

The future shape and financing of Network Rail

Consultation summary and analysis

Appendix C: Individuals' online responses
(Presented alphabetically by surname)



Tamsin Bacchus

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Tamsin Bacchus

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

Tamsin Bacchus

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

I do not have the knowledge or experience to answer your specific questions - being just an interested observer and occasional passenger. I have though read the report with interest - the matter being brought to my attention by one of the members of the body I work for. I admire the politically neutral tone throughout but will be unashamedly political myself. I always felt that the privatisation of the railways was a step too far and was relieved when Network Rail was brought back into public ownership. (In my direct experience the different franchisees running into London Bridge/Charing Cross and Cannon Street has reduced the flexibility of service options.) I am concerned at the hints in the report that political pressure may be brought to bear to take steps that go toward re-privatisation. And would urge you to resist this. Found comfort in paragraph 5.19 where you said that you would disregard in your recommendation the alleged need to reduce the public sector borrowing requirement. I have been involved in much campaigning - both in connection with work and as an individual - regarding the fate of the NHS and would urge you to take into consideration the downsides of PFI agreements. They can sometimes benefit the public in getting capital projects built that would otherwise not see the light of day but all too often the effect is simply to syphon off public money into the private finance sector with long service and maintenance agreements and - in the health service at present - punishing rates of interest servicing contracts entered into prior to 2008. There is also the implicit threat in TTIP and ISDR reducing flexibility if the profits, or potential profits, of any international corporation are threatened by the requirement new regulation to meet changing circumstances. So I highly commend your work - but would urge you to stand firm in your recommendations and not give way to short-term political pressure. Like the NHS the railways are crucial to our

Tamsin Bacchus

society. The NHS has received body-blows from the Right and Left in politics - the governments of Thatcher and Major setting out the route to privatisation by stealth (see Letwin's book) and Brown, desperate to be seen to be keeping borrowing down mortgaging the future to PFI.

Peter Bailey

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

I wish there to be a publicly owned comprehensive rail network encompassing all aspects of rail service delivery.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

Future confidence depends upon a stable political view of rail ownership and management

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Don't know

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Don't know

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Track and signalling failures and engineering work frequently disrupt services.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Social media, feedback forms on trains, push buttons on stations, statistics published in real time, better explanations of problems and their solutions - with timetables for resolution.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

Building pride in a national service.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Disaggregating the network will lead to unacceptable inter-service demarcation disputes, poor coordination, buck-passing, transaction and communication costs and errors, inappropriate competition and demoralisation.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

Don't know

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Purchasing, accounting, HR, advertising, communication, coordination, planning, significant event and serious incident management and analysis.

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

Don't know

Peter Bailey

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

Not relevant

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Uncertainty leads to planning blight.

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Don't know

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Don't know

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

French, German and Italian national rail systems.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Unitary, publicly owned body.

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

A culture in which "Every Defect is a Treasure" supporting all to recognise and mitigate risk and safety issues, quality problems and other significant events.

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

No

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

Safety, efficiency, cost control, investment framework, public pride and worker satisfaction in the system

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

It is entirely appropriate that the performance of the rail system should affect the government's fiscal balance sheet. Therefore the RAB remains relevant.

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

By public ownership

Peter Bailey

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Through central taxation

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

Sovereign governments can choose what resources they put in to infrastructure.

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

I do not think that private sector capital is relevant to rail provision.

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Government bond holders.

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

Not useful

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

Not useful

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

No

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

No

Jon Barden

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Network rail should be focused on providing the best railway transport infrastructure possible whilst remaining in Public ownership. We do not want or need a repeat of Railtrack and the thought of a for profit company or even a trust type arrangement does not feel me with confidence.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Network rail as an "arms length" relationship to the transport minister is ideal if a way of ministers not being responsible for their decisions. I would prefer the ministers to be accountable for their decisions and not have a fudge that we have at the moment.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

No, that is how safety is diminished.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

Making the transport minister more accountable

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

No, but if free access and greater services are to be sought a better framework for timetabling may be required.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

Please, Please how can a co-ordinated transport system be achieved if it is all decentralised to the nenth degree?

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

None

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

Jon Barden

None

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

None

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

lack of certainty by the political masters, let's face it a opening of the Woodhead route would be great as part of the Northern Powerhouse but as yet the politicians have yet to realise this and this only makes Network Rail's job even harder.

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Nationalised, accountable with clear political accountabilities.

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Jon Barden

As part of the National debt as any other option would leave it open to the vagaries of the market and would not be in the long term interests of the nation as a whole.

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

A mix of direct governmental/EU funding and payment from train operating companies.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

The botched privatisation and the resulting dash to purchase GM/GE Diesel locomotives has left the nation worse off. Instead we need a push for more electrification and the use of Electric traction with possibly "the last mile" on board diesel capacity.

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

Responsible, co-ordinated and remaining a public asset. Private sector capital if used requires guaranteed returns and this is not in the nations interest.

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Obviously... None remain in public ownership.

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

I feel that the bias towards private funding is irrational and only of interest to the treasury and the more right wing of the politicians.

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

None

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Please consider the country as a whole. History has shown that short term political bias is of no use in the long term provision of transport infrastructure. Beeching decimated the railways and privatisation brought short term issues to the fore and safety along with pretty much everything else went out of the window.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

leonie bennett

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

leonie bennett

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

leonie bennett

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Why are Network Rail's neighbours are treated so badly that they are not even invited to comment? Are they not equal contributors to the massive tax-payer subsidies Network Rail receive? (£3.7billions in 2013/14 - Page 54)

Why are Network Rail encouraged to pour all the pollution of their industry into the very heart of residential districts, while motorways are diverted around settlements?

Why are the neighbours of Network Rail not protected from excessive noise or vibration?

To whom is Network Rail accountable regarding environmental pollution?

Why is Network Rail exempted, by law, from criminal and civil prosecution?

Why does Network Rail fiercely resist using technology to reduce noise and vibration?

NOTE that Oxford City Council passed the following motion:

Residents of Upper Wolvercote have been frequent complainants, for 6 months or so, to Oxford City Council and Network Rail during construction of the new east/west rail link.

Reasons include excessive noise, fumes, and vibrations causing damage to nearby houses, and by the felling of nearly all mature trees on embankments – in spite of Network Rail's claim to be an environmentally conscious and sensitive organisation .

Network Rail has exercised its statutory right to carry out engineering operations on railway land without external sanction.

The Public Inquiry Inspector recommended conditions, endorsed by the Secretary of State, that are mainly concerned with rail service operations, not construction, and the City has not found them useful in monitoring or preventing poor practice during construction.

Council, therefore, calls on central government to pass legislation removing all permitted development rights for projects on railway land, and requiring railway operators to apply to the local planning authority for detailed planning permission for engineering operations on railway land – as with any other landowner. Landscaping issues would need to be included in any application, as well as good construction practice details. Administration costs and costs

leonie bennett

of officers' time and consultants' services would be paid by applicants, and exemptions would be safety related projects.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

Geof Branch

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Privatisation has been an absolute disaster.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

Probably

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Minimal

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

No

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Not at all

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Yes. The network should be brought back into public ownership with a strong customer/passenger representation on the board

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

Public ownership

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

N/a

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

No

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

N/A

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

N/A

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

N/a

Geof Branch

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Privatisation has not proved to benefit the travelling public

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Privatisation has not proved to benefit the travelling public

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Privatisation has not proved to benefit the travelling public

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Public ownership of the railways

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Public ownership of the railways

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

Ditto

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

The benefit to the public - travellers, passengers. The continued privatisation of the railways does not confer much benefit.

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

No

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Public ownership

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Public ownership

Geof Branch

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

N/a

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

N/a

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Public investment

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

N/a

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

None

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

nn

Averil Cameron

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

There should be more and better, ie more detailed, consultation of and information for people living alongside lines most affected.

Network Rail also needs to be required to invest in noise abatement and environmental measures.

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

I do not think that Network Rail is sufficiently accountable to the people directly affected by its plans

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

I am a resident living alongside the line affected in North Oxford and also near the HS2 planned development north of Euston, but I am not a 'customer'. The needs of residents and those most affected should also be highlighted.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Network Rail is not sufficiently accountable in my view.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

Averil Cameron

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

Averil Cameron

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Environmental impact is not sufficiently provided for, and the same applies to the impact of noise levels on local residents.

I do not think that Network Rail should enjoy exemptions from the planning process

Timothy Cribb

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

It is the nature of a system that its parts interact, so despite the complexity it's essential to have a point where the interactions can be seen comprehensively and hence comprehendingly. The Hatfield disaster taught a bitter lesson that security cannot be treated in isolation from the other functions. A TOC, as an acting part within a system, is clearly not in a position to see the system as a whole. Delegation by contracting out secures legal controls through contractual specifications and the time-limits of contracts enables monitoring by results.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

Not that I'm aware, but a professional may well suggest some.

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

A matrix model of management seems for a complex system with a long history seems appropriate. To work, it depends on a mature culture of cooperation and understanding that allows initiatives and common sense. Otherwise there's a risk of bureaucratic petrification.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

No. You mainly have the TOCs in mind as customers, but they are only the agents of delivery for passengers and freight operators, who are the primary customers. Freight operators get occasional mention, but not nearly enough. Local and regional interest groups, local and regional authorities speaking for their populations are similarly neglected. They could supply much information on needs and expectations mentioned in 5.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

I can't tell from this report. There are no measures. Numbers of journeys, tonnage of deliveries tell only what's happened, not what's needed or expected.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Yes, by as it were enfranchising local and regional groups mentioned in 4.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

The answers should be available from research. Why did the railways lose the Royal Mail contract to road haulage? What incentives would have retained the contract? There must be similar cases.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

The current structure is reflective-reactive rather than entrepreneurial-creative. Britain's economic integration with the European market means there is a need for cross-country East-West routes between the East coast ports, the Midlands, the South West, Wales and the North West, a need currently met by increasing lorry traffic. A Felixstowe to Birmingham line would be more useful than HS2 (though that's needed too).

Timothy Cribb

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

One of the objectives of devolution is to access local knowledge but it's not clear how devolution through TOCs achieves this. See answer to Q.4.

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Commission of rolling stock.

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

More consultation with vested commercial interests, appropriate institutions, and local elected bodies as sources of information and ideas. For instance, world authorities on urban transport planning in my university have recently started working with the local authority on its transport plan.

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

The obvious one would be relief of traffic congestion on road routes to other towns and cities currently overburdened with freight.

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

The five-yearly system seems appropriate.

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

I'm not competent to comment.

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Not competent to comment.

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Universities such as Cranfield, Manchester, Cambridge could be drawn on for international expertise.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Given the matrix nature of the current management approach, it's difficult to see how other providers could be introduced without disruption.

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

Timothy Cribb

Not competent to comment.

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

I'm not involved in such processes.

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

The fact that the funding now appears on the national fiscal account, while correct in terms of public accounting for a public service, should not be allowed to sway decisions on what's needed for the rail system. These should be operationally rational, not political.

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

A very technical question to put to a layman. From the Review's description of the current operation it looks satisfactory.

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

As at present, i.e. the national government is the appropriate ultimate guarantor of a public monopoly service. Contrast banks!

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

The partial privatisation represented in the middle column of your spectrum seems both desirable and appropriate.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

Pass,

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

If private capital is introduced it should be on normal private capital terms, i.e. the tax payer should not secure the risk.

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Green energy companies clearly have a big future and may well supply energy for rail.

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

Answer as for 25.

Timothy Cribb

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

Pass.

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

The idea of risk appears to be purely financial. That's not adequate for an industry which has a social benefit dimension. Risk analysis should include assessment of the risks of not pursuing developments as well as of pursuing them and the metrics of the risks should be social as well as financial.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

When the report talks about investments it seems to have either government or commercial companies in mind. Is there not a role at various levels for social investors, such as user groups, institutions, local authorities? Their motives would be the functional utility to them, i.e the social benefit.

Robert Dagleish

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Robert Dalglish

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

Robert Dalglish

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

The Report Team should further consider the fundamental and inherent lack of common purpose between the core objectives of developing a national asset for the benefit of all (including the non-paying natural environment) and making a private investment for monetary gain. A primary commitment to the provision and improvement of a public good (a developing rail network attracting more users) is a poor fit with the primary profit motive of removing as much wealth as possible from the assets concerned.

Robert Davidson

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

The document is sensible but seems to infer that the current state of the rest of the UK railway is satisfactory and unchangeable. Clearly neither is true.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

"Without vision we perish"

It seems that the means for getting a collective UK railway vision is entirely absent.

There are so many folks pulling in opposite directions that it is hard to imagine how progress is ever to occur if no one is in a position to

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

The cost to the UK government of providing railway services has risen greatly (well above inflation) since the days of British Rail.

This is in a background of substantial growth: it is not unreasonable to ask where all the extra funds have gone. Has the industry not developed into a large group of self-serving companies masquerading as customers?

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Satisfactorily but those around and affected by the railway feel they have not been involved and are stakeholders too.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Not very well.

Costs are far too high, systems are too complex, competition is a sham and information scant.

The expectations are well out of line with reality: both are wrong!

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

There is no need for this if those really in charge have the customers and the country's best interests at heart.

Customers should really include all those affected by the railway, i.e. most of the population.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

If the real cost of disrupted journeys was charged, the railway would be a very different place.

Many customers of the UK railway are incredibly affected by problems in just one part: the system is essentially a series system in which it is almost impossible

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

No, better integration is needed and a unified management.

It can and did work.

Robert Davidson

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

It seems that those with areas responsibility cannot feel the railway is "theirs" and treat it as just another bit of kit belonging to someone else.

Buck-passing and short-termism are bound to result.

Good central control and stable long term "owning" of

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

The long term strategies (e.g. for rolling stock research & development) would be much better done centrally.

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

-

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

-

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

The current system seems so constrained and lacking in vision.

See above for notes: Q7.

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Seems to be a nightmare from beginning to end: complex operations, with inadequate & short term staff without long term understanding.

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Projects (i.e. short term work) is all very well but if the core of the organisation is too small then the core competencies cannot continue from group of staff to the next.

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

The key is a united team with vision, unfettered by legal disputes, running the railway for everyone's benefit.

Quite like British Rail Network SouthEast at its best under Chris Green?

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

See above.

Robert Davidson

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

Yes, treating all those affected by the railway as customers.

Interfaces, decent ones with road transport: incredibly poor at present.

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

All unnecessary if run with vision by a suitable motivated central organisation.

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

See above for my suggestions.

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

-

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

I think it would best managed as a government department.

Do what is sensible and not what we can't afford.

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

By the taxpayer via the government.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

It may be unfashionable, but British Rail was the envy of the continental railways.

Whilst there have been some silly EU rules since then, integrated organisations working for the benefit of all concerned (rather than just shareholders) have got to be the

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

-

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

-

Robert Davidson

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

-

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

Short-termism tends to dominate: all railway projects are essentially long term (20-40 years) not beloved of private companies.

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Yes:-

The effect of one "customer" or company on all the others.

A much more robust system is urgently needed.

All tracks & signalling to be reversible, etc.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

I feel the way the whole industry and government are going is a collective abdication of any vision and duty to the UK population and a continual pandering to company shareholders.

The government IS perfectly capable of running a railway (and an NHS, etc.) it is chooses: private capital has proven deficient already and by its fiduciary duty to its shareholders always will.

David Dry

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Renationalise the railways

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

David Dry

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

In need of renationalisatio

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

David Dry

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Renationalisation

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Renationalise the railways

Mark Edon

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

I would like the railways to be nationalised so that the dividends currently being paid out to various profit making organisations can instead be reinvested into the railways.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

Mark Edon

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Nationalisation. Running there always for the benefit of the passengers and the wider economy and being accountable to parliament.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

Mark Edon

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure? There are many successful and well invested nationalised railways around the world.

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

David Fenner

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Network Rail's principle functions should be to timetable the operation of the railway network and to operate that network to deliver the agreed timetable. To achieve this task it needs to also maintain and renew the network assets in a manner that does not damage network performance. Finally in a railway that is experiencing growth Network Rail, in conjunction with TOC's, FOC's and Government must plan and organise execution of enhancements to increase capacity. It is possible that enhancements, especially "green field" ones could be dealt with by others but any interfaces with current infrastructure will need to be coordinated with Network Rail and may impact on other locations on the overall route. Network Rail will have many trackside assets some of which may well be suitable as sources of revenue (e.g. arches for rent).

The above definitions would suggest that perhaps Network Rail do not need to have a significant role in operating and managing stations beyond the platform interface. The issue then is how another organisation would operate the station such that passenger throughput is maintained or increased and with equal service to all TOC's running services from the station (or freight terminal). This structure would be reminiscent of the airlines where one organisation operates the airspace and plane schedules whilst the airports are each operated by different organisations. Airlines are however significantly different in not being confined to a specific track thus not subject to the degree of scheduling inherent in a railway.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

No specific Comment

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

No specific comment

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

No specific comment

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

No specific comment

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

It is difficult to see how direct customer pressure on Network Rail can improve the situation, given that often the customers will have pressures operating in different directions. For example passenger TOC's would prefer line closures at night whereas in

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

No specific comment

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

David Fenner

The structure of Network Rail is a major challenge. It is arguable that the current route structure is not ideal but then one giant monolith isn't either. My key comment in this area is that the network is becoming increasingly integrated. Thameslink will join the Southern and London North East Routes in a significant way providing up to half the traffic on each route between Bedford/Peterborough/Cambridge and Gatwick/Brighton. Similarly Crossrail will significantly impact on Western and Anglia although in this case the focus will dominantly be on the slow or local lines of those routes. And in future the probability of Crossrail 2 is increasing and will generate further integration.

Similarly the increasing drive for better and faster transpennine services and electrification will increasingly blur the boundaries between LNE and LNW but neither would a Northern Powerhouse Route work since significant traffic is on a north south axis and almost certainly will remain that way even after HS2 because of access to other centres.

Devolution does potentially work for Scotland as, at least until HS2, journey times to many parts of England make flying the preferred option and there is minimal "local" traffic across the border.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

Given the increasing integration of the network as outlined above it is essential that timetable planning is centralised and thus the "Route" can only operate in a "day to day" mode within a tight set of conditions arising from engineering standards and h

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

See my comment to Q18 concerning suitable and sufficient resources, especially skilled.

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

No specific comment

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

No specific comment

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

No specific comment

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

No specific comment

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

David Fenner

It is perhaps notable that major station renovation schemes seem to progress on time and budget as do some other largely “greenfield” or well defined projects. Is this because they require limited interference with train running and focus the disruption t

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

No specific comment

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Infrastructure by its nature is a monopoly system, at least locally and in the case of our rail and road systems it is essentially highly integrated so that journeys can be made between disparate places as required by the ultimate user. In addition the ra

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

A major issue which has had limited exposure through the document is the availability of competent resources. Some of these are engineering, some are in timetable planning and some are in operating the railway day to day. All have resource limitations tha

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

As mentioned under the response to Q15 it is doubtful that major line of route projects are have sufficient time to be developed within one Control Period cycle and certainly not in the time between HLOS and final determination.

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

No specific comment

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

No specific comment

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

No specific comment

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

No specific comment

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

No specific comment

David Fenner

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

No specific comment

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

No specific comment

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

No specific comment

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

No specific comment

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

No specific comment

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Figure 3 should not appear in the final report in its current form. The way the trains are shown in the diagram significantly over states the capacity benefits of moving block and thus has the potential to undermine the thinking on other parts of the report. Optimal 4 aspect colour light signalling provides a minimum separation of trains at full line speed of two empty blocks (the braking distance) behind the front train with the next service in the third block (not quite as shown in your diagram). Moving block allows the second train to run at constant distance behind the first, not wait until a discrete section has been cleared. If full braking distance and the same line speed are assumed then the boxes around each train in the moving block example need to be equal to two blocks in the 4 aspect signal case. There are two options that could apply to your moving block diagram. Firstly trains could run at reduced speed, but this is already possible with conventional signalling with trains running slower on yellow signals or if less than braking distance was permitted between trains. The later would be a major departure from current practice and since trains cannot swerve would sooner or later end in a major disaster.

In addition this only accounts for the technical headway, i.e. the absolute minimum separation to maintain speed. In practice on a mixed traffic railway the variability in train performance, the different stopping patterns and station dwell times all result in the operational headway being further extended. This further erodes, but does not eliminate the benefits of moving block.

My concern is that your diagram implies at least a doubling of capacity, from 2 to 4 trains. In practice the benefit will be significantly less probably around 15%.

Ed Furst

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Fine

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Ed Furst

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

Ed Furst

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Make the questionnaire shorter. A long questionnaire makes it look as though you hope respondents will run out of steam and go away.

Ann Godfrey

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Network Rail would work better in public ownership.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

Yes. Public ownership's advantages.

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

They would be better done if in public ownership.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

N/a

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Not very effectively. They would be better met under public ownership.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

No

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

No

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

The network should on no account be disaggregated. It should work as one harmonious network. The best way to achieve this would be through public ownership.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

No. There will always be difficulties with such a disjointed structure. The rail network and all rail companies should be brought back into public ownership.

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

The whole network would benefit from economies of scale if in public ownership as one entity.

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

Public ownership.

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

I am retired.

Ann Godfrey

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

It is currently inevitably very disjointed.

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Very disjointed.

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Very disjointed.

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Yes. Countries in which there is public ownership of utilities.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

One national structure in public ownership.

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

No

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

No

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

No comment

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

No comment

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Through public ownership.

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Through public ownership.

Ann Godfrey

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

No comment.

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

The private sector should be removed from involvement in network rail.

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Investors who would wish a large return on their investments, to the detriment of the rail network.

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

Public ownership is the right form of financing.

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

No comment.

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

No comment.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

No comment

Professor David Hands

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

They should be widened to include operation of train services to gain the quality and cost improvements of a fully integrated and publicly owned railway network

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

Scope of the study was too limited by not including rail operating companies.
Study has underestimated the significance of the safety and quality failures post Hadfield

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Requires arms length corporate public body to plan and operate integrated rail network

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Yes

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

NR is impeded by not being able to control the operating companies

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Yes, through specifically constituted national and regional customer councils

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

Pride in delivery of an integrated national service

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Network should be further aggregated, not disaggregated. HS2 is a doubtful investment.
Money should be spent instead on improving existing infrastructure

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

See above

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Integrating operating companies with strategic planning and infrastructure through an integrated single corporate structure at national level

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

See above

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

Professor David Hands

If the proposal I have described above were to be implemented I believe that rail services in the UK could be planned and provided much more cost-effectively

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Strength: National organisation and funding

Weakness: unable to gain benefits from more cost effective operation of services

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

having to negotiate with operating companies

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

No idea

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Look at former NHS structure before imposition of internal market

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Ability to integrate all aspects of planning and delivery through a single national organisation

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

"Bottom up" assessment of passenger needs aggregated towards a national plan

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

No need for current bureaucratic review mechanisms: should be replaced by proper corporate governance and passenger representative mechanisms

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

N/A

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

no

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Through a single corporate and transparent integrated national organisation

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Professor David Hands

Through earnings from passenger revenue from satisfied passengers supplemented by limited public subsidy when necessary

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure? Look at British Rail and do a proper comparative study!

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

Private sector capital is more expensive to the public purse (see PFI disasters across the public sector). The public sector can borrow money more cheaply and invest it more cost effectively

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Not interested in anything other than investment funded either by new British Rail or government

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

Private sector investment is not relevant

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

Not necessary

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

See above

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

See above comments on too limited scope of study which leads to a biased outcome

Rosemary Harris

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Rosemary Harris

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

Rosemary Harris

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Network Rail behave as bullies to their lineside neighbours. They have caused damage to my property and have failed or refused to remedy the damage, which is now in the hands of my insurance company. They trespass on my land. They have carried out NIGHT TIME works with NO prior notice on a regular basis - on one occasion there there 2 weeks night time works replacing the track and re-ballasting during the two week A level exam period when I had students living in my home, other times in the night they were drilling bore holes a few feet from my bedroom window with shouting and swearing and radios blasting. The current works were predicted to take 3 months working from 7am until 7 pm at but after more than six months working SIX days per week directly outside my property, these heavy construction works which are very noisy ALL day long, are no where near finished. Although I am eligible for noise insulation to my home in the form of new windows once the new track is operational and it was agreed that this would be provided prior to the noisy construction works commencing, Network Rail have failed to provide this additional noise insulation so I have suffered unnecessary stress and nuisance. During the last SIX months of construction, my house regularly rocks from side to side or trembles from the vibration which is very frightening when you are in the house. The noise levels are so bad all day long, that it is impossible to concentrate or block out the noise. Although the construction code of practice claims that noise will be reduced where ever possible, as one example, it took four months of complaints about a noisy generator which had a terrible metallic rattle for it to be replaced and as another example the contractors have refused in SIX months to provide any temporary noise barriers for their exceptionally noisy works. In addition, rather than using smaller plant that reduce the noise they have appeared only to use the largest plant. I have had to have numerous meetings with the Site Manager encouraging him to ensure that this staff and sub-contractors behave reasonably for example when they are digging out the cutting by not using unnecessary force which shakes my house, none of which I should need

Rosemary Harris

to have done if Network Rail was properly regulated in respect of rules governing behaviour to its lineside neighbours.

There appears a complete resistance by Network Rail to use any technology which would reduce the nuisance of construction or maintenance works or to provide prior notification of maintenance works. Although, there is a helpline number for complaints, it can take hours to get through during the night and then if I actually manage to report the issue, nothing happens - the complaints are not usually even acknowledged and there are no response and when I call back there is no record that I had previously made a complaint. There needs to be a mechanism for overseeing and dealing with complaints.

I recently carried out a FOI request asking for the costs versus benefits of all technology to reduce noise and vibration for lineside neighbours including rail dampers. Network Rail claimed that they did not hold this information. (I will provide a copy of Network Rail's response separately). It is alarming that a public entity such as Network Rail with so many lineside residents has never carried out an exercise to determine the costs versus benefits of different types of noise barriers, under track matting, soft pads etc.

In the Noise Scheme of Assessment, which was approved by our local authority, it showed that my bedroom window closest to the track was not eligible for noise insulation but that my upstairs bedroom windows further from the track were, which makes no sense but no one has been able to explain how this is possible. Clearly, Network Rail require providing much more accurate noise maps.

Throughout most of the day during the last six months there are several plant in a cutting directly alongside my property. Often their engines are switched on and they are not moving for several minutes waiting for a space to go into the tunnel. The diesel fumes coming up the cutting into my home are appalling and stink out my home and garden.

There is almost constant noise of reversing sirens because the large plant cannot turn around in the cutting which is in addition to the heavy construction noise and vibration.

By contrast, the local authority who are carrying out road works the other side of my property at the same time and when I complained about excessive noise, they provided noise barriers which made a huge difference.

In summary, Network Rail have a large number of lineside residents and they need to behave responsibly which they clearly do not do, so there needs to be a proper independent regulator to ensure that our lives are not a misery and we can have reasonable prospect of having some quality of life in the future and that our buildings are not damaged and that if they are (in my case) that Network Rail puts right that damage.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

David Henshaw

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

It is too remote from the users of the network. We sometimes complained about British Rail, but it was a wonderfully accountable organisation compared to Network Rail

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

I don't think so, but you have not given any serious thought to renationalisation

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Network Rail doesn't seem to be accountable to anyone, other than paying inflated compensation to very grateful private sector franchisees. This is absurd.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

No relevant to me... see below in 6.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Well, I can look around here in Dorset and Somerset and identify 50 simple enhancement projects that would make a vast difference to the reliability and effectiveness of the railways. But virtually none are even on the long-distance planning ladder, because

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

My view is that the railway as a whole should be renationalised, with the exception of freight carriers and some outsourcing of rail enhancement projects as below

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

There has to be a fairly straightforward formula for rewarding managers in Network Rail for good planning and on-time, on-budget enhancements.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

I would certainly have allowed some experiments with vertical integration. Merseyrail and Chiltern spring to mind. Government's failure to bite the bullet and allow such experiments is shameful. Network Rail needs a yardstick against which to measure its performance and find new ways of operating efficiently.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

I really don't know, but stronger local management is always good

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

I don't want to see Network Rail broken up, because there must be functions that are best handled from the centre

David Henshaw

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

Not sure

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

Only as a rail traveller... any large-scale change would be a serious problem, holding up vital enhancements even further

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

The company is much too risk-averse, and remote from the needs of the travelling public

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Slow, and generally behind schedule and over-budget

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Some small projects seem to go well. And some medium-size projects too. But the very large schemes have been appallingly planned.

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

For enhancements the Red Tape has to be hacked away, allowing a degree of competition. Network Rail should have to bid for enhancements against private companies

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

The problem with Network Rail is that it's fundamentally flawed, through being the remnants of a nationalised company, forced into the private sector, then hastily renationalised when that model failed. But altering the structure is only going to make ma

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

Yes! It's over-burdened with needless regulations and rules. This goes far beyond sensible Health & Safety into absurd territory. It's no wonder projects run over budget

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

I am not involved, other than as an observer

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

Endless assessment is not the way! Network rail has to be in a fit state to do the job without endless assessments

David Henshaw

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

I can only say that it's clearly not working now!

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

It's clearly not accountable now, and there has to be a means of holding managers accountable without making them even more risk-averse!

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

The company is still dealing with the last 50 years of under-investment and de-investment in the form of pointless rationalisation, such as track singling that is now having to be reversed at huge expense. Meanwhile, it has been asked to go from zero elec

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

I think is best practise in many other countries that could be adopted, but I don not have detailed knowledge. America seems to be able to see projects through in a much more cost-effective way, with a refreshing lack of Red Tape. Switzerland has immacula

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

I'm not quite sure I understand how private capital would be cheaper or more effective. Private expertise by all means

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Only local authorities, and very grudgingly, because they are well aware of how useless and profligate the organisation can be. If a local authority needs a particular enhancement, it should be allowed to invite other infrastructure companies to bid for t

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

No idea

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

not relevant to me

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

David Henshaw

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

I think I've covered everything. As already mentioned, I can't see why private sector cannot be brought to bid for stand-alone projects, such as the Borders Railway. No-one seems to have been willing to bid for that because the whole thing was so complex. The private sector just wants to bid on individual engineering projects, and they can generally do it cheaply and efficiently

Simon Higgs

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Simon Higgens

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Thank you for sight of the Shaw Report Scoping document and for the opportunity to provide comment.

Before I provide an answer to one of your questions, I think it useful that I provide some context as to my background. I joined the railway industry just

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

Simon Higgens

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

John Hinchliffe

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

It should ensure that we have an efficient rail service throughout the UK.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

I'm sure you will have chosen the factors you mention because it suits your ideology.

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

It should be accountable to the electorate through parliament. It should remain in public ownership. Previous privatisation contributed to disasterous accidents with many people killed.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Yes

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Our needs as users are met very well and this would not be enhanced by privatisation.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

No. The government / parliament can regulate and pressure Network Rail as required.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

The government / parliament can insist on what Network Rail delivers, and ensure that it does so. Incentives are not necessary.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

A good start would be opening up the services Beeching destroyed in the 1960s. Disaggregating leads to lack of integration.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

All responsibilities should be more centralised to develop a more integrated service. Routes should be nationalised and integrated and not privately fragmented.

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Economies of scale should be enjoyed more in an integrated nationalised rail service

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

How is a service user meant to answer that!

John Hinchliffe

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

As a service user build on what you have rather than try to build something new.

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

I thought that was your brief.

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

How as a service user would I know that.

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

No idea.

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

You tell me!

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Accountability and an ability to deliver a safe efficient service.

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

The ability to consult with the public in an effective manner. This survey is appalling!! We are not all economists! Although my first degree was in that I had great difficulty understanding these questions.

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

I don't understand this!

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

Is it good for service users.

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

Even as a finance economist this is rather meaningless to me.

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Sensibly.

John Hinchliffe

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

By taxpayers, service users, and government.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

I do not have that knowledge.

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

Private capital requires profit to be made for them. The state should invest in the infrastructure and the service. Increase taxes to create a world class network.

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Greedy ones.

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

Projects should be funded by the public sector.

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

No idea

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Unfortunately there seems to be a belief that private ownership and private investment is superior to state ownership. Denationalisation does not have a positive track record - the fragility of electricity supplies, fragmentation of rail services, the death of coal, reliance on Russian gas, water owned by God knows who. Capital and capitalism cannot be relied on to deliver - remember the banking crisis!

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Consider that the railways should be totally in public ownership.

Edward Humphreys

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

OMRE should remain as core functions. So called ancillary functions should be retained. There is unlikely to be benefit in complex outsourcing or adding to industry complexity. The temptation to create a vertically integrated railway should be resisted as this will undermine FOCs and open access passenger operations promoted under EU rail reform packages.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

NR needs to develop a strong view on where its enhancement investment should be made. Although NR has a near monopoly of rail infrastructure in GB it is not a monopolist in transport because road dominates and is priced politically. Therefore, NR's prices

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Yes, as organised at present. The ORR is not the customer but it seems more likely that the DfT will become the customer.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

they are largely met but at unacceptably high cost.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Through the political process. Also by longer passenger franchises. The relative weakness of FOCs is a problem that should be carefully addressed. Channelling more funds through TOCs to NR to get them off public sector books could unbalance the treatment

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

Gear senior salaries explicitly to delivery. Do not reward failure. Reward efficiency using industry benchmarks in a more decentralised structure.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

There is a case for route/area structure focussed on different markets/ core businesses. BR's Ofor Q demonstrated this. It would require careful rules of asset management and sharing for which there is precedent. Geography (is there a plural?) is of secondary importance.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

Strong central functions (timetable planning, network vision, procurement etc) are needed. Route /area management should be incentiveised to deliver the infrastructure required by operators and compete for funds allocated by the central body on the basis

Edward Humphreys

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

There is unlikely to be a case for devolving timetable planning, capacity planning, research (this is very weak now) or various corporate services. All, however, require liaison with route/area level. This does not mean that HQ needs to be big.

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

No answer

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

N/A

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Over-complex and not based on clear long term vision. NR has insufficient influence over HLOS. The problem of how to foster long term vision in NR despite changes in political priorities remains. a more arms length relationship with government is needed. T

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

The main weakness appears to be loss of memory; strengths are not clear. Privatisation stripped out many BR managers. Recruitment from other industries at senior level did not help (hence Hatfield etc). You now have NR largely led by managers without deep r

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

No answer

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

No time to answer fully.

Learn from the long term Chiltern trains franchise and Project Evergreen.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Must be independent of TOCs and FOCs
needs clear long term objectives
needs a simpler planning process.

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

Edward Humphreys

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

There should be stronger inputs from regional LU/development plans.

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

*promotion of cost-effective enhancements

*partnership funding on projects with shared benefits and costs between customer and provider

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

No answer

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Mitigate risk by understanding what is driving growth and by establishing stable well-based costing so that the scale of financial risk can be better understood.

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Stronger regional funding by devolved/regional government with substantial funds allocated by central government with as few strings as possible.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

No answer

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

No answer

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

No answer

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

No answer

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

No answer

Edward Humphreys

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

You have not addressed the key issues of lack of integration of passenger rail operators, and rail and bus operators.

The role of railways and other public transport in the longer term is not being addressed.

The overriding problem is cost control. The ORR has not controlled costs and may not be independent enough. NR structure is of secondary importance to cost control. We could have met much more of projected growth if costs had been contained as BR achieved.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

DfT involvement in HLOS development seems to have resulted in inappropriate projects such as the "Electric Spine". Such schemes need strong railway and transport economics inputs to avoid weak or strange agendas.

Chris Irwin

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Network Rail should be responsible for the maintenance and development of the UK's rail infrastructure. It should be required to do this in environmental sustainable ways and to manage the land that it owns in accordance with the same planning guidelines and constraints that apply to local authorities and central government.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

There is little mention of the interests of those who live adjacent to the rail lines and who are affected every day by the noise, vibration and pollution generated by the rail network. Since we all as taxpayers contribute to funding the rail network, the

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

The current accountability arrangements for new developments do not work well, as what is agreed as conditions of development at public enquiries and at planning stage gets changed by Network Rail without adequate accountability.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

You need to include those who live next to the rail network, as they are impacted by the service.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Most people complain about the high prices and the late services. We should be able to do better. We, as a country need to invest more in the rail infrastructure, but it must be effectively managed so that the money is not wasted.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Yes, but privatising the rail network will not help, as it will create a conflict between the customers interests and those of the shareholders.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

There needs to be better rail links to our major airports especially Heathrow (from the west) without having to go into London, and between Gatwick and Heathrow.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Chris Irwin

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

Chris Irwin

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

I think Network Rail should remain in public ownership as it is a key aspect of our national infrastructure. We have already seen how badly it can go wrong when privatised, let's not repeat the mistake, better to improve its governance and accountability

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Why are Network Rail's neighbours treated so poorly, since they are not even invited to comment? As taxpayers we should have the right to have a say.

Why are Network Rail encouraged to develop railways running through Densely populated residential districts, causing increased noise, vibration and air pollution while motorways are diverted around settlements, and are not allowed to cause such pollution?

why Are those living near Network Rail land not protected from excessive noise or vibration?

To whom is Network Rail accountable regarding environmental pollution?

Why is Network Rail exempted, by law, from criminal and civil prosecution? This should not be allowed.

Why does Network Rail seem to resist using technology to reduce noise and vibration?

Chris Irwin

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

Mike Jackson

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Mike Jackson

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

It is too important a part of our overall superstructure as a nation to be left in the hands of the for-profit sector simply because this suits the ideology of a political party. Under state control the East Coast mainline performed better in all respects

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

Mike Jackson

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Greed-driven, self-serving investors who will have no sense of responsibility other than to themselves. They will seek to drive down wages and drive up fares (as has been the story of the railways since privatisation).

There'll be no shortage of this typ

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

You only have to look back over the past 30 years to get some clues here. Undoubtedly number one is to put state assets on the market at a fraction of their real worth. George Osborne can give you some tips on this from his recent dealings with privatisin

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Well there is the small matter of the theft of a nationalised railway system that land my forebears invested in with our taxes for two generations. No-one has been investigated.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

John Jefferis

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

We need a single, publicly-owned body to develop and manage the railways. Network Rail's operation can be improved, but we must also learn from the mistakes of the past. Breaking up or selling off parts of Network Rail's operations would lead to fragmentation, confused priorities and reduced accountability. There is no reason why the railway tracks should not be owned and run by the state in the same way as the road system

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

Network Rail should have a structure that helps the railway to grow. The existing structure can be a hindrance to this. There needs to be better, clearer, long-term planning for the railways. This should go beyond the five year Control Periods. Five years

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

The voice of passengers should be stronger in deciding national priorities for the future of the railways and local priorities for better services and stations. Network Rail needs to have structures and processes to that directly include passengers' views and interests.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

The Rail Operators are your direct customers, but it is the travelling public who are your real customers. It is they who need to be consulted, as local commerce and prosperity is dependant on a good rail network. There should therefore be greater public passenger voice in running and decision making.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Not at all. Look at London Bridge station, look at Finsbury Park last year. The public have had no say at all

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

One way of doing this would be to establish a board for each franchise area, where important partners like the train operators, local authorities and passengers could meet regularly with Network Rail.

There could also be a team of people in Network Rail

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

At the moment, Network Rail has little responsibility for passenger satisfaction - it only matters whether or not the trains run on time.

Network Rail, passengers, train operators and others like local authorities need to work together to make sure is h

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

John Jefferis

While Network Rail needs to stay as a single, national organisation, it is important that planning for the railways is joined up with other transport planning. That means Network Rail having the structure and staff to work much more closely with local authorities for example. There is no case for re-privatising all or part of Network Rail.

It is important to learn lessons from the catastrophic failure of Railtrack. By separating management of the tracks from the trains, Railtrack fragmented the railways in ways it is still struggling to cover from. None of the problems facing the railways would be solved by going back down this route.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

The balance between routes and the centre is not currently at the right level.

Our railways need to be outward looking. Network Rail's role should include helping support other objectives like housing, the economy and road congestion. Devolving more power

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

The whole network needs to be properly integrated, not just between routes and between Operating Companies, but between buses, roads and air transport. This can only be achieved by having a central integrated transport policy and operating system.

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

Integration is the key and this can only be achieved by nationalisation

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

n/a

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Cost, cost and cost. How much has been spent on HS2 to get nowhere?

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

France and Spain are both developing their rail networks, particularly high speed lines. They also see the necessity to have direct cross country high speed routes rather than everything centring on the capital.

John Jefferis

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

John Jefferis

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

Chris Johnson

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Network Rail's functions should continue to provide a coherent service in overseeing the infrastructure of the nation's railways.

The Innovation function is not spelt out but it would be useful if there could be regular public consultation over potential extensions to the rail network so that there is a long-term alternative to grid-locked roads and more areas sacrificed to tarmac.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

See Innovation above.

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Accountability is only as good as the people asking the questions. There needs to be an equivalent of the Public Accounts Committee with the equivalents of several Margaret Hodges asking the questions.

Like many other citizens, I am fed up with politicians claiming that public services are inherently inefficient when it is they, the politicians, who have failed to ask the searching questions or failed to provide the necessary support to keep senior managers on target.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

If you have put rail passengers and tax-payers first, then yes; but what we see is these groups spoken about as if they are most important but then ignored in practice, as fares shoot up, ticketing remains chaotic, complaints are passed from one operator to another and huge prestige projects like HS2 are imposed from above whilst local improvements take a back seat.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

This question illustrates the big problem with current rail provision: a rail traveller wants a reasonably smooth journey with no surprises at an affordable cost. The current fragmented structure means that when something goes wrong (such as a delay, a ca

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

The experience of enabling "customers" to be directly involved with providers of public services has not been an overwhelming success. Think of the minute numbers who attended School Governors' annual meetings. The complexity of the service (just look at

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

It says much about what has happened to public services that you have to mention "incentives". Organisations where the staff are happy tend to have staff who want to do their jobs and do them well. Pressurising people with targets (often unrealistic) migh

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Chris Johnson

"Disaggregating" sounds uncomfortably similar to "dismantling". All most passengers want is a coherent service that is safe and affordable. There needs to be an overview of the nation's needs, rather than a "backyard first" approach.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

I don't know. I do know that there are some crazy pieces of timetabling, such as the train from Newcastle that gets into York just in time to see the Leeds train depart, necessitating a wait of nearly 20 minutes. Railways need to be a national system, so

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Don't know what you mean.

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

A central co-ordination would be a useful start.

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

Don't know: It depends what those structural changes are.

If Network Rail were to be released from the huge financing costs (how many billion pounds each year ??!), this would allow more funds to be spent on the railways themselves, rather than building b

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Who is aware of its current approach or of what these "enhancements" are ?

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Ditto.

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

King's Cross last year was not exactly a resounding success. Is the problem a lack of skilled project managers ?

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Yes: Have a coherent national system of railways owned by the public. German Railways are one excellent example of both efficient rail travel and of national pride exemplified.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Public ownership with a competent set of Hodge-like watchdogs to oversee accountability.

Chris Johnson

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

Extricating it from the web of financial restrictions and complications. They are national railways and the nation should pay for them. It might help tax receipts if every tax payer (individual and corporate) received a breakdown of public income and expense.

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

No.

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

Is there public benefit?

Do the public want it?

Any criteria should be made as simple as possible so as not to deter consultation by making it unfathomable for the lay reader.

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

National railways should be financed by national income and expenditure.

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

1. Avoid the ludicrously expensive PFI models.
2. Risk assess every project.
3. Design every project into its smallest components, so that as long as each component works, the project will succeed.
4. Ensure that each project is preceded by the best possible

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

National railways should be financed by national income and expenditure.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

n/a

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

n/a

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Other nation's public railways, such as DB. This is ludicrous.

Chris Johnson

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

The private sector pays (or should pay) taxes. The taxes are what should be used to pay for public services, including the railways.

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

The goal of an efficient national railway not saddled with debt should be an incentive for everyone.

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

The greatest risk is that the railways, like this consultation, proceeds with no thought to how it complements other forms of travel. For example, in the future it might be possible for more people to work from home, thus cutting some transport needs. The ever-increasing amount of road traffic could be alleviated by Channel Tunnel style roll-on-roll-off trains between major cities.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

There appear to have been no consideration as to whether Network Rail's Innovation function could enable it to look at the feasibility of introducing Metro or Metrolink-style light railways onto some of the rural routes closed in the 1950s and 1960s. Affordable transport in these areas would help to tackle rural poverty and shift the balance away from a continuing drift to cities, especially those in the south.

Gordon Johnston

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Current scope is effective

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

Strategic value of rail network

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

A system which fines one part of a transport structure for effects on what should be part of the same structure is illogical.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Yes

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Well met.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Unconvinced strengthening direct public pressure is sound - invokes crisis management.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

No.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Total integration of the route structure is the only logical approach.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

Again, vertical integration is the logical approach.

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

All rail purchasing - beyond just Network Rail to entire system. Additionally, a holistic approach is needed. If contracts are awarded abroad - where do the tax revenues go, what is the effect on UK employment and skills base?

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

Not able to comment.

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

Not applicable.

Gordon Johnston

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Conflict between Government and Rail industry objectives is huge hindrance.

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Network Rail has the skills. Political considerations threaten this.

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Remarkably well for all projects.

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

No.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Integrated and co-ordinated approach.

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

Reduce the awful fragmentation. East Coast did an excellent job - stop this race to privatise at any cost.

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

No.

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

Don't know.

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

RAB could and should be strengthened.

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Finances need to be government backed and on the public account sheet.

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Government funding should be a major contributor alongside passenger and freight revenues.

Gordon Johnston

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure? DB and Nedrail are very successful - take a look at how Government owned national networks run.

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?
Bad idea.

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?
Still a bad idea.

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?
See previous answer.

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?
And again.

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?
Just don't go down this route.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Privatising Network Rail is to continue down an inefficient route for political ends. This small island need less fragmentation and privatisation of strategic assets, not more.

Grzegorz Kadziolka

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Grzegorz Kadziolka

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

Grzegorz Kadziolka

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Why the neighbours of Network Rail are not protected from excessive noise or vibration?

Whole jubilee way street in Bicester exposed to noise as acoustic barriers not been installed!

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

David Kirk

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Worse for safety

We need to learn the lessons from privately owned Railtrack, which was heavily criticised for the fatal train crashes in the late 1990s. We don't want to go down that route again - passenger safety must come before profit.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

too many delays from repairs up grades

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

yes. put rail back into a publicly owned company NOT privatised.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

take proffits off the shareholders.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

no

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

should be constantly reassessed

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

no

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

re nationalise it

David Kirk

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

so far its made travel very difficult

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

not on time

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

too slow and caused a great deal of inconvenience

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

delays are happening and being extended.

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

They should be answerable to the public

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

privatise it

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

less chat more action

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

whats best for the customer not the share holder

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Nationalise it.

David Kirk

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

thru gov investment drawn from tax on business whose workforce use the system

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure? have you looked a european models?

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

its too important to let it be a oney making tool for private investors the function =ing of the country should be the priority

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

The NAtion as a whole

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

not private investors they're only concerned with their proffits not the greater good of Britain

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

You only seem interested in the network as a potetial proffit machine for investors not as service to the nation

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Think about the country not about investors

Michael Lee

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Network Rail's core purpose is as infrastructure service provider, including the key system operator role. In delivering this core purpose many options exist on the insourcing/outsourcing spectrum. This has varied over time, and will no doubt continue to vary - indeed it may be right to outsource particular activities at some times and not at others. Outsourcing can bring the benefits of competition, but if taken too far or without sufficient attention to the role of informed buyer, can fundamentally undermine overall delivery; the experience of outsourcing maintenance was not a happy one. Such decisions should generally be for the Network Rail board, which is accountable for the consequences. Network Rail's functions include others which are not essential to its core purpose, in particular some 'industry' functions many of which it acquired at the time of the 2005 Act. These include parts of its industry planning and IT systems functions. They sit with Network Rail almost by default, there being no other network-wide body of sufficient substance and permanence to beat the responsibilities. But this increases the overall burden on the company, and (no matter how diligently and sensitively the roles are carried out) it can exacerbate the perceived imbalance of power between Network Rail and its customers. It may be worth considering whether a body such as RDG, were it to develop greater decision-making effectiveness, legitimacy and corporate substance, could take over Network Rail's overseeing functions in areas such as these.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

No comments

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

These arrangements are unsatisfactory. There is no shortage of 'accountabilities', but they are confused and poorly understood - particularly since reclassification. As a result they work imperfectly and fail to command the confidence of stakeholders.

CONFUSION

Some confusion about accountabilities to the Secretary of State (and Scottish Ministers) and to ORR predates reclassification, but it has increased. The high profile and political sensitivity of the rail industry (in which the UK is exceptional even among its peers) inevitably causes difficulty in this area but it is vital that - at least at Network Rail and the government bodies themselves - there is maximum possible clarity. This is not simply academic; the Bowe review findings suggest that difficulties now being experienced with the CP5 enhancements programme may well be in part the result of some uncertainty (or lack of confidence) about each party's critical responsibilities during development of the HLOS and CP5 Determination.

STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE

When Network Rail's train operator customers complain that it is unaccountable, their concern is generally that they have insufficient leverage themselves on the company's performance. In this regard it was particularly mistaken and unhelpful that, at the time of the 2005 Act, the view of government was that train operators could not have genuine customer-supplier relationships with the company, and changes made around that time therefore undermined these relationships. Happily this is now viewed differently, and I am glad to see the importance placed in the Scoping Report on the customer perspective.

Michael Lee

Certainly Network Rail is a monopoly supplier (and would effectively remain so under any structure other than full vertical integration) but there are things which can be done to increase the train operators' leverage. This should be a constant aim of the ORR. You say that "anecdotal evidence suggests that NR is currently incentivised to treat the ORR as [its] main customer, instead of those funding its activities." I am familiar with the claim; ORR must work ceaselessly to ensure that it is without foundation. While at ORR (2005-12) I always sought to emphasise that for Network Rail satisfying its customers was not an alternative to satisfying the ORR, but the very same thing. During this period we ensured that train operator satisfaction became a factor in the executive bonus scheme, and developed a new option for regulatory enforcement (the 'recovery board') which put significant additional power in the hands of Network Rail's customers to determine remedial actions if it had breached its licence obligations. While ORR must give full regard to longer-term objectives (sustainability) which may be of lower priority to train operators, it must ensure that regulatory theory never distorts its focus on making Network Rail truly customer-focussed.

When the wider public, politicians and media criticise Network Rail's 'lack of accountability' the underlying reason is the inability to see who 'bears the pain' for corporate shortcomings - other than the public themselves. The focus of this question should be on the company Board. It is the Board which sets direction and holds the management to account; if the Board (including its individual members) is not properly accountable the rest of the structure cannot compensate for that. While recognising attempts which have been made to tackle this over the years, there still needs to be much greater clarity and transparency on the processes for, and the specific decisions taken in respect of, board appointments and directors' remuneration - including who is taking those decisions and on what basis. Stakeholders need to be repeatedly assured that Network Rail's directors are exposed to the consequences of failure - and indeed can share the rewards of success.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

I believe so, and that this is fundamental (see my previous answer).

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

In 4.41 you say that "...the ORR has had to take licence enforcement action against Network Rail and others on 43 occasions....This suggests that management changes alone are not sufficient to resolve the planning and process issues on which industry is a

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Yes it should, where it can be. This should include building on and further developing steps of the kind I refer to in my answer to question 3 under 'stakeholder confidence'.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

See also my answer to question 3 under 'stakeholder confidence'.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

No comments

Michael Lee

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

No comments

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

No comments

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

I have concerns that one of the factors behind the apparent reversal of improvements in Network Rail delivery is related to the new devolved structure. The significant increase in Route autonomy calls for a quite different approach at the corporate centre in holding the Routes to account. A difficult balance has to be struck between permitting new freedoms at Route level and ensuring that across the company as a whole its corporate objectives are delivered. My limited observation of this has left me questioning whether sufficient attention was paid, at least in the early days, to ensuring that the necessary skills and processes were in place for HQ to perform this governance effectively and to give the Routes the scrutiny, and the support, they need.

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

No comments

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

There needs to be more of the 'Paisley Canal' approach to value engineering. Network Rail currently has little incentive to do this prior to a regulatory determination, and no effective counterparty with whom to do it afterwards. Operators' interests gene

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

CP4, which itself required a step up in the scale of Network Rail enhancement activity, demonstrated that the company was capable of excellent delivery of major enhancement projects. CP5 stretches that capability much further which, coupled with the loss

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

The CP5 experience indicates that the rigid 5 year HLOS process can be ill-suited to the development of major enhancement programmes when it is not perfectly aligned to government policy cycles. The industry needs reasonable stability in its enhancement p

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

No comments

Michael Lee

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

No comments

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

No comments

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

No comments

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

Whatever the overall objectives (which may include cost efficiency, customer responsiveness, effective delivery and public acceptability) assessment should also take account of the transition costs and risks associated with each option, as identified well later in the Scoping Report.

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

No comments

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

No comments

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

No comments

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

No comments

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

No comments

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

No comments

Michael Lee

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

No comments

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

No comments

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

I strongly agree with the risks identified and welcome the recognition that decisions must be pragmatically based. What matters is what works, for both the short and the long term.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

No comments

Christopher Lewin

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Christopher Lewin

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Private finance can be used for the construction of some kinds of new infrastructure, particularly for any new infrastructure which is "self contained". Another possibility is to lease parts of the existing infrastructure in return for capital sums and us

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

Christopher Lewin

HS1 where existing infrastructure was leased to private investors is a good example of what can be done.

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

Private investors would want to be assured of a flow of income which is not liable to reduction as a result of political decisions but is dependent on usage and fares/charges. Where fares and charges are limited in future by decisions not foreseeable at t

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Pension funds and insurance companies would be interested in long leases with revenue flows likely to increase with growing prosperity of the nation. However, they would only invest if there are sufficient safeguards for their future revenue streams (see

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

Private finance is most likely to be attracted to enhancement projects which are relatively self contained, so that the revenues and costs can easily be ascertained. Public support would be needed to cover any shortfall in revenues from what investors are

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

The key point is the need for investors to be sure of being fully compensated if their revenue stream is adversely affected by regulation or political decisions in ways not foreseen at the outset.

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

The privatisation of certain routes could be seriously considered, with private companies taking control of both customer services and infrastructure. The investors would then be responsible for maintenance of the infrastructure and for enhancing it if they could see a satisfactory return on their additional investment. The Government would be able to subsidise enhancements if they wished. Sound sustainable arrangements for sharing costs and revenues for trains passing outside the route boundaries would be essential. Compensation would be required if fares and charges were limited by regulation or political decision.

Philip Lindan

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

The scope is too limited because of the artificial and inefficient divide between infrastructure and operations. Rail transport (people and goods) is a natural monopoly that requires public operation in the public interest. Economic benefit would be maximised not through pseudo-market devices, but by planned public service from an integrated rail service funded from general taxation.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

See above.

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

The halfway house - notional private company overseen by govt. - gets nothing particularly right. Accountability should be by direct governmental operation of a public resource.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

This is a loaded question - customers buy goods and services, whereas the railways should operate and be operated to the benefit of society as a whole. There is no correct or legitimate place for the language of consumerism here.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

See my answer to 4. A better question is: how effectively are society's needs and expectations met. Simply by comparison with other EU countries the UK has its needs and expectations rather poorly met, at much too high a personal cost.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Yes, but on an integrated rail provider. Through (e.g.) planned fare structures reviewed by (e.g.) OBR. Not by any market mechanism.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

This question is hopelessly pre-loaded with market thinking. It is disingenuous and pre-judges the outcome of this consultation.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

There is every basis for planning a rail service fit for society. If that planning reveals advantages for e.g. local variations to service delivery, so be it.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

Regrettably, the current system is, as an accident of misconceived privatisation, unbalanced and unfit for purpose. Centralised == integrated across the entire service is the correct approach.

Philip Lindan

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Yes, integration of the service.

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

A leading question presuming the devolved structure is appropriate - it isn't.

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

N/A

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Presumes the outcome, again a begged question.

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Presumes the outcome, again a begged question.

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Presumes the outcome, again a begged question.

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Yes! France, Germany, Italy and Spain are getting much more right than is the UK. All have extensive state support and planned systems. The answer is staring you in the face if you drop the dogma.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Integration across the entire operation, and a planned not market-driven model.

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

You could have not begged the questions in favour - blatantly - of a private, market driven operation.

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

Evident from all previous answers.

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

Evident from all previous answers.

Philip Lindan

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

Simon Lowe

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

The rail industry is only just recovering from the sale of British Rail's telecomms infrastructure, which caused the industry to lose control of its telecomms network. It is important that the same mistake is not repeated and that ownership of the railway's telecomms assets remain with Network Rail.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

It would have been helpful if figure 2 had included a comparison of total taxpayer subsidies to the rail industry in 1995 and 2014. Figure 3 grossly exaggerates the benefit of moving block signalling, implying a threefold increase in capacity. In reality,

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

They appear to be somewhat cumbersome. A sensible and sustainable long term strategy would see the role of the ORR reduced as the rail industry was gradually reintegrated.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

I would suggest that this is a matter for Network Rail alone to decide. I would be concerned if external pressure for more devolution was applied with the motive of forming a stepping stone towards breaking up Network Rail into separate companies, which would be disastrous.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

The engineering functions of Network Rail must remain at a national level; otherwise, there will be a decline in safety standards and loss of economies of scale.

Simon Lowe

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

Further structural change has the potential to introduce uncertainty amongst the staff, affecting morale and will most likely drive up costs.

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

As a national body, Network Rail is in a strong position to plan enhancements consistently and strategically. This would be threatened if Network Rail was to be broken up.

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

As a national body, Network Rail is in a strong position to deliver enhancements consistently and strategically. This would be threatened if Network Rail was to be broken up.

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

It must remain as one coherent national organisation. Right at the outset of rail privatisation, it was recognised within Railtrack's Railway Safety Case that industry fragmentation is an inherent risk to the safety of the railway, and that pre-privatisation

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

The criteria must consider the impact on safety as well as the effect on value for money for rail passengers and taxpayers, who are currently getting a very raw deal from the privatised railway, which promised lower fares and reduced subsidies but delivered the exact opposite.

Simon Lowe

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

The government alone should be prepared to take on the financial risk of running the country's essential public services.

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

In a civilised society, it is incumbent on the state to fund the country's essential public services through taxation.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

Experience in almost every other country in the world demonstrates that railways operate more efficiently in the public sector. Before privatisation, British Rail was one of the most efficient railways in the world. It would be refreshing indeed if Britis

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

The principal enabling factor to achieving a sustainable and affordable railway is to reintegrate the entire industry and reduce the involvement of the private sector.

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Most probably greedy, unethical and risk-averse investors with scant regard for public service or safety, who are looking to make a fast profit by exploiting Network Rail's property portfolio.

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

I cannot understand this obsession with involving the private sector, which seems to be either ideological or motivated by the present government's kleptocratic inclinations. Since privatisation, annual state funding to the rail industry has increased by

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Simon Lowe

It is vital to recognise that industry fragmentation is an inherent risk to safety on the railway.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Please rule out privatising or breaking up Network Rail.

John Marshall

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

The mainline through Devon should have an alternative route. At the moment the SW is at risk from storms. This risk will increase with climate change and increased sea levels.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

It might be sensible to adjust responsibilities so as to enable integrated public transport systems. Things are verging on chaotic in some places.

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

John Marshall

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

John Marshall

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

Eric Matthews

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Network Rail is semi-essential to a functioning rail system as an integrated rail network where trains are aware of the timetables, running schedules, as well as hardware (track gauge, etc) of other regions to provide a joined up service that works for the user.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

You can not compete on ownership of a bit of track. Unless you're opening up competition to lay new track networks across the country capitalist competition will not work to improve the rail system.

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Not good enough.

Hold train franchises to higher account of punctuality, reliable service, and not running overfull trains.

Also they should be investing their profits into rolling stock and upgrade works at a much higher rate than they are, and this should perhaps be written into contract.

Retendering work back out to failed companies is not good practice, c.f. Virgin.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

The people who use trains, as well as the big whigs paying for track rental to run their franchised services.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Not that well if you're a common person using the rail network.

Moderately well if you're the head of a rail franchise making a nice load off of the poor accountability and lack of ties to reinvestment in the railways.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Yes.

End rail franchising as a pointless step of middle management and make Network Rail be back in direct control of trains across the British railways.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Ish, but that would require huge capital investment and radical changes to countryside and urban settings that is probably unfeasible at this time.

Most of the more effective routes have been worked out by this time, and track built up in accordance with that - at least across the South.

Why would you want to manage railway on political economies? Seems like a way to gyp the people on the ground.

Eric Matthews

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

Devolve more day to day powers, but centralise the whole operational thing.

End the franchising of train running to other companies and take it back in house.

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Rolling stock procurement.

Station redevelopment

Engine maintenance.

Training

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

Get rid of the middle management of private franchise operators.

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

n/a

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Pretty decently done at the moment, loading into short intensive bursts that are known in advance to be planned around does a good job. Especially loading at weekends and bank holidays.

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Gets inconvenient if a section of track is closed for months at weekends.

Though as not being a railway engineer I can't really comment on how it could be improved.

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Try following Germany, Japan, France, or the Netherlands.

Countries which have decent rail systems.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Management accountability to the public.

A way for workers to hold management to account over wages and delivery.

Eric Matthews

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

By national ownership and backing by the state.

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Nationalisation!

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

The East Coast Mainline's high performance while in national ownership is a very good example of how railways should be run.

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

Nationalisation now!

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Rich people with more money than care for the public and service as a whole.

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

By putting profit and return above customer service.

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

See above.

Eric Matthews

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Consider nationalisation, it would be a much better way to run our railways.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Nationalisation now.

c.f. East Coast Main Line under national ownership actually paying money into the state coffers rather than relying on huge amounts of subsidy to shore up corporate profits while management got multi-million pound remuneration.

Glen Mynott

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

It is important that we have a single, publicly-owned body to develop and manage the railways.

Network Rail's operation can be improved, but we must also learn from the mistakes of the past. Breaking up or selling off parts of Network Rail's operations would lead to fragmentation, confused priorities and reduced accountability.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

Network Rail's overall objective is very important and needs to be set out explicitly.

Network Rail should have a structure that helps the railway to grow. The existing structure can be a hindrance to this. There needs to be better, clearer, long-term p

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Network Rail needs to be more accountable to passengers. The voice of passengers should be stronger in deciding national priorities for the future of the railways and local priorities for better services and stations. Network Rail needs to have structures and processes in place that directly include passengers' views and interests. This is unlikely to happen if Network Rail is privatised.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Passengers are an important customer for Network Rail but our voice is not often heard. Passengers' interests are wider than those of train operators. For example, we understand how the railways can support communities, development and the economy. Passengers need more opportunities to directly influence Network Rail's priorities.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Network Rail does not directly hear the voice of passengers and therefore does not prioritise their interests. The problems at Finsbury Park between Christmas and New Year 2014 show this very clearly.

Network Rail needs to work directly with train opera

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Passengers need a stronger voice.

Network Rail should be rewarded if more people are using trains, and passengers are satisfied with services. A form of revenue sharing should be considered to replace the current compensation arrangements, which are con

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

At the moment, Network Rail has little responsibility for passenger satisfaction - it only matters whether or not the trains run on time.

Network Rail, passengers, train operators and others like local authorities need to work together to make sure it i

Glen Mynott

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

The Government is giving local authorities and other bodies more control over how transport is planned. It is important that the railways are part of this.

While Network Rail needs to stay as a single, national organisation, it is important that planning for the railways is joined up with other transport planning. That means Network Rail having the structure and staff to work much more closely with local authorities for example.

There is no case for re-privatising all or part of Network Rail.

It is important to learn lessons from the catastrophic failure of Railtrack. By separating management of the tracks from the trains, Railtrack fragmented the railways in ways it is still struggling to cover from. None of the problems facing the railways would be solved by going back down this route.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

The balance between routes and the centre is not currently at the right level.

Our railways need to be outward looking. Network Rail's role should include helping support other objectives like housing, the economy and road congestion. Devolving more power

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Glen Mynott

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

It should be largely publicly funded and publicly owned.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

Glen Mynott

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

The lack of publicity given to this consultation and the demands on time of completing this survey. This consultation document will not be accessible to many people who will be discouraged by its length and complexity from responding to the report.

Lucian O'Neill

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Network Rail is insufficiently powerful to curb the excesses of the private rail operators. Only renationalisation of the railways can do this.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Although Network Rail can be made accountable to customers, the problem is that they are unable to hold the rail operators to account.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Yes, to a point.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

I believe that Network Rail are unable to deal with the real concerns of rail customers because they have insufficient leverage over private rail companies who, once they own their particular franchise can act with total impunity and with total disregard

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Again, customer pressure on Network Rail is not the issue. It is how Network Rail can have any influence on greedy private train operators. This could only be achieved through renationalisation of the railways with a customer feedback process written into

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Britain has the only fully-privatised railway in Europe, and some of the most expensive fares in Europe, while our railways still cost the taxpayer millions in subsidies. It is worth noting that Intercity and Network Southeast, which were both still part

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

Lucian O'Neill

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

In the words of Chris Grayling himself in 1996:

"We think, with hindsight, that the complete separation of track and train into separate businesses at the time of privatisation was not right for our railways. We think that the separation has helped push u

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Renationalisation

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

An ability to end the ridiculous and harmful fragmentation and dangerous monopolies on local services that have been given to unaccountable private companies

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

Lucian O'Neill

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Renationalisation.

This is the only apparent way to drive down fares, which are at frankly laughable and ludicrous levels and rise regularly.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Thanks for listening

Richard Painter

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

It makes economic sense to have one single organisation responsible for the track/signalling etc. infrastructure. Doing so means there is little scope for competition, and it is therefore wrong to assume that handing the organisation over to the private sector again will improve efficiency. It did not happen last time.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

No

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Network rail must continue to be accountable to the people of this country via Parliament. Not to the Government of France, Germany, China, or whomever might end up as majority shareholder if it were to be privatised.

yes it will cost more, and it may slow down decision making, but the decisions are more likely to be the right ones, rather than the disastrous decisions Railtrak made in contracting out essential maintenance to firms that were not competent to deliver - leading to the spate of crashes that destroyed Railtrak's finances (as well as the lives of so many people).

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Yes

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Not as well as they should be. Network Rail does need more effective leadership. I do not believe that the leadership it needs could be found by privatisation however.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Yes. Passenger compensation for delays caused by infrastructure failures to be met directly by Network Rail, not via the train operators.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

Numerical targets for performance against easily-measurable processes rarely work. The people responsible always find ways to make the numbers look good regardless of passenger experience. And there are often unintended negative consequences. Public satis

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

The greatest advantage for the passenger would be found by integrating the whole of the railways service - infrastructure, rolling stock and services - into one organisation. The East Coast mainline proved that the public sector provides better value for money and greater passenger satisfaction than the private companies can achieve. It should all be returned to the public sector and re-integrated as each contract ends.

Richard Painter

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

All should be centralised.

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

It is one system. It does not make sense being broken up at regional or local level. There would be diseconomies created by duplication of back-office functions, excessive salaries paid to the plethora of new company executives and disputes over responsi

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

The capability most missing at the moment appears to be effective leadership. The processes should be the responsibility of Network Rail, not of Government, but there should be an expectation that the leadership of Network Rail be held to account for streamlining them and improving efficiency. What is really needed is an effective strategy setting out what the public expects of a rail network provider with clear long-term aims and a plan of how to achieve them.

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

Privatisation and/or desegregation would lead to a poorer service and higher fares.

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

Richard Painter

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

It should be funded through general taxation. This would not need to increase the tax burden, borrowing, the national debt or the deficit in the medium to long term if the Government were to pursue a policy of infrastructure investment that would improve

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

Richard Painter

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

Dave Parsons

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Insufficient, the organisation was created in the wake of the disaster that was the privately run Railtrack. What should have been done was the renationalisation of the rail industry

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

The damage done to Britain's railways by privatisation and underinvestment since the 1980's

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

I would rather have the railways effective and accountable to parliament as a nationalised industry

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

?

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Well in as much as they can with the limitations on the scope of their work

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

I would rather have the railways effective and accountable to parliament as a nationalised industry

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

Nationalise and prevent the Treasury from tying the hands of the new body

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Unless the network works as a whole it will not work as it should, thus any kind of 'disaggregation' will make matters worse

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

The whole structure should be nationalised and centralised

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Economy of scale was abandoned with privatisation

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

?

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

Dave Parsons

Catastrophe

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

As they do not control the whole system anything they do is immediately flawed

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

As they do not control the whole system anything they do is immediately flawed

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

As they do not control the whole system anything Network Rail do is immediately flawed

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

In most other countries in Europe the railways are nationalised and receive sufficient investment without finance ministry/treasury interference

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Nationalisation

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

The failure of privatisation

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

Nationalisation

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

Do they improve services or cut ticket prices

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

A return to British Rail

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Try taking some financial risk and find out BR was always prevented from doing so

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

A combination of ticket and freight charges to cover day to day costs and significant capital investment from government to pay for capital projects

Dave Parsons

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?
Dutch, French and German Railways

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

Nationalisation on a model which allowed for and encouraged partnership working between public and private sector rather than preventing it as was done by the Treasury with BR

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

The tourist, manufacturing, finance and transport industries

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

A standard practice of government at least matching private investment

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

Nationalisation and a free hand given to the new organisation

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

Nationalisation

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

No

Len Porter

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Comprehensive and as defined.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

Not enough emphasis placed on the primary role as the Infrastructure Asset Manager

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

As mentioned in your introduction planning needs significant improvement and processes are frustrating. Amongst other things this has led to a lack of broader industry trust and support and contributed to a low level of effectiveness when considered over the life of the company.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Yes

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Badly when considered over the last 12 years or so of the company.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Direct customer pressure should be strengthened. This could be achieved by considering the RSSB governance model. In particular consider introducing primary customers directly within the Network Rail board structure or as a strong Advisory Board also chair

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

Incentivise the move towards a world class infrastructure asset management capability.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

No comment

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

No comment

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Infrastructure Asset Management systems and processes e.g. asset information, risk and reliability management systems

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

No comment

Len Porter

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

No comment

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

The major weakness is that they are made without considering an integrated transport plan for the future.

This isn't helped by the lack of an adequate government energy policy

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Poor contractual arrangements are a major weakness and the subsequent working arrangements that they encourage.

By considering modern collaboration and partnering arrangements with all parties but particularly supply companies matters could be considerab

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

See 14 above - the size wouldn't matter under those changed circumstances.

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

See MTR approach to infrastructure asset management.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

A structure that included a world class forward thinking strategic infrastructure asset management capability.

The ability within the above to acknowledge rail's strengths and weaknesses and embrace rail's place in an integrated transport plan of the fut

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

You mention RSSB in the document primarily as a safety body (...work to achieve continuous improvement in health and safety performance.). This fails, however, to acknowledge that for a considerable part of the last decade or so that description included

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

No comment

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

No comment

Len Porter

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

No comment

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

No comment

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

No comment

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

No comment

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

No comment

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

No comment

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

No comment

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

No comment

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

No further comment

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

I felt during my time as chief executive of RSSB that, amongst other things, Network Rail failed to collect good data and had poor information management systems which subsequently caused the company to have a less than adequate understanding of (business) risk and reliability. Also its procurement practices were as poor as they get. Arguably, however, this was not recognised by a continuously poor ORR who failed to write improvement in these areas and broader improvement in asset management into successive

Len Porter

Control Period documentation until very recently - at least 10 years too late. So a lot of blame needs to be shouldered by the ORR rather than Network Rail. The relationship between ORR and RAIB and the subsequent impact on industry/Network Rail did little to help. The actions of DfT often only made matters worse.

For these reasons I often felt that Network Rail was in an extremely difficult position and struggled with both external and internal direction. The various boards of directors never adequately got to grips with this.

I think the current changes at board level in NR should be given a chance to further improve on the last few years improvement. Maintaining a strong and central NR working properly as system operator and on behalf of "GB Rail plc" is essential for the strategic growth of the GB integrated transport sector, not only rail.

I am at heart a supporter of NR and feel that, whatever other major changes are considered, they should be given a chance to lead the industry properly with reduced peripheral bodies and enhanced system responsibility

Rob Potter

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

I do not believe that you have made enough mention of the fact that the system is hamstrung by the multitudinous webs of contracts between all the parties, which not only provides a goldmine for armies of (expensive!) lawyers and accountants, but also un

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

"The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers" (Henry IV Part 2)

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Not well enough - for example, the Brighton Line out of action for 10 days over this Christmas period.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

It is ludicrous to spend £43 billion on HS2 so that businessmen can get to Birmingham 20 minutes earlier. The private sector understands this, which is why they haven't wanted to invest in it. But a grandiose project offers better PR than many smaller, but more useful, upgrades.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

Rob Potter

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

As already mentioned, many European countries manage their railways very well in public ownership.

The current push for privatisation is simply a device to get Network Rail off the public books, following its reclassification as a public body in 2014.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Public ownership. Run for the public good rather than for the benefit of shareholders.

Ultimately, any private company's first duty is to shareholders: while having regard to any laws or regulations is, naturally, a consideration, shareholder good comes first.

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

Rob Potter

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Publicly-funded, publicly run, fully integrated. Learn lessons from Railtrack and the ludicrous PPP for the London Tube.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

Privately-raised capital will invariably cost more than public capital. Which is why the entire PFI/PPP system has been the fiasco that it has.

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Carpetbaggers, who will demand extreme rates of return.

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

A decent consideration of the costs and benefits of a fully publicly-owned and run railway system would have been nice, but probably too much to expect.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

Caroline Robertson

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

The Secretary of State for Transport oversees both Network Rail's and the ORR's activities whilst at the same time holding them to account. This is self regulation. Due to various acts of Parliament, Network Rail is also effectively above the law.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

Caroline Robertson

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

– please see answer to Question 29

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

Caroline Robertson

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

The following is taken from my experience of the TWA process (including the public inquiry) and Network Rail's ("NR") delivery of the new Oxford to Bicester railway (East West Rail Phase 1).

It is now well known that noise, vibration and air pollution are detrimental to health. These considerations do not appear to concern NR. As far as mitigation is concerned, NR is putting in no more and in some cases less, than originally proposed at the start of the public inquiry. What few concessions objectors managed to obtain in the form of conditions attached to the TWA Order, have been ignored, dismissed or rendered useless. Oxford City Council's planning department and the majority of councillors have been complicit in allowing this to happen through inexperience, lack of knowledge, political ambitions and/or a general disinterest in the health of such a small number of people, including hundreds of children, who live near the line or attend the two local primary schools.

The TWA Order was meant to include all the planning consents required for the new railway. The TWA Order allows for some deviations. However, there are numerous examples of where work is underway which are not covered by the TWA Order. Just giving one example briefly below:

- Noise barriers were proposed at the public inquiry (2010) as being 2 m high and 2 m from the nearest track, except where the railway is positioned in the Wolvercote cutting. The nearest track is approximately 10 m from the NR boundary.
- The Noise Scheme of Assessment (early 2015) gave barrier locations but these could not be challenged as both the positions and heights had not yet been finalised.
- After construction was allowed to begin, NR refused to consider any change to the positions and height of barriers to those in the Noise Scheme of Assessment.

Caroline Robertson

- Noise barriers next to the track are now 2.5 m high and 2.6 m from the nearest track (this small deviation is covered by the TWA Order). However, in one location and on one side of the track only, a noise barrier is proposed that is set back from the nearest track to just 1.2 m from the NR boundary. The railway is not in a cutting at this point and this amount of deviation is not covered by the TWA Order. The noise barrier so close to the boundary will:
 - o Be completely ineffective for the line-side residents, many of whom live in first and second floor flats; and
 - o Cause an obstruction to the fire brigade in the event of a fire breaking out in one of the line-side flats. The flats were built on the NR boundary; NR has produced no evidence to suggest that NR raised any objection to the development or access over NR land for maintenance etc.

On the other side of the track, the affluent side, the barrier will be 2.6 m from the nearest track.

The new Bicester to Oxford railway was first announced in 2009. It is now the end of 2015 and it is still not operational. NR has made various representations which it has not honoured. NR has spent a lot of time and expense on “experts” to produce documents to show that heavier, faster, more frequent and longer trains will generate no more or even less noise, vibration and air pollution than the less frequent, shorter, slower (30 mph), and lighter trains that used to use the single track line. The exception to this is stone trains, which NR claims in its Noise Scheme of Assessment will travel at no more than 20 mph (line speed 100 mph), will only operate during the day and there will be no more than two per day. When Oxford Parkway opened the number of passenger trains operating was considerably greater than the number used in the Noise Scheme of Assessment only months earlier.

To avoid further tax payers' money being spent on public inquiries that achieve nothing, there would be considerable savings if Government through legislation:

1. set noise, vibration and air pollution limits which must not be exceeded;
2. enforce continuous monitoring of noise, vibration and air pollution;
3. set out what mitigation must be installed; and
4. allowed NR to be held to account like any other business that blights its neighbours with noise, vibration and air pollution.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

- please see answer to Question 29

Robert Rush

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

NR are allowed far too much leeway on services they provide.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

The lack of effective investment.

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Yes

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Poorly. Customer satisfaction is at an all-time low, given the combined cost, reliability and availability situation.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Yes. Effective external management auditors embedded within NR to monitor and report on areas of concern.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Demand for services is bound to increase and NR should explain how this will be accommodated. Alternative and enhanced routes should be developed. (E.g. twin rail the Exeter to Waterloo line, encourage the North Dartmoor route, etc.)

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

I don't know.

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

Robert Rush

I refer you to Caius Petronius quote from A.D. 65. concerning the effects of re-organisation.

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Do they have "planning enhancements"?

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Too long into the future. Compare european rail infrastructure with ours. Travel on a Belgian train and you will appreciate our backwardness.

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Nationalised entity.

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

A "can do" attitude would be a step forward.

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

No.

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Nationalisation.

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Nationalisation.

Robert Rush

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?
[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?
[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?
[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?
[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?
[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?
[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

The rail structure in the UK is falling behind other countries in service and infrastructure standards through lack of investment and support. Privatising further is obviously not the answer. Bringing back ownership into the public domain is the correct way forward.

John Sarson

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

It is my view that Network Rail's functions should as far as is possible be restricted to maintaining and enhancing track and the associated infrastructure necessary to plan and provide track paths for train operators. This core function is so complex that there should be no distractions. As far as is possible, Network Rail's income should derive from payments for track access.

There are plenty of maintenance depots for rolling stock not owned or operated by Network Rail. There is no good reason why Network Rail should own any rolling stock maintenance depots.

There is no good reason why Network Rail should own all the stations or operate any stations. London St Pancras and London Southend Airport stations are two good examples of stations that work perfectly well without any involvement from Network Rail.

There is no good reason at all for Network Rail to own or operate any car parks.

There is no good reason for Network Rail to retain any property that is surplus to operational requirements.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

John Sarson

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

John Sarson

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

As far as is possible, Network Rail's income should derive from payments for track access.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

Richard Shillcock

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

They should be even further expanded and integrated. There is a clear case for nationalization of all aspects of rail transport in the UK, to plan across the whole of the UK for a very long timescale, longer than private finance is able to envisage, and for public good, not private profit.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

Richard Shillcock

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

Richard Shillcock

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?
[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?
[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?
[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?
[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?
[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?
[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?
[No response]

Tony Somerset

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Confused. Split responsibilities do not lend to cohesion

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

passenger expectations. The ultimate consideration is what passengers expect. Our rails miles are so expensive and the service mediocre.

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Why pay lawyers to argue on split hairs? The 'market' is an artificial device that is broken in concept.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

No.

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Passengers want a cohesive and comprehensible network in which they can plan and travel across it whole width with minimum fuss and inconvenience.

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Passenger pressure yes. Direct passenger online response to travel difficulties with direct accountability and responsibility accepted, with NO buck passing.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

Delivery must equate to finding ways to reduce the absurd rail mile cost to the passengers. Not by 'special' narrow promotions but across the travelling board.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Yes. Try a local manager to touch with their local demands pitched against the regional needs counter balanced by the national network needs. Roll in the preserved lines for spice and contrast.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

No. Yes fully devolved. Here in the southwest are needs are so very different to a city commute.

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

As a nation we must have fast frequent cheap intercity.

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

Tony Somerset

Use a connected online with you passenger base.

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

We retired have a wealth of experiences across the whole range of skills to provided considered solutions. Open up a forum for us to contribute.

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

None. Fractured, dysfunctional.

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

ditto

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

fail to take into account the end user needs.

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Yes, there are plenty of other models for providing an effective and economic transport service. Once you get out of you box.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

to be the running service provider

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

mend the split between infrastructure and rolling stock services

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

abandon.

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

1. does it cater for more people to go by rail?
2. will it lead to a cheaper rail mile cost?
3. will reliability improve?
4. will service frequency increase?

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

Tony Somerset

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

invest in people. Experienced skilled people who have to answer directly for their mistakes are the only and by far best insurance at minimising risk.

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

We are still benefitting from the investments the Victorians made.

We should invest as a nation in our future. Rail travel is carbon efficient and community inclusive.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

Nil profit! Shareholding returns cannot be basis. Try crowdfunding. Let the commuters contribute to a positive fare cost return.

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

idiots

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

The chance to extort more out of the travelling public cannot be any part of providing a service. A service is just that, a service.

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

None. They are an unnecessary complication n that have no meaningful role. They are an artificial construct. that merely confuses.

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

No. Point is missed. The Network is itself wrong. Comprehensive integrated provider of a rail service in touch and communicating effectively with tits passenger needs. Able to articulate and respond to providing a reliable, cost effective and comfortable service.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Tony Somerset

Bring Back British Rail. Get back to serving the passengers and not investment institutions

Dr Nigel Speight

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Dr Nigel Speight

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

It should remain fully nationalised

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

Dr Nigel Speight

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

Tim Spencer

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Network Rail should be one single publicly owned body.

Breaking up would lead to fragmentation, confused and conflicting priorities and would repeat the mistakes of the past.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

There should be a longer term plan for the railways.

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Network Rail needs to be more accountable to passengers and the wider public.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Network Rail should be able to work closely with local bodies so that we have an efficient integrated transport system including but not restricted to the railways.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

Tim Spencer

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Railways should be both publicly owned and funded.

We should not have the worst of both worlds where private corporations run an (often poor) service whilst receiving vast public subsidies.

Tim Spencer

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

There seems to be a built in presumption that private finance is desirable. It is not - the railway infrastructure is too important to be subject to the whims of the market and the pressures that exist within the private sector to make a profit at the expense of a high quality, reliable and safe service.

Kieran Turner

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Kieran Turner

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

I strongly disagree with privatisation of the railways, and believe this should be opposed in all parts of the network. It is ridiculous how much tickets now cost in the UK, and it is disgusting that a lot of the price of a ticket goes to shareholders. A

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

Kieran Turner

German Rail - a lot of European systems are infinitely better than ours, with far more reasonable ticket prices.

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

Simon Turner

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

No to privatization

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

No to privatization

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

No to privatization

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

No to privatization

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

No to privatization

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

No to privatization

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

No to privatization

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

No to privatization

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

No to privatization

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

No to privatization

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

No to privatization

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

No to privatization

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Simon Turner

No to privatization

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

No to privatization

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

No to privatization

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

No to privatization

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

No to privatization

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

No to privatization

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

No to privatization

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

No to privatization

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

No to privatization

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

No to privatization

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

No to privatization

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

No to privatization

Simon Turner

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

No to privatization

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

No to privatization

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

No to privatization

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

No to privatization

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

No to privatization

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

No to privatization

Francis Voisey

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Not applicable

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

Not applicable

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Not applicable

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

Not applicable

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

Not applicable

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Not applicable

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

Not applicable

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Not applicable

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

Not applicable

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Not applicable

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

Not applicable

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

Not applicable

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Francis Voisey

Not applicable

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Not applicable

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Not applicable

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Not applicable

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Not applicable

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

Not applicable

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

Not applicable

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

Not applicable

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

Not applicable

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Not applicable

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Wholly by the taxpayer

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

Not applicable

Francis Voisey

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

Not applicable

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Absolutely not applicable.

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

Absolutely not applicable.

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

Not applicable

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

You may be surprised and or frustrated by my answers of 'Not applicable' to most of the previous questions. This is because I feel the whole approach is wrong. I know nothing of the complexities of financing Network Rail but feel very strongly that Britain's railways should be wholly renationalised. Hence the intricacies of the financing of Network Rail as part of a private railway are irrelevant. The references to growth are also rubbish. We live on a finite planet with finite resources, we cannot have endless economic growth on the railway or anywhere else.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

As a part of the complete renationalisation of the railway which is long overdue there should be a gross simplification of the fares structure to one where tickets are charged at a fixed sum per unit distance. Also first class should be abolished. Finally buses should not be substituted for trains except as a last resort, if I pay for a train ticket I expect to travel on a train, not a substitute bus.

David Waite

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

[No response]

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

No

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

By actually taking notice of the opinions of rail users, rather than ignoring them. Ask rail users directly whether they want their railway to be run privately or renationalised, and promise to accept their opinion, however inconvenient it may be.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

The rail network is already fragmented beyond any rational level. The network will be more efficient and effective if all services were controlled by one body. This would enable them to work together for the maximum benefit of rail users.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

David Waite

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

Yes - Northern Ireland has a more successful rail network than England, with more users and lower fare increases. We should follow their model.

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Any future infrastructure provider should be in the public sector, and therefore directly accountable to government. They should not have shareholders, whose needs would take priority over rail users.

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

David Waite

The rail network should be re-nationalised. This would immediately make it more efficient, since the whole network would work together rather than in competition. Subsidies would then reduce to pre-privatisation levels, and hopefully lower.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

Northern Ireland Railways (a subsidiary of Translink). It is more efficient (99% of trains arriving within 5 minutes of schedule), has a larger increase in passengers and requires a lower subsidy than the English model. The lessons are that a publicly own

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

A sustainable and affordable capital structure must be through public means, not reliant on private sector investors with no interest in rail users or the long-term success of the rail network.

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Spivs - key attractions are taking a large profit from rail users.

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

Enhancement projects should be publicly funded as part of a nationalised rail network.

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

To be taken seriously, your report must look at the option of keeping Network Rail in the public sector and nationalisation of all rail services. Railtrack proved that privatisation is the wrong model for the rail network. The success of East Coast Mainline and Northern Ireland railways proved that railways can be run profitably and efficiently, when the goal is long term success for users rather than short-term profit for shareholders.

Peter Webb

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

In my view the function of Network Rail is to manage, maintain and develop the national rail infrastructure. The infrastructure is an essential national asset and the previous folly of privatisation has shown that it must remain so.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Network Rail should be accountable to its owners, the tax payers, albeit through the government currently in power. The government may change but Network Rail is still accountable to the tax payers.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

I believe that you have placed too much emphasis on the TOCs as customers. The ultimate customers are the tax payers and the passengers and freight. The expectations and aims of the TOCs and FOCs are not necessarily and often are not the same as the tax payers and passengers

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

With no direct interface between Network Rail and passengers/tax payers the effectiveness of meeting their needs relies on the TOCs. The weakness of this situation has recently been illustrated by the failure of the TOCs to pass on to customers monies due

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Yes, but not through the TOCs. Some form of referendum could be a useful tool.

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

At the end of the day the only incentive is cash but cash penalties applied for the benefit of TOCs should not be implemented since this can then become the aim of the TOCs in order to enhance profits.

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Disaggregation would inevitably mean inefficiency and duplication.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

A balance between devolution and centralisation is always necessary since everyone is using the same asset and there is much inter-dependability. A ballance is required.

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

Peter Webb

All assets of Network Rail should be considered at a national level.

Capabilities should be built up within Network Rail to carry out some of the smaller projects and maintenance work without having to rely on external contractors.

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

As above, Network Rail should have the capability to carry out maintenance/modernisation work without having to rely on external contractors. All the contractors do is to manage a set of specialist sub contractors. The capability to manage specialist sub contractors should exist within Network Rail to provide cost effective and efficient projects.

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

N/A

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

Overall planning of enhancements to the network should be looked at as a business case for Network Rail and not be subject to the whims of politicians. Network Rail, tax payers and passengers are permanent. Governments are not. Long term planning could b

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

Short term thinking by government has too much influence.

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

Short term thinking in planning and reliance on external contractors for all work.

As previously said, external contractors merely manage a number of specialist sub contractors but add a considerable overhead and profit level to all costs. For all but the

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

Any provider must be controlled by Network Rail. The rail industry must not make the same mistake as the NHS by considering PFA type contracts. The only people to benefit by these would be the contractors and financiers. Off balance sheet accounting would

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

There should be more self reliance for Network Rail.

Peter Webb

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

The periodic review process is too political and there should be more public consultation since the public are the ultimate customers and financiers.

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

The first question which should be asked is "Does Britain want a rail infrastructure?" If the answer to this is, and I believe it is, yes then Britain must accept that it must be paid for. Dubious financial accounting methods will only increase the overall

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

Financial risk should be managed by Network Rail employing top class managers to carry out this work.

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

As above, it should be funded by the government budgeting for agreed costs, if necessary following public consultation.

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

HS1 is the only one I am aware of. Whilst this was apparently successful we do not know what the cost would have been had it been carried out by Network Rail. However, no joined up thinking was applied at the planning stage. It would have been straight fo

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

Network Rail must not make the same mistakes as the NHS by using dubious practices of off balance sheet accounting principles with PFI.

There is no such thing as a free lunch as the NHS is finding out. Vast amounts of profit was made by the contractors an

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

I am sure that there would be many financiers very happy to invest in Network Rail but at what cost? Network Rail is owned by the tax payer already.

Network Rail and tax payers/passengers are permanent. The Government is transient and should not be allowe

Peter Webb

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

As above

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

As above

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

One risk not stated is political dogma such as privatisation of the NHS.

Network Rail should be managed and budgeted as a business without targets which cannot be justified on a business case benefiting the tax payer.

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

With good management and the backing of the government/tax payer there is no reason why it cannot develop the rail infrastructure on a commercial basis.

There may be a need for public consultation on some points but without management by committee which may produce a camel.

Thomas Wheeler

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

Any changes must be careful to avoid repeating mistakes made in the past. For example, privatisation introduced fragmentation into the industry and this has led to reduced accountability and, in some areas at least, higher costs. Selling off parts of Network Rail would add to the fragmentation problem.

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

As you rightly state, the accountability relationships across the rail industry are complex. This complexity, at least in part, is another result of the fragmentation introduced at privatisation, with numerous 'key players' now within the rail industry or involved with it.

Perhaps it would be useful to reduce the number of 'key players'. Perhaps one approach to this would be to create a single public-transport oversight/regulation/watchdog body incorporating the public transport functions of the Office of Rail and Road (ORR) and Transport Focus. This would of course involve separating the road functions recently added to these two organisations from the former 'Passenger Focus' and 'Office Of Rail Regulation'. 'Passenger Focus' covers bus as well as rail, and perhaps merging this responsibility for buses with the rail regulator would help encourage integration between bus and rail.

Of all the groups to whom Network Rail are accountable, passengers and freight customers should be considered the most important. Unfortunately these groups are only 'indirect' customers of Network Rail, with the TOCs and FOCs being 'direct' customers, meaning the end-users are a level removed from Network Rail. Network Rail should be accountable to customers, not private shareholders.

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Passengers need a stronger voice and more opportunities to directly influence Network Rail's priorities. The earlier suggestion of combining the rail regulator with the passenger watchdog may help here. Another approach might be to establish area groups w

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Thomas Wheeler

Given the increasing devolution of responsibilities from the central Westminster government to local authorities, and the Welsh and Scottish governments, it makes sense that Network Rail is devolving certain functions to its 'routes' which are able to work closely with local government in their areas. However, as you note, there are also economies of scale from having a single, national, organisation and there are cross-boundary issues too (for example the Wales route broadly aligns with the Wales & Borders franchise but this crosses boundaries between English and Welsh counties). Also, while commuter and regional-local services need a stronger local focus, freight, Intercity and long-distance regional-express services require planning on a national level. It is therefore important that Network Rail remains as a national entity, but there is a balance to be struck with devolution to local areas within that organisation.

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

A key weakness is that there appears to be no very-long-term vision of where we would like the railway to be in future (this applies to HS2, as well as Network Rail). For example, do we eventually want all lines electrified (except perhaps a few deeply ru

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

Thomas Wheeler

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

One of the criteria should probably be the scale of changes involved. Major structural upheaval should be avoided as such reorganisations tend to be very disruptive. Any changes should be kept to minimum and/or be implemented gradually so as to avoid undesirable side-effects. There is no case for re-privatising all or part of Network Rail. Railtrack was a failed experiment and this should not be repeated.

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

Network Rail assets which have a potential to earn revenue to fund the railway, at least in part, should be exploited where possible. Such assets should be retained by Network Rail and either managed by them or leased, to provide a long-term income stream

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

Thomas Wheeler

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]

Amila Y'Mech

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

The whole of the rail network should become publicly owned - nothing should remain in private hands - the railway industry is public property, is used by the public, should be owned by it, and its priorities should be publicly determined...

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

That the pursuit of private profit has no place in a public service!

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

Accountability should be to the passengers, the employees and the public...

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

Yes. Rail-users should be present on the board of a newly public British Rail...

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

Customer satisfaction, environmental sustainability should be top incentives...

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

Increase the number of lines and stations...

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

Make the business as decentralised as is commensurate with an efficiently run enterprise...

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

National purchasing should make costs lower...

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

Amila Y'Mech

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

Amila Y'Mech

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

[No response]

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

Get private business out of the railways altogether - no place for profiteering!

Martha Young

1. What are your views on the scope of Network Rail's functions?

I may be mistaken but I understand Network Rail to be responsible for all railway lines in the UK except for preserved lines. I'm not sure if they are responsible for railway stations. I believe that to ensure a high and uniform standard of safety all railway tracks, signalling and stations should be publicly owned. The fragmentation of British Rail at privatisation has brought poorer service and higher fares

2. Have we failed to mention any specific and important factors?

[No response]

3. What are your views on these accountability arrangements and their effectiveness?

[No response]

4. Have we correctly identified and defined Network Rail's customers?

[No response]

5. How effectively are customer needs and expectations met by Network Rail at present?

[No response]

6. Should direct customer pressure on Network Rail be strengthened? If so, how might this be achieved?

[No response]

7. Are there more positive incentives for delivery which would be useful? Are any of these incentives more effective than others?

[No response]

8. Is there a case for changing the route structure and what are the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to disaggregating the network?

[No response]

9. Does the current balance of responsibilities between the routes and the centre seem at the right level? Are there any further responsibilities that should be devolved or centralised?

[No response]

10. Can you point to any specific economies of scale that should be protected at national rather than route level?

[No response]

11. What processes and capabilities need to be in place (at both the centre and route level) to support Network Rail's current devolved structure?

[No response]

Martha Young

12. Drawing on your previous experiences where relevant, what would be the potential impact on your organisation of further structural change within Network Rail?

[No response]

13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to planning enhancements?

[No response]

14. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's current approach to delivering enhancements?

[No response]

15. How well do the current delivery and planning processes work for projects of different sizes?

[No response]

16. Are there any useful models or precedents from other sectors or countries for long term infrastructure planning and delivery processes that we should consider?

[No response]

17. What would be the most important structural features of any future infrastructure provider?

[No response]

18. Are there any other processes which we have not highlighted, either, within Network Rail or the wider industry, which could be improved?

[No response]

19. Do you have any views on how the relationship between the periodic review process and other processes with which you are involved could be improved?

[No response]

20. What criteria should be used to assess structural options under consideration? How, if at all, should these criteria be prioritised?

[No response]

21. Do you have any views on whether the RAB remains a relevant concept in the railways, and, if not, what should replace it?

[No response]

22. How should financial risk be managed in Britain's rail infrastructure in the future?

[No response]

23. Do you have views on how Britain's railway infrastructure should be funded in the future, regardless of corporate structure?

[No response]

Martha Young

24. What positive case studies are there where more affordable and sustainable funding and financing structures have been implemented, with or without private sector capital input? And how do you think the lessons learnt could be applicable to the Britain's railway infrastructure?

[No response]

25. What are your views on the enabling factors facilitating a sustainable and affordable capital structure for Britain's railway infrastructure? What factors would be required specifically for private sector capital introduction?

[No response]

26. What are the types of investors that may be interested in investing in Network Rail or in select parts of it?

Any prospective investors will be interested in how much they can make out of their investment this will lead to poorer service and/or higher cost

27. What characteristics do you think enhancement projects would need to have to attract private sector investment and to what extent and in what form would public sector support would be needed? What types of financing structure could be brought to bear?

[No response]

28. What incentive mechanics or control structures on Network Rail would facilitate third party involvement in the financing of enhancement projects?

[No response]

29. Do these feel like the right concerns? Has anything been missed that it is vital to consider at this stage?

[No response]

Do you have any further views or comments you would like the Report Team to take into account when considering our recommendations?

[No response]