

Dear Gabriela,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed revised NR approach to allocating vehicles to suspension bandings.

In response to the consultation questions contained in the Appendix A of the Network Rail proposal I would make the following responses:

*1. Do you agree that the revised approach (to allocating freight vehicles to Suspension Bands) addresses the issues raised in responses to the June 2011 consultation?*

**YES**

*2. Do you consider the revised approach to be generally fit for purpose?*

**YES**

*3. Do you have any comments to make on Manchester Metropolitan University's (MMU) report (attached)?*

**NO**

Timing of introduction

*4. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce the revised approach (to allocating freight vehicles to Suspension Bands) from the beginning of CP5?*

**WE ARE NOT OPPOSED TO THIS PROPOSAL**

*5. Do you agree that the revised approach (to allocating freight vehicles to Suspension Bands) should not be applied retrospectively for old bogie types in CP4 and CP5?*

**YES**

*6. Do you agree that it is reasonable to reset all Suspension Factors to 1.00 from the beginning of CP6?*

**WHILST UNDERSTANDING THE LOGIC FOR THIS PROPOSAL, WE ARE CONCERNED THAT IT WILL INCREASE COSTS FOR OPERATING EXISTING VEHICLES WITH ESTABLISHED 'TRACK FRIENDLY' SUSPENSIONS UNLESS COST IS INCURRED TO UNDERTAKE THE NECESSARY STUDY RETROSPECTIVELY TO ALLOCATE A SUSPENSION BAND BY THE NEW PROCESS. IT WOULD SEEM UNREASONABLE TO SET THE SUSPENSION FACTOR TO 1.00 FOR EXISTING WAGONS WITH KNOWN 'TRACK FRIENDLY' SUSPENSIONS.**

*Suspension Factors*

*7. Do you agree that it is reasonable to retain the current spread between the highest and lowest Suspension Factors of +9.8% and -14.2% respectively?*

**YES**

Thank you

David

David Barney  
Secretary General  
PWF  
07789 801395