

RFC NSM

# ERTMS Deployment Action Plan Feedback



Co-financed by the European Union  
Connecting Europe Facility

*easier, faster, safer*

# ERTMS Deployment Action Plan Feedback

- 1. EC ERTMS Deployment Plan**
- 2. Precisions from the Commission**
- 3. RFC NSMWorkplan**
- 4. Conclusion & discussion**

# 1. EC ERTMS Deployment Action Plan

## Reminder : role of RFC

The RFC is a cooperation grouping of IM's around various stakeholders:

- Executive Board / EC
- Management Board / IM
- RAG
- TAG, etc.

With the aim to develop rail freight on its lines, the main role of the RFC is to:

- be an exchange platform for all stakeholders
- Act as a whistle-blower for the "spot" issues raised its stakeholders
- Act as a one-stop shop for the structural technical issues that its stakeholders can address

# 1. EU ERTMS Deployment Action Plan

## Expectations for RFC expressed in the EC document

- RFC and RAG are considered as a stakeholder to gather the views about ERTMS deployment
- ERA approval for trackside projects : RFC must be involved in learning cases anticipating the 4RP before 2019.
- Addressing non interoperable infrastructure :
  - MB have to steer among their member the development of BCA on the cross border sections → We recommend that this task is held on national level or on bilateral level in case of cross border section
  - Involvement in the identification of non-interoperable infrastructure
  - Involvement in the development of strategy to address non-interoperable infrastructure
- Involvement in the prioritisation of cases for the incompatibilities between trackside and OBU – identification of problems in the national rules

# 1. EU ERTMS Deployment Action Plan

## Expectations for RFC expressed in the EC document

Being the decider for the investments, the ExBo should have the following tasks held, in the coordination with IM's

- Publication of a plan for the deployment of ERTMS
- Involvement in the EDP follow-up
- Involvement in the communication and publication of national rules which could impact on interoperability
- Authorisation of vehicle by ERA : involvement in learning case → we consider that ERA and/or RUs should inform RFC and / or IM's in case of difficulties, and ask the RFC to act as a facilitator/moderator for bilateral discussions. In addition, if problems are reported directly to the RFC, it will transfer this information to ERA
- Involvement in the engagement with IM to explore possible changes to requirements/plans to provide a more attractive case for RU with standard OBU → we consider it is not the role of RFC but the role of the ERA
- Involvement in the production of a structured tender template for the OBU → we consider it is not the role of RFC but the role of ERA or RU organisation

# ERTMS Deployment Action Plan Feedback

1. **EC ERTMS Deployment Plan**
2. **Precisions from the Commission**
3. **RFC NSM Workplan**
4. **Conclusion & discussion**

## 2. Complementary email from the Commission

### **Softening and explaining the expectations...**

- RFC means cooperation between IM (between all stakeholders: RFC office, IM's, RU's, etc.)
- RFC = a platform to facilitate the information flow between respective entities
- Goal : making corridor really interoperable
- List of actions :
  - ERA approval trackside : detection of the possible exported constraints from one network to another one which impacts the traffic
  - Addressing non-interoperable infrastructure : in function of the Baseline Compatibility Assessment
  - Collaboration to resolve incompatibilities between trackside and OBU

## 2. Complementary email from the Commission

### Softening and explaining the expectations...

- Collect the data for the ERTMS roll out on the principal, diversionary and connecting lines to make an overview, relevant for the customers
- Develop a plan to make possible the run of non-class B locos on the lines
- Identify and communicate to ERA the national rules which can have an impact on ERTMS (Appendix A TIS OPE)
- Authorisation of vehicle : inform ERA of any exported constraints on OBU due to a trackside or class B system → we consider that ERA and/or RUs should inform RFC and / or IM's in case of difficulties, and ask to be a facilitator for bilateral discussions. In addition, if difficulties are directly reported to the RFC, it will give the information to the ERA
- Funding/Financing : no involvement but the RAG can be use to promote joint purchasing on a voluntary basis → This is not in the RFC's field of competencies and decisions but we can inform them via the RAG and support them via support letters

# ERTMS Deployment Action Plan Feedback

1. EC ERTMS Deployment Plan
2. Precisions from the Commission
3. RFC NSM Workplan
4. Conclusion & discussion

### 3. RFC North Sea - Med Workplan

#### Actions taken

- Focus on the Rodange triangle implementation (BE-FR-LU)
- Deep fit-gap analysis made on national rules compared to the Appendix A of TSI OPE → [Next steps to be decided with the ERA WG.](#)
- Collaboration with the RAG to identify problems of decommissioning in BE and LU
- Collaboration with the RAG to identify and try to solve the BE-NL border problem
- Study on the constraints exports of the breaking curves parameters in collaboration with ERA

# ERTMS Deployment Action Plan Feedback

1. EC ERTMS Deployment Plan
2. Precisions from the Commission
3. RFC NSM Workplan
4. Conclusion & discussion

## 4. Conclusion and discussion

**We are on the good way and maybe we can develop :**

- Collaboration made with other corridors in order to promote our fit-gap analysis on national rules compared to the Appendix A of TSI OPE
  - the ERA WG took over this task and integrated it in its WG
  - RFC Network Group can collect, underline the identified issues and inform the TSI OPE ERA WG.
- Further collaboration with the RAG and involved IM in order to :
  - detect possible export of constraints from a network to another one
  - detect interoperability issues, and address them to the relevant IM's or ERA with the help of the RFC
- Develop the customer's view about running a train without a class B system including all the possible operations problems (rerouting, parking and siding, etc.)

The sole responsibility of this publication lies with the author.  
The European Union is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained there in.

## Contact

[oss@rfc2.eu](mailto:oss@rfc2.eu)

[www.rfc-northsea-med.eu](http://www.rfc-northsea-med.eu)

**ProRail**

**INFRABEL**  
*Right On Track*

**NetworkRail**

**SNCF**  
RÉSEAU



**CFL**



ACF

 **SBB CFF FFS**

trasse.ch  
trasse | schweiz | ag  
sillon | suisse | sa  
traccia | svizzera | sa  
swiss | train paths | ltd



Co-financed by the European Union  
Connecting Europe Facility