



PROGRESS REPORT:

RU Dialogue "Legislation/Implementation/Soft Measures Subgroup"

Coordination of infrastructure works (Annex VII)

Maciej Gladyga, ERFA board member and Office Director IGTL

BACKGROUND



- > A chain is only as strong as its weakest link
- Rastatt proved the above to be true unfortunately railway system is to blame
- ➤ A need for **effective international coordination** and **real involvement** of customers
- ➤ Proper organisation of planned line closures/restrictions is a good basis for better management when there are unplanned disturbances.
- ➢ Aim of Annex VII legislation = improve international coordination of infrastructure works

WHAT DO WE LIKE ABOUT ANNEX VII?





IM Coordination work – Infrastructure managers, including those impacted by the rerouting of trains, are obliged to coordinate amongst themselves capacity restrictions



Better understanding of user needs – Railway undertakings and service facilities have a right, subject to invitation from the infrastructure managers, to be involved in the coordination work for international rail services.



Information to users – The planned day, time of day, the section of lines affected and the <u>capacity of diversionary lines</u> shall be provided to users far in advance



Planning that minimizes rail disruptions:

For major capacity restrictions infrastructure Managers are obliged to set up a coordination platform, together with users and service facilities to prepare timetables, including the provision of diversionary routes.

For the most disruptive capacity restrictions at least 2 alternatives of capacity restrictions shall be offered to users, indicating the duration of the disruption and available capacity on diversionary lines.

RELEVANCE TO RASTATT?



The processes and structures only apply to planned disruptions

BUT



They improve **coordination** among IMs



Puts in place **structures and processes** for dealing with construction works that impact international services



Creates **improved understanding** about the RU **needs** forcing IMs to think about RU capacity availability on diversionary lines

All useful for unplanned disruptions!

WHERE ARE WE NOW:





ERFA Chair, Gladyga Maciej has chaired 3 subgroup meetings

RU subgroup has joined the RNE Taskforce developing Guidelines for Annex VII implementation:



- Collaborative approach
- Directly influencing IM implementation



- Guidelines are voluntary
- IMs do not need to take on board RU input



Main points of discussion!

- TCR definition
- Involvement of applicants/Rus
- Information provision to the market

WHAT NEXT?



ERFA RU subgroup to reconvene in the New Year to produce RU recommendations:

- What best practice can we promote?
- ➤ What is **missing** from the RNE Guidelines?
- ➤ How can IMs and RUs work together to put pressure on National Ministries to better support rail?

ERFA strives to create an improved framework for IM management and planning of planned disruptions, which we also believe will support international rail freight services in the event of unplanned disruptions, such as Rastatt!

RNE GUIDELINES – Task Force



Timeline of activities

	Т					Π																
	Before X-24	X-24	X-23	Х-22	X-21	X-20	X-19	X-18	ZT-X	X-16	X-15	X-14	X-13	X-12	X-11	X-10	6-X	8-X	X-7	9-X	Х-5	X-4
Major impact TCRs	Preliminary consultation of applicants Coordination with neighboring IMs Requests from applicants	First publication of TCRs	Finalization of provision of alternatives; consultation and coordination					Coordination finalization			Final consultation			ation of TCRs								
High impact TCRs	Preliminary consult Coordination with Requests fro	First publica					Consultation	coordination				Coordination	finalized Final consultation	Second publication of TCRs								
Medium impact TCRs	Consultation and coordination											Coord	fina Final con	Publication								
Minor impact TCRs		Preliminary consultation and coordination																	First information	Consultation	and coordination	Publication