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1 Purpose

1.1 This paper sets out the strategic position that GB representatives will take when discussing the OPE TSI within the various European bodies (Community of European Railways and Infrastructure Companies (CER), European Infrastructure Managers (EIM) and European Rail Agency (ERA) OPE Working Group).

2 Introduction

2.1 There are currently a number of versions of the OPE TSI in various parts of the European process:

2.2 On the European statute book are the High Speed and Conventional Rail OPE TSI, which came into force on 14 November 2010. A merged version with the scope extended to cover all the European network is currently out for Social Consultation. Also out for consultation is Annex A of the OPE TSI which includes the principles, rules and procedures for ERTMS. Whilst this version is being consulted on, work is continuing to take place on updating a number of annexes; these include:

a Annex B – common European Rules
b Annex C – Communication protocols
c Annex D – Data and Structure of the Route and Rule Book and revision of the requirements for recording data

3 Timescales

3.1 The original timescales set out in the mandate from the European Commission (EC) to the ERA was that the work on the above annexes would have to be completed by September 2012, however following further discussions between the EC and ERA it is now certain that the mandate will be extended to September 2013 to get a final version for Social Consultation.

4 Annex B

4.1 The sector organisations (CER and EIM) have agreed a joint process for agreeing common rules amongst themselves in order to propose them to the ERA. This joint process was originally proposed by GB and was accepted without amendment. The process has been piloted and common rules have been established for ‘Defective Horn’ and ‘Defective Front End Lights’. Two further common rules are in process namely ‘Assisting a Failed Train, which is not divided’ and ‘Technical failure at Level Crossings’.

4.2 The Strategy that GB representatives are employing in regards to these rules is that:

a Any changes that would be required to GB rules will enhance performance without compromising the high level of operational safety on the GB network.

b The rules that are agreed in Annex B are targeted at the interface between the Railway Undertaking and the Infrastructure Manager (that is that they are fully within scope of the OPE TSI).

c An agreed position on each rule is agreed between CER and EIM GB representatives prior to the decision at the joint CER/EIM meeting.
5  **Annex C**

5.1 This Annex, setting out the required communications protocols required for operating the railway, is recognised throughout Europe as over complex and confusing. In line with many other member states, the GB strategic position is to simplify this Annex.

5.2 At the same time as simplifying the Annex the GB position is also to:

a  Take into account research (T700) carried out by RSSB into further formalisation of communication statements used in the rail industry.

b  Only target, within the Annex, communication between the Railway Undertakings and the Infrastructure Manager.

c  Gain support from TOM SC for the final position to be agreed by CER/EIM.

6  **Annex D**

6.1 This Annex currently puts additional information behind the requirements within section 4 of the OPE TSI in regards to the structure of both the Rule Book and Route Book. The GB position on the Rule Book is that this additional structure is not really required as it is for both the Infrastructure Manager and the Railway Undertaking to issue the appropriate rules for their staff (GB is in a special position with RSSB performing this function for both parties) and as long as the staff concerned get all the appropriate rules and are trained as competent there is no more to do. However, it is understood that this GB position could cause difficulties for its European partners as European Railway Undertakings rely on their Infrastructure Managers to provide them with the rules. This being the case GB is willing to support the provision of information (whether for the Rule Book or the Route Book) from the Infrastructure Manager to the Railway Undertaking to be harmonised as long as an agreed migration phase is agreed. GB representatives do not see the need for neither a harmonised Rule Book nor a harmonised Route Book.