

## LISTING OF ALL OPINIONS GIVEN BY THE ADVISORY GROUPS SINCE 2013

Opinions	Follow-up by the Management Board (MB)
<p>Have the possibility to run trains with P400 loading gauge on the main lines of the corridor (RAG meeting 18/1/2013)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Launch of a RAG/MB working group to study the exact request of the RUs</li> <li>- In Luxembourg and France, studies, co-financed by the EU, were launched to analyse the possibility to upgrade sections of the corridor to P400 (Calais – Longuyon – Luxembourg - Thionville – Metz – Strasbourg – Basel)</li> <li>- In France, the upgrade of the tunnels of these lines are planned to take place as from 2016</li> </ul> <p>Further information on loading gauge upgrade studies (scope, customer’s needs,) is available <a href="#">here</a> .</p>
<p>Harmonise path prices in Europe (RAG meeting 18/1/2013)</p>	<p>A RAG/MB working group was launch to analyse the competitiveness of RFC 2 and to study in which areas improvements had to be made to lower the costs for RUs.</p> <p>The working group concluded that path costs are not the main obstacle. The main issue is the higher number of signaling systems on RFC North Sea - Med compared to RFC Rhine - Alpine. The study and detailed conclusions are available <a href="#">here</a>.</p>
<p>Improve the coordination of works and the information given to RUs on works which restrict capacity (RAG meeting 18/1/2013)</p>	<p>Launch of a RAG/MB working group on coordination of works.</p> <p>The main conclusions of the group are that the publication of works can be fine-tuned and that Athus-Meuse and Artère Nord Est can be used as alternative routes. This working group is activated each time there is a need.</p>
<p>Improve cross border acceptance such as for safety certificates, rolling stock (RAG meeting 18/1/2013)</p>	<p>Launch of a RAG/MB working group on cross border interoperability.</p> <p>The main conclusions of the group is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Light” cross acceptance already exists in the countries of our corridor</li> <li>- It is not really a solution as far as the station right after the border point is not a hub used by the RU</li> <li>- ETCS seems to be the best solution for the long term</li> <li>- Improvements can be performed at Roosendaal (study ongoing)</li> </ul>

<p>Extend the corridor to North of London and with the inclusion of HS1 (RAG meeting 18/1/2013 and 19/3/2014)</p>	<p>The MB started discussions with HS1 to include its line in the corridor. The extension North of London will be performed according to Regulation (EU) 913/2010 as amended</p>
<p>Put links of other RFCs and of PCS on RFC2's website (RAG meeting 19/3/2014)</p>	<p>A page of useful links (other RFCs, PCS, TIS, IM, RNE ...) is now on the corridor website</p>
<p>Opinions given on the first Implementation plan (consultation of the TAG and RAG on Implementation plan in April 2013)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Add the Metz bottleneck on the map</li> <li>- Provide maps at larger scale</li> <li>- Clarify the governance of the RAG</li> <li>- Make changes to the transport market study</li> <li>- Mention EPR and keep financial aspects as a goal</li> <li>- ERTMS: include a planning of characteristics and inform on the date of removal of legacy system</li> <li>- Plan the electrification of the last mile in port of Calais</li> <li>- Give more information on investments needed for P400 loading gauge and 740 meter- trains</li> <li>- Clarify the role of the C-OSS for capacity request on more than one corridor</li> <li>- Allow drivers to be able to speak only in French or only Flemish in Belgium</li> <li>- Add lines</li> </ul>	<p>Answers given by the MB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Metz bottleneck has been added</li> <li>- A GIS has been created</li> <li>- A president was nominated at the RAG of 19/5/2013</li> <li>- The changes requested to the TMS were not performed as this study was subcontracted to external consultants in order to have an impartial study. Though, two modifications were performed: addition of Ghent as an important industrial area and removal of data on charging as they are inconsistent</li> <li>- The integration of EPR in TPM is already described in the Implementation plan. It is added that the implementation of financial part of EPR is not a goal at short/medium term</li> <li>- These dates are already included in the implementation plan, when known</li> <li>- Investment not planned as not socioeconomically profitable</li> <li>- Only investments planned are included in the investment plan</li> <li>- This role has been clarified in book IV of the Corridor Information Document</li> <li>- The issue of languages is not under the responsibility of the MB so the request was passed to the Belgium ministry via the Executive board of the corridor. Concerning cross-border operations, the issue on languages was also passed to the Executive board, the SERAC, the EU and the NSA. On 21<sup>st</sup> December 2015, the EU Commission and ERA reached an agreement to modify Directive 2007/59/EC so that more flexibility is provided to train drivers for cross border operations</li> <li>- Lines added: Nancy - Reding (diversionary line), Lille - Arras via Lens (principal line), last km to port of Calais (connecting line), Ambérieu - Vénissieux (diversionary line), connection to the port of</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Add terminals</li> </ul>	<p>Zeebrugge (principal line as from 2016), electrified lines of the port of Antwerp (connecting)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lines not added: Somain – Valenciennes (not much international traffic), Paris – Lyon (Paris node is already very congested), Aulnoye-Quévy-Mechelen (line too steep, already 3 border lines in the area and would go to Brussels node)</li> <li>- Terminals added: La Louvière (BE), Antwerp Main Hub (BE), Antwerp Schijnpoort (BE), Vénissieux (FR) and 5 terminals in the port of Dunkirk</li> <li>- Terminals not added: Châtelet (BE) as no activity</li> </ul>
<p>Uniform train length in order to not have to change the composition of the train at borders nor to keep low train length (RAG meeting of 1/10/2014)</p>	<p>the Investment Plan of the corridor includes a budget to invest on the Belgium side of the corridor in a few sidings to allow 740 meter trains to be admitted at all times.</p>
<p>Postpone the prohibition to run on lines equipped with ETCS 2.3.0d with rolling stock not equipped with ETCS or TBL 1+ (RAG meeting of 1/10/2014)</p>	<p>A Royal Decree was published on 23rd December 2015 postponing the dismantling of the Memor-Crocodile to 12 December 2016 and therefore postponing the prohibition to run on lines equipped with ETCS 2.3.0d with rolling stock not equipped with ETCS or TBL 1+</p>
<p>Insure compatibility between ETCS systems (RAG meeting of 1/10/2014)</p>	<p>An ETCS working group works on this issue to make sure that there is a high degree of compatibility between ETCS systems</p>
<p>Create more paths (RAG meeting of 1/10/2014)</p>	<p>The 2016 catalogue provides a higher number of PaPs: the offer was 22% higher compared to timetable 2015 and the allocation 79% higher</p>
<p>Have common RAG meetings with other corridors (RAG meeting of 1/10/2014)</p>	<p>Common RAG meetings, which gathers representatives from each RAG and from each MB, are now organized with ECCO (UIC) and RNE to deal with all issues common to the corridors</p>
<p>Opinions given on the timetable 2016 CID (consultation of the TAG and RAG)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RUs must continue to be involved in the Train Performance Management working group</li> <li>- Perform the study on loading gauge South of Lyon (also TAG meeting 23/9/2015)</li> </ul>	<p>Answers made by the MB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As the quality of data had improved, the RU/MB working group on TPM was re-launched in 2015</li> <li>- A study will soon be performed between Lyon and Marseille and the MB will inform the RAG of the outcomes of the study</li> </ul>
<p>Opinions given on the Flex-PaP product (consultation of the RAG in February 2015). Major positive remark: timetables may be better adapted to the needs of the customer Major negative remark: scepticism towards the quality of the delivered timetable</p>	<p>The MB decided not to offer Flex-PaP for the moment, as this product doesn't meet the needs of the applicants</p>
<p>The works in Belgium between Ottignies and Namur should not decrease allowable train weight and should not reduce capacity significantly (RAG meeting of 27/05/2015)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line 144 will be reduced to single track which will extend the loading gauge profile</li> <li>- There will be no change in allowable loading weight in both directions</li> <li>- On L130, some works are postponed to 2019 at the earliest</li> </ul> <p>Works in Ottignies will not start without Infrabel having gone through all the different possibilities with the RUs</p>

Harmonise terminal forms with the ones of other RFCs (TAG meeting 23/9/2015)	The template is already common with RFC 1 & 8 and the MB will suggest that all corridors use the same template. s
Adapt the cost of TIS to all terminals as some have very little rail traffic and couldn't afford paying the price described in the presentation (TAG meeting 23/9/2015)	The MB passed this information to RailNetEurope who decided to connect terminals to TIS for free as long as the EU continues to co-finance it
Have more information on the RAG/MB working groups (aim of group, timeline, name of members)	The MB created an EDMS for RAG & TAG members where the required information is indicated
Have more PaPs in 2017 (RAG meeting of 26/11/2015)	The 2017 catalogue will provide a higher number of PaPs
Get help from the MB to find areas where SNCF Réseau is abandoning capillary network and which could lead to a loss of international freight traffic (RAG meeting of 26/11/2015)	This issue has been addressed to SNCF Réseau who is currently studying it
Speed-up the achievement of P400 loading gauge on the corridor, and especially in the Vosges tunnels (RAG meeting of 26/11/2015)	The RAG informed that an official letter will be sent to the MB on this issue. The MB will then provide an answer.

RFC North Sea – Med is co-financed by the European Union's TEN-T.

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 therein.



**Co-financed by the European Union**  
 Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T)