

# Meeting of the terminal advisory group

9 Octobre 2013 - Rotterdam

## Summary

---

<b>Progress of the corridor</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Consultation on the Implementation plan</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Corridor information document</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Results of the transport market study</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Information on terminals</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Terminal Information System</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>8</b>

## Participants

---

### **Terminal advisory group of Rail Freight Corridor 2 (TAG)**

Maurits Van Schuylenburg	Port of Rotterdam
Jan Willem Reuchlin	Port of Amsterdam
Pieter Förrer	RSC Rotterdam
Koerd Reijken	CTT Intermodal transport
Christian de Bruijn	Keyrail
Jeffery Piarrat	ATICS
Frédéric Zoller	Duferco
Fernanda van Opstral	APM terminal Zeebrugge
Frédéric Buyse	IFB
Ben Beinaert	Combinant NV
Kate Verslype	Port of Ghent
Koen Cuypers	Port of Antwerp
Dany de Bryune	Naviland Cargo
Yves Lalaut	Port de Dunkerque
Christine Wustmann	Sté des Ports de Moselle
Anthony Pétilion	Port de Calais
Patrick Linden	CFL Multimodal
Martin Haller	SBB Cargo AG
Marc Jansen	Hupac

### **Regulator**

Coen Timermann	Dutch Regulatory body
----------------	-----------------------

### **Management board of Rail Freight Corridor 2**

Erik Van Der Linden	Prorail
Peggy Esseldeurs	Infrabel
Michel Geubelle	Infrabel
Andri Mathis	Sillon Suisse
Rudi Achermann	CFF
Maurice Faramelli	ACF
Daniel Thull	CFL
Paul Mazataud	GEIE RFC2
Eric Guenther	GEIE RFC2
Thomas Vanbeveren	GEIE RFC2
Claire Hamoniau	GEIE RFC2

## Introduction

---

Erik Van der Linden welcomes the participants to this fourth meeting of the terminal advisory group.

Paul Mazataud indicates that the agenda will be quite heavy with six topics to discuss. He insists that the feedback of the terminals is crucial for the corridor.

A tour de table is made so that all participants introduce themselves.

## Progress of the corridor

---

Paul Mazataud, together with Eric Guenther and Claire Hamoniau, inform on the progress of the corridor since the last meeting of the TAG which took place in March 2013 (see presentation "Progress of the corridor"): the implementation plan, the future extensions of the corridor, the coordination of works, traffic management, EU funding and communication issues.

## Consultation on the Implementation plan

---

Claire Hamoniau presents the results of the consultation of the Implementation plan (see presentation "Consultation of the Implementation plan").

### List of terminals

Paul Mazataud indicates that one of the most important decisions made in the Implementation plan is the list of terminals. This list is approved by the Executive board, as part of the Implementation plan. The consequences from being on that list are to be integrated in the TAG and that information from these terminals is included in the Corridor Information Document. Also, more generally, it is expected that there is or will be important traffic to the terminals listed, and therefore the EEIG would like to develop the relationship with them, as a collaboration between the corridor and the terminals is important to facilitate the development of the traffic. It is therefore in the interest of the terminal to be in the list.

There are four categories of terminals: ports, combined transport terminals, marshalling yards and Inland waterway ports. Most marshalling yards belong to infrastructure managers..

Eurotunnel was taken away from the list of terminals, as it is an infrastructure manager and not a terminal. It will therefore belong to the Management board at the latest in 2016.

### Corridor lines

The last mile of the port of Calais has not been added as a line of the corridor as it is not owned by RFF.



### **Train performance management**

Thomas Vanbeveren explains that a performance management working group has been set up. Railway undertakings are invited to some meetings (approximately 2 per year). The necessary data on international train runs is obtained through TIS for the main lines of the corridor. Reports are made, for the moment for internal use only.

### **Infrastructure charges**

Paul Mazataud informs that Regulation 913-2010 doesn't foresee that the corridor has any responsibility on charges. It doesn't take any decision on charging. Therefore the paths allocated through the corridor will be invoiced by each infrastructure manager. In the Corridor Information Document, information is nevertheless given on charging, via the links to the national network statements.

### **Traffic management – priority rules**

Paul Mazataud explains that Book IV of the Corridor Information Document will inform on priority rules in each country. In fact, in most countries - there are still challenges with Belgium – a freight train that is on time should remain on time as far as possible. These last words are important as for ex if a single track blocks a freight train, it might be impossible to let this freight train remain on time. Nevertheless, there is a higher probability that an international freight train is late compared to a Passenger train. There is therefore an indirect dissymmetry with this new rule.

Marc Jansen believes that there should be more fairness between freight and passenger traffic and that this takes too long to come.

Paul Mazataud answers that so far the corridor has focussed on the compliance with Regulation 913-2010: trains on time should remain on time. Still, this is a binary view (on time or late). Therefore, when everybody is late, who should have priority? The corridor is still willing to go further than the Regulation as reliability is the most important point addressed by stakeholders in the transport market study. In future, we will carry out bilateral discussions to see what processes can be put in place so that punctuality improves.

Coen Timermann would like to know if the priority rules of Infrabel will be harmonised by 10 November 2013 with the rest of the corridor?

Michel Geubelle answers that these rules will be adapted as soon as possible.

### **Works**

Marc Jansen would like to know what are the “obligations” for an infrastructure manager in terms of works: is there a timeline foreseen for the information by the infrastructure manager? Is it obliged to give an alternative path? If so, what would be a correct alternative? For example, a departure at 5 p.m. instead of 5 a.m. would not be a good alternative.

Paul Mazataud answers that pre-arranged paths (PaP) are a major change for freight. Indeed, the regulation foresees that the PaP cannot be cancelled within the two last months except for Force Majeur linked to safety problems. It is only possible for the infrastructure manager to cancel a PaP if the applicant agrees so and if it can provide



another PaP instead. Also, the corridor has to publish works. Regulation 913-2010 doesn't give time limits, so it was decided to publish a list of the following two years of works. This list, which is indicative, is updated every six months.

### **Path requests**

Paul Mazataud informs of the concept of feeders / outflows. When requests which are partly on and out of the corridor are made, the contact person is the Corridor-One-stop shop who will coordinate with the national infrastructure manager for what is not on the corridor. The feeder / outflow is a "normal" path, so there is a combination between a normal path and a PaP.

### **Addition of terminals on the corridor list**

Maurits Van Schuylenburg would like to know how it is decided to add terminals to the list. Are new terminals added automatically?

Paul Mazataud answers that the Corridor Information Document is updated once a year. It is therefore at that time that we decide to add terminals or lines. If the request comes from a terminal and the Infrastructure manager concerned confirms that it makes sense on a market point of view, the terminal is then added to the list. Nothing is automatic, but all terminals which have an impact for the corridor should be on the list of corridor terminals. Terminals should inform us if they want a new terminal to be on the list.

### **Capacity**

Paul Matataud informs that on 10 November 2013 we will publish reserve capacity for 2014, which will consist of a small amount of PaPs. For 2015, many more PaPs will be published

Coen Timermann would like to know if the performance of paths will be monitored.

Thomas Vanbeveren answers that an annual performance report will be published in December 2014. It will be composed of 19 performance data.

## **Corridor information document**

---

Thomas Vanbeveren presents the Corridor Information Document - CID (see presentation "Corridor Information Document"):

- the structure of the CID.
- the Book IV of the CID: the Corridor-One-stop shop, PCS which is the only tool to book pre-arranged paths, the authorised applicants – which is with the pre-arranged paths - the most important item of the Regulation 913-2010, the path products.

### **PaPs**

Thomas Vanbeveren explains that fees are applicable for PaPs not used. These fees are charged by the infrastructure managers according to national rules.



Coen Timermann believes that there should be a dependency between the one way and the return of a train run. He asks if a return path linked to the first path can be booked.

Paul Mazataud indicates that the corridor has as many paths one way as the other way, but that they can't be booked together. Thomas Vanbeveren adds that a PCS dossier contains one direction for the moment, not the return. He will check if it is possible to add the return.

### **Corridor processes**

It seems for Marc Jansen that each corridor is implementing its own rules therefore he asks for these rules to become homogeneous.

Thomas Vanbeveren answers that Regulation 913-2010 left place for interpretation and it was sometimes difficult to reach harmonisation. For example, concerning the time limits until which reserve capacity can be booked, it was decided on Corridor 2 to be closer to market demand, though this meant not using the same rule as other corridors. There are a few different rules between corridors which corridors try to harmonise through RNE.

Marc Jansen sees a possible competition between corridors, due to the differences of rules.

Thomas Vanbeveren answers that there is no competition between corridors and our first aim is to delete boundaries.

### **Corridor activities regulation**

Coen Timermann informs that corridor activities are under the control of regulatory bodies. The corridors have to be transparent and not act in a discriminatory way. If clients feel that they are treated with discrimination, they can make a complaint to the regulator. The regulators of each Corridor signed a cooperation agreement in which they agreed to nominate one regulatory body which will be in charge of each corridor. For Corridor 2, it will be the regulator of Luxembourg.

## **Results of the transport market study**

---

Eric Guenther presents the results of the transport market study (see presentation "Transport market study"). This market study, which is now coming to its end, is composed of four tasks. Task three "market projections" (swot analysis, comparison of rail costs with the costs of road and inland waterway) and four "Multi Criteria Analysis" to estimate the impact of the soft measures on the performance of the corridor are detailed in this presentation.

A graph shows that transport by rail is cheaper on three of the corridor routes. Fernanda van Opstral indicates that this is the case for travels of over 600 km.

Ben Beinaert asks if terminals have to leave timeslots to the corridor. Thomas Vanbeveren answers that pre-arranged paths are only provided by infrastructure managers. Terminals will manage their capacity as before. Paul Mazataud adds that pre-arranged paths are



based on the demand of applicants, which is based on the current access time of terminals.

Paul Mazataud concludes that the message from the study is that on top of investments such as ERTMS, there is a lot of demand on quality of service. Soft measures, which are not investments, such as coordination of works or capacity management, are often more efficient for the modal shift and traffic increase than many investments. The corridor should therefore concentrate, besides ERTMS, on soft measures.

## Information on terminals

---

Claire Hamoniau explains that Regulation 913-2010 requests that the Corridor Information Document contains information on terminals (the list of corridor terminals and their characteristics). For this reason, it was decided in the last TAG meeting that each terminal will fill in forms with the necessary information. The forms, one for each type of terminal, has been drafted together with Corridor 1 so that terminals which are on both corridors don't receive two different forms. By now, all terminals must have received these documents, through the port authority if the terminal is in a port.

We therefore ask each terminal to fill in the forms, place them on their website and send the link of the corresponding page to the corridor. The corridor will then make a link from its own website to the webpage of the terminal. They have to be filled in and then put on the website of the terminal. After the terminal has sent the corridor the link to the corresponding webpage, the corridor will put in his. This process will enable the forms to be updated directly by the terminals. We would appreciate to have the links to the templates filled by the 18<sup>th</sup> October.

## Terminal Information System

---

Thomas Vanbeveren presents this tool, provided by RNE, which provides real time information on international trains. The template has to be signed before the access to TIS is given.

Paul Mazataud informs that a template on confidentiality agreement will be sent to all terminals of the corridor. The letter from the ministries encourages terminals to use TIS. Indeed, terminals don't have anything to lose by using TIS. It is free of charge and the corridor can help terminals to use it. There are about half a dozen railway undertakings active on the corridor and terminals only have to sign the cooperation agreement with the main railway undertakings which use their terminal. It is indeed important to know where trains are located even if they are in another country. This issue was discussed with the railway undertakings last week and they don't have any objection in signing the confidentiality agreements.

Fernanda van Opstral reminds that the system still depends on the information put in the system.

Thomas Vanbeveren answers that data quality is also monitored in TIS. Quality checks are constantly been performed. He gives the example of train numbering which is not always



kept the same for the whole train run. He informs that TIS now gives the possibility, for the moment not on all lines, to add a point on the network and see the trains going on this point.

Rudi Achermann adds that the estimated time of arrival (ETA) is calculated for TIS as the delay put to the end of the train run.

## Conclusion

---

Paul Mazataud concludes this meeting. He informs that the presentations and the RNE template for the TIS confidentiality agreement will be sent. He will be grateful if the terminals could send the link to the terminal form and offers the help of the corridor for this request.

Next TAG meeting will be in 2014. A save the date will be sent for the event in Ghent.

He thanks the participants for having come to the meeting and for being more and more numerous in TAG meetings. This shows their increasing involvement in corridor matters.