

MEETING OF THE RAILWAY UNDERTAKING ADVISORY GROUP

26 November 2015, Brussels

Participants

Railway undertakings and associations

Ghislain Bartholomé	CFL Cargo
François Coart	Europorte
Neil Crossland	GB Rail Freight
Lieven Goethals	SNCB logistics
Dominique Louppe	Sibelit
Gaëlle Vantalou-Korovitch	SNCF Logistics
Ad Toet	KNV

Regulatory body

Gretel Panels (Belgium)

Executive board

Peter Geens (Belgium)

Management board

Bryan Athew	Network Rail
Daniel Thull	CFL
Rudi Achermann	SBB
Kris Van Crombruggen	Infrabel
Daniel Haltner	Trasse Schweiz
Guillaume Confais-Morieux	Permanent team
Eric Guenther	Permanent team
Thomas Vanbeveren	Permanent team
Mohammed Salimène	Permanent team
Claire Hamoniau	Permanent team

Expectations from the RAG

G. Confais-Morieux welcomes the participants.

F. Coart, on behalf of the RAG, informs of the railway undertakings' expectations, following the pre-RAG meeting:

- To benefit from the developments linked to the extensions of the corridor;
- To get help from the Management board to find the areas where SNCF Réseau is abandoning capillary network and which could lead to a loss of international freight traffic;
- To have more PaPs in 2017;
- To find solutions so that the single tracking of line 144 and the signaling works in Ottignies (Belgium) don't reduce capacity significantly;
- To boost the achievement of P400 loading gauge enhancement on the corridor, and especially in the Vosges tunnels;
- To have very quickly the information on the obligation for freight locomotives to be equipped with ETCS in Belgium, as there is just one month left before ERTMS becomes compulsory.

G. Confais-Morieux answers that most of the topics raised will be dealt during the meeting, specifically for the 2017 timetable capacity.

Capillary network

F. Coart indicates that the capillary network cannot be disconnected from the corridor and on the contrary, we should try and develop this network. It seems that 20% of freight traffic, mostly European, could be lost if the capillary network was abandoned.

G. Confais-Morieux proposes that this issue is more deeply studied by the permanent team together with SNCF Réseau. A working group will be set-up on this issue if needed.

Works in Belgium (line 144 and Ottignies)

G. Confais-Morieux will come back to the RAG on this issue and suggests using the working group on coordination of works to deal with it if necessary.

Loading gauge upgrade

D. Haltner informs that the Swiss Ministry of Transport is aware of the need for adapting the profile in the two tunnels between St Louis and Basle. The parliament allocated money for the upgrade of tunnels between Basel and Italy, and the ministry will see if this amount can include the two tunnels between St Louis and Basel or if he has to ask for more money.

F. Coart thanks D. Haltner for his reactivity on this topic as it was recently raised. He asks if support is needed from the RAG. D. Haltner informs that no help is necessary for the time being.

E. Guenther presents the state of play of tunnel works on the corridor (see presentation "[Loading gauge enhancement studies](#)").

F. Coart clarifies that railway undertakings want to transport P400 trailers.

He asks how the corridor can help SNCF Réseau to get the money to perform the works, as we have to be more ambitious in the timing for the loading gauge upgrade of these tunnels. It is thanks to the corridor that we reopen the file so we now have to put positive pressure to accelerate the process.

G. Confais-Morieux informs that a new CEF Call should be launched in 2018 and could be a source of financing of the works in the tunnels. Also, he suggests the RAG to write an official letter for this request, with an indication on the traffic growth expectations linked to the increase of loading gauge. C. Hamoniau adds that the letter should be written to the Management board who will inform the Executive board of this request.

ERTMS on-board

G. Confais-Morieux informs that there is for the moment no official information on this topic.

F. Coart wonders why the decision comes so late. He also asks if we are sure that the ERTMS foreseen in UK is compatible with the continental one.

B. Athew informs that he will check this issue and F. Coart suggests also checking with Eurotunnel.

What's new on the corridor?

Presentation made by G. Confais-Morieux (see PowerPoint "[What's new on the corridor](#)") on the following subjects:

- Organisation of the corridor;
- EU subsidy, framework for capacity allocation and sector paper on the recast of Regulation (EU) 913-2010;
- Extensions of the corridor;
- Cooperation with other RFCs;
- State of play of the corridor's working groups;
- Cooperation with the CNC.

Sector paper on the recast of Regulation (EU) 913-2010

G. Confais-Morieux will send the sector paper to the participants. This paper is very close to the RFC paper.

A. Toet thinks that we need more ambition with the corridors, for example by giving more power to the offices of the corridors and by giving facilities to the EEIGs to finance the expectations of railway undertakings, such as on PCS.

G. Confais-Morieux states that not everything needs to be written in the regulation. Eg, the evolution of PCS must be dealt with out of the regulation.

Ad Toet asks how the process of investments on longer trains can be accelerated.

K. Van Crombruggen informs that at this point of time, Infrabel has no precise idea of which planned investments can be made and at what time, apart from ETCS.

A. Toet states that applicants need to have better paths and that they don't need to be PaPs, which is just an instrument.

G. Confais-Morieux answers that there are advantages in PaPs (coordination, path made in advance ...) and that we shouldn't kill the PaP before we are sure to have a better product.

Extensions

B. Athew stresses that the UK ministry is really in favor of the RFC, but not for the planned date of the extension beyond London.

K. Van Crombruggen informs that the route to Zeebrugge is now defined, and goes through Aubange, Namur, Chareroi, Tournai and Courtrai. It has been decided not to go through Ghent nor Mechelen which are bottlenecks. T. Vanbeveren adds that the other route which can interest the railway undertakings belongs to RFC1 and can also be used. CFL and Sibelit express their concern on the route chosen.

Geographical Information System

C. Hamoniau provides information on RailNetEurope's new tool called Customer Information Platform. This tool provides a Geographical Information System which will be implemented by RFC North Sea – Med. On a longer term, the tool will be developed with new functionalities. It will be presented to the RAG at its next meeting.

Results of the 2015 customer satisfaction survey

Presentation made by C. Hamoniau (see PowerPoint "[Customer satisfaction survey](#)").

Concerning the coordination of works, the RAG informs that the non-satisfaction of railway undertakings does not concern so much the information delivered by the corridor, but the impact on their traffic.

ERTMS

Presentation made by G. Confais-Morieux (see PowerPoint "[ERTMS state of play](#)").

Railway undertakings will inform after the meeting if they want the working group on the ERTMS on-board approvals to continue.

P. Geens informs that a letter should be addressed to all railway undertakings concerning a new delay given for the mandatory use of ERTMS, until end 2016. This letter should be ready end December.

C. Hamoniau informs on the coming CEF call and indicates that the Management board would be pleased to write a letter to stress the importance of ERTMS on-board deployment that could be annexed to an application.

P. Geens specifies that for this call, baseline 2 has been included (only baseline 3 was included in last call) and that for prototypes and retrofitting, there is no maximum amount foreseen for the grant per locomotive.

Loading gauge works in France - Capacity impact

Presentation made by E. Guenther (see PowerPoint "[Loading gauge enhancement – impact on capacity](#)").

Concerning the works at Tunnel de la Platinerie, D. Louppe informs that his company has already found a solution with SNCF Réseau. He asks T. Vanbeveren if PaPs will be available on the alternative route during the works.

T. Vanbeveren explains that the PaP will be finalised on time in January, but with not all alternatives, as these will only be precisely known in February.

D. Louppe asks if SNCF Réseau has the assurance that there will not be any "trou de regime". T. Vanbeveren answers that there is no guaranty for the moment.

D. Thull stresses that if the works in the Vosges tunnels will be performed in 2019, there will be less alternative routes to cope with the works in the Tunnel of the Platinerie.

E Guenther explain that he has just received the list of works for that period from the infrastructure managers and will check with them that no works take place at the same time on the main lines and the alternative lines. He informs that the people in charge of works at each infrastructure manager now coordinate together.

G. Confais-Morieux would appreciate if Sibelit and CFL could participate in the coordination of works' working group which will be re-launched.

Capacity allocation

Presentation made by T. Vanbeveren (see PowerPoint "[Corridor Capacity](#)").

D. Louppe wonders if PCS Next generation will be compatible with the NetPaPs. This point will be checked by the C-OSS, who received contradictory information in this field from RailNetEurope. On a question by R. Achermann, he also informs that Sibelit works manually with PCS.

D. Louppe asks if the segmentation in PCS can provide a cut in Woippy instead of Metz and asks to keep the cut in Strasbourg and not in Strasbourg Port du Rhin.

T. Vanbeveren informs that the Atlantic, North Sea – Med and Mediterranean RFCs are organising a PCS Next generation training (27 & 28 January in Brussels). People are welcome to respond to the invitation.

D. Louppe asks why it is the railway undertakings who have to make their expression of needs (and therefore not obtain the PaPs if they ask for them less than 5 to 7 times a

week), and not the RFC (who would therefore get a higher amount of PaPs). T. Vanbeveren answers that it is exactly what is being done by the corridor, as for example some railway undertakings don't make any requests, but it is up to the infrastructure manager to make the final decision on the PaP offer. In previous years, some infrastructure managers said they could not put so much extra paths compared to what was requested. D. Louppe explained that Sibelit gave their expression of needs to SNCF Réseau who answered that they could not provide as many paths as requested.

G. Confais-Morieux stresses that if railway undertakings need the corridor to put more pressure on the infrastructure managers to get more PaPs, it is important that they provide their expression of needs.

Corridor Information Document for timetable 2017

Presentation made by Thomas Vanbeveren (see PowerPoint "[Corridor Information Document](#)")

T. Vanbeveren informs on the main changes for the 2017 timetable CID. These changes will also be highlighted in the mail sent to the advisory groups for the consultation on this CID.

Conclusion

G. Confais-Morieux thanks the participants for their attendance to the meeting. He informs that the corridor will organise the next RAG meeting in May and will invite the railway undertakings to a meeting on coordination of works. He reminds the participants on the PCS training session on 27 and 28 January in Brussels.