

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"> - Launch of a RAG/MB working group to study the exact request of the RUs - 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) - In France, the upgrade of the tunnels of these lines are planned to take place as from 2016 <p>Further information on loading gauge upgrade studies (scope, customer’s needs,) is available here .</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 here.</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"> - “Light” cross acceptance already exists in the countries of our corridor - It is not really a solution as far as the station right after the border point is not a hub used by the RU - ETCS seems to be the best solution for the long term - Improvements can be performed at Roosendaal (study ongoing)

<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"> - Add the Metz bottleneck on the map - Provide maps at larger scale - Clarify the governance of the RAG - Make changes to the transport market study - Mention EPR and keep financial aspects as a goal - ERTMS: include a planning of characteristics and inform on the date of removal of legacy system - Plan the electrification of the last mile in port of Calais - Give more information on investments needed for P400 loading gauge and 740 meter- trains - Clarify the role of the C-OSS for capacity request on more than one corridor - Allow drivers to be able to speak only in French or only Flemish in Belgium - Add lines 	<p>Answers given by the MB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Metz bottleneck has been added - A GIS has been created - A president was nominated at the RAG of 19/5/2013 - 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 - 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 - These dates are already included in the implementation plan, when known - Investment not planned as not socioeconomically profitable - Only investments planned are included in the investment plan - This role has been clarified in book IV of the Corridor Information Document - 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 21st 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 - 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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add terminals 	<p>Zeebrugge (principal line as from 2016), electrified lines of the port of Antwerp (connecting)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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) - Terminals added: La Louvière (BE), Antwerp Main Hub (BE), Antwerp Schijnpoort (BE), Vénissieux (FR) and 5 terminals in the port of Dunkirk - Terminals not added: Châtelet (BE) as no activity
<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"> - RUs must continue to be involved in the Train Performance Management working group - Perform the study on loading gauge South of Lyon (also TAG meeting 23/9/2015) 	<p>Answers made by the MB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As the quality of data had improved, the RU/MB working group on TPM was re-launched in 2015 - A study will soon be performed between Lyon and Marseille and the MB will inform the RAG of the outcomes of the study
<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"> - Line 144 will be reduced to single track which will extend the loading gauge profile - There will be no change in allowable loading weight in both directions - On L130, some works are postponed to 2019 at the earliest <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)