

Meeting of the railway undertaking advisory group

1 October 2014 - Rotterdam

Minutes

I)	Introduction	3
II)	Comparison between the technical characteristics of RFC 1 & 2	3
III)	ERTMS	6
IV)	Capacity allocation	9
V)	Extension of the corridor to the UK	12
VI)	Capacity allocation (continuation)	13
VII)	Loading gauge enhancement	15
VIII)	Studies for the improvement of operations in ports	15
IX)	Participation of applicants other than RUs in the RAG	16
X)	Conclusion	17

Participants

Railway undertakings

François Coart, Europorte
Lieven Goethals, B-Logistics
Arnaud Jacques, Sibelit
Régis Vircondelet, Fret SNCF
Marie-Anne Menguy, Fret SNCF
Frédérique Erlichman, DB Schenker

RU associations

Ad Toet, KVN
Tony Berkeley, RFG
Ilja Lorenzo Volpi, CER

Executive Board

Mrs Nienke Smith, Dutch ministry

Management Board

Erik Van der Linden, ProRail
Marc Kampinga, ProRail
Ian Cleland, Network Rail
Kris Van Crombruggen, Infrabel
Sylvain Mosmann, RFF
Lucie Chevrat, RFF
Daniel Thull, CFL
Maurice Faramelli, ACF
Rudi Achermann, SBB

EEIG

Paul Mazataud
Eric Guenther
Thomas Vanbeveren
Claire Hamoniau

I) Introduction

Régis Vircondelet welcomes the participants at this RAG meeting which, for the first time, takes place in English.

Paul Mazataud informs that we have reasons to be optimistic. Indeed, since April 2013, the traffic on the corridor increased by 8 %. Also, since the Ghent conference, many initiatives were launched: on capacity allocation with the flexible pre-arranged paths (PaPs) product, on the governance of the corridors with the launch of the RFC club, the investment strategy has been developed with the Core Network Corridor Work Plan which is currently being drafted and which gives a highlight on investments concerning long trains, loading gauge, ERTMS.

But there are nevertheless obstacles, difficulties and challenges, more specifically for 2016 timetable.

Régis Vircondelet informs that the railway undertakings would like to be aware more in advance of issues on which their opinion is requested. He also asks what the Management board expects from railway undertakings for them to be more proactive.

Paul Mazataud answers that for this meeting, there is no problem for the participants to give their feedback after the meeting.

II) Comparison between the technical characteristics of RFC 1 & 2

Paul Mazataud, Eric Guenther and Thomas Vanbeveren present the study that has been made to compare the following technical characteristics of RFC 1 & 2: power supply, train weight, loading gauge, train length, ETCS, distance, journey time, access charges and available capacity (see presentation).

Tonnage

Lievens Goethals informs that he heard that Infrabel would decrease the maximum tonnage in Belgium from 1400 to 1000 tons. He is fighting against it. Also, the transfer of all trains to the Artère Nord-Est would not be an efficient solution, as it would cause capacity problems in the area of Ghent.

Arnaud Jacques indicates that this limitation of tonnage would be the consequence of the closing of the line going from Gembloux to the North East (junction 139), as its alternative route (number 147) only allows trains of a maximum of 1000 tons. He informs that no decision has been taken on that point yet and that it was brought to consultation.

Paul Mazataud concludes on the item of train weight: the information given by Lievens Goethals is new to him and he will get further information from Infrabel.

Train length

Régis Vircondelet indicates that a uniform length of train is necessary in order to not change the composition of the train at borders nor to keep low train length.

Paul Mazataud informs that the CNC Work Plan includes a budget to invest on the Belgium side of RFC 2 in a few sidings to allow 750 meters trains to be admitted. This investment, which concerns train length between Antwerp and Aubange, is included in a 52 M€ budget for the improvement of the Athus-Meuse. By the end of the decade, we will have improved train length for Belgium and therefore on the entire Antwerp-Basel route.

ETCS

Concerning the solution to make KVB (FR) and ATB (NL) work well together on the same locomotive (which would consist in making KVB be switched on only in the French territory), Sylvain Mosmann informs that it could work with a magnet system, but that we will have to investigate how to do it.

François Coart informs that the access to Antwerp with TBL1+ or ETCS will be compulsory from 2016 and adds that his decision was made with almost no consultation. All locomotives not equipped with TBL1+ or ETCS, and more specifically the ones of new-entrants, will be banned from Antwerp, then gradually from the network. He insists on the fact that we need a realistic timing with what the industry can deliver and more consultation.

Régis Vircondelet adds that railway undertakings need more consultation and more visibility about the deployment on ERTMS.

Paul Mazataud indicates that the issue brought by François Coart is typically the sort of issue which can be helped by a formal statement from the RAG, as it is an important point which affects the railway business.

Other comments

Lieven Goethals thinks that it is good news that access charges are cheaper on RFC 2 than on RFC 1 as on RFC 2, railway undertakings have to change locomotives, which has a cost. Also paths in certain countries of the corridor like France can be uncertain.

Ad Toet informs that this comparison was very much appreciated by Dutch railway undertakings at a meeting which took place in August. It pinpoints the points to trigger. He thanks Paul Mazataud for the efforts made on that work.

III) ERTMS

Sylvain Mosmann and Claire Hamoniau present the following items on ERTMS:

- the agreement on the Executive board level;
- the updated planning on ETCS deployment and map of the different ETCS levels;
- the 2014 CEF calls for which railway undertakings can apply for ETCS on-board equipment.

Sylvain Mosmann stresses that, on the corridor lines, it will be mandatory to run:

- in Luxembourg: with ETCS, as from July 2017;
- in Belgium: with ETCS or TBL1+ as from 1.1.2016 (law edited last summer);
- in Switzerland: with ETCS for new locomotives (the legacy system can still be used for the other locomotives) and, for locomotives coming from France, with KVB (*and* PZB until Muttenz);

François Coart asks the definition of “new locomotive”. Rudi Achermann will check (*after the meeting: a new locomotive is a locomotive purchased after 1 July 2014 – all necessary information on ETCS in Switzerland can be found at <http://www.bav.admin.ch/themen/03818/index.html?lang=fr>*).

- In France, there is no rule yet.

Paul Mazataud concludes by saying that France seems to be willing to deploy ERTMS quickly on Longuyon-Basel and the deployment on the rest of the French part of the corridor may take much more time due to the lack of

funding. Thanks to this commitment, the implementation plan is now approved. In the Implementation Plan, there is also a new wording saying that no decision has been taken yet about the removal of KVB in France (this point is currently being discussed). The new version will therefore be uploaded on our website.

Régis Vircondelet informs that railway undertakings would like to have a reliable deployment plan in order to adapt themselves. He explains that in France, railway undertakings don't get equipped as they don't know what to do. He suggests making something easy to understand like a table with, per route, the necessary equipment needed, the period with both systems allowed and the last limit to be equipped only with ERTMS. Paul Mazataud answers that this information will be included in the Corridor Information Document, which will be updated in January 2015.

Tony Berkeley asks what progress has been made about the compatibility of ETCS equipment between suppliers.

François Coart informs that Switzerland is deploying a level 3 version which is new and not stabilized yet and adds that there is no compatibility between Netherlands and Switzerland.

Paul Mazataud answers that each time ETCS is deployed, temporary issues occur. Some parameters need to be fine-tuned. He doesn't think that all Bombardier equipment is not compatible with Alstom equipment. For example, this is not the case in Germany.

Sylvain Mosmann explains that we can be optimistic as Spain has used many suppliers for ETCS on-board and track-side systems, and it works. The main challenge is to pass one locomotive on two different types of ETCS level 1 equipment, as they are each based on the national legacy systems.

François Coart thinks that there is no piloting of ETCS at European level for the time being to ensure compatibility. Different ERTMS should be completely compatible and this should be the role of the corridor.



Paul Mazataud adds that Sylvain Mosmann chairs the ETCS working group for RFC 2, in which there are many technical discussions between infrastructure managers to make sure that there is a high degree of compatibility between ETCS systems. Currently, there is indeed no single system, no same supplier, no same level on the entire corridor but infrastructure managers are doing their best to make them compatible at least at borders.

2014 call

Paul Mazataud informs that funds will be requested to equip the Longuyon-Basle and Rotterdam-Antwerp sections of the corridor, which will amount to a total subsidy of around 100 M€. Therefore, if other corridors obtain funds for ETCS track-side equipment, there is a risk that only a small amount would then be left for railway undertakings.

Tony Berkeley asks which train operator gets the grants, as it would not be fair if only the incumbent companies got them. Also, as infrastructure managers will get more revenues as they will get more traffic, he wonders if they will be ready to finance this investment by themselves.

Paul Mazataud answers that there is a decision making process with a jury. They make decisions on a very short period of time. The first selection process is based on the quality of the applications. He suspects that anything related to international traffic or even better corridor traffic will be perceived as something positive by the deciders. Concerning the second question, all cost benefit analysis have shown that ETCS will be a source of losses for infrastructure managers.

Ad Toet thinks that this funding is useful for incumbent railway undertakings, but the other railway undertakings usually lease their locomotive, which we are not addressing. He also asks if RFC 2 can ask for subsidies for on-board equipment.

Paul Mazataud answers that RFC 2 has already applied for funding, with the EEIG being coordinator. Similarly, if there were at least two railway



undertakings and/or rental companies which would like to apply for this funding, RFC 2 could apply for them. As RFC 2 is also working on other subsidies, he strongly recommends railway undertakings to inform the Management board soon.

Claire Hamoniau informs that the Executive board would like to have information on the planning of ETCS on-board equipment, which will be shown to the Executive board in December. One month will be given to provide the answer.

Régis Vircondelet fears that the information will be disappointing if railway undertakings don't have a clear view of the future. They might like to wait, specifically for the existing fleet of locomotives. Paul Mazataud thinks that in and of itself this would be an interesting answer.

IV) Capacity allocation

Thomas Vanbeveren presents the topic on capacity allocation:

- 2015 timetable application;
- forecast for the 2016 timetable PaPs (pre-arranged paths) supply;
- evolution of priority rules for the allocation of PaPs;
- Flexible PaPs: concept and status;
- train numbering for PaPs.

Forecast for the 2016 timetable PaPs supply

Lieven Goethals asks why RFC 2 doesn't always meet market's demand for the supply of PaPs.

Paul Mazataud answers that there are three reasons:

- some requests have been dealt without PaPs, mainly when the railway undertakings preferred paths under a framework agreement or paths which were not under the status of PaPs;
- RFF strategy is to create paths only if there is an existing robust demand, with a train run which has already been done in the past. The consequence is that when there is a request to develop paths, it will have to be a late request and not a catalogue path request as RFF's ultimate goal is to make sure that the vast majority of catalogue paths are booked by their clients;
- also concerning RFF, the lack of capacity in certain nodes; i.e. the Lyon node, requires a lot of human resources to make a long distance path.

When the Management board showed these figures to RFC 2 Executive board last week, it led to a dense discussion as there were three frustrations:

- the number of PaPs is not increasing in comparison to last year. This is in comparison with other corridors such as RFC1 for which the number of paths increased by 30%;
- the lines to Paris: there is one path per direction for each route. The reason is that there is a major railway undertaking using Somain as hub, and it does not seem possible to have PaPs to Somain as these would not be international train paths;
- Lyon route: as last year, only a small number of paths (4 paths per direction instead of 3 last year) can be provided.

Paul Mazataud adds that these are not the final figures. RFF considers adding extra paths. They propose Woippy – Lyon, which doesn't cross a border and Woippy- Basel. It would be better if these paths could cross a border. The reaction of the RAG is welcome and could actually help to convince RFF that

the market is not necessarily only Woippy-Lyon and Woippy- Basel, but other destinations.

Network PaPs

Paul Mazataud gives the perspective of this new approach: following diverging interpretation on the current priority rule, where RFC 1 considered that only the corridor PaP kilometers should be taken into account, this new proposal came as a compromise. It was initiated by RFC 2 and has been accepted by the Executive board and RNE. The only drawback of this new rule is its complexity to understand.

Frederique Erlichman asks what will be the answer to the customer if one applicant doesn't get the path.

Paul Mazataud answers that this new rule should already help to reduce the number of conflicts. But if a conflict arises, the corridor will propose another PaP which hasn't been booked or will request the infrastructure manager to create a tailor made path.

Paul Mazataud informs that the decision to create a network PaP comes from the Management board(s). If two corridors are concerned, they have to agree. The creation of a network PaP is also presented to the RAG. He adds that some people from ministries and regulatory bodies have asked if there was a risk of discrimination, as the network PaP can satisfy the needs of a specific railway undertaking. In fact, there is no difference with the building of a standard PaP. Nevertheless, it is envisaged to consult regulatory bodies when corridor(s) decide to make network PaPs. For RFC 1 & 2, a joint meeting will soon take place with regulatory bodies of both corridors on this matter.

The capacity management item is interrupted in order to deal with the extension of the corridor to UK, before the departure of the Network Rail representative.



V) Extension of the corridor to the UK

Paul Mazataud presents the background, governance, routes and terminals, capacity allocation issues and the potential market of the extension of the corridor to the UK.

Ian Cleland explains that the UK lines of the corridor have a good level of train length, train weight and axle weight. But, due to historical legacy, there is no overhead electricity system and the tunnels loading gauge has a small size. He remains at the disposal of railway undertakings who may wish to get further information on the technical characteristics of these routes. These characteristics are described in annex of these minutes.

Tony Berkeley adds that the interest of using HS1, which can be used five nights a week, is that the loading gauge has a continental size. The Barking terminal can't take any more trains. He informs that the demand from the customers is to get as many continental gauge trains to London and he will see HS1 to make sure they accept to join the corridor.

Paul Mazataud indicates that the Management board will highlight all advantages for HS1, will inform them that it does not want any interference with passenger traffic, and will insist on the fact that HS1 will be the sole decision maker on the number of paths. If things happen well, they will have more traffic on their lines.

On a question from Régis Vircondelet, Paul Mazataud explains that the two years delay of the extension north of London from 2016 to 2018 is not due to the justice (UK has challenged the validity of article 29 and Annex 3 of Regulation 1316/2013 and the legal action takes two years) but it is a coincidence. If the UK challenge doesn't work, the extension north of London will still be implemented on time.

François Coart expresses his frustration to see that the UK government doesn't want to promote international traffic. Only 20% of the traffic has London as its final destination, so it is important that the corridor is extended beyond

London. He wonders if there is a way to solve the problem by negotiation between UK and the EU, as we cannot take the risk that this extension doesn't take place.

Régis Vircondelet is himself convinced that Network Rail will find a solution as there will still be capacity on these lines.

Paul Mazataud adds that the legal action doesn't slow down the process and that it is preferable to work step by step, with a successful extension to London.

To answer a question from Marie-Anne Menguy, Paul Mazataud explains that the problems of having HS1 in the corridor could be due to staffing, maybe also to fees. Ian Cleland informs that Network Rail can help resolve the resource issue. Indeed, Network Rail can build their PaPs as they already do their train planning. Network Rail will do the work which could help them. Paul Mazataud adds that HS1 could delegation at least parts of its task from to Network Rail, which could help these issues.

VI) [Capacity allocation \(continuation\)](#)

Flexible PaPs: concept and status

Arnaud Jacques asks if the infrastructure managers are able to make the Flex PaPs as he wishes, as applicants need to organise the rotation of drivers and locomotives.

Paul Mazataud explains that there is double flexibility: for the applicant and for the infrastructure manager. The applicant can request any modification to the paths, but there is no guaranty that the request is accepted by the infrastructure manager. Flexibility is also given to the infrastructure manager, but the applicant cannot refuse the path modification. Therefore, there is a dissymmetry, as the full flexibility given to the infrastructure manager is not the

same flexibility given to the applicant. Nevertheless, the infrastructure manager will do its best to answer favorably to the applicant.

Arnaud Jacques replies that, on average, the train runs at a speed of 50km/h, but the speed would be even slower if the infrastructure manager could change the path for a lower quality. The time would be longer and Sibelit would need an extra driver.

Paul Mazataud answers that the concept of Flex PaP started by a request from RFC 1 & 7. It is a European concept which doesn't need to be adopted by all corridors, as we fix the time at borders and we could even fix the time between two corridors. Therefore, it is possible to have Flex PaPs in one country and not in the other. As far as RFC 2 is concerned, we all agree that we will make Flex PaPs if our customers wish so. The advantage of them is that we will offer more PaPs and we will be able to modify them in the way the applicants want, the drawback is that the quality of the PaP may decrease.

On a question from Régis Vircondelet, Paul Mazataud informs that RFF thinks it could be a good idea to make Flex PaP as they have already been requests to modify PaPs. Thomas Vanbeveren adds that this was the case as PCS doesn't enable to ask for modifications yet.

For Arnaud Jacques, it seems that the danger is bigger than the advantages. Indeed, Sibelit doesn't need more PaPs, but the right number of PaPs with good performance. He gives as example the fact of being forced to wait three hours in Hausbergen instead of three hours in Thionville, as he would have preferred.

Régis Vircondelet indicates that the RAG will give a formal feedback. He asks if the Management board can describe the concept and the RAG will give a clear answer with arguments and ideas. Paul Mazataud agrees with this formal feedback and adds that idea could be that the flexibility is limited to a few minutes.

Rudolf Achermann informs that there were lots of conflicts in 2014 in Switzerland. Trasse Schweiz supports the idea of Flex PaPs and tries to find an



answer to this lack of capacity. Its timetabling department will describe the flexibility. Nevertheless, this is a short term view. SBB has in mind a mid/long term view and will increase dramatically the overall capacity for freight by 2020 after the opening of the Gotthard Base Tunnel in 2016, then the Ceneri Base Tunnel in 2019.

Train numbering

Arnaud Jacques explains that the problem which occurred this year is that the process was not respected, Trasse Schweiz having assigned train numbers although it was RFF who was entitled to do so.

VII) Loading gauge enhancement

Paul Mazataud informs that, due to a lack of time, the presentation of this subject is postponed to next RAG meeting (see presentation “Loading gauge enhancement”). He nevertheless informs that the studies on loading gauge enhancement are progressing well and that there was good news about the cost of upgrading certain tunnel on the French network. The studies for the remaining French tunnels are expected to be done before end 2015.

VIII) Studies for the improvement of operations in ports

Due to a lack of time, the presentation of this subject is postponed to next RAG meeting (see presentation “improvement of operations in ports”).

IX) Participation of applicants other than RUs in the RAG

Claire Hamoniau asks the RAG if they agree that the Management board invites active applicants to RAG meetings (see presentation “Participation RAG”).

Paul Mazataud adds that the organisations concerned are combined transport operators, who are in the TAG because they operate terminals, but who don't have same interests as maritime or inland waterway ports, as they are more interested in capacity allocation issues and other subjects discussed in the RAG. It would therefore make more sense that these entities belong to the RAG.

Régis Vircondelet answers that there is no principle opposition from the RAG on that point, as it is a good proposal to accept new members to facilitate the discussions and find common solutions on common problems. He also asks if common TAG-RAG meetings as well as synchronised RAG meetings with other corridors, on specific issues which also concern other corridors, like short penetration, could be organized.

Paul Mazataud adds that the corridors have discussed together the relevance of doing common RAG meeting and it was decided to do them not more than once a year, as some issues are specific for each corridor. For example, loading gauge in the Vosges mountains or in Switzerland, ERTMS in the Netherlands. Concerning combined transport operators moving to the RAG, it will enable the TAG to focus on rail operations in maritime ports for example. This is not the main priority of transport combined operators. The TAG will survive if the combined transport operators, who are applicants, move to the RAG.

Lieven Goethals would like to have a common meeting with maritime ports in order to discuss on common issues with ports.

Claire Hamoniau answers that this is the reason why the subject of rail operations in maritime ports was on the agenda of today's meeting, as the corridor wishes to make studies on operations in ports.

Paul Mazataud concludes that:

- the RAG doesn't oppose that other active applicants are invited to the RAG meetings;
- to have more interfaces between RAG and TAG. Common meetings would not be manageable, as too many people would be participating, but we could talk of maritime ports in the RAG and vice versa;
- to have a yearly common RAG meeting for all corridors will make sense so that we don't talk about same common issues in the RAG meetings of each corridor.

X) Conclusion

Régis Vircondelet concludes by thanking the UK railway undertaking and infrastructure manager representatives for their presence in the meeting. He sees in a positive way the work with UK, as he saw a fruitful participation from these representatives to work with the RAG, which is very positive for the extension to UK. There is as always a good cooperation between railway undertakings and infrastructure managers and he is very thankful about it.

RFC 2 extension to London

Operating characteristics for Network Rail infrastructure

Characteristic	Main Route	Redhill diversion	Sevenoaks diversion
Signalling – main system	Visual – colour light	Ditto	Ditto
Signalling – warning systems	UK AWS and TPWS	Ditto	Ditto
ERTMS	No date has been set for these routes within the GB fitment programme.		
Traction	750 volt DC 3rd rail current collection. Or diesel.	Diesel	750 volt DC 3rd rail current collection. Or diesel.
Trailing weight	1,400 -1,600 according to locomotive type	Ditto	Ditto
Total train length	775 m	Ditto	500 m
Axle weight	25.5 t	Ditto	Ditto
Loading gauge	Max S44 on 825 mm wagon deck height.	Ditto	Very limited for intermodal traffic.
Capacity	17 freight train paths <i>each way</i> per weekday are expected to be offered as PaPs using a combination of the main and diversionary routes. Redhill is normally only used at night one week in every 5 to 6 weeks. Other paths may be available.		

Notes

1. Please note that the parameters shown above are *indicative* only to assist new Freight Corridor stakeholders with an overview of international freight train operation to / from GB. For the purposes of planning new rail business you should consult Network Rail's formal data sources i.e. its Network Statement and operational publications. For assistance and further information you are welcome to contact;

- Ian Cleland, Head of Freight Market Development, Network Rail. ian.cleland@networkrail.co.uk . + 44 7887 896 763
- Steve Walston, Freight Data Manager, Network Rail. stephen.walston@networkrail.co.uk . + 44 7919 528 325

2. Other operational requirements may apply e.g. cab radio system - GSMR.

3. The above does not encompass other networks – Eurotunnel (and HS1).

