

MEETING OF THE RAILWAY UNDERTAKING ADVISORY GROUP

24 May 2016, London

Participants

Railway Undertakings and associations

Corbeel, Nicolas	B- Logistics
Goethals, Lieven	B-Logistics
Maier, Jürgen	BLS Freight
Lambert, Eric	CFL multimodal S.A.
Jones, Nigel	DB Cargo UK
Coart, François	Europorte
Crossland, Neil	Europorte
McSpadden, Sharon	Forwardis UK
Hayman, Nigel	GB Railfreight Ltd.
Remond, Thomas	Naviland Cargo
Berkeley, Tony	Rail Freight group UK
Jacques, Arnaud	Sibelit
Vantalon-Korovitch, Gaëlle	SNCF Logistics
Vircondelet, Régis	SNCF Logistics
Heller, Jean-Edouard	VIIA
Soskic, Jelena	CER
Lamb, Julia	ERFA
Gehenot, Sandra	UIC

Regulatory Body

Westlake, Matt	ORR, UK
----------------	---------

Executive Board

Phelan, Deborah	UK Department for Transport
Swartenbroekx, Bernard	SPF Mobilité, Belgium

Management Board

Lambert, Claude	ACF
Thull, Daniel	CFL Infra
Marteau, David	Eurotunnel

Geubelle, Michel	Infrabel
Rhymes, Steve	Network Rail
De Mol, Guus	ProRail
Achermann, Rudy	SBB
Mazataud, Paul	SNCF Réseau
Halter, Daniel	Trasse Schweiz
Confais-Morieux, Guillaume	Permanent team
Vanbeveren, Thomas	Permanent team
Salimène, Mohamed	Permanent team
Maeselle, Matthieu	Permanent team

Expectations of the RAG

G. Confais-Morieux welcomes the participants. The [agenda](#) is proposed.

R. Vircondelet welcomes the participants and announces that as the pre-RAG meeting as designated Mr. L. Goethals as new president of the RAG.

1. **R. Vircondelet, on behalf of the RAG, informs of the railway undertakings' expectations and issues raised, following the pre-RAG meeting:**

I. Language topics: Strasbourg – Kehl (Eric Lambert):

- [See Presentation 8](#) moved to 1st point raised by the RU's
- G. Confais-Morieux reminds that Strasbourg is based on our corridor, but not Kehl. So far, no feeder / outflow requests have been received by the C-OSS.
- Answer P. Mazataud + G. De Mol points out that the situation is unclear now.
- RU's requests that we get local derogations for the B1 obligation.
- Next steps:
 - o RAG prepares a list of problematic border points where derogations would be needed.
 - o G. Confais-Morieux will ask during the next Serac meeting what will happen after 1 July (regulation 2014) if RUs are not ready?
 - o P. Mazataud, M. Geubelle & G. De Mol propose to create a task force or common platform of RUs, NSAs, ERA/EC, IMs to find a long term solution. This task force or common platform will be RFC2 oriented, and possibly later enlarged to other RFCs (following GCM advice, priority is given to the efficiency and not to find from the beginning a solution that would fit to all RFCs but would be very hard to find). It must be investigated if there is a real language problem on our RFC NSM.

II. Safety at the entry of the channel tunnel:

- F. Coart / Europorte asks what is the state of play of the planned investment for a scanner.
- D. Marteau / Eurotunnel answers that the project is going on. No timeline is available yet but the decision of investment is made.

III. Path allocation difficulties 2016:

- T. Remond / Naviland: 1/3 of the paths were touched by “trous de régime” in 2016. B-Logistics / N. Corbeel faced the same situation. T. Remond / Naviland asked if the PaP status offered more protection against modification/cancelling because of these problems.
- RUs are asking that SNCF Réseau reviews its process of TCR planning.
- Answer SNCF Réseau / P.Mazataud :
 - o We have a huge amount of work that affects our TCR and timetable planning.
 - o Long term solution is new IT projects (but not operational before TT2019).
 - o On the short term, we have difficulties to propose simultaneously quantity & quality.
- Answer T. Vanbeveren / RFC NSM :
 - o As a corridor we can only put pressure on the involved IMs to deliver PaPs as stable as possible. Protection against modifications by the IM can only be guaranteed 2 months before the scheduled train run.

Presentations

2. What's new on the corridor:

- [See Presentation 2](#) made by G. Confais-Morieux.
- No questions from the assistance.

3. State of Play 'Working Groups':

3.1. State of play working group 'Coordination of works':

- [See Presentation 3.1](#) made by M. Salimène.
- No questions from the assistance.

3.2. State of play working group 'Capacity TT2016':

- [See Presentation 3.2](#) made by T. Vanbeveren.
- Fret SNCF: can PCS still be used after the timeline for RC (request for traffics <30 days.)
 - o T. Vanbeveren / RFC NSM points out that the corridor offers PaPs for late path requests and throughout the running timetable, up to 30 days before the running of the train via PCS. PCS is equipped to be used even on a shorter term, but at this point, this is an IM responsibility. It's up to every IM to decide if they accept these short term requests via PCS (e.g. if they can manage them).
 - o P. Mazataud will investigate this point for SNCF-Réseau.
- E. Lambert / CFL explains that the relative bad figures for Zoufftgen/Bettembourg are explained by the “trou de régime” and the fact that CFL abandoned the PCS tool and used national tools.
 - o T. Vanbeveren and G. Confais-Morieux / RFC NSM indicate that in practice this shouldn't make any difference, and that placing such types of requests via the national tools have per definition a higher probability of leading to unsatisfying results. They will contact the CFL-C planners to clarify this point;
- G. Confais-Morieux underlines the very good figures concerning the share of the capacity allocated via the C-OSS of RFC NSM at the border points of the Corridor, when compared to the total amount of train runs scheduled.

3.3. State of play working group 'ETCS':

- [See Presentation 3.3](#) made by M. Salimène.

- L. Goethals points out that it absolutely must be avoided that a typical BE/FR Cross border loco as T13 after equipment with ETCS for the Luxembourg and Lorraine Area, in a next step cannot operate anymore in the Northern France (Lille) region due to different ETCS-versions. Although, operating is actually possible without any issue. He points that ETCS is costly software-investment, although he cannot accept that this kind of issues makes interoperability even more costly (due to sub park management of loco's e.g.).

-

4. Performance report 2015:

- [See Presentation 4](#) made by T. Vanbeveren.
- Remarks L. Goethals / B-Logistics: KPI04: theoretical running time Aubange – Basel:
 - o the objective IP is considered by the RUs as too low (48 km/h)
 - o RUs observe a decrease of some of the figures (from 51 to 48 km/h for example).
 - o Specifically on the Rotterdam-Antwerp-Lille section, there are quite some concerns on the average running time which has decreased significantly compared to previous years. Demand is made to improve the theoretical running time for the next TT.
 - o The average speed on the most important axis of the corridor should increase instead of decrease, especially taking into account the fact that the Athus-Meuse line in Belgium is a dedicated freight line and that the TGV-Est implementation in 2016 should solve some problems as well. The corridor should show more ambition here, as average speed is of high importance to allow the RUs to efficiently plan its resources.
- T.Vanbeveren / RFC NSM points out that the objectives are reviewed every year and that this comment will be taken into account, just as weak results will be analysed and taken into account in the construction of the new PaP catalogue.

5. Capacity TT2017, TT2018:

- [See Presentation 5](#) made by T. Vanbeveren.
- TT2017: T. Vanbeveren presents the results of the allocation 2017. The capacity, demand & PaP allocation is expending a lot for the corridor.
- Expression of need TT2018: the permanent team reminds how important this exercise is to have argument in face of an IM to get more capacity.

6. Geographical Information System:

- [See Presentation 6](#) had to be made by M. Maeselle.
- Presentation is postponed, could not be discussed. Will be presented in a next web conference proposed by M. Maeselle in the days to come.

7. Loading gauge study SNCF Réseau:

- [See Presentation 7](#) made by P. Mazataud.
- The results are now finalized.
- The project cost is roughly estimated at 60 M€ / with a probable net investment of 45 M€ if we could raise CEF funds.
- The project is not financed by SNCF Réseau, and has no chance to be (investments are only allowed for project with return on investments).
- A support from the RAG is therefore needed.
- The RAG members propose to build a business case to present to the ExBo, complementary to the RFC analyse, in order to have more chance to get additional funds from member states and make this investment possible.

8. Cross border operations: See point I of Pre-RAG expectations

9. TSI on noise:

- [See Presentation 9](#) had to be made by R. Achermann & Permanent Team members.
- Could not be discussed. The presentation will be sent to the participants and discussed in a next RAG if needed.

10. Introduction to TAF TSI:

- [See Presentation 10](#) had to be made by R. Achermann & Permanent Team members.
- Could not be discussed. The presentation will be sent to the participants and discussed in a next RAG if needed.

11. Strategy of RFC North Sea – Med: does it meet our customers' expectations?:

- The discussion could not be held during the meeting.
- It is proposed to have a strategic discussion with the RAG during our next meeting.
- RU's are kindly asked to address their strategic issues that we could discuss in our next meeting.