

MEETING OF THE RAILWAY UNDERTAKING ADVISORY GROUP

25th of January, Paris

Participants

Railway Undertakings and associations

Corbeel, Nicolas	B-Logistics
Goethals, Lieven	B-Logistics
Lambert, Eric	CFL multimodal S.A.
Erlichman, Frédérique	DB Cargo
Coart, François	Europorte
Madid, Salma	Fret SNCF
Jacques, Arnaud	Sibelit
Czernecki, Nicolas	Sibelit
Velandia, Monica	VIIA
Soskic, Jelena	CER
Lamb, Julia	ERFA

Executive Board

Swartenbroeckx, Bernard	SPF Mobilité, MoT Belgium
Lunet, Joseph	MoT France

Regulatory Bodies

Behm, Mathias	RB Luxemburg
---------------	--------------

Management Board – Permanent Team

Biava, Stéphanie	ACF
Thull, Daniel	CFL Infra
Geubelle, Michel	Infrabel
de Mol, Guus	ProRail
Hamoniau, Claire	SNCF Réseau
Mazataud, Paul	SNCF Réseau
Mathis, Andri	Trasse Schweiz
Confais-Morieux, Guillaume	Permanent team
Vanbeveren, Thomas	Permanent team

Salimène, Mohamed
Maeselle, Matthieu

Permanent team
Permanent team

Expectations of the RAG

G. Confais-Morieux, Managing Director of the RFC NSM, welcomes the participants. The [agenda](#) is proposed.

L. Goethals, speaker of the RAG, welcomes the participants.

The RAG members and the permanent team convene that the expectations of the RAG members, discussed during the pre-RAG meeting, will be addressed within the presentations 2 and 3.

Presentations

1. What's new on the corridor:

- [See Presentation 1](#) made by G. Confais-Morieux (GCM).
- On the point 'Process for the construction of international path catalogue'
 - o Sibelit expresses their fears about the priority rules in the allocation of PaP capacity, as it can lead to loose historic paths which are very important for their business. To counter this problem, Sibelit requested to certain IMs national paths. However, as CFL points out, this practice is not only used by Sibelit.
 - o GCM answers that this situation is not acceptable and that the RUs should not interfere in the allocation process.
 - Grandfather rights is in opposition with the principles defined by European legislation.
 - Moreover, so far, little to no conflicts have been observed for the requests made by the RUs for RFC NSM PaPs. If more conflicts would occur in the future, it would give RFC NSM more arguments to ask to the IMs to offer more PaPs in the RFC NSM catalogue.
 - A good preparation of the RFC NSM offer supposes that the expression of needs survey is not misused for individual reasons. Only when the RUs fully cooperate, the RFC can effectively support their needs and wishes.
 - o This position is shared by the French and Belgium MoT and by all Management Board Members. Guus de Mol points out that requests for international paths must be placed on international level, as coordinated requests, to allow a proper treatment by the involved IMs. Placing requests for international paths per IM lead to a suboptimal allocation and capacity use.
 - o Sibelit states that in their experience, the results of requests placed directly to SNCF-Réseau are better than those placed via the C-OSS. PM states that this is virtually impossible as their treatment is exactly the same. However SNCF-Réseau will investigate internally.
 - o The members of the ExBo who participated to the meeting proposed to raise the topic during the next Executive Board.
 - o GCM & Thomas Vanbeveren stress the point that for TT 2018, a clear choice for quality and transparency has been made:
 - Only PaP's with a minimum of Quality (80% availability) have been kept in the new PaP catalogue.

- Moreover, all the periods with a high risk of work impact on the paths have been put out of the PaP catalogue.
- Therefore, the paths impacted by “trou de regime” should be at a much lower level for TT2018 compared to the previous periods.
- RUs indicated that they might prefer that PaP with less availability are published, as they receive alternative paths by the IM at a later stage for many of the remaining days. They will make a statement at the next RAG.
 - RFC NSM will take all comments on this method into account for next publications.

2. Action plan following previous RAG

- [See presentation 2](#) made by G. Confais-Morieux.
- On Action 3: RFC NSM strived to 80% quality in France: Communication has been done via the RAG window in the Executive Board.
- On Action 4 and Action 6: [See presentation 2.1](#) made by Claire Hamoniau. RUs indicated that they prefer to have a correct catalogue at a later stage than one with errors earlier
- On Action 8:ETCS
 - RFC NSM strives to a global approach of ETCS implementation
 - EDP: permanent team follows up the national deployment plans expected to be released by the end of June 2017.
 - Corridor development plan implementation: once national deployment plans released, the permanent team will prepare a presentation.
- On Action 10:
 - The RAG members express the need to have an open discussion with experts of the engineering department of SNCF Réseau: RFC NSM permanent team will organise a meeting.
 - The Permanent team and Management board members stress out that positive conclusions of the test train can't automatically lead to conclusions on an enhancement of the loading gauge on the concerned axes.
 - FYI: E. Lambert (CFL MM) points out that a same exercise is under preparation on RFC Atlantic.
- On Action 11: [See presentation 2.2](#) made by M. Salimène

3. Expectations of the RAG based on input of the Pre-RAG

- Concerning the ETCS implementation:
 - The RAG members expresses the wish of having an outlook of the ETCS implementation plan comparable to the one of RFC RALP
- Concerning KPI's:
 - Thomas Vanbeveren points out that the performance reporting of 2016 is not ready yet and will be published as is the case each year in March.
 - The RFC will do its best to present intermediary results for every RAG
 - The results of the KPI's will be discussed with the RAG Speaker
 - The status of the Train Performance Management project was requested. Thomas Vanbeveren points out that the WG has continued to work behind the scenes, and that an increased involvement of the RUs is foreseen from 2017.
- Concerning Cross-border operations:
 - The RAG members raise that on some border points, language issues occurs. CER will check and let know the RAG members.
- Concerning the safety material issue in Roosendaal: RFC NSM present Management Board members and permanent team points out that safety is not within the scope of the RFC's. Guus de Mol stress the point that RAG members prepare a presentation on the issue which will be put on the agenda of the next Executive Board, presented by the speaker during the RAG window in the Executive Board. B.

Swartenbroeckx, representing the Executive Board presidency, welcomes the idea to escalate and present the issue at the Executive Board.

4. Presentation Customer Satisfaction Survey results and link with the Action Plan

- [See presentation 4](#) made by M. Maeselle.
- No additional questions or comments were formulated by the RAG members.

5. State of Play 'Working Groups':

5.1. State of play working group 'TCR':

- [See Presentation 5](#) made by M. Salimène.
- RAG members ask for involvement in the preparation of the works at Sterpenich in addition to the other border points presented.

6. Capacity: offer TT2018, preparation of TT2018:

- [See Presentation 6](#) made by T. Vanbeveren.
- Some parts of the presentation were already addressed in response to topics raised in presentation 2.

7. TSI OPE workshop EC: possible topics?:

- [See Presentation 7](#) had to be made by the Permanent Team
- The RAG Speaker will forward the request to the RAG members asking their input.
- No additional comments were added by the RAG members during the presentation.

8. Open Points and AOB:

- The RAG members agree to hold the next RAG on Tuesday 19th of September 2017, in Bettembourg (Luxemburg) by kind invitation of E. Lambert of CFL-MM.