

MEETING OF THE TERMINAL UNDERTAKING ADVISORY GROUP

12 October 2016, Amsterdam

Participants

Railway Undertakings and associations

Reuchlin, Jan Willem	Port of Amsterdam
van Schuylenburg, Maurits	Port of Rotterdam
de Kerf, Marjolein	Zeeland Seaports
Verslype, Kate	Port of Ghent
Pétilion, Anthony	Port of Calais Boulogne
Margail, Fabienne	Marseille – Fos Port Authority
Beirnaert, Ben	Combinant
Buyse, Frédéric	IFB
Kronenberger, Paul	CFL-MM
Van Opstal, Fernanda	Zuidnatie
Ersek, Akos	UIRR

Executive Board

Morsink, Rob	MoT of The Netherlands
Monfoort, Wouter	ACM, Dutch Regulator

Management Board – Permanent Team

Thull, Daniel	CFL Infra
Geubelle, Michel	Infrabel
Van Crombruggen, Kris	Infrabel
de Mol, Guus	ProRail
Achermann, Rudi	SBB Infra
Hamoniau, Claire	SNCF Réseau
Confais-Morieux, Guillaume	Permanent team
Vanbeveren, Thomas	Permanent team
Maeselle, Matthieu	Permanent team

Expectations of the TAG

G. Confais-Morieux, Managing Director of the RFC NSM, welcomes the participants and thanks the Port of Amsterdam for hosting the TAG meeting. The [agenda](#) is proposed.

J.W. Reuchlin welcomes in name of the Port of Amsterdam the participants as host of this TAG meeting.

1. **J.W. Reuchlin starts with a presentation of the Port of Amsterdam as a kick-off of the open discussion about the expectations of the TAG members regarding the meeting:**

I. Presentation of the Port of Amsterdam:

- See Presentation 1 that was given by J.W. Reuchlin.
- Presenter points out that a major infrastructure project is on its way to enable rail freight traffic from the port of Amsterdam without passing through Amsterdam Central Station.
- Presenter stresses the point of implementation and fully interoperable ERTMS on the Corridor.
- On top of that, he stresses also the importance of other interoperability aspects on the Corridor.

II. Open discussion expectations TAG members regarding the meeting:

- RFC NSM asks to the TAG members if they see any added value to nominate a speaker of the TAG meeting. Later feedback on the question can be given by the TAG members after the TAG meeting.

Presentations

2. **What's new on the corridor:**

- [See Presentation 2](#) made by G. Confais-Morieux with an intervention of T. Vanbeveren (Permanent Team) on the part of 'Performance monitoring'.
- A. Ersek (UIRR) stresses that punctuality must be a prime project of the Corridor.
- T. Vanbeveren states that within the Corridor community there is an aim to come to more harmonised KPI's, so they can be more a base of comparison. This must be visible from with the performance reporting of TT 2016.
- F. Buysse (IFB) points out that KPI Tons km would be helpful. RFC NSM will investigate, but no KPI is available for the moment, the information is not treated equally by IMs in the corridor, as mentioned by T. Vanbeveren in previous point. Nevertheless, RFC NSM will investigate if a regular publication is possible based on estimations, however, the added value of calculating this KPI might only be minor because of the fact that different type of traffics can differ greatly in weight.

3. **Presentation of Terminals & Ports:**

- Point 3 and 5 of the agenda have been switched.

3.1. **Joint presentation of Port of Ghent & Zeeland Seaports:**

- [See Presentation 3.1](#) made by K. Verslype (Port of Ghent) and M. de Kerf (Zeeland Seaports).
- Presenters call on the RFC NSM to support possible solutions for the rail infrastructure bottlenecks faced on the East Bank of the Ghent-Terneuzen Canal, which are mainly the missing link of 8km on Dutch part of the stretch and the Wiedauwkaai-bridge in Ghent.

- R. Morsink (Dutch MoT) reminds that resolving the missing link on the Dutch part is very costly. No money is available until 2028. A more detailed Cost-Benefit analysis is also needed.
- Presenters points out that they receive some questions of terminals and shippers regarding railways, with limited knowledge to respond to these questions. The permanent team of RFC NSM repeat their full availability in case of questions regarding rail freight.
- G. de Mol (Pro-Rail, member of the Management Board of RFC NSM) stresses that the concept of a Rail Freight Corridor enables the IM's and the MoT's to work together in an international context, which was missing before the creation of the Rail Freight Corridors.

3.2. Presentation Combinant:

- [See Presentation 3.2](#) made by B. Beirnaert (Combinant).
- Presenter stresses following expectations:
 - o More 'real' terminals in the TAG
 - o Work together with other RFC's, e.g. in a network of Corridors.
- The permanent team of the Corridor commits to investigate how to motivate more terminals to participate to the TAG's, within the possibilities to do this together with other RFC's (e.g. regional TAG's).

3.3. Presentation Port of Boulogne-Calais:

- [See presentation 3.3](#) made by A. Pétilion (Port of Boulogne-Calais).
- Presenter stresses the operational and security impact of the refugee problem for the Port of Calais, and the possible propagation of the problem to other ports on the North Sea coast.
- The permanent team of the Corridor promises to pass the message to the Executive Board of the Corridor, as it has no impact within its range of authorities as RFC.
- Having read the presentation, Eurotunnel deny the right of Port of Boulogne Calais to present any information on its behalf and expressly disagrees with the findings, interpretations and conclusions presented.

3.4. Presentation Port of Rotterdam:

- [See presentation 3.4](#) made by M. van Schuylenburg (Port of Rotterdam).
- Presenter stress the point that only 5% of rail freight traffic to RFC NSM, due to different signalling systems, electricity voltage, Train driver language issues, and market issues.
- Presenter asks for support of the RFC NSM on presented realisations, by lobbying to Member states and the EU.

4. CID & GIS presentation:

- [See Presentation 4.1](#) made by M. Maeselle (Permanent Team).
- [See Presentation 4.2](#) made by A. Ersek (UIRR): <http://www.railfreightlocations.eu/>
- The audience agrees with the ambition to strive to integrate information of the Terminals found in the CIP-platform of the Corridors (where the GIS-tool is part of), and the information that will be found in the Rail freight portal. A. Ersek adds that the Rail freight portal will be hosted by RNE in the future. As the current CIP-platform of the Corridors is under hosting of RNE as well, the permanent team commits to strive with RNE to that integration, under the condition that current developments and investments in the CIP-platform are not compromised.

5. Capacity:

- [See Presentation 5](#) made by T. Vanbeveren.
- No additional comments were added by the TAG members.

6. Open Points and AOB:

- The TAG Members will be requested by the permanent team for their input on following:

- Traffic Market study
- Consultation on CID Book V
- The permanent team proposes to further discuss the need of a TAG speaker.