

Annual Performance Report







Co-financed by the Connecting Europe Facility of the European Union

easier, faster, safer

Content

- Introduction
- Choosing performance indicators
- Update on Corridor Traffic
 - KPI 01: Traffic Volume (Total)
 - KPI 02: Corridor Punctuality
 - OM 01: Traffic Volume (Per Corridor Border)
- Update on Corridor capacity
 - KPI 03: Planned Average Speed of Corridor Capacity
 - KPI 04: Volume of offered capacity
 - KPI 05: Volume of requested capacity
 - KPI 06: Volume of pre-allocated capacity
 - OM 03: Volume of requests + OM 04: Number of conflicts
 - OM 05 : Relation between results capacity wishes survey, the published and the requested capacity



Introduction

Article 19.2 of Regulation EU 913/2010 requires the Management Board of the RFCs to monitor the performance of rail freight services on the freight corridor an publish the results of this monitoring once a year.

In the Implementation Plan of the Corridor, a number of KPI's and Other Measurements (OM) are described that are being monitored to be able to follow the overall performance of the Corridor. To be able to easily understand the figures in this report, a clear explanation is foreseen on how the calculation was made and what is measured for each indicator.

To be able to compare, the list of indicators described in this document is similar to those used in the previous Annual Performance Reports.

The indicators can be divided into two business fields.

- The information on corridor traffic
- The information on the corridor capacity offered & allocated by the C-OSS.

Each of these groups consists of Key Performance Indicators (KPI), for which clear objectives have been defined, and Other Measurements (OM), that give an insight into what is happening on the corridor, but to which no objective can be linked.



Choosing performance indicators

The KPIs and OMs in this performance monitoring report were chosen on the basis of the following parameters:

- Measurability: performance should be measurable
 with the tools and resources available on the corridor
- Clarity: KPI/OM should be understandable to the public it is designed for
- Comparability: KPI/OM should be comparable across time and region
- Relevance and empowerment: KPI/OM should provide information on which project decisions can be based



KPI 01 – Traffic Volume (Total)

<u>KPI 01</u> displays all corridor trains on the Rail Freight Corridor North Sea – Mediterranean. <u>Trains that pass more than one border are counted only once</u>. The first graph gives an overview of the number of trains over the last four years, the second show the 12-months evolution over the last four years.

Data used per border :

Essen
Mouscron
Aubange
Aubange
Aubange
Blandain
Erquelinnes
Bettembourg
St.Louis
Pougny
CalaisEréthun

NORTH SEA - MEDITERRANEAN

Roosendaal: Infrabel data
Tourcoing: Infrabel data
Rodange: Infrabel data
Mont-Saint-Martin: Infrabel data
Baisieux: Infrabel data
Jeumont: Infrabel data
Zoufftgen: CFL data
Basel: SNCF Reseau data
La Plaine : SNCF Réseau data

CalaisFréthun: SNCF Réseau data



*Geneva' volumes counted since 2019

easier, faster, safer

KPI 01 – Traffic Volume (Total Jan. 2017 - Dec. 2020(rull month))



January 2017 to December 2020

IM data

*The decrease of volumes in April / May 2020 is due to Covid crisis.



easier, faster, safer

KPI 01 – Traffic Volume (Total)

The moving average is displayed to smooth out short-term fluctuations and highlight longer-term trends or cycles. Each figure shows the number of train runs during the last 12 months preceding the last day of the given month.





KPI 01 – Traffic Volume (Total Jan.2017 - Dec.2020)



*Geneva' volumes counted since 2019

easier, faster, safer



KPI 02 – Corridor Punctuality

KPI 02 measures the average punctuality of trains running on the corridor <u>on</u> <u>a fixed number of locations.</u> A train will be added to this train list if it meets the following criteria:

- > Passing a Corridor border point <u>AND</u>
- > Passing one of the predefined measuring points along the Corridor

This means that from 2017, the global corridor punctuality figure is no longer calculated on the basis of a fixed list of regular trains, but on all trains meeting the above described standard.

A corridor train is punctual when having a delay of maximum 30 minutes.

The data is displayed :

- > Overview of the average punctuality per month over the last four years
- > Average punctuality at entry and exit of the Corridor

The follow-up of this punctuality report is done via the Train Performance Management Working Group, to which Corridor users are regularly invited to participate.



KPI 02 : Corridor Punctuality



Monthly punctuality reports OBI/TIS data

New TIS 2020 + Change of reports in October 2020. The figures are not comparable with the year before and there are still need of controlling the figures from reporting points.



KPI 02 : Corridor Punctuality

NORTH SEA - MEDITERRANEAN

Punctuality at RFC entry and exit – Report from OBI / TIS



OM 01 – Traffic Volume (Per Corridor Border) (1)

OM 01 displays <u>all corridor trains</u> on the Rail Freight Corridor North Sea – Mediterranean, <u>per border</u>. Trains that pass more than one border are thus counted several times. The data used per border is the following:



The table shows the annual share of trains per border and the evolution between 2019 and 2020.

The volume of traffic related to PaPs is explained later on in the update on corridor capacity.



OM 01 – Traffic Volume per corridor border % per border



Border locat	tion name	Volume (N 20	Nb Trains) 20	Share	Δ 20/19
Prorail	Infrabel				
Roosendaal Grens	Essen Grens		9402	24%	-3%
Infrabel	ACF CFL				
Aubange frontière LU	Rodange frontière		2211	6%	-52%
Infrabel	SNCF Reseau				
	Tourcooing				
Mouscron Fr	frontière		3391	9%	-27%
	Mont St Martin				
Aubange Fr LU	frontièrere		4432	11%	19%
Erquelines frontière	Jeumont fonrtière		2521	6%	-5%
Blandain frontière	Baisieux frontière		916	2%	-20%
Feignies	Quevy		2702	7%	4%
ACF CFL	SNCF Reseau				
Bettembourg frontière	Zoufftgen frontière		5846	15%	-18%
SNCF Reseau	CFF Infra				
Bale St Jean	Basel St Johan		5461	14%	-20%
Pougny Chnacy	La Plaine		299	1%	-12%
Eurotunnel	SNCF Reseau				
Declando Maara	Calais frethun				
	faisceau tunnel		1945	5%	-19%

IM data



Update on Corridor Capacity

The following pages will provide insight into the capacity that has been published by the C-OSS of the Corridor, and the requests that have been received for this capacity.

Capacity on the Corridor is published under the form of PaPs (or RP-Rolling Planning in the frame of the TTR Pilot Amsterdam – Paris), via the online platform PCS. Only requests that have been placed via this tool can be taken into account.



easier, faster, safer



KPI03 – Average Planned Speed of PaPs (1)

KPI 03 compares the average planned speed of pre-arranged paths on predefined Rail Freight Corridor North Sea – Mediterranean routes with the pre-arranged paths on the corresponding lines for the previous year.

Per corridor route, an objective has been defined in the Corridor Implementation Plan, which is displayed in the table provided.

The goal of this KPI is to be able to determine the evolution of the speed of the PaPs over time.





KPI03 – Average Planned Speed of PaPs (2)

KM/h per Corridor Route													
Route including	Length Km	Catalogue TT 2013	Catalogue TT 2020	Catalogue TT 2021	Catalogue TT 2022	Objective catalogue TT 2018 to 2020	Objective catalogue TT 2025						
Antwerp - Basel	748,8	57	55,1	54,4	7 55,68	55	58						
Antwerp - Bettembourg	343,7	60,7	57,4	54,9	56,03	60	62						
Mont-St-Martin - Basel	425,9	51,4	50,5	51,9	52,02	50	54						
Rotterdam-Antwerp	74,3	53,4	64,1	64,1	62,59	70	72,5						
Antwerp-Lille	125,4	50,2	49,2	61,9	58,14	56	60						
Lille-Paris	247,3	NA	68,5	70,7	62,91	72,5	75						
Metz - Lyon	454,1	NA	65,3	66,5	a 62	70	72,5						
Dunkerque - Liège	311,1	NA	58,7	58,7	59,2	57,5	60						

→ Journey times include commercial and operational stops



1

KPI03 – Average Planned Speed of PaPs (3)







KPI03 – Average Planned Speed of PaPs (4)

Due to BREXIT from TT2022 we are not measuring anymore London – Calais & Calais – Metz.

Only moderated fluctuations are noted except for the Paris – Lille relation. This might be due to the low quantity of published PaPs (one round trip Antwerp – Bayonne) & depends of the exact measuring point that used to be taken the last years.

We note also some average speed decrease for Antwerp-Lille & Metz-Lyon. The sampling is higher, we believe the traffic increase without increase of the line capacity might be the reason.



KPI04 – Volume of offered capacity

KPI 04 displays all the PaPs (KMs per year) that have been published by the C-OSS of the Corridor in January 2021, for the **annual timetable 2022**, and in fall 2020 as Reserve Capacity for late path requests and ad hoc requests for timetable 2021.

A total of 20,2 million KMs were published as PaPs for TT2022 (-7% compared to TT2021)



KPI05 – Volume of requested capacity

KPI 05 displays all the requests for PaPs (KMs per year) that have been received by the C-OSS of the Corridor for the annual timetable 2021 in April 2020, and for RC up to February 2021.

12,5 million KMs of PaPs were requested for TT2021 (-10% compared to TT 2020)

- ➔ 13,9 million for TT 2020
- → 13,6 million for TT2019
- → 7,4 million for TT2018
- → 7,1 million for TT2017
- → 6,1 million for TT2016
- → 2.8 million for TT2015

A total of 181 dossiers were submitted for TT2021 for PaP capacity

- → 244 for TT2020
- → 260 for TT2019
- → 137 for TT2018
- → 134 for TT2017
- → 118 for TT2016
- → 51 for TT2015

79055 Kms were requested as RC for TT2021 so far

- → 0,14 million for TT2020
- ➔ No RC requested for TT2019
- ➔ 0,16 million for TT2018
- ➔ 0,47 million for TT2017
- ➔ 0,13 million for TT2016
- ➔ 0,40 million for TT2015



8 dossiers were submitted for RC for TT2021 so far

- → 9 for TT 2020
- ➔ No RC dossiers for TT2019
- ➔ 9 for TT2018
- → 14 for TT2017
- ➔ 5 for TT2016
- → 11 for TT2015

KPI06 – Volume of pre-booked capacity

KPI 06 shows the number of PaPs which have been (pre-) booked by the C-OSS in the second half of April 2020. This means that the PaP sections requested were allocated, but only under the condition that possible feeder/outflow sections, which appear in most of the requests, can be constructed by the concerned IMs/ABs and that these proposals will be accepted by the applicant, and/or that the applicant does not withdraw its request before active timetable (end of August). The KPI is displayed as KMs per year.

If the volume of requested capacity is close to the volume of pre-booked capacity, this means that there are very little conflicting requests, and that thus the PaP offer can be perceived as adequate (both are identical for TT2021, thus no conflicts occurred).



KPI04 / KPI05 / KPI06 Overview (1)

in millions of KMs



CORRIDOR NORTH SEA - MEDITERRANEAN

KPI04 / KPI05 Overview (1)





easier, faster, safer

KPI04 / KPI05 Overview (2)

Per Infrastructure Manager is indicated:

Percentage of capacity requested in April 2020 which was offered in January 2020

Number of PaPs at least partly requested in April 2020 / PaPs published in January 2020





KPI 07: Ratio of the capacity allocated by the C-OSS and the total allocated capacity (1)

KPI 07 provides information on the share of trains per RFC Border Crossing allocated in the yearly TT which were ordered via the C-OSS, compared to the total number of allocated freight trains.

To have an idea of this, we have analysed the number of <u>scheduled</u> international freight train runs at the RFC NSM borders for timetables 2018 to 2020 (<u>as per start of timetable</u>), to be able to compare these figures to the number of train runs foreseen for timetable 2018 to 2020 as ordered and allocated via the RFC NSM OSS (<u>end of August</u>)

- This means a border crossing via PaP
- Or via <u>feeder/outflow</u>

Figures can only be regarded as an indication:

- Works or last minute demands from the customer might lead to changing timetables, routing or calendar; partly or entirely
- Cancellations (between allocation by C-OSS and start of timetable; partly or entirely)



KPI 07: Ratio of the capacity allocated by the C-OSS and the total allocated capacity (2)



1	Share of scheduled trains allocated via the C-OS (X-3)											
inzation		TT 2018	TT 2019	TT2020	TT 2021							
1	Basel/St.Louis	44%	78%	79%	79%							
2	Blandain/Baisieux	46%	100%	38%	83%							
3	Erquelinnes/Jeumont	26%	32%	9%	26%							
4	Aubange/Rodange	68%	96%	80%	93%							
5	Aubange/Mont-St-Martin	60%	100%	100%	92%							
6	Zoufftgen/Bettembourg	15%	36%	10%	65%							
7	Mouscron/Tourcoing	37%	94%	55%	84%							
8	Essen/Roosendaal	38%	27%	27%	34%							
9	Calais Fréthun-tunnel	50%	48%	55%	55%							
10	La Plaine/Pougny-Chancy		0%	59%	0%							
11	Feignies/Quévy			36%	75%							

Figures for Feignies are mentioned, even though the

border does not officially make part of RFC NSM lines. This way, overall evolution of crossborder freight services can be better monitored.



KPI 07: Ratio of the capacity allocated by the C-OSS and the total allocated capacity (3)



We see that more than half of all freight services that cross RFC NSM borders are requested through RFC2s' C-OSS (PaP or feeder/outflow).



OM 03: Volume of requests -OM 04: Number of conflicts

OM 03 (volume of requests) and OM 04 (number of conflicts) cannot be analysed separately.

It is important to stress that a request means one dossier in PCS. Such a dossier can have the following characteristics:

A request for:

- > A PaP running one day of the year ←→ A PaP running all days of the year
- > A PaP running on one section $\leftarrow \rightarrow$ A PaP running on ten sections
- > A PaP with feeder/outflow sections $\leftarrow \rightarrow$ A pure PaP
- > A PaP on one Corridor \leftarrow > A PaP on several Corridors
- ➤ A PaP crossing a border on another Corridor ← ➤ A PaP crossing a Rail Freight Corridor North Sea – Mediterranean border

For this reason, the number of requests in itself doesn't tell a lot. However, to be able to analyse and understand the level of conflicts (conflicting requests placed between January and April), this figure should be known.

OM 04 provides information on the number of conflicts for timetable 2021 at X-8, for which the priority rule had to be applied.



OM 03: Volume of requests -OM 04: Number of conflicts





OM 05: Relation between results capacity wishes survey, the published and the requested capacity

OM 05 compares for each timetable year, for a given Corridor O/D, the following:

- the average number of paths per day, that were expressed as capacity need
- the average number of PaPs per day, that were published in the PaP Catalogue
- The average number of paths per day requested in April via the C-OSS, via PaP or feeder/outflow.

The goal of this KPI is to be as transparent as possible in the analysis if what is published as a PaP meets market demands.



OM 05: Relation between results capacity wishes survey, the published and the requested capacity

	TT 2	TT 2015		TT2016		TT2017			TT2018			TT2019			TT2020			TT2021		
route	Offer per corridor route	requested per corridor route	Expressed capacity wishes per corridor route	Offer per corridor route	requested per corridor route	Expressed capacity wishes per corridor route	Offer per corridor route	requested per corridor route	Expressed capacity wishes per corridor route	Offer per corridor route	requested per corridor route	Expressed capacity wishes per corridor route	Offer per corridor route	requested per corridor route	Expressed capacity wishes per corridor route	Offer per corridor route	requested per corridor route	Expressed capacity wishes per corridor route	Offer per corridor route	reques ted per corrido r route
Including		Average paths per day, both directions combined																		
Antwerp - Basel	22	9	18	18	13	18	23	11	22	18	15	23	26	11	26	22	19	11	16	16
Antwerp - Bettembourg	12	1	8	27	11	8	38	11	5	33	9	5	40	20	4	65	10	7	46	9
Mont-St-Martin - Basel	18	9	18	15	12	18	21	6	17	9	9	24	20	20	22	18	18	11	7	20
Rotterdam - Antwerp	36	0	2	36	3	0	29	1	6	31	3	8	37	5	6	32	1	14	32	6
Antwerp - Lyon	2	0	16	2	3	2	2	1	15	2	1	8	4	7	3	5	2	0	0	0
Antwerp - Lille	14	5	52	27	13	6	25	11	38	20	8	30	19	22	24	20	10	14	14	14
Lille/Somain - Paris	N.A.	2	8	2	4	4	10	7	29	6	6	16	13	9	12	13	4	6	6	6
Metz - Lyon	6	0	26	11	10	10	15	13	24	18	11	47	29	13	36	36	30	40	36	30
Dunkerque - Liège	N.A.	0	6	3	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
London - Calais	N.A.	0	0	N.A.	1	10	4	5	0	4	2	0	6	0	0	4	2	6	2	2
Calais - Metz	N.A.	0	4	2	3	12	6	11	8	5	4	12	6	5	17	14	7	8	2	1



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 there in.

> Contact marie-anne.menguy@sncf.fr jean.quaeyhaegens@infrabel.be www.rfc-northsea-med.eu



