
**Summary of the 10th meeting with the RFC North Sea – Baltic
RAG & TAG 30th March 2017**

Date: 30th of March 2017
Venue: *Mercure Hotel Berlin City
Invalidenstr. 38; 10115 Berlin*

1. Welcome and introduction address from the Executive and Management Boards Chairmans and the Managing Director.

Weronika Karbowski (Managing Director of the RFC NS-B) and Jan Ilik (Chairman of the RFC NS-B Executive Board) welcomed the participants. Oliver Sellnick (Chairman of the RFC NS-B Management Board) opened the 10th RFC NS – B RAG&TAG meeting and presented the agenda together with the amendments made:

1. After the C-OSS presentation Mr. Holger Westphal from METRANS will present remarks to the PaP offer (point 3 of the agenda);
2. Julie Buy from the European Commission will give the EC feedback on the Regulation 913/2010 revision (point 7 of the agenda);
3. Under AOB three additional topics were prepared for the meeting and if the time allows they will be presented:
 - Information about TRIMODE project;
 - Future cooperation between RFC Orient – East Med and RFC North Sea – Baltic;
 - Next steps - 10 priorities from Sector Statement.

All proposed points were added to the agenda which was adopted (Annex 1 Final agenda for RAG&TAG meeting 30.03.2017). Afterwards all participants introduced themselves.

2. Capacity: PaP offer for TT 2018 and ordering process; RU's expectations for TT 2019 offer.

Florian Müller (RFC NS-B C-OSS Manager), run the presentation regarding the RFC NS-B offer (Presentation 2. Presentation RFC NS-B Capacity), including the topics:

- PaP-Offer TT 2018;
- Reserve Capacity Offer TT 2017;
- Book 4 for TT 2018.

Florian Müller summarized all improvements in the RFC NS-B offer done according to the customers' feedback:

- Offering PaPs via Bad Bentheim;
- Longer stopping time in Frankfurt (Oder) Oderbrücke;
- Separate offer on overlapping section with RFC Rhine Alpine;
- New handover point between SŽDC and DB Netz AG (Decin st.hr/Bad Schandau Grenze).

He informed that soon the template “Expression of customer capacity wishes for TT 2019” will be circulated by e-mail. He stressed that it is crucial for the corridor to receive this feedback on its basis the offer can be further improved.

Florian Müller also summarized the customer visits and PCS training which he provided in cooperation with other RFCs. He pointed out that the training in PCS is really important and the individual training for the customers can be provided if needed. Regarding Book 4 for TT 2018, C-OSS Manager informed that the Book 4 is harmonized for the first time (see details in the presentation).

Afterwards discussion took place. Regarding PaPs requests for TT 2018 Agnieszka Świerszczyńska (PKP Cargo) stated that at present PKP Cargo doesn't plan any requests. Alexander Schroeder (Captrain) stated that because of the changes made in the offer he will request. Lieven Goethals (B-Logistics) stated that it is more than likely the requests will be placed.

3. METRANS customer presentation.

Holger Westphal run the presentation about METRANS remarks to the PaP-offer for TT 2018. He informed that METRANS will not order PaPs for TT 2018 as it was done for TT 2017. He summarized the requirements and processes that should be implemented to meet the customer expectations:

- PaPs should be available daily;
- Priority in proceeding (even in case of infrastructure work) should be given;
- In case of infrastructure works providing diversionary routes, also on other countries infrastructure if necessary;
- Internationally agreed train numbers for the complete “PaP run” should be kept if the PaP crosses different borders.

Regarding offering diversionary route Holger Westphal raised a question what is the payment method for infrastructure usage in a case of diversion of a PaP path? Michel Geubelle (RFC NS-B Management Board Member) stated that in Belgium only original run has to be paid. In Netherlands there is a compensation if there is diversionary path proposed. In Poland if train path was requested in annual timetable but there is a change to diversionary line the cheaper price is requested. In case described train had to be rerouted via Poland, whether originally went via Germany and Czech Republic therefore this path was not treated as diversionary path on Polish infrastructure. It has been highlighted by RUs during the discussion that the compensation does not include the rerouting on neighbouring network. This issue has to be further investigated

Florian Müller thanked Holger Westphal for the presentation and stated that the remarks are taken into account and as much as possible the RFC offer for TT 2019 will be tailored to the customer wishes.

4. Temporary Capacity Restrictions: overview and process description, RU's involvement in the process.

Reiner Losekamm (RFC NS-B TCR Subgroup Leader) presented the topic of Temporary Capacity Restrictions and impact for freight trains on the RFC North Sea - Baltic in the timetable 2018

(Presentation 4. Presentation RFC NS-B regarding TCR). The attention of RAG&TAG was drawn especially to:

- Timeline for the coordination of Temporary Capacity Restrictions on RFC NS-B;
- Temporary Capacity Restrictions with impact for freight trains on the west section of the RFC NS-B;
- Temporary Capacity Restrictions with impact for traffic trains on the east section of RFC NS-B;
- New developments such as RNE tool for TCR display and coordination which in the future may be connected to CIP.

The participants discussed the presentation. Reiner Losekamm stated that Emmerich-Oberhausen section is the most impacted part of the RFC for TT 2018. The focus point was the coordination done between corridors and offering diversionary paths via the cross borders that does not belong to the corridor. Reiner Losekamm answered the questions including one asked by Lieven Goethals from B-Logistics, regarding the border crossing Bad Bentheim closing times which are:

- Saturday 11:30 pm till Sunday 07:00 am and
- Monday 00:00 am till 05:00 am

Guus de Mol (RFC NS-B Management Board Member) summarized that the RFC is already working on coordination of TCR however more work has to be done. Olivier Sellnick stated that it's a duty of the RFC to lower the impact of TCR on the RFC offer, keeping in mind that the infrastructure and maintenance works have to be done. In order to improve the information flow Oliver Sellnick proposed to set up a meeting with customers in August 2017 regarding the TCRs for TT 2019.

5. Results of the Customer Satisfaction Survey

Oliver Sellnick run the presentation of the results of the Customer Satisfaction Survey 2016 (Presentation 5. Presentation RFC NS-B USS 2016 results) including: Survey Design, General comments given by respondents to open questions, 10 top and 10 bottom aspects. He also summarized what actions were taken by the RFC regarding every topic and what are the possible next steps.

6. Train Performance Management: process, reporting and involvement of RU's.

Ann Verstraelen (RFC NS-B Performance Management and Operations Working Group Leader) run the presentation about the train performance management topic (6. Presentation RFC NS-B Train Performance Management.), explaining what is the train performance management in the corridor and the TPM process.

The idea of the TPM process is to analyze the reports on punctuality and delay reasons in the bilateral working groups. Ann Verstraelen presented and explained the draft report on punctuality and delay analysis which was circulated among participants before the presentation (6. Draft report on RFC NS-B punctuality and delay). In order to join the TPM Working Group RUs are invited to sign the Confidentiality Agreement.

The question was raised how the report is generated. Ann Verstraelen answered that the reports are generated by the OBI System and the data comes from TIS.

Additionally in regard to the issue raised by Holger Westphal of one train number Ann Verstraelen informed RUs that national trains can be linked in TIS by RUs in order to display the international train run.

7. European Commission feedback.

Julie Buy from DG MOVE informed participants about the decision taken on postponing the revision of the Regulation 913/2010 by two years in order to focus on strengthening and improving existing operational processes. EC decided to postpone the decision whether to revise the RFC Regulation by 12 – 24 months. As requested by the sector, EC will leave more time to the sector to deliver results and to progress on key projects, in particular the ones identified in the Rotterdam Sector Statement and Ministerial Declaration. We are giving ourselves a deadline of the December Rail Freight Day this year, in which our Commissioner is expected to participate, for a reporting back on significant progress. In the more short-term, the next SERAC WG in RFCs on 17th of May will also be an opportunity to take stock.

8. Reply to RAG speaker topics:

Details regarding sub points 8.1 to 8.3, can be found in Presentation 8. Presentation Reply to RAG speaker topics.

8.1 Braking sheets in Poland.

Mateusz Urański (RFC NS-B ExBo Member - PL Ministry of Infrastructure and Construction) presented the topic informing that the braking sheet model is described in the Regulation of the Minister of Transport of 2nd of November 2006 regarding the documents which should be in a railway vehicle and set out in Annex 1 to the Regulation. This provision applies to trains running in national traffic. The Regulation states that for an international train braking sheet may be issued according to the model established between:

1. Railway Undertakings responsible for train run;
2. Railway Undertaking and Infrastructure Manager of the state to which the train enters;
3. Railway Undertaking and the Railway Management of the state to which the train enters.

PL MoT considers starting investigation on possible harmonisation of braking sheet model in Poland. If such initiative was to be taken by PL MoT, it would have to consider that some of the Polish companies are working on the international braking sheet.

Dirk Oelschläger (RFC NS-B RAG Speaker) thanked Mateusz Urański for the presentation.

8.2 Locomotive driver identification in Czech Republic.

Jan Ilik presented the topic informing that SŽDC Network Statement requires in compliance with TSI TAF an entry information “Train Ready” which includes a contact detail to the train driver, which may be:

- GSM-R,
- standard radio,
- or even public GSM telephone connection which is also accepted from the SŽDC.

It depends on Railway Undertaking which type of communication channel provides and there are no additional requirements on RFC NS-B lines.

8.3 Communication process regarding cross-border agreements.

Weronika Karbowski presented the topic explaining that the communication process regarding the cross-border agreements is the responsibility of the infrastructure manager and introducing an extra step in the communication between the IM and the RU would not improve the communication process but additionally raise safety issues. A list of the existing Border Agreements is available on the corridor website. Ann Verstraelen informed that all the relevant documents will be implemented to CIP in the future as well.

9. Feedback on Estimated Time of Arrival project and Last Mile project.

Guus de Mol run the presentation regarding the ELETA project (Presentation 9. Presentation ELETA), explaining at the beginning that following the ETA implementation is one of the 10 priorities from the Sector Statement.

Core tasks of the ETA project are:

1. Establishing the Electronic data exchange link between all stakeholders in the chosen intermodal logistic chains.
2. Feeding into the link valid data on Estimated Time of Arrival.

ETA will be used by different purposes: last destination, station, unloading point.

Guus de Mol pointed out that primarily TIS was built for the international traffic but at the moment more and more infrastructure managers feed TIS with the information about all trains: international and national ones. The crucial development is to estimate the time of arrival on the basis of the algorithm calculations not only on the running advices which will bring an extra value to assessing time of the estimated arrival. At present the situation is that if delay is 20 min in Warsaw it will appear as 20 min in Berlin.

Sharing data process could be improved as at the moment data is not really shared between different stakeholders. Stefan Nagel (RFC NS-B ExBo Member – German Ministry of Transport MoT) informed that in mid-April the confirmation should be received which countries/companies will participate in the project regarding the data sharing. However the issue is that some companies see the data as confidential - for business purposes.

10. Cross-border communication: language

Dirk Oelschläger presented the topic of the future of cross-border communication on RFC NS-B (Presentation 10. Presentation regarding Cross-border communication.), summarizing the developments, trends and challenges:

- Train operation requires verbal communication between locomotive driver and staff authorizing train movements.
- Locally staffed border stations allow flexible language arrangements for cross-border traffic – the basic knowledge of neighboring county language is assured.
- Trend towards centralisation of infrastructure management is reducing the availability of local staff.

Regarding the options for facilitating future cross-border communication Dirk Oelschläger underlined that the short term solutions are found, however to develop permanent long term solution the railway sector should work jointly.

Guus de Mol reminded that the TSI implementation is foreseen in 2020 and for the time being national rules applies which are different and in some countries out of the scope of infrastructure managers. DG MOVE informed that a question on the single operational language had been included in the questionnaire for the evaluation of TDD. Fifty-one percent of the respondents to the public consultation considered the introduction of a single, common operational language at least to some extent beneficial, especially for cross-border traffic, would simplify the language training and increase safety. They also highlight the possibility of considering the using a common language on the international corridors in a first step. If EC decides to proceed with the revision of TDD this could be one option to be thoroughly assessed in terms of costs and benefits during the impact assessment.

Götz Walther (VDV) summarized the existing status quo regarding cross-border communication:

- The possibility of the derogation seems to cause more problems as it foresees that infrastructure manager may grant the derogation to specific RU but not on the cross border itself which may result in unfair treatment, as well as cause safety issue, whether at one cross border same rules should apply to all RUs running trains;
- Moreover it shouldn't be IMs responsibility; NSAs should have the leading role in the process;
- Two language areas are the most common now and should be promoted - Bilingual systems on cross-border sections.
- Cost of language training should be divided between the infrastructure managers.

Discussion took place. Alexander Schroeder (Captrain) asked if possibility of using English as a leading language was taken into consideration? Götz Walther answered that the topic was mentioned several times but for some reasons it may not be good solution as:

1. International traffic is only a part of all traffic;
2. For railway operations communication is necessary in special cases but not used on regular daily basis as for the plane operations.
3. Number of people working in railways with fluent English is limited.

Jan Ilik questioned how the solution can be found for the RFC NS-B. Oliver Sellnick stated that discussion about principles is limited and if the individual customer is facing problems RFC NS-B may be notified and corridor – together with Ministries and NSAs - will focus on finding the best solution for the concrete border crossing.

11. AOB

Details regarding sub points 11.1 to 11.3, can be found in Presentation 8. Presentation RFC NS-B AOB.

11.1 TRIMODE project.

Julie Buy shortly informed about the TRIMODE project. Transport Integrated Model of Europe is an integrated model where transport activity will be the core but economy and energy use in transport will also be covered. This project is underdevelopment; it should be ready mid-2019 and may be used by corridors for their Transport Market Study updates.

11.2 Future cooperation between RFC Orient – East Med and RFC North Sea – Baltic.

Oliver Sellnick informed participants about future extension of RFC Orient - East Med to Germany and its impact for RFC NS-B offer as most of the lines will overlap. He underlined that the goal is to minimize the disruption for the customers and steps toward achieving this are being already taken together with RFC O-EM.

Oliver Sellnick summarized that geographical split-up seems to be best variant because of the below advantages:

- More customer-oriented due to a better offer on the overlapping sections;
- Interoperability between the RFCs via connecting point (Prague);
- Clear sales competences between the C-OSS.

He also informed that operational extension of the RFC North Sea – Baltic to Rostock is considered.

11.3 Next steps - 10 priorities from Sector Statement.

Oliver Sellnick presented the 10 priorities in 4 clusters which were approved by all nine RFCs already:

- Priority cluster 1 – Planning
- Priority cluster 2 – Operations
- Priority cluster 3 – Infrastructure Investments
- Priority cluster 4 – Governance

He pointed out that the transparency of information is the element which put cooperation forward. He also informed about Cross-corridor Strategy Workshop organized in February by corridors with representatives of RUs, Terminals and end- customers (Annex 11.3 Feedback letter Sector declaration).

After presentation Jan Ilik asked RUs representatives who stated that the request for PaPs won't be placed to present the remarks in the form of presentation as Holger Westphal from METRANS. After a discussion it was stated that all RUs are asked to fill in the template with expression of capacity wishes and C-OSS Manager may organize a workshop with the customers in order receive their remarks.

The next RAG/TAG meeting is foreseen for 27th of September 2017 in Warsaw.

Jan Ilik, Oliver Sellnick and Weronika Karbowskiak thanked the participants for taking part in the meeting.

List of annexes and presentations:

All the presentations and annexes are available on the RFC NS-B website in [Downloads area](#) .

- 1) Annex 1 Final agenda for RAG-TAG meeting 30.03.2017
- 2) 2. Presentation RFC NS-B Capacity
- 3) 3. Presentation METRANS remarks to the PaP-offer for TT 2018
- 4) 4. Presentation RFC NS-B regarding TCR
- 5) 5. Presentation RFC NS-B USS 2016 results
- 6) 6. Presentation RFC NS-B Train Performance Management
- 7) Annex 6.1 Draft report on RFC NS-B punctuality and delay
- 8) 8. Presentation Reply to RAG speaker topics
- 9) 9. Presentation ELETA
- 10) 10. Presentation regarding Cross-border communication
- 11) 11. Presentation RFC NS-B AOB
- 12) Annex 11.3 Feedback letter Sector declaration

*Prepared by Patrycja Urbańska
RFC NS-B Office*