

Summary of the meeting with the RFC 8 North Sea – Baltic RAG & TAG 14th October 2015

Venue:

PKP PLK S.A. HQ
Targowa St. 74
03-734
03-735 Warsaw

Timing:

9:00 – 13:00

1. Welcome address from the Chairman and the Director

Jakub Kapturzak, Managing Director of the Corridor Office, welcomed the participants and opened the meeting. Jakub Kapturzak explained that the Management Board Chair, Mr. Oliver Sellnick, could not attend the meeting, as he is participating at the same day in a meeting concerning Revision of the Regulation 913/2010. Afterwards Jakub Kapturzak presented the draft agenda. The agenda was accepted without remarks.

2. Progress report from the Management Board

Jakub Kapturzak delivered the presentation mentioning at the beginning that all the documents for the meeting were provided to the interested participants in the beginning of September.

3. Results of the consultation of the Implementation Plan

Jakub Kapturzak delivered the presentation. No discussion took place.

4. Reserve capacity and Pre-arranged Path offer

Florian Müller the C-OSS Manager delivered the presentation.

Katarzyna Marciniak from DB Schenker Polska asked who are the customers that the C-OSS is going to contact? Guus de Mol explained that the C-OSS will contact all the known customers who run international trains and also inform everybody who is asking for information.

Michał Litwin (Freightliner) asked a question regarding how the reserve capacity is allocated and about offer on Southern part of PL.

Jörg Schulz (Eurogate, Bremerhaven) asked about the experience with reserve capacity in RFC 1. Guus de Mol explained that the PaPs are not so logical for the market and doesn't always fit the demand of RUs. Therefore there is a discussion going on in order to find solutions to give more flexibility in PaP offer. The idea of PaPs is different from what the companies are used to offer. But in any case the customers can ask the C-OSS if we can fulfill his demands. He said also concerning the usage of capacity that heavily used parts of the corridor are always overbooked.

Frauke Paul from the Port of Hamburg raised a question about the possibility to book capacity into the terminals with PCS. Guus de Mol explained that PCS is not developed capacity allocation on terminals.

Jakub Majewski (ProKolej foundation) asked whether paths in eastern Poland are coordinated between the two IMs in Poland and for southern Part of Poland he asked why a line that no longer exists was drawn on the RFC offer scheme. Agnieszka Kaczorek replied that the path should go through Gliwice as the line presented on the map does not exist. Concerning the first question Michel Geubelle stated that the MB was never informed about the existence of two IMs in Małaszewicze. There is no formal complaint about Małaszewicze entrance. Izabela Kuligowska from the Polish RB confirmed that there is no formal complaint about the entrance to Małaszewicze and on the operations done by Cargo Tor.

DB Schenker Rail Polska stated that the case is very crucial for them as it is not solved since years. Izabela Kuligowska answered again that it cannot be investigated when they do not complain formally. ProKolej said that they have send official letter to EC in order to investigate this.

Michał Vietz asked about allocation of capacity and what will happen when not used capacity. Michel Geubelle replied that then national law applies.

Katarzyna Marciniak asked a question about quality of product due to huge construction works on Polish part of RFC 8, especially regarding punctuality was asked. Michel Geubelle answered that one of RFC obligation is to collect data on ongoing works and take them into consideration when an offer is elaborated. This way construction works should not effect on punctuality of freight trains. He pointed out that in RFC 1 and 2 85% of the trains are on time (it means that they have a delay of less than 30 minutes)

Katarzyna Marciniak also noticed that the Regulation named Terespol as the Eastern end (station) of the Corridor and the presentation shows offers only to Małaszewicze. For the customers, the corridor offer is not legal and does not fit the regulation.

Michał Litwin said that Andreas Pietsch already informed the MB about the access charges problem in the area of Małaszewicze. Jakub Kapturzak answered that the letter was received and the case was discussed in the MB but it was concluded that the RB was the competent body to handle the question.

Izabela Kuligowska explained that there are different rules for different kinds of infrastructure. She pointed out that the Regulation is for the European gauge. Cargotor has got two types of the infrastructure so different law applies to each. There is no possibility to access Małaszewicze without using Cargotor infrastructure. There are many operators using this infrastructure among them there is DB Schenker yes but Freightliner not and therefore it seems that there are no problems.

Jakub Majewski asked if it is obligatory in Poland to offer capacity for a price/ charge calculated by taking into account only the direct costs.

Izabela Kuligowska explained that this is a business case, access contract is signed with each railway operator. Charges are same for everyone. She explained additionally on request of Jakub Majewski that the national IM is a different case. Charges are lower due to subsidies from the State. Jiri Samek pointed out that Cargotor charges are 200% higher than PKP PLK

S.A. ones. METTRANS confirmed that and said that access charges of 12€ per km are discriminating other RUs.

Jörg Schulz proposed not to continue the issue as it can't be solved. He asked to amend the map of PaPs. Michel Geubelle pointed out that the map was accepted by the Management Board and Executive Board. Changes can be made only for TT 2017 if Polish IM submits a request.

Maciej Gładys from the Polish Ministry in charge of transport and Jakub Kapturzak explained that the map is correct despite the fact that in the Regulation, Terespol is a border point but Małaszewicze is a real point of destination for freight train in the EU since Belarus is not part of the Corridor. Terespol is only border crossing for passengers and even if there will be a path offered to the town nobody would order it.

Guus de Mol pointed out that there is a similar situation with Rotterdam and Antwerp – trains are going to the area of the city but not to the city itself.

Jakub Kapturzak summarized that the issue cannot be solved by the Corridor, but with the active participation of RUs, IM and RB.

Jiri Samek asked another questions regarding capacity from Falkenberg to Magdeburg and Frankfurt/O to Magdeburg. Florian Müller answered that it is a network, so trains don't always go to the end.

Jiri Samek asked also how quick he can go after ordering the trains if for instance he wants three trains from Rotterdam to Poznań Gądki. Florian Müller explained that there are two products, the Prearranged Paths (PaPs) for the annual TT and Reserve Capacity (RC) for ad hoc for requests. RC will be offered from 11th November for TT 2016 and for PaPs will be offered from mid January until April 2016 for TT 2017.

5. Corridor Information Document with focus on terminal information

Jakub Kapturzak delivered the presentation. No discussion took place.

6. Preparation for the upcoming common RAG meetings

Jakub Kapturzak delivered the presentation. During the discussion Guus de Mol underlined that RFCs concluded that it is an additional exercise if RUs come together with RFCs because the aim is to harmonize and coordinate among corridors. It would be good if terminals could come together. Jörg Schulz said that there are no contractual or business relations between terminals and IMs. Important to know is also for him how UIRR would finance their engagement to organize a common TAG meeting. Michał Litwin added that the common meetings are not organized to replace RAGs but as something extra.

7. Points proposed by RAG

a) Coordination of works

Jakub Kapturzak explained that in scope of the RFC, CoW is related to collection of the information.

b) Access to Małaszewice infrastructure

Point was discussed within the discussion on point 4.

c) Fiscal guarantees for rail freight

Jakub Kapturzak pointed out that in his opinion this is not an issue for the corridors, but rather Member States.

d) Preparation of EU Rail Freight days

Jakub Kapturzak informed that this year this event is combined with RNE BC on 4th December. The agenda is prepared by EC and RNE. There will be an exhibition part with stands of all corridors.

e) PCS NextGen

Florian Müller delivered the presentation.

Michał Litwin asked about the language issue. Jakub Kapturzak explained that this was included in the Progress Report. Paweł Skowroński added fresh information from the RISC (Rail Interoperability & Safety Committee) information that the derogation could be given by IM (not NSA) – this procedure would be lighter. It is a common understanding but when it comes to next formal steps – everything depends on the EC because most probably it will be discussed and voted in the beginning of 2016. In PL, the Ministry is preparing transition solutions.

8. Points proposed by TAG

No points were raised.

9. AOB

Tadeusz Wilamowski asked why there is no revitalization of line between Warsaw and Petersburg. Jakub Kapturzak answered that this no line and there is ongoing extensive work on the other line E75. There is a list of investment in PL, on this matter PKP PLK S.A. should be contacted. Łosośna will be connected to the corridor when E75 construction lines are done.

List of annexes:

Annex 1 – list of attendance

All the meeting presentations are available on the corridor's website.

Prepared by: Katarzyna Rocka, RFC North Sea – Baltic Office