

## Summary of the 17<sup>th</sup> meeting with the RFC North Sea – Baltic RAG & TAG on 16<sup>th</sup> of September 2020

**Date: 16<sup>th</sup> of September 2020 via Microsoft Teams**

### **1. Welcome and introduction.**

Oliver Sellnick (Chairman of the RFC NS-B Management Board) welcomed the participants. Participants introduced themselves. He also introduced and welcomed RAG and TAG Speakers: Dirk Zender from DB Cargo AG (RAG Speaker) and Friedrich Stuhmann from MSC Gate Bremerhaven GmbH & Co. KG (TAG Speaker) and Ad Toet (representative of ELETA project). Oliver Sellnick presented the agenda.

### **2. Results of the Final Offer for TT2021 and PaP construction for TT2022**

Felicia Riedl (RFC NS-B C-OSS Manager) welcomed all participants of the RAG/TAG, especially the new members of Latvia & Estonia, as the RFC is being extended and the RFC products are offered from 12<sup>th</sup> of October 2020 (Reserve capacity) and the 11<sup>th</sup> of January 2021 (Annual Timetable) for all 8 countries belonging now to RFC North Sea-Baltic.

The presentation itself shared two topics:

- Finalization of the PaP procedure for TT2021
- Ideas for the PaP construction process TT2022

#### **• Finalization of the PaP procedure for TT2021**

Felicia Riedl informed that the results are satisfying as on one hand, the number of PaPs for TT2021 doubled and on the other hand, all observations placed by the applicants regarding the draft offer could be solved by the involved IMs.

The implementation though of the new comparison function in the international path ordering system PCS was not that self-explanatory. But the function could be used after clarification jointly (applicants & C-OSS) in a good manner.

However, 40 from 42 Dossiers requested for international path (PaP, Feeder/Outflow), were submitted to the Active Timetable to conclude the contract for the timetables placed in PCS.

2 Dossiers were closed during the observation phase by an applicants as the contract to run the train could not be concluded for TT2022.

16 observations were placed in 9 dossiers and could be solved with final offer.

Overall the PaP process for TT2021 was successful finalized.

#### **• Ideas for the PaP construction process TT2022**

The RFC NS-B will have a second trial on construction “long distance PaPs” for TT2022.

The PaPs will now be constructed from September – December 2020 taking market needs coming from the wishes of the wish list and experiences from TT2021 into account.

66 wishes were expressed by 9 applicants.

Next steps to catch up on for the COSS:

- Coordinate the for PaP construction TT2022
- Create the DigiCat TT2022

- Import & publish PaPs to PCS
- Organize PCS training in February 2021. If the new applicants would prefer a separate PCS training, this could be organized by the C-OSS anytime.
- Start working on a new approach for PaP construction TT2023.

Felicia Riedl thanked the RUs and Executive Board Members for the attention. Oliver Sellnick thanked Felicia Riedl for the presentation.

### 3. RAG slot

Dirk Zender welcomed the participants. He stated that since the last meeting the below RUs requests, were fulfilled by the RFC NS-B:

- TPM Quality check of RFC 8 products
    - PaP offer during the complete timetable period incl. alternative reroutings
    - harmonized border crossing paths (incl. Feeder)
  - Management of the RFC NS-B must be deeply involved in construction work on the corridor
    - Management board must be involved in the planning period of construction work (just the RFC's are having the complete overview of clients & products)
    - long train runs must be in the focus (RFC NS-B is having extremely long train runs)
  - RAG Speaker must be invited to the Management board
- missing feedback of questionnaire (oversized User Satisfaction Survey – should be shorter)

Dirk Zender listed also the fields which need a further improvements:

- RU's don't see the unique selling proposition of RFC products
- Terminal slots must be part of RFC products to offer a complete product with added values
- TPM Quality check of RFC 8 products: harmonized parameter on border crossing path in PaP offers. Statement from RFC is expected.

RFC 3 have the terminal shots but they were never ordered.

- Oliver Sellnick requested Felicia Riedl to provide more information regarding this concept from RFC Mediterranean. He also proposed that he will send e-mail to RAG/TAG Speakers regarding this topic.
- Additionally, the ICM topic is still open as training concept once per year is unclear
  - Oliver Sellnick agreed that training with RUs is a good idea. He requested the Office to organise a workshop.

Dirk Zender stated that the RAG Members need arguments why they should use RFC products instead of national products offered by IMs.

- Oliver Sellnick pointed out that the RFC NS-B offers a coordinated capacity, which can be offered as it can be booked via C-OSS Manager, instead of ordering different paths from IMs.
- Dirk Zender confirmed that it will be helpful if in daily operation system RFC offer could be prioritized. OS answered that priority for freight trains can't be offered. However DB Netz started a couple of years ago priority train project, if all IMs can agree on it, it will be a real advantage.

- Dirk Zender stated that terminal slots must be part of the RFC products to offer. Felicia Riedl informed that messages from terminals will be visible in Train Management System.
- Felicia Riedl and Dirk Zender underlined that terminals are open for discussion regarding the improvements.
- Oliver Sellnick pointed out that harmonised parameters on borders can't be achieved by the reduction of parameters to minimum and informed that RFC NS-B run the Capacity Improvement Study.

In the second part of the slot, Dirk Zender indicated also additional RU's expectations:

- The border crossing paths between Brest and Małaszewicze are not matched with the RFC NS-B and Amber products

Explanation and fixed rules:

- in 2020 are daily 11 fixed paths available (in 2021 appr. 15)
- all paths are matched with RU's, except 1 daily which can be booked max 24h in advance
- RFC products are not linked with dedicated border crossing paths with the result of:
  - extended stopover times in Małaszewicze
  - negative handover times
  - delayed trains
- RU's need one offer from Brest till the final destination westbound and more transparency about the border crossing paths.
  - Oliver Sellnick stated that the Polish Ministry informed that the Małaszewicze Workshop will be organised in March 2021 if it's possible. Oliver Sellnick suggested that Felicia Riedl in cooperation with the PKP PLK S.A. Time Table Office will prepare the workshop.

Dirk Zender suggested that during the workshop it should be discussed how is the daily business run, what can be done in order to harmonise the handover of paths as it is non EU.

Memorandum of understanding (MoU): Dirk Zender informed that the proposal was that RUs will write a memorandum how to pass the border faster. Eight RUs signed and confirmed it already – the document is attached to the summary as Annex 3.1 Memorandum of understanding.

- Marcel Tijs (Executive Board Chairman) asked Dirk Zender what is foreseen to be achieved with MoU.
- Dirk Zender answered that the goal of MoU is to reduce the timings for example stop time. Additionally sometimes some data is missing. The content of the MoU will guarantee that data is known already - as currently is not known.
- Oliver Sellnick said that the Management Board of the RFC NS-B wants to congratulate Dirk Zender and RAG Members on great cooperation in order to smooth the boarding process.
- Marcel Tijs pointed out that regarding Małaszewicze, the infrastructure discussion is important but not only as the operational side should be discussed, also non-infrastructure services and how the collaboration works.
- Jarosław Majchrzak (Management Board Member – PKP PLK S.A.) informed that Małaszewicze capacity which is 14 trains per day increased due to COVID. He added that Małaszewicze is a terminal hub which also form a new trains as 1520 trains are not only unloaded but 1435 trains are formed and start from Małaszewicze.

- Julija Vasilkova (Chairman of the Board - SIA LDZ Logistika) thanked Dirk Zender for the presentation. She informed that she represents SIA LDZ Logistika and asked is it possible to expand routing to China. Julija Vasilkova proposed to consider the Baltic States as alternative route to China. Dirk Zender informed that this rerouting is a part of presentation regarding Kaliningrad in point 5 of this agenda.

#### 4. TAG slot

Friedrich Stuhmann thanked for including: terminal message standardization and Land bridge to Asia topics in the agenda requested by the TAG Members.

#### 5. Landbridge to Asia:

- **Silk road map**

Felicia Riedl informed that the China-Eurasian route map was created by the Working Group TT/COSS of the Corridor. The initial idea resulted from the RAG/TAG meeting one year ago, where the discussions started about the bottlenecks turning out for Silk Road traffics. This map can be used as an additional information and is seen as a living document to be completed any time.

The different gauges are displayed on the map:

- 1,435 normal gauge in Europe
- 1,520 wide gauge used also in our European Baltic states
- 1,676 gauge used mainly in Pakistan & India.

To provide an additional value in using the map, more details regarding the technical data on the borders or routes are linked to the map. By pressing on the border locations belonging to RFC NS-B or on the [Customer Information Platform](#) stated in the legend, the user is being directed to the information.

Finally, this map is now handed over to the applicants for further disposal or communication and attached to the meeting summary as Annex 5 China-Eurasia route map.

- **Landbridge to Asia**

Dirk Zender presented the topic informing that it takes 45 days to ship goods from China and 21 days by train which is actually half of the time. The main facts are:

- length of trains on the Russian stretch max.1500m (in Poland max. 600m)
- different consignment note right (CIM/SMGS) Non EU -EU
- several clients per block train between China and the Belarussian border
- bottleneck Brest-Małaszewicze due to limited border crossing paths and extended border crossing procedures

He informed that clients tried to find different alternative routings via shortsea or train, to bypass the bottleneck Brest, listing the following advantages and disadvantages:

Advantages:

- routings are out of the overcrowded East-West Highway
- high capacity availability of the Terminal Kaliningrad

Disadvantages:

- out of RFC 8 products

- on top interfaces train/shortsea
- limited border crossing paths due to local traffics PL/RUS
- no daily shortsea connection

Dirk Zender summarised the topic:

- additional volume must be rerouted via Kaliningrad to be a competitive solution
- Shortsea isn't faster than by train because of the less frequencies and on top loadings/unloading's.

Dirk Zender pointed out that stabilisation of the Małaszewicze bottleneck and integration of Kaliningrad in RFC NS-B as privileged partner can be a solution.

- Andres Uusoja (HHLA TK Estonia) suggested that when the RFC NS-B extends to Latvia and Estonia there is an Amber Project which can be connected with the RFC and Russia. However, the RFC is very price sensitive. Dirk Zender pointed out that fuel trains are expensive as price is counted per kilometre.
- Julija Vasilkova informed that the market research can be conducted by using unused TMS funds received by LDZ as not only Kaliningrad but other Baltic ports should be considered.

It was agreed that Julija Vasilkova will contact Katarzyna Wachowicz and Felicia Riedl in order to discuss it.

- Oliver Sellnick pointed out that RFC wants to promote rail and some ports. Dirk Zender stated that the main priority should be to include the Baltic States in the RFC activities. Unfortunately, the Russian government supports Kaliningrad very strongly.
- Agnieszka Świerczyńska (PKP Cargo S.A.) stated that she has some remarks on information regarding the length of trains included in the presentation. She pointed out that presentation says that in Poland it is not more than 600m but between Rzepin and Małaszewicze for example it is 680 m, also in Germany sometimes 740 m.
- Agnieszka Świerczyńska also pointed out that regarding the limited border paths, Poland and Belarus offers 15 paths each so PKP Cargo disagrees that Małaszewicze is a bottleneck because of this. It is a result of the EU Regulation and different gouges.
- Friedrich Stuhmann said that it is interesting how the train network is supported. He added that inclusion of the Kaliningrad will be difficult as it is a political issue.
- Andres Uusoja stated that when the goods are shipped, the rail connection is needed.
- Friedrich Stuhmann pointed out that the main focus should be on shorting the existing bottlenecks, not looking for alternatives.
- Dirk Zender added that the business model of RUs is to transport goods by rail. Maybe Braniewo – Mamonowo line could be improved.
- Algis Paukštas informed that new lines from Minsk to Vilnius and Kaunas will be added to the RFC as additional one for Belarus.
- Oliver Sellnick summarised that these observations should be included in the preparation for the workshop in Małaszewicze.

- **Proposal of possible projects and role of the RFC**

Oliver Sellnick informed that the rules of the financing will change next year. EC will continue the support with strong focus on joined RFCs projects. The RFC NS-B is involved in the Land bridge to Asia project, Zuhail Nalbant (RFC NS-B Project Implementation Manager - DB Netz AG) will complement the additional ideas.

Zuhal Nalbant listed why the Euro-Asian Landbridges are of interest to RFCs:

Several EU Freight Corridors are leading to the border crossing points at EU Eastern border:

- RFCs are ending/beginning - but traffic is continuing.

Important feeder function of RFCs:

- RFCs cover the first/last leg of Euro-Asian transport chains

Growing volumes/business potential in Euro-Asian rail freight:

- Increasing volumes and number of destinations of Euro-Asian train services

RFC customers/stakeholders are engaging in Euro-Asian rail freight:

- Potential for RFCs to facilitate for customer to develop their business

Zuhal Nalbant informed that the project will start in 2021. The customers' expectations have to be identify and current analysis have to be taken into account (UIC study).

Areas which could be potentially supported by the RFCs are:

- Terminals
- Capacity
- Infrastructure
- Operational/Border issues
- Political lobbying
- Digitalisation
- Marketing

In order to start working on projects, a basic analysis is needed (including existing studies) including:

- Stakeholder-management
- Infrastructure
- Market
- Legal & KPIs

- Marcel Tijs stated that both presentations are very interesting. He pointed out that the TEN-T requirements have to be fulfilled. He added that the political lobby is an interesting and if projects are defined, Chinese, Belarusian and Kazakh players can be approached and involved. Marcel Tijs stated that he has some proposals so maybe Speakers from out of RFCs railways can be invited to the discussion. He added that in the Netherlands Ministry, he is in charge of RFC and Chinese topics so he will pass the message to the Executive Board. Maybe, Coordinating Council on Trans-Eurasian Transportation (CCTT) can be also approached.
- Zuhal Nalbant suggested that if there is information missing, RFC can be contacted after the meeting. The presentation is attached to the summary as Annex 5.2 Proposal of possible projects and role of the RFC.

## **6. RFC NS-B Capacity improvement study – discussion on the results of the study**

Oliver Sellnick stated that the aim of the discussion is to gain opinion and ideas on the study from the RAG/TAG Members. Additionally, harmonisation of the train parameters should be also discussed with the Executive Board.

- The Executive Board confirmed to support the 740m train project.
- Dirk Zender suggested to prepare a few bullet points for the next RAG/TAG meeting in order to be discussed.

The Study is attached to the summary as Annex 6 RFC NS-B Capacity improvement study as requested.

## 7. Results of the CID questionnaire – discussion

Katarzyna Wachowicz informed that on 13<sup>th</sup> -29<sup>th</sup> of May 2020, the online CID questionnaire coordinated by RNE, was conducted with 23 RUs.

She added that regarding the accessibility of information in CID, RUs answered that:

- Several documents are very complex;
- It is not easy to search in Books as they are pdf. Files;
- There is single archive with topic search links;
- It would be easier to use via electronic platform.

She informed that the tool currently is being developed for the digitalisation of NSs and CIDs and it will be designed to solve these matters.

Katarzyna Wachowicz said that participants also answered if there is any information that is important for their company, but not included in the CIDs stating among others that:

- A more user-friendly presentation of the RFC routes' infrastructure parameters to check whether a certain train composition fits to a given route; this is also relevant for the NS

Solution: The route planning function is available in [Customer Information Platform](#).

- Reliable and precise information about TCR.

Solution: TCR Tool is under development

- Different regulations between countries.

- Restrictions of weight, train length, dangerous goods.

Solution: The ExBo took a note of the above and topics will be followed.

- An overview (maybe an Excel sheet or a schematic map) of lines of the corridor and their most important parameters, such as line category, maximal allowed train length, maximal speed and declivity.

Solution: The overview of the lines and their parameters is available in [Customer Information Platform](#).

- Zuhail Nalbant informed that she is representing RFC NS-B in RNE CID and NS Working Group and since a several years the group is working on the user friendliness of the CID. There are 5 Books in CID and WG is trying to simplify and harmonise them.

## 8. Terminal message standardization

Oliver Sellnick welcomed Ad Toet (Representative of the ELETA project). He presented the topic stating that:

- In June 201, IMs and RUs agreed in Rotterdam to make information on estimated time of arrival available to their contract partners, including terminals and combined transport operators;
- From 2017-2019 Hupac, Kombiverkehr, Mercitalia, Lineas and RCA implemented this agreement under the ELETA project using Artificial Intelligence and based on data from the RNE Train Information System (TIS);
- Many practical difficulties in contractual conditions were overcome. The experience resulted in simplification of these conditions and them being embedded in the TAF TSI legal context.
- Data sharing between the rail sector and its terminals was made obligatory under the Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2177 on access to service facilities and rail related services.

Ad Toet summarised the data sharing with terminals:

- There are 2 directions :

- 1) ETA info to the terminals
- 2) Train status info from the terminals to IMs and RUs

- Various message formats are being used in Terminal Operating Systems (TOS), which are not yet ) TAF TSI compliant

- RNE, UIRR, Hupac , Port of Rotterdam and DB DUSS are making a practical start by using TIS as platform

- Friedrich Stuhmann pointed out that it is a very interesting IT concept and project is going to the next phase. He asked how this project can be used in some relations for RFC NS-B.
- Ad Toet informed that RFC Baltic-Adriatic showed some interest already. The RFC data sharing between RUs, terminals and IMs is not harmonised now but TIS will make it possible, so also mapping on terminals on RFC NS-B can be started.
- Eric Lambert (CFL Multimodal) said that the access in TIS for terminals is possible since years and letter was sent to ELETA to confirm the involvement of Railway undertakings.
- Ad Toet confirmed that indeed TIS was available to terminals but not really used.
- Oliver Sellnick suggested to Friedrich Stuhmann that the project should be discussed further as it can be in interest of TAG Members. Friedrich Stuhmann agreed with this opinion.

Oliver Sellnick thanked Ad Toet for the presentation and his input in creating transparency.

## 9. AOB:

### • User Satisfaction Survey 2020 – information on the survey and timeline

Katarzyna Wachowicz informed about the requirements of performing the User Satisfaction Survey by RFC. Moreover, Katarzyna Wachowicz informed that the Rail Freight Corridors cooperate under coordination and execution of RailNetEurope and conduct one, joint, shortened online User Satisfaction Survey in order to avoid the situation of sending multiply surveys.

She also presented the timeline of the User Satisfaction Survey 2020:

- 17<sup>th</sup> September 2020 - Pre-announcement email
- 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020 - First deadline to complete the Survey 2020
- November/December 2020 - Publication of the User Satisfaction Survey 2020 results on the Rail Freight Corridors and RailNetEurope websites.

### • Calendar 2021

RAG/TAG meetings in 2021 will take place on:

- 31<sup>st</sup> of March - Riga
- 13<sup>th</sup> of October – place not decided yet



- Dirk Zender suggested that maybe Małaszewicze workshop should be organized before the RAG/TAG meeting, so the results can be discussed.

• **Topics for the next RAG/TAG meeting**

Oliver Sellnick asked what topics should be discussed during the next RAG/TAG meeting and what should be the meeting format:

- SCI study – short presentation
- Małaszewicze workshop - feedback and conclusions
- Landbridge to Asia
- Frankfurt Oder - state of play
- Rail Baltica - ongoing works

- Eric Nieuwenhuis (GVT Intermodal Freightmanagement B.V.) suggested that the task force should be organised regarding the Frankfurt Oder and short trains issue. Oliver Sellnick informed that the border workshop will be organized next year. It was agreed that Eric Nieuwenhuis will provide the information and prepare the presentation for the next meeting.
- Dirk Zender thanked for organisation of the meeting. He added that he can see the benefits, potential and the topic of Landbridge to Asia should be continued. He suggested that the Russian stakeholders should be invited to the meeting in order to discuss and clarify what is expected from the RFC NS-B.
- Justina Hudenko (RFC NS-B Management Board Member – LatRailNet/LDz) also recommended to invite Russian forwarder to explain what are the bottlenecks.
- Marcel Tijs informed that Silk road summit will take place 10<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> of November in Amsterdam: <https://www.silkroadsummit.eu/?gdpr=accept> .
- Jost Hock (Duisburger Hafen AG) said that topics are really interesting and suggested the cooperation with other RFCs maybe joined RAG/TAG meeting with RFC Amber could be organised. Justina Hudenko also supported this idea.
- Andreas Pitch pointed out that in the last months there was a significant rise in Asian - EU land traffic.
- Eric Nieuwenhuis informed that he was surprised as on the RFC NS-B website there is information regarding the total closure of line to Małaszewicze for 3 months so he would like to confirm it. Jarosław Majchrzak answered that he is not aware of this closure so this has to be clarified. It was agreed that PKP PLK S.A. TCR Expert will clarify this and contact Eric Nieuwenhuis.
- Friedrich Stuhmann thanked for organisation of the meeting and participation in it.
- JM thanked for the meeting and touching the important topics which are the elements of the common business.

Oliver Sellnick thanked the participants for taking part in the meeting, their feedback and cooperation.

**List of annexes and presentations:**

All the presentations and annexes are available on the RFC NS-B website in the Download area.

- 1) Annex 1 Agenda for the RAG-TAG meeting on 16.09.2020
- 2) Annex 2 PaP Result TT2021 PaP construction TT2022 RAG TAG meeting
- 3) Annex 3 RAG slot
- 4) Annex 3.1 Memorandum of understanding
- 5) Annex 5 China-Eurasia route map
- 6) Annex 5.1 Landbridge to Asia
- 7) Annex 5.2 Proposal of possible projects and role of the RFC
- 8) Annex 6 RFC NS-B Capacity improvement study
- 9) Annex 7 Results of the CID questionnaire
- 10) Annex 8 Terminal message standarization
- 11) Annex 9 AOB USS 2020 and Calendar 2021