

Siège social

9, place de la Gare | L-1616 Luxembourg
 Tél. +(352) 49 90 33 02 | Fax + (352) 49 90 34 40
 Immatriculation D78 | Numéro de TVA LU-21840285
 Compte bancaire LU75 0019 2455 6903 7000 | BIC Code BCEELULL

Minutes of the RAG & TAG of 27 June 2012

Participants

Family name	First name	Company - Organisation
Beirnaert	Ben	Combinant
Bizien	Marc	Sibelit
Bouly	Ulrich	SNCF Lille
Bourbonnaud	Guy	Port de Dunkerque
Couturier	Martin	SNCB logistics
Cuypers	Koen	Gemeentelijk Havenbedrijf Antwerpen
Dediste	Jean	Terminal Container Athus
Faramelli	Maurice	ACF
Gendaj	Mathieu	Infrabel
Gombert	Vincent	Europorte / Port de Dunkerque
Guenther	Eric	GEIE Corridor C
Haltner	Daniel	Trasse Schweiz
Haslé	Hélène	Port Autonome de Strasbourg
Imbert	Christine	Europorte / Port de Dunkerque
Jaeger	François	CFL
Lacoste	Sébastien	ARAF
Lambert	Eric	CFL Cargo + Terminal de Bettembourg
Le Merre	Anne-Laure	CER
Luhmann	Jean-Luc	SNCF Geodis
Mazataud	Paul	GEIE Corridor C
Menguy	Marie Anne	SNCF Geodis
Mosmann	Sylvain	RFF
Paquet	Jean-Eric	EC - DG Move
Peeters	Joannes	Belgique Ministère
Piarrat	Jeffrey	Logisitcs in Wallonia / ATIC
Poeker	Jeannot	Port de Metert
Roger	Luc	RFF
Roman	Marc	Belgique Ministère
Thull	Daniel	CFL
Tonon	Pierre	ERFA
Van Crombruggen	Kris	Infrabel
Van Den Heede	Gerda	Infrabel
Van Der Linden	Erik	ProRail
Vanbeveren	Thomas	GEIE Corridor C
Vernieuwe	Guy	Infrabel
Vircondelet	Régis	SNCF Geodis

Common meeting of the morning

1. Presentation of the corridor

This presentation is made by M. Jaeger and M. Mazataud.

2. Why and how the member states support the implementation of the corridor

This presentation is made by M. Roman, president of the Executive board

3. Rail freight corridors, major axis of the European transport policy

This presentation is made by M. Paquet, Directeur du réseau européen pour la mobilité, DG Move

Railway Advisory Group

1. Functioning of the RAG

This presentation is made by Erik van der Linden.

RU would like to be consulted and not only to be seen 2 or 3 times a year. The way of working has to be clarified. It is well written in the Regulation, but we have to see how the RAG and the Management board work together. There can also be a different point of view within the RAG (new entrants / historical RUs). The RAG requests the Management board to inform of RAG meetings in a public way, for example through the website.

The Management informs that all RUs and potential RUs that we are aware of have been invited.

2. ERTMS deployment on the corridor

This presentation is made by Sylvain Mosmann.

M. Bizien would like the deployment and overlap with legacy systems to be clearly communicated in an official way.

For on-board ERTMS equipment, M. Jaeger informs that the corridor can coordinate the EU application for the RUs.

3. The transport market study

This presentation is made by Eric Guenther.

He indicates that the toll Transtool will enable to get the flows of traffic.

The scope of the study is to get the right zones, which may not be on the corridor.

The RUs will like to know which are the main marshalling yards, with information on opening hours, times to load and unload.

4. Pre-arranged paths

This presentation is made by M. Faramelli.

RUs wonder how national paths with PaPs are articulated. Maurice Faramelli answers that national framework agreements are taken into account.

Daniel Haltner informs that the priority rules which will be applied are the ones proposed by RNE.

Terminal advisory group

1. Functioning of the terminal advisory group

This presentation is made by M. Van Crombruggen.

Terminals would like to know the process of information on terminals towards railway undertakings. They stress the importance of the broad definition of a terminal, according to the regulation and wonder if they all have been invited. They request that the port rail manager is invited to these TAG meetings.

2. Pre-arranged paths

This presentation is made by M. Haltner.

Terminals say that it will not always be easy for terminals to allocate a train path linked to a PaP.

The Management board also informs that the IMs and terminals must work together, for example, by connecting IT tools. It is important to work together within this advisory group to start working together on all these issues.

The Management board suggests having two or three meetings a year. This frequency seems to be the most realistic.

Terminals wish to increase freight traffic and it seems to them that there is a lot to do.

3. Demonstration of Train Information System

This demonstration is made by M. Vanbeveren.

Terminals wonder if we can see the reasons for delay and say that this information is important to terminals.

The Management board answers that the reasons for delay is not yet completely accurate.

4. Transport market study

This presentation is made by M. Guenther.

Terminals wonder if there will be a coordination between the market study of Corridor 1 and of Corridor 2.

The Management board answers that the consultants have been asked to take Corridor 1 into consideration (eg: flows from corridor 1), but that both market studies are not performed at the same time. Transtool will be used to assess the flows.

CFL cargo asks not to make common meetings anymore as small companies like his can't split in two.

Summary of the questionnaires which were handed during the meeting

Overall all the stakeholders request more information.

They also ask to be more involved (even up to participate in choosing our own consultants).

This trend is rather of RUs and especially of historical RUs.

During the session of the RUs advisory group, some customers indicated they would like to push up participation to inquire about the agendas of our meetings and even go into the details of everyday life in the corridor.

One participant raised in this context an interesting question: What do we (we = corridor) expect from the advisory groups and, consequently, how far do we accept that they step in?

It is important that the organisation of the corridor set very clear rules from the beginning on this subject and even repeat these rules systematically at the meetings.

The railway undertakings need to be filled in priority with the investments along the corridor (ERTMS and other subjects) and by extension on the coordination of works on one axis or another, and / or between countries.

Terminals require first to address the coordination of operations between their facilities and the national infrastructure and second to define the services that we would have to provide.

Curiously and perhaps this is disturbing, the pre-arranged paths, capacity allocation and traffic management are not priority # 1 for both groups.

Most of the participants enjoyed the day and found the agenda relevant.

The presentations were better received by the Terminals than the RUs. RUs have asked more detailed information on each subject.