

<p><b>RAG meeting RFC RALP</b></p> <p><b>Date of meeting:</b> 18 October 2023  <b>Venue:</b> Munich  <b>Time:</b> 09:00-11:00</p>
<p><b>Participants:</b> For data protection reasons not disclosed</p>
<p><b>Enclosures</b> -</p>

	Annex	Topic / content	Who	Time
1		<p><b>Welcome and approval of agenda</b></p> <p>MA: the point “IP update” is replaced by presentation of TT2024 results and preparation TT2025</p>	MA	09:00-09:10
2		<p><b>Meetings in 2024</b></p> <p>Matthieu Maeselle (RFC NS-Med) proposed on behalf of their RAG Speaker to organize a RAG meeting with Lineas, Infrabel and port of Antwerp-Bruges during the Belgian presidency. Date still to be fixed.</p> <p>Below dates have been agreed by the participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st joint meeting: 12th March physical Zürich</li> <li>• 2nd joint meeting: 10th October physical Belgium</li> <li>• 20th June RAG online morning</li> <li>• 28th Nov RAG online afternoon</li> </ul>	MA	09:10-09:20
3	X	<p><b>Current TCRs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New planning for Emmerich-Oberhausen</li> </ul> <p>ProRail: The planning of the long closures was discussed a long time ahead. In the planning phase Venlo and Bad Bentheim are open. Neighboring countries should increase their traffic. Due to the Ukraine war, in the Netherlands traffic has already increased by 10%.</p> <p>Infrabel: we were informed of the construction capacity and bottlenecks by ProRail and DB Netz from the start.</p> <p>ProRail: We face a lot of no-shows, and we lost a lot of capacity, if your train doesn’t run cancel it in time.</p> <p>Participants had no comments.</p>	MA	09:20-09:40

		<p>Next: Marc presented the overview of eintaktung to spread all the information</p> <p>ProRail: We should receive this information at earliest otherwise it could be not foreseen at IMs.</p> <p>Yann Le Floc’h announced a meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> of November, organized by several IMs to discuss the coordination of TCRs for 2026 with the RUs. Have the RAG members received the information?</p> <p>SBB Cargo: We were informed by DB.</p>		
4	X	<p><b>Right Rhine Track – future High Performance Corridor</b></p> <p>The overview slide 2024 – 2030 was shown.</p> <p>Currently IMs are not discussing TCRs 6 years in advance.</p> <p>RUs had several questions: which standard is going to be used? 740m tracks seem not to be included – MoT should be informed.</p> <p>RUs should also raise their issues on the re-routings.</p>	DB Netz	09:40-09:55
5		<p><b>Update Quality Core Group</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Last meeting and further plan</li> </ul> <p>ProRail: some proposals were received but it’s unclear who’s pushing the project forward.</p>	MS/MA	09:55-10:10
6	X	<p><b>TT2024 result – preparation TT2025</b></p>	PH	10:10-10:20
		<p><b>Short update:</b></p> <p>SB: For 2024, we had good communication with the applicants. We had less time to check the offer. The communication of DB Netz regarding the delay in the FTT could be better. Apart from not reaching the deadline, deviations between PCS and national systems remain. In Switzerland conflict solving is ongoing, we took all the points that we need to improve the communication and sometimes regulatory say you cannot do too much.</p> <p>JQ (C-OSS): RFC2 also has 50 dossiers open and we have the same problem.</p>	SB	

		<p>TT2025: SB: Some changes we identified at the moment, and we try to do the same as last year. We want to increase the PaPs at Luino but not Switzerland and it's a shift between two borders. We have increased to 2000t at Infrabel and general parameter will change. Also, Infrabel will combine fix border times with flex PaPs. No PaPs will be offered via Venlo during the TCR Emmerich – Oberhausen.</p> <p>RAG members reacted this would be a real advantage to have PaPs via Venlo.</p> <p>ProRail responded that planning 20 months in advance is not useful because of the unstability of the order of the RUs.:</p> <p>SB also asked whether the RAG foresee more trains via Chiasso for TT2026 with the opening of the new terminal in Milan.</p>		
7		<p><b>ETCS Rollout Germany and ETCS entering Basel from FR and DE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current Plan and pos. changes</li> </ul>	HH	10:20-10:40
8		<p><b>Proposal: ETCS Day with RFC next year</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invitation to technical experts of Rus</li> </ul> <p>DB Netz is working on the update of the deployment plan in Germany. Stretches planned with ETCS L1 LS will be switched to L2. As long as the financial agreement is not concluded the documents cannot be officially distributed. The planning at different border crossings was presented. ETCS is not part of the HLN on Emmerich – Oberhausen.</p> <p>Sandra: at Belgium border it's very interesting to involve RUs when you are planning.</p> <p>HH: This platform was created by EEIG they are more or less at passenger RUs. I would also give information email and number to SB.</p>	HH	10:40-10:45

		It's also proposed to have an ETCS Day with the ERTMS experts, organized with the EEIG assistance. Probably in May/June in Basel or online/hybrid.		
9		<p><b>ExB Workshop 913/2010 – TEN-T Regulation</b></p> <p>Sandra: we would like to have a workshop to discuss which topics the RFCs are doing at the moment are valuable and should be continued if they are no longer foreseen in the CM Regulation. A first draft is being prepared with PH and German MoT members. Due to the publication of the capacity regulation, it makes sense to meet this year and see if we have a common opinion to influence the regulation.</p> <p>MA: Who will participate?</p> <p>Sandra: Everybody can participate (MB/EXBo/RU), A doodle will be sent out – Sandra needs distribution list of MB/ExBo members. Aniek: feedback on how ICM was managed. One tube is open and to create some stability i TT 2024 will be renegotiated for the first half. The capacity is reduced we don't have a lot of capacity and we have a lot of connection breaks.</p> <p>Sandra: We can present this topic in the management board in November and Aniek can take part.</p> <p>End of RAG of corridor 1</p>	SK	10:45-11:00

<p><b>Common RAG of RFC NSM and RALP</b></p> <p><b>Date of meeting:</b> 18 October 2023  <b>Venue:</b> Munich  <b>Time:</b> 11:00-13:00</p>
<p><b>Participants:</b> For data protection reasons not disclosed</p>
<p><b>Enclosures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacity Visualisation Study presentation</li> </ul>

	Annex	Topic / content	Who	Time
1		<p><b>Welcome and approval of agenda</b>  The agenda was approved</p>		11:00-11:10
2	X	<p><b>Rastatt Closure 2024</b></p> <p>A state of play was given about the solidarity shuttle to re-route via France. Confirmation is needed of the harmonisation of the paths by SNCF-R and DB Netz. An offer has been proposed regarding the price. By March 2024 the final scope of the service should be known. The sector cannot support this financially. DB Netz is willing to contribute considerably – the answer of DB Netz is awaited by the end of October.</p>	SBB Cargo	11:10-11:25
4		<p><b>TCR Tool Questions and TCR Impact Sheets</b></p> <p>RFC RALP and NSM: we want to consult the RAG about the TCR publication and would like to receive their opinion on the following 3 questions:  What is the added value of the TCR publication by the Corridor (Excel Sheet and/or impact sheets):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are improvements needed or more information?</li> <li>2. Is the frequency of publication (January/August) fine?</li> <li>3. Is the implementation of the TCR Tool helpful?</li> </ol> <p>DB Cargo: Excel is not used for Germany, as more detailed info can be obtained via DB systems, and we get more updates.  More updates would be welcome. The TCR Tool is interesting, but not all IMs use it; an interface with the national systems is needed. We want to know the effect and how much capacity will be left/ available RFC RALP:</p>	PH/MM	11:25-11:40

		<p>Do you want more stable information or to get it more often?</p> <p>DB Cargo: Excel sheet contains old information from DB Netz due to the revision of the whole construction process at DB Netz. Excel sheets in general might not be the right tool for TCRs.</p> <p>RFC NSM: RNE implementing TCR tool, will it be helpful and do you see any improvement possibility?</p> <p>SBB Cargo International: the Excel sheet is not used. The filter function in the TCR Tool is good. The nature of the works is interesting but more important is the available capacity. There are different kinds of TCRs in terms of effects, but what is a major TCR?</p> <p>Lineas: Excel list is not used, but impact sheets are. A filter is needed on a period and per direction. Most important is to know the impact per direction. Not familiar with the content of the TCR Tool.</p> <p>Hupac: We do not use this.</p> <p>CFL Cargo: In Luxemburg we only use the information of IMs.</p> <p>No comments from the Online participants.</p> <p>RFC NSM: The regulation requires us to publish TCRs - I think once a year should be enough to publish the Excel sheet.</p> <p>Should we organise a webinar with RNE on the TCR Tool? The Tool is currently not used by DB Netz. DB Cargo asks whether more pressure should be made? The RAG prefers the TCR Tool instead of the Excel list.</p>		
5	X	<p><b>Capacity visualization study Project</b></p> <p>The presentation can be found on the website, <a href="#">click here</a>.</p> <p>Yann Le Floc’h present the MVP Capacity Intelligence presentation:</p> <p>The study is still ongoing. MVP capacity intelligence helps the decision-making process.</p>	RFC 2	11:40-12:10

		<p>We can make appropriate TTR and maps and we took the opportunity of the TTR project to launch the prototype phase means we try to implement approach in full and consolidated database we had a funding from the condition</p> <p>A lot of database together to merge but we have to do a lot of manual things. The purpose is to get feedback on from multiple mirror groups, IMs, RUs and institutional groups KPIs and visualization.</p>		
6		<p><b>R-CDM Webinar Announcement</b></p> <p>RFC NSM: R-CDM approach we propose a dedicate webinar by RNE and call for interesting parties.</p> <p>The pilot Lyon – Bettembourg will join as R-CDM pilot as well.</p> <p>RU’s took note and marked their interest in the webinar. Potential candidates will address the RAG responsible bilaterally.</p>	MM	12:10-12:15
7		<p><b>CIP Usage</b></p> <p>Matthieu Maeselle (RFC NSM): RNE is actually working on the implementation of RIS (Railway Infrastructure System) that will integrate all infrastructure data available at RNE in 1 single database instead of a separate one per application. For CIP it has a positive implication we have a more possibility to view and visualize available infrastructure data (noted: in future also capacity and TCR data e.g.). Question to the RAG members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the added value of a new systems?</li> <li>2. What could be interesting features to be implemented in the future</li> </ol> <p>SBB Cargo: I do not wish more features, but more reliable information RFC NS-Med: RIS should take info from RINF in the future, and this should be more accurate. But it will only be current information and not info about a future situation. Question: When is RIS is available? RFC NS-Med: Timeline has been updated and foreseen for spring 2024.</p>	PH/MM	12:15-12:30

		<p>RAG asked about the connection between RIS and RFP. This is only foreseen at a later stage.</p> <p>UIRR pointed out that more help from the RB would be useful. The Italian RB obliges the use of the RFP. There is also info on terminals in RINF by ERA, but less detailed.</p>		
8		<p><b>Capacity Regulation</b> Open discussion about the capacity regulations:</p> <p>DB Cargo: The regulation is based on TTR, but only ENIM is responsible for drafting the frameworks, but RUs are not involved, and we can only look what is happening. A good basis, but it will depend on how it will be implemented.</p> <p>ProRail: we need to look how to involve other parties such as RUs and MS. Things are now being discussed at several places – TTR is developed in 1 group with IMs and RUs. Consulting is needed, but no co-decision making. We need to look for an effective way of consulting.</p> <p>SBB Cargo: I was missing the goals and it’s hard to read and where are we heading to with this regulation. We fear national thinking will remain.</p> <p>CFL Cargo questions how coordination of international paths will work.</p> <p>Regarding the merger of the 2 corridors and the possible disappearance of the RFCs we wait for a clarification of the TEN-T revision first.</p>	All	12:30-13:00



<p><b>RAG of RFC NSM</b></p> <p><b>Date of meeting:</b> 18 October 2023  <b>Venue:</b> Munich  <b>Time:</b> 13:45-15:45</p>
<p><b>Participants:</b> For data protection reasons not disclosed</p>
<p><b>Enclosures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- State of Play TT 2024, Update on the TT2025 and TCR</li> </ul>

	Annex	Topic / content	Who	Time
1		<p><b>Welcome and approval of agenda</b>  Vice-President welcomes the participants.</p>		13:45-14:00
2		<p><b>What’s new on the Corridor</b>  <b>Following information has been presented:</b></p> <p><b>RU’s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gaëlle Vantalou left SNCF Fret/RCE and will be replaced soon. As soon as her successor is known, he/she will be invited to participate to the RAG.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New NL ExBo representative, Marcel Tijs.</li> <li>• Tenzin Norgay is on maternity leave and temporarily replaced. Elmar Baumgartner is ensuring the continuity of SBB representation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Initiatives:</b>  Performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lyon – Bettembourg: High quality at departure has been reached, however the trains are still losing time during its journey, action is to be taken. Task force “on-demand” (Hupac traffic): Suggestion to work on stucked trains.</li> </ul> <p><b>TCRs:</b>  Coordination now led by IMs. The First RU Meeting is planned the 22nd of November.  Post meeting information: this group, called RANS, where all concerned IM’s are part of (All IM’s on RFC NSM + DB Netz), presented its activities: goal is not to close the Corridor for a long period without a proper deviation possibility.</p>	Perm. Team	14:00-14:15

3	X	<p><b>State of Play TT 2024, Update on the TT2025 and TCR</b></p> <p>The presentation can be found on the website, <a href="#">click here</a>.</p> <p>Also, the C-OSS mentioned orally the C-OSS survey: a few weeks after the April path reservation, the C-OSS asked to IM and applicants and the cooperating RFC's if there were happy with the cooperation.</p> <p>No particular remarks were formulated by the RU's after the presentation.</p>	JQ	14:15-15:00
4		<p><b>Implementation plan Update: Request for consultation and opinion gathering by the RU's</b></p> <p>An update of the IP is due by the end of the year (TA deliverable). Regulation 913/2010 imposes a mandatory consultation of stakeholders. The written stakeholder's consultation was announced in the session, with a mentioning that the update contains no big changes: minor updates to technical parameters, minor updates KPI's &amp; objectives, and update of the investments plan &amp; ERTMS implementation.</p> <p>Also, a webinar was proposed at the end of the consultation period, to formally collect all feedback and close the consultation period. A date for this webinar was agreed in session, 25/11.</p>	Perm. Team	15:00-15:15
5		<p><b>Average speed on International O/D's: Analysis requested by the RU's</b></p> <p>A discussion has then been initiated about the philosophy of this KPI:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should we remove the operational &amp; circulation stops (+ dwell time at borders) from the transit time from origin to destination? Some stakeholders have replied that these stops are usually requested by applicants &amp; make part of the total journey time;</li> <li>• Is there a difference between the average speed of a PaP &amp; a tailor-made capacity on a defined origin/destination?</li> </ul> <p>No conclusion / decision has been taken after the discussion.</p>	JQ/ALL	15:15-15:30