Minutes of the 12th TAG/RAG Meeting of the Mediterranean RFC

**Venue:** Mahart Container Center (MCC), Weiss Manfréd Street 5-7, Budapest 1211 (Hungary)

**Date:** 28/11/2018 – 9:30 – 17:00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAG RAG Pre-meetings</td>
<td>TAG-RAG Spokesmen</td>
<td>9:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Welcome from MAHART Container Center</td>
<td>Managing Director MCC</td>
<td>10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TAG RAG Spokesmen presentation</td>
<td>TAG RAG Spokesmen</td>
<td>10:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 COSS state of play + Q/A (15min)</td>
<td>COSS Manager</td>
<td>11:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 TAG RAG feedback and Q/A</td>
<td>Managing Director Claire Hamoniau</td>
<td>12:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lunch break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Analysis report on Train Lengths</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>14:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 TPM state of play + Q/A (15min)</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>14:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 International Contingency Plan Q/A (15min)</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>15:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Visit to Terminal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-meetings RUs and TMs

As it is practice since the 6th Mediterranean RFC TAG RAG meeting and according to the procedure for TAG RAG Consultation (Ch.8.1.1 of the Implementation plan), the meeting started with a first session where RUs and TMs, guided by the RAG and TAG spokesmen, independently collected inputs, needs and requests to be presented to the Mediterranean RFC Management.

The overview came after the welcome from MCC.

1. Welcome from the Mahart Container Center

Mr Zoltán FÁBIÁN, Managing Director for MAHART CONTAINER CENTER Ltd opened the meeting and presented the characteristics of MAHART Container Center. Mahart Container is a private, neutral Terminal (doesn't belong to any RU group) and one of the first terminal receptioning containers in the late 60s. It is a Tri modal Container Terminal at the riverside of Danube and 2,5km from Budapest-Ferencvaros rail Station. It offers 25,2 km of private rail tracks and its availability for shunting services on 8 shunting tracks, with 3 shunting locos.

The terminal has block train projects with some rail operators West/East and to the South, especially to the Adriatic Sea ports, such as Rijeka, Koper and Trieste.

The full presentation is available on Mediterranean RFC Website.

2. RAG Spokesman feedback

Mr Aldo Maietta presented the issues gathered by the RUs before and during the pre-meeting.

Comments from RUs about PaPs which were exposed and partially discussed during the meeting:
- Easier for RUs with branches abroad to define their wishes in due time than for RU partners.
- In case of Temporary Capacity Restriction, need for alternative PaPs on deviating route to be published.
- Possibility to have multi-corridor PaPs through a PCS interface that defines a new track both in cases of interruptions along the corridor and in case of normal use of the infrastructure.
- Greater reliability and guarantee of the PaPs. Once published, the PaPs should not be changed / restricted due to infrastructure works, with the exception of cases of force majeure (publication of the PaPs after the harmonization with the TCRs).
- Missing harmonization of paths at borders: PaPs are often modified or cancelled even after the PaP-publication and up to 2 months before timetable change. Thus, harmonization of paths at the border is not guaranteed anymore. Path offers contain in some cases departure time incompatible with arrival time or with long stops at border, which prevent certain traffic concepts from being feasible.
- Regulation in “Corridor Information Document Book 4” and in “Guidelines for C-OSS concerning PaP and RFC Management” needs to be amended in order to include a description of the PaP-process from Publication to Active Timetable phase in a sufficient mandatory way and be implemented by all IMs with the same level of quality and reliability.
- A quality check needs to be done by IMs/ RFCs before PaPs publishing Draft and Final Offers.
- Harmonized communication by RFCs about placing offer and the valid deadline.
The C-OSS mentioned the Project TTR from RNE which might in the long-term answer to some issues raised by the RAG Speaker. On a shorter term, those comments will be studied by the C-OSS.

- The spokesman also raised the issue of TCRs, expressing that it would be desirable to have a major harmonization of the interruptions between the various countries (combine the infrastructural works in the same period of time and communicate the alternative routes to be used).

The C-OSS explained that TCRs coordination were being reorganized following the recast of the Annex VII and these comments will be taken into consideration for further organization developments at corridor level.

- The spokesman raised an issue about the Realization of Standard Gauge track on the Spanish Part. In view of the interoperability of corridors, the initiative is welcome but can generate disadvantages for the freight sector (due to the loss of Spanish gauge on this section), for the following reasons:
  - The detailed design is not finalized and there are no details about how final users, and even railway service facilities will be connected (if they have ever been considered).
  - Operations management conditions/model, mixing passenger high speed with freight trains, have not been clearly defined. (Lack of experience in Spain)
  - There are no locomotives homologated to run through this infrastructure: time limit is already too short to homologate new equipment and technical requirements for homologating existing European locomotives are not clear;
  - Infrastructure future cost for users is not defined;
  - In relation to track gradients, much higher in Spain than in the rest of central Europe, European trains will need double traction in most cases;
  - Spanish companies will be in clear disadvantage with European ones, as they will need to invest in new equipment to reach a "new small section of the Spanish network", accessible for them up to now. Wouldn't this be a competition issue?
  - Traffics that may need to cross this section (pure UIC gauge) with origin or destination somewhere outside the corridor in the Iberian network will disappear due to too higher costs of alternative routes (longer distances or big weight constraints due to very high gradients).
  - The corridor will be disconnected from the rest of the Iberian network, and traffics that would require to triangle with other destinations (to reduce empties) will not be able to be developed. It will only allow equilibrated northbound and southbound trains within the corridor (is this realistic?) which will tremendously cap the future rail freight development.

Consequences from RUs point of view could be:

- Rail freight traffic will require big public funds if we ever want to develop it to compensate extra costs
- The rail freight traffic development in the corridor will be limited as well as the rail freight traffic evolution in the rest of the Iberian network

Possible alternative

- To keep an Iberian connection to allow freight UIC traffic to be developed (or not) under competitive market offer-demand conditions and not by imposing a theoretical operational model designed on paper.

This topic will be further studied by Mediterranean Corridor PMO and ADIF.
The spokesman raised the issue of **Delays at Dobova border station and Villa Opicina border station.**

Croatia, not being a member of the Schengen Area, border police checks can occur at Dobova station. Following this, the train can be sent to a non-electrified shunting area for further checks which create extra costs and delays for the RUs as well as a risk of losing the allocated Path from Villa Opicina in Italy.

RUs would like the make the following proposals:

- **Additional police team** should work in Dobova station in one shift at least
- **Slovenian IM should coordinate the acceptance of the trains from Croatia,** based on the existing 24-hour plan for Villa Opicina station, which they receive every day. If it was possible from them to respect the order of the trains regarding that plan, it would prevent station Dobova from being blocked by trains.

*This topic was discussed during the meeting in order to fully understand the issue. RUs are asking for a better predictable time of dwelling at Dobova. This issue will be studied with relevant IMs and raised at the next Mediterranean RFC ExBo Meeting.*

As requested by the MD of Mediterranean RFC, the RAG spokesman gathered some Feedback on the Short-Term Capacity Pilot proposed by RFC 6 for TT 2018.

The C-OSS briefly presented what had been proposed on the Corridor, an approach with PaPs available **through PCS up to 8 days before** the train runs instead of 30 days for the “classic” Reserve Capacity Product.

The main reason why the RUs did not request any capacity through this pilot were identified as follow:

- The pilot could be used for new traffic but there is no need to activate new traffic at the moment.
- Need for use of PCS: due to lack of interface with national system, it requires double work. This additional time is not functional for short-term requests because in these cases the deadlines are too short and immediate responses are needed. Currently, the PCS is used only for long-term planning.
- It’s necessary to speed up the development and implementation of data exchange interfaces between national systems and PCS in a way that PCS is the only system that can be used for all (IMs and RUs)
- It would be useful to have the possibility of carrying out training courses for using the PCS, for the PCS users, to be held in every countries of the corridor and in the mother language. This would result in better use of the PCS system and Paps and greater participation of the various national Rus: one might think of the Corridor as organizer of such courses;
- It would be useful to **include in the PCS the whole National routes catalogue,** in addition to PaPs. In this way, it would be possible to request paths from origin to destination (including feeder and outflow).

*The MD and the C-OSS thanked the RUs for their useful feedback. They understand that at shorter terms, on our corridor, it might not be necessary to look at shortening deadlines as this won't be compatible with the use of PCS. Still, other ideas could be shared in order to develop "interim requests” which follows the idea of the Rolling Planning within the TTR project. Mediterranean RFC insisted on the fact that if launching a new pilot for ad hoc requests, they want to include RUs since the beginning of the project definition. Mediterranean RFC invited RUs to come back to them with ideas for new ad hoc pilot to be*
developed. The MD also mentioned that he would like to develop a TTR Pilot on the corridor in the coming years.

3. **RAG Spokesman feedback**

Mr Carles Rua, from the Port of Barcelona presented the output of the TAG pre-meeting. The main issue they raised is related to the Service Facility Portal.

TAG members, even if they support the initiative want to raise their worries related to the gathering and dispatching of accurate information on the portal. As long as there is no automatic updating possibility between the Terminals website and the SF Portal, resources have to be dedicated in order to make sure that the information is updated on the Portal and if this could be possible for big terminal, it could also be difficult to ensure for smaller terminals (provided that smaller terminal are aware of this obligation as the communication could also be an issue).

They suggested that an homogenous set of data should be agreed to be posted on the portal which should then be seconded by a link to each terminal website where they can ensure that the data is really up to date since they are the owner of these information. Following this logic, their suggestion is to limit the set of common data to be uploaded on the portal.

*The MD offered the possibility to discuss this topic at the next Mediterranean RFC ExBo.*

4. **TAG/RAG last meeting feedback (Valencia)**

The MD presented the issues raised at the previous TAG RAG in Valencia which are as follow:

- Applicants would like to have Faster and better-quality corridor train path on HU-HR-SI-IT, meeting market requirements

*The C-OSS explained that, with concerned IMs and despite a lot of ongoing works, they had this in mind and were trying to develop the offer even if at shorter terms, the offer won’t be developing really fast.*

- Applicants were also suggesting that a unique coordination of all the corridors in order to have a complete view on TCR, rerouting, PaPs and other products would be helpful as considering the harmonisation of works among the four corridors crossing the Alps (RFC 1, 3, 5 and 6)

*The C-OSS explained later on in her presentation the changes taking place with the Recast of Annex VII and ensured that those comments would be taken into consideration when setting up the new organization around TCRs along corridors.*

- EC Regulation 2177/2017 on access to service facilities and rail-related services

*This had been previously discussed in the morning with the TAG pre-meeting feedback.*

- Priorities of operational issues Logbook:
  - Train composition harmonization of wagon list
  - Breaking performance
  - Tail lights vs plates
  -

*The MD provided a feed-back on Issues Logbook development. In addition, SNCF Réseau presented the Reflective Plates Study taking place on SNCF R lines close to Spanish Borders at the moment.*
5. **C-OSS State of Play**

The C-OSS presented an overview of Mediterranean results since 2015 in order to have in mind the figure trends (publication + 24% in 2019 versus 2018, Requests including Late Path requests: +28% in 2019 versus 2018).

The results were shown, network to network highlighting the heterogeneous results and the need to adapt to different systems. The bad quality of the offer 2019 was also discussed and the need for more anticipation from IMs in order to face quality issues.

The C-OSS had explained earlier in the day that the Short-term product won’t be offered for TT 2019, leaving the Reserve Capacity as the only ad hoc product.

As for TT 2020, the PaPs to be published are still under constructions as are the documents as Book 4, either for the Capacity and the TCR part. They will all be published in due time. The C-OSS explained the reasons why PCS “Envelop Concept” won’t be used for TT 2020 and is being postponed for 1 year. In the meantime, PCS NG will still be used and the same specificities might be used as last year on some Networks (publication of 365 days for technical reasons and pap pre booking sent as Tailor Made for some cases).

The new overlapping section with new coming Amber RFC is also carefully being studied.

The C-OSS showed also all the dates for the coming PCS trainings to which bookings can be done already through CMS, please use the link below:


The C-OSS presented as well the PCS Envelop concept (a video is available also through CMS on the link above) and the TTR project for Timetable Redesign which is supposed to be applicable on all European Networks by 2024. It was highlighted that a TTR project might be foreseen on Med RFC as in any case, Pilots are foreseen to test the feasibility. At the moment, 3 pilots are running on RFC 2,3 and 4 and the whole ÖBB network should follow for the next TT.

The C-OSS then gave an update on the work being carried out by RNE, IMs and RFCs in order to comply with Annex VII recast.

An update of all foreseen TCRs on the Hungarian Network for TT 2019 and 2020 was then presented.

6. **Analysis report on Train Lengths**

On behalf of the Project Manager, the Managing Director illustrates the first draft of the Long Train Analysis and explains the purpose of the Study. The slides, which are taken form the Corridor Implementation Plan (Book 5), have been previously verified with the involved IMs and show the expected development of the Train Length along the Corridor in the next years up to 2030, when the target is to allow 740m trains all over the Mediterranean RFC, together with the main resulting bottlenecks.

The goal is to facilitate in this way an in depth analysis of future development of the rail network by RUs and Terminals, so to verify its adherence to market needs. RUs and Terminals have been requested to provide a feed-back on the issue during the meeting. Further remarks and suggestions can be provided to the Project Manager, within Dec, 14th.

7. **TPM State of Play**

DD presented the job done in 2018. Highlighted that for the TPM reporting a very detailed list of the RFC points has be defined together with member IMs, to identify the RFC entry and RFC Exit precisely based on the complete list of TIS reporting points. The RFC experts indicated, which points belong to
our RFC and which not. As an outcome 982 points are belonging the MED RFC and additional 308 related points have been identified, which are not lying on the RFC, but have some impact on the performance of MED RFC.

As the problems of cereal shipments from Hungary to Italy via Croatia/Slovenia are an important topic thanks to some Hungarian RUs the loading and unloading locations were collected and included in the TIS points list. In Hungary 129 TIS points and in Italy 29 points have been specified.

So far, from 1 point of origin and 1 point of destination with 1 route can be managed in the reporting system. This was a challenge to RNE’s reporting system, however they managed to find a solution to include all the points loading and unloading facilities, border and HUB crossing points. The report can be edited with filters of

- Train numbers
- Route points
- IMs
- RUs

The draft report in the TEST Folder has been introduced.

With this Cereal Shipment report MED RFC intends to support a detailed analysis of Cereals shippers’ needs, and through the check of the exact train runs by the Hungarian Cereal Association to identify the weak points of the system. The Study will be performed with the steps below to put together an Action Plan:

- Step #1 Come and figure out together what do we want to see
- Step #2 Supply chain analysis
  - Stakeholders & roles
  - Volumes
  - Loading facilities in Hungary
  - Border crossings along the route
  - HUB crossings along the route
  - Unloading facilities in Italy
  - Empty train returns
- Step #3 Win-win solutions
- Step #4 Actions to put together a sustainable operation model
- Step #5 Feed backs

The DD added that also other Studies following the same approach will be performed by Mediterranean RFC, relevant to other Rail oriented industries, such as:

- Chemical products
- Automotive shipments
- Container trains

On behalf of Cereal Association Mrs Zsófia Pótsa gave an overview of the cereal export volumes, key markets, the existing problems to solve.

She highlighted the anomalies of loading facility bookings and the related cancellation measures, fees at MÁV. Some proposition was articulated to better organise the shipments, such as

- To have an open access capacity allocation system with all the details publicly available, where, when, who does the booking.
- To have a comprehensive booking/allocation procedure, linked to some pre-conditions to be performed.
- To check all the loading facilities. Pre-booking confirmation if no limitations at and around the tracks.
- To make the allocation system available at all the stations.

Another problem point has been already identified, as the cereal product loading activity can only be managed in a dry weather and so already MÁV has been requested to consider these weather conditions as a vis major. In 2018 the request has been temporarily accepted up to year-end 2018 by MÁV. It would desirable to be prolonged to the next coming years.

8. International Contingency Plan

DD summarised the background of this topic, including the Rastatt incident, the Commission request for an ICM Handbook elaboration which was finally adopted by the RNE GA in May. This Handbook defines the necessary cooperation in case of disruptions with international relevance between the IMs concerned. The key criteria are an incident with a forecasted impact more than 3 calendar days, with a high impact on international traffic, negative impact on 50% of the trains.

The key element is a pre-defined RFC re-routing overview with options and scenarios to be created and published for TT2019. It also contains a capacity indication of free indicative capacity of the deviation routes.

The scenarios are based on identification of critical sections with measures in case of disturbances. All the routes are presented on a schematic map.

The RU will be contacting at about mid-January 2019.

9. Terminal Visit

At the end of the meeting a visit to the Mahart Container Center has been performed, under the guidance and with the explanations Mr Zoltán FÁBIÁN, the Managing Director.