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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Annex** | **Topic / content** | **Who** | **Time** |
| **1** |  | **Welcome and approval of agenda** RFC RALP: the point “IP update” is replaced by presentation of TT2024 results and preparation TT2025 | RFC RALP | 09:00-09:10 |
| **2** |  | **Meetings in 2024**RFC NSM 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.Below dates have been agreed by the participants:1st joint meeting: 12th March physical Zürich2nd joint meeting: 10th October physical Belgium20thJune RAG online morning28th Nov RAG online afternoon  | RFC RALP | 09:10-09:20 |
| **3** | X | **Current TCRs*** New planning for Emmerich-Oberhausen

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%. Infrabel: we were informed of the construction capacity and bottlenecks by ProRail and DB Netz from the start. 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.Participants had no comments.RFC RALP presented the overview of “Eintaktung” of trains on the Emmerich-Oberhausen line to spread the current information available. ProRail: We should receive this information at earliest otherwise it could be not foreseen at IMs.RFC NSM announced a meeting on 22nd of November, organized by several IMs to discuss the coordination of TCRs for 2026 with the RUs. Have the RAG members received the information? SBBC: We were informed by DB. | RFC RALP | 09:20-09:40 |
| **4** | X | **Right Rhine Track – future High Performance Corridor**The overview slide 2024 – 2030 was shown. Currently IMs are not discussing TCRs 6 years in advance. RUs had several questions: which standard is going to be used? 740m tracks seem not to be included – MoT should be informed.RUs should also raise their issues on the re-routings.  | DB Netz | 09:40-09:55 |
| **5** |  | **Update Quality Core Group*** Last meeting and further plan

ProRail: some proposals were received but it’s unclear who’s pushing the project forward.  | RFC RALP | 09:55-10:10 |
| **6** | X | **T**T**2024 result – preparation TT2025**RFC RALP (C-OSS): 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, but there are limits to communication between IM / C-OSS and the RUs to solve conflicts according to the national regulations.RFC NSM (C-OSS): RFC2 also has 50 dossiers open and we have the same problem.TT2025:RFC RALP (C-OSS): 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.RAG members reacted this would be a real advantage to have PaPs via Venlo. ProRail responded that planning 20 months in advance is not useful because of the unstability of the order of the RUs.: RFC RALP (C-OSS) also asked whether the RAG foresee more trains via Chiasso for TT2026 with the opening of the new terminal in Milan. | RFC RALP | 10:10-10:20 |
| **7** |  | **ETCS Rollout Germany and ETCS entering Basel from FR and DE*** Invitation to technical experts of Rus

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.             DB Cargo: at Belgium border it’s very interesting to involve RUs when you are planning.WG ERTMS: This platform was created by EEIG for freight RUs, but in future talks passenger RUs will also be invited to share experience and information. 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.  | WG ERTMS | 10:40-10:45 |
| **8** |  | **ExB Workshop 913/2010 – TEN-T Regulation**DB Cargo: 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 RFC RALP 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.RFC RALP: Who will participate? DB Cargo: Everybody can participate (MB/EXBo/RU), A doodle will be sent out – Sandra needs distribution list of MB/ExBo members. SBBC: 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. DB Cargo: We can present this topic in the management board in November and Aniek can take part.End of RAG of corridor 1 | DB Cargo | 10:45-11:00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Common RAG of RFC NSM and RALP****Date of meeting:** 18 October 2023**Venue:** Munich**Time:** 11:00-13:00 |
| **Participants:** For data protection reasons not disclosed |
| **Enclosures** |
| **MStatus of document:** Final  | **Date of issue:** 30.10.2023 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Annex** | **Topic / content** | **Who** | **Time** |
| **1** |  | **Welcome and approval of agenda** The agenda was approved  |  | 11:00-11:10 |
| **2** | X | **Rastatt Closure 2024**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.  | SBB Cargo | 11:10-11:25 |
| **3** |  | **TCR Tool Questions and TCR Impact Sheets**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):1. Are improvements needed or more information?
2. Is the frequency of publication (January/September) fine?
3. Is the implementation of the TCR Tool helpful?

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: Do you want more stable information or to get it more often?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.RFC NSM: RNE implementing TCR tool, will it be helpful and do you see any improvement possibility? 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? 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.Hupac: We do not use this. CFLC: In Luxemburg we only use the information of IMs.RFC NSM: The regulation requires us to publish TCRs - I think once a year should be enough to publish the Excel sheet.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. | RFC NSM /RALP | 11:25-11:40 |
| **4** | X | **Capacity visualization study Project**RFC NSM present the MVP Capacity Intelligence presentation: The study is still ongoing. MVP capacity intelligence helps the decision-making process.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 conditionA lot of databases 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.  | RFC NSM | 11:40-12:10 |
| **5** |  | **R-CDM Webinar Announcement**Infrabel: RCDM approach we propose a dedicate a webinar by RNE and call for interesting parties. The pilot Lyon – Bettembourg will join as R-CDM pilot as well. | RFC NSM | 12:10-12:15 |
| **6** |  | **CIP Usage**RFC NSM: for CIP it has a positive implication we have a more possibility to view.1. What is the added value of a new systems?
2. What could be interesting features to be implemented in the future SBBC?

I do not wish more features, but more reliable information RFC NSM: 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.Yann: When is RIS is available?RFC NSM Timeline has been updated and foreseen for spring 2024. RAG asked about the connection between RIS and RFP. This is only foreseen at a later stage. 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.  | RFC NSM/ RALP | 12:15-12:30 |
| **7** |  | **Capacity Regulation**Open discussion about the capacity regulations:DBC: 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. 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. SBBC: I was missing the goals and it’s hard to read and where are we heading to with this regulationWe fear national thinking will remain.CFLC questions how coordination of international paths will work.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.  | All | 12:30-13:00 |