



## RAG/TAG Meeting RFC North Sea - Baltic

16th September 2020



Co-financed by the Connecting Europe  
Facility of the European Union

## What are our expectations, wishes and ideas to the RFC 8 which we want to adress in the next RAG/TAG meeting 1st April 2020 in Riga?

- RU's doesn't see the unique selling proposition of RFC products? **X**
- Terminal slots must be part of RFC products to offer a complete product with added values **X**
- TPM Quality check of RFC 8 products
  - PaP offer during the complete timetable period incl. alternative reroutings **✓**
  - harmonized border crossing pathes (incl. Feeder) **✓**
  - harmonized parameter on border crossing path in PaP offers **X**
- Management of RFC 8 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 8 is having extremly long train runs) **✓**
- RAG Speaker must be invited to the Management board **✓**
- missing feedback of questionnaire (oversized USS – User Satisfaction Survey – should be shorter) **✓**
- Open topics ICM
  - training concept once per year unclear **✓**



## What are our expectations, wishes and ideas to the RFC 8 which we want to address in the next RAG/TAG meeting 16th September

- The border crossing pathes between Brest and Malaszewicze are not matched with the RFC 8/11 products

### **Explanation and fixed rules:**

- in 2020 are daily 11 fixed pathes available (in 2021 appr. 15)
- all pathes 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 pathes 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 westbounds and vv and more transparency about the border crossing pathes**