



RFC North Sea - Baltic – RAG TAG meeting

RAG Slot

DB Cargo AG | Eva Eckert | F.CBP 6 | Berlin | 27.03.2019

Paper „RAG Speaker Framework Conditions“

Brainstorming on the cooperation – are we happy with how the cooperation goes?

Template for Framework Conditions

- Sets basis for the RAG Speaker
- Brings continuity and reliability into cooperation with RFC members
- Basic rights
- Basic duties

Objections, questions, comments?

RU contingency planning

What is it about:

- IMs did publish their Contingency Handbook in 2018
- ERFA and UIC have now come up with a first draft for the RU Contingency Management Handbook

RU Contingency Handbook¶

1. Introduction¶

RU-contingency-plans are an essential element of an RU's risk management and business strategy.¶

RUs currently have contingency plans in place to deal with day-to-day disruptions of their services and to manage potential disruptions of a larger nature.¶

An additional layer is needed in the event of large incidents with significant international impact (in this document referred to as international disruption), which both in duration and scale, jeopardise major trade flows and risk undermining customer confidence in rail's resilience as a transport mode.¶

This Handbook outlines the following:¶

- RU risk management preparatory measures that should be taken and that can be drawn upon in the event of an international disruption.¶
- The essential steps to be taken by RUs during an international disruption to minimise disruption to trade flows.¶
- In detail processes and procedures that RUs should take in communication with other RUs, IMs and end customers¶

The Handbook also recognises the enhanced role that the RFCs can play in organising the RU response to an international incident. As major rail freight flows are concentrated on the rail freight corridors and as they are central to organising international rail freight services, the RFCs could usefully serve as the backbone of contingency plans in the event of an international disruption.¶

Deliverables:

- A state of play of the re-routing options, proposed by the RFCs
- Implementation of communication processes with RU customers, IMs and RFCs
- In the capacity allocation process, implement a pool of planners as the single point of contact for the leading IM (and RFC)
- Propositions to soften specific rules (regulations, route knowledge, rolling stock authorization)

Next steps:

- UIC call for experts to participate in the following work sessions
- Meeting will take place on 1st April from 10:30 – 17:00 at UIC, Paris
- Contact person: Eric Guenther, guenther@uic.org

Feedback to RFC 8 from RUs:

- When ordering the paths in national system it can be ordered longer than in PCS
- Reality is longer than the PaPs
- Weight is also heavier
- NI, DE, CZ, PL, BE,
- Lithuania is still waiting for connection to Kaunas terminal - that is why they cannot order PaP
- When will RFC 8 have a European gauge so that international transports can be made?
- Rus need PaPs that have shorter times - as quick as possible - Running times on the PaPs are slower than on regular paths, it takes longer
- Improvement of accuracy of fit / parameters of trains
- Times on crossborders are not flexible but fixed between PL and DE

Re topic 4 of RAG TAG agenda “Contingency processes and re-routing scenarios”

What was the feedback of DB Cargo:

Netherland-Germany:

We agree to the proposal of the RFC 8 and in case of a rerouting we try to handle it within operations. In general, we can reroute the trains, but this depends on the availability of the daily resources.

Germany:

see above

Germany - Czech via Cheb/Bad Brambach:

see above

Germany – Czech via Poland:

We just about can reroute these trains in case of longer interruptions on the line since we have the technical resources available. However, it is complex to organize additional loco driver in Poland for the trains – therefore, additional option with rerouting via Horka/Węglińiec and Chałupki/Bohumin can be added.

Germany- Poland:

we agree

within Poland:

we agree

Poland – Belarus:

We do not agree because for sure, Belarussian Railways was not involved in the conception and so, we cannot reroute trains with short notice (one day to the other) via Siemianowka due to the missing agreements. Better ,and therefore more options, for alternative routes might be the border crossings of

- Czeremcha - Wysokolitowsk
- Bruzgi - Kuznica
- Braniewo- Mamonovo

OUR COMMENT:

- Rerouting is not without effort/evident, especially if the announcement comes unexpected and short-noticed
- Is re-routing possible via broad gauge, esp. from Kaunas down to PL?
- We need an alternative re-routing from PL to Belarus; Mala is not enough; we need more options!
- Suggestion from RUs:
 - Short term alternative bordercrossing from PL to Belarus
 - Longterm alternative routing via Lithuania

Revision of Annex VI to EU Directive EU 59/2007 TDD – Update and current status

Current status

- The Commission Regulation amending Annex VI of Directive 2007/59/EC passed the scrutiny period and EU Com can now officially adopt the Regulation.
- The publication is expected within the next 6 months.
- IMs and RUs preparing a pilot with language level below B1, can start phase 1 of their pilot. For phase 2, the amended Annex VI will apply.

RUs can give feedback to EU Com until 28th March 2019

Comments, questions, suggestions

Are there any plans for pilots testing language derogations and IT tool or any other pilot in your country?

- DB Cargo DE, DB Cargo NL and SBB Cargo International are developing with DB Systel a translation tool.
- Preparations are in order for a pilot at border crossing Venlo – Kaldenkirchen; aim: testing of IT tool to support communication.
- XX

Any other business

Extention of RFC 8

- Additional border crossing Guben/Gubin
- Additional Legnica-Lubin-Rudna

TPM workshop for Frankfurt/Oder – Oderbrücke