



MARKET PLACE SEMINAR

INLAND HUBS: KEY TOWARDS
RAIL FREIGHT
CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT

The corridor challenges for a European full-service provider

Thorsten DIETER




DUISBURG, GERMANY
14-15 SEPTEMBER 2017



Foto: Volker Emersleben


The corridor challenges for a European full-service provider

Everyone is talking about Rastatt – an accident. But: Rastatt reveals a lot of problems in the sector and should lead to action



The EU Commission had a clear vision with the creation of the European Rail Freight Corridors subject to 913/2010

The corridors should help to overcome existing national thinking and behaviours and provide the infrastructural basis for competitive rail freight services



“In order to be competitive with other modes of transport, international and national rail freight services must be able to benefit from a **good quality** and **sufficiently financed** railway infrastructure, namely, one which allows freight transport to be provided under good conditions in terms of **commercial speed** and **journey times** and to be **reliable**, namely, that the service it provides actually corresponds to the contractual agreements entered into with the railway undertakings.”

Unfortunately the reality is far away from the perfect picture the EU Commission painted with the regulation

But the sector is aware of this fact and presented in June 2016 during the TEN-T Days in Rotterdam a „Sector Statement“ and a corresponding „Ministerial Declaration“, in which many stakeholders declared to do their best to reach the aims defined in the regulation 913/2010.

Sector Statement Priority		Caretaker / Co-Caretakers
1.	Following the TimeTable Redesign project (TTR)	Joachim Kroll / RNE Peter Jäggy / FTE (Co)
2.	New concepts for capacity offer on RFCs	Oliver Sellnick / DB Netz Michel Geubelle / Infrabel (Co)
3.	Improving coordination on temporary capacity restraints (TCR)	Joachim Kroll / RNE
4.	Enhancing use of Path Coordination System (PCS)	Joachim Kroll / RNE
5.	Improving harmonisation of processes at borders	Roland Hartkopf / DB Cargo N.N. of Member States (Co)
6.	Train tracking and Expected Time of Arrival (ETA)	Ad Toet / KNV Ralf-Charley Schultze (Co) / UIRR
7.	Monitoring TEN-T parameters on RFCs	Jürgen Maier / BLS N.N. of EC / CNC (Co)
8.	Following ERTMS Implementation	Jean-Baptiste Simonnet / CER Wilko Leune / ProRail (Co)
9.	Monitoring the quality of freight services with implemented and shared KPIs	Alfred Pitnik / RCA+RU-D Subgroup Joachim Kroll / RNE
10.	Harmonising the Corridor Information Document (CID)	Guus de Mol / ProRail

At the moment the sector is focussing on 10 priority projects and DB Cargo is supporting at its best.



But only if all stakeholders are willing to overcome national thinking and accept harmonisation even if it means changing national rules and requirements, the projects could lead to real progress!

Diapositive 5

SKu1

Tabelle muss noch aktualisiert werden. Müller fragt aktuellen Stand an. Caretaker heißen nun Rapporteurs

Kuhlmann, Sandra; 01/09/2017

Harmonisation is one key issue to strengthen competitiveness of rail freight on the corridors

The rail sector has to harmonise a lot of rules and requirements along the Rail Freight Corridors to reach an equal level playing field with road transport.

The TSI are the basis for generating interoperability in Europe. Fact is, that TSI often define a principal standard, but allow national additional requirements in sub-clauses. And these are used in various ways, so that the patchwork European rail network would never become unique.

Even small standardisations would help to save costs and simplify production processes. Examples:



Tail light vs. tail plate: Different national rules are complicating rail freight services. Some Infrastructure Managers insist on the use of the tail light on the whole network even if defined lines are fulfilling the requirements for using the tail plate.



Train Composition Message: It becomes apparent, that Railway Undertakings will face various variants of TCMs if Infrastructure Managers are furthermore refusing the idea to find one sector-wide solution, which concentrates on the minimal affordable data.

Often safety aspects are used as ultimate argument to avoid changes. Stricter TSI and a control of the necessity of national additional requirements by the ERA could be a solution to prevent further patchwork.

The original idea was, that Pre arranged Paths (PaPs) should be the flagship products of the Corridors

As communicated during the last Rail Freight Days in Vienna DB Cargo is not satisfied with the recent practiced PaP-offering process, the functionality of the IT-system and the quality of the offered PaPs.

That's why DB Cargo decided to take a timeout in PaP-ordering until the offers are improved. We are very welcoming the activities of RNE to improve the PaPs and we are supporting the ongoing project to improve the quality at our best.

Due to construction works and other capacity reasons we have been forced to order some PaPs and we are now facing again the same problems as in the last years:




- Timetables differ in PCS vs. national systems
- Border times are not harmonised
- Inconsistent data in draft offers
- Parameters are not matching to the request
- ...

A lot of work has to be done so that the PaP-product is contributing to reach the aims of the regulation. Before discussing further developments – like the integration of terminal slots – basic problems have to be solved.

A better estimation of the time of arrival is in the sense of the customer and the whole sector

Besides the increase of customer satisfaction an improvement of ETA is also leading to efficiency effects on Railway Undertakings and Infrastructure Managers side.

Thus DB Cargo is supporting the EU-financed project ELETA and also pushing forward cooperative approaches like the pilot in the terminal of Duisburg. The ongoing works show, that ETA is a topic, which could only be solved in cooperation between all stakeholders. Nobody is on its own able to create an ETA, because various components have to be taken into consideration:



Only in cooperation between all stakeholders a reliable ETA could be created: The right persons have to exchange the right data at the right time!

Temporary capacity restrictions are massively influencing quality of transports and by that the customer satisfaction

The sector is aware of this topic and has elaborated processes to better plan works, inform about works, to involve the Railway Undertakings and to take into consideration international aspects.

With the revision of Annex VII of 2012/34 and the subproject TCR within the Timetabling Project an international process for planning of temporary capacity restrictions has been agreed by all stakeholders.

Now it is time to implement it and to live the new processes. The corridors could take over a leading role to establish the dialogues between the different stakeholders.



Railway Undertakings should be involved at an early stage, so that negative effects for transport services could be minimised.

Also PaPs should take into consideration construction works and offer an alternative during the construction period. To simply cut of construction periods is not compatible with the original thought of the European Commission.

We have to solve the before mentioned problems in due time before Rail Freight is becoming history

Rastatt has clearly shown the complexity of the rail system. Only if all stakeholders work hand in hand rail freight services can become competitive to other modes.



- The European rail patchwork must become **one** single rail system.
- The corridors are predestined to take over a leading role for **interoperability** and **international optimisation**.
- National decisions must be **harmonised** and should be based on a European thinking. Keeping hold of national egoisms – and even worse: creating new national differing rules/behaviours – is a synonym for drawing the curtain over rail freight in Europe.
- Infrastructure managers, railway undertakings, operators, customers, terminals, regulatory bodies and legislators have to **cooperate** and involve each others in **the problem solving** process.