



RU Advisory Group Meeting RFCs OEM and RhD Prague

21 November 2023

RU AG Speakers O/E-M & Rh-D Gyula Farkas and Martin Erlinger

Speed does matter - as it is a pre-requisite for modal shift



20-30 km/h planned speed is good for a bike but not for an international quality transport on rail

And speed in operations is often even lower....(this is why we propose a new KPI to be introduced by the Implementation Plan – see issue nr. 7 on agenda)

Dwell time development along the RFC



Waiting times S-N (min.)

2021 2022



Waiting times N-S (min.)

Status at Curtici



Average waiting times in Curtici S-N (hours)

Changes of average waiting times in minutes (basic 2022.08.)



Consequences



Waiting time between arrival and handover is reduced by about 50% on average



Time of waiting border police check increased more than 20% average



Overall amount of waiting time decreased more than 2 hours



Overall amount of waiting time is around 9 hours !!! Far from aim at 2 hours

No acceptable for freight market

Focus on ensuring transit time country by country

Technical compliance of CNCs - 2021



Source: OEM / RD CFs Working Group Meeting on Rail Issues Albrecht MALCHEREK

- ETCS is not in operation on 89% of OEM, while GSM-R on 49% of the Corridor (according to ERTMS Deployment Plan (EDP), 1,960 km and 2,760 km are expected to be operational by 2021 and 2023, respectively) ;
- Train length is a major issue along the entire Corridor (except Germany) (Note: train length has to be seen in combination with capacity; no harmonized definition for 740m train length in place);
- Minimum axle load of 225 kN (22.5 tonnes) is an issue for Romania and Greece;
- Maximum operating speed of lower than 100 km/h is a barrier for freight trains for short sections in Slovakia, Czech Republic and Hungary (Budapest area) and along much longer sections in Romania and Bulgaria; nonelectrification at small parts in Germany, Romania and Greece, as well as traction system breaks.

Technical compliance of CNCs - 2030



In some key areas such as terminal accessibility for 740m trains there is no positive development visible.

Such a too slow development is a major threat for the current and future competitiveness of rail freight along the two RFCs and along the future European Transport Corridors – both for Freight but also for Passenger trains.

Many TCRs in SEE region

Budapest–Hegyeshalom Gr. line: Not planned track works for approx. 3 months Reduced capacity for freight trains (1 track is closed), for 3 weeks total closure



Expectations / recommendations

- Aim of EC: Increase rail freight transport volume ->
 - tool: increase competitiveness of RUs infrastructure: stable, reliable, predictable transit time

Best practice: to provide sources for maintenance and renewal for IMs (MAC) at least 2 years before the beginning of actual timetable year (in order to increase reliability and predictability and to coordinate with neighbouring IMs in time)

RUs' expectation

- to speed up infrastructure development according to TEN-T requirements (increase interoperability, providing alternative routes during the track closures, additional cost compensation for usage of alternative routes)
- to enable time window for freight trains, transparent TCR and Annex VII compatible planning & coordination process and communication for all stakeholders
- close cooperation between ministries of transport and internal affairs (to reduce dwelling time at border stations and to involve border police staff in efficient way)
- to harmonise the different traffic regulations and rules, to validate additional costs of different traffic rules and regulations, to speed up harmonisation, cancellation policies
- better information flow and monitoring info on operational KPIs regarding circulation of corridor trains among all stakeholders
- joint cooperation (OEM and RhD RFC) on key issues of RUs (dwelling time, TCR, harmonisation)

RU position on draft capacity regulation

Five most critical items to be improved

Overview of priority points

1. Network of IMs receives power, but the external control is not sufficient

FORUM TRAIN EUROPE

_ <mark>\</mark>∠

> a Regulatory Body with decision power on European scale should be added

2. Missing legal mandate for organised RU / Service Facility voice

> structured RU voice, as a follow up of RAGs, should be added

3. Only consultations = only reactive market involvement

- > IMs start and thus take more power in strategical planning
- > RU input at beginning of strategic planning stages has to be added («CNAs»)

4. IMs can reject capacity requests not in line with their plans

- > simple rejection to be replaced by effort of IMs to provide alternative/diverging capacity, in dialogue with RU. Non-offering remains a last resort
- 5. Main implementation is late for Timetable 2030
- > benefits should be earlier (if above shortcomings are overcome)
- > Non-TTR aspects could be immediately (respecting Network Statement timelines) E.g. multi-network capacity rights, reciprocal commercial conditions, framework agreements, performance review body etc

Thank you for your kind attention!