Minutes RAG meeting				
Date of meeting: 20 April 2023 **Venue:** Basel **Time:** 10:00-15:00				
Participants: For data protection reasons not disclosed				
Enclosures				
Status of document: Final			**Date of issue:** 28.02.2023	

	Annex	Topic / content	Who	Time
1		**Welcome and approval of agenda**		
2		**Follow-ups last RAG** •		
3		**User Satisfaction Survey 2022** Presentation on Sharepoint General Overview • 11 participants (constant), 13 evaluations (13% decrease compared to previous year) • 76% positive satisfaction (16% decrease compared to previous year) • Focus topics with wish for improvements: quality and usability of re-routing scenarios, infrastructure capacity, infrastructure parameters, quantity of alternative offers, measures to improve infrastructure standards, protection of PaPs from TCRs, time-table of PaPs Discussion • GdM emphasizes the USS is a legal requirement, inconvenient or not. The questions are standardized, thus do not fit every RU necessarily. The general satisfaction level question is political (not really relevant) so it must be questioned • GdM would rather prefer a big survey every 5 years than a small one yearly • Discussion about the appropriateness of a quantitatively oriented survey with only 11 participants (?) • PH: Suggestion to hold qualitative interviews to be able to explain numbers and obtain detailed results about problems	PH	

4		**Ten-T Revision: pot. Changes for RAG**	PH	
		Presentation of EU Council position from December on Sharepoint		
		Discussion		
		• GdM: The consequences of the TEN-T revision are unclear		
		• GdM: Art 65 of the TEN-T revision (art. 8)		
		• GDM expresses disappointment on the low level of participation in the RAG by the members of the ExB and also the MB		
		• PH: Any decision of the RAG must show it is based on a common RAG position		
		• GdM: regulation 913/2010 will disappear (it will become a capacity mgt/operations regulation); the influence of the rail freight coordinators will increase and the role of the RFCs will diminish significantly; within DG Move there is an internal struggle going on		
		• The RFCs provide a platform for exchange between the IMs and the MoTs		
		• UK: If the RFCs no longer exist as a structure, this issue should be discussed internally to have a joint reflection on the risks of such an outcome and raise awareness in the Commission		
		• MG: The commission only looked at the modal shift (where the RFCs were not successful); the RFCs solved more problems by simply discussing them		
		• The scale of the platform should be as limited as possible		
		• On 21st June proposal of the Commission is expected		
5		**Merger of RAG of RFC 1 & 2**	GdM	
		Proposed timeline based on publication on Jan 2024 (Draft) on Sharepoint		
		• If the publication will not happen by end of this year then the TT 2027 can not be done		
		• Yann suggests to start to merge both RAGs now already		
		• UK: states that meetings within RALP there have been more meeting within the year (3-4 small ones and 1 big one incl. 5-6 RUs)		
		• Yann supports this idea and brings in the idea of making more webinars on certain ideas perhaps one big meeting in a year		

		• It has been decided to do one big meeting and 3-4 smaller meetings virtually with the idea to provide information as a webinar • LG: Yesterday it was decided to continue with the Joint RAG formula • Maybe a Teams meeting before the actual live one would be fruitful • Investment plans are based on the national investment plans; the MB just collects the info from the National plans, so the actual role of the MB is very limited, can not decide about investments • MG. eg for 740m trains: Belgium was the worst student of the class, but now money has been freed up and Infrabel will be ready by 2030 • GdM: In the escalation steps proposed by the commission it is the RUs who advise the MB; the RAG should suggest next steps… • Matthias (CH): Pressure from the RAG and the ExB was crucial for the P400 issue • AP: The RAG should think two steps ahead and anticipate to guide the MB & ExB • In Italy the RUs are requested (legal requirement) to give their opinion on the national investment plans to RFI • Opinion of the RAG on the quality of the performance on the corridor should be expressed • GdM: The RAG should focus on the big picture, not on eg a change of a switch. The influence of the RAG can improve but we should look for ways to make this as effective as possible • AP/UK: The importance of a measure should determine whether they are treated in the RAG or not • AP between the lines of art. 65: the RAG should become more formal, with binding consequences to its advice		
6		**R-CDM - Current status and Discussion of pos. implementation of an pilot** Presentation on Sharepoint • Current obstacles & necessary measures: • Every actor is rather working and optimizing for themselves; weak organizational connection between systems -> harmonized procedures	SM	

	- Capacity constraints -> increasing capacity - Everybody is depending on, but not getting the necessary informations; ex: terminal does not know when it is receiving its train -> information sharing - Develop a common view on railway – collaborative decision making - Looking at aviation - commonly agreed times sent to all operational actors; move away from "blame culture" and "first come first served" attitude - First actors to involve: Terminals, IMs and RUs - Idea for now: Start with a section of corridor 1 and try this mode of cooperation and information sharing - Next steps: having meetings together with the stakeholders to reach a common understanding of R-CDM - GdM: we should move from punctuality to reliability (predictability) - AP: Is the project limited to time stamps or will the project influence the process pro-actively? AP: this requires limitless resources - GdM: its about what is planned vs what is happening in reality - MG: TAF TSI train ready message already exists and also requires resources - This implies a commitment of the different players; if someone is not living up to the commitment, he is kicked out of the process and put back at the bottom of the list - Question SM: Are RUs interested to participate in the pilot, knowing the data will need to be shared? - MG: the ELETA project also required sharing info - IMs must realise the importance to share information, eg. time at the border crossings ETMN (European Traffic Mgt Network) is a must - Sandra: Project is important to show the commission that the RFCs are doing a lot to improve performance on the corridors - Mat. S. : Every company (RU) has its own TC, its imperative that the different TCs RUs, Terminals, IMs share their info - With regards to the CEF call for funding: MG: does not want to give the impression that funding of the commission will solve everything (only max 30%).		

		• UK/MG: The whole logistics chain must be involved, terminals ,RUs, IMs, Operators…		
7		**TCR compensation regimes** • GdM: Which TCRs are we talking about? • IMs will not compensate TCRs which were known long beforehand • UK: All TCRs? There is no set format yet; There are lots of different systems with different IMs, in the Ecco group an analysis was attempted • Maybe a special RAG would be useful - will happen on 23rd June • AP idea behind it: a) general costs generated to RUs by TCR; b) mechanism needed so that the IMs realize the impact of the TCRs		
8		**Language Translation regimes** Overview of activities regarding language tool on Sharepoint		
		Lunchbreak		
9		**Quality Core Group** Presentation about organization, tasks & current process of QCG on Sharepoint	MW	
10		**RFI TCR** See presentation on Sharepoint (?) • Alternatives are provided, 740m and PC80 are guaranteed; rerouting is foreseen. • UK: Combined with the other planned TCRs, these additional TCRs in Italy are just too much for the RUs to handle • GdM: IMs should talk to RUs about traffic consequences and not TCRs; investments must be geared to the RUs • MG: INEA forces timelines very strictly	SB / AG	
11		**TCR Tool – current status** • GdM: RU should send direct message to IM if TCR is not coordinated, who must take the appropriate actions • MG: At the moment no TCR part in the TAF/TAP message	RNE	

12		**Update RIS − Rail Facilities Portal** See Presentation on Sharepoint (?) - CIP will offer the possibility to see all the Service facilities - The way how this visualization will be fulfill is up to the CCB next week - MG Major/High TCRs are included − does not understand why so few IMs have uploaded their TCRs	RNE	
13		**New speaker** Matthias Stoorvogel will be following up UK, together with Sandra of DB Cargo	UK	
14		**AoB**	UK	