

5.

Eszter Boglárka Gádoros – RFC AMBER Secretariat
Gerhard Troche – Managing Director

Update of the RFC AMBER Implementation Plan and revision of corridor objectives

AMBER RAIL FREIGHT CORRIDOR

Implementation Plan TT2025 update

Eszter Boglárka Gádoros | VPE
RAG-TAG meeting | 18 May 2023



Co-funded by
the European Union



TA Deliverables for 2023

- **Deliverable D1.1 – Implementation plan TT2025 update**
- To be published in January 2024
 - Lead Beneficiary: VPE
- Cooperation with the Working Groups, especially:
 - ➔ Timetable & C-OSS
 - ➔ Infrastructure & Interoperability and ERTMS
 - ➔ Traffic Management, Performance & Operations

Main milestones

- ① First update and approval by the MaBo → **mid/ end of May**
- ② Submission to the RAG-TAG and to the ExBo and consultation of applicants for a first round of commenting → **mid of June**
- ③ Discussion and incorporation of the comments + MaBo approval → **mid/ end of September**

Implementation Plan TT2025 update timeline

| Implementation Plan TT2025 update - Timeline | January 2023 | February 2023 | March 2023 | April 2023 | May 2023 | June 2023 | July 2023 | August 2023 | September 2023 | October 2023 | 2023 November | 2023 December |
|---|--------------|---------------|------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Collaboration and consultation with the WG leaders Glossary of terms and abbreviations (Secretariat) 1. Introduction (Coordination group) 2. Corridor description (Infrastructure & Interoperability and ERTMS WG, Secretariat) 3. Market analysis Study (untouched until the TMS revision) 4. List of measures (TCR WG, Timetable & C-OSS WG, Traffic Management, Train Performance & Operations WG) 5. Objectives and performance of the corridor (Traffic Management, Train Performance & Operations WG, TCR WG, Timetable & C-OSS WG) 6. Investment Plan (Infrastructure, Interoperability and ERTMS WG) | | | | mid of April | | | | | | | | |
| First update of the IP | | | | | mid of May | | | | | | | |
| First round approval by the MaBo | | | | | end of May | | | | | | | |
| IP submitted to the ExBo and to the RAG TAG for a first round of commenting | | | | | | mid of June | | | | | | |
| Discussion and incorporation of the comments from the ExBo | | | | | | | | | mid of September | | | |
| Second round approval by the MaBo | | | | | | | | | end of September | | | |
| IP submitted to the ExBo for a second round of commenting | | | | | | | | | | mid of October | | |
| IP approved by the EB | | | | | | | | | | | end of November | |
| The document is ready to be uploaded to the Sygma system | | | | | | | | | | | | mid/end of December |



AMBER RAIL FREIGHT CORRIDOR

Thank you for your attention!

www.rfc-amber.eu



Co-funded by
the European Union



AMBER RAIL FREIGHT CORRIDOR

Corridor objectives

Dr. Gerhard Troche | **Managing Director**
RAG-TAG meeting | 18 May 2023



Co-funded by
the European Union



Corridor objectives – conceptual framework

- Corridor objectives laid down in the implementation plan
- Currently mostly of qualitative and very general nature
- Future corridor objectives to be:
 - complemented by indicators operationalising the objectives
 - Indicators based on an objectively defined methodology
 - accompanied by a monitoring system to assess the current situation and progress
 - specified by target values or verbal description

→ RFC AMBER opted for deriving corridor objectives as far as possible on the KPIs commonly agreed among RFCs

Steps for definition of corridor objectives

Step 1:

Selection of indicators (KPIs), from which corridor objectives shall be derived

- How many objectives?
- Which KPIs?
- Additional non-quantifiable objectives?



Steps for definition of corridor objectives (cont.)

Step 2:

Definition of target values

- Absolute values or percentage values?
- Definition of time horizon for achievement of target values

+ verbal description of non-quantifiable objectives (if any)



Set of commonly applicable KPIs

01

CAPACITY MANAGEMENT

- Volume of **offered capacity** (PaPs and RC)
- Volume of **requested capacity** (PaPs and RC)
- Number of **requests** (PaPs and RC)
- Number of **conflicts** (PaPs)
- Volume of **pre-booked capacity** (PaPs)
- **NEW:** Ratio of pre-booked capacity (PaPs)
- Average **planned speed** of PaPs

02

OPERATIONS

- Punctuality at **origin** (delay ≤ 30 and ≤ 15 minutes)
- Punctuality at **destination** (delay ≤ 30 and ≤ 15 minutes)
- Number of trains crossing a border along the RFC
- **NEW:** Train kilometers of trains crossing a border along the RFC
- **NEW:** **Dwell times** in border sections (planned and actual)

03

MARKET DEVELOPMENT

- Number of trains per border
- **NEW:** Train kilometers of trains per border
- Ratio of capacity allocated by the C-OSS and the total allocated capacity



Proposed corridor objectives

- **Objective 1**: Average planned speed of PaPs (Capacity Mgmt KPI)
- **Objective 2**: Punctuality at destination (Operational KPI)
- **Objective 3**: Dwell times in border sections (Operational KPI)
- **Objective 4**: Number of trains per border (Market KPI)
- **Objective 5**: Provision of paths with improved parameters, e.g. train length or train weight (Qualitative KPI)

Proposed time horizons for objectives

Time horizons for target values:

- **Short-term:** 2024
- **Medium-term:** 2028 (5 years)

Monitoring of indicators will be done on an annual basis



„Matrix” of objectives (work in progress)

| Objective | Target 2024 | Target 2028 (5 years) | Comment |
|--|-------------|--------------------------|--|
| Average planned speed of PaPs | ... | ... | Target values to be elaborated by Timetable & OSS WG |
| Punctuality at destination | ... | ... | Target values to be elaborated by Traffic Mgmt, Performance and Operations WG |
| Dwell times in border sections | ... | ... | Target values to be elaborated by Traffic Mgmt, Performance and Operations WG |
| Number of trains per border | ... | ... | Target values to be elaborated by Traffic Mgmt, Performance and Operations WG |
| Provision of paths with improved parameters, e.g. train length or train weight | ... | ... | Targets to be elaborated by Infrastructure & Interoperability WG, in cooperation with Timetable & OSS WG |



Involvement of RAG-TAG

- Results of the User Satisfaction Surveys have been taken into account in the selection of corridor objectives
- RAG-TAG are invited to express views and opinions in connection with the consultation of the Implementation Plan
- RAG-TAG may also issue opinions on measures by RFC AMBER Members contributing to achieving the objectives

We are aware of, that the achievement of the objectives is influenced by and dependent on a multitude of factors, many of them outside the control of RFC AMBER Members (Infrastructure Managers and Allocation Body). Thus, the objectives express a wish by RFC AMBER for a future situation on the corridor, but their achievement is not and cannot be a commitment by RFC AMBER.

AMBER RAIL FREIGHT CORRIDOR

Thank you for your attention!

www.rfc-amber.eu



Co-funded by
the European Union

