



**RFC Amber + RFC Baltic-  
Adriatic RAG-TAG-meeting  
Prague**





## RFC5 Topics

- 1.** QCO Tarvisio
- 2.** Shunting services at Italian Borders
- 3.** RFI penalty system

## **Idea:**

- Implementation of a joint working group on RFC 5

## **Background:**

- In 2021 there have been discussions and requests from RUs about the necessity of a joint Working Group (RUs and IMs) similar to the WG on RFC3.
- The main idea is to give RUs and IMs a platform to get into a more active dialogue and to be able to find common solutions, e.g. for Pontebbana closure.
- First coordination of such a working group should be done via the Corridor Management.

### **Current status:**

- RFI has withdrawn its own shunting services at Trivisio. Inrail is currently providing the shunting service in a non-discriminatory way.
- RUs demand that the IMs must guarantee that shunting services will also be provided in future at the borders.
- If the IM does not have the resources to fulfil it independently, they must find an adequate partner who provides non-discriminatory shunting services.

### **Current status:**

- RFI is working on a penalty system for delayed freight trains. The Italian regulatory body demands a system that should encourage RUs to work on the punctuality of international freight trains.
- RFI has revised its first version and put a reviewed version of the fining methodology in circulation. The main point is that the maximum annual penalty fee must not exceed 3 % of the total amount paid for paths per year.
- Penalty system will be published in the network statement 2024

■ Formula:

- $T_{es}$ : excess layover time
- $T_t$ : maximum time for transit operations (e.g. 40min for Tarvisio)
- Penalty will be applied only in the event of excess layover times  $T_{es}$  exceeding 10'
- Max. Penalty p.a. → 3 % of the amount paid for international paths.

T of excess layover	Penalty (€)
$0 < T_{es} \leq T_t$	167,7 $0,3 * 559$
$T_t < T_{es} \leq 2T_t$	335,4 $0,3 * 2 * 559$
...	...
$(n-1)T_t < T_{es} \leq nT_t$	$0,3 * n * 167,7$ 559



## RFC11 Topics

- 1.** RNE TIS problems (at PKP Cargo)
- 2.** New AŽP/SZ Infra request for non Slovenian RUs
- 3.** TEN-T alignment vs. Małaszewicze

# 1. RNE TIS problems (at PKP Cargo)

## **Fact:**

- PKP CARGO S.A. trains are regularly missing from RNE TIS system.

## **Background:**

- PKP CARGO S.A already sent numerous interventions/requests with specific examples, to the relevant parties but unfortunately no feedback. Even though the problem exists for several months, we see no changes/update from IM side (PKP PLK, DB Netz) IT systems. Therefore the system in existing formula is for us useless. And as a result we need to use alternative sources of information.



## 2. New AŽP/SZ Infra request for non Slovenian RUs



## 2. New AŽP/SZ Infra request for non Slovenian RUs

### Current status (between 2001 and 2022):

#### New border between HU-SLO

- 2000.11.16. Agreement between HU and SLO about the new border crossing
- 2001.05.16. Official opening event, the joint handover station is Hodoš
- 2010.05.18. Electrification on HU side between Zalaegerszeg-Hodoš (~25kV)
- 2016.06.10. Electrification on SLO side between Hodoš-Pragersko (=3kV), system change in Hodoš (~25kV / =3kV)

Based on the state agreement the border crossing traffic was regulated in many topics, like;

- Language
- Railway safety and traffic management:
  - Trains are running to/from Hodoš with HU locomotives and staff
  - On Hodoš railway station SZ Infra rules are valid
  - IMs may agree in to use Hungarian rules in the case of not safety relevant topics
- 2001: When the agreement was signed there were only two state owned railway companies
- 2022: **46! RUs** are running on this border section
- 2001-2022. Traffic was (is) running without any problem

## 2. New AŽP/SZ Infra request for non Slovenian RUs

First railway package of 2001, Second railway package of 2004, Third railway package of 2007	
Óriszentpéter – Border.	Border – Hodoš handover railwaystation
HU RU : Licence, Safety Certificate, train path owner	SLO RU : Licence, Safety Certificate, train path owner
→ HU locomotive and locomotive driver between Óriszentpéter – Hodoš handover railwaystation	
Fourth railway package of 2016	
Óriszentpéter - OH.	OH. – Hodoš üzemváltó állomás
HU RU : Licence, Safety Certificate, train path owner <b>????</b>	
→ HU locomotive and locomotive driver between Óriszentpéter – Hodoš handover railwaystation	

There are rules in the 4th Railway package about border crossings: **(EU) 2016/798 DIRECTIVE Art.10. (8); (EU) 2018/763 IMPLEMENTING REGULATION Art. 3. (11):**

„Where the applicant indicates in its application that it intends to operate to stations in neighbouring Member States with **similar network characteristics** and **similar operating rules**, when those stations are close to the border, **the single safety certificate shall also be valid to such stations without requesting an extension** of the area of operation, following **consultation of the national safety authorities** of the neighbouring Member States by the safety certification body.”

## 2. New AŽP/SZ Infra request for non Slovenian RUs

- July-August 2022.07-08. AŽP check
- 05.08.2022. SŽ - Infrastruktura, d.o.o. inform MÁV about new rules of operation from 01. October 2022 (2 months!) – only for 12 RUs!
- September 2022 – New and not clear information about requirements;
  - Infrastructure Access Contract for 5 kilometers
  - Train path request by HU RU
  - B1 level Slovenian language knowledge
- Deadline was 30.09.2022 – **Impossible to fulfill the criterias in 55 days**
- Deadline was postponed till non-defined date on 30. September

**Should we close the border?**



### Main findings/pain points

#### 12 years after the RFC Regulation;

- RUs (and international freight traffic) are still neglected
- Cooperation of Regulatory Bodies still not working
- Consultation with Customers (RUs) is still not evident
- Level and cost of bureaucracy is increasing
- Why RUs should spend time and money for RFC contribution when the added value is close to zero?
- In the era of Solodarity lanes from UA e.g. to the Mediterranean Ports to block the biggest RUs (*RCH, DB Cargo, Metrans, CER, Retrack, etc.*) may not be the smartest idea.
- Selections among RUs may lead to discrimination!

### 3. TEN-T alignment vs. RFC11/Małaszewicze

#### Is the Baltic Sea – Adriatic Sea Corridor the future of RFC11?

What happen with the missing lines? E.g

- **Easter branch of RFC11**
- **HU/SLO connection**
- What is the future of the planned Polish infrastructure developments in Małaszewicze area?
- Małaszewicze is still the connecting point of the OSJD Corridor 1!
- What will happen with the Chinese – Europe traffic?

Silk Road by rail has 3 main branches and covers a distance of 10,000 - 12,000 km



