

Summary of the Joint Advisory Groups Meeting of RFC Baltic-Adriatic, North Sea – Baltic and Rhine-Danube.

Date: 22.10.2025 09:30 - 15:30

Venue: Federal Ministry of Innovation, Mobility
and Infrastructure

Radetzkystraße 2, 1030 Vienna, Austria

1. Welcome and introduction.

Guus de Mol, Management Board Member of the RFC North Sea – Baltic (NS-B) welcomed the participants and opened the meeting. Dariusz Knopp from Polish Ministry of Infrastructure also welcomed the participants on behalf of Executive Board and thanked for organization of the meeting. Ms Anne Jensen, ETC BSAS Coordinator thanked for the invitation. She informed that RFC NS-B Coordinator Ms. Catherine Trautmann couldn't participate in the meeting, but Jan Steinkohl participates on her behalf. She reminded that revised regulation provides a number of provisions setting up framework for a solid collaboration between the European Coordinators, the rail freight community, Management Boards, Advisory Groups and the Executive Boards and she is looking forward to this cooperation. It is the right way to move ahead and she is convinced that cooperation is a key work to improve the rail freight transport. Therefore, via joint effort, exchange of information and working together of all stakeholders can make it happen. The gradual building of a culture of trust is a key.

2. RAG slot.

Damjan Rak, RFC Baltic-Adriatic (BA) RAG Speaker welcomed the participants on behalf of the RAG Speakers.

Martin Erlinger RFC Rhine-Danube (RD) RAG Speaker informed that RAG Speakers prepared presentation indicating where they see the current challenges in interoperability, especially in operations and train operations, in order to briefly compare the requirements which are there in theory and the reality that they are facing. He added that the interoperability is a key issue for the work of the rail freight corridors, therefore the aim is to ensure that traffic is flowing smoothly over different networks from origin to destination.

RAG Speakers presented the RFCs' interoperability challenges in operations – requirements vs. reality, including:

The section-wise, non-harmonized implementation of new train protection systems(e.g. ETCS): Martin Erlinger pointed out that lack of harmonisation creates uncertainty for the users of the rail infrastructure, raises high additional costs for the rail sector and increases travel times due to additional stops at or before interfaces between different systems—e.g. DE/AT. He added that there is a big issue along the corridors with the different standards of ETCS, among others because the timeline of the implementation of the ETCS is not harmonised. He summarised that there is a need of the joint work together with especially ministries in order to maximise the benefit of the ETCS. There is a need for implementation deadline simultaneously along the corridors, and it should also follow the same sub standards.

The European rules on train drivers working time: Paweł Wiechoczek RFC North Sea – Baltic RAG Speaker, presented the topic. His main focus was on the issue of making the construction works in general but also construction works plans at the very beginning. Infrastructure managers are deciding to cut off the tracks instead of building the new ones all instead of keeping the existing ones. The result is that modern main tracks will be created with all of the systems with the high-speed good parameters. However, the problem is with the sidetracks, as the European rules on train drivers working time stays:

- Maximum 9 hours of driving during a day shift and 8 hours during a night shift between daily rests.
- When the working day is 6–8 hours, the driver must have a break of at least 30 minutes; if working more than 8 hours, the break must be at least 45 minutes.

Procedures requiring trains to stop at border points: Paweł Wiechoczek stated that the below procedures require trains to stop at border points:

- Change of railway operator.
- In case of MS-locos: change of power system or change of safety system.

Paweł Wiechoczek summarized that to ensure the required stops, the infrastructure must have a sufficient number of side tracks.

Regarding siding parts Weronika Karbowski, Chairwoman of the RFC BA Management Board said that it wasn't a good approach to remove those sidings to cut cost. She hopes that the Croatian example shows that it's already a history and also PLK is now having this approach of restore and modernise them. Additionally, bottleneck removal programme is ongoing and within it PLK also restoring those sidings. She said that she hopes that all Infrastructure Managers within 3 corridors are now aware of this issue and don't have in their plans the further removal of the sites. Additionally, there are now a lot of consultations for the TCRS, so she kindly asked participants to stay active.

Guus de Mol said that in the Netherlands historically all freight trains were around 500 metres, so a lot of their sidings were 550 metres. In case of renovation they were taken out, as trains are longer. He appreciates presence of Coordinator in the room, because it's very interesting phase where it's 740 metres, if trains get longer there will be the same situation.

Götz Walther, representative of "Verband Deutscher Verkehrsunternehmen" (Association of German Transport Companies) thanked for this initiative. He said that in many countries the side tracks have been reduced because during renovation infrastructure managers are looking to the costs. He pointed out both long and short tracks are needed so some standards for investment procedure and for the decision making procedure in the politics set on the network, should be developed where the number of side tracks is clearly written down.

Götz Walther questioned if there is a similar discussion regarding motorways. He pointed out that no, as side paths are normal part of the system. However, in the railway infrastructure, when the politics are making the funding it is question, if there is economic reason for this sidetrack.

TEN-T regulation for operational improvement

Damjan Rak pointed out the TEN-T regulation goals for operational improvement:

- Reducing dwelling times on borders
- Reducing delays on destinations

- Pushing GOV planning of reducing existing sidings
- TCR increasing > delays rising > stops/sidings needed
- passenger traffic is increasing – speed of them is rising
- Sidings needed for overtaking a slower freight train.

He pointed that the governments are under public pressure, so the passenger traffic is prioritized. Damjan Rak sums up the approach of the Croatian IM which concentrated on optimising & renovation via:

- Reducing number of some close small stations and tracks
- Renovation with electrifying existing non -electrified tracks
- Creating fast line
- Sidings/Hubs for overtaking/rests/TCR's stops.

Damjan Rak added that RUs are fully supporting all the operational goals from TEN-T Regulation, but to reach those goals, we must have conditions on infrastructure to be able to follow them. And conditions are:

- available side tracks for short term parking of the trains, (Train Driver Directive – needed stops after 5 hours of running, stops because of even short time TCR's, passenger overtaking, border stations bottlenecks ...)
- track capacity for locomotive exchange between RU's from different companies. Administration and safety prevention of using one/same locomotive from different owner to different RU's on same train
- counting not only stop at exact border station but on the stations before too,
- enough long train path capacity .

RUs are also Involved in the language programme from RNE, which helps translate the communication between local drivers. He also thanked for understanding of RUs needs as only cooperation can lead to goals achievement.

Status of MoU implementation in each corridor: Paweł Wiechoczek thanked participants for applause as it shows that there is an understanding of issues presented. He informed that the Memorandum of Understanding between Railway Undertakings, setting out their work relationship in the Railway Advisory Group of the Rail Freight Corridor document was jointly created. He presented the status of the Memorandum of Understanding in three Rail Freight Corridors. He pointed out that this document structures cooperation, it was sent to RAG, members in order to facilitate discussion and published by the RFC NS-B and some other RFCs on the RFCs websites already.

Alessandro Turconi, RFC BA Managing Director asked about the state of play regarding the RFC BA MoU. Damjan Rak explained that the intention of the MoU is to push RUs to be more cooperative on the corridors and help the corridor to gain more opinions. The number of RUs are rising all over the Europe, maybe some have different opinions, experience, ideas, questions which they will communicate. Alessandro Turconi suggested that the same approach can be used regarding the cooperation with TAGs. Guus de Mol said that RFC NS-B supports this approach, which is also forced by the regulation.

Zuhal Nalbant, Chairwoman of the RFC RD Management Board added that the topic of MoU was discussed and RFCs will proceed in order to publish documents on the websites.

3. TAG slot.

Alessandro Turconi introduced Christian Ressaenar, RFC BA TAG Speaker who couldn't participated in the meeting. However, he proposed the topic of regulation implication for the terminals that would be officially part of the European transport corridor. He suggested that some information could be provided by European Coordinator and advisors about the new requirements that will be requested by 2031, for example the 740 metres tracks. Marcin Wójcik, European Coordinator's adviser, confirmed that one of the major challenging requirements is the availability or the possibility of accepting 740 meter trains without further manipulation. Further specific information from the Regulation could be provided during next meeting if requested. Guus de Mol pointed out that in the TEN-T Regulation there is an obligation to all the Member States to do a study on terminals, which have to be finished within two years.

How to increase the number of terminals on the North Sea – Baltic corridor (and optimize the existing ones).

Erik Nieuwenhuis, RFC NS-B TAG Speaker presented the topic how to increase the number of terminals on the North Sea – Baltic corridor (and optimize the existing ones). He stated that his aim is to get more terminals involved in the working groups and in discussion, so the presentation is just a start up point and the detailed discussion should continue during the next meeting.

He summarised what actions can be taken by the Infrastructure Managers (Rail and road), owners of rail connected (or easy to connect) locations and province, municipality or cities.

RFC NS-B TAG Speaker also presented points which should be checked before start-up with a project for a new terminal by Infrastructure Managers.

Erik Nieuwenhuis pointed out that it has to be taken into account that something has to be done on a European level, not only per country. Every country works for its own and forget it is a European question for corridors, so the European approach is needed.

Guus de Mol pointed out that Infrastructure Managers are basically financed only for the maintenance and all the investments are financed by ministries, so every investment, is not an Infrastructure Manager, it's a ministerial decision. The Infrastructure Managers can only support ministries in cost calculation.

Erik Nieuwenhuis said that the point is the politics and European Union has to change the way of how European money for making more terminals is used.

Weronika Karbowskiak stated that this topic is of importance and crucial. She said in Poland there is a company called PKP which is the owner of line properties across the train lines, therefore it can be proper partner for terminals in Poland, together with the rail Transport Office regulatory body, as they are also focusing on development of the terminals and have had a dedicated programme a few years ago.

Guus de Mol summed up that stakeholders should start talking in triangle: ministries, Infrastructure Manager and terminals according to policy for this. He thanked Erik Nieuwenhuis for the presentation.

4. Temporary Capacity Restrictions including High Performance Network works in 2026 on the sections Obertraubling-Passau and Nürnberg-Regensburg and the consequences for the RFCs.

Guus de Mol said that the Temporary Capacity Restrictions (TCRs) topic will be presented, he added that within TCRs are also degradation of lines, therefore TCRs can't be called only works.

Baltic-Adriatic TCRs Working Group activities and scope of the analysis.

Sandra Ferrari, RFC BA C-OSS Manager presented the Baltic-Adriatic TCRs Working Group activities and scope of the analysis.

She reminded that beyond the two yearly TCRs publications mandatory for Corridors, RFC BA usually publishes an intermediate review list in spring -together with maps - in order to provide as much as possible updated information to RUs and partners.

Along these lines, she explained that last Spring it was asked to the working group to make a different exercise, as to identify main TCRs with impact on infrastructure improvements (i.e. in terms of speed, gauge, ERTMS, etc.). This exercise was done out of about 38 main/high TCRs 2025-2027 filtered from the total amount (limited to total closures, more than 7 days duration with capacity restrictions).

Out of this overall amount, 13 TCRs were detected as aimed at “infrastructure improvement” this means about 32%. These TCRs were mainly concentrated in the Northern/Central part of the Corridor (in particular Czech Republic and Slovakia, Poland). On the basis of TCRs maps 2025-2027, she briefly illustrated those TCRs highlighted in green.

Alessandra Libardo, representative of the Venice Port Authority stated that the topic is very interesting, however for ports it is more useful to know how the destination can be reached and what the characteristics are, stressing that more level of detail in terms of timing and works accomplishment are needed. Sandra Ferrari answered that this is exactly the second stage of this exercise. This is a just a kick off Showing a map or elaborating a list is the first stage/sample where main high TCRs can be identified. What is needed is more defined roadmap which identifies periodical accomplishment and what can be offered on a certain date in terms of infrastructure improvement.

Marcin Wójcik asked information about possible communication strategy, stressing to clarify which degree of information can be offered to RUs and partners (for example, if the line is partially operational, what is the capacity during this time and what does it mean for the RUs or forwarders that might be interested in the infrastructure). He also asked clarification on how to communicate the outcome of those works on a given section. For example, how to inform if there are any improvements, as a second track built or an electrification foreseen. Sandra Ferrari answered that regarding the communication strategy this is just a kick off exercise. It is necessary being sure to release information having a certain degree of quality, focusing on the main points crucial for operators, by RFC BA website or Customer Information Platform in a way that it could be readable and suitable for users. The intention is thinking about a kind of “roadmap” for TCRs elaborated together with IMs, which summarizes the TCRs excel file.

TCR Impact Sheets RFC NS-B for timetable 2026 and 2027

Arjan Olsthoorn, RFC NS-B Working Group Temporary Capacity Restrictions Member presented the RFC NS-B TCR Impact Sheets for timetable 2026 and 2027. Those with the biggest impact in TT2026 and TT2027 are as follows:

- Impact of TCR TT 2026
 - Section Korsze Towarowa – Ełk Towarowy (PKP PLK)
 - Section Rzepin - Poznań Starołęka (PKP PLK)
 - Section Děčín - Lysá nad Labem (SZCZ)
 - Section Emmerich Border - Oberhausen Main Station (DB InfraGO)

- Section Frankfurt Oder – Erkner (DB InfraGO)
- Section Dresden – Děčín (Elbe valley) (DB InfraGO)
- Section Aachen – Rheydt (DB InfraGO)
- Section Zeebrugge – Montzen (Infrabel)
- Section Kijfhoek – Meteren – Zevenaar (A15 Tracé) (ProRail)
- Section Breda – Tilburg (ProRail)
- Section Kijfhoek-Amersfoort (ProRail)

- Impact of TCR TT 2027
 - Section Bremen - Oldenburg (DB InfraGO)
 - Section Osnabrück -Rheine (DB InfraGO)
 - Section Y. Rooierweg – Y. Oost Dr Aarschot (Infrabel)
 - Section Breda -Tilburg (ProRail)
 - Section Kijfhoek – Meteren – Zevenaar (A15 Tracé) (ProRail)
 - Section Kijfhoek-Amersfoort (ProRail)

Paweł Wiechoczek requested clarification regarding section Frankfurt Oder - Erkner because available information is quite misleading. Zuhai Nalbant informed that the situation will be explained in detail on the Customer Conference of DB InfraGO AG and PLK S.A, which will take place on 5th of November in Legnica but the information will be also provided before. The presented TCR “Frankfurt (Oderbrücke)-Erkner” for TT2026 on DB InfraGO network (slide 10 Annex 4b - RFC NS-B TCRs for TT2026, TT2027) has been reviewed and harmonized in the Grupa Odra-Nysa on 17.10.2025 under the 3 sections Stadtforst - Frankfurt (Oder) Pbf, Stadtforst - Berliner Außenring and Frankfurt (Oder) Pbf - Frankfurt (Oder) Grenze. The updated closures can be found in the document Annex 4b1 TCR update RFC NS-B .

The Impact Sheets presented at the RAG/TAG are only published twice a year on the RFC and changes might apply after their publication. The presented information lists TCRs on a higher level which can affect the depth of information. If the accurate information about TCRs is needed the national information communicated by the IMs should be considered.

Temporary Capacity Restrictions RFC Rhine-Danube for timetable 2026 and 2027.

Bernd Wetzel, RFC RD C-OSS Manager presented the topic. He stated that TCRs are provided in a huge Excel file which are not convenient, fortunately RNE is developing the TCR tool. The tool will provide much more user friendly format. He presented the RFC RD, TCR Impact Sheets for timetable 2026 and 2027. Those with the biggest impact in TT2026 and TT2027 are as follows:

- Impact of TCR TT 2026
 - Section Passau – Regensburg (DB InfraGO)
 - Section Česká Kubice – Plzeň (SZCZ)
 - Section Hranice na Moravě - Horní Lideč (SZCZ)
 - Section Kúty – Bratislava (ZSR)
 - Section Hegyeshalom – Rajka (GYSEV)
 - Section Győr -Sopron (GYSEV)
 - Various Sections in Romania (CFR)

- Impact of TCR TT 2027
 - Section München-Salzburg (DB InfraGO)

- Various Sections in Romania (CFR)

General Renovations 2026 Nuremberg-Regensburg and Obertraubling-Passau

Henrik Pelzl, International Coordinator High Performance Network DB InfraGO presented the DB InfraGO concept of general renovations on its high-performance network. He informed that stretched rollout scenario was published in coordination with the German Federal Ministry for Transport on 9th of September. There was a sector dialogue this year that reviewed the old schedule of the general renovations. This sector dialogue happened with stakeholders DB InfraGO and then in coordination also with the German Federal Ministry of Transport. The results of this dialogue were that the schedule is now directly linked to the duration of the special fund for structure that the federal government has decided on. He presented 40 sections that will be renovated until 2036. This rollout scenario is also confirmed by the federal government.

Henrik Pelzl said that Frankfurt Mannheim was renovated by the end of last year. It's now back into operation since December and at the moment Emily Oberhausen and Hamburg Berlin are renovated. The renovation on Nuremberg, Regensburg, and over troubling Paso stay as they were communicated, he presented an overview on those corridors. In the last two years, there were intense coordination happening to develop a joint traffic concept with DB InfraGO partners at ÖBB and RFI to allow a harmonised scheduling of construction measures on all the three networks. This resulted in an adaptation of the closure. He added that more detailed information regarding the renovation Nuremberg – Regensburg & Obertraubling – Passau will be provided after meeting, there will be different timetable phases also depending on the timetable phase, there are different diversion routes. Regarding construction, at the moment DB InfraGO works on emergency and disposition concepts, for the trains on the diversion routes and those have been now nearly finished in cooperation with local operation centre in Munich and also the international infrastructure partners. The final draft of this disposition concept will be presented to railway undertakings in November and the ICM routings of the RFCs will be examined and the emergency concepts in the event of an ICM will be developed in parallel. He added that DB InfraGO is now in the final development phase for the annual timetable of next year, so the last conflicts will be probably solved in the next weeks and at the moment there are works on microscopic concepts to serve the railway sidings on the close.

Marcin Wójcik said that there are a lot of merits of all those approaches, but they are very diverse. Different information is provided by different RFCs in different formats, so maybe there is a room to find a common, concerted approach.

Martin Erlinger said that RUs desperately need a harmonised and up-to-date information source for such kind of information. There is the TCR tool, but despite the fact that this IT tool is still under RNE development, it would be worth if Infrastructure Managers could use the tool.

Guus de Mol said that TCR tool will be developed to provide all the available information. However, it is hard to predict works because of war, inflation etc., also the budget has to be planned to predict TCR. He summed up that TCR tool has to be filled in and start operating.

5. Operational performance:

Operations on European corridors – Challenges to enhance transport quality on European tracks.

Dirk Shade, representative of the DB Cargo group presented topic of operations on European corridors - Challenges to enhance transport quality on European tracks. He said that DB Cargo offers a comprehensive European Network by taking heed of different rules and languages. The operations focus is on improvement of rail transport quality on European corridors which are:

- long term (6 years): Harmonized operation rules on III RFC's, O-D related;
- mid-term (3-6 years): Agreements on simplified process rules within the main RFC stretches, TAF-TSI based;
- short term (3 years): Research on solutions to overcome obstacles – work on progress by RFC organizations;

Guus de Mol asked about examples what helps RUs in standardisation. Dirk Shade answered that 100% standardisation is not working at all. The specific standardisation is needed which helps to enhance transports in a way that rules are similar. The other important thing is a lingua franca, common language which would improve communication. The issue is that the authorities don't pay enough attention to this task and there is lack of discussion. Therefore, they should be involved in discussion regarding needs. Additionally, Guus de Mol requested participants to conclude if the joint RAG/TAG meeting format should be continued.

Operational performance RFC BA

Alessandro Turconi, Managing Director of the RFC BA presented operational performance topic. He informed that it was decided to organize a meeting once a year with the EU Coordinator and the operators in order to analyse the performance of a corridor, especially in terms of the new indicators that are foreseen by the regulation for the operational activities.. Alessandro Turconi presented the state of play of works of RFCs with the support of RailNetEurope (RNE) on measuring TEN-T operational priorities dwell times and punctuality:

- He presented the proposed new methodology.

Alessandro Turconi presented the RFC BA figures regarding: dwell times, arrival punctuality and 740m-long trains. He then presented an analysis of punctuality, concluding that the main driver to improve it would be working at the punctuality at origin. He showed figures of punctuality at key Ports/Terminals, adding that he encourages ports, terminals and Railway Undertakings to closer cooperation with RFCs and Infrastructure Managers in order to analyze together and take joint corrective actions. It is important for the sector to focus on cooperation in order to improve presented figures.

Erik Nieuwenhuis questioned how calculating of dwell times works on stations, before and after the border. If there is a station two kilometres in front of the border and again three kilometres after the border, how is it calculated. Alessandro Turconi answered that the focus is on the border section. Border section is defined by the Infrastructure Managers, so if there are two station and there is a border agreement between the two Infrastructure Managers the dwell time in the station where the operational activities are performed is taken into account. If the operational activities are performed in both stations both are calculated.

The Trieste&Monfalcone port authority representative stated that it is important to know where the 740m – long trains can be run. Guus de Mol answered that almost always the longer trains can be run. The only problem is it's fully depending on the other trains. If the timetable concept is changed, what was possible yesterday is no longer possible tomorrow, so it's the

only parameter which is fully soft and it can't be measured on every route. However, Guus de Mol pointed out that some predictions for 2030 are already available in the presentation. Alessandra Libardo pointed out that seven ports are participating in the meeting and they all face the same issue. They are investing a lot of money in improvements, the infrastructure and all the new investment in order to reach this length of train inside the Port terminals but if there is no response in the European network on this question it is a no sense for investments. She added that she has to provide information to clients about the max train length that can be run from the Port along the main nodes of RFC network. Guus de Mol said that there is a definition in the regulation regarding a number of trains per day, per hour. He added that TEN-T Coordinator can approach Ministries regarding the fulfilment of regulation. Weronika Karbowski added that definition is quite complex but there are also infrastructure, capacity and priority rules in allocation aspects.

Damjan Rak added that the question is how more goods can be transported with the same amount of trains by adding additional waggons, therefore the train length is important. He said that everything which is discussed today TCRs, delays, dwelling times, capacities, everything is some kind of circle because it affects arriving train to the port. He suggested that RUs and ports should be involved in preparing this kind of data presented during the RAG/TAG meeting as their use would have some kind of different statement regarding that or even figures related to that also regarding the borders. Alessandro Turconi agreed that all stakeholders should work together.

Paweł Wiechoczek stated that presentation regarding 740m-long trains was interesting and he requested to prepare the same information from RFC NS-B to be presented during the RFC NS-B RAG/TAG meeting. He asked RFC BA to share today's presentation. Regarding dwelling time for border crossing Zebrydowice – Petrovice, he suggested to develop QCO.

Ms Anne Jensen thanked the organizers as it was extremely fruitful discussion and great organized. The RFCs are very open and transparent. She added that this cooperation will be developed and expand.

Operational performance RFC RD

Márk Háy, Deputy MB representative of RFC RD provided further information regarding two main indicators. The dwell time is more than talking about pure figures as there are many different factors. The additional aspects like earlier arrival to a border station or technology have to be taken into consideration. These supplementary factors are also really important if we consider measuring any kind of indicators. He presented dwell times published by RNE. He reminded that the participating IMs still have the possibility to revise those values and also make own measurements using their national systems, compare the figures and investigate further influencing factors.

The punctuality is another one of commonly applicable key performance indicators which were developed by RNE in line with the regulation. Márk Háy pointed out the operational factors like interoperability, language barriers, border processes or police control, which are very different on each border section. Therefore, it is not easy to compare the "performance" of various border sections. He presented the example for punctuality at origin / punctuality at destination pointing out that punctuality is less influenced by IM reasons. This shows that there are many aspects which are beyond the control of the Infrastructure Managers.

6. Transport Market Study update to ETC routings and E-TMS 2025-2027.

Transport Market Study update to ETC routings

Alessandro Turconi presented the Transport Market Study update according to the ETC alignment. He informed that the study was a joint RFCs study under coordination of RNE and was delivered this Spring.

The study was European wide but based on the extension to the alignment of the nine European transport corridors. He presented the main findings of the study including:

- Tons of freight train runs crossing the ETCs borders
- International freight transport in the ETCs catchment area: the modal share 2022 (mln ton)
- International rail freight transport in the catchment area: top 10 Origin - Destinations by volume
- The catchment area of the ETC BSAS, ETC NS-B and ETC RD 2022 Origins of international Rail freight volumes that use it
- The catchment area of the ETC BSAS, ETC NS-B and ETC RD 2022 Destinations of international Rail freight volumes that use it

Alessandro Turconi informed that the results are published in the Implementation Plan updates by corridors.

The conclusion of the study is forecasts in 2030 of the rail freight volumes scenarios.

He added that the sensitivity scenario shows that an infrastructure network interoperable at TEN-T standards could produce a significant modal shift to rail:

- +15% or 52 mln ton by rail for the 9 ETCs network
- +16mln each for BSAS & NS-B; +20mln for RD

Martin Erlinger also added that he is surprised that Rotterdam - Saarbrücken is the second strongest origin - destination. Guus de Mol explained in Saarbrücken there is one of the biggest European iron factories and every day approximately 12 trains or 4000 tonnes are running.

E-TMS 2025-2027

Gabriel Bustad, Team Leader RNE Corridor Management and Camille Dachicourt, Senior Stakeholder Manager at RNE presented the topic. He presented the topic as follows:

1. Introduction to the European Transport Market Study
 - European Transport Market Study timeline
 - Main modules of the European Transport Market Study
 - Workflow based on future ETMS outputs set up by RNE
 - E-TMS Project timeline
2. ETMS and stakeholder management
 - ETMS Stakeholder involvement in meeting forums
 - ETMS Workshop 1 on 25th of September 2025
 - Stakeholder overview and involvement for ETMS
 - Main objectives the ETMS 2025-2027
 - ETMS Milestones 2025-2027
 - ETMS Workshops overview.

7. RFC BA, NS-B and RD PaP capacity offer TT 2027

Sandra Ferrari, RFC BA C-OSS Manager said that C-OSS Managers will present the main features for the collection that was made this year for the collection of capacity wishes for timetable 2027. She informed that:

- Survey was sent out via the C-OSS Community Assistant to all applicants of the European RFCs on May 19th of May 2025.
- Responding deadline was 15th of August 2025.

RFC BA PaP capacity offer TT 2027

Sandra Ferrari, RFC BA C-OSS Manager presented the RFC BA wish list TT2027 results:

- 9 Rus/operators replied (55 in TT2026)
- 59 wishes were received
 - 29 N-S direction
 - 27 S-N direction
- 1 operator/new traffics requested
- The wishes included traffic that will be dealt in cooperation with RFC RD and RFC NS-B.

RFC NS-B PaP capacity offer TT 2027

Anna Difliff, RFC NS-B C-OSS Manager informed that there are a lot of changes in the RFC NS-B routing due to the update of the TN-T regulation.

She presented the RFC NS-B wish list TT2027 results:

- 10 applicants replied
- 47 wishes for TT2027 (92 in TT2026):
 - 17 E-W direction
 - 19 W-E direction
 - 4 N-S direction
 - 7 S-N direction
- 1 new applicant expressed wishes for TT2027
- The wishes include common sections or combined relations with RFC NSRM, RFC SCANMED, RFC RD and RFC BA.

RFC RD PaP capacity offer TT 2027

Bernd Wentzel, RFC RD C-OSS Manager presented the RFC RD wish list TT2027 results:

- 13 applicants responded (8 for TT 2026)
- 126 wishes were received in total (110 for TT 2026)
- The wishes include common sections or combined relations with RFC AWB, RFC NS-B.

Weronika Karbowskiak informed that Sandra Ferrari is leaving RFC BA structure, she thanked her on behalf of corridor community for her contributions during her work in RFC BA.

8. AOB:

- Topics for next joint RAG/TAG meeting

Katarzyna Wachowicz asked participants about opinion, expectations regarding the further RAG/TAG meetings and potential topics. Martin Erlinger answered that RUs appreciate this joint meeting format. However, there should be also one dedicated RFC RAG/TAG meeting in order to discuss corridor specific issues.

- Meetings in 2026

Katarzyna Wachowicz informed that RFC NS-B dedicated RAG/TAG meeting is already planned for March 2026. The second joint RAG/TAG meeting will take place in Poland.

List of annexes and presentations:

All the presentations and annexes are available on the RFC NS-B website in the Download area <https://rfc8.eu/downloads/>.

- 1) Agenda for the RAG-TAG meeting on 22.11.2025
- 2) Annex 2 RAG slot
- 3) Annex 3 TAG slot
- 4) Annex 4a TCRs RFC5 2025 2027 RAG TAG
- 5) Annex 4b RFC NS-B TCRs for TT2026, TT2027
- 6) Annex 4 b1 TCR update RFC NS-B
- 7) Annex 4 b 2 RFC RD Rag-Tag TCR-Update
- 8) Annex 4 b 3 251022 RAG TAG RFC589 GeneralRenovation2026
- 9) Annex 5 a RAG TAG Meeting Vienna DB Cargo
- 10) Annex 5 b - Operational Performance
- 11) Annex 5 c Operational performance - RFC Rhine-Danube - 2025.10.22
- 12) Annex 6 a - TMS RAG-TAG
- 13) Annex 6 b - Introduction E TMS 2025-27 – RAGTAG
- 14) Annex 7 – 20251022 PaP Offer TT2027 Joint RAG-TAG REV2(1)

*Prepared by Patrycja Echarri
RFC NS-B Office*