

WP 6

EXPERT GROUP FINAL REPORT

Jorma Härkönen

3.6.2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Background | 1 |
| Setting Up the Expert Group | 2 |
| Observations of the Process | 3 |
| The Survey Results Assessment by the Expert Group | 4 |
| Interoperability Guideline Criteria for RB Intermodal Terminals.. | 6 |
| Proposal for the Key Nodal Points Along the RBGC | 7 |
| Proposed List of the Key Nodal Points on RBGC | 8 |
| Comments on WP 6 Final Report | 9 |

BACKGROUND

The Lead Partner of Rail Baltica Growth Corridor (RBGC) nominated LIMOWA Association of Finland to provide expert advice services to assist the productivity of Work Package 6 and to ensure the quality of the WP6 outcome. The practical working period was between November 2012 and May 2013 alongside the final stage of the WP 6 project itself. In this report we concentrate on the specific tasks of Expert Group. WP 6 responsible person Mr Aruna will issue the Final report which describes the whole outcome of the Pilot Logistics project.

Following targets were set for Expert Group by the Lead Partner:

Helping the Lithuanian project personnel to finalize the specifications for the logistics centers, the questionnaire to be sent to candidate companies and the list of all relevant existing and future logistics centers on the route of Rail Baltica. STATUS: DONE.

Setting up and leading the Expert Group, consisting of one logistics expert from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland; STATUS: DONE

Forming the interoperability criteria for the logistics centers; STATUS: GUIDELINE CRITERIA GIVEN IN THIS REPORT

After the project group has gathered all relevant information, making the final proposal with the help of Expert Group; STATUS: PROPOSAL IS DONE IN THIS REPORT

Attending four international meetings (St.Petersburg in October, Riga in November, Ludwigsfelde in December and Tallinn in January) to promote the above-mentioned activities. STATUS: DONE

The person in charge from LIMOWA Association c/o Technology Centre TechVilla Oy, Finland has been Jorma Härkönen, M.Sc (Econ), Director, Logistics.

SETTING UP THE EXPERT GROUP

In the WP6 work the most important target is to make an analysis and nomination of key nodal points for intermodal freight traffic on RBGC. Based on gathered survey results the task was to make a proposal for the Pilot Logistics nodal points for the next stage development. It was decided to have one person from five countries in the Expert Group. The person involved were expected to have a wide experience and credibility in the field of logistics in their native countries. The choice of persons was done by Jorma Härkönen and accepted by the Lead Partner.

Germany was left out of the group for the reason that the German end of RBGC, Grossbeeren GVZ (Berlin Süd) worked as a benchmark as well as the whole German GVZ system. There was no need of extra assessment there.

The following persons were nominated to the Expert Group:

Jorma Härkönen, Director of the LIMOWA Logistics Centre Cluster, Hyvinkää, Finland
Illimar Paul, Logistics Consultant, Managing Director, Sensei Oü, Tallinn, Estonia
Andris Spulis, Cluster Facilitator at Latvian Supply Chain Cluster, Riga., Latvia
Marcin Foltynski, Logistics Specialist, ILIM Logistics Institute, Poznan, Poland
Albertas Aruna, Leader of the WP6 Project Group, Vilnius, Lithuania

The Expert Group had a one full day kick-off meeting in Riga 23.11.2012 and after that the contacts have been maintained by e-mails and phone. Jorma Härkönen has been reporting about the progress in the RBGC project meetings in St.Petersburg, Ludwigsfelde, Tallinn and Riga during the process.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE PROCESS

Surprisingly big part of Expert Group work was needed to assist the project group to finalize the survey questionnaire itself. The Expert Group started this work immediately in Riga kick-off meeting 23.11.2012 and only after several addition and amendment rounds the final questionnaire was launched in January 25th 2013.

At the beginning there were really few answers received and the interest by terminal owners seemed to be really low towards the survey and the whole Rail Baltica project. In order to help in getting the replies, it was decided that each Expert Group member will contact the relevant respondents in their own country, explaining the logic and importance of reacting to the survey. After this round the complete picture and necessary replies were received from all other countries except Poland and, very surprisingly, Germany.

With the help of IPG, Potsdam the needed details of DUSS Grossbeeren terminal were finally received in May.

Poland appeared to be the problem until the very end of the working period. The terminals under different ownership compete hard against each other. Although they officially claim to be open for competing operators, they don't necessarily follow that principle in reality. Therefore they in some cases do not fulfill the criteria of a Freight Village.

The unfortunate end result of the Polish survey results is that proper responses were only received from Poznan area. Warsaw and Mazovian intermodal terminal owners did not react to numerous contacts and reminders at all. There will, however, be reported expert opinion results of Mazovian/Warsaw and Lodz area in the final WP 6 project report, based on general logistics analysis by project group itself and Marcin Foltynski's separate opinion. Generally speaking the overall response rate in Poland to the survey is clearly a failure and a disappointment.

The background reason in Poland probably is that there isn't any national logistics clusters and the competition between the regions ("Voivodships") makes the development very fragmented. For the next stage of RBGC there must be partners who will have a clear mandate to work in the whole territory of Poland and co-ordinate the work of regional experts

THE SURVEY RESULTS ASSESSMENT BY THE EXPERT GROUP

After the Lithuanian WP 6 project leader had finally received the responses they were sent to Expert group members for assessment. The survey results themselves are documented in the WP 6 Final report.

In order to rationalize the Expert Group work a separate template was produced asking the members of the group to reply the following questions. The trend and the most important contents of replies are summarized under each separate question. The full answers by country can be found in the attached material for the use of RBGC co-ordinator.

How satisfied are you in general with the survey and received data?

There was criticism especially to the lengthy process but also opinions that apart from Poland the results are satisfactory. The received data was seen partly irrelevant (although the questionnaire was amended several times by expert group requests). Polish low level of responses was a clear disappointment

How satisfied are you with the survey and received data as to your own country?

The replies vary depending on the country.

Is/are there any relevant logistics centre(s) missing in your own country/in other countries?

Reasonably well except in Poland. Warsaw and Lodz are missing there.

Is the data enough to make a suggestion of key nodal intermodal terminals along Rail Baltic?

The data generally speaking is enough. In Poland it is more based on professional opinion than the received data.

Is the data enough to assess the interoperable capabilities of the intermodal terminals?

Most experts were in doubt of this. The basic criteria can be given (and is given in this report) but in full strategic, operational and technical level more data and more detailed studies are needed. The criteria given can be a guiding tool towards the complete list of requirements.

In your country, do authorities (at central, regional and local level) co-operate in the Freight Village development. Do bureaucracy and conflicting political interests slow down the development?

The situation differs from country to country. The awareness and support of the intermodal transports and nodal points generally are growing. Especially the regional own interests and the level of investment in infrastructure cause worries.

In your own country, do you see that national transport policies favour rail transports?

Not everywhere. Road transports are still toll free in most of the countries and rail transports are burdened by several additional fees. However, the official statements are in favour of rail transport and the environmental aspects play an important role in this.

In your own country, do you think that environmental concern is a reality, influencing the intermodal choice?

Replies vary again but the general trend everywhere is towards bigger awareness of environmental decisions needed and the role of logistics in this. In many cases, however, it is still more in speeches than in real action.

In your own country, do the national conditions and regulations conflict with the EU Transport Policy which is strongly promoting TEN-T corridors and intermodal transport systems?

No bigger conflicts were seen. In Finland there is a political decision process going on, however, which is not in favour of rail transports. The maximum masses and heights of lorries are to be increased up to 76 tons and 4,4 meters as a part of compensation package for the new sulphur directive in Baltic Sea.

In your opinion which is/are the right location(s) for Rail Baltic nodal point? How do the survey results support that choice?

Based on the replies and WP6 project work the proposed list is given in this report (page 8).

In your opinion, what are the most critical interoperability requirements for a Rail Baltic nodal point?

The guideline criteria is given in this report but the most crucial things are related to terminal infrastructure, ICT service structure, handling equipment, legislation synchronisation and removal of legislative, administrative and operational barriers of co-operation between the terminals in different countries.

Your other comments about RB, WP6 process and the work of Expert Group

There was either no comments or a shared feeling that the work could have been started earlier.

INTEROPERABILITY GUIDELINE CRITERIA FOR RB INTERMODAL TERMINALS

The interoperability question between nodal points in six countries is quite complicated. That's why we took two approaches to the question:

- interoperability in the nodal point itself (intermodal terminal) and in its surrounding areas
- interoperability between the future Rail Baltica freight villages, along the corridor network

Our guideline criteria given here must be taken as a guideline tool for further analysis and decisions. There are multiple technical and operational challenges to overcome until we can realistically talk about a fully integrated chain of nodal points.

1. NODAL POINT

- 1.1 Road access for trucks for loading allowance of 11 tn/axle
- 1.2 Gate services with "Check in/check out area" provided with sufficient parking areas
- 1.3 Enough rail track capacity for smooth handling and transshipment matching the traffic volume. Exact criteria to be set.
- 1.4 Rail mounted gantry cranes with sufficient capacity (RMG). Technical criteria to be set.
- 1.5 Two or three interim storage or buffer lanes; reserve area
- 1.6 EU standard safety regulations set and followed in the terminal area
- 1.7 Double sided rail access with direct entry and departure of the train by the main line traction unit; enabling smooth and fast operations of the trains
- 1.8 Multipurpose activity enabled in the terminal (SWAP bodies, semitrailers, containers, re Fridgerated, ADR goods)

2. CORRIDOR NETWORK

- 2.1 Quality management system (ISO 9001) introduced
- 2.2 Environmental management system (ISO 14001) introduced
- 2.3 Security management system (ISO28000 scheme) introduced

2.4. The ICT infrastructure serving the whole chain; transparency, technical compatibility, real-time information services

2.5 National and regional administrative and operational barriers have to be removed

2.6 Neutrality and openness of terminals for all operators and clients

PROPOSAL FOR THE KEY NODAL POINTS ALONG THE RBGC

During the process it became obvious what kind of nodal points are essential along the Rail Baltica Growth Corridor. The requirements are quite logical:

- the key nodal points must be in the crossroads of the main corridors, highways and railway lines.
- they must serve a larger zone around them.
- they are in the proximity of the bigger cities, serving big enough business and consumer demand.
- there must a space and plans for future development of international intermodal services

Following this logic we are proposing the following intermodal terminals to be chosen for the key nodal points of RBGC. The nine nodal points are listed from north to south.

Please note: Although the list excludes St. Petersburg at this stage, it is elementary to be included in the next stage planning. There are several options for the nodal point location still to be considered. Many of them are being developed at the moment to meet the requirements of container operations.

Proposed list of key nodal points on RBGC

- 1. Kouvola intermodal terminal, Finland**
- 2. Port of Vuosaari intermodal terminal, Finland**
- 3. Muuga intermodal terminal, Estonia**
- 4. Riga Schenker intermodal terminal (until the new terminal is being built in Salaspils area on Riga future bypass railroad), Latvia**
- 5. Kaunas Palemonas intermodal terminal, Lithuania**
- 6. Mazovia/Warsaw, Poland (exact location to be further studied)**
- 7. Lodz**
- 8. Wielkopolska region/Poznan**
- 9. Berlin Grossbeeren (Berlin Süd)**