

**Minutes of RECORDIT PROJECT
3rd Steering Committee Meeting
23-24 October 2000, Delft**

Present :

Andrea Ricci (AR)	ISIS	Michael Henriques (MH)	TETRAPLAN
Riccardo Enei (RE)	ISIS	Tim Gustav Weibel(TW)	TETRAPLAN
Tina Fera (TF)	ISIS	Michel Savy (MS)	LATTS/ENPC
Stephan Schmid (SS)	IER Stuttgart	Antoine Kunth (AK)	LATTS/ENPC
Rainer Friedrich (RF)	IER Stuttgart	Nienke Maas (NM)	TNO
Sigurd Weinreich (SW)	ZEW	Hanno Uiteboogaart (HU)	TNO
Georg Buehler (GB)	ZEW	Douwe-Frits Broens (DFB)	TNO
Oliviero Baccelli (OB)	Gruppo CLAS	Yannis Handanos (YH)	NTUA
Carlo Vaghi (CV)	Gruppo CLAS	Miroslav Capka (MC)	CDV
Ian Black (IB)	Cranfield University	Akos Radoczy (Ara)	RT-TRANS
Roger Seaton (RS)	Cranfield University		

Monday 23 October

1. News from FP5 and other relevant issues from the EC (interaction with other projects, etc.)

this point is skipped due to the absence of Commission' representatives

AR will contact Catharina Sikow to report on project advancement, and seek clarifications where needed. News from the UNITE project, if relevant, will be circulated.

ACTION : ISIS

2. Project status

AR presents a summary of the project status (slides attached)

Items faced :

- ◆ approval of D1: from July 31st - date of its submission - no feedback in writing has been received from the EC. In September AR met Catharina Sikow and Patrick Mercier who agreed to look through external and internal costs respectively. Although the contractual period of 2 months has elapsed, and D1 may therefore be considered as automatically approved, the RECORDIT Consortium agrees to seek formal confirmation
- ◆ Forthcoming submission of D2: the final Draft is handed out. It will be submitted to the EC in early November and circulated also to the Users.

3. Work in progress

- a) NM presents the current status of WP5: Data collection process and way forward. D5 will be finalised as per Technical Annex by end of January. Each PC will provide TNO with the following data on Tax, Charges and Subsidies concerning road, railway and port traffic by mid November. The following problems in data collection have been underlined:

Country	PC involved	Road, Railway, Port			Prices
		Tax	Charges	Subsidies	
Italy	ISIS	Y	Y	Y	Ongoing – deadline mid November
Austria					Ongoing – deadline mid November
Greece	NTUA	Y	Y	Y	Problem
Germany	ZEW	Y	Y	Y	Ongoing- collected together with internal costs
Switzerland		Problem: several ministries have to be contacted to have info on TC GB will keep TNO (HU) informed about the situation by November 6.			
Hungary	RT-TRANS	Y railway	Y railway	Y	No data on road sector
		Will check with HU by November 6			
Scandinavian border	TETRAPLAN	Y	Y	Y	Y, Hyperterminal price (road+rail)
France	LATTS	Y	Y		
Spain					Average price in corridor (ok from terminal to terminal)
Poland	To be checked with Polish partner				
Slovenia	To be checked with Hungary partner and further contacts (i.e via Austria)				

NM agrees on circulating an updated version of the table containing the column « social charges », takes responsibility to check the process of data collection and to make PCs keep to their commitments.

ACTION: ISIS, RT-TRANS, ZEW, LATTS, Academy of Economics, TNO

b) CV presents the current status of WP3: Data collection and way forward (slides attached)

Each PC is responsible for providing preferably disaggregated (or aggregated) data as well as prices on its own country up to the border. PCs' responsibilities in WP3 are the same as in Task 2.2. GRUPPO CLAS will

- circulate a table with PCs' responsibilities which serves as a confirmation for WP3 data collection by October 27.
- Circulate 3 files. Each PC has to fill them for the tri-modal corridors
- prepare a simplified version of the excel file presented during the meeting for the road transport.

The deadline for WP3 data collection is set by mid December.

ACTION. GRUPPO CLAS AND ALL

c) SS presents the current status of WP4: Data collection and way forward.

Task 4.1 will be finalised by end of November. Each PC will provide IER with the data needed by that date as follows:

Data on external costs

PC	Road	Rail	Inland waterway	Marine	Short-sea shipping	Notes
ISIS	Y	Y				
Gruppo CLAS	Y	N				
ZEW		Y				Contacted Deutsche Bahn, no answer
RT-TRANS	Problems both for costs and prices	Y				Already sent, but will send more
TNO			Y, will send more			
NTUA	Y			Y	Y	Already sent all the necessary data
CRANFIELD					Rotterdam-Felixstone	Will provide data on how to allocate costs to the units

IER will circulate a format for Energy supply in Rail transport which each PC has to fill in on a country basis by mid November in order to appraise the national electricity mix for Rail.

ACTION : IER and ALL

Open issues :

- ◆ shortage of information on location of nodal terminals
- ◆ extension of external cost calculation to nodes

Corridor segment	Data need	PC involved	Notes
1st corridor			
Genoa-Chiasso	Traffic volume of passenger cars	ISIS	(data needed for congestion)
2nd corridor			
Patras-Brindisi	Data on Pre-haulage	Gruppo Clas through CEMAT	
Brindisi-Verona-Brennero		ISIS	
Brennero-Kupstein		ZEW	
Danish border to Gothenborg		TETRAPLAN	data from 3 Ferry companies *
3rd corridor			
Barcellona-Ventimiglia		LATTS/ENPC	Problem with railway data on slots
Ventimiglia-Savona-Torino		ISIS	

Slovenia	traffic railway volume	RT-TRANS	Problems with road traffic
Slovakia	Road traffic	CDV*	
Poland - corridor Chyzne-Warsaw		Academy of Economics ?	

* 2 different routes have been taken into consideration (the first route – rail solution - is more internal, the second one – road solution - runs along the coast through the Czech borders-Budapest-Slovakian borders. GRUPPO CLAS and CDV have to reach a final decision asap.

ACTION : GRUPPO CLAS, CDV, Academy of Economics and ALL

4. Preparation of the Users Group meeting

The problem of the enlargement of the Users Group is strongly felt. There is a need for an alternative approach in order to get more cooperation from the Users' side.

MH suggests to adopt a double approach which the audience accepts:

- bilateral contacts with Intermodal operators
- invitation to UG meeting for associations

AR proposes

- to extend the range of the Users contact list, focusing more on contacts with operators involved in specific corridors (the aim should be to identify specific sets of data)
- to go back to WP2 for a good coverage of the corridor operators in order to further develop direct approach
- to split responsibilities between PCs (WP3) and, if necessary and feasible, to partially re-allocate resources originally assigned to reimbursement of expenses of UG participants.

5. Preparation of First Workshop and other dissemination activities

AR emphasizes that the success of the workshop depends on

- the possibility to present (if only preliminary) results on costs and prices of corridors
- the possibility to attract participants thanks to the concurrence of other professional events where the same attendees may be involved.
- Attendees' reimbursement of expenses for travel and subsistence

AR presents a proposal for the overall structure, the attendance expected, the possible categories of speakers (slides attached)

SW comments on the structure (too much based on Report presentations and not oriented towards the research work, tendency to present ready made solutions rather than asking for interactivity, comments from experts, risk of repetition)

After discussion, it is agreed that :

- the final decision about the date will be made by mid November (the current option is 16 March 2001).
- personal contacts with would-be attendees need to be established first, an attractive letter together with an attractive programme should be prepared for advertising
- the Workshop will last one day and it will take place in Athens
- the overall structure will be the following

▪ PLENARY SESSION	▪ The Recordit project presentation and the methodological issues (UNITE contributions), comments and discussion	▪ 10.00-13.00
▪ Lunch		
▪ 2 Concurrent sessions	▪ Policy issues ▪ Data and implementation issues	▪ 14.00-16.00
▪ PLENARY SESSION	▪ Conclusion	▪ 16.00-17.00

- The targeted attendance is of about 50 people (30 external experts and 20 people from the RECORDIT Consortium).
- YH will prepare a budget estimate contributions, including expenses for the experts to be invited.
- NTUA will issue a CD-Rom of the workshop in lieu of proceedings.

ACTION : ISIS, NTUA and ALL

As for other dissemination activities, YH informs the audience that 2 levels of passwords are presently operating on the website. The following ID and Passwords allow for access to the documents:

	first level (partners)	second level (Users)
ID	Partners	Usersgroup
Password	Athens2004	NTUAU123

It is decided that the following documents will be uploaded in « pdf format » to the website and will be accessible by the Users, too:

- Deliverables as soon as they are ready
- Slides of most of the presentations
- Minutes of the Users Group meetings

Tuesday 24 October

6. Users Group Meeting (see Minutes of the Users Group meeting)

7. Next steps

AR presents the Current state of advancement of WP7 and an outline of required inputs: from methodology to practice (slides attached).

It is decided that by mid November

- ISIS will prepare and circulate a text explaining cost drivers concept
- CRANFIELD and ENPC/LATTS with the contribution of TNO will prepare a preliminary list of policies and actions linked with cost drivers. It should contain intervention geared to fiscal policy and road pricing as well as measures to increase the productivity of the Intermodal

Transport Chain. The list will be circulated and enhanced by all PCs. The final list will be ready by end of November

ACTION : ISIS, CRANFIELD, LATTS, TNO and ALL

Points of concern are:

- How to integrate external costs into the DSS ? (due to the complex calculation process).
- Will the RECORDIT software actually be used ? (previous experience with databases and software developed within RTD projects suggests that it is difficult to achieve widespread diffusion).

Two paths (RF and MH suggestions) for its development are proposed:

1. No real generalisation: data and calculations are only provided for the three RECORDIT corridors, with however the possibility of carrying out extensive sensitivity analyses to test policy impact
2. Based on the interactive input of the DSS user, calculations of both internal and external costs for any corridor are made possible

AR suggests a compromise solution based on the use of the results of WP4 on the 3 corridors and the subsequent identification of ranges of values of external costs associated to typical intermodal segments.

AR will prepare a text on this subject and circulate it to both MH and RF.

ACTION : ISIS

MH presents brief preliminary issues related to WP6

MS presents WP8 (slides attached)

8. Administrative issues

AR informs about:

A. The 1st Cost Statement (period: January-December 2000)

AR reminds that 3 payments are envisaged throughout the RECORDIT Contract:

1. Advance (already received)
2. after the successful approval of First Cost Statements
3. At the end of the project (i.e. after 31 December 2001)

An ad-hoc excel file, called TRENELEC has to be used for Cost Statements preparation and submission. ISIS will check the integrity and usability of this with the EC and circulate the correct forms by mid November. Payment from EC is expected to be received within 6 months after Cost Statement submission.

In order to speed up the initial phase of the process of payment, it is proposed to submit the first Cost Statement by mid January 2001. Each Principal Contractor (PC) will make an effort to send ISIS two original signed copies of the Cost Statements by the second week of January.

NM raises the issue of how to report a delay in the work in progress both in the Cost Statement and the Management Report. AR replies that two cases need to be distinguished:

1. delay on a specific task
2. more general delay affecting future WPs.

In the first case, a formal notification to the EC should be made

The second case must absolutely be avoided. In fact, according to FP5 new rules, extensions of the project are no longer accepted.

ACTION: ISIS and ALL

B. The 2nd Management Report (coverage: June-December 2000)

ISIS, as the Coordinator, will be in charge of drafting the general part of the 2nd Management Report, while each WP leader will prepare a summary of the work carried out within the WP he leads in the period concerned.

The Management Report and the Cost Statement Report have to be submitted to the EC by January 15, 2001. Each WP leader to send ISIS its contribution by the second week of January.

ACTION: ISIS and WP leaders

C. The Mid Term Assessment (MTA) (due in January 2001)

It is a novelty of the FP5, and represents a important mandatory clause because it may become a tool for the EC to decide to stop the project. Since the timing of the MTA overlaps that of the Second Management Report (MR), ISIS will check with the EC whether the MTA may replace and incorporate the MR. ISIS will circulate the instructions on how to prepare the MTA and the MR as well as how to break down responsibilities among the Partners in due time.

A Mid-Term Assessment meeting with the EC is in principle scheduled in February 2001. Its organisation and participation (only the Commission and the Coordinator or only the WP leaders or else) have yet to be clarified. ISIS will check with the EC and inform the PCs.

A lower-than expected involvement of the User Group Members urges the Consortium to change the RECORDIT approach in an attempt to get more cooperation from the Users' side - perhaps through bilateral contacts which may imply visits to the Users' country and accordingly higher travel expenses for the PC involved. This may lead to a partial reallocation of the budget initially intended to cover their expenses for travel and subsistences and of data provision among the partners.

It needs to be checked with the EC whether the money allocated to the Coordinator for a specific purpose can be moved to another one and thus reallocated among the PCs.

ACTION: ISIS and ALL