

**Minutes of RECORDIT PROJECT
4th Steering Committee Meeting
3rd of April 2001, Athens**

Present:

1. Catharina Sikow (CS)	EC
2. Andrea Ricci (AR)	ISIS
3. Ricardo Enei (RE)	ISIS
4. Claudia Vannoni (CLV)	ISIS
5. Stephan Schmid (SS)	IER Stuttgart
6. Sigurd Weinreich (SW)	ZEW
7. Georg Buehler (GB)	ZEW
8. Carlo Vaghi (CV)	Gruppo CLAS
9. Ian Black (IB)	Cranfield University
10. Roger Seaton (RS)	Cranfield University
11. Michael Henriques (MH)	TETRAPLAN
12. Tim Gustav Weibel(TW)	TETRAPLAN
13. Michel Savy (MS)	LATTS/ENPC
14. Nienke Maas (NM)	TNO
15. Hanno Uiteboogaart (HU)	TNO
16. Yannis Handanos (YH)	NTUA
17. Yannis Golias (YG)	NTUA
18. Dimitris Tsamboulas (DT)	NTUA
19. Miroslav Capka (MC)	CDV
20. Akos Radoczy (AKA)	RT-TRANS

1. Debriefing after Workshop (2nd of April, Athens)

AR gives an overview on the Recordit Workshop summarising as follows:

1. High level of participation
2. Intense discussions
3. Debate mainly concentrated on the results of the external cost analysis.

Debate:

MS, CS: the reaction of the operators to the numerical values presented during the Workshop is probably geared to their perception that the future position of the European Commission could be influenced by the results of Recordit.

AR raises the issue of the lack of involvement of, and of data from the railways operators.

CS suggests to analyse a study on the estimation of marginal infrastructure costs of the Finnish rail network.

RS will contact some UK railways operators in order to collect more data.

AR will prepare a document to be sent to the Workshop participants stressing the need for additional comments and contributions, particularly on the data presented during the workshop.

WP3, WP4 and WP5 leaders will also prepare a shortlist of critical points to be attached to the mentioned document.

After discussion, it is agreed to finalise D3, D4, and D5 on the basis of data currently available while any further change in data collected will be implemented directly within WP7.

ACTION: ISIS, TNO, IER, CLAS, Cranfield University

2. Administrative issues

AR presents an overview of the current situation.

The Mid Term Report prepared by ISIS with the contribution from all PCs was approved by the European Commission.

Cost statements are being processed by the financial cell of DG TREN

Concerning future actions, the second (and last) Cost Statements are due at the end of the project.

AR asks for comments on the choice of the venue and the date of the final conference.

CS suggests to choose Bruxelles instead of Rome for the final conference of Recordit in order to facilitate the participation of European Commission' representatives.

3. Finalisation of WP3/D3

CV presents the main contents of D3.

It is agreed to introduce a section in order to stress that data presented within D3 are corridor dependent; therefore the generalisation of the main results of WP3 analysis will be carried out in WP7.

CV presents the current status of data collection along the three corridors:

1. Patras – Gothenburg:
 - Intermodal solution analysis: well assessed
 - Road solution analysis: partially assessed
2. Genoa – Manchester:
 - Intermodal solution analysis: well assessed

CV raises the issue of a partial lack of data for the segment between Rotterdam and Felixstowe.

IB will provide Gruppo Clas with additional data on this link.

- Road solution analysis: well assessed
3. Barcelona – Warsaw:
 - Intermodal solution analysis: partially assessed.

CV raises the issue of a partial lack of data for French, Spanish, Polish and Hungarian railway segment.

- Road solution analysis: more advanced than the IT option.

CV will include time costs within the internal costs already assessed in order to complete the analysis.

CV will finalise the D3 by the end of April, if still missing data are available.

All the PCs agree on the importance of analysing the three corridors also by segments even though, currently, some corridor sections are not market related and completely developed yet.

ACTION: Gruppo Clas, Cranfield University

4. Finalisation of WP4/D4

SS presents the main contents of D4.

SS underlines that the external costs are basically calculated in terms of Euro per vehicle*kilometres rather than per loading unit. In order to translate the output data into Euro per loading unit (LU), it is necessary to define the type of LU and the load factor to be used for the calculation.

After discussion, it is agreed to hold a technical session at the end of the meeting in order to define a common set of technical parameters, including the type of LU to consider for evaluating costs.

SS presents a summary of the current status of WP4.

Items faced:

1. Air pollution: well advanced
2. Accident: partially assessed

SS highlights some problems in data collection especially for the third corridor (from Barcelona to Warsaw). The lack of data concerns the following countries:

- France
- Spain
- Croatia
- Slovenia
- Slovakia
- Poland
- Hungary

3. Congestion: partially assessed

SS raises the issue of a partial lack of data for the French and the Swedish segment. Data gaps for congestion hold of course also for all countries on the third corridor, except Italy.

4. Noise: partially assessed.

SS asks the partners to complete the required information on traffic volume on roads (Average daily traffic, if possible disaggregated to the hour of the day).

SS asks the partners to gather additional information needed for railways noise estimation: the number of trains (passengers and freight) for three time-periods (07.00 – 19.00; 19.00-23.00; 23.00-07.00) in both directions along the selected corridors. An E-mail with more detailed information would specify further requirements.

SS underlines the necessity to proceed by analogy, whenever required, in the final assessment of the external costs due to noise because of a definitive lack of input data.

MS will provide data on accidents for the French and Spanish segments and improved data on traffic flows for the French portion of the third corridor for other than the summer (holiday) period.

AKA will provide data on accidents (reference year: 1995) and on traffic flows for Hungary. Whenever feasible, he will provide data on accidents also for Slovenia.

MC could provide data on accidents from a data bank. He takes responsibility to collect data on traffic flows for Slovenia (deadline 20th of April).

IB will contact the CU sub – contractor (D.Kisperska-Moron (DKM)) to check upon current progress concerning data for the Polish segment.

SS raises the issue of homogeneity with the approach followed in the UNITE project where the monetary evaluation of externalities does not include taxes.

CS states that the choice of the methodology must be done within the project consortium. On the other hand, the results of two alternative approaches should be always comparable.

In order to be consistent with the UNITE approach SS plans to finalise D4 by the end of May.

ACTION: IER, LATTIS/ENPC, RT-TRANS, CDV, Cranfield University TNO, ISIS, ZEW, TETRPLAN

5. Finalisation of WP5/D5

NM underlines that the major problems arisen in the Work Package 5 concern subsidies and marshalling charges evaluation.

NM asks to PCs to send comments on the draft of D5 circulated during the Workshop.

Concerning the D5 finalisation, it is agreed:

- To incorporate in the D5 some output tables containing data classified by type of taxes (slides attached);
- To refine numerical results (deadline 15th of April)
- To incorporate any comment on the D5 contents before the 23rd of April
- To finalise the D5 by the end of April

ACTION: TNO and All

6. WP8: Start up: detailed planning work

MS illustrates contents, timing and distribution of tasks between partners in order to achieve the WP8 objectives (see attached slides): identifying and analysing the means to reduce the door-to-door intermodal transport costs. The focus is on two classes of means: technological and organisational, in addition with the identification of actors involved, i.e. operators, public organisations, etc. The timing proposed is the following:

- April, for the identification of means to be analysed;
- May, for synthesis analysis and definition of cluster of policies;
- June, production of draft report with the assessment of costs reduction.

The partners involved in the WP8, each for own country, should provide information on the actors, the organisational and technological means that could reduce costs, according to the following scheme:

- IER, (Germany) and for the external costs
- Gruppo Clas, (Italy) for the internal costs;
- Cranfield, (Uk) for SSS;
- TNO (Netherland) for IWW;
- ENPC (France) and co-ordination

AR suggests that a preliminary step in order to ensure the effective implementation of the above tasks should be the drafting of a list of sensible costs items or blocks, to be linked with specific policies (or clusters).

CV asks who is in charge to study possible policies to avoid technical inefficiencies in segments of the corridors not covered directly by partner's country.

MS agrees with the proposals providing a short list of cost items in the next days.

CLV suggests the need to provide the specification of cost items as more detailed as possible, in order to facilitate their implementation through the DSS.

ACTION: ENPC, IER, Gruppo CLAS, Cranfield, TNO

7. WP9: Start up: detailed planning work

IB illustrates the contents and timing of WP9 (see attached slides).

It is agreed that negative impacts of policies, if any (e.g. increase of certain costs) must also be accounted for.

IB asks how in the context of WP7 it could be possible to calculate the impacts on costs of intermodal with a “zone to zone” approach, i.e. considering the impacts along the catchment areas between two points of origin/destinations.

AR suggests calculating the impacts “zone to zone” on the basis of the level of disaggregation of data on territorial scale, if the information of flows and demand elasticity will be available.

CS suggests taking in account the results of SCENES project in order to estimate the coefficients of elasticity in freight transportation area.

IB suggests that WP8 should incorporate the analysis of the barriers to implementation of recommended policies, using the approach of TENASSESS. In doing so, a partial redistribution of man-months between WPs should be arranged.

AR asks to specify the proposed redistribution of men-months and the related partners involved in the next days.

Although it is recognised that the final deadline of end-December is very tight, it is agreed that all efforts must be made to match this deadline, as no contract extension is realistically envisageable.

ACTION: Cranfield

8. WP6: Current state and detailed planning for future work

MH introduces WP6 concerning the relationship between prices and costs (see attached slides).

One of the main problems is on the prices side. Prices collected so far are just a little sample to be used for the purposes of an effective comparison.

A reference to other EC projects, i.e. SOFTICE, is recommended to fill the gap of data.

MH then illustrates contents and timing of sub-tasks 6.1 and 6.2. With reference to the sub-task 6.1 (analysis of real costs versus current costs), the methodological issue to be defined is whether we have to compare specific charges and taxes with external costs or we have to compare the sum of taxes and charges on one side and the total external costs on the other.

AR supports the latter approach, claiming that the main objective of the project is to quantify the gap between direct costs (including taxes and charges) and external costs, and not to assess the capability of one specific tax or charge to cover externalities. It would be consistent with the project objectives to avoid linkages or causal effects between tax or charge and external costs.

SW recommends avoiding the direct comparison between taxes, charges and external costs when the tax or charge to be compared is not clearly devoted to cover externalities, i.e. mineral oil tax. Especially the tax on oil is mainly raised due to fiscal reasons.

SS agrees.

MH concludes the presentation of task 6.1 indicating the distribution of tasks among partners and timing.

The distribution of tasks among partners will be the following:

- taxes and charges with external costs (TNO);
- real costs with current costs (Gruppo CLAS);
- intermodal versus all-road costs (ISIS).

The deadline for partners is May 15th.

Sub-task 6.2, devoted to the analysis of prices, is strongly related to the findings of WP3, WP4 and WP5.

To allow WP6 to proceed without delays, AR suggests to finalise WP3, WP4 and WP5 along a corridor-related sequence, in the following order:

1. Genova-Manchester;
2. Patras-Gothenburg;
3. Barcellona-Warsaw

MH,TW agree to use the first corridor as a first input to WP6, and to build up the structure of the comparisons and afterwards expand this when data from the remaining two corridors were available.

ACTION: TETRAPLAN, ISIS, NTUA, IER, Gruppo CLAS, TNO

9. Dissemination activities: current state and future activities

NTUA will upload D1 and D2 on project website, with no password required, as well as information on the Athens Workshop (agenda, list of participants and presentations).

ISIS and NTUA will provide a mailing list of the participants to the Workshop to be included in a long list of potential “users” of Recordit findings, i.e. intermodal operators, institutions, etc.

The final conference of the project will be held in Brussels (approximately during the second week between 12th and 15th), with two other days (one before and one later) to accommodate a project meeting.

ACTION: NTUA, ISIS

10. WP7: current state and detailed planning for future work

AR asks to the partners whether, after the detailed presentation during the Workshop, some other issues have to be discussed. Concerning the three sections of DSS:

1. analysis of internal costs
2. policy evaluation
3. analysis of external costs

the issue of how to manage the external costs through the DSS is undoubtedly the first to be dealt with.

MH introduces some hints (see attached slides) concerning the method to generalise the external costs, typically corridor-specific, to a new corridor. The paths would start with the description of the new corridor through key parameters being able to influence the external costs:

- physical,
- meteorological
- technical.

The second step would estimate the external cost of the new corridor taking as reference the external costs of an existing corridor with similar characteristics (physical, meteorological, technical).

SS suggests that within the calculation of external costs through a method of generalisation, the problems differ between external cost categories and that possibly the 'level of detail' for the assessment should take into account the relative importance of the respective category.

- global warming, for instance, is simple to handle, as impacts are not related to surrounding
- the risk of accidents could be estimated with reference to national, average, values.

An appropriate method of generalisation should be defined for congestion, air pollution and noises.

While for congestion and air polluting an appropriate segmentation of corridor could estimate average external costs, for the noise the generalisation is quite difficult, due the extreme detailed information required to the users.

MH suggests that owing to the huge type of information required, the DSS should guide the user to select the appropriate technical characteristics of the new corridor.

AR suggests that the location of corridor would be the first criteria the user has to choose, followed by the type of externality to be assessed.

SS adds the vehicle technology, i.e. selecting the prevailing energy standard (Euro1, 2, 3)

MH also proposes the use of maps

SS will provide the related technical information to validate the use of parameters for the assessment of external costs.

ACTION: TETRAPLAN, IER

11. AOB

A technical session takes place between the partners in charge for WP3, WP4, WP5 in order to defining some common technical assumption (type of LU, vehicle type) for the estimation of costs (both internal and external). A list of basic parameters relating to rail, urban, SSS and inland waterways vehicles is drafted, to be validated by the intermodal operators participating in the Workshop.

The next project meeting is planned for July 2nd in Copenhagen.

ACTION: TNO, IER, Gruppo CLAS