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1 – EIM – A quick introduction

EIM in a nutshell
- Founded: March 2002
- Legal entity: AISBL (International Non-Profit Association)
- Office: Brussels, Belgium
- Coverage: 11 countries
- Members: 12 full members and 3 associate members
- President: Pier Eringa (ProRail)
- Executive Director: Monika Heiming

Contact
- Address: Square de Meeûs 1, B-1000 Brussels
- Phone: +32 2 234 37 70
- Website: www.eimrail.org
- E-mail: info@eimrail.org

Mission
- EIM promotes the development, improvement and efficient delivery of rail infrastructure in the EU
- EIM represents its members’ political, technical and business interests to all relevant EU institutions
- EIM supports business development by providing a forum for cooperation

Vision
- EIM supports an open and seamless European rail network, promoting a safe and sustainable transport system

See our new Annual Report 2017: http://www.eimrail.org/publications/annual-reports-list
The value chain:
- Planning
- Building
- Operating
- Maintaining

The functions:
- Extended role
- Multimodality
- Interoperability
- Safety
- ERTMS & Signalling
- Customer management
- Traffic management
- Asset Management
- Digitalisation
- Cyber-/Security
Our business:
- Planning
- Building
- Operating
- Maintaining

Our tasks:
- Funding & resources
- Renewals & upgrades
- Traffic management
- Contingency management
- Safe operations
- ERTMS & Signalling
- Repairs & Maintenance
- Life Cycle Costing
- Digitalisation
-...

Strategy
- Long-term planning
- Funding
- Human resources
- Relationship with regulator and public funders
- Capacity allocation and charges

Investments
- Renewing and enhancing the rail infrastructure
- Ultimate design and development of projects
- Project management and delivery or procurement
- Land ownership

Operations
- Operating a safe network (operation and control centres)
- Meeting needs of customers (RUs and ext stakeholders)
- Path allocation
- Signalling/ Traffic management
- Ensure safety and meet customer needs

Maintenance
- Whole life management of assets
- Maintenance working closely with Asset Management teams
- Data collection to improve decision making
- Minor renewals and enhancements
3 – Cross border infrastructure management

Main comments:

- Rail infrastructure is a national asset and thus not “international”;
- Rail Baltica is the first multi-shareholder project of its kind and thus unique (no comparable best practice);
- The single European railway area (SERA) with seamless cross-border operations is still not the norm, but an exception;
- A successful cross-border rail infrastructure requires harmonised political, technical, financial and operational rules and procedures;
- Rail Baltica has the unique chance to become the “best in class” example for a successful multi-country EU compliant infrastructure project and in future cross-border IM.

Adoption of the 4th RP which fosters cross-border traffic (e.g. vehicle authorisations and safety certifications via the EU Agency for Railways; liberalisation of national rail passenger markets);
- Directive 2012/34 on the SERA (Recast) allows Member Stages to establish cross-border agreements to facilitate cross-border traffic;
- Platform of rail infrastructure managers in Europe (PRIME) addressing rail infrastructure issues, incl cross-border topics;
- EC initiative “Issue Log” to overcome technical-operational obstacles to cross-border traffic;
- Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) to fund cross-border missing links;
- Rail Baltica benefits from wider EU support (incl from EIM).

Technical harmonisation ‘in progress’:
- Different technical rules and legacy systems across the EU -> there are no best practice rules, yet – but the EU and the sector are working on it;
- Operational harmonisation ‘in progress’:
  - Different operational rules across the EU, e.g. language, contingency management, commercial conditions and other aspects, etc. -> harmonisation initiatives have been launched;
- Different procurement rules: not an issue for national projects but well for cross-border projects like Rail Baltica;
- Fiscal and financial incentives to foster cross-border traffic by rail incl the related feeder lines;
- Lack of data for cross-border sections to support planning and facilitate quick project uptake and cross-border traffic.

Good approaches on EU level

Challenges on EU level
3 – Cross border infrastructure management

Examples

- Channel Tunnel (UK/FR): inter-governmental committee;
- High-speed line between Perpignan Figueres (FR/ES): harmonised governance during project delivery (incl on procurement);
- Fehmarnbelt Fixed Link road/rail tunnel (DE/DK): risk allocation between countries in project delivery;
- Brenner Base Tunnel (AT/IT): solution-oriented (and not code-oriented) project delivery.

Non-key success factors to avoid

- Cultural differences to rules, standards and regulation;
- Operational differences between countries and railway operations;
- Double work (each side works on its own), increasing costs and delays;
- Different procurement rules*;
- Lack of data and transparency.

* We are probably witnessing a paradigm change on EU level, reducing the emphasis of political discretion but increasing the regulatory oversight and execution.
## 4 – Governance benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Border</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trieste-Divaca</td>
<td>IT-SI</td>
<td>EEIG among IMs</td>
<td>The creation of a European Economic Interest Grouping reassured the European Commission and INEA. The project was strongly pushed by coordinator Brinkhorst (now Radicovà). Both Member States and IMs have their respective fora (IGC &amp; EEIG) while they also meet in the framework of the corridor.</td>
<td>The Intergovernmental Commission does not guarantee success. Trieste-Divaca was criticised by the Commission in 2013 for a delay that was due to a lack of commitment by IT. Local authorities are not directly involved in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euralpine Tunnel Lyon-Turin</td>
<td>FR-IT</td>
<td>IGC among MS</td>
<td>Coordination through unique project promoter. Sufficient means and competence to develop the project. Having a single President/Head makes the representation of the company more cohesive.</td>
<td>Unbalanced relationships between France and Italy: More funding from Italy. Most of the works are on FR territory. Share of public financing is very high and is therefore relying on political decisions → less certainty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Baltica</td>
<td>EE-LT-LV</td>
<td>Stock company</td>
<td>Unique project promoter: Special Purpose Vehicle. Strong political commitment. Strong support from the European Commission and coordinator.</td>
<td>RB Rail is a mix of different governance models (3 companies holding the shares of RB RAIL SA) that are ultimately controlled by Ministers from the 3 Member States. This is a challenge to the operational capacity of the joint company.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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