# Evaluation of Regulation (EU) 913/2010 of the European Parliament and the Council of 22 September 2010 concerning a European rail network for competitive freight

### Targeted survey questionnaire[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |
| --- |
| Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 on the European rail network for competitive freight established rules for the selection, organisation, management and indicative planning of investments, concerning eleven Rail Freight Corridors (RFCs). The objective was to improve: the coordination between different stakeholders on the management of the railways; access to infrastructure and investment in rail infrastructure; and the continuity of traffic in all countries. Among others, the Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 introduced the concept of international Pre-arranged Train Paths (PaPs) to offer capacity on the RFCs and the setting up of the Corridor One-stop shop (C-OSS) to facilitate train path management for international rail freight. The European Commission has asked TRT, supported by M-Five, MC-Vienna and TEPR, to undertake an evaluation study of the Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 (the RFC Regulation). This aims at identifying its impacts by comparing the actual development in the rail freight sector, i.e. with the Regulation in place, to a baseline scenario describing the likely development that would have occurred without this intervention. This will feed into quantitative and qualitative analyses on the implementation of the legal framework for rail freight and the functioning of the RFCs. Your responses to the interview questions will be used to help us assess the various aspects of the Regulation. If you have any queries, please contact at TRT Trasporti e Territorio Enrico Pastori (pastori@trt.it) or Marco Brambilla (brambilla@trt.it). |

# GDPR[[2]](#footnote-2), anonymity and use of your input

The study team will make use of your contribution (information/data provided) only for the needs of this evaluation support study. Please indicate how you would like us to present the information provided:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Publication of your contribution with reference to the organisation represented | [ ]  |
| Any information that you provide will be used for the purpose of the evaluation study, without reference to your name or organisation, but only with reference to the industry sector/type of the organisation | **[ ]**  |
| Anonymised publication of statements made without the name of the organisation and without affiliation to industry sector | **[ ]**  |

# Information on your organisation

**1.1 Please provide the following information concerning the organisation you represent**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the organisation |  |
| Country |  |
| The answers to this questionnaire also cover the following other organisations (e.g. subsidiaries belonging to the same group of companies) |  |
| Position in the organisation  |  |
| Contact person name(s)  |  |
| Email address(es) |  |
| Telephone number(s) |  |

**1.2 Do you take part in the governance structure of any RFC?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Executive Board | [ ]  |
| Management Board/European Economic Interest Grouping (EEIG) | **[ ]**  |
| Railway Undertaking Advisory Group (RAG) | **[ ]**  |
| Terminal Advisory Group (TAG) | **[ ]**  |
| Please specify the role in the governance of the RFC: |

**1.3 Please indicate the RFC(s) that you know better or where you carry out your business. We assume that your replies to the rest of the questions will reflect your experience in these RFCs**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| All RFCs | [ ]  |
| Corridor 1 ‘Rhine-Alpine’ | **[ ]**  |
| Corridor 2 ‘North Sea-Mediterranean’ | **[ ]**  |
| Corridor 3 ‘Scandinavian-Mediterranean’ | **[ ]**  |
| Corridor 4 ‘Atlantic’ | **[ ]**  |
| Corridor 5 ‘Baltic-Adriatic’ | **[ ]**  |
| Corridor 6 ‘Mediterranean’ | **[ ]**  |
| Corridor 7 ‘Orient/East-Med’ | **[ ]**  |
| Corridor 8 ‘North Sea-Baltic’ | **[ ]**  |
| Corridor 9 ‘Czech-Slovak’ (future ‘Rhine Danube’) | **[ ]**  |
| Corridor 10 ‘Alpine-Western Balkan’ | **[ ]**  |
| Corridor 11 ‘Amber’ | **[ ]**  |

**1.4 In how many of the EU Member States and other states involved in the RFCs do you provide international rail freight services?**

In answering this question, please consider rail freight services provided in the **EU Member States and in other countries involved in the RFCs**: 27 EU Member States, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland and United Kingdom.

Rail freight services are either provided by a single RU – or several RUs belonging to the same group of RUs – for the entire journey (‘open access mode’) or by several RUs which hand over trains to each other (‘cooperative mode’).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | Please explain, if necessary |
| Number of countries in which we provide(d) international rail freight services in open access mode |  |  |  |  |
| Total number of countries in which we provide(d) international rail freight service, i.e. either in open access or in cooperative mode |  |  |  |  |
| Estimated share of international rail freight services provided in open access mode (on the long haul, i.e. excluding first and last mile, e.g. in ports) in total international rail freight services (‘open access’ and ‘cooperative mode’)Please estimate the share in % roughly based on train-km. |  |  |  |  |

**1.5 Other countries in which you provide international rail freight services**

In answering this question, please consider all countries which are not EU Member States and which are not involved in the RFCs (i.e. all countries not included in the list of countries in question 1.4).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | Please explain, if necessary |
| Number of countries in which we provide(d) international rail freight services |  |  |  |  |
| Please list the 5 countries with the highest volume of international rail freight services (tonnes) among the countries indicated above. |  |  |  |  |

# General

**2.1 In your opinion, are the following objectives of the Regulation still relevant to the needs of the market?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| General objective | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not any more | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Improving coordination between infrastructure managers, Member States, railway undertakings and terminal owners/operators, both between these different groups of actors and – within the groups – across borders | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Coordinating and planning investments to ensure that infrastructure capacities and capabilities available along the corridor meet the needs of international rail freight traffic, including as regards interoperability | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Improving operational conditions for international rail freight services, in particular by coordinating traffic management along the corridors, including in the event of disturbance and monitor the performance of rail freight services on the corridors | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Guaranteeing international freight trains access to adequate infrastructure capacity, recognizing the needs of other types of transport, including passenger transport | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Facilitating the use of rail infrastructure for international rail freight services and support fair competition between rail freight service providers | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Improving intermodality along the corridors  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**2.2 In your opinion, how effective has the Regulation been in meeting the following specific objectives?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Specific objective | Very effective | Moderately effective | Slightly effective | Not effective | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Improving coordination between infrastructure managers, Member States, railway undertakings and terminal owners/operators, both between these different groups of actors and – within the groups – across borders | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Coordinating and planning investments to ensure that infrastructure capacities and capabilities available along the corridor meet the needs of international rail freight traffic, including as regards interoperability | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Improving operational conditions for international rail freight services, in particular by coordinating traffic management along the corridors, including in the event of disturbance and monitor the performance of rail freight services on the corridors | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Guaranteeing international freight trains access to adequate infrastructure capacity, recognizing the needs of other types of transport, including passenger transport | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Facilitating the use of rail infrastructure for international rail freight services and support fair competition between rail freight service providers | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Improving intermodality along the corridors  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Please indicate any other matter that you considered has been influenced by the introduction of the Regulation (EU) 913/2010: |

**2.4 Which are the key barriers to increasing the competitiveness and the market share of rail freight? (OPC)[[3]](#footnote-3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Key barrier | 1 Highest importance | 2 High importance | 3 Moderate importance | 4 Small importance | 5 Not important at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Lack of price competitiveness of rail freight transport services compared to other transport modes (e.g., road) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Lack of quality of rail freight transport services, in particular lack of punctuality, predictability and flexibility caused e.g. by sub-optimum operational practices and/or business models of rail service providers | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Lack of capacity to serve the actual or potential transport demand | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Lack of flexibility to meet shippers’ needs | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Lack of customer orientation of infrastructure managers | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Interoperability barriers for rail (e.g. different track gauges, electrification standards, safety and signalling systems and operational rules) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Lack of level playing field between different transport modes (e.g. lack of consistent application of ‘polluter pays’ and ‘user pays’ principles) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Structural economic changes that put rail at disadvantage, in particular the decline in commodities for which rail transport is particularly suitable (e.g., bulk cargo such as coal) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other key barriers, please specify: |  |

**2.8 Which side effects did the Regulation have (i.e. effects that were not intended by the Regulation)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Side effects that had an overall impact on international rail freight | Please specify | Please explain, if necessary |
| Positive impact |  |  |
| Negative impact |  |  |

# Designation of the RFCs – Definition, creation and modification (Articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7)

**3.1 To which extent do you agree with the following statements as regards the lines designated to the RFCs include all lines relevant for international rail freight traffic?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statement | Fully agree | Partially agree | Do not agree | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Overall, the network formed by the RFCs includes the lines most relevant for international freight traffic | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The network formed by the RFCs includes most relevant principal lines but important diversionary lines are missing | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Some important lines are missing (please specify) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**3.3 Does the possibility to establish ‘further’ rail freight corridors (Article 5) contribute to achieving the objectives of the Regulation?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes, to a large extent | Yes, to a moderate extent | Yes, to some extent | No, not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

# Governance structure of the RFCs (Article 8)

**4.1 Are the role, competences and responsibilities of the Executive Board clearly enough defined to perform its functions?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes, to a large extent | Yes, to a moderate extent | Yes, to some extent | No, not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**4.2 In which of the following areas can the Executive Board of a rail freight corridor contribute to achieving the objectives of the Regulation?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Area | Executive Board can contribute | Executive Board did contribute in practice | Please explain, if necessary |
| **To a large extent** | **To a moderate extent** | **To a small extent** | **Not at all** | **Do not know** | **To a large extent** | **To a moderate extent** | **To a small extent** | **Not at all** | **Do not know** |
| Improving coordination of freight transport policy between different Member States | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Improving coordination between Member States and rail freight stakeholders, in particular infrastructure managers | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Supervising and providing strategic guidance for corridor development | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Improving coordination of investments in rail infrastructure | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Providing a harmonised framework for the allocation of capacity | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Addressing legal barriers hampering international rail freight | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| For other area, please specify: |  |

**4.8 Did the Executive Board(s) appropriately take into account any issue raised by the advisory groups?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes, in all/most cases | Not in all cases | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**4.9 Did the Management Board(s) appropriately take into account any issue raised by the advisory groups?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes, in all/most cases | Not in all cases | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**4.10 To what extent is the role of the railway undertakings’ advisory group in the decision-making process adequate to ensure that the opinions of railway undertakings are duly taken into account?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To some extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**4.12 Do the advisory groups of the railway undertakings and of the terminal owners and managers represent in a balanced way the stakeholder groups concerned? Are all the stakeholders represented in the group and are there sufficient mechanisms to ensure that the opinions of all members are represented in a balanced way?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes, to a large extent | Yes, to a moderate extent | Yes, to some extent | No, not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**4.13 Do you participate in the advisory groups of the railway undertakings or the terminal owners/managers and, if not, why?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes, we participate | No, because we do not know these groups | No, because we have no resources (time, experts, etc.) to participate | No, because we do not see sufficient effects to justify participation | Others, please specify |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**4.14 To what extent have the working groups established by the RFCs on various issues been an effective tool to implement the Regulation, in particular as far as regards tasks assigned to infrastructure managers (e.g., definition of pre-arranged train paths, coordination of works, train performance management) and the coordination between the corridor governance and competent services within infrastructure managers?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To some extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**4.15 To what extent does the lack of a formal status of the working groups in the Regulation constrain their effectiveness, e.g., by limiting their accountability or by restricting the readiness of stakeholders to participate?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To some extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**4.16 Does the governance structure involve all relevant stakeholder groups?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes, all relevant groups already participate | [ ]  |
| No, the following stakeholders groups are missing: |
| * Customers of rail freight services (e.g. shipper, forwarders, and combined transport operators)
 | [ ]  |
| * Authorities in charge of railway safety (e.g. national safety authorities and the European Union Agency for Railways)
 | [ ]  |
| * Entities in charge of rail research and innovation (e.g. Shift2Rail, national railway research bodies, railway supply industry)
 | [ ]  |
| * Other (please specify)
 | [ ]  |

**4.17 To what extent does the Regulation define mechanisms and tools to ensure that the governance structure of the corridor takes corrective action based on the monitoring of performance and user satisfaction of the rail freight corridors services?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To some extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**4.18 The Regulation does not impose a formal framework for the cooperation between the governance structure of different RFCs. In practice, the stakeholders involved in the different layers of the governance structure have organised network-level (cross-RFC) coordination on a voluntary basis.**

**In this context, do you think that the lack of formal requirements on the network-level coordination in the Regulation (be it at network level or at corridor level) has affected negatively coordination between the rail freight corridors? (OPC)[[4]](#footnote-4)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| No, voluntary cross-RFC coordination has been effective and more flexible than coordination based on legal requirements | [ ]  |
| Yes, voluntary coordination has been insufficient to ensure adequate cooperation and harmonisation at network level | [ ]  |
| Yes, for other reasons (please specify) | [ ]  |
| Do not know | [ ]  |

**4.26 Do you think that rail freight corridors provide a value-added in supporting international rail freight transport compared to actions undertaken at bilateral level (e.g., agreements), in terms of:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | Very effective | Moderately effective | Slightly effective | Not effective | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Capacity management (allocation and management of train paths, coordination of works) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Traffic management | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Coordination of investment planning | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Coordination with and access to terminals | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Providing information about infrastructure and the conditions of its use | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Performance and customer satisfaction monitoring | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Monitoring competition | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**4.27 Did the Executive Boards ensure effective coordination between the work of the RFCs and national policies relevant for rail freight transport?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes, there was significant coordination  | [ ]  |
| Yes, there was some coordination | [ ]  |
| No, there was no coordination but an exchange of information | [ ]  |
| No, there was neither coordination nor an exchange of information | [ ]  |
| Do not know | [ ]  |
| For other comments, please explain: |

# Measures for implementing the RFCs (Articles 9 and 10)

**5.3 To what extent have you been involved or consulted in the preparation of the transport market studies of the RFCs?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sufficiently | Insufficiently | Not at all | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**5.4 Are you aware of the results of the transport market studies of the RFCs that concern you?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes, to a large extent | Yes, to a moderate extent | Yes, to some extent | No, not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**5.5 Which of the following purposes should a transport market study of an RFC ideally serve?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Options | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| To evaluate the overall growth potential of rail freight transport along the corridor | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| To inform infrastructure development, e.g. as regards the need for new infrastructure | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| To inform the definition of infrastructure capacity allocated to freight trains (pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| To provide insights on how to improve the attractiveness of rail freight services for customers | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| To provide insights on how to increase the efficiency of planning and operations of rail freight services | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| RFC transport market studies do not serve any purpose | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other options, please specify: |  |

**5.6 To which extent did the transport market studies conducted by the RFC actually fulfil the following purposes?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Options | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| To evaluate the overall growth potential of rail freight transport along the corridor | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| To inform infrastructure development, e.g. as regards the need for new infrastructure | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| To inform the definition of infrastructure capacity allocated to freight trains (pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| To provide insights on how to improve the attractiveness of rail freight services for customers | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| To provide insights on how to increase the efficiency of planning and operations of rail freight services | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| RFC transport market studies do not serve any purpose. | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other options, please specify |  |

**5.9 Do you think that the Regulation addresses the issue of IT systems and applications supporting the planning and operation of international rail freight in an appropriate way?**

There are two references to technical systems and applications in the Regulation:

* Article 8(9) of the Regulation specifies that “the management board shall coordinate in accordance with national and European deployment plans the use of interoperable IT applications or alternative solutions that may become available in the future to handle requests for international train paths and the operation of international traffic on the freight corridor”
* Article 11(1b) requires that the implementation plan should include “a deployment plan relating to the interoperable systems along the freight corridor which satisfies the essential requirements and the technical specifications for interoperability which apply to the network as defined in Directive 2008/57/EC on the interoperability of the rail system within the Community[[5]](#footnote-5). This deployment plan shall be based on a cost-benefit analysis of the use of interoperable systems;”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Options | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Overall, infrastructure managers have introduced satisfactory IT systems and applications for capacity management (path requests) and traffic management | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The requirement set out in Article 8(9) and 11(1a) are sufficient, allowing for a flexible implementation of IT systems based on customer needs | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The requirements are not specific enough, resulting in incomplete implementation (e.g. introduction of interoperable systems at corridor level but lacking interfaces with the systems of individual infrastructure managers) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The requirements regarding IT systems are not broad enough in scope, leaving information gaps (e.g. information on capacity restrictions, estimated time of arrival etc.) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The Regulation does not refer sufficiently to other legislation on IT and telematics applications, in particular to TAF TSI[[6]](#footnote-6) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Additional comments (please specify): |  |

# Investment and planning (Articles 11 and 12)

**6.1 Did the Regulation influence the coordination and investments along the RFCs, to the extent that national investment strategies and plans were aligned with the corridor investment plan where needed?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| In many cases | In a few cases | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**6.2 To what extent did the management board remove capacity bottlenecks as identified in the plan for the management of the capacity of freight trains (Article 11(1c))?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| In many cases | In a few cases | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

# Capacity management (Articles 13 to 15)

# Corridor One stop shop (C-OSS)

**7.1 Do you think that a single interface between infrastructure managers and applicants (railway undertakings) is necessary to facilitate the timetabling and capacity management processes for international rail freight traffic?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Option | Answer |
| Yes, a single interface is necessary and a one stop shop at corridor level is the ideal tool to provide this interface | **[ ]**  |
| Yes, a single interface is necessary but it may be implemented in another form if this turns out to be more effective | **[ ]**  |
| No, having a separate interface with each infrastructure manager is sufficient provided that infrastructure managers properly coordinate the entire timetable process between each other and with terminals | **[ ]**  |
| No opinion | **[ ]**  |
| For other options, please specify: |

**7.2 Do you think that overall, the corridor one-stop shop concept has provided the facilitation effect that it was supposed to? (OPC)[[7]](#footnote-7)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Option | Answer |
| Yes, entirely | **[ ]**  |
| Yes, to a certain extent | **[ ]**  |
| No, the scope of the services offered by the C-OSS is too limited to make it a viable option to request and manage capacity | **[ ]**  |
| No, for other reasons (please specify) | **[ ]**  |
| No opinion | **[ ]**  |
| For other options, please specify: |

**7.3 To what extent do the following factors limit the usefulness of the corridor one-stop shop as a tool to facilitate international rail freight?**

**The C-OSS is a joint body set up or designated by the Management Board of each corridor to take decisions with regard to applications for pre-arranged train paths specified in Article 14(3) and for the reserve capacity specified in Article 14(5). It may be a technical body within the corridor management structure or one of the Infrastructure Managers concerned**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Factor | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Limited involvement in the overall capacity management process (role of corridor one-stop shops limited to publication and allocation of capacity but no involvement in other process steps) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Limitation to international capacity, i.e. different interfaces for national and international capacity persist | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Limitation to a single corridor, complicating the management of capacity involving multiple corridors | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The IT tool used for the publication and allocation of pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity (PCS) does not provide the necessary performance (functionalities, ease of use etc.) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The IT tool used for the publication and allocation of pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity (PCS) does not provide accurate and up-to-date information (e.g., due to a lack of synchronisation with national systems) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The corridor one-stop shop does not simplify commercial and legal aspects of rail infrastructure use (e.g. no reduction of administrative burden related to contracts, no harmonisation of commercial rules) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other factors, please specify: |  |

The Regulation includes the objective to guarantee international freight trains access to adequate infrastructure capacity. A general perception of lack of quality of infrastructure capacity available for international rail freight has been one of the key issues motivating the Regulation. Complaints about the quality of rail freight capacity persist despite the establishment of the RFCs. The notion of the “quality” of infrastructure capacity is complex, as it has properties both of a product (i.e., the “train path” itself) and of a service (i.e., the process, tools). The purpose of the following questions is to establish which criteria define the “quality” of infrastructure capacity.

**7.4 From the perspective of an operator of rail freight services (i.e., railway undertaking, applicant), how relevant are the following quality criteria for infrastructure capacity? Please assess and comment the criteria proposed and/or propose missing criteria**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | Highly relevant | Somewhat relevant | Relevant for specific segments (specify in comment) | Not relevant | Do not know | Please comment, if necessary |
| (C1) Transparency: Information about the availability of infrastructure capacities should be made available by infrastructure managers as early as possible and in a presentation and format understandable and usable for interested applicants | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C2) Certainty: Capacities offered and allocated should be protected against unilateral changes by the infrastructure manager (e.g., modifications or cancellations after publication/allocation should be as limited as possible) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C3) Uniformity: Variations between circulation days (e.g. in terms of routings, timings and parameters) should be limited as much as possible throughout the entire timetable period to facilitate resource management of railway undertakings and to ensure a uniform service to customers | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C4) Availability: Infrastructure capacity should be available in sufficient quantity to serve the demand of current or potential customers of rail freight services | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C5) Flexibility (regarding timing of requests): Applicants should have the possibility to request capacity whenever capacity needs materialise, either due to customer demand or due to the concretisation of railway undertakings’ operational planning | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C6) Performance: Infrastructure capacity should ensure competitiveness with other modes (in particular road) and operational efficiency, based on parameters such as transport time, train length, train weight etc. | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C7) Harmonisation: Capacity should be harmonised in terms of routing, timing and other parameters from the origin to the destination of a train run, i.e. across infrastructure managers and between infrastructure managers and rail service facilities such as terminals | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C8) Customization: Infrastructure capacity should meet the specific operational needs of railway undertakings (e.g., as regards the location and timing of operational stops for driver and loco changes) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C9) Resilience: It should be feasible to execute operations in line with planning, also in the event of smaller disturbances (e.g., by including adequate buffers in planning) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Additional criteria: please specify, add as many lines as needed and a short description of each criterion |  |

**7.5 To which extent does the concept of pre-arranged train paths as defined in Article 14 of the Regulation meet the quality criteria described in question 7.4? In answering, please assume the theoretical potential of the pre-arranged train path concept (i.e., a hypothetical optimal implementation)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please comment, if necessary |
| (C1) Transparency | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C2) Certainty | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C3) Uniformity | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C4) Availability | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C5) Flexibility | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C6) Performance | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C7) Harmonisation | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C8) Customization | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C9) Resilience | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other criteria, please specify: |  |

**7.6 To which extent does the concept of reserve capacity as defined in Article 14 of the Regulation meet the quality criteria described in question 7.4? In answering, please assume the theoretical potential of the reserve capacity concept, i.e. a (hypothetical) optimal implementation.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please comment, if necessary |
| (C1) Transparency | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C2) Certainty | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C3) Uniformity | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C4) Availability | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C5) Flexibility | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C6) Performance | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C7) Harmonisation | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C8) Customization | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C9) Resilience | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Other criteria, please specify: |  |

**7.7 With respect to the quality criteria outlined in question 7.4, to which extent do you agree with the following statements relating to pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity? In answering, please assume the theoretical potential of the pre-arranged train path and reserve capacity concepts (i.e., a (hypothetical) optimal implementation)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | Fully agree | Somewhat agree | Do not agree | Do not know | Please comment, if necessary |
| (C1) Transparency: Pre-arranged train paths increase the transparency of infrastructure capacity available for rail freight due to their publication at X‑11 (i.e., ahead of the deadline to request capacity in the annual timetable at X‑8) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C1) Transparency: The publication of pre-arranged train paths at X‑11 is too late (e.g., for mid to long-term planning needs of railway undertakings) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C2) Certainty: The fact that pre-arranged train paths are pre-arranged and published allows to safeguard capacity for rail freight from competing uses of capacity, in particular passenger traffic or TCRs | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C2) Certainty: The requirement defined in the Regulation that pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity must not be cancelled less than 2 months before the train run reduces uncertainty after capacity allocation, in particular the risk of late cancellations when adjustments become more costly for railway undertakings | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C2) Certainty: The requirement that pre-arranged train paths must not be cancelled later than 2 months before the train run in Article 13(8) is not sufficient. Pre-arranged train paths should benefit from stronger protection against changes by infrastructure managers | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C3) Uniformity: The absence of requirements regarding the uniformity of the pre-arranged train paths offer throughout the timetable year (similar quantity, timings, routings for all circulation days) is a gap that reduces the effectiveness of the pre-arranged train paths concept | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C4) Availability: The Regulation does not define sufficiently concrete requirements as regards the volume of pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity to be offered. IMs can therefore easily circumvent the requirement to ‘safeguard’ sufficient capacity for international rail freight by offering less pre-arranged train paths than the overall capacity needs | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C5) Flexibility: Pre-arranged train paths have to be requested by the deadline to submit request capacity request for the annual timetable at X‑8. At this stage railway undertakings do not know about their concrete capacity needs (i.e., concrete train paths) which makes subsequent changes likely | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C5) Flexibility: The requirement that allow for a quick and appropriate response to ad hoc requests for capacity as referred to in Article 23 of Directive 2001/14/EC | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C6) Performance: The provisions of the Regulation are not sufficient to oblige IMs to provide pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity of higher performance (e.g., higher commercial speed) than capacity provided by individual IMs through the annual timetable process | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other criteria, please specify: |  |

**7.8 To which extent do the pre-arranged train paths actually offered by the C-OSS differ from capacity provided by individual infrastructure managers via the annual timetable process? If the assessment differs significantly between RFCs and/or infrastructure managers, please indicate this in the comments column**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please comment, if necessary |
| (C1) Transparency: The publication of pre-arranged train paths, in the form of paths catalogues and in PCS, has provided more transparency about infrastructure capacities available for international rail freight transport | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C2) Certainty: Pre-arranged train paths benefit from a better protection against changes requested by the IM after allocation, e.g. due to works. In other words: pre-arranged train paths are modified less frequently by the infrastructure manager) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C3) Uniformity: Pre-arranged train paths are available more in a more uniform way across the whole timetable period (i.e., there are less variations as regards e.g. running days, route, train parameters etc.)  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C4) Availability: Pre-arranged train paths were offered in sufficient quantity to effectively safeguard capacity for international rail freight on capacity-constrained lines | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C5) Flexibility: Pre-arranged train paths offer more flexibility to accommodate changes required by railway undertakings after allocation (e.g., changes in routing and timing due to changes in tactic and operational planning (addition of a stop to change locos)) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C6) Performance: Pre-arranged train paths offer a higher commercial speed (i.e. average speed from origin to destination, for example due to a reduction of stops required for overtaking by passenger trains) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C6) Performance: Pre-arranged train paths allow a longer maximum train length | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C7) Harmonisation: Pre-arranged train paths are better harmonised at border crossings (i.e. between infrastructure managers) than train paths allocated by individual infrastructure managers | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C7) Harmonisation: Pre-arranged train paths are better harmonised with terminal capacity (slots) (i.e. between infrastructure managers and terminals) than train paths allocated by individual infrastructure managers | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C8) Customisation: Pre-arranged train paths are better in line with our specific routing and timing requirements, both at origin/destination and at intermediary locations (e.g., for driver changes) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| (C9) Resilience: Pre-arranged train paths are designed in a such a way that it is more likely to comply with the schedule in operations, for example due to appropriate buffer times (e.g., at border crossings or with respect to other trains) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other criteria, please specify: |  |

**7.10 Have you ever requested and been allocated pre-arranged train paths and/or reserve capacity?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of capacity | Yes | No | Please explain, if necessary |
| Pre-arranged train path | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Reserve capacity | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**7.11 Which is the approximate share of capacity requested and allocated via the C-OSS (pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity) in your total international rail freight traffic (share of train-path km)?**

**In the estimation of share, please compare pre-arranged train paths to the total volume of international traffic requested via the annual timetable process and as ‘late request’ (until X‑2); reserve capacity to total capacity requested as ‘ad hoc capacity’ in a broad sense (i.e., any capacity requested after X‑2)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of capacity | Share of path-km | Share of requests | Please explain, if necessary |
| **0-10%** | **10-25%** | **25-50%** | **50-100%** | **0-10%** | **10-25%** | **25-50%** | **50-100%** |
| Pre-arranged train path | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Reserve capacity | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**7.14 Which are the key reasons to request capacity via the annual timetable process (until X‑8) as opposed to placing ‘late paths requests’ (between X‑8 and X‑2) or ad-hoc requests (after X-2)? In answering the question, please consider both capacities requested via the C-OSS and via individual infrastructure managers**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reason | Always/often | Sometimes/rarely | Never | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| To request capacity for which capacity needs are already known at the level of detail of a specific train path (incl. exact routing and timing) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| To safeguard capacity for traffic which is certain (e.g. due to the existence of a transport contract with a customer)  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| To safeguard capacity for traffic which may materialise later on | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other reasons, please specify: |  |

**7.15 Which are the key reasons to request capacity via ad-hoc requests in a broad sense (i.e., any requests placed after X‑2)? In answering the question, please consider both capacities requested via the C-OSS (reserve capacity) and via individual infrastructure managers**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reason | Always/often | Sometimes/rarely | Never | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Capacity needs that only emerge at this stage (e.g., spot traffic) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Capacity allocated via the annual timetable process is not sufficiently stable, i.e. subject to repeated and significant changes by the IM (e.g. due to works). Therefore, we prefer to request capacity on short notice when the available capacity is known with a higher degree of certainty (e.g., planning of works has been finalised) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| As a replacement for capacity requested earlier on (e.g., via the annual timetable process) which has been cancelled by the infrastructure manager on short notice (e.g. due to works) and for which no alternative capacity has been offered by the IM | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other reasons, please specify: |  |

**7.19 Which were the most important factors preventing railway undertakings from requesting higher volumes of capacity via the C-OSS, including pre-arranged train paths, reserve capacity and any other capacity (e.g., “tailor-made” train paths)?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Factor | Important | Unimportant | Not relevant | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Insufficient quality and quantity of the pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity at the moment of publication (e.g., commercial speed, train length, etc.) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Lack of cross-border harmonisation of the process following allocation of pre-arranged train paths (at X‑7.5) limits the facilitation effect (i.e., the need to interact with several IMs remains and the C‑OSS is actually an additional interface) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The IT tool for requesting and allocating capacity via the corridor one-stop shops (PCS) is not satisfactory in terms of functionality and usability | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The IT tool for requesting and allocating capacity via the corridor one-stop shops (PCS) is not satisfactory in terms of the completeness and accuracy of data (e.g. it is not up-to-date due to missing interfaces with national IT systems for timetabling) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity do not offer significant advantages over capacity allocated by individual infrastructure managers in terms of reliability (e.g., protection against modifications due to capacity restrictions due to work) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The facilitation effect of the C-OSS is limited for requests involving lines not in included in the network of RFCs (i.e., involving ‘feeder’ and ‘outflow’ sections) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The facilitation effect of the C-OSS is limited for requests involving two or more RFCs | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Legal issues make it difficult to request international train paths, in particular in the case of freight trains operated in ‘cooperative mode’ by several RUs. This includes for example the question of liability of the (lead) railway undertaking – which requests an international train path for the entire journey of a train – on networks on which the train is operated by another railway undertaking | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Challenges on RU side to make use of RFC services (e.g., language knowledge of staff, lack of familiarity with PCS, etc.) | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other factors, please specify: |  |

**7.21 Did you request capacity other than pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity via the C-OSS?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Answer | RFC1 | RFC2 | RFC3 | RFC4 | RFC5 | RFC6 | RFC6 | RFC7 | RFC8 | RFC9 | RFC10 | RFC11 |
| Yes, and the C-OSS has provided a single interface for the entire request (i.e., forwarded the request to individual infrastructure managers and informed us about their allocation decision) | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Yes, and the C-OSS has forwarded the request to individual infrastructure managers but was not involved further in the process | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Yes, but the C-OSS did not forward the request and asked us to contact directly individual infrastructure managers | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| No, we did not request capacity other than pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity from C-OSS | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| For other, please specify: |  |

**7.24 Have the following provisions of Article 14(8) been implemented in practice?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Provision | Yes | Partially | No | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| *RFC capacity (pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity) may not be cancelled less than 2 months before its scheduled time if the applicant concerned does not approve such cancellation* | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| *In such a case (note: cancellation less than 2 months before a train’s scheduled time) the infrastructure manager concerned shall make an effort to propose to the applicant a train path of an equivalent quality and reliability which the applicant has the right to accept or refuse* | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other provisions, please specify: |  |

# Temporary Capacity Restrictions (TCR)

**7.41 Which sources of information do you use as regards information on TCRs on the lines of the rail freight corridors and their impact?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source of information | As primary source of information | As complementary source of information | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Publication of the RFC in accordance with Article 12 | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Publications (network statement etc.) and IT systems of individual IMs | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Events organised by individual infrastructure managers | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Publications by infrastructure managers at bilateral or trilateral level | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Ad-hoc information by the RFCs | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other source of information, please specify: |  |
| Please indicate examples of good practice in the cross-border coordination of TCRs, whether at RFC, bilateral or multilateral level |  |

**7.42 Which has been the role of the RFCs in the coordination of TCRs in the RFCs you are involved in?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Role | RFC1 | RFC2 | RFC3 | RFC4 | RFC5 | RFC6 | RFC6 | RFC7 | RFC8 | RFC9 | RFC10 | RFC11 |
| The RFC has a significant role in the coordination of TCRs | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| The RFC publishes information about TCRs as provided by individual IMs; significant TCR coordination takes place at bilateral level (IM/IM) | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| The RFC publishes information about TCRs as provided by individual IMs, but there is no coordination at RFC level and bilateral level | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| For other roles, please specify: |  |

**7.43 Which are the key challenges for international rail freight traffic with respect to capacity restrictions due to infrastructure works? Please, use the comments field, e.g. to indicate in which areas certain challenges are particularly important**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Key challenge | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please comment, if necessary |
| A lack of coordination of TCRs across infrastructure managers | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The overall volume of TCRs limits the capacity available for traffic in an unacceptable manner. | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The instability of TCR planning, e.g. late publication, frequent or late changes, etc. | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| A lack of suitable diversionary routes  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Infrastructure managers do not offer alternative train paths (with acceptable routings or timings) with a reasonable lead time before the actual running day affected by the TCRs | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other key challenge, please specify: |  |

# Traffic management (Articles 16 and 17)

**8.2 To what extent does a lack of coordination of traffic management negatively affect international rail freight traffic? Please indicate key coordination gaps issues in the comment (for example: trains are given priority on one network but then delayed on another network due to lower priority)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To a large extent | To some extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**8.3 How has the coordination of traffic management changed after RFCs have been made operational?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Significantly improved | Slightly improved | Unchanged | Worsened | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**8.5 Do you think that the provisions of the Regulation, which require the management board to ‘put in place procedures for coordinating traffic management’, are sufficient to improve freight train operations along the rail freight corridors?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Option | Answer |
| Yes, improving cooperation between the traffic control centres of individual infrastructure managers is sufficient, any additional layer would mainly complicated matters | **[ ]**  |
| No, a separate entity with access to operational information for the entire corridor is needed in order to implement effective end-to-end coordination; this entity should have a monitoring and advisory role | **[ ]**  |
| No, a separate entity with access to operational information for the entire corridor is needed in order to implement effective end-to-end coordination; this entity should have the competence to give instructions to the traffic control centres of individual IMs if needed | **[ ]**  |
| Do not know | **[ ]**  |
| For other option, please specify: |

**8.6 To what extent is the principle defined in Article 17(3), that trains running on a pre-arranged train path or on reserve capacity “which comply with their scheduled time in the working timetable shall not be modified, as far as possible” respected in practice?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**8.7 To what extent has contingency management, i.e. addressing disturbances going beyond normal delays, improved since the Regulation was introduced?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**8.8 To what extent do the factors below limit the ability to re-route trains in the event of disturbances of an RFC line?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Factor | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please comment, if necessary |
| Lack of clearly defined processes, rules and responsibilities to address contingency situations | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Lack of availability of adequate capacity (train paths) on diversionary routes | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Timely and reliable communication and information on the event | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Lack of diversionary routes with adequate infrastructure (lack of interoperability, e.g. different track gauge, lack of electrification, etc.) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Lack of cooperation with other railway undertakings | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Lack of operational interoperability (e.g., language requirements, operational rules for train drivers, route knowledge etc.) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other factors, please specify: |  |

# Information provision

**9.1 On an overall level, to what extent has the information provided by the RFCs (including all documents such as the corridor information document, the publication of PaPs and reserve capacity, the publication on TCRs, the implementation plan etc.) produced a simplification effect for the planning and operation of rail freight services or for RU asset management?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**9.2 To which extent have the following factors limited the simplification effect of the information provided by the RFCs? In other words, which of these factors have the result that information provided on national level still needs to be consulted to plan and operate rail freight services?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Factors | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Information provided by the RFCs covers only designated RFC lines but a significant share of international rail freight services uses other lines as well | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Information provided by the RFCs is not as complete and comprehensive as information provided at national level in terms of content and details provided | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Information provided by the RFCs is not as up-to-date as information provided as information provided at national level | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Information provided by the RFCs is not as easily accessible as information provided at national level (e.g., less user-friendly presentation, printed instead of electronic, lack of electronic interfaces) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**9.3 In how far has the following information and documents provided a value-added for planning and operating rail freight services or for monitoring competition over similar information provided at national/network level?**

**Please consider all possible uses of the documents, whether in operational or more strategic phases (e.g., the “deployment plan relating to the interoperable systems along the freight corridor” according to Article 11(1b) might potentially be useful for developing an ERTMS deployment strategy for locos)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Information and documents | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| The implementation plan (Article 9(1)) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The investment plan (Article 11) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The deployment plan relating to interoperable systems (Article 11(1b)) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The publication on the schedule for carrying out all the works on the infrastructure and its equipment that would restrict available capacity on the freight corridor (Article 12) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Information on “infrastructure capacity available at the time of request” (Article 13(2)) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Register on the activities of the corridor one-stop shop containing dates of requests, names of applicants, details of documentation and incidents (Article 13(5)) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The framework for the allocation of the infrastructure capacity on the freight corridor (Article 14(1)) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The corridor information document (Article 18) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The publication on the results of the performance monitoring of rail freight services (Article 19(2)) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| The publication on the results of user satisfaction survey (Article 19(3)) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

# Performance monitoring

**10.1 To what extent does performance monitoring of the RFCs address the following stages of the rail logistics value chain?**

Transport and logistics services involving rail are provided in a value chain involving multiple supplier-customer relationships: infrastructure managers provide rail infrastructure services to railway undertakings (physical infrastructure, infrastructure capacity, traffic management etc.). Railway undertakings in turn use these services (and their own resources) as input to provide rail transport services to their customers, such as combined transport operators, logistic service providers or shippers. Member States provide the framework for all stakeholders in terms of legislation and public financing and, in turn, have an interest in reaching their policy objectives (e.g. gain in economic efficiency, sustainability or safety of the transport sector).

Each of these relationships has different needs in terms of performance and performance monitoring. The Regulation requires the management boards to “monitor the performance of rail freight services on the freight corridor”, which would require addressing both the services provided by infrastructure managers and by railway undertakings. Member States and regulatory bodies obviously also have an interesting in monitoring the performance.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Value chain | Answer | Please explain, if necessary |
| Supplier (who is monitored) | **Customer** | **Subject of performance monitoring** | **To a large extent** | **To a moderate extent** | **To a small extent** | **Not at all** | **Do not know** |
| Infrastructure manager | Applicants, in particular railway undertakings | Rail infrastructure services | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Railway undertakings | Buyers of rail transport services | Rail freight transport services | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Infrastructure manager | Member States | Policy objectives | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**10.2 Do you receive reliable, up-to-date and timely information about train operations on an end-to-end basis (i.e., across borders and from terminal to terminal), including the real-time location of trains and the estimated time of arrival, as a basis for your own operational management?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes, to a large extent | Yes, to a moderate extent | Yes, to some extent | No, not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**10.3 With respect to question 10.2, please indicate positive examples (e.g., origin, destination, terminals and combined transport operators involved) - *add as much lines as necessary***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Example | Short description |
| Corridor(s), origin(s) and destinations(s) covered |  |
| Stakeholders involved (infrastructure managers, railway undertakings, terminals, combined transport operators, logistics service providers etc.) |  |
|  |  |

# Information to elaborate a baseline scenario (i.e., situation without Regulation, or “no policy situation”)

**11.1a Please indicate the total volume of rail freight traffic you operated (train-km)**

Rail freight services are either provided by a single RU – or several RUs belonging to the same group of RUs – for the entire journey (‘open access mode’) or by several RUs which hand over trains to each other (‘cooperative mode’). For rail freight services provided in cooperative mode please include only the parts provided by your company or your group of companies.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2010** | **2013** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **Total traffic, i.e. sum of domestic and cross-border traffic within EU, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland and United Kingdom****(in million train-km, please use “.” as decimal separator)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **If the value in train-km is not available or confidential, please indicate the appropriate category:** | More than 100 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 to 100 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 to 33 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 to 10 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 to 3 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300,000 to 1 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100,000 to 300,000 train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 100,000 train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **International traffic, i.e. cross-border traffic within EU, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland and United Kingdom****(in million train-km, please use “.” as decimal separator)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **If the value in train-km is not available or confidential, please indicate the appropriate category:** | More than 100 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 to 100 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 to 33 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 to 10 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 to 3 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300,000 to 1 million train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100,000 to 300,000 train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 100,000 train-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **For any other relevant information, please specify:** |

**11.1b Please indicate the total volume of rail freight transport you operated (tonne-km)**

Rail freight services are either provided by a single RU – or several RUs belonging to the same group of RUs – for the entire journey (‘open access mode’) or by several RUs which hand over trains to each other (‘cooperative mode’). For rail freight services provided in cooperative mode please include only the parts provided by your company or your group of companies.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2010** | **2013** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **Total transport, i.e. sum of domestic and cross-border traffic within EU, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland and United Kingdom****(in billion tonne-km, please use “.” as decimal separator)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **If the value in tonne-km is not available or confidential, please indicate the appropriate category:** | More than 100 billion tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 to 100 billion tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 to 33 billion tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 to 10 million tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 to 3 billion tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300 million to 1 billion tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 million to 300 million tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 100 million tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **International transport, i.e. cross-border traffic within EU, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland and United Kingdom****(in billion tonne-km, please use “.” as decimal separator)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **If the value in tonne-km is not available or confidential, please indicate the appropriate category:** | More than 100 billion tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 to 100 billion tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 to 33 billion tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 to 10 million tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 to 3 billion tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300 million to 1 billion tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 million to 300 million tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 100 million tonne-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **For any other relevant information, please specify:** |

**11.2 Based on your experience, to what extent have the RFCs had an impact on the actual commercial speed of international rail freight services?**

For your estimate, please use the following definition of “actual commercial speed”:

* “Actual”: speed in operation (as opposed to “speed in the timetable”/ “speed of the train path”)
* “Commercial”: the average speed between origin and destination of a train including all intermediate stops, such as operational stops, stops at border crossings etc. (as opposed to “maximum speed” or the “average speed on subsections of the overall train run”, e.g. only on the lines designated to RFCs)
* “Origin” and “destination” are to be interpreted as the first and last station of a train run

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Difference(% with sign) | No significant difference | Not known | Please explain, if necessary |
| Overall, has the actual commercial speed of international rail freight services running on lines designated to RFC (whether or not using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity) changed as a consequence of making the RFCs operational?  |  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Does the actual commercial speed of international rail freight services using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity differ from that of comparable international rail freight services also running on lines designated to RFCs but not using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity? |  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Does the actual commercial speed of international rail freight services using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity differ from that of national rail freight services (on the common sections)? |  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| For any other relevant information, please specify:  |

**11.3 Based on your experience, to what extent can the change of the actual commercial speed indicated in question 11.2 be attributed to the following activities of the RFCs?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Infrastructure investments, including in interoperable systems, coordinated through the RFC implementation plan | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Better coordination of infrastructure works restricting capacities available on the RFC | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Allocation of capacity via the corridor one-stop shops | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Capacity products offered by the corridor one-stop shops (pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Procedures to coordinate traffic management put in place by the RFC (for “regular” situations, i.e. excluding major international disruptions) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Guidelines for traffic management in the event of disturbance (i.e. in the event of major international disruptions) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Priority rules for the management of different types of traffic drawn up by individual infrastructure managers in accordance with common RFC targets and principles | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Procedures to coordinate operations of railway infrastructure and terminals put in place by infrastructure managers and terminals. | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Information on the conditions of use of the freight corridor via the corridor information document and other documents, IT platforms and systems, etc. | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Other service improvements, e.g. as a result of the RFC Transport Market Study or other specific studies | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Other factors, (i.e. outside the scope of the Regulation), had a bigger overall impact than the activities of the RFCs | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other activity, please specify: |

**11.4 Based on your experience, to what extent have the RFCs had an impact on the punctuality of international rail freight services?**

For your estimate, please use the following definitions:

* For railway undertakings and terminal operators, “origin” and “destination” are to be interpreted as the first and last station of a train run on the RFC
* For customers of rail freight services, “origin” and “destination” are to be interpreted as the points in time when the train is handed over between railway undertaking and customer and/or the next stakeholder in the logistics chain (e.g. the shipper/consignee, terminal, etc.)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Difference(% with sign) | Not significant variation at entry or exit point | Not known |
| **Origin** | **Destination** |
| Overall, has the punctuality of international rail freight services running on lines designated to RFCs (whether or not using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity) changed as a consequence of making the RFC operational?  |  |  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Does the punctuality of international rail freight services using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity differ from that of comparable international rail freight services also running on lines designated to RFCs but not using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity? |  |  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Does the punctuality of international rail freight services using pre-arranged train paths differ from that of national rail freight services? |  |  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| For other indicator, please specify: |

**11.5 Based on your experience, to what extent can the change in punctuality of international rail freight services indicated in question 11.4 be attributed to the following activities of the RFCs?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Infrastructure investments, including in interoperable systems, coordinated through the RFC implementation plan | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Better coordination of infrastructure works restricting capacities available on the RFC | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Allocation of capacity via the corridor one-stop shops | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Capacity products offered by the corridor one-stop shops (pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Procedures to coordinate traffic management put in place by the RFC (for “regular” situations, i.e. excluding major international disruptions) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Guidelines for traffic management in the event of disturbance (i.e., in the event of major international disruptions) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Priority rules for the management of different types of traffic drawn up by individual infrastructure managers in accordance with common RFC targets and principles | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Procedures to coordinate operations of railway infrastructure and terminals put in place by infrastructure managers and terminals. | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Information on the conditions of use of the freight corridor via the corridor information document and other documents, IT platforms and systems, etc. | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Other service improvements, e.g. as a result of the RFC Transport Market Study or other specific studies | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Other factors, (i.e. outside the scope of the Regulation), had a bigger overall impact than the activities of the RFCs | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other activity, please specify: |

**11.6 Based on your experience, to what extent have the RFCs had an impact on the dwelling time of freight trains at border crossings?**

In your estimate, please consider the following:

* “Dwelling time at border crossings” means any additional time a freight train incurs due to the fact that it crosses a border. This includes in particular stops directly at the border station(s) as well as stops at upstream/downstream stations (e.g., to avoid congestion at the border station itself).
* Furthermore, please consider any dwelling time, irrespective of:
	+ Who is responsible (i.e., infrastructure manager, railway undertaking or public authorities);
	+ Nature of the dwelling time (e.g., process-related such as loco changes or pure idle time, e.g. waiting for a replacement loco driver, waiting for border control procedures etc.); and
	+ Whether it is planned (e.g. included in train path as buffer time) or not (e.g. delay to lack of coordination such as missing loco driver etc.)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Change(% with sign) | Not significant variation | Not known |
| Overall, has the dwelling time at border crossing as a consequence of international rail freight services running on lines designated to RFC (whether or not using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity) changed as a consequence of making the RFCs operational?  |  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Does the dwelling time at border crossing of international rail freight services using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity differ from that of comparable international rail freight services also running on lines designated to RFCs but not using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity? |  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| For other indicator, please specify: |

**11.7 Based on your experience, to what extent can the change in dwelling time of freight trains at border crossings indicated in question 11.6 be attributed to the following activities of the RFCs?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Infrastructure investments, including in interoperable systems, coordinated through the RFC implementation plan | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Better coordination of infrastructure works restricting capacities available on the RFC | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Allocation of capacity via the corridor one-stop shops | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Capacity products offered by the corridor one-stop shops (pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Procedures to coordinate traffic management put in place by the RFC (for “regular” situations, i.e. excluding major international disruptions) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Guidelines for traffic management in the event of disturbance (i.e. in the event of major international disruptions) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Priority rules for the management of different types of traffic drawn up by individual infrastructure managers in accordance with common RFC targets and principles | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Procedures to coordinate operations of railway infrastructure and terminals put in place by infrastructure managers and terminals | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Information on the conditions of use of the freight corridor via the corridor information document and other documents, IT platforms and systems, etc. | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Other service improvements, e.g. as a result of the RFC Transport Market Study or other specific studies | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Other factors, (i.e. outside the scope of the Regulation), had a bigger overall impact than the activities of the RFCs | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other activity, please specify: |

**11.8 Based on your experience, to what extent do the following measures in the competence of RUs affect the dwelling time of freight trains at border crossings?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Same RU (or RUs belonging to the same group) operating the train on both sides of the border crossing | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| No change of loco at border crossing | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| No change of train driver at border crossing | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| ‘Trusted handover’ of trains between RUs to avoid technical checks of trains/wagons (in line with TSI OPE, e.g. based on the ATTI agreement) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Exchange of train composition information before train is handed over (in line with TAF TSI, e.g. based on Hermes 30 messages) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Exchange of consignment note information before train is handed over (in line with TAF TSI) | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Specify other measures in the competence of RUs affecting dwelling time of freight trains at border crossings: |

**11.10 Based on your experience, to what extent have the RFCs had an impact on the costs of planning and operating international rail freight services?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Change(% with sign) | No significant variation | Not known |
| Overall, have the costs of planning and operating international rail freight services running on lines designated to RFCs (whether or not using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity) changed as a consequence of making the RFCs operational?  |  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Do the costs of planning and operating international rail freight services using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity differ from that of comparable international rail freight services also running on lines designated to RFCs but not using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity? |  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Do the costs of planning and operating international rail freight services using pre-arranged train paths or reserve capacity differ from that of national rail freight services? |  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| For other indicator, please specify: |

**11.11 Based on your experience, to what extent have the following activities of the RFCs resulted in a reduction of the costs of planning and operating international rail freight services?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please explain, if necessary |
| Infrastructure investments, including in interoperable systems, coordinated through the RFC implementation plan | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Better coordination of infrastructure works restricting capacities available on the RFC | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Allocation of capacity via the corridor one-stop shops | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Capacity products offered by the corridor one-stop shops (pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Procedures to coordinate traffic management put in place by the RFC (for “regular” situations, i.e. excluding major international disruptions) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Guidelines for traffic management in the event of disturbance (i.e. in the event of major international disruptions) | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Priority rules for the management of different types of traffic drawn up by individual infrastructure managers in accordance with common RFC targets and principles | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Procedures to coordinate operations of railway infrastructure and terminals put in place by infrastructure managers and terminals. | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Information on the conditions of use of the freight corridor via the corridor information document and other documents, IT platforms and systems, etc. | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Other service improvements, e.g. as a result of the RFC Transport Market Study or other specific studies | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| Other factors, (i.e., outside the scope of the Regulation), had a bigger overall impact than the activities of the RFCs | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| For other activity, please specify: |

# Direct, indirect costs and benefits arising from the provisions of the Regulation

**12.3 To which extent do you agree with the following statements relating to the costs and benefits of implementing the Regulation?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expected direct benefit | To a large extent | To a moderate extent | To a small extent | Not at all | Do not know | Please quantify, if possible |
| In order to improve the relation between benefits and costs, there should have been a focus on reducing costs to the maximum extent possible while maintaining more or less the current level of benefits | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |
| In order to improve the relation between benefits and costs, there should have been a focus on increasing the benefits even if this would have come at the expense of higher costs for stakeholders | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**12.4 Which areas do you consider having potential to reduce the costs or increase the benefits stemming from the implementation of the Regulation?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance of international rail freight services | Potential to reduce costs of implementation | Potential to increase benefits of implementation | Please explain, if necessary |
| Dwelling time at cross-border | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Service reliability | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Transport operating costs | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Journey time | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Availability of pre-arranged train paths capacity | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Interoperability | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Intermodality | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Coordination among stakeholders |  |  |  |
| Traffic management in case of service disruption | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Set up coordinated implementation plans (including investments) | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |

**12.5 According to your experience, are there any significant indirect benefits associated to the application of the Regulation that should be taken into account in the evaluation?**

|  |
| --- |
| Please explain, if necessary: |

# Suggestions and other issues

**13.1 Would you like to suggest a case of unsatisfactory coordination of TCRs for a case study, taking into account the following criteria?**

* There was a lack of coordination between two IMs, i.e. the problems were not only limited to the network of a single IM;
* You would be able and willing to provide evidence on the impact of the case on international rail freight traffic in the context of a case study, ideally on the basis of quantified indicators (or at least substantiated estimates)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Information requested | Field to fill in | Comment |
| RFCs concerned |  |  |
| IMs concerned |  |  |
| Line and/or node concerned (name)  |  |  |
| Duration (month/year) |  |  |
| Announcement of TCR (in days/weeks/months before TCR became effective) |  |  |
| Nature of the TCR (partial/total closure of the line, due to upgrade, renewal, maintenance, etc.) |  |  |
| Problem (“what went wrong”, diversionary routes on neighbouring network not available, lack of coordination resulted in unnecessary prolongation of capacity restrictions, etc.) |  |  |
| Presumed underlying reason (lack of coordination or funding, poor planning, legal issues, etc.) |  |  |
| Was the RFC involved in coordinating the TCR? |  |  |
| For other information, please explain: |  |

**13.2 Would you like to suggest a rail line designated to one or more RFCs on which (international) rail freight suffers from a shortage of capacity for a case study?**

* The preamble of the Regulation states that ‘within the framework of a freight corridor, (…) sufficient priority should be given to rail freight traffic’. In many parts of the EU, capacity available for international rail freight is constrained, in many cases due to the mixed-use nature of the rail networks and due to the resulting competition for capacity between different traffic types.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Information requested | Field to fill in | Comment |
| RFC(s) concerned |  |  |
| IM(s) concerned |  |  |
| Line section or node concerned (name/code of line and nodes)  |  |  |
| Short description of the problem (e.g. description of the infrastructure available, why are diversionary lines not an option, does the capacity shortage occur in regular situation or during works, is the shortage limited to certain periods of time, which other traffic types limit capacity available for international rail freight, etc.) |  |  |
| Is the line congested already today or is congestion likely to occur in the foreseeable future? |  |  |
| Has the line been declared congested in the sense of Article X of Directive 2012/34/EU? Have the procedures provided for in this article been applied? Have there been any results? |  |  |
| Did the RFC take measures to safeguard sufficient capacity for international rail freight? If so, which? |  |  |
| Do you have any suggestions on how to resolve the capacity constraints for international rail freight? |  |  |

**13.3 Please explain any other issue you consider to be relevant**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**13.4 Is there any other data or literature that you believe would help us in carrying out this evaluation study?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**13.5 Would you be available for an interview to further elaborate on some or all of the issues addressed in this survey questionnaire?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | [ ]  |
| NO | **[ ]**  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide contact details of (an) potential interview partner(s): |
| If you have would like to address or focus on particular issues, please specify:  |

**Thank you for your participation**

1. This questionnaire is addressed to railway undertakings. Separate versions of the questionnaire have been submitted to Member States (represented in the executive boards of the RFCs), infrastructure managers (management boards of the RFCs), the permanent management offices and one-stop shops of the RFCs, regulatory bodies, terminal owners and operators and customers of rail freight services. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. European Commission (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Question already included in the open public consultation; please skip if already answered. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Question already included in the open public consultation; please skip if already answered. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Replaced by Directive (EU) 2016/797 on the interoperability of the rail system within the European Union. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Version currently in force: Commission Regulation (EU) No 1305/2014 of 11 December 2014 on the technical specification for interoperability relating to the telematics applications for freight subsystem of the rail system in the European Union and repealing the Regulation (EC) No 62/2006. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Question already included in the open public consultation; please skip if already answered. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)