# 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 geographical focus of your international rail freight business based on the map of the network of RFCs.[[3]](#footnote-3)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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  | [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**2.4 Which are the key barriers to increasing the competitiveness and the market share of rail freight? (OPC)[[4]](#footnote-4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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: |  |

# Governance structure of the RFCs (Article 8)

**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 |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

# Capacity management (Articles 13 to 15)

# Corridor One stop shop (C-OSS)

**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 | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**7.1 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: |

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 |  |

**7.14 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: |  |

# 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 |  |

**7.43 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 |
| [ ]  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |  |

**8.5 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: |

**8.8 To what extent do the factors below limit the ability to re-route trains in the event of disturbances of a rail line important for international rail freight traffic?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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: |  |

# Performance monitoring

**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:** |

**11.8 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: |

# 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 **rail freight undertakings active in international rail freight transport but not involved in the rail freight corridors so far**. In this context, “not active” means railway undertakings which have not made use of the products and services of the RFCs so far and which have not been involved in any of the advisory groups for railway undertakings. It is a short version of the questionnaire addressed to railway undertakings which are involved in the RFCs. 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. Please consult the overview map available at <http://rne.eu/rail-freight-corridors/rail-freight-corridors-general-information/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Question already included in the open public consultation; please skip if already answered. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)