

Impact assessment: "Better management and coordination of cross-border rail traffic"

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

1. Introduction

Transport accounts for a quarter of the EU's greenhouse gas emissions. To achieve climate neutrality, a 90% reduction in transport emissions is needed by 2050.

Rail has a significant role to play in accelerating the reduction in transport emissions, as one of the most environmentally friendly and energy-efficient transport modes. Rail is largely electrified and emits far less CO₂ than equivalent transport by road or air. It can reduce traffic congestion and road accidents.

While the share of passenger rail in Union land transport increased from 7.0% to 7.6% between 2007 and 2016, rail's share in Union land freight has decreased from its peak in 2011 (19%) to 16.7% in 2017. Only around 10% of passenger rail transport is cross-border, whereas about half of rail freight transport is across Member States. In the [sustainable and smart mobility strategy](#), the European Commission proposed doubling rail freight and tripling high-speed rail traffic by 2050. It is clear that actions at EU level are needed to boost rail.

The lacklustre performance of rail freight transport is one of the reasons why it is less attractive for customers of freight transport services. The current public consultation will focus on policy measures that can improve rail infrastructure capacity and traffic management, i.e. the process of organising rail traffic across EU Member States. The goals are to improve cross-border rail punctuality, speed, reliability, maximise the use of existing rail infrastructure, strengthen competition in the sector, drive costs down and ultimately make rail transport (especially freight) more attractive.

The [Regulation concerning a European rail network for competitive freight](#) sets the framework for the establishment of rail freight corridors. These corridors include designated railway lines linking terminals along a predefined principal route and, where appropriate, diversionary routes and connecting sections. The corridors are essentially cross-border coordination platforms with a governance structure, which brings together key stakeholders involved in rail freight transport (Member States, infrastructure managers, railway undertakings and terminal operators).

Structure of the questionnaire

Section 2 is obligatory for all respondents, collecting information about the respondent and asking for the right to publish the information.

Sections 3 to 5 are intended to seek input and views from all stakeholders on problems, on society's needs and on possible policy intervention(s) with respect to cross-border passenger and freight rail services.

Using the questionnaire

You can skip questions that you do not feel comfortable responding to. However, replies to questions marked with an asterisk are compulsory. You can also pause at any time and continue later. Once you have submitted your answers, you will be able to download a copy of your completed questionnaire.

Disclaimer

This document is a working document of the Commission services for consultation and does not prejudice the final decision that the Commission may take.

The views reflected in this consultation paper provide an indication of the approach the Commission services may take but do not constitute a final policy position or a formal proposal by the Commission.

The responses to this consultation paper will provide important guidance to the Commission when preparing, if considered appropriate, a formal Commission proposal.

Please note: fields marked with * are mandatory.

2. About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* First name

Josef

* Surname

SCHNEIDER

* Email (this won't be published)

josef.schneider@epf.eu

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

European Passengers' Federation EPF

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica | <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Maldives | <input type="radio"/> Serbia |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini | <input type="radio"/> Mali | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands | <input type="radio"/> Martinique | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia | <input type="radio"/> Fiji | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia |
| <input type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> Mauritius | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia |
| <input type="radio"/> Azerbaijan | <input type="radio"/> France | <input type="radio"/> Mayotte | <input type="radio"/> Solomon Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahamas | <input type="radio"/> French Guiana | <input type="radio"/> Mexico | <input type="radio"/> Somalia |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahrain | <input type="radio"/> French Polynesia | <input type="radio"/> Micronesia | <input type="radio"/> South Africa |
| <input type="radio"/> Bangladesh | <input type="radio"/> French Southern and Antarctic Lands | <input type="radio"/> Moldova | <input type="radio"/> South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Barbados | <input type="radio"/> Gabon | <input type="radio"/> Monaco | <input type="radio"/> South Korea |
| <input type="radio"/> Belarus | <input type="radio"/> Georgia | <input type="radio"/> Mongolia | <input type="radio"/> South Sudan |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Belgium | <input type="radio"/> Germany | <input type="radio"/> Montenegro | <input type="radio"/> Spain |
| <input type="radio"/> Belize | <input type="radio"/> Ghana | <input type="radio"/> Montserrat | <input type="radio"/> Sri Lanka |

- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan

- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria

- Burkina Faso
- Burundi

- Cambodia

- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands

- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile

- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland

- Grenada
- Guadeloupe

- Guam

- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau

- Guyana

- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong

- Hungary

- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran

- Iraq

- Ireland
- Isle of Man

- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma

- Namibia
- Nauru

- Nepal

- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua

- Niger

- Nigeria
- Niue

- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan

- Palau

- Palestine
- Panama

- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland

- Syria

- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand

- The Gambia

- Timor-Leste
- Togo

- Tokelau
- Tonga

- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu

- Uganda
- Ukraine

- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena
Ascension and
Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States
Minor Outlying
Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association', 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

* Do you have a professional link to rail?

- No, I answer as an interested citizen
- Railway undertaking providing freight services
- Railway undertaking providing passenger services
- Rail infrastructure managers and allocation bodies
- Rail regulatory body
- Transport operators of other modes (e.g. road hauliers)
- Terminal owners and operators
- Multimodal operators (MTOs)
- Logistics services providers, freight forwarders and transport organisers
- Industry and commerce
- Umbrella organisations and associations representing the rail stakeholders
- Non-governmental organisations (not specialising in rail transport) and civil society
- Ministries, regulatory bodies, national safety authorities and other public authorities
- Research and academia
- Other (please specify)

Please specify "Other"

3. Main problems for cross-border rail

1. What are the main challenges that need to be addressed to achieve the goals set by the European Commission for rail freight transport?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion / I don't know	Agree	Strongly agree
The higher prices of rail freight services compared to other modes of transport	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The poor performance of rail freight transport services compared to other modes of transport (lower speed, lack of reliability, poor integration with other modes of transport, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Insufficient availability of scheduled rail freight services, notably for multimodal transport (e.g. lack of connections offered, insufficient frequency)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The limited growth potential of rail freight transport services due to lack of capacity on the rail network to accommodate additional traffic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

EPF is not dealing with freight

2. What are the main challenges that need to be addressed to achieve the goals set by the European Commission for high-speed passenger rail transport?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion / I don't know	Agree	Strongly agree
Higher ticket prices compared to other modes of transport	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Lower performance of services compared to other modes of transport (lower speed, lack of reliability, lack of user-friendly ticketing, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Lack of availability of high-speed passenger services offered (e.g. lack of connections to certain regions, inconvenience caused by need to change trains, insufficient frequency, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Limited growth potential of rail services due to lack of capacity on the rail network to accommodate additional traffic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Comments

(1) There isn't a level playing field on ticket prices. There are different tax policies are in place for each mode of transport, whereby rail transport is taxed heavier compared to aviation . Secondly, a ticket in rail reflects all costs, however individual transport most often just the marginal costs (fuel, toll) are considered by users. As there are just a few operators and there is a lack of competition incentives to reduce prices and/or rise service

(2) There is a lack of through ticketing, a passengers needs to make combinations of different kind of tickets themselves. Which in case of disruption a high risk for the passengers as journey continuation is not known by the passenger. Making a multimodal trip is even more difficult as ticketing is even more fragmented. On

(3) High speed connections are missed on some heavily used aviation/car corridors. Users are always uncertain if a connection is part of their schedule. At least they should be protected by (multimodal) passengers rights.

(4) (New) high speed rail links need to be connected to national and regional networks as well. Additional traffic near these nationals nodes is often difficult which result in more disruptions, delays or longer travel time for the passengers.

3. What are the main problems causing poor performance of cross-border rail freight transport?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion / I don't know	Agree	Strongly agree
Poor performance of railway undertakings (lack of respect of the timetable resulting in poor punctuality, poor organisation of cross-border operations, insufficient preparations for disruptions and incidents, lack of coordination with other transport modes, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Poor services provided by infrastructure managers and allocation bodies (train paths not being in line with railway undertakings' requests, poor coordination of train paths across borders, outdated processes and IT tools, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Low priority for cross-border rail freight services in planning and operations compared to domestic and passenger traffic, e.g. when allocating capacity or when dispatching trains in case of delays, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Insufficient integration of rail freight services in multimodal transport chains (time lost or delays incurred in terminals, no door-to-door tracking and tracing and estimated time of arrival, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

EPF is not dealing with freight

4. What are the main problems with the services provided by rail infrastructure managers and allocation bodies to the operators of cross-border rail freight services?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion / I don't know	Agree	Strongly agree
Low priority for cross-border rail freight services in planning and operations, compared to domestic and passenger traffic and to infrastructure works restricting capacity, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of stability of the capacity (train paths) available for cross-border rail freight services (train paths are modified by infrastructure managers after allocation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Insufficient infrastructure capacity available for short-term capacity needs of rail freight operators	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Capacity (train paths), operations (traffic management) and supporting processes are not properly aligned between infrastructure managers, hampering cross-border freight traffic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of or poor performance of IT tools, interfaces and applications for planning cross-border rail traffic (capacity management)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of or poor performance of IT tools, interfaces and applications for managing cross-border train operations (traffic management)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of sufficient alternative routes, or of capacity on available routes, in case of planned or unplanned line closures, e.g. due to infrastructure works or force majeure (landslides, floods, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

EPF is not dealing with freight

5. What are the main problems with the services provided by the infrastructure managers / allocation bodies to the operators of cross-border passenger rail services?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion / I don't know	Agree	Strongly agree
Low priority for cross-border rail passenger services in planning and operations, compared to domestic traffic, infrastructure works restricting capacity, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Lack of stability of the capacity (train paths) available for cross-border rail passenger services (train paths are modified by infrastructure managers after allocation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Insufficient infrastructure capacity available for short-term capacity needs of passenger rail operators	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Capacity (train paths), operations (traffic management) and supporting processes are not properly aligned between infrastructure managers, hampering cross-border passenger traffic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of or poor performance of IT tools, interfaces and applications for planning cross-border rail traffic (capacity management)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of or poor performance of IT tools, interfaces and applications for managing train operations (traffic management)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of sufficient alternative routes, or of capacity on available routes, in case of planned or unplanned line closures, e.g. infrastructure works or due to force majeure (landslides, floods, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Comments

There are just a few corridors where trains are operating every hour or even more frequent. On most cross border rail links frequencies are low compared to domestic trains. Allocations of path should not be a problem. As path should be repetitive 24/7.

International infrastructure is less available compared with domestic infrastructure, which means that travel time for passengers will be longer in case of planned (Construction works) or unplanned disruptions.

Rerouting a train more difficult and rail replacement bus services are slower and cannot match quality criteria of a train.

4. Measures to address the problems

6. Infrastructure managers can prepare plans for the utilisation of capacity on the rail network, covering an adequate partitioning of capacity between different rail services (national, cross-border, passenger, freight, etc.), events with a large impact on available capacity, such as infrastructure works, or contingency plans for major disruptions. Should these plans be aligned at EU level and how should this be done?

- No, there is no need to align such plans across Member States
- Yes, alignment should be supported by bilateral processes, involving only the infrastructure managers concerned
- Yes, alignment should be supported by a governance set up at the level of transport corridors covering the main trade and transport flows in the EU

- Yes, alignment should be supported by a single EU entity responsible for the entire network of strategic lines in Europe
- No opinion
- Other (please specify)

Comments

7. Rail infrastructure capacity is limited and some lines and nodes are congested with traffic. Infrastructure managers must choose between conflicting capacity requests on such lines. The socio-economic and environmental benefits of passenger and freight traffic differ depending on the specific situation. Should there be rules at EU level that define how capacity should be split between different types of traffic (national, regional, cross-border, passenger, freight, etc.)?

- No
- Yes, but rules should only provide guidance
- Yes, there must be clear legally binding rules that capacity is shared in an objective and transparent manner on congested lines
- No opinion
- Other (please specify)

Comments

8. On certain congested lines, a major share of capacity is currently allocated to regional or national passenger trains. If cross-border rail freight traffic is to be developed, the number of passenger trains might need to be reduced in some cases. In case harmonised EU rules on the prioritisation of different types of rail traffic are introduced, how detailed should they be, what should they include and at what level?

- There is no need for harmonised rules at EU level

- EU rules should only identify the main principles, e.g. requiring capacity allocation on the basis of the socio-economic and environmental benefits of the different types of traffic
- EU rules should be legally binding and based on harmonised objectives, such as maximising the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions or the maximisation of socio-economic benefits
- EU rules should give clear priority to long-distance and cross-border rail traffic, while regional and local traffic should be moved to alternative means (e.g. buses) where necessary
- No opinion
- Other (please specify)

Comments

9. Managing capacity and operations for cross-border traffic requires close coordination and cooperation, covering infrastructure works restricting infrastructure availability, changes to the timetable after capacity allocation, etc. Currently, 11 rail freight corridors support this coordination and provide 11 one-stop shops for cross-border traffic. The [evaluation of Regulation \(EU\) 913/2010](#) concluded that this set up has not resulted in sufficient harmonisation at EU level and that co-existence of 11 one-stop shops does not always match the needs of cross-border rail operators. Should there be a single entity at EU level to support the coordination between infrastructure managers and what should its functions be?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion / I don't know	Agree	Strongly agree
No, there is no need for a single entity at EU level; the existing coordination structures are sufficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Yes, an entity at EU level should be responsible for developing a harmonised framework, such as common rules, procedures and IT tools	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Yes, an entity at EU level should support and supervise planning processes between the stakeholders involved, such as the coordination of infrastructure works	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Yes, an entity at EU level should support the dispatching of cross-border traffic (traffic management) and the management of large incidents (contingency management)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Yes, an entity at EU level should provide a one-stop shop for the operators of cross-border services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

10. In case of complaints, railway undertakings can revert to national rail regulatory bodies. However, national regulatory bodies cannot address issues outside the national territory. Under current EU law, regulator bodies are required to cooperate with each other on cross-border traffic. However, there are indications that decisions by national regulatory bodies are not always consistent with each other. How to ensure that regulatory supervision of rail infrastructure managers takes adequately into account the needs and requirements of cross-border traffic?

- There is no need for changes, cross-border traffic is adequately taken into account by national regulatory bodies
- There should be a mandatory requirement for regulatory bodies to take aligned decisions on all matters affecting cross-border traffic on the basis of clear rules
- There should be a European layer for regulatory supervision, either in the form of a network of regulatory bodies or via a dedicated regulatory body at EU level competent for all matters concerning cross-border transport
- No opinion
- Other (please specify)

Comments

11. Rail freight often covers only part of door-to-door freight transport operations, such that goods need to be transhipped to other modes of transport (ships, trucks, etc.). What are the best measures to increase the efficiency and performance, e.g. in terms of punctuality, reliability and speed, in multimodal transport chains involving rail?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion / I don't know	Agree	Strongly agree
No additional measures are needed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better coordination of capacity on the rail infrastructure and in terminals in the planning phase	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better coordination of day-to-day transport operations within terminals and between terminals and traffic on the rail network	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Commitment of stakeholders to improve performance and efficiency in a collaborative manner, e.g. supported by agreements between stakeholders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better IT tools, interfaces and formats supporting the exchange of planning and operational data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Measures incentivising performance and efficiency improvements, e.g. performance schemes involving bonus-malus systems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Creation of additional transshipment capacity, either by building additional terminals or by increasing the capacity of existing ones	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More efficient transshipment technologies and facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

12. Digitalisation and automation have a huge potential to make rail and multimodal transport more efficient and competitive. EU laws define frameworks and concepts for digital information exchange between the stakeholders involved. However,

deployment of these frameworks takes time and there are no strict implementation deadlines. Should there be deadlines to accelerate the deployment of digital services supporting rail transport and logistics?

- No need to require digitalisation of services via EU law
- Yes, there should be deadlines to guide digitalisation but they should be only indicative
- Yes, there should be deadlines, which are legally binding
- No opinion
- Other (please specify)

Comments

13. Should there be greater ambition to harmonise European traffic management? If so, which aspects should be covered by such harmonisation?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion / I don't know	Agree	Strongly agree
There is no need to harmonise traffic management at European level	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Harmonisation should target the technical level (e.g. standards and systems enabling automation of traffic management and automatic train operations)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Harmonisation should target processes (e.g. standardised communication and consultation between stakeholders)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Harmonisation should target rules and/or principles to determine priority, notably to resolve conflicts between trains of different categories	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

Harmonisation must have a comprehensible advantage for the passenger, for example continuous real-time information also in cross-border traffic.

14. Improving performance requires a good understanding of current performance and its limitations. Performance monitoring is also an essential prerequisite to improving the efficiency and customer-orientation of rail (freight) services. According to the [Commission's proposal for the revision of the TEN-T Guidelines](#), European Coordinators will monitor administrative, operational and interoperability aspects of passenger and freight traffic and services along corridors. Is there a need to further strengthen performance monitoring for rail (freight) transport services?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion / I don't know	Agree	Strongly agree
No, the performance monitoring carried out currently is sufficient	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Yes, more rigorous performance monitoring should be introduced as a day-to-day task based on a harmonised framework for cooperation by all stakeholders involved in operations, including infrastructure managers, railway undertakings and multimodal / terminal operators	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Yes, an independent entity should supervise performance monitoring, supported by a panel of experts in rail and multimodal transport and logistics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Comments

In order to get a realistic picture of customer satisfaction, it is useful and necessary to involve passenger associations in regular monitoring.

5. Further comments and documents

15. If relevant, you can provide comments other than those covered by the previous questions.

3000 character(s) maximum

16. You may attach supporting documents for your replies to the questions above. Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire which is the essential input to this open public consultation. The document is an optional complement and serves as additional background reading to better understand your position.

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Contact

move-rail-2022@ec.europa.eu