

## 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

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](mailto:pastori@trt.it)) or Marco Brambilla ([brambilla@trt.it](mailto:brambilla@trt.it)).

### GDPR<sup>1</sup>, 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  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Anonymised publication of statements made without the name of the organisation and without affiliation to industry sector  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

<sup>1</sup> 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).

## 1 Information on your organisation

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

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Name of the organisation</b>     | <i>NL Ministry of Infrastructure and Water management</i> |
| <b>Country</b>                      | <i>NL</i>   |
| <b>Position in the organisation</b> | <i>Coordinator international rail affairs</i>             |
| <b>Contact person name(s)</b>       | <i>[name]</i>   |
| <b>Email address(es)</b>            | <i>[name]@minienw.nl</i>                                  |
| <b>Telephone number(s)</b>          | <i>+31650662760</i>                                       |

## 2 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   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| 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                                    | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| 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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| Guaranteeing international freight trains access to adequate infrastructure capacity, recognizing the needs of other types of transport, including passenger transport  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| Facilitating the use of rail infrastructure for international rail freight services and support fair competition between rail freight service providers   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| Improving intermodality along the corridors   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |

## 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   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |   |
| 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                                    | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Depends on MS willingness to decide on infrastructure |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |   |
| Guaranteeing international freight trains access to adequate infrastructure capacity, recognizing the needs of other types of transport, including passenger transport  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |   |
| Facilitating the use of rail infrastructure for international rail freight services and support fair competition between rail freight service providers   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |   |
| Improving intermodality along the corridors   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |   |
| 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)<sup>2</sup>

| 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)   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| 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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| Lack of capacity to serve the actual or potential transport demand  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Depending on corridor. E.g. RALP very capacity is very important |
| Lack of flexibility to meet shippers' needs   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| Lack of customer orientation of infrastructure managers   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| Interoperability barriers for rail (e.g. different track gauges, electrification standards, safety and signalling systems and operational rules)  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| Lack of level playing field between different transport modes (e.g. lack of consistent application of 'polluter pays' and 'user pays' principles)   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| 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)                                   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| For other key barriers, please specify:   | Lack of flexibility to offer new / adapted services due to capacity allocation restrictions |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |                          |  |

<sup>2</sup> Question already included in the open public consultation; please skip if already answered.

## 2.5 Is the level of detail of the provisions of the Regulation appropriate? Are some of the provisions too detailed, implying a risk of over-regulation, or not detailed enough, comprising the effectiveness of the Regulation?

| Provisions   | Appropriate                         | Too detailed                        | Not detailed enough                 | Do not know                         | Please explain, if necessary   |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Definition of the rail freight corridor (Article 2)                              | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Disproportiante  |
| Selection and modification of Rail freight corridors (Articles 3 to 7)           | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Too complicated to add extensions to the RFC, long period for EC to react (9 months) |
| Governance of freight corridors (Articles 8 to 10)                               | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Competences executive board. Advisory groups rights and obligations.                 |
| Implementing freight corridors (Article 9)                                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |  |
| Investment planning (Article 11)   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Insufficient effects   |
| Coordination of works (Article 12)   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Annex VII 2012/34. Support implementation.   |
| Corridor one-stop shop and capacity allocation (Articles 13, 14 and 15)          | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Legal basis FCA missing. European OSS (procedures / ICT) needed.                     |
| Traffic management, including in the event of disturbance (Articles 16 and 17)   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Cross border rules   |
| Information on the conditions of use (Article 18)                                | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |  |
| Quality of service on the freight corridor (Article 19)                          | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |  |
| Regulatory bodies (Article 20)   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Decision making in appeals   |
| Monitoring implementation and application of the Regulation (Articles 22 and 23) | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |  |

## 2.6 To what extent do the requirements to provide information in the Regulation (i.e., the implementation plan, the investment plan, the corridor information document, performance monitoring and user satisfaction survey) relate to the following other reporting obligations at EU level?

| Reporting requirements   | Is there a relation in principle (i.e. is there an overlap with information to be provided by the RFCs)?   |                                     |                                     |                          |                                     | In practice, was there coordination when actually preparing the information? |                              |                                     |                                     | Please explain, if necessary          |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|  | Strong   | Moderate                            | Weak                                | No relation at all       | Do not know                         | The work has been complementary  | The work has been duplicated | The work is not related             | Do not know                         |                                       |
| Indicative rail infrastructure development strategy (Art. 8(1) of Directive 2012/34/EU)  | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Art 8.1 network wide                  |
| RINF Implementing Regulation   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |                                       |
| The TENtec system  | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |                                       |
| The work plans of the CNC coordinators   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |                                       |
| Rail Market Monitoring by the Commission   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |                                       |
| Implementing Regulation on access to service facilities and rail-related services  | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Rfc's use the access to services info |
| Infrastructure managers' network statements  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |                                       |
| Performance monitoring carried out in the context of PRIME   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |                                       |
| Report on Railway Safety and Interoperability in the EU by European Union Agency for Railways  | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |                                       |
| For other comments, please specify:<br>@hinne, hier kunnen we volgens mij prima een tekst kwijt over oa:<br>- <b>Pleiten voor meer samenhang</b> | Ontology development should be key to create data once and use for different functionalities. For rail ontology approach should cover both technical and economic / market part of regulation. In this way cooperation can be enhanced, eg. Between RFC's and CNC's. |                                     |                                     |                          |                                     |  |                              |                                     |                                     |                                       |

- **Pleiten voor meer samenwerking**



## 2.7 To what extent did the rail freight corridors support the development of international rail freight transport in the following areas for which the Regulation does not specify explicit requirements?

| Options   | To a large extent                   | To a moderate extent                | To a small extent                   | Not at all               | Do not know              | Please explain, if necessary  |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Improve interoperability of railway operations and other barriers at border crossings (e.g. on issues such as technical checks of trains at border crossings, simplification of train braking requirements, language requirements, customers and border control procedures, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | There is room to improve this. Depends largely on motivation specific executive board / management board. |
| Identifying and realising additional demand for rail freight services (e.g., by directly involving customers of rail freight services)  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Customers are intermodal operators, not directly involved   |
| Involvement in capacity management after the allocation decision (e.g. quality management in the event of train path modifications)   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | C-OSS supports after sales functions and coordination between IM's  |
| Cross-corridor harmonisation beyond the requirements set out in the Regulation (coordination of capacity offer and traffic management, incl. in the event of disturbance)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | RNE developments with RFC largely positive  |
| Implementation of pilot projects for the 'timetable redesign' (TTR) programme   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | RFC support the pilots  |
| For other areas, please specify:  |                                     |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |   |



|  |  |
|--|--|
| Only limited impact of executive board on capacity offer by RFC's. |  |
|--|--|

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

Hinne, onderstaande twee willen ik even bespeken met je (komen uit artikel 4)

de samenhang van de goederencorridor met de TEN-V-, de ERTMS-corridors en/of de corridors die zijn vastgesteld door RNE;

c) de integratie van de prioritaire TEN-V-projecten ( 1) in de goederencorridor;

#### 3.2 Are the criteria defined in Article 4 on the selection of further corridors and modifications of corridors sufficient to allow for a transparent selection?

| 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 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |

#### 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 |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |

## 4 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  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Executive board formally has limited decision powers (IP, FCA). Important is the coordination role of Executive board |

### 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                                | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes, potentially regarding infrastructure.   |
| Improving coordination between Member States and rail freight stakeholders, in particular infrastructure managers | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>                   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes there is structured dialogue. However executive board lacks powers to steer management board |
| Supervising and providing strategic guidance for corridor development   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Depending per RFC and ambitions Member States  |

|   |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |   |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
|   |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |                          | IM tend to act on their own? (even anders formuleren..)                     |
| Improving coordination of investments in rail infrastructure    | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Even goed over nadenken wat we kiezen hier                                  |
| Providing a harmonised framework for the allocation of capacity | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | FCA is harmonised. However share of capacity allocated by C-OSS too limited |
| Addressing legal barriers hampering international rail freight  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes, e.g. in the corridor action plans                                      |
| For other area, please specify:                                 |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |   |

### 4.3 Are the role, competences and responsibilities of the Management 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  |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Management board decisions depend also on consensus. For performance / quality management MB lacks competences. |

### 4.4 To what extent does the Management Board have the appropriate instruments to perform its functions in light of its competences?

| Instrument   | To a large extent                   | To a moderate extent                | To a small extent                   | Not at all               | Do not know              | Please explain, if necessary  |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Coordinating the use of interoperable IT applications to handle requests for international train paths and the operation of international rail freight traffic | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Experiences TIS and ETA show large bottlenecks (e.g. data protection) |
| Cooperating with regional and/or local administrations   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | E.g. EGTC Rhine Alpine positive example                               |
| Removing bottlenecks identified in the implementation plan   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Identifying bottlenecks yes, decision making national level           |
| Coordinating investments on the corridor lines, including the deployment of interoperable systems  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Common analysis is helping  |
| Coordinating works   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Dep on IM's and financial frameworks behind.                          |

|   |                                     |                                     |                                     |                                     |                          |   |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Evaluating the need for capacity to be allocated to freight trains running on the freight corridor  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |   |
| Coordinating priority rules relating to capacity allocation on the freight corridor   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 80% of capacity allocation depend still on wide variety of national rules             |
| Putting in place procedures to coordinate traffic management along the corridor and ensure their application  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Essential task of MB, but progress moderate   |
| Adopting common targets for punctuality and/or guidelines for traffic management in the event of disturbance and ensure their application   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | ICM part is positive. Need to enforce ICM rules and extend it to smaller disturbances |
| Coordinating rail capacity with access to terminals   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Terminals are acting independent from IM. First transparency can help                 |
| Promoting compatibility between the performance schemes along the freight corridor  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Example proposed harmonisation cancellation fees show the difficulties                |
| Monitoring the performance of rail freight services on the freight corridor, i.e. the transport services offered to customers of railway undertakings (shippers, freight forwarders and combined transport operators) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes, harmonised KPI's on traffic, not so much on                                      |

#### 4.5 Did the Management Board(s) appropriately take into account any issues raised by the Executive Board?

| Yes, in all/most cases   | Not in all cases                    | Not at all               | Do not know              | Please explain, if necessary   |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | IM's tend to see the ExBo not as their supervisory board. Cooperation depends on motivation and corridor political guidance. |

#### 4.7 What was the effect of the unanimity rule for decision-making in the Executive Board and in the Management Board?

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Positive</b> , as it ensured that the positions of all parties were taken into account, supporting ownership and implementation of the decisions   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Negative</b> , as it comprised the ability of the board to take decisions  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Do not know   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| For other comments, please explain: Unanimity makes progress slower but more shared. Difficult however to see which issues could be decided without consensus. A European framework and body for allocation for rail freight should have sufficient powers in individual cases. |                                     |

#### 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   |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Participation from different RU's and Terminals is not enough.<br>IM's act very slow.<br><br>Participation of RAG's in executive board can help responsible actions. |

#### 4.11 To what extent is the role of the terminals' advisory group in the decision-making process adequate to ensure that the opinions of terminals 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   |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Participation from different RU's and Terminals is not enough.<br>IM's act very slow |

**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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |

**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  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | WG can push innovation but depend on national support in implementation |

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

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Yes</b> , all relevant groups already participate  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| <b>No</b> , the following stakeholders groups are missing:  |                                     |
| - Customers of rail freight services (e.g. shipper, forwarders, and combined transport operators)                                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| - Authorities in charge of railway safety (e.g. national safety authorities and the European Union Agency for Railways)           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| - Entities in charge of rail research and innovation (e.g. Shift2Rail, national railway research bodies, railway supply industry) | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| <b>NSA's</b> : depending on situation per corridor  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| <b>Others more on ad hoc basis</b> : example is custom authorities  |                                     |

**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               |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Transparency helps coordination of efforts |

**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)<sup>3</sup>**

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| No, voluntary cross-RFC coordination has been effective and more flexible than coordination based on legal requirements | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Yes, voluntary coordination has been insufficient to ensure adequate cooperation and harmonisation at network level     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Yes, for other reasons (please specify)   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Do not know   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**4.19 To what extent does the Regulation give regulatory bodies the necessary tools to fulfil their function of monitoring competition and ensuring non-discriminatory access to the corridor? Are the competences of regulatory bodies clearly enough defined?**

| To a large extent        | To a moderate extent                | To some extent           | Not at all               | Do not know              | Please explain, if necessary                           |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Only one RB is competent for MS where C-OSS is located |

<sup>3</sup> Question already included in the open public consultation; please skip if already answered.

#### 4.20 To what extent did the cooperation between the regulatory bodies of the Member States on the rail freight corridors contribute to achieving the objectives of the Regulation?

| To a large extent        | To a moderate extent                | To some extent           | Not at all               | Do not know              | Please explain, if necessary  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | RB's cooperation can help transparency. More active assessments and recommendations are needed. |

#### 4.24 To what extent do the formal competences and the practical work of RFCs and Core Network Corridors (CNC) overlap in terms of the following activities?

| Intervention area  | To a large extent                   | To a moderate extent                | To a small extent                   | Not at all                          | Do not know              | Please explain, if necessary                                       |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Overall  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| Investment planning  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | RFC has expertise. CNC closer to financing. CNC hardly coordinates |
| Deployment of new technologies and telematic applications, incl. ERTMS     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| Examining the demand for transport services (e.g., Transport Market Study) | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | CNC takes no rol in demand studies                                 |
| Improving infrastructure use   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| Improving intermodal/multimodal transport                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| For other intervention areas, please explain:                              |                                     |                                     |                                     |                                     |                          |  |

**4.25 For those areas for which you think there is an overlap in competences and activities, how do you assess the cooperation in practice between the governance structure of the rail freight corridors, on the one hand, and the EU coordinators and their secretariat, on the other?**

| Intervention area  | To a large extent        | To a moderate extent     | To a small extent                   | Not at all               | Do not know              | Please explain, if necessary |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Overall  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| Investment planning  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| Deployment of new technologies and telematics applications, incl. ERTMS    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| Examining the demand for transport services (e.g., Transport Market Study) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| Improving infrastructure use   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| Improving intermodal/multimodal transport                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| For other intervention areas, please explain:                              |                          |                          |                                     |                          |                          |                              |

**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) | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Differences between corridors |
| Traffic management  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                               |
| Coordination of investment planning   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                               |
| Coordination with and access to terminals   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                               |
| Providing information about infrastructure and the conditions of its use              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                               |
| Performance and customer satisfaction monitoring                                      | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                               |
| Monitoring competition  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                               |

#### 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  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Yes, there was some coordination   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| No, there was no coordination but an exchange of information   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| No, there was neither coordination nor an exchange of information  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Do not know  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| <p><b>For other comments, please explain:</b></p> <p>In the RFC's there is regular exchange of information on national rail freight policies. Member States remain competent for issues of intermodal subsidies or framework for charging but try where possible to coordinate</p> |                                     |

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

### 5.1 To what extent are the requirements as regards the contents and structure of the corridor implementation plan clear (for example, is the wording “description of the characteristics of the freight corridor” clear enough)?

| To a large extent                   | To a moderate extent     | To a small extent        | Not at all               | Do not know              | Please explain, if necessary            |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Content clear. Impact moderate / small. |

### 5.2 To which extent do you agree with the following statements as regards the requirement to “periodically review the implementation plan” in Article 9(2) of the Regulation?

| Options  | Fully agree              | Partially agree                     | Do not agree             | Do not know              | Please explain, if necessary                   |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| The requirement is sufficiently clear  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ‘periodically’ gives to much space to manœuvre |
| The requirement is justified as an up-to-date formal documentation of corridor implementation is needed, i.e. a constantly updated ‘corridor development plan’   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| The requirement creates unnecessary administrative burden as corridor implementation measures are largely accomplished once the corridor has been made operational and there should be more flexibility for subsequent reporting | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |

### 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 |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |

### 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 |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |

## 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   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| To inform infrastructure development, e.g. as regards the need for new infrastructure   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| To inform the definition of infrastructure capacity allocated to freight trains (pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity) | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| To provide insights on how to improve the attractiveness of rail freight services for customers                                 | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| To provide insights on how to increase the efficiency of planning and operations of rail freight services                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| RFC transport market studies do not serve any purpose   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| 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   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| To inform infrastructure development, e.g. as regards the need for new infrastructure   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Decisions nationally taken   |
| To inform the definition of infrastructure capacity allocated to freight trains (pre-arranged train paths and reserve capacity) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| To provide insights on how to improve the attractiveness of rail freight services for customers                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| To provide insights on how to increase the efficiency of planning and operations of rail freight services                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| RFC transport market studies do not serve any purpose.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| For other options, please specify   |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |                              |

### 5.7 To what extent have national studies contributed to or used the RFC transport market studies?

| Options                                       | To a large extent        | To a moderate extent                | To a small extent                   | Not at all               | Do not know              | Please explain, if necessary                                |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| National studies contributed to the RFC study | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |   |
| The RFC study contributed to national studies | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No common view on CBA, no common view on market assessments |
| For other options, please specify:            |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |   |

## 6 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 |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 740m, ERTMS                  |

**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 |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |

**6.3 To what extent does the “deployment plan relating to the interoperable systems along the freight corridor” (Article 11(1b)) provide a value-added over the other plans in this regard (e.g., national implementation plans for TSIs, European Deployment Plan for ERTMS, etc.)?**

| To a large extent                   | To a moderate extent     | To a small extent        | Not at all               | Do not know              | Please explain, if necessary                 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Makes corridor picture clear and coordinated |

## 10 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      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| Railway undertakings        | Buyers of rail transport services              | Rail freight transport services   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |
| Infrastructure manager      | Member States                                  | Policy objectives                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                              |

## 13 Suggestions and other issues

### 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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| NO  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Please provide contact details of (an) potential interview partner(s):

[contactperson]

.....  
Rail Transport Department  
Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management  
**Rijnstraat 8 | 2515 XP | The Hague | The Netherlands**  
**P.O. Box 20901 | 2500 EX | The Hague | The Netherlands**  
.....

**Tel. +31.70.4561678 Mobile: +31.6.50662760**  
**Fax.: +31.70.3516591**

**[email contactperson]**

If you have would like to address or focus on particular issues, please specify:

**Thank you for your participation**