

# Corridor Information Document (CID) RFC Rhine-Alpine



## 2025 timetable year

The sole responsibility of this publication lies with the author. The European Union is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.



Funded by  
the European Union

## Version control

Version	Chapter changed	Changes compared to the previously published version	X marks which part in the chapter concerned has been changed	
			Common part	Corridor-specific part
08.01.2024	New version			

Glossary .....	6
<b>4 Procedures for Capacity, Traffic and Train Performance Management .....</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	6
4.2 Corridor OSS.....	6
4.2.1 Function.....	7
4.2.2 Contact .....	7
4.2.3 Language of the C-OSS .....	7
4.2.4 Tasks of the C-OSS.....	7
4.2.4.1 Path register .....	9
4.2.5 Tool.....	9
4.3 Capacity allocation .....	9
4.3.1 Framework for Capacity Allocation .....	9
4.3.2 Applicants .....	9
4.3.3 Requirements for requesting capacity .....	10
4.3.4 Annual timetable phase.....	11
4.3.4.1 PaPs.....	11
4.3.4.2 Schematic corridor map.....	12
4.3.4.3 Features of PaPs.....	13
4.3.4.4 Multiple corridor paths .....	14
4.3.4.5 PaPs on overlapping sections .....	14
4.3.4.6 Feeder, outflow and tailor-made paths.....	15
4.3.4.7 Handling of requests .....	15
4.3.4.8 Leading tool for the handling of capacity requests.....	16
4.3.4.9 Check of the applications.....	16
4.3.4.10 Pre-booking phase.....	17
4.3.4.11 Priority rules in capacity allocation .....	17
4.3.4.12 Network PaP .....	18
4.3.4.13 Priority rule in case no Network PaP is involved.....	18
4.3.4.14 Priority rule if a Network PaP is involved in at least one of the conflicting requests 19	19
4.3.4.15 Random selection .....	19
4.3.4.16 Special cases of requests and their treatment .....	19
4.3.4.17 Result of the pre-booking.....	20
4.3.4.18 Handling of non-requested PaPs.....	21
4.3.4.19 Draft offer .....	21
4.3.4.20 Observations.....	21
4.3.4.21 Post-processing.....	22

4.3.4.22 Final offer .....	22
4.3.5 Late path request phase .....	22
4.3.5.1 Product .....	22
4.3.5.2 Multiple corridor paths .....	23
4.3.5.3 Late paths on overlapping sections .....	23
4.3.5.4 Handling of requests .....	23
4.3.5.5 Leading tool for late path requests.....	23
4.3.5.6 Check of the applications.....	23
4.3.5.7 Pre-booking.....	23
4.3.5.8 Path elaboration.....	23
4.3.5.9 Late request offer.....	24
4.3.6 Ad-hoc path request phase .....	24
4.3.6.1 Reserve capacity (RC) .....	24
4.3.6.2 Multiple corridor paths .....	25
4.3.6.3 Reserve capacity on overlapping sections .....	25
4.3.6.4 Feeder, outflow and tailor-made paths.....	25
4.3.6.5 Handling of requests .....	25
4.3.6.6 Leading tool for ad-hoc requests .....	25
4.3.6.7 Check of the applications.....	25
4.3.6.8 Pre-booking.....	26
4.3.6.9 Path elaboration.....	26
4.3.6.10 Ad-hoc request offer.....	26
4.3.7 Request for changes by the applicant.....	26
4.3.7.1 Modification.....	26
4.3.7.2 Withdrawal.....	26
4.3.7.3 Transfer of capacity .....	27
4.3.7.4 Cancellation .....	27
4.3.7.5 Unused paths .....	29
4.3.8 Exceptional transport and dangerous goods .....	30
4.3.8.1 Exceptional transport .....	30
4.3.8.2 Dangerous goods .....	30
4.3.9 Rail related services .....	30
4.3.10 Contracting and invoicing .....	30
4.3.11 Appeal procedure .....	31
4.4 Coordination and Publication of planned Temporary Capacity Restrictions .....	31
4.4.1 Goals.....	31

<b>4.4.2 Legal background .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>4.4.3 Coordination process of corridor-relevant TCRs .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>4.4.3.1 Timeline for coordination .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>4.4.3.2 Coordination between neighbouring IMs (first level of coordination) .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>4.4.3.3 Coordination at Corridor level (second level of coordination) .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>4.4.3.4 Conflict resolution process.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>4.4.4 Involvement of applicants .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>4.4.5 Publication of TCRs .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>4.4.5.1 Criteria for publication.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>4.4.5.2 Dates of publication.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>4.4.5.3 Tool for publication .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>4.4.6 Legal disclaimer .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>4.5 Traffic management.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>4.5.1 Cross-border section information .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>4.5.1.1 Technical features and operational rules.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>4.5.1.2 Cross-border agreements .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>4.5.2 Priority rules in traffic management .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4.5.3 Traffic management in the event of disturbance .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4.5.3.1 Communication procedure .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.5.3.2 Operational scenarios on the Corridor in the event of disturbance.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.5.3.3 Allocation rules in the event of disturbance .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.5.4 Traffic restrictions .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.5.5 Dangerous goods .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>4.5.6 Exceptional transport .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>4.6 Train Performance Management.....</b>	<b>39</b>

## Glossary

A general glossary which is harmonised over all Corridors is available under the following link:

[https://rne.eu/wp-content/uploads/NS\\_CID\\_Glossary\\_2023-Working-file\\_clean-version.xlsx](https://rne.eu/wp-content/uploads/NS_CID_Glossary_2023-Working-file_clean-version.xlsx)

## 4 Procedures for Capacity, Traffic and Train Performance Management

### 4.1 Introduction

This Section of the CID describes the procedures for capacity allocation by the C-OSS, planned Temporary Capacity Restrictions (TCRs), Traffic Management and Train Performance Management on the Corridor.

All rules concerning applicants, the use of the C-OSS and its products — Pre-arranged Paths (PaPs) and Reserve Capacity (RC) — and how to order them are explained here. The processes, provisions and steps related to PaPs and RC refer to Regulation (EU) No. 913/2010 and are valid for all applicants. For all other issues, the relevant conditions presented in the Network Statements of the IMs/ABs concerned are applicable.

Pilots are being conducted on parts of some RFCs to test the results of the RNE-FTE project Redesign of the International Timetabling Process: 'TTR for Smart Capacity Management' (TTR).

For a complete and up-to-date overview of lines concerned by the aforesaid pilots, refer to the 'TTR Pilots Communication Platform' maintained by RNE under the URL: <https://rne.eu/capacity-management/ttr/implementation/pilots-and-mvp/>.

Specific rules and terms for capacity allocation are applicable on these parts of the Corridors, which the MB of the particular Corridor decides upon.



Corridor Rhine-Alpine does not participate in a TTR pilot project.

Some of these pilots follow the rules and terms described and defined in Annex 4 of the Framework for Capacity Allocation. For all other lines of the above Corridors, the rules described in this Section 4 apply.

This document is revised and updated every year before the start of the yearly allocation process for PaPs. Changes in the legal basis of this document (e.g. changes in EU regulations, Framework for Capacity Allocation or national regulations) will be implemented with each revision.

Any changes during the running allocation process will be communicated directly to the applicants through publication on the Corridor's website.

### 4.2 Corridor OSS

According to Article 13 of the Regulation, the MB of the Corridor has established a C-OSS. The tasks of the C-OSS are carried out in a non-discriminatory way and it maintains confidentiality regarding applicants.

#### 4.2.1 Function


The C-OSS is the only body where applicants may request and receive dedicated infrastructure capacity for international freight trains on the Corridor. The handling of the requests takes place in a single place and a single operation. The C-OSS is exclusively responsible for performing all the activities related to the publication and allocation decision with regard to requests for PaPs and RC on behalf of the IMs / ABs concerned.

#### 4.2.2 Contact

	
Address	C-OSS Corridor Rhine-Alpine c/o Stephanie Bscheid Adam-Riese-Strasse 11-13 D-60327 Frankfurt am Main Germany
Phone	+49 69 265 267 71 +49 160 974 675 34
Email	<a href="mailto:cos@corridor-rhine-alpine.eu">cos@corridor-rhine-alpine.eu</a>

#### 4.2.3 Language of the C-OSS

The official language of the C-OSS for correspondence is English.

	
Additionally, the C-OSS can assist you in German.	

#### 4.2.4 Tasks of the C-OSS

The C-OSS executes the tasks below during the following processes:

- Collection of international capacity wishes:
  - Consult all interested applicants in order to collect international capacity wishes and needs for the annual timetable by having them fill in a survey. This survey is sent by the C-OSS to the applicants and/or published on the Corridor's website. The results of the survey will be one part of the inputs for the predesign of the PaP offer. It is important to stress that under no circumstances the Corridor can guarantee the fulfilment of all expressed capacity wishes, nor will there be any priority in allocation linked to the provision of similar capacity.
- Predesign of PaP offer:
  - Give advice on the capacity offer, based on input received from the applicants, and the experience of the C-OSS and IMs/ABs, based on previous years and the results of the Transport Market Study
- Construction phase:
  - Monitor the PaP/RC construction to ensure harmonised border crossing times, calendar days and train parameters
- Publication phase:

- Publish the PaP catalogue at X-11 in the Path Coordination System (PCS)
  - Inspect the PaP catalogue in cooperation with IMs/ABs, perform all needed corrections of errors detected by any of the involved parties until X-10.5
  - Publish offer for the late path request phase (where late path offer is applicable) in PCS
  - Publish the RC at X-2 in PCS
- Allocation phase: annual timetable (annual timetable process)
- Collect, check and review all requests for PaPs including error fixing when possible
  - Create a register of the applications and keep it up-to-date (see 4.2.4.1)
  - Manage the resolution of conflicting requests through consultation where applicable
  - In case of conflicting requests, take a decision on the basis of priority rules adopted by the Executive Board along the Corridor (see Framework for Capacity Allocation (FCA) in Annex 4.A)
  - Propose alternative PaPs, if available, to the applicants whose applications have a lower priority value (K value) due to a conflict between several path requests
  - Transmit path requests that cannot be treated to the IM/AB concerned, in order for them to elaborate tailor-made offers
  - Pre-book capacity and inform applicants about the results at X-7.5
  - Allocate capacity (PaPs) in conformity with the relevant international timetabling deadlines and processes as defined by RailNetEurope (RNE) and according to the allocation rules described in the FCA
  - Monitor the construction of feeder and/or outflow paths by sending these requests without delay to the IMs/ABs concerned and obtain their responses/offers. In case of non-consistent offers (e.g. non-harmonised border times), ask for correction
  - Send the responses/offers (draft offer and final offer including feeder and outflow) to the applicants on behalf of the IMs/ABs concerned
  - Keep the PaP catalogue updated
- Allocation phase: late path requests (annual timetable process)
- Collect, check and review all requests for the late path request phase including error fixing when possible
  - Allocate capacity for the late path request phase where applicable
  - Monitor the construction of feeder and/or outflow paths by sending these requests to the IMs/ABs concerned and obtain their responses/offers. In case of non-consistent offers (e.g. non-harmonised border times), ask for correction
  - Send the responses/offers to the applicants on behalf of the IMs/ABs concerned
  - Keep the catalogue concerned updated
- Allocation phase: ad-hoc requests (RC) (running timetable process)
- Collect, check and review all requests for RC including error fixing when possible
  - Create a register of the applications and keep it up-to-date
  - Allocate capacity for RC
  - Monitor the construction of feeder and/or outflow paths by sending these requests without delay to the IMs/ABs concerned and obtain their responses/offers. In case of non-consistent offers (e.g. non-harmonised border times), ask for correction
  - Send the responses/offers to the applicants on behalf of the IMs/ABs concerned
  - Keep the RC catalogue updated



#### 4.2.4.1 Path register

The C-OSS manages and keeps a path register up-to-date for all incoming requests, containing the dates of the requests, the names of the applicants, details of the documentation supplied and of incidents that have occurred. A path register shall be made freely available to all applicants concerned without disclosing the identity of other applicants, unless the applicants concerned have agreed to such a disclosure. The contents of the register will only be communicated to them on request.

#### 4.2.5 Tool

PCS is the single tool for publishing the binding PaP and RC offer of the Corridor and for placing and managing international path requests on the Corridor (see also 1.8.1). Access to the tool is free of charge and granted to all applicants who have a valid, signed PCS User Agreement with RNE. To receive access to the tool, applicants have to send their request to RNE via [support.pcs@rne.eu](mailto:support.pcs@rne.eu).

Applications for PaPs/RC can only be made via PCS to the involved C-OSS. If the application is made directly to the IMs/ABs concerned, they inform the applicant that they have to place a correct PaP request in PCS via the C-OSS according to the applicable deadlines. PaP capacity requested only through national tools will not be allocated.

In other words, PaP/RC applications cannot be placed through any other tool than PCS.

### 4.3 Capacity allocation

The decision on the allocation of PaPs and RC on the Corridor is taken by the C-OSS on behalf of the IMs/ABs concerned. As regards feeder and/or outflow paths, the allocation decision is made by the relevant IMs/ABs and communicated to the applicant by the C-OSS. Consistent path construction containing the feeder and/or outflow sections and the corridor-related path section has to be ensured.

All necessary contractual relations regarding network access have to be dealt with bilaterally between the applicant and each individual IM/AB.

#### 4.3.1 Framework for Capacity Allocation

Referring to Article 14.1 of the Regulation, the Executive Boards of the Rail Freight Corridors agreed upon a common Framework for Capacity Allocation. The document is available in Annex 4.A. and below.



The Framework for Capacity Allocation can be found under the following link: [FCA](#)

The FCA constitutes the basis for capacity allocation by the C-OSS.

#### 4.3.2 Applicants

In the context of a Corridor, an applicant means a railway undertaking or an international grouping of railway undertakings or other persons or legal entities, such as competent authorities under Regulation (EC) No. 1370/2007 and shippers, freight forwarders and combined transport operators, with a commercial interest in procuring infrastructure capacity for rail freight.

Applicants shall accept the general terms and conditions of the Corridor as stipulated in this CID by accepting the respective check-box in PCS before placing their requests.

Without accepting the general terms and conditions, the applicant will not be able to send the request. In case a request is placed by several applicants, every applicant requesting PaP sections has to accept the general terms and conditions for each corridor on which the applicant is requesting a PaP section. In case one of the applicants only requests a feeder or outflow section, the acceptance of the general terms and conditions is not needed.


The acceptance shall be done only once per applicant and per corridor and is valid for one timetable period.

With the acceptance the applicant declares that it:

- has read, understood and accepted the Corridor's CID and, in particular, this Section 4,
- complies with all conditions set by applicable legislation and by the IMs/ABs involved in the paths it has requested, including all administrative and financial requirements,
- shall provide all data required for the path requests,
- accepts the provisions of the national Network Statements applicable to the path(s) requested.

In case of a non-RU applicant, it shall appoint the RU that will be responsible for train operation and inform the C-OSS and IMs/ABs about this RU as early as possible, but at the latest 30 days before the running day. If the appointment is not provided by this date, the PaP/RC is considered as cancelled, and national rules for path cancellation are applicable.

In case the applicant is a non-RU applicant, and applies for feeder / outflow paths, the national rules for nomination of the executing RU will be applied. In the table below the national deadlines for nomination of the executing RU for feeder / outflow paths can be found.

	
An overview of the deadlines of the IMs/AB on the Corridor from the different Network Statement is listed below.	
IM	Deadline
ProRail; Netherlands	Within 30 days of the traffic date
Infrabel; Belgium	Not later than 7 calendar days before the train path day (exceptions: see NS 3.2.1.2)
DB InfraGo, Germany	30 days before first running day
SBB / BLS / TVS Switzerland	30 days before first running day
RFI; Italy	30 days before running day

#### 4.3.3 Requirements for requesting capacity

The Corridor applies the international timetabling deadlines defined by RNE for placing path requests as well as for allocating paths (for the Corridor calendar, see <https://rne.eu/capacity-management/capacity-planning-timetabling/> or Annex 4.B).

All applications have to be submitted via PCS, which is the single tool for requesting and managing capacity on all corridors. The C-OSS is not entitled to create PCS dossiers on behalf of the applicant. If requested, the C-OSS can support applicants in creating the dossiers in order to prevent inconsistencies and guide the applicants' expectations (maximum

1 week prior to the request deadline). The IMs/ABs may support applicants by providing a technical check of the requests.

A request for international freight capacity via the C-OSS has to fulfil the following requirements:

- it must be submitted to a C-OSS by using PCS, including at least one PaP/RC section (for access to PCS, see 1.8.1 and 4.2.5). Details are explained in the PCS User Manual <https://rne.eu/it/rne-applications/pcs/documentation/>),
- it must cross at least one border on a corridor,
- it must comprise a train run from origin to destination, including PaP/RC sections on one or more corridors as well as, where applicable, feeder and/or outflow paths, on all of its running days. In certain cases, which are due to technical limitations of PCS, a request may have to be submitted in the form of more than one dossier. These specific cases are the following:
  - Different origin and/or destination depending on running day (But using identical PaP/RC capacity for at least one of the IMs for which capacity was requested).
  - Transshipment from one train onto different trains (or vice versa) because of infrastructure restrictions.
  - The IM/AB specifically asks the applicant to split the request into two or more dossiers.

To be able for the C-OSS to identify such dossiers as one request, and to allow a correct calculation of the priority value (K value) in case a request has to be submitted in more than one dossier, the applicant shall indicate the link among these dossiers in PCS. Furthermore, the applicant shall mention the reason for using more than one dossier in the comment field.

- the technical parameters of the path request have to be within the range of the parameters – as originally published – of the requested PaP sections (exceptions are possible if allowed by the IM/AB concerned, e.g. when the timetable of the PaP can be respected)
- as regards sections with flexible times, the applicant may adjust/insert times, stops and parameters according to its individual needs within the given range.



No specific corridor requirements for additional cases on the Corridor Rhine-Alpine.

#### 4.3.4 Annual timetable phase

##### 4.3.4.1 PaPs

PaPs are a joint offer of coordinated cross-border paths for the annual timetable produced by IMs/ABs involved in the Corridor. The C-OSS acts as a single point of contact for the publication and allocation of PaPs.

PaPs constitute an off-the-shelf capacity product for international rail freight services. In order to meet the applicants' need for flexibility and the market demand on the Corridor, PaPs are split up in several sections, instead of being supplied as entire PaPs, as for example from Rotterdam to Genoa. Therefore, the offer might also include some purely national PaP sections – to be requested from the C-OSS for freight trains crossing at least one border on a corridor in the context of international path applications.


A catalogue of PaPs is published by the C-OSS in preparation of each timetable period. It is published in PCS and on the Corridor's website.



The PaP catalogue can be found under the following link: [Here](#)

PaPs are published in PCS at X-11. Between X-11 and X-10.5 the C-OSS is allowed to perform, in PCS, all needed corrections of errors regarding the published PaPs detected by any of the involved parties. In this phase, the published PaPs have 'read only' status for applicants, who may also provide input to the C-OSS regarding the correction of errors.

#### 4.3.4.2 Schematic corridor map



Symbols in schematic corridor map:

Nodes along the Corridor, shown on the schematic map, are divided into the following types:

➤ Handover Point

Point where planning responsibility is handed over from one IM to another. Published times cannot be changed. In case there are two consecutive Handover Points, only the departure time from the first Handover Point and the arrival time at the second Handover Point cannot be changed.

On the maps, this is shown as:

 Handover Point

➤ Intermediate Point

Feeder and outflow connections are possible. If the path request ends at an Intermediate Point without indication of a further path, feeder/outflow or additional PaP section, the

destination terminal / parking facility of the train can be mentioned. Intermediate Points also allow stops for train handling, e.g. loco change, driver change, etc. An Intermediate Point can be combined with a Handover Point.

On the maps, this is shown as:

 Intermediate Point

 Intermediate Point combined with Handover Point

➤ Operational Point

Train handling (e.g. loco change, driver change) are possible as defined in the PaP section. No feeder or outflow connections are possible.

On the maps, this is shown as:

 Operational Point

A schematic map of the Corridor can be found in Annex 4C.

#### 4.3.4.3 Features of PaPs

A PaP timetable is published containing one of the following features:

- Sections with fixed times (data cannot be modified in the path request by an applicant).
  - Capacity with fixed origin, intermediate and destination times within one IM/AB.
  - Intermediate Points and Operational Points (as defined in 4.3.4.2) with fixed times. Requests for changes to the published PaP have to be examined by the IMs/ABs concerned and can only be accepted if they are feasible and if this does not change the calculation of the priority rule in case of conflicting requests at X-8.
- Sections with flexible times (data may be modified in the path request by an applicant according to individual needs, but without exceeding the given range of standard running times, stopping times and train parameters. Where applicable, the maximum number of stops and total stopping time per section have to be respected).
  - Applicants are free to include their own requirements in their PaP request within the parameters mentioned in the PaP catalogue.
  - Where applicable, the indication of standard journey times for each corridor section has to be respected.
  - Optional: Intermediate Points (as defined in 4.3.4.2) without fixed times. Other points on the Corridor may be requested.
  - Optional: Operational Points (as defined in 4.3.4.2) without fixed times.

Requests for changes outside of the above-mentioned flexibility have to be examined by the IMs/ABs concerned if they accept the requests. The changes can only be accepted if they are feasible.

The C-OSS promotes the PaPs by presenting them to existing and potential applicants.



Due to infrastructure specificities, Corridor Rhine-Alpine knows the following two additional types of sections

- Sections with standard common parameters

- the parameters display the maximal value and cannot be exceeded
- standard common parameters to fit in the major part of the path requests
- Applicants have the freedom to include their own requirements in their PaP request within the parameters mentioned in the PaP catalogue
- Exception: Sections with minimum parameters (Basel SBB RB – Brig – Domodossola) (concerned PaP defined in annex 4.D-5)
  - Within those sections the request must exceed the profile of PC 45/364.
  - Requests which do not exceed the minimum parameter will be handed over directly to the responsible IM to be planned within the national allocation process.

The following PaP combinations on the Corridor Rhine-Alpine are possible

- Sections with fixed times and standard common parameter
- Sections with fixed times and minimum parameter
- Sections with flexible times and standard common parameter

On Corridor Rhine – Alpine there are further national specificities known in Belgium, Germany and Switzerland, please see Annex 4.D.

#### 4.3.4.4 Multiple corridor paths

It is possible for capacity requests to cover more than one corridor. A PaP offer harmonised by different corridors may be published and indicated as such. The applicant may request PaP sections on different corridors within one request. Each C-OSS remains responsible for allocating its own PaP sections, but the applicant may address its questions to only one of the involved C-OSSs, who will coordinate with the other concerned C-OSSs whenever needed.



Multiple corridor paths on the Corridor Rhine-Alpine are displayed on the map in Annex 4C.

Reserve capacity is not offered on multiple corridor paths on the Corridor Rhine-Alpine.

Corridor Rhine-Alpine is connected to	at / between	offer
Corridor North Sea – Mediterranean	Basel SBB RB	Harmonised PaP offer
Corridor Scan Med	Piacenza	Harmonised path offer

#### 4.3.4.5 PaPs on overlapping sections

The layout of the corridor lines leads to situations where some corridor lines overlap with others. The aim of the corridors, in this case, is to prepare the best possible offer, taking into account the different traffic flows and to show the possible solutions to link the overlapping sections concerned with the rest of the corridors in question.

In case of overlapping sections, corridors may develop a common offer, visible via all corridors concerned. These involved corridors will decide which C-OSS is responsible for the final allocation decision on the published capacity. In case of conflict, the responsible C-OSS will deal with the process of deciding which request should have priority together with the other C-OSSs. In any case, the applicant will be consulted by the responsible C-OSS.



Corridor Rhine-Alpine has no common offer on overlapping sections.


#### 4.3.4.6 Feeder, outflow and tailor-made paths

In case available PaPs do not cover the entire requested path, the applicant may include a feeder and/or outflow path to the PaP section(s) in the international request addressed to the C-OSS via PCS in a single request.

A feeder/outflow path refers to any path section prior to reaching an Intermediate Point on a corridor (feeder path) or any path section after leaving a corridor at an Intermediate Point (outflow path).

Feeder / outflow paths will be constructed on request in the PCS dossiers concerned by following the national path allocation rules. The offer is communicated to the applicant by the C-OSS within the same time frame available for the communication of the requested PaPs. Requesting a tailor-made path between two PaP sections is possible, but because of the difficulty for IMs/ABs to link two PaP sections, a suitable offer might be less likely (for further explanation see 4.3.4.16).

Graph with possible scenarios for feeder/outflow paths in connection with a request for one or more PaP section(s):



#### 4.3.4.7 Handling of requests

The C-OSS publishes the PaP catalogue at X-11 in PCS, inspects it in cooperation with IMs/ABs, and performs all needed corrections of errors detected by any of the involved parties until X-10.5. Applicants can submit their requests until X-8. The C-OSS offers a single point of contact to applicants, allowing them to submit requests and receive answers regarding corridor capacity for international freight trains crossing at least one border on a corridor in one single

operation. If requested, the C-OSS can support applicants in creating the dossiers in order to prevent inconsistencies and guide the applicants' expectations. The IMs/ABs may support the applicants by providing a technical check of the requests.

#### 4.3.4.8 Leading tool for the handling of capacity requests

Applicants sending requests to the C-OSS shall use PCS. PCS is used to manage the complete international path: PaP section, feeder and/or outflow and tailor-made path. Within the construction process of feeder and/or outflow paths and tailor-made paths, the national tool may show additional information to the applicant.

The following matrix shows for each step of the process which tool is considered as the leading tool.

Phase	Application (till X-8)	Withdrawal (X-8)	Pre-booking (X-7.5)	Draft offer (X-5)	Observation (X-5 till X-4)	Final offer (X-3.5)	Acceptance (until X-3)	Modification (after X-4)	Cancellation (after X-4)
Leading tool	PCS	PCS	PCS	PCS	PCS	PCS	PCS	National tool/PCS	National tool/PCS
Additional tool			Email (for pre-booking information)						



All requests for modification and/or cancellation must be placed in IM's national tool only. For Infrabel, modifications/cancellations after X-4 must be entered via the PCS application.

#### 4.3.4.9 Check of the applications

The C-OSS assumes that the applicant has accepted the published PaP characteristics by requesting the selected PaP. However, for all incoming capacity requests it will perform the following plausibility checks:

- Request for freight train using PaP and crossing at least one border on a corridor
- Request without major change of parameters

If there are plausibility flaws, the C-OSS may check with the applicant whether these can be resolved:

- if the issue can be solved, the request will be corrected by the C-OSS (after the approval of the applicants concerned) and processed like all other requests. The applicant has to accept or reject the corrections within 5 calendar days. In case the applicant does not answer or reject the corrections, the C-OSS forwards the original request to the IM/AB concerned.
- if the issue cannot be resolved, the request will be rejected.

All requests not respecting the published offer are immediately forwarded by the C-OSS to the IM/AB concerned for further treatment. In those cases, answers are provided by the involved IM/AB. The IMs/ABs will accept them as placed in time (i.e. until X-8).





Checks of the C-OSS additional steps:

- Legitimation Applicants (includes the acceptance of terms and conditions)
- Plausibility of PaP request due to the timetable
- Routing, start/final point (terminal) and feeder/ outflow of request
- Identical Running Days for whole PaP request
- Flex-PaP due to the range of flexibility
- PaP requests with special cases
- Doubling of train numbers
- Parameter of PaP request
- Parameter national specificities

In case of missing or inconsistent data the C-OSS directly contacts the leading applicant and asks for the relevant data update/changes to be delivered within 5 calendar days.

In general: in case a request contains PaPs on several corridors, the C-OSSs concerned check the capacity request in cooperation with the other involved C-OSS(s) to ensure their cooperation in treating multiple corridor requests. This way, the cumulated length of PaPs requested on each corridor is used to calculate the priority value (K value) of possible conflicting requests (see more details in 4.3.4.11). The different corridors can thus be seen as part of one combined network.

#### **4.3.4.10 Pre-booking phase**

In the event of conflicting requests for PaPs placed until X-8, a priority rule is applied. The priority rules are stated in the FCA (Annex 4.A) and in 4.3.4.11.

On behalf of the IMs/ABs concerned and according to the result of the application of the priority rules - as detailed in 4.3.4.11 - the C-OSS pre-books the PaPs.

The C-OSS also forwards without delay the requested feeder/outflow path and/or adjustment to the IMs/ABs concerned for elaboration of a timetable offer fitting to the PaP already reserved (pre-booked), just as might be the case with requests with a lower priority value (priority rule process below). The latter will be handled in the following order:

- consultation may be applied
- alternatives may be offered (if available)
- if none of the above steps were applied or successful, the requested timetable will be forwarded without delay to the IMs/ABs concerned to elaborate a tailor-made offer as close as possible to the initial request.

#### **4.3.4.11 Priority rules in capacity allocation**

Conflicts are solved with the following steps, which are in line with the FCA:

- A) A resolution through consultation may be promoted and performed between applicants and the C-OSS, if the following criteria are met:
  - The conflict is only on a single corridor.

- Suitable alternative PaPs are available.
- B) Applying the priority rule as described in Annex 1 of the FCA (see Annex 4.A) and in 4.3.4.13 and 4.3.4.14.
  - a. Cases where no Network PaP is involved (see 4.3.4.13)
  - b. Cases where Network PaP is involved in at least one of the requests (see 4.3.4.14)
 The Table of Distances in Annex 4.E shows the distances taken into account in the priority calculation.
- C) Random selection (see 4.3.4.15).

In the case that more than one PaP is available for the published reference PaP, the C-OSS pre-books the PaPs with the highest priority until the published threshold is reached. When this threshold is reached, the C-OSS will apply the procedure for handling requests with a lower priority as listed above.



Corridor Rhine-Alpine does not apply conflict-solving through consultation.

#### 4.3.4.12 Network PaP

A Network PaP is not a path product. However, certain PaPs may be designated by corridors as 'Network PaPs', in most cases for capacity requests involving more than one corridor. Network PaPs are designed to be taken into account for the definition of the priority of a request, for example on PaP sections with scarce capacity. The aim is to make the best use of available capacity and provide a better match with traffic demand.



Corridor Rhine-Alpine does not designate any Network PaPs.

#### 4.3.4.13 Priority rule in case no Network PaP is involved

The priority is calculated according to this formula:

$$K = (L^{PAP} + L^{F/O}) \times Y^{RD}$$

$L^{PAP}$  = Total requested length of all PaP sections on all involved RFCs included in one request. The definition of a request can be found in Chapter 4.3.3.

$L^{F/O}$  = Total requested length of the feeder/outflow path(s) included in one request; for the sake of practicality, is assumed to be the distance as the crow flies.

$Y^{RD}$  = Number of requested running days for the timetable period. A running day will only be taken into account for the priority calculation if it refers to a date with a published PaP offer for the given section.

$K$  = The rate for priority


All lengths are counted in kilometres.

The method of applying this formula is:

- in a first step the priority value ( $K$ ) is calculated using only the total requested length of pre-arranged path ( $L^{PAP}$ ) multiplied by the Number of requested running days ( $Y^{RD}$ );

- if the requests cannot be separated in this way, the priority value ( $K$ ) is calculated using the total length of the complete paths ( $L^{PaP} + L^{FO}$ ) multiplied by the number of requested running days ( $Y^{RD}$ ) in order to separate the requests;
- if the requests cannot be separated in this way, a random selection is used to separate the requests. This random selection is described in 4.3.4.15.


#### 4.3.4.14 Priority rule if a Network PaP is involved in at least one of the conflicting requests


Corridor Rhine-Alpine does not offer any Network PaPs.

#### 4.3.4.15 Random selection

If the requests cannot be separated by the above-mentioned priority rules, a random selection is used to separate the requests.


- The respective applicants will be acknowledged of the undecided conflict before X-7.5 and invited to attend a drawing of lots.
- The actual drawing will be prepared and executed by the C-OSS, with complete transparency.
- The result of the drawing will be communicated to all involved parties, present or not, via PCS and e-mail, before X-7.5.


Corridor Rhine-Alpine uses the above-described random selection.

#### 4.3.4.16 Special cases of requests and their treatment

The following special use of PaPs is known out of the allocation within the past timetables: Division of continuous offer in shares identified by the PaP ID (PaPs / non-PaPs). This refers to the situation when applicants request corridor capacity (on one or more corridors) in the following order:

- 1) PaP section
- 2) Tailor-made section
- 3) PaP section



These requests will be taken into consideration, depending on the construction starting point in the request, as follows:

- Construction starting point at the beginning: The C-OSS pre-books the PaP sections from origin until the end of the first continuous PaP section. No section after the interruption of PaP sections will be pre-booked; they will be treated as tailor-made.
- Construction starting point at the end: The C-OSS pre-books the PaP sections from the destination of the request until the beginning of the last continuous PaP section. No sections between the origin and the interruption of the PaP sections will be pre-booked; they will be treated as tailor-made.
- Construction starting point in the middle: The C-OSS pre-books the longest of the requested PaP sections either before or after the interruption. No other sections will be pre-booked; they will be treated as tailor-made.

However, in each of the above cases, the requested PaP capacity that becomes tailor-made might be allocated at a later stage if the IMs/ABs can deliver the tailor-made share as requested. In case of allocation, the PaP share that can become tailor-made retains full protection. This type of request doesn't influence the application of the priority rule.

#### 4.3.4.17 Result of the pre-booking

The C-OSS provides interim information to applicants regarding the status of their application no later than X-7.5.

In the case that consultation was applied, the applicants concerned are informed about the outcome.

In the case that no consultation was applied, the interim notification informs applicants with a higher priority value (K value) about pre-booking decisions in their favour.

In case of conflicting requests with a lower priority value, the C-OSS shall offer an alternative PaP, if available. The applicant concerned has to accept or reject the offered alternative within 5 calendar days. In case the applicant does not answer, or rejects the alternative, or no alternative is available, the C-OSS forwards the original request to the IM/AB concerned. The C-

OSS informs the applicants with a lower priority value (K value) by X-7.5 that their path request has been forwarded to the IM/AB concerned for further treatment within the regular process for the annual timetable construction, and that the C-OSS will provide the draft path offer on behalf of the IM/AB concerned at X-5 via PCS. These applications are handled by the IM/AB concerned as on-time applications for the annual timetable and are therefore included in the regular national construction process of the annual timetable.

#### 4.3.4.18 Handling of non-requested PaPs

There are two ways of handling non-requested PaPs at X-7.5, based on the decision of the MB.

- A) After pre-booking, all non-requested PaPs are handed over to the IM/AB.
- B) The MB takes a decision regarding the capacity to be republished after X-7.5. This decision depends on the “booking situation” at that moment. More precisely, at least the following three criteria must be fulfilled in the following order of importance:
  1. There must be enough capacity for late requests, if applicable, and RC.
  2. Take into account the demand for international paths for freight trains placed by other means than PCS.
  3. Take into account the need for modification of the capacity offer due to possible changes in the planning of TCRs.



Corridor Rhine-Alpine handles non-requested PaPs according to A above.

#### 4.3.4.19 Draft offer

After receiving the pre-booking decision by the C-OSS, the IMs/ABs concerned will elaborate the flexible parts of the requests:

- Feeder, outflow or intermediate sections
- Pre-booked sections for which the published timetable is not available anymore due to external influences, e.g. temporary capacity restrictions
- In case of modifications to the published timetable requested by the applicant
- In case of an alternative offer that was rejected by the applicant or is not available

In case IMs/ABs cannot create the draft offer due to specific wishes of the applicant not being feasible, the C-OSS has to reject the request.

The C-OSSs shall be informed about the progress, especially regarding the parts of the requests that cannot be fulfilled, as well as conflicts and problems in harmonising the path offers.

At the RNE draft timetable deadline (X-5) the C-OSS communicates the draft timetable offer for every handled request concerning pre-booked PaPs including feeder and/or outflow, tailor-made sections and tailor-made offers in case of conflicting requests to the applicant via PCS on behalf of the IM/AB concerned.



The draft offer of Corridor Rhine-Alpine is planned to the minute and therefore no flexibility is scheduled.

#### 4.3.4.20 Observations

Applicants can place observations on the draft timetable offer in PCS one month from the date stated in Annex 4B, which are monitored by the C-OSS. The C-OSS can support the applicants

regarding their observations. This procedure only concerns observations related to the original path request — whereas modifications to the original path requests are treated as described in 4.3.7.1 (without further involvement of the C-OSS).

#### 4.3.4.21 Post-processing

Based on the above-mentioned observations the IMs/ABs have the opportunity to revise offers between X-4 and X-3.5. The updated offer is provided to the C-OSS, which – after a consistency check – submits the final offer to the applicant in PCS.

#### 4.3.4.22 Final offer

At the final offer deadline (X-3.5), the C-OSS communicates the final timetable offer for every valid PaP request including feeder and/or outflow, tailor-made sections and tailor-made offers in case of conflicting requests to the applicants via PCS on behalf of the IM/AB concerned. If, for operational reasons, publication via national tools is still necessary (e.g. to produce documents for train drivers), the IMs/ABs have to ensure that there are no discrepancies between PCS and the national tool.



The final offer of Corridor Rhine-Alpine is planned to the minute and therefore no flexibility is scheduled.

The applicants involved shall accept or reject the final offer within 5 calendar days in PCS.

- Acceptance > leads to allocation
- Rejection > leads to withdrawal and closing of the request
- No answer > The C-OSS will actively try to get an answer. In case there is no answer from the applicants, the C-OSS will end the process (no allocation).

If not all applicants agree on the final offer, the request will be considered as unanswered.

#### 4.3.5 Late path request phase

Late path requests refer to capacity requests concerning the annual timetable sent to the C-OSS within the timeframe from X-7.5 until X-2.



Corridor Rhine-Alpine does not offer the possibility to place late path requests.

##### 4.3.5.1 Product

Capacity for late path requests can be offered in the following ways:

- A) In the same way, as for PaPs, either specially constructed paths for late path requests or PaPs which were not used for the annual timetable.
- B) On the basis of capacity slots. Slots are displayed per corridor section and the standard running time is indicated. To order capacity for late path requests, corridor sections without any time indications are available in PCS. The applicant may indicate his individually required departure and/or arrival times, and feeder and outflow path(s), as well as construction starting point. The indications should respect the indicated standard running times.

Capacity for late path requests has to be requested via PCS either in the same way as for PaPs or by using capacity slots in PCS.

Products for late path requests are not available on Corridor Rhine-Alpine.

#### 4.3.5.2 Multiple corridor paths

It is possible for capacity requests to cover more than one corridor if capacity is offered. See 4.3.4.4.

#### 4.3.5.3 Late paths on overlapping sections

See 4.3.4.5.

Corridor Rhine-Alpine does not provide a common offer for late path requests on overlapping sections.

#### 4.3.5.4 Handling of requests

The C-OSS receives and collects all path requests that are placed via PCS.

#### 4.3.5.5 Leading tool for late path requests

Applicants sending late path requests to the C-OSS shall use PCS. PCS is used to manage the complete international path: PaP section, feeder and/or outflow and tailor-made path. Within the construction process, the national tool may show additional information to the applicant.

The following matrix shows for each step of the process which tool is considered as the leading tool.

Phase	Application (X-7.5 till X-2)	Withdrawal (X-8 till X-2)	Offer (X-1)	Acceptance (until X-0.75)	Modification	Cancellation
Leading tool	PCS	PCS	PCS	PCS	National tool/PCS	National tool/PCS

All requests for modification and/or cancellation must be placed in IM's national tool only. For Infrabel, modifications/cancellations must be entered via the PCS application.

#### 4.3.5.6 Check of the applications

The C-OSS checks all requests as described in 4.3.4.9.

#### 4.3.5.7 Pre-booking

The C-OSS coordinates the offer with the IMs/ABs concerned or other C-OSS if needed by following the rule of "first come – first served".

#### 4.3.5.8 Path elaboration

During the path elaboration phase, the IMs/ABs concerned will prepare the Late Path offer under coordination of the C-OSS.

#### 4.3.5.9 Late request offer

All applicants involved shall accept, ask for adaptations or reject the late request offer within 5 calendar days in PCS. By triggering the 'ask for adaptation' function, applicants can place comments on the late request offer, which will be monitored by the C-OSS. This procedure only concerns comments related to the original path request – whereas modifications to the original path requests are treated as described in 4.3.7.1 (without further involvement of the C-OSS).

- Acceptance > leads to allocation
- Ask for adaptations > late offer can be returned to path elaboration with comments; IM/AB will make an alternative proposal; however, if no alternatives are possible, the applicant will have to prepare a new request
- Rejection > leads to withdrawal and closing of the request
- No answer > The C-OSS will actively try to get an answer. In case there is still no answer from the applicants, the C-OSS will end the process (no allocation)

If not all applicants agree on the final offer, the request will be considered as unanswered.

#### 4.3.6 Ad-hoc path request phase

##### 4.3.6.1 Reserve capacity (RC)

During the ad-hoc path request phase, the C-OSS offers RC based on PaPs or capacity slots to allow for a quick and optimal answer to ad-hoc path requests:

- A. RC based on PaPs will be a collection of several sections along the Corridor, either of non-requested PaPs and/or PaPs constructed out of remaining capacity by the IMs/ABs after the allocation of overall capacity for the annual timetable as well as in the late path request phase.
- B. In case RC is offered on the basis of capacity slots, slots are displayed per corridor section and the standard running time is indicated. The involved IMs/ABs jointly determine the amount of RC for the next timetable year between X-3 and X-2. The determined slots may not be decreased by the IMs/ABs during the last three months before real time.

To order reserve capacity slots, corridor sections without any time indication are available in PCS. The applicant may indicate his individually required departure and/or arrival times, feeder and outflow path(s) as well as construction starting point. The indications should respect the indicated standard running times as far as possible.



Corridor Rhine-Alpine offers RC through variant B. The timeframe for RC requests is +/- 3 hours from the start or endpoint the applicant indicates.

RC is published by the C-OSS at X-2 in PCS and on the website of the Corridor under the following link:



Reserve capacity for timetable 2025 will be available from October 2024 under the following link: <https://www.corridor-rhine-alpine.eu/c-oss.html>

On all RFC sections the number of guaranteed timeslots is one per day. The offer is not valid in case of unavailable infrastructure capacity.



The IMs can modify or withdraw RC for a certain period in case of unavailability of capacity due to force majeure. Applicants can book RC via the C-OSS until 30 days before the running day. To make ad-hoc requests less than 30 days before the running day, they have to contact the IMs/ABs directly.

#### 4.3.6.2 Multiple corridor paths

It is possible for capacity requests to cover more than one corridor. See 4.3.4.4.

#### 4.3.6.3 Reserve capacity on overlapping sections

See 4.3.4.5.



Corridor Rhine-Alpine does not provide a common offer on overlapping sections for reserve capacity.

#### 4.3.6.4 Feeder, outflow and tailor-made paths

See 4.3.4.6. For RC the same concept applies as for PaPs in the annual timetable.

#### 4.3.6.5 Handling of requests

The C-OSS receives and collects all path requests for RC placed via PCS until 30 days before the running day. If requested, the C-OSS can support applicants in creating the dossiers to prevent inconsistencies and guide the applicants' expectations. The IMs/ABs may support the applicants by providing a technical check of the requests.

#### 4.3.6.6 Leading tool for ad-hoc requests

Applicants sending requests for RC to the C-OSS shall use PCS. PCS is used to manage the complete international path: PaP section, feeder and/or outflow and tailor-made path. Within the construction process, the national tool may show additional information to the applicant.

The following matrix shows for each step of the process which tool is considered as the leading tool.

Phase	Application and allocation (X-2 till X+12)	Withdrawal	Offer (10 calendar days before train run)	Answer (within 5 calendar days after offer)	Modification	Cancellation
Leading tool	PCS	PCS	PCS	PCS	National tool/PCS	National tool/PCS



All requests for modification and/or cancellation must be placed in IM's national tool only. For Infrabel, modifications/cancellations must be entered via the PCS application.

#### 4.3.6.7 Check of the applications

The C-OSS checks all requests as described in 4.3.4.9.

#### 4.3.6.8 Pre-booking

The C-OSS applies the 'first come – first served' rule.

#### 4.3.6.9 Path elaboration

During the path elaboration phase, the IMs/ABs concerned will prepare the offer under coordination of the C-OSS.

#### 4.3.6.10 Ad-hoc request offer

Applicants shall receive the ad-hoc offer no later than 10 calendar days before the train run. All applicants involved shall accept, ask for adaptations or reject the ad-hoc offer within 5 calendar days in PCS. By triggering the 'ask for adaptation' function, applicants can place comments on the ad-hoc request offer, which will be monitored by the C-OSS. This procedure only concerns comments related to the original path request – whereas modifications to the original path requests are treated as described in 4.3.7.1 (without further involvement of the C-OSS).

- Acceptance > leads to allocation
- Ask for adaptations > ad-hoc offer can be returned to path elaboration with comments; IM/AB will make an alternative proposal; however, if no alternatives are possible, the applicant will have to prepare a new request
- Rejection > leads to withdrawal of the offer and closing of the request
- No answer > The C-OSS will actively try to get an answer. In case there is still no answer from the applicants, the C-OSS will end the process (no allocation)

If not all applicants agree on the final offer, the request will be considered as unanswered.

### 4.3.7 Request for changes by the applicant

#### 4.3.7.1 Modification

The Sector Handbook for the communication between Railway Undertakings and Infrastructure Managers (RU/IM Telematics Sector Handbook) is the specification of the TAF-TSI (EC) No. 1305/2014 Regulation. According to its Annex 12.2 UML Model of the yearly timetable path request, it is not possible to place change requests for paths (even including PaPs) by the applicant between X-8 and X-5. The only option in this period is the deletion, meaning the withdrawal, of the path request.

#### 4.3.7.2 Withdrawal

Withdrawing a request is only possible

- After submitting the request (until X-8) until the final offer
- before allocation during the late path request phase (where applicable) and ad-hoc path request phase.

Resubmitting the withdrawn dossier will be considered as annual request only until X-8.



An overview of withdrawal fees and deadlines of the IMs/AB on the Corridor (extract from the different Network Statements) is listed below.

IM	Withdrawal fees and deadlines
ProRail; Netherlands	No financial penalties in the form of charges or surcharges apply to the non-use of train paths by titleholders.

Infrabel; Belgium	No fees
DB InfraGo, Germany	<p>The final regulation is not yet available at the time of publication. The German regulatory body is expected to issue its decision regarding the charging and cancellation rules for the timetable year 2025 by the end of March 2024. Subsequently, the regulation is provided after the RB's decision.</p> <p>The regulations for the timetable year 2024 can be found in the DB Netz Network Statement 2024.</p>
SBB / BLS / TVS; Switzerland	<p>No fees</p> <p>Exception</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ On congested lines, the cancellation payment (table under 4.3.7.4) becomes active if the following points are given: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ a provisionally allocated train path if the allocation had been in place for at least five working days;</li> <li>○ an ordered train path if the order leads to conflicts among users and the infrastructure managers informed the users concerned about the conflict more than five working days before.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
RFI; Italy	<p>between X-8 – X-4: no fees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ - after final offer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ of trains on limited infrastructure capacity = 75%</li> <li>○ of trains on not-limited infrastructure capacity = 50%</li> </ul> </li> </ul>


#### 4.3.7.3 Transfer of capacity

Once capacity is pre-booked or allocated to an applicant, it shall not be transferred by the recipient to another applicant. The use of capacity by an RU that carries out business on behalf of a non-RU applicant is not considered a transfer.

#### 4.3.7.4 Cancellation

Cancellation refers to the phase between final allocation and the train run. Cancellation can refer to one, several or all running days and to one, several or all sections of the allocated path.

In case a path has to be cancelled, for whatever reason, the cancellation has to be done according to national processes.


		
<p>An overview of cancellation fees and deadlines of the IMs/AB on Corridor Rhine-Alpine (extract from the different network statements) is listed below.</p>		
<b>IM</b>	<b>Cancellation fees and deadlines</b>	
ProRail	After scheduled departure	100%

	< 24h before departure	50%
	Between 24h and 4 days	0%
	Between 5 days and 30 days	0%
	Between 31 days and 60 days	0%
	> 60 days before scheduled departure	0%
Infrabel	Cancellation after the scheduled departure	100%
	Cancellation less than 24 hours before the scheduled departure	75%
	Cancellation between 24 hours and 4 calendar days before the scheduled departure	40%
	Cancellation between 5 calendar days and 30 calendar days before the scheduled departure	25%
	Cancellation between 31 calendar days and 60 calendar days before the scheduled departure	15%
	Cancellation more than 60 calendar days before the scheduled departure	0%
DB InfraGo	<p>The final regulation is not yet available at the time of publication. The German regulatory body is expected to issue its decision regarding the charging and cancellation rules for the timetable year 2025 by the end of March 2024. Subsequently, the regulation is provided after the RB's decision.</p> <p>The regulations for the timetable year 2024 can be found in the DB Netz Network Statement 2024.</p>	
SBB / BLS TVS <sup>1</sup>	Cancellation after the scheduled departure	200%
	Cancellation less than 24 hours before the scheduled departure	100%
	Between 24 hours and 4 calendar days before the scheduled departure	80%
	Between 5 calendar days and 30 calendar days before the scheduled departure	70%
	Between 31 calendar days and 60 calendar days before the scheduled departure	50%

	More than 60 calendar days before the scheduled departure	20%
RFI	<b>until 5 days before operation trains</b>	
	Cancellations trains on no limited capacity infrastructure	0%
	Cancellations trains on limited capacity infrastructure	50% minus any energy cost
	<b>by 4 days before operation trains</b>	
	Cancellations trains on no limited capacity infrastructure	30% minus any energy cost
	Cancellation trains on limited capacity infrastructure	60 % minus any energy cost
<p><sup>1</sup>Exception: On congested lines, the cancellation payment (table above) becomes active if the following are given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a provisionally allocated train path if the allocation had been in place for at least five working days;</li> <li>• an ordered train path if the order leads to conflicts among users and the infrastructure managers informed the users concerned about the conflict more than five working days before.</li> </ul>		

#### 4.3.7.5 Unused paths

If an applicant or designated RU does not use the allocated path, the case is treated as follows.

	
<p>An overview of fees for unused paths for the IMs/AB on Corridor Rhine-Alpine (extract from the different Network Statements) is listed below.</p>	
<b>IM</b>	<b>Fees for unused paths</b>
ProRail; The Netherlands	The penalty for not using a train path without cancellation is equal to the price for cancellation after scheduled departure in the table chapter 4.3.7.4.
Infrabel; Belgium	Non use without cancellation leads to 100% of the charge to be invoiced.
DB InfraGo; Germany	<p>The final regulation is not yet available at the time of publication. The German regulatory body is expected to issue its decision regarding the charging and cancellation rules for the timetable year 2025 by the end of March 2024. Subsequently, the regulation is provided after the RB's decision.</p> <p>The regulations for the timetable year 2024 can be found in the DB Netz Network Statement 2024.</p>

SBB / BLS / TVS; Switzerland	If a path is not cancelled by the RU, the train is charged in accordance with the standard rates set out in the “List of infrastructure service (section 5.3.2.)”.
RFI; Italy	100% of the charge

#### 4.3.8 Exceptional transport and dangerous goods

##### 4.3.8.1 Exceptional transport

PaPs and RC do not include the possibility to manage exceptional consignments (e.g. out-of-gauge loads). The parameters of the PaPs and RC offered have to be respected, including the published combined transport profiles.

Requests for exceptional consignments are forwarded by the C-OSS directly to the IMs/ABs concerned for further treatment.

##### 4.3.8.2 Dangerous goods

Dangerous goods may be loaded on trains using PaPs or RC if both international and national rules concerning the movement of hazardous material are respected (e.g. according to RID – Regulation governing the international transport of dangerous goods by rail).

Dangerous goods have to be declared, when making a path request, to all IMs/ABs on the Corridor.

#### 4.3.9 Rail related services

Rail related services are specific services, the allocation of which follows national rules and partially other deadlines than those stipulated in the process of path allocation. Therefore, the request has to be sent to the IMs/ABs concerned directly.


If questions regarding rail related services are sent to the C-OSS, he/she contacts the IMs/ABs concerned, who provide an answer within a reasonable time frame.

#### 4.3.10 Contracting and invoicing

Network access contracts are concluded between IMs/ABs and the applicant on the basis of national network access conditions.

The C-OSS does not issue any invoices for the use of allocated paths. All costs (charges for using a path, administration fees, etc.) are invoiced by the relevant IMs/ABs.

Currently, differences between various countries exist regarding invoicing for the path charge. In some countries, if a non-RU applicant is involved, it receives the invoice, whereas in other countries the invoice is issued to the RU that has used the path.

	
<p>An overview of who must pay the path charge when a non-RU applicant uses the path on Corridor Rhine-Alpine per IM/AB (extract from the different Network Statements) is listed below.</p>	
<p><b>Explanations</b></p>	
ProRail; The Netherlands	Path charge will be invoiced to the titleholder that used the path

Infrabel; Belgium	Path charge will be invoiced to the applicant
DB InfraGo; Germany	The final regulation is not yet available at the time of publication. The German regulatory body is expected to issue its decision regarding the charging and cancellation rules for the timetable year 2025 by the end of March 2024. Subsequently, the regulation is provided after the RB's decision.  The regulations for the timetable year 2024 can be found in the DB Netz Network Statement 2024.
SBB / BLS / TVS; Switzerland	Path charge will be invoiced to the responsible RU
RFI; Italy	Path charge will be invoiced to the RU that used the path

#### 4.3.11 Appeal procedure

Based on Article 20 of the Regulation: in case of complaints regarding the allocation of PaPs (e.g. due to a decision based on the priority rules for allocation), the applicants may address the relevant Regulatory Body (RB) as stated in the Cooperation Agreement signed between RBs on the Corridor.



The Cooperation Agreement can be found under:

[Cooperation Agreement](#)

#### 4.4 Coordination and Publication of planned Temporary Capacity Restrictions

##### 4.4.1 Goals

In line with Article 12 of the Regulation, the Management Board of the freight corridor shall coordinate and ensure in one place the publication of planned Temporary Capacity Restrictions (TCRs) that could impact the capacity on the Corridor. TCRs are necessary to keep the infrastructure and its equipment in operational condition and to allow changes to the infrastructure necessary to cover market needs. According to the current legal framework (see 4.4.2), in case of international traffic, these capacity restrictions have to be coordinated by IMs among neighboring countries.

Notwithstanding the above coordination requirements, the process and criteria for the involvement of the Corridor in the coordination of the TCRs on the Corridor are regulated in 4.4.3. The RFC TCR Coordinator appointed by the Management Board is responsible for ensuring that the needs of international freight traffic along the corridors are adequately respected.

Additionally, the Corridor's aim is to regularly update the information and present all known TCRs in an easily accessible way.

##### 4.4.2 Legal background

The legal background to this chapter can be found in:

- Article 53(2) of and Annex VII to Directive 2012/34/EU as amended by Commission Delegated Decision (EU) 2017/2075 - hereafter “Annex VII”
- Article 12 of the Regulation (“Coordination of works”).

A framework has been developed by RNE in the "[Procedures for Temporary Capacity Restriction Management](#)" and it is reflected in the Corridor’s specific procedures.

#### 4.4.3 Coordination process of corridor-relevant TCRs

Coordination is the continuous process of planning TCRs with the aim to reduce their impact on traffic. If this impact of a TCR is not limited to one network, cross-border coordination between IMs is necessary. It results in optimising the common planning of several TCRs, and in offering alternative capacity for deviations on relevant lines to keep international freight traffic running.

##### 4.4.3.1 Timeline for coordination

Different types of TCR (see 4.4.5.1) require a different deadline for final coordination:

- Major impact: 18 months before the start of the annual timetable
- High and medium impact: 13,5 months before the start of the annual timetable
- Minor impact: 5 months before the start of the annual timetable

Coordination of corridor-relevant TCRs is carried out according to the following procedure.

##### 4.4.3.2 Coordination between neighbouring IMs (first level of coordination)

Coordination will be performed during regular coordination processes between neighbouring IMs on the Corridor during coordination meetings. The result of coordination is:

- a. common agreement between the involved IMs about coordinated TCRs linked to the timing of the TCR and describing the impact on capacity as far as it is known and
- b. a common understanding of open issues, which have to be resolved, and a timeline for how to continue with the unresolved issues.

Criteria for coordination between IMs are set up in Annex VII, but additional criteria are taken into account, if according to IMs’ expertise they are relevant for international traffic.



Due to IMs’ experience and expertise, additional TCRs may have to be considered.

Coordination meetings are organised by the respective IMs. The RFC TCR Coordinator will be informed about the results and open issues concerning TCRs on Corridor lines. The RFC TCR Coordinator monitors the results of the coordination and if required, proposes additional actions to find solutions for open issues.

##### 4.4.3.3 Coordination at Corridor level (second level of coordination)

Coordination at Corridor level is necessary if the impact of the TCR is not limited to the second network and a third or a fourth network is involved or the aggregated impact of several TCRs exceeds the criteria agreed.




Corridor Rhine-Alpine has no specific criteria for initiating coordination on Corridor level.



#### 4.4.3.4 Conflict resolution process

Unresolved conflicts on Corridor lines shall be reported by the RFC TCR Coordinator to the Corridor's Management Board directly when it becomes clear that the coordination has not led to sufficient results.


IMs involved in the conflict will initiate the conflict resolution process (e.g. by initiating specific bi/multi-lateral meetings). The specific Corridor's process is described in the box below.


<p>Conflict resolution process on Corridor Rhine-Alpine.</p> <p>Experts with relevant knowledge of planning TCRs and timetables will work on proposals for alternatives to find solutions. The management of the IM(s) where the works take place is responsible for a final decision. The results will be reported to the management of the affected IMs and MB of the involved corridor.</p>

#### 4.4.4 Involvement of applicants

Each IM has its own national agreements, processes and platforms to consult and inform their applicants about TCRs during the various phases. These processes are described in the network statement of each IM.

At Corridor level, the involvement of applicants is organised in the following way:


<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The results of the TCR's coordination that are known for principal and diversionary lines of Corridor Rhine-Alpine are published on Corridor Rhine-Alpine's website and in CIP. Applicants may send their comments on the planned TCRs to the involved IMs. The comments of applicants have an advisory and supportive character and shall be taken into consideration as far as possible.</li> <li>2) Regular meetings of the Railway Undertaking Advisory Group (RAG) and Terminal Advisory Group (TAG) are used to discuss issues related with TCRs.</li> <li>3) Additional meetings with applicants, to discuss and resolve open issues, will be treated on a case by case basis.</li> </ol>

#### 4.4.5 Publication of TCRs

##### 4.4.5.1 Criteria for publication

	Consecutive days	Impact on traffic (estimated traffic cancelled, re-routed or replaced by other modes of transport)	First publication deadline according to Annex VII
<b>Major impact TCR<sup>1</sup></b>	More than 30 consecutive days	More than 50% of the estimated traffic volume on a railway line per day	X-24
<b>High impact TCR<sup>1</sup></b>	More than 7 consecutive days	More than 30% of the estimated traffic volume on a railway line per day	

<b>Medium impact TCR<sup>1</sup></b>	7 consecutive days or less	More than 50% of the estimated traffic volume on a railway line per day	X-12
<b>Minor impact TCR<sup>2</sup></b>	unspecified <sup>3</sup>	More than 10% of the estimated traffic volume on a railway line per day	X-4

<b>Less than minor impact TCR</b>	unspecified	Maximum of 10% of the estimated traffic volume on a railway line per day	<p>The IMs are recommended to comply with the Path Allocation requirements<sup>4</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Passenger: T<sup>5</sup>-135</li> <li>➤ Freight: T-45</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------	-------------	--	---

1) Annex VII of Directive 2012/34/EU, article (11);

2) Annex VII of Directive 2012/34/EU, article (12).

3) According to Annex VII of Directive 2012/34/EU, article (12) "7 consecutive days or less", modified here.

4) Data coming from the RNE Path Alteration Handbook. Less than minor TCRs are not regulated by Annex VII.

5) T- #: a deadline referring to the first day of the capacity restriction (T) and the number of days (#) in advance of this deadline.



Corridor Rhine-Alpine also publishes in CIP impact sheets for TCRs with high impact for traffic on which the TCRs and the impacts are indicated.

After initial publication of TCRs, further details may be added as soon as they are available.

#### 4.4.5.2 Dates of publication

IMs have to publish their major, high and medium impact TCRs at X-12. The Corridor publishes the relevant TCRs for TT 2025 – 2027 on the following dates:

	<b>January 2024 (X-11)</b>	<b>January 2024 (X-23)</b>	<b>August 2024 (X-3.5)</b>	<b>January 2025 (X-11)</b>	<b>January 2025 (X-23)</b>
<b>Major</b>	X (second publication)	X (first publication)		X (second publication)	X (first publication)
<b>High</b>	X (second publication)	X (first publication)		X (second publication)	X (first publication)
<b>Medium</b>	X (international impact)			X (international impact)	
<b>Minor</b>			X		
<b>Applicable timetable</b>	<b>TT 2025</b>	<b>TT 2026</b>	<b>TT 2025</b>	<b>TT 2026</b>	<b>TT 2027</b>

#### 4.4.5.3 Tool for publication

After coordination between all IMs involved on the Corridor the results are published in the harmonised Excel overview which is available on the Corridor's website and/or in the CIP.



Corridor Rhine-Alpine publishes the overview in Excel in [CIP](#)

Corridor Rhine-Alpine also publishes in [CIP](#) impact sheets for TCRs with high impact for traffic on which the TCRs and the impacts are indicated.

#### 4.4.6 Legal disclaimer

By publishing the overview of the corridor relevant TCRs, the IMs concerned present the planning status for TCRs to infrastructure availability along the Corridor. The published TCRs are a snapshot of the situation at the date of publication and may be subject to further changes. The information provided can be used for orientation purposes only and may not constitute the basis for any legal claim. Therefore, any liability of the Corridor organisation regarding damages caused using the TCR parameters (e.g. day, time, section, etc.) shall be excluded.

The publication of TCRs at Corridor level does not substitute the publication of TCRs in accordance with the relevant provisions of national and European law. It lies within the IMs' responsibility to publish and communicate TCRs in accordance with the process described in their network statements and/or defined in law.

#### 4.5 Traffic management

In line with Article 16 of the Regulation, the Management Board of the freight corridor has put in place procedures for coordinating traffic management along the freight corridor.

Traffic management is the prerogative of the national IMs and is subject to national operational rules. The goal of traffic management is to guarantee the safety of train traffic and achieve high quality performance. Daily traffic shall operate as close as possible to the planning.

National IMs coordinate international traffic with neighbouring countries on a bilateral level. In this manner, they ensure that all traffic on the network is managed in the most optimal way.



No additional Traffic Management rules have been developed on Corridor Rhine-Alpine.

#### 4.5.1 Cross-border section information

In the table below, all cross-border sections covered by the Corridor are listed:



Cross-border section	IM 1	IM 2
Zevenaar Oost – Emmerich	ProRail	DB InfraGo AG
Venlo – Kaldenkirchen	ProRail	DB InfraGo AG
Montzen – Aachen West	Infrabel	DB InfraGo AG

Zelzate – Sas van Gent	Infrabel	ProRail
Basel Bad Bf – Basel SBB PB/RB	DB InfraGo	SBB
Brig – Domodossola	SBB / BLS	RFI
Cadenazzo – Luino	SBB	RFI
Chiasso	SBB	RFI

#### 4.5.1.1 Technical features and operational rules

For all corridor-related cross-border sections, the following information is available:

- Technical features
  - Maximum train weight and train length
  - Railway line parameters (number of tracks, electrification, profile, loading and vehicle gauge, speed limit, axle load, etc.)
- Operational rules
  - Languages used
  - Requirements concerning running through the border (administrative and technical preconditions)
  - Special rules in case of system breakdown (communication system failure, safety system failure).



For Corridor Rhine-Alpine the above-mentioned information can be found:

- Railway line parameters and maximum train length are displayed on the overview map in the Corridor Information Platform (CIP) [https://cip.rne.eu/apex/f?p=212:101:::P101\\_CORRIDOR:1](https://cip.rne.eu/apex/f?p=212:101:::P101_CORRIDOR:1)
- In the Network Statements of the involved IMs, to be found in the NCI portal as mentioned in section 2: <http://nci.rne.eu/>
- On the RNE website – Traffic Management Information – Border section information sheet within the Excel table (<https://rne.eu/traffic-management/other-activities/>)

#### 4.5.1.2 Cross-border agreements

Cooperation between the IMs on a corridor can be described in different types of agreements: in bilateral agreements between states (at ministerial level) and/or between IMs and in the detailed border section procedures.

Agreements applicable on the Corridor can be found in the overview below and contain the following information:

- Title and description of border agreement
- Validity
- Languages in which the agreement is available
- Relevant contact person within IM.

On Corridor Rhine-Alpine the above-mentioned overview information can be found:

- On the RNE website – Traffic Management Information – Border agreements Level 1 and Level 2 sheets within the Excel table (<https://rne.eu/traffic-management/other-activities/>)

#### 4.5.2 Priority rules in traffic management

In accordance with the Regulation, IMs involved in the Corridor commit themselves to treating international freight trains on the Corridor or feeder / outflow lines that run punctually according to the timetable in such a way that a high quality and punctuality level of this traffic is ensured, but always within the current possibilities and within the framework of national operational rules.

No additional corridor-specific rules have been agreed.

To see the overview of national IM priority rules in traffic management, please visit: <https://rne.eu/traffic-management/other-activities/>

#### 4.5.3 Traffic management in the event of disturbance

The goal of traffic management in case of disturbance is to ensure the safety of train traffic, while aiming to quickly restore the normal situation and/or minimise the impact of the disruption. The overall aim should be to minimise the overall network recovery time.

In order to reach the above-mentioned goals, traffic management in case of disturbance needs an efficient communication flow between all involved parties and a good degree of predictability, obtained by applying predefined operational scenarios at the border.

In case of disturbances, IMs work together with the concerned RUs and neighbouring IMs in order to limit the impact as far as possible and to reduce the overall recovery time of the network.

In case of disruptions of international traffic longer than 3 days with a high impact on international traffic, (if 50% of the trains on the affected section need an operational treatment), the initiating IM shall declare a case of International Contingency Management (ICM).

To allow continuation of freight and passenger traffic flows at the highest possible level despite an international disruption and to ensure non-discriminatory treatment of the RUs, transparency of the status of the disruption and its impact on traffic flows for all relevant stakeholders across Europe, the IMs should apply the rules and procedures defined in the '[Handbook for International Contingency Management](#)' (ICM Handbook) approved by the RNE General Assembly.

According to the ICM Handbook, the Corridors act as facilitators with respect to the disruption management and the communication process.

Apart from the mandatory processes defined in the ICM Handbook, RFC-specific decisions on the following matters were taken:

1. Need to have a back-up organisation: This responsibility is shifted to a back-up organisation (SBB Infrastruktur) during night, at weekends and during public holidays.

2. Need to organise a communication telco during an ICM case in order to coordinate the public communication: The communication telco will always be organised.
3. List of stakeholders to be additionally informed during an ICM case (e.g. sector associations, etc.) taking into account the suggestions defined in the ICM Handbook:  
RNE (President, Secretary General).

#### 4.5.3.1 Communication procedure

The main principle on which the communication procedure in case of disturbance is based is that the IM concerned is responsible for communication; it must deliver the information as soon as possible through standard channels to the RUs on its own network and to the neighbouring IMs.

In case of international disruptions longer than 3 days with a high impact on international traffic, the international contingency management communication procedures as described in the ICM Handbook will be applied.



For Corridor Rhine-Alpine no specific procedures are applied. Operation centers do have a regular contact across the borders. Processes are reviewed and improved; experiences are shared in order to optimize the traffic management.

#### 4.5.3.2 Operational scenarios on the Corridor in the event of disturbance

For international disruptions longer than 3 days with a high impact on international traffic, the Corridor with its member IMs and related corridors developed an international corridor re-routing overview combining national re-routing plans across borders along the Corridor, according to the ICM Handbook.



Corridor Rhine-Alpine publishes and updates re-routing scenarios in [CIP](#) on an annual basis.

#### 4.5.3.3 Allocation rules in the event of disturbance

In case of international disruptions longer than 3 days with a high impact on international traffic, the international contingency management allocation principles as described in the ICM Handbook will be applied.



No additional corridor-specific rules have been agreed.

#### 4.5.4 Traffic restrictions

Information about planned restrictions can be found in 4.4, Coordination and Publication of Planned Temporary Capacity Restrictions (TCRs).



On Corridor Rhine-Alpine the information about unplanned restrictions can be found:

- On the internal channels / tools of the involved IMs

#### 4.5.5 Dangerous goods

Detailed information about conditions for the transport of dangerous goods can be found in the Network Statements of the IMs involved in the Corridor or in the NCI portal (see Section 2).

#### 4.5.6 Exceptional transport

Detailed information about conditions for the carriage of exceptional consignments can be found in the Network Statements of the IMs involved or in the Corridor in the NCI portal (Section 2).

### 4.6 Train Performance Management

The aim of the Corridor Train Performance Management (TPM) is to measure the performance on the Corridor, analyse weak points and recommend corrective measures, thus managing and improving the train performance of international services. RNE has developed guidelines for train performance management on corridors ([https://rne.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/RNE\\_Guidelines\\_for\\_Train\\_Performance\\_Management\\_on\\_RFCs.pdf](https://rne.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/RNE_Guidelines_for_Train_Performance_Management_on_RFCs.pdf)) as a recommendation for processes and structures. However, the implementation of the TPM is subject to particular Corridor decision.

A necessary precondition for analysis of TPM is the implementation and use of the RNE Train Information System (as described in 1.8.2) by all involved IMs.

Corridors publish in the CIP or on their websites a management summary of the Corridor's monthly punctuality report, harmonised among the corridors.

Several different reports have been developed by RNE for the needs of corridors. Interested parties (applicants, terminals and others) are welcome to contact the Corridor TPM WG leader in case of need for further, specific, detailed analyses. The list of Corridor TPM WG leaders can be found on the [RNE Website](#). In addition, direct access to the reporting tool can be requested by applicants via the [RNE Joint Office](#).



The practical application of the main principles described in the “RNE Guidelines for Freight Corridor Punctuality Monitoring” can be found in the TPM Reference Manual of Corridor Rhine-Alpine. It is not dealt with in detail in this document. The management summary of the Corridor monthly punctuality report is published in the [CIP](#).

Corridor Rhine-Alpine has set up a working group “Train Performance Management” within the framework of its organisational structure that is responsible for the train performance management of the Corridor. In this group IM representatives, RUs and third parties work together on a case by case basis in order to make the railway business more attractive and competitive. For all Border sections Bilateral Working Groups are established with involvement of all relevant Partners and coordination with the TPM WG is ensured.