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1 Study Design
Survey Design

23 respondents
20 RFC1 users / 3 non-users
20 full interviews / 3 partial interviews
19 nominated by RFC1 / 4 nominated by other RFCs
5 agreed to forward name

- Computer Aided Web Interviews (CAWI)
- Contacts (e-mail address) delivered by RFCs
- 81 e-mail invitations sent
- Field Phase: 3 September to 6 October 2014
2 Satisfaction with the RFC
The following question is about the network of railway lines designated to a corridor. To what extent are you satisfied with the adequacy of the selected lines? Are they the right ones in your opinion? To what extent are you satisfied with the Infrastructure standards of all designated lines, including diversionary routes, dedicated to the RFC concerning parameters like Train length, Axle load, Electrification, Loading gauges, etc.?
Satisfaction with Coordination of Possessions

value of information in list of works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5% (1 of 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

granularity of list of works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>15% (3 of 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

involvement of RU in coordination process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>10% (2 of 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"To what extent are you satisfied with the value of the information given in the list of works with effect on availability of the line? || How do you judge the "granularity" of content in the list? Is it detailed enough? || How do you feel about the involvement of you as a Railway Undertaking in the coordination process?"

n = 20
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Satisfaction with Corridor Information Document (CID)

To what extent are you satisfied with the structure of the Corridor Information Document (CID)? Can you easily find the information you want? Is the information organized in a logic way? … with the content of the CID? Is the content adjusted for your business needs? Is the detail level sufficient? … with the comprehensibility of the CID? Is the wording clear and user-friendly? Are there enough graphical elements? Is the CID layout design attractive?

n = 20
Satisfaction with Pre-arranged Path (PAP)

**PAP parameters**
- Very unsatisfied: 24%
- Slightly dissatisfied: 35%
- Neutral: 12%
- Slightly satisfied: 24%
- Very satisfied: 6%

**Origin/destinations and middle stops in PAP**
- Very unsatisfied: 12%
- Slightly dissatisfied: 41%
- Neutral: 24%
- Slightly satisfied: 24%

**PAP schedule (adequate travel/departure/arrival times)**
- Very unsatisfied: 6%
- Slightly dissatisfied: 13%
- Neutral: 31%
- Slightly satisfied: 44%
- Very satisfied: 6%

**PAP quantity (number of paths)**
- Very unsatisfied: 13%
- Slightly dissatisfied: 13%
- Neutral: 19%
- Slightly satisfied: 31%
- Slightly satisfied: 13%
- Very satisfied: 13%

**PAP reserve capacity**
- Very unsatisfied: 23%
- Slightly dissatisfied: 23%
- Neutral: 8%
- Slightly satisfied: 38%
- Very satisfied: 8%

*To what extent are you satisfied with the Pre-arranged Path (PAP) parameters such as length, weight, etc.? || To what extend are you satisfied with the origin/destinations and middle stops? || To what extent are you satisfied with the PAP schedule? || To what extent are you satisfied with the PAP quantity? || To what extent are you satisfied with the Reserve Capacity offered by the RFC? Compared to the PAP offer, is the Reserve Capacity enough/adequate?*

n = 20
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Satisfaction with Corridor One-Stop Shop (C-OSS)

How do you judge the availability of the Corridor One-Stop Shop (C-OSS)?
How do you judge the business know-how of the C-OSS?
How satisfied are you with the result of the allocation process? Did it cover your request?
In case of conflict-solving – how did you experience the process?
How do you judge the overall offers provided by the C-OSS (PAP, remaining capacity, conflict solving and allocation)?

n = 20
"Does your company use the booking tool PCS for international path requests?"

- **PaPs**: 59% use it always, 24% frequently, 18% seldom, 10% never, and 10% don't know.
- **PaPs + feeder/outflow**: 50% use it always, 25% frequently, 19% seldom, 6% never, and 15% don't know.
- **Other path requests**: 60% use it always, 27% frequently, 13% seldom, and 20% never, and 20% don't know.

*n = 20*
"What is the volume of path requests (dossiers) you placed in PCS for Timetable 2015?"

n = 17
Satisfaction with Path Coordination System (PCS)

How satisfied are you all in all with PCS as booking tool for international path requests? Did it cover your needs? How do you judge the usability of the booking tool PCS concerning the display of the PaP-offer? The usability of the booking tool PCS concerning the selection of required PaPs? The usability concerning the modification/post-processing of PaPs? The usability concerning the display of remaining capacity? The usability concerning the selection of required remaining capacity?

Percentage of respondents - PCS is used (always/frequently/seldom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCS overall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usability of PCS - display of PaP-offer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usability of PCS - selection of PaPs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usability of PCS - modification/post-processing of PaPs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usability of PCS - display of remaining capacity</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usability of PCS - selection of remaining capacity</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean

- PCS overall: 3.1
- usability of PCS - display of PaP-offer: 3.1
- usability of PCS - selection of PaPs: 3.4
- usability of PCS - modification/post-processing of PaPs: 2.2
- usability of PCS - display of remaining capacity: 2.9
- usability of PCS - selection of remaining capacity: 3.0

Don't know

- PCS overall: 6% (1 of 17)
- usability of PCS - display of PaP-offer: 12% (2 of 17)
- usability of PCS - selection of PaPs: 12% (2 of 17)
- usability of PCS - modification/post-processing of PaPs: 24% (4 of 17)
- usability of PCS - display of remaining capacity: 59% (10 of 17)
- usability of PCS - selection of remaining capacity: 65% (11 of 17)

n = 17
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Satisfaction with Terminal Services

To what extent are you satisfied with the RFCs' provision of terminals? Are all relevant terminals included/described in the CID? || To what extent are you satisfied with the supply of terminal information?

n = 20

1 = very unsatisfied
2
3
4
5
6 = very satisfied

Percentage of respondents:

- Provision of terminals:
  - 33% very unsatisfied
  - 56% neutral
  - 11% very satisfied
  - 45% don't know

- Supply of terminal information:
  - 11% very unsatisfied
  - 33% neutral
  - 56% very satisfied
  - 45% don't know

Mean ratings:
- Provision of terminals: 3.8
- Supply of terminal information: 3.3
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### Satisfaction with Train Performance Management

**Performance Reports**
- 11% very unsatisfied
- 22% unsatisfied
- 44% neutral
- 22% satisfied
- Mean: 2.8
- 45% (9 of 20) don't know

**Measures to Improve Punctuality**
- 13% very unsatisfied
- 25% unsatisfied
- 38% neutral
- 25% satisfied
- Mean: 2.8
- 50% (10 of 20) don't know

**Availability/Know-How of Performance Manager**
- 50% very unsatisfied
- 25% unsatisfied
- 25% neutral
- 25% satisfied
- Mean: 3.8
- 50% (10 of 20) don't know

---

"How satisfied are you with the performance reports? Do they show the information you need? || How do you judge the efficiency of measures taken in order to improve the punctuality? || How satisfied are you with the availability and the professional know-how of your performance manager?"

n = 20
"How do you judge the information you get from the different operation centres on the corridor while operating trains? || How useful is the information you get from the operation centres in case of disturbances? || How helpful is the Infrastructure Managers’ (IMs’) traffic management for you to run your trains in a good quality?"

n = 20

percentage of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information from operation centres</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness of information in case of disturbances</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helpfulness of traffic management by infrastructure managers</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information from operation centres</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness of information in case of disturbances</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helpfulness of traffic management by infrastructure managers</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

don't know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information from operation centres</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45% (9 of 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness of information in case of disturbances</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% (10 of 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helpfulness of traffic management by infrastructure managers</th>
<th>1 = very unsatisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 = very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55% (11 of 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"How satisfied are you with your representation in the RFC governance structure as an RU Advisory Group/Terminal Advisory Group (RAG/TAG)? || Are you satisfied with the procedure of handling complaints within the RFC?"

n = 20
Satisfaction with Co-operation with the RFC Management Board (2)

“Do you perceive that the opinions of the Advisory Group have been properly considered by the RFC Management Board? || Are the respective decisions taken by the RFC Management Board comprehensible for you? || Is the information regarding the functioning if the RFC easily available and understandable for you?”

n = 20

Percentage of respondents

- Opinions of Advisory Board properly considered: 25% (6 of 20) yes, 67% partly, 8% no, 30% don’t know.
- Decisions by Management Board comprehensible: 25% yes, 58% partly, 17% no, 30% don’t know.
- Information regarding functioning of RFCs available and understandable: 50% yes, 43% partly, 7% no, 20% don’t know.
Satisfaction with Overall RFC Communication

*To which extent are you satisfied with the information provided by RFCX website?||To which extent are you satisfied with the RAG Meetings?||To which extent are you satisfied with the communication with the management board of RFCX other than at the RAG meetings?||To which extent are you satisfied with the brochures/newsletters/annual report of RFCX (as far as they exist)?*

n = 20

RFC User Satisfaction Survey 2014 || RFC1 || 20
3  Sample Description
Volume of International Rail Freight Business

"What is the volume of your company's international rail freight business (in gross kilometre tonnage/year)?"

n = 23 non/potential users included

- 57% less than 100,000
- 24% 100,001 to 500,000
- 10% 500,001 to 1 Million
- 5% 1 Million to 10 Million
- 5% more than 10 Million

[gross kilometre tonnage/year]
"Do you operate the trains on your own as the responsible Railway Undertaking (RU)?"

n = 23 non/potential users included
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Open Access or Co-operation

"Do you operate cross-border (open access) or do you make use of (a) co-operation partner(s) on sections of the train run?"

n = 23 non/potential users included
"Which of the following type or types characterize your company best?"

n = 23 non/potential users included
Path Coordination System (PCS) - Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Days Per Week</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0% (0 of 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0% (0 of 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5% (1 of 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5% (1 of 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5% (1 of 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Does your company use the booking tool PCS for international path requests?"

n = 20
Non/potential users
Users vs. non users

- **RFC users**: 87%
- **Non/potential users**: 13%

- Usage will start in December 2014
- Operate mainly in southern Italy
- Located in Scandinavia

n = 23
5 Summary
Summary - Satisfaction Rating

Top 10 aspects:

1. Adequacy of network of lines
2. Brochures of RFCX
3. Usefulness of information in case of disturbances
4. Information from operation centres
5. Availability of C-OSS
6. Information on RFCX website
7. Newsletters of RFCX
8. Representation in RFC governance structure (RAG/TAG)
9. Provision of terminals
10. Availability/know-how of performance manager

Bottom 10 aspects:

1. Usability of PCS - selection of remaining capacity
2. Infrastructures standards
3. Result of allocation process by C-OSS
4. PAP reserve capacity
5. Value of information in list of works
6. Handling of complaints within RFC
7. Performance reports
8. Measures to improve punctuality
9. Origin/destinations and middle stops in PAP
10. Usability of PCS - modification/post-processing of PAPs
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