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1 Study Design
Survey Design

18 respondents
18 RFC1 users / 0 non-users
15 full interviews / 3 partial interviews
10 nominated by RFC1 / 8 nominated by other RFCs
3 agreed to forward name
2 used topic-forward

Computer Aided Web Interviews (CAWI)

Contacts (e-mail address) delivered by RFCs

42 e-mail invitations sent

Field Phase: 13 September to 7 October 2016
2 Satisfaction with the RFC
Overall Satisfaction

"Overall, how satisfied are you in general as a user of the RFC(s)?"

n = 18
foster the "how can WE get things done together" among corridor members
improve cross-border harmonization; speed up projects
mentioned in the PaP offer Meeting in Frankfurt
ministries should take over more responsibility to solve problems they are in charge of, like longer trains (financing of longer tracks)
one overall TAG Meeting for all corridors, this would ensure a coherent treatment of topics
please DON'T create more PaPs
the advantage of PAP towards national paths is still unclear/not given
a cross-corridor coordination and consultation process together with RU should be set up; an official body (e.g. Executive Board) should approve that process and eventually establish a regularly reporting
please harmonize the nationals network statements
secure financial investment independence for minor bottleneck eliminations
the contrast of flexible and various needs from the market towards a nearly fix PAP offer is probably a irresolvable structural problem (as long as non-discriminatory criteria are respected)
be more politically active to enhance interoperability and standardization along corridor
coach members of corridors on how to act to help corridor development
development of ETA on the whole corridor

"If there are any other opinions/suggestions/expectations (either concerning the state of play or the future development of the RFC) that you would like to share with us, please describe them below."
Satisfaction with Infrastructure

To what extent are you satisfied with the adequacy of the selected lines? || To what extent are you satisfied with the infrastructure standards of all designated lines, including diversionary routes dedicated to the RFC, concerning parameters such as train length, axle load, electrification, loading gauges, etc.? || To what extent are you satisfied with the measures taken by the RFCs' Infrastructure Managers to improve the infrastructure standards on the lines assigned to the corridor?

Percentage of respondents; RU and Non-RU Applicants only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy of Network of Lines</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Slightly Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to Improve Infrastructure Standards</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Very Unsatisfied</td>
<td>Slightly Unsatisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy of Network of Lines</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy of Network of Lines</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Standards</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures to Improve Infrastructure Standards</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 11; 14; 20
very unsatisfied/unsatisfied
station Aachen-West: track length + direction change + tonnage limit
740m train length in Germany still missing and no reliable implementation plan until 2020
2000t train weight in Italy still missing and no reliable implementation plan until 2020
high profile in Italy

slightly unsatisfied or better
in Switzerland it is usual to operate trains with 2 or 3 engines in the mountains; this is not always good from infrastructure in definition of meters
train length of 740m is not possible
the overall limited/insufficient capacity is the most crucial issue on the infrastructure

"If you are 'unsatisfied' or 'very unsatisfied', please specify the main reasons?"
Satisfaction with Coordination of Works & Possessions

To what extent are you satisfied with the result/quality of the coordination of planned temporary capacity restrictions (works and possessions) on the corridor? || … with the quality of the information given in the list of planned temporary capacity restrictions that will affect the availability of the lines assigned to the corridor? || … with the level of detail in the contents of the list? || How do you feel about the way your opinion is taken into account in the relevant processes?

Percentage of respondents: RU and Non-RU Applicants only

- Result/Quality of Coordination of Works and Possessions: 
  - Very unsatisfied: 20%
  - Unsatisfied: 30%
  - Slightly unsatisfied: 10%
  - Satisfied: 10%
  - Very satisfied: 30%

- Quality of Information in List of Works and Possessions: 
  - Very unsatisfied: 22%
  - Unsatisfied: 33%
  - Slightly unsatisfied: 44%

- Level of Detail of List of Works and Possessions: 
  - Very unsatisfied: 13%
  - Unsatisfied: 38%
  - Slightly unsatisfied: 50%

- Involvement of RU in Relevant Processes: 
  - Very unsatisfied: 14%
  - Unsatisfied: 14%
  - Slightly unsatisfied: 29%
  - Satisfied: 14%
  - Very satisfied: 29%

Mean ratings:
- Result/Quality: 2014/2015 not measured
- Quality of Information: 2014: 4.0, 2015: 3.5
- Involvement: 2014: 3.3, 2015: 2.4

Don't know:
- Result/Quality: 2014: 10% (2 of 20), 2015: 29% (4 of 14), 2016: 36% (4 of 11)
- Quality of Information: 2014: 15% (3 of 20), 2015: 36% (5 of 14), 2016: 27% (3 of 11)
- Level of Detail: 2014: 5% (1 of 20), 2015: 10% (2 of 20), 2016: 21% (3 of 14)
- Involvement: 2014: 9% (1 of 11), 2015: 36% (5 of 14), 2016: 18% (2 of 11)

n = 11; 14; 20
Quality of information in list of works and possessions || criticism/suggestions || open question

very unsatisfied/unsatisfied
publication lists are very complex and detailed and barely harmonized between different IM
we receive the information about construction works but without corresponding measures/alternatives; this is an essential information.
lists are not sufficiently updated; partly we receive information from the IM which is different from what has published

"If you are 'unsatisfied' or 'very unsatisfied', please specify the main reasons?"
Involvement of RU in relevant processes || criticism/suggestions || open question

very unsatisfied/unsatisfied
the process agreed by RNE is not respected; we virtually cannot identify any process of coordination
we mentioned various times that the offered paths do not correspond with actual running products

"If you are 'unsatisfied' or 'very unsatisfied', please specify the main reasons?"
closer coordination of IMs and sections of IMs to have one harmonized coordination result

good information from Swiss infrastructure

more and direct communications

offer existing trains

RUs should be invited to coordination meetings of the IMs at a moment where the planning of restrictions can still be influenced

take into account capacities on potential alternative routes

taking care for the availability of alternative lines

educate coordinators in customer needs more thoroughly

get CH to offer handmade solution and not only kick back in KAT-procedure
Satisfaction with Corridor Information Document (CID)

**Structure of CID**
- Very unsatisfied: 8%
- Slightly unsatisfied: 46%
- Satisfied: 46%

**Content of CID**
- Very unsatisfied: 8%
- Slightly unsatisfied: 42%
- Satisfied: 50%

**Comprehensibility of CID**
- Very unsatisfied: 8%
- Slightly unsatisfied: 17%
- Satisfied: 33%

**Mean Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>4,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>4,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>4,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Don't Know**
- 2014: 17% (3 of 18)
- 2015: 21% (3 of 14)
- 2016: 15% (3 of 20)

**Survey Details**
- n = 18; 14; 20

"To what extent are you satisfied with the structure of the CID for the 2017 timetable year? Can you easily find the information you want? Is the information organized in a logical way? ... with the contents of the CID? Do the contents match your business needs? Is the level of detail sufficient? ... with the comprehensibility of the CID? Is the wording clear and user-friendly? Are there enough graphical elements (where clear illustration is required)? Is the CID layout/design attractive?"
General suggestions for CID || open question

- add large construction projects leading to reduced capacity (e.g. Luino line 2017)
- complete trains 1-7 in all countries
- harmonized CID among all RFCs and in line with national rules
- more and direct communications
- optimize the information about construction works

"Do you have any ideas for improvement of the CID?"
To what extent are you satisfied with the Pre-arranged Path (PaP) parameters such as length, weight, etc.? || … with the origins/destinations and intermediate stops? || … with the PaP schedule? || … with the amount of the PaPs? Is there a sufficient number of PaPs? || … with the RC concept? || … with the quality of Reserve Capacity? || PaP offer and the capacity management process on overlapping corridor sections?*

*percentage of respondents; RU and Non-RU Applicants only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAP parameters</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>origin/destinations and intermediate stops in PaP</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP schedule (adequate travel/departure/arrival times)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of PaPs (number of paths)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reserve capacity concept</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of PaP reserve capacity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP offer/capacity management on overlapping sections</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAP parameters</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>origin/destinations and intermediate stops in PaP</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP schedule (adequate travel/departure/arrival times)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of PaPs (number of paths)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reserve capacity concept</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of PaP reserve capacity</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Details**

- **2016**: 11 respondents
- **2015**: 14 respondents
- **2014**: 20 respondents

**Notes**

- 0% = very unsatisfied
- 20% = slightly unsatisfied
- 40% = unsatisfied
- 60% = slightly satisfied
- 80% = satisfied
- 100% = very satisfied
very unsatisfied/unsatisfied
P400 in IT
infrastructure parameters reflect the least common denominator
PaPs are basing on currently blocked capacity by a running traffic - means who wins a PaP is hitting a running traffic out of the production model
there are situations with 2-3 engines in the mountains; these meters with 2-3 engines are not implemented in the PaP
for discriminatory reasons it is not allowed to create customized PAP for RU. The result is an average which is not suitable for the RU anymore

"If you are 'unsatisfied' or 'very unsatisfied', please specify the main reasons?"
slightly unsatisfied or better

- a PAP is always a compromise compared to customized solutions
- the needs between the RU are very (too) different to create an offer which suits everybody

"If you are 'unsatisfied' or 'very unsatisfied', please specify the main reasons?"
quality of PAP reserve capacity || criticism/suggestions || open question

very unsatisfied/unsatisfied

- current approach for Reserve Capacity does not reflect the real needs
- the approach with national requests is more efficient (RFC would only be one more player in the process)
- despite of the work of the RFC during some months, there was still no harmonized offer of train paths
- PaP ad hoc capacity block Swiss national traffic

"If you are 'unsatisfied' or 'very unsatisfied', please specify the main reasons?"
Satisfaction with Path allocation (2) - FlexPAP & NetPAP

“To what extent are you satisfied with the flexible approach to arrival/departure times and the possibility to shift intermediate stops (FlexPAP concept)?

… with the FlexPAP concerning running/stopping times and description? Is the indicated range of standard running times / maximum stopping times useful and is the description of the FlexPAP concept in CID 2017 sufficient?

… with the Net-PaP concept to influence / improve the priority value of your PaP request in case of conflicts?”

n = 11; 14; 20

2014 not measured

2016

2015

don't know

9% (1 of 11) 7% (1 of 14)

18% (2 of 11) 14% (2 of 14)

27% (3 of 11) 14% (2 of 14)
NetPAP concept || criticism/suggestions || open question

slightly unsatisfied or better
the idea is good, but the various types of PAP has reached a complexity which is hardly manageable (including systems)

"If you are 'unsatisfied' or 'very unsatisfied', please specify the main reasons?"
Satisfaction with Path allocation (3) - C-OSS

How satisfied are you with the availability of the Corridor One-Stop Shop (C-OSS)? (Is the reaction time of the C-OSS adequate?)

- Very unsatisfied: 22%
- Unsatisfied: 67%
- Slightly unsatisfied: 11%

How satisfied are you with the business know-how of the C-OSS?

- Very unsatisfied: 11%
- Unsatisfied: 44%
- Slightly unsatisfied: 33%
- Satisfied: 11%

How satisfied are you with the result of the allocation process for the 2017 timetable year? (Please consider especially the pre-allocation by the C-OSS, and the delivery of the draft and final timetable offers.)

- Very unsatisfied: 13%
- Unsatisfied: 50%
- Slightly unsatisfied: 38%
- Satisfied: 11%

How satisfied are you with the conflict-solving procedure?

- Very unsatisfied: 11%
- Unsatisfied: 50%
- Slightly unsatisfied: 25%
- Satisfied: 25%

Survey results for 2016, 2015, and 2014:

- 2016:
  - Availability of C-OSS: Mean score 4.9
  - Business know-how of C-OSS: Mean score 4.4
  - Result of allocation process by C-OSS: Mean score 4.3
  - Conflict solving procedure by C-OSS: Mean score 3.3

- 2015:
  - Availability of C-OSS: Mean score 4.2
  - Business know-how of C-OSS: Mean score 4.4
  - Result of allocation process by C-OSS: Mean score 3.6
  - Conflict solving procedure by C-OSS: Mean score 3.2

- 2014:
  - Availability of C-OSS: Mean score 4.0
  - Business know-how of C-OSS: Mean score 4.0
  - Result of allocation process by C-OSS: Mean score 3.3
  - Conflict solving procedure by C-OSS: Mean score 2.9

n = 11; 14; 20
General suggestions for PAPs and C-OSS || open question

- concentrate on creating additional traffic, not on changing running systems
- make C-OSS more than just an interface
- more transparency in the allocation of PAP
- see topics of the workshop
- the situation with Luino and the switch to Simplon is not coordinated well between infra and RFC
- PAP only interesting for short term needs; yearly timetable prefers a customized solution
- publishing of really available capacity for new traffics
- reduce incentives for ordering more PAP than necessary (result of allocation formula)
- reduce the discrimination of short-distance traffics (result of allocation formula)

"Do you have any ideas for improvement to the PaPs and C-OSS?"
**Path Coordination System (PCS) - Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PaPs</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaPs + feeder/outflow</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other path requests</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of Respondents (RU only):**

- **always**
- **frequently**
- **seldom**
- **never**
- **don't know**

- **PaPs**
  - 2015: 42% (25), 22% (22)
  - 2014: 56% (25), 25% (19)
  - 2015: 8% (8), 25% (19)
  - 2014: 62% (11), 17% (6)
  - 2015: 11% (22), 0% (0)
  - 2014: 11% (13), 0% (0)
  - 2015: 6% (13), 0% (0)
  - 2014: 17% (3), 0% (0)

- **PaPs + feeder/outflow**
  - 2015: 42% (8), 33% (17)
  - 2014: 50% (19), 25% (6)
  - 2015: 8% (8), 33% (17)
  - 2014: 62% (11), 17% (6)
  - 2015: 11% (22), 0% (0)
  - 2014: 11% (13), 0% (0)
  - 2015: 6% (13), 0% (0)
  - 2014: 17% (3), 0% (0)

- **other path requests**
  - 2015: 8% (8), 25% (50)
  - 2014: 60% (27), 25% (13)

*How often does your company use the PCS booking tool for international path requests?***

n = 10; 14; 18
What is the volume of path requests (dossiers) you placed in PCS for the 2017 timetable year?

Path Coordination System (PCS) - volume

- 0% (0 of 9) don't know
- 9% (1 of 11) in 2015
- 6% (1 of 16) in 2014

- 1 to 10 requests
- 11 to 20 requests
- 21 to 30 requests
- more than 30 requests
Satisfaction with Path Coordination System (PCS)

How satisfied are you all in all with PCS as a booking tool for international path requests? Does it match your needs? || … with the usability of PCS concerning the display of the PaP-offer? || … concerning the selection of required PaPs? || … concerning the display of remaining / reserve capacity (late and ad-hoc path requests)? || … with the usability of PCS concerning the handling of required remaining / reserve capacity (late and ad-hoc path requests)?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCS overall</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usability of PCS - display of PAP-offer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usability of PCS - selection of PAPs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usability of PCS - display of remaining/reserve capacity</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usability of PCS - selection of remaining/reserve capacity</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean:

- 2016: 3.1, 3.1, 2.9, 3.1, 3.1, 3.1
- 2014: 3.1, 3.1, 3.1, 3.1, 3.1

Don't know:

- 2016: 0% (0 of 9)
- 2014: 0% (0 of 11)
- 2014: 6% (1 of 16)

n = 9; 11; 16
On 25 January 2016 RNE released an overhauled version of PCS ("PCS Next Generation"). The new system is based on modern standards, its goal being to increase usability. Have you perceived any significant improvements in the use of PCS compared to the previous year?

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

- Improvements in use of PCS
  - Yes: 67
  - Partly: 33
  - Don't know: 0

- Improvements in use of PCS
  - Yes: 27
  - Partly: 18
  - No: 55
  - Don't know: 0

n = 9; 11
General suggestions for PCS || open question

make PCS less complicated and more user friendly (more efficient for entering)
create one interface, make national requirements obsolete
make available for ordering process as well as carrying out the planning itself

"Do you have any ideas for improvement to PCS?"
Satisfaction with Terminal Services

To what extent are you satisfied with the list of terminals along the RFC that are provided by the RFC? Are all relevant terminals included in the CID 2017? To what extent are you satisfied with the supply of information on terminals? Is the RFC supplying all relevant information on Terminals (either contained inside the CID 2017 or other sources)?

n = 11; 14; 20
"How satisfied are you with the performance reports? Do they show the information you need? || How satisfied are you with the efficiency of measures taken in order to improve punctuality? || How satisfied are you with the feedback you receive from your whole RFC performance management team (if it exists) / train performance management? The RFC performance management team evaluates the punctuality of your trains and reports it back to you."

n = 10; 14; 20
**Satisfaction with Traffic Management**

1. Information from operation centres/traffic control centres:
   - Very unsatisfied: 11% (2016), 10% (2015), 10% (2014)
   - Slightly unsatisfied: 44% (2016), 38% (2015), 40% (2014)
   - Satisfied: 44% (2016), 38% (2015), 40% (2014)
   - Very satisfied: 11% (2016), 13% (2015), 13% (2014)
   - Don't know: 10% (2016), 29% (2015), 45% (2014)

2. Usability of information in case of disturbances:
   - Very unsatisfied: 13% (2016), 20% (2015), 20% (2014)
   - Unsatisfied: 13% (2016), 43% (2015), 50% (2014)
   - Slightly unsatisfied: 63% (2016), 30% (2015), 30% (2014)
   - Satisfied: 13% (2016), 3% (2015), 5% (2014)
   - Very satisfied: 13% (2016), 4% (2015), 2% (2014)
   - Don't know: 20% (2016), 20% (2015), 50% (2014)

3. Helpfulness of traffic management:
   - Slightly unsatisfied: 71% (2016), 36% (2015), 36% (2014)
   - Satisfied: 14% (2016), 36% (2015), 36% (2014)
   - Very satisfied: 14% (2016), 38% (2015), 38% (2014)
   - Don't know: 14% (2016), 5% (2015), 5% (2014)

"How satisfied are you with the information you get from the different operation centres / traffic control centres of the IMs on the corridor while operating trains? \... with the usability of the information you get from the operation centres / traffic control centres of the IMs on the corridor in case of disturbances? \... How helpful is the Infrastructure Managers' (IMs') traffic management as regards running your trains with a high service quality?"
slightly unsatisfied or better
more reliable and quick information regarding ETA -> to final destination

"If you are 'unsatisfied' or 'very unsatisfied', please specify the main reasons?"
helpfulness of traffic management || criticism/suggestions || open question

very unsatisfied/unsatisfied
especially Infrabel

slightly unsatisfied or better

to many interruptions due to infrastructure failure in the past year

time for resuming full service after interruption to long

information not fast enough, reliable ETA to final destination needed

"If you are 'unsatisfied' or 'very unsatisfied', please specify the main reasons?"
Satisfaction with Co-operation with the RFC Management Board (1)

How satisfied are you with the RU Advisory Group/Terminal Advisory Group (RAG/TAG) meetings. Is your attendance beneficial and useful for your company?

n = 18; 14; 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (very unsatisfied)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (unsatisfied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (slightly unsatisfied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (satisfied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (very satisfied)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (don't know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know:
- 33% (6 of 18) in 2016
- 29% (4 of 14) in 2015
- 40% (8 of 20) in 2014
Satisfaction with Co-operation with the RFC Management Board (2)

- **opinions of Advisory Group properly considered**
  - 2015:
    - Yes: 22%
    - Partly: 67%
    - No: 11%
    - Don't know: 10%
  - 2014:
    - Yes: 25%
    - Partly: 67%
    - No: 8%
    - Don't know: 9%

- **decisions by Management Board understandable**
  - 2015:
    - Yes: 22%
    - Partly: 78%
    - No: 9%
    - Don't know: 22%
  - 2014:
    - Yes: 25%
    - Partly: 58%
    - No: 17%
    - Don't know: 21%

- **information regarding functioning of RFCs available and understandable**
  - 2015:
    - Yes: 36%
    - Partly: 55%
    - No: 30%
    - Don't know: 28%
  - 2014:
    - Yes: 50%
    - Partly: 43%
    - No: 10%
    - Don't know: 20%

*Do you consider that the opinion of the Advisory Group has been properly taken into account by the RFC Management Board? || Are decisions taken by the RFC Management Board (that concern your business) understandable for you? || Is information regarding the functioning of the RFC easily available and understandable for you?*

---

**n = 18; 14; 20**
active, business related use of the existing working groups
communication about the RFC decisions and implementation of investments for the market players (potential users of the corridor) should be done in clearer way; what's in it for the shippers, for the logistical players, for the road haulers etc.
past steps of 1 pagers and action list have been good
possibility to have an agenda point in the management board meeting
active business partnership
coordination of works with corridor RFC2 should be taken into account
improve feedback loop - especially in between meetings
coordination of implementation of capacity issues, long and heavy trains should be clarified between Belgium, Germany, Switzerland and Italy
more transparency of current activities and status of ExB/MB for RAG/ TAG
ERTMS developments to be aligned along the corridor
use mediums of video telcos
design/construct customer information platform more user friendly/up to date
the cost challenge is not explicitly addressed in the regulation but it should be the basic idea of the RFC concept

"Do you have any ideas for improving your involvement in the RFCs` activities?"
Satisfaction with Overall RFC Communication

- **Information on RFC Website**
  - Very unsatisfied: 36%
  - Unsatisfied: 64%
  - Mean: 4.6

- **Information at RAG/TAG Meetings**
  - Very unsatisfied: 10%
  - Unsatisfied: 40%
  - Satisfied: 50%
  - Mean: 4.3

- **Communication with Management Board (except RAG/TAG meetings)**
  - Very unsatisfied: 14%
  - Unsatisfied: 29%
  - Satisfied: 14%
  - Mean: 3.9

- **Brochures by RFC**
  - Very unsatisfied: 36%
  - Unsatisfied: 64%
  - Mean: 4.6

- **Annual Report by RFC**
  - Very unsatisfied: 8%
  - Unsatisfied: 54%
  - Satisfied: 38%
  - Mean: 4.3

"To which extent are you satisfied with the information provided by RFC's website? || To which extent are you satisfied with the information provided by the RAG/TAG Meetings? || To which extent are you satisfied with the communication with the Management Board of the RFC other than at the RAG/TAG meetings? || To which extent are you satisfied with the brochures/annual report published by the RFC? "

n = 18; 14; 20
General suggestions for RFC communication || open question

a harmonization challenge (operational processes & technical aspects) and a legal challenge (removal of redundant national rules)

communication is useful, but focus on results, communication comes in a second step

monitor of pending issues regarding where what is blocked, why and what are next steps

monitoring of relevant issues concerning the corridor, discussed at the commission/ other committees etc.

the cost challenge is not explicitly addressed in the regulation but it should be the basic idea of the RFC concept

stronger involvement of Transport Ministries /Member States would help in overcoming national barriers to harmonization

"On which subjects would you like the RFC to communicate more?"
Sample Description
To which of the following types of target groups does your company belong?

- Railway Undertaking (RU)
- Non-RU Applicant
- Terminal (other than Non-RU Applicant)

Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railway Undertaking</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-RU Applicant</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 18; 14
**Usage of different corridor sections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** How frequently does your company operate/run international services on the following sections of this corridor?

- **daily**: 75% (2015), 5% (2014)
- **several days per week**: 15% (2015), 10% (2014)
- **weekly**: 13% (2015), 5% (2014)
- **monthly**: 5% (2015), 5% (2014)
- **yearly**: 13% (2015), 31% (2014)
- **never**: 13% (2015), 30% (2014)

**Notes:**
- For Belgium, Italy, and Germany, the data is consistent across years.
- For Switzerland, the data shows a slight increase in weekly usage in 2015 compared to 2014.

---

"How frequently does your company operate/run international services on the following sections of this corridor?"
4 Non/potential users
Summary - Satisfaction Rating

Top 10 aspects

1. Availability of C-OSS performance reports
2. Usability of information in case of disturbances
3. Information from operation centres/traffic control centres
4. Information on RFC website
5. Brochures by RFC
6. FlexPAP running/stopping times/description
7. Information from operation centres/traffic control centres
8. Feedback from performance management
9. FlexPAP concept in general
10. Business know-how of C-OSS

Bottom 10 aspects

1. Communication with management board (except RAG/TAG meetings)
2. PAP schedule (adequate travel/departure/arrival times)
3. Usability of PCS - selection of remaining/reserve capacity
4. Reserve capacity concept
5. Measures to improve infrastructure standards
6. Usability of PCS - display of remaining/reserve capacity
7. PCS overall
8. Supply of information on terminals
9. Usability of PCS - display of PAP offer
10. Involvement of RU in relevant processes

Mean scores:
- Top 10: 4.9
- Bottom 10: 3.0

Additional aspects:
- Usability of information in case of disturbances
- Information from operation centres/traffic control centres
- Information on RFC website
- Brochures by RFC
- FlexPAP running/stopping times/description
- Information from operation centres/traffic control centres
- Feedback from performance management
- FlexPAP concept in general
- Business know-how of C-OSS
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Summary - Satisfaction Rating || Comparison to 2015/2014 (1)

Attention: very small sample sizes!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Allocation</th>
<th>mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAP parameters</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>origin/destinations and intermediate stops in PAP</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP schedule (adequate travel/departure/arrival times)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of PAPs (number of paths)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reserve capacity concept</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of PAP reserve capacity</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FlexPAP concept in general</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FlexPAP: running/stopping times getDescription</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetPAP concept in general</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP offer/capacity management on overlapping sections</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>availability of C-OSS</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business know-how of C-OSS</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result of allocation process by C-OSS</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict solving procedure by C-OSS</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attention: very small sample sizes!**
Summary - Satisfaction Rating || Comparison to 2015/2014 (3)

**Path Coordination System**
- Usability of PCS - display of remaining/reserve capacity: 2.9 (2016), 2.9 (2015), 3.4 (2014)
- Usability of PCS - selection of remaining/reserve capacity: 3.0 (2016), 3.0 (2015), 3.8 (2014)

**Terminal Services**

**Train Performance Management**

Attention: very small sample sizes!
Summary - Satisfaction Rating || Comparison to 2015/2014 (4)

Attention: very small sample sizes!
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