

Questionnaire for Infrastructure Managers

If you have any further questions, do not hesitate to contact me (Mr. Andreas Lischke) at:

E-Mail : <u>Andreas.Lischke@dlr.de</u> Telephone: ++ 49 / 30 / 67 05 5-2 36

Please send by post your completed questionnaire to DLR- German Aerospace Center Institute of Transport Research Mr. Andreas Lischke Rutherfordstrasse 2 12489 Berlin Germany

or fill in the on-line questionnaire (www.rail-partner.org)

by March 10th, 2004

D ath

A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

uropean

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research



D ath

A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

uropear

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

		1. General information	
1.1 Nar	ne of your company	····	
1.2 Cor	ntact Person of the c	company	
Teleph	one number:		
E-mail	address:		



A Ilocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

e for

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

Questionnaire for Infrastructure Managers

2. Current Situation about train path

Foreword:

man-day

day

We want to learn more about the current situation of your work. It will help us to compare the situation of the European Infrastructure Managers.

	.1 What is the current number of international trains (all trains: passenger and freight), on average, crossing <u>daily</u> your national borders?						
	less than 10	11-50	51-100	101-200	201-300	more than	300
2.2	What is the ap	•		•		•	ve
	to produce per	<u>r year</u> to acco	mmodate th	e real traffi	c, as above	said?	
	less than 25	26-100	101-200	101-400	401-600	more than	600
3	Can you give a	an estimate of	the current	labour reso	ources in m	an-davs	
	that are neces					•	
						9	
	less than ½	½ to 1 man-	1-2 ma	n- 3-5 ma	an- more	than 5	

days

days

man-days



A llocation

R e-engineering

T of imetable

etworks

for uropean

Railways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

2.4	2.4 Do you believe these labour resources can be sensibly reduced, if better tools and methods are made available?				
	☐ YES ☐ NO		☐ doı	n't know	
2.5	Due to open railway markets, the path allo	ocation proce YES	ss will ir NO	n any case require don´t know	
	•more labour force				
	•improved Computer Aided Design tools				
	•improved processes				





A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

for urope

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

Questionnaire for Infrastructure Managers

3. Existing systems supporting process

Foreword:

The following section of the questionnaire is aimed at the current process of timetable design and path allocation between two or more independent infrastructure management organisations with regard to international route planning and the tools used to support this process.

3.1 Do you use a co YES	mputer based timeta	able design tool to design a timetable?
3.2 Do you use the s	same tool for designi	ing international routes? ☐ NO
cross-border tim	netable design? (seve	contacted by other IMs with regard to eral answers are possible) Uideoconferencing Internet Application
Other (please describe)		



A llocation

R e-engineering

T of imetable

etworks

for uropea

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

other IMs in timetable matters? Please attach the descriptions if you have one.
3.5 Within the FTE (Forum Train Europe) framework, the new system PATHFINDER been developed and is being put on the field by various companies. Are you familiation with PATHFINDER? YES NO
If "YES", do you already use or plan to use PATHFINDER for international timetable definition? YES NO
What, in addition to PATHFINDER, should be implemented to support the international path allocation?



A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

for uropear

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

Questionnaire for Infrastructure Managers

3.6 Which of the following technologies or processes could help to advance the

process of international route planning in your opinion?				
	helpful	not helpful	don't knov	
a) Video conferencing				
b) Computer based workflow				
c) Sharing time-distance graphs				
d) Sharing other timetable information (e.g. textual data)				
 e) Data exchange and alignment during the design process (e.g. before a PATHFINDER dossier is created) 	1 I			
f) Other cooperative methods (please specify or pr	opose su	ggestions)		



A llocation

R e-engineering

T of imetable

etworks

for uropear

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

Questionnaire for Infrastructure Managers

3.7 The time-distance diagram is not the only design endeavour and information

that characterises an international train.

In your opinion, what are the essential data or constraints that should be additionally provided to have an international path ready for validation and selling to railway undertakings?
3.8 Would you be willing to share information about sparing capacity with other IMs to advance the process of international route planning?
3.9 Do you always get all essential data from your neighbour IM in the process of international route planning? NO
If "NO", which are the essential data which are not yet managed in the process of international timetable planning? Please describe



A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

for uropean

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

3.1	0 Beside formal timetable de Europe, FTE) do you curr analysis and studies with	ently make, or hav	e made in the past, joint ca	
	☐ YES	☐ NO	don't know	
_	If "YES", please give experie	ence feed-back an	d recommendation for furth	er practice
3.1	What is (are) the timetable timetable design and path manufacturer.		rently in use at your compa sible, please name acronyn	
3.1	2 Do you expect and/or plar developments for these to international route planning	ool(s) in the next 2	years with regards to	
_				



A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

for urope

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

Questionnaire for Infrastructure Managers

4. Business Process

Foreword:

The following section of the questionnaire is aimed at characterizing the activities belonging to the allocation of rail capacity and charging on international routes from the point of view of business process management.

Generally speaking, business processes are what the enterprise must do to conduct its business successfully. They are the actions taken to respond to particular events,

convert inputs into outputs, and produce a particular result.

rail capacity al		the individuals or groups tha utes and get back the result	•
□Railway Undertaking	Other Infrastructure gs Managers	Operator of Combined Road/Rail	☐Transport Operator, forwarder
Other (please describe)			



D ath

A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

for urope

Railways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

4.2 What are the end products of your work? (Please describe the output or attach a sample.)
output:
What kind of output do you produce? (several answers are possible)
☐ telephone call ☐ letter or fax ☐ IS report
Other (please describe)
4.3 What are the resources (e.g. money, people, equipment, information, services) used by you in order to reply to a request for rail capacity allocation on international routes?
input:
How do you get the input? (several answers are possible)
☐ telephone call ☐ letter or fax ☐ Information System report
Other (please describe)



A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

for uropear

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

4 What events prompt you to start to work on a request for rail capacity allocation on international routes?						
telephone call	letter or fax	☐ Information System report				
Other (please describe)						



A llocation

e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

fo

uropean

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

Questionnaire for Infrastructure Managers

5. Train path charging on international corridors

Foreword:

One of the aims of the PARTNER-project is to develop a charging method that is based upon some generalized formulation. The currently used tariff systems of the EU member states exhibit a high degree of heterogeneity, partially caused by different national legislations. In order to understand the current charging methods and in order to get a clearer picture of what a 'fair' charging method should look like, we would like you to answer the following questions.

5.1	Do you think that a fair charging system on international corridors.	YES	NO	don't know
	a) should vary the charging fee according to the type of trains?		NO	
	b) should vary the charging fee according to the time of the day?	>		
	c) should vary the charging fee according to the weight of the train?			
	d) should vary the charging fee according to the expected congestion on the route?			
	e) should follow different national charging rules?			
	f) should distinguish between international and national trains on the same line section?			
	g) should give discounts to faster trains which are given lower speeds?			
	h) should give discounts to trains which are subject to lower quality of service (e.g. trains with more expected delays)?			
	i) should impose penalties on slower trains which impose lower speeds on faster trains on the same line section?			



Questionnaire for Infrastructure Managers

Path
Allocation
R e-engineering
of
imetable
etworks
for
uropean
Railways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

.2 Does your current charging system	YES	NO, depends on law	NO, depends on other reasons
a) vary the charging fee according to the type of trains?			
b) vary the charging fee according to the time of the day?			
c) vary the charging fee according to the weight of the train?			
d) vary the charging fee according to the expected congestion on the route?			
e) follow different national charging rules?			
f) distinguish between international and domestic trains on the same line section?			
g) give discounts to faster trains which are given lower speeds?			
h) give discounts to trains which are subject to lower quality of service (e.g. trains with more expected delays)?			
i) impose penalties on slower trains which impose lower speeds on faster trains on the same line section?			
Please try to describe these other reasons			



A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

for

uropean

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

5.3	In your opinion,	what perce	ntage of th	e infrastruct	ure costs sh	nould be cover	ed by the
	fees?						
	0.200/	21 400/	41.600/	<u> </u>	01.1000/	1 64 1	
	0-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%	don't know	
5.4	Is there someth your network st	-			?	ted lines in	
	If "YES", please	e write dowr	n in which c	document:			
5.5	Considering the changed?		ars, how m			orging method I	
5.6	Please add any you consider th						ints, if



D ath

A llocation

R e-engineering

T of imetable

etworks

___ fo

uropean

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

Questionnaire for Infrastructure Managers

Foreword:

The following section of the questionnaire concerns the method that is currently adopted by your company in order to design timetables and allocate capacity to the train path requests that you receive. These methods may possibly include decision support systems based on optimization algorithms.

6.1 How long does it take you to respond to a request received on short notice for a new international train path (average time)?							
			,.		months		
less than	3-5	6-10	10-30	more th	an 1 month,		
2 days	days	days	days	please s	specify		
6.2 Do you requi	e fast plan	ning or re-pla	nning (adap	otation) of ti	metables (i.e.	. within 1 day)?	
	ES		☐ NO				
If "YES",	would you	equire that c	urrent perfo	rmance be	improved suc	ch that re-	
plann	ing is carrie	ed out within:					
	6 hours	☐ 12 hou	rs 🗌	24 hours	hours	3	
			_				
6.3 For spare or	additional p	ath allocation	າ, does youi	company i	use:		
a) dummy or public cata	•	ucted paths,	e.g. availab	le in a	☐ YES	□ NO	
b) dummy or public cata	•	ucted paths,	not available	e as	☐ YES	□ NO	
c) paths wh	ich are con	structed ad h	oc on dema	ind	☐ YES	\square NO	



A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

for uropear

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

6.4	In designing timetables (train-paths) on international corridors do you think passenger and freight trains should have basically the same priority rules in capacity allocation? YESNO
	If "NO" please specify or comment.
6.5	In designing timetables, do you consider the main corridors first or do you consider the overall network?
	☐ main corridors ☐ particular areas ☐ overall network
6.6	Do you use decision support systems (optimization algorithms) for timetable design and path allocations?
	Please specify in both cases:







R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

for uropear

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

	In designing the rwith current tools			•	etables, are you s	satisfied
		YES	,	☐ NO		
	In designing and are the more imp asked for by you	ortant and	critical busin	ess factors th		•
	more time flexibility	☐ ch tin	anging depa ne	arture	on route re-pla	nning changes
6.9	Which regularity	tolerance w	ould you acc	cept for the a	rrival of internation	onal freight trains?
	less than 15	16-30	31-59	1-2 hours	more than 2	
	minutes	minutes	minutes		hours	



A llocation

R

of imetable

etworks

for

uropean

R

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

6.10	6.10 Considering that the UIC (Fiche 451-1) gives recommendations for regularity margins, do you think the definition of more <u>international standards</u> are required or may be useful, such as: YES NO					
	a) rules for running time calculation					
	b) locomotive traction power margins					
	c) haulage availability					
	d) standard catalogue paths					
_	e) others (please specify or comment)					
6.11	UIC has recently made available a new months based on the "compression method". Are	•	•	on (Fiche 40	05-1)	
	If "YES"			YES	NO	
	Would you think it is useful to implement based on the new UIC Fiche 405-1 (2003)		rithms			
	Have you already tested the method on p	oractical cases	s?			
	Do you consider it useful to implement the tool?	ne method as	a software			



A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

fo

uropean

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

Questionnaire for Infrastructure Managers

7. Additional Questions

Foreword:

The following section of the questionnaire concerns some special questions. If you would like to give us some attachments to the following questions or to any other question, you can send it by e-mail or post. Address and e-mail address can be found on our web site (www.rail-partner.org) or in the accompanying letter or e-mail.

com	panying letter or e-mail.	(in the same of t	•
7.1	Is the EU Directive 2001/1 to national laws in your cou	4/CE of the first railway package transferred intry?	
	☐ YES	□ NO	
7.2	realize realistic case studie	iple, to provide PARTNER with data or other information so of international path-allocation? (e.g. data on past infidentiality is preserved and any other constraints are	
	☐ YES	□ NO	
7.3		copy in English or any other information (e.g. website) of letwork Statement (if available, as required by EC	on
	\square YES, you will find it a	t www,railneteurope.org. or www.eicis.com	
	☐ YES, you will find it a	t www	
	YES, I will put it as an	n attachment of the questionnaire.	
	□ NO		



A llocation

R e-engineering

of imetable

etworks

for uropear

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

7.4 Can you provide a copy or information on how to get a copy of your path charging system? NO	
If "YES", please attach the charging system or give the link.	
www	
Please add an additional contact person (if necessary) who can respond to a continued short notice request about the charging system.	
Contact Person of the company for the charging system	
Telephone number:	
E-mail address:	
I enclose the questionnaire with the following attachments:	
*	
*	
*	
*	



A llocation

R e-engineering

imetable

etworks

for uropea

R ailways

2004-02-11

DLR, Institute of Transport Research

Questionnaire for Infrastructure Managers

Please add any additional comments or observations regarding the previous points, if you consider them appropriate for better analysis or understanding.

Thank you very much for your participation!

Your Project PARTNER Team