

TTR: Allocation guidelines for conflicting capacity announcements and requests

(Draft Version 0.5.1)

RailNetEurope
Oelzeltgasse 3/8
AT-1030 Vienna

Phone: +43 1 907 62 72 00
Fax: +43 1 907 62 72 90

mailbox@rne.eu
www.rne.eu

Forum Train Europe
Hilfikerstrasse 3
CH-3000 Bern 65

Phone: +41 51 285 07 45

info@forumtraineurope.eu
www.forumtraineurope.eu

Version	Date	Description
0.1	21 Sept. 2018	Document created by Daniel Haltner
0.2	04 Oct. 2018	Revision of first version by the members of the WP Allocation Rules
0.3	05 Nov. 2018	Inclusion of feedbacks from WP Allocation Rules members as well as inputs from the TTR Pilot Board meeting on 30.10.18
0.4	29 Nov. 2018	Inclusion of feedbacks from WP Allocation Rules members to V0.3 as well as inputs from S. Carek
0.4.1	5 Dec. 2018	Inputs for a more comprehensive explanation regarding “better management of TCRs” and conditional allocation.
0.5	16 May 2019	Inclusion of inputs from TTR Legal Task Force
0.5.1	8 Feb. 2023	Adding of a disclaimer

Disclaimer:

This paper was created with the aim to have guidelines for IMs when capacity shortage conflicts occur in the various phases of the timetable process. This document has not yet been released for use in daily business. On the one hand, new or changed TTR elements have to be taken into account. On the other hand, there is no basis for decision-making in the event that the iterative conflict resolution negotiations have not led to success. At the current time (Feb. 2023), this document serves only to illustrate potential situations with capacity shortages.

Table of contents

1.	Basics	3
1.1	Definitions	3
1.2	Goal of the allocation guidelines for conflicting capacity announcements and requests	3
1.3	Scope of this document	3
1.4	Reference documents	4
1.5	Overview of extracts from the existing legal framework	4
2.	Description of the elements of the TTR Allocation guidelines	6
2.1	Capacity model (X-36 – X-18)	6
2.2	Capacity planning (X-16 – X-12)	7
2.3	Allocation Rules for Annual Timetable	8
2.4	Rolling Planning.....	10
2.5	Path alteration.....	11
3.	Allocation Rules for Rail-Related Services	12
4.	Allocation Rules for the TTR Pilots.....	12

1. Basics

1.1 Definitions

For the purpose of this Manual, the following definitions apply:

- (1) 'Allocation rules' means rules set out by the law and/or the infrastructure manager (IM)/allocation body (AB) to be applied in the capacity-partitioning and allocation process (X-60 up until X+12).
- (2) 'Conflict' means a situation of two or more applicants announcing to request or requesting identical infrastructure capacity. Thus, the conflict can occur at any major phase of the allocation process (e.g. capacity model, capacity planning, annual scheduling, etc.). For a detailed explanation in the annual TT (ATT), see the corresponding chapter ("definition of conflict") in point 2.3.
- (3) 'Coordination' means a process of attempting to resolve a conflict through consultation of the IM with the applicants concerned.

1.2 Goal of the allocation guidelines for conflicting capacity announcements and requests

This manual aims to give a comprehensive overview of possible approaches on how to handle situations where the available capacity is or might not be sufficient. This can happen in the phase of the creation or update of the capacity model (X-36 until X-18), in the path planning phase (X-16 until X-12) or in case of conflicting path requests.

1.3 Scope of this document

This manual can be applied in the TTR Pilots for timetable period 2020 et seq. It provides an overview of extracts from the existing legal framework relevant to the TTR capacity allocation process as well as suggestions on how to handle conflicts during the capacity design and allocation process, which are based on operational experience from IMs that already have some experience with such or similar processes. IMs should consider the document as guidance when defining the measures, they intend to apply in such cases. Before including information on the relevant measures/procedures in their network statement (or PID), it is strongly recommended to check compliance with the applicable legal framework.

The rules and procedures described in this manual follow these principles:

- Principal aim of allocation rules: Non-discriminatory and optimal capacity usage implying transparency on the allocation conditions/criteria and, where necessary (for better use of the railway infrastructure), implying to support the adjustment of the capacity offer to suit the needs for infrastructure.
- Allocation rules are necessary to ensure that the capacity defined in the capacity model can be guaranteed and maintained regarding the amount and quality of the offered paths, both for the ATT and rolling planning (RP) capacity.
- The overall capacity of a railway network is not a fixed value and varies depending on the supply respectively timetable concept. At the same time, applicants shall be enabled to adjust their activities to the market.

- In order to achieve the overall objective of TTR to make applicants request paths not before the date when the capacity requirements are sufficiently well known, it is crucial that the applicants can rely on a sufficient capacity offer. Therefore, the proposed allocation guidelines for the path planning phase (X-16 to X-12) should support the provision of a reliable capacity for all traffic needs.
- Allocation guidelines should be the decision-making tool only in case no commonly agreed solution between the involved parties can be found at the end of a conflict resolution and/or coordination process.
- Allocation guidelines should ideally be implemented in an identical way on all networks in order to ensure an aligned treatment in case they are applied. However, this might be problematic under the existing legal framework due to national legal frameworks and national allocation rules.

1.4 Reference documents

This manual is based on the complete TTR description (“TTR: Description of the redesigned timetabling process”, Version 0.19-1).

1.5 Overview of extracts from the existing legal framework

1.5.1 European law

This manual contains allocation procedures for all stages of TTR, starting from the design of the capacity model up until the allocation of capacity to ATT and RP requests, while existing European provisions on allocation of capacity and handling conflicting requests mainly relate to the annual scheduling phase and do not (explicitly) mention the RP concept.

- a) Directive 2012/34/EU contains the following provisions relevant to the scope of this manual:

Article 39(1) of the Directive entitles Member States to lay down a capacity allocation framework; in doing so, they have to respect the management independence of the IM. The IM has to allocate infrastructure capacity in a fair and non-discriminatory manner.

According to Article 45 the IM must, as far as possible, meet all requests for infrastructure capacity and take account of all constraints on applicants. If the IM encounters conflicts between different requests during the annual scheduling process, it must attempt, through coordination of the requests, to ensure the best possible matching of all requirements (see Article 46).

Where, after coordination of the requested paths and consultation with applicants, it is not possible to satisfy requests for infrastructure capacity adequately, Article 47 requires the IM to immediately declare the section of infrastructure on which this has occurred to be congested. IM also have to declare congested infrastructure which can be expected to suffer from insufficient capacity in the near future.

The IM may give priority to specific services within the scheduling and coordination process only where a line has been declared congested or on specialized infrastructure (see Articles 47 and 49).

Article 48(2) entitles the IM to keep available reserved capacity in the final scheduled working timetable (even on congested lines) to enable it to respond to foreseeable requests.

Point 6 of Annex VII clarifies that the IM can reschedule an already allocated path if it is necessary to ensure the best possible matching of all path requests and if it is approved by the applicant to which the path had been allocated.

- b) Regulation (EU) 913/2010 contains the following provisions relevant to the scope of this manual:

Article 14(1) of the Regulation requires the Executive boards of the rail freight corridors (RFC) to establish a framework for capacity allocation on the RFC. According to Article 14(4) of the Regulation pre-arranged paths established on the basis of the Regulation have to be first allocated to freight trains crossing at least one border.

At the level of the framework for capacity allocation the Executive boards of the RFCs have agreed on common priority rules to be applied in the case of conflicting requests for pre-arranged paths (see Annex 1 to the frameworks for capacity allocation on the RFCs).

- c) Commission Implementing Regulation 2016/545 on framework agreements contains the following provisions relevant to the scope of this manual:

Article 10 of the implementing Regulation on framework agreements requires IMs to hold a coordination in case of a conflict of an ATT request with an existing framework agreement. If this coordination does not allow to solve the conflict, the IM has to assess the path request and the framework agreement according to a list of criteria established in Article 10(2). This assessment aims at identifying whether the framework agreement or the ATT request would allow to make better use of the infrastructure and at identifying the impact of an allocation of the capacity to the ATT request on the holder of the framework agreement. If the assessment shows that the requested paths would provide for making a better use of the infrastructure and if the additional income generated from allocating these paths would at least offset any contractual penalties incurred by a modification or termination of the framework agreement, the IM must request the modification of existing framework agreements for the next timetable period.

A similar approach is to be followed in case of conflicting requests for framework agreements (see Article 9 of the Commission Implementing Regulation).

1.5.2 National law

Based on Article 39(1) of Directive 2012/34/EU, Member States have adopted capacity allocation frameworks with different levels of detail. In some Member States detailed allocation rules are defined in law and significantly limit the freedom of IMs to define these, whereas in other Member States it is mostly up to the IMs or ABs to define them. The rules and procedures proposed in this manual may be in conflict with some of the rules defined in national law. Wherever this is the case, it should be assessed whether the national legal framework adequately respects the management independence of the IM (see Article 4 of Directive 2012/34/EU).

2. Description of the elements of the TTR Allocation guidelines

In the life cycle of the timetabling process from X-60 until X+12, there are several occasions where allocation guidelines and/or rules and procedures can support the decision of an IM on distribution of capacity in case of restricted capacity. These phases are: capacity model (2.1), capacity planning (2.2), requests for ATT (2.3), requests for RP (2.4) and path alteration (2.5).

2.1 Capacity model (X-36 – X-18)

Introduction

In case that today's available capacity can cover today's capacity needs, it can be assumed that it will also be the case in some years if nothing is going to change on the IM side (e.g. no new or changed infrastructure, technology, restrictions) as well as on the side of the market needs.

There can also be cases where changes on the IM side or new/different market needs do not have an impact as there will be enough capacity available.

On the other hand, there can also be changes on the side both of the IM and/or market requirements where the available capacity will not be sufficient. In such an event, the following proposal might be helpful to solve conflicts in the capacity model preparation or updating phase.

Proposed approach

During the capacity model design phase, there are four possible circumstances where the available capacity cannot satisfy all requirements from the market as well as IM internal needs (TCRs/maintenance). For each of these circumstances, there are possible solutions (procedures/suggestions) that might solve or reduce capacity conflicts. The proposed solutions focus on short-term operational measures; at the same time, it needs to be recalled that Article 47 of Directive 2012/34 requires the IM to declare any section that can be expected to suffer from insufficient capacity in the near future as congested.

TCRs with major, high or medium impact; different maintenance concept

- Instead of a standard maintenance program for all lines, an IM could have different maintenance concepts depending on the type of line (tailor-made solution of each line)
- In case of TCRs, after consultation of potential applicants, the best period for conducting the work should be defined. Aim: limit the impact and/or common agreement between both IMs and applicants and give applicants the possibility to look for alternative routings in due time.
- Annex VII to Directive 2012/34/EU: It is expected that the implementation of the new mandatory rules on TCR coordination will lead to an improved management of TCRs which will result in either a reduction of impacts or an acceptance of the impact thanks to a transparent and early consultation and coordination with stakeholders.

New or changed traffic demand

- Optimal usage of the capacity is closely linked to a system paths offer with standardised parameters. The closer a new or changed traffic demand is in line with these parameters, the higher is the chance for realisation.
- New or changed traffic demand can be implemented differently. It is proposed that an IM creates scenarios for the various options with a focus on the capacity consumption, based on fixed and volatile elements and parameters that had been agreed on with the applicant. Together, the best solution in terms of an optimal usage of the capacity should be taken in a coordination process.

Change in the production concept of an applicant (circumstances triggered by rolling stock changes)

- In case of missing capacity, a partial implementation might be a (intermediate) solution by for example not making full benefit of the new concept.
- One approach could be the harmonisation of speed in order to avoid having too many different system paths with heterogeneous parameters.
- Example for the above statement: Tilting train reduces the journey times by 15 minutes but destroys three paths of another category without any alternative. Solution could be, that the tilting function is used only on a section (e.g. last section before entering a node) and the time benefit is not 15 minutes but still several minutes without any negative impact on other paths.

New or changed infrastructure (circumstances triggered by infrastructure)

- When defining the requirements for the new infrastructure, a possible negative impact on the capacity should be already taken into account (e.g. for a new stop: not only building a platform but perhaps also an overtaking track for faster trains).
- Evaluation of scenarios by either the IM and or the applicant (e.g. new stop replaces another less frequented stop, applicant defines different stopping philosophy or even a different concept).

An overview of these approaches can be seen in the Annex.

2.2 Capacity planning (X-16 – X-12)

Introduction

This chapter refers to the phase from approx. X-16 to X-12 when IMs are planning the capacity either for ATT or RP traffic. It might happen that in the phase of the elaboration of the capacity model, enough capacity can initially be made available for the various needs. However, due to for example TCRs with a medium impact, the IM might subsequently face the problem that there is a lack of capacity in this planning phase. Therefore, this chapter presents possible criteria that can be applied in such a case.

Proposed approach

Respecting paragraphs 8 and 11 of Annex VII to Directive 2013/34/EU, the corresponding descriptions in the “RNE Guidelines for Coordination/Publication of Planned Temporary Capacity Restrictions” will probably be the most promising approach for solving conflicts in this phase.

Process steps for coordinating all known medium impact TCRs

Medium impact TCRs

As early as known, but before X-13.5, IMs shall inform applicants and affected IMs about known medium impact TCRs with international impact. Based on this information, IMs trigger the consultation of applicants, who may place their comments and concerns.

IMs perform the coordination of TCRs according to the results of the consultation phase in such a way that impact on capacity and applicants is as low as reasonably possible, the use of infrastructure as efficient as reasonably possible (no non-parallel works on the same line, etc.). Coordination shall be facilitated through bilateral (or trilateral) meetings of neighbouring IMs. The IMs shall, if necessary, invite the applicants active on the lines concerned, the main operators of service facilities and RFC concerned to get involved in that coordination. In case of conflicting TCRs, IMs have to make sure that these conflicts are being resolved.

Between X-18 (major TCRs) or X-13,5 (high and medium TCRs) and X-12

Medium impact TCRs

Coordination shall be finalised at the latest at X-13.5, after which IMs consult applicants on the results. Decisions resulting from the different rounds of consultation with the applicants should reflect the aim of reducing IMs' costs and minimising the impact on applicants.

It needs to be highlighted that the impact on the ATT capacity needs to be discussed with the potential applicants for this capacity and for the impact on the RP capacity, the potential applicants for this category must be consulted. It should not be forgotten that some of the RP capacity has already been committed to an applicant who had requested multi-annual RP capacity some time ago.

2.3 Allocation Rules for Annual Timetable

Introduction

The deadline for receipt of requests for paths to be incorporated into the ATT will be at X-8,5. Requests received after this deadline shall also be considered by the IM/AB. However, in principle they are treated on the basis of "first come – first served".

Path requests received on time generally have the same starting position for the allocation of capacity. Therefore, clear rules need to be defined, which can be applied when no commonly agreed solution can be found in case of path request conflict.

If an IM is able to convert the capacity needs announcements from applicants into very realistic pre-planned (system) paths and applicants request these pre-planned paths as foreseen, there will not be many paths requesting conflicts. Nevertheless, there will always be situations where two or more applicants request the identical ATT capacity. The following conflicts are possible:

- Between passenger trains only

- Between passenger and freight train placed in the ATT process
- Between freight trains placed in the ATT process only
 - for the exactly same traffic (at the end just one applicant will operate the train)
 - or between different types of traffic

Proposed approach

Before applying any allocation rules, a path request conflict resolution procedure in accordance with Article 46 of the Directive shall take place. However, this might be challenging if paths for long-running trains travelling through some countries are involved and there are conflicts in various areas. The added value of this conflict resolution can be limited if there is absolutely no willingness from the “potential” winner of a conflict to be ready to accept an alternative. The reduction of the path construction phase from 12 to 8 weeks should motivate the involved IMs and applicants to find a joint solution in an efficient conflict resolution process.

Path conflicts: if in one country, the path is involved in a conflict, this IM (leading IM) should check with the applicant (if this is not the leading applicant, then the leading applicant needs to be consulted by the leading IM in a first step) if the solution should be searched in an earlier or later time window or even in a different routing. Based on the feedback of the (leading) applicant, the leading IM should mandate the involved IMs to elaborate an alternative. The result will be handed over to the applicants for consultation.

An IT solution must be used in order to facilitate the coordination and consultation between IMs as well as between applicants and finally between IM and applicant.

In case of a call for tender, there is a high probability that requests for the identical capacity will be placed. An IM will block the requested capacity only once. This capacity will be allocated to the winner of the call for tender. Due to different production concepts of applicants, it might be that not exactly the identical capacity will be requested. All requests will be further treated as regular requests with separate, individual draft and final offer for each request. If the call for tender is still ongoing at the time of the final allocation, IMs should not allocate the relevant capacity but keep it available as reserve capacity for foreseeable ad-hoc requests in the working timetable.

Definition of conflict: A path requesting conflict is a situation where the IM(s) cannot satisfy the requests for infrastructure capacity adequately. There are on the one hand “technical” conflicts where on the IM side the path construction cannot be harmonised or aligned with the customer request (e.g. TCRs with a minor impact, negative border times or time-related derogation to the initials times of the path request (can be different for each type of train category)). In this case, the IMs need to solve them before forwarding the offers to the applicants. On the other hand, there are conflicts in the path allocation in case two or more applicants requested the identical or conflicting capacity. Here, the involvement of these applicants is needed in order to coordinate the offer.

IMs have to look for a consensus-based solution in a conflict resolution process, as required by article 46 of Directive 2012/34/EU. In the absence of a joint agreement, allocation (= priority) rules are needed.¹ From a European and from an economic point of view, trains running on paths on long stretches and on a frequent (daily) basis should benefit with regard

¹ Article 45(2) and point 3(e) of Annex IV to Directive 2012/34/EU seems to suggest that priority rules can only be applied on infrastructure that has been declared congested and on specialised infrastructure. However, some national capacity allocation frameworks and network statements of IMs foresee the application of priority rules also in other cases where coordination has not allowed to solve a conflict. The relevant provisions have up until now not been challenged by the European Commission

to paths that are used just on short stretches and not very often. The allocation rule currently published in the Framework of Capacity Allocation on the rail freight corridors (see Article 14 of Regulation (EU) 913/2010) already reflects this approach. Taking over this approach (calculation of distance x number of running days) into the ATT conflict resolution procedure would lead to the fact that in the future long running trains would benefit in case of a path requesting conflict. In other words, international traffic could be in a better position to be allocated the requested path than domestic traffic, even if the distance in one country is shorter than the one of the conflicting request.

If in the conflict resolution round the requests cannot be separated based on the allocation rules/priority criteria (e.g. same distance and identical operating days) and no commonly agreed decision can be found, a bidding or a random selection (toss a coin, random draw, etc.) could be used as a last possibility to decide on the requests.

Proposed approach for ATT requests conflicting with capacity safeguarded for RP requests

The TTR concept is based on the idea of splitting capacity into (inter alia) capacity for ATT requests and capacity for RP requests ahead of the annual scheduling phase. If an applicant were to request capacity reserved for RP requests during the ATT request period, the IM should in principle be in a position to reject such request without coordination provided that capacity for RP requests has been reserved in accordance with Article 48(2) of Directive 2012/34/EU or Article 14(5) of Regulation (EU) 913/2010.²

Proposed approach for path requests referring to a Framework Agreement

In a path requesting conflict involving at least one request that refers to a Framework Agreement, the procedure as described in article 10 of the “Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/545 of 7 April 2016 on procedures and criteria concerning framework agreements for the allocation of rail infrastructure capacity” must be applied.

Proposed approach for late path requests (point 3 of Annex VII to Directive 2012/34/EU)

The IM will treat requests for ATT traffic placed after the deadline for ATT traffic first from residual but not yet requested ATT capacity. If no residual ATT capacity is available or does not meet customer requirements, the remaining unplanned capacity should be used.

2.4 Rolling Planning

Introduction

In RP, the “first come – first served” principle will be applied. Therefore, receiving two conflicting path requests at the same time for exactly the identical capacity is highly unlikely. However, in order to ensure the optimal use of capacity, an IM should prevent the situation where an allocated and already operating RP traffic with just a minor number of operating days (e.g. every Wednesday) restricts RP traffic with a higher volume.

Proposed approach

If the IM encounters conflicts between allocated and already operating RP traffic and new RP capacity requests, that cannot be solved due to missing available capacity, a coordination

² Please note that discussion as to whether Article 48 of Directive 2012/4/EU and Article 14(5) of Regulation (EU) 913/2010 can be accepted as legal basis to reserve capacity for RP requests is still ongoing.

round should take place. The intention of this step is that applicants with just a few running days a week can be motivated to merge their path (respectively their slot for the upcoming TT periods) with other paths being used also on a few weekdays only. This procedure shall only take place if the already operating RP traffic runs the train – for instance – once or twice a week and the new RP requests is for at least three weekdays. Point 6 of Annex VII to Directive 2012/34/EU might provide a legal basis for making an “owner” of a RP slot accept a re-allocation. However, there are cases where this procedure should not be applied. Examples: 1) RP slot/capacity was requested some time ago for 1x/week for 36 months. New RP slot request for 5x/week but only for three months. 2) Applicant has a RP slot 2x/week from Stockholm to Milano. Another applicant requests RP capacity 5x/week from Padborg to Hamburg. Finding an alternative for the applicant with two running days in 5 countries might be very challenging.

Call for tender: If the IM(s) realise in the path construction phase that two or more RP requests refer to the same traffic, an identical procedure as for call for tender requests in the ATT can be applied. If an IM has already sent the offer to the applicant and another applicant is requesting identical capacity later on, the IM must forward a different offer.

2.5 Path alteration³

Introduction

An applicant can expect an allocated path to be available up to its time of operation. However, if an event occurs (e.g. important short-term needs for construction works or TCRs with minor impact) prior to the start of the operation and the allocated path is no longer available, the IM has to trigger a path alteration process as soon as the new TCR or a disturbance is known to provide the applicants with an alternative path. There, applicants and IMs jointly define in which way the alternative offer should be prepared. However, it can happen that there will be not enough capacity for the elaboration of an alternative offer for all affected paths. Thus, an IM needs clear rules on how to deal with such a situation.

Proposed approach

The following allocation principles shall be followed if there is less capacity than needed. 100% of capacity available for re-routing (residual and non-planned capacity) is allocated between ATT, RP and ad-hoc traffic according to the shares of these three segments in the current working timetable.

For the share of the ATT and regular RP, traffic is analysed per week during the expected time of interruption. The share of every applicant on the route with the TCR is calculated at the location where the TCRs start and/or end as the basis for determining the number of paths to be offered on each re-routing line. The already allocated paths on the rerouting line needs to be taken into account as well. If the weekly share of an applicant in the ATT or RP applied to the reduced capacity of a re-routing line does not allow for daily paths, the days of operation will be coordinated with the individual applicant. Every applicant gets at least one path per week and direction.

³ Might need to be aligned with the RNE Handbook on path alteration, which is currently under elaboration

3. Allocation Rules for Rail-Related Services

If requests for access to the service facility or supply of a service are in conflict with another request or concerns service facility capacity already allocated, the coordination procedure as described in article 10 of the “Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2177 of 22 November 2017 on access to service facilities and rail-related services” must be applied.

Based on article 7 of the above implementing regulation, IMs and service facility operators need to coordinate to ensure that capacity allocated on the infrastructure and in service facilities matches.

4. Allocation Rules for the TTR Pilots

Remark:

The TTR pilots are finished. The capital below is retained for illustrative purposes only.

Introduction

The principle “first come – first served” will be applied already in the pilot phase. For the pilots “Rotterdam – Antwerpen” and “Mannheim – Miranda de Ebro”, it is foreseen that the RP capacity needs to be requested via PCS. PCS dossiers will be forwarded to a single entity (C-OSS) for further processing.

For the pilot “Munich – Verona”, a different solution is planned. Applicants asked the pilot organisation if they can place requests for RP capacity with the national tools*. In the most extreme case, in a cooperation model with three applicants in AT, DE and IT, the requests for the same traffic will be placed at the three IMs. This procedure could become a challenge if for example in one country, the request for the national section will be placed later (e.g. due to a national holiday).

** From the perspective of improving international business, this can only be an approach for a launching phase. In addition, no coordination or monitoring/supervising role can be given to the C-OSS due to missing access to national tools.*

Proposed approach

Pilots “Rotterdam – Antwerpen” / “Mannheim – Miranda de Ebro”:

The C-OSS is able to see which request has been placed earlier. The processing of these requests will be done in batch mode. However, IMs shall arrange the paths in a certain sequence in order to make best use of the available RP capacity. In any case, the published parameters of the RP capacity need to be respected. The “first come – first served” principle will be applied only in case of conflicts of missing capacity for solving a conflict.

Pilot “Munich – Verona”:

a) In this case, all three IMs will receive the dossier at the same time. Further processing as described in the proposed approach for the other two pilots.

b) If the applicants wish for placing national requests will be fulfilled, the three IMs have to agree on the solution that the time of receipt of the third/last path request applies for the determination of the “first come – first served” deadline. The precondition for this approach is

that IMs are able to recognise which requests refer to the same traffic. It means that applicants need to add a comment/identifier for IMs in order to mark which national request refer to each other.

c) Applicants can either place their request via PCS or in the national systems. If the national systems will be used, the same reservation as for approach b) applies.

DRAFT

Annex: Capacity model – possible solutions for supporting the attribution of the available capacity to the various needs

Introduction: In case that today's available capacity can cover the needs of today's requirements, it can be assumed that it will also be the case in some years if nothing is going to change on the IM side as well as on the side of the market need. Below is an overview of events that have an impact on the available capacity, including proposals for solving capacity conflicts:

Overview of events with an impact on the available capacity

Event	TCRs or different maintenance concepts	New or changed traffic demand	Change in the production concept of an RU (rolling stock triggered circumstances)	New or changed infrastructure (circumstances triggered by infrastructure)
Short description	TCRs with major, high or medium impact or IMs intention to change the existing maintenance concept to a new/different approach	RU/applicants announced additional (new) services or intend a time shifting of existing services	RU/applicants intend to change the rolling stock of an existing service which has an impact on the journey times (tilting train, different engine type, etc.)	Events with an impact on the journey times (e.g. inauguration of an additional stopping location, different signalling system)
Possible approaches (criteria)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Instead of a standard maintenance program for all lines, an IM should have different maintenance concepts depending on the type of line (tailor-made solution of each line) 2) In case of TCRs, together with potential applicants the best period for concluding the work should be defined. Aim: limit the impact or common agreement between stakeholders 3) Annex VII, 2012/34/EU: Implementation will lead to 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) An optimal usage of the capacity is closely linked to system paths offer with standardised parameters. The closer a new or changed traffic demand is line with these parameters, the higher is chance for realisation. IMs should motivate their customers to indicate the capacity needs announcements as detailed as possible. 2) New or changed traffic(*) demand can be implemented differently. It is proposed that an IM creates 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In case of missing capacity, a partial implementation might be possible. Example: Not making full benefit of the new concept – tilting train with speed restrictions on some parts of journey (e.g. lines entering a node) 2) Harmonisation of speed in order to avoid having too many different system paths with heterogeneous parameters 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) When defining the requirement for the new infrastructure, possible negative impact to the capacity should be already taken into account (e.g. for a new stop: not only building the platform but perhaps also an overtaking track for faster trains). 2) Evaluation of scenarios (new stop replaces another less frequented stop, RU defines different stopping philosophy or even a different concept)

	<p>“better” management of TCRs which will result in either a reduction of impacts or an acceptance of the impact thanks to a transparent and early consultation of the stakeholders. This requires that the IMs information on TCRs and RU/applicants on their future capacity needs stay reliable.</p>	<p>scenarios for the various options with a focus on the capacity consumption. Together with the RU/ applicant, the best solution from an optimal usage of the capacity, especially on lines or part of it as well as nodes with a high occupation, should be taken in an iteration process</p> <p>3) IMs need to analyse inputs for new traffic with their own hypothesis on the traffic development</p> <p><i>(*) In freight traffic, several RU/applicants might inform the IM for a new traffic demand for the same end customer, and in the worst case with even different planned production concepts.</i></p>		
Timing for the measure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Prior to the definition of the cap. model 2) During the TCR consultation phase 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Ongoing process in customer contacts 2) Upon reception of new/changed cap. needs announcements or customer inputs 3) ditto 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Upon reception of new/changed cap. needs announcements or customer inputs 2) ditto 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Already in the evaluation phase for new or changed infrastructure 2) As part of the evaluation phase or the feasibility study for the implementation of new or changed infrastructure

Information: These criteria can be used in the phase of preparing the Capacity Model (X-36) as well as in the regular reviews of the Capacity Model.