




Commonly applicable RFC KPIs
RFC Orient/East-Med
December 2024

CAPACITY MANAGEMENT

Volume of offered capacity – PaPs (at X-11)




Volume of requested capacity – PaPs (at X-8)





**The figures refer to the capacity which the C-OSS of the RFC concerned publishes and pre-allocates. These might therefore not reflect the total amount of offered and pre-allocated PaPs along the RFC.*

CAPACITY MANAGEMENT

Number of requests – PaPs (at X-8)
(number of PCS dossiers)



Number of conflicts – PaPs (at X-8)
(number of conflicting PCS dossiers)



**The figures refer to the capacity which the C-OSS of the RFC concerned publishes and pre-allocates. These might therefore not reflect the total amount of offered and pre-allocated PaPs along the RFC.*

CAPACITY MANAGEMENT

Volume of pre-booked capacity – PaPs (at X-7.5)



2024	for TT 2025	7.8 mio (path) km
2023	for TT 2024	7.3 mio (path) km
2022	for TT 2023	8.2 mio (path) km

Ratio of pre-booked capacity (to the volume of capacity offered at x-11)





2024	for TT 2025	48.7%
2023	for TT 2024	41.4%
2022	for TT 2023	48.1%

**The figures refer to the capacity which the C-OSS of the RFC concerned publishes and pre-allocates. These might therefore not reflect the total amount of offered and pre-allocated PaPs along the RFC.*

CAPACITY MANAGEMENT

Average planned speed of PaPs (calculation per O/D pairs, km/h)





**This KPI should be perceived as qualitative as journey times might include commercial and operational stops.*

CAPACITY MANAGEMENT

Volume of offered capacity – Reserve Capacity (at X-2)



TT 2025		0.00 mio (path) km
TT 2024		1.31 mio (path) km
TT 2023		0.68 mio (path) km

**The figures refer to the capacity which the C-OSS of the RFC concerned publishes and pre-allocates. These might therefore not reflect the total amount of offered and pre-allocated PaPs along the RFC.*

CAPACITY MANAGEMENT

**Number of requests –
Reserve Capacity (at X+12)**
(number of PCS dossiers)



TT 2024	■	4
TT 2023		0
TT 2022	■	4

**Volume of requested capacity –
Reserve Capacity (at X+12)**




TT 2024	■	0.67 mio (path) km
TT 2023		0.00 mio (path) km
TT 2022	■	0.12 mio (path) km

**The figures refer to the capacity which the C-OSS of the RFC concerned publishes and pre-allocates. These might therefore not reflect the total amount of offered and pre-allocated PaPs along the RFC.*

OPERATIONS


Punctuality at origin (RFC entry)




(delay ≤ 30 minutes)



Punctuality at destination (RFC exit)




(delay ≤ 30 minutes)



OPERATIONS


Punctuality at origin (RFC entry)




(delay \leq 15 minutes)



Punctuality at destination (RFC exit)




(delay \leq 15 minutes)



OPERATIONS


Train Kilometers (million) of trains crossing a border along the RFC*



*The calculation of this KPI is based on data in RNE's TIS. International freight trains crossing a border of an RFC are considered in the calculation. The presented data might differ from the data gathered in the national systems due to data quality differences between individual IMs.

OPERATIONS

Number of trains crossing a border along the RFC*



*The calculation of this KPI is based on data in RNE's TIS. International freight trains crossing a border of an RFC are considered in the calculation.

OPERATIONS

Dwell times in border sections (planned and actual)


2023

Border	Avg. planned dwell (min.)	Avg. real dwell (min.)
Bad Schandau - Děčín	87	91
Bernhardsthal - Břeclav os.n.	131	160
Curtici - Lökösháza	45	55
Episcopia Bihor - Biharkeresztes	44	67
Giurgiu Nord - Ruse	24	35
Golenți - Vidin	8	8
Kittsee - Bratislava-Petržalka	75	86
Komárno - Komárom	87	60
Lanžhot - Kúty	67	35
Loipersbach-Schattendorf - Sopron	5	5
Marchegg - Devínska Nová Ves	24	67
Nickelsdorf - Hegyeshalom	82	92
Rusovce - Rajka	100	98
Štúrovo - Szob	77	90

*The calculation of this KPI is based on the data in RNE's TIS. International freight trains crossing a border of an RFC are considered in the calculation. The presented data might differ from the data gathered in the national systems due to data quality differences between individual IMs.

MARKET DEVELOPMENT

Train kilometers of trains per border 2023




*The calculation of this KPI is based on the data in RNE's TIS. International freight trains crossing a border of an RFC are considered in the calculation. The presented data might differ from the data gathered in the national systems due to data quality differences between individual IMs.

MARKET DEVELOPMENT

Number of trains per border - Part 1*

	2021	2022	2023
Total DE - CZ:	28,737	26,675	27,447
Total CZ - SK:	18,880	16,688	13,992
Total CZ - AT:	11,816	12,027	12,692
Total AT - HU:	20,289	20,634	18,917
Total AT - SK:	8,714	8,749	9,685




*The calculation of this KPI is based on data in IMs' systems. The total sum of the figures per border does not correspond to the figure of the KPI 'Overall number of trains on the RFC' due to, among other reasons, the potential double-counting of trains crossing more than one border.

MARKET DEVELOPMENT

Number of trains per border - Part 2*

	2021	2022	2023
Total SK - HU:	18,203	16,759	15,160
Total HU - RO:	11,893	10,904	10,116
Total RO - BG:	3,750	4,269	4,183
Total BG - GR:	396	454	102



*The calculation of this KPI is based on data in IMs' systems. The total sum of the figures per border does not correspond to the figure of the KPI 'Overall number of trains on the RFC' due to, among other reasons, the potential double-counting of trains crossing more than one border.

MARKET DEVELOPMENT

Ratio of capacity allocated by the C-OSS and the total allocated capacity*

Location Code	Between member states		Between operational points		RFC(s) Involved	Allocated by C-OSS 2021	Allocated by C-OSS 2022	Allocated by C-OSS 2023
EU00043	Germany	Czechia	Bad Schandau	Děčín	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	7.2%	12.1%	8.0%
EU00063	Czechia	Austria	Břeclav	Bernhardsthal	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	9.5%	10.3%	10.7%
EU00081	Czechia	Slovakia	Lanžhot	Kúty	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	4.6%	8.7%	7.6%
EU00103	Austria	Hungary	Baumgarten	Sopron	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
EU00104	Austria	Hungary	Loipersbach	Sopron	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
EU00105	Austria	Hungary	Nickelsdorf	Hegyeshalom	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	6.6%	8.9%	8.7%
EU00109	Austria	Slovakia	Kittsee	Bratislava-Petržalka	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	1.3%	4.9%	5,7%
EU00110	Austria	Slovakia	Marchegg	Devínska Nová Ves	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	0.0%	0.0%	0%
EU00170	Slovakia	Hungary	Štúrovo	Szob	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	38.7%	28.6%	37.1%
EU00171	Slovakia	Hungary	Komárno	Komárom	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	13.9%	26.5%	28.3%
EU00172	Slovakia	Hungary	Rusovce	Rajka	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	0.0%	3.7%	22.6%
EU00187	Bulgaria	Greece	Svilengrad	Dikea	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
EU00188	Bulgaria	Greece	Kulata	Promachon	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
EU00194	Hungary	Romania	Biharkeresztes	Oradea	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	30.0%	58.7%	38,8%
EU00196	Hungary	Romania	Lőkősháza	Curtici	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	86.6%	59.5%	55,6%
EU00207	Romania	Bulgaria	Giurgiu Nord	Ruse	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	25.9%	29.5%	25.9%
EU00208	Romania	Bulgaria	Golenti	Vidin tovarna	RFC 7 Orient/East Med	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

*In case of border points with more than one C-OSS responsible (in case of common offer or in case of overlapping sections), the KPI figure presents the combined number of all C-OSSs concerned.

Disclaimer

- » The KPIs reflect the performance of each individual RFC, therefore, when comparing the figures of various RFCs, the specificities of each one have to be considered. Each RFC may apply any additional KPIs, which are published in their annual reports on their websites and/or in the [Customer Information Platform](#) (CIP), where applicable.
- » Please refer to the annual reports of individual RFCs for comprehensive information concerning the figures and their analysis. In addition, you can find the description of each commonly applicable KPI in the RNE '[Guidelines for Key Performance Indicators of Rail Freight Corridors](#)'.