

Consultations with Railway Undertakings

Questionnaire

Please complete by 22.10.2024 and return to hrj@hrj.gov.pl.

The responses collected will be summarised in a consultation report in a way that guarantees the anonymity of the participant.

General information	
Company name	
Contact person for the questionnaire	
E-mail	

1. General issues

1.1	In addition to those mentioned in the presentation, what topics would you like to discuss during the consultation?
1.2	Are you interested in a bilateral meeting?
1.3	Space for other comments not mentioned in the survey

2. The concept of predefined commercial routes

2.1	Please refer to the market organisation concept presented at the meeting based on PSO, predefined commercial routes and open access. Do you see an opportunity to jointly develop a network of predefined commercial routes in order to make it attractive to you in business terms on the one hand, and on the other hand to be part of the overall long-distance connection system defined in the HRJ (Horizontal Timetable)?
2.2	One of the key substantive challenges we noted in the HRJ is defining the separation between PSO and commercial services. Given the end of the current framework agreement with PKP Intercity S.A. in 2030, the need to define this separation will occur at one point for all services. Too high a market share of PSO routes may reduce the economic sense of launching commercial services. On the other hand, defining the scope of PSO too narrowly may lead to a situation where the carrier market does not have the potential to launch all relevant connections or does not take the risk of launching them. This could then create gaps in the transport system that are difficult to fill, especially given the time it takes to go through the PSO tendering process. What is your view on the above issue and how can it be responsibly addressed?

2.3	Regarding the procedure for launching open access services, what barriers (legal, capacity, information) do you see to their launch after 2030? What would you improve in the procedures?
2.4	In terms of pre-defined commercial routes, how do you assess the method implemented in Spain to resolve conflicts over access to the rail network by organising tenders for train paths? When a situation arose in which the number of train paths requested by operators exceeded the available capacity, a call for tenders was held in Spain, the criteria for which were based solely on the applicants' proposed use of the slots allocated (the winner was the one who proposed the highest use). How do you assess this solution to the stalemate? What other criteria do you think could be taken into account if a similar situation arose?
2.5	How do you assess the idea that, in terms of commercial transport, pre-defined commercial routes should have a higher priority than open access services when constructing the annual timetable?
2.6	Please refer to the instrument of framework agreements with the infrastructure manager (in the context of both open access and pre-defined commercial routes). In your opinion, is it important to obtain them with a view to financing rolling stock? Will simply signing a framework agreement be sufficient for any bank guarantees when purchasing rolling stock at one's own risk? Furthermore, please indicate how long the preferred duration of such an agreement would be. Is this duration differentiated by possible investments in rolling stock?
2.7	Please specify how far in advance a possible framework agreement should be concluded with the infrastructure manager, taking into account the need to obtain funding for rolling stock, technical facilities, personnel and to complete the necessary formalities for the newcomers? Could this time be reduced if rolling stock for commercial operations were made available by the rolling stock pool (assuming that the production/availability time of the rolling stock is irrelevant)?
2.8	Would you be interested in using a rolling stock pool for commercial services if one were to be created? A rolling stock pool would in principle be an alternative source of access to rolling stock authorised for use on high-speed (or conventional) lines on equal terms for all operators.
2.9	How do you assess the concept of synergy stops, whereby cooperation would be possible in establishing additional stops for commercial services? What conditions would have to be met by the organiser?

2.10	Space for other comments on the predefined commercial routes

3. General approach to tendering under the PSO

3.1	Other than those mentioned in the presentation, what other features and parameters of the PSC agreement are relevant in terms of consultation?
3.2	What criteria other than those mentioned in the presentation are relevant for the creation of route packages for tenders?
3.3	In your opinion, what should be the size of the route packages created for tenders?
3.4	Please indicate how long the preferred duration of the PSC contract would be? What does it depend on? How do you assess the relevance of the factors mentioned in the presentation (acquisition of rolling stock or existing rolling stock, verification of the commercial potential of the line, management of the change in the route/parameters of the transport line)? Are there other elements influencing the length of the contract?
3.5	Would you be interested in the organiser providing rolling stock as part of a PSC contract?
3.6	Other than those mentioned in the presentation, what other rolling stock requirements should we pay attention to?
3.7	Please specify how far in advance before the start of the service the contract with the organiser for PSO services should be concluded, taking into account the need to organise the rolling stock, technical facilities, personnel and to complete the necessary formalities for the new rail operator? Can these times be varied according to the organiser's provision of rolling stock?
3.8	Apart from the issue of the period between the signing of the contract and the start of the services, do you have any other comments on the framework timetable for the tendering procedure presented in the presentation?
3.9	Space for other comments not mentioned in the survey

