




RFC User Satisfaction Survey 2018

Report for RFC 6



October 2018



- ▶ 11 respondents
11 RFC6 users / 0 non-users
11 full interviews / 0 partial interviews
11 nominated by RFC6 / 0 nominated by other RFCs
(10 additional respondents evaluated RFC6, but were not nominated by it - these cases are excluded, but only for 2018 results)
6 agreed to forward name
3 used topic-forward
- ▶ Computer Aided Web Interviews (CAWI)
- ▶ Contacts (e-mail address) delivered by RFCs
- ▶ 15 e-mail invitations sent
- ▶ Field Phase: 13 September to 12 October 2018

Attention: very small sample sizes!



Total interviews (user + non user)	21 (-6)
Full interviews	21 (-5)
Partial interviews	0 (-1)
RFC user	21 (-4)
non/potential user <i>(according to respondent)</i>	0 (-2)
Invitations sent	15 (-21)
Interviews (user + non user)	11 (-8)
Response rate overall <i>(invited by RFC only)</i>	73% (+20%)
topic-forward used	3 (-4)
forward name	6 (-4)

In this report only respondents nominated by RFC 6 are included (see previous page).

2018 *(change from 2017)*




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




"To what extent are you satisfied with the adequacy of the lines assigned to the RFC? || ... 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.? || ... with the measures taken by the RFCs' Infrastructure Managers to improve the infrastructure standards on the lines assigned to the RFC?"


Satisfaction with Coordination/Communication of Temporary Capacity Restrictions




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




"To what extent are you satisfied with the Corridor Information Document (CID) for the 2019 timetable year? (Can you easily find all the information you are looking for and is it structured in a logical way? Do the contents match your business needs? Is the level of detail sufficient?) || To what extent are you satisfied with the supply of information on terminals? (Are all relevant pieces of information on terminals included in the CID 2019 or in other sources, e.g. CIP?)"




"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 commercial speed of PaPs? || ... with the amount of the PaPs? Is there a sufficient number of PaPs? || ... with the quality of Reserve Capacity (RC)? || ... with the PaP offer and the capacity management process on overlapping corridor sections? || ... with the survey on capacity needs?"




"How satisfied are you with the product offered in the pilot project run by the RFC and the way it meets your needs for short-term capacity?"




"Were you involved in a request for corridor capacity via the C-OSS as a leading or participating RU?"




"How satisfied are you with the availability of the Corridor One-Stop Shop (C-OSS)? (Is the reaction time of the C-OSS adequate?) || How satisfied are you with the business know-how of the C-OSS? || How satisfied are you with the allocation process for the 2019 timetable year? (Please consider especially the pre-allocation by the C-OSS, and the delivery of the draft and final offers.) || How satisfied are you with the conflict-solving procedure?"




"How satisfied are you all in all with PCS as a booking tool for international path requests?"




"How satisfied are you with the helpfulness of the Infrastructure Managers' traffic management on the RFC (as regards running your trains with a high service quality) and with the information you receive from them?"



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



"Do you consider that the opinion of the Advisory Group has been properly taken into account by the RFC Management Board?"



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

