

Report of the TAF TSI Implementation for 2023

RU/IM Telematics Joint Sector Group (JSG)

January 2024



version 1.0

Jan-Christian Arms, JSG Vice-chairman

Document history

Version	Name	Changes	Date
0.1	Jan-Christian Arms	Initial version	18.01.2024
0.2	Jan-Christian Arms Filippo Massari	Chapter 5 to chapter 7 updated	29.01.2024
0.3	Filippo Massari	Review	01.02.2024
0.4	Jan-Christian Arms Filippo Massari	Document ready for IRG	07.02.2024
1.0	Jan-Christian Arms Filippo Massari	Approved by JSG	29.04.2024

Contents

LIST OF TABLES	5
LIST OF DIAGRAMS	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
1. BACKGROUND TO THE ASSIGNMENT	9
2. METHODOLOGY	10
General assumptions	10
Establishment of this report	10
3. PARTICIPATION IN THE 2023 REPORTING SESSION	13
Responses to the survey	13
Participation per company type	15
4. DATA BASIS FOR EVALUATION	16
5. IMPLEMENTATION MONITORING OF TAF TSI FUNCTIONS	18
Common Reference Files - Primary Location Codes (IMs)	18
Common Reference Files - Company Code (all companies)	19
Common Interface Implementation (all companies)	21
New Identifiers (all companies)	22
Path Request (IMs and RUs-F)	23
Path Details (IMs and RUs-F)	24
Train Running Information (IMs and RUs-F)	27
Train Running Interruption Message (IMs and RUs-F)	28
Train Running Forecast (IMs and RUs-F)	29
Train Composition Message (IMs and RUs-F)	30
Consignment Note Data (RUs-F)	31
Wagon Movement (RUs-F)	32
Shipment ETA (RUs-F)	33
Rolling Stock Reference Database (WKs)	34

Reasons for not starting implementation of TAF/TAP TSI functions	35
Degree of implementation at European level	38
7. COMMON SECTOR TOOLS	46
8. CONCLUSION AND FINDINGS	47
ANNEX 1: MEMBERS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION REPORTING GROUP (IRG)	48
ANNEX 2: RESPONSES CONTACT LIST 2023	49
ANNEX 3: RESPONSES CONTACT LIST 2022	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Reporting periods	11
Table 2: TAF/TAP TSI functions as reported per type of company	11

LIST OF DIAGRAMS

Diagram 1: Evolution of participation over time	13
Diagram 2: Evolution of response rate over time	13
Diagram 3: Number of responses per country	14
Diagram 4: Evolution of responses per country	14
Diagram 5: Evolution of participating per company type over time	15
Diagram 6: Number of types of company per reporting session	16
Diagram 7: Number of types of company per reporting session	17
Diagram 8: Common Reference Files - Primary Location Codes (PLC)	18
Diagram 9: Evolution of responses and implementation for PLC	18
Diagram 10: Common Reference Files - Company Codes (CC)	19
Diagram 11: Evolution of responses and implementation for Company Codes	19
Diagram 12: Alphanumeric Company Codes (CC)	20
Diagram 13: Evolution of capability to process alphanumeric codes (CC)	20
Diagram 14: Common Reference Files - Common Interface (CI)	21
Diagram 15: Evolution of responses and implementation for Common Interface	21
Diagram 16: New Identifiers (NI)	22
Diagram 17: Evolution of responses and implementation for New Identifiers	22
Diagram 18: Path Request (PR)	23
Diagram 19: Evolution of responses and implementation for Path Request	23
Diagram 20: Path Details (PD)	24
Diagram 21: Evolution of responses and implementation for Path Details	24
Diagram 22: Train Ready (TR)	25
Diagram 23: Train Ready (TR)	25
Diagram 24: Evolution of responses and implementation for Train Ready	26
Diagram 25: Train Running Information (TRI)	27
Diagram 26: Evolution of responses and implementation for Train Running Information	27
Diagram 27: Train Running Interruption Message (TRIM)	28
Diagram 28: Evolution of responses and implementation for Train Running Interruption Message	28
Diagram 29: Train Running Forecast (TRF)	29
Diagram 30: Evolution of responses and implementation for Train Running Forecast	29
Diagram 31: Train Composition Message (TCM)	30
Diagram 32: Evolution of responses and implementation for Train Composition Message (TCM)	30
Diagram 33: Consignment Note Data (CND)	31
Diagram 34: Evolution of responses and implementation for Consignment Note Data (CND)	31
Diagram 35: Wagon Movement (WM)	32
Diagram 36: Evolution of responses and implementation for Wagon Movement (WM)	32
Diagram 37: Shipment ETA	33
Diagram 38: Evolution of responses and implementation for Shipment ETA	33
Diagram 39: Rolling Stock Reference Database	34
Diagram 40: Evolution of responses and implementation for RSRD	34

Diagram 41: Reasons for not starting implementation of TAF/TAP TSI functions	35
Diagram 42: TAF/TAP functions with reasons for not starting implementation	36
Diagram 43: Evolution of insufficient awareness of TAF/TAP requirements	37
Diagram 44: Reported DI for IM functions (planning)	38
Diagram 45: Reported DI for IM functions (operation)	38
Diagram 46: Reported DI for RUs-F functions (planning)	39
Diagram 47: Reported DI for RUs-F functions (operation)	39
Diagram 48: Reported DI for WK functions	40
Diagram 49: Summary of DI development for TAF TSI	40
Diagram 50: Implementation of PLC of IMs across European countries	42
Diagram 51: Implementation of alphanumeric CC of IMs across European countries	42
Diagram 52: Implementation of CI of IMs across European countries	42
Diagram 53: Implementation of NI of IMs across European countries	43
Diagram 54: Implementation of PR of IMs across European countries	43
Diagram 55: Implementation of PD of IMs across European countries	43
Diagram 56: Implementation of TRI of IMs across European countries	44
Diagram 57: Implementation of TRIM of IMs across European countries	44
Diagram 58: Implementation of TRF of IMs across European countries	44
Diagram 59: Implementation of TR of IMs across European countries	45
Diagram 60: Implementation of TCM of IMs across European countries	45
Diagram 61: Common sector tools in use	46

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This TAF TSI implementation report 2023 summarizes the results received via the JSG Reporting Tool in November/December 2023 and thus shows the status of implementation by the end of 2023.

For this reporting session a total of 873 invitations were sent out and 379 responses were received from 23 countries across Europe, resulting to a slightly increase response rate of 43.4 %.

A total of 446 company types responses were taken into consideration, which is a 19% increase comparing the 2022 report (375). Comparing the 2023 result with the previous campaign, it is possible to note the following positive developments per company type: IM 14%, RU-F 27%, RU-P 24%, WK 9%

The questionnaire covers all functions mandated by the TAF and TAP TSI. Thus, also this 2023 report can be considered as complete.

A new question was introduced asking for the VAT number in the case the question about company code had a negative answer. The questionnaire contains a total of 73 questions in 17 question groups, which is a big number of questions. Anyway, the questionnaire is based on specific process. Depending on the company type, companies only need to answer a respective set of questions and most companies could do it in their native language. The questionnaire 2023 was translated into 19 European languages with the help of National Contact Points (NCPs).

Looking at the different TAF TSI functions, the following facts can be observed:

- Most IMs reported to have completed the initial upload of Primary Location Codes on their network. Update, maintenance, and use of codes are not part of this report.
- 394 companies in the reporting are identified by Company Code, which means a small rise for all types of companies compared to the previous reporting session. This number is increasing at constant rate taken in consideration the last four surveys.
- The target implementation date for processing the alphanumeric CC is 2026. Therefore, the progress of the completed projects within all types of companies is still at a low level with 28%. However, this represents already an increment of 34% from the previous year.
- For the Common Interface a slight positive trend is visible for all types of companies.
- The number of all types of companies having introduced New Identifiers is slightly negative compared to previous years and still on a low level of full implementation.
- The number of IMs and RUs-F having introduced Path Request messages has decreased. 64 companies have replied in the process of implementing this function, but it is necessary to further investigate the data comparing the subjects' replies from previous report. Considering the increase on responses (especially RU_F), it is expected to have at least a stable implementation.
- As the Path Request function, the implementation of the Path Details function has a negative trend mostly due to the RU-F replies.
- 2/3 of the companies reported not implementing Train Ready messages based on TAF/TAP standard but using domestic solutions. 46 RUs-F reported complete implementation of the function whilst the figure on 2022 report was 51.

- The Train Running Information is widely used in operations management; however, RUs-F report a lower implementation as in previous reporting. In addition, 35 companies which have not yet complete implementation use the Train Information System (TIS) a common sector tool managed by RNE.
- The Train Running Interruption Message has a positive trend on IMs and RUs-F implementation but still a low level of implementation.
- Implementation of Train Running Forecast is still on a low level with a slight positive trend for RUs-F.
- Implementation of Train Composition Message is stable with a slight negative trend for RUs-F.
- With 227 company feedback 52 report already full implementation of the Consignment Note Data function.
- 38 companies report complete implementation for the TAF Wagon Movement messages showing a negative evolution respect previous campaign even if the responses had increased.
- Shipment ETA function is reported to be finished by 39 companies despite higher participation (+4%) in the current reporting session.
- Quite steady is the number WKs fulfil the Rolling Stock Reference Database functionality via the common sector tool RSRD2. There are 114 WKs having RSRD in production by the end of 2023.
- The feedback from companies about reasons for not yet started the implementation of TAF TSI has increased from 1336 to 1442, with only very little shift between the reasons. Dedicated information sessions should be initiated as a mitigation measure. ERA should indicate NCPs those companies in their respective countries to support the raise of awareness of TAF/TAP requirements.
- Diagram 49 gives a good overview of the development in terms of degree of implementation for the different TAF functions and the different types of companies.
- Information from the companies regarding the usage of common tools are not further investigated and only the company self-declaration for each TAF Function is considered in the reporting.
- When analysing the status of implementation per countries it is remarkable that many IMs with the longest network plan to implement TSI TAF TAP functions within the next two years, as it can be observed in diagram 50 to 60.

Overall, the 2023 report has had very good feedback in responses for all company types, but the evolution in terms of degree of implementation had fallen in comparison with 2022 report. From 28 TAF TSI functions to be implemented by all company types together, only 5 had developed in a positive way.

1. BACKGROUND TO THE ASSIGNMENT

According to Article 5, Section 1, of Commission Regulation (EU) No 1305/2014¹ relating to the Telematics Applications for Freight subsystem (TAF TSI), the European Union Agency for Railways (ERA) shall assess and oversee its implementation.

The ERA has established the ‘TAF TSI Implementation Cooperation Group’ to evaluate the reports of the sector. The remit of this group is monitoring the parameters for RU/IM communication of both TAF and TAP TSIs. Members of the European railway sector are encouraged to submit their reports through the JSG to the Agency.

¹ COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) No 1305/2014 of 11 December 2014 on the technical specification for interoperability relating to the telematics applications for freight subsystem of the rail system in the European Union and repealing the Regulation (EC) No 62/2006 amended by

- Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/278 of 23 February 2018
- Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/778 of 16 May 2019
- Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2021/541 of 26 March 2021

2. METHODOLOGY

General assumptions

Starting with the 6th Reporting session in 2017, the monitoring of RU/IM functions is being carried out using one common questionnaire for both TAF and TAP TSIs. However, results from the survey are presented in two separate reports.

The progress of implementation of the TAF and TAP TSI has been reported twice a year until 2018. Since 2019 data are collected once a year for RU/IM communication based on the following assumptions:

- Companies are requested to report per mandatory TAF or TAP TSI function and report the target implementation date if the function is not yet implemented completely.
- The level of fulfilment will be displayed in predetermined percentage steps at 0%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 100%.
- Each message-based function is realized at 100%, if there is at least one implementation of message exchange in production, even if with a single partner only.

The level of fulfilment in terms of percentage steps are defined as follows:

- 0% - Level 1: Not started - Project not launched
- 25% - Level 2: Initiating phase - Implementation plan is available in the company
- 50% - Level 3: Planning phase - Project development
- 75% - Level 4: Executing phase - Pilot project / System testing
- 100% - Level 5: In-Production & Monitor and Control: Finished means Telematics data exchange is implemented

The obligation to meet functions of the TAF and TAP TSI is sometimes limited to specific stakeholders of the railway sector. Evaluation of the results of this survey is therefore stakeholder specific. For that reason and in accordance with European legislation the following stakeholders are considered:

- Infrastructure Manager (IM)
- Railway Undertaking for Freight transport (RU-F)
- Railway Undertaking for Passenger transport (RU-P)
- Wagon Keeper (WK)
- Allocation Body (AB)

Establishment of this report

The present report also integrates data from wagon keepers using RSRD2 submitted by UIP.

This report summarised the results received via the JSG Reporting Tool² during the 2023 reporting period lasting from 13 November 2023 to 8 December 2023 and thus shows the status of implementation by 31 December 2023. Diagrams in the following chapters of this report show results per RU/IM function summarised in an anonymous way.

² The JSG uses the tool 'EUSurvey' for collecting the data and managing the survey about TAF and TAP RU/IM implementation. 'EUSurvey' is supported by the European Commission's ISA programme, which promotes interoperability solutions for European public administrations.

Table 1 gives an overview about the history of reporting periods.

Report session	Reporting period	Number of questions ³
1 st Report	01.07.2014 - 31.12.2014	21
2 nd Report	01.01.2015 - 30.06.2015	40
3 rd Report	01.07.2015 - 31.12.2015	42
4 th Report	01.01.2016 - 30.06.2016	53
5 th Report	01.07.2016 - 31.12.2016	57
6 th Report TAF/1 st Report TAP	01.01.2017 - 30.06.2017	91
7 th Report TAF/2 nd Report TAP	01.07.2017 - 31.12.2017	65
8 th Report TAF/3 rd Report TAP	01.01.2018 - 30.06.2018	66
9 th Report TAF/4 th Report TAP	01.07.2018 - 31.12.2018	59
2019 Report TAF and TAP	01.01.2019 - 31.12.2019	52
2020 Report TAF and TAP	01.01.2020 - 31.12.2020	68
2021 Report TAF and TAP	01.01.2021 - 31.12.2021	68
2022 Report TAF and TAP	01.01.2022 - 31.12.2022	72
2023 Report TAF and TAP	01.01.2023 - 31.12.2023	73

Table 1: Reporting periods

The '2023 TAF/TAP TSI Implementation Report' questionnaire contains seventeen question groups, fifteen of which are about the current implementation of TAF and TAP TSI functions:

TAF/TAP TSI functions for RU/IM communication to be implemented/reported per type of company		Type of company				
		IM	RU-F	RU-P	WK	AB
TAF/TAP TSI function	Primary Location Codes (PLC)	X				
	Company Code (CC)	X	X	X	X	X
	Common Interface (CI)	X	X	X	X	X
	New Identifiers (NI)	X	X	X	X	X
	Path Request (PR)	X	X	X		X
	Path Details (PD)	X	X	X		X
	Train Ready (TR)	X	X	X		
	Train Running Information (TRI)	X	X	X		
	Train Running Interrupted Message (TRIM)	X	X	X		
	Train Running Forecast (TRF)	X	X	X		
	Train Composition Message (TCM)	X	X			
	Consignment Note Data (CND)		X			
	Wagon Movement (WM)		X			
	Shipment ETA (ETA)		X			
	Rolling Stock Reference Database (RSRD)				X	

Table 2: TAF/TAP TSI functions as reported per type of company

Two more general question groups intend to find out the actual situation and intentions of companies:

- Company information
- Common Sector Tools in use

³ Please note, the questions in the TAF and TAP RU/IM questionnaire are context specific. The number of questions to be responded, depend on the type of company and is not the total number listed in the table 1.

One new question in the present questionnaire asks companies to provide their VAT number, if no Company Code exists yet.

The 2023 questionnaire contains messages of all RU/IM functions mandated by the TAF and TAP TSIs and set out in the TAF and TAP masterplan. It was translated into nineteen European languages with the help of the NCPs. The participating companies could choose their native language for replying to the survey.

This report was drafted by the Implementation Reporting Group (IRG), the members of which are listed in Annex 1. As a result, it was endorsed at the JSG meeting on 29 February 2024 and published accordingly. It will be presented to the ERA TAF TSI Implementation Cooperation Group on 14 March 2024.

3. PARTICIPATION IN THE 2023 REPORTING SESSION

Responses to the survey

The number of project managers invited to report about the implementation of the TAF TSI and TAP TSI is shown in diagram 1 together with the number of responses received thereof. Since the last report one year ago, invitations and responses have grown again to a new record high.

The 2023 report includes 295 responses provided via the JSG reporting tool and 84 WKs submitted by UIP using RSRD². After stagnation in the previous period, feedback to the survey grew by 17 % compared to 2022.




Diagram 1: Evolution of participation over time

Hence, the response rate, calculated as number of responses in relation to number of invitations, has slightly went up to 43,4 % (see diagram 2).




Diagram 2: Evolution of response rate over time

Diagram 3 displays the distribution of all 379 responses per country. The feedback comprises 23 EU Member States plus Serbia, Switzerland, Norway, and Turkey.




Diagram 3: Number of responses per country

Diagram 4 shows the distribution and the development of responses per country. The total number of responses in the 2023 reporting period is 379, which is 54 more than in the last session.




Diagram 4: Evolution of responses per country

Participation per company type

Some companies in this survey have multiple roles, such as RU and WK at the same time. Therefore, the total number of responses displayed in diagram 1 (379 companies) and listed in Annex 2 is lower than the total number of company types shown in diagram 5 hereafter (446 companies).

Compared to the previous survey, participation shows a growing development for all types of companies.

Annex 2 ‘Responses contact list 2023’ to this report gives a detailed overview about the companies per country having replied to the 2023 session of TAF and TAP TSI implementation monitoring. Please note, that there are entities which have reported on behalf of several companies.




Diagram 5: Evolution of participating per company type over time

4. DATA BASIS FOR EVALUATION

Even if the number of participating ABs has tripled, feedback represents about 1 per cent of the total number of responses. Hence, ABs are not further considered, and 440 types of company remain for evaluating the 2023 data.

To establish a wider sector representation, 60 companies from the previous survey, which have not replied this time, are also taken into consideration. For companies having reported to both surveys, only the company information from the latest session is included.

Diagram 6 displays the total number of types of company (500) with their allocation to the following reporting sessions:

- Companies only reporting to the 2022 reporting session (top with light colour)
- Companies reporting to both 2022 and 2023 reporting session (middle with normal colour)
- New companies reporting to the 2023 reporting session only (bottom with dark colour)

The data included in this report thus represents the data since January 2022.

This time, the number of companies taken over from the last reporting (60) is relatively low while the number of new companies in the present session (136) is relatively high.




Diagram 6: Number of types of company per reporting session

Annex 3 'Responses contact list 2022' to this report lists the companies per country having replied to the 2022 session of TAF and TAP TSI implementation monitoring and not to the present one.

Since the seventh reporting session by the end of 2017, the data from the previous survey were included in the next reporting session. Diagram 7 displays the total number of companies included in the reporting session as data basis for further evaluation.




Diagram 7: Number of types of company per reporting session

5. IMPLEMENTATION MONITORING OF TAF TSI FUNCTIONS

Common Reference Files - Primary Location Codes (IMs)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Primary Location Code Function (PLC) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2013. This activity corresponds to Primary Location Codes, which must be reported by IMs. Consequently, the following diagram only refers to IMs. Responses refer to initial upload of primary location codes but update and maintenance process and use of codes is a different issue and not part of this report.

Diagram 8 indicates that most IMs reported to have completed the Common Reference Files for locations on their network. However, complete population of PLC is not yet reached. Regarding the level of fulfilment of PLC implementation, diagram 8 shows 34 IMs with complete implementation. 9 out of 57 IMs in the evaluation are considered with data from the previous survey.




Diagram 8: Common Reference Files - Primary Location Codes (PLC)

Diagram 9 shows a similar situation as in the last reporting year.




Diagram 9: Evolution of responses and implementation for PLC

Common Reference Files - Company Code (all companies)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Company Code Function (CC) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2013.

The bar chart below (diagram 10) is indicating the existence and use of company codes as part of the Common Reference Files for IMs, RUs-F and WKs. For CCs only two predefined percentage steps exist, because either a company does have an own CC or not. Most of companies having replied to the query possess a CC.




Diagram 10: Common Reference Files - Company Codes (CC)

According to Diagram 11, the number of companies with CCs has increased for all types of companies together with the total number of responses since the survey last year.




Diagram 11: Evolution of responses and implementation for Company Codes

The legal provisions of the TAF TSI require the use of alphanumeric CCs from 01.01.2026.

Diagram 12 below shows the current status of ability of companies processing alphanumeric CCs in their IT applications. Currently only a minority of companies is capable to do so.




Diagram 12: Alphanumeric Company Codes (CC)

Nevertheless, the ability to process alphanumeric codes has increased compared to last year according to diagram 13.




Diagram 13: Evolution of capability to process alphanumeric codes (CC)

In total, 63 companies have provided their VAT number, more than half of which in addition to their CC.

Common Interface Implementation (all companies)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Common Interface Function (CI) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2013.

Diagram 14 summarises the feedback related to the availability of CI and shows a difference in level of fulfilment between IMs, RUs-F and Wks. The CI is completely implemented by 23 IMs, 78 RUs-F and 31 Wks. RSRD² has not yet implemented the CI. Wks using RSRD² therefore form part of the 25% level.




Diagram 14: Common Reference Files - Common Interface (CI)

Diagram 15 shows the development of complete implementation of the CI and the number of responses per company type. There is a positive evolution of CI in production for RUs-F and Wks up to December 2023, while it is negative for IMs.




Diagram 15: Evolution of responses and implementation for Common Interface

New Identifiers (all companies)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the New Identifiers (NI) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2020.

The bar chart below (diagram 16) illustrates most companies not having yet implemented the NI function.




Diagram 16: New Identifiers (NI)

The number of all types of companies having introduced NIs is more or less stable since 2022 according to diagram 17.




Diagram 17: Evolution of responses and implementation for New Identifiers

Path Request (IMs and RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Path Request (PR) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2017.

The level of fulfilment of diagram 18 shows 12 IMs and 52 RUs-F with 100% implementation of the PR message. In addition, 50 companies which do not have fully implemented PR declared to use PCS according to their feedback to the survey.




Diagram 18: Path Request (PR)

The number of IMs and RUs-F having introduced PR messages shows a negative trend according to diagram 19.




Diagram 19: Evolution of responses and implementation for Path Request

Path Details (IMs and RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Path Details (PD) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2017.

The level of fulfilment of diagram 20 shows 16 IMs and 61 RUs-F with 100% implementation of the PD message.




Diagram 20: Path Details (PD)

The number of IMs having introduced PD messages has increased according to diagram 21. In contrast, the number of RUs-F has declined.




Diagram 21: Evolution of responses and implementation for Path Details

Train Ready (IMs and RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Train Ready Message (TR) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2019.

About one third of IMs and RUs-F stated implementing the Train Ready function using the respective TAF message, which is like the previous reporting period (diagram 22). Companies using other means of implementation in accordance with the TSIs remain out of consideration.

Regardless of the different participation in the 2022 survey, the share of TAF/TAP messages for TR implementation remains quite similar.




Diagram 22: Train Ready (TR)

The level of fulfilment of diagram 23 shows 8 IMs and 46 RUs-F with 100% implementation of the TR message.




Diagram 23: Train Ready (TR)

The development of complete implementation and the number of responses per company type of the TAF message TR since 2019, when it was reported for the first time, is shown in diagram 24. There is an opposing evolution of TR in production for IMs and RUs-F up to December 2023.




Diagram 24: Evolution of responses and implementation for Train Ready

Train Running Information (IMs and RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Train Running Information message (TRI) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was end of 2017. This monitoring concerns only one aspect of the TAF TSI basic parameter 'Train running forecast', the Train Running Information message. The Train Information System (TIS) is a common sector tool managed by RNE. Messages sent by IMs to TIS or messages received by RUs from TIS through traditional interfaces are considered as 75 % fulfilment. TAF messages sent or received by Common Interface are counted as 100 % fulfilment.

Diagram 25 indicates 23 IMs and 89 RUs-F with 100 % level of fulfilment. Beyond that, 35 companies which do not have fully implemented TRI declared to use TIS according to their feedback to the survey.




Diagram 25: Train Running Information (TRI)

Regarding diagram 26, the number of RUs-F having implemented completely the TRI decreased in comparison to the previous reporting session at a higher level of participation. For IMs participation and implementation went up.




Diagram 26: Evolution of responses and implementation for Train Running Information

Train Running Interruption Message (IMs and RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Train Running Interruption Message (TRIM) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2019.

The level of fulfilment of diagram 27 shows 15 IMs and 58 RUs-F with complete implementation of the TRIM message. However, most companies have not yet started implementation.




Diagram 27: Train Running Interruption Message (TRIM)

Diagram 28 indicates a positive evolution of implementation for TRIM at a relative low level compared to the number of participating companies.




Diagram 28: Evolution of responses and implementation for Train Running Interruption Message

Train Running Forecast (IMs and RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Train Running Forecast (TRF) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2017.

TRF is reported to be fully implemented end of 2022 by 16 IMs and 58 RUs-F.




Diagram 29: Train Running Forecast (TRF)

Following a higher participation of IMs and RUs-F, complete implementation of the TRF function also shows a higher level than the previous year.




Diagram 30: Evolution of responses and implementation for Train Running Forecast

Train Composition Message (IMs and RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Train Composition Message (TCM) as part of the Train Preparation Function according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was end of 2018. TCM is mandatory to be sent by RUs-F. However, implementation by IMs is also reported, because the message is sometimes required via the Network Statement.

19 IMs and 88 RUs-F have implemented TCM completely.




Diagram 31: Train Composition Message (TCM)

Figures show an increase for IMs and decrease for RUs-F in terms of complete implementation of TCM since last reporting session. 88 RUs-F out of 227 which replied to the survey have completely implemented the TCM while 19 out of 57 IMs have finished their duty.




Diagram 32: Evolution of responses and implementation for Train Composition Message (TCM)

Consignment Note Data (RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Consignment Note Data function (CND) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was end of 2017.

ORFEUS (Open Rail Freight EDI User System) is a common sector tool managed by Raildata, which allows to exchange consignment data.

Diagram 33 indicates 52 RUs-F out of 227 having finished implementation of CND. Besides, 23 companies declared in the questionnaire using ORFEUS, but 10 of them not having implemented CND completely.




Diagram 33: Consignment Note Data (CND)

The evolution of responses increases, while the evolution of implementation for CND decreases quite significantly for 2023 (diagram 34).




Diagram 34: Evolution of responses and implementation for Consignment Note Data (CND)

Wagon Movement (RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Wagon Movement function (WM) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was end of 2016.

The common sector tool ISR ensures exchange of movement information for wagons in international traffic through a central platform.

Responses to this questionnaire indicate 38 RUs-F having completed the WM function from a total of 227 companies. Moreover, 19 RUs-F declared using the Common Sector Tool ISR, out of which 11 companies did not have implemented WM completely.




Diagram 35: Wagon Movement (WM)

The implementation for WM shows a significant negative evolution for 2023 (diagram 36).




Diagram 36: Evolution of responses and implementation for Wagon Movement (WM)

Shipment ETA (RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Shipment ETA function (ETA) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2018.

The 'Shipment ETA' function (ETA) is relevant for RUs-F only. Even if there are several IMs that will realise this function on behalf of their customers, they are not considered in the present report.

39 RUs-F out of a total of 227 RUs-F declare to have implemented this function by the end of 2023 is shown in diagram 37.




Diagram 37: Shipment ETA

Despite increased participation in the survey, the number of companies having implemented the ETA-function has fallen in 2023 according to diagram 38.




Diagram 38: Evolution of responses and implementation for Shipment ETA

Rolling Stock Reference Database (WKS)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the RSRD function according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2015.

The ‘Rolling Stock Reference Database’ function (RSRD) is relevant for companies which keep wagons. Those companies might at the same time also be RUs or IMs.

Many companies intend fulfilling this functionality in a collaborative way via the common sector tool RSRD². Information delivered by UIP for RSRD² means 100% of fulfilment. 116 WKS have implemented this function, out of which 80 WKS thanks to RSRD².




Diagram 39: Rolling Stock Reference Database

Despite higher participation to the survey, the evolution of implementation fall off compared to the previous report (see diagram 40).




Diagram 40: Evolution of responses and implementation for RSRD

Reasons for not starting implementation of TAF/TAP TSI functions

Companies could declare in a dedicated answer for each TAF/TAP TSI function one reason why they did not yet start implementing it. Diagram 41 gives a summary of the total number of reasons mentioned in the questionnaire.

Compared to the previous survey, feedback regarding reasons for not implementing went up by about 8 % in total from 1336 reasons in 2022.




Diagram 41: Reasons for not starting implementation of TAF/TAP TSI functions

Diagram 42 shows the distribution of the responses to the various TAF/TAP functions. The number indicates how many companies have not yet started implementing this function and gave reasons for not yet doing so.




Diagram 42: TAF/TAP functions with reasons for not starting implementation

Diagram 43 gives a closer look to the development of ‘Insufficient awareness of TAF/TAP TSI requirements’ over time. The percentage given in diagram 43 as a green line, is calculated as the number of companies not being aware about TAF/TAP in relation to all companies giving a reason for not starting to implement. It turns out, that this percentage has fallen since last year to 18% and the absolute number of 256 companies declaring ‘Insufficient awareness of TAF/TAP TSI requirements’ is below the number of 2020.




Diagram 43: Evolution of insufficient awareness of TAF/TAP requirements

Degree of implementation at European level

This chapter summarises the development of the Degree of Implementation (DI) at European level for the TAF TSI functions since the beginning of reporting.

The DI in this report is defined as the relation of companies having fully implemented (100 %) the function compared to the companies having replied to this query in %.

Diagrams 44 and 45 show the DI for planning and operation functions to be implemented by IMs. Relative to the last report, implementation of nearly all IM planning and IM operational functions show a negative trend, except for CC and TR.




Diagram 44: Reported DI for IM functions (planning)




Diagram 45: Reported DI for IM functions (operation)

Diagrams 46 and 47 indicate the evolution of implementation for RUs-F functions. Generally, the proportion of RUs having finished implementation is considerably lower than for IMs.

RUs-F functions for planning and operation show mainly a negative development in terms of degree of full implementation. Exceptions are the CC function for planning and the TRIM and TRF functions for operation.




Diagram 46: Reported DI for RUs-F functions (planning)




Diagram 47: Reported DI for RUs-F functions (operation)

Diagram 48 shows the reported DIs for the WK functions in the present report. The development of full implementation is unchanged or negative.




Diagram 48: Reported DI for WK functions

The progress of DI at European level compared to the previous year has developed in completely the opposite direction. For the period 2021 to 2022 the DI for 21 functions in total has gone up while for the current period shown in diagram 49 the DI for 19 functions in total has fallen.

Development of Degree of Implementation (DI) at European level since 2022 reporting session		Type of company		
		IM	RU-F	WK
TAF/TAP TSI function	Primary Location Codes (PLC)	↘		
	Company Code (CC)	↗	↗	→
	Common Interface (CI)	↘	→	→
	New Identifiers (NI)	↘	→	↘
	Path Request (PR)	↘	↘	
	Path Details (PD)	↘	↘	
	Train Ready (TR)	↗	↘	
	Train Running Information (TRI)	↘	↘	
	Train Running Interrupted Message (TRIM)	↘	↗	
	Train Running Forecast (TRF)	↘	↗	
	Train Composition Message (TCM)	↘	↘	
	Consignment Note Data (CND)		↘	
	Wagon Movement (WM)		↘	
	Shipment ETA (ETA)		↘	
	Rolling Stock Reference Database (RSRD)			↘

Diagram 49: Summary of DI development for TAF TSI

6. IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF IMS PER COUNTRY

This chapter gives an impression about the state of implementation of TAF functions by IMs in countries across Europe.

The IMs having the longest network have been taken as relevant for the country. For EU Member States those IMs account for at least 90 % of network share. Consequently, these dominating companies play a major role for implementing RU/IM functions in a country. Once they have decided implementing RU/IM communication via TAF/TAP messages, the respective national railway sector will follow and have to adapt.

European maps indicate the level of implementation separately for each function and the dominating IM of the respective country. Where complete implementation has not yet been reached, current planned end date is made visible by colours.




Diagram 50: Implementation of PLC of IMs across European countries




Diagram 51: Implementation of alphanumeric CC of IMs across European countries




Diagram 52: Implementation of CI of IMs across European countries




Diagram 53: Implementation of NI of IMs across European countries




Diagram 54: Implementation of PR of IMs across European countries




Diagram 55: Implementation of PD of IMs across European countries




Diagram 56: Implementation of TRI of IMs across European countries




Diagram 57: Implementation of TRIM of IMs across European countries




Diagram 58: Implementation of TRF of IMs across European countries




Diagram 59: Implementation of TR of IMs across European countries




Diagram 60: Implementation of TCM of IMs across European countries

7. COMMON SECTOR TOOLS

Participants of the questionnaire could select all common sector tools in use to meet some specific requirements of the TAF/TAP TSI.

The number of companies having indicated using such tools has been relatively stable with 790. The summary shown in diagram 58 does not contain companies declaring not to use any tool (154 nominations).

Decrease of use of common sector tools relative to 2022 is at 2 %.




Diagram 61: Common sector tools in use

RSRD² and TIS both stay the most used Common Sector Tools for TAF TSI functions.

8. CONCLUSION AND FINDINGS

The 2023 reporting session can be described as successful with the highest number of invitations (+87) and the highest number of responses (+54). As always, the number of companies having responded to the 2023 questionnaire is significantly lower than the number of companies having been invited. The response rate of over 43 % of the current reporting session is quite a good rate regarding the high number of invitations.

There might be different reasons for this positive fact:

- Most companies can select to answer the questionnaire in their native language
- Reduction of the survey frequency to once a year
- Higher awareness of the regulation due to new EU subsidies in the CEF calls.

The inclusion of data from the previous reporting session has proved its worth to have a more complete view of the company's feedback and of the current level of implementation.

The maps showing the implementation of some functions indicate that many IM's plan the implementation of function in the next two years.

The degree of implementation (DI) as set out in diagrams 44 to 48 of this report is calculated from the responses to the questionnaire. If companies not having responded would be also taken into calculation, the degree of implementation would drop off.

To have a better overview for DI, functions were split in planning and operation showing 11 functions for IM, 13 functions for RU and 4 functions for WK.

The DI for the different TAF functions in the present report shows generally a mixed development:

- negative trends for IM planning functions except CC
- negative trends for IM operation functions except TR
- stable trends for all RUs-F planning functions except for PR and PD (negative)
- negative trends for all RUs-F operation functions except for TRIM and TRF (positive)
- negative trends for all WK function except CC and CI (unchanged)

For some TAF TSI functions there is a strong need to precisely define the compliance with TAF TSI regulation. For example, for the NI, PR and PD functions, companies claim that some requirements and the criteria for fulfilling are still unclear. This task has been initiated from the sector and work is ongoing.

More common sector tools are in use and the common sector tools are used by more companies. RSRD2 and TIS remain the most used common sector tools following feedback to this survey.

Conclusion and findings for the functions where Common Tools are widely used are getting more and more difficult to accomplish, because the responses from the companies are sometimes contradictory and a deep manual verification of the responses is not possible due to lack of resources and time. Improvements in the future KPI reporting will be discussed with the responsible IT-provider.

ANNEX 1: MEMBERS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION REPORTING GROUP (IRG)

Last Name	First Name	Company	e-mail
Arms (Chair)	Jan-Christian	DB AG	jan-christian.arms@deutschebahn.com
Achermann	Rudolf	SBB	rudolf.achermann@sbb.ch
Heydenreich	Thomas	UIP	rsd@th-heydenreich.de
Maglajlic	Seid	FTE	sma@interconnective.at
Massari	Filippo	RFI	f.massari@rfi.it
Matheau	Franck	SNCF	franck.matheau@sncf.fr
Möllmann	Jan	DB AG	jan.moellmann@deutschebahn.com
Enno	Wiebe	CER	enno.wiebe@cer.be
Paul	Michael	DB Systel	michael.mi.paul@deutschebahn.com
Stefanovic	Vojkan	RNE	Vojkan.stefanovic@rne.eu
Stahl	Josef	RNE	josef.stahl@rne.eu
Weber	Christian	SNCF	christian.weber@sncf.fr

ANNEX 2: RESPONSES CONTACT LIST 2023

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
1	AT	IM	ÖBB-Infrastruktur AG	
2	AT	IM	Steiermärkische Landesbahnen	
3	AT	IM, RU-P	Raab Ödenburg Ebenfurter Eisenbahn AG	
4	AT	RU-F	DB Cargo Austria	
5	AT	RU-F	LTE Austria GmbH	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.
6	AT	RU-F	LTE Logistik- und Transport-GmbH LTE Holding	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.
7	AT	WK	Felbermayr Transport- und Hebetchnik GmbH & Co KG	
8	AT	WK	waggon-service WSG mbH	
9	BE	IM	Infrabel	
10	BE	RU-F	Crossrail Benelux	
11	BE	WK	Lineas SA/NV	
12	BE	WK	Mosolf Automotive Railway GmbH	
13	BE	WK	Terminal Athus SA	
14	BG	IM	National Railway Infrastructure Company NRIC	
15	BG	RU-F	LTE Bulgaria EOOD	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.
16	BG	RU-F	"ТРАНСПОРТНО СТРОИТЕЛСТВО И ВЪЗСТАНОВЯВАНЕ" ЕАД	
17	BG	RU-F	BDZ TOVARNI PREVOZI EOOD	
18	BG	RU-F	Bulgarian Railway Company EAD	
19	BG	RU-F	MMIRL	
20	BG	RU-F	Rail Cargo Carrier - Bulgaria EOOD	
21	BG	RU-F	Булмаркет Рейл Карго ЕООД	
22	BG	RU-F	Карго Транс Вагон България АД	
23	BG	RU-F, WK	DB Carco Bulgaria EOOD	
24	CH	IM	BLS-Netz AG	
25	CH	IM	SBB Infrastruktur	
26	CH	RU-F	BLS Cargo AG	
27	CH	RU-F	railCare AG	
28	CH	RU-F	SBB Cargo	
29	CH	RU-F	SBB Cargo International AG	
30	CH	WK	CICA SA	
31	CH	WK	DHL FoodLogistics GmbH	
32	CH	WK	Diversified Investments SA	
33	CH	WK	HASTAG (Zürich) AG	
34	CH	WK	MITRAG AG	
35	CH	WK	Osterwalder St. Gallen AG	
36	CH	WK	SBB Cargo AG	
37	CH	WK	TRANSWAGGON AG	
38	CH	WK	VTG Schweiz GmbH	
39	CZ	IM	Správa železnic, státní organizace	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
40	CZ	IM, AB	SART - stavby a rekonstrukce a.s.	
41	CZ	IM, RU-F, WK	ORLEN Unipetrol Doprava, s.r.o.	
42	CZ	RU-F	DB Cargo Czechia	
43	CZ	RU-F	DBV-ITL, s.r.o.	
44	CZ	RU-F	Gerhát Train s.r.o.	
45	CZ	RU-F	HSL-Logistik s.r.o.	HSL-Logistik s.r.o.
46	CZ	RU-F	LokoTrain s.r.o.	
47	CZ	RU-F	LTE Czechia s.r.o.	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.
48	CZ	RU-F	Retrack Czech s.r.o.	
49	CZ	RU-F	SLEZSKOMORAVSKÁ DRÁHA a.s.	
50	CZ	RU-F	SUAS Transportation Service s.r.o.	
51	CZ	RU-F, RU-P	METRANS Rail s.r.o.	
52	CZ	RU-F, RU-P, WK	České dráhy, a.s.	
53	CZ	RU-F, RU-P, WK	CityRail, a.s.	
54	CZ	RU-F, WK	AWT ROSCO a.s.	PKP CARGO INTERNATIONAL a.s.
55	CZ	RU-F, WK	ČD Cargo, a.s.	
56	CZ	RU-F, WK	GJW Praha spol. s r.o.	
57	CZ	RU-F, WK	PKP CARGO INTERNATIONAL a.s.	
58	CZ	RU-F, WK	SWIETELSKY Rail CZ s.r.o.	
59	CZ	RU-P	Die Länderbahn CZ s.r.o.	
60	CZ	RU-P	RegioJet ÚK, a.s.	
61	CZ	WK	Česká republika - Správa státních hmotných rezerv	
62	CZ	WK	Ceskomoravsky cement	
63	CZ	WK	EP Cargo Invest	
64	CZ	WK	Ermewa GmbH	
65	CZ	WK	Felbermayr Transport- und Hebetchnik spol.s.r.o.	
66	CZ	WK	Holcim (Česko), a.s.	
67	CZ	WK	Interfracht s.r.o.	
68	CZ	WK	KOS Trading, akciová společnost	
69	CZ	WK	Liberty Ostrava a.s.	
70	CZ	WK	Lovochemie, a.s.	
71	CZ	WK	NH - TRANS, SE	
72	CZ	WK	RYKO PLUS spol. s r.o.	
73	CZ	WK	ŠKODA AUTO a.s.	
74	CZ	WK	Spolek pro chemickou a hutní výrobu, akciová společnost	
75	CZ	WK	V.K.S. Vagon Komerc Speed, spol. s.r.o.	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
76	CZ	WK	VÁPENKA VITOŠOV s.r.o.	
77	DE	IM	Bayernhafen GmbH & Co. KG	
78	DE	IM	Duisburger Hafen AG	
79	DE	IM	Häfen und Güterverkehr Köln AG	
80	DE	IM	Hamburg Port Authority	
81	DE	IM	SWEG Schienenwege GmbH	
82	DE	IM, AB	DB Netz AG	
83	DE	IM, RU-F, RU-P	U E F Eisenbahn-Verkehrsgesellschaft mbH	
84	DE	IM, RU-P	Albtal-Verkehrs-Gesellschaft mbH	
85	DE	RU-F	boxXpress.de GmbH	
86	DE	RU-F	DB Cargo BTT GmbH	
87	DE	RU-F	LTE Germany GmbH	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.
88	DE	RU-F	METRANS Rail (Deutschland) GmbH	
89	DE	RU-F	Nordic Rail Service GmbH	
90	DE	RU-F	RBH Logistics GmbH	
91	DE	RU-F	SBB Cargo Deutschland GmbH	SBB Cargo International AG
92	DE	RU-F	TFG Transfracht GmbH	
93	DE	RU-F	VIAS GmbH Transportart Guterverkehr	VIAS GmbH
94	DE	RU-F, WK	DB Cargo AG	
95	DE	RU-P	City-Bahn Chemnitz GmbH	
96	DE	RU-P	DB Fernverkehr AG	
97	DE	RU-P	DB Regio AG	
98	DE	RU-P	FlixTrain GmbH	
99	DE	RU-P	VIAS Passenger	VIAS GmbH
100	DE	WK	Alzchem Trostberg GmbH	
101	DE	WK	Aretz GmbH und Co. KG	
102	DE	WK	ARS Altmann AG	
103	DE	WK	BASF SE	
104	DE	WK	BSAS EisenbahnVerkehrs GmbH & Co.KG	
105	DE	WK	Bundeswehr	
106	DE	WK	Certis Belchim B.V. Railservice	
107	DE	WK	Dortmunder Eisenbahn GmbH	
108	DE	WK	ERR European Rail Rent GmbH	
109	DE	WK	Euro-Waggon GmbH	
110	DE	WK	GATX Rail Austria GmbH	
111	DE	WK	GATX Rail Germany GmbH	
112	DE	WK	ITL Eisenbahngesellschaft mbH	
113	DE	WK	Kombiverkehr Deutsche Gesellschaft für kombinierten Güterverkehr mbH & Co. KG	
114	DE	WK	Linde GmbH Gases Division	
115	DE	WK	Logistik Service GmbH	
116	DE	WK	MFD Rail GmbH	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
117	DE	WK	On Rail Gesellschaft für Eisenbahnausrüstung und Zubehör mbH	
118	DE	WK	On Rail Gesellschaft für Vermietung und Verwaltung von Eisenbahnwaggon mbH	
119	DE	WK	Petrochem Mineralöl-Handels-GmbH	
120	DE	WK	Railco a.s.	
121	DE	WK	Schienenfahrzeuge Export-Import Handelsgesellschaft mbH - SFH	
122	DE	WK	Schröder & Klaus GmbH & Co. KG	
123	DE	WK	Spedition Kübler GmbH	
124	DE	WK	TRANSWAGGON GmbH	
125	DE	WK	Tyczka Gase GmbH	
126	DE	WK	voestalpine Rail Center Königsborn GmbH	
127	DE	WK	Vossloh Rail Services Deutschland GmbH	
128	DE	WK	VTG Rail Europe GmbH	
129	DE	WK	VTG Schweiz GmbH (ex AAE)	
130	DE	WK	WASCOSA AG Luzern	
131	DE	WK	Zürcher Bau GmbH	
132	DK	IM	Öresundsbro Konsortiet	
133	EE	IM	Edelaraudtee AS	
134	EE	IM, AB	AS Eesti Raudtee	
135	EE	RU-F	AS Operail	
136	EE	RU-F	GoRail AS	
137	ES	IM	ADIF	
138	ES	IM	Línea Figueras Perpignán S.A.	
139	ES	RU-F	Continental Rail, S.A.U.	
140	ES	RU-F	CSP Logitren, S.A.	
141	ES	RU-F	GO TRANSPORT SERVICIOS 2018, S.A.	
142	ES	RU-F	Transfesa Logistics S.A.	
143	ES	RU-F, WK	Renfe Mercancías, S.M.E. S.A.	
144	ES	RU-F, WK	Tracción Raíl	
145	ES	RU-P	Renfe Viajeros SME	
146	ES	WK	CONTINENTAL RAIL, S.A.U.	
147	ES	WK	Sociedad de estudios y explotacion de material auxiliar de transportes S.A.	
148	FI	RU-F	VR-Group Plc	
149	FR	IM	SNCF Réseau	
150	FR	RU-F	Captrain France	
151	FR	RU-F	DB CARGO FRANCE	
152	FR	RU-F	EUROPORTE	
153	FR	RU-F	FRET SNCF SAS	
154	FR	RU-P	SNCF Voyageurs SA	
155	FR	RU-P	Trenitalia France	
156	FR	WK	ATIR-RAIL	
157	FR	WK	CAT France	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
158	FR	WK	Ermewa SA	
159	FR	WK	GCA WAGONS	
160	FR	WK	Lotras srl	
161	FR	WK	Millet SAS	
162	FR	WK	SOCOMAC	
163	FR	WK	Transportes Ferroviarios Especiales S.A.	
164	HR	IM	HŽ Infrastruktura d.o.o.	
165	HR	RU-F	Adria Transport Croatia	
166	HR	RU-F	CER Cargo d.o.o.	
167	HR	RU-F	ENNA Transport	
168	HR	RU-F	PRUŽNE GRAĐEVINE d.o.o.	
169	HR	RU-F	Train Hungary subsidiary Zagreb for freight transport service	
170	HR	RU-F, WK	HŽ-Cargo	
171	HR	RU-P	HŽ Putnički prijevoz d.o.o.	
172	HU	AB	VPE	
173	HU	IM	GYSEV Zrt.	
174	HU	IM	MÁV Zrt.	
175	HU	RU-F	CER CO	CER Cargo d.o.o.
176	HU	RU-F	GYSEV CARGO Zrt.	
177	HU	RU-F	LTE Hungária Kft.	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.
178	HU	RU-F	MMV Magyar Magánvasút Zrt.	
179	HU	RU-F	V-Híd Cargo Zrt.	
180	HU	RU-F, WK	PKP CARGO INTERNATIONAL HU Zrt	PKP CARGO INTERNATIONAL a.s.
181	HU	RU-F, WK	Rail Cargo Hungaria Zrt.	
182	HU	RU-P	MÁV-START	
183	HU	WK	GYSEV Cargo Zrt	
184	HU	WK	MÁV FKG Felépitménytartó és Gépjavító Korlátolt Felelősségű Társaság	
185	HU	WK	TOUAX Rail Ltd.	
186	IT	IM	Ferrottramviaria SpA - Divisione Infrastruttura	
187	IT	IM	Ferrovie del Gargano s.r.l.	
188	IT	IM	Ferrovie Emilia Romagna S.r.l.	
189	IT	IM	FERROVIENORD S.p.A.	
190	IT	IM	Infrastrutture Venete	
191	IT	IM	La Ferroviaria Italiana S.p.A.	
192	IT	IM	RETE FERROVIARIA ITALIANA S.p.A.	
193	IT	IM, RU-P, WK	FERROVIE UDINE - CIVIDALE SRL	
194	IT	RU-F	CAPTRAIN ITALIA SRL	
195	IT	RU-F	DB Cargo Italia S.r.l.	
196	IT	RU-F	EVM Rail Srl	
197	IT	RU-F	FuoriMuro Impresa Ferroviaria S.r.l.	
198	IT	RU-F	GTS Rail	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
199	IT	RU-F	Hupac SpA	
200	IT	RU-F	InRail S.p.A.	
201	IT	RU-F	LTE Italia S.r.l.	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.
202	IT	RU-F	Oceanogate Italia S.r.l.	
203	IT	RU-F	Sangritana SpA	
204	IT	RU-F	SBB Cargo Italia Srl	SBB Cargo International AG
205	IT	RU-F	Trasporti Ferroviari Italiani	
206	IT	RU-F	TX Logistik Transalpine GmbH - Sede Secondaria Italiana	
207	IT	RU-F, RU-P	Ferrotramviaria S.p.A.	
208	IT	RU-F, RU-P	Trasporto Ferroviario Toscano SpA	
209	IT	RU-F, WK	Mercitalia Rail	
210	IT	RU-P	BLS Cargo Italia S.r.l.	
211	IT	RU-P	Busitalia Sita Nord Srl	
212	IT	RU-P	ENTE AUTONOMO VOLTURNO SRL	
213	IT	RU-P	FERROVIE DEL GARGANO SRL	
214	IT	RU-P	Grandi Treni Espressi SpA	
215	IT	RU-P	Sistemi Territoriali SpA	
216	IT	RU-P	Trenitalia S.p.A.	
217	IT	RU-P	Trenitalia tper S.c.a.r.l.	
218	IT	WK	GCF	
219	IT	WK	Giovanni Ambrosetti Auto Logistica S.p.A	
220	IT	WK	LOTRAS S.r.l.	
221	IT	WK	Mercitalia Intermodal S.p.A.	
222	IT	WK	RAILOC SRL	
223	IT	WK	SITFA SpA	
224	IT	WK	Vrail s.r.l.	
225	LT	IM, RU-F, RU-P, WK, AB	JSC "Lithuanian Railways"	
226	LU	AB	ACF	
227	LU	IM	CFL terminals s.a.	
228	LU	IM	Société Nationale des Chemins de Fer Luxembourgeois (IM)	
229	LU	RU-F, WK	CFL cargo SA	
230	LU	RU-P	Société Nationale des Chemins de Fer Luxembourgeois (SNCFL)	
231	LV	IM	VAS Latvijas dzelzceļš - LDz	
232	LV	RU-F, WK	SIA LDZ CARGO (LDZ Cargo)	
233	NL	IM	ProRail	
234	NL	RU-F	DB Cargo Nederland N.V.	
235	NL	RU-F	LTE Netherlands BV	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
236	NL	RU-F	SBB Cargo Deutschland GmbH	SBB Cargo International AG
237	NL	RU-F	VolkerRail	
238	NL	RU-P	Arriva	
239	NL	WK	Eiffage Infra-Rail GmbH	
240	NL	WK	EUROWAGON SP. Z O.O.	
241	NL	WK	Ministerie van Defensie Koninklijke Landmacht Materieellogistiek Commando Land Afdeling Logistiek	
242	NL	WK	RailRelease B.V.	
243	NO	RU-P	OSLO SAS	
244	PL	IM	PKP POLSKIE LINIE KOLEJOWE S.A.	
245	PL	IM, RU-F	ZPMW "POL-Carbon" Sp. z o.o.	
246	PL	IM, RU-P	PKP Szybka Kolej Miejska w Trójmieście Sp. z o.o.	
247	PL	RU-F	BARTER S.A.	
248	PL	RU-F	Captrain Polska Sp. z o.o.	
249	PL	RU-F	CARGO-POWER sp. z o.o.	
250	PL	RU-F	CD Cargo Poland	
251	PL	RU-F	CIECH Cargo Sp.z o.o.	
252	PL	RU-F	CL Cargo Logistics Sp. z o.o.	
253	PL	RU-F	CLIP Intermodal Sp. z o.o.	
254	PL	RU-F	CTL Logistics Sp. z o.o.	
255	PL	RU-F	CTL Północ Sp.. z o.o.	
256	PL	RU-F	DAB Rail Sp. z o.o.	
257	PL	RU-F	ENEA BIOENERGIA SPÓŁKA Z O.O.	
258	PL	RU-F	Eurasian Railway Carrier Sp. z o.o.	
259	PL	RU-F	Eurotrans Spółka . z o.o.	
260	PL	RU-F	FDM REW Damian Żur	
261	PL	RU-F	Fortis Logistics Group Sp. z o.o.	
262	PL	RU-F	Freightliner PL Sp. z o.o.	
263	PL	RU-F	G&G TRAIN POLSKA SP. Z O. O. SP. K.	
264	PL	RU-F	GB Rail Spółka z ograniczoną odpowiedzialnością	
265	PL	RU-F	HSL Polska	
266	PL	RU-F	IGL SP. Z O.O. SP. K.	
267	PL	RU-F	Inter Cargo Sp. z o.o.	
268	PL	RU-F	IRT Sp. z o.o.	
269	PL	RU-F	Jaxan Rail Sp. z o.o.	
270	PL	RU-F	Kolej Bałtycka S.A.	
271	PL	RU-F	Loko Train s.r.o. Sp. z o.o. Oddział w Polsce	Loko Train s.r.o.
272	PL	RU-F	LOTOS Kolej Sp. z o.o.	
273	PL	RU-F	LTE Polska	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.
274	PL	RU-F	LTE Polska Spółka z o.o.	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.
275	PL	RU-F	LTG Cargo Polska sp. z o.o.	
276	PL	RU-F	METRANS Rail sp. z o.o.	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
277	PL	RU-F	NEWAG S.A.	
278	PL	RU-F	OLAVION SP. Z O.O.	
279	PL	RU-F	Orion Rail Logistics Sp. z o.o. Sp. k.	
280	PL	RU-F	OST-west Logistic Poland	
281	PL	RU-F	PCC Intermodal S.A.	
282	PL	RU-F	PGE Energetyka Kolejowa S.A.	
283	PL	RU-F	POL-MIEDŹ TRANS Sp. z o.o.	
284	PL	RU-F	Portos Sawicki i Perz Sp. J.	
285	PL	RU-F	POZ BRUK SP. Z O.O. SP. JAWNA	
286	PL	RU-F	PROTOR GROUP sp. z o.o.	
287	PL	RU-F	Przedsiębiorstwo Napraw i Utrzymania Infrastruktury Kolejowej w Krakowie Sp. z o.o.	
288	PL	RU-F	PUK Kolprem	
289	PL	RU-F	Rail Cargo Carrier - Poland Sp. z o.o.	
290	PL	RU-F	Rail Force One Poland Sp. z o.o.	
291	PL	RU-F	RC Trans Rail Sp. z o.o.	
292	PL	RU-F	Stalserwis Batory Sp. z o.o.	
293	PL	RU-F	Swietelsky Rail Polska Sp. z o.o.	
294	PL	RU-F	T&C Sp. z o.o.	
295	PL	RU-F	Tekol sp. z o.o.	
296	PL	RU-F	TKP Silesia Sp. z o.o. Sp.K.	
297	PL	RU-F	Track Tec Logistics sp. z o.o.	
298	PL	RU-F	Trainspeed Sp. z o.o.	
299	PL	RU-F	Transchem Sp. z o.o.	
300	PL	RU-F, RU-P	CARGO Master Sp. z o.o.	
301	PL	RU-F, RU-P	NKN Usługi Kolejowe Sp. z o.o.	
302	PL	RU-F, RU-P	RailTrans Poland sp.z o.o. sp.k.	
303	PL	RU-F, WK	Budimex Kolejnictwo S.A.	
304	PL	RU-F, WK	CEMET S.A.	
305	PL	RU-F, WK	Db Cargo Polska S.A.	
306	PL	RU-F, WK	DB Cargo Spedkol Sp. z o.o.	
307	PL	RU-F, WK	Ecco Rail Sp. z o.o.	
308	PL	RU-F, WK	Grupa Azoty "KOLTAR" Sp. z o.o.	
309	PL	RU-F, WK	JSW Logistics Spółka z ograniczoną odpowiedzialnością	
310	PL	RU-F, WK	Kopalnia Piasku kotłarnia S.A.	
311	PL	RU-F, WK	Lotos Kolej Sp. z o.o.	
312	PL	RU-F, WK	Lubelski Węgiel "Bogdanka" S.A.	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
313	PL	RU-F, WK	Majkoltrans Sp. z o.o.	
314	PL	RU-F, WK	Moris Sp. z o.o.	
315	PL	RU-F, WK	PBS TRANSKOL SP. z o.o.	
316	PL	RU-F, WK	Pomorskie Przedsiębiorstwo Mechaniczno - Torowe sp. z o.o.	
317	PL	RU-F, WK	Przedsiębiorstwo Robót Torowych "TORREMS" Sp. z o.o.	
318	PL	RU-F, WK	Rail Polska Sp. z o.o.	
319	PL	RU-F, WK	SILVA LS SP.ZO.O.	
320	PL	RU-F, WK	Zakład Inżynierii Kolejowej Sp. z o.o.	
321	PL	RU-F, WK	Zakład Robót Komunikacyjnych - DOM w Poznaniu sp. z o.o.	
322	PL	RU-F, WK	ZUE S.A.	
323	PL	RU-P	"Koleje Mazowieckie - KM" sp. z o.o.	
324	PL	RU-P	Koleje Dolnośląskie S.A.	
325	PL	RU-P	Koleje Małopolskie sp. z o.o.	
326	PL	RU-P	Koleje Śląskie sp. z o.o.	
327	PL	RU-P	Łódzka Kolej Aglomeracyjna Sp. z o.o.	
328	PL	WK	Felbermayr Polska Sp z.o.o.	
329	PL	WK	GATX Rail Poland Sp. z o.o.	
330	PL	WK	Lotos Kolej Sp. z o.o.	
331	PL	WK	Tankwagon Sp. z o. o.	
332	PT	IM	Infraestruturas de Portugal	
333	PT	RU-F	Medway Operador Ferroviario	
334	PT	RU-F	TAKARGO - Transporte de Mercadorias SA	
335	PT	RU-P	CP - Comboios de Portugal EPE	
336	PT	RU-P	FERTAGUS, S.A.	
337	PT	WK	ADP Fertilizantes, S.A.	
338	PT	WK	CIMPOR - SERVIÇOS, S.A.	
339	PT	WK	Takargo, Transporte de Mercadorias, S.A.	
340	RO	RU-F	LTE-RAIL ROMANIA S.R.L	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.
341	RS	RU-F	ENNA Transport BGD	
342	SE	IM	Trafikverket	
343	SE	RU-F	Svensk Tågkraft AB	
344	SE	RU-F	TX Logistik AB	
345	SE	RU-F, WK	Green Cargo	
346	SE	RU-P	FlixBus Sverige AB	FlixTrain GmbH
347	SE	RU-P	SJ AB	
348	SE	WK	Stena Recycling AB	
349	SE	WK	TRANSWAGGON AB	
350	SI	IM	SŽ Infrastruktura, d.o.o.	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
351	SI	RU-F	SŽ Tovorni promet	
352	SI	WK	Adria kombi d.o.o.	
353	SK	IM	Slovak Railways - Železnice Slovenskej republiky	
354	SK	IM	U. S. Steel Košice s.r.o	
355	SK	RU-F	CD Cargo Slovakia	
356	SK	RU-F	CENTRAL RAILWAYS, a.s.	
357	SK	RU-F	CER Slovakia a.s.	
358	SK	RU-F	DMG s. r. o.	
359	SK	RU-F	HSL-Logistik s.r.o.	
360	SK	RU-F	LOKORAIL, a.s.	
361	SK	RU-F	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.	LTE Slovakia s.r.o.
362	SK	RU-F	METRANS /Danubia/, a.s.	
363	SK	RU-F	NZ RAIL.s.r.o.	
364	SK	RU-F	Rail Cargo Carrier Slovakia s.r.o.	
365	SK	RU-F	Railtrans international, a.s.	
366	SK	RU-F	RAILTRANS LOGISTICS, a.s.	
367	SK	RU-F	Retrack Slovakia s.r.o	
368	SK	RU-F	TSS Grade	
369	SK	RU-F	Železničná spoločnosť Cargo Slovakia, a.s.	
370	SK	RU-F, RU-P	RegioJet a.s.	
371	SK	RU-F, WK	Hornonitrianske Bane zamestnanecká, akciová spoločnosť	
372	SK	RU-F, WK	PKP CARGO INTERNATIONAL SK a.s.	
373	SK	RU-F, WK	Prvá Slovenská železničná, akciová spoločnosť	
374	SK	WK	Cargo Wagon, a.s.	
375	SK	WK	Duslo, a.s.	
376	SK	WK	EEWS, spol. s r. o.	
377	SK	WK	Felbermayr Slovakia s.r.o.	
378	SK	WK	Railtrans Wagon, s.r.o	
379	TR	WK	TRANSWAGGON Vagon Isletmeleri Ltd. Sti.	

ANNEX 3: RESPONSES CONTACT LIST 2022

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
1	AT	RU-F	Rail Cargo Austria AG	
2	AT	RU-F	WLC - Wiener Lokalbahnen Cargo GmbH	
3	AT	WK	Rail Cargo Austria AG	
4	BE	RU-F	Lineas NV	
5	BE	RU-P	THI Factory SA	
6	BE	WK	Lineas NV	
7	CH	WK	WASCOSA AG	
8	CZ	IM	KŽC Doprava, s.r.o.	
9	CZ	IM	PDV RAILWAY a.s.	
10	CZ	IM	Vítkovická doprava a.s.	
11	CZ	RU-F	AWT ROSCO a.s.	
12	CZ	RU-F	KŽC Doprava, s.r.o.	
13	CZ	RU-F	Rabbit Rail s.r.o.	
14	CZ	RU-F	TORAMOS s.r.o.	
15	CZ	RU-F	WTT, s.r.o.	
16	CZ	RU-P	KŽC Doprava, s.r.o.	
17	CZ	WK	AWT ROSCO a.s.	
18	CZ	WK	EP Cargo Invest	
19	CZ	WK	Rail Cargo Operator - CSKD s.r.o.	
20	CZ	WK	Vápenka Čertovy schody a.s.	
21	DE	IM	Hafen Krefeld GmbH & Co. KG	
22	DE	IM	Stadtwerke Schweinfurt GmbH	
23	DE	RU-F	Hafen Krefeld GmbH & Co. KG	
24	DE	RU-F	LOCON Logistik & Consulting AG	
25	DE	RU-F	Rail Cargo Carrier Germany	
26	DE	WK	Rail Cargo Carrier Germany	
27	FI	IM	Finnish Traffic Infrastructure Agency	
28	FI	RU-F	Operail Finland Oy	
29	FR	RU-F	Lineas France	Lineas NV
30	FR	WK	ERMEWA	
31	FR	WK	Lineas France	Lineas NV
32	GR	IM	ΟΡΓΑΝΙΣΜΟΣ ΣΙΔΗΡΟΔΡΟΜΩΝ ΕΛΛΑΔΟΣ	
33	IT	IM	EAV srl	
34	IT	RU-F	Adriafer srl	
35	IT	RU-F	Interporto Servizi Cargo SpA	
36	IT	RU-F	Rail Cargo Carrier Italy	
37	IT	RU-P	Italo Spa	
38	IT	RU-P	Rail Cargo Carrier Italy	
39	IT	RU-P	SAD - Trasporto Locale SpA	
40	IT	RU-P	TRENORD SRL	
41	NL	RU-F	Rail2U	Lineas NV
42	NL	RU-F	Railexperts BV	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
43	NL	RU-F	Shunter Tractie	
44	NL	RU-F	VTR Rail	Lineas NV
45	NL	RU-P	Railexperts BV	
46	NL	WK	Rail2U	Lineas NV
47	NL	WK	VTR Rail	Lineas NV
48	PL	RU-F	CARGO Master Sp. z o.o.	
49	PL	RU-F	Dolnośląskie Przedsiębiorstwo Napraw Infrastruktury Komunikacyjnej "DOLKOM" Sp. z o. o.	
50	PL	RU-F	ORLEN KolTrans S.A.	
51	PL	RU-F	TORPOL S.A.	
52	PL	RU-F	Track Tec Rail sp. z o.o.	
53	PL	RU-P	CARGO Master Sp. z o.o.	
54	PL	WK	Dolnośląskie Przedsiębiorstwo Napraw Infrastruktury Komunikacyjnej "DOLKOM" Sp. z o. o.	
55	PL	WK	ORLEN KolTrans S.A.	
56	PL	WK	TORPOL S.A.	
57	RO	IM	CFR	
58	RO	RU-P	SC INTERREGIONAL CALATORI SRL	
59	SI	RU-F	ENNA Transport SI d.o.o.	
60	SK	RU-F	I.G.Rail, s.r.o.	

Disclaimer

The RU/IM Telematics Joint Sector Group (JSG)

The JSG was set up in October 2012 as a voluntary organisation supported by fourteen European Associations involved in the implementation of the rail technical specifications for interoperability of the Telematic Application for Freight (TAF TSI).

<http://taf-jsg.info/>