



CFR NETWORK STATEMENT - 2024

## **ANNEX 20.b** PROCESS OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION

**Validity:** 10.12.2023 – 14.12.2024

**Version:** 13.0.0

**Update:** 12.12.2022



COMPANIA NATIONALA DE CAI FERATE CFR SA

**APPROVED BY**  
**DIRECTOR GENERAL**  
**Ion SIMU-ALEXANDRU**

**QUALITY-ENVIRONMENT-SAFETY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**  
**OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE**  
**SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTES RELATED TO**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY ALLOCATION**

Code: PO **0-8.5-08**

**Edition: 2**

Revision: 1

Date of entry into force:

Number of the copy:

ENDORSED BY:

Deputy Director General for Operation

ENDORSED BY:

Traffic Director

Marian COȚOFANĂ

ENDORSED BY:

Director of the Legal Directorate

Ana – Maria DASCĂLU

ENDORSED BY:

Deputy Traffic Director

Horațiu IONESCU

VERIFIED BY:

Head of the Capacity Allocation Office

Ionuț STUPINARU

VERIFIED BY:

Head of the Unit for Infrastructure Access

Regulations

Viorel PAȘA

PREPARED BY:

Central Traffic Inspector

Monica PAVEL

QEMS VERIFIED BY:

Head of the OMQSP

Cristina MIHAI



|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|  <p>CNCF „CFR”- SA</p> <p>TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE</p> | <p>QESMS</p> <p>OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE</p> <p>SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OVER THE INFRASTRUCTURE<br/>CAPACITY ALLOCATION</p> <p>Code PO 0-8.5-08</p> | <p>Edition: 2</p> <p>Revision: 1</p> <p>Page: 3/11</p> |
|---|---|--|

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1 PURPOSE .....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2. SCOPE .....</b>   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>3. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS .....</b>   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>4. DEFINITION AND ABBREVIATIONS.....</b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>4.1. Definitions .....</b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>4.2 Abbreviations .....</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>5. DESCRIPTION .....</b>   | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>5.1 Overview .....</b>   | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>5.2 Working Method - Description of the Activity of Settling the Disputes related to Infrastructure Capacity Allocation .....</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>5.2.1. Method of Setting Up the Dispute Settlement Commissions.....</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>5.2.2. Settlement of the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation - the General Case.....</b>   | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>5.2.3 Settlement of the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation - the case of the traffic sections for intermodal terminals .....</b>                                  | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>5.2.4. Settlement of the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation, Other than Those related to Conflicting Requests .....</b>   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>6. RESPONSIBILITIES .....</b>  | <b>12</b> |
| <b>6.1. Head of the CAO (Traffic Directorate/Traffic Divisions within the RRB 1-8) .....</b>  | <b>12</b> |
| <b>6.2. Deputy Head of the Central Traffic Regulator.....</b>   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>6.3. Head of the Regional Traffic Regulator .....</b>  | <b>12</b> |
| <b>6.4. Employee of the Traffic Directorate/Traffic Division within the RRB 1-8.....</b>  | <b>12</b> |
| <b>7. DOCUMENTED INFORMATION (RECORDS) .....</b>  | <b>13</b> |
| <b>8. ANNEXES .....</b>   | <b>13</b> |
| • Annex No. 1 - Minutes on the Analysis Carried Out Following the Application of the Criteria for Settling the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation — the General Case |           |
| • Annex No. 2 – Information of the RUs on the Modality to Settle the Conflict between the Conflicting Requests (if the RUs agree with the disclosure of their identity)   |           |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|  <p>CNCF „CFR“- SA</p> <p>TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE</p> | <p>QESMS</p> <p>OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE</p> <p>SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OVER THE INFRASTRUCTURE<br/>CAPACITY ALLOCATION</p> <p>Code PO 0-8.5-08</p> | <p>Edition: 2</p> <p>Revision: 1</p> <p>Page: 4/11</p> |
|---|---|--|

- Annex No. 3 – Information of the RUs on the Modality to Settle the Conflict between the Conflicting Requests (if the RUs do not agree with the disclosure of their identity)
- Annex No. 4 - Minutes on the Consultation of the RUs on the Settlement of Disputes
- Annex No. 5 - Minutes on the Analysis Carried Out Following the Application of the Criteria for Settling the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation – the Case of the Traffic Sections for Intermodal Terminals
- Annex No. 6 - Process Diagram regarding the Development of the Dispute Settlement Procedure by Using the Criteria – the General Case
- Annex No. 7 - Process Diagram regarding the Development of the Dispute Settlement Procedure by Using the Criteria – the Case of the Traffic Sections for Intermodal Terminals
- Annex No. 8 - Process Diagram regarding the Development of the Dispute Settlement Procedure without Using the Criteria
- Forms - The Checklist of Editions/Reviews; the Procedure Analysis Form; the Dissemination/Withdrawal List.

## 1 PURPOSE

---

The procedure shall set out the system for settling the disputes related to:

- the conflicting requests for infrastructure capacity allocation which could not be settled by means of the coordination procedure;
- disputes related to infrastructure capacity allocation, other than those mentioned above.

## 2. SCOPE

---


(1) The procedure shall be applied by the employees of the Traffic Directorate/Traffic Division – the Regional Railway Branches 1 to 8, for the requests for infrastructure capacity allocation that could not be settled by means of the coordination procedure, as well as for disputes related to the infrastructure capacity allocation, other than those mentioned above.

(2) The procedure shall apply to the specific infrastructure capacity allocation activities for:

- the conflicting requests for infrastructure capacity allocation during the period of the actual preparation of the timetable;
- the conflicting requests for infrastructure capacity allocation for the infrastructure capacities resulting from the railway line rehabilitation works or from the construction of new railway lines both for the period of the actual preparation of the timetable and for the validity period of the relevant timetable;
- the conflicting requests for infrastructure capacity allocation on the traffic sections for intermodal terminals;
- disputes related to infrastructure capacity, other than those mentioned above, both for the period of the actual preparation of the timetable and for the validity period of the relevant timetable.

## 3. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

---

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|  <p>CNCF „CFR“- SA</p> <p>TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE</p> | <p>QESMS</p> <p>OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE</p> <p>SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OVER THE INFRASTRUCTURE<br/>CAPACITY ALLOCATION</p> <p>Code PO 0-8.5-08</p> | <p>Edition: 2</p> <p>Revision: 1</p> <p>Page: 5/11</p> |
|---|---|--|


- Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing the Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation), with Corrigendum L 127/23.05.2018;
- Law No. 202/2016 on the integration of the Romanian railway system into the Single European Area, with its subsequent amendments and supplements;
- GD No. 1696/2006 on approving the Regulation for the allocation of railway infrastructure capacities;
- Regulation (EU) No. 913/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Commission concerning a European rail network for competitive freight;
- Annex No. 2.2 *“The List of Traffic Sections for IAC Calculation, classified by classes of lines”* to the 2021-2025 Activity and Performance Contract of Compania Nationala de Cai Ferate „C.F.R.” - S.A.– (GD No. 920/2021);
- Order of the Secretariat - General of the Government No. 600/2018 for approving the Code of Internal Management Control of Public Entities;
- Order of the Minister of Transport No. 134/2022 for amending Annex No. 2 to the Order of the Minister of Transport and Infrastructure No. 153/2011 for amending and supplementing the Regulation No. 005 on the movement and shunting of the railway vehicles, approved by means of the Order of the Minister of Transport, Construction and Tourism No. 1816/2005, and for defining the passenger trains according to the services supplied by the passenger railway undertakings
- Romanian Standard EN ISO 9001:2015 Quality Management Systems. Requirements;
- Romanian Standard EN ISO 14001:2015 Environmental Management Systems. Requirements with guidance for use.
- QESMS documents in force.

#### 4. DEFINITION AND ABBREVIATIONS

---

##### 4.1. Definitions

- **Allocation** - distribution of the railway infrastructure capacity by the infrastructure manager;
- **Allocation schedule** – allocation schedule for the purposes of this procedure means the schedule of the infrastructure capacity allocation process set out in the Annexes No. 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2 to GD No. 1696/2006.
- **Cadenced timetable** – a particular working timetable in which the paths are established at identical intervals (equal periods of time).
- **Capacity of a traffic section (Cs)** - the maximum number of trains or pairs of trains that can run on it in 24 hours, depending on the traffic organization system, the technical equipment of the railway stations, the traffic sections and the hauling means.
- **Capacity of a railway station** - represents the maximum number of trains or wagons that can be received, shipped, transited, processed, loaded, unloaded in 24 hours, with the help of the available technical equipment.
- **Conflicting requests** – requests for train paths covering the same infrastructure capacity for trains of the same rank. The requests shall be dealt with during the same period of time within the allocation schedule.
- **Dispute** – case in which conflicting requests arise, as well as any other dispute related to infrastructure capacity allocation that could not be settled by means of the procedure *“Principles on the Coordination of the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation”*.
- **Infrastructure capacity** – the possibility of scheduling the train paths required for an infrastructure segment for a certain period of time.

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|  <p>CNCF „CFR”- SA</p> <p>TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE</p> | <p>QESMS</p> <p>OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE</p> <p>SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OVER THE INFRASTRUCTURE<br/>CAPACITY ALLOCATION</p> <p>Code PO 0-8.5-08</p> | <p>Edition: 2</p> <p>Revision: 1</p> <p>Page: 6/11</p> |
|---|---|--|

- **Non-use coefficient** (Pa) - represents the ratio between the total sum of the length of the unused paths at the request of the applicant (except for the cases in which the non-use is due to causes not depending on the applicant) and the total sum of the length of the paths allocated in the rail service books at the date of the entry into force of the timetable.
- **Timetable** – all the processes of planning and allocating the infrastructure capacities with a view to achieving the traffic of the passenger and freight trains. The train timetable shall be drawn up for a one-year period and shall be carried out for the entire 24-hour period of the day. On some traffic sections with low traffic the activity can be concentrated only on a certain period of the day.
- **Working timetable** – the data defining all planned train and rolling-stock movements on the relevant infrastructure during the validity period of this timetable.

#### 4.2 Abbreviations

- CAO – Capacity Allocation Office (Traffic Directorate/the RRBs 1 - 8);
- CFR - CNCF „CFR”-SA - Compania Națională de Căi Ferate „CFR”-SA – the public railway infrastructure manager;
- RRBs 1-8 - the Regional Railway Branches 1 to 8;
- RU - railway undertaking or other applicants as defined by Law No. 202;
- QESMS - Quality-environment-safety management system.

## 5. DESCRIPTION

### 5.1 Overview

**5.1.1.** The dispute settlement procedure for the conflicting requests for infrastructure capacity allocation shall be applied according to the categories of trains as follows:


- by the Traffic Directorate through the CAO for:
  - the paths of the passenger trains in internal traffic, classified according to the legislation in force in the categories: intercity, interregio and regio, running on two or more Regional Railway Branches;
  - the paths of the freight trains running in internal traffic on two or more Regional Railway Branches.
- by the RRBs 1-8 through the CAO for:
  - the paths of the passenger trains in internal traffic, classified according to the legislation in force in the regio category, running on a single Regional Railway Branch;
  - the paths of the freight trains running in internal traffic on a single Regional Railway Branch.
  - The Traffic Directorate may also decide to carry out the dispute settlement process in certain cases that are within the competence of the RRB.

### 5.2 Working Method - Description of the Activity of Settling the Disputes related to Infrastructure Capacity Allocation

#### 5.2.1. Method of Setting Up the Dispute Settlement Commissions

The disputes related to the conflicting requests for infrastructure capacity allocation shall be settled by a commission made up, as appropriate, of:

- The head of the CAO or his replacement, from the Traffic Directorate/Traffic Division;
- The deputy head of the Central Traffic Regulator/Head of the Regional Traffic Regulator or his replacement;

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|  <p>CNCF „CFR“- SA</p> <p>TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE</p> | <p>QESMS</p> <p>OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE</p> <p>SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OVER THE INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY ALLOCATION</p> <p>Code PO 0-8.5-08</p> | <p>Edition: 2</p> <p>Revision: 1</p> <p>Page: 7/11</p> |
|---|---|--|


- A member of the CAO or another employee from the Traffic Directorate/Division.

### 5.2.2. Settlement of the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation - the General Case

(1) The settlement of the disputes related to the conflicting requests for infrastructure capacity allocation shall be carried out if, after the application of the operational procedure: PO 0-8.5-07, Edition 1, Review 0, „Principles on the Coordination of the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation”, CFR fails to adapt all the requests based on this coordination.

(2) In this case, the assessment criteria on the basis of which the assessment is made in order to settle the disputes shall be:

| Criterion no. | Name of assessment criterion  | Dispute settlement  | Application                        |
|---------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| 1             | Existence of the statement of the RU on the compatibility of the rolling stock specified in the written request with the traffic route  | Infrastructure capacity shall be allocated to the applicant who meets the criterion.  | Applies to new infrastructure only |
| 2             | Efficient use of infrastructure capacity  | The infrastructure capacity shall be allocated to the applicant with the highest traffic speed of the rolling stock. In cases where the maximum speed of the rolling stock is higher than the maximum speed allowed by the railway infrastructure, the value of the maximum speed of the rolling stock shall be considered equal to the value of the maximum speed allowed by the railway infrastructure. |                                    |
| 3             | The estimated usage of the infrastructure capacity. It shall be determined with the help of the estimated usage indicator K<br>$K = (a \cdot 4 + b \cdot 3 + c \cdot 2 + d \cdot 1) \cdot x(n)$ where a, b, c, and d are the distances expressed in kilometres related to the sections of the lines Class A, B, C, and D on the path in question<br>n - number of traffic days<br>$L(\text{path length}) = a + b + c + d$ | The infrastructure capacity shall be allocated to the request with the highest usage indicator.   |                                    |
| 4             | Existence of requests to/from the multimodal transport terminals  | It shall be decided in favour of the request to/from the multimodal transport terminals   |                                    |
| 5             | The least polluting rolling stock - diesel or electric traction   | It shall be decided in favour of the request with electric traction   |                                    |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <br>CNCF „CFR”- SA<br><br>TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE | QESMS<br>OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE<br>SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OVER THE INFRASTRUCTURE<br>CAPACITY ALLOCATION<br><br>Code PO 0-8.5-08 | Edition: 2<br>Revision: 1<br>Page: 8/11 |
|---|---|---|

|          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>6</b> | Operating capacity and efficiency of path usage:<br>$Pa = \left( \frac{\sum \text{train} \cdot \text{km non-used paths}}{\sum \text{train} \cdot \text{km paths allocated in acc. with the Rail Service Book}} \right) \times 100$ | It shall be decided in favour of the request submitted by the applicant who ensured in the previous timetable the highest efficiency of the usage of all the allocated path, respectively who had the lowest percentage of non-used paths | Criterion 6 shall not apply if at least one applicant did not hold a railway infrastructure access contract in the previous timetable |
| <b>7</b> | Impairment of railway station capacity   | It shall be decided in favour of the request that least affects the capacity of the railway station.  |   |

The commission provided for at item 5.2.1. shall apply the criteria in the order set out above. The criteria are eliminatory in that order.

Criterion 5 shall be analysed on the basis of the applicant's statement at the time of submitting the path request. CFR shall reserve the right to sanction the relevant RU by calculating the Pa coefficient by including the volume of train-kms for the case when diesel traction rolling stock is used instead of the electric one (as indicated in the path request) in the volume of non-used train-kms. Exceptions are the cases due to the railway infrastructure.

The value of the Pa coefficient shall be calculated for the entire railway network as follows:

- The denominator shall be calculated, every year, at the date of the entry into force of the timetable, by the Capacity Allocation Office within the Traffic Directorate;
- The numerator shall be calculated, each year, after the expiry of the timetable, by the Central Traffic Regulator, on the basis of the data supplied by the Regional Traffic Regulators.

The data shall be distributed to the RRBs 1-8.

If, following the application of the criteria, it results that:

- there is a request for which the allocation has been decided; in this case, there shall be performed the tracing. Alternative solutions shall be proposed for the other requests, if possible. For the RUs who accept the alternative solutions, there shall be performed the tracing;


- there is no request to decide on the allocation. In this case, there shall be proposed alternative solutions, if possible. For the RUs who accept the alternative solutions, there shall be performed the tracing.

The result of the assessment shall be mentioned in a minutes in accordance with the template included in Annex No. 1.

After the conclusion of the minutes, the Traffic Directorate/Division shall inform the RU, in writing, on the modality in which the dispute between the conflicting requests was settled, by using one of the templates included in Annexes No. 2 or 3, as appropriate.

(3) The deadline for completing the analysis shall be 10 working days from the moment when CFR finds out that no agreement can be reached by using the coordination procedure.



|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|  <p>CNCF „CFR“- SA</p> <p>TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE</p> | <p>QESMS</p> <p>OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE</p> <p>SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OVER THE INFRASTRUCTURE<br/>CAPACITY ALLOCATION</p> <p>Code PO 0-8.5-08</p> | <p>Edition: 2</p> <p>Revision: 1</p> <p>Page: 9/11</p> |
|---|---|--|

### 5.2.3 Settlement of the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation - the case of the traffic sections for intermodal terminals

(1) This paragraph sets out the rules of procedure in the case of the conflicting requests for traffic sections where the following conditions are cumulatively met:

- The traffic section serves an intermodal terminal such as airport, port, etc.;
- The working timetable proposed by CFR is of the cadenced type;
- The paths on the relevant section have the same parameters;
- CFR's capacity offer consists of pairs of paths due to specific restrictive conditions;
- No requests other than those established in the cadenced timetable are admissible.

(2) The settlement of the disputes related to the conflicting requests for infrastructure capacity allocation shall be carried out if, after the application of the operational procedure: PO 0-8.5-07, Edition 1, Review 0, „Principles on the Coordination of the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation“, CFR fails to adapt all the requests based on this coordination.


The settlement of the disputes related to the conflicting requests for infrastructure capacity allocation shall be carried out through the analysis made by a commission made up in accordance with the provisions of Item 5.2.1.

(3) In this case, the assessment criteria on the basis of which the assessment is made in order to settle the disputes shall be:

| Criterion no. | Name of assessment criterion   | Dispute settlement  | Application                        |
|---------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| 1             | Existence of the statement of the RU on the compatibility of the rolling stock specified in the written request with the traffic route | Infrastructure capacity shall be allocated to the applicant who meets the criterion.  | Applies to new infrastructure only |
| 2             | Efficient use of infrastructure capacity   | The infrastructure capacity shall be allocated to the applicant with the highest traffic speed of the rolling stock. In cases where the maximum speed of the rolling stock is higher than the maximum speed allowed by the railway infrastructure, the value of the maximum speed of the rolling stock shall be considered equal to the value of the maximum speed allowed by the railway infrastructure. |                                    |



|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | <p>The estimated usage of the infrastructure capacity. It shall be determined with the help of the estimated usage indicator K</p> $K = (a^4 + b^3 + c^2 + d^1) \times n$ <p>where a, b, c, and d are the distances expressed in kilometres related to the sections of the lines Class A, B, C, and D on the path in question</p> <p>n - number of traffic days</p> $L(\text{path length}) = a + b + c + d$   | The infrastructure capacity shall be allocated to the request with the highest usage indicator.   |   |
| 4 | Existence of requests to/from the multimodal transport terminals  | It shall be decided in favour of the request to/from the multimodal transport terminals   |   |
| 5 | The least polluting rolling stock - diesel or electric traction   | It shall be decided in favour of the request with electric traction   |   |
| 6 | <p>Operating capacity and efficiency of path usage:</p> $Pa = \left( \frac{\sum \text{train} \times \text{km non-used paths}}{\sum \text{train} \times \text{km paths allocated in acc. with the Rail Service Book}} \right) \times 100$  | It shall be decided in favour of the request submitted by the applicant who ensured in the previous timetable the highest efficiency of the usage of all the allocated path, respectively who had the lowest percentage of non-used paths | Criterion 6 shall not apply if at least one applicant did not hold a railway infrastructure access contract in the previous timetable |
| 7 | <p>The proportional distribution to the total number of requests. The number of pairs of allocated paths <math>T_a</math> shall be determined with the help of the formula:</p> $T_{ai} = (T_{si} / \sum T_{si}) \times T_{st}$ <p>where:</p> <p><math>T_{ai}</math> – pairs of paths allocated to each of the RUs</p> <p><math>T_{si}</math> – pairs of paths requested by each RU that can be considered conflicting requests</p> <p><math>\sum T_{si}</math> – the sum of all the requests for pairs of conflicting paths</p> <p><math>T_{st}</math> – pairs of available paths for which conflicting requests have been submitted</p> | The calculation of $T_{ai}$ results in the number of pairs of paths allocated to each applicant.  |   |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <br>CNCF „CFR”- SA<br><br>TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE | QESMS<br>OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE<br>SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OVER THE INFRASTRUCTURE<br>CAPACITY ALLOCATION<br><br>Code PO 0-8.5-08 | Edition: 2<br>Revision: 1<br>Page: 11/11 |
|---|---|--|

|          |  |  |  |
|----------|--|--|--|
| <b>8</b> | Impairment of railway station capacity | It shall be decided in favour of the request that least affects the capacity of the railway station. |  |
|----------|--|--|--|

The commission provided for at Item 5.2.1. shall apply the criteria in the order set out above, as follows:

a) Criteria 1-5 shall be eliminatory in the order mentioned;

b) Criterion 5 shall be analysed on the basis of the applicant's statement at the time of submitting the path request. CFR shall reserve the right to sanction the relevant RU by calculating the Pa coefficient by including the volume of train-kms for the case when diesel traction rolling stock is used instead of the electric one (as indicated in the path request) in the volume of non-used train-kms. Exceptions are the cases due to the railway infrastructure;

c) if at least one applicant did not hold a railway infrastructure access contract in the previous timetable, Criterion 6 shall not apply;

d) By applying Criterion 6, there shall be determined the value of the non-usage coefficient for each applicant.

In this case, the number of paths allocated to each applicant shall be determined after carrying out the following stages:

d1) on the basis of the Pa coefficient determined for each applicant, a ranking shall be drawn up in descending order. Each applicant shall be assigned a place in this ranking. Each applicant shall receive a number of points according to the place he occupies in the ranking, as follows:

- Place 1 receives N points, where N is the number of applicants;
- Place 2 receives N-1 points;
- Place 3 receives N-2 points;
- ....

d2) There shall be established for each applicant a share of the number of paths in dispute to be allocated to him, whereas this share shall be calculated with the help of the formula:

$$C_1 = \frac{N}{S}; C_2 = \frac{N-1}{S}; \dots; C_N = \frac{1}{S}$$


where:

S – represents the sum of all the points received by the applicants;

N – number of applicants;

C1.....CN - share to be assigned to each applicant.

e) If at least one applicant did not hold a railway infrastructure access contract in the previous timetable, Criterion 6 shall not apply, the number of allocated paths shall be assigned on the basis of the proportionality principle (Criterion 7).

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|  <p>CNCF „CFR“- SA</p> <p>TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE</p> | <p>QESMS</p> <p>OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE</p> <p>SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OVER THE INFRASTRUCTURE<br/>CAPACITY ALLOCATION</p> <p>Code PO 0-8.5-08</p> | <p>Edition: 2</p> <p>Revision: 1</p> <p>Page: 12/11</p> |
|---|---|---|

The result of the assessment shall be mentioned in a minutes in accordance with the template included in Annex No. 5.

After the conclusion of the minutes, the Traffic Directorate/Division shall inform the RU, in writing, on the modality in which the dispute between the conflicting requests was settled, by using one of the templates included in Annexes No. 2 or 3, as appropriate.

(4) The deadline for completing the analysis shall be 10 working days from the moment when CFR finds out that no agreement can be reached by using the coordination procedure.

---

#### 5.2.4. Settlement of the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation, Other than Those related to Conflicting Requests

(1) In case of any other disputes notified in writing by the RU, arising out of the request and allocation of the infrastructure capacity, the settlement shall be exclusively performed by means of consultations. The disputes shall be analysed by the commission provided for at Item 5.2.1. If all the RUs involved agree, in writing, with the disclosure of their identity (for which the RUs' agreement has been requested), they shall be directly consulted. If at least one of the RUs does not agree with the disclosure of the identity or if, following the consultations, the parties do not reach a unanimously accepted solution, CFR shall decide to reject the complaint.

(2) The deadline for completing the analysis shall be 10 working days from the moment when the RU's notice is received, and the result of the analysis shall be recorded in a minutes, in accordance with the template included in Annex No. 4.

(3) The RU shall be informed, in writing, on the modality in which the dispute was settled.

## 6. RESPONSIBILITIES

### 6.1. Head of the CAO (Traffic Directorate/Traffic Divisions within the RRB 1-8)

- Settles the disputes related to the infrastructure capacity allocation in accordance with this procedure.
- Transmits to the applicants the manner in which the disputes related to infrastructure capacity allocation have been settled.
- Enforces the provisions of this procedure for settling the disputes related to infrastructure capacity allocation.
- Takes part in the commission for settling the disputes related to infrastructure capacity allocation.

### 6.2. Deputy Head of the Central Traffic Regulator


- Takes part in the commission for settling the disputes related to infrastructure capacity allocation.

### 6.3. Head of the Regional Traffic Regulator

- Takes part in the commission for settling the disputes related to infrastructure capacity allocation.

### 6.4. Employee of the Traffic Directorate/Traffic Division within the RRB 1-8

- Takes part in the commission for settling the disputes related to the infrastructure capacity allocation.


|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <br><b>CNCF „CFR”- SA</b><br><br><b>TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE</b> | <b>QESMS</b><br><b>OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE</b><br><b>SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OVER THE INFRASTRUCTURE</b><br><b>CAPACITY ALLOCATION</b><br><br><b>Code PO 0-8.5-08</b> | <b>Edition: 2</b><br><b>Revision: 1</b><br><b>Page: 13/11</b> |
|---|--|---|

## 7. DOCUMENTED INFORMATION (RECORDS)

| <b>Current No.</b> | <b>Name of record</b>  | <b>Prepared by</b> | <b>Archiving place</b> | <b>Archiving duration</b> |
|--------------------|--|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1.                 | Minutes on the Analysis Carried Out Following the Application of the Criteria for Settling the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation - the General Case  | <b>Commission</b>  | CAO                    | 5 years                   |
| 2.                 | Request for the RUs' Agreement with the Disclosure of their Identity   | <b>CAO</b>         | CAO                    | 5 years                   |
| 3.                 | Information of the RUs on the Modality to Settle the Conflict between the Conflicting Requests (if the RUs agree with the disclosure of their identity)  | <b>CAO</b>         | CAO                    | 5 years                   |
| 4.                 | Information of the RUs on the Modality to Settle the Conflict between the Conflicting Requests (if the RUs do not agree with the disclosure of their identity)   | <b>CAO</b>         | CAO                    | 5 years                   |
| 5.                 | Minutes on the Analysis Carried Out Following the Application of the Criteria for Settling the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation – the Case of the Traffic Sections for Intermodal Terminals | <b>Commission</b>  | CAO                    | 5 years                   |
| 6.                 | Minutes on the Consultation of the RUs on the Settlement of Disputes, Other than Those related to Conflicting Requests   | <b>Commission</b>  | CAO                    | 5 years                   |
| 7.                 | Other Electronic Written Communications between CFR and the RUs  | <b>CAO</b>         | CAO                    | 5 years                   |

## 8. ANNEXES

- Annex No. 1 - Minutes on the Analysis Carried Out Following the Application of the Criteria for Settling the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation - the general case
- Annex No. 2 – Information of the RUs on the Modality to Settle the Conflict between the Conflicting Requests (if the RUs agree with the disclosure of their identity)
- Annex No. 3 – Information of the RUs on the Modality to Settle the Conflict between the Conflicting Requests (if the RUs do not agree with the disclosure of their identity)
- Annex No. 4 - Minutes on the Consultation of the RUs on the Settlement of Disputes
- Annex No. 5 - Minutes on the Analysis Carried Out Following the Application of the Criteria for Settling the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation – the Case of the Traffic Sections for Intermodal Terminals
- Annex No. 6 - Process Diagram regarding the Development of the Dispute Settlement Procedure by Using the Criteria – the General Case

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <br>CNCF „CFR”- SA<br><br>TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE | QESMS<br>OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE<br>SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OVER THE INFRASTRUCTURE<br>CAPACITY ALLOCATION<br>Code PO <b>0-8.5-08</b> | Edition: 2<br>Revision: 1<br>Page: 14/11 |
|---|--|--|

- Annex No. 7 - Process Diagram regarding the Development of the Dispute Settlement Procedure by Using the Criteria – the Case of the Traffic Sections for Intermodal Terminals
- Annex No. 8 - Process Diagram regarding the Development of the Dispute Settlement Procedure without Using the Criteria
- Forms - The Checklist of Editions/Reviews; the Procedure Analysis Form; the Dissemination/Withdrawal List.

Traffic Directorate/Traffic Division within the RRB 1-8

Capacity Allocation Office

No. ....../Date .....

**Minutes**

**The Analysis Carried Out Following the Application of the Criteria for Settling the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation — the General Case**

Concluded today, ....., following the analysis of the conflicting requests related to infrastructure capacity allocation in the timetable .....

| Current No. | RU | Criterion |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-------------|----|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|             |    | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Result of the application of the coordination process:

Commission:

| Current No. | Last name, first name | Position | Signature |
|-------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------|
| 1           |                       |          |           |
| 2           |                       |          |           |
| 3           |                       |          |           |

**Traffic Directorate/Traffic Division within the RRB 1-8**

**Capacity Allocation Office**

**No. ....../Date .....**

**To,**

**(RU).....**

**Director.....**

**Regarding:** Information of the RUs on the Modality to Settle the Conflict between the Conflicting Requests (if the RUs agree with the disclosure of their identity)

Following the analysis of your request No. .... of ....., we send you the results of the coordination process between the conflicting requests related to infrastructure capacity allocation:

| Current No. | RU | Criterion |   |   |   |   |   |
|-------------|----|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|
|             |    | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7 |
| 1           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |

There was applied Criterion 6 (if applicable) with the following result:

(Other comments).....



Traffic Director/Head of the Traffic Division

(Last name, first name, signature)

Head of the CAO

(Last name, first name, signature)

Prepared by:..... (Last name, first name, signature)

**Traffic Directorate/Traffic Division within the RRB 1-8**

**Capacity Allocation Office**

**No. ....../Date .....**

**To,**

**(RU).....**

**Director.....**

**Regarding:** Information of the RUs on the Modality to Settle the Conflict between the Conflicting Requests (if the RUs do not agree with the disclosure of their identity)

Following the analysis of your request No. .... of ....., we communicate to you the following:

.....

Traffic Director/Head of the Traffic Division

(Last name, first name, signature)

Head of the CAO

(Last name, first name, signature)

Prepared by:..... (Last name, first name, signature)

Traffic Directorate/Traffic Division within the RRB 1-8

Capacity Allocation Office

No. ....../Date .....

**Minutes**

**the Consultation of the RUs on the Settlement of Disputes**

Concluded today, ....., following the direct consultation with the applicants involved following the disputes related to infrastructure capacity allocation in the timetable .....

A. Opinion of the RU:

1. RU .....

2. RU .....

3. RU .....

4. RU .....

5. CFR.....

B. Conclusions:

Participants:

| Current No. | Last name, first name | Company/firm | Position | Signature |
|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------|-----------|
| 1           |                       |              |          |           |
| 2           |                       |              |          |           |
| 3           |                       |              |          |           |
| 4           |                       |              |          |           |
| 5           |                       |              |          |           |
| 6           |                       |              |          |           |
| 7           |                       |              |          |           |

Prepared by:..... (Last name, first name, signature)

Traffic Directorate/Traffic Division within the RRB 1-8

Capacity Allocation Office

No. ....../Date .....

**Minutes**

**The Analysis Carried Out Following the Application of the Criteria for Settling the Disputes related to the Conflicting Requests for Infrastructure Capacity Allocation – the Case of the Traffic Sections for Intermodal Terminals**

Concluded today, ....., following the analysis of the conflicting requests related to infrastructure capacity allocation in the timetable .....

| Current No. | RU | Criterion |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|-------------|----|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
|             |    | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |  |
| 1           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| 2           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| 3           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| 4           |    |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |

There was applied Criterion 7 (if applicable) with the following result:

Result of the application of the coordination process:

Commission:

| Current No. | Last name, first name | Position | Signature |
|-------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------|
| 1           |                       |          |           |
| 2           |                       |          |           |
| 3           |                       |          |           |

**THE CHECKLIST OF EDITIONS/REVIEWS OF THE DOCUMENT**  
**OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE**  
**SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTES RELATED TO INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY ALLOCATION**  
**Code PO 0-8.5-08, Edition 2, Review 1**

| Ed/<br>Rev | Change reason  | Changes chapter, paragraph/ page/row                           | Date of the entry into force | Prepared/<br>reviewed by | Approved by           |
|------------|--|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
|            |  |  |                              | First name, last name    | First name, last name |
| 1/0        | <b><u>Initial preparation</u></b>                    | -  | 19.11.2020                   | Monica PAVEL             | Ioan PINTEA           |
| 2/0        | Decision of the Competition Council No. 1/31.03.2021 | Ch. 2; Ch. 3; Ch. 4 (4.1); Ch. 5; Ch. 6; Ch. 7; Ch. 8; Annexes | 19.05.2022                   | Monica PAVEL             | Ion SIMU- ALEXANDRU   |
| 2/1        | Clarification of formulas                            | Item 5.2.3 letter d1), d2)                                     | 2022                         | Monica PAVEL             | Ion SIMU- ALEXANDRU   |
| ...        |  |  |                              |                          |                       |

f 0-7.5-01-01, Ed. 6, Rev. 0

**FORM OF THE ANALYSIS OF THE DOCUMENT**  
**OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE**  
**SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTES RELATED TO INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY ALLOCATION**  
**Code PO 0-8.5-08, Edition 2, Review 1**

| Current No. | Org. structures who took part in the analysis of the document                       | They drew up points if view | Comments                    |
|-------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1.          | General Inspectorate for Railway Traffic Safety                                     | x                           | from the SMS point of view  |
| 2.          | Directorate for Human Resources   | x                           |                             |
| 3.          | Technical Directorate – Office for the Management of Quality Systems and Procedures | x                           | from the EQMS point of view |

f 0-7.5-01-02, Ed. 6, Rev. 0



**LIST OF THE DISSEMINATION/WITHDRAWAL OF THE DOCUMENT**

**OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE**

**SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTES RELATED TO INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY ALLOCATION**

**Code PO 0-8.5-08, Edition 2, Review 1**

| Nr.<br>exemplar | Name of the document (code/update):   |                       |      |                     |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|------|---------------------|
|                 | Disseminated:   |                       |      | Withdrawn:          |
|                 | PO 0-8.5-08, Edition 2, Review 1  |                       |      | Edition 2, Review 0 |
|                 | Recipient   | First name, last name | Date | Date                |
| 1               | Technical Directorate   |                       |      |                     |
| 2               | General Inspectorate for Railway Traffic Safety                                     |                       |      |                     |
| 3               | Directorate for Human Resources   |                       |      |                     |
| 4               | Technical Directorate – Office for the Management of Quality Systems and Procedures |                       |      |                     |
| ....            | RU  |                       |      |                     |

| Nr.<br>exemplar | Name of the document (code/update):   |                       |      |                     |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------|---------------------|
|                 | Disseminated:                         |                       |      | Withdrawn:          |
|                 | PO 0-8.5-08, Edition 2, Review 1      |                       |      | Edition 2, Review 0 |
|                 | Recipient                             | First name, last name | Date | Date                |
| 1/              | The Bucharest Regional Railway Branch |                       |      |                     |
| 2/              | The Craiova Regional Railway Branch   |                       |      |                     |
| 3/              | The Timișoara Regional Railway Branch |                       |      |                     |
| 4/              | The Cluj Regional Railway Branch      |                       |      |                     |
| 5/              | The Brașov Regional Railway Branch    |                       |      |                     |
| 6/              | The Iași Regional Railway Branch      |                       |      |                     |
| 7/              | The Galați Regional Railway Branch    |                       |      |                     |
| 8/              | The Constanța Regional Railway Branch |                       |      |                     |
| .....           |                                       |                       |      |                     |

