



Directorate-General
for Energy
and Transport

The European Commission Public Consultation on Integrated Air-Rail ticketing

Giuseppe Rizzo
Infrastructures & Airports Unit

Gatwick, 29 October 2008



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION



- **What?**

- ***The European Commission
Public Consultation on
Integrated Air-Rail ticketing***

● Why?

- As part of existing policy
- Foreseen in COM (2006) 819 of 24.1.2007
- As part of a renewed political interest
- No intention to play dirty tricks to the industry!



- **When?**

- The public consultation was open from 4 July to 30 September 2008

● Who?

- The consultation was open to all citizens but obviously was primarily targeting a limited number of specialized operators.

● 48 High Quality Answers

- 9 Railways (incl. 4 associations)
- 7 airports incl. 1 association
- 6 airlines incl. 3 associations
- 6 citizens
- 3 CRS + 1 Schedule provider
- 4 Administrations (Local/National)
- 4 Local/public transport operators/authorities
- 3 Intermodality organisations
- 2 Travel Agents/Tour op. (incl. 1 association)
- 2 consumers associations
- 1 University 1 EU project team

● Q1: Your opinion on the potential market

European Passengers' Federation: We are convinced that the market potential for integrated air/rail ticketing is good, provided it offers attractive fares, (...) flexibility and (...) local public transport.

DB believes that intermodal mobility and seamless travel is one of the key elements of customer needs in the future

IARO + FRAPORT The market potential might be limited given all the necessary preconditions: infrastructure, profitability, harmonization of strategies

● Q2: Scope of Integrated ticketing. Should it be enlarged?

- **Air France:** No doubt, the most convenient and easiest integration is with a “non reservation” transport mode.
- **UNIFE:** Technically it is feasible to include urban public transport.
See www.fahren-fliegen.de
- **CER:** Integrated ticketing is not the solution for a successful co-operation between airlines and railways

● Q3: Which routes and which criteria for the interchange points?

- **ATOC:** In our own market, around 75% of international pax use an airport served by rail. However, only 4% use an airport directly served by long distance high speed services.
- **DB:** More than 60% of air pax live less than 100Km from the airport. Integrating urban transport is essential.
- **ANCI:** Unified signposting in Europe, more comfortable stations, more destinations and frequencies. Luggage is a later step

● Q4: Feasibility of voluntary agreements

- **Fraport_(Q3)**: Every company will have its own strategy. It seems [they] are not used to intermodal business plans.
- **ACCESRAIL**: A compulsory piece of legislation is the only route to ensure success.
- **OAG**: Given the wide differences it is difficult to see how a compulsory approach could be made to work. Operators will be persuaded to participate by arguments of commercial benefit.
- **IATA**: We already have a set of standards and protocols (on intermodality). The Commission consultation is unjustified.
- **Finnish Consumers' Assoc.**: In either case an entity has to warrant pax rights & interests.

● Q5: Which technical solutions?

- **ACCESRAIL:** The technological trap would be for the Commission to rely on any of the interested players to implement this policy i.e. GDSs, Railways or Airlines. (...) No more than half a year would be needed to develop the proper links to an existing distribution platform.
- **AMADEUS:** Any solution will require a lot of technical development.
- **A Consultant:** The development of new untried methodologies from scratch seems unlikely to offer greater introductory speed or economy than adaptation of the existing airline systems.
- **A Travel Agent:** Having all on one screen is a dream but don't forget the back office impact. Also who will pay the cost of the system?

● Q6: Which management structure initially?

- **SNCF:** (A committee) incorporating all stakeholders should be able to study measures allowing to make huge quality improvements in air/rail services (...) and to launch market studies at European level in order to identify customer needs.
- **Air France:** A small taskforce that is charged with the development of a European air-rail model will be more effective than involving a large number of organisations.
- **Abertis (Luton Airport):** The European Commission should lead the process, but (...) it is the industry which should bear the burden. (...) A consortium is the best solution.

- **Q7: Are main problems operational or distributional?**
 - **Manchester Airport:** The solution has to be flexible enough to take account of the wide range of sales channels used by both airlines and rail operators
 - **A citizen (+DB):** Legal and distribution
 - **Eurostar:** There are both (A) operational and (B) financial problems. A= ticketing incompatibility. B=average transaction of rail is lower and operators should not bear the high costs associated with flight ticketing.
 - **Travelport:** cost, operation & distribution.

● Q8: What about intermodal registered luggage?

- **Lyon Airport:** The most important [thing] is to offer space in the trains (and other public transport) to put luggage and a comfortable way between the railway station and the airport terminal with lifts and moving walkways.
- **FS:** It seems absolutely non realistic and we do not envisage any solutions.
- **SNCB:** Not perceived as a priority.
- **UITP:** Only a very limited number of origins and destinations can be envisaged for registering and collecting registered luggage.
- **Fraport:** because of cost reasons the solution at the moment is: Remote check-in + baggage drop at the airport

● Q9: Any Further Comment?

- **UNIFE:** The distribution of rail tickets independently of their operators – just as in air transport – has the potential of making rail travel in Europe more competitive.
- **Routerank:** Providing additional information concerning the CO2 emissions of each form of transport, the probability of delays on routes, and other metrics not currently made available to travellers would provide a more complete picture of the potential travel options.
- **A citizen:** Do not finance airport projects if there is no rail station existing or planned at the airport itself.

● Some preliminary conclusions

- Many stakeholders will be convinced only upon the results of a specific study
- A win-win (€!) solution has to be found
- Registered luggage is **not** a priority
- Airport Express services have a great intermodal potential
- Integration with local transport already happens in some countries
- Some success stories already exist and have to be analysed closely

● What next? Options...

- Networking, visiting, comparing, learning!
- More specific studies (e.g. on real market potential, obstacles, pax priorities & wishes)
- Working groups
- Commission communication
- New program: “Marco Polo for Passengers”
- Legislation

● ***Thank you for your attention!***

