8th Florence Rail Forum

Rolling-Stock: the limits of the business approach for railway operators

28th APRIL 2014

Nicolas FOURRIER

Head of railway strategy and regulation department





- Historically: one country / one network / one market / one TOC
 => Rolling stock had not to be liquid, optimisation due to the specification for a single market
- Today: this business model does not work anymore in Europe
 - international traffic, TEN-T, need of interoperability
 - competition: risk for TOC to lose a market, need to redeploy quickly its train sets
- → Rolling stock liquidity becomes a major issue in Europe



→ Airplanes are more liquid than trains

Air sector	Rail sector
worldwide market	regional / local markets infrastructure standards
worldwide harmonised safety standards	national type approval (ex : NTV train sets not able to operate in France)
modular constructed airplanes	no harmonised specs between vehicles with expensive refurbishing cost
incentive for regular upgrades (ex: low cost renew their assets every 4/8 years)	long term investment (30 years)
Standardised spare parts and competition between the producers	TOC have to buy spare parts from original manufacturer



→ Different services offered by TOC

- Technical criteria : energy, signalisation, gauge
- Economic and commercial criteria
 - How many 1st class / 2nd class seats ?
 - Generous capacity in Paris area, not for "coutryside" trains
 - Coaching stock dedicated to night services (couchette)
- Political criteria: Local PTA want their own train designs (issue for the second hand market)

→ Higher liquidity for Freight sector

- Internationally interoperable rolling stocks
- Less specific freight locomotives
- Easier market entrance
- Efficient second hand market and rent / leasing market



- → Key conditions for a better passenger rolling stock liquidity
 - Need for interoperability :
 - **Infra**:but only when it is necessary because infrastructure modifications are costly and cross-border trains are more expensive (between 25% and 30%).
 - **Technical norms**: Many opportunities to reduce national specs: door opening systems, fire fighting appliances, exhaust pipes, toilets ...
 - Approval process: a single European certification
 - Need for modular trains: arbitrate between immediate and lifecycle costs
 - Need for standardisation: big volumes reduce the unit cost and the fixed engineering cost





In France, the exhaust pipe is on the side



And in Germany, in the middle



Reduced Cost for TOC

Matching between rolling-stock lifecycle and railway passenger market

Investment in rolling stock decided by TOC

Open access (France, Germany, Italy) and Some Regional TOC

Rolling stock owned and financed by the TOC

Rolling stock owned by a ROSCO and leased to the TOC

Rolling stock owned and financed by a PTA then provided to the TOC

contracts,...

French Regional trains /

Some German Länder./ etc

reduce risk and cost, such as

Rolling stock bought by the TOC

and financed through mechanisms

developped by the PTA in order to

subsidy, bank guarantee, long term

UK passenger franchises

Cost supported by TOC

Some German Länder



Decision to invest in rolling stock not taken by TOC

Matching between rolling-stock lifecycle and railway passenger market

- → Franchised market: no silver bullet
 - Long term contracts => no competition / incentive for TOC
 - Take-back guarantee: if there is a guarantee, PTA cannot renew the rolling stock for each contract. If there is no guarantee, all the risk and cost are borne by the TOC (ex: German Länder)
 - No rolling-stock conditions in the contract: TOC has the possibility to bring new or second-hand market rolling stock
 - PTA decides of the rolling stock: TOC missions only those of a train carrier and implies that PTA has the knowledge to make the technical specs



Matching between rolling-stock lifecycle and railway passenger market

- → Open market: high risks borne by the TOC
 - Gap between lifecycle of rolling stock and knowledge of the passenger market
 - Economic framework: level of track access charges, energy prices, passenger demand....
 - Intermodal competition conditions
 - Capacity to adapt services
 - Question of the optimal duration of operational life
 - Is there a model for shorter life assets with lower purchasing and maintenance cost?
 - Risk of lack of visibility
 - Over-investment in rolling stock : bankruptcy risk
 Under-investment in rolling stock : reduction of the offer and/or price increase for the customer
 SNCF was forced to write off TGV assets due to the insufficient profitability of our stock of TGV trains (-€700M in 2011 and -€1400M in 2013).

Matching between rolling-stock lifecycle and railway passenger market

Which responsibility for the TOC on rolling stock to optimise its operations?

- Reduce the number of types of vehicles
- Optimise train specs for customers' needs and infrastructure requirements (e.g. platform length and height, acceleration and breaking performance)
- Arbitrate: extending life / refurbishing of existing fleets / buying new asset
- Optimise the use of the depot, maintenance and production

Who takes the risks?

- Financial risk: TOC and PTA are saddled with debt
- Which guarantee for the residual value of the rolling stock
- Risk associated wit the introduction of new rolling stock onto the network
- → SNCF is in favour of a business model which keeps the ability for TOC to provide an integrated system knowledge including train set decision and maintenance

Conclusion

- 7 The direct purchasing by PTA remains the less expensive financial mechanism. Innovative financing mechanisms are an answer to shrinking budgets, They do not reduce the rolling stock costs
- TOC must keep their ability to make their own decisions about and train set specs and maintenance
- A sufficient ROCE is necessary to decide in new rolling stock assets: Only way to guarantee sustainable investment, real efficient second hand market and fair competition between TOC

