Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

PUBLIC

Interinstitutional files:
2026/0115 (COD)

Brussels, 08 October 2026

WK 15629/2026 INIT

LIMITE

TRANS
CODEC

This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.

WORKING DOCUMENT

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Working Party on Transport - Intermodal Questions and Networks
Subject:	Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on rail ticketing - Presidency Steering Note

Delegations will find attached the Presidency Steering Note on the Regulation on rail ticketing (RTR).

ÉIRE2026.EU
IRELAND2026.EU

PUBLIC

Regulation on Rail Ticketing: Presidency Steering Note

Intermodal WP

15 October 2026

Introduction

Following the discussion in the Intermodal WP on 24 September, the Presidency view is that, while there was broad support for the Presidency to explore the options outlined in the steering note (WK 14252 2026), there is value in focussing more concretely on the hosting obligation which would apply to platforms owned or controlled by railway undertakings with significant market presence (Article 5 and Article 7).

As the hosting obligation constitutes one of the core elements of this proposal, this steering note poses two questions to MS to better understand how concerns might be most effectively addressed. The Presidency notes a significant number of MS are still establishing their overall position on the package and have expressed clear reservations about the imposition of a hosting obligation. However, the Presidency is seeking to find potential policy directions that allows us to advance discussions on the hosting obligation. While the below proposals are not mutually exclusive, they do represent different policy directions.

Delegations are invited to give their views on the two questions below.

Thresholds and scope

In the WP on 24 September, several delegations supported the idea of widening the scope of the regulation to cover online platforms with a significant market presence that are not vertically integrated with a carrier. Furthermore, some delegations noted that the 30% figure suggested by the Presidency (which aligns with the threshold for significant market presence at national level set in RMB) might be further lowered to capture other significant players in the market.

The Presidency notes that the inclusion in scope of non-vertically integrated platforms would require an additional or different method of calculation of thresholds than what is currently proposed in Article 7(1). As the reporting requirement in the Rail Market Monitoring Implementing Regulation ((EU) 2015/1100) only covers railway undertakings, an additional or different method for calculating the size of the rail ticketing market in each MS would be required. Similar to the Regulation on Multi-Modal Booking (RMB), this could be achieved via an implementing act. Depending on the approach taken under RMB, it could also be explored whether the thresholds applying to rail in the RMB could be used, in addition to a designation based on the Rail Market Monitoring Scheme.

Q1: Would delegations support reorienting Articles 5 and 7 to capture non vertically integrated platforms and to amend the calculation of the scope accordingly?

PUBLIC

Commercial freedom and contracting

Central to the hosting obligation is that railway undertakings with significant market presence cannot refuse to enter into a hosting contract with a requesting undertaking except those circumstances laid out in Article 5(3). The obligation also requires the railway undertakings with significant market presence to display, relink, resell or distribute tickets of requesting operators.

Given the feedback received at the previous WP raising concerns over limitation on commercial freedom, the Presidency would like the view of delegations about limiting the hosting obligation to re-linking only. Such a limitation would not stop operators that wish to enter into an agreement to distribute each other's tickets from doing so.

While this modification would give more commercial freedom to undertakings with significant market presence, it would not facilitate the distribution of tickets for new entrant operators or for passengers wishing to combine tickets of different operators or buying them in one transaction.

Limiting the hosting obligation to re-linking also raises questions about FRAND and the RPRR single tickets proposal. On FRAND, delegations would need to consider if reducing the hosting obligation to re-linking only and making distribution voluntary reflects the current market situation. If one was to apply the same logic to online ticket distribution as to physical ticket distribution (the latter is a service under Article 13(8) of the SERA Directive), an online ticketing service provider that agrees to resell or distribute the tickets of one operator, would have to do so for all requesting operators. Basically, this raises the question whether the option to offer different types of contracts to different railway undertakings nonetheless should be considered fair in this case.

On single tickets, the Commission proposal relies on single tickets being purchased in a single commercial transaction. In cases where a railway undertaking with significant market presence has agreed only to relink the offers of another operator, this would not constitute a single transaction and therefore the single ticket would not be created.

Q2: The Presidency welcomes the views of delegations on the way forward as proposed above.