Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

PUBLIC

Interinstitutional files:
2026/0113 (COD)
2026/0114 (COD)
2026/0115 (COD)

Brussels, 03 July 2026

WK 9872/2026 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:	Passenger Package questions from Denmark – Intermodal WP 09.07.2026

Delegations will find attached the written questions from **Denmark** on the above subject.

Transportministeriet

PUBLIC

Questions on multimodal booking from Denmark

Impact assessment

The Regulatory Scrutiny Board concluded that the impact assessment does not sufficiently demonstrate the expected benefits of the proposal or adequately assess its impacts on transport operators and MDMS providers.

- Could the Commission elaborate on the analyses underpinning the conclusion that the expected benefits are proportionate to the administrative and economic burdens imposed by the proposal?

The Regulatory Scrutiny Board further concluded that the enforcement model is not sufficiently described.

- Could the Commission elaborate on how consistent enforcement across Member States is intended to be ensured?

Article 2 - Scope

- Could the Commission clarify to what extent the Regulation also applies to purely domestic transport services, given that the rationale for the proposal primarily refers to challenges relating to multimodal and cross-border journeys?
- Could the Commission clarify the distinction between multimodal digital mobility services (MDMS), transport operators' own digital sales channels and other digital travel services?

Article 4 – Designation of B2C MDMS providers with significant market presence

- How are national enforcement authorities expected to collect and verify the information used to designate B2C-MDMS providers with significant market presence?

Article 5 – Conditions for commercial agreements between transport operators and B2C MDMS

PUBLIC

providers with significant market presence or B2B MDMS providers

- Could the Commission clarify how the concepts of fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory conditions should be interpreted in practice?
- Does the Commission intend to develop guidance or standard contractual principles regarding these conditions?

- Could the Commission clarify how the provisions concerning the protection of commercially sensitive information are intended to interact with the information that MDMS providers are simultaneously required to process or share under the Regulation?

Article 7 – Neutral display and ranking criteria

- Could the Commission clarify how the requirement for neutral display and ranking is intended to operate in practice, including how the ranking criteria should be weighted and whether MDMS providers may continue to offer personalised search results?

Article 8 – Marketing information data

- Could the Commission clarify which marketing information transport operators are entitled to receive from MDMS providers and how this information is intended to be used in practice?

Article 9 – Information on greenhouse gas emissions and carbon dioxide equivalent emissions

- Could the Commission clarify whether MDMS providers are only required to display information on greenhouse gas emissions where such information is made available by transport operators, or whether the proposal introduces new obligations for transport operators to generate or provide such data? Please also refer to Article 7, paragraph 7.

Article 10 – Sharing of data with public transport authorities

- Could the Commission clarify which specific data are to be shared with public transport authorities?

PUBLIC

Article 12 - National enforcement bodies

- Could the Commission clarify the specific powers that national enforcement bodies are expected to have with regard to disputes between transport operators and MDMS providers?
- How is cooperation between national enforcement bodies and the Commission intended to function in cross-border cases?

Article 14 – Complaints

- Could the Commission clarify how the complaints procedure is intended to operate in cross-border cases involving more than one Member State or more than one national enforcement body?

Annex

- Could the Commission explain the methodology underlying the threshold values set out in the Annex, including the rationale for the individual threshold values and how they have been determined?

For example, for Denmark, the threshold value for bus ticket sales is approximately seven times higher than the threshold value for rail ticket sales, even though the number of bus products is only around 50% higher than the number of rail products.

Transportministeriet

PUBLIC

Questions on Rail Ticketing from Denmark

Impact assessment

The Regulatory Scrutiny Board questioned why digital services that provide journey information without selling tickets are covered by the proposal.

- Could the Commission clarify the rationale for including such services?
- Could the Commission explain the distinction between journey information services and online ticketing service providers?

The Regulatory Scrutiny Board concluded that the existence of a market failure in the market for online rail ticketing has not been sufficiently demonstrated.

- Could the Commission elaborate on the specific market failures that justify the proposed Regulation and the analysis underpinning this assessment?

Article 2 - Scope

- Could the Commission clarify to what extent the Regulation also applies to purely domestic rail services, given that the main objective of the proposal is to improve access to tickets for cross-border rail journeys and journeys involving more than one railway undertaking?

Article 4 - Obligation to provide content to online ticketing service providers (sharing obligation)

- Could the Commission clarify whether Article 4 requires existing integrated ticketing products to be separated, so that the rail component must be made available and distributed independently by third-party online ticketing service providers?

- Could the Commission clarify how the following provision should be interpreted and applied in practice: "The agreement referred to in the first subparagraph shall not cover tickets that allow their holders to travel on multiple transport modes, provided that tickets for the relevant railway service are made available and can be purchased as a stand-alone rail product." In particular, what is meant by a *"stand-alone rail product"*?

PUBLIC

Article 5 - Obligation for indispensable railway online ticketing service providers to host rail products (hosting obligation)

- Could the Commission clarify the relationship between Article 5(1) and Article 5(4)?
- In particular, what is the independent legal effect of Article 5(4), given that indispensable railway online ticketing service providers are already required under Article 5(1) to host the rail products of railway undertakings with a significant market presence?
- In this context, could the Commission also clarify how the obligation to display all available rail services should be interpreted and implemented in practice?

Article 6 - Fair and non-discriminatory conditions

- Could the Commission clarify how the concepts of fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory contractual conditions should be interpreted in practice?
- Does the Commission intend to develop guidance or standard contractual principles regarding these conditions?

- Could the Commission clarify how liability is intended to be allocated between railway undertakings and online ticketing service providers where an online ticketing service provider combines tickets from several railway undertakings into a single journey?
- Does this allocation of liability also apply to purely domestic journeys, or only to cross-border journeys?

- Could the Commission clarify whether the proposal introduces new data-sharing requirements for railway undertakings, or whether it merely relies on the existing requirements under Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/1926 (ITS Delegated Regulation) and TSI Telematics?

Article 8 - Booking horizon

- Could the Commission clarify to what extent railway undertakings may continue to change ticket prices, introduce additional services or departures, or otherwise modify their

PUBLIC

offer after tickets have been made available no later than five months before departure?

- Could the Commission clarify on the need for a specific horizon?
- And elaborate om the choice of a five-month horizon?

Article 9 – National enforcement bodies

- Could the Commission clarify the specific powers that national enforcement bodies are expected to have with regard to disputes concerning commercial agreements between railway undertakings and online ticketing service providers?

Article 11 - Complaints

- Could the Commission clarify how the complaints procedure is intended to operate in cross-border cases involving more than one Member State?

Ministry of Urban and
Rural Affairs and Transport

PUBLIC

Questions on rail passenger rights regarding single tickets from Denmark

General question

- Does the proposal make it mandatory for all regional rail services to allow other railway undertakings, ticket vendors and tour operators to sell train tickets on their behalf?

Question on scope

We understand that regional services are also within the scope of the proposal to amend the rail passenger rights regulation.

In Denmark, we have exempted (sub)urban and regional rail passenger services in accordance with article 2(6)(a) of regulation 2021/782. As the proposal on single tickets does not amend article 2, our reading is, that the regional services can still be exempted from the regulation apart from the mandatory provisions listed in article 2(8) of regulation 2021/782.

We would therefore like for the Commission to confirm

i. that the regional services can still be exempted from e.g. article 19 (compensation), but still have to allow rerouting in accordance with article 18(3).
ii. that it is still only article 12(1) regarding through-tickets that will apply after 7 June 2028 for regional services, where the exemption provision has been fully utilized.

Questions on Article 12

- Can a minimum connection time be as low as 5 minutes? It is most likely not uncommon, that a long-distance train can be delayed 5 minutes and the implications can be great, if the journey for the single ticket is planned with a tight schedule and possibly with the last departures of each leg on the journey.

Questions on Article 19, paragraph 1

- What is the reason behind limiting the rules to trips below 12 hours? From Copenhagen to Paris the train ride is around 13 hours. It is most likely on these longer trips,

PUBLIC

that passengers need the right to continue of their journey.

- Is it correctly understood, that no matter the price of the ticket from one operator, that operator can be held liable to pay compensation for the whole single ticket journey?