UNITED NATIONS



Economic and Social Council

Distr.

GENERAL

TRANS/WP.24/2005/5 28 December 2004

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

<u>Joint ECMT/UNECE Working Party/Group on Intermodal Transport and Logistics</u>¹ (7 and 8 March 2005)

Working Party on Intermodal Transport and Logistics

(Forty-third session, 8 March 2005, agenda item 5 (d))

EUROPEAN AGREEMENT ON IMPORTANT INTERNATIONAL COMBINED TRANSPORT LINES AND RELATED INSTALLATIONS (AGTC)

Relevance of existing AGC and AGTC standards and parameters

Note by the secretariat

A. MANDATE AND BACKROUND

1. In accordance with the request of the Working Party, the secretariat has transmitted questionnaires to all Contracting Parties to the AGC² and AGTC Agreements with a view to soliciting their views on the relevance of the existing infrastructure and performance standards as contained in the AGTC Agreement.

_

¹ ECMT and UNECE have adopted cooperative arrangements in establishing the "Joint ECMT/UNECE Working Party/Group on Intermodal Transport and Logistics" consisting of separate ECMT and UNECE segments, the UNECE segment consisting of its Working Party on Intermodal Transport and Logistics (WP.24).

European Agreement on Main International Railway Lines (AGC).

- 2. The objectives of the AGC and AGTC Agreements prepared in 1985 and 1991 respectively (see list of Contracting Parties below) is to facilitate and develop international railway traffic in Europe and to make international intermodal transport in Europe more efficient and attractive to customers. Therefore, the two multilateral pan-European treaties establish a legal framework that lays down a coordinated plan for the development and construction of railway lines and combined transport infrastructures and services at the pan-European level based on internationally agreed standards and parameters.
- 3. The UNECE Working Party on Intermodal Transport and Logistics decided to evaluate the relevance and usefulness of the standards and parameters and its target values contained in the AGC and AGTC Agreements in the light of the above objectives and to keep them in line with future development of international railway and intermodal transport in Europe. The questionnaire prepared by the secretariat for this purpose also provides for the possibility to suggest other standards and/or parameters for possible inclusion into the AGC and/or AGTC Agreements.
- 4. The table below provides a summary of the questionnaire replies for consideration by the Working Party³.
- 5. The questionnaire also inquired about the purposes for which the data in the Yellow Book are used. Six respondents felt that the data and information in the Yellow Book are used for transport policy purposes, three felt that they are used for academic/research purposes and eight respondents felt that they are used for international comparisons, including the monitoring of progress in interoperability between neighbouring countries. One respondent mentioned that the Yellow Book is not used in his country.
- 6. Suggestions for improvements in the presentation of data in the Yellow Book included the provision of country maps showing transit corridors. One respondent suggested using international statistics from railway operators and infrastructure managers to avoid the present collection of data from national operators and infrastructure managers.
- 7. Another respondent referred to EU Directive 2001/14/CE that stipulates that infrastructure managers are obliged to develop provisions allowing for access to the European rail network. These will include also existing and planned technical infrastructure parameters that should be taken into account for the technical parameters enshrined in the AGTC Agreement. In this context, the Working Party may wish to discuss how to ensure coherence between the technical infrastructure parameters of the AGTC and the AGC Agreements, the Trans-European and the Pan-European transport networks, as well as the infrastructure standards of access to national rail networks (European Directive 2001/14/CE).

³ By 24 December 2004, the following countries have transmitted replies to the secretariat: Austria; Belgium; Bulgaria; Croatia; Czech Republic; Denmark; France; Hungary; Germany; Portugal; Romania; Switzerland; Ireland; Ukraine.

B. SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO THE UNECE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE RELEVANCE OF STANDARDS AND PARAMETERS IN THE AGC AND AGTC AGREEMENTS

8. Indications on the relevance of parameters/standards in the AGC and AGTC Agreements as contained in the table below (Yes/No) refer only to the views expressed by the respondents to the questionnaire as indicated in the last column of the table together with some explanations, if provided. Still relevant (i.e. "Yes") means that none of the respondents had indicated that the parameter/standard was irrelevant. Not relevant (i.e "No") means that the indicated respondent had felt that this parameter was no longer relevant and/or should be modified. "Yes/No" means that no unambiguous position had been expressed by the respondents.

Yellow	AGC/AGTC ^{*/} Parameter/Standard			AGC/AGTC Target Value				
Book	Description		Still relevant? Yes/No	Target Value	Still relevant?			
(Reference column)					Yes/No	Other target value (Please propose more appropriate value, if any)		
Railway lines: Infrastructure Parameters								
(Annex II – AGC; Annex III -AGTC)								
3		mber of tracks	Yes	Not specified	Yes	Minimum 2 (Denmark)		
4	Loading gauge of vehicles d'		Yes	(UIC B)	No	UIC C; UIC G2 (Germany) UIC C1 (Ukraine)		
5	Minimum distance between track centres ^{e/}		Yes	4.0 m	No	% (Denmark) 4.2 m (Ukraine)		
6	Nominal minimum speed		Yes No	AGTC ^{f/} (100km/h) (120km/h) AGC ^{g/} (160km/h)	No	Problems with mountainous sections (Bulgaria) Need definition/better method (Denmark) Maximum speed (Germany)		
7		Locomotives ^{h/}	Yes	22.5 t	Yes			
8	Authorized	Rail cars and rail motor sets h/	No	17 t	No	22.5 t (Germany) (Hungary)		
9	iori	Carriages h/	No	16 t	No	22.5 t (Germany; Hungary)		
10	Aut	Wagons i/	No	20 t 18 t	No	22.5 t (Germany)		
11	Authorized mass per linear meter ^{j/}		Yes	8 t	Yes			
12	Maximum gradient ^{k/}		No	AGTC (not specified) AGC (35 mm/m)	Yes No	(Hungary)		

^{*/} For footnotes: see end of table.

Yellow Book	AGC/AGT Parameter/Sta	AGC/AGTC Target Value					
		Still relevant?		Still relevant?			
(Reference column)	Description	Yes/No	Target Value	Yes/No	Other target value (Please propose more appropriate value, if any)		
	s: Infrastructure param AGC; Annex III - AGTO						
13	Minimum platform length in principal stations	Yes No	400 m	Yes	300-320 m. What is meant by "principal"? (Denmark)		
14	Siding length	Yes	min. 750 m	No	> 750 m (Belgium) < 1000 m (Belgium)		
15	Capacity bottlenecks 1/	No	seldom	No	Waiting probability (Germany, Hungary) never (Ukraine)		
16	Level crossings	No		No	(Denmark; Hungary)		
	Other proposed infrastructure parameter, if any	Please specify:					
	Other proposed infrastructure parameter, if any						
Performance (Annex IV-	Parameters of Combin	ed Transport Tra	nins				
`		Vac	M:: 750 ::	Van	1000 m (Palaium)		
19	Maximum authorized length of train	Yes	Min. 750 m	Yes	1000 m (Belgium)		
20	Maximum authorized weight of train	Yes	Min. 1,500 t	Yes			
21	Maximum Authorized axle load of wagon	Yes	Min. 20t ^{m/}	No	22.5 t (Germany)		
22	Operating speed	No	Min 120 km/h	No	(Germany, Hungary)		
23	Priority rating	No	high ^{n/}	No	(Germany)		
24	Direct (block) trains or wagon groups	No	often ^{o/}	No	(Denmark, Germany)		
	Other proposed performance parameter, if any		lease specify: Container block trains (Bulgaria) alue proposed: Never; seldom; occasionally; often; always				
Standards fo	or Combined Transport	Terminals					
26	Average time for formation of trains ^{q/}	Yes	Max. 60 min.	Yes No	Definition needed (Denmark)		
27	Average waiting time for lorries ^{r/}	Yes	Max. 20 min.	Yes No	Definition needed (Denmark)		
28	Accessibility by roads/	Yes	good	Yes			
29	Accessibility by rail §/	Yes	good	Yes			
30	Capacity bottlenecks ^{t/}	No	seldom	Yes No	(Hungary)		
	Other proposed standard for combined transport terminals, if any	Please specify: Value proposed:	Length of tracks (Belgium)				

^{*/} For footnotes: see end of table.

Yellow	AGC/AG Parameter/St	AGC/AGTC Target Value							
Book		Still relevant? Yes/No	Target Value	Still relevant?					
(Reference column)	Description			Yes/No	Other target value (Please propose more appropriate value, if any)				
Standards fo	r Border Crossing Poin	ts							
32	Average length of stop ^{u/}	Yes	Max. 30 minutes	No	0 minutes (Belgium) 4 hours (Ukraine)				
33	Joint border station	No	yes	No	(Hungary)				
34	Problems encountered ^{1/}	No		No	(Germany, Hungary)				
Standards fo	Standards for Axle Gauge Interchange Stations								
36	Duration of interchange	No	As short as possible	No	(Hungary)				
37	Problems encountered ^{t/}	No		No	(Germany, Hungary)				
Standards fo	Standards for Ferry links /Ports								
39	Average duration of ro-ro operation v/	Yes	No value specified	Yes No	Definition needed (Denmark)				
40	Ferry/rail timetable co-ordinated	Yes	Yes	Yes					
41	Problems encountered ^{1/}	No		No	(Germany, Hungary)				
	Other proposed standard for ferry links/ports, if any	Please specify: Value proposed:	Extreme weather conditions (Hungary) Same as in footnote !						

^{*/} For footnotes: see end of table.

Explanation of footnotes

 $(as\ contained\ in\ the\ Yellow\ Book:\ Inventory\ of\ existing\ AGC\ and\ AGTC\ standards\ and\ parameters\ (1997))$

- d/ Target values as contained in the AGTC given in the table refer to existing lines only. For new lines, the AGTC stipulates loading gauge C1. In filling in the tables the actual values have been inserted indicating the value of the most restrictive parameters.
- e/ 4.0 m for existing lines; 4.2 m for new lines.
- f/ 120 km/h is the AGTC target value for existing and new lines.
- g/ 160 km/h is the AGC minimum value for existing lines. For new lines, minimum speeds are 300 km/h (for passenger traffic only) or 250 km/h (for passenger and goods traffic).
- \underline{h} / Specified only in AGC.
- i Target values for existing and new lines:

For wagons \leq 100 km/h: 22.5 t; for wagons \leq 120 km/h: 20 t.

For wagons \leq 140 km/h: AGC sets a maximum of 18 t.

j/ Specified only in AGC.

- $\underline{\mathbf{k}}$ As a recommendation for new lines only in the AGTC. AGC establishes 35 mm/m for new lines dedicated exclusively to passenger traffic.
- 1/ "never", "seldom", "occasionally", "often" or "always".
- m/ 22.5 t at 100km/h (target value).
- $\underline{\mathbf{n}}$ / Trains of combined transport shall be rated as those with highest priority (AGTC, annex IV, para.7).
- o/ Use of direct trains or transport by wagon groups (AGTC, annex IV, para.13).
- p/ Terminal(s), border crossing point(s), axle gauge interchange station(s) or ferry links/ports as contained in the AGTC, annex II.
- Time from the latest time of acceptance of goods to the departure of trains, and from the arrival of trains to the availability of wagons ready for the unloading of loading units (containers, swap-bodies, etc.).
- \underline{r} / Waiting periods for road vehicles delivering or collecting loading units shall be as short as possible.
- s/ "good", "satisfactory", or "not satisfactory".
- t/ Description of bottlenecks or problems (AGTC, annex IV, para. 10-12, 14-17).
- <u>u</u>/ The AGTC Agreement foresees no stop at borders, if possible (AGTC, annex IV, para.14). No stop required: "o"
- \underline{v} Quick loading and unloading of ferry boats and storage of loading units/wagons (if possible not more than one hour).

C. CONTRACTING PARTIES

European Agreement on Main International Railway Lines (AGC)

Austria Luxembourg Belarus Poland

Belgium Republic of Moldova

Bosnia and Herzegovina Romania

Bulgaria Russian Federation
Croatia Serbia and Montenegro

Czech Republic Slovakia France Slovenia

Germany The former Yugoslav Republic of

Greece Macedonia
Hungary Turkey
Italy Ukraine

Lithuania

European Agreement on Important International Combined Transport Lines and Related Installations (AGTC)

Kazakhstan
Austria Luxembourg
Belarus Netherlands
Belgium Norway
Bulgaria Poland
Croatia Portugal

Czech Republic Republic of Moldova

Denmark Romania

France Russian Federation

Georgia Slovakia
Germany Slovenia
Greece Switzerland
Hungary Turkey

Italy