



Economic Commission for Europe**Inland Transport Committee****Working Party on Intermodal Transport and Logistics****Sixty-seventh session**

Geneva, 16–18 October 2024

Item 5 (b) of the provisional agenda

Policies and measures in support of intermodal transport:**National policy measures to promote intermodal transport****Responses to survey on the promotion of intermodal transport****Note by the secretariat****I. Introduction**

1. At its sixty-sixth session, the Working Party on Intermodal Transport and Logistics (WP.24) agreed on a new survey in MS Forms for reporting on the national policy measures to promote intermodal transport. WP.24 requested all countries to complete it in the first half of 2024 and the secretariat to issue an official document with the results of the survey.
2. This document contains the responses received to the survey.
3. WP.24 is invited to consider the responses received and, given that they identified measures which more attention should be given to, WP.24 may decide on appropriate ways forward.
4. WP.24 may also wish to request the secretariat to update information on national policy measures for promotion of intermodal transport in <http://apps.unece.org/NatPolWP24/>.

II. Responses

5. The secretariat circulated the survey in MS Forms. In line with the WP.24 decision, it was circulated by electronic message to countries with active WP.24 focal points and by official letter to other Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) countries. The electronic message was sent out on 29 January 2024 to WP.24 focal points, while the official letters were circulated on 29 February 2024 to Deputy Ministers for Transport.
6. By 6 August 2024 the following nine countries responded to the survey: Armenia, Austria, Greece, the Netherlands (Kingdom of), Norway, Poland, Portugal, Türkiye and Uzbekistan.

7. The following responses were received:

To Q.1 and Q.2

- On central importance of intermodal freight transport in the national policy:

All reporting countries give essential importance to intermodal freight transport in the national policy.
- Explanation

The importance is given for different reasons, e.g.:

 - To solve present and future problems caused by freight transport by road.
 - To increase the potential for transit/provide fast/reliable and sustainable transport links between Europe and Asia.
 - To be able to shift easily between modes.
 - To shift to more environment-friendly modes while allowing for same pricing level.

To Q.3 and Q4

- On intermodal freight transport as a transport solution in achieving high-level objectives such as decreasing environmental and climate pressures from transport

All reporting countries except for one consider intermodal freight transport as a transport solution for achieving high-level objectives.
- Explanation
 - Intermodal freight transport is essential to gain further market share for rail freight transport and hence by shifting to rail make freight transport more sustainable by decreasing its environmental/climate footprint.
 - Rail infrastructure needs to be electrified before intermodal freight transport can help address the environmental and climate pressures. Otherwise, it is seen in some countries as reliable and inexpensive way of carriage of freight.

To Q.5 and Q.6

- On policy coordination between relevant national competent authorities

All reporting countries confirmed to coordinate nationally on policies.
- Explanation
 - Coordination through national policy working groups.
 - Coordination required by national law in some cases.

To Q.7 and Q.8

- On policy coordination at international level

One third of countries informed that they do not coordinate the policies internationally versus the remaining two thirds informed of doing so.
- Explanation
 - Done within groups in the context of specific conventions/agreements.
 - Ongoing work in different transport and environment expert groups of the European Commission, or the TEN-T work or EU-AFI Regulation.

To Q.9 through Q.14

- On regulations and mechanisms to internalise external costs from road transport

All reporting countries except for one reported to have established regulations/mechanism to internalise external costs.

- Explanation
 - Air and noise pollution fees for road transport and traffic-based CO2 emission fees in accordance with European Union Directives 1999/62/EC and 2022/362/EC.
 - Application of other user pays principles linked to vehicle's wear and tear of road infrastructure.
- On importance of internalization of external costs as a solution for establishing a fair competition between modes

Majority of reporting countries attach importance to internalization of external costs as a solution for establishing a fair competition between modes.
- Explanation
 - The prerequisite for fair competition is the elimination of distortions, and the implementation and guarantee of true costs, especially that rail track access charging is a reality.
- On interest in exchanging good practices on internalisation of external costs and results achieved

All reporting countries are interested to exchange good practices on solutions for internalisation of external costs.
- On the role of WP.24 in assisting exchanges on internalisation of external costs.

All reporting countries expressed interest in WP.24 assisting the exchange of the good practice.

To Q.15 through Q.18

- On progress in establishing cheaper and more efficient interfaces between modes of transport

Six countries reported progress noted in establishing cheaper and more efficient interfaces between modes of transport, three countries have not noted such progress and one provided no answer.
- On examples of policy solutions for efficient interfaces
 - Support programmes for terminals and railway sidings.
 - Digitalization and automation.
- On interest in exchanging good practices on efficient interfaces

Eight countries are interested in exchanging good practice on efficient interfaces.
- On the role of WP.24 in assisting exchanges on efficient interfaces

The same countries are interested in WP.24 assisting these exchanges.

To Q.19 through Q.22

- On integrated solutions for terminal planning at different levels of planning

Seven countries reported having established integrated solutions for terminal planning while two reported that they did not establish such solutions.
- Explanation
 - Terminal concept for analysing development possibilities.
 - Terminal funding and support programmes.
 - Regulations in place.
 - Master plans in place.

- On interest in exchanging information on integrated solutions for terminal planning
All reporting countries are interested to exchange information on integrated solutions for terminal planning.

- On the role of WP.24 in assisting exchanges on integrated solutions

All reporting countries expressed interest in WP.24 assisting these exchanges.

To Q.23 through Q.25

- On improving (i) terminal access to all interested transport actors and (ii) terminal operations and facilities

Seven countries reported having taken measures to improve terminal access and terminal operations and facilities while two countries reported having not taken such measures.

- Explanation

- Updated information on freight terminals on government's website.
- Investment projects to improve access.
- Non-discriminatory regulations on access.

- On impact of these measures

- Access to up-to-date information about the terminals supports the use of terminals.
- All rail operators use terminals.
- Elimination of infrastructure bottlenecks, improved service quality.

To Q.26 through Q.29

- On a standard for ensuring compatibility of railways and signalling systems

All countries reported that they work on ensuring compatibility of railways and signalling systems.

- Explanation

- Ongoing implementation of European Rail Traffic Management System (ERTMS) according to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2023/1695.
- Preparation of by-law for application of technical specification for interoperability (TSI) and technical uniform prescriptions (UTP).

- On introducing a common standard(s)/parameter(s) for railway information and signalling systems in the AGTC/AGC

Three countries reported seeing an advantage from introducing this common standard to the AGTC/AGC while five countries do not see any advantage from doing so. One country has not shared its view.

- Explanation

- TSI and UTP are already in place.
- TSI and UTP only cover respectively EU/EU collaborating countries and relevant COTIF Contracting Parties.

To Q.30 through Q.33

- On any specific other standards or measures for interoperability

Seven countries reported working out other standards/measures for interoperability. Two countries did not respond.

- Explanation
 - Regulations on vehicle dimensions and weight/increased limits for vehicles used in intermodal transport.
 - Implementation of the “Single European Rail Area” (SERA)/Directive 2016/797 on rail interoperability.
- On their inclusion in the AGTC or other UN infrastructure agreements

Four countries reported no need to include such standards in the AGTC, three reported to be in favour, two countries provided no opinion.
- Explanation
 - EU countries/EU collaborating countries follow the established EU standards.
 - The existing standards do not cover the whole ECE region.

To Q.34 through Q.39

- On introducing financial support measures for intermodal transport-related investment

Five countries reported introducing such measures, three did not, one country provided no answer.
- Explanation
 - Financial support to investments in installations, systems and mobile equipment necessary for the transport or handling of goods in combined transport.
 - Financial support for investments in terminals, regarding construction, enlargement and modernization of transshipment points.
 - Support to investments in railway sidings.
- On introducing financial support measures for intermodal transport-related operations

Six countries reported introducing such measures, two did not, one country provided no answer.
- Explanation
 - Compensation of transport costs.
 - Benefits for combined transport in motor vehicle tax/discount on certification/licence fees.
 - Environmental support scheme applicable for rail freight operators.
- On interest in exchanging information on financial support/fiscal measures for intermodal transport

Seven countries would like to exchange information on fiscal measures in support for intermodal transport, one country reported no interest to do so. One other country provided no view to this end.
- On the role of WP.24 in assisting exchanges on financial support/fiscal measures for intermodal transport

Countries interested in exchange of information would like WP.24 to support it.

To Q.40 through Q.41

- On any exemptions from restriction and traffic bans applied to international road haulage in favour of intermodal/combined transport

Five countries reported having implemented no exemptions, four countries reported having done so.

- Explanation
 - Exemption from weekend and holiday driving ban for lorries.
 - Exemption from night driving ban for lorries not meeting noise emissions standards if used in combined transport.

To Q.42 through Q.43

- On liberalization of initial and terminal hauls

Seven countries reported having liberalized initial and terminal hauls, one country report not having done so. One country did not respond.
- Explanation
 - Initial and final road leg is liberalized for motor vehicles registered within the European Union or the European Economic Area and holding a Community licence.
 - Permits not required for some specific road corridors for initial and final hauls of rolling road connections to certain terminals.

To Q.44 through Q.45

- On higher weight limits for road vehicles transporting ITUs

Five countries reported having introduced higher limits and four reported not having done so.
- Explanation
 - Higher permitted mass for vehicles in combined transport versus road transport in general

To Q.46 through Q.47

- On facilitating controls for intermodal transport

All but one country reported facilitating controls for intermodal transport.
- Explanation
 - Single platform for declarations/documents checks.
 - Implementation of customs corridors/roads.
 - Customs operations completed at terminals, no stopping of trains at the border.

To Q.48 through Q.49

- On a system to ensure strict compliance with road haulage regulations

All reporting countries responded to have put in place a strict compliance system for road haulage.
- Explanation
 - Regulations for weigh infringement and sanctions.
 - National control strategies in place.
 - Control activities for driving and resting times of drivers.
 - Digital tachograph.

To Q.50 through Q.51

- On interest in exchanging information on regulatory and support measures as covered in Q.40 through Q.49

All reporting countries reported to be interested in exchanging information on regulatory and support measures in support of intermodal transport.

- On the role of WP.24 in assisting exchanges on regulatory and support measures
All reporting countries expressed interest in WP.24 assisting these exchanges.

To Q.52 through Q.54

- On liberalization of access to rail freight networks
All reporting countries confirmed to have liberalized access to rail freight networks.
- On plans to liberalize access to rail freight transport in the future
No answers, given that all countries reported to have already liberalized access.
- Explanation
 - Separation of railway infrastructure and railway carriage services.
 - Subsidies to railway carriage service to state-owned railway undertaking reduces the competitiveness in the sector.

To Q.55 through Q.57

- On liberalization of access to inland water transport
Seven countries reported to have liberalized access to inland water transport. Two countries did not respond.
- On plans to liberalize access to inland water transport in the future
No answers
- Explanation
 - Liberalization of access done according to the EU “acquis communautaire” and the Belgrade Convention.
 - Public service subject to regulated competition through public tenders for concessions.

To Q.58 through Q.59

- On interest in exchanging information on liberalization of access to transport services
Six countries expressed interest for exchanging information on liberalization of access to transport services. One country reported no interest, and two countries did not respond.
 - On the role of WP.24 in assisting exchanges on liberalization of access to transport services

Those countries which expressed interest for exchanging information would also like WP.24 to assist these exchanges.

To Q.60 through Q.63

- On encouraging innovation advancing intermodal/combined transport
All but one reporting country informed that they encourage innovation for advancing intermodal transport.
- Explanation
 - Support to interdisciplinary research aimed at developing both technological and socio-organisational innovations.
 - Mobilisation of business, academia and policy makers for collaboration on transformative innovation policies.
 - Participation in EU RAIL Joint Undertaking Research and Innovation Programme and Flagship project TRANS4M-R (Transforming Europe's Rail Freight).

- On interest in exchanging information on fostering innovation
All countries expressed interest in exchanging information on fostering innovation.
- On the role of WP.24 in assisting exchanges on fostering innovation
All reporting countries expressed interest in WP.24 assisting these exchanges.

To Q.64 through Q.65

- On promotion of cooperation and partnership agreements
All reporting countries but one informed that they promote cooperation and partnership agreements.
- Explanation
 - Participation in multilateral platforms on combined transport through conclusion of agreements.
 - Active involvement in the establishment and implementation of rail freight corridors.
 - Collaboration on the implementation of the TEN-T Core Network Corridor.

To Q.66 through Q.67

- On promotion of use of intermodal transport for the transport of dangerous goods
Five countries informed that they do not promote use of intermodal transport for carriage of dangerous goods, three countries reported to do so, and one country provided no answer.
- Explanation
 - Rail/road operators can carry dangerous goods in intermodal transport provided they comply with regulations in force for the transport of dangerous goods.

To Q.68 through Q.69

- On promotion of use of international pools of wagons
Five countries reported that they do not promote use of international pools of wagons, four countries informed that they do so.
- Explanation (limited explanation provided)
 - Purchase or lease of wagons is open to the European market.

To Q.70 through Q.71

- On promotion of operation of rail block trains between terminals
Six countries reported that they promote operation of rail block trains between terminals, three informed of not doing so.
- Explanation
 - Support provided to combined transport operations to secure high-quality offer of rail freight transport, no additional support for block trains.
 - Block trains between terminals are the norm.
 - Intermodal relief in the rate of access to railway infrastructure for intermodal trains.

To Q.72

- On promotion of use of effective and compatible EDI systems (e.g. for tracking and tracing)

Five countries reported that they promote the use of compatible EDI systems, three countries informed that they do not do it. One country provided no response.

To Q.73 through Q.74

- On interest in exchanging information on issues covered in Q.64 through Q.72

All reporting countries expressed interests in exchanging information on cooperation and partnership agreements, use of intermodal transport for carriage of dangerous goods, use of international pools of wagons, operations of block trains and use of EDI systems.

- On the role of WP.24 in assisting exchanges on those issues

All reporting countries expressed interest in WP.24 assisting these exchanges.
