

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

COM(77) 676 final.

Brussels, 15 December 1977.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL

Report on the application of the Council directive of 17th February 1975 concerning the establishment of common rules for certain combined rail/road carriage of goods between Member States.

COM(77) 676 final.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL

Report on the application of the Council directive of 17th February 1975 concerning the establishment of common rules for certain combined rail/road carriage of goods between Member States.

(OJ of the EC no L 48 of 22.2.1975, pages 31/32)

1. Article 7, 1st sub-paragraph of the above mentioned directive lays down that the Commission should make a report on the application of the measure and submit any relevant proposals to it to the Council before 31st December 1977.

The objective of the attached report is to meet these terms of reference. Consequently, in the first instance, it provides information on the application of this directive during the period 1st October 1975 until 1st July 1977.

2. To this effect the services of the Commission have consulted the interested professional organisations in this transport,
 - the railways of the group of nine,
 - the two transport liaison committees for hire and reward and own account transport of the IRU (International Road Transport Union) attached to the Communities,
 - the "Union Internationale des Transports combinés rail/route" (UIRR),
 - the "UNICE" (Union des Industries de la Communauté Européenne).

The report reflects the different points of view of the aforementioned organisations and indicates some problems of a rather technical nature which have been brought to the knowledge of the Commission by economically interested parties.

3. The Commission is of the opinion that the initial effect of the Directive must be considered as a positive element for the future evolution of this traffic.

Therefore, the Commission can already say that, in accordance with Article 7, sub-paragraph 2 of the directive, it will submit to the Council during 1978 a proposal with a view to maintaining on a permanent basis the experimental system already set up and will propose the introduction of the necessary measures taking into account the experience gained.

4. The Commission, however, considers that the development of combined rail/road transport requires, at the Community level, a global policy which passes the limited goal of the directive, involving the solution of problems in areas other than that of access to the market, some of which are already outlined in the present report.

5. The Commission also envisages submitting in connection with this, during 1978, some proposals favouring the development of combined transport at community level.

REPORT

on the application of the
Council Directive No 75/130/EEC
concerning the establishment of common rules for
certain types of combined rail/road carriage of goods
between Member States

(O.J. of the European Communities, No. L 48 of 22 February 1975 pp. 31/32)

(Communication from the Commission to the Council)

<u>SUMMARY</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. ENFORCEMENT OF THE DIRECTIVE	2
2.1. Application measures taken by the Member States	2
2.2. Importance, development and distribution of the traffic	2
2.2.1. General considerations	2
2.2.2. Development of the traffic - Analysis of the figures	3
2.2.3. Contribution of the various commercial combined transport companies to this traffic	4
2.2.4. Distribution of traffic by transport link	5
2.2.5. Number of wagons assigned to combined carriage	5
2.2.6. Distribution by nature of combined carriage	5
2.3. Installations (transshipment terminals)	6
3. INFLUENCE OF LIBERALIZATION MEASURES	6
4. CONTINUATION OF THE ACTION AT NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY LEVELS	7
4.1. General considerations on the desirability of stimulating the development of combined rail/road carriage	7
4.2. Problems to be resolved	8
4.2.1. Authorization system for tug-units employed in terminal runs	8
4.2.2. Tariffs and rate fixing	9
4.2.3. Determination of "appropriate nearest station"	9
4.2.4. Infrastructure	10
4.2.5. Rolling stock	10
4.2.6. Commercial organisation	11
5. CONCLUSIONS	12
6. ANNEX	
<u>Annex I</u> : Points of view expressed by the carriers and the users interested in combined carriage	
<u>Annex II</u> : Statistics (table 1 to 4)	

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. In its directive of 17 February 1975 the Council laid down common rules for certain types of combined rail/road carriage of goods between Member States for a limited period until 31 December 1978. These rules provided especially for the freeing of this type of carriage from any quantitative restriction (quota) and the removal of various administrative constraints (authorizations) at the latest by 1 October 1975.

Article 7, 1st sub-para. of the Directive lays down that the Commission shall report on the application of the directive and submit proposals relating to it to the Council before 31 December 1977.

In accordance with sub-para. 2 of Article 7, which limits the validity of the directive to 31 December 1978, the Council, upon the Commission's proposal, should give a ruling before this date, on the system to be applied subsequently.

1.2. The objective of this report is to meet the terms of reference given to the Commission in the 1st sub-para. of Article 7 of the directive. Consequently, in the first instance, it provides information on the application of this directive during the period from 1 October 1975 until 1 July 1977.

2. ENFORCEMENT OF THE DIRECTIVE

2.1. Application measures taken by the Member States

2.1.1. In accordance with the provisions of Article 5 of the directive of 17 February 1975 the Member States were obliged to take the necessary measures for the implementation of this directive and to send details of them to the Commission, before 30 June 1975. On 10 February 1976, the latter sent them to all the Member States for information.

To sum up the position, it can be stated that all the Member States tried to meet the common fixed compulsory objectives by appropriate and effective measures. The existence of certain problems, as set out below in Chapter 4, does not affect this general positive impression.

2.2. Importance, development and distribution of the traffic

2.2.1. General considerations

Within the framework of this directive, the current experience analyzed in this report covers a period of less than two years up till now. In addition, during the period under consideration, international trade - which since 1950 and

until the beginning of the 1970's had been developing in a continuous fashion at an average rate of nearly 7% p.a. - obviously suffered from the effects of the economic recession and the development of transport carried out by combined techniques was temporarily checked.

Consequently, the data concerning the development of combined rail/road traffic should be considered in the light of this situation.

2.2.2. Development of the traffic - analysis of the figures

On the basis of the statistics provided by the various combined transport companies, the attached table (Annex II, Table 1) gives an outline of the development of rail/road traffic carried out by semi-trailers (including vehicle combinations) as well as swop bodies.

Despite taking precautions some double counting has not been entirely eliminated. With this reservation one can note that the overall gross traffic (national and international) has developed as follows :

in 1000 tonnes

	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976(1)
Gross Tonnes	2981	3668	4452	4664	4301	5332
Indices	100	123	149	156	144	179

The share of international traffic in these figures was about 1 million tonnes in 1976, i.e. ± 19% of the total traffic.

When examining these figures one can see that after the decline in 1975 in relation to 1974 the overall traffic for 1976 showed a marked increase.

In order to put the combined rail/road carriage in relation to total freight traffic into perspective, it would be wrong to compare the two overall figures. In fact, in so doing, one would come to the false conclusion that combined carriage traffic still plays a rather unimportant rôle (2).

(1) 1977 figures not yet available at the time of compiling this report

(2) Example : in 1975, 0.5% of the overall rail freight traffic of the Community

This method does not give an exact idea of the situation because it does not compare like with like. Indeed, in this case, no account is taken of the fact that combined rail/road carriage can only be carried out in a rational and profitable way over relatively large distances, over transport links which are fixed in relation to the volume carried and for certain categories of goods. An attempt to draw a comparison on this basis, even though difficult in the absence of objective criteria, does confirm the fact that in certain sub-markets combined carriage already at present occupies a non-negligible share and this is increasing.

But this technique will always face certain limits to its development resulting mainly from the fact that it requires the carriage of very important deadweight (lorry or semi-trailer). Only the swop-bodies, which resemble a container, avoid this inconvenience.

Nevertheless, international traffic carried out by the combined transport companies inside the Community seems to be developing strongly (+ 22% during the first half of 1977).

2.2.3. Contribution of the various commercial combined transport companies to this traffic

Combined carriage, which links rail and road transport, and which is called "ferroustage" (road/rail), is carried out through commercial companies with subsidiaries in several European countries.

- In Germany the KOMBIVERKEHR Company was responsible for 20% of the international traffic in 1975,
- In Belgium, the T.R.W. Company was responsible for 9% of this traffic,
- in France the NOVATRANS Company was responsible for 40% of this traffic,
- In Italy the FERPAC Company was responsible for 2% of this traffic,
- In the Netherlands the TRAILSTAR Company was responsible for 10% of this traffic,
- In Switzerland the HUPAC Company was responsible for 15% of this traffic.

Since 1970 these six companies have been joined by a seventh, the A.S.G. Company (Sweden) in the "Union Internationale des Transports combinés rail/route" (U.I.R.R.).

In addition a joint rail/road committee has been set up, with the aim of co-ordinating efforts at an international level for the development of rail/road carriage. The Committee is made up of the member companies of the U.I.R.R. and the railways of Member States and of Switzerland and Austria.

2.2.4. Distribution of traffic by transport link

Table 2 (Annex II) shows the main international transport links concerned in this traffic. Of the 76 links 29 concern Italy and, outside the Community, one can especially note the connections with Spain and with Switzerland.

2.2.5. Number of wagons assigned to combined carriage

Table 3 (Annex II) shows the number of wagons assigned to combined carriage at the end of 1976, by major categories. Of a total of 2,300 wagons 25% are assigned to international traffic. Nearly 1,100 wagons belong to the German railways and in France nearly 800 wagons belong to the management companies of private wagons.

2.2.6. Distribution by nature of combined carriage

The commercial combined carriage companies use different "ferroutage" techniques. One can make out two main categories :

- techniques where the wagon is adapted to the road vehicle (dropped-axle wagons or wagons with guide rails)
- techniques where the road vehicle is planned for adaptation to the rail wagon (special semi-trailer or swop-body).

It has not been possible to give a distribution of traffic by technique employed. One can only point out that in France, the NOVATRANS Company for the most part uses the kind of dropped axle wagon known as "Kangeroo" while in Germany the kind of dropped axle wagon of the "Aachen" type and swop-bodies of the "Flexi-Van" type tend to be used. These latter types are currently being employed more and more often in all the countries. In this area, as well, statist should be improved in order to obtain better information on the development of the various techniques.

In any case the Community should encourage the development of methods which allow simple and rapid transshipment with the minimum use of specialised rail vehicles even more of specialised road vehicles in order to limit the necessary investments to the strict minimum.

2.3. Installations (transshipment terminals)

Table 4 (Annex II) gives a list of the main transshipment terminals (rail/road interchange) for combined carriage, i.e. about 60 such terminals of which half are in France and 16 in Germany. The creation of new terminals is being studied in Spain (Valencia and Barcelona), in Italy (Venice), in France (Morlaix and Noisy), in the Netherlands (Grubbenvorst, Veendam, Flushing, Amsterdam) and in Belgium (Courtrai).

3. INFLUENCE OF LIBERALIZATION MEASURES

3.1. In order to provide information on the development of combined rail/road traffic and especially on the obstacles which might hinder its expansion, this report sets out, in Annex I, in a succinct manner, the opinions expressed by the representatives of the railways, own account and hire and reward road hauliers, users and the commercial combined carriage companies.

These opinions reveal that there are still some anxieties of a commercial and of a psychological nature which might check the development of combined traffic but, in the Commission's view, these could be overcome in the light of the objective advantages which can follow for all those concerned in this new technique.

Indeed, combined carriage uses rail for long distance journeys and is therefore capable of improving the conditions of rational operation. In particular block trains on well selected transport links constitute a form of traffic which is specifically adapted to the modern and profitable operation of the railways.

On the other hand, carriage by rail over long distances allows road hauliers to reduce operating costs, especially in the area of labour which constitutes one of the most important elements of production costs, and to offer the customers a punctual service which is not influenced by traffic or weather conditions.

Consequently, the Commission is convinced, as has been proven by the effects in initiatives already adopted and which have been put in concrete form by the setting up of a joint rail/road Committee, that the initial difficulties can be overcome in the framework of increased co-operation between the two transport modes and by the adoption of adequate measures aimed at better guaranteeing their respective interests.

The summary of observations in Annex I already allow certain factors which are capable of playing a role in the political activities concerning this sector in the future to be brought out.

Finally, the Commission considers that the pilot-effect of the directive should be considered as a positive element, for the period in the immediate past and above all for the future development of this traffic. This directive should be made permanent as it aims at rail and road transport complementing one another and falls into line with those actions which take account of the general interest and especially of the obligations of energy policy and regional development. In addition its extension to international carriage with third countries could be considered. The Commission even believes that it would be appropriate to study in greater depth the question of long distance national carriage with the aim that it should benefit from an analogous system.

4. CONTINUATION OF THE ACTION AT NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY LEVELS

4.1. General considerations on the desirability of stimulating the development of combined rail/road carriage

At first sight, the "ferroutage" technique allows all interested parties to benefit

- the railways: it allows them to bring in new traffic to be carried over long distances;
- road hauliers: it brings advantages of safety, regularity and speed of carriage over long distances;
- users: it brings together the advantages of door-to-door and rail carriage;
- the community: finally it brings a reduction in road traffic and, consequently, an increase in safety while at the same time making a contribution towards protection of the environment.

This "ferroutage" technique implies close co-operation between the various transport modes both at investment level and at management level. The narrow nature of the European land area tends to oblige most of this traffic to cross at least one frontier. Therefore it is necessary to encourage close co-operation, on the one hand between the various railway undertakings of the Community and on the other of the various road haulage undertakings both for hire and reward and own account, including also transport agents.

The development of this technique therefore requires a dynamic investment policy at Community level, while at the same time avoiding the simultaneous development of too many transport systems, and co-operation at management level by common actions in developing, stimulating and commercialising this kind of carriage.

The public authorities who, generally speaking, are in favour of the development of combined transport in which they can see the benefits of economy of energy and the reduction of traffic on the main roads, could encourage this development by certain positive measures as long as they avoid the creation of distortions in the conditions of competition with classical transport modes.

4.2. Problems to be resolved

On the basis of information at the Commission's disposal, the normal operation of the directive still comes up against the following difficulties in particular :

4.2.1. Authorization system for tug-units employed in terminal runs

Under the terms of Article 2 of the directive, combined carriage which comes under the criteria set out in the first article is freed from any quota or authorization system. However, Article 6 provides that national regulations concerning the conditions of admission to the profession and of access to the transport market shall not be altered. Thereby, vehicles used in combined carriage should, as in the past, be covered by national authorizations and come under national quotas insofar as such instruments are found in the national regulations of the various Member States.

In the light of information received by the Commission, it seems that this situation could raise problems which must be elaborated from the point of view of the subsequent system; the following two questions are concerned :

- the requirement that a tug unit belonging to a foreign company, stationed in a Member State for the purpose of effecting the terminal runs of its own semi-trailers, trailers or swop-bodies, should satisfy the national provisions of that Member State insofar as quotas and authorizations are concerned;
- the fact that the terminal runs of semi-trailers, trailers or swop-bodies used in own-account carriage are considered as if they were for hire and reward subject to authorization when the tug-units do not fulfil the conditions provided for own-account carriage.

In order that everything is done to stimulate combined rail/road transport, the Commission considers that more suitable solutions must be looked for.

Whatever the circumstances the Commission is convinced of the fact that the development of combined carriage, boosted by all interested parties, risks being held back and possibly even blocked as long as some situations come under too bureaucratic a treatment.

4.2.2. Tariffs and rate fixing

The fixing of attractive rates is an important element which will decide the future of combined rail/road carriage. It is necessary to understand that the term "attractive" includes especially that the rates for carriage by rail should, on the one hand, prompt the road haulier to give up door-to-door carriage because of the greater costs involved and to choose combined carriage instead because of its less costly operation. On the other hand the rate should also be commercially acceptable to the railways.

This last condition means that the revenues from combined carriage should, in the long run, allow the railways to cover the complete cost of this traffic. The question as to whether this is already the situation or could, in any case, be the situation in the future, is a problem which deserves detailed study. Depending upon the results of this study, the question could be asked as to whether combined carriage by rail could be exempted from the requirement that it should be a commercial service, at least during a certain experimental period.

In the context of this report this question can only be raised and not studied in depth. Above all the reply will depend on the degree of importance to be attributed to combined rail/road carriage within the framework of a transport policy based on the public interest.

Apart from this question of transport rates the offer of a quality service, guaranteeing users both rapid and regular conveyance, is also a not unimportant factor capable of contributing towards the development of combined carriage.

4.2.3. Determination of "appropriate nearest station"

The Commission considers that it is necessary that the two criteria should be judged separately for each transport service. They should, incidentally, be put forward in a cumulative way, in the sense that the "nearest" station from the point of view of the distance is not appropriate when, as much from the technical as from the commercial angle, it is not considered for optimum operation of such carriage.

Consequently, the Commission believes that it would be appropriate to prove flexibility in implementing this concept or to improve the present text of the directive in order to take adequate account of the practical transport requirements.

4.2.4. Infrastructure

The development of combined transport also depends on the possibilities for creating and modernising the rail/road transshipment centres. These centres should be well chosen in such a way as to allow the establishment at Community level of a network of complete trains which, by the ease of circulation they offer and the lowering of costs which result cannot fail to encourage combined carriage.

The financial implications of the localisation of these transshipment centres can be very important. The multi-modal nature of these centres in fact requires that they should be surrounded by sufficient and fluid road routes.

In this sector, financial action by the States and by the Community could be necessary in the form of subsidies fixed at a rate based on a proportion of the corresponding infrastructure costs and on the necessary equipment for the road share of the technique.

Such actions should be planned together and carried out within the framework of an overall plan with an integrated view not only for "ferroutage" but also for the gantry cranes at the "trans-container" yards which could be common user on condition that payment is made for their use.

4.2.5. Rolling stock

Investments in rail rolling stock are usually made by the railways concerned. In France, nevertheless, it is the "Société d'Équipement des Grands Itinéraires" (SEGI) which buys the necessary special wagons. When this company was set up banks and builders of rolling stock provided capital and are therefore concerned in the development of combined transport.

The SEGI draws up its orders on the basis of the needs expressed by NOVATRANS and hires out all its vehicle stock to that company for a length of time equivalent to the usual use and amortisation period of the wagons.

In order to ensure the optimum adaptation of the vehicle stock to the needs at Community level one wonders whether it might not be worthwhile creating an international company on the lines of the SEGI company.

This company could progressively encourage greater uniformity of the too great diversity of "ferroutage" techniques which leads to poor profitability of the investments.

In fact the multiplicity of techniques both on the railways side with the different types of wagon and on the road side with the variety of semi-trailers or again the diversity of handling methods lead to a wastage of resources, especially at the international level.

In conclusion it would be desirable for the hauliers concerned to work together towards defining uniform equipment.

4.2.6. Commercial organisation

An investigation into the possibilities of improving the organisation of combined transport is mainly the responsibility of the undertakings themselves.

4.2.6.1. As far as railways are concerned the Commission has the impression, confirmed moreover by the experts, that an action based on more confidence and on a better understanding of the common interest will usefully contribute towards a development of this interesting traffic.

The Commission has no criticisms to offer on any particular points. However it has highlighted a point which is capable of being improved. It concerns its proposal aiming at mutual communication of the specific costs of carriage by complete trains in which some railway undertakings participate (1).

The idea behind this suggestion, i.e. greater co-operation between the railway undertakings, could be developed further than the aspect of costs alone.

4.2.6.2. As far as road hauliers and forwarding agents are concerned the creation of specialized companies for combined carriage has led to the solution of many organizational problems, and without doubt the most important ones. During consultation between the Commission's services and the relevant sectors the question was asked as to whether an appeal would be useful when the opportunity offers, to the services of the "Bureau de rapprochement des entreprises" (set up in the Commission) in order to find a solution to the present or future problems concerning combined carriage.

The Commission would merely put forward this idea. In cases where the governments also consider that this idea is worth taking into consideration there is nothing to stop this question being studied more deeply.

Nevertheless, in the Commission's view, problems of organization should be settled first of all by the undertakings themselves. This holds for the size of combined carriage undertakings, the breadth of their field of activity, their commercial activities as well as "last but not least" their competitive policy (including the fairly delicate question of their behaviour vis à vis the companies for the transport of containers which are subsidiaries of the railway companies).

(1) Article 6 of the proposed Council (EEC) regulation concerning the fixing of uniform principles for the calculation of the costs of railway undertakings (OJ N° C 155/10 of 2 July 1977)

4.2.6.3. On the same lines it is worth mentioning also that the share of own account transport in combined carriage does not seem to have been settled everywhere in a satisfactory way. Whatever the circumstances the own-account representatives complain of the fact that in some Member States their direct admission to combined carriage work is made difficult by exaggerated conditions in the sectors of fixing of rates and of organisation, especially by making them work through transport agents.

On the one hand one cannot criticise the railway undertakings for selling their combined carriage services at a greater cost to a single firm using combined carriage on own account than to major customers such as specialised combined carriage companies. These latter advance the argument that they are responsible primarily for looking after the interests of their members. But, on the other hand, it does not seem justified to require the services of a transport agent every time.

A solution could be found in fixing a rate which is economically justified and which does not allow any discrimination for own-account transport. In addition the greater the share of these latter in combined carriage the greater the need to call upon the specialised combined carriage companies, which will also provide them with economic advantages.

5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1. The list of problems above is no doubt non-exhaustive. The Commission can only highlight those situations of which it has been informed by the relevant economic sectors. It is not out of the question that the discussion of this report will reveal other features to be included or the need to make some corrections.

Nevertheless it is worthwhile again drawing attention to the fact that the Commission, in accordance with its terms of reference, has refrained from submitting concrete proposals on the combined transport.

5.2. The Commission, in accordance with sub-paragraph 2 of Article 7 of the directive, covered by this report, will submit a proposal during 1978 on the measures to be implemented in order to encourage the development of "ferroutage" which will replace the system set up under the present directive after 31 December 1978.

Points of view expressed by the carriers and the users
interested in combined carriage

1. Railways' point of view

The railway undertakings made the observation that the liberalisation of combined carriage has had a positive influence on the behaviour of some road transport undertakings which have adapted their investment plans to the possibilities of combined carriage.

On the other hand, they consider that the effect of this freedom could have been more favourable if the quotas for "pure" road transport, where they exist, had been stabilised or reduced. The railways state that there has been rather more a tendency towards increasing the quotas and that the greater freedom resulting from the directive has led to increased competition.

The railway undertakings are in favour of measures which would tend to develop combined carriage more, even if this were combined with a revenue which was inferior to that obtained from other traffic. But they demand, in return, that this traffic should be deducted from road haulage and not from railway traffic which is carried out by other more profitable rail techniques.

It is for this reason that they are in favour of an adjustment of the road transport quotas based on the activity recorded for combined carriage following its possible development. In this report the whole range of "pure road" transport activity and "combined transport" should be considered as road activities.

The railways do not, through these demands, wish to interfere in the commercial management of the road hauliers.

2. Point of view of the hire and reward road hauliers

The professional carriers of freight by road consider, on the other hand, that the directive is capable of distorting the conditions of competition between the combined carriage technique and that of the classical carriage of freight by road. This influence would be especially strengthened if the directive and its objectives were used as a pretext for refusing necessary alterations of the authorisation system for access to the market in the road goods transport market.

In addition the road hauliers fear that the railways could cancel the combined carriage services or discourage their development by altering the tariffs or by refusing to improve the organisation of the services. Such action could affect their independence.

Despite these reservations hire and reward road hauliers are in favour of an extension of the directive on condition, however, that no connection is established between the regulation and contract of combined carriage and that of road goods transport capacity, and that in this regard the promotion of combined carriage stays neutral.

3. Point of view of own-account road hauliers and users

The point of view of the own-account haulier is more or less the same. This transport sector is also opposed to the idea that combined carriage should be used as an instrument "against" road haulage and "in favour" of the railways. It underlines especially the need to leave the commercial management of combined carriage to the road transport undertakings.

This opinion is in accordance with the theme of the transport users which is also against any "artificial" co-ordination between railway and road and which considers that it would be as well, first of all, to leave the decision in the matter of future development of combined carriage to the market situation.

4. Point of view of the commercial combined transport companies

The member companies of U.I.R.R. (Union Internationale des transports combinés rail/route) are in general positive as regards the directive. In particular they point out the reduction in the administrative structure and the removal of certain disadvantages such as the delays caused by the loss of authorisations, the time required for obtaining them and the refusal of loads because of unrenewed authorisations. In general these undertakings noted a greater flexibility in operations. In any case they are in favour of maintaining the present system even if only because of the brief length of the experimental period since 1 October 1975.

S T A T I S T I C S

<u>Table</u>	1	Development of rail/road traffic
	2	Major international traffic links
	3	Wagons used for combined carriage
	4	Main depots (terminals) for combined carriage

Development of rail/road combined carriage since 1971
in semi-trailers (including vehicle combinations) and swop bodies of 12m and 2 x 7m
(indices calculated in relation to 1971)

Table 1

Number in 1000 units
Tonnage in 1000 tonnes

	1971			1972			1973			1974			1975			1976		
<u>NOVATRANS</u>	Num- ber	Gross Tonnes	Index	Num- ber	Gross Tonnes	Index	Num- ber	Gross Tonnes	Index	Num- ber	Gross Tonnes	Index	Num- ber	Gross Tonnes	Index	Num- ber	Gross Tonnes	Index
<u>Semi-trailers</u>																		
National	54	1.076	100	59	1.150	107	64	1.254	117	72	1.366	127	62	1.108	103	67	1.186	110
International	16	327	100	18	393	120	22	482	147	24	514	157	18	380	116	23	500	153
<u>Swop bodies</u>																		
National	3	55	100	4	66	120	5	78	140	4	63	115	3	47	85	4	60	108
International													1	20		3	61	
T O T A L		1.458	100		1.609	110		1.814	124		1.943	133		1.555	106		1.807	124
<u>TR W</u>																		
<u>Semi-trailers</u>																		
International (Total)	3	62	100	4	92	148	6	156	252	5	127	205	3	67	109	7	183	295
<u>TRAILSTAR</u>																		
<u>Semi-trailers</u>																		
International (Total)	7	138	100	6	134	97	6	126	91	5	108	78	6	125	91	8	187	136
<u>H U P A C</u>																		
<u>Semi-trailers</u>																		
National	5	123	100	6	183	149	6	256	208	7	286	233	8	354	288	15	655	533
International	0.5		100	2		3	4		6	10								
<u>Swop bodies</u>																		
International				1			2			2			2			3		
T O T A L		123	100		183	149		256	208		286	233		354	288		655	533

<u>KOMBIVERKEHR</u>																		
<u>Semi-Trailers</u>																		
National	33			32			34		28			29			28			
International	0.5	1.200	100	3	1.650	138	6	2.100	175	6	2.200	183	8	2.200	183	13	2.500 ^{x)}	208
<u>Swop Bodies</u>																		
National	39			62			79		97			92			103			
International				1			2		2			2			3			
T O T A L																		
		1.200	100		1.650	138		2.100	175		2.200	183		2.200	183		2.500	208
<u>OVERALL TOTALS</u>																		
NOVATRANS		1.458	49,3%		1.609	43,9%		1.814	40,7%		1.943	41,7%		1.555	36,2%		1.807	33,9
T R W		62	2,1%		92	2,5%		156	3,5%		127	2,7%		67	1,6%		183	3,4
TRAILSTAR		138	4,6%		134	3,7%		126	2,8%		108	2,3%		125	2,9%		187	3,5
H U P A C		123	4,1%		183	4,9%		256	5,8%		286	6,1%		354	8,2%		655	12,3
KOMBIVERKEHR		1.200	39,9%		1.650	45%		2.100	47,2%		2.200	47,2%		2.200	51,1%		2.500	46,9
		2.981	100 %		3.668	100 %		4.452	100 %		4.664	100 %		4.301	100 %		5.332	100 %

x) estimated figure

Major Traffic Links

N°	Companies	Traffic Link	Departure Day /Time	Arrival Day/Time
1	Novatrans, Trailstar	Rotterdam - Hendaye return	A 19.30 A 19.00	C 9.00 C 8.00
2	" "	Rotterdam - Marseilles return	A 19.30 A 18.45	C 7.30 C 8.00
3	" "	Rotterdam - Perpignan return	A 19.30 A 20.00	C 11.30 C 8.00
4	" "	Rotterdam - Milan return	A 19.30 A 19.30	C 9.00 C 8.00
5	Novatrans, T R W	Antwerp - Hendaye return	A 18.00 A 19.00	C 9.00 C 7.30
6	" "	Antwerp - Perpignan return	A 18.00 A 20.00	C 11.30 C 7.30
7	" "	Antwerp - Milan return	A 18.00 A 19.30	C 9.00 C 7.30
8	" "	Antwerp - Novara return	A 18.00 A 20.30	C 8.00 C 7.30
9-12	" "	Brussels - (see Antwerp)		
13	" "	Brussels - Toulouse return	A 18.30 A 20.30	C 7.45 C 7.30
14	" "	Brussels - Bologna return	A 18.30 A 15.00	D 8.30 D 7.30
15	" "	Brussels - Rome return	A 18.30 A 20.00	D 18.00 D 7.30
16-21	" "	Charleroi - (see Brussels)		
22	" "	Charleroi - Marseilles return	A 18.30 A 18.45	C 7.30 C 7.30
23	" "	Charleroi - Turin return	A 18.30 A 17.30	C 7.45 C 7.30
24-27	" "	Liège - (see Brussels)		
28	" "	Paris - Brussels return	A 19.00 A 18.30	B 7.30 B 6.30
29	" "	Paris - Charleroi return	A 19.00 A 18.30	B 7.30 B 6.30

Source : UIRR

N°	Companies	Traffic Link	Departure Day /Time	Arrival Day/Time
30	Novatrans	Paris-Bologna return	A 19.00 A 15.00	C 8.30 C 6.30
31	"	Paris-Milan return	A 19.00 A 19.30	C 9.00 C 6.30
32	"	Paris-Novara return	A 19.00 A 20.30	C 8.00 C 6.30
33	"	Paris-Rome return	A 19.00 A 20.00	D 18.00 D 6.30
34	"	Paris-Turin return	A 19.00 A 17.30	C 7.45 C 6.30
35	"	Le Havre-Hendaye return	A 11.00 A 19.00	B 9.00 C 8.30
36	"	Le Havre-Perpignan return	A 11.00 A 20.00	B 11.30 C 7.30
37	"	Le Havre-Milan return	A 11.00 A 19.30	C 9.00 C 16.00
38	"	Le Havre-Novara return	A 11.00 A 20.30	C 8.00 C 16.00
39	"	DunkerK-Milan return	A 18.30 A 19.30	C 9.00 C 8.30
40	"	DunkerK-Novara return	A 18.30 A 20.30	C 9.00 C 8.30
41	"	DunkerK-Turin return	A 18.30 A 17.30	D 7.45 C 17.30
42	"	DunkerK-Rome return	A 18.30 A 20.00	D 18.00 D 8.30
43	"	DunkerK-Bologna return	A 18.30 A 15.00	D 16.00 D 8.30
44	"	Turin-Hendaye return	A 17.30 A 9.30	C 17.00 D 7.45
45	"	Turin-Le Havre return	A 17.30 A 11.00	C 16.00 C 7.45
46	"	Turin-Lille return	A 17.30 A 19.00	C 7.00 D 7.45
47	"	Turin-Perpignan return	A 17.30 A 20.00	C 11.30 D 7.45
48	Novratrans, T.R.W.	Turin-Brussels return	A 17.30 A 18.30	C 7.30 D 7.45
49	" "	Turin-Liège return	A 17.30 A 18.30	C 7.30 D 7.45
50	" "	Milan-Hendaye return	A 19.30 A 19.00	C 17.00 D 9.00

N°	Companies	Traffic Link	Departure Day /Time	Arrival Day/Time
51	Novatrans	Milan-Lille return	A 19.30 A 19.00	C 7.00 C 9.00
52	"	Milan-Lyons return	A 19.30 A 20.15	C 7.00 C 9.00
53	"	Milan-Perpignan return	A 19.30 A 20.00	C 11.30 C 9.00
54	"	Novara-Hendaye return	A 20.30 A 19.00	C 17.00 D 8.00
55	"	Novara-Lille return	A 20.30 A 19.00	C 7.00 C 8.00
56	"	Novara-Perpignan return	A 20.30 A 20.00	C 11.30 C 9.00
57	"	Novara-St. Quentin return	A 20.30 A 11.30	C 16.00 C 8.00
58	Novatrans, Kombi	Cologne-Paris return	A 18.45 A 19.45	B 6.00 B 6.15
59	" "	Cologne-Perpignan return	A 18.45 A 20.00	C 11.30 C 9.15
60	" "	Wuppertal-Lyons return	A 19.00 A 20.00	C 6.00 C 7.00
61	Kombi, Trailstar	Rotterdam-Munich return	A 15.00 A 19.00	B 8.40 B 12.30
62	" "	Rotterdam-Mannheim return	A 15.00 A 19.30	B 6.40 B 12.30
63	Kombi, Hupac	Cologne-Mailand return	A 19.30 A 12.00	B 6.00 B 7.00
64	" "	Cologne-Melide return	A 19.30 A 15.00	B 13.15 B 7.00
65	" "	Cologne-Wohlen return	A 19.30 A 19.00	B 8.30 B 7.00
66-68	" "	Neuss-(see Cologne)		
69-71	" "	Mannheim (see Cologne)		

N°	Companies	Traffic Link	Departure Day /Time	Arrival Day/Time
72	Kombi, Ferpac	Cologne-Verona return	A 17.30 A 17.50	B 13.00 B 13.30
73	"	Cologne-Ljubljana return	A 17.30 A 17.00	B 16.00 B 14.30
74	"	Munich-Ljubljana return	A 11.00 A 21.00	B 02.00 B 10.00
75	Trailstar, Hupac	Rotterdam-Milan return	A 15.00 A 10.00	C 6.00 B 12.30
76	" "	Rotterdam-Melide return	A 15.00 A 15.00	B 15.00 B 12.30

Wagon fleet used for combined carriage

Specialised wagons for :

Owners	Tug-units and lorries	Semi-trailers		"pocket" wagons	Swop Bodies	Total
		2 axles	4 bogies			
Sofra mixte					50	50
ALGECO		98				98
SEGI			470	80		550
SNCF	13		50			63
Novatrans				30		30
France	13	98	520	110	50	791
DB	65		320	107	988	1.090
Hupac	36	10	104			150
OeBB	20					20
FS	6					6
ASG				5		5
SJ				36	200	236
Total	140	108	944	258	838	<u>2.288</u>
of which international	45	—	500	30	—	<u>575</u>

Source : U.I.R.R.

Table 4

Main depots (terminals) for combined rail/road carriage

		<u>Transshipping method</u>	
		<u>horizontal</u>	<u>vertical</u>
<u>GERMANY</u>	: BERLIN (West)	—	X
	BIELFELD	—	X
	BOCHUM	X	X
	BREMEN	X	X
	FRANKFURT	X	X
	HAMBURG	X	X
	HANNOVER	—	X
	KARLSRUHE	—	X
	COLOGNE	X	X
	LUDWIGSBURG via Stuttgart	X	X
	MANNHEIM	X	X
	MUNICH	X	X
	NEUSS	X	X
	NEU-ULM	—	X
	NUREMBERG	X	X
WUPPERTAL	X	X	
<u>BELGIUM</u>	: ANTWERP	X	X
	BRUSSELS	X	X
	CHATELINEAU	—	X
	LIEGE	—	X
	OSTEND Terminal Huckepack	X	—
<u>FRANCE</u>	: AVIGNON	X	X
	BORDEAUX	X	X
	DAX	X	—
	DIJON	—	X
	DUNKERK	X	—
	GRENOBLE	—	X
	HENDAYE	X	—
	LE HAVRE	X	X
	LILLE	X	X
	LORIENT	—	X
	LYONS	X	X
	MARSEILLES	X	X
	METZ	—	X
	MULHOUSE	—	X
	NANCY	—	X
	NANTES	—	X
	NICE	—	X
	PARIS	X	X
	PAU	X	X
	PERPIGNAN	X	X
	RHEIMS	—	X
	RENNES	—	X
	ROANNE	—	X
ST BRIEUC	X	—	

Transshipping method

	<u>horizontal</u>	<u>vertical</u>
<u>FRANCE</u> : ST. ETIENNE	X	_____
ST. QUENTIN	_____	X
SETE	_____	X
STRASBOURG	X	X
TOULOUSE	X	X
TRAPPES	X	_____
<u>NETHERLANDS</u> : ROTTERDAM	X	_____
<u>ITALY</u> : BOLOGNA	X	_____
MILAN	X	X
NOVARA	X	_____
ROME	X	_____
TURIN	X	_____
VERONA	X	X
<u>SWITZERLAND</u> : BALE	X	_____
MELIDE/Lugano	X	X

Source : U.I.R.R.

