



Economic Commission for Europe**Working Party on Rail Transport****Group of Experts on International Railway Passenger Hubs****Third session**

Geneva, 23–25 May 2022

Item 4 of the provisional agenda

Identification of the technical and service parameters**necessary for the definition of an international passenger railway hub****Defining technical and service parameters for international railway passenger hubs****Submitted by the secretariat****I. Introduction**

1. This document has been prepared in accordance with the decision at the second meeting of the Group of Experts (ECE/TRANS/SC.2/HUBS/2021/6 paragraphs 19). It provides the comments received by experts on defining technical and service parameters for international railway passenger hubs as set out in document ECE/TRANS/SC.2/HUBS/2021/9.

II. Comments from experts**A. Belgium**

2. On the identification the technical and service parameters necessary for the definition of an international passenger railway hub (ECE/TRANS/SC.2/HUBS/2021/9), the parameters set forward by the secretariat concerning passenger facing station facilities, connectivity and accessibility for passengers are deemed of utmost importance and Belgium agrees with the proposed approach.

3. The parameters set forward by the secretariat concerning the necessary railway infrastructure for railway operators are an interesting approach, although Belgium deems it important to make a distinction between primary and secondary hubs, especially with regards to infrastructure matters.

4. Also, further discussions should be held with regards to the definition of “nearby facilities”, as this approach might be too vague to come to an agreement.

5. With regards to the reservation of a certain number of tracks and platform, as well as the number of platform as part of capacity drivers, we agree this seems a relevant approach, however the importance of capacity management should also be taken into account.

B. UIC

6. In relation to section A, in paragraph 7, it is important that priority is given to English when considering other languages. In relation to paragraph 10 on passengers with reduced mobility it is important to note that in EU legislation, the TAP Technical Standard for Interoperability requires train operators to provide service to people with reduced mobility. In the case of international trips, the UIC PRM ABT (exclusive to EU members for the moment) can forward information from country A to country B and guarantee service continuity even after crossing a border via rail. Technically, there is no restriction to extend this tool to other countries. In paragraph 11 it is important to note that UIC does extensive work on information sharing to passengers and is in the process updating this work and collaboration with UNECE and its working parties is welcome on this. In paragraph 12, it is not clear what wireless connectivity would be envisaged. Paragraph 13 should split out safety from security as currently it seems to be focused more on security.

7. In relation to section B, paragraph 21 highlights the importance of private parking facilities, it should be clear that this should refer to all personal mobility devices (car, bicycles, motorbikes, new urban mobility device e-mobility solutions, etc) with a strong focus on shared mobility solutions. In paragraph 22, further clarity needs to be provided on what is meant by direct connectivity.

C. In session comments to the document

8. At its second session the Group discussed in detail the parameters included in the document assessing their relative importance. In particular, it was noted that requirements for ticketing facilities should reflect modern technologies, that the use of real-time traffic data should be considered (where it is publicly available) and the importance of staff being visible and available. It also noted that alternative options should be considered to these parameters such as the use of video terminals for information sharing and the third party service providers for such things as services to persons with reduced mobility. Considerations relating to the availability of all necessary border controls in stations where these are required or appropriate, should also be set out in more detail.

9. Delegates noted the importance of addressing issues related to the interface with multiple operators and who would be responsible for the ultimate delivery of the services identified in this document.

10. The Group also discussed the potential for a two-tier system where different technical and service parameters could be assigned to primary and secondary hubs. The Group concluded that it may be difficult to exclude some of the technical parameters identified in document ECE/TRANS/SC.2/HUBS/2021/9 and as such it could be better to retain the parameters for all hubs noting that the parameters that are available for infrastructure in AGC are target parameters meaning that they are parameters that contracting parties work towards rather than having fixed deadlines by which they need to be implemented.

III. Next steps

11. Experts are invited to review these comments along with document ECE/TRANS/SC.2/HUBS/2021/9 and to discuss a further refinement of the technical and service parameters at the third session of the Group.
