



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.5/2005/9  
20 January 2005

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

**INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE**

Working Party on Transport Trends and Economics  
(Eighteenth session, 19-20 September 2005,  
agenda item 10)

**QUALITY-OF-SERVICE CONCEPT**

**Submitted by Russian Federation Railways**

We have examined the questionnaire containing quality-of-service indicators circulated by the secretariat, and overall we endorse the division of the indicators into three groups (legal and operational, safety and security, environmental impacts). At the same time, within these groups we propose splitting the assessment of quality of services by mode of transport into freight and passenger traffic, and, if necessary, into urban, suburban and (separately) intercity.

Looking at the data submitted by the Governments of Belarus, Croatia, Ireland, Hungary, Lithuania and Poland, it is clear that lack of statistical data makes it hard to rate some of the indicators in the questionnaire. We therefore believe that, to the extent possible, the indicators should be cross-linked to the existing national statistics of Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) member countries.

The following changes should be made in section 1, "Legal and operational indicators":

- (a) Degree of competition. We agree with the proposed indicator.
- (b) Public transport passenger trips. This should be omitted as being too difficult to calculate. The following indicators should be used instead:
  1. Mobility of population (thousands of passenger-kilometres/person);

2. Transport situation:

- Freight traffic (thousands of tonne-kilometres/km<sup>2</sup>);
- Passenger traffic (thousands of passenger-kilometres/km<sup>2</sup>).

(c) Normal fare (euro). Add the following in the “Definition” column:

- For urban and suburban traffic, monthly fare per average length of journey (indicate average length of journey in kilometres);
- For intercity traffic, fare for each journey per average length of journey (indicate average length of journey in kilometres).

(d) Receipts from public sector for investments in infrastructure and rolling stock. We agree with the proposed indicator.

(e) Add these indicators:

- Passenger train speed:
  - Urban and suburban trains (km/h);
  - Intercity trains (km/h);
- Rate of progress of freight consignments (km/day).

The following changes should be made in section 2, “Safety and security indicators”:

(a) Traffic safety. We agree with the proposed indicator.

(b) Employee safety, driver training, security at stops and stations/freight terminals and transfer points, security in vehicles. These should be omitted given the lack of statistics.

The following indicator should be included:

1. Fulfilment of contractual obligations:

- For passenger traffic on urban, suburban and intercity routes, proportion of trains running to timetable (%);
- For freight traffic, proportion of consignments delivered within scheduled time (%).

In section 3, “Environmental impacts”, all the indicators should be omitted given the lack of statistical information by sector.

The following indicators should be included:

1. – Emissions into the environment (kg of harmful substances/  
1,000 passenger-kilometres);  
– Emissions into the environment (kg of harmful substances/  
1,000 tonne-kilometres).
2. – Use of energy by freight traffic per 1,000 tonne-kilometres, expressed  
in kilowatt-hours (tonnes of standard fuel);  
– Use of energy by urban and suburban passenger traffic per  
1,000 passenger-kilometres, expressed in kilowatt-hours  
(kg of standard fuel);  
– Use of energy by intercity passenger traffic per  
1,000 passenger-kilometres, expressed in kilowatt-hours  
(kg of standard fuel).
3. – Ratio of excess emissions of harmful substances to total emissions of  
harmful substances.

-----