

Group of Experts on Euro-Asian Transport Links, 4th session

6th September 2010, Geneva

**“ Updating the EATL priority transport infrastructure projects and developing an international investment plan under EATL Project Phase II”:
*Initial Data Collection and Analysis***

Prepared by
The External Consultant
Professor Dimitrios Tsamboulas
Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering
National Technical University of Athens, Greece

Content

- Summary of prioritization methodology and data collection process
- Countries' input
- Suggested way forward for study completion

Phases of Methodology

- PHASE A: Identification
- PHASE B: Analysis and application of MCA
- PHASE C: Time Period Classification
 - *Category I*: projects which have funding secured and are on-going and expected to be completed in the near future (up to 2013)
 - *Category II*: projects which may be funded or their plans are approved and are expected to be implemented rapidly (up to 2016)
 - *Category III*: projects requiring some additional investigation for final definition before likely financing and implemented (up to 2020)
 - *Category IV*: projects requiring further investigation for final definition and scheduling before possible financing, including projects for which insufficient data existed (most likely to be implemented after 2020)

Important Conditions for Methodology of EATL PHASE II

- Projects should be along the identified main EATL routes.
- Projects should refer to an expenditure of at least 10 million \$ per project.
- Projects with secured funding and being at the final implementation phase (almost completed) can be directly considered for Category I.
- For projects without committed funding or partially committed funding or under the planning phase, further analysis (Phase B of the methodology) is carried out in order to set implementation priorities against common shared objectives.
- Since the analysis is based on data collected from the countries, projects with no data will be automatically classified as last priority in terms of implementation (Category IV).

Data Collection

- Case A (Templates B1-4)
 - Projects identified under EATL Phase I (15 countries that submitted data).
- Case B (Templates 2A-D)
 - New project proposals from the 15 countries that have participated in EATL Phase I
 - Project proposals of those that did not submit any data during EATL Phase I (Afghanistan, Russian Federation, Turkmenistan)
 - New project proposals from newly involved countries (Finland, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Mongolia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia).

Example: Template B1(Road)

TEMPLATE B1-ROAD

NETWORK	PROJECT ID	DESCRIPTION (Project and Section Names)	PROJECT LOCATION			ROAD TYPE <i>Motorway, Expressway, National Road (please select one)</i>	TRAFFIC VOLUMES		CURRENT STATUS <i>Programming, Planning, Design, Construction (please select one)</i>	TIME PLAN		TOTAL COST (in mio euro)	EXPENSES so far (in % of total cost)	% FUNDING SECURED (or possible funding sources [*])					IRR / (ROE if PPP)	
			Start point/node /city	End point/node /city	Total Length (km)		Existing Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)	Forecasted		Start year	End year			National Funds	EU Funds	Bank Loans	Grants	Private Funds		
Road	ARM-ROD-01	Highways and bridges rehabilitation							Construction	2001	2004	31\$								45%
Road	ARM-ROD-02	Road maintenance and rehabilitation (every year)							Construction	2004	2004	22\$		√						100%
Road	ARM-ROD-03	Investigation of 62 road bridges and design of documents							Study/Design	2004	2004	0.128\$		√						
Road	ARM-ROD-04	Rehabilitation of 62 road bridges							Study/Design	2006	2007	3.3\$		√						

TEMPLATE B2-RAIL

NETWORK	PROJECT ID	DESCRIPTION (Project and Section Names)	PROJECT LOCATION			ADTT (passenger)		ADTT (freight)		CURRENT STATUS <i>Programming, Planning, Design, Construction (please select one)</i>	TIME PLAN		TOTAL COST (in mio euro)	EXPENSES so far (in % of total cost)	% FUNDING SECURED (or possible funding sources [*])					IRR / (ROE if PPP)	
			Start point/node /city	End point/node /city	Total Length (km)	Existing	Forecasted	Existing	Forecasted		Start year	End year			National Funds	EU Funds	Bank Loans	Grants	Private Funds		
Railway	ARM-RLW-01	Railway tracks rehabilitation (70 km)								Construction	2001	2004	15\$						√		45%
Railway	ARM-RLW-02	Investigation of railway bridges and design of documents								Study/Design	2006	2006	0.3\$		√						100%
Railway	ARM-RLW-03	Rehabilitation of railway bridges								Study/Design	2007	2010									
Railway	ARM-RLW-04	Development of Armenian Railway: rehabilitation (110 km)									2006	2011	50\$						√		
Railway	ARM-RLW-05	Constructin of new railway (Gavar - Martuni - Jermuk - Sisian - Kapan - Meghri - Merand (IR)																			

GDP (in year 2007 & in million\$)	% Budget of Public Works allocated	[*] Please indicate reasons of project implementation delay, if applicable:

TEMPLATE 2A – Road and related infrastructure Project Fiche

Project Name:
Project ID:
Network (EATL Route):
Project Description:

Projects Group: *Funded/ Unfunded*

Note: If Funded, fill in Section 1 only. If Unfunded, fill in Sections 1 and 2.

Section 1. Project Technical Characteristics:

1. Location (latitude/longitude or alternatively a map):
2. Start point/node/city
3. End point/node/city
4. Road Class¹:
5. Length (in km):
6. Number of carriageways:
7. No of lanes:
8. Design Speed (km/h):
9. Annual Average Daily Traffic²:
10. Estimated % of freight vehicles³:
11. Annual Average Daily Traffic (passengers):
12. Annual Average Daily Traffic (tonnes):
13. Expected (total) traffic increase (in % - both existing and generated):
14. Road toll implementation: YES NO

Section 2. Project Information Concerning Criteria of CLUSTER A

15. Is the project serving international connectivity? YES NO
 If yes is it expected to:
 A: Greatly improves connectivity, B: Significantly improves connectivity, C: Somewhat improves connectivity, D: Slightly improves connectivity, E: Does not improve connectivity.

16. Will the project promote solutions to the particular transit transport needs of the landlocked developing countries? YES NO
 If yes is the project providing solution:
 A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not

17. Will the project connect low income and/or least developed countries to major European and Asian markets? YES NO
 If yes is the project providing connection:
 A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not

18. Will the project cross natural barriers, removes bottlenecks, raises substandard sections to meet international standards, or fills missing links in the EATL? YES NO

If yes is the project crosses...:
 A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not

19. Will the project have a high degree of urgency due to importance attributed by the national authorities and/or social interest? YES NO
 If yes the projects is:
 A: In the national plan and immediately required (for implementation up to 2013), B: In the national plan and very urgent (for implementation up to 2016), C: In the national plan and urgent (for implementation up to 2020), D: In the national plan but may be postponed until after 2020, E: Not in the national plan.

20. Will the project potentially create negative environmental or social impacts (pollution, safety, etc)? YES NO
 If yes the size of impact is:
 A: No impact, B: Slight impact, C: Moderate impact, D: Significant impact, E: Great impact.

Project Information Concerning Criteria of CLUSTER B

21. Project cost (in million):

22. Expected Starting Date:

23. Expected Completion Date:

24. IRR:

25. Project's stage: Construction Tendering Study/Design
 Planning Identification

26. Expected Funding Sources (and the % of funding for each one):

- a.
- b.
- c.
- d.

¹ If AGR (M=Motorway, E=Express road, O=Ordinary road); if AH (P=Primary, I= Class I, II= Class II, III=Class III), or both if applicable.

² For the year 2008 and latest year, if available.

³ Freight vehicles include any vehicles used to transport freight, such as trucks and trailers.

Additional information upon original submission

- Additional information will be requested from counties that will submit their respective input through direct correspondence with each respective NFP.
- For Case A-Templates B(1-4):
 - Information on the reasons for which the implementation of projects had been delayed, if applicable.
 - The rate of prices adjustment from year 2007 to 2008, since project cost will be given in 2007 prices.
- For Case B-Templates 2 (A-D):
 - Expenses made so far (2009), as a percentage of the projects total cost
 - Percentage of budget of public works allocated.
 - GDP (year 2008 in million).
 - Recommendations with regards to potential sources of funding for the cases of non-secure funding, if applicable.
 - Reasons for which project implementation has been delayed, if applicable.
- Their own weights –if they decide so- for the purpose of the Phase B-Analysis of the methodology (*see next slide*).

Criteria Weights Template

Criterion Weight	Description of Criterion	Default Weight (as used in EATL Phase I)	Weight provided by Country
CLUSTER A			
W _{CA1}	Serving international connectivity (reaching a border crossing point or provide connection to a link that is border crossing).	3.13	
W _{CA2}	Promoting solutions to the particular transit transport needs of the landlocked developing countries.	9.38	
W _{CA3}	Connecting low income and/or least developed countries to major European and Asian markets.	19.79	
W _{CA4}	Crossing natural barriers, removing bottlenecks, raising substandard sections to meet international standards, or filling missing links in the TEM network.	17.71	
Total A		50	50
CLUSTER B			
W _{CB1}	Having high degree of urgency due to importance attributed by the national authorities and/or social interest.	12.67	
W _{CB2}	Passing economic viability test.	12.67	
W _{CB3}	Having a high degree of maturity, in order to be carried out quickly (i.e. project stage)	3.33	
W _{CB4}	Financing feasibility	7.33	
W _{CB5}	Environmental and social impacts.	14.00	
Total B		50	50
Total		100	100

Input received

- Countries involved were asked to submit completed data collection templates by June 2010. *(A reminder was send with the deadline 2nd July).*
- To present, out of the 26 countries participating in this project:

- Countries that submitted data:

Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, China, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey

(It must be noted that a number of them provided limited data.)

- Countries yet to submit data:

Afghanistan, Armenia, Belarus, Iran, Latvia, Republic of Moldova, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Finland, Luxemburg, Mongolia

Input Summary

Countries participating in EATL Phase II		Data Input EATL I	Data Input EATL II			
			EATL Routes	Old Projects-Templates B	New Projects-Templates 2	Additional Info upon original submission
Phase I &II	Armenia	√				
	Afganistan	-				
	Azerbaijan	√	√	√		
	Belarus	√				
	Bulgaria	√		√	√	
	China	√		√	√	
	Georgia	√		√		
	Iran	√				
	Kazakhstan	√			√	
	Kyrgystan	√	√	√		
	Republic of Moldova	√				
	Romania	√		√	√	
	Russian Federation	-			√	
	Tajikistan	√				
	Turkey	√	√	√	√	
	Turkmenistan	-				
	Ukraine	√				
Uzbekistan	√					
Phase II	Finland	-		-		
	Germany	-		-	√	√
	Greece	-	√	-	√	
	Latvia	-	√	-		
	Lithuania	-	√	-	√	
	Luxemburg	-		-		
	Mongolia	-		-		
	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	-	√	-	√	

Azerbaijan

- Azerbaijan proposed 6 projects of total cost over 938,48 million \$
- Out of which:
 - 4 of total cost 938,48 million \$ were submitted under EATL Phase I, have committed funding
 - For the remaining 4 projects limited data was submitted.

Afghanistan

- Did not submit data
- From other sources:
 - *Road*: 14 projects of total cost 1454 million \$, 1 under construction and 13 have no committed funding
 - *Rail*: 11 projects of total cost 1500 million \$, for which limited information is available.

Bulgaria

- Bulgaria proposed 32 projects (11 new), with a total cost exceeding 5594,74 million €.
- Out of which:
 - 1 is completed (cost 145 million €) and 23 have committed funding, with a total budget exceeding 717,84 million €.
 - The remaining with a total budget 4732,1 million € will be evaluated based on data provided by the country.

China

- China proposed 18 projects (14 new), with a total budget exceeding 6670,9 million €
- Out of which:
 - 10 have committed funding, with a budget exceeding 4453,5 million €.
 - The remaining, with a total budget exceeding 2217,4 million € will be evaluated for the prioritization based on data provided by the country.

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

- The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia proposed 6 projects, with a total budget 1018,7 million €
- Out of which:
 - 4 projects, with a budget of 520,7 million € have committed funding.
 - The remaining 2 projects, with a total budget of 498 million € will be evaluated for the prioritization based on data provided by the country.

Georgia

- Georgia proposed 24 new projects, with a total budget exceeding 922,66 million \$.
- Out of which:
 - 8 projects with a total budget of 608,43 million \$ have committed funding.
 - Limited information was submitted for the remaining ones, with an estimated budget of 314,23 million \$.
 - Projects under EATL Phase I were either completed or not realized, and thus only new projects are proposed.

Germany

- Germany proposed 5 projects, with a total budget exceeding 1305 million €
- They will be evaluated for prioritization based on data provided by the country.

Greece

- Greece proposed 5 projects (road only), with a total budget exceeding 607 million €
- Out of which:
 - 4 have committed funding, with budget of 607 million €
 - The remaining one will be evaluated for the prioritization based on data provided by the country.

Kazakhstan

- Kazakhstan proposed 2 new projects with a total budget of 1141 million € with committed funding.

Kyrgyzstan

- Kazakhstan proposed 12 new projects, with a total budget of 1861,2 million \$
- Out of which:
 - 2 projects with a budget of 39,1 million \$ have been completed
 - 9 projects with a budget of 472,1 million \$ have committed funding
 - The remaining one, with a budget of 1350 million \$, will be evaluated for prioritization based on data provided by the country.

Lithuania

- Lithuania proposed 55 projects with a total budget of 1293.1 million € with committed funding.

Romania

- Romania proposed 11 projects (6 new), with a total budget exceeding 7459,25 million €
- Out of which:
 - 4 projects, with a total budget of 169,85 million € have been completed.
 - 5 projects with a budget of 371,4 million € have committed funding.
 - The remaining, with a budget more than 6918 million €, will be evaluated for prioritization, based on data provided by the country.

Russian Federation

- Data submitted for TER, but in need of further clarifications.
 - *Road Projects: under analysis*
 - *Rail Projects: 39 projects with limited information*
 - *Inland waterways: 1 project with committed funding*
 - *Ports: 5 projects with committed funding and 5 projects with limited information*

Turkey

- Turkey proposed 18 projects, with budget exceeding 19215 million €
- Out of which:
 - 10 projects, with a budget of 7990 million € have committed funding
 - The remaining with budget exceeding 11225 million € will be evaluated for prioritization based on data provided by the country.

Results Summary

(per type of modal infrastructure)

Country	Total	Per type of infrastructure			
		ROAD	RAILWAY	MARITIME	INW
		No. of projects	No. of projects	No. of projects	No. of projects
Afganistan	25	14	11		
Armenia					
Azerbaijan	6	4	1	1	
Belarus					
Bulgaria	32	11	19	1	1
China	18	16		2	
Georgia	24	22	2		
Iran					
Kazakhstan	2		2		
Kyrgystan	12	11	1		
Republic of Moldova					
Romania	11	1		5	5
Russian Federation			39	10	1
Tajikistan					
Turkey	18	8	7	3	
Turkmenistan					
Ukraine					
Uzbekistan					
Finland					
Germany	5	2	3		
Greece	4	4			
Latvia					
Lithuania	55	12	33	6	1
Luxemburg					
Mongolia					
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	6	2	4		
Total	218	107	122	28	8

TOTAL BUDGET

- Based on the data submitted so far, the projects proposed have a total value of approx. 50 billion Euro

Way Forward

- At present, participating countries are requested to send updated data.
- A discussion with the representatives present at the EATL Meeting could provide value added to the study elaboration.
- Countries will be contacted for further clarifications/additional data and possible comments.
- **New Deadline Set: End of September 2010.**
- For those countries that do not submit data:
 - The data as per the original EATL study will be used.
 - In addition, in an attempt to cover missing data, the study will make use of related studies and data following desktop research.
- Projects for which limited data is submitted will be classified as *Priority Category IV* and will not be included in the proposed projects prioritization.
- The participation of each country is critical for the success of the study and its implementation plan !

Countries to Submit Data!

- Afghanistan
- Armenia
- Belarus
- Finland
- Greece (Rail Projects)
- Iran
- Latvia
- Luxemburg
- Mongolia
- Republic of Moldova
- Tajikistan
- Turkmenistan
- Ukraine
- Uzbekistan

**Thank you for your
attention!**