

UNITED NATIONS



NATIONS UNIES

UNECE – UNESCAP

**UN Development Account Capacity Building Project on
Interregional Transport Linkages**

**REPORT OF THE UNECE-UNESCAP
4TH EXPERT GROUP MEETING ON DEVELOPING
EURO-ASIAN TRANSPORT LINKAGES**

21 – 24 November 2006
Thessaloniki, Greece

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
<i>I. INTRODUCTION.....</i>	1 - 3
<i>II. DEVELOPING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURES ALONG EURO-ASIAN ROUTES</i>	
A. Summary of progress to date.....	4
B. Review of the work done on developing a Euro-Asian Transport network	5 - 7
C. Review of the GIS work done and consideration for its use and final development.....	8
D. Identification of priority projects to improve transport operations along selected Euro-Asian routes.....	9 - 10
E. Country presentations on progress on connecting route infrastructure along the selected routes	11
F. Complementary activities of other organisation.....	12 - 15
<i>III. TRANSPORT FACILITATION ALONG SELECTED EURO-ASIAN ROUTES</i>	
G. Non-physical obstacles to transit transport along the selected routes as well as measures to remove them	16 - 18
H. Legal arrangements for the smooth movement of goods internationally	19
<i>IV. ECE-ESCAP IN-HOUSE STUDY ON DEVELOPING EURO-ASIAN TRANSPORT LINKS.....</i>	20
<i>V. SHARING BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED</i>	
I. Best practices in developing transport infrastructure and facilitation of international transport in Europe and Asia	21 - 23
J. Lessons learned from the implementation of the UN Development Account project	24
<i>VI. WAYS TO PROCEED IN THE FUTURE</i>	25
<i>VII. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</i>	26 - 53

ANNEXES

- Annex 1: Agenda
- Annex 2: Programme
- Annex 3: List of Participants
- Annex 4: Selected Euro-Asian rail, road, inland water transport routes and inland water transport ports for further development and cooperation
- Annex 5: Euro-Asian transport priority infrastructure projects of international importance

Report of the 4th Expert Group Meeting on Developing Euro-Asian Transport Linkages

21 – 24 November 2006, Thessaloniki, Greece

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The 4th Expert Group Meeting (EGM) on Developing Euro-Asian Transport Linkages was jointly organized by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) and the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) in Thessaloniki, Greece, 21-24 November 2006. The Meeting was generously hosted by the Ministry of Transport of Greece. The agenda and programme are attached as Annexes 1 and 2.

2. The Meeting was attended by the designated National Focal Points (NFP) and Experts from 11 countries: Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, China, Georgia, Greece, Kazakhstan, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Romania, Tajikistan and Ukraine. The Meeting was also attended by a number of international institutions and organizations, including EC, OSCE, EUROPLATFORMS, IRU and BSEC-BISCA as well as transport operators and Port Authorities. The list of participants is attached as Annex 3.

3. The Meeting was jointly opened by Mrs. Konstantina Lianou, speaking on behalf of the Ministry of Transport and Communications of Greece, and Mr. Michalis Adamantiadis, Chief, Transport and Infrastructure Development Section, Transport Division, UNECE, and Ms. Geetha Karandawala, Chief, Transport Facilitation Section, Transport and Tourism Division, UNESCAP. The proceedings of the meeting are reported below.

II. DEVELOPING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURES ALONG EURO-ASIAN ROUTES

A. Summary of progress to date

4. The representative of UNECE presented a summary of progress in the implementation of the project. He outlined the main achievements under the project to date, namely the consolidation of data and elaboration of GIS maps based on the national country reports; identification of major Euro-Asian routes and intermodal points such as sea and inland ports; endorsement of the methodology for prioritization of investment projects along the identified routes; agreement on a process for addressing non-physical obstacles and security risks to transit transport; and the holding of two national workshops on transport facilitation in Azerbaijan and Georgia. He then reported on ongoing work including the completion of the technical assessment of the routes; finalization of the prioritization exercise; analysis of the physical and non-physical obstacles along the routes; and the finalization of the GIS database and maps. He stressed that the current meeting would be an opportunity to discuss the continuation of the project and the need to follow up the results in various fora.

B. Review of the work done on developing a Euro-Asian Transport network

5. The representative of UNECE presented an overview of the major ECE infrastructure agreements, namely the AGR, AGC, AGTC and the AGN. He also informed the meeting of the developments under the TEM and TER projects. In this regard, he stressed that the elaboration of the TEM and TER Master Plan of the TEM and TER projects in 2004-2005, which had identified the priority infrastructure needs of 21 Central, Eastern and South-Eastern European countries, and

evaluated and prioritized 491 projects with a total cost of 102 billion Euro, had been a significant achievement in the history of both projects and set out a clear plan for future development of transport infrastructure in Europe.

6. The representative of UNESCAP updated the meeting on the development and formulation of the Asian Highway network and the Trans-Asian Railway network. He noted that 28 countries had signed the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Asian Highway Network, of which 19 were parties. He also informed the meeting that the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Trans-Asian Railway Network had been signed by 18 countries at the Ministerial Conference on Transport, held from 6 to 11 November 2006 at Pusan, Republic of Korea, and that the Agreement was now deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in New York and would be open for signature for the next two years.

7. The secretariat informed the meeting that it had carefully reviewed the routes proposed during the 3rd EGM, held in June 2005 in Istanbul, Turkey, and identified those sections which required further clarification by countries. It had also received a number of additional proposals from countries since the 3rd EGM. The secretariat presented the results of this review and proposed a number of amendments to the rail, road and Inland Water Transport routes respectively, for the consideration of the meeting. The National Focal Points (NFPs) expressed their views on the changes and a final set of routes were agreed upon. Due to the absence of several participating countries, it was agreed that the final set of routes should be sent to NFPs for their final comments, to be received by the secretariat within six weeks of the meeting.

C. Review of the GIS work done and consideration for its use and final development

8. The GIS consultant presented the current status of the GIS Database. After outlining the steps taken to develop the GIS Database, he gave some examples of how it could be used for analysing and monitoring the development of the Euro-Asian Transport Linkages. However he noted that its effectiveness depends on the data behind the Database, and urged countries to fill in the missing data as soon as possible. Finally he informed the participating countries that they would receive a CD-ROM containing the GIS Database, as well as the MapInfo Proviewer which would allow them to view the data and pre-defined maps. The meeting noted that there was scope for the further development of the programme.

D. Identification of priority projects to improve transport operations along selected Euro-Asian routes

9. Professor Tsamboulas of the National Technical University of Athens, in his capacity as consultant on the investment prioritization exercise under the project, presented the results of the evaluation and prioritization of investment projects along the identified routes. He explained the methodology used to evaluate the projects and noted that in total, 230 projects had been submitted with a total investment value of \$42.02 billion, including both funded (more than 50% of total projects) and newly proposed projects. Of this total, nearly 50% were road projects with a total value of nearly \$12 billion (approximately 29% of total investment cost); nearly 30% were railway projects with a total value of \$22.8 billion (54%); 16% were Maritime projects with a total value of \$5.7 billion (14%); less than 5% were Inland waterway projects with a total value of \$1.6 billion, and just two projects were for inland border crossings, with a total value of just over \$3 million. Each project was assigned a level of priority ranging from Priority I to IV. Those

projects with funding secured were automatically assigned Priority I, while those projects with insufficient data to conduct the exercise were automatically assigned Priority IV.

10. The meeting noted that ultimately the decision-making process rests on the investment priorities of the national governments, but that in many cases countries needed assistance to develop sound medium and long-term investment strategies. Professor Tsamboulas concluded that given the high number of projects, which fell within Priority I, the results of the exercise suggested that the network had a good chance for implementation. However, he also noted that 30% of the projects belonged to Priority IV, mainly due to the lack of data for analysis. He urged all countries to submit their data to improve the analysis, especially those countries which had not yet submitted any projects. The report on the results of the evaluation and prioritization of investment projects along the identified routes is attached as Annex 5.

E. Country presentations on progress on connecting route infrastructure along the selected routes

11. The NFPs updated the meeting on completed projects as well as ongoing and recently initiated projects along the Euro-Asian Transport Linkages in their countries. A number of countries stated that their governments were drafting new laws regarding financing in order to make it easier for private investment into transport infrastructure and services. Several countries also reported on steps being taken to reform their railways, as well as to privatize transport operations at maritime ports, with the aim of increasing their competitiveness. The NFPs noted that the continuous development of major Euro-Asian Transport routes would enhance their trading capacities and thereby improve the economic performance of their countries.

F. Complementary activities of other organisation

12. The representative of the European Commission updated the meeting on the follow-up to the High Level Group on “the extension of the major trans-European transport axes to the neighbouring countries and regions”, chaired by former Commission Vice-President Ms. Loyola de Palacio. Part of the aim of this exercise was to try to integrate the various regional exercises, such as the Pan-European Corridors and the TRACECA programme, into a comprehensive strategy. Of the EATL countries, countries participating in the High Level Group include Bulgaria and Romania (as part of the EU 27) and Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine. Through a series of meetings which took place between October 2004 and November 2005, the Group identified five major transnational transport axes extending beyond the borders of the European Union, including the Motorways of the Sea; Northern Axis, Central Axis, South eastern Axis, and South western Axis. The representative informed the meeting that the Commission was preparing a Communication to the Council and the European Parliament before the end of 2006.

13. The representative of the IRU focused on two main areas in his presentation: the IRU’s work on monitoring border waiting times and the promotion of the TIR Convention. Over the past few years the IRU has been further developing its Border Waiting Times Observatory. With its improved user facilities including better geo-identification, analytical functions, and a new interactive web application, the programme is a powerful tool for monitoring and analysis of real-time obstacles at border crossings. The representative also updated the meeting on the status of the TIR Convention and noted that as of 2005 it had 55 contracting parties. As part of its effort to promote Euro-Asian transport, the IRU was also developing the New Eurasia Land

Transport Initiative (NELTI), an international pilot business project organized by the private sector with a view to promoting and facilitating road transport along the Euro-Asian transport routes. This initiative was expected to provide important real data about existing non-physical obstacles and waiting times at the borders along the key Euro-Asian road transport linkages, which would be useful for the current project. The representative invited the Euro-Asian Transport Linkages project to collaborate more closely with the IRU in this and other initiatives.

14. The representative of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) introduced the aims and work of his organization to the meeting. He noted that the theme of the 14th OSCE Economic Forum, held in January 2006 under the Chairmanship of Belgium, had been “Transportation in the OSCE area: Secure transportation networks and transport development for to enhance regional economic cooperation and stability”. The main conclusions emanating from the Forum were that OSCE’s role in this area should include: cooperation with the UNECE in the area of transport; addressing the problems of landlocked countries; promoting transport security; and promoting good governance in the area of trade and transport. He informed the meeting that in this regard, two joint project proposals, including one on a follow-up to the Euro-Asian Transport Linkages project, had been developed in cooperation with the UN secretariat and were now open for funding through voluntary contributions from OSCE member states. He also informed the meeting that a joint OSCE-UNECE pilot project was underway to monitor the implementation of the UNECE legal instruments for transport, and that the Convention on the Harmonization of Frontier Control of Goods had been selected as a test case. Two capacity-building seminars on this Convention were planned for December 2006 and early 2007.

15. The representative of the Black Sea International Shipowners Association (BINSIA) introduced the work of his association. He noted the importance of sea-crossings across the Black and Caspian Seas in the transport of goods between Europe and Asia, and noted his association’s interest in the Euro-Asian Transport Linkages project.

III. TRANSPORT FACILITATION ALONG SELECTED EURO-ASIAN ROUTES

G. Non-physical obstacles to transit transport along the selected routes as well as measures to remove them

16. The representative of UNESCAP presented UNESCAP’s experience in applying the time/cost methodology along selected routes which were similar to the Euro-Asian Transport routes. She noted that a number of non-physical barriers persisted, including long waiting times at borders; multiple inspections; inappropriate fees and formalities; and unclear trade and transport rules. However she also noted that the overall trading environment was improving, thanks partly to the increased cooperation between countries. She presented the meeting with a number of examples of how the time/cost methodology could be used to analyse the efficiency of policy and infrastructure improvements and monitor changes along the Euro-Asian Transport routes, and proposed that the project could select a limited number of routes to analyse on a pilot basis. It was suggested that the project focus first on the obstacles at border crossings. It was also suggested that the border crossing assessment was an integral part of the route analysis, and that the route analysis could provide a better overall picture of the competitiveness of the routes. The secretariat agreed to send the time/cost templates to the NFPs for them to complete and send back to the secretariat.

17. The NFPs then gave their perspectives on the various non-physical obstacles along the selected routes. These could be broadly grouped into administrative obstacles; legal obstacles; and trans-border obstacles. Amongst the administrative obstacles, the issuance of licenses and permits for international transport and tax and tariff related problems were identified as significant sources of problems. With regard to legislative obstacles, complicated control procedures and the registration of and rules regarding transport personnel were cited. However the most significant obstacles appeared to occur at border crossings, where the current legislation in many countries held back the smooth transport of goods across borders.

18. Countries reported on various steps being taken to remove these obstacles, such as the reduction in the number of documents needed for international transport; the introduction of the single weighing certificate at borders; the opening of joint border crossings; the introduction of new methods to facilitate rail track gauge changes; the creation of a single transit space within a country (to facilitate cross-country movements); and accession to major international transport facilitation conventions. The meeting also discussed the issue of unauthorized/incentive payments which affect international transport, especially in the road sector. Several countries reported on legislative changes which were being implemented to tackle this issue.

H. Legal arrangements for the smooth movement of goods internationally

19. The UNECE hosts and manages almost 60 international legal instruments in the area of transport. They deal with infrastructure, sign and signals, border crossing facilitation, transit, dangerous goods and many others. Solutions to many major transport problems in Europe and Asia, including landlocked countries can be solved through the more effective implementation of UNECE's legal instruments. Given this background, the representative of UNECE presented several international transport conventions, which could help overcome some of the problems identified in the previous session. The most successful transit convention – the TIR Convention – is administered by the UNECE and its Secretariat has been making great efforts to expand the use of this convention to Asia and the Middle East. A key border crossing facilitation convention – the International Convention on the Harmonization of Frontier Controls of Goods – has its secretariat in Geneva too. The effective implementation of this convention should be seen as the first necessary step national authorities need to take to obtain large economic gains by lowering transit time and costs.

IV. ECE-ESCAP IN-HOUSE STUDY ON DEVELOPING EURO-ASIAN TRANSPORT LINKS

20. A first draft ECE-ESCAP in-house study was distributed at the meeting. The discussion focussed on the major conclusions of the study. The main recommendations are summarized in Section VII. below.

V. SHARING BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

I. Best practices in developing transport infrastructure and facilitation of international transport in Europe and Asia

21. The representative of Europlatforms introduced the background and work of his association. He informed the meeting that the European Association of Freight Villages, or

Europlatforms, currently consisted of 60 freight villages in ten European countries. He explained that many freight villages were based on the public-private partnership model, with local government authorities involved in the planning and in some cases funding of the construction of the village, and the private sector involved in the financing and day-to-day operations of the village. As freight villages by definition were well connected to various transport modes, including railways, the transshipment of goods could be done in an efficient and cost-effective way. The quality of the logistics services was also high due to the efficient organization of handling services and IT applications. The freight village concept also utilizes the advantages of multimodal transport. He gave some examples of freight villages in Europe and the way they transformed the transport operations in their regions.

22. The representative of UNESCAP presented some examples of best practices from the Asian region. He noted that since the International Agreement on the Asian Highway Network had come into force in 2005, the signatories were taking concrete steps towards upgrading operationalising the network. For example, several countries were prioritising their AH routes in their national plans and investment strategies. The Agreement also attracted the support of the international financial institutions who were increasingly aware of the need to consider their investments from a regional, and not just a national, perspective. In this regard, there were several examples of how the Agreement was helping to enhance cooperation between neighbouring countries, with some countries investing in sections of the AH across their own borders. For example, in Mongolia the ADB was supporting the development of 750 km of road between Yaratai-Houd-Ulaanbaishint, which would link China and the Russian Federation through Mongolia, while India was investing in the road from its border to the capital of Bhutan, Thimpu. With regard to the work being undertaken on the Trans-Asian Railway, the demonstration runs of container block trains across the TAR Northern Corridor were stimulating great interest amongst the trading communities of the far east and in Europe. In addition to the launch of regular operations, for example the Mongolian Vector between Ulaanbaatar and Brest, a number of trial runs for the development of new services between Asia and Europe were being planned. UNESCAP was also helping to track and monitor these runs, with the aim of helping the railways to identify bottlenecks and promote their services..

23. The representative of UNECE Transport Division presented data of the “World Bank Doing Business” program, which assesses the procedural requirements for exporting and importing a standardized cargo of goods. Every official procedure is counted from the contractual agreement between the two parties to the delivery of goods along with the time and cost necessary for completion. The representative presented detailed information – by country - on the number of documents required to export/import goods and the time necessary to comply with all procedures required to export/import goods. In particular, the information on the duration of inland transport, customs clearance and document preparation was stressed. Many of the countries participating in the Euro-Asian Transport Links project were shown to lag relative to the most efficient countries in the world.

J. Lessons learned from the implementation of the UN Development Account project

24. The meeting discussed some of the major lessons learned from the implementation of the UN Development Account project, both in terms of administrative issues and substantive issues. The main recommendations from the discussion are summarized in Section VII. below.

VI. WAYS TO PROCEED IN THE FUTURE

25. The meeting discussed a number of pressing issues regarding the future of the project. The meeting agreed that the project should be continued through a second phase, and noted that a project proposal for Phase II had been jointly prepared by the UNECE-UNESCAP secretariats and submitted to the OSCE for its members to consider financing. The meeting also made a number of suggestions on what the focus of the second phase should be. The main recommendations from the discussion are summarized in Section VII. below.

VII. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

26. Following intensive discussions on all the items of the agenda, the participants of the Meeting came to the following conclusions:

27. The Meeting considered the Euro-Asian Transport routes maps, which have been elaborated on the basis of the decisions of the 3rd Expert Group Meeting and were distributed to all participating countries. It also considered some modifications proposed by countries and the UNECE and UNESCAP (hereafter called secretariat). Experts provided clarifications on the sections of the rail, road and inland water transport routes. The adopted changes are reflected in Annex 4.

28. The Meeting requested the secretariat to communicate the revised list of selected routes to the National Focal Points of countries that were not present in the meeting seeking their consensus by 15 December 2006. It was agreed that after the expiration of the set deadline the consolidated list of routes would be annexed to the final report and the respective in house study.

29. The Meeting noted that some of the identified EATL routes fall outside the routes covered by the E road network and the E rail network, the Asian Highway network and the Trans-Asian Railway network, and requested the experts to bring these routes to the attention of their respective governments. This would facilitate further discussions with neighbouring countries in order to follow the process and propose the inclusion of these sections in the respective agreements.

30. The Meeting highly appreciated the results of the GIS work and thanked Mr. Galbenu for his contribution. The Meeting agreed that upon collection and processing of the inputs by participating countries, a CD containing the relevant work would be distributed to all National Focal Points. The CD would allow countries to view the respective maps and associated data in a GIS environment for a number of pre-selected layers. At the same time the meeting agreed that the respective set of most important maps be posted on the project's website.

31. The Meeting requested the secretariat to complete the GIS work and include its further development in the follow-up activities of the project in future.

32. The Meeting highly appreciated the results of the prioritisation exercise of investment projects and thanked Professor Tsamboulas (NTUA) for his contribution. National Focal Point of Russian Federation was requested to submit by 15 December 2006, its country inputs for the priority projects to be considered in the final report. The same as above deadline was set for submission of comments by the National Focal Points to the draft report on the prioritisation exercise, which was distributed to the participants (Annex 5).

33. The Meeting recognized that the identified projects could serve as reference from the international perspective and emphasized the importance of national priorities attached by the individual governments.

34. The Meeting agreed that thereafter the revised final report of the work be distributed to the National Focal Points and be included in the in house study.

35. The Meeting agreed that monitoring the implementation of identified priority projects should be among the follow-up activities and encouraged participating countries to implement priority projects along the selected routes. It noted that future tasks of the project could include activities aiming at assisting countries to (a) elaborate national Master Plans (b) consider those national plans into sub-regional and regional context (c) elaborate an interregional infrastructure development strategy along the Euro-Asian transport routes and its funding possibilities and (d) seek funding of priority infrastructure projects including facilitation meetings of donors and International Financial Institutions.

36. The Meeting welcomed the closer cooperation of OSCE and UNECE-UNESCAP and in particular OSCE efforts to ensure funding for the continuation of the project in a new Phase II (2007-2010).

37. The Meeting was of view that the development of infrastructure alone will not achieve the objective of ensuring the smooth movement of goods between Europe and Asia and that much work is yet to be done to remove the non-physical obstacles. These obstacles need to be addressed in an integrated manner in consultation with the private sector.

38. The experts from each participating country briefed the meeting on the most significant barriers to the smooth movement of goods including administrative, operational, and legal obstacles that countries face and highlighted the improvements that have taken place.

39. The Meeting agreed that the UNESCAP time/cost-distance model should be used to identify and isolate the bottlenecks and assessing the success of facilitation measures and the competitiveness of the identified routes with periodic snapshots. In this regard, the meeting requested the secretariat to send the questionnaire on none physical bottlenecks to focal points that had not received the questionnaire and to also send the relevant templates to enable the focal points to collect the required data. The experts agreed to collect and send the data to the ESCAP secretariat within six weeks after receiving the questionnaire and template.

40. The experts recognized the role of multilateral and bilateral agreements and national legislation in facilitating the smooth movement of goods along the Euro-Asian transport links. They noted the international legal instruments developed under the auspices of ECE and the priority international conventions included in ESCAP resolution 48/11 and the proposal to enhance the resolution 48/11.

41. In this regard, the Meeting agreed that greater effort is needed to promote international legal instruments in the area of border-crossing facilitation, including accession to them and effective implementation. The Meeting requested the secretariats to work with countries to assess the implications of the international agreements, and the implementation of existing agreements.

42. The Meeting noted the role of the transport and trade facilitation mechanisms at a national level and the need for coordination between the EATL Focal Points and Facilitation bodies. In this regard the Meeting welcomed the national workshops that are being undertaken under the project, with a focus on facilitation mechanisms and legal frameworks.

43. The Meeting welcomed the proposal of the IRU to strengthen cooperation with the project in a new Phase II in particular related with the extension of the monitoring of the border crossing waiting times along main Euro-Asian routes, accessible to all those concerned.

44. The Meeting discussed the first draft of the in-house study on developing Euro-Asian transport links elaborated by the secretariat as well as the draft conclusions and recommendations. It was agreed that the recommendations of the study should include the following points:

- the extension of the project into the new Phase II (2007-2010) is essential to ensure the continuity and sustainability of the results achieved so far;
- the widening of the geographical coverage in the Phase II to include more countries from Europe and Asia. This would facilitate the identification of complete Euro-Asian routes along the Euro-Asian axis;
- in order to implement the Phase II of the project, government, international financial institutions and other potential donors have to provide the necessary funding;
- the results of the in-house study should be widely disseminated among international organizations and governments. This would allow the appropriate intergovernmental bodies in the UNECE and UNESCAP as well as concerned governments or other relevant bodies to make the best use of the results;
- promote and disseminate information on the project at high level conferences and other appropriate fora.

45. The Meeting agreed that in the Phase II the project should focus on the following points:

- Setting up the appropriate mechanism for ensuring coordination and monitoring of the development of the Euro-Asian links as well as active involvement and cooperation of the countries and other bodies concerned;
- Further assessment and prioritization of transport infrastructure projects along the main Euro-Asian transport links;
- Further development and regular updating of the GIS database;
- Identifying, isolating and addressing the obstacles that hamper the smooth movement of goods along the Euro-Asian linkages;
- Improving the performance of border crossing operations along the Euro-Asian linkages;
- Promoting the harmonization of transport legislation and administrative procedures for the development of international transport operations along the main Euro-Asian transport routes;
- Preparing recommendations for further actions based on lessons learned;
- Disseminating widely relevant information.

46. The Meeting identified a number of activities that could be considered “the best practices” on developing transport infrastructure and facilitation of international transport in Europe and Asia. These include:

- the TEM and TER projects and their Master Plan;

- the EU High Level Group;
- the UNESCAP time/cost-distance methodology;
- the development of freight village concept;
- the IRU and TER project border crossing monitoring activities;
- the co-financing of the development and upgrading of AH network;
- demonstration runs of container block trains.

47. The Meeting agreed that the National Focal Points would, within one month from the receipt of the final draft on the in-house study, communicate their comments to the secretariat in order to be considered in the final report.

48. The meeting discussed the lessons learned from the implementation of the project. The following points were cited as among the basic elements of success:

- the nomination of the National Focal Points by the Governments involved;
- the submission of country reports based on uniform questionnaires;
- the willingness of the countries to cooperate;
- the organization of the expert group meetings kindly hosted by governments;
- the use of expertise provided by external consultants for the implementation of specific tasks;
- the GIS work and the project prioritization exercise;
- the organization of national workshops in the framework of capacity building activities of the project.

49. Furthermore the meeting identified problems encountered. These include:

- late nomination of national focal points by some participating countries;
- incomplete submission of data by some countries;
- delays in the provision of expected country inputs from some countries.

50. The meeting discussed the best use of the results and experience from the implementation of the project. It felt that for both, infrastructure and facilitation exercises it is recommended that the project results should be brought to the attention of the appropriate bodies in the ECE and ESCAP for consideration of possible follow up actions in the framework of their normal legislative and normative work.

51. The Meeting discussed the establishment of a suitable mechanism for ensuring efficient coordination and monitoring of activities related to Euro-Asian links on the basis of the Expert Group established under the project. It felt that the existing Expert Group is well equipped to continue and further develop the work that has already been accomplished in this respect and that the continuation of this Group would ensure the necessary sustainability and momentum of this activity. It recommended that the project would ensure the necessary sustainability and momentum of this activity.

52. The Meeting also recommended that a formal letter from ECE/ESCAP be addressed to the Governments of the involved countries announcing the continuation of the exercise and asking for the renewal of the mandate to the designated National Focal Points to continue the work for the period 2007-2010. The meeting also recommended that the respective Governments be requested to designate an alternate person who could assist the work of the National Focal Point and substitute the National Focal Point in case needed.

53. The Meeting expressed its appreciation to the Ministry of Transport and Communications of Greece and the Greek Government for its warm hospitality and efficient organization in hosting the Meeting, as well as Thessaloniki Port Authority, Egnatia Odos, and Superfast Ferries for hosting a number of side events.

Annex 1

AGENDA

Opening of the Meeting, welcome addresses

1. Summary of progress to date

EXPERT GROUP MEETING - PART ONE

DEVELOPING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURES ALONG EURO-ASIAN ROUTES

2. Review of the work done on developing a Euro-Asian transport network
 - a. Overview of European transport networks
 - b. Overview of Asian networks
 - c. Recap of selected Euro-Asian transport routes using maps and associated data
 - d. Comments and views of countries
3. Review of the GIS work done and consideration for its use and further development
 - a. Demonstration of the final product of the GIS work, strengths and weaknesses
 - b. Consideration of the its use and future development
 - c. Comments and view of countries
4. Identification of priority projects to improve transport operations along selected Euro-Asian routes
 - a. Results of the evaluation and prioritization of projects, strengths and weaknesses
 - b. Comments and views of countries
5. Country presentations on progress on connecting route infrastructure along the selected routes
6. Complementary Activities of other Organizations (with a particular focus on priority investment areas of IFIs)

TRANSPORT FACILITATION ALONG SELECTED EURO-ASIAN ROUTES

7. Non-physical obstacles to transit transport along the selected routes as well as measures to remove them
 - a. Application of the UNESCAP cost/time-distance methodology along Euro-Asian transport routes
 - b. Comments and views of countries
 - c. Results of questionnaire on transport facilitation
 - d. Country Presentations on non-physical obstacles, focusing on most significant barriers to the smooth movement of goods
8. Legal arrangements for the smooth movement of goods internationally, comments and views of countries

ECE-ESCAP IN-HOUSE STUDY ON DEVELOPING EURO-ASIAN TRANSPORT LINKS

9. Draft ECE-ESCAP in-house study on developing Euro-Asian transport links
 - a. Presentation of conclusions and recommendations of the study
 - b. Comments and view of countries

EXPERT GROUP MEETING - PART TWO

SHARING BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

10. Presentation of best practices on developing transport infrastructure and facilitation of international transport in Europe and Asia
 - a. Best practices in Europe
 - b. Best practices in Asia
11. Lessons learned from the implementation of the UNDA project on interregional transport linkages
 - a. Lessons learned from the implementation of the Euro-Asian transport links project component
 - b. Best use of the results and experience from the implementation of the Euro-Asian transport links project

WAYS TO PROCEED IN FUTURE

12. Next steps on developing Euro-Asian transport links
 - a. Establishment of a suitable mechanism for ensuring efficient coordination and monitoring of activities related to Euro-Asian links on the basis of the Expert Group established under the project
 - b. Continuation of the project in a new Phase II (2007 – 2010)
13. Adoption of summary conclusions and recommendations

Annex 2

PROGRAMME

1st Day: Tuesday, 21 November 2006

0900	Registration	
OPENING OF THE MEETING		
09.30	Welcome addresses Agenda Item 1: Summary of progress to date	Representative of Government of Greece ECE - ESCAP ECE
EXPERT GROUP MEETING - PART ONE		
DEVELOPING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURES ALONG EURO-ASIAN ROUTES		
10.00	Agenda Item 2: Review of the work done on developing a Euro-Asian transport network a. Overview of European transport networks b. Overview of Asian transport networks c. Recap of selected Euro-Asian transport routes using maps and associated data d. Comments and views of countries	ECE ESCAP ECE – ESCAP National Focal Points
11.00	Coffee break	
11.30	Agenda Item 3: Review of the GIS work done and consideration for its use and further development a. Demonstration of the final product of the GIS work, strengths and weaknesses b. Consideration of its use and future development c. Comments and views of countries	ECE and Mr. R. Galbenu National Focal Points
12.15	Agenda Item 4: Identification of priority projects to improve transport operations along selected Euro-Asian routes a. Results of the evaluation and prioritization of projects, strengths and weaknesses b. Comments and views of countries	Prof. D. Tsamboulas National Focal Points
13.00	Lunch break	

DEVELOPING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURES ALONG EURO-ASIAN ROUTES (continued)		
14.00	Agenda Item 5: Country presentations on progress on connecting route infrastructure along the selected routes	National Focal Points Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, China, Georgia, Kazakhstan,
15.30	<i>Coffee break</i>	
16.00	Agenda Item 5: (continued) Country presentations on progress on connecting route infrastructure along the selected routes	Kyrgyzstan, Iran, Moldova, Romania, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, Uzbekistan
17.30	<i>End of Day One Meeting</i>	
20.00	<i>Gala Dinner kindly hosted by Superfast Ferries</i>	

2nd Day: Wednesday, 22 November 2006

DEVELOPING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURES ALONG EURO-ASIAN ROUTES (continued)		
09.30	Agenda Item 6: Complementary Activities of other Organizations (with a particular focus on priority investment areas of IFIs)	EC-OSCE -IRU-other
11.00	<i>Coffee break</i>	
TRANSPORT FACILITATION ALONG SELECTED EURO-ASIAN ROUTES		
11.30	Agenda Item 7: Non-physical obstacles to transit transport along the selected routes as well as measures to remove them a. Application of the UNESCAP cost/time-distance methodology along Euro-Asian transport routes b. Comments and views of countries c. Results of questionnaire on transport facilitation	ESCAP and National Focal Points of participating countries
13.00	<i>Lunch break</i>	
TRANSPORT FACILITATION ALONG SELECTED EURO-ASIAN ROUTES (continued)		
14.00	Agenda Item 7: Non-physical obstacles to transit transport along the selected routes as well as measures to remove them (continued)	

	d. Country Presentations on non-physical obstacles, focusing on most significant barriers to the smooth movement of goods	National Focal Points
15.30	<i>Coffee break</i>	
16.00	<u>Agenda Item 8:</u> Legal arrangements for the smooth movement of goods internationally, comments and views of countries	ECE-ESCAP and National Focal Points
17.30	<i>End of Day Two Meeting</i>	
20.00	<i>Dinner kindly hosted by Thessaloniki Port Authority</i>	

3rd Day: Thursday, 23 November 2006

ECE-ESCAP IN-HOUSE STUDY ON DEVELOPING EURO-ASIAN TRANSPORT LINKS		
09.00	<u>Agenda Item 9:</u> Draft ECE-ESCAP in-house study on developing Euro-Asian transport links a. Presentation of conclusions and recommendations of the study b. Comments and views of countries	ECE-ESCAP National Focal Points
EXPERT GROUP MEETING - PART TWO		
10.00	<u>Item 10:</u> Presentations of best practices on developing transport infrastructure and facilitation of international transport in Europe and Asia a. Best practices in Europe b. Best practices in Asia	Europlatforms, ECE ESCAP
11.15	<i>Coffee break</i>	
SHARING BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED		
11.30	<u>Item 11:</u> Lessons learned from the implementation of the UNDA project on interregional transport linkages a. Lessons learned from the implementation of the Euro-Asian transport links project component b. Best use of the results and experience from the implementation of the Euro-Asian transport links project	ECE and ESCAP Discussion

12.30	<i>End of Day Three Meeting</i>
12.30	<i>Lunch break</i>
13.15	Guided visit to the archaeological site of Vergina (the ancient Capital of Macedonia) and the Royal Tomb of Philip II, father of Alexander The Great, kindly hosted by the Ministry of Transport and Communications of Greece http://alexander.macedonia.culture.gr/2/21/211/21117a/e2111qa04.html
15.30	Technical visit to “Kastania” construction site of EGNATIA Motorway kindly organized by EGNATIA ODOS SA
17.30	<i>Return to Hotel</i>
20.00	<i>Dinner kindly hosted by EGNATIA ODOS SA</i>

4th Day: Friday, 24 November 2006

WAYS TO PROCEED IN FUTURE		
09.30	<p><u>Item 12:</u> Next steps on developing Euro-Asian transport links</p> <p>a. Establishment of a suitable mechanism for ensuring efficient coordination and monitoring of activities related to Euro-Asian links on the basis of the Expert Group established under the project</p> <p>b. Continuation of the project in a new Phase II (2007 – 2010)</p>	<p>ECE and ESCAP National Focal Points</p> <p>ECE and ESCAP</p>
11.00	<i>Coffee break</i>	
11.30 – 13.00	<i>Presentation of Thessaloniki Port and visit to the Port</i>	
13.00	<u>Item 13:</u> Adoption of summary conclusions and recommendations	
14.00	<i>End of the Expert Group Meeting</i>	

Annex 3

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

СПИСОК УЧАСТНИКОВ

PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES		СТРАНЫ УЧАСТНИКИ
Republic of Azerbaijan		Азербайджанская Республика
1.	Mr. Ramiz Talib SHARİFOV Deputy Chief, Department of International Relations, Ministry of Transport 1054, Tbilisi Ave., Baku, AZ1 122 Tel: (99412) 339920 Fax:(99412) 17266 Email: ramiz@mintrans.az	Рамиз Талиб оглы ШАРИФОВ Заместитель начальника отдела международных отношений, Министерство транспорта Азербайджана
Republic of Bulgaria		Республика България
2.	Mr. Nikolai B. STRATIEV Director of International cooperation Directorate Ministry of Transport “Dyakon Ignaty” street 9 Sofia 1000 Tel: +35 92 9409616 Fax: +35 92 9874942 E-mail: Nstratiev@mtc.government.bg	Николай СТРАТИЕВ Начальник управления международного сотрудничества, Министерство транспорта Болгарии
China		Китай
3.	Mr. Xiaojie ZHANG Director International Organizations Division Dept. of International Cooperation Ministry of Communications 11, Jianguomenei Avenue Beijing 100736 Tel: (86-10) 6529 2210 Fax: (86-10) 6529-2246 E-mail: Zhangxj@moc.gov.cn	Ксяожи ЖАНГ Начальник отдела международных организаций Департамента международного сотрудничества, Министерство связи Китая
Georgia		Грузия
4.	Mr. Lasha KHMIADASHVILI Head of Division Ministry of Economic Development 12 Chanturia Street 0108 Tbilisi Tel.: +995 32 988 901 Fax: +995 32 934 545 E-mail: l_khmiadashvili@econom.ge	Лаша ХМИАДАШВИЛИ Начальник отдела, Министерство экономического развития Грузии
Greece		Греция

5.	Mrs. Kalliopi RIGAKI-PAPADAKI International Affairs Division Ministry of Transport and Communications 2, Anastaseos Str., Papagou GR-101 91 ATHENS Tel: +30 210-650 8442 Fax: +30 210-650 8409 E-mail. k.lianou@yme.gov.gr	Καλλιόπη ΡΙΓΑΚΙ-ΠΑΠΑΔΑΚΙ Отдел международных отношений, Министерство транспорта и связи Греции
----	---	---

6.	Ms. Konstantina LIANOU International Affairs Division Ministry of Transport and Communications 2, Anastaseos Str., Papagou GR-101 91 ATHENS Tel: +30 210-6508421 Fax: +30 210-6508409 E-mail. k.lianou@yme.gov.gr	Константина ЛИАНУ Отдел международных отношений, Министерство транспорта и связи Греции
7.	Mr. Konstantinos GKRINIAS Head of the Studies and Research Dept. Port Authority of Igoumenitsa S.A. New Port of Igoumenitsa GR-461 00 IGOUMENITSA Tel: +30 266 50 99320 Fax: +30 266 50 99338 E-mail. Kgrinias@olig.gr	Константинос ГКРИНИАС Начальник исследовательского отдела Администрация порта Игуменица Новый порт Игуменица
8.	Mr. Evangelos MELLOS Managing Director Port Authority of Igoumenitsa S.A. Central Passenger Terminal New Port of Igoumenitsa GR-461 00 IGOUMENITSA Tel: +30 266 50 99300 Fax: +30 266 50 99330 E-mail. Olig@olig.gr	Евангелос МЕЛЛИОС Заместитель директора по административно-хозяйственной части, Администрация порта Игуменица Центральный пассажирский терминал Новый порт Игуменица
9.	Mr. Nikolaos KOLETISIS Head Officer International Affairs Department Secretariat of Ports and Port Policy Ministry of Mercantile Marine Akti Kondili 26-28 and Aitolikou GR-185 45 PIRAEUS Tel: +30 210-4146 322 Fax: +30 210-4146 334 E-mail. dlpa@yen.gr	Николаос КОЛЕТСИС Старший сотрудник Секретариат порта и портовой полиции Министерство торгового флота
	Kazakhstan	Казахстан
10.	Ms. Zukhra ABISHEVA Head of Section Dept. of Transport Policy and Foreign Relations Ministry of Transport and Communications Kabanbay Batyr St., 47, Astana Tel: +3172- 242-097 Fax: +3172 - 241-763 E-mail: abisheva@mtc.gov.kz	Зухра АБИШЕВА Начальник секции, Департамент транспортной политики и международных отношений Министерство транспорта и связи Казахстана
	Moldova	Молдова
11.	Mr. Nicolae A. CIOBANU Chief of Road Industry Department Ministry of Transport and Road Industry Blvd Stefan cel Mare, 134 Chisinau, MD 2012 Tel: +37-322 251165 Fax: +37-322 546 564	Николай ЧОБАНУ Начальник Департамента дорожного хозяйства, Министерство транспорта и дорожного хозяйства Молдовы

	E-mail: ciobanu@mtc.gov.md	
12.	Mr. Vitalie PANURCO General Director The State Road Administration Bucuriei, 12a Chisinau, MD Tel: +37-322 740 727 Fax: +37-322 740 570 E-mail: ciobanu@mtc.gov.md	Виталий ПАНУРКО Генеральный директор Государственная дорожная администрация
	Romania	Румыния
13.	Mr. Alexandru Serban CUCU General Director Ministry of Transport, Construction and Tourism, 38, Dinicu Golescu Bucharest Sector 1 Tel: +4021 319 6203 Fax: +4021 319 6106 Email: news24@mt.ro / dtmdie@mt.ro	Александру Щербан КУКУ Генеральный директор, Министерство транспорта, строительства и туризма Румынии
	Russian Federation	Российская Федерация
14.	Mr. Viacheslav I. ARSENOV Director of SCCT Scientific Centre of Complex Transport Problems Ministry of Transport of the Russian Federation 34 "B" Sofiyskaya nab. Moscow 115035 Tel: +495- 953 46 34, 953 89 13 Email: necktp@online.ru	Вячеслав АРСЕНОВ Директор научного центра по комплексным транспортным проблемам, Министерство транспорта РФ
15.	Mr. Yury DEMIDOV Consultant International Cooperation Department Ministry of Transport of the Russian Federation Rozhdestrenka 1, bld.1 Moscow 109012 Tel: +7-095- 926-9574 Fax: +7-095- 926-9116	Юрий ДЕМИДОВ Консультант Департамент международного сотрудничества, Министерство транспорта РФ
16.	Ms. Elena BATALOVA Leading Expert International Cooperation Department Ministry of Transport of the Russian Federation Rozhdestrenka 1, bld.1 Moscow 109012 Tel: +7-095- 926-9693 Fax: +7-095-926-9116 Email: batalovaLv@mintrans.ru	Елена БАТАЛОВА Ведущий эксперт Департамент международного сотрудничества, Министерство транспорта РФ
	Tajikistan	Таджикистан
17.	Mr. Anvar NUROV Senior Specialist Dept. of Transport and Communications Office of the President Rudaky Street, 80 Dushanbe	Анвар НУРОВ Главный специалист Управление транспорта и связи, Администрация Президента Таджикистана

	Tel: +992 372 21 58 24 Fax: +992 372 21 51 10 Email: transcomrt@mail.ru	
	Ukraine	Украина
18.	Mr. Hryhorii LEHENKYI Director, Transport and Communications Systems Development and Coordination Department, Ministry of Transport and Communications of Ukraine 14, Peremogy ave. 01135 Kyiv Tel.: +380-44 461 65 40 Fax: +380-44 2165338 Email: vmtkl@mtu.gov.ua	Григорий ЛЕГЕНЬКИЙ Директор Департамента развития и координации систем транспорта и связи, Министерство транспорта и связи Украины
	INTERNATIONAL & REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS	МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЕ И РЕГИОНАЛЬНЫЕ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ
	UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP)	Экономическая и социальная Комиссия ООН для Азии и Тихого океана (ЭСКАТО)
19.	Ms. Geetha KARANDAWALA Chief, Transport Facilitation Section Transport and Tourism Division Rajdamnern Avenue Bangkok 10200, Thailand Tel: +66-2288-1376 Fax: +66-2280-6042 Email: karandawala.unescap@un.org	Гиита КАРАНДАВАЛА Начальник секции упрощения перевозок, Отдел транспорта и туризма
20.	Mr. Dongwoo HA Chief, Transport Infrastructure Section Transport and Tourism Division Rajdamnern Avenue Bangkok 10200 Tel: +662 288-1515 Fax: +66-288-3050 Email: hadw@un.org	Донгвуу ХА Начальник секции транспортной инфраструктуры, Отдел транспорта и туризма
21.	Ms. Fuyo Jenny YAMAMOTO Economic Affairs Officer Transport Infrastructure Section Transport and Tourism Division Rajdamnern Avenue Bangkok 10200, Thailand Tel: +66-2288-2488 Fax: +66-288-6042 Email: yamamotoj@un.org	Фуо Джени ЯМАМОТО Специалист по экономическим вопросам Секция транспортной инфраструктуры, Отдел транспорта и туризма

	UN European Commission for Europe (UNECE)	Европейская экономическая комиссия ООН (ЕЭК ООН)
22.	Mr. Michalis ADAMANTIADIS Chief, Transport and Infrastructure Development Section Transport Division 8-14, avenue de la Paix CH-1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland Tel.+41229171128 Fax.+41229170039 Email: michalis.adamantiadis@unece.org	Михалис АДАМАНТИАДИС Начальник секции транспорта и развития инфраструктуры, Отдел транспорта
23.	Mr. Robert NOWAK Economic Affairs Officers Transport Division 8-14, avenue de la Paix CH-1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland Tel.+4122917 1267 Fax.+41229170039 Email: robert.nowak@unece.org	Роберт НОВАК Специалист по экономическим вопросам, Отдел транспорта
24.	Ms. Caroline JEUNET Programme Assistant Transport Division 8-14, avenue de la Paix Palais des Nations CH-1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland Tel.+412291732 42 Fax. +41229170039 Email: caroline.jeUNET@unece.org	Каролин ЖЕНЕ Ассистент программы, Отдел транспорта
	EUROPEAN COMMISSION	ЕВРОПЕЙСКАЯ КОМИССИЯ
25.	Ms. Sanna KUUKKA Administrator DG Energy and Transport European Commission Rue de Mot, 24 B-1040 Brussels, Belgium Tel: + 32 2 29 55726 Fax: + 32 2 29 54349 Email: Sanna.Kuukka@ec.europa.eu	Санна КУУККА Администратор Генеральный директорат по вопросам энергии и транспорта, Европейская комиссия
	OSCE	ОБСЕ
26.	Mr. Gabriel LEONTE Economic and Environmental Adviser OSCE Secretariat Kartnerring 5-7 1010 Vienna, Austria Tel: +43 664 920 92 94 Fax: +43 664 514 36 6251 Email: Gabriel.leonte@osce.org	Габриэль ЛЕОНТЕ Консультант по экономическим вопросам и охране окружающей среды Секретариат ОБСЕ

	INTERNATIONAL ROAD TRANSPORT UNION (IRU)	Международный союз автомобильного транспорта (МСАТ)
27.	<p>Mr. Haydar ÖZKAN General Delegate IRU Permanent Delegation to the Middle East and Region Yapı Kredi Plaza c Blok Kat. 15 Levent 34330 Istanbul, Turkey Tel: (90 212) 284 97 47 Fax: (90 212) 284 97 52 E-mail: Haydar.ozkan@iru.org</p>	<p>Хайдар ОЗКАН Генеральный представитель Постоянная делегация МСАТ на Среднем Востоке и регионе</p>
	EUROPLATFORMS	ЕВРОПЛАТФОРМЫ
28.	<p>Mr. Gilberto GALLONI President EUROPLATFORMS GEIE c/o INTERPORTO BOLOGNA SpA Via Altabella, 15 I - 40126 Bologna, Italy Tel: +39 051 2913011 Fax: +39 051 221505 Email: interportobo@bo.interporto.it</p>	<p>Жильберто ГАЛЛОНИ Президент</p>
	BLACK SEA INTERNATIONAL SHIPOWNERS ASSOCIATION (BINSА)	Международная ассоциация судовладельцев Черноморского бассейна (БИНСА)
29.	<p>Mr. Sakit MALIKOV Expert Pionerskaya Str. UKR-65009 Odessa, Ukraine Tel: +38 0482 68 80 29 Fax: +38 0482 728 60 33 E-mail: binsa@ukr.net</p>	<p>Сакит МАЛИКОВ Эксперт</p>
	OTHER PARTICIPANTS	ДРУГИЕ УЧАСТНИКИ
30.	<p>Ms. Foula ANAGNOSTOPOULOU Cargo Director Superfast Ferries 157, C. Karamanli Avenue GR-16673 VOULA, Greece Tel: +30 210-891 9110 Fax: +30 210-891 9119 E-mail: fa@superfast.com</p>	<p>Фула АНАГНОСТОПУЛОС Директор по грузовым перевозкам Superfast Ferries</p>
31.	<p>Mrs. Iro DIMITRIADOU Head of Studies Department TRADEMCO S.A. 21, Kodratou str. GR-104 36 ATHENS, Greece Tel: +30 210 527 9300 Fax: +30 210 527 9399 Email: idimitriadou@trademco.gr</p>	<p>Иро ДИМИТРИАДУ Начальник исследовательского отдела TRADEMCO S.A.</p>

32.	<p>Mr. Miltiadis ARVANITIDIS Head of Marketing and Sales Thessaloniki Port Authority S.A. P.O. Box 10467 GR-54 110 THESSALONIKI Tel: +30 2310 593 393 Fax: +30 2310 530 729 Email: marvanitidis@thpa.gr</p>	<p>Мильтиадис АРВАНИТИДИС Начальник отдела торговли и сбыта Администрация порта Салоники</p>
33.	<p>Mr. Marilena ARGHYROU Editor-in-Chief Supply Chain & Logistics Magazine Vouliagmenis Ave. & 33 Karpou Str. GR-116 31 ATHENS, Greece Tel. +30 210 901 0040 Fax: +30 210 901 0041 Email: arghyrou@supply-chain.gr</p>	<p>Марилена АРГИРУ Главный редактор Supply Chain & Logistics Magazine</p>

	RESOURCE PERSONS	ПРИГЛАШЕННЫЕ ЭКСПЕРТЫ
34.	<p>Mr. Dimitrios TSAMBOULAS Associate Professor Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering National Technical University of Athens 5, Iroon polytechniou str., Zografou GR – 13773, Greece Tel: +30210-7721367 Fax: +30210-7722404 E-mail: dtsamb@central.ntua.gr</p>	<p>Димитриос ЦАМБОУЛАС Адъюнкт-профессор, Департамент транспортного планирования и машиностроения, Афинский национальный технический университет</p>
35.	<p>Mr. Romeo Mihai GALBENU Consultant GIS and Database issues Baraju Iezeru Nr. 4a. M2A+B, sc. B, Ap.36 BUCHAREST, Romania Tel: +40 074109 7056 Email: yellrom@gmail.com</p>	<p>Ромео Михай ГАЛБЕНУ Консультант во вопросам геоинформационных систем (ГИС) и базам данных Румыния</p>

Annex 4

**SELECTED EURO-ASIAN RAIL, ROAD, INLAND WATER TRANSPORT ROUTES AND
INLAND WATER TRANSPORT PORTS FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT AND
COOPERATION**

1. RAIL ROUTES

		Comment	AGC	TAR¹
1.	Brest - Minsk - Moscow – Nizhniy Novgorod – Perm - Yekaterinburg - Omsk - Novosibirsk - Ulan Ude - Karimskaya – Vladivostock (Port)/Vostochny (Port)	PETC 2; OSJD 1	E20	Y
1.a.	Buslovskaya – St. Petersburg (Port) –Moscow - Yekaterinburg	PETC 9; OSJD 16	E10, E20	YI
1.b.	Mostiska/ Chop - Lvov – Moscow	PETC 5, 9; OSJD3	E30, E95	N
1.c.	Tavshet – Irkutsk – Ulan Ude – Naushki – <i>Border with Mongolia</i>		N	Y
1.d.	Karimskaya – Zabaykalsk – <i>Border with China</i>		N	Y
1.e.	Kaliningrad – (<i>Lithuania</i>) – Minsk		N	NA
1.f.	Novosibirsk – Lokot – Aktogai		N	Y
2.	Brest - Minsk - Moscow - Yekaterinburg – Kurgan - Astana - Drujba - Urumqi - Lianyungang (Port)/Shanghai (Port)	PETC 2; OSJD 1	E20, E24	Y
2.a.	Buslovskaya – St. Petersburg (Port) –Moscow - Yekaterinburg	PETC 9; OSJD 16	E10, E20	Y
2.b.	Kaliningrad – (<i>Lithuania</i>) – Minsk		N	NA
2.c.	Ekaterinburg – Chelyabinsk – Taranovskaya – Zaayatskaya – Tobol – Astana		N	Y
3.	Curtici – Arad – Bucharest – Constanta (Port) – Poti/Batumi (Port) – Tbilisi – Baku (Port) – Aktau (Port) – Beineu – Nukus – Uchkuduk – Navoi – Tashkent – Shymkent – Almaty – Dostyk – <i>Alataw Shankou – Lianyungang (Port)/Shanghai (Port)</i>	PETC 4, TRACECA; OSJD 6a, 8, 10, 2, 5	E54, E562, E60, E50	Y
3.a.	Baku (Port) – Turkmenbashi (Port) – Ashgabat – Chardzhou – Bukhara – Navoi	TRACECA; OSJD 10	E60	Y
3.b.	Tbilisi – Sadakhlo – Gyumri - Yerevan - Gavar – Meghri – Nourdouz – Jolfa (Yerevan - Gavar – Meghri – Nourdouz – Jolfa under study)	TRACECA	E692	Y
3.c.	Balychi - Bishkek – Lugovaya	TRACECA	NA	Y
3.d.	Tashkent – Kanibadam – Andizhan - Jalalabad – Turunart – <i>Kashi – Urumai (Jalalabad – Turunart –</i>	TRACECA	E696	Y

		Comment	AGC	TAR ¹
	Kashi section under construction)			
3.f.	Dushanbe – Termez – [Turkmenistan] - Bukhara	TRACECA	E695	Y
3.g.	Mersin (Port) / Iskenderun (Port) – Malatya – Dogukapi – Gyumri – Sadakhlo – Tbilisi	TRACECA	E70, E692, E97	Y
3.h.	Ungheni - Chisinau – Bendery - Kuchurgan – Rozdil’na – Odessa (Port) / Ilyichevsk (Port) – Poti/Batumi (Port)	TRACECA; OSJD 5a, 7	E95	NA
3.i.	Border with FYROM - Sofia – Pleven – Varna (Port) – Poti/Batumi (Port)	PETC 8	E680	NA
3.j.	Curtici – Arad – Timisoara – Craiova – Bucharest – Giurgiu – Russe – Kaspichan – Varna (Port) – Poti/Batumi (Port)	PETC 10, 8	E66, E56, E95, E660, E680	NA
3.k.	Dragoman – Sofia – Gorna – Burgas (Port) – Poti/Batumi (Port)		E70, E720	NA
3.l.	Ungheni – Iasi – Bucharest – Giurgiu		E95	NA
3.m.	Bukhara – Karshi – [Turkmenistan] - Termez – Kurgan- T’ube – Kul’ab	TRACECA	E695	Y
3.n.	Kars – Akhalkalaki - Tbilisi (Kars – Akhalkalaki section under construction)		E692	Y
3.o.	Tashkent – Angren – Pap – Andijan (Angren – Pap section under construction)		E696	Y
3.p.	Chisinau – Revaca – Cainari – Giurgiulesti (river port) – Galati (port)		E95, E560	NA
4.	Dragoman - Sofia – Svilengrad – Kapikule – Istanbul – Haydarpara (Port) – Izmit – (Derince Port) - Ankara – Malatya - Kapikoye – Razi – Qazvin - Tehran – Sarakhs – Sarahs - Mary – Chardzou – Navoi – Tashkent – Shymkent – Almaty - Dostyk – Alataw Shankou – Lianyungang (Port)/Shanghai (Port)	PETC 4, 8, 10; OSJD 6, 10, 2, 5; TRACECA	E70, E60, E50	Y
4.a.	Mersin (Port) / Iskenderun (Port) – Malatya		E97	Y
4.b.	Ilyichevsk (Port) - Samsun (Port) – Kalin – Sivas – Bostankaya (rail ferry planned)	TRACECA	E97, E70	Y
4.c.	Tehran – Qom – Meybod – Yazd – Bafgh – Kerman – Zahedan – Mirjaveh – Koh-i-Taftan (Border with Pakistan) (Kerman – Zahedan under construction).		NA	Y
4.d.	Izmir (Port) – Balikesir – Eskisehir		E74	Y
4.e.	Izmir (Port) – Usak – Afyon – Yenice – Mersin (Port)/ Iskenderun (Port)		E97	N
4.f.	Pehlivankoy – Uzun-kopru – Border with Greece		NA	NA
4.g.	Ilychevsk (Port) – Derince (Port) - Izmit			NA

		Comment	AGC	TAR ¹
4.h.	Constanta (Port) – Derince (Port) – Izmit			NA
4.i.	Constanta (Port) – Samsun (Port) (<i>rail ferry planned</i>)			NA
5.	Buslovskaya - St. Petersburg (Port) – Volgograd – Astrakhan (Port) – Alya (Port) - Anzali (Port) – Rasht – Qazvin - Tehran – Qom – Meybod – Bafgh – Bandar Abbas (Port) (Anzali - Rasht – Qazvin section under construction)	PETC 9; OSJD 11	E10, E99, E50	Y
5.a.	Astrakhan (Port) – Alya (Port) – Amirabad (Port) – Garmsar – Tehran		NA	Y
5.b.	Astrakhan (Port) – Samur – Yalama - Baku – Astara (Azerbaijan) – Astara (Iran) – Rasht (Astara – Astara – Rasht section under study)	OSJD 11	E60, E694	Y
5.c.	Astrakhan (Port) – Askarayskaya – Ganyuchikino – Makat – Beineu – Nukus – Uchkuduk – Bukhara – Chardzhou – Sarahs - Sarakhs – Mashhad – Bafgh	TRACECA	E50, E597	Y
5.d.	Alya (Port) – Aktau (Port) – Beineu		E597	Y
5.e.	Tehran – Qom – Arak – Ahvaz - Bandar Emam (Port)		NA	Y
5.f.	Tehran – Kashan – Badrud - Esfahan – Shiraz – Bushehr (Port) (Esfahan – Shiraz – Bushehr planned)		NA	Y
5.g.	Bafgh – Kerman – Fahraj – Chabahar (Port) (Fahraj – Chabahar planned)		NA	Y
5.h.	Murmansk (Port) – St. Petersburg		NA	N
6.	Mostiska/ Chop/Yagudin - Lvov – Kiev – Kharkov – Liski – Samara – Ufa – Kurgan – Omsk - Novosibirsk - Ulan Ude - Karimskaya – Vladivostock (Port)/Vostochny (Port)	PETC 3, 5	E30, E24	Y
6.a.	Chisinau – Bender – Rozdil’na – Zhmerynka	PETC 9	E95,	NA
6.b.	Tavshet – Irkutsk – Ulan Ude – Naushki – <i>Border with Mongolia</i>		E20	Y
6.c.	Karimskaya – Zabaykalsk – <i>Border with China</i>		NA	Y
6.d.	Aktau (port) – Beyneu - Makat - Kandagach – Nikeltay – Chelyabinsk	TRACECA	E30, E50, E597	T
7.	Mostiska/ Chop - Lvov – Zhmerynka – Fastov – Donietsk – Likhaya – Volgograd – Aksarayskaya – Makat – Beineu – Nukus – Uchkuduk – Navoi – Tashkent – Shymkent – Almaty – Dostyk – <i>Alataw Shankou – Lianyungang (Port)/Shanghai (Port)</i>	PETC 3, 5 ; TRACECA	E30, E50, E593, E597	Y
8.	Mostiska/ Chop - Lvov – Fastov – Krasnoarmelsk – Kvashino – Uspenskaya – Rostav-na-Donu – Veseloe – Gandtiadi – Senaki – Tbilisi – Alyat – Astara (Azerbaijan) – Astara (Iran) (Astara – Astara section under construction)	PETC 3, 5; TRACECA	E30, E50, E593, E99, E60	Y

		Comment	AGC	TAR¹
8.a.	Tbilisi – Gyumri – Yerevan	TRACECA	E694	Y
8.b.	Kaliningrad (Port) – <i>(Lithuania)</i> – Minsk – Gornosaivka – Nizhyn – Kiev		E95	NA
8.c.	Kafkas (Port) – Novorossysk (Port) – Krasnodar		E99	Y
8.d.	Varna (Port) - Novorossysk (Port) – Poti/Batumi (Port)		NA	N
9.	Buslovskaya – Moscow – Ryazan – Orenburg – Aktyubinsk – Kandagach – Aris – Tashkent – Bukhara – Karshi – Tashguzar – Baysun – Kumchurgan – Termez – Galaba – Hairatan (border of Afghanistan) (Tashguzar – Baysun – Kumchurgan section under construction)	TRACECA	E10, E24, E30, E50, E695	Y
9.a.	Ryazan - Aksarayskaya – Makat – Karakalpakiya – Uchkuduck – Navoi – Bukhara	TRACECA	E50, E597	Y
9.b.	Rostov-na-Donu – Volgograd – Baskunchak - Aksarayskaya		E99, E50	Y
9.c.	Bukhara – Karshi – Tashguzar – Baysun - Kumchurgan – Sariacia – Dushanbe – Vaghdad (Tashguzar – Baysun – Kumchurgan section under construction)		E695	Y

Notes:

1. The Intergovernmental Agreement on the Trans-Asian Railway was adopted in 2005 and signed by 18 countries in 2006. It is now open for signature and accession by ESCAP member countries. Those sections which are in the Agreement will be indicated.
2. Italicized sections are located in countries who are not participating in the project or where countries have not confirmed inclusion.
3. Numbering is indicative only.
4. Turkey's border with Armenia is currently closed.

2. ROAD ROUTES

		AGR	AH
1.	Torfyanovka - St. Petersburg (Port)– Moscow – Nizhniy Novgorod – Ekaterinburg – Omsk – Novosibirsk – Krasnoyarsk – Irkutsk – Ulan Ude – Chita – Belogorsk – Khabarovsk – Ussuriysk - Vladivostock (Port)/Vostochny (Port)/Nahodka (Port)	E105, E22	AH8 AH6 AH30
1.a.	Brest – Minsk – Moscow	E85,E30	AH6
1.b.	Mostiska/Chop – Lvov – Kiev – Moscow	E40, E101	NA
1.c.	Moscow – Yaroslavl – Vologda – Archangelsk (Port)	E115	NA
1.d.	Semipalatinsk – Novossibirsk	N	N
2.	Brest – Minsk - Moscow – Nizhniy Novgorod – Ufa - Chelyabinsk – Kurgan – Petropavlovsk – Astana – Almaty – Khorgos – Jinghe – Urumqi – Xi’an – Lianyungang (Port) / Shanghai (Port)	E85, E30, E125	AH6, AH64, AH7 AH60
2.a.	Torfyanovka – St. Petersburg – Moscow	E18, E105	AH8
2.b.	Petropavlovsk – Omsk – Pavlodar – Semipalatinsk – Georgievka – Taskesken – Ucharal – Dostyk – Alatawshankou – Kuitun – Urumqi	E127	AH60, AH68, AH 5
2.c.	Moscow - Samara – Uralsk – Aktobe – Dossor – Makat – Beyneu – Nukus – Navoi – Tashkent – Almaty	E121, E38	AH 60, AH63, AH61
2.d.	Chelyabinsk – Kaerak – Kostani – Astana	E123, E016	AH7
2.e.	Archangelsk – Perm – Yekaterinburg – Kurgan – Petropavlovsk	N	N
3.	Mostiska - Lvov – Kiev – Guktov – Kursk – Saratov – Ozinki - Uralsk – Aktyubinsk – Karabutsk – Aralsk – Kyzylorda – Shymkent – Almaty – Khorgos – Jinghe – Urumqi – Xi’an – Lianyungang (Port) / Shanghai (Port)	E40, E95, E101, E38	AH61
3.a.	Chop – Uzhgorod – Mukacevo – Stryei – Lvov – Kiev – Kharkov – Kamensk – Shahtinskiy – Volgograd – Astrakhan – Atyrau – Beyneu – Nukus – Bukhara – Navoi - Samarkand – Tashkent – Shymkent	E40	AH70, AH8, AH63, AH5
3.b.	Yagodyn – Kovel – Sarny – Kiev	E373	NA
3.c.	Kaliningrad (Port) - Tolpaki – Nesterov – (Lithuania) - Minsk – Gomel – Kiev	E28, E271, E95	NA
3.d.	Mostiska/Chop – Uzhgorod – Mukacevo – Stryei – Ternopol – Khmel'nitski – Vinnitza – Uman – Kirovograd – Dnepropetrovsk – Donetsk – Rostov-na-Donu – Armavir – Mineralijnie Vodi – Vladikavkaz – (Tbilisi) - Makhachkala (Port) – Aktau (Port) – Beyneu	E50 E121	AH70
3.e.	Rostov-na-Donu – Krasnodar – Novorossiysk (Port) – Kafkas (Port) – Samsun (Port) / Poti/Batumi (Port) / Burgas (Port)	E115, E97	NA

		AGR	AH
3.f.	Sofia – Popvica – Stara Zagora – Burgas (Port) – Kafkas (Port) – Novorossysk (Port) – Poti/Batumi (Port)	E773	NA
4.	Nadlag - Arad – Bucharest – Constanta (Port) – Poti/Batumi (Port) – Tbilisi - Alat – Baku (Port) – Aktau (Port) – Beyneu – Nukus – Bukhara – Tashkent – Shymkent – Bishkek – Almaty – Sary-Ozek – Khorgos – Urumqi – Xi'an – Lianyungang (Port) / Shanghai (Port)	E68, E60, E121, E40, E60	AH5, AH70, AH63, AH62
4.a.	Tbilisi – Sadakho – Yerevan – Eraskh – Goris – Kapan – Megri – (Agarak) – Nourdouz – Jolfa (Iran)– Eyvoghli	E117	AH82
4.b.	Ruse – Giurgiu – Bucharest – Urziceni – Marasesti – Albita – Leucheni – Chisinau – Odessa (Port) – Poti/Batumi (Port)	E85, E581, E58	NA
4.c.	Kiev – Odessa (Port) / Ilyichevsk (Port) – Poti/Batumi (Port)	E95	NA
4.d.	Sofia – Pleven – Ruse – Varna (Port) – Poti/Batumi (Port)	E79, E83, E85, E70	NA
4.e.	Merzifon – Samsun (Port) – Trabzon (Port) - Sarp (Turkey) – Sarpi (Georgia) – Batumi (Port) – Poti (Port)	E95, E70	AH5
4.f.	Baku (Port) - Turkmenbashi (Port) – Ashgabat – Mary – Bukhara	E60	AH5
4.g.	Bishkek – Naryn – Torugart – Kashi	E125	AH61
4.h.	Shymkent – Merket – Almaty	NA	AH5
4.i.	Brest – territory of Belarus - border with Ukraine – territory of Ukraine – border with Moldova – Chisinau – Odessa (Port) / Ilyichevsk (Port) – Poti (Port) / Batumi (Port)	E30, E85	NA
4.j.	Batumi (Port) – Hopa – Kars – Gyumri – Yerevan	E70	AH5*
4.k.	Chisinau - Giurgiulesti (river port)	E584	NA
4.l.	Gyumri – Erzurum	E691, E80	NA
4.m.	Odessa (Port) / Ilyichevsk (Port) - Samsun (port) / Trabzon (port)	NA	NA
4.n.	Samsun (Port) / Trabzon (Port) — Poti/Batumi (Port)	NA	NA
4.o.	Djulfa (Azerbaijan) – Nakhichevan – Sadarak – Border with Turkey - Igdir (Turkey)	E99	N
5.	Border with Serbia Montenegro/FYR of Macedonia - Sofia – Kapikule – Istanbul – (Haydarpasa Port) - Izmit (Derince Port) – Merzifon – Refahiye - Gurbulak – Bazargan – Eyvoghli - Tabriz - Qazvin – Tehran – Semnan – Damghan – Sabzevar – Mashhad – Dogharoun – Islam Qala – Herat – Mazar-i-Sharif – Termez – Guzar – Samarkand – Tashkent – Andizhan – Osh – Sary-Tash – Irkeshtam – Kashi – Urumqi – Xi'an – Lianyungang (Port)/ Shanghai (Port)	E80	AH1, AH5, AH85, AH 77
5.a.	Tehran - (Saveh – Salafchegan) - Oom – Yazd – Anar –	NA	AH 2

		AGR	AH
	Kerman – Zahedan – Mirjaveh - <i>Border of Pakistan</i>		
5.b.	<i>Nadlag</i> – Arad – Timisoara – Lugoj - Carasebes – Dr.-Turnu – Severin – Craiova – Calafat – Vidin – Botevgrad – Sofia	E70, E79	NA
5.c.	<i>Istanbul (Kinalı Junction) – Silivri – Kesan – Kipi – Alexandroupolis (port) – Kommotini – Xanthi – Kavala (port) – Thessaloniki (port) – Veria – Metsovo – Igoumenitsa (port)</i>	E90, E84	NA
5.d.	Kiev – Uman - Odessa (Port) / Ilyichevsk (Port) – Samsun (Port) - Merzifon	E95	AH5
5.e.	Mashhad – Sarakhs – Tejen	NA	AH75
5.f.	Mazar-i-Sharif – Polekhumri – Kabul – border with Pakistan	NA	AH76, AH7, AH1
5.g.	Mazar-i-Sharif – Polekhumri – Nizhniy Panj – Dushanbe – Sary-Tash	E123, E60	AH76, AH7, AH65
5.h.	Termez – Dushanbe – Vakhdat – Kulob – Khorugh – Murgab – Kashi	E60, E009, E008	AH65, AH66, AH4
5.i.	Constanta (Port) – Haydarpasa (Port)	NA	NA
5.j.	Ilyichevsk (Port) – Derince (Port)	NA	NA
5.k.	Tashkent – Aybek – Kodjent – Andarkhan – Kokand	E006	N
6.	Torfyankovka - St. Petersburg – Moscow – Volgograd – Astrakhan/Alya (Port) – Anzali (Port) – Qazvin - Tehran – Bandar Abbas (Port)	E105, E119, E40	AH8, AH1, AH2, AH70
6.a.	Astrakhan (Port) – Alya (Port) – Samur – Yalama - Baku (Port) – Astara (Azerbaijan) – Astara (Iran) – Qazvin – Tehran	E119	AH8
6.b.	Astrakhan (Port) – Amirabad (Port) – Sari	NA	AH70
6.c.	Astrakhan (Port) – Alya (Port) – Aktau (Port) – Beineu	E121	AH70
6.d.	Qazvin – Saveh – Ahvaz – Bandar Emam (Port)	NA	AH8
6.e.	Tehran – Qom – Esfahan – Shiraz – Bushehr (Port)	NA	AH72
6.f.	Eserdar – Guduroolum – Inche Boroun – Gorgan – Sari – Semnan – Damghan – Yazd – Anar – Bandar Abbas (Port)	E 121	AH70
6.g.	Astrakhan – Atyrau (Port) – Makat – Beyneu – Aktau (Port) - Turkmenbashi (Port) – Ashgabat – Tegen – Saras – Sarakhs – Mashhad – Birjand – Nehbandan – Dastak – Zahedan – Chabahar (Port)	E40, E121, E60	AH70, AH5, AH75
7.	Murmansk (Port) - Petrozavodsk – St. Petersburg (Port)– Pskov – Ostrov – Gomel – Kiev – Odessa (Port) / Ilyichevsk (Port)	E105, E95	NA

Notes:

1. Italicized sections are located in countries who are not participating in the project or have not confirmed inclusion.

2. Numbering is indicative only.
 3. Turkey's border with Armenia is currently closed.
- * Part of proposed Euro-Asian Roads in Turkey.

3. INLAND WATER TRANSPORT LINKAGES

	Country	From – To	E- Number or other int'l ref. No.
1	Bulgaria	Danube Km 610 - Km 374	Corridor VII, E-80
2	Kazakhstan	Sr.Trekinskiy Yar – Peshnoi island – entering buoy of Uralo-Caspian channel (the Ural river)	
3	Moldova	Prut river from the mouth to Ungheni (0 - 559 km)	E 80-07
4	Moldova	Dniester river from the port Belgorod-Dnestrovsky (Ukraine) to Bender (0 - 667 km)	E 90-03
5	Romania	Danube km. 1.075 – km. 863	Corridor VII E-80
6	Romania	Danube km. 863 - km. 175	Corridor VII E-80
7	Romania	Danube km. 175 - Mm. 0	Corridor VII E-80
8	Romania	Danube – Black Sea Canal	E-80-14
9	Romania	Poarta Alba – Midia – Navodari Canal	E-80-14-01
10	Russian Federation	St Petersburg - Svir - Cherepovets - Rybinsk - Nizhniy Novgorod - Kazan - Samara - Saratov - Volgograd - Krasnoarmeysk - Astrakhan (port) - Caspian Sea (includes Volgo-Baltiyskiy Vodniyput)	North-South Waterway (NSW), E-50
11	Russian Federation	(Rybinsk) - Moskva - Riazan – Nizkhniy Novgorod (includes Kanal im. Moskvi)	NSW, E-50-02
12	Russian Federation	Azov - Rostov-na-Donu - Oust-Donetsk - Krasnoarmeysk – Astrakhan (port) – Caspian Sea	NSW4, NSW, E-90
13	Turkey	Lake Van (Tatvan – Van)	
14	Ukraine	Route №9 Dniper river (on regulate condition)	E-40
15	Ukraine	River Danube, border between Ukraine/Moldova - cape Izmailskii Chatal	E – 80
16	Ukraine	Danube-Kilia Arm, cape Izmailskii Chatal -sea approach canal (Bistroe Arm Outlet)	E – 80 – 09

4. INLAND RIVER PORTS ALONG SELECTED IWT LINKAGES

No	Country	Name and Location
1	Bulgaria	Port Complex Rousse (P 80-56) Danube, km 489.300, km 496.050
2	Bulgaria	Rousse East
3	Bulgaria	Rousse West
4	Bulgaria	Port Complex Lom (P 80-53) Danube, km 742.300
5	Bulgaria	Port Vidin, Danube, from km 785 400 to 793 500
6	Kazakhstan	Atyrau River Port (Ural, km ...)
7	Kazakhstan	Pavlodar River Port (Ural, km ...)
8	Moldova	Bender (P 90-03-02) , Dniester, km 228.0
9	Moldova	Rîbnița, Prut, km ...
10	Moldova	Ungheni, Prut, km ...
11	Moldova	Giurgiulești (P 80-62) Danube, km 133.0
12	Romania	Sulina, Danube, km 0
13	Romania	Tulcea (P 80-64), Danube, km.71
14	Romania	Galati (P 80-61), Danube, km.150
15	Romania	Braila (P 80-60), Danube, km.170
16	Romania	Giurgiu (P 80-57),Danube, km.493
17	Romania	Calafat, Danube, km.795
18	Romania	Drobeta Turnu Severin (P 80-51),Danube, km 931
19	Romania	Orsova (P 80-50),Danube, km.954
20	Romania	Moldova Veche, Danube, km.1048
21	Russian Federation	St. Peterburg River Port (P 50-02) Neva, km 1 385
22	Russian Federation	Yaroslavl River Port (P 50-05) Volga, km 520
23	Russian Federation	Nizhni Novgorod River Port (P 50-06) Volga, km 907
24	Russian Federation	Kazan River Port (P 50-07) Volga, km 1313
25	Russian Federation	Samara River Port (P 50-09) Volga, km 1746
26	Russian Federation	Volgograd River Port (P 50-11) Volga, km 2560
27	Russian Federation	Ust-Donetsk River Port (P 90-05) Don, km 2997
28	Russian Federation	Rostov-na-Donu River Port (P 90-05) Don, km 3134
29	Russian Federation	Azov River Port (P 90-03) Don, km 3168
30	Russian Federation	Yeysk River Port (P 90-02) Don, Taganrog Bay of the Azov Sea
31	Turkey	Tatvan Port (rail ferry port on Lake Van)
32	Turkey	Van Port (rail ferry port on Lake Van)
33	Ukraine	Reni (P 80-63) Danube, 128 km Danube
34	Ukraine	Izmail (P 80-09-01), Danube-Kilia Arm, km 93
35	Ukraine	Kiliia (P 80-09-02), Danube-Kilia Arm, km, 48
36	Ukraine	Ust'-Dunaisk (P 80-09-03), Danube-Kilia Arm, km 1.0
37	Ukraine	Belhorod-Dnestrovskii (P 90-03-01), Dnestrovskii Liman, Black sea
39	Ukraine	Kherson (P 40-12), Dniiper, km 28

No	Country	Name and Location
40	Ukraine	Kiev River Port
41	Ukraine	Odessa River Port, Black Sea
42	Ukraine	Cherkassy river port (P 40-06), Dniper, km 653
43	Ukraine	Kremechuk river port (P 40-07), Dniper, km 541
44	Ukraine	Dneprodzerzhinsk river port (P 40-08), Dniper, km 429
45	Ukraine	Dnepropetrovsk river port (P 40-09), Dniper, km 393
46	Ukraine	Zaporizhya river port Stock insurer company «Ukrrechflot» (P 40-10), Dniper, km 308
47	Ukraine	Nova Kakhovka river port (P 40-11), Dniper, km 96
48	Ukraine	Khersonskii river port, Stock insurer company «Ukrrechflot» Dniper, km ...

Notes:

1. Numbering is for reference only. Where relevant, references to the International Agreement on Inland Waterways of International Importance (AGN) are indicated.

Annex 5

**EURO-ASIAN TRANSPORT PRIORITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS OF
INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE**

1 Methodology and Assumptions

Introduction

According to the analysis presented in **Document 7 (Proposed methodology for prioritization of investment projects along selected Euro-Asian routes)** of the 3rd Expert Group Meeting¹ on Developing Euro-Asian Transport Linkages, all projects to be considered should be subjected to a structured evaluation based on a strict prioritisation methodology.

The methodology has three main phases:

PHASE A – Identification



PHASE B – Evaluation



PHASE C – Prioritisation

Identification: the initial screening process that grouped projects in two groups, those with committed funding and those without committed funding.

Evaluation of projects without committed funding with respect to more specific evaluation criteria.

Prioritisation of the projects -based on the screening process and the evaluation results- in order to classify them into four specific Priority Categories (I, II, III, IV).

It has to be noted that projects with no sufficient data/information could not pass the identification phase and were directly placed into a “Reserve Priority Category”.

The whole exercise was based on the countries’ reports.

1.1 PHASE A - Project Identification

Within the identification phase, projects were grouped according to whether they have committed funding or not. If a project has already secured necessary funding, there was a scope for collecting some additional data (“project technical specifications”) but there was no need for the evaluation exercise. It would be directly placed into the Priority Category I.

Based on the country reports, the consultants completed TEMPLATE 1², which contained the list of projects proposed in their country reports. Then the countries were requested to further

¹ 27 – 29 June 2005, Istanbul, Turkey

² All TEMPLATES can be found in ANNEX I

elaborate this list of projects in case they wished and then for each project listed in TEMPLATE 1 they were asked to complete the respective TEMPLATES 2, in the following manner:

- a) For projects with funding committed, only some additional technical information should be completed (Section 1 of TEMPLATE 2).
- b) For projects without funding committed, additional technical information and evaluation criteria questionnaire should be completed (Section 1 and Section 2, respectively, of TEMPLATE 2).
- c) For newly proposed projects, complete all necessary information in TEMPLATE 2.

1.2 PHASE B - Evaluation

Criteria selection

The still very preliminary level of definition of most of the unfunded projects, the lack of precise information on the present situation, the imperfect knowledge of transport demand perspectives, the large array in types of projects as well as the specific objectives of EATL, mitigate in favour of utilizing a Multi-Criteria Analysis, instead of any other method, to compare and evaluate the identified projects. Such a method allows available information to be taken into account on projects, even at their very preliminary level of definition, as well as background data.

The specific evaluation criteria were developed in two “dimensions”:

- the horizontal dimension called “Functionality/ Coherence” expresses the role of the project in the functionality and coherence of the Euro-Asian Transport Linkages.
- the vertical dimension called “Socio-economic Efficiency/ Sustainability” expresses the socio-economic return on investment.

Under these two fundamental orientations of the evaluation process, the following criteria have been introduced, which are aimed at covering all of the objectives and specifics relating to the EATL exercise. The criteria were identified during the 2nd Expert Group Meeting.

CLUSTER A - Horizontal Dimension: Functionality/ Coherence Criteria (C_A)

- Serve international connectivity (reaching a border crossing point or provide connection with a link that is border crossing); (C_{A1})
- Promote solutions to the particular transit transport needs of the landlocked developing countries; (C_{A2})
- Connect low income and/or least developed countries to major European and Asian markets; (C_{A3})
- The project crosses natural barriers, removes bottlenecks, raises substandard sections to meet international standards, or fills missing links in the EATL; (C_{A4})

CLUSTER B - Vertical Dimension: Socio-economic Efficiency and Sustainability Criteria (C_B)

- Have high degree of urgency due to importance attributed by the national authorities and/or social interest; (C_{B1})
- Pass economic viability test; (C_{B2})
- Have a high degree of maturity, in order to be carried out quickly (i.e. project stage); (C_{B3})
- Financing feasibility (C_{B4})
- Environmental and social impacts (C_{B5})

Criteria measurement

Criteria were first quantified in a physical scale, for each of the projects under consideration, by direct classification according to measurable characteristics, and by “quality attributes”. The physical scale of criteria measurement was derived by the consultant based on his previous experience with similar studies. (see example below)

Criterion C_{A1}

Serve international connectivity (reaching a border crossing point or provide connection with a link that is border crossing);

Physical scale/possible answers:

A: Greatly improves connectivity, **B:** Significantly improves connectivity, **C:** Somewhat improves connectivity, **D:** Slightly improves connectivity, **E:** Does not improve connectivity.

Criteria scores

The direct classification was performed by the countries’ (the national representatives in the EATL project) by completing the evaluation criteria questionnaire (Section 2 of TEMPLATE 2). *The form of the evaluation questionnaire and the measurement for the above criteria can be seen in ANNEX 5.1.*

Then -according to the completed evaluation questionnaires- the transformation of criterion scores to the artificial scale took place. According to the quantification of criteria the A value is 5 (the highest) in terms of score and respectively for value E, is 1 (the lowest). Therefore:

$$C_{Ji} \in [1,5]$$

Where:

J = A or B and

i = 1, ..., 5

It has to be noted here that the good communication between the external appraisers and country experts is necessary in order to quantify properly all the criteria. Nonetheless, the lowest scores were assigned to unfunded projects if no answers were provided in the evaluation questionnaire,

Weighting/ Hierarchy of Criteria

Having the criteria scores, the evaluation of projects is complete. But in order to proceed with the prioritization of projects criteria weights must be defined. The weights were derived with the Paired Comparison Method (the complete description of the method can be found in ANNEX 5.2). Pair wise comparisons of all criteria were performed according to the “policy” priorities specified by the interviewed experts (the consultants, UNECE and UNESCAP).

A standard axiom of most of multicriterial methods is that the sum of criteria weights should be 1. Therefore:

$$W_{Ji} \in [0,1] \text{ and}$$

$$\sum_{J=A}^C \sum_{i=1}^5 W_{Ji} = 1$$

where:

J = A or B and

i = 1, ..., 5

It has to be noted here, that countries (through national representatives) may provide their own weights, with the proper justification of course.

1.3 PHASE C - Prioritization

Projects' total score

To prioritize the projects, we first had to obtain their final/ total scores. This was purely a responsibility of the Consultant. To derive the project's **total score in each country** the consultant used the linear additive model. The Total Score – for all dimensions together - of each project **in each country** is the weighted sum of the criteria scores and takes values between 1 (the lowest) and 5 (the highest). To derive the project's **total score in each country** we use the following relationship:

$$T.S.\text{-Project/Country} = \sum_{J=A}^C \sum_{i=1}^5 C_{Ji} * W_{Ji}$$

where:

$C_{Ji} \in [1,5]$

$W_{Ji} \in [0,1]$

J = A or B and

i = 1, ..., 5

Therefore:

$TS_{\text{Project/Country}} \in [1,5]$

Projects' priorities

The combination of the criterion scores and priorities puts each project in one of the four priority categories or reserve category.

If the project already has committed funding, it belongs to priority category **I**.

If the project scores between 4-5, then it belongs to priority category **II**.

If the project scores 3 –4, then it belongs to priority category **III**.

If the project scores 1 –3, then it belongs to priority category **IV**.

If the project has not passed the pre-selection phase, then it belongs to reserve category.

The classification of priorities is as follows:

- **I:** projects, which have funding secured and are ongoing or planned and are expected to be completed in the near future (up to 2010).

- **II:** projects, which may be funded and implemented rapidly (up to 2015).
- **III:** projects requiring some additional investigations for final definition before likely financing (up to 2020).
- **IV:** projects requiring further investigations for final definition and scheduling before possible financing.
- **Reserve:** projects to be implemented in the long run, including the projects where insufficient data existed.

2. Results

2.1 *Data submitted by the countries*

Out of the 18 countries participating in this project, 15 countries have submitted data on the projects under evaluation.

Countries that submitted data:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, China, Georgia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Romania, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, Uzbekistan.

Countries not submitting data:

Afghanistan, Russian Federation, Turkmenistan

Each project is identified with a unique **Project ID** specifying the country, the transport mode and a specific number.

The following abbreviations were introduced for country identification in Project ID:

Afghanistan (AFT), Armenia (ARM), Azerbaijan (AZT), Belarus (BL), Bulgaria (BG), China (CH), Georgia (GE), Islamic Republic of Iran (IR), Kazakhstan (KZ), Kyrgyzstan (KG), Moldova (MD), Romania (RO), Russian Federation (RU), Tajikistan (TJK), Turkey (TU), Turkmenistan (TM), Ukraine (UKR), Uzbekistan (UZB).

The following abbreviations were introduced for type of infrastructure identification in Project ID:

Road projects (ROD), Railway project (RLW), Maritime projects (MAR), Inland waterway project (INL). Inland/border crossing and other projects (INM).

For example, a project with the ID AZT-RLW-1 is a railway project number 1 in Azerbaijan.

In total 230 projects were included in this phase with aggregate value of \$43.4 billion of which:

- **112 road projects account for \$12.7 billion;**
- **68 railway projects account for \$23.4 billion;**
- **37 maritime projects account for \$5.7 billion;**
- **11 inland waterway projects account for \$1.6 billion and**
- **2 inland/border crossing projects for \$0.003 billion.**

The respective numbers per country are shown below in Table 1.

Table 1 The data submitted by countries for all projects and per type of infrastructure (*number of projects and costs in million \$*)

Country code	All types of projects		Per type of infrastructure									
			ROD		RLW		MAR		INW		INM	
	No. of projects	Cost of projects	No. of projects	Cost of projects	No. of projects	Cost of projects	No. of projects	Cost of projects	No. of projects	Cost of projects	No. of projects	Cost of projects
ARM	8	121.7	3	56.4	5	65.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
AZT	10	1 681.5	7	1 079.1	1	600.0	2	2.4	-	-	-	-
BL	4	28.1	3	27.4	1	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
BG	24	5 488.9	15	1 532.8	7	3 816.8	1	115.6	1	23.7	-	-
CH	3	4 603.0	1	413.0	-	-	2	4 190.0	-	-	-	-
GE	49	3 312.0	4	108.2	21	2 140.5	24	1 063.3	-	-	-	-
IR	44	8 428.3	34	3 700.3	10	4 728.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
HZ	14	1 902.4	14	1 902.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KG	8	1 555.1	5	218.7	3	1 336.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
MD	9	888.9	5	225.5	3	413.4	-	-	1	250.0	-	-
RO	12	721.8	-	-	-	-	7	333.3	5	388.5	-	-
TJK	7	240.2	4	237.0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.1
TU	19	11 450.0	12	3 124.0	7	8 326.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
UKR	7	1 226.2	-	-	2	292.6	1	1.5	4	932.2	-	-
UZB	12	1 774.5	5	100.8	7	1 673.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	230	43 422.56	112	12 725.68	68	23 393.42	37	5 706.02	11	1 594.32	2	3.1

Note: The table includes only the countries that sent data.

2.2 *Prioritization results, including simple cost analysis*

The prioritization results can be found in the excel file “**Prioritization exercise_results.xls**”. In this excel file the following analysis has taken place:

- In the respective worksheets with countries’ names, the results (as well as all the computing process) of prioritization can be found for each country.

In each of these “country name” sheets a note by the consultant (at the bottom of the page) from the consultant explains relevant calculations.

- In the worksheet “**All priorities**” all projects (regardless of their priority) are summarized along with their costs.

In this worksheet, for each country, each project is presented by:

- (a) a **project ID** column,
 - (b) a **description** column, in which the title of the project is presented as given by the relevant countries,
 - (c) a **cost** column representing the total cost of the project (in million \$ and in some cases in million €)
 - (d) a **score** column representing the result of the multicriterial evaluation (results are based on a scale between 1 and 5 where 5 represents the highest possible score and 1 the lowest possible score), and
 - (e) the **category** column with the project’s priority ranking, which reflects the score.
- In the worksheets “**Direct Priority I**”, “**Priority II**”, “**Priority III**” and “**Priority IV**”, the projects are summarized per priority category in the same way as in the worksheet “**All priorities**”.
 - In the worksheet “**Simple statistics_Summary**”, the “statistical” summary of results of prioritization can be found (% of projects belonging in each priority category for all projects and per type of infrastructure) and
 - In the worksheet “**Cost statistics**”, the costs are presented for all projects and per type of project as well as for all countries and at the country level, both in absolute numbers and percentages.

The prioritization results are summarized below.

Prioritization results and cost analysis - per country (in raw numbers)

Armenia (ARM)

		All	Per Priority Category				Reserve
			I	II	III	IV**	
No. of projects		8	5			3	
Cost* of projects		121,7	71,7			50	
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	3	3			
		Cost* of projects	56,4	56,4			
	RLW	No. of projects	5	2			3
		Cost* of projects	65,3	15,3			50
	MAR	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					
	INW	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					
	INM	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					

*All costs in million \$

**Projects received priority categorisation IV, due to lack of data

Azerbaijan (AZT)

		All	Per Priority Category				Reserve
			I	II	III	IV**	
No. of projects		10	9			1	
Cost* of projects		>1681,5	1681,5			n.a.***	
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	7	7			
		Cost* of projects	1079,1	1079,1			
	RLW	No. of projects	1	1			
		Cost* of projects	600	600			
	MAR	No. of projects	2	1			1
		Cost* of projects	>2,4	2,4			n.a.***
	INW	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					
	INM	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					

*All costs in million \$

**Projects received priority categorisation IV, due to lack of data

*** No cost estimate was provided.

Belarus (BL)

		All	Per Priority Category				Reserve
			I	II	III	IV	
No. of projects		4	4				
Cost* of projects		28,1	28,1				
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	3	3			
		Cost* of projects	27,4	27,4			
	RLW	No. of projects	1	1			
		Cost* of projects	0,7	0,7			
	MAR	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					
	INW	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					
	INM	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					

*All costs in million \$

Bulgaria (BG)

		All	Per Priority Category				Reserve
			I	II	III	IV**	
No. of projects		24	21			3	
Cost* of projects		5488,9	4300,9			1188	
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	15	12			3
		Cost* of projects	1532,8	344,8			1188
	RLW	No. of projects	7	7			
		Cost* of projects	316,8	316,8			
	MAR	No. of projects	1	1			
		Cost* of projects	115,6	115,6			
	INW	No. of projects	1	1			
		Cost* of projects	3,67	3,67			
	INM	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					

*All costs in million \$

**Projects received priority categorisation IV, due to lack of data

China (CH)

			All	Per Priority Category				
				I	II	III	IV	Reserve
No. of projects			3	1	2			
Cost* of projects			4603	413	4190			
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	1	1				
		Cost* of projects	413	413				
	RLW	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
	MAR	No. of projects	2		2			
		Cost* of projects	4190		4190			
	INW	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
INM	No. of projects							
	Cost* of projects							

**All costs in million \$*

Georgia (GE)

			All	Per Priority Category				
				I	II	III	IV**	Reserve
No. of projects			49	4			45	
Cost* of projects			3312	108,2			3203,8	
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	4	4				
		Cost* of projects	108,2	108,2				
	RLW	No. of projects	21				21	
		Cost* of projects	2140,5				2140,5	
	MAR	No. of projects	24				24	
		Cost* of projects	1063,3				1063,3	
	INW	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
INM	No. of projects							
	Cost* of projects							

**All costs in million \$*

***Projects received priority categorisation IV, due to lack of data*

Islamic Republic of Iran (IR)

			All	Per Priority Category				
				I	II	III	IV	Reserve
No. of projects			44	36	5	3		
Cost* of projects			8428,3	4580,3	2238	1610		
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	34	31	2	1		
		Cost* of projects	3700,3	2900,3	640	160		
	RLW	No. of projects	10	5	3	2		
		Cost* of projects	4728	1680	1598	1450		
	MAR	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
	INW	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
	INM	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						

**All costs in million \$*

Kazakhstan (KZ)

			All	Per Priority Category				
				I	II	III	IV	Reserve
No. of projects			14	14				
Cost* of projects			1902,4	1902,4				
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	14	14				
		Cost* of projects	1902,4	1902,4				
	RLW	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
	MAR	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
	INW	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
	INM	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						

**All costs in million \$*

Kyrgyzstan (KG)

			All	Per Priority Category				
				I	II	III	IV**	Reserve
No. of projects			8	5			3	
Cost* of projects			1555,1	218,7			1336,4	
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	5	5				
		Cost* of projects	218,7	218,7				
	RLW	No. of projects	3				3	
		Cost* of projects	1336,4				1336,4	
	MAR	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
	INW	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
	INM	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						

*All costs in million \$

**Projects received priority categorisation IV, due to lack of data

Moldova (MD)

			All	Per Priority Category				
				I	II	III	IV**	Reserve
No. of projects			9	2			7	
Cost* of projects			888,9	272			616,9	
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	5				5	
		Cost* of projects	225,5				225,5	
	RLW	No. of projects	3	1			2	
		Cost* of projects	413,4	22			391,4	
	MAR	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
	INW	No. of projects	1	1				
		Cost* of projects	250	250				
	INM	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						

*All costs in million \$

**Projects received priority categorisation IV, due to lack of data

Romania (RO)

		All	Per Priority Category				Reserve
			I	II	III	IV**	
No. of projects		12	6	1		5	
Cost* of projects		721,8	263	201,6		257,2	
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					
	RLW	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					
	MAR	No. of projects	7	3			4
		Cost* of projects	333,3	104,9			228,4
	INW	No. of projects	5	3	1		1
		Cost* of projects	388,5	158,1	201,6		28,8
INM	No. of projects						
	Cost* of projects						

*All costs in million \$

**Projects received priority categorisation IV, due to lack of data

Tajikistan (TJK)

		All	Per Priority Category				Reserve
			I	II	III	IV**	
No. of projects		7	2			5	
Cost* of projects		>240,2	3,1			>237	
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	4			4	
		Cost* of projects	237			237	
	RLW	No. of projects	1			1	
		Cost* of projects	n.a.***			n.a.***	
	MAR	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					
	INW	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					
INM	No. of projects	2	2				
	Cost* of projects	3,1	3,1				

*All costs in million \$

**Projects received priority categorisation IV, due to lack of data

*** No cost estimate was provided.

Turkey (TU)

		All	Per Priority Category				Reserve	
			I	II	III	IV		
No. of projects		19	9	5	5			
Cost* of projects		>11450	6172	5278	n.a.**			
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	12	7		5		
		Cost* of projects	>3124	3124		n.a.***		
	RLW	No. of projects	7	2	5			
		Cost* of projects	8326	3048	5278			
	MAR	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
	INW	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
INM	No. of projects							
	Cost* of projects							

*All costs in million \$

** No cost estimate was provided.

Ukraine (UKR)

		All	Per Priority Category				Reserve	
			I	II	III	IV**		
No. of projects		7	5			2		
Cost* of projects		1226,2	475,2			751		
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects						
		Cost* of projects						
	RLW	No. of projects	2	2				
		Cost* of projects	22,6	292,6				
	MAR	No. of projects	1	1				
		Cost* of projects	1,5	1,5				
	INW	No. of projects	4	2			2	
		Cost* of projects	932	181,15			751	
INM	No. of projects							
	Cost* of projects							

*All costs in million \$

**Projects received priority categorisation IV, due to lack of data

Uzbekistan (UZB)

		All	Per Priority Category				
			I	II	III	IV	Reserve
No. of projects		12	10		2		
Cost* of projects		1774,5	844,2		930,3		
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	5	5			
		Cost* of projects	100,8	100,8			
	RLW	No. of projects	7	5		2	
		Cost* of projects	1673,7	743,4		930,3	
	MAR	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					
	INW	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					
	INM	No. of projects					
		Cost* of projects					

*All costs in million \$

Prioritization results and cost analysis – for all countries (in raw numbers)

All Countries

		All	Per Priority Category					
			I	II	III	IV**	Reserve	
No. of projects		230	133	16	10	71	-	
Cost* of projects		43422,5	21334,2	13244	2540,3	6303,9	-	
Per type of infrastructure	ROD	No. of projects	112	92	2	6	12	-
		Cost* of projects	12725,7	10275,1	640,0	160,0	1650,5	-
	RLW	No. of projects	68	26	11	4	27	-
		Cost* of projects	23393,4	10218,8	8212,4	2380,3	2581,9	-
	MAR	No. of projects	37	6	2	-	29	-
		Cost* of projects	5706	224,3	4190	-	1291,7	-
	INW	No. of projects	11	7	1	-	3	-
		Cost* of projects	1594,3	612,9	201,6	-	779,8	-
	INM	No. of projects	2	2	-	-	-	-
		Cost* of projects	3,12	-	-	-	3,12	-

*All costs in million \$

**Projects received priority categorisation IV, due to lack of data

Prioritization results and cost analysis – for all countries (in statistics)

Based on the last table presented above, we can conclude the summary of results as follows.

(a) *Statistics concerning projects' type and cost*

- **48.7%** of the Projects are **Road projects**, with the estimated value of **\$12 725.7 million**, representing **29.3%** of the total investment cost.
- **29.6%** of the Projects are **Railway projects**, with the estimated value of **\$23 393.4 million**, representing **53.9%** of the total investment cost.
- **16.1%** of the Projects are **Maritime projects**, with the estimated value of **\$5 706.0 million**, representing **13.1%** of the total investment cost.
- **4.8%** of the Projects are **Inland waterway projects**, with the estimated value of **\$1 594.3 million**, representing **3.7%** of the total investment cost.
- **0.9%** of the Projects are **Inland/Cross border (etc.) projects**, with the estimated value of **\$3.1 million**, representing **0.01%** of the total investment cost.

(b) *Statistics concerning projects' priorities and cost*

- **57.8%** of the Projects belong to **Priority Category I**, with the estimated value of **\$21 334.3 million**, representing **49.1%** of the total investment cost.

(These projects have secured funding)

- **7%** of the Projects belong to **Priority Category II**, with the estimated value of **\$13 244.0 million**, representing **30.5%** of the total investment cost.

(For these projects funding was not secured but the national representatives have sent sufficient data/answers for multi-criterial evaluation)

- **4.3%** of the Projects belong to **Priority Category III**, with the estimated value of **\$2540.3 million**, representing **5.9%** of the total investment cost.

(For these projects funding was not secured but the national representatives have sent sufficient data/answers for multi-criterial evaluation)

- **30.9%** of the Projects belong to **Priority Category IV**, with the estimated value of **\$6 303.9 million**, representing **14.5%** of the total investment cost.

(For these projects funding was not secured and the national representatives have not sent sufficient data/answers for multi-criterial evaluation and thus the consultant being unauthorized to valuate criteria, assigned directly the lowest score and derived the lowest priority)

The respective percentages per project type are shown below.

(b₁) Statistics concerning Road Projects' priorities and cost

- (a) **82.1%** of the Road projects belong to **Priority Category I**, with the estimated value of **\$10 275.1 million**, representing **80.7% of the total investment cost for Road projects**.
- (b) **1.8%** of the Road projects belong to **Priority Category II**, with the estimated value of **\$640 million**, representing **5.0% of the total investment cost for Road projects**.
- (c) **5.4%** of the Road projects belong to **Priority Category III**, with the estimated value of **\$160 million**, representing **1.3% of the total investment cost for Road projects**.
- (d) **10.7%** of the Road projects belong to **Priority Category IV**, with the estimated value of **\$1 650.6 million**, representing **13.0% of the total investment cost for Road projects**.

(b₂) Statistics concerning Railway Projects' priorities and cost

- (a) **38.2%** of the Railway projects belong to **Priority Category I**, with the estimated value of **\$10 218.8 million**, representing **43.7% of the total investment cost for Railway projects**.
- (b) **16.2%** of the Railway projects belong to **Priority Category II**, with the estimated value of **\$8 212.4 million**, representing **35.1% of the total investment cost for Railway projects**.
- (c) **5.9%** of the Railway projects belong to **Priority Category III**, with the estimated value of **\$2 380.3 million**, representing **10.2% of the total investment cost for Railway projects**.
- (d) **39.7%** of the Railway projects belong to **Priority Category IV**, with the estimated value of **\$2 581.9 million**, representing **11.0% of the total investment cost for Railway projects**.

(b₃) Statistics concerning Maritime Projects' priorities and cost

- (a) **16.2%** of the Maritime projects belong to **Priority Category I**, for a total value of **\$224.3 million**, representing **3.9% of the total investment cost for Maritime projects**.
- (b) **5.4%** of the Maritime projects belong to **Priority Category II**, with the estimated value of **\$4 190 million**, representing **73.4% of the total investment cost for Maritime projects**.
- (c) **78.4%** of the Maritime projects belong to **Priority Category IV**, with the estimated value of **\$1 291.7 million**, representing **22.6 % of the total investment cost for Maritime projects**.

(b₄) Statistics concerning Inland waterway Projects' priorities and cost

(a) **63.6%** of the Inland waterway projects belong to **Priority Category I**, with **the estimated value of \$612.9 million**, representing **38.4% of the total investment cost for Inland waterway projects**.

(b) **9.1%** of the Inland waterway projects belong to **Priority Category II**, with **the estimated value of \$201.6 million**, representing **12.6% of the total investment cost for Inland waterway projects**.

(c) **27.3%** of the Inland waterway projects belong to **Priority Category IV**, with **the estimated value of \$779.8 million**, representing **48.9% of the total investment cost for Inland waterway projects**.

(b₅) Statistics concerning Inland/Border crossing (etc.) Projects' priorities and cost

(a) **100%** of the Inland/Border crossing (etc.) projects belong to **Priority Category I**, with **the estimated value of \$3.1 million**.
