



**TRANS EUROPEAN RAILWAY (TER)
PROJECT CENTRAL OFFICE**

**Summary of Conclusions of the 1st TER Expert Group
Meeting for TER Master Plan**

**10-11 February 2004
Budapest, Hungary**

1. On 10-11 February 2004, the 1st Meeting of TER experts for the elaboration of TER Master Plan took place in Budapest, Hungary. The meeting was attended by the experts from 12 TER member countries and 2 observer countries. Also, the external consultant, the representatives of UNECE and TER-PCO attended the meeting. The list of participants is attached (Annex 1).
2. The agenda of the meeting concentrated on the presentation of the methodology for project identification, draft Questionnaires to be filled in by the countries, collection of data from non TER member countries etc. The agenda of the meeting is attached (Annex 2).
3. The representative of the UNECE underlined the importance attached by UNECE as well as the international transport bodies to the elaboration of TER Master Plan. He informed the participants of the positive reply received from various international fora as well as the interest expressed in the results of this operation.
4. The representative of the UNECE presented in PowerPoint the document on TER Master Plan together with background information and objectives of the meeting. He also introduced Prof. D. Tsamboulas, external consultant for the elaboration of TER Master Plan.
5. The participants to the meeting received as documents the Presentation of the TER Master Plan prepared by the representative of the UNECE, the Draft Project Methodology for identification of priority railway projects, Example of methodology implementation of deriving criteria scores prepared by the external consultant as well as the Review of the EU Railway Infrastructure legal framework with impact on the TER region prepared by the external consultant with the support of TER-PCO.

6. The external consultant made a detailed presentation on the methodology for project identification giving concrete examples how to fill in the required Questionnaires. He also replied to the questions of participants clarifying the aspects related to their tasks during the implementation of the TER Master Plan.
7. From the discussions appeared necessary to be brought some corrections to the evaluation criteria for the assessment of projects. Based on countries' suggestions the external consultant promised to provide soon the new version of the methodology of project identification.
8. The consultant proposed the following amendments to be made to the above mentioned Methodology report for TER:
 - The IRR ranges/levels in Criterion CA2 - Cost effectiveness changed, and they are lower in order to avoid putting most of the projects in a low priority category.
 - Since there was a problem of different levels of country cost, the quantification of criterion CA3- Relative investment cost changed. Relative investment cost quantification will be done on a project-country level, as it is described in ANNEX I of the revised report.
 - In TEMPLATE 2B, the Passenger costs as well as Travel time units have been clarified. We want passenger cost/km for the section considered and Travel time for the section considered. This was not clear in previous versions of the report.
 - In Section 2 - Forecasting it is now mentioned that if projections of traffic do not exist, therefore not collected, then WP3 (forecasting) results will be used. In addition, for any projections provided in the relevant TEMPLATES, consistency with the macro-level forecasts (elaborated in WP3) will be investigated. That was deemed necessary due to the possibility of no availability of traffic projections or even estimations.
 - The importance of good communication regarding criteria scores and weights, between the externals and the country experts is highlighted. This was done because taking into consideration the specific conditions of a country, the criterion scores or the default weights have to be changed. This will reflect the importance one specific country attaches to some of them. As an example, Bosnia-Herzegovina wishes to put high priority for sections of the network destroyed by the war. Then, they have to be classified as missing links, and in the weighting it has to put high values in the criterion CB4, as well as criterion CC2. Another example is when a country wishes to promote a link that it considers important as a domestic link: in such a case it has to put a very low weight to criteria (CB1), (CB2), (CC1).
 - It was also included in the methodology and more specifically in the description and quantification of criterion CA3 the possibility of a new railway line project, before we had only rehabilitation/ upgrading.

- In TEMPLATE 2A, regarding the financing resources, if they are not available then DO LEAVE IT BLANK.
 - Furthermore it is now highlighted in the report (page 17) that if a project results i.e. to be in priority category II according to TER Methodology but according to Van Miert prioritization belongs in another Priority Class (i.e. A, B or C) then Van Miert's prioritization will be followed, at least for the EU member states (current and the ones to be members in 1/5/2004). On the other hand, in the unlikely case that the priority of a project differs with the national priority, a more thorough analysis on the underlying assumptions will take place.
9. It was agreed that end of April 2004 is the deadline for the submission to TER-PCO of the filled in Questionnaires by the each country.
 10. In this context, the representative of the UNECE underlined that required information could be collected by the countries from the available national Master Plans, from the latest studies like TIRS, REBIS, elaborated by consultants, results of the work of Van Miert group, information from the Secretariats of Pan-European corridors etc.
 11. It was underlined that non-TER member countries would be requested to communicate to TER PCO the respective sections of their network which they consider that should be part of the TER network under study.
 12. For any additional information or clarifications, the countries were requested to address by e-mail directly to Prof. Tsamboulas (dtsamb@central.ntua.gr).
 13. The external consultant presented also the socio-economic characteristics and alternative scenarios of growth which will be used during the assessment of projects submitted by the countries in order to identify the real priority projects.
 14. The representatives of RAND Europe introduced ETIS (European Transport Information System) project foreseen to develop a complete European transport database system based on EUROSTAT data(Annex 3). Its pilot prototype would be ready by March 2004. TER countries expressed their interest in the follow up of these activities.
 15. It was agreed that the amended methodology for project identification with examples as well as the EU railway infrastructure legal framework would be made available on the UN-TER webpage.
 16. The 2nd Meeting of TER experts for TER Master Plan will take place on 22-23 June 2004 in Budapest, Hungary.