

30 October 2009

ENGLISH

## **ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

### **INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE**

Working Party on Transport Trends and Economics

Group of Experts on Euro-Asian Transport Links

Third session

Istanbul, 12-13 November 2009

### **EATL PHASE II - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE IDENTIFICATION OF PRIORITY ROUTES AND INVESTMENTS**

#### **Updating the EATL priority transport infrastructure projects and developing an international investment plan under EATL Project Phase II**

(Note by the secretariat)

The work plan of activities of the Group of Experts on Euro-Asian Transport Links contains the coordination and monitoring of the development of the Euro-Asian transport links (Expected Accomplishment 1) and the coordinated planning of those links as well as the evaluation and prioritization of infrastructure projects along main Euro-Asian transport routes (Expected Accomplishment 2).

With regard to the prioritization of projects, the detailed action plan refers to collecting information from involved countries about their investment plans and implementation (action 1.2 (i)), developing status report on priority projects (action 1.2.(ii)) and analysing the implementation rate, reasons of progress or lack of progress (action 1.2.(iii)). The detailed action plan also refers to updating EATL priority projects based on country inputs through uniform questionnaire and templates with a view to developing an interregional investment plan (action 2.1.(iii)).

At its 2<sup>nd</sup> session, held on 7 September 2009, in Geneva, the group discussed the ways and means of collecting, reviewing and updating the information on the national EATL routes and priority transport infrastructure projects. The group agreed on the way that related questionnaires will be sent to those countries which did not participate in the EATL Phase I and to those which participated. End of 2009 was set as the deadline for replies. These questionnaires and templates have been prepared by the secretariat, with assistance from external consultants, and will be communicated to the National Focal Points soon.

In view of the forthcoming 3<sup>rd</sup> Third Expert Group Meeting, to be held on 11–13 November 2009, in Istanbul, and the expected discussions on the questionnaires and related country inputs, the secretariat has prepared this note containing explanations

on the methodological framework for updating the list of EATL priority projects based on country inputs, the related questionnaires and templates and the process for collecting and updating information of priority projects.

## **I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PRIORITIZATION OF INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS ALONG THE MAIN EURO-ASIAN INLAND TRANSPORT ROUTES UNDER THE UNECE-UNESCA EATL PROJECT (PHASE I)**

1. In the course of 2003-2007 and within the overall framework of a General Assembly approved project “Capacity-building in developing interregional land and land-cum-sea transport linkages”, ECE and ESCAP jointly implement a project component on developing Euro-Asian transport links (now called EATL Phase I). The following countries were invited to participate and designate Focal Points: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, China, Georgia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Turkey, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. In 2004, Greece, during its chairmanship-in-office of the Organization of the Black Sea Cooperation (BSEC), expressed the wish to be associated to the activities of the project.

2. Among the main achievements of this endeavor was to identify and prioritize transport infrastructure projects along the selected main Euro-Asian transport routes. The work was based on country inputs and the applications of an agreed methodology. Fifteen countries participated in the projects’ prioritization exercise of EATL Phase I and made proposals, namely: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, China, Georgia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

3. At its 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, held on 27-29 June 2005, in Istanbul, Turkey, the EATL Phase I Expert Group endorsed a methodology for the prioritization of projects, which was pursued with the assistance from external consultant. For more information on the agreed methodology and results, see Document 7 of the 3<sup>rd</sup> EGM of June 2005 and UNECE-UNESCAP Joint Study on Developing Euro.-Asian Transport Links ([http://www.unece.org/trans/main/eatl/docs/3rd\\_EGM\\_Doc7\\_e.pdf](http://www.unece.org/trans/main/eatl/docs/3rd_EGM_Doc7_e.pdf).  
([http://www.unece.org/trans/MinisterialITC70/min\\_study.htm](http://www.unece.org/trans/MinisterialITC70/min_study.htm))

4. The Meeting of Ministers of Transport of countries in the Euro-Asian region, held on 19 February 2008, in Geneva, inter alia, confirmed its support for the development of Euro-Asian transport links and endorsed the priority routes and projects identified by the EATL Project Phase I

## **II. METHODOLOGY FOR UPDATING PRIORITY PROJECTS AND DEVELOPING AN INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT PLAN ALONG THE SELECTED EATL ROUTES (EATL PHASE II)**

5. Fulfilling of the project’s related activities targeted by the group, entails the achievement of following main goals:

a. Asses the status of implementation of projects identified under EATL Phase I, including analysis of their implementation rate, reasons of progress or lack of progress based on country inputs;

b. Review and update projects identified under EATL Phase I, to be included in a new investment plan;

c. Establish a methodology for the prioritization of new proposed projects to be included in the new investment plan;

d. Collect and process information on new projects based on country inputs, prioritize them applying the agreed methodology and include them in the new investment plan.

6. Therefore, the prioritization exercise of EATL Phase II, would have to consider three kinds of projects, as follows:

a. Completed projects during the period elapsed from the EATL Phase I and projects of EATL Phase I for which no change is reported

b. Projects of EATL Phase I, updated or revised, including those for which additional data is provided;

c. Any new projects submitted, from both group of countries involved in the EATL Phase II;

7. In order to ensure consistency of the projects identified under the two EATL phases, which is essential for the revision, it is clear that the same methodology of EATL Phase I should also apply in EATL Phase II. However, there are some new elements that should be taken into account, such as:

- Updating EATL projects entails the identification and grouping of projects into one of the four implementation time periods that may not be the same with those of EATL Phase I. Proposed implementation periods and categories are described in para. 10 below;
- Some projects under EATL Phase I were placed in category IV due to lack of essential data. This data may be available now and if provided, some of those projects may score higher rates and deserve a better place in the new investment plan;
- Projects placed into a specific category in Phase I for which no change is reported in Phase II, should remain in the same category in the new investment plan.

8. Although the rest of the methodology remain identical to that used in EATL Phase I, it is deemed necessary to recall some conditions contained in it that may facilitate the understanding. These are as follows:

- Projects should be along the identified main EATL routes;
- Projects should refer to an expenditure of at least 10 million \$ per project;
- Projects with secured funding and being at the final implementation phase (almost completed) can be directly considered for Category I;
- Projects without committed funding or partly committed funding or under the planning phase, further analysis (Phase B of the methodology) is carried out in order to set implementation priorities, against common shared objectives;
- As the analysis is based on data collected from the countries, projects without any data will be automatically classified as last priority in terms of implementation (Category IV).

9. The methodological framework is structured in three phases (identification, analysis and time period classification). The set of criteria to be used reflect societal values, the priorities and the available resources of the countries involved, as well as the viability of the projects (as stated by the countries) and their global/ international character. These criteria are the same with those used in EATL Phase I. More precisely, the application of the methodology would entail the following steps:

**PHASE A - IDENTIFICATION:** The identification phase entails the recording of prospective projects, based on their readiness and funding possibilities as well as the common-shared objectives of responsible authorities, national or international, as well as the collection of readily available information/ data regarding these projects.

**PHASE B - ANALYSIS:** The analysis is done with the application of the well-established multi-criteria approaches, such as the direct analysis of criteria performance, Pair Comparison Matrix and MAUT (Multi Attribute Utility Theory). Both approaches were used in the original EATL Master Plan and they are well documented in the respective Report

**PHASE C – TIME PERIOD CLASSIFICATION:** In the final phase, the selection of those projects is made according to their “performance” score. Based on the latter, projects are classified into four Time Periods Categories (I, II, III and IV), each related to a specified time horizon.

10. The categories of prioritization of projects is proposed below:

**Category I:** projects, which have funding secured and are on-going and expected to be completed in the near future (up to 2013).

**Category II:** projects which may be funded or their plans are approved and are expected to be implemented rapidly (up to 2016).

**Category III:** projects requiring some additional investigation for final definition before likely financing and implemented (up to 2020).

**Category IV:** projects requiring further investigation for final definition and scheduling before possible financing, including projects, for which insufficient data existed. (most likely to be implemented after 2020)

11. The definition of Project remain the same as in EATL Phase I and is as follows:

**Definition of Project:** A project is considered a new construction or the upgrade/rehabilitation of a transport infrastructure section. Also a project can be the construction or the upgrade/rehabilitation of a transport terminal/port (maritime or inland waterways) etc. The infrastructure section can vary in length however it should constitute an expenditure of almost 10 million \$. An exception of the latter mentioned rule applies if the project involves a missing link or a bottleneck.

### III. COLLECTION OF DATA AND TEMPLATES

12. Consequently, the expected inputs from countries (through questionnaires and templates) are divided into two main categories. First, those referred to projects identified under EATL Phase I, involving only the 15 countries mentioned in above para 2. And second, those concerning new project proposals by all countries involved in EATL Phase II.

13. Annex I and II provide an overview of the type of templates and questionnaires that will be used in EATL Phase II. More information is provided below.

14. With regard to **assessing the implementation status, reviewing and updating** of projects identified under EATL Phase I, Templates B (B1, B2, B3, B4) will be used. National Focal Points (NFP) **will receive separately those templates in Excel file** containing the data of their country as originally submitted. These files should be updated for each of the on-going and planned projects, if changes have occurred. Please note that no action is needed for the completed projects, other than providing this information. Moreover, NFP would be expected to update, for each one of the **on-going and planned projects, “the expenses so far (2009)” and the “country GDP for 2008”**. Completion of Templates B (B1, B2, B3, B4) is crucial in order to fulfill the requirements of the EATL Phase II, including the assessment of their implementation process. NFP would have to provide also information on the reasons for which the **implementation of projects had been delayed** (if applicable). A sample of this table (with empty cells in yellow,) is provided in the Annex I.

14. With regard to **new project proposals** to be submitted either from newly involved countries or from countries that have participated in the EATL Phase I, **Templates 2 (2A, 2B, 2C, 2D) will be used..** These templates are contained in Annex II. NFP should extract these templates and use them in providing inputs.

15. National Focal Points of all countries involved are invited to ask questions or make comments on the questionnaires, at the 3<sup>rd</sup> EGM.

Annex I : Templates B (B1, B2, B3, B4)

Annex II : Templates 2 (2A, 2B, 2C, 2D)

**ANNEX I: TEMPLATES B (B1, B2, B3, B4)**

**TEMPLATE B1. UPDATE FIGURES OF EATL ROAD PROJECTS EXISTING IN THE ORIGINAL EATL MASTER PLAN (COST IN 2007 PRICES)**

NETWORK (EATL ROUTE)	PROJECT ID	DESCRIPTION (Project and Section Names)	PROJECT LOCATION			ROAD TYPE	TRAFFIC VOLUMES		CURRENT STATUS
			Start point/node/ city	End point/node/city	Total Length (km)	Motorway, Expressway, National Road (please select one)	Existing Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)	Forecasted	Programming, Planning, Design, Construction (please select one)

TIME PLAN		TOTAL COST (in mio euro)	EXPENSES so far(in % of total cost)	% FUNDING SECURED (or possible funding sources)					IRR / (ROE if PPP)
Start year	End year			National Funds	EU Funds	Bank Loans	Grants	Private Funds	

Comments:  
I) The following amendments

GDP (in year 2008 & in mio euro)
% Budget of Public Works allocated

are made:

A: For Project ID:..... changes are made to: Expenses so far, Total Cost, ..... etc.

B: For Project ID:..... changes are made to: Expenses so far, Total Cost, .....etc ...

II) The following additions have been made:

A) For Project ID:.....: IRR, (ROE if PPP), etc.

.....



**TEMPLATE B2. UPDATE FIGURES OF EATL RAILWAY PROJECTS EXISTING IN THE ORIGINAL EATL MASTER PLAN (COST IN 2007 PRICES)**

NETWORK (EATL ROUTE)	PROJECT ID	DESCRIP TION (Project and Section Names)	PROJECT LOCATION			ADTT (passenger)		ADTT (freight)		CURRENT STATUS
			Start point/node / city	End point/node /city	Total Length (km)	Existing	Forecasted	Existing	Forecast ed	Program ming, Planning, Design, Construct ion  (please select one)

TIME PLAN		TOTAL COST (in mio euro)	EXPENSES so far(in % of total cost)	% FUNDING SECURED (or possible funding sources)					IRR / (ROE if PPP)
Start year	End year			National Funds	EU Funds	Bank Loans	Grants	Private Funds	

GDP (in year 2008& in mio euro)
% Budget of Public Works allocated

Comments:

**I) The following amendments are made:**

A: For Project ID:..... changes are made to: Expenses so far, Total Cost, ..... etc.

B: For Project ID:..... changes are made to: Expenses so far, Total Cost, .....etc ...

**II) The following additions have been made:**

B) For Project ID:.....: IRR, (ROE if PPP), etc.

.....

**TEMPLATE B3. UPDATE FIGURES OF EATL INLAND WATERWAY PROJECTS EXISTING IN THE ORIGINAL EATL MASTER PLAN (COST IN 2007 PRICES)**

TIME PLAN		TOTAL COST (in mio euro)	EXPENSES so far(in % of total cost)	% FUNDING SECURED (or possible funding sources)					IRR / (ROE if PPP)	CURRENT STATUS Programming, Planning, Design, Construction (please select one)
Start year	End year			National Funds	EU Funds	Bank Loans	Grants	Private Funds		

Comments:  
I) The following amendments are made:  
A: For Project

ID:..... changes are made to: Expenses so far, Total Cost, ..... etc.  
 B.For Project ID:..... changes are made to: Expenses so far, Total Cost, .....etc ...  
 .....  
 II) The following additions have been made:  
 C) For Project ID.....: IRR,(ROE if PPP), etc.  
 .....

<b>GDP (in year 2008&amp; in mio euro)</b>
<b>% Budget of Public Works allocated</b>

**TEMPLATE B4. UPDATE FIGURES OF EATL PORTS (SEA AND INLAND WATERWAY), INLAND CONTAINER DEPOT/INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL/FREIGHT VILLAGE/LOGISTIC CENTRE PROJECTS EXISTING IN THE ORIGINAL EATL MASTER PLAN (COST IN 2007 PRICES)**

TIME PLAN		TOTAL COST (in mio euro)	EXPENSES so far(in % of total cost)	% FUNDING SECURED (or possible funding sources)					ANNUAL THROUGHPUT IRR / (ROE if PPP)	CURRENT STATUS
Start year	End year			National Funds	EU Funds	Bank Loans	Grants	Private Funds		
									Programming, Planning, Design, Construction (please select one)	

Comments:  
 I) The following amendments are made:  
 A: For Project

t ID:..... changes are made to: Expenses so far, Total Cost, ..... etc.  
 B.For Project ID:..... changes are made to: Expenses so far, Total Cost, .....etc ...  
 II) The following additions have been made:  
 D) For Project ID.....: IRR,(ROE if PPP), etc.

<b>GDP (in year 2008&amp; in mio euro)</b>
<b>% Budget of Public Works allocated</b>

**ANNEX II: TEMPLATES 2 (2A, 2B, 2C, 2D)**

## TEMPLATE 2A – Road and related infrastructure Project Fiche

<p><b>Project Name:</b>  Project ID:  Network (EATL Route):  Project Description:</p>
<p><b>Projects Group:</b> <i>Funded/ Unfunded</i></p>
<p><i>Note:</i> If Funded, fill in Section 1 only. If Unfunded, fill in Sections 1 and 2.</p>
<p><b>Section 1. Project Technical Characteristics:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Location (latitude/longitude or alternatively a map):</li> <li>2. Start point/node/city</li> <li>3. End point/node/city</li> <li>4. Road Class<sup>1</sup>:</li> <li>5. Length (in km):</li> <li>6. Number of carriageways:</li> <li>7. No of lanes:</li> <li>8. Design Speed (km/h):</li> <li>9. Annual Average Daily Traffic<sup>2</sup>:</li> <li>10. Estimated % of freight vehicles<sup>3</sup>:</li> <li>11. Annual Average Daily Traffic (passengers):</li> <li>12. <i>Annual Average Daily Traffic (tones):</i></li> <li>13. Expected (total) traffic increase (in % - <i>both existing and generated</i>):</li> <li>14. Road toll implementation: <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</li> </ol>
<p><b>Section 2. Project Information Concerning Criteria of CLUSTER A</b></p> <p>15. Is the project serving international connectivity? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO  If <b>yes</b> is it expected to:  A: Greatly improves connectivity, B: Significantly improves connectivity, C: Somewhat improves connectivity, D: Slightly improves connectivity, E: Does not improve connectivity.</p> <p>16. Will the project promote solutions to the particular transit transport needs of the landlocked developing countries? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO  If <b>yes</b> is the project providing solution:  A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not</p> <p>17. Will the project connect low income and/or least developed countries to major European and Asian markets? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO  If <b>yes</b> is the project providing connection:  A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not</p> <p>18. Will the project cross natural barriers, removes bottlenecks, raises substandard sections to meet international standards, or fills missing links in the EATL? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO  If <b>yes</b> is the project crosses..:</p>

A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not

19. Will the project have a high degree of urgency due to importance attributed by the national authorities and/or social interest?  YES  NO

If **yes** the projects is:

A: In the national plan and immediately required (for implementation up to 2008), B: In the national plan and very urgent (for implementation up to 2010), C: In the national plan and urgent (for implementation up to 2015), D: In the national plan but may be postponed until after 2015, E: Not in the national plan.

20. Will the project potentially create negative environmental or social impacts (pollution, safety, etc)?  YES  NO

If **yes** the size of impact is:

A: No impact, B: Slight impact, C: Moderate impact, D: Significant impact, E: Great impact.

**Project Information Concerning Criteria of CLUSTER B**

21. Project cost (in million):

22. Expected Starting Date:

23. Expected Completion Date:

24. IRR:

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

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

a. ....

b. ....

c. ....

d. ....

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

<sup>2</sup> For the year 2008 and latest year, if available.

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

**NOTE: The shadowed cells information will be completed by the consultant for each identified road project, based on the countries reports. And then countries will have to complete the white cells, following the note in cells "Projects Group". In the case of a newly proposed project that was not initially proposed in the country report, countries will have to complete all data. The same stands for missing information from the country report, which will be indicated in red letters from the consultant.**

## TEMPLATE 2B – Rail and related infrastructure Project Fiche

<b>Project Name:</b> Project ID: Network (EATL Route): Project Description:
<b>Projects Group:</b> <i>Funded/ Unfunded</i>
<i>Note: If Funded, fill in Section 1 only. If Unfunded, fill in Sections 1 and 2.</i>
<b>Section 1. Project Technical Characteristics:</b> 1. Location (latitude/longitude or alternatively a map): 2. Start point/node/city: 3. End point/node/city: 4. Length (in km): 5. Track gauge (mm): 6. No of tracks: 7. Traction: <input type="checkbox"/> Electrified <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Electrified 8. Signaling type: <input type="checkbox"/> Automatic <input type="checkbox"/> Manual 9. Maximum allowed speed - passenger trains: 10. Maximum allowed speed - freight trains: 11. Average Daily Train Traffic - Passenger trains <sup>1</sup> : 12. Average Daily Train Traffic - Freight trains <sup>1</sup> : 13. Expected (passenger) traffic increase (in % - <i>both existing and generated</i> ): 14. Expected (freight) traffic increase (in % - <i>both existing and generated</i> ): 15. Volume of cargo moved (tones and TEUs) <sup>1</sup> :
<b>Section 2. Project Information Concerning Criteria of CLUSTER A</b> 16. Is the project serving international connectivity? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If <b>yes</b> is it expected to: A: Greatly improves connectivity, B: Significantly improves connectivity, C: Somewhat improves connectivity, D: Slightly improves connectivity, E: Does not improve connectivity. 17. Will the project promote solutions to the particular transit transport needs of the landlocked developing countries? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If <b>yes</b> is the project providing solution: A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not 18. Will the project connect low income and/or least developed countries to major European and Asian markets? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If <b>yes</b> is the project providing connection: A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not 19. Will the project cross natural barriers, removes bottlenecks, raises substandard sections to meet international standards, or fills missing links in the EATL? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

If **yes** is the project crosses..:

A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not

20. Will the project have a high degree of urgency due to importance attributed by the national authorities and/or social interest?  YES  NO

If **yes** the projects is:

A: In the national plan and immediately required (for implementation up to 2008), B: In the national plan and very urgent (for implementation up to 2010), C: In the national plan and urgent (for implementation up to 2015), D: In the national plan but may be postponed until after 2015, E: Not in the national plan.

21. Will the project potentially create negative environmental or social impacts (pollution, safety, etc)?  YES  NO

If **yes** the size of impact is:

A: No impact, B: Slight impact, C: Moderate impact, D: Significant impact, E; Great impact.

**Project Information Concerning Criteria of CLUSTER B**

22. Project cost (in million):

23. Expected Starting Date:

24. Expected Completion Date:

25. IRR:

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

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

a. ....

b. ....

c. ....

d. ....

<sup>1</sup>For the year 2008 and latest year, if available.

**NOTE: The shadowed cells information will be completed by the consultant for each identified rail project, based on the countries reports. And then countries will have to complete the white cells, following the note in cells "Projects Group". In the case of a newly proposed project that was not initially proposed in the country report, countries will have to complete all data. The same stands for missing information from the country report, which will be indicated in red letters from the consultant.**



## TEMPLATE 2C – Inland waterways and related infrastructure Project Fiche

<b>Project Name:</b> Project ID: Network (EATL Route): Project Description:
<b>Projects Group:</b> <i>Funded/ Unfunded</i>
<i>Note: If Funded, fill in Section 1 only. If Unfunded, fill in Sections 1 and 2.</i>
<b>Section 1. Project Technical Characteristics:</b> 1. Location (latitude/longitude or alternatively a map): 2. Start point/node/city: 3. End point/node/city: 4. Length (in km): 5. Max. admissible LNWL <sup>1</sup> : 6. Mi. bridge clearance at HNWL <sup>2</sup> : 7. Lock dimensions: 8. Permitted operational speed (km/h): 9. Yearly vessel traffic <sup>3</sup> : 10. Expected (total) traffic increase (in % - <i>both existing and generated</i> ):
<b>Section 2. Project Information Concerning Criteria of CLUSTER A</b> 11. Is the project serving international connectivity? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If <b>yes</b> is it expected to: A: Greatly improves connectivity, B: Significantly improves connectivity, C: Somewhat improves connectivity, D: Slightly improves connectivity, E: Does not improve connectivity. 12. Will the project promote solutions to the particular transit transport needs of the landlocked developing countries? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If <b>yes</b> is the project providing solution: A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not 13. Will the project connect low income and/or least developed countries to major European and Asian markets? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If <b>yes</b> is the project providing connection: A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not 14. Will the project cross natural barriers, removes bottlenecks, raises substandard sections to meet international standards, or fills missing links in the EATL? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If <b>yes</b> is the project crosses...: A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not 15. Will the project have a high degree of urgency due to importance attributed by the national authorities and/or social interest? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

If **yes** the projects is:

A: In the national plan and immediately required (for implementation up to 2008), B: In the national plan and very urgent (for implementation up to 2010), C: In the national plan and urgent (for implementation up to 2015), D: In the national plan but may be postponed until after 2015, E: Not in the national plan.

16. Will the project potentially create negative environmental or social impacts (pollution, safety, etc)?  YES  NO

If **yes** the size of impact is:

A: No impact, B: Slight impact, C: Moderate impact, D: Significant impact, E; Great impact.

**Project Information Concerning Criteria of CLUSTER B**

17. Project cost (in million):

18. Expected Starting Date:

19. Expected Completion Date:

20. IRR:

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

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

a. ....

b. ....

c. ....

d. ....

<sup>1</sup> *Low Navigable Water Level*

<sup>2</sup> *Highest Navigable Water Level*

<sup>3</sup> *For the year 2008 and latest year, if available.*

**NOTE: The shadowed cells information will be completed by the consultant for each identified inland waterway project, based on the countries reports. And then countries will have to complete the white cells, following the note in cells "Projects Group". In the case of a newly proposed project that was not initially proposed in the country report, countries will have to complete all data. The same stands for missing information from the country report, which will be indicated in red letters from the consultant.**

**TEMPLATE 2D – Ports (sea and inland waterway), Inland container depot/Intermodal freight terminal/Freight village/Logistic centre and related infrastructure Project Fiche**

<p><b>Project Name:</b> Project ID: Network (EATL Route): Project Description:</p>
<p><b>Projects Group:</b> <i>Funded/ Unfunded</i></p> <p><i>Note: If Funded, fill in Section 1 only. If Unfunded, fill in Sections 1 and 2.</i></p>
<p><b>Project Type:</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> Sea Port    <input type="checkbox"/> Inland Waterway Port    <input type="checkbox"/> Inland Container Depot  <input type="checkbox"/> Intermodal Freight Terminal    <input type="checkbox"/> Freight Village/Logistic Center</p>
<p><b>Section 1. Project Technical Characteristics:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Location (latitude/longitude or alternatively a map):</li> <li>2. Start point/node/city:</li> <li>3. End point/node/city:</li> <li>4. Maximum draft of vessels served (in m) – PORTS ONLY:</li> <li>5. Ships berths available (in m) – PORTS ONLY:</li> <li>6. Handling facilities (specific equipments)<sup>1</sup>:</li> <li>7. Open/ covered storage space (in m<sup>2</sup>):</li> <li>8. Customs and services available:</li> <li>9. Types of ships handled (refer to specific types i.e. Dry cargo-bulk-container-Ro/Ro Passenger):</li> <li>10. Bulk cargo handling capacity (tonnes/day)<sup>2</sup>:</li> <li>11. Container handling capacity (TEU/day):</li> <li>12. Annual throughput (tones and TEUs)<sup>3</sup>:</li> <li>13. Expected (total) traffic increase (in % - <i>both existing and generated</i>):</li> </ol>
<p><b>Section 2. Project Information Concerning Criteria of CLUSTER A</b></p> <p>14. Is the project serving international connectivity?    <input type="checkbox"/> YES    <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If <b>yes</b> is it expected to:</p> <p>A: Greatly improves connectivity, B: Significantly improves connectivity, C: Somewhat improves connectivity, D: Slightly improves connectivity, E: Does not improve connectivity.</p> <p>15. Will the project promote solutions to the particular transit transport needs of the landlocked developing countries?    <input type="checkbox"/> YES    <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If <b>yes</b> is the project providing solution:</p> <p>A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not</p> <p>16. Will the project connect low income and/or least developed countries to major European and Asian markets?    <input type="checkbox"/> YES    <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If <b>yes</b> is the project providing connection:</p> <p>A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not</p> <p>17. Will the project cross natural barriers, removes bottlenecks, raises substandard sections to meet international standards, or fills missing links in the EATL?    <input type="checkbox"/> YES    <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>

If **yes** is the project crosses...:

A: Greatly, B: Significantly, C: Somewhat, D: Slightly, E: Does not

18. Will the project have a high degree of urgency due to importance attributed by the national authorities and/or social interest?  YES  NO

If **yes** the projects is:

A: In the national plan and immediately required (for implementation up to 2008), B: In the national plan and very urgent (for implementation up to 2010), C: In the national plan and urgent (for implementation up to 2015), D: In the national plan but may be postponed until after 2015, E: Not in the national plan.

19. Will the project potentially create negative environmental or social impacts (pollution, safety, etc)?  YES  NO

If **yes** the size of impact is:

A: No impact, B: Slight impact, C: Moderate impact, D: Significant impact, E; Great impact.

**Project Information Concerning Criteria of CLUSTER B**

20. Project cost (in million):

21. Expected Starting Date:

22. Expected Completion Date:

23. IRR:

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

25. Expected Funding Sources (Name the sources and the % of funding for each one):

a. ....

b. ....

c. ....

d. ....

<sup>1</sup> *Cranes-gantries-mobile-forklifts-20'/40' containers. Also indicate availability of rail/road transshipment facilities.*

<sup>2</sup> *Where applicable.*

<sup>3</sup> *For the year 2008 and latest year, if available.*

**NOTE: The shadowed cells information will be completed by the consultant for each identified ports (sea and inland waterway), Inland container depot/Intermodal freight terminal/Freight village/Logistic centre project, based on the countries reports. And then countries will have to complete the white cells, following the note in cells "Projects Group". In the case of a newly proposed project that was not initially proposed in the country report, countries will have to complete all data. The same stands for missing information from the country report, which will be indicated in red letters from the consultant.**