

ADDITIONAL EXPLANATORY NOTE TO THE METHODOLOGY

Based on the list of topics/problems/questions discussed during the elaboration of the Methodology. The following amendments have been made to it:

- 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 2A, 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 decided 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)
- 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 the project 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.