



Improving the GE.4 benchmarking data analysis – *Considerations on the way ahead*

*GE.4, 11th session
Geneva, 8-9 April 2021*



What is available so far?

- “Benchmarking analysis of transport infrastructure construction costs in the ECE region” – **Working document 8 – ECE/TRANS/WP.5/2020/8**
- “Transport Infrastructure Construction Cost Data Collected by the Group of Experts for Further Analysis” **WP.5/ 2020 Informal Document No. 4**
 - Annex 1 which provides additional analysis performed by the **Government of Turkey** on construction costs of tunnels and bridges
 - Annex 3 – inter-modal terminal in **Switzerland**

How to use this? Feedback from lead countries Turkey, Poland and Croatia



What is available so far?

- Filled out questionnaires received after **30 June 2020** (partially overlapping with WP.5/ 2020 Informal Document No. 4)
- From **Andorra** (rail and road); **Azerbaijan** (rail); **Belgium** (rail); **Austria** (inland waterways and ports); **Croatia** (inland waterways and ports); **Poland** (inland waterways); **Czechia** (inter-modal); **Slovakia** (road, inland waterways and ports); **Luxembourg** (inland waterways); **Slovenia**(road)
 - Rail: +3
 - Road: +3
 - IWW: +5
 - Inter-modal: +1

How to use this? Sufficient IWW data to provide analysis?

Feedback from lead countries Turkey, Poland and Croatia



What are the challenges?



- **ECE/TRANS/WP.5/2020/8 – Benchmarking analysis:** Too long (over 128 pages), many charts and diagrams, at the same time narrative/ explanatory part too short

- **Next steps:**
 - **Re-assess quality and findings** (also in view of additional data received)
 - **Streamline/ harmonize analysis, create a story line, formulate clear policy messages**
 - **Reduce the number of charts and tables** while expanding the narrative/ explanatory part
 - **Validity of data and analysis in 2022?** Need for additional normalization/ application of a conversion rate? If so, for all modes?
 - **Is there a need for additional calls to relevant UNECE WPs?**

- **Who will lead these efforts?**



What are the challenges? (2)

- **Additional data received after 30 June 2020** (WP.5/ 2020 informal document no. 4/):
 - What is the accuracy and adequacy of this additional data received, across the various modes? Can this be assessed by the GE.4 lead countries?
 - How to integrate this data in/ and normalize it with the already existing benchmarking analysis?

- **Limited GE.4 membership**
 - Would GE.4 wish to expand its membership in order to share the “analytical burden”? If so, how to expand, which countries to reach out to and through which channels?
 - Suggestions/ ideas?



Additional analysis on maintenance costs



- **Draft questionnaires prepared by Government of Turkey and Polish Railways**

- **Important considerations by GE.4:**
 - What will be the status of this additional analysis, to be integrated in the GE.4 final report or as a stand-alone section?
 - Do the other components of the report, the terminology list, the literature review and the overview of national practices need to be reviewed accordingly and cover maintenance aspects as well?
 - Will it be possible to come up with a consolidated set of conclusions and recommendations covering both infrastructure construction and maintenance costs? Is there sufficient “common ground” to do so?
 - How to stimulate further interest of Governments to provide data?



Ultimate purpose

- **The current extension should enable GE.4:**
 - To collect **more and better-quality data** from a **larger group of countries** on their transport infrastructure **construction and maintenance** costs **across all inland modes**
 - **To prepare a high-quality, comprehensive** and more **data rich final report** for endorsement by the 35th Session of WP.5 in September 2022
 - To issue this final report as an **official UN publication** (in three ECE languages)



Thank you for your attention!

