

Guidance Note

Authors: Paul Riley, Michael Strohn, Lubica Papajova
Majeska

Subject: Brno Rail Node Feasibility Study – Options analysis for short-listing

Ref: 2014 091 CZ AMT RAL

Docs received: Evaluation of Brno rail node options and recommendation of options for further development and assessment

The following JASPERS summary comments refer to the document “Evaluation of Brno rail node options and recommendation of options for further development and assessment” received in a revised version on the 29th of June 2016 (first draft on the 16th of June):

- i. The document includes a descriptive summary and comparison of the various options and sub-options so far developed. We note, however, in particular the lack of:
 - Any information on costs.
 - Really useful comparative information on the total amount of time savings of existing PT passengers or the volume of mode shift produced by the different options.
 - A full description/interpretation of the table on environmental issues in Annex 6.

All of this makes it difficult to make any real comparison at this point.

- ii. We appreciate generalizing the previous *B1e* option as *B1x(500)* for all *B1* options.
- iii. Conclusions have been reached only as regards option(s) *B2*, in that the high investment in underground platforms intended for high speed rail in options *B2* at this point would lead to a poor CBA result and should be excluded from further consideration in the study. All other options and sub-options will go forward to more detailed final assessment including CBA analysis.
- iv. We agree with the conclusion on excluding *B2* but our reasoning is somewhat different: commitment to such a partial investment in underground platforms would constitute a high degree of risk of wasted investment given the lack, so far, of any serious conceptual, options, socio-economic assessment or any real certainty (from many perspectives) for the Czech high speed rail concept. This concept should be assessed separately and in its entirety with all associated costs, benefits and risks considered.
- v. We assume that the hybrid option *B1c/B1f* recommended by JASPERS in the previous Guidance Note will be further considered in the next phase of the FS. It is not considered in this document.

<p>Disclaimer: JASPERS assistance is provided in good faith and with reasonable care and due diligence (<i>diligentia quam in suis</i>), drawing on the experience and business practices of its partners, the EIB and EBRD; however, the beneficiaries acknowledge that EIB in its role as JASPERS will not be responsible for any loss or damage resulting from any advice provided by JASPERS.</p>
