

**DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM FOR
THE EVALUATION AND COMPARISON OF
CONCESSION PROJECT INVESTMENTS**

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

ALISON KATE McCOWAN
B.Eng. (Hons1), MIEAust

from

**School of Engineering
Faculty of Engineering & Information Technology**

**GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY
GOLD COAST CAMPUS**

January 2004

DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Alison Kate McCowan

January 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

“No man is an island entire of itself” (John Donne, 1572-1631). The completion of this PhD would not have been possible without the help, encouragement and support of many individuals to whom I would like to express my deepest gratitude.

I would like to first thank my supervisor, Dr Sherif Mohamed, for his invaluable inspiration, guidance and support throughout the course of my studies. I truly appreciate the input Dr Mohamed has had into my development as a researcher and count it a privilege to have worked under the supervision of such a high calibre individual.

Thanks are also due to the Australian Postgraduate Award (APA) Scholarship Scheme and the School of Engineering for providing the necessary financial support without which, this research simply would not exist.

To all those in the School of Engineering at Griffith University who have provided assistance throughout my research, be it technical or administrative, it has not gone unnoticed. I would also like to acknowledge: Kathy Melih from the School of IT who put me back on track with my Visual C++ programming on several occasions; Mike Dempsey Head of the School of Accounting and Finance for brainstorming with me over financial formulae in almost painful detail; and all the questionnaire respondents who gave of their time and expert knowledge to make the pilot study possible.

Most of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my family and friends for their encouragement and moral support through all the ups and downs of a PhD rollercoaster. Thanks go especially to my husband Phil, my parents, my sister, Kirsty, and my brother, Iain, for their timely words of wisdom; and also to Christie Schacht who kept me sane in the office during the latter half of my research.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank my Father in Heaven for His unending love and grace. You truly have never left me nor forsaken me.

ABSTRACT

Governments of developed and developing countries alike are unable to fund the construction and maintenance of vital physical infrastructure such as roads, railways, water and wastewater treatment plants, and power plants. Thus, they are more and more turning to the private sector as a source of finance through procurement methods such as concession contracts. The most common form of concession contract is the Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) contract, where a government (Principal) grants a private sector company (Promoter) a concession to build, finance, operate and maintain a facility and collect revenue over the concession period before finally transferring the facility, at no cost to the Principal, as a fully operational facility. Theoretically speaking, these projects present a win-win-win solution for the community as well as both private and public sector participants.

However, with the opportunity for private sector companies to earn higher returns comes greater risk. This is despite the fact that concession projects theoretically present a win-win-win solution to the problem of infrastructure provision. Unfortunately, this has not been the case in a number of countries including Australia. Private sector participants have admitted that there are problems that must be addressed to improve the process. Indeed they have attributed the underperformance of concession projects to the inability of both project Principals and Promoters to predict the impact of all financial and non-financial (risk) factors associated with concession project investments (CPIs) and to negotiate contracts to allow for these factors.

Non-financial project aspects, such as social, environmental, political, legal and market share factors, are deemed to be important; but these aspects would usually be considered to lie outside the normal appraisal process. To allow for the effects of such qualitative aspects, the majority of Principal or promoting organisations resort to estimating the necessary money contingencies without an appropriate quantification of the combined effects of financial and non-financial (risks and opportunities) factors.

In extreme cases, neglect of non-financial aspects can cause the failure of a project despite very favourable financial components; or can even cause the failure to go-ahead with a project that may have been of great non-financial benefit due to its projected

ordinary returns. Hence, non-financial aspects need careful analysis and understanding so that they can be assessed and properly managed. It is imperative that feasibility studies allow the promoting organisation to include a combination of financial factors and non-financial factors related to the economic environment, project complexity, innovation, market share, competition, and the national significance of the project investment. While much research has already focused on the classification of CPI non-financial (risk) factors, and the identification of interdependencies between risk factors on international projects, no attempt has yet been made to quantify these risk interdependencies. Building upon the literature, this thesis proposes a generic CPI risk factor framework (RFF) including important interdependencies, which were verified and quantified using input provided by practitioners and researchers conversant with risk profiles of international and/or concession construction projects. Decision Support Systems (DSSs) are systems designed to assist in the decision making process by providing all necessary information to the analyst. There are a number of DSSs that have been developed over recent years for the evaluation of high-risk construction project investments, such as CPIs, which incorporate the analysis of both financial and non-financial (risk) aspects of the investment. However, although these DSSs have been useful to practitioners and researchers alike, they have not offered a satisfactory solution to the modelling problem and are all limited in their practical application for various reasons. Thus, the construction industry lacks a DSS that is capable of evaluating and comparing several CPI options, taking into consideration both financial and non-financial aspects of an investment, as well as including the uncertainties commonly encountered at the feasibility stage of a project, in an efficient and effective manner. These two criteria, efficiency and effectiveness, are integral to the usefulness and overall acceptance of the developed DSS in industry.

This thesis develops an effective and efficient DSS to evaluate and compare CPI opportunities at the feasibility stage. The novel DSS design is based upon a combination of: (1) the mathematical modelling technique and financial analysis model that captures the true degree of certainty surrounding the project; and (2) the decision making technique and RFF that most closely reproduces the complexity of CPI decisions. Overall, this thesis outlines the methodology followed in the development of the DSS – produced as a stand-alone software product – and demonstrates its capabilities through a verification and validation process using real-life CPI case studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Figures.....	xi
List of Tables.....	xiii
Acronyms.....	xv

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Motivation and Overview.....	1-1
1.2 Objectives.....	1-7
1.3 Methodology.....	1-9
1.3.1 Phase I - Literature Review and Analysis.....	1-10
1.3.2 Phase II – Design and Implementation.....	1-11
<i>Technique Selection.....</i>	<i>1-11</i>
<i>Architectural Design of DSS.....</i>	<i>1-12</i>
<i>Pilot Study – Generic Risk Factor Framework.....</i>	<i>1-12</i>
<i>Development and Verification</i>	
<i>Engineering of DSS Software.....</i>	<i>1-13</i>
<i>Verification and Validation of DSS.....</i>	<i>1-13</i>
<i>Production of DSS Documentation.....</i>	<i>1-14</i>
1.4 Organisation of Thesis.....	1-15
1.5 Accompanying CD-ROM.....	1-17
1.6 Original Contributions.....	1-17
1.7 Publications Resulting from Research.....	1-18
1.7.1 International Journal Publications.....	1-18
1.7.2 International Conference Publications.....	1-18
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	2-1
2.1 General Remarks.....	2-1
2.2 Risks in Concession Project Investments (CPIs).....	2-2
2.2.1 Political Environment.....	2-2
2.2.2 Social Environment.....	2-4
2.2.3 Source of Finance.....	2-4
2.2.4 Organisational Policy.....	2-6
2.2.5 Construction Delays and Cost Overruns.....	2-8
<i>Design Changes.....</i>	<i>2-9</i>
<i>Climate.....</i>	<i>2-9</i>
<i>Material Supply.....</i>	<i>2-9</i>
<i>Productivity.....</i>	<i>2-9</i>
<i>Technical Standards and Codes.....</i>	<i>2-10</i>
<i>Commissioning.....</i>	<i>2-10</i>
2.2.6 Operations and Maintenance (O&M).....	2-10
2.2.7 Market and Revenue.....	2-11

2.3	Investment Appraisal.....	2-12
2.3.1	Uncertainty and Risk.....	2-13
2.3.2	Risk Assessment in Construction - Current Practice.....	2-18
2.4	Benefits of a CPI DSS.....	2-20
2.5	Requirements of a CPI DSS.....	2-21
2.6	Mathematical Modelling Techniques.....	2-23
2.7	CPI Financial Analysis Models.....	2-27
2.7.1	INFRISK Financial Model.....	2-27
2.7.2	BOT Financial Model (Bakatjan et al., 2003).....	2-29
2.7.3	Other CPI Financial Models.....	2-31
2.7.4	Comparison of CPI Financial Analysis Models.....	2-32
2.8	Decision Making Techniques.....	2-34
2.9	Currently Available DSSs.....	2-34
2.9.1	Economic Framework Incorporating Uncertainty.....	2-35
	<i>COMFAR III</i>	2-36
	<i>CASPAR</i>	2-36
	<i>@RISK, NPV-at-Risk and Value-at-Risk (VaR)</i>	2-37
	<i>INFRISK</i>	2-38
	<i>Four Moment Framework</i>	2-39
2.9.2	Real Options Frameworks.....	2-40
2.9.3	Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) Frameworks.....	2-42
	<i>Frameworks Not Including Factor Interdependencies</i>	2-42
	<i>Frameworks Including Factor Interdependencies</i>	2-42
	<i>Neural Networks</i>	2-42
	<i>Cross Impact Analysis (CIA)</i>	2-43
	<i>Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP)</i>	2-45
	<i>ICRAM-1</i>	2-45
	<i>Analytic Network Process (ANP)</i>	2-46
2.9.4	Summary.....	2-49
2.10	Risk Factor Frameworks.....	2-51
3.	TECHNIQUE SELECTION.....	3-1
3.1	General.....	3-1
3.2	Selection of Mathematical Modelling Technique.....	3-1
3.2.1	Pilot DSS Methodology and Model Input.....	3-2
3.2.2	Numerical Application 1.....	3-8
3.2.3	Numerical Application 2.....	3-11
3.2.4	Summary.....	3-13
3.3	Selection of Financial Analysis Model.....	3-14
3.4	Selection of Decision Making Technique - DSS Structure.....	3-17
3.4.1	Numerical Example.....	3-17
	<i>Analysis Case 1 – AHP</i>	3-17
	<i>Analysis Case 2 – CIA</i>	3-19
	<i>Analysis Case 3 – ANP</i>	3-20
	<i>Critical Comparison</i>	3-21
3.4.2	Final Selection of Decision Making Technique.....	3-23
3.5	Selection of CPI Risk Factor Framework.....	3-25
3.6	Summary.....	3-28
4.	DSS ARCHITECTURE.....	4-1

4.1	General.....	4-1
4.2	Overall DSS Architecture.....	4-1
4.3	Module One –Model Definition.....	4-3
4.3.1	Financial Component.....	4-4
4.3.2	Non-Financial Component.....	4-5
4.3.3	Summary.....	4-8
4.4	Module Two –Model Evaluation and Ranking.....	4-9
4.4.1	Financial Formulae.....	4-10
	Construction Period.....	4-11
	Operations Period.....	4-13
4.4.2	Non-Financial Formulae.....	4-16
4.4.3	Summary.....	4-19
4.5	Module Three – Sensitivity Analysis.....	4-19
4.6	Summary.....	4-21
5.	PILOT STUDY.....	5-1
5.1	General.....	5-1
5.2	Objectives.....	5-2
5.3	Pilot Study – Development.....	5-3
5.3.1	Sampling.....	5-3
	<i>Sampling Criteria</i>	5-3
	<i>Preliminary Interviews</i>	5-4
	<i>Final Sample</i>	5-5
5.3.2	Questionnaire Design.....	5-5
5.3.3	Interviews: Refinement of Questionnaire Design and Adapted RIM.....	5-7
5.4	Pilot Study – Implementation.....	5-9
5.4.1	Questionnaire Dissemination & Collation of Responses.....	5-9
5.4.2	Data Analysis.....	5-10
	<i>Classification of Respondents</i>	5-11
	<i>Industry Sub-Sample – International Project Experience</i>	5-11
	<i>Researchers Sub-Sample – Concession Project Experience</i>	5-14
	<i>Comparison of Industry vs. Researcher Sub-Samples</i>	5-16
5.4.3	Development of Final Risk Influence Matrix.....	5-17
5.5	Application.....	5-18
5.6	Summary.....	5-20
6.	DSS SOFTWARE ENGINEERING.....	6-1
6.1	General.....	6-1
6.2	Design Overview.....	6-1
6.3	Module One –Model Definition Module.....	6-3
6.3.1	Step 1: Parameters.....	6-4
6.3.2	Step 2: Benefits (\$)......	6-6
6.3.3	Step 3: Costs (\$)......	6-8
6.3.4	Step 4: Risks.....	6-8
6.3.5	Step 5: Opportunities.....	6-9
6.4	Module Two – Evaluation and Ranking Module.....	6-10
6.5	Module Three – Sensitivity Analysis Module.....	6-13
6.6	Help Section and User Manual.....	6-17
6.7	Summary.....	6-17

7.	DSS SOFTWARE VALIDATION.....	7-1
7.1	General.....	7-1
7.2	Need for DSS Verification and Validation.....	7-3
7.3	Verification.....	7-4
7.3.1	Financial Analysis Model.....	7-4
7.3.2	Non-Financial Model.....	7-8
7.3.3	Sensitivity Analysis.....	7-8
	<i>Financial Factors</i>	7-9
	<i>Non-Financial</i>	7-10
7.4	Validation - Case Study Selection Criteria.....	7-12
7.5	Validation - Case Study One.....	7-14
7.5.1	General.....	7-14
7.5.2	CPI Model Development.....	7-15
	<i>Financial Factors</i>	7-15
	<i>Non-Financial Factors</i>	7-17
7.6	Validation - Case Study Two.....	7-18
7.6.1	General.....	7-18
7.6.2	CPI Model Development.....	7-19
	<i>Financial Factors</i>	7-19
	<i>Non-Financial Factors</i>	7-19
7.7	Validation - Case Study Three.....	7-21
7.7.1	General.....	7-21
7.7.2	CPI Model Development.....	7-21
	<i>Financial Factors</i>	7-21
	<i>Non-Financial Factors</i>	7-23
7.8	Validation - ECCO Analysis Results.....	7-24
7.9	Validation - ECCO Sensitivity Analysis.....	7-35
7.10	Limitations of ECCO Software.....	7-37
7.10.1	Module One.....	7-37
7.10.2	Module Two.....	7-38
7.10.3	Module Three.....	7-38
7.11	Summary.....	7-39
8.	CONCLUSIONS, CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	8-1
8.1	General.....	8-1
8.2	Conclusions.....	8-1
8.3	Contributions to Academic Knowledge Base and Implications for ... Research	8-5
8.4	Implications for the Construction Industry.....	8-7
8.5	Recommendations for Future Research.....	8-9
8.6	Closure.....	8-10
	REFERENCES.....	R-1
	APPENDICES	
	Appendix A: Possibility Theory Methods.....	A-1
	<i>Vertex Method</i>	A-1
	<i>Averaging Method</i>	A-3

<i>Ranking Index Model</i>	A-4
Appendix B: Questionnaire –Risk Factor Interaction in Concession Project Investments	B-1
Appendix C: Questionnaire –Risk Factor Interaction in International..... Projects	C-1
Appendix D: Non-Pooled T-Test Results – Two Sub-Samples of	D-1
Pilot Study at 0.05 Significance Level	
Appendix E: ECCO User Manual.....	E-1
Appendix F: Verification – Financial Analysis Model.....	F-1
<i>Turkey HEPP Project</i>	F-1
Appendix G: Verification – Financial Analysis Model	G-1
<i>“Fuzzy test” ECCO Project Data File</i>	G-1
Appendix H: Verification – Non-Financial Model.....	H-1
<i>ECCO Project Data File – Test 1</i>	H-2
<i>ECCO Project Data File – Test 2</i>	H-3
<i>Super Decisions Model</i>	H-5
Appendix I: Validation – Case Study One.....	I-1
<i>ECCO Project Data File – Model 2</i>	I-1
Appendix J: Validation – Case Study Two.....	J-1
<i>Financial Data Spreadsheet</i>	J-2
<i>ECCO Project Data File – Model 1</i>	J-3
<i>ECCO Project Data File – Model 2</i>	J-6
Appendix K: Validation – Case Study Three.....	K-1
<i>ECCO Project Data File – Model 1</i>	K-2
<i>ECCO Project Data File – Model 2</i>	K-5
Appendix L: Analysis Run 4.....	L-1
<i>ECCO Analysis Results File – 3 Case Study Projects</i>	L-2
Appendix M: Validation – Sensitivity Analysis Results.....	M-1
<i>ECCO – SA Results File: Financial (Equity Fraction)</i>	M-1
<i>ECCO – SA Results File: Non-Financial (Approval & Permit)</i>	M-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Research Activities, Objectives and Expected Output.....	1-9
Figure 1.2	Methodology Flowchart.....	1-15
Figure 2.1	Potential Stakeholders in a Concession Scheme (Carmichael, 2000)	2-5
Figure 2.2	Typical BOT Project Contractual Arrangements..... (Walker & Smith, 1995)	2-7
Figure 2.3	Diagrammatic Representation of the IRR Method.....	2-15
Figure 2.4	Diagrammatic Representation of the Payback Period.....	2-16
Figure 2.5	a) Possibility Distribution b) Probability Distribution.....	2-24
Figure 2.6	Triangular Possibility Distribution of Car Price.....	2-26
Figure 2.7	Conventional (a) and Fuzzy (b) Risk Analysis Process..... (Wirba et al. 1996)	2-26
Figure 2.8	A Classification of Available DSSs for the Analysis of CPIs.....	2-35
Figure 2.9	Flowchart Diagram of INFRISK (Dailami et al. 1999).....	2-39
Figure 2.10	Components of Four Moments Framework (Abdel-Aziz, 2000).....	2-40
Figure 2.11	Two Step Binomial Pyramid (Ho and Lui, 2002).....	2-41
Figure 2.12	A Neural Network With Three Layers (Al-Tabtabai and Alex, 2000)	2-43
Figure 2.13	Illustrative CIA DSS Framework.....	2-44
Figure 2.14	Illustrative AHP Hierarchy With Three Levels.....	2-45
Figure 2.15	Structuring of Criteria in ICRAM-1 (Hastak and Shaked, 2000).....	2-46
Figure 2.16	Typical ANP Framework Adapted From Zhi's (1995) Risk..... Identification Hierarchy	2-47
Figure 2.17	ANP Project Rating Method.....	2-48
Figure 2.18	Refined Risk Factor Framework (Wang et al., 2002).....	2-54
Figure 3.1	The Pilot DSS Process Flowchart (Mohamed & McCowan, 2001).....	3-3
Figure 3.2	Analyst's Perception of Design Cost: (a) Single Value;..... (b) Closed Interval; (c) Triangular Distribution; (d) Trapezoidal Distribution	3-4
Figure 3.3	Resultant NPV Possibility and its Normalised Distributions.....	3-5
Figure 3.4	The Overall 'Combined' Possibility Distributions For Project A and B	3-13
Figure 3.5	Decision Problem Structure for Case 1 – AHP.....	3-18
Figure 3.6	Decision Problem Structure for Case 2 – CIA.....	3-19
Figure 3.7	Decision Problem Structure for Case 3 – ANP.....	3-20
Figure 3.8	Saaty's (2001) ANP Project Rating Method.....	3-24
Figure 4.1	Flowchart of DSS Modules.....	4-2
Figure 4.2	First Adaptation of ANP Project Rating Method.....	4-3
Figure 4.3	Second Adaptation of ANP Project Rating Method.....	4-3
Figure 4.4	Typical Risk Factor Framework.....	4-6
Figure 4.5	The 1-7 Scale for Non-Financial Factors.....	4-7
Figure 4.6	Model Definition Module Flowchart.....	4-9
Figure 4.7	Possibility Distribution Centre of Gravity (Cx).....	4-16
Figure 4.8	Matrix Representation of Each Risk/Opportunity Framework.....	4-17
Figure 4.9	Matrix Representation of W^∞	4-17
Figure 4.10	CPI Evaluation Methodology.....	4-18
Figure 4.11	Module Two Flowchart.....	4-19
Figure 4.12	Module Three Flowchart.....	4-21
Figure 5.1	Pilot Study Sampling.....	5-4

Figure 5.2	Scale of Influence.....	5-6
Figure 5.3	Data Analysis Procedure.....	5-11
Figure 5.4	Respondent Role Profile.....	5-12
Figure 5.5	Respondent's International Project Experience Profile.....	5-13
Figure 5.6	Respondents' Concession Knowledge Profile.....	5-15
Figure 5.7	Respondent Profile by Project Type.....	5-15
Figure 5.8	Respondent Profile by Project Host Country/Region.....	5-16
Figure 5.9	Questionnaire Process Flowchart.....	5-21
Figure 6.1	The Main ECCO Dialog.....	6-2
Figure 6.2	Project Data Dialog.....	6-3
Figure 6.3	Open File Dialog.....	6-4
Figure 6.4	Financial Parameters Dialog.....	6-4
Figure 6.5	Loan Milestone Dates Dialog.....	6-5
Figure 6.6	Financial Parameters Definition Dialog.....	6-6
Figure 6.7	Revenue Dialog.....	6-7
Figure 6.8	Define Financial Data Dialog.....	6-7
Figure 6.9	Risk Data (1) Dialog.....	6-8
Figure 6.10	Risk Data (2) Dialog.....	6-9
Figure 6.11	Analysis (1) Dialog.....	6-10
Figure 6.12	Analysis (2) Dialog.....	6-10
Figure 6.13	Analysis Results Dialog.....	6-11
Figure 6.14	Sensitivity Analysis (1) Dialog.....	6-14
Figure 6.15	Sensitivity Analysis (2) Dialog –Financial Factor.....	6-15
Figure 6.16	Sensitivity Analysis (2) Dialog – Non-Financial Factor.....	6-16
Figure 7.1	Sensitivity Analysis (2) Dialog –Financial Verification.....	7-9
Figure 7.2	Sensitivity Analysis (2) Dialog – Non-Financial Verification.....	7-11
Figure 7.3	Transformation of Interest Rate (%) into Possibility Distribution.....	7-16
Figure 7.4	Cycling Between Approval & Permit and Corruption Risk Factors.....	7-27
Figure 7.5	Graphical Comparison of Case Study One CPI Model Results.....	7-28
Figure 7.6	Fourth Analysis Run Results – Equity Holder B/C Ratio	7-30
	Distributions	
Figure 7.7	Fourth Analysis Run Results – Annual DSCR Values.....	7-32
Figure 7.8	Fourth Analysis Run Results – Overall Project B/C Ratio.....	7-33
Figure 7.9	Sensitivity Analysis Results – Equity Fraction.....	7-35
Figure 7.10	Sensitivity Analysis Results – Approval and Permits Risk Factor...	7-37

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Comparison of CPI Financial Analysis Model Performance Measures	2-33
Table 2.2	Summary of Currently Available DSS Advantages and Limitations...	2-50
Table 3.1	Base Data for Projects A and B (Moselhi and Deb, 1993).....	3-9
Table 3.2	Summary of Financial Results Using Possibility vs. the Utility Method	3-10
Table 3.3	Project A Financial Input and Output.....	3-11
Table 3.4	Project A Non-Financial Input and Output.....	3-12
Table 3.5	Project B Financial Input and Output.....	3-12
Table 3.6	Project B Non-Financial Input and Output.....	3-12
Table 3.7	Pairwise Comparison Matrix and Resulting Normalised Priorities for Level 1 - Criteria wrt Goal (Selection of Best Project).....	3-18
Table 3.8	Level 2 Comparisons -Projects wrt Criteria.....	3-18
Table 3.9	Input for the CIA Model Project A.....	3-20
Table 3.10	Pairwise Comparisons of Non-Financial Factors wrt Financing.....	3-21
Table 3.11	Comparison of Technique Efficiency.....	3-22
Table 3.12	Most Critical Risk Factors As Previously Identified By Wang et al.(2002)	3-26
Table 3.13	Adapted Risk Influence Matrix Based On Wang et al., 2002.....	3-27
Table 3.14	Selected Techniques and DSS Requirements for Which They Cater..	3-27
Table 4.1	How DSS Requirements Are Met By DSS Design.....	4-22
Table 5.1	Adapted Risk Influence Matrix - Preliminary Version.....	5-7
Table 5.2	Adapted Risk Influence Matrix - Refined Version.....	5-9
Table 5.3	Questionnaire Response Summary.....	5-10
Table 5.4	Frequency of Responses by Project Host Country.....	5-14
Table 5.5	Respondents' Knowledge of Concession Projects by Host Country..	5-16
Table 5.6	Final Risk Influence Matrix.....	5-18
Table 7.1	Revenue and O&M Costs (US\$,000) (Bakatjan et al., 2003).....	7-6
Table 7.2	Comparison of Financial Analysis Results for Turkey BOT HEPP Project	7-7
Table 7.3	Comparison of Financial Analysis Results – Single Equivalent Values	7-7
Table 7.4	Comparison of Results: ECCO vs. Super Decisions©.....	7-8
Table 7.5	Comparison of Sensitivity Analysis Results.....	7-10
Table 7.6	Comparison of Results – ECCO vs. SuperDecisions©.....	7-12
Table 7.7	Financial Factor Possibility Distributions (US\$,000) – Case Study One	7-16
Table 7.8	Risk Factor Ratings – Case Study One.....	7-17
Table 7.9	Project Sponsor Construction Costs (\$US million) – Case Study Two	7-19
Table 7.10	Risk Factor Ratings – Case Study Two.....	7-20
Table 7.11	Annual Cost and Revenue Data – Case Study Three.....	7-22
Table 7.12	Risk Factor Ratings – Case Study Three.....	7-23
Table 7.13	Risk Influence Matrix (RIM) for Case Study Three.....	7-24
Table 7.14	Comparison of Analysis Results – Case Study One.....	7-25
Table 7.15	Comparison of Analysis Results – Case Study Two.....	7-26
Table 7.16	Comparison of Analysis Results – Case Study Three.....	7-26

Table 7.17 Analysis Results for Final Analysis Run - Equivalent Single Values. 7-30

ACRONYMS

AHP	Analytical Hierarchy Process
ANP	Analytic Network Process
B/C	Benefit/Cost
B/CR	Benefit/(Cost x Risk)
BO/CR	(Benefit x Opportunity)/(Cost x Risk)
BOLT	Build-Own-Lease-Transfer
BOO	Build-Own-Operate
BOOST	Build-Own-Operate-Subsidize-Transfer
BOOT	Build-Own-Operate-Transfer
BOT	Build-Operate-Transfer
BTHSR	Bureau of Taiwan High Speed Rail
BTO	Build-Transfer-Operate
CASPAR	Computer Aided Simulation for Project Appraisal and Review
CIA	Cross Impact Analysis
COMFAR	Computer Model for Feasibility Analysis and Reporting
CPI	Concession Project Investment
CSF	Critical Success Factor
DBFO	Design-Build-Finance-Operate
DBOT	Design-Build-Operate-Transfer
DSCR	Debt Service Coverage Ratio
DSS	Decision Support System
ECCO	Evaluate and Compare Concession Options
EMC	Electromechanical Cost
FBOOT	Finance-Build-Own-Operate-Transfer
HEPP	Hydroelectric Power Plant
HSR	High Speed Rail
ICRAM-1	International Risk Assessment Model
IRR	Internal Rate of Return
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
MCC	Modified Coefficient of Consensus
MCDM	Multi Criteria Decision Making
NN	Neural Networks
NPV	Net Present Value
NSW	New South Wales
NZ	New Zealand
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
O/R	Opportunity/Risk
PFI	Private Finance Initiative
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
RFF	Risk Factor Framework
RIM	Risk Influence Matrix
THSRC	Taiwan High Speed Rail Corporation
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UK	United Kingdom
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
US	United States
VaR	Value at Risk

VBA	Visual Basic for Applications
VCC	Ventana Coefficient of Consensus
VFM	Value For Money
WACC	Weighted Average Cost of Capital