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This presentation answers a handful of guiding questions

- What is LICB?
- What are the challenges ahead for infrastructure managers?
- How can LICB support infrastructure managers?
- How did the expenditures and cost drivers develop?
- How can the comparative results be used?
- What are the lessons learned and what is next for LICB?
LICB is a UIC-led platform for continuous comparison and tracking of trends

Annual comparisons
- Maintenance and Renewal Expenditures
- Network Characteristics and Utilisation
- Key Work Activities (Track Renewals ...)
- Asset Performance (Failure Statistics)

Development
- Cost Driver Analysis
- Normalisation Methodology
- Toolbox of Good Practices
- Annual Updates
- Trend Evaluation
- LICBweb-Tool
- Steady State
- Asset Performance
- Smart KPIs
- Work Efficiency
More than 20 IMs have contributed to the project since its initiation in 1996.
Infrastructure managers are facing rising expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC White Paper (extract)</th>
<th>National Targets (examples)</th>
<th>Current Challenges (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 2030</td>
<td>Reduction of maintenance expenditures per gtkm by 11% (SBB)</td>
<td>Many IMs in Europe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savings in expenditures by almost 20% (NR)</td>
<td>(Over-)ageing assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33% cut in total subsidies (Infrabel)</td>
<td>Renewal backlogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 2050</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bane NOR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renewal backlog almost 10 times as high as average annual renewal expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trafikverket:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific components decreased to approx. half their theoretical life span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TSR leading to increase in travel time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many IMs in Europe:
- (Over-)ageing assets
- Renewal backlogs

Bane NOR:
- Renewal backlog almost 10 times as high as average annual renewal expenditures

Trafikverket:
- Specific components decreased to approx. half their theoretical life span
- TSR leading to increase in travel time
LICB often has been the starting point for good practice exchange and in-depth cooperation

Objectives
- Long-term expenditure levels
- Relative cost-position among peers
- Areas with most promising improvement potentials

Methodology
- Fair and meaningful comparison of expenditures
- Normalisation of expenditures accounting for factors such as network configuration and utilisation

Benefits
- Start for further initiatives to improve maintenance and renewal activities
- Analysis and identification of optimal ratio between maintenance and renewal activities
- Internal and external communication tool, e.g. transparency needs in budget negotiations
- Input for econometric studies and academic research
Spending in the rail infrastructure has been significantly ramped up since 1996

Development\(^1\) of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network size (main track)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrified main track</td>
<td></td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch density</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>+13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset failure frequency (since 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td>+110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)1996–2015, totals / weighted averages of eight current LICB participants, inflation adjusted to 2015 price levels
The increase in renewal expenditures has to be explained mainly by increasing activity levels

Average annual renewal expenditures (eight LICB participants)

1,000 Euros per main track-km

- 1996: 26.5 (±1%)
- 2015: 54.2 (±90%)

Switch density: -0.7 (±2%)

Network utilisation: 4.2 (±16%)

Activity levels, other causes: 23.9

Renewals, inflation adjusted; relative impact on 1996 cost in brackets
However, most railway infrastructure managers realised renewal rates below steady state

Realised vs. steady state renewal rates

in percent

Switches & Crossings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Steady state</th>
<th>Realised (average of 2011 to 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Normalised expenditure levels can be used to identify indicative gaps to good practice

Average annual maintenance and renewal expenditure levels¹)

Possible explanations for remaining differences

- Further structural and topological differences
- Line categories
- Maintenance standards and norms
- (Not) sufficient funding to implement an optimal LCC-strategy
- Infrastructure performance
- Efficiency levels in work execution
- ...

¹) Cost indices based on 2011–2015 averages of eight participants
LICB is a useful tool for infrastructure managers helping to better manage LCC

- LICB is a typical top-down benchmarking analysing annual maintenance and renewals of existing infrastructure
- Results can be used to identify indicative gaps to good practice
- LICB is often used for communication with internal and external stakeholders
- The comparison can be used as starting point for further necessary in-depth analysis in order to derive target levels
- LICB continuously extends and enhances the benefits provided to its participants
  - Analysis of work efficiency
  - Integration of Key Cost Drivers as developed by the Asset Management Working Group
Please get your personal copy of the 20 years LICB report …

... and thanks for your attention!
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