



**Beyond Paris: Financing and implementing climate  
change commitments**  
**Austrian climate change workshop**  
**30 – 31 March 2017, Vienna**

**SCALING UP CITY-LEVEL CLEAN TRANSPORT  
INVESTMENTS INTO NATIONAL PROGRAMMES:  
PROMOTING CLEAN URBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORT  
IN KAZAKHSTAN**

**Nelly Petkova**  
**OECD, Environment Directorate**

**Rafal Stanek**  
**Kommunalkredit Public Consulting**





# Evolution of OECD work on environmental public finance

---

- OECD supports EECCA countries to improve the management of public resources allocated to support environmental investments
- OECD has developed a number of practical tools that can be used in the preparation of public investment programmes
  - OECD Council Recommendation for environmental public environmental expenditure programmes (PEEM)
  - Handbook for appraisal of environmental projects financed from public funds
- Developing green public investment programmes supported with public funds – investment programme design and costing model
  - Kommunalkredit Public Consulting is OECD contractor implementing the project



# Why green public investment programmes?

---

- There are significant investment needs in the countries, including at a city level
- The private sector needs to play a crucial role in financing green investments, however, not all types of investments are interesting for the private sector
- Economic conditions (small and financially weak service providers, low tariffs) often make private sector reluctant to invest without clear incentives
- Public support can be used to stimulate green public investments



# Economics of using public funds

| Project characteristics |                   | Economic efficiency   |  |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---|--|
|                         |                   | Yes ( $ERR > r$ )   | No ( $ERR < r$ )   |
| Commercial viability    | Yes ( $IRR > r$ ) | Project should be implemented but no subsidy necessary  | Project should not be implemented even if private sector wants to support it                 |
|                         | No ( $IRR < r$ )  | Project should be implemented but market alone will not do the job (subsidy from a public source justified or creating a new market required) | Project should not be implemented and market will not support it (no intervention necessary) |

# Programme objectives and focus of the clean urban transport programme in Kazakhstan

---

- **Starting point:**
  - High air pollution in Kazakh cities; transport not a major polluter but makes significant contribution
  - Very old bus fleet in the cities (majority of buses are more than 15 years old and often more than 25 years)
  - Public transport provided by small private operators (except in the cities of Astana and Almaty)
  - Relatively low tariff, problems to increase tariffs – private operators alone not willing to make investments in clean transport and fuel
- **Programme objective and focus:** Reduce air pollution from urban public transport sector by replacing old bus fleet in urban centres with modern buses powered by clean fuels such as:
  - Compressed Natural Gas (CNG), where available
  - Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) in other cities
  - Alternatively, diesel but considering the import of EURO6 fuel



# Scope of the investment programme

---

- **2-stage investment programme:**
  - **Phase 1 (Pilot phase)** – covers the cities of Kostanay and Shymkent
  - **Phase 2:** the Programme is extended to cover all major urban centres in Kazakhstan
- **Two scenarios for Phase 2 of the Programme were costed:**
  - Scenario 1 – covers buses older than 15 years
  - Scenario 2 – includes also buses older than 10 years



# Modelling the costs and the environmental effects of the two scenarios

---

## Excel-based model developed to support programme design:

- Calculates optimal level of subsidy for bus replacement to incentivise investment by a typical private operator of public transport in Kazakhstan
- Uses assumptions on average passenger-km, investment and operating costs of new, clean buses and old buses
- Takes into account the existing bus fleet in Kazakhstan
- Calculates costs and emission reductions (CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM, SO<sub>2</sub>) per dollar spent
- Users may define target parameters to optimise the programme, including programme budget and emission reduction targets (only one emission reduction parameter at a time can be set as a target: CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM, SO<sub>2</sub>)



# Modelling costs and environmental effects of two scenarios

---

## Algorithm used:

- The model reviews information on public transport for each city. The review is done in four iterations, starting from the oldest buses (>15 years) and then respectively >10 years, > 5 years and 0-5 years
- The model checks first if the city has potential to run CNG buses, if yes it proposes a replacement of an old bus with a CNG bus
- If the city does not have potential for CNG buses, the model follows the same steps with LPG/modern diesel-powered buses
- The costs of new CNG stations are also taken into account. If the number of replaced buses is higher than 100, it is assumed that a CNG station is a commercial project and a subsidy is not required
- These steps repeated until the target is reached or all old buses in a given iteration are replaced



# Results of modelling

| City                                      | Investment costs<br>(including loans) | Public co-financing |      |    |      |      |      |      |      |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------|----|------|------|------|------|------|
|   |                                       | Total               | Year |    |      |      |      |      |      |
|   |                                       |                     | 1    | 2  | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    |
| million USD                               |                                       |                     |      |    |      |      |      |      |      |
| <b>Scenario 1</b>                         |                                       |                     |      |    |      |      |      |      |      |
| Preparation costs (including fundraising) | 0,03                                  | 0,03                | 0,03 |    |      |      |      |      |      |
| Pilot phase                               | 29                                    | 14                  |      | 14 |      |      |      |      |      |
| Implementing Unit (operating costs)       | 0,22                                  | 0,22                |      |    | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Programme promotion                       | 0,09                                  | 0,09                |      |    | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,01 | 0,01 |      |
| Second phase                              | 149                                   | 74                  |      |    | 15   | 15   | 15   | 15   | 15   |
| Total scenario 1                          | 178                                   | 88                  | 0    | 14 | 15   | 15   | 15   | 15   | 15   |
| <b>Scenario 2</b>                         |                                       |                     |      |    |      |      |      |      |      |
| Preparation costs (including fundraising) | 0,03                                  | 0,03                | 0,03 |    |      |      |      |      |      |
| Pilot phase                               | 29                                    | 14                  |      | 14 |      |      |      |      |      |
| Implementing Unit (operating costs)       | 0,22                                  | 0,22                |      |    | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Programme promotion                       | 0,09                                  | 0,09                |      |    | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,00 |
| Second phase                              | 244                                   | 121                 |      |    | 24   | 24   | 24   | 24   | 24   |
| Total scenario 2                          | 274                                   | 135                 | 0    | 14 | 24   | 24   | 24   | 24   | 24   |



# Results of modelling

|                    | New buses |            |              | Emission reduction per year |         |                      |             |                      |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|--------------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|
|                    | Diesel    | CNG        | LPG          | CO <sub>2</sub> (t)         | CO (kg) | NO <sub>x</sub> (kg) | PM 2.5 (kg) | SO <sub>2</sub> (kg) |
| <b>Pilot phase</b> | 0         | 100        | 200          | 7 840                       | 35 250  | 190 164              | 5 507       | 4 363                |
| <b>Scenario 1</b>  | 0         | <b>369</b> | <b>1 441</b> | 47 301                      | 189 851 | 1 122 519            | 33 512      | 25 582               |
| <b>Scenario 2</b>  | 0         | <b>928</b> | <b>1 830</b> | 67 648                      | 314 901 | 1 705 288            | 49 717      | 39 300               |