



Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation Program

Moving Forward on Transport Facilitation in the Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation Region

September 2012

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- (i) CAREC countries should take a **pragmatic, corridor-based, and results-driven approach**, building on their ongoing and planned transport facilitation measures covering the six CAREC corridors, and/or forging new, simple bilateral/plurilateral agreements to serve the transport facilitation needs of these CAREC corridors.
- (ii) The **governments of CAREC countries** should identify relevant, corridor-specific agreements which adhere to basic principles of transport facilitation but which, over time, will pave the way for member countries to effectively implement a wider regional agreement. In line with *CAREC 2020*, the selection of “pilot” agreements to be implemented will be based on (a) the willingness of countries to participate, (b) the volume of international trade passing through the corridor, and (c) the readiness of transport and border infrastructure to handle increased cross-border traffic.
- (iii) The selected agreements will be analyzed with a view to identifying key impediments to their effective implementation and proposing measures to address the impediments in line with the minimum and highly critical requirements for facilitated cross-border transport operations. The analysis should address the question of how existing and operational transport facilitation agreements in participating countries relate to each other and with other planned agreements to ensure that they build on each other’s facilitation effects, leading to development of **a sound business case** for cross-border transport facilitation initiatives through the CAREC platform.
- (iv) The **governments of CAREC countries** should strengthen their respective national transport and trade facilitation bodies through: (i) systematic and sustainable capacity building with the assistance of development partners, (ii) regular and constructive dialogues with transport facilitation bodies in neighboring countries, and (iii) active engagement with **private sector stakeholders** in the country and neighboring countries.
- (v) **National transport and trade facilitation bodies** should each formulate and implement their respective **action plans**. With participation of the private sector, they should regularly monitor the effectiveness of existing agreements and make the necessary adjustments through voluntary national actions. They will also be responsible for disseminating knowledge on good practices to encourage other CAREC country sub-groupings to pursue their own effective transport facilitation arrangements along their respective CAREC transport corridors.
- (vi) ADB, as **CAREC Secretariat**, has been requested to play the role of facilitator and honest broker in regard to the above recommendations.

Moving Forward on Transport Facilitation in the Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation Region

1. In September 2011, a meeting of the national focal points (NFPs) of the Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation (CAREC) Program¹ was held in Beijing, the People's Republic of China (PRC), in which proposals to pursue cross-border transport facilitation was discussed. There was overall concurrence on the need to remove nonphysical barriers to inter-state and transit transport in the CAREC region. The NFPs agreed that as a first step, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) would organize information sharing workshops and country consultations on ongoing and planned transport facilitation arrangements in CAREC countries. These workshops and consultations were to formulate recommendations on feasible approaches for addressing nonphysical barriers to the cross-border movement of goods and people along CAREC corridors.

2. In response to the NFPs' agreement at the September 2011 Beijing meeting—and in line with *CAREC 2020: A Strategic Framework for the Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation Program 2011–2020*,² endorsed by the member countries in November 2011—a Roundtable Seminar (the Seminar) on Ways Forward for Corridor-Based Transport Facilitation Arrangements in the CAREC Region was held on 2–3 July 2012 in Beijing, PRC. This report, based on the Seminar deliberations, will serve as a background paper for discussions at the September 2012 NFPs' consultation meeting in Bangkok, Thailand, on future directions of transport facilitation arrangements in CAREC countries. Recommendations contained in the report are proposed for consideration at the Bangkok consultation and—subject to the NFPs' approval—subsequent consideration by the 11th CAREC Ministerial Conference in Wuhan, PRC in November 2012.

I. Need for Transport Facilitation in the CAREC Region

3. Improved transport linkages cut the cost of doing business, create good conditions for larger trade flows, bring people closer to markets and social services, and ultimately become a means to accelerate economic growth. This was underscored in the Transport and Trade Facilitation (TTF) Strategy.³ Under the TTF Strategy, transport facilitation measures pursue more efficient movements through borders by removing nonphysical barriers, relating to legal, regulatory, administrative, documentary, organizational, and other hindrances that adversely affect the efficiency, speed, and cost of cross-border transport operations. These barriers increase transport costs, and consequently, the price of raw materials and commodities. In extreme cases, these barriers completely prohibit cross-border transport of goods, people, and

¹ Founded in 2001, CAREC is a partnership of 10 countries—Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, the People's Republic of China, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Mongolia, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan—and six multilateral institution partners: Asian Development Bank (ADB), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the Islamic Development Bank, the United Nations Development Programme, and the World Bank. ADB has been serving as CAREC secretariat since 2001.

² *CAREC 2020: A Strategic Framework for the Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation Program, 2011–2020*. Manila, 2011.

³ The strategy was endorsed by the CAREC member countries at the sixth ministerial conference in Dushanbe, Tajikistan in 2007. It aims to: (i) establish competitive transport corridors across the CAREC region; (ii) facilitate efficient movement through corridors and across borders; and (iii) develop sustainable, safe, and user-friendly transport and trade networks.

services. *CAREC 2020* emphasizes the importance of transport and trade facilitation⁴ in the achievement of its strategic objectives of expanded trade and improved competitiveness.

4. Transport facilitation is particularly important for the CAREC region, which serves as a strategic crossroad for surface transport linking East Asia, Southeast Asia, and South Asia on one hand, and Europe and the Russian Federation on the other. Moreover, given that eight of the ten CAREC member countries are landlocked, transport facilitation in the region is particularly relevant. Transit rights may be granted to landlocked countries by the general principles of customary international law and may be contained in express provisions of various international conventions. However, they require concrete implementation through transport facilitation measures. Without transport facilitation measures, the transit right principle is neither practicable nor economically viable due to cost, delay, and other prohibitive burdens that render it theoretical.

5. An assessment of transport and trade indicators along CAREC corridors was conducted in January-December 2011, as part of the CAREC Corridor Performance Measurement and Monitoring (CPMM) Project.⁵ The CPMM revealed that the average time to clear a border-crossing point (BCP) was 7.9 hours,⁶ and the average cost at a BCP was \$156. Moreover, the average speed for a 20-ton truck or 20-foot equivalent unit container to travel 500 kilometers (km) along a CAREC corridor section was 38 km per hour (kph) without delay and 22 kph with delay. The average cost to travel along a corridor section was \$959. Although there were improvements in the values of some CPMM indicators from 2010 to 2011, many bottlenecks and impediments to the smooth flow of goods, vehicles, and people along each of the six CAREC corridors⁷ continue to be observed. Queuing and loading/unloading were noted as major impediments, leading to inefficiency. A major cause of delay and a source of high cost is transshipment at BCPs as cross-border transport operations along CAREC corridors continue to be not allowed or inefficient. Transport facilitation is thus required to maximize the benefits derived from the CAREC corridors.

6. There are many cross-border transport facilitation agreements involving CAREC member countries. These include international transport facilitation conventions to which many CAREC countries are contracting parties; plurilateral agreements,⁸ such as agreements under the Transport Corridor Europe–Caucasus–Asia (TRACECA) Program, Economic Cooperation Organization, Shanghai Cooperation Organization; and bilateral transport agreements, such as the *Agreement on the Cross-Border Transport of Persons, Vehicles and Goods Within the Framework of Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation* between the Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan.⁹ Progress in finalizing and implementing these arrangements has been varied but

⁴ Transport facilitation is an element of the related concept of trade facilitation, since trade requires the movement of goods. The demarcation between pure transport facilitation and trade facilitation is, however, not always clear cut. Transport facilitation relates to the simplification of formalities, processes, and procedures relating to persons, transport operators, vehicles, goods, and procedures. Trade facilitation relates to the improvement of trade procedures and controls, governing the movement of goods across national borders to reduce associated cost burdens and maximize efficiency.

⁵ *CAREC CPMM Corridor Performance Measurement & Monitoring. Annual Report. 2011.* Manila, 2012.

⁶ In comparison, a study of New Eurasian Land Transport Initiative reported that crossing European borders at their BCPs takes on average two hours.

⁷ The six CAREC Corridors are: CAREC 1: Europe - East Asia; CAREC 2: Mediterranean - East Asia; CAREC 3: Russian Federation - Middle East-South Asia; CAREC 4: Russian Federation - East Asia; CAREC 5: East Asia - Middle East and South Asia, and CAREC 6: Europe – Middle East and South Asia.

⁸ A *plurilateral* agreement is an agreement between more than two countries, but not a great many. In the parlance of the World Trade Organization, it is a special type of multilateral agreement.

⁹ Afghanistan has expressed its intention to become a contracting party to the Agreement, and signed, together with Tajikistan, a protocol to formalize its accession. The protocol is being considered by the Kyrgyz Republic.

generally slow and has barely addressed the key constraints to cross-border transport in the CAREC region, including: (i) restrictions on the entry of motor vehicles, often causing costly and time-consuming transshipment; (ii) different standards pertaining to vehicle size, weight, and safety requirements, and driver qualifications; (iii) inconsistent and complex formalities related to customs procedures, inspections, clearances, and assessment of duties; and (iv) restrictive visa requirements.

7. As significant progress has been made in the past decade in upgrading the six CAREC corridors, the need to address the nonphysical barriers to the cross-border transport of goods and people along these corridors has become increasingly important. In order to meet the operational priorities of *CAREC 2020*, immediate and effective measures must be put in place to address these nonphysical barriers. As part of *CAREC 2020's* action plan for 2011-2015, it is envisaged that relevant transport facilitation agreements will be reviewed and/or formulated, and subsequently implemented on a pilot basis along selected CAREC corridors and associated BCPs. The selection of pilots will be based on (i) the willingness of countries to participate, (ii) the volume of international trade passing through the corridor, and (iii) the readiness of transport and border infrastructure to handle increased cross-border traffic.

II. Lessons Learned on Transport Facilitation

8. CAREC member countries participated in the July 2012 Roundtable Seminar on Ways Forward for Corridor-Based Transport Facilitation Arrangements in the CAREC Region in Beijing, PRC, and benefitted from the experience-sharing among themselves, as well as from experts of other regions and academia.¹⁰ The objectives of the Seminar were:

- (i) to take stock of and learn from existing transport facilitation arrangements (operational or otherwise) in the CAREC region, particularly those that relate to any part of the CAREC transport corridors;
- (ii) to learn from international good practices on region/subregion-wide transport facilitation arrangements; and
- (iii) to consolidate feasible and practical recommendations for moving forward with corridor-based transport facilitation in the CAREC region.

The summary of the Seminar is available at:

www.carecprogram.org/uploads/events/2012/CBTA-Seminar/Roundtable-Seminar-Summary.pdf

9. Each country delegation presented its experience with transport facilitation, which generally covered the CAREC corridors.¹¹ The delegations presented existing agreements, including bilateral, plurilateral, and multilateral accords that have been implemented to varying degrees and with varying effectiveness. They raised key issues impeding effective

¹⁰ The Seminar was attended by: (i) senior CAREC government officials representing transport, customs, and other concerned agencies, including the NFPs' offices, (ii) Freight/Transport Operators Associations representatives from CAREC member countries, (iii) international experts, (iv) officials from Argentina and Viet Nam who shared their experience on transport facilitation, and (v) staff from ADB and the ADB Institute.

¹¹ For the list of agreements and their correspondence to the six CAREC corridors, see Annex 1: Matrix of Transport Agreements along CAREC Corridors.

implementation¹² and highlighted the benefits of existing agreements—e.g., between 2000 and 2011, Azerbaijan’s freight transport increased by 83% and transit goods traffic by 87%, attributed largely to the implementation of the TRACECA. However, the Seminar found existing transport facilitation agreements to be insufficient to facilitate cross-border transport along the CAREC corridors. It was observed that the ongoing and planned transport facilitation agreements, which were presented at the seminar, lacked some of the key elements to ensure efficient cross-border transport and trade (e.g., customs transit regime and mutual recognition of third party motor liability insurance).

10. The participants drew the following key lessons from the Seminar:

- (i) Transport and trade facilitation has contributed to increased transnational movement and associated trade and development in other regions, and the CAREC region could expect equal benefit from such measures.
- (ii) Effective transport facilitation can be a long process; the relatively successful operation of regional transport facilitation agreements in the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) and South America should provide encouragement and concrete lessons for CAREC and other regional arrangements.
- (iii) Transport facilitation agreements take time to implement even if they have already been signed and ratified by the participating countries. A realistic expectation of implementation timeline is important. In such an extended process of implementation, adopting a pilot approach can help build confidence in the process and identify critical issues to be addressed at the initial stage. Key factors which facilitate immediate and effective implementation are identified as follows: (a) capacity development for relevant officials should be planned in a sustainable way; (b) national institutions for transport and trade facilitation should be established and operationalized; and (c) a framework for continuing cooperation among national institutions for CAREC transport and trade facilitation of participating countries should be established.
- (iv) Involvement of the private sector from the early stages of transport facilitation agreement implementation is strongly recommended, not only as beneficiaries of such agreements, but also as participants in the development, application, and enforcement of related regulations.
- (v) Considering the CAREC TTF Strategy’s goal of establishing competitive transport corridors in the region, a viable approach would be to pursue, on a pilot basis, corridor-specific agreements that adhere to certain basic principles, but which over time will pave the way for member countries to effectively implement a wider regional agreement.
- (vi) Implementation of transport facilitation agreements should start with a focus on highly critical provisions, initially addressing outright barriers to cross-border traffic, and gradually advancing to issues of moderate or less critical provisions.¹³
- (vii) A corridor-based approach would allow for immediate initial results¹⁴—new, visible contributions to transport and trade facilitation with relatively low

¹² A few examples of such impediments discussed are: unilateral suspension of bilateral agreements by one party and maximum gross weight standards that prevent trucks registered in one CAREC member country from operating in neighboring CAREC countries.

¹³ On the criticality of transport facilitation provisions, see Annex 2: Assessment of Criticality of the CAREC Cross-Border Transport Agreement Provisions, August 2011. While the brief report analyzes the criticality of articles contained in the *Agreement on the Cross-Border Transport of Persons, Vehicles and Goods Within the Framework of Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation* between the Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan, its finding applies to transport facilitation agreements in general.

implementation constraints—which would be vital in establishing credibility and in preparing the ground for more difficult agreements. This approach will encourage countries to pursue agreements on a bilateral or plurilateral basis, where common interests may be greater than over a wider region.

- (viii) Experiences and lessons learned in other regions indicate that the corridor-based approach, while not devoid of drawbacks,¹⁵ is the most feasible initial step toward transport facilitation in CAREC.

III. Moving Forward on Transport Facilitation in the CAREC Region

11. Based on the lessons learned detailed in Section II, the Seminar participants agreed on actions to be recommended to the 11th CAREC Ministerial Conference for moving forward on transport facilitation in the CAREC region.

12. It was recommended that CAREC countries take a **pragmatic, corridor-based, and results-driven approach**, building on their ongoing and planned transport facilitation measures covering the six CAREC corridors. In line with this, CAREC countries should, in the short- to medium-term, move toward improved transport facilitation in the region by:

- (i) enhancing existing bilateral/plurilateral agreements to ensure that essential transport facilitation measures along CAREC corridors are included and existing implementation-related issues are adequately addressed; and/or
- (ii) forging new, simple bilateral/plurilateral agreements—containing highly critical requirements (see Annex 2 and footnote 13)—to serve the transport facilitation needs of CAREC corridors.

13. Before commencing work on corridor-based transport facilitation agreements, the Seminar participants agreed on the following preparatory steps:

- (i) identification of countries willing to pursue corridor-based transport facilitation measures for CAREC corridors and of relevant agreements between/among countries concerned;
- (ii) detailed analysis of existing agreements with proposals for amendment;
- (iii) identification of key issues impeding the effective implementation of the agreements, and formulation of measures to address these issues; and
- (iv) amendment of the existing agreements to bring them in line with the minimum and highly critical requirements for facilitated cross-border transport operations, if applicable.

14. Other key elements to be part of the preparatory process include:

¹⁴ For this perspective, see Nguyen Van Thach's presentation at the Seminar, *Cross Border Transport Facilitation between Vietnam and Neighbouring Countries*, available at: [www.carecprogram.org/uploads/events/2012/CBTA-Seminar/Session4-Cross-Border-Transport-Facilitation-Viet-Nam-Neighboring-Countries.pdf]. For an example of studies which highlight the importance of the corridor approach in identifying and addressing the nonphysical barriers to transport facilitation, see United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, 2003. *Transit Transport Issues in Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries (Landlocked Developing Countries Series, No. 1)*, New York.

¹⁵ Examples of drawbacks are: networking and interconnecting among different corridors is more complicated; and for interstate—as opposed to transit—operations, the facilitation effect is lost to a certain extent if the points of inland origin and final destination are not situated on the same corridor.

- (i) development of a sound business case for cross-border transport facilitation initiatives through the CAREC platform, taking into account expected results from the planned 2012/2013 midterm review of the CAREC TTF Strategy. It is important to estimate the likely benefits of transport facilitation in terms of increased trade, improved competitiveness, and lower costs.
- (ii) an analysis of how existing and operational transport facilitation agreements in participating countries relate to each other and with other planned agreements to ensure that they build on each other's facilitation effects, instead of creating different transport facilitation regimes, which could create confusion or serve as a precept to further regulate (rather than liberalize) cross-border transport operations.

15. To assist sustainable and effective development and implementation of the agreements, it was recommended that the governments of the CAREC countries strengthen their respective national transport and trade facilitation bodies through: (i) systematic and sustainable capacity building with the assistance of development partners, (ii) regular and constructive dialogue with transport facilitation bodies in neighboring countries with a view to amicably resolving issues impeding effective implementation, and (iii) active engagement with private sector stakeholders in the country and neighboring countries. If such a body has not been established in a country, it is recommended that it be established, building upon the experience compiled by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and other international organizations.¹⁶

16. National transport and trade facilitation bodies should each formulate and implement their respective action plans. These action plans should focus on selected, highly critical actions that tackle key impediments to cross-border transport and produce immediate results necessary to build confidence among the participating countries. National transport and trade facilitation bodies should actively engage the private sector, based on the principle of public-private partnership. They (ideally through their private sector members) should regularly monitor the effectiveness of existing agreements through the CPMM and/or other measures, and make the necessary adjustments through voluntary national actions. They should disseminate knowledge on good practices to encourage other CAREC country sub-groupings to pursue their own effective transport facilitation arrangements along other CAREC transport corridors.

17. ADB, as CAREC Secretariat, was requested to play the role of facilitator and honest broker in regard to these recommended provisions.

¹⁶ United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, *Trade Facilitation Handbook, Part I, National Facilitation Bodies: Lessons from Experience*, 2006; and Asian Development Bank and United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, *Designing and implementing Trade Facilitation in Asia and the Pacific*, Part III, 2009, Chapter 3, pp. 143-150.

Matrix of Transport Agreements along CAREC Corridors

Corridor	AFG Afghanistan	AZE Azerbaijan	PAK Pakistan	PRC People's Republic of China	KAZ Kazakhstan	KGZ Kyrgyz Republic	MON Mongolia	TAJ Tajikistan	TKM Turkmenistan	UZB Uzbekistan
1				PRC/KAZ PRC/KGZ PRC/KGZ/KAZ/ PAK (quadrilateral)	PRC/KAZ KAZ/ KGZ PRC/KGZ/KAZ/ PAK (quadrilateral) TRACECA NSITC	PRC/KAZ KAZ/ KGZ PRC/KGZ/KAZ/ PAK (quadrilateral) TRACECA NSITC				
2		TRACECA NSITC				TRACECA NSITC				TRACECA
3	AFG/TKM				KAZ/TAJ KAZ/UZB KAZ/KGZ PRC/KGZ/KAZ/ PAK (quadrilateral) TRACECA NSITC	KGZ/UZB KAZ/KGZ PRC/KGZ/KAZ/ PAK (quadrilateral) TRACECA NSITC		KAZ/ TAJ TRACECA NSITC	AFG/TKM Ashgabat Agreement *	KAZ/ UZB KGZ/ UZB Ashgabat Agreement * TRACECA
4				PRC/MON			PRC/MON			
5	AFG/PAK		AFG/PAK PAK/PRC	PRC/TAJ PRC/ KGZ PAK-PRC		PRC/KGZ CAREC CBTA		PRC/ TAJ CAREC CBTA		
6					NSITC			NSITC		

Notes:

(i) Agreements discussed during the Roundtable Seminar on Ways Forward for Corridor-Based Transport Facilitation Arrangements in the CAREC Region held in Beijing, People's Republic of China on 2–3 July 2012. E.g. PRC/KAZ = bilateral transport/transit agreement between the People's Republic of China and Kazakhstan.

(ii) Colors mark countries that are along a specific CAREC Corridor.

(iii) List of Acronyms:

- TRACECA = Transport Corridor Europe–Caucasus–Asia (since May 1993)
- NSITC = North-South International Transport Corridor (since September 2000; also known as the International North-South Transport Corridor)
- CAREC CBTA = Agreement on the Cross-Border Transport of Persons, Vehicles and Goods Within the Framework of Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation (December 2010)

(iv) Ashgabat Agreement = signed by Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Iran, Oman and Qatar (April 2011)

Assessment of the Criticality of the CAREC CBTA Provisions* August 2011

I. Introduction

1. This assessment of the criticality of the provisions of the *Agreement on the Cross-Border Transport of Persons, Vehicles and Goods within the Framework of Central Asian Regional Economic Cooperation* (CAREC Cross-Border Transport Agreement or CBTA) has been prepared as an input into the prioritizing elements of the action plan for CBTA implementation. For this purpose, subject to discussion with the contracting parties, provisions of the CBTA have been categorized as (i) highly critical (indispensable), (ii) moderately critical, or (iii) of limited criticality. Only CBTA articles and annex provisions that require some implementation action are discussed.

II. Highly Critical (Indispensable) Provisions

2. Highly critical are the provisions relating to matters that create an outright barrier to cross-border traffic. These are the provisions that:

- (i) allow transport operators to operate across the border [Articles 3 and 9 except (f)];
- (ii) determine the designation of transport operators by defining the market access conditions (Annex 6) and the licensing requirements (Annex 7 Part I);
- (iii) allow motor vehicles to cross the border [Article 7(a) (principle) and (b) (mutual recognition of technical standards)];
- (iv) allow drivers to drive motor vehicles across the border [Article 5(c), mutual recognition of driving licenses]; and
- (v) define the corridors and entry/exit points (Annex 2).

III. Moderately Critical Provisions

3. Moderately critical are the provisions that enhance efficiency relating to matters that would not block cross-border traffic, but the absence of which make it constantly more onerous and time-consuming. These are the provisions that:

- (i) ban non-cost related charges (Article 4 and Annex 3);
- (ii) install mutual recognition of the home country third-party motor liability insurance cover (Article 7(c) and Annex 5);
- (iii) install the customs temporary admission regime for motor vehicles (Article 7(d) and Annex 4 Part III) and for containers (Article 8 and Annex 4 Part IV);
- (iv) install the customs transit and temporary admission regime for goods (Article 10 (a) and (b) and Annex 4 Part II);
- (v) provide for border crossing clearance facilitation measures (Article 12 and Annex 9);
- (vi) require the indispensable concomitant equipment, infrastructure, and facilities for those border crossing facilitation measures in Annex 8 Part II; and

* The paper was presented by ADB at the CAREC Cross-Border Transport Agreement (CBTA) Meeting of Experts to Finalize the Draft Action Plan for CBTA Implementation and Consider Accession by Afghanistan on 23-25 August 2011 in Bangkok, Thailand.

- (vii) require transparency of legislation and regulation (Article 19 CBTA).

IV. Provisions of Limited Criticality

4. Provisions of relatively limited criticality are those that:

- (i) require the application of international health regulations on people (Article 5(c)) and on goods (Part III Annex 1) crossing the border;
- (ii) exempt personal effects from customs duties (Article 5(b) CBTA and Annex 4 Part I);
- (iii) facilitate visa issuance to vehicle drivers (Article 6);
- (iv) require definition of restricted and prohibited goods (Article 10(c) and Annex 1 Part I);
- (v) require a regime for oversized and overweight cargo (Article 10(d)) and for perishable goods (Annex 1 Part II);
- (vi) harmonize traffic regulation and signage (Article 7(e)) and construction and design standards of infrastructure and facilities (Article 11) and define the roadside equipment and facilities (Annex 8 Part I);
- (vii) pursue harmonization of other standards (Article 13);
- (viii) require availability of facilities (Article 14);
- (ix) prescribe institutional strengthening (Article 15);
- (x) prescribe a law and order and user-friendly environment (Article 18);
- (xi) require protection of free competition in transport services (Article 21); and
- (xii) set the pricing system and carrier liability regime (Annex 7 Part II).