## APPENDIX OF CHAPTER 12

### 12.1 PT PANN Multi Finance

(1) Introduction

In the early stages of PT. PANN Multi Finance's establishment in 1974,'s its business activities consisted of ships financing, including new building and second hand to be sold on cash basis, on installment; or through leasing arrangements with the shipping companies concerned.

The Minister of Finance Decree No.1105/KMK, 013/1991 dated November 12, 1991, expanded the company activities to cover General Leasing (Vessels and other capital goods), Factoring and Consumers Financing.

So far the company is engaged in general leasing, where the objects financed were ships, aircraft, hotels and truck trailers.

Through ships financing, PT. PANN Multi Finance has supported:

- inter-island transportation for staple and other goods as well as passengers;
- transmigration transport;
- transportation of export goods;
- growth of the maritime industry;
- creation of job opportunities;
- development of the fishing industry;
- development of national shipping companies and domestic shipyards; and,
- regional development and equal distribution of income.

PT. PANN Multi Finance is also implementing government projects, namely the building and leasing of 31 tuna long liner ships.

By financing aircraft, the company has assisted in:

- improving domestic as well international services of air transport for both goods and passengers;
- developing the national air transport services industry;
- stimulating the growth of the tourism sector; and,
- creating job opportunities.

By financing truck trailers, PT. PANN Multi Finance supported:

- the flow of goods to and from the ports for inter-island goods as well as for
export;
- load/unloading of ships; and,
- employment opportunities.

Through hotel financing, the company has contributed to the:

- hotel industry; and,
- growth of the tourism sector.

Due to the changes in the business environment, the company's focus has shifted back to its core business, namely ships.

In line with the government's program to intensify the utilization of marine resources, PT. PANN Multi Finance through its activities of ships financing is taking an active share in the development of the sea communication and fishery sector.
(2) Business Results

The Financial Report shows: (in billions of rupiah)

|  |  | 2001 | 2002 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| * Revenue | $:$ | 134.66 | 280.08 |
| * Expenses | $:$ | 228.24 | 338.72 |
| * Profit (loss) | $:$ | $(93.58)$ | $(58.63)$ |
| * Correction of Previous Year's Profit | $:$ | 32.46 | - |
| * Profit before income tax | $:$ | $(61.12)$ | $(58.63)$ |
| * Total Assets | $:$ | $2,902.95$ | $2,809.93$ |
| * Current Ratio | $:$ | $62.0 \%$ | $58.0 \%$ |

Procurement of Capital Goods: (capital goods so far proceeded by the company)

| - Vessels (Sea Transportation) | $:$ | 133 units |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| - Fishing Vessels | $:$ | 31 units |
| - Hotels | $:$ | 3 units |
| - Aircraft | $:$ | 10 units |
| - Truck Trailers | $:$ | 15 units |

Production Tools: The main production of the company up till 2002 consisted of the procurement of vessels, air craft, hotels, and truck trailers. PT. PANN Multi Finance presently owns:

* 51 vessels ( $163,192 \mathrm{Dwt}+800 \mathrm{Brt}+220 \mathrm{PNP}+4,423 \mathrm{Grt}+1,200 \mathrm{GT})$ operated by 28 shipping companies,
* 10 aircrafts operated by 3 airlines
* 2 hotels operated by 2 companies

Company Performance: Based on the criteria stated in the Minister of Finance Decree No. 826/KMK.013/1992 dated $24^{\text {th }}$ July 1992, PT PANN Multi Finance's performance was rated as "unhealthy".

Tax \& Dividend: For 2002 there was no obligation to pay taxes and dividend, because of the losses during the previous years, the company is still at a loss in aggregate.

Assistance to Small Business and Cooperation: PT. PANN Multi Finance's assistance funds that has been successfully accumulated in 2001 was Rp. 9,686,34 million, derived from: (in million of rupiah)

| - Share of the company’s profit | $:$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (allocation 1989 up to 97) | $:$ | $3,802.01$ |
| - Repayment of PUKK loans (principal) | $:$ | $4,845.35$ |
| - Income (interest, giro and others) | $:$ | $1,038.98$ |

As a result, Rp. $8,935.17$ million has been channeled to small business and cooperation.

## (3) Company Objectives

The company aims to create financial services that are managed professionally and efficiently, using finances from internal as well as external sources in a correct, fast and diligent manner, thus achieving sustainable profit levels, earning the customers trust as a solid company with high competitiveness supported by quality human resources, enabling the company to respond to the dynamics of fast developing and changing business.

Quantitative goals for 2003:

- Operational earnings : Rp. 97.89 billion
- Total earnings : Rp. 137.42 billion
- Profits $:$ Rp. 37.02 billion
- Profit Margin $\quad:$ Rp. 37.82 \%
(4) Company Strategy

Refocusing of business: To refocus its business, the company is for the time being concentrating on its core business, namely ships financing. Financing of other capital goods are temporarily stopped, awaiting improvement of the national economy.

Optimizing the operation of production means: All the production means are to be operated optionally. Whenever possible unproductive or non-operating production means that create burdens of cost are to be sold.

Debt Collection: Debt collection to be intensified through the Debt Collection Team. Outsourcing of debt collection whenever necessary is considered more effective and advantageous. To reward prime operators who fulfill their obligations properly, they will be given priority on further financing.

Restructuring of Debt: Government loans for the Financing of aircraft and fishing vessels are to be restructured. Concessions are being requested with regard viz, the forgiving of penalties, rescheduling of capital repayments, conversion of loans into equity to improve the capital structure of the company.

Internal Revitalizing: Internal improvements to be achieved through better organizational structure, adjustment of Human Resources, optimization of employment of production means / capital goods intensification of debt collection and promotion of hard work ethics.

### 12.2 BMI (Bank Mandiri Indonesia)'s Finance for Businesses (corporate banking)

(1) Introduction

BMI is government-owned and is the largest bank in Indonesia after the merger of four former state banks; namely, BAPINDO (Development Bank), EXIM Bank (Export Import Bank), Bank DAGAN NEGAEA (Industrial \& Commercial Bank), Bank BUMI DAYA (National Bank).

BMI's corporate banking directorate provides private and government-related customers with a range of loan and deposit products as well a variety of value-added services, such as trade finance services, cash management services and treasury services. BMI's lending products include loan facilities such as working capital and term loans and syndicated loans and non-funded loan facilities such as bank guarantees and letters of credit. Its deposit products include demand deposits, time deposits and certificates of deposit.

As of December 31, 2002, by value, on a consolidated basis, corporate customers represented $77.5 \%$ of BMI's total loan portfolio, of which Government-related entities accounted for $11.0 \%$. In 2002, BMI extended Rp. 12.5 trillion in new loans to corporate customers, bringing the total corporate loan portfolio to Rp. 50.7 trillion. Also as of December 31, 2002, BMI held total deposits of Rp. 12,382 billion (US $\$ 1,434$ million) from 477 corporate customers and Rp . 65,392 billion (US $\$ 7,360$ million) from 691 Government-related customers. Deposits from corporate and Government-related customers represented, in aggregate, $42.5 \%$ of BMI's total deposits at the end of 2002.
(2) Details of loans
(a) By Economic Sector:

|  | 2002 | 2001 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Foreign currency: |  |  |
| Manufacturing | 15,940,259 | 11,118,555 |
| Trading restaurant and hotel | 2,112,997 | 2,110,727 |
| Mining | 1,722,031 | 1,316,843 |
| Agriculture | 1,588,469 | 1,080,991 |
| Other services | 1,583,105 | 1,439,446 |
| Construction | 1,423,625 | 1,255,969 |
| Transportation, warehousing and communications | 556,099 | 679,822 |
| Electricity, gas and water | 319,136 | 363,576 |
| Social services | 7,334 | 15,881 |
| Otheres | 653,449 | 1,238,630 |
|  | 25,906,504 | 20,620,440 |
| Total | 65,417,248 | 48,339,302 |
| Less: Allowance for possible losses | $(8,906,545)$ | $(6,100,252)$ |
| Deferred income | $(164,284)$ |  |
|  | 56,346,419 | 42,239,050 |
| (b) By Collectability: |  |  |
|  | 2002 | 2001 |
| Current |  |  |
|  | 44,451,924 | 30,972,027 |
| Special mention | 16,201,501 | 12,655,129 |
| Sub-standard | 1,521,643 | 2,561,479 |
| Doubtful | 1,039,787 | 966,132 |
| Loss | 2,202,393 | 1,184,535 |
| Total | 65,417,248 | 48,339,302 |
| Less: Allowance for possible losses | $(8,906,545)$ | $(6,100,252)$ |
| Deferred income | $(164,284)$ |  |
|  | 56,346,419 | 42,239,050 |

The non-performing loans ratio (consolidated gross basis) as of December 31, 2002 and 2001 is $7.28 \%$ and $9.75 \%$, respectively (Bank only $-7.39 \%$ and $9.89 \%$ for 2002 and 2001, respectively). Included in loans classified as current as of December 31, 2002 are loans purchased from IBRA through "Program Penjualan Aktiva Kredit" ("PPAK") amounting to Rp. 3,990, with an allowance for possible losses of Rp. 288,797, and deferred income of Rp. 164,284.

### 12.3 BRI (Bank Rakyat Indonesia)'s Finance for Micro Business

The micro business has shown encouraging growth year on year, despite the unstable conditions of the national economy. The positive results were reflected in the growth in Kupedes, Simpedes and other savings accounts both in terms of nominal value and the number of account holders.

For example, total Kupedes loan outstandings at the end of December 2002 stood at Rp. 12,011 billion, up by $22 \%$ over the Rp. 9,841 billion figure of 2001.

Kupedes loan is projected to continue its upward trend, as the term for the debtors with fixed income has been Rp. 50 million. By the end of 2002, the accumulated Kupedes loan facilities exceeded Rp. 72trillion. These loan facilities have been used by more than 30 million customers.

In the meantime, by the end of 2002 Simpedes deposits had shown very significant growth compared to the performance of the previous year. As one of BRI's leading savings products, Simpedes had succeeded in mobilizing public funds with a total amount of $\operatorname{Rp} 16,894$ billion by the end of 2002 , and this accounted for $71.95 \%$ of the total amount of savings at BRI's Units, which stood at Rp 23,480 billion. The figure is projected to continue to rise in the upcoming years.

BRI's extensive experience in providing a broad range of loans to the public and in mobilizing funds can be leveraged to grow lending and funding at the rural level through local BRI's Units. This will address the need of the rural customers for a banking facility. Its realization is reflected in the increasing number of BRI's Units in the far corners of Indonesia. The plan of online system further extends its services that facilitate customers' inter-region transaction activities, even to remote places that have been too difficult for the other commercial banks to reach.

During 2002, BRI developed and improved its micro-finance services with a very vast network. By the end of December 2002, the number of BRI's Units had risen to 3.916, while the number of Village Service Point had grown to 211. With the addition of more BRI's Units, especially in the rural areas, the local communities from the lower strata are now able to enjoy banking services, especially micro business financing.

In line with advancement in technology, BRI's Unit has also adopted information technology through the implementation of BRI's Unit BRINETS (online) at some BRI's Unit offices in stages. By the end of 2002, 115 BRI's Units were already connected to the BRINETS. These included 70 BRI's Units in the Jakarta area, 15 in Bandung, 10 in Semarang, 5 in Surabaya and 6 in Denpasar.

In 2002, based on the study of the Hong Kong-based UBS Warburg, BRI was deemed fit to be used as a benchmark for Indonesian banks.

BRI's existence and reputation, particularly the success stories of its BRI Unit, has been recognized by the international community, as reflected in the Sugianto Pioneer Award
given by the Microfinance Network in 1998, as wall as the recognitions from international institutions.

In addition, the success stories of BRI Unit have also been published in various books and international journals. The institution has been receiving visitors from a number of foreign countries intent on developing micro finance in their respective nations.

### 12.4 BTN (Bank Tabungan Negara)'s Finance for Housing and Others

(1) Introduction

In accordance with the vision of BTN, namely to become a reputable and profitable bank engaging in non-subsidized housing financing sector, BTN has made efforts to increase the extensions of new non-subsidized credits. This was reflected in the composition in 2002 in the amount of $14 \%: 86 \%$ compared to $24 \%: 76 \%$ in 2001.

Being in the middle of a less advantageous condition compared to the other participants of recapitalization banks, BTN and several other banks suggested that some of the government's bonds be exchanged from fixed rate to variable rate. This is with the consideration that starting from August 2001, the SBI rate was above the average rate of the government's fixed-rate bonds. The Government, by virtue of the Letter of the Minster of Finance No. S-84/MK.01/2002 dated March 26, 2002 regarding the implementation of Conversion of FR Series Bonds into VR Series Bonds on March 26, 2002, had approved the conversion of Fixed Rate into Variable Rate of the government's bonds in BTN.

During the year 2002 in credit sector, BTN remained applying the prudential banking practice. This was reflected by the improvement of Credit Policies either for public or individual credits, improvement of Credit Information System and monitoring of the performance of Management Information System (MIS) on the Silver Lake Integrated Banking System (SIBS) and Models (CSM) aimed at improving the entire credit collectability and company's performance.

Activities in the field of human resources during the year 2002 were reflected in various policies included in the Human Resources restructuring. The intended Human Resources restructuring policies include the following: the preparation of process for the application of career hierarchy based on competency, performance and job grading, improvement of software of integrated Human Resources Information System (HRIS), adjustment of several policies related to the application of the new Human Resources system, and the staffing policy in Head Office and Branch Offices and evaluation of such staffing based on the new organizational structure.

In 2002 , BTN had entered a new stage in the implementation of the new banking system. The on-line real-time system technology with IBM-AS 400 basis had been implemented in all outlets of BTN. This technology system will continuously be improved in the future. In line with the implementation of such banking system and in an effort to increase retail funds, especially savings and giros, BTN kept on making improvements on facilities and product features.

## (2) Business Activities

Summary of business activities of PT. Bank Tabungan Negara (Persero) years 2002 and 2001 are presented in Table 12.1. During the year 2002, business activities of BTN increased in comparison with the same of the previous year. This condition is evidenced by the increase of assets by $2.12 \%$ from Rp. 26,509,197 million in 2001 to Rp . $27,071,977$ million in 2002.
(3) Credits Extended

The position of loans extended up to and including the year 2002 before being deducted by provision for loan losses reached the amount of Rp.10,210,984 million, representing an increase of Rp. $1,799,068$ million or $21.39 \%$ in comparison with the same of the previous year amounting to Rp.8,411,916 million. The position of loans extended in the context of Home Ownership Credit (KPR) and Non Home Ownership Credit (Non KPR) (before being reduced by Provision for loan losses) reached the amount of Rp.9,557,575 million, representing an increase of Rp. $1,474,050$ million or $18.24 \%$ in comparison with the same of the 2001 period amounting to Rp. $8,083,525$ million, as described in Table 12.2.

Based on the composition of credit realization in the current year, there was a decrease in the realization of subsidized KPR from the total credit realization in the year 2001 in comparison with that of the year 2002. In 2001, the realization of subsidized KPR was $24.06 \%$ out of the total credit realization, while in 2002 the realization of subsidized KPR was $14.24 \%$. This was in accordance with the management policy to focus on non-subsidized KPR as described in the diagrams illustrated in Figure 12.1.

Table 12.1 BTN's Business Activities, 2001 and 2002

| (Rp. Million |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POSITION/STATUS | 2002 | 2001 | CHANGE (\%) |
| Total assets | 27,071,977 | 26,509,197 | 2.12\% |
| Credits extended | 10,210,984 | 8,411,916 | 21.39\% |
| Placement and commercial papers | 15,201,582 | 15,519,259 | -2.05\% |
| Equities | 893,682 | 830,458 | 7.61\% |
| Current Accounts | 1,175,921 | 1,065,144 | 10.40\% |
| Time Deposits | 15,636,115 | 14,187,987 | 10.21\% |
| Deposit Certificates | 13,484 | 279,207 | -95.17\% |
| Savings | 3,496,659 | 3,571,391 | -2.09\% |
| Commercial Papers Issued | 216,590 | 679,673 | -68.13\% |
| Loans received | 4,392,337 | 4,610,778 | -4.74\% |
| Total Income | 3,983,090 | 3,089,012 | 28.94\% |
| Total Expense | 3,680,047 | 2,967,752 | 24.00\% |
| Profit(Loss) Before Tax Credit | 303,043 | 121,260 | 149.91\% |
| Deferred Tax | 152,186 | $(3,421)$ | -4548.58\% |
| Current Year Profit(Loss) | 150,857 | 124,681 | 20.99\% |
| FINANCIAL RATIO |  |  |  |
| Capitalization |  |  |  |
| CAR- | 11.39\% | 10.85\% | 4.98\% |
| Fixed assets to capital- | 55.61\% | 75.32\% | -26.17\% |
| Earning Assets |  |  |  |
| Non-performing productive asset- | 3.37\% | 3.90\% | -13.59\% |
| NPL- | 4.76\% | 4.75\% | 0.21\% |
| Provision for Losses of Earning Assets | 4.17\% | 3.54\% | 17.80\% |
| Fulfillment of Provision for Losses of Earning Assets | 112.51\% | 123.21\% | -8.68\% |
| Remunerativeness |  |  |  |
| ROA- | 1.13\% | 0.49\% | 130.61\% |
| ROE- | 31.31\% | 25.06\% | 24.94\% |
| NIM- | 2.44\% | 1.24\% | 96.77\% |
| BOPO- | 93.04\% | 95.52\% | -3.00\% |
| Liquidity |  |  |  |
| LDR- Inter-Bank Obligation | 51.31\% | 46.28\% | 10.87\% |
| Against Core Capital | -71.79\% | 10.75\% | 767.81\% |
| Compliance |  |  |  |
| Violation of LLL- | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Excess of LLL- | 0.00\% | 0.0.). | 0.00\% |
| GWM Rupiah- | 5.21\% | 5.04\% | 3.37\% |
| NOP- | 7.42\% | 5.75\% | 29.04\% |

## Table 12.2 Provision of Loan Services

| POSITION/STATUS | (Rp Millions) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Home Ownership Credit (KPR) |  | 2002 | CHANGE(\%) |
| Non Home ownership Credit (Non KPR) | 3.646 .706 | 7.239 .212 | $-22.00 \%$ |
| Sub Total | $\mathbf{9 . 5 5 7 . 5 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 0 8 3 . 5 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 2 4 \%}$ |
| Credits To the Board of Directors |  |  |  |
| And Employees | 73.420 | 32.782 | $123.96 \%$ |
| Investment Credits | 76.637 | 4.570 | $1576.96 \%$ |
| Working Capital Credits | 503.352 | 291.039 | $72.95 \%$ |
| Sub Total | $\mathbf{6 5 3 . 4 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 8 . 3 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 . 9 7 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 . 2 1 0 . 9 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 4 1 1 . 9 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 3 9 \%}$ |
| Provision for Loan Losses | $\mathbf{( 6 8 2 . 2 9 3 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 3 1 1 . 0 3 5 )}$ | $119.36 \%$ |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{9 . 5 2 8 . 6 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 1 0 0 . 8 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 6 3 \%}$ |

Figure 12.1 Composition of Realized Credit, 2001 and 2002


### 12.5 Japan's Experience in Public Ship Finance

(1) History

Among various government assistance to the shipping sector in Japan, the one provided through the Maritime Credit Corporation (MCC) was the most significant with regard to ship finance. It was established in 1959 as a quasi-governmental organization to mainly replace wartime standard ships which provided unreliable passenger shipping services at that time. In 1966 the corporation expanded its coverage to cargo vessels.

Prime objective of MCC is centered on the contribution to the provision of adequate and smooth domestic shipping. Although the statement is simple, it aims to promote social stability and economic growth. From the beginning, MCC has kept its unique business method: joint building and vessel ownership.

In line with reforming governmental organizations and streamlining quasi-governmental entities, Maritime Credit Corporation was merged in Corporation for Advanced Transport and Technology (CATT) in 1997. Again, CATT was reorganized to Japan Railway Construction, Transport and Technology Agency (JRTT). Though experiencing those two organizational changes, however, MCC's services have continued with an unchanged method and procedure. Therefore this article still calls MCC as a body to provide public ship finance service.

Figure 12.2 Organizational Change

(2) Achievements

More than half of the domestic shipping vessels have been built through the joint building and vessel ownership method between shipowners and MCC. Until the year 2002, the method was adopted to 938 passenger vessels ( $863,000 \mathrm{gt}$ in total) and 2,700 cargo vessels ( $2,954,000 \mathrm{gt}$ in total). This is the most popular ship acquisition method since 1959. Even recently, during the period 1995-2000, the method had shares of $72 \%$ for passenger vessels and $57 \%$ for cargo vessels, respectively.

The Japanese domestic shipping industry is characterized as a mass of small-scale shipping companies. Generally speaking, such small companies lack assets, collateral to get finance and creditability of their business. Most of them therefore find it difficult to tap commercial finance to renew their vessels. However, the joint building and vessel ownership method can work well even among those companies because of its unique mechanism.

Figure 12.3 Share of Joint Building and Ownership Method in Five Years, 1995-2000


Source: MLIT, Japan

## (3) Joint Building and Vessel Ownership Method

In order to support the building of domestic passenger ship or domestic cargo ship (cargo ship less than 16,000 gross ton), MCC supplies long term fixed and low rate funds and provides technical support through shared ownership vessel building program. When building steel ships financed by the loan, old cargo ships should be scrapped or exported.

The joint building and vessel ownership method is outlined as follow:

- According to the proposal of a maritime transport company, both the company and MCC share the cost and give an order of shipbuilding jointly to a dockyard. Construction supervision and inspection throughout working period until completion are also jointly performed.
- Both a maritime transport company and MCC own jointly at a certain period of time (normally over the whole period of depreciation) and the share is determined by the cost it pays.
- This shared ownership vessel is used and maintained by the maritime transport company and both the income and the expenditure from the vessel operation belong to the company. The company should repay the MCC's share of the building cost both principal and interest throughout shared period. Repayment amount per year is designed to be the same throughout amortization period.
- After the joint project period is expired, the vessel ownership will be $100 \%$ owned by the maritime transport company by it's paying the MCC's share of the remaining book value to MCC.

Table 12.1 Project Flow of Joint Building and Vessel Ownership Method

(4) Remarkable Attractiveness

Collateral free: Bank loan to build vessels requires collateral, but MCC's loan does not require collateral as a general rule since MCC directly owns some share of the vessel under the shared method. Therefore, vessel building is possible if the company prepares only collateral to funds financed for their own portion.

Low and fixed interest rate: MCC's interest rate is determined by the long-term prime rate as a general rule and in addition, it is fixed. Thus, the company can prospect the project with ease. In addition, since MCC does not impose compulsory deposit from the company, the increase in the net interest cost will not cause any losses to the company.

Long-term repayment: Term of repayment is more or less tied with the vessel's life period. Long-term repayment from 7 to 15 years according to the category of vessels is possible so as to match to the company's reasonable repayment schedule.

Technical assistance: Shared ownership vessel is partially a property of MCC. The shipping company can receive various technical assistances from MCC which has professional capability to provide consultancy services regarding ship design and building, ship-management and shipping business. This is a large benefit since these assistances cannot be provided if the company gets loans from other financial institutions.

Preferential taxation: The company is exempted from a title registration tax when registering an ownership title corresponding to a MCC's share of the joint ownership vessel.

## (5) Stable Resource

MCC fund comes from Fiscal Investment and Loan Program (FILP) which is the generic term for the government's fiscal techniques to carry out policy objectives by using funds on the basis of the state's credit. The FILP's original sources are among others postal savings, government insurance funds and social security funds. FILP is interest bearing fund and domestic fleet is one of the policy-oriented development targets.
(6) MCC's Current Roles

In principle, MCC has not changed its basic roles such as securing of national minimum, maintaining and development of domestic shipping and supporting for small and medium enterprises over 40 years. To meet contemporary shipping needs, however, development priority and finance incentives are placed on new vessel types, i.e., environmentally friendly vessels for more environment concern, barrier free vessels to prepare for aging society, and Ro-Ro vessels to promote multimodalism over the country.

Figure 12.4 Roles and Functions of MCC


Source: http://www.jrtt.go.jp/business/vessel.htm

### 12.6 Questions and Answers concerning ODA Fund in the Shipping Sector

Since Indonesia has not experienced much about ODA projects in the shipping sector, particularly the case where private entities become direct beneficiaries in procuring and improving vessels through TSL. Therefore this section highlights the questions and answers made at the STRAMINDO Workshop on Shipping Investment and Ship Finance on $22^{\text {nd }}$ October, 2003. The questions were likely frequent questions to this aspect among Indonesian shipping business entities. However, the answers were limited to the experts' previous experiences and personal opinion. They do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of GOJ and JBIC.

## Q.1: Possibility of cooperation by GOJ?

A: (1) Up to the priority rated by GOI since GOJ's assistance is on request basis.
(2) The project content should be clearly shown and justified by FS report.
(3) GOJ needs to show its concern and probably to conduct preparatory work such as TA study before engaging a bilateral agreement.
Q.2: How much amount of fund can be provided by Japan?

A: (1) It can be predicted from previous similar project, i.e., the Domestic Shipping Modernization Program (TSL) I, II for the Philippines.
(2) Size of the country and the sector could be taken into account.
Q.3: How about interest rate of sub loan?

A: (1) Probably app. 12\%, considering the similar scheme in Indonesia $2-3 \%$ lower than prevailing commercial rate.
(2) Existing 6\% special term loan will not be succeeded.

## Q.4: What kind of currency can be used as sub loan?

A: (1) Usually Rps.
(2) If there will be justifiable reason or need $¥$ can be used?
(3) US\$ is possible but unusual
Q.5: Who will be the supplier of ships under the plan?

A: (1) Suppliers will be decided through ICB including LCB.
(2) JV of foreign and local manufacturers should be given chance.
Q.6: How about lending period of ODA loan and sub loan?

A: (1) Probably 25 years including with 5 years grace period.
(2) Reasonable sub loan period is 5 years with 1-year grace period.
Q.7: Can loan conduit through less commercial institution?

A: (1) Sub loan should be conduit through reliable bank. Loan administration and book keeping is important.
(2) BMI or BRI are considered to be capable enough to handle this type of loan.
Q.8: Other costs, i.e. guarantee fee, TA fee, etc will be added to $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ ?

A: (1) It is possible to include these charges within $12 \%$.

## Q.9: More attention should be paid for the strengthening of traditional shipping

A: (1) It should be supported by ODA. (TSL)
(2) Traditional ships should be included in tertiary shipping program.
Q.10: What kind of fund is best for the shipping sector?

A: (1) $O D A$ is the best. But ODA is insufficient.
(2) Funds other than ODA should be sought.
Q.11: Ship building sector should also be supported.

A: (1) FDI should be encouraged.
(2) In order to encourage FDI to Indonesia, sufficient domestic demand is prerequisite.
(3) Past effort to support shipbuilding was not enough.
Q.12: Does ODA fund cover foreign vessels?

A: (1) As long as they are operating in domestic route, they are not denied. They are eligible to ODA loan from Japan. (There have been such cases.)
(2) Fund however should exclusively be used for domestic shipping. International shipping will not be eligible.

Domestic shipping should encompass routes between Indonesia to and from Malaysia or Singapore, because these routes cannot be separated from other domestic routes.
Q.13: Fund should cover the investment for related facilities like loading and unloading (L \& UL) equipment.

A: (1) It is necessary. L \& UL equipment, distribution center etc. Without improving them, effect of ship improvement will often be insufficient.
(2) Other than physical improvement made by investment, institutional improvement i.e. shipping operation and management, port operation and management, custom services, etc. should be made together.

## APPENDIX OF CHAPTER 13

### 13.1 Table of Major, Medium and Minor Shipyard

Major Shipyards for Ship repair are:

1. East Java Shipyard (A)
2. East Java Shipyard (B)
3. Central Java Shipyard (I)
4. Jakarta Shipyard (K)
5. Jakarta Shipyard (L)
6. South Sulawesi Shipyard (D1)

Medium Shipyards for Ship repair are:
7. North Sulawesi Shipyard (D2)
8. South Sumatra Shipyard (F)
9. South Sumatra Shipyard (G)
10. Jakarta Shipyard (J)
11. Jakarta Shipyard (M)

Minor Shipyards for Ship repair are:
12. East Java Shipyard (C)
13. East Kalimantan Shipyard (E)
14. South Sumatra Shipyard (H)

## MAJOR SHIPYARD




| CENTRAL JAVA SHIPYARD (I) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Manpower $=303$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kind of Vessel | Quantity <br> [ Unit ] | Total GT [GT] | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Total Repair } \\ \text { Cost } \\ \text { [Million Rp] } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total Work Days [Days] | Total Repair Cost / GT [Million] | Total Repair Cost Work Days [Million] | Total GT / <br> Total <br> Manpower | Total Repair Cost / Total Manpower [Million] | Total Working Days / Total Manpower | Total Repair Cost Total Work Days Total Manpower | Ave. Repair Day for Kind of Vessel | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Man.Day / } \\ \text { GT } \end{gathered}\right.$ |
| Tanker | 11 | 16,365.00 | 4,980 | 550 | 0.30 | 9.05 | 54.01 | 16.44 | 1.82 | 29,884.32 | 50.00 | 10.18 |
| Cargo Ship | 38 | 118,205.00 | 21,030 | 2,100 | 0.18 | 10.01 | 390.12 | 69.41 | 6.93 | 33,050.01 | 55.26 | 5.38 |
| Passenger | 4 | 9,144.00 | 4,721 | 126 | 0.52 | 37.47 | 30.18 | 15.58 | 0.42 | 123,649.64 | 31.50 | 4.18 |
| Ferry / Ro-Ro | 44 | 85,513.00 | 44,948 | 2,032 | 0.53 | 22.12 | 282.22 | 148.34 | 6.71 | 73,002.83 | 46.18 | 7.20 |
| Barges | 4 | 5,489.00 | 571 | 245 | 0.10 | 2.33 | 18.12 | 1.88 | 0.81 | 7,687.45 | 61.25 | 13.52 |
| Tug Boat | 15 | 4,797.00 | 2,536 | 487 | 0.53 | 5.21 | 15.83 | 8.37 | 1.61 | 17,184.33 | 32.47 | 30.76 |
| LCT | 1 | 1,250.00 | 693 | 22 | 0.55 | 31.52 | 4.13 | 2.29 | 0.07 | 104,030.30 | 22.00 | 5.33 |
| Fishing Boat | 6 | 2,240.00 | 1,431 | 590 | 0.64 | 2.43 | 7.39 | 4.72 | 1.95 | 8,005.79 | 98.33 | 79.81 |
| Total | 123 | 243,003.00 | 80,909 | 6,152 | 0.33 | 13.15 | 801.99 | 267.03 | 20.30 | 43,404.95 | 50.02 | 7.67 |


Appendix-54


| JAKARTA SHIPY | ( $L$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Manpower $=334$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kind of Vessel | Quantity <br> [ Unit ] | Total GT [GT] | Total Repair Cost <br> [Million Rp] | Total Work Days [Days] | Total Repair Cost / GT [Million] | Total Repair Cost / Work Days [Million] | Total GT / <br> Total <br> Manpower | Total Repair Cost / Total Manpower [Million] | Total Working <br> Days / Total Manpower | Total Repair Cost / Total Work Days / Total Manpower | Ave. Repair Day for Kind of Vessel | Man.Day GT |
| Tanker | 38 | 44,181.71 | 19,008 | 2,269 | 0.43 | 8.38 | 132.28 | 56.91 | 6.79 | 25,081.67 | 59.71 | 17.15 |
| Cargo Ship | 75 | 139,437.35 | 20,757 | 2,609 | 0.15 | 7.96 | 417.48 | 62.15 | 7.81 | 23,820.15 | 34.79 | 6.25 |
| Passenger | 39 | 134,667.60 | 13,886 | 1,228 | 0.10 | 11.31 | 403.20 | 41.58 | 3.68 | 33,856.70 | 31.49 | 3.05 |
| Barges | 7 | 6,956.95 | 1,709 | 178 | 0.25 | 9.60 | 20.83 | 5.12 | 0.53 | 28,746.29 | 25.43 | 8.55 |
| Tug Boat | 66 | 6,423.55 | 18,968 | 2,406 | 2.95 | 7.88 | 19.23 | 56.79 | 7.20 | 23,603.31 | 36.45 | 125.10 |
| LCT | 7 | 917.15 | 196 | 118 | 0.21 | 1.66 | 2.75 | 0.59 | 0.35 | 4,962.29 | 16.86 | 42.97 |
| Fishing Vessel | 1 | 350.00 | 290 | 23 | 0.83 | 12.61 | 1.05 | 0.87 | 0.07 | 37,750.59 | 23.00 | 21.95 |
| Seapup Ring | 1 | 1,300.00 | 525 | 23 | 0.40 | 22.83 | 3.89 | 1.57 | 0.07 | 68,364.96 | 23.00 | 5.91 |
| KRI > 2,000 GT | 2 | 5,212.00 | 1,160 | 106 | 0.22 | 10.94 | 15.60 | 3.47 | 0.32 | 32,758.99 | 53.00 | 6.79 |
| Dredger | 3 | 8,735.00 | 3,226 | 196 | 0.37 | 16.46 | 26.15 | 9.66 | 0.59 | 49,280.16 | 65.33 | 7.49 |
| Research Vessel | 2 | 1,740.00 | 1,348 | 75 | 0.77 | 17.97 | 5.21 | 4.03 | 0.22 | 53,794.40 | 37.50 | 14.40 |
| Navigation Vessel | 3 | 3,449.00 | 627 | 407 | 0.18 | 1.54 | 10.33 | 1.88 | 1.22 | 4,613.82 | 135.67 | 39.41 |
| Others | 13 | 5,525.00 | 1,628 | 276 | 0.29 | 5.90 | 16.54 | 4.88 | 0.83 | 17,664.13 | 21.23 | 16.68 |
| Total | 257 | 358,895.31 | 83,328 | 9,914 | 0.23 | 8.41 | 1,074.54 | 249.48 | 29.68 | 25,164.90 | 38.58 | 9.23 |

SOUTH SULAWESI SHIYARD (D1)

MEDIUM SHIPYARD

| NORTH SULAWE | HIPY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Manpower $=96$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kind of Vessel | Quantity <br> [ Unit ] | Total GT <br> [GT] | Total Repair Cost <br> [Million Rp] | Total Work Days [Days] | Total Repair Cost / GT [Million] | Total Repair Cost / Work Days [Million] | Total GT / <br> Total <br> Manpower | Total Repair Cost / Total Manpower [Million] | Total Working <br> Days / Total Manpower | Total Repair Cost / <br> Total Work Days / <br> Total Manpower | Ave. Repair Day for Kind of Vessel | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Man.Day } \\ \text { GT } \end{array}$ |
| Cargo | 13 | 2,249.00 | 2,709 | 411 | 1.20 | 6.59 | 23.43 | 28.22 | 4.28 | 68,669.52 | 31.62 | 17.54 |
| Passenger | 6 | 1,704.00 | 2,859 | 245 | 1.68 | 11.67 | 17.75 | 29.79 | 2.55 | 121,573.18 | 40.83 | 13.80 |
| Ferry / Ro-Ro | 17 | 6,527.00 | 4,242 | 407 | 0.65 | 10.42 | 67.99 | 44.18 | 4.24 | 108,557.74 | 23.94 | 5.99 |
| Tug Boat | 20 | 760.96 | 2,287 | 541 | 3.01 | 4.23 | 7.93 | 23.82 | 5.64 | 44,032.18 | 27.05 | 68.25 |
| LCT | 24 | 3,367.00 | 5,991 | 775 | 1.78 | 7.73 | 35.07 | 62.40 | 8.07 | 80,520.49 | 32.29 | 22.10 |
| Fishing Boat | 17 | 2,387.70 | 1,239 | 157 | 0.52 | 7.89 | 24.87 | 12.91 | 1.64 | 82,215.71 | 9.24 | 6.31 |
| Barge | 12 | 6,178.90 | 5,336 | 380 | 0.86 | 14.04 | 64.36 | 55.59 | 3.96 | 146,280.79 | 31.67 | 5.90 |
| Tanker | 2 | 204.75 | 80 | 37 | 0.39 | 2.16 | 2.13 | 0.83 | 0.39 | 22,522.52 | 18.50 | 17.35 |
| Total | 111 | 23,379.31 | 24,743 | 2,953 | 1.06 | 8.38 | 243.53 | 257.74 | 30.76 | 87,282.19 | 26.60 | 12.13 |


| SOUTH SUMATERA SHIPYARD (F) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Manpower $=\quad 94$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 家 Kind of Vessel | Quantity <br> [ Unit ] | Total GT <br> [GT] | Total Repair Cost [Million Rp] | Total Work Days [Days] | Total Repair Cost / GT [Million] | Total Repair Cost Work Days <br> [Million] | Total GT / Total Manpower | Total Repair Cost / Total Manpower [Million] | Total Working Days / Total Manpower | Total Repair Cost Total Work Days Total Manpower | Ave. Repair Day for Kind of Vessel | $\begin{gathered} \text { Man.Day } / \\ \text { GT } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\underset{\times}{ }$ Cargo | 16 | 14,651.00 | 1,592 | 890 | 0.11 | 1.79 | 155.86 | 16.94 | 9.47 | 19,032.39 | 55.63 | 5.71 |
| $\checkmark$ Tanker | 14 | 8,888.75 | 1,596 | 551 | 0.18 | 2.90 | 94.56 | 16.97 | 5.86 | 30,805.91 | 39.36 | 5.83 |
| Passenger | 1 | 1,500.00 | 85 | 21 | 0.06 | 4.05 | 15.96 | 0.90 | 0.22 | 43,059.78 | 21.00 | 1.32 |
| Ferry / Ro-Ro | 1 | 200.00 | 132 | 68 | 0.66 | 1.94 | 2.13 | 1.40 | 0.72 | 20,627.35 | 68.00 | 31.96 |
| Barges | 74 | 62,539.75 | 5,469 | 1,810 | 0.09 | 3.02 | 665.32 | 58.18 | 19.26 | 32,141.64 | 24.46 | 2.72 |
| Tug Boat | 51 | 25,070.00 | 1,929 | 918 | 0.08 | 2.10 | 266.70 | 20.53 | 9.77 | 22,359.65 | 18.00 | 3.44 |
| Total | 157 | 112,849.50 | 10,803 | 4,258 | 0.10 | 2.54 | 1,200.53 | 114.92 | 45.30 | 26,989.74 | 27.12 | 3.55 |

SOUTH SUMATERA SHIPYARD (G)

| SOUTH SU | SHIPYA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Manpower $=130$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kind of Vessel | Quantity <br> [ Unit ] | Total GT <br> [GT] | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Total Repair } \\ \text { Cost } \\ \text { [Million Rp] } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total Work Days [Days] | Total Repair Cost / GT [Million] | Total Repair Cost Work Days [Million] | Total GT / <br> Total <br> Manpower | Total Repair Cost / Total Manpower [Million] | Total Working Days / Total Manpower | Total Repair Cost Total Work Days Total Manpower | Ave. Repair Day for Kind of Vessel | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Man.Day } \\ \text { GT } \end{array}\right\|$ |
| Cargo | 12 | 7,312.50 | 2,440 | 265 | 0.33 | 9.21 | 56.25 | 18.77 | 2.04 | 70,827.29 | 22.08 | 4.71 |
| Passenger | 20 | 3,000.00 | 417 | 245 | 0.14 | 1.70 | 23.08 | 3.21 | 1.88 | 13,092.62 | 12.25 | 10.62 |
| Barges | 47 | 45,500.00 | 11,800 | 1,275 | 0.26 | 9.25 | 350.00 | 90.77 | 9.81 | 71,191.55 | 27.13 | 3.64 |
| Tug Boat | 32 | 4,120.00 | 21,875 | 648 | 5.31 | 33.76 | 31.69 | 168.27 | 4.98 | 259,674.74 | 20.25 | 20.45 |
| Total | 111 | 59,932.50 | 36,532 | 2,433 | 0.61 | 15.02 | 461.02 | 281.02 | 18.72 | 115,501.60 | 21.92 | 5.28 |


| JAKARTA SHIPYARD (J) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Manpower $=175$ | 175 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kind of Vessel | Quantity <br> [ Unit ] | Total GT <br> [GT] | Total Repair Cost <br> [Million Rp] | Total Work Days [Days] | Total Repair Cost / GT [Million] | Total Repair Cost Work Days [Million] | Total GT / <br> Total <br> Manpower | Total Repair Cost Total Manpower [Million] | Total Working Days / Total Manpower | Total Repair Cost Total Work Days Total Manpower | Ave. Repair Day for Kind of Vessel | $\begin{gathered} \text { Man.Day } \\ \text { GT } \end{gathered}$ |
| Tanker | 15 | 17,533.10 | 2,647 | 457 | 0.15 | 5.79 | 100.19 | 15.12 | 2.61 | 33,093.53 | 30.47 | 4.56 |
| Cargo Ship | 75 | 86,916.05 | 15,250 | 2,892 | 0.18 | 5.27 | 496.66 | 87.14 | 16.53 | 30,131.80 | 38.56 | 5.82 |
| Passenger | 3 | 4,788.00 | 987 | 67 | 0.21 | 14.73 | 27.36 | 5.64 | 0.38 | 84,153.12 | 22.33 | 2.45 |
| Ferry / Ro-Ro | 10 | 8,649.00 | 1,047 | 134 | 0.12 | 7.81 | 49.42 | 5.98 | 0.77 | 44,643.06 | 13.40 | 2.71 |
| LCT | 8 | 3,512.60 | 211 | 62 | 0.06 | 3.41 | 20.07 | 1.21 | 0.35 | 19,474.54 | 7.75 | 3.09 |
| Tug Boats | 70 | 26,880.00 | 4,338 | 1,410 | 0.16 | 3.08 | 153.60 | 24.79 | 8.06 | 17,579.61 | 20.14 | 9.18 |
| Others | 127 | 12,200.00 | 30,758 | 1,749 | 2.52 | 17.59 | 69.71 | 175.76 | 9.99 | 100,493.01 | 13.77 | 25.09 |
| Total | 308 | 160,478.75 | 55,237 | 6,771 | 0.34 | 8.16 | 917.02 | 315.64 | 38.69 | 46,616.79 | 21.98 | 7.38 |


Appendix-57
MINOR SHIPYARD

| EAST JAVA SHIP | RD (C) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Manpower = 135 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kind of Vessel | Quantity [ Unit ] | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total GT } \\ {[\mathrm{GT}]} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total Repair Cost [Million Rp] | Total Work Days [Days] | Total Repair Cost / GT [Million] | Total Repair Cost / Work Days [Million] | Total GT / <br> Total <br> Manpower | Total Repair Cost / Total Manpower [Million] | Total Working <br> Days / Total Manpower | Total Repair Cost $/$ Total Work Days / Total Manpower | Ave. Repair Day for Kind of Vessel | Man.Day GT |
| Cargo | 11 | 5,473.00 | 1,483 | 289 | 0.27 | 5.13 | 40.54 | 10.98 | 2.14 | 38,002.46 | 26.27 | 7.13 |
| Ferry / Ro-Ro | 35 | 13,790.00 | 5,386 | 910 | 0.39 | 5.92 | 102.15 | 39.90 | 6.74 | 43,845.71 | 26.00 | 8.91 |
| Barge | 19 | 40,560.00 | 4,157 | 962 | 0.10 | 4.32 | 300.44 | 30.79 | 7.13 | 32,009.21 | 50.63 | 3.20 |
| Tug Boat | 18 | 3,468.00 | 2,209 | 614 | 0.64 | 3.60 | 25.69 | 16.37 | 4.55 | 26,655.51 | 34.11 | 23.90 |
| LCT | 1 | 143.00 | 560 | 282 | 3.92 | 1.99 | 1.06 | 4.15 | 2.09 | 14,722.01 | 282.00 | 266.22 |
| Total | 84 | 63,434.00 | 13,796 | 3,057 | 0.22 | 4.51 | 469.88 | 102.19 | 22.64 | 33,429.26 | 36.39 | 6.51 |



### 13.2 Graph Man.day / GT for Kind of Vessel
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(2) Medium Shipyard
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2. SOUTH SUMATERA SHIPYARD (F)

3. SOUTH SUMATERA SHIPYARD (G)
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## 3. SOUTH SUMATERA SHIPYARD (H)


13.3 Graph Average Repairing Days for Kind of Vessel
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## APPENDIX OF CHAPTER 14

### 14.1 Vessel Price and Capital Cost

(1) Vessel Price

Based on the STRAMINDO surveys and interviews, the prices of representative vessels are assumed as shown in Table 14.1.

Table 14.1 Vessel Price

| Investment | DWT / GT | Vessel Price (Million Rp) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | New | Second Hand |
| Conventional | $0 \sim 1,000$ | 12,500 | 5,000 |
|  | 1,000 $\sim 2,000$ | 27,000 | 10,800 |
|  | $2,000 \sim 4,000$ | 43,500 | 17,400 |
|  | $4,000 \sim 8,000$ | 67,500 | 27,000 |
|  | Over 8,000 | 125,000 | 50,000 |
| Container | $0 \sim 4,000$ | 54,000 | 21,600 |
|  | $4,000 \sim 8,000$ | 80,000 | 32,000 |
|  | $8,000 \sim 12,000$ | 150,000 | 60,000 |
|  | 12,000~18,000 | 210,000 | 84,000 |
|  | Over 18,000 | 260,000 | 104,000 |
| Bulker | $1,000 \sim 4,000$ | 17,500 | 7,000 |
|  | $4,000 \sim 8,000$ | 32,500 | 13,000 |
|  | $8,000 \sim 15,000$ | 60,000 | 24,000 |
|  | Over 15,000 | 110,000 | 44,000 |
| Barge | $5,000 \sim 10,000$ | 12,000 | 4,800 |
|  | 10,000 $\sim 15,000$ | 18,750 | 7,500 |
|  | Over 15,000 | 24,000 | 9,600 |
| Tanker | $0 \sim 1,000$ | 17,500 | 7,000 |
|  | $1,000 \sim 4,000$ | 75,000 | 30,000 |
|  | $4,000 \sim 8,000$ | 110,000 | 44,000 |
|  | $8,000 \sim 15,000$ | 187,000 | 74,800 |
|  | 15,000~25,000 | 250,000 | 100,000 |
|  | 25,000~35,000 | 300,000 | 120,000 |
|  | Over 35,000 | 332,500 | 133,000 |
| Passenger (GT) | $1,000 \sim 4,000$ | 17,000 | 6,800 |
|  | $4,000 \sim 8,000$ | 130,000 | 52,000 |
|  | $8,000 \sim 12,000$ | 150,000 | 60,000 |
|  | Over 12,000 | 260,000 | 104,000 |
| Passenger Ro-ro (GT) | $0 \sim 4,000$ | 185,000 | 74,000 |
|  | Over 4,000 | 206,000 | 82,400 |

(2) Capital Cost

Capital cost consists of depreciation cost and interest cost, which are calculated by using the prices of new vessels in the above table.
(a) Depreciation Cost

The depreciation period is assumed to be 15 years with $10 \%$ residual value. Accordingly the annual depreciation cost is calculated by the following formula:

$$
\text { Depreciation cost }=((\text { new vessel price })-10 \%) /(15 \text { years })
$$

(b) Interest Cost

The interest rate is assumed as $15 \%$ per annum. Also assuming that the loan portion is $40 \%$ of vessel price based on the results of interview surveys with shipping companies, the interest cost is calculated by the following formula.

$$
\text { Interest Cost }=(\text { new vessel price }) \times 40 \% \times 15 \%
$$

In the case of container vessel of 5000 DWT, for instance, the depreciation cost and interest cost are estimated as:

Depreciation $=80,000$ million $R p \times 0.9 / 15=4,800$ million Rp.
Interest Cost $=80,000$ million $\mathrm{Rp} \times 0.4 \times 0.15=4,800$ million Rp.
Capital Cost $=$ Depreciation + Interest Cost $=9,600$ million Rp.

### 14.2 Economic Transport Costs by Vessel Type for Case 0 and Case 1

Economic Transport Cost by Vessel Type

| Vessel | Transport Cost |  | Ca |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | (million Rp) | 2002 | 2014 | 2024 | 2014 | 2024 |
| Container | Fixed Cost | 998,536 | 998,536 | 998,536 | 2,316,096 | 3,897,023 |
|  | Fuel Cost | 103,022 | 114,762 | 109,787 | 260,762 | 515,416 |
|  | Cargo handling cost | 90,437 | 90,437 | 90,437 | 257,327 | 454,776 |
|  | Port call cost | 4,586 | 4,630 | 4,376 | 12,762 | 21,310 |
|  | Sub-total | 1,196,581 | 1,208,365 | 1,203,136 | 2,846,947 | 4,888,525 |
| Conventional | Fixed Cost | 4,056,703 | 9,658,495 | 16,066,641 | 5,452,473 | 8,036,356 |
|  | Fuel Cost | 594,946 | 2,383,941 | 2,162,337 | 962,934 | 1,528,896 |
|  | Cargo handling cost | 54,090 | 248,734 | 227,401 | 90,461 | 143,001 |
|  | Port call cost | 17,453 | 71,436 | 61,899 | 29,149 | 46,020 |
|  | Sub-total | 4,723,192 | 12,362,607 | 18,518,278 | 6,535,017 | 9,754,273 |
| Bulker | Fixed Cost | 1,101,537 | 1,782,324 | 2,086,167 | 1,735,477 | 1,988,134 |
|  | Fuel Cost | 209,733 | 335,030 | 419,114 | 330,750 | 412,387 |
|  | Cargo handling cost | 46,428 | 79,150 | 100,483 | 78,749 | 99,871 |
|  | Port call cost | 14,036 | 22,505 | 27,550 | 22,248 | 27,157 |
|  | Sub-total | 1,371,735 | 2,219,009 | 2,633,314 | 2,167,224 | 2,527,548 |
| Tanker | Fixed Cost | 1,891,095 | 2,479,558 | 2,614,935 | 2,479,558 | 2,614,935 |
|  | Fuel Cost | 2,279,801 | 3,066,097 | 3,233,505 | 3,066,097 | 3,233,505 |
|  | Cargo handling cost | 218,852 | 295,171 | 307,536 | 295,171 | 307,536 |
|  | Port call cost | 45,134 | 59,494 | 63,397 | 59,494 | 63,397 |
|  | Sub-total | 4,434,883 | 5,900,319 | 6,219,373 | 5,900,319 | 6,219,373 |
| Total | Fixed Cost | 8,047,871 | 14,918,912 | 21,766,279 | 11,983,604 | 16,536,447 |
|  | Fuel Cost | 3,187,502 | 5,899,830 | 5,924,742 | 4,620,542 | 5,690,204 |
|  | Cargo handling cost | 409,808 | 713,492 | 725,858 | 721,708 | 1,005,184 |
|  | Port call cost | 81,210 | 158,065 | 157,223 | 123,653 | 157,884 |
|  | Grand-total | 11,726,391 | 21,690,299 | 28,574,101 | 17,449,506 | 23,389,719 |

- Final Report -


### 14.3 Benefit and Cost Stream

| Year | Benefit Cost Stream in Case1(Master Plan) |  |  |  |  |  |  | Discount Rate: |  | 12.0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Investment Cost(billion Rp) |  | Benefit (billion Rp) |  |  |  | Total Cost | Total Benefit | Discounted |  |
|  | Fleet Cost | Ship yard | Cargo | Ac cident | Passenger | Passenger |  |  | Cost | Benefit |
|  | (Case 1- Case0) | Cost | Transp.cost | Reduction | Transp cost | Time cost |  |  |  | Beneft |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 1601.17 |  | 302 | 38.5 | 162 | -7 | 1,601 | 496 | 1,430 | 443 |
| 2006 | 1601.17 |  | 627 | 39.4 | 219 | -10 | 1,601 | 875 | 1,276 | 698 |
| 2007 | 1601.17 |  | 977 | 40.2 | 276 | -13 | 1,601 | 1,281 | 1,140 | 911 |
| 2008 | 1601.17 |  | 1,353 | 41.1 | 335 | -16 | 1,601 | 1,713 | 1,018 | 1,088 |
| 2009 | 1601.17 |  | 1,756 | 42.0 | 395 | -20 | 1,601 | 2,173 | 909 | 1,233 |
| 2010 | 1624.95 |  | 2,188 | 43.8 | 456 | -23 | 1,625 | 2,665 | 823 | 1,350 |
| 2011 | 1624.95 |  | 2,651 | 45.7 | 518 | -27 | 1,625 | 3,188 | 735 | 1,442 |
| 2012 | 1624.95 |  | 3,146 | 47.7 | 582 | -31 | 1,625 | 3,744 | 656 | 1,512 |
| 2013 | 1624.95 |  | 3,675 | 49.8 | 647 | -36 | 1,625 | 4,336 | 586 | 1,564 |
| 2014 | 1624.95 |  | 4,241 | 51.9 | 714 | -41 | 1,625 | 4,966 | 523 | 1,599 |
| 2015 | 713.1 | 869 | 4,313 | 53.4 | 714 | -41 | 1,583 | 5,039 | 455 | 1,449 |
| 2016 | 713.1 | 869 | 4,386 | 55.0 | 714 | -41 | 1,583 | 5,113 | 406 | 1,312 |
| 2017 | 713.1 | 869 | 4,460 | 56.6 | 714 | -42 | 1,583 | 5,189 | 363 | 1,189 |
| 2018 | 713.1 | 869 | 4,536 | 58.3 | 714 | -42 | 1,583 | 5,266 | 324 | 1,078 |
| 2019 | 713.1 | 869 | 4,613 | 60.0 | 714 | -43 | 1,583 | 5,344 | 289 | 976 |
| 2020 | 4583.91 | 869 | 4,691 | 62.3 | 714 | -43 | 5,453 | 5,424 | 890 | 885 |
| 2021 | 4583.91 | 869 | 4,770 | 64.6 | 714 | -43 | 5,453 | 5,505 | 794 | 802 |
| 2022 | 4583.91 | 869 | 4,850 | 67.1 | 714 | -44 | 5,453 | 5,587 | 709 | 727 |
| 2023 | 4583.91 | 869 | 4,932 | 69.7 | 714 | -44 | 5,453 | 5,671 | 633 | 658 |
| 2024 | 4583.91 | 869 | 5,184 | 72.3 | 714 | -44 | 5,453 | 5,926 | 565 | 614 |
|  |  |  |  | Residual Value |  |  | -45,005 |  | $(4,166)$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  | 10,358 | 21,530 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B/C= | 2.08 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B-C= | 11,172 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | EIRR= | 37.30\% |  |

