



Local Government Engineering Department
Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh



Guideline on Effectiveness and Performance Evaluation of Rural Paved Roads of LGED

June 2025



Local Government Engineering Department (LGED)
Local Government Division (LGD)
Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Co-operatives.
Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh

FINAL GUIDELINE ON EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RURAL PAVED ROADS
OF LGED, First Edition

© LGED 2025; All rights reserved.

General disclaimers: The guideline document is intended for the mention of specific companies or of certain manufacturers' products does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by LGED in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

Document Version: Version 1.0

Date of Final Version: 01.06.2025

Contributing Authors:

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering,
Islamic University of Technology (IUT), Gazipur, Bangladesh



Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	5
1.1	PURPOSE OF DEVELOPING THE GUIDELINE.....	5
1.2	BROAD OBJECTIVE	5
1.3	WORK SCOPE.....	6
1.4	SCOPE OF THE GUIDELINE	6
2	CHAPTER 2 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	16
2.1	DETAILS OF THE SHORT-TERM PHASE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	16
2.2	CRITERIA 1 TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ASSESSMENT	18
2.3	CRITERIA 2 ROAD SAFETY ASSESSMENT	25
2.4	CRITERIA 3 PAVEMENT CONDITION ASSESSMENT	29
2.5	CRITERIA 4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITION ASSESSMENT	34
2.6	CRITERIA 5 CLIMATE IMPACT ASSESSMENT	36
2.7	CRITERIA 6 ROAD STRUCTURE CONDITION ASSESSMENT	38
2.8	CRITERIA 7 SOCIO ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT	41
3	CHAPTER 3 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	45
3.1	OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS.....	45
3.2	WHAT IS AHP.....	45
3.3	SUMMARY OF THE AHP METHOD	46
3.4	HOW AHP IS APPLIED FOR DEVELOPING THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK.....	47
3.5	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION GUIDELINE FOR SHORT-TERM PHASE.....	49
3.6	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION GUIDELINE FOR OTHER PHASES	50
4	CHAPTER 4 DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY	52
4.1	PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION THROUGH FIELD SURVEY	52
4.2	SECONDARY DATA COLLECTION FROM ONLINE SOURCES AND LGED OFFICES	55
4.3	LEVEL OF EFFORT AND COST FOR EACH METHOD	56
5	CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION	59
5.1	UPDATES REQUIRED	59
5.2	ACTIONS NEEDS FOR IMPLEMENTATION	59
	APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY	61
	APPENDIX B. AI-BASED PAVEMENT SURFACE EVALUATION USING REGULAR CAMERAS FOR LGED ROADS.....	62
	APPENDIX C. PILOT SITES SUMMARY	66
	APPENDIX D. PILOT SITE 3 SCORE CALCULATION	67

PREAMBLE

The Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) is entrusted with the critical task of maintaining and developing Bangladesh's extensive rural paved road network, a vital artery for socio-economic progress. To ensure the sustainable functionality and longevity of these assets, regular and reliable performance evaluations are indispensable. These evaluations provide a scientific assessment of road conditions, enabling LGED to identify areas needing immediate attention, prioritize maintenance efforts, and optimize resource allocation. By implementing a standardized evaluation framework, LGED can move beyond reactive maintenance towards proactive asset management, ensuring that limited resources are effectively deployed to address the most pressing needs.

A systematic approach to performance scoring, grounded in scientific methodologies, empowers LGED to make data-driven decisions regarding network improvements. This allows for the development of targeted interventions, such as timely repairs, rehabilitation, or reconstruction, based on objective assessments of road conditions and performance. With reliable performance data at its disposal, LGED can enhance its planning processes, improve the efficiency of maintenance operations, and ultimately deliver a more resilient and effective rural road network that benefits the communities it serves. This report outlines the guidelines for such a framework, aimed at enhancing LGED's capacity to manage and improve its crucial infrastructure assets.

Chapter 1 Introduction



1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of developing the guideline

The Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) under the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development & Cooperatives is responsible for planning, developing, maintaining and managing local level rural roads, and urban and small-scale water resources infrastructure nationwide. LGED recognizes that it is essential to manage assets to sustainably deliver appropriate levels of services to the community and to meet the expectations and needs of the present and future generations.

The Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) plays a crucial role in the development of infrastructure in Bangladesh. With its mandate to plan, design, construct, and maintain various infrastructure projects, LGED strives to ensure sustainable and efficient delivery of essential services to the people. LGED is responsible for a vast network of roads that serve as a lifeline for rural and urban communities. To ensure the continued functionality and quality of these roads, it is essential to conduct regular effectiveness and performance evaluations. These rural roads play a crucial role in facilitating access to basic services, transportation of goods, and improving the overall socio-economic conditions in rural areas. Over time, the quality and performance of these roads can deteriorate due to factors like weather conditions, traffic volume, and maintenance practices. To ensure that LGED's efforts are efficient and effective in maintaining rural paved roads, a comprehensive effectiveness and performance evaluation is essential.

LGED created this consulting opportunity to develop a comprehensive guideline for the systematic effectiveness and performance evaluation of rural paved roads.

Infrastructure is a central pillar for sustainable and resilient development. Physical infrastructure assets provide a means for delivering essential services and play an important role in enhancing and protecting the lives and livelihoods of people and for the developing economy to thrive in Bangladesh. The Rural Paved Road network of LGED is the lifeline for the development and prosperity of rural communities of the country. LGED successfully developed a vast network of about 1.5 lakh kilometers of paved roads under its rural road network and maintaining this vast road asset is an enormous challenge.



A comprehensive performance and effectiveness evaluation framework is thus an imperative for LGED. A holistic and comprehensive evaluation framework would ensure cost effective and appropriate data collection and systematic data driven decision making leading to optimization of scarce funding and resources against the monumental task of maintaining the rural connectivity and enabling socio economic growth and development of rural communities of Bangladesh. As an effort to develop an effective evaluation framework, the consultant has worked out the objectives and defined specific tasks for an efficient achievement of the key objectives of the study. The scope of work and tasks are briefly discussed in the following section. This document presents the framework and guideline for performance and effectiveness evaluation of Rural Paved Roads of LGED.

1.2 Broad objective

The broad objective of the study is to develop a performance evaluation framework for rural paved roads of LGED.

1.3 Work Scope

1.3.1 Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study are:

- ❖ To develop detailed guidelines for the effectiveness and performance evaluation of rural paved roads managed by LGED.
- ❖ To outline clear parameters and criteria for assessing road condition, durability, and functionality in respect to technical, environmental, and socio-economic aspects.
- ❖ To provide step-by-step methodologies for data collection and analysis.
- ❖ To integrate user-friendly tools for consistent and accurate evaluations.
- ❖ To ensure the guidelines are adaptable to varying regional conditions and road types.

1.3.2 Scope of Work

The scope of work of the study are as follows:

- ❖ Conduct Literature Review
- ❖ Identification of Evaluation Parameters
- ❖ Development of Evaluation Guidelines
 - Provide detailed process, parameters, criteria and methodologies for assessment
 - Incorporation of Technological Tools in the guideline
 - Integrate Adaptability and Region-Specific Considerations in the guideline
- ❖ Conduct a pilot implementation for pilot performance evaluation and improve the guidelines
- ❖ Conduct Capacity Building through trainings and workshops
- ❖ Finalization of Performance Evaluation Guideline.

1.3.3 Applications of the guideline

Primary application of the guideline is for evaluation of paved roads of LGED through a systematic and scientific manner for assessment of performance and performance-based ranking of paved roads.

1.3.4 What are LGEDs current practice in this regard

LGED does not have any specific guided method for scoring performance of a road. Currently only maintenance prioritization is done using a ranking of performance.

1.4 Scope of the guideline

1.4.1 Long list of performance indicators

Based on the literature review, and a series of discussions and workshop sessions with LGED concerns, a broad list of themes and criteria were identified. These lists were then grouped into three stages for the implementation.

- **Short term (from 2025, next 3 years)**
- **Mid-term (starting from 2028, continue for 5 years)**
- **Long term (starting from 2033, for next 5 years)**

Short term criteria and sub criteria are those for which required data and information can be readily collected by LGED without any major investment in equipment and does not have major dependency on historical records and project specific records. The current report will cover the short-term framework in detail and for the mid-term and long-term framework, will only list the potential criteria

and sub criteria. The pilot work and development of the evaluation framework will be limited to the short-term criteria lists presented below. For future development of the evaluation framework the mid-term and long-term phase will have additional criteria and sub criteria in addition to the short-term list. The themes or criteria selected for the performance evaluation framework are listed below

Theme or Criteria for Evaluation
1. Traffic Condition Assessment
2. Road Safety Assessment
3. Pavement Condition Assessment
4. Environmental Condition Assessment
5. Climate Condition Assessment
6. Road Structure Condition Assessment
7. Socio Economic Impact Assessment

Under each of these themes or criteria, few sub-criteria are finalized for the framework, which are presented below. The measures or attributes under the sub criteria are listed below along with their assigned or proposed implementation phase. General attributes / Road Characteristics for sample grouping and comparative performance analysis.

#	ATTRIBUTES	VALUES
A	Road ID	LGED database unique id
B	Road Width	Carriageway Width in m
C	Road class	Upazila/Union/Village Road A/ Village Road B
D	Pavement type	BC/CC/RCC/BLOCK/HBB/EARTHEN
E	Road type (All Season)	All season /submersible/ hilly
F	Road length	Length in km*

* For some sites, the road length taken for pilot study assessment is less than the actual road length.

Table 1-1 List of attributes under each sub criterion with the evaluation framework phase

Criteria		Sub criteria		Measures / Attributes		ID	Phase
1	Traffic Condition Assessment	1.1	Traffic volume	1.1.1	AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic)	1	Short term
				1.1.2	No. of Commercial Vehicle (CVD)	2	Short term
				1.1.3	%NMV & %SMVT (Non-Motorized vehicle and slow-moving vehicular traffic)	3	Short term
				1.1.4	Peak Hour Flow (PCU/hr)	4	Short term
				1.1.5	Difference between %Primary OD pair and %Target OD pair	5	Mid term
				1.1.6	Travel speed	6	Mid term
				1.1.7	Traffic density	7	Mid term
				1.1.8	Percent followers	8	Mid term
				1.1.9	V/C Ratio	9	Mid term
		1.2	Service Quality	1.2.1	% travel cost increased in 3 years	10	Short term
				1.2.2	% travel speed decreased in 3 years	11	Short term
				1.2.3	user satisfaction level (riding quality, safety, mobility)	12	Short term
2	Road Safety Assessment	2.1	Percent encroachment	2.1.1	% road area encroached by illegal parking or temporary stalls or hawkers	13	Short term
				2.1.2	% road area encroached by bazar activities, shops fronts, car workshops	14	Short term
				2.1.3	% road area encroached by permanent structures or shops/ buildings	15	Short term
		2.2	Crash risk assessment	2.2.1	no. of crashes total per year	16	Short term
				2.2.2	no. of fatality per year	17	Short term
				2.2.3	no. of serious injury per year	18	Short term
				2.2.4	pedestrian safety condition	19	Short term
		2.3	Road sign and marking condition	2.3.1	Road sign condition	20	Mid term
				2.3.2	Road marking condition	21	Mid term
3	Pavement Condition Assessment	3.1	Crack rate evaluation	3.1.1	Pavement Surface Crack Index (PSCI)	22	Short term
		3.2	Pot-hole assessment	3.2.1	Total Area of potholes per km	23	Short term
		3.3	Rutting evaluation	3.3.1	Total Rutting length per km	24	Short term
		3.4	Surface roughness Assessment	3.4.1	average IRI value of road	25	Short term
		3.5	Deflection level measurement	3.5.1	total deflection of road	26	Mid term
		3.6	Edge Failure	3.6.1	edge failure length / km	27	Mid term
4	Environmental Condition Assessment	4.1	Air Pollution increase	4.1.1	increase in air pollution in last 3 years	28	Short term
				4.1.2	PM10 level condition, compared to acceptable baseline	29	Mid term

Criteria		Sub criteria		Measures / Attributes		ID	Phase
		4.2	Noise Pollution increase	4.2.1	increase in noise pollution in last 3 years	30	Short term
				4.2.2	noise level dB condition, compared to acceptable baseline	31	Mid term
5	Climate Condition Assessment	5.1	Road closing days due to climate conditions	5.1.1	extreme weather related to the inaccessibility of road to users (flood, Cyclone, road or bridge seriously damaged or broken)	32	Short term
				5.2.1	flood duration	33	Mid term
		5.2	Flooding severity	5.2.2	flood depth (max in 10 years)	34	Mid term
				5.2.3	flood coverage or % road area flooded	35	Mid term
6	Road Structure Condition Assessment	6.1	Drainage condition	6.1.1	road side drainage condition (flow, continuity)	36	Short term
				6.1.2	% of road subject to waterlogging	37	Short term
				6.1.3	no. of days of waterlogging	38	Short term
				6.1.4	adequacy of road side drainage structure	39	Mid term
		6.2	Hydraulic structure condition	6.2.1	flow condition	40	Short term
				6.2.2	structural stability condition	41	Short term
				6.2.3	size and placement adequacy judgement	42	Mid term
		6.3	Slope Protection Condition	6.3.1	structural condition	43	Short term
				6.3.2	erosion risk	44	Short term
				6.3.3	adequacy of slope protection	45	mid term
7	Socio Economic Impact Assessment	7.1	Agricultural Production increase	7.1.1	overall increase in production in the surrounding community owing to the road in past 5 years	46	Short term
				7.1.2	increase in no. of goods vehicles for agricultural goods on the road	47	Short term
		7.2	Industrial Production increase	7.2.1	overall increase in production in union/upazila served by the road in past 5 years	48	Short term
				7.2.2	increase in no. of goods vehicles for industrial goods on the road	49	Short term
		7.3	Educational facility connectivity	7.3.1	no. of educational institute directly connected	50	Short term
		7.4	vehicle Ownership	7.4.1	vehicle ownership increase	51	Short term
				7.4.2	increase of motorized trips	52	Short term
		7.5	Health Care facility connectivity	7.5.1	no. of medical facilities directly connected by the road	53	Short term
				7.5.2	no. of facilities that are dependent on this road for access	54	Short term
		7.6	Employment Generated by road works	7.6.1	Number of jobs generated because of road construction and maintenance work for local community.	55	Mid term
				7.6.2	number of programs for ensuring gender equality actions through female work group engagements in road works	56	Mid term

Criteria		Sub criteria		Measures / Attributes		ID	Phase
		7.7	Gender-Responsive Accessibility and Safety	7.7.1	% of women reporting improved access to essential services (education, healthcare, market) due to road	57	Short term
				7.7.2	% of women using the road regularly for commuting or economic activity	58	Short term
		7.8	Accessibility induced settlement enhancement	7.8.1	% increase in settlement area within the 2km area surrounding the road	59	Mid term
				7.8.2	% increase in Nighttime light coverage within the 2km area surrounding the road	60	Mid term
		7.9	Cost benefit analysis	7.9.1	to assess the economic return on investment in maintenance and road improvements	61	Long term
		7.10	Impact on property valuation	7.10.1	increase in property and land value due to improved accessibility and connectivity	62	Long term

Table 1-2 Unit and data collection methods for each of the attributes

Measures / Attributes		ID	Phase	Unit	Scale (4-1)	data collection and assessment method
C1. Traffic Condition Assessment						
1.1.1	AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic)	1	Short term	AADT	4 excellent 3 good 2 moderate 1 poor	traffic survey video capture, AI processing
1.1.2	No. of Commercial Vehicle (CVD)	2	Short term	No. of CVD	4 excellent 3 good 2 moderate 1 poor	traffic survey video capture, AI processing
1.1.3	%NMV & %SMVT (Non-Motorized vehicle and slow-moving vehicular traffic)	3	Short term	% of AADT	4 excellent 3 good 2 moderate 1 poor	traffic survey video capture, AI processing
1.1.4	Peak Hour Flow (PCU/hr.)	4	Short term	PCU/Hr.	4 excellent 3 good 2 moderate 1 poor	traffic survey video capture, AI processing
1.1.5	Difference between %Primary OD pair and %Target OD pair	5	Mid term	%	4 excellent 3 good 2 moderate 1 poor	market interview survey
1.1.6	Travel speed	6	Mid term	kmph	4 excellent 3 good 2 moderate 1 poor	drive through video dashboard
1.1.7	Traffic density	7	Mid term	Veh/km	4 excellent 3 good 2 moderate 1 poor	processed from video capture, AI processing
1.1.8	Percent followers	8	Mid term	%	4 excellent 3 good 2 moderate 1 poor	survey video capture, AI processing
1.1.9	V/C Ratio	9	Mid term	ratio	4 excellent 3 good 2 moderate 1 poor	estimated from video processing data
1.2.1	% travel cost increased in 3 years	10	Short term	%	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey
1.2.2	% travel speed decreased in 3 years	11	Short term	%	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey
1.2.3	user satisfaction level (riding quality, safety, mobility)	12	Short term	avg. of responses	4 highly satisfactory 3 satisfactory 2 neutral 1 not satisfactory	market interview survey
C2. Road Safety Assessment						
2.1.1	% road area encroached by illegal parking or temporary stalls or hawkers	13	Short term	%	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	Drive through video capture
2.1.2	% road area encroached by bazar activities, shops fronts, car workshops	14	Short term	%	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	Drive through video capture
2.1.3	% road area encroached by permanent structures or shops/ buildings	15	Short term	%	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	Drive through video capture
2.2.1	no. of crashes total per year	16	Short term	no.	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey
2.2.2	no. of fatality per year	17	Short term	no.	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey
2.2.3	no. of serious injury per year	18	Short term	no.	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey
2.2.4	pedestrian safety condition	19	Short term	avg. of responses	4 very safe 3 safe 2 neutral 1 not safe	market interview survey
2.3.1	Road sign condition	20	Mid term	avg. of observations	4 excellent 3 Good 2 Moderate 1 Poor	Drive through video capture AI processing
2.3.2	Road marking condition	21	Mid term	avg. of observations	4 excellent 3 Good 2 Moderate 1 Poor	Drive through video capture AI processing

Measures / Attributes		ID	Phase	Unit	Scale (4-1)	data collection and assessment method
C3. Pavement Condition Assessment						
3.1.1	Pavement Surface Crack Index (PSCI)	22	Short term	PSCI	4 excellent 3 good 2 fair 1 poor	Drive through video capture AI processing
3.2.1	Total Area of potholes per km	23	Short term	sqm per km	4 excellent 3 good 2 fair 1 poor	Drive through video capture AI processing
3.3.1	Total Rutting length per km	24	Short term	m per km	4 excellent 3 good 2 fair 1 poor	Drive through video capture Manual/AI processing
3.4.1	Average IRI value of road	25	Short term	IRI	4 excellent 3 Good 2 Fair 1 Poor	Smartphone based or roughometer 4 based or roadroid based survey
3.5.1	total deflection of road	26	Mid term	depth / km	4 excellent 3 Good 2 Fair 1 Poor	Deflection surveys (FWD)
3.6.1	edge failure length / km	27	Mid term	length / km	4 excellent 3 Good 2 Fair 1 Poor	Drive through video capture AI processing
C4. Environmental Condition Assessment						
4.1.1	increase in air pollution in last 3 years	28	Short term	avg. of responses	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey
4.1.2	PM10 level condition, compared to acceptable baseline	29	Mid term	avg. of observations	4 excellent 3 good 2 moderate 1 poor	handheld/fixed station device survey
4.2.1	increase in noise pollution in last 3 years	30	Short term	avg. of responses	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey
4.2.2	noise level dB condition, compared to acceptable baseline	31	Mid term	avg. of observations	4 excellent 3 good 2 moderate 1 poor	handheld/fixed station device survey
C5. Climate Condition Assessment						
5.1.1	extreme weather related to the inaccessibility of road to users (flood, Cyclone, road or bridge seriously damaged or broken)	32	Short term	days/year	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey
5.2.1	flood duration	33	Mid term	days	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey & historical database
5.2.2	flood depth (max in 10 years)	34	Mid term	ft from road surface	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey & historical database
5.2.3	flood coverage or % road area flooded	35	Mid term	%	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey & historical database
C6. Road Structure Condition Assessment						
6.1.1	road side drainage condition (flow, continuity)	36	Short term	avg. of observations	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	Drive through video capture Manual/AI processing
6.1.2	% of road subject to waterlogging	37	Short term	% road length	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey
6.1.3	no. of days of waterlogging	38	Short term	days/year	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	market interview survey

Measures / Attributes		ID	Phase	Unit	Scale (4-1)	data collection and assessment method
6.1.4	adequacy of road side drainage structure	39	Mid term	avg. observation	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	Drive through video capture Manual assessment
6.2.1	flow condition	40	Short term	avg. observation	4 excellent 3 good 2 fair 1 poor	structure inspection survey
6.2.2	structural stability condition	41	Short term	avg. observation	4 excellent 3 good 2 fair 1 poor	structure inspection survey
6.2.3	size and placement adequacy judgement	42	Mid term	avg. observation	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	structure inspection survey
6.3.1	structural condition	43	Short term	avg. observation	4 excellent 3 good 2 fair 1 poor	structure inspection survey & drive through video capture Manual assessment
6.3.2	erosion risk	44	Short term	avg. observation	4 low 3 moderate 2 high 1 very high	structure inspection survey
6.3.3	adequacy of slope protection	45	mid term	avg. observation	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	structure inspection survey & drive through video capture Manual assessment
C7. Socio Economic Impact Assessment						
7.1.1	overall increase in production in the surrounding community owing to the road in past 5 years	46	Short term	average responses	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	market interview survey & historical database
7.1.2	increase in no. of goods vehicles for agricultural goods on the road	47	Short term	average responses	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	market interview survey & traffic database
7.2.1	overall increase in production in union/upazila served by the road in past 5 years	48	Short term	average responses	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	market interview survey & historical database
7.2.2	increase in no. of goods vehicles for industrial goods on the road	49	Short term	average responses	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	market interview survey & traffic database
7.3.1	no. of educational institute directly connected	50	Short term	number	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	Google map, LGED database/ online map
7.4.1	vehicle ownership increase	51	Short term	average responses	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	market interview survey
7.4.2	increase of motorized trips	52	Short term	average responses	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	market interview survey
7.5.1	no. of medical facilities directly connected by the road	53	Short term	number	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	Google map / OSM

Measures / Attributes		ID	Phase	Unit	Scale (4-1)	data collection and assessment method
7.5.2	no. of facilities that are dependent on this road for access	54	Short term	number	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	Google map / OSM
7.6.1	Number of jobs generated because of road construction and maintenance work for local community.	55	Mid term	number	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	Based on LGED local office database
7.6.2	number of programs for ensuring gender equality actions through female work group engagements in road works	56	Mid term	number	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	LGED database/ work records
7.7.1	% of women reporting improved access to essential services (education, healthcare, market) due to road	57	Short term	%	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	FGD survey (gender disaggregated)
7.7.2	% of women using the road regularly for commuting or economic activity	58	Short term	%	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	Gender-disaggregated traffic survey
7.8.1	% increase in settlement area within the 2km area surrounding the road	59	Mid term	%	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	LGED GIS database/ Satellite image processing
7.8.2	% increase in Nighttime light coverage within the 2km area surrounding the road	60	Mid term	%	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	Satellite image processing, time series data at night
7.9.1	to assess the economic return on investment in maintenance and road improvements	61	Long term	ratio	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	based on life cycle cost, CBA analysis. LGED database maintained for road wise historical cost/ benefit information, RAMS.
7.10.1	increase in property and land value due to improved accessibility and connectivity	62	Long term	% increase	4 very high 3 High 2 moderate 1 low	LGED database or Asset management system, road side land use and land price database, RAMS.

Chapter 2 Performance Indicators



2 Chapter 2 Performance Indicators

2.1 Details of the short-term phase performance indicators

The criteria and sub criteria considered for the short-term phase are listed below. Detail discussion of each criterion is presented in the following sections.

ID	Criteria
1	Traffic Condition Assessment
2	Road Safety Assessment
3	Pavement Condition Assessment
4	Environmental Condition Assessment
5	Climate Condition Assessment
6	Road Structure Condition Assessment
7	Socio Economic Impact Assessment

For C1 Traffic Condition Assessment

Sub Criteria	Measures / Attributes	ID	Phase
1.1 Traffic volume	1.1.1 AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic)	1	Short term
	1.1.2 No. of Commercial Vehicle (CVD)	2	Short term
	1.1.3 %NMV & %SMVT (Non-Motorized vehicle and slow-moving vehicular traffic)	3	Short term
	1.1.4 Peak Hour Flow (PCU/hr)	4	Short term
1.2 Service Quality	1.2.1 % travel cost increased in 3 years	10	Short term
	1.2.2 % travel speed decreased in 3 years	11	Short term
	1.2.3 user satisfaction level (riding quality, safety, mobility)	12	Short term

For C2 Road Safety Assessment

Sub Criteria	Measures / Attributes	Id	Phase
2.1 Percent encroachment	2.1.1 % road area encroached by illegal parking or temporary stalls or hawkers	13	Short term
	2.1.2 % road area encroached by bazar activities, shops fronts, car workshops	14	Short term
	2.1.3 % road area encroached by permanent structures or shops/ buildings	15	Short term
2.2 Crash risk assessment	2.2.1 no. of crashes total per year	16	Short term
	2.2.2 no. of fatality per year	17	Short term
	2.2.3 no. of serious injury per year	18	Short term
	2.2.4 pedestrian safety condition	19	Short term

For C3 Pavement Condition Assessment

Sub criteria	Measures / Attributes	ID	Phase
3.1 Crack rate evaluation	3.1.1 PSCI (crack index)	22	Short term
3.2 Pot-hole assessment	3.2.1 Total Area of potholes per km	23	Short term
3.3 Rutting evaluation	3.3.1 Total rutting length per km	24	Short term
3.4 Surface roughness Assessment	3.4.1 Average IRI value of road	25	Short term

For C4 Environmental Condition Assessment

Sub criteria		Measures / Attributes		ID	Phase
4.1	Air Pollution increase	4.1.1	increase in air pollution in last 3 years	28	Short term
		4.1.2	PM10 level condition, compared to acceptable baseline	29	Mid term
4.2	Noise Pollution increase	4.2.1	increase in noise pollution in last 3 years	30	Short term
		4.2.1	noise level dB condition, compared to acceptable baseline	31	Mid term

For C5 Climate Condition Assessment

Sub criteria		Measures / Attributes		ID	Phase
5.1	Road closing days due to climate conditions	5.1.1	extreme weather related to the inaccessibility of road to users (flood, Cyclone, road or bridge seriously damaged or broken)	32	Short term

For C6 Road Structure Condition Assessment

Sub criteria		Measures / Attributes		ID	Phase
6.1	Drainage condition	6.1.1	road side drainage condition (flow, continuity)	36	Short term
		6.1.2	% of road subject to waterlogging	37	Short term
		6.1.3	no. of days of waterlogging	38	Short term

For C7 Socio Economic Impact Assessment

Sub criteria		Measures / Attributes		ID	Phase
7.1	Agricultural Production increase	7.1.1	overall increase in production in the surrounding community owing to the road in past 5 years	46	Short term
		7.1.2	increase in no. of goods vehicles for agricultural goods on the road	47	Short term
7.2	Industrial Production increase	7.2.1	overall increase in production in union/upazila served by the road in past 5 years	48	Short term
		7.2.2	increase in no. of goods vehicles for industrial goods on the road	49	Short term
7.3	Educational facility connectivity	7.3.1	no. of educational institute directly connected	50	Short term
7.4	vehicle Ownership	7.4.1	vehicle ownership increase	51	Short term
		7.4.2	increase of motorized trips	52	Short term
7.5	Health Care facility connectivity	7.5.1	no. of medical facilities directly connected by the road	53	Short term
		7.5.2	no. of facilities that are dependent on this road for access	54	Short term
7.7	Gender-Responsive Accessibility and Safety	7.7.1	% of women reporting improved access to essential services (education, healthcare, market) due to road	57	Short term
		7.7.2	% of women using the road regularly for commuting or economic activity	58	Short term

2.2 Criteria 1 Traffic and Road Safety Assessment

Traffic and road safety assessments have four sub-criteria or performance indicators listed below. The intention of these sub-criteria is to assess the accessibility, mobility and road safety performance of the subject road. Definition and measures for each sub-criterion are also described below. Key parameters considered for this assessment are classified traffic volume count, flow, mode share, cost, time, % road area encroached by illegal activities (shops, parking, temp struct.), no. of crashes, no. of fatality & serious injury etc. Scoring equation for criteria 1 is given below.

$$C1 = SC1.1 + SC1.2 + SC1.3 + SC1.4$$

$$C1 = AT1.1.1 * LW + AT1.1.2 * LW + AT1.1.3 * LW + AT1.1.4 * LW + AT1.2.1 * LW + AT1.2.2 * LW + AT1.2.3 * LW$$

Where, SC is sub criteria, AT is attribute value, LW is local weightage.

2.2.1 SC 1.1 Traffic Volume Count

Definition: Traffic volume count is a key indicator for mobility performance of the road, which will provide a clear indication of the level of use of the road by motorized and non-motorized vehicles, and the current level of service of the road based on flow characteristics. The following measures are considered for measuring the traffic volume count indicator.

How to measure: The indicator traffic volume count has four measures or attributes. The score for Traffic volume count 1.1 will depend on the values of these four measures.

Attribute	Data collection method
1.1.1 AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic) value	Data collected from field survey and LGED historical database.
1.1.2 Number of Commercial Vehicles per day (bus and trucks)	
1.1.3 %NMT (Rickshaw, van and Bicycle) & %SMVT (Battery Rickshaw & Van, Easy Bike, Autorickshaw, CNG)	
1.1.4 Peak hour flow	

The SC 1.1 value or score will be assessed through summing up the four attributes while considering equal weightages for all.

1.1.1 AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic) of the Road

The annual average daily traffic we can understand the importance and current performance of the road. In a broad sense, the higher the value of daily traffic, the better the performance of the road. However, only after taking into account the road capacity, the performance of the road can be measured effectively. But that indicator is considered for long term phase.

The first step is to identify the design or intended traffic range of the road, based on road width and other geometry. If a road has a highly varying road configuration, then assessment should be done separately for each major homogenous section. After establishing a range of high and low expected traffic volume of the road, the current average daily traffic observed from survey will be compared to check the increase or decrease of traffic volume from expected range. If traffic is significantly lower than expected traffic volume, then the performance of the road is deemed bad. Same way if the traffic is significantly higher than the expected traffic volume, then the road is performing very well. Hence the significance of the variation from the design / intended range of traffic volume yields the performance of the road. This scoring will depend on the design of the road or class of the road.

Unit of measure: deviation from the lower range of AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic) in Vehicles per day

Baseline for score: To assess the performance score of a road based on the traffic volume or AADT, the observed or estimated AADT of the road is compared to the expected lower bound of the range

presented in the above table. The range is developed for LGED road design type or primarily the carriageway width of the roads.

Table 2-1 Expected AADT range for LGED Road carriageway width

carriage way width m	AADT*
3	0-450
3.7	450-900
5	780-871
5.5	871-1300
6.1	1200-6000
6.7	6000-6300
7.3	6300-8400

*Derived from RHD road design guideline, comparing the carriageway width and linear interpretation.

To get the performance score we need to check if the linear difference from the expected or design traffic varies significantly. However, checking the significance of variation from a range for a single value (one road's AADT) is not possible through statistical assessment like Z test or T test. The most suitable or reliable check is the linear difference of a road's traffic value from the lower bound of its relevant range. More difference from lower bound indicates lower performance of the road in terms of traffic or mobility. So, if a road has 5.5 m width, and the traffic volume is 700 AADT, then SC1.1.1 score is $|871 - 700| = 171$. Now, $(171/871) = 19.63\%$ lower than the expected lower bound for a 5.5 m carriageway road.

Table 2-2 AADT based Range for scoring for AT1.1.1

AADT value compared to range	Condition	Score
Higher than the range	Excellent	4
Within the range	Good	3
0-20% lower than lower bound	Poor	2
More than 20% lower than lower bound	Very poor	1

1.1.2 Number of Commercial Vehicles per day (CVD)

From the traffic composition, the percentage of heavy vehicles can be determined. The greater number of heavy vehicles indicates more capacity or performance of the road to carry heavy vehicles. This scoring will depend on the road design class. If a road carries less than the expected number of commercial vehicles as per its class, then the performance is less compared to a road carrying an expected number of commercial vehicles or more.

Unit of measure: Commercial Vehicles per day (CVD)

Baseline for score: similar to AADT, we check the difference or variance from the relevant lower bound of the respective CVD range from the below table. When variance % is high, or the CVD number is quite low compared to expected range, the performance of the road is considered bad. Calculation and other processes are similar to AT 1.1.1

Table 2-3 CVD range for LGED Road carriageway width

carriage way m	CVD*
3	0-50
3.7	51-100
5	101-200
5.5	201-300
6.1	301-400
6.1	401-500
6.7	501-750
7.3	751-1000

*Taken from LGED Road design manual 2021

The following table shows the scoring based on the CVD values for a subject road.

Table 2-4 CVD based Range for scoring for AT1.1.1

CVD value compared to range	Condition	Score
Higher than the range	Excellent	4
Within the range	Good	3
0-20% lower than lower bound	Poor	2
More than 20% lower than lower bound	Very poor	1

1.1.3 %NMT & %SMVT (Rickshaw, Battery Rickshaw, CNG Autorickshaw)

From the mode share and traffic composition, the percentage of NMT (non-motorized traffic) & SMVT (slow moving vehicular traffic) can be determined. The more percentage of SMVT indicates more importance of the road in terms of local accessibility and mobility. Higher % of NMT indicates comparatively less importance of the road (less long / mid trips and more short trips). Also, NMT is mostly replaced with battery powered alternatives, hence instead of considering NMT% it is recommended to consider NMT and SMVT % collectively to assess the slow moving local short/mid trip vehicles. Less % means the road has higher motorized / fast moving vehicles. So, this is negatively marked or scored. Vehicles considered for NMT and SMVT are listed below

Table 2-5 List of vehicles with classification

Vehicle category	Type	Remarks
1. Truck Medium	Motorized traffic	Large trucks (>3.5 ton)
2. Truck Light	Motorized traffic	Small trucks (<3.5 ton)
3. Bus Heavy	Motorized traffic	Large interdistrict buses
4. Bus Mini	Motorized traffic	Small bus/ coaster
5. Bus Light	Motorized traffic	Includes microbus
6. Utility	Motorized traffic	SUV, jeep, Pajero etc.
7. Delivery Vehicle	Motorized traffic	Small pickups
8. Car	Motorized traffic	Private car
9. Auto Rickshaw	Slow Moving vehicular traffic	Includes easy bikes, CNGs
10. Tempo	Motorized traffic	Leguna, includes Nasimon-karimon
11. Motorcycle	Slow Moving vehicular traffic	Motorbike and scooters
12. Bicycle	Non-Motorized traffic	cycles
13. Rickshaw	Non-Motorized traffic	Pedal and battery rickshaw
14. Rickshaw Van	Non-Motorized traffic	Pedal and battery vans
15. Animal cart	Non-Motorized traffic	Pushcart/ animal cart

Easy bikes and CNG are small slow-moving vehicles which are quite different from fast moving vehicles or larger motorized vehicles. Taken from LGED vehicle classification list.

Unit of measure: % NMT & % SMVT of total AADT

Baseline for score: From the AADT table details, total NMT+SMVT is calculated and then the %NMT&SMVT is estimated. From the expected range of the %NMT the score of the road is assessed.

Table 2-6 CVD range for LGED Road carriageway width

carriage way	%NMT& %SMVT
3	30%-50%NMT
3.7	30%-50%NMT
5	20%-30% NMT
5.5	20%-30% NMT
6.1	20% - 0% NMT
6.7	20% - 0% NMT
7.3	20% - 0% NMT

The following table shows the scoring based on the %NMT& %SMVT values for a subject road.

Table 2-7 %NMT & %SMVT based Range for scoring for AT1.1.3

%NMT & %SMVT value compared to range	Condition	Score
lower than lower bound	Excellent	4
Within the range	Good	3
0-20% Higher than the range	Poor	2
More than 20% lower than lower bound	Very poor	1

1.1.4 Peak Hour Flow (PCU/hr)

The peak hour flow rate is another key performance indicator for the road, as the peak hour flow rate is associated with the level of service of the road and indicates the traffic characteristics of the road. A high peak flow rate generally reflects an important and high performing road (from mobility perspective). Higher flow rates mean better scores.

Table 2-8 Vehicle wise PCU List

Vehicle type	Vehicle class ID	Passenger Car Unit (PCU)*
All Trucks	1,2	3.6
Bus	3,4,5	3.0
Utility Vehicles	6, 7	1.3
Car	8	1.0
Tempo/CNG	10	1.0
Auto Rickshaw	9	0.6
Pedal Rickshaw	13 14	1.0
Motorcycle	11	0.4
Bicycle	12	0.5
Animal cart/ Pushcart	15	4.0

*Source: LGED Design Manual

Unit of measure: PCU per Hour.

Baseline for score: Peak hour flow value in terms of PCU will be directly used for scoring. The scores for various sites will be normalized before inputting in the performance score equation. For the score assessment the following range table will be used to determine the variation from the expected range for each type of road. Lower than the lower bound means poor performance.

Table 2-9 PCU / peak hour range for LGED Road carriageway width

carriage way width m	PCU/Peak Hour
3	<325*
3.7	325-400
5	401-1000
5.5	401-1000
6.1	1001-1400
6.7	1401-1800
7.3	1801-2200

**For 3m carriageway there is no value in the table, so a linear interpretation is considered.*

The following table shows the scoring based on the Peak hour traffic values for a subject road.

Table 2-10 Peak hour PCU/hr-based range for scoring for AT1.1.4

PCU/Hr value compared to range	Condition	Score
Higher than the range	Excellent	4
Within the range	Good	3
0-20% lower than lower bound	Poor	2
More than 20% lower than lower bound	Very poor	1

Method of data collection: With advancement in AI tools and image / video processing, traffic flow data can be collected in a highly effective and economic way compared to the conventional manual tally method for counting. With plenty of commercial platforms available for digitizing the traffic count data for specific vehicle classes, all that is required is to set up an IP or CC camera at the survey location. AI traffic detection tools have the potential to revolutionize the way traffic volume surveys are done. By removing the need for manual observations or human enumerators involvement, the entire process becomes automated, and a real time data assessment can be achieved. Automatic traffic count detection allows automatic recording of class wise traffic count, directional movement ratios, speed.

Traffic datasheets can be automatically generated / exported out of the video processing platform and then the excel datasheet will be processed to generate the daily traffic datasheet, hourly distribution chart and modal share charts. From these datasheets AADT, CVD, %SMVT, Peak hour flow can be easily determined.

Frequency of data collection: A key criterion for selecting the data collection method would be how frequently the data is required to be collected. Data needs to be representative for each attribute as per standard. Traffic data is expected to be collected every year in the dry and wet season, for hat-day and non-hat day. Alternatively using the suggested AI based auto detection method of traffic through CC cameras, traffic data can be collected throughout the year at some base points. These base points can then be used to establish the necessary traffic factors or patterns to facilitate shorter duration survey data at other satellite points (points surrounding the base point or have similar characteristics as the base point). For every union at least one point can be established for data collection round the year.

Cost of data collection: Below is an indicative cost for data collection for various methods as discussed above. Setting up a CC camera with constant power through power bank does not cost much however community engagement is key here as maintenance and preservation of equipment would need active participation from local community or market stakeholders.

Survey system	Cost	Remarks
CC camera setup for a year 365 days 24 hours data	15,00,000/ year	Includes processing data, setup cost, surveyor cost, equipment full price.
CC camera setup for a day 12hours	10,000/ day	Includes processing of data, setup cost, surveyor cost, equipment rent.

The survey will yield all attributes under SC1.1. Prices are indicative only, the budget would highly depend on the packaging of the survey or data collection work (number of fixed stations, duration and other issues like stakeholders' responsibilities and facilities, electricity bill etc.)

Remarks and recommendations: Only challenge for this AI based traffic detection is that the vehicle classes of the software / tools commercially available from reliable vendors does not completely match with LGED standard vehicle classifications. However, this challenge can be easily resolved through specific module development for Bangladesh or LGED traffic classes through a test project. This is particularly needed for unconventional traffic modes plying on rural roads (various versions of battery rickshaw, easy bikes, auto rickshaw etc.). With automatic license plate recognition technologies, it is also possible to get more detail and reliable information of vehicle class by utilizing vehicle registration

information. Ratio of registered and unregistered vehicles as well as other key statistics on traffic composition and flow pattern are also possible to assess through integration of such technology.

2.2.2 SC 1.2 Service Quality Assessment

Definition: The service quality of a road is a key indicator of the road performance, which reflects the roads' functional performance in providing the intended accessibility to the community in the desired level of quality. A trend for increasing travel cost and travel time would mean a lower performance of the road and on the contrary a reduction in travel time reflects better performance of the road.

How to measure: three attributes or measures considered for service quality as discussed below.

1.2.1 %travel costs increased in 5 years

An indirect measure to reflect the overall accessibility option improvement or change in travel cost between the major OD pair for the last 5 years. A decrease in travel cost generally indicates better performance of the road in terms of accessibility, while an increase of cost means the road has a declining performance in terms of accessibility. Scoring is done on direct values from field (average of the field survey responses). From field survey responses the average travel cost increase is assessed.

Base of scoring:

Level of travel cost increase	Score
Low increase	4
Moderate increase	3
high increase	2
Very high increase	1

Same scoring is used for 1.2.2 attribute listed below.

1.2.2 %travel speed increased or decreased in 5 years

An indirect measure to reflect the overall travel pattern change or variation in travel speed between the major OD pair for the last 5 years. An increase in speed indicates better performance of the road, while decrease will reflect the road has a declining performance. Scoring is done on direct values from field (average of the field survey responses). From field survey responses the average travel cost increase is assessed.

1.2.3 User satisfaction level on ride quality, traffic congestion and road safety

A user satisfaction level check for the road where the people's perception on ride quality or pavement condition level, traffic congestion level and road safety situation are assessed through the questionnaire survey. Higher satisfaction means better performance of the subject road. Scoring is done on direct values from field (average of the field survey responses). Three classes are defined for scoring to mark the performance of the road as satisfactory, neutral or not satisfactory. Scoring basis is given in the table below.

Base of scoring:

Average User satisfaction Level	Score
Highly Satisfactory	4
Satisfactory	3
Neutral	2
Not satisfactory	1

Note: the following is same for all attributes under SC1.2

Frequency of data collection: Survey to be repeated once every year.

Cost of data collection: Depends on the road length and number of prominent markets or growth centers associated with the road. For a typical road with less than 3 markets associated with the road the survey can be done within one day. Hence a per day rate for covering 3 market surveys could be useful for budget assessment. Rates for per day survey could be 6000 tk considering 1 surveyor. Note the market survey data will collect a lot attributes / indicators information for other sub criteria as well hence the price would be justified for an elaborate questionnaire survey work.

Method of data collection: Questionnaire surveys on digital platforms that can provide quick dash boards illustrating the OD routes or diagrams can be utilized for this measure. A LGED network along with the Key establishments, namely Upazila HQ, Union HQ, GC, Rural market etc. A RHD road network should also be incorporated in the map / application to check the OD of roads that connect LGED network to RHD network. Field OD data will be collected through FGD at local markets where people will be interviewed to identify the most dominant origin and destinations of trip through the route or corridor under survey. Then based on the classification the intended OD will be determined based on the location of the corridor. The questionnaire will include the most frequent origin, destination, trip time and average trip cost for various modes of transportation. It is also essential to cover all OD patterns as trucks or commercial vehicles may have different OD than the NMV.

2.3 Criteria 2 Road Safety Assessment

Traffic assessments have two sub-criteria or performance indicators listed below. The intention of these sub-criteria is to assess the accessibility, mobility performance of the subject road. Definition and measures for each sub-criterion are also described below. Scoring equation for criteria 2 is given below.

$$C\ 2 = SC\ 2.1 + SC\ 2.2$$

$$C2 = AT\ 2.1.1 * LW + AT\ 2.1.2 * LW + AT\ 2.1.3 * LW + AT\ 2.2.1 * LW + AT\ 2.2.2 * LW + AT\ 2.2.3 * LW + AT\ 2.2.4 * LW$$

Where, SC is sub criteria, AT is attribute value , LW is local weightage.

2.3.1 SC 2.1 Percent encroachment

Definition: The road encroachment negatively impacts the mobility of the road and is detrimental to its performance. In a broad sense, the higher the encroachment the lower the performance of the road.

How to measure: The % of road encroachment is evaluated from three measures, listed below,

2.1.1 %road area encroached by illegal parking or temporary stalls or hawkers or agricultural activities (hey stock, cattle tying on roadside).

Most common in bazar or commercial areas of the road. For rural roads in bazar areas, it is observed in general that autorickshaw, van and other vehicles are parked on the road often for loading / unloading purpose of goods or waiting for passengers. In case of prominent bazars power tillers, pickup trucks are also parked directly on the road, narrowing the road width and causing congestion and safety risks. The vegetable and other vendors in bazars occupy the road side / part of the road to setup their stall encroaching part of the carriageway. In most growth centers or rural markets parking facility or arrangement is not planned or available forcing or encouraging people to illegally encroach the road for parking (when road side space is narrow or encroached by other temporary vendors or shop fronts). Hey stocks, paddy drying, tying cattle on the roadside is also a major concern for road encroachment and road safety as these encroachments drastically reduce the effective carriageway width.

Base of scoring: Scoring is done using the following range

- 0% road encroached, Excellent condition, score 4
- 0-10% road encroached good condition, score 3
- 10-30% road area encroached poor condition, score 2
- more than 30% road area encroached, very poor condition, score 1

same scoring applied for the other two attributes.

2.1.2 %road area encroached by bazar activities, shops fronts, car workshops.

Most common in commercial areas, rural markets and other bazar areas. It is a common malpractice of illegally occupying part of verge, shoulder or road to extend the shop front area. This is notoriously done for automobile workshops or other showrooms. In bazar area many shops / vendors extend their shop fronts by illegally encroaching part of the road, tea stalls / restaurants, fruit shops, and many other retailers or small shops do the same.

2.1.3 % road area encroached by permanent structures or shops/ buildings.

This is a special case and typically rare. But in case of suburban sections or urban areas of a LGED road, people construct permanent structures like market buildings, commercial establishments or residential buildings encroaching part of the road area. This seriously impacts the roadside safety issue

as the road width is reduced or narrowed down and shoulders / verge portions are completely encroached. These encroachments are difficult to remove and have long term impact on safety.

Note: Base of scoring, Data collection Frequency and costing is same for all attributes under SC 2.1.

Frequency of data collection: Drive through Survey to be repeated once every year.

Cost of data collection: Depends on the road length. Per road per day an approximate 10000 BDT is proposed considering coverage of more than 10km road length (round trips) and all other costs including all payments for surveyors, data processing, driver etc.

Method of data collection: the percentage of road encroachment can be done in three ways. One is the contemporary manual process where a field team will survey the road to record the areas of the encroachment per category and plot them in a GIS platform or simply calculate the total area of the encroachment in a datasheet to get the % of encroachment. The other methods involve collecting the video of the road and using AI processing to identify the area of encroachment. Another approach would be to utilize the spatial analysis of either satellite image or drone ortho mosaic images. Using advanced image processing and AI tools, from drone ortho mosaic imagery or from high resolution satellite imagery road encroachment area can be identified and mapped at a mass scale. While satellite image use is more convenient, drone images offer more reliability.

Remarks and recommendations: The video capture process can yield both pavement condition assessment data as well as roadside land use, road furniture, road marking and road encroachment information. Hence it is recommended that use of AI processing should be prioritized for getting a reliable assessment of encroachment. However, when drone image or high-resolution satellite image archives are available to LGED, these images can be processed using AI to quickly assess the level of encroachment for the rural road. In future for the mid-term or long-term approach, different scoring for different encroachment types can be adopted for achieving a better comparison between sites.

2.3.2 SC 2.2 Crash risk assessment

Definition: road safety condition assessment or crash risk assessment of a particular road can be done through a market interview survey or focus group discussion with the local community at the prominent bazars on the road. As the crash data on the particular road is not available in a systematic manner, as a surrogate measure the community survey can reflect on the existing crash risk scenario at site. Based on the likelihood of a crash and the approximate total number of fatal and serious injuries per year, the road safety and crash risk of a road can be defined.

How to measure: crash risk likelihood and number of casualties in past 3 years is collected through market survey. While information for fatalities is collected with more context, the serious injuries information is collected more like a trend / frequency of events rather than actual number or specific details of events. For example, during the survey if there was a fatality on the road, specific information can be sought after, like where the accident was, how long ago, who was involved in the crash. But in case of injury crash events people typically respond that there's multiple events every month, so it is not possible to get specific information on each event, rather a trend is established from the interview, what are the most common type of injury crashes, which vehicles are involved and what is the frequency. Through market survey the number of road crashes, number of fatalities and number of serious injuries are recorded for the subject road. From which a per km number of crashes, fatality and SI can be estimated. However, as these are not accurate figures and are subject to perception and possible exaggeration from the interviewees, instead of using an exact number for the events, the likelihood or risk is used for assigning an appropriate safety score to the road. In case there are multiple surveys done for a single road; the average score would be used in the performance evaluation equation.

2.2.1 no. of crashes per year

Total no. of road crashes occurred within the portion of the road per year. The values are collected as a range or likelihood of a crash as presented in the table below.

2.2.2 no. of fatality per year

Similar to the crash parameter, from the market interview survey the likelihood of total number of fatalities per year is estimated.

2.2.3 no. of serious injury per km per year

The serious injury per year data is collected simultaneously with the fatality and crash data. These are approximate values or likelihood of an event instead of accurate figures.

Base value and scoring: For the above three attributes 2.2.1~2.2.3, same base of scoring is applied. the Likelihood of fatalities and serious injuries from road crashes are recorded based on the following table.

Likelihood	Risk	Event frequency for Crash/Fatality/Serious Injury	Score
Frequent	Extreme	Once or more in a month	4
Likely	High	Once or more within 6 months	3
Occasional	Moderate	Once or more within year	2
Unlikely	Low	Once or less within 3 years	1

Here, fatality is considered death due to road accident, on spot or in hospital within 30 days of the road crash, while serious injury from a road crash is considered when the victim has to be hospitalized for treatment. The likelihood of slight injury and property damage only accidents are not considered in this assessment.

2.2.4 pedestrian safety condition

People or respondents' perception of pedestrian safety issues, whether they feel safe to walk along or across the road and what do they think of the overall safety condition for pedestrians. This is a qualitative assessment of road user satisfaction of the pedestrian facilities of the subject road.

Base of scoring:

Average Pedestrian Safety Level	Score
Very safe	4
Safe	3
Neutral	2
Not Safe	1

Note: Data collection Frequency and costing is same for all attributes under SC 2.2.

Frequency of data collection: Survey to be repeated once every year.

Cost of data collection: Data to be collected during market survey, hence cost is included in SC 1.2.

Method of data collection: Market interview survey or Focus group discussion survey at prominent markets on the road. In future the data should be collected directly from a crash database instead of relying on surrogate measures. However, injury surveys have an extremely high likelihood of being underreported even in a crash database system for a rural road network. Hence for injury events such person or community survey-based approach will still prove useful to compensate for the underreporting of the injury crashed.

Remarks and recommendations: For proper crash risk assessment there's no alternative to proper crash data collection and a modern crash data management system. In an advanced RCDMS crash records are systematically archived and as required queried to present the crash patterns and crash rates along with spatial assessments. GIS integration is a key advantage of using a modern RCDMS. But lack of crash records can pose a serious challenge to safety assessment of rural roads. It is necessary to adopt short term and long-term assessment goals to tackle the issue. For example, utilizing surrogate measures, like FGD, market interview surveys, key informant interview surveys, a rough indication of crash records can be collected for a rural road where proper crash records are absent. However, with advancement in AI tools, it is possible to do text mining from various crash information sources and extract key information fields from social media posts, news and other sources. For RSA and RSI also drone and satellite imagery can greatly benefit the auditor in assessment of the road safety aspects. Image processing and geospatial tools can be utilized to automate identification and assessment of high-risk geometric features of existing roads or a scheme. When the crash records are collected in a systematic manner and with acceptable coverage on rural road networks, the performance evaluation framework may be updated to use the actual crash / FSI numbers instead of the risk/likelihood range scoring.

2.4 Criteria 3 Pavement Condition Assessment

Pavement condition assessments have a total of six sub-criteria or performance indicators listed below. The intention of these sub-criteria is to assess the pavement surface condition, ride quality and pavement structure condition and rideability performance of the subject road. Out of the six, four key attributes are proposed for short term phase framework, while rest of the two are proposed for the midterm phase. The measurement equation for criteria 3 is given below:

$$C3 = SC\ 3.1 + SC\ 3.2 + SC\ 3.3 + SC\ 3.4$$

$$C3 = AT\ 3.1.1 * LW + AT\ 3.2.1 * LW + AT\ 3.3.1 * LW + AT\ 3.4.1 * LW$$

Definition and measures for the short-term phase sub-criterion are described below.

2.4.1 SC 3.1 Crack rate evaluation

Crack rate evaluation is a critical measure for pavement condition assessment. The % area of cracks per km reflects the surface condition of the road. For this sub criteria the attribute considered is Crack density, or the number of cracks per unit area. This attribute is assessed to understand the extent of cracking for the subject road. The severity levels of cracks are classified as minor (hairline cracks), moderate (partial cracks), and severe (alligator cracks). Minor cracks: Less than 0.5 mm in width. Moderate cracks: 0.5 to 2 mm in width. Severe cracks: Greater than 2 mm in width. Typical road condition surveys (rapid and detailed assessment survey) rely on visual inspections involving manual identification and documentation of surface cracks (area and numbers). While straightforward, this method is time-intensive and subject to human error.

2.4.2 SC 3.2 Pothole assessment

Pothole assessment involves identifying and measuring the size and depth of potholes using measuring tapes and depth gauges. The number of potholes per kilometer is recorded to assess the severity of the issue. This assessment is crucial because potholes can significantly impact vehicle safety and comfort, and they indicate underlying structural problems in the pavement. Pothole density, or the number of potholes per kilometer, is used to prioritize repair needs. Minor potholes: Less than 50 mm in depth and 300 mm in diameter. Moderate potholes: 50 to 100 mm in depth and 300 to 500 mm in diameter. Severe potholes: Greater than 100 mm in depth and more than 500 mm in diameter.

2.4.3 Standard Measurement method for SC 3.1 and SC 3.2

The ASTM E3303-21 standard specifies how to compute PSCM and PSCI based on measured crack length (L), crack width (w), and the area (A) of each analysis tile:

$$PSCM = (100 * L * w) / A$$

$$PSCI = 100 * \exp(-0.45 * PSCM)$$

The PSCI transforms a physical crack density metric into a standardized index ranging from 0 (worst) to 100 (best). This can be aligned with maintenance decisions, as Nguyen's Singaporean study proposed three severity thresholds: $PSCI \geq 75$ (low severity), $50 < PSCI < 75$ (moderate), and $PSCI \leq 50$ (high severity).

Balzarini (2021) clarified that while PSCI is not a direct replacement for PCI, it functions as an analogous surface condition index. Their methodology split each road segment into standard zones—central, wheel-path, and edge—and further into tiles, each analyzed for crack dimensions using either laser or high-resolution imaging. Critically, this method allows PSCI to be computed even with partial coverage or irregular data—making it ideal for image-based surveys using regular video.

The AASHTO R85 protocol complements this by setting detection performance standards for automated image analysis tools. Systems should identify at least 85% of cracks wider than 5 mm and 60% of those between 3–5 mm, with a minimum detection accuracy of 33% for finer cracks. These standards, although developed for high-fidelity imaging, serve as validation goals for AI-based detection models operating on standard RGB images, including those used for pothole and patching detection.




Table 2-11 Flowchart PSCM/PSCI Calculation and integration to LGED framework




Table 2-12 Example Software Capacity

2.4.4 Evaluation of LGED Road from Potholes and Cracking Parameters

3.1 Contextual Challenges for LGED

LGED manages an extensive rural road network composed of both paved and unpaved segments. Manual inspection is time-consuming, subjective, and difficult to scale. Advanced laser scanning systems like LCMS-2 are cost-prohibitive for widespread use in Bangladesh. Therefore, LGED requires an intermediate standard that allows for scalable, repeatable, and objective assessment using accessible tools.

A practical solution involves vehicle-mounted cameras (such as dashcams or smartphones) and AI models trained to detect surface distresses from these images. While the lack of laser resolution restricts precise measurement of crack widths and pothole depths, visual estimation of crack area coverage, pothole size, pattern density, and continuity allow PSCM and thus PSCI to be approximated.

3.2 Adapting PSCI and Pothole Detection for Visual Rating from Regular Cameras

LGED can adopt the PSCI scale as a proxy for crack-based pavement condition and use object detection algorithms to identify potholes. A simplified workflow is as follows:

1. Data Collection: Use standard video cameras to collect pavement surface imagery across 10 m segments.
2. AI Detection: Use neural networks (e.g., U-Net, YOLOv8) to detect cracks and potholes.
3. PSCM Calculation: Use tile-based segmentation to compute estimated PSCM values, interpolated from visible crack data.
4. PSCI Assignment: Convert PSCM to PSCI using:

$$\text{PSCI} = 100 * e^{(-0.45 * \text{PSCM})}$$

or the alternative version by Balzarini:

$$\text{PSCI} = 15 + 85 * e^{(-0.64 * \text{PSCM})}$$

5. Pothole Quantification: Count potholes and estimate size using bounding box dimensions against lane width references.
6. Condition Rating:
 - $\text{PSCI} \geq 90 \rightarrow \text{Excellent}$
 - $75 < \text{PSCI} < 90 \rightarrow \text{Good}$
 - $50 < \text{PSCI} < 75 \rightarrow \text{Fair}$
 - $\text{PSCI} \leq 50 \rightarrow \text{Poor}$
7. Supplement with pothole counts or patching severity as a qualitative layer.
8. To assess the pothole severity the following scoring is used for SC3.2

LGED collects Pot hole area during the road condition survey, which is a good indicator of pavement condition. The following range is proposed for scoring based on pothole area.

- Poor condition, score 1, greater than 10.0 m² of pothole area per kilometer,
- Moderate condition, score 2, 5.1 m² to 10.0 m² of pothole area per kilometer,
- Good Condition, Score 3, 1 m² to 5.0 m² of potholes per kilometer,
- Excellent condition, score 4. Negligible to less than 1 m² of potholes per kilometer

2.4.5 SC 3.3 Rutting Area assessment

Rutting evaluation involves measuring rut depths using straight edges and rulers and documenting the extent and severity of rutting along wheel paths. This is usually done annually or after significant traffic increases to ensure that ruts are identified and mitigated before they compromise road safety. Minor ruts: Less than 10 mm in depth. Moderate ruts: 10 to 20 mm in depth. Severe ruts: Greater than 20 mm in depth. Rut depth, measured from the lowest point of the rut to the highest point of the pavement surface, is a key parameter in this evaluation.

3.3.1 Rutting area length / km: Data is collected using an action camera mounted on a car / jeep and then by data enumerators visually assess the rutting length from the video. From the geotag the start and the end of the rutting section is noted and then the total length of such sections is calculated. Then by dividing the length of the road, the rutting area length per km of the road is estimated.

Unit: Rutting area length / km

Scoring:

- Poor condition, 100m+ rutting per km
- Moderate condition, 50-100m pothole per km
- Good Condition, Score 3, 0-50m pothole per km
- Excellent condition, score 4. 0m rutting per km

Data collection frequency: Same as for 2.1 sub criteria.

Data collection Cost: similar to 2.1 sub criteria. Video collection will not no extra cost, but per km manual detection cost should be 200 tk (instead of the AI processing rate).

Recommendations: AI based automatic rutting detection methodologies need to be implemented in the midterm and later phases which will remove the need for manual detection and assessment. However, at the moment the technologies available require experimental setup involving laser modules and very high-level accuracy for GPS and these methods are not commercially available or tested on a mass scale or industry level. Hence the guideline recommends adopting a video based manual detection method while proposing automatic detection for later phases when more commercial or industry tested options will be available.

2.4.6 SC 3.4 Surface roughness Assessment

Surface roughness evaluation involves measuring the International Roughness Index (IRI) to assess ride quality and pavement condition. IRI is a standardized indicator of road smoothness, calculated using profilometers or vehicle-mounted sensors. Higher IRI values indicate rougher surfaces, which can lead to increased vehicle wear, discomfort, and safety risks.

Average IRI Value per km: IRI measurements are conducted using vehicle-mounted systems equipped with accelerometers and laser profilers. This method measures surface smoothness and ride quality, providing a standardized measure for comparing the roughness of different road segments.

Unit: Average IRI (m/km)

Scoring:

- **Poor condition (Score 1):** $IRI > 10$ m/km
- **Moderate condition (Score 2):** $8 < IRI \leq 10$ m/km
- **Good condition (Score 3):** $6 < IRI \leq 8$ m/km
- **Excellent condition (Score 4):** $IRI \leq 6$ m/km

Data Collection Frequency: IRI surveys are typically conducted annually or after major repairs.

Data Collection Cost: Initial setup cost for laser/inertial sensors is high, but per-km assessment cost is moderate (~300–500 Tk/km). Manual validation may add ~200 Tk/km if secondary checks are needed.

Recommendations: For future IRI measurement, we recommend gradually adopting advanced technologies like AI-powered video analysis, smart Roughometer devices, and drone/satellite-based monitoring. These methods should be supported by proper data management systems and partnerships with technology providers. This approach will improve accuracy, reduce costs, and enable large-scale roughness assessments for better road maintenance planning.

2.5 Criteria 4 Environmental Condition Assessment

The criteria Environmental Condition Assessment has two proposed sub criteria for the short-term phase of the evaluation framework.

$$C4 = SC4.1 + SC4.2$$

$$C4 = AT\ 4.1.1 * LW + AT\ 4.2.1 * LW$$

How to measure: For these criteria the following measures are considered; increase in PM10 or air pollution due to road activities, increase in sound pollution, number of road closure days per year due to extreme weather-related events. The last sub criteria present the inaccessibility of road to users, due to road section being flooded, road section being damaged or washed away, structure broken or damaged.

2.5.1 SC 4.1 Air Pollution increase

The attribute used for short term phase or pilot implementation stage is the increase in PM10, PM2.5 compared to past 3 years. The data is collected from a market survey. Direct measures through portable device were also attempted but the results were not consistent or usable for the pilot assessment work. Hence an indirect or qualitative attribute is used for this sub criteria assessment.

3.1.1. The increase in PM10, PM2.5 compared to past 3 years: During market survey the historical trend or increase in air pollution considering past 3 years is assessed to score the pilot sites in the following range. Key reason behind the increase is also collected from respondents.

- Low level increase score 1
- Medium level increase score 2
- High level increase score 3

Recommendations: Using suitable air quality measurement device that can record the PM 2.5 PM 10 values, directly in a series of events or log basis with acceptable accuracy for outdoor assessment air Pollution Due to Road Infrastructure and Activities can be assessed as a direct measure or attribute for sub criteria 3.1. Details for this attribute is given below.

Air Pollution Due to Road Infrastructure and Activities: Emissions of particulates, gases, and other pollutants generated by road materials, traffic, and maintenance activities that impact ambient air quality.

Unit: Micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), Parts per million (ppm).

Data Collection Method:

- **Primary Sources:** Air quality monitoring stations, portable dust samplers, traffic flow analysis.
- **Secondary Sources:** Reliable national and international data repositories, such as:
 - Department of Environment (DoE), Bangladesh: www.doe.gov.bd
 - Bangladesh Air Quality Monitoring Project (BAQMP): www.baqmp.gov.bd
 - World Air Quality Index Project: www.waqi.info
 - World Health Organization (WHO) Air Quality Database: www.who.int
 - NASA's Earth Observing System Data and Information System (EOSDIS): www.earthdata.nasa.gov

Data Collection Frequency: Daily, with emphasis during high-traffic and construction periods.

Understanding the Results: Road material degradation, vehicle movement, and maintenance activities can contribute to air pollution through the release of particulate matter, microplastics, and chemical emissions. Leveraging both primary and secondary data sources ensures comprehensive monitoring,

helps identify pollution hotspots, and supports the implementation of dust suppression and sustainable road management practices.

2.5.2 SC 4.2 Noise Pollution increase

3.2.1. The increase in noise level (dB), compared to past 3 years: during market survey the historical trend or increase in noise pollution considering past 3 years is assessed to score the pilot sites in the following range. Key reason behind the increase is also collected from respondents.

- Low level increase score 1
- Medium level increase score 2
- High level increase score 3

Recommendations: Using suitable noise level measurement device that can record the ambient decibel levels directly in a series of events or log basis with acceptable accuracy for outdoor assessment noise Pollution Due to Road Infrastructure and Activities can be assessed as a direct measure or attribute for sub criteria 3.2. Details for this attribute is given below.

Noise Pollution Due to Road Infrastructure and Activities: Unwanted or excessive sound generated by road traffic, construction, and maintenance activities that impact human health, wildlife, and the surrounding environment. **Unit:** Decibels (dB).

Data Collection Method:

- **Primary Sources:** Noise level meters, sound monitoring equipment, traffic analysis.
- **Secondary Sources:** Reliable national and international data repositories, such as:
 - Department of Environment (DoE), Bangladesh: www.doe.gov.bd
 - World Health Organization (WHO) Environmental Noise Guidelines: www.who.int
 - Global Noise Mapping Projects (e.g., European Environment Agency): www.eea.europa.eu
 - United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Noise Pollution Resources: www.unep.org
 - Acoustic research databases, such as the US National Transportation Noise Map: www.transportation.gov

Data Collection Frequency: Continuous or hourly during peak traffic periods and active construction phases.

Understanding the Results: Noise pollution from roads arises from vehicle engines, tire friction, honking, and construction machinery. High noise levels can harm public health (e.g., hearing loss, stress), disrupt wildlife habitats, and reduce quality of life. Monitoring noise pollution helps identify high-impact zones, implement noise reduction measures such as sound barriers, and develop traffic management strategies to minimize environmental and health impacts.

Table: Summary table for the three sub criteria measures.

Parameters /Conditions	Measures	Primary data collection process	Secondary data collection process
Air pollution	PM10 and PM2.5 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) weekly to compare with standards. Temperature and humidity also affect air quality. Other parameters include O_3 , NO_2 , SO_2 , CO, VOCs, NH_3 , and Pb, which are monitored to assess air pollution and its health impacts.	Baseline survey of air/ LGED	Historical data obtain from reliable sources (as mentioned)
Noise pollution	Noise in decibel (dB) weekly to compare with standards	Baseline survey of noise / LGED	Historical data obtain from reliable sources (as mentioned)

2.6 Criteria 5 Climate Impact Assessment

2.6.1 SC 5.1 Road closing days due to extreme climate conditions

Extreme weather-related inaccessibility of roads (flood, Cyclone, road or bridge seriously damaged or broken) is the third sub criteria for environmental and climate condition assessment. The attribute considered for this sub criteria is described below.

5.1.1 Road closures due to extreme weather events: The total number of days per year section of the road is closed due to extreme weather events is collected from the market survey. The following scale is used for condition assessment and scoring of this attribute.

- Poor condition, score 1, 30 days or more road closure per year
- Moderate condition, score 2, 7-30 days road closure per year
- Good condition, score 3. 0-7 days of road closure per year
- Excellent condition, score 4. Zero days road closure per year

Recommendation: This is a critical data or parameter for the assessment of a road's resilience to extreme climate events and climate change.

Table: Summary table for the three sub criteria measures.

Parameters /Conditions	Measures	Primary data collection process	Secondary data collection process
Road closures due to extreme weather events	Road accessibility disruptions (days). Extreme weather-related inaccessibility of road to users (e.g. flood, cyclone, hot, cold, road or bridge seriously damaged or broken, etc.)	On-site inspections, road condition surveys (if possible) / LGED	Historical data collection from reliable sources (as mentioned), e.g. BWDB, BMD, Department of Disaster Management (DDM) under the Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief.

2.6.2 Possible Impacts of Climate Change on LGED Rural Roads in Bangladesh

- **Definition:** The effects of changing climatic patterns, such as temperature fluctuations, erratic rainfall, flooding, and extreme weather events, on the durability, functionality, and maintenance of rural road infrastructure.
- **Unit:** Qualitative assessments, frequency and intensity of climate events, road damage metrics (e.g., kilometers affected, maintenance costs, road closures in days, etc.).
- **Data Collection Method:**
 - **Primary Sources:** On-site inspections, road condition surveys, hydrological and meteorological data analysis.
 - **Secondary Sources:**
 - Bangladesh Meteorological Department (BMD): www.bmd.gov.bd
 - Climate Change Cell (CCC), Department of Environment: www.doe.gov.bd
 - Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Reports: www.ipcc.ch
 - World Bank Climate Knowledge Portal: climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org
 - United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC): unfccc.int
- **Data Collection Frequency:** Annually and during extreme weather events.
- **Understanding the Results:**
 1. **Temperature Variations (High and Low):**
 - **High Temperatures:** Extreme heat, like the 2019 Dhaka heatwave, causes thermal expansion, leading to surface cracking, rutting, and degradation of

materials. Asphalt and concrete may soften, making roads more susceptible to wear.

- **Low Temperatures:** Though rare, lower temperatures can cause materials to become brittle, leading to cracks, fractures, and increased vulnerability to traffic loads.
- Roads must be designed with materials that can withstand both thermal expansion and brittleness due to temperature extremes.

2. **Erratic Rainfall and Flooding:**

- The 2022 Sylhet floods, for example, overwhelmed road systems, causing erosion of the road base and weakening the subgrade. Such intense rainfall patterns may continue to increase, especially during monsoon seasons.
- Poor drainage and waterlogging exacerbate road degradation. Roads need effective drainage systems to prevent surface water accumulation and foundation weakening.

3. **Cyclones and Storm Surges:**

- Cyclones like Sidr (2007) and Amphan (2020) caused significant damage to coastal roads through storm surges, wind-blown debris, and saltwater intrusion. Saltwater further accelerates corrosion of concrete and steel structures.
- With the rising frequency of storms and rising sea levels, coastal and low-lying areas will face increasing risks of permanent road damage.

4. **Soil and Groundwater Impacts:**

- **Salinity and pH Levels:** Saltwater intrusion and fluctuating pH levels from coastal flooding weaken road materials, accelerating corrosion, especially for roads made with concrete and steel reinforcements. Elevated salinity can also affect the durability of bitumen used in road paving.
- **Groundwater Fluctuations:** High groundwater levels during the rainy season, as seen in areas like Barisal, can saturate the subgrade, leading to soil instability, road deformation, and pavement cracking. Fluctuations in groundwater depth can cause swelling or shrinking of the soil, affecting the integrity of road foundations.

5. **Drought Conditions:**

- Prolonged droughts, like those in Rajshahi, cause soil desiccation, which results in soil shrinkage and cracking of the road base. This leads to pavement settlement and increased stress on road structures.

By considering these impacts, LGED can plan for resilient infrastructure by using durable materials, enhancing drainage systems, and implementing regular maintenance schedules. Additionally, proactive monitoring and adaptive design modifications can help maintain the integrity and longevity of rural roads in Bangladesh under changing climate conditions.

2.7 Criteria 6 Road Structure Condition Assessment

Four sub criteria considered for the drainage assessment as listed below.

- SC 6.1 Drainage condition
- SC 6.2 Hydraulic structure condition
- SC 6.3 Slope Protection Condition

These are briefly discussed below with the scoring mechanism of each indicator.

2.7.1 SC 6.1 Drainage condition

Poor drainage can lead to serious damage to pavement and degrade road performance. So, to assess the drainage condition at the road or site, flow condition, continuity of drainage structures, or surface runoff, adequacy and absence of drainage structures are all significant. Surface drainage condition assessment can be done through AI image or video processing from video captured from a car mount camera. Similarly, roadside drainage structure or roadside drainage condition can also be assessed from video processing. However, during the pilot implementation work the assessment is done by manual observation of the video instead of using an AI tool. The reason behind the rural roads of LGED has little to no road side drain structures and it is very challenging to find a suitable tool that can do the needed assessment for conditions similar to LGED rural roads. Hence for short term phase manual detection from video is considered the most suitable option (faster and reliable than the field survey tally sheet, as the video capture method has the advantage of easily accessible evidence).

How to measure: Two attributes are defined for measuring the flow condition and continuity of drainage structure as well as judging the adequacy of drainage structures for the subject road. However, the adequacy part is proposed for later phases.

6.1.1 drainage condition (flow, continuity): From the captured video, the overall drainage flow condition is assessed and the continuity of the drainage structures is also assessed. Scores are assigned in three categories,

- Poor condition, score 1
- Moderate condition, score 2
- Good condition, score 3.
- Excellent condition, score 4

Recommendation: Use of Video processing AI tools for with better road side condition assessment and road furniture detection and condition assessments.

From a climate and drainage perspective it is essential to understand the extent, severity and duration of waterlogging on a rural road. Water logging poses a serious threat to the pavement structure and greatly hinders the traffic flow and causes road users' discomfort and hassle. Two attributes are checked under this sub criterion: total area of waterlogging and no. of days of waterlogging.

6.1.2 Percentage of road subject to waterlogging: Through market survey the primary locations of water logging risks are identified. Then a tentative area/ length is mapped to get the total percentage of road length that has been subject to waterlogging in past 3 years. The unit of measure is % road length, so the total approximate length of waterlogged section of road divided by total length of the road. The following scale is used for condition assessment and scoring of this attribute.

- Very Poor condition, score 1, 20-50% waterlogging
- Poor condition, score 2 , 10-20% waterlogging
- Good condition, score 3. 0-10% waterlogging

- Excellent condition, score 4. 0% waterlogging

6.1.3 Total Number of days of waterlogging per year: Similarly, through market survey the total number of days the road section remains waterlogged is approximately assessed. The measure unit is days/year. The following scale is used for condition assessment and scoring of this attribute.

- Poor condition, score 1, 30 days or more waterlogging per year
- Moderate condition, score 2, 7-30 days waterlogging per year
- Good condition, score 3. 0-7 days of waterlogging per year
- Excellent condition, score 4. Zero days waterlogging

Recommendation: Use of satellite image and secondary databases would result in a more data driven evidence-based approach to identify the waterlogging areas as well as the duration of the waterlogging events. However, this is recommended for mid-term phase, for LGED to plan, collect and archive the necessary satellite image in desired quality for such assessment.

2.7.2 SC 6.2 Hydraulic structure condition

Mainly assessed to see the structural stability and overall condition of the hydraulic structure (bridge or culvert). The flow condition of the structures as well as the size and placement adequacy judgement for the bridge or culvert is very important for performance measure of rural roads, as small bridge and culverts are the vulnerable to a lot of climate hazard and risks when they are not well designed or well maintained.

How to measure: Two attributes are defined for measuring the flow condition and structural stability condition, as well as judging the adequacy of size and placement of hydraulic structures (bridge and culverts) for the subject road.

4.2.1 Average flow condition of structures: From the on-field structure inspection the average flow condition through all the structures on the road is assessed. Scores are assigned in three categories,

- Poor condition, score 1
- Moderate condition, score 2
- Good condition, score 3
- Excellent condition, score 4

4.2.1 Average structural stability condition: Both from the on-field structure inspection and the captured video from the car mounted action camera, the overall structural condition of the bridge or culvert is assessed. Scores are assigned in three categories,

- Poor condition, score 1
- Moderate condition, score 2
- Good condition, score 3
- Excellent condition, score 4

Recommendation: Use of drone Video processing using AI tools for with bridge or culvert structural health assessment. There are established methodology and platforms that can reliably perform crack detection and other defect assessments for bridge structures. This is a rapid assessment process compared to physical inspection or testing methods. Such improvements can be adopted in mid-term phase for priority structures.

2.7.3 SC 6.3 Slope Protection Condition

Although this indicator is very critical for the performance of a rural road, the collection and assessment of the data is not very easy to collect in a traditional way. Hence here also using the AI tools it is necessary to establish an economic/ cost effective and feasible solution to record and identify erosion and roadside slope protection. The presence/absence and continuity of the hydraulic structural condition.

How to measure: Two attributes are defined for measuring the structural condition and erosion risk of the slope protection structures. The attributes help to measure the structural condition of slope protection structures, as well as in assessment of the erosion risk of the road side embankment or slope protection.

6.3.1 structural condition: The assessment is done through utilizing the video captured by the car mounted action camera. Manual observation-based assessment is proposed for the short-term phase. Similar to the hydraulic structure condition scenario the slope protection condition is also not suitable or easy to assess through AI video processing tools. The visibility of the slope structure and the various nature or appearance of the structure makes this very challenging, hence short-term phase does not recommend AI tool use for this. Scoring of results are done the following way

- Poor slope protection structural condition, score 1
- Moderate slope protection structural condition, score 2
- Good slope protection structural condition, score 3
- Excellent slope protection structural condition, score 4

6.3.2 Erosion risk: Assessment of the erosion risk of the road side embankment assessment of the erosion risk of the road side embankment or slope protection or slope protection structures is assessed by the location of the road and the road side land use. Also, the drainage system of the surrounding area. Based on the erosion risk of a road the following scoring range is proposed for the evaluation framework.

- Low erosion risk, score 4
- Mid erosion risk, score 3
- High erosion risk, score 2
- Very high erosion risk, score 1

Note: The following section is applicable for all the above attributes under SC 6.

Data collection frequency: Should be carried out at intervals of not greater than a year or immediately after periods of flooding or other natural disasters.

Data collection methodology: Structural condition survey and drive through video data collection survey will be used for the criteria 4 assessment. The survey to be carried out using digital forms where pictures are also recorded using smartphone or tab and archived in cloud storage. Drive through video data to be used as a cross-check method for assessing the reliability of the form-based data collection.

Note: For phase 1, no image processing or AI tool is proposed, hence no cost considered for the same. In future phases when drone based structural assessment would be possible by LGED, the costing framework should be updated accordingly.

Cost for data collection: For the Structural condition survey per day 5000 BDT for one surveyor should be considered. Drive through video data collection survey cost is covered in criteria 1 and 2.

2.8 Criteria 7 Socio Economic Impact Assessment

The sub criteria considered under the social impact assessment related to road performance are briefly listed below.

Sub Criteria	Phase
7.1 Agricultural Production increase	Short term
7.2 Industrial Production increase	Short term
7.3 Educational facility connectivity	Short term
7.4 Vehicle Ownership	Short term
7.5 Health Care facility connectivity	Short term
7.7 Gender-Responsive Accessibility and Safety	Short term

*Only short-term sub criteria are shown.

However, two sub criteria are proposed for the mid-term phase of evaluation rather than short term phase. The sub criteria SC 7.6 requires historical database to properly assess the impact. It also requires a lot of project or program related detailed information for the road construction or maintenance work. The sub criteria SC 7.7 Accessibility induced settlement enhancement requires historical custom tailored satellite image dataset (Particular time, frequent, high resolution, images with high interval or frequency), and for this reason this sub criteria are proposed for mid-term phase instead of short-term phase.

How to Measure: Through market survey key measures for the social impact of the road is assessed. These measures include overall increase in agricultural and industrial production directly influenced by the subject road, % goods vehicle on the road, no. of educational institutes on the road, % of trips on the road leading to educational institutes, vehicle ownership change, increase of motorized trips, % trips on the road leading to medical facilities, no. of medical facilities directly connected by the road, no. of facilities that can be accessed via this road.

2.8.1 SC 7.1 Agricultural Production increase:

This is an indirect measure to assess the impact of the subject road on agricultural production in the connected communities or marketplaces. From market survey it is possible to identify an approximate estimate of the volume of trucks or goods vehicles (trucks or pickups) per day carrying agricultural goods via this road. The same can be cross checked with the volume count data on the road. Also, the major agricultural goods carried via the subject road are asessed along with the location of the source to the market and other destinations from the market. Based on the volume of goods vehicles carrying agricultural products, a qualitative assessment of the subject road's contribution to the increase in agricultural production can be assessed (As good connectivity is one of the driving factors for increase in agricultural production).

7.1.1 Overall increase in agricultural production in the surrounding community owing to the road in past 5 years: From market survey this information is collected. This is an indirect and approximate measurement, for which the following scale or score is proposed

- Low increase, score 1
- mid increase, score 2
- high increase, score 3
- very high increase, score 4

7.1.2 Increase in no. of goods vehicles for agricultural goods on the road: The approximate increase of the of goods vehicle for agricultural products is assessed based on the market survey. This is an indicative parameter to roughly understand the impact of the road on agricultural goods transport. Increase is measured in the following scale for scoring.

- Low increase, score 1
- mid increase, score 2

- high increase, score 3
- very high increase, score 4

2.8.2 SC 7.2 Industrial Production increase

Similar to the agricultural production, industrial production increase assessment is also an indirect and qualitative assessment. The number of industrial production establishments directly connected to the road is a key indicator of the road's performance. An approximate volume of goods vehicles carrying industrial products via the subject road also indicates its importance and impact on the increase in industrial productivity of the region. Better connectivity is a key driving factor for industrial productivity and development in an area, hence is directly associated with the performance of a road in the same regard.

7.2.1 Overall increase in Industrial production in the surrounding community owing to the road in past 5 years: From market survey this information is collected. This is an indirect and approximate measurement, for which the following scale or score is proposed I

- Low increase, score 1
- mid increase, score 2
- high increase, score 3
- very high increase, score 4

7.2.2 Increase in no. of goods vehicles for industrial goods on the road: The approximate increase of the of goods vehicle for Industrial products is assessed based on the market survey. This is an indicative parameter to roughly understand the impact of the road on Industrial goods transport. Increase is measured in the following scale for scoring.

- Low increase, score 1
- mid increase, score 2
- high increase, score 3
- very high increase, score 4

2.8.3 SC 7.3 Educational facility connectivity

Number of schools/ college / university / madrasa or other educational institutes directly connected to the road or dependent on this road. Approximate number of educational trips on the subject road. These indicators will be useful to compare between other LGED roads of the upazila / district, for a qualitative assessment of the impact or contribution of the road in the educational development of the community. Good connectivity has a positive influence in performance and development of educational institutes and similarly a road serving many important educational institutes has a high-performance status in this regard compared to other roads in the same network. However, the comparison should take into account the nature or type of the road, as a paved upazila roads performance should not be compared with a paved village road. Approximate volume or number of education trips in the subject road leading to educational institutes.

5.3.1 Number of educational institutes directly connected

The open street map and google map is utilized to check the location of the educational institutes. The total number of educational institutes that are directly connected to the project road is counted and marked in the map. Following range is used for estimating the score for 5.3.1 attribute.

- Low, score 1, 1 school connected
- Moderate, score 2, 2-5 school connected
- High, score 3, 5-10 or more school connected
- Very High, score 4, college or university connected.

2.8.4 SC 7.4 Vehicle Ownership

Vehicle Ownership Changes: The quality of a road (ride quality, safety and geometry), has significant influence in the vehicle ownership changes in the adjacent households and among the regular road users or commuters. Travel behavior and vehicle ownership of the associated community is highly influenced by improvement in road quality as well as lack of public transport or other issues. A better performing road encourages an increase of motorized trips and as a result influences the increase in vehicle ownership in the community. With a better paved road connection, people are encouraged to buy motorcycles or even cars (based on the community land use pattern, suburb / rural) which they would not consider if the connectivity were less accommodating for motorized vehicles.

Measures:

- Vehicle ownership change: Assessment of whether ownership of bike or car has been increased significantly or marginally.
- Increase of motorized trips of locality due to road is construction, improvement or upgraded to paved or widened.

7.4.1 Vehicle ownership change in surrounding area in past 3 years: An assessment of bike and car ownership change in past 3 years presented in a scale of three categories as shown below.

- Low change, score 1
- mid change, score 2
- high change, score 3
- Very high change, score 4

7.4.2 Overall increase of motorized trips in the road in the past 3 years: From market survey the overall increase in motorized trips can be recorded qualitatively. The scoring range is given below.

- Low **increase**, score 1
- mid **increase**, score 2
- high **increase**, score 3
- Very high **increase**, score 4

2.8.5 SC 7.5 Health Care facility connectivity

Like educational institutes, connectivity to health care facilities like hospitals and clinics are also an indirect but good measure for importance and performance of a paved road. To assess this, an approximate number of trips on the subject road leading to medical facilities can be considered. Also, another critical parameter is the no. of medical facilities directly connected by the road. Similarly, if there are more facilities that are on reliant on the subject road/ route it is also useful to consider the no. of such facilities that are commonly accessed via this road. The following three attributes are considered for this sub criteria.

7.5.1 No. of medical facilities directly connected by the road

The open street map and google map is utilized to check the location of the medical facilities. The total number of facilities that are directly connected to the project road is counted and marked in the map.

7.5.2 No. of facilities that are dependent on this road for access

Similarly other medical facilities within 2km buffer from the subject road that relies on this road for communication is the measure for this attribute.

Both of these attributes are measures in the following scale

- Low, score 1, 1 community clinic/ welfare center connected

- Moderate, score 2, 2 or more clinic/welfare center, health care centers connected
- High, score 3, 1 or more upazila health complex and health center connected.
- Very High, score 4, Medical college or general hospital connected.

Note: The following section is applicable for all the above attributes under SC 5.

Data collection frequency: Every year one time.

Data collection methodology: Market survey, digital form questionnaire survey at prominent markets associated with the road. Same as SC1.2.

Cost of data collection: same as SC1.2 (market survey cost 6000 BDT per day).

2.8.6 SC 7.7 Gender-Responsive Accessibility and Safety

7.7.1 % Of women reporting improved access to essential services (education, healthcare, market) due to road

Rural paved roads are critical for accessing the essential services like educational facilities, healthcare facilities and commercial facilities or market places. For Women to have safe and conformable journey on the rural road, some basic features should be there, like walkable shoulder or verge, in market or commercial areas dedicated walkway or footpath; convenient public transport stoppages on the road, good ride quality of the road (comfort and safety), night time visibility / street lights where applicable specially on route to essential facilities (education, health, markets).

Unit: % of response,

Method of Data Collection: Household / market survey (gender disaggregated)

Scoring: based on the female group interview survey, the % response affirming the improvement in accessibility to essential services is used for the following scale or scoring.

- very high satisfaction, Score 4
- High satisfaction, Score 3
- moderate satisfaction, Score 2
- low satisfaction, Score 1

7.7.2 % Of women using the road regularly for commuting or economic activity

Another important indicator of gender responsive accessibility improvement is the percentage of women using the road or commuting regularly. This represents the share of the road users from a gender perspective, although the share of women using the road has many indicators that impact the

The share of women road users can be collected or estimated from a gender-disaggregated traffic survey. Market survey or FGD with local female community can also provide critical qualitative indication to this percentage.

- very high share, score 4 (30-50% road users are female)
- High share, score 3 (20-30% road users are female)
- moderate share, score 2 (10-20% road users are female)
- low share, score 1 (0-10% road users are female)

3 Chapter 3 Performance Evaluation Framework

3.1 Overview of the process

The performance evaluation framework is presented below. First the list of criteria, sub criteria and attributes are checked or updated as required by LGED. Once the updated list is available an AHP questionnaire survey is conducted to get responses from LGED officials at various units and various positions. These responses are used in the AHP process to estimate the global weightage for all indicators (criteria, sub criteria and attributes). Once AHP based global weightage is set, the value for each attribute is inserted. Values are calculated or observed based on the specific data measure methods explained in the earlier section. To complete the scoring process, the values are checked against defined range or table and then assigned predefined scores based on their respective values. The scale for all attributes is kept same at a 1-4 level scale, this ensures consistency and avoids any unintended weightage to any attribute resulting from different scoring scale. The uniformity also allows the score to be done independently for each criterion and then simply adding them to get a combined score. Unlike other direct ranking tools, this method ensures that all roads performance is measured against a fixed base score or standard value instead of through a comparative assessment among a group of sample sites or roads.




Table 3-1 performance evaluation framework

3.2 What is AHP

The Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) is a decision-making technique designed to prioritize and rank options when multiple criteria are involved. It is particularly useful in complex scenarios where subjective judgments and expert opinions play a significant role. Through pairwise comparisons, AHP evaluates the relative importance of factors, assigning weights to each while ensuring a logical and consistent ranking. AHP was chosen for prioritizing the performance indicator / criteria due to its structured and systematic approach, which effectively addresses the limitations of other available tools (like Delphi, TOPSIS, or simple scoring/ranking techniques). While the Delphi method is useful for consensus-building, it lacks the ability to quantify priorities or provide precise rankings. TOPSIS, though suitable for multi-criteria problems, is computationally complex and less intuitive. Simple scoring/ranking techniques lack rigor, as they do not support pairwise comparisons or consistency checks, often leading to subjective results. By translating qualitative expert judgments into quantitative weightages, AHP overcomes these challenges. Its consistency ratio ensures logical coherence, enhancing both reliability and transparency. With its mathematical rigor and accessibility, AHP proved to be the most effective method for deriving credible and actionable rankings for the performance evaluation criteria.

3.3 Summary of the AHP method

The Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) steps are presented below.

3.3.1 Step 1: Development of Pairwise Comparison Form

A pairwise comparison survey was designed specifically for this study. The survey included structured questions where participants were asked to compare each pair of main criteria or theme based on their relative importance for road performance evaluation. The comparisons used the standard AHP scale, which is shown in the table below. This detailed scale allowed for careful evaluations and ensured accurate calculation of weights.

Table 3-2 Standard AHP Scale

Significance	Equal Importance	Moderate Importance	Strong Importance	Very Strong Importance	Extreme Importance
Scale Value	1	3	5	7	9

3.3.2 Step 2: Participant Selection

To ensure proper judgement, the selection of participants was limited to those expert personnel of LGED who have extensive expertise and a comprehensive understanding of paved road performance evaluation and has good understanding of LGEDs current practices. The list was developed in discussion and considering the recommendations from LGED. The designations and roles of the participants have been presented below. Apart from the senior officials, the list also includes six assistant engineers who are directly involved in planning and maintenance of LGED roads.

3.3.3 Step 3: Data Collection

Based on the participant list, a schedule was taken from each participant for the interview. The interviews were taken in person, where the participant filled out the forms in pen and then provided the filled-up copies to the interviewer. The interviewer provided the participant with an index and definition chart of the performance criteria and sub criteria and supported the process by providing explanation of the criteria as required. All inputs were then converted to an excel database. Respondents signed with date in the hardcopies which were also preserved by the interviewer.

A total of twenty-three responses were collected from various levels of LGED officials (Additional chief engineer, Superintending engineer, Executive Engineers Senior Assistant Engineers and Assistant Engineers). The inclusion criteria prioritized engineers in roles that directly related to road performance issues (road maintenance unit, quality control unit, road design unit and Road database and GIS unit).

3.3.4 Step 4: AHP Analysis

After collecting all the responses from the participants, the pairwise comparison data was analyzed using the following key steps:

1. **Matrix Formation and Calculations:** A comparison matrix was developed for each participant, with the criteria as rows and columns. Each cell represented the participant's judgment on the relative importance of two criteria. The principal eigenvector of each matrix was calculated using the general balanced-n scale to determine the relative weights of the criteria. These weights reflect the perceived importance of each front based on the judgments provided.
2. **Consistency Check:** A consistency ratio (CR) was calculated for the aggregated comparison matrix i.e., for the consolidated group. Geometric means were used to aggregate the individual judgements. A CR below 0.2 was considered acceptable for individual responses as suggested by Goepel, K.D. (2013), signifying that the results were consistent.

3. The individual weights from all participants were aggregated to determine group priorities. This involved calculating the geometric mean of the individual weights for each criterion, which provided an overall ranking. The aggregation process ensured that the group results captured diverse expert opinions while reflecting a consolidated priority structure.

3.4 How AHP is applied for developing the evaluation framework

For developing the evaluation framework, the first step was to conduct a pair wise comparison for the selected performance indicators classified or grouped into 7 criteria and 20 sub criteria. For this, 23 participants from LGED were interviewed for the AHP data collection work or collecting responses for the pairwise comparisons. Each participant was approached individually to record their response. Responses were collected in paper forms and then digitized in datasheet for assessment. To prioritize the performance criteria and sub criteria, this pairwise comparison was conducted for LGED officials from various levels from various units of LGED. The responses from the experts are used for developing relative weightage of each criterion, a comparison matrix was developed through AHP. The AHP derived weightage for criteria and sub criteria (for short term phase) are presented below,

Table 3-3 Criteria weightages

ID	Criteria Name	Weightage
1	Traffic Condition Assessment	0.222
2	Road Safety Assessment	0.139
3	Pavement Condition Assessment	0.312
4	Environmental Condition Assessment	0.051
5	Climate Condition Assessment	0.069
6	Road Structure Condition Assessment	0.144
7	Socio Economic Impact Assessment	0.063

From AHP method Local weightage has been calculated for all sub criteria and from the weightage of respective criteria, the global weightage for each sub criteria is also calculated.

Sub Criteria Global Weightage = Local weightage of the Sub criteria * weightage of the concern criteria

Table 3-4 Sub criteria weightages for short term phase

ID	SUB CRITERIA	Local Weightage	Global Weightage
1.1	Traffic volume	0.6	0.1332
1.2	Service Quality	0.4	0.0888
2.1	Percent encroachment	0.374100719	0.052
2.2	Crash risk assessment	0.625899281	0.087
3.1	Crack rate evaluation	0.294871795	0.092
3.2	Pot-hole assessment	0.320512821	0.1
3.3	Rutting evaluation	0.224358974	0.070
3.4	Surface roughness assessment	0.16025641	0.050
4.1	Air Pollution increase	0.637254902	0.0325
4.2	Noise Pollution increase	0.362745098	0.0185
5.1	Road closing days due to climate conditions	1	0.069
6.1	Drainage condition	0.583333333	0.084
6.2	Hydraulic structure condition	0.236111111	0.034
6.3	Slope Protection Condition	0.180555556	0.026
7.1	Agricultural Production increase	0.293650794	0.0185
7.2	Industrial Production increase	0.182539683	0.0115
7.3	Educational facility connectivity	0.198412698	0.0125
7.4	vehicle Ownership	0.119047619	0.0075
7.5	Health Care facility connectivity	0.134920635	0.0085
7.7	Gender-Responsive Accessibility and Safety	0.071428571	0.0045

For a combined assessment the Criteria scores are multiplied with the respective weightage to get the combined performance score.

$$\text{Combined Performance Score} = \text{Score C1} * \text{weightage C1} + \text{Score C2} * \text{weightage C2} + \text{Score C3} * \text{weightage C3} + \text{Score C4} * \text{weightage C4} + \text{Score C5} * \text{weightage C5}$$

Now for calculating the score for each criterion, respective attributes values for short-term phase are multiplied by the local weightage for that attribute. For all attributes local weightages are given below (under each criterion). Also, the global weightage for each attribute is given in the below table.

Table 3-5 Local Weightage of the Attributes for each criterion

ID	Measures / Attributes	Local Weightage	Global Weightage
C1 Traffic Condition Assessment			
1.1.1	AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic)	0.3	0.0666
1.1.2	Number of Commercial Vehicle (CVD)	0.15	0.0333
1.1.3	%NMV & %SMVT (Non-Motorized vehicle and slow-moving vehicular traffic)	0.09	0.01998
1.1.4	Peak Hour Flow (PCU/hr)	0.06	0.01332
1.2.1	% travel cost increased in 3 years	0.08	0.0666
1.2.2	% travel speed decreased in 3 years	0.08	0.0333
1.2.3	user satisfaction level (riding quality, safety, mobility)	0.24	0.01998
C2 Road Safety Assessment			
2.1.1	% road area encroached by illegal parking or temporary stalls or hawkers	0.12470024	0.017333333
2.1.2	% road area encroached by bazar activities, shops fronts, car workshops	0.12470024	0.017333333
2.1.3	% road area encroached by permanent structures or shops/ buildings	0.12470024	0.017333333
2.2.1	no. of crashes total per year	0.15647482	0.02175
2.2.2	no. of fatality per year	0.15647482	0.02175
2.2.3	no. of serious injury per year	0.15647482	0.02175
2.2.4	pedestrian safety condition	0.15647482	0.02175
C3 Pavement Condition Assessment			
3.1.1	PSCI (crack index)	0.294871795	0.092
3.2.1	Area of potholes per km	0.320512821	0.1
3.3.1	Rutting length per km	0.224358974	0.07
3.4.1	Average IRI (m/km)	0.16025641	0.05
C4 Environmental Condition Assessment			
4.1.1	increase in air pollution in last 3 years	0.637254902	0.0325
4.1.3	increase in noise pollution in last 3 years	0.362745098	0.0185
C5 Climate Condition Assessment			
5.1.1	extreme weather related to the inaccessibility of road to users (flood, Cyclone, road or bridge seriously damaged or broken)	1	0.069
C6 Road Structure Condition Assessment			
6.1.1	road side drainage condition (flow, continuity)	0.240740741	0.034666667
6.1.2	% of road subject to waterlogging	0.171296296	0.024666667
6.1.3	no. of days of waterlogging	0.171296296	0.024666667
6.2.1	flow condition	0.118055556	0.017
6.2.2	structural stability condition	0.118055556	0.017
6.3.1	structural condition	0.090277778	0.013
6.3.2	erosion risk	0.090277778	0.013
C7 Socio Economic Impact Assessment			

ID	Measures / Attributes	Local Weightage	Global Weightage
7.1.1	overall increase in production in the surrounding community owing to the road in past 5 years	0.146825397	0.00925
7.1.2	increase in no. of goods vehicles for agricultural goods on the road	0.146825397	0.00925
7.2.1	overall increase in production in union/upazila served by the road in past 5 years	0.091269841	0.00575
7.2.2	increase in no. of goods vehicles for industrial goods on the road	0.091269841	0.00575
7.3.1	no. of educational institute directly connected	0.198412698	0.0125
7.4.1	vehicle ownership increase	0.05952381	0.00375
7.4.2	increase of motorized trips	0.05952381	0.00375
7.5.1	no. of medical facilities directly connected by the road	0.067460317	0.00425
7.5.2	no. of facilities that are dependent on this road for access	0.067460317	0.00425
7.7.1	% of women reporting improved access to essential services (education, healthcare, market) due to road	0.035714286	0.00225
7.7.2	% of women using the road regularly for commuting or economic activity	0.035714286	0.00225
7.5.1	no. of medical facilities directly connected by the road	0.067460317	0.00925
7.5.2	no. of facilities that are dependent on this road for access	0.067460317	0.00925

3.5 Performance evaluation guideline for short-term phase

Utilizing the weightage derived from the practice or AHP process, the following performance score formula can be formulated. The following formulas are for the seven criteria.

- $C1 = AT\ 1.1.1 * 0.3 + AT\ 1.1.2 * 0.15 + AT\ 1.1.3 * 0.09 + AT\ 1.1.4 * 0.06 + AT\ 1.2.1 * 0.08 + AT\ 1.2.2 * 0.08 + AT\ 1.2.3 * 0.24$
- $C2 = AT\ 2.1.1 * 0.1247 + AT\ 2.1.2 * 0.1247 + AT\ 2.1.3 * 0.1247 + AT\ 2.2.1 * 0.15647 + AT\ 2.2.2 * 0.15647 + AT\ 2.2.3 * 0.15647 + AT\ 2.2.4 * 0.15647$
- $C3 = AT\ 3.1.1 * 0.294871795 + AT\ 3.2.1 * 0.320512821 + AT\ 3.3.1 * 0.224358974 + AT\ 3.4.1 * 0.16025641$
- $C4 = AT\ 4.1.1 * 0.63725 + AT\ 4.1.3 * 0.36275$
- $C5 = AT\ 5.1.1 * 1$
- $C6 = AT\ 6.1.1 * 0.24074 + AT\ 6.1.2 * 0.1713 + AT\ 6.1.3 * 0.1713 + AT\ 6.2.1 * 0.11806 + AT\ 6.2.2 * 0.11806 + AT\ 6.3.1 * 0.09028 + AT\ 6.3.2 * 0.09028$
- $C7 = AT\ 7.1.1 * 0.14683 + AT\ 7.1.2 * 0.14683 + AT\ 7.2.1 * 0.09127 + AT\ 7.2.2 * 0.09127 + AT\ 7.3.1 * 0.19841 + AT\ 7.4.1 * 0.05952 + AT\ 7.4.2 * 0.05952 + AT\ 7.5.1 * 0.06746 + AT\ 7.5.2 * 0.06746 + AT\ 7.7.1 * 0.03571 + AT\ 7.7.2 * 0.03571$

Here, the calculation for each attribute value is done using the following formula

Attribute Value * Local Weightage = Attribute weighted Score

Criteria Score = \sum weighted score for all attributes

This method allows score assessment for individual criteria.

From the pilot sites, Site 3 data is used to demonstrate the equation below. Detail estimation is given in appendix D. The results or scores for each criterion are shown below.

- Criteria 1 C1 score = 2.94, Base score 4, hence C1 score is 74%
- Criteria 2 C2 score = 2.65 Base score 4, hence C2 score is 66%
- Criteria 3 C3 score = 2.907 Base score 4, hence C3 score is 69%
- Criteria 4 C4 score = 2 Base score 4, hence C4 score is 50%
- Criteria 5 C5 score = 2 Base score 4, hence C5 score is 50%
- Criteria 6 C6 score = 2.347 Base score 4, hence C6 score is 59%
- Criteria 7 C7 score = 1.7103 Base score 4, hence C7 score is 43%

Combined weighted Score for performance is then derived simply by adding all the weighted scores for all criteria

$$PS = C1 * W + C2 * W + C3 * W + C4 * W + C5 * W + C6 * W + C7 * W$$

Combined Scoring

$$PS = 2.94 \times 0.222 + 2.655 \times 0.139 + 2.744 \times 0.312 + 2 \times 0.051 + 2 \times 0.069 + 2.347 \times 0.144 + 1.710 \times 0.063$$

PS = 2.614407, Base score for combined is 4

Hence Performance score of Site 3, is $(2.563/4) = 64.07\%$

Now the performance framework Scale is defined as 1 Poor, 2 Moderate, 3 Good and 4 Excellent.

Hence the following scoring range for performance is proposed

- 0-25% Score reflects Poor Performance
- 26-50% Score reflects Moderate Performance
- 51-75% Score reflects Good Performance
- 76-100% Score reflects Excellent Performance

Table: Summary of performance of site 3

ID	Criteria	Score	Remarks
1	Traffic Condition Assessment	74	Excellent
2	Road Safety Assessment	66	Good
3	Pavement Condition Assessment	69	Good
4	Environmental Condition Assessment	50	Moderate
5	Climate Condition Assessment	50	Moderate
6	Road Structure Condition Assessment	59	Good
7	Socio Economic Impact Assessment	43	Moderate
Weighted Combined Score		65/100	Good

So, Site 3 assessment reflects Good Performance

3.6 Performance evaluation guideline for other phases

In order to include the mid-term or long-term phase new/ additional indicators, the following steps are to be followed

- Define the new indicators and update the AHP pair-wise comparison questionnaire
- Carryout survey and do the AHP analysis with new indicators
- Determine the updated global weightage for all indicators
- Update the performance evaluation score equation

Chapter 4 Data Collection methodology



4 Chapter 4 Data Collection methodology

For the performance evaluation work, data collection should be carried out in two methods. Primary data collection through field survey and secondary data collection from LGED & online databases.

4.1 Primary data collection through field survey

For the primary data collection, the following field survey works are identified and listed below.

- A. Traffic video data collection from fixed points on the road.
- B. Drive through video data collection
- C. Market Interview Survey
- D. Air and Noise pollution data collection
- E. Structure Inspection survey



Traffic video data collection



Drive through video data collection



Market Interview Survey



Air & Noise Pollution Survey



Structure Inspection survey

Table 4-1 Data collection methods for field survey

4.1.1 Traffic video data collection from fixed point on the road.

This will be achieved by putting an outdoor IP video camera at a suitable point beside the road, covering the traffic movement in both directions. Typically, the camera is setup at a vantage point or at least at a height more than 4m, however depending on the nature of the road and roadside development situations, the camera can be setup on Shop roofs, on billboard or tree top or attached to the roadside poles. Video will be collected for 16 hours on each road covering both direction flow.

For rural roads, the nighttime traffic is very insignificant hence 24 hours data collection is not considered in general. However, in case of special site conditions (urban area, nighttime commercial truck activities, cargo movement etc.) if necessary 24 hours data can also be collected. This will be decided based on the filed reconnaissance.

Depending on the length of the road, multiple camera installation might be necessary. Identification of the optimum location suitable for capturing the maximum flow of the traffic is essential for this survey. Camera locations should not be directly on a junction as well as inside the market area. It is preferred to install the camera near / edge of the market avoiding typical UCM and truck parking spots.

Once the data is collected, the video will be assessed to develop the classified traffic count through a manual observation method (conventional method / contemporary practice) that has some advantages compared to the on-site manual tally method (greater accuracy); however, another method proposed is utilizing AI image detection method for automatically classify the traffic count from the video data. Although this practice is very limited or not common for LGED, this AI based tool is extensively used in other countries and this is essential for LGED to adopt to achieve greater accuracy, reliability and cost effectiveness in mass scale traffic data collection programs.




Table 4-2 traffic volume survey video capture method

The traffic data for the pilot sites were processed through two methods, one is manual counting from observing the video at desk and creating tally sheets. The other method is using an AI model to utilize image processing technique to create traffic data sheet. For the AI system there are many international vendors like Good Vision, Datafromsky and many more. However, for the pilot project a local vendors product has been tested for the application of AI in determining the 15 vehicle classes of Bangladesh.



Table 4-3 AI traffic video processing platforms

4.1.2 Drive through video data collection

Survey Team will drive through the road, collecting high-resolution video of the road surface, with action camera mounted at front and back of the survey vehicle. The wide-angle view of the action camera will also capture the roadside scenario during the data collection. The video will be collected in an uninterrupted way, for which the data collection time should be chosen during the least traffic period or off-peak period. If possible, a Police vehicle / LGED vehicle should run ahead of the survey vehicle to create a clear view in front of the survey vehicle to allow clear capture of the road surface. A series of three vehicles can ensure this, preferably one being a police patrol vehicle.

The quality and clarity of the captured video is of enormous importance as the success of data extraction through AI image processing will highly depend on the quality of the input.

Apart from the image processing purposes, the wide-angle video collected will also be used for roadside condition and land use pattern observations.



Table 4-4 action camera for collecting drive through video

The road pavement video data is processed through a AI platform to list all the pavement defect or anomalies in distinct categories like potholes, cracks, raveling, garbage etc. For the pilot data processing “Road athena” platform is utilized to get the number and percentage of potholes and cracks.



Table 4-5 AI pavement defect video processing platform

4.1.3 Market Interview Survey

The associated growth centers and rural markets on the pilot site roads will be listed for conducting market interview surveys. For each site, all-important markets on the roadside will be surveyed. The nearest growth center will also be surveyed, considering the subject road has any direct connection to the GC. If the nearest GC is too far / has no connection to the pilot site road, then Growth center survey will be skipped.

The market interview will provide great insight in local traffic travel patterns, Origin destination pairs, travel challenges, traffic mix, road safety and road crash scenarios, adverse weather impacts on road, closing days of the road due to extreme weather events etc.

4.1.4 Air and Noise pollution data collection

Air pollution data collection

For air pollution measurement on the road, handheld particulate meter will be used, to measure the PM10, PM2.5 and PM1.0 levels. The device will be kept stationary for 8 hours in start and end of the road and if the road is longer than 5km, then after each 5km the data collection process would be repeated.



Table 4-6 Air pollution measure handheld device (PM10 and PM2.5)

Noise pollution collection

To measure the noise pollution of the road. The reading will be taken at various points of the road, preferably at locations of high and low congestion.



Table 4-7 Handheld Noise level measurement device

4.1.5 Hydraulic and drainage structure condition survey

The culverts and bridges on the road will be monitored to check the functional condition of the structure and pictures will be taken as record.

4.2 Secondary data collection from online sources and LGED offices

There are two main sources for secondary data collection, one is LGEDs own database, and the other one is various government and non-government organizations. Both sources are discussed below.

4.2.1 LGED Databases

As described in the chapter C, many measures of the performance indicators will be collected from the existing archives and database of LGED. For this purpose, consultant will collect LGED database information from the listed units of LGED.

- LGED's Road and Structure Database Management System (RSDMS)
- GIS division/ GIS portal
- Road maintenance Unit database
- Quality control Unit database
- Field office database (for the selected eight sites).




Table 4-8 LGED GIS PORTAL

These will include construction history of the road, pavement thickness, maintenance history, various investment or improvement projects, road improvement and rehabilitation history, soil reports, traffic and axle load information, roadside settlement information, road furniture and other asset information, bridge and culvert structure information etc.

4.3 Level of effort and cost for each method

Data collection method	Collected data	Level of Effort	Cost per site or Cost per day*	Remarks
Traffic flow video collection	High res. Video Excel datasheet	Field work little Desk work manual high Desk work AI little	8000*	One surveyor One camera set
Drive through video collection for pavement and road condition	High res. Video GIS database	Field work little Desk work AI little	10000*	One surveyor One action camera set
Market Interview Survey	Interview form Excel sheet	Field work moderate Desk work little	6000	one surveyor, digital forms
Noise Level monitoring	8 hrs Reading data in excel	Field work moderate Desk work little	5000	One surveyor, one device
Air pollution monitoring	8 hrs Reading data in excel	Field work moderate Desk work little	5000	One surveyor, one device
Hydraulic structures condition survey	Condition form with pictures	Field work moderate Desk work little	3000	One surveyor and local transport

*Costs include all rent, field expenditure and other costs. Also, rates are indicative only, depending on work volume and the competitiveness of the procurement rates may vary.

4.3.1 Year wise / or frequency of the data collection

Data collection method	Frequency
Traffic flow video collection	Twice every year (dry and wet season) for 12 hours hat and non-hat day, variable locations. Throughout the year at one location in all upazila. (one fixed station)
Drive through video collection for pavement and road condition	Once every year (dry season)
Market Interview Survey	Once every year
Noise Level monitoring & Air pollution monitoring	Once every year during the market survey, 24 hours survey work. Throughout the year at one location in all upazila. (one fixed station)
Hydraulic structures condition survey	Once every year or after major disasters

4.3.2 Storage and archiving and management of the database

The collected data intended for performance evaluation needs to be archived in the LGED road database system. It is expected to integrate the collected data in a standard modern Road asset management system or RAMS.

4.3.3 Monitoring and evaluation of the guideline implementation

The performance evaluation process should be monitored and reviewed for improvement throughout the year. The data collection, processing and using the data to evaluate the performance score of a LGED road need throughout the year monitoring and evaluation and review for improvement and maintaining the quality of work.

4.3.4 CQI of the framework

Few examples are explored below to understand how continuous quality improvement of the performance framework can benefit the overall effectiveness and reliability of the performance equation.

- *The framework could benefit from a filter option or dependent set of variables that are associated with a certain general characteristic of the sites.*
- *For special site conditions, the scoring process should be able to adapt to the new challenges.*
- *Explore and introduce correlation between parameters or attributes.*

Chapter 5 Conclusion



5 Chapter 5 Conclusion

The guideline is developed to assess performance of any rural paved road of LGED. However, there could be special scenarios or cases where the evaluation framework or equation may require updates or modifications. Also, the guideline is proposed for a short-term phase of 3 years and highly focuses on methodology that are easily available to implement, scalable to mass scale programs and requires minimal level of effort and are adaptable to budget constraints. The evaluation process should be updated based on the field observations and implementation challenges through continuous quality improvement process.

5.1 Updates Required

The guideline is detailed for short-term implementation and have been established based on the results and observations from pilot work at eight sites around the country. Thus, this guideline may require additional updates while upgrading to the mid-term phase and while implementing to special scenarios that the pilot work could not encompass. The inclusion of new parameters and changes to proposed parameter evaluation would be possible to accommodate within the same evaluation structure with the following efforts only.

- Update the AHP study to update the global weightage
- Based on new scenario or observations update the measurement method or unit
- Evaluation process or scoring to be updated accordingly.

5.1.1 How to update the AHP

- Update the questionnaire form to include desired changes
- Prepare list of participants and conduct the survey
- Carry out the assessment and derive new global weightages for sub criteria/ attributes.
- Use the new global weightages in the performance evaluation equation

5.2 Actions needs for implementation

5.2.1 RAMS

LGED should establish a modern road asset management system for efficient management of its vast road assets throughout the country and develop a robust asset database through regular reliable data collection efforts compatible with the RAMS.

5.2.2 Budget

LGED should develop a comprehensive survey plan for the evaluation of paved road performance and allocate sufficient budget for the field work and assessment efforts. The survey data can be greatly useful to LGED if the data is integrated into the RAMS. The traffic and road condition data would also be greatly beneficial to road development or rehabilitation projects. Updating from the conventional labor-intensive manual data collection practices would eventually prove to be more economical.

Appendix



Appendix A. Questionnaire survey


Market Survey Questionnaire

Questionnaire for the performance evaluation framework

- 1.2.1 % travel cost increased in 3 years
☐ 4 low ☐ 3 moderate ☐ 2 high ☐ 1 very high
- 1.2.2 % travel speed decreased in 3 years
☐ 4 low ☐ 3 moderate ☐ 2 high ☐ 1 very high
- 1.2.3 user satisfaction level (riding quality, safety, mobility)
☐ 4 highly satisfactory ☐ 3 satisfactory ☐ 2 neutral ☐ 1 not satisfactory
- 2.2.1 no. of crashes total per km per year _____ mention number
- 2.2.2 no. of fatality per km per year _____ mention number
- 2.2.3 no. of serious injury per km per year _____ mention number
- 2.2.4 pedestrian safety condition
☐ 4 very safe ☐ 3 safe ☐ 2 neutral ☐ 1 not safe
- 4.1.1 increase in air pollution in last 3 years
☐ 4 low ☐ 3 moderate ☐ 2 high ☐ 1 very high
- 4.2.1 increase in noise pollution in last 3 years
☐ 4 low ☐ 3 moderate ☐ 2 high ☐ 1 very high
- 5.1.1 extreme weather related to the inaccessibility of road to users (flood, Cyclone, road or bridge seriously damaged or broken) _____ mention days
- 6.1.2 % of road subject to waterlogging _____ mention days
- 6.1.3 no. of days of waterlogging _____ mention days
- 7.1.1 overall increase in production in the surrounding community owing to the road in past 5 years
☐ 4 Very High ☐ 3 High ☐ 2 Moderate ☐ 1 Low
- 7.1.2 Increase in number of goods vehicles for agricultural goods on the road
☐ 4 Very High ☐ 3 High ☐ 2 Moderate ☐ 1 Low
- 7.2.1 overall increase in production in union/upazila served by the road in past 5 years
☐ 4 Very High ☐ 3 High ☐ 2 Moderate ☐ 1 Low
- 7.2.2 increase in number of goods vehicles for industrial goods on the road
☐ 4 Very High ☐ 3 High ☐ 2 Moderate ☐ 1 Low
- 7.4.1 Vehicle ownership increase
☐ 4 Very High ☐ 3 High ☐ 2 Moderate ☐ 1 Low
- 7.4.2 Increase of motorized trips
☐ 4 Very High ☐ 3 High ☐ 2 Moderate ☐ 1 Low
- 7.7.1 % of women reporting improved access to essential services (education, healthcare, market) due to road
☐ 4 Very High ☐ 3 High ☐ 2 Moderate ☐ 1 Low
- 7.7.2 % of women using the road regularly for commuting or economic activity
☐ 4 Very High ☐ 3 High ☐ 2 Moderate ☐ 1 Low

Appendix B. AI-Based Pavement Surface Evaluation Using Regular Cameras for LGED Roads

1. Literature Review of Automated Pavement Surface Distress Evaluation



Modern approaches to pavement evaluation are undergoing a transition from manual visual inspections and laser-based profilers to flexible, camera-based systems supported by artificial intelligence (AI). At the forefront of this evolution is the application of regular video cameras, including smartphone-grade devices, in combination with deep learning algorithms to quantify pavement surface condition.

Nguyen et al. (2023) highlighted the use of both manual and automated image-based approaches to monitor pavement cracking in Singapore's road network. Their study adopted the ASTM E3303-21 standard, which introduces the Pavement Surface Cracking Metric (PSCM) and the Pavement Surface Cracking Index (PSCI)—both computed solely from images of the pavement surface.

This is significant because the ASTM E3303-21 method does not require crack type classification but focuses on measuring crack length and width within defined analysis areas. While Nguyen's study used high-resolution 3D images from an LCMS-2 system, the standard itself allows for adaptation to 2D image analysis, which means that a network-level application using standard digital cameras is feasible for organizations like LGED, provided AI-assisted detection methods are properly trained.

Balzarini et al. (2021) further validated the PSCM/PSCI concept, simulating thousands of pavement sections with different crack types and dimensions. They demonstrated that PSCI could be reliably used to represent surface distress severity even when traditional PCI calculation was not possible due to limited data or missing input on structural conditions. Importantly, PSCI was found to strongly correlate with PCI when surface distresses dominated the pavement condition.

In parallel, AI-based systems for pothole detection and measurement have also emerged. Many of these systems use object detection architectures like YOLOv5 and YOLOv8, trained on datasets such

as RDD2020 and GAPs, which allow real-time detection and classification of potholes in regular video streams. The size and shape of potholes can be approximated using pixel dimensions referenced against known vehicle calibration data or lane markings. Several implementations in countries such as India and Vietnam have demonstrated successful application of these systems using motorcycle-mounted or dashboard-mounted smartphones, validating their suitability for resource-constrained environments.

Together, these studies form a foundation for adopting PSCI and complementary visual distress metrics (including potholes) as practical tools in low-resource settings. The technology stack for this approach includes basic vehicle-mounted video cameras, image annotation, pothole detection, and crack segmentation algorithms using convolutional neural networks (CNNs).

2. Review of Relevant Codes and Benchmarks

The ASTM E3303-21 standard specifies how to compute PSCM and PSCI based on measured crack length (L), crack width (w), and the area (A) of each analysis tile:



$$\text{PSCM} = (100 * L * w) / A$$

$$\text{PSCI} = 100 * \exp(-0.45 * \text{PSCM})$$

The PSCI transforms a physical crack density metric into a standardized index ranging from 0 (worst) to 100 (best). This can be aligned with maintenance decisions, as Nguyen's Singaporean study proposed three severity thresholds: $\text{PSCI} \geq 75$ (low severity), $50 < \text{PSCI} < 75$ (moderate), and $\text{PSCI} \leq 50$ (high severity).

Balzarini (2021) clarified that while PSCI is not a direct replacement for PCI, it functions as an analogous surface condition index. Their methodology split each road segment into standard zones—central, wheel-path, and edge—and further into tiles, each analyzed for crack dimensions using either laser or high-resolution imaging. Critically, this method allows PSCI to be computed even with partial coverage or irregular data—making it ideal for image-based surveys using regular video.

The AASHTO R85 protocol complements this by setting detection performance standards for automated image analysis tools. Systems should identify at least 85% of cracks wider than 5 mm and 60% of those between 3–5 mm, with a minimum detection accuracy of 33% for finer cracks. These standards, although developed for high-fidelity imaging, serve as validation goals for AI-based detection models operating on standard RGB images, including those used for potholes and patching detection.

**Table 5-1 Flowchart PSCM/PSCI Calculation and integration to LGED framework****Table 5-2 Example Software Capacity**

3. Evaluation of LGED Road from Potholes and Cracking Parameters

3.1 Contextual Challenges for LGED

LGED manages an extensive rural road network composed of both paved and unpaved segments. Manual inspection is time-consuming, subjective, and difficult to scale. Advanced laser scanning systems like LCMS-2 are cost-prohibitive for widespread use in Bangladesh. Therefore, LGED requires an intermediate standard that allows for scalable, repeatable, and objective assessment using accessible tools.

A practical solution involves vehicle-mounted cameras (such as dashcams or smartphones) and AI models trained to detect surface distresses from these images. While the lack of laser resolution restricts precise measurement of crack widths and pothole depths, visual estimation of crack area coverage, pothole size, pattern density, and continuity allow PSCM and thus PSCI to be approximated.

3.2 Adapting PSCI and Pothole Detection for Visual Rating from Regular Cameras

LGED can adopt the PSCI scale as a proxy for crack-based pavement condition and use object detection algorithms to identify potholes. A simplified workflow is as follows:

1. Data Collection: Use standard video cameras to collect pavement surface imagery across 10 m segments.
2. AI Detection: Use neural networks (e.g., U-Net, YOLOv8) to detect cracks and potholes.
3. PSCM Calculation: Use tile-based segmentation to compute estimated PSCM values, interpolated from visible crack data.
4. PSCI Assignment: Convert PSCM to PSCI using:

$$\text{PSCI} = 100 * e^{(-0.45 * \text{PSCM})}$$

or the alternative version by Balzarini:

$$\text{PSCI} = 15 + 85 * e^{(-0.64 * \text{PSCM})}$$

5. Pothole Quantification: Count potholes and estimate size using bounding box dimensions against lane width references.
6. Condition Rating:
 - $\text{PSCI} \geq 75 \rightarrow \text{Good}$
 - $50 < \text{PSCI} < 75 \rightarrow \text{Fair}$
 - $\text{PSCI} \leq 50 \rightarrow \text{Poor}$
 - Supplement with pothole counts or patching severity as a qualitative layer

Bibliography

- ASTM E3303-21. (2021). Standard Practice for Generating Pavement Surface Cracking Indices from Digital Images. ASTM International.
- Balzarini, A., Xu, B., Bennett, C. R., & Branthwaite, M. (2021). Development and calibration of a visual pavement condition index for network-level assessments. *Transportation Research Record*, 2675(12), 1084–1096.
- Nguyen, T., Lee, K., Tan, J. Y., & Ho, N. Y. (2023). Proposed severity ranking for ASTM E3303-21 protocol to quantify asphalt pavement cracking from automated 3D surveys. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 1289(1), 012057.
- AASHTO R85-18. (2018). Standard Practice for Quantifying Cracks in Asphalt Pavement Surfaces from Collected Pavement Images Utilizing Automated Methods. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials.
- Road Damage Detection Challenge (RDD2020). (2020). IEEE Big Data 2020.
- GAPs Dataset. (2021). Global Asphalt Pavement Dataset for Pothole Detection and Surface Condition Monitoring.

Appendix C. Pilot Sites summary

Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Division	Rajshahi	Dhaka	Rangpur	Mymensingh	Chattogram	Sylhet	Barishal	Khulna
District	Sirajganj	Gazipur	Dinajpur	Netrokona	Cox's bazar	Sunamganj	Barishal	Bagerhat
Upazila	Ullapara	Sadar	Sadar	Madan	Ramu	Jagannathpur	Gouranadi	Mongla
Road Type	Upazila	Upazila	Upazila	Upazila	Union Road	Union Road	Upazila	Village Road A
Road no.	188942004	333302005	127643005	372562001	422663002	690473020	506322002	20158 4007
Road Name	Hatikumrul R&H-Tarash GC road	Rajandrapur-MirzapurRoad	Ranigonj GC to Motunirhat(Kaharol) GC via-Jamtoli,Nasipurt Road.	Madan-Fatepur (Hatshira) GC Road	Garjania UP Office - Thimchhari (Baisari) Road.	Jagdal UP - Kabirpur (Jagannathpur GC)) via Bhurakhali (Jagannathpur part) road	Batazore-Agorpur-Sarikul via Hosnabad-Nalgora-Miarchar road.	Khasherdanga-Dhonkhali
Road length km	12.38	6.65	5.5	13.39	7.7	8.00	17.18	4.3
• Earthen								
• BC	12.38	5.33	5.75	13.39	7.7		16.18	
• HBB								0.13
• RCC		1.32				8.00	1	
• Uni block								4.17
Bridge/culvert no.	10	3	16	40	23	7	24	5
Bridge/culvert Length m	126.05	100.2	319.7	213.8	82.9	13.4	202.7	16.4
GC	None, nearest Boalia hat (5km away)	GC MIRZAPUR BAZAR	GC Raniganj Hat, burir hat bazar	GC Fatehpur bazar, Parashkhila & Balali bazar	Time bazar, Thimchori bazar	None, nearest bazar chilaura bazar	GC Batajor, GC sarikul hat	None, nearest is gopper hat
District/upazila/ Union HQ	Hatikamrul union HQ, Salanga union HQ	Bangla bazar Rajendrapur chowrasta bazar	Fazilpur Union HQ	Fatehpur, Tiasree & Madan union HQ	Garjana Union HQ	None	Batajor Union HQ Sarikul Union HQ	None

Appendix D. Pilot Site 3 score Calculation

ID	Measures / Attributes	LW	Value	Score	weighted score
1.1.1	AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic)	0.3	9595	4	1.2
1.1.2	No. of Commercial Vehicle (CVD)	0.15	97	3	0.45
1.1.3	%NMV & %SMVT (Non-Motorized vehicle and slow-moving vehicular traffic)	0.09	90%	1	0.09
1.1.4	Peak Hour Flow (PCU/hr)	0.06	534	4	0.24
1.2.1	% travel cost increased in 3 years	0.08	moderate	3	0.24
1.2.2	% travel speed decreased in 3 years	0.08	moderate	3	0.24
1.2.3	user satisfaction level (riding quality, safety, mobility)	0.24	neutral	2	0.48
2.1.1	% road area encroached by illegal parking or temporary stalls or hawkers	0.12470024	0%	4	0.498801
2.1.2	% road area encroached by bazar activities, shops fronts, car workshops	0.12470024	16%	2	0.2494
2.1.3	% road area encroached by permanent structures or shops/ buildings	0.12470024	0%	4	0.498801
2.2.1	no. of crashes total per 5km per year	0.15647482	very high	1	0.156475
2.2.2	no. of fatality per 5km per year	0.15647482	low	4	0.625899
2.2.3	no. of serious injury per 5km per year	0.15647482	very high	1	0.156475
2.2.4	pedestrian safety condition	0.15647482	safe	3	0.469424
3.1.1	PSCI (crack index)	0.294871795	76	3	0.884615
3.2.1	Area of potholes per km	0.320512821	32	2	0.641026
3.2.1	Rutting length per km	0.224358974	0	4	0.897436
3.4.1	Average IRI (m/km)	0.16025641	9.48	2	0.320513
4.1.1	increase in air pollution in last 3 years	0.637254902	moderate	2	1.27451
4.1.3	increase in noise pollution in last 3 years	0.362745098	moderate	2	0.72549
5.1.1	extreme weather related to the inaccessibility of road to users (flood, Cyclone, road or bridge seriously damaged or broken)	1	14 days/year	2	2

ID	Measures / Attributes	LW	Value	Score	weighted score
6.1.1	road side drainage condition (flow, continuity)	0.240740741	poor	1	0.240741
6.1.2	% of road subject to waterlogging	0.171296296	10%	3	0.513889
6.1.3	no. of days of waterlogging	0.171296296	14 days/year	2	0.342593
6.2.1	flow condition	0.118055556	good	3	0.354167
6.2.2	structural stability condition	0.118055556	good	3	0.354167
6.3.1	structural condition	0.090277778	good	3	0.270833
6.3.2	erosion risk	0.090277778	good	3	0.270833
7.1.1	overall increase in production in the surrounding community owing to the road in past 5 years	0.146825397	moderate	2	0.293651
7.1.2	increase in no. of goods vehicles for agricultural goods on the road	0.146825397	moderate	2	0.293651
7.2.1	overall increase in production in union/upazila served by the road in past 5 years	0.091269841	low	1	0.09127
7.2.2	increase in no. of goods vehicles for industrial goods on the road	0.091269841	low	1	0.09127
7.3.1	no. of educational institute directly connected	0.198412698	4	2	0.396825
7.4.1	vehicle ownership increase	0.05952381	high	3	0.178571
7.4.2	increase of motorized trips	0.05952381	moderate	2	0.119048
7.5.1	no. of medical facilities directly connected by the road	0.067460317	low	1	0.06746
7.5.2	no. of facilities that are dependent on this road for access	0.067460317	none	0	0
7.7.1	% of women reporting improved access to essential services (education, healthcare, market) due to road	0.035714286	high	3	0.107143
7.7.2	% of women using the road regularly for commuting or economic activity	0.035714286	moderate	2	0.071429

Performance score PS = C1 x W + C2 x W + C3 x W + C4 x W + C5 x W + C6 x W + C7 x W

Performance score **PS= 2.94 x 0.222 + 2.655 x 0.139 + 2.743589 x 0.312 + 2 x 0.051 + 2 x 0.069 + 2.347 x 0.144 + 1.710 x 0.063**

Performance score PS = 2.563; Base score for combined is 4; Hence Performance score of Site 3 is (2.563 / 4) = 64.07%

Site 3 assessment reflects Good Performance.