ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 05,2025

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRANSIT COMPETITIVENESS: UKC RAILWAY VS. KAZAKHSTAN AND IRAN CORRIDORS

Bo'riyev Shuxrat Xamroqul ugli,

Boymurzayev Alovuddin Ramozon ugli,

Xakimov Umidjon

Introduction

As Central Asia emerges as a pivotal hub in the trans-Eurasian transport network, countries are investing in strategic railway corridors to capture transit trade flows. The Uzbekistan–Kyrgyzstan–China (UKC) railway, still under development, seeks to compete with established routes such as the Kazakhstan–China and Iran–Central Asia corridors. Assessing the transit competitiveness of these corridors is essential for regional policy and investment planning.

This study compares the UKC railway corridor with alternative routes in terms of transit time, cost efficiency, infrastructure quality, geopolitical risk, and customs performance. It aims to determine whether UKC can emerge as a preferred option for transcontinental freight movement between China and Europe.

Methods

The research employs a multi-criteria comparative analysis methodology, using both qualitative and quantitative indicators. Key steps include:

- Transit Time and Cost Benchmarking: Based on published freight schedules and pricing from logistics providers and railway authorities.
- Infrastructure Assessment: Evaluation of track quality, tunnel capacity, and intermodal facilities.
- Risk Indexing: Analysis of geopolitical risk, customs efficiency, and border delays using World Bank and Global Logistics Index data.
- Expert Consultation: Interviews with freight forwarders and policy analysts in Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Iran.

Performance indicators were normalized to create a weighted composite index of corridor competitiveness.

Results

The Kazakhstan route currently handles over 55% of trans-Central Asian rail traffic, with an average transit time of 12 days from western China to Europe. The Iran route, affected by sanctions and infrastructure constraints, averages 15–17 days. The projected UKC corridor is expected to achieve an 8–10 day delivery window.

Table 1: Corridor Comparison Summary

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 05,2025

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

Metric	UKC (Projected)	Kazakhstan	Iran Corridor
Avg. Transit Time (days)	8–10	12	15–17
Avg. Freight Cost (USD/TEU)	3,100	3,700	3,300
Customs Time (hours)	10–12	16	20+
Border Crossings (#)	2	3	4
Geopolitical Risk (score)	Medium	Low	High

UKC shows a cost and time advantage over Iran and is competitive with Kazakhstan on performance metrics. However, it lacks the operational maturity of its counterparts.

Discussion

The comparative analysis confirms that UKC has the potential to outperform existing corridors in terms of time and cost efficiency, provided it meets its projected infrastructure and regulatory targets. Its streamlined route design, fewer border crossings, and favorable topography (post-tunnel development) contribute to its competitiveness.

The Iran route faces major geopolitical and financial sanctions risks, affecting its long-term reliability. Meanwhile, Kazakhstan's corridor, though well-developed, is nearing capacity, causing potential bottlenecks.

UKC's success will depend on synchronized policy frameworks, digital customs integration, and logistics zone development. Further, investment in terminal automation and cargo handling efficiency will be required to maintain its edge.

Transport operators express cautious optimism, citing the need for transparent tariffs, predictable border policies, and multi-modal connectivity (road–rail–sea) to enhance corridor performance.

Conclusion

The UKC railway corridor has a viable opportunity to emerge as a leading Central Asian transit route, especially if complemented by institutional and technological enhancements. It offers lower transit times, fewer geopolitical disruptions than Iran, and potentially better cost structures than the Kazakhstan route.

Stakeholders should prioritize phased investments, international cooperation on customs harmonization, and continuous monitoring of corridor performance metrics to ensure long-term competitiveness.

References:

1. World Bank. (2023). Logistics Performance Index Report.
2. UNESCAP. (2022). Corridor Development and Transit Analysis in Central Asia.
3. CAREC Institute. (2023). Regional Freight Flow and Risk Assessment.
4. Kazakh Railways. (2022). Transit Traffic Statistics.

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 05,2025
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

5. Iranian Ministry of Transport. (2021). Transit Corridor Feasibility Report.
6. Deloitte. (2023). Geopolitical Risk in Infrastructure Development.
7. Maersk Logistics. (2022). Freight Tariff Index for Eurasian Corridors.
8. Uzbek Ministry of Transport. (2023). UKC Railway Investment Overview.
9. International Union of Railways. (2021). Transcontinental Corridor Profiles.
10. UNCTAD. (2023). Customs Efficiency and Trade Facilitation Benchmark.