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European policy

• Urban transport causes 80% of congestion, 14% of all CO$_2$
• Urban areas account for 60% of people, 85% of economy
• Thus urban transport cannot be left solely to cities
• Current policy:
  – Supports the development of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans
  – Encourages incentives, expert assistance
  – Proposes making SUMP\'s mandatory for cities over a given size
  – And making allocation of EC Funds conditional on SUMP\'s
• New SUMP guidelines published in early 2014
  – 11 elements; 32 specific activities
  – www.mobilityplans.eu
Characteristics of a SUMP

• Long term vision and strategy
• Participatory involving citizens and stakeholders
• Committed to sustainability in all its dimensions
  – Economic, environmental, social
• An integrated approach
  – Between modes of transport (and types of policy measure)
  – Between policy sectors
  – Between neighbouring authorities
  – Between tiers of government
• Cost-effective, affordable, solutions to meet agreed targets
The capabilities of EU countries

• Well established approach to SUMPｓ
  – 5 countries
  – Plus Flanders, England and Wales

• Moving towards the development of SUMPｓ
  – 10 countries
  – Plus Wallonia, Scotland

• Yet to adopt the principles of SUMPｓ
  – 10 countries
  – Plus Northern Ireland

• But even the first group are not yet comprehensive
The SUMP cycle (actually a spiral)
National guidance

- France: PDUs for cities over 100k since 1996
  - Now with broader focus and five yearly reviews
- UK: TPPs from 1974 to 2000; LTPs since 2001 in England
  - Three rounds of five year LTPs, each specified very differently
  - But UK government has now withdrawn from providing guidance
- Other countries with requirements and guidance
  - Norway (1993); Italy (2005); Spain (2006); Flanders (2010)
- Three sources of input
  - Good practice in individual cities
  - Research into barriers to planning
  - Research into ways of overcoming barriers
Research into the barriers

- ECMT study 2002-2006
  - Identified seven key barriers
  - Developed recommendations for national governments
- The UK Atkins study
  - Identified weaknesses in cities’ processes, abilities for LTP1
  - Made recommendations for enhancements in LTP2
- The UK DISTILLATE study
  - Worked alongside LTP2 preparation
  - To identify the key barriers and develop tools to overcome them
- The IMPACT study
  - Adopted a similar approach in Scandinavia
The principal barriers

• Remarkable consistency
  – Between ELTISplus, ECMT, Atkins, DISTILLATE, IMPACT

• The seven principal barriers
  – Conflicting institutional roles, vertically and horizontally
  – Hesitant political commitment to sustainability, solutions
  – Poor integration between policy sectors, e.g. transport & land use
  – Inappropriate funding for plan preparation and implementation
  – Limited skills in option generation; undue supply-side emphasis
  – Limited public support; lack of experience in stakeholder input
  – Poor data; lack of evidence on performance of new policies
Research on overcoming the barriers

- **PILOT (EC)**
  - Manual, training tools, guidelines, recommendations
  - Focusing on coordination, vision, objectives, targets, monitoring

- **GUIDEMAPS (EC)**
  - Handbook on project management, stakeholder involvement
  - Particular emphasis on implementation and reviewing outcomes

- **DISTILLATE (UK) and PROSPECTS (EC)**
  - Tools for monitoring, option generation, financing, modelling, appraisal, partnership working; decision-makers’ guidebook

- **CH4LLENGE (EC)**
  - Guidance on participation, institutions, option generation, evaluation
  - Including enhanced knowledgebase, KonSULT, with 61 policy measures
The barriers in developing cities

• The ADB assessment
  – Inadequate enabling environment from national governments
  – City institutions which are poorly managed, unable to deliver
  – Dominance of politics over professional advice
  – Over-optimistic assumptions on available finance
  – Plans based on wish lists rather than feasible strategies
  – Dominance by experts; lack of involvement of stakeholders, residents
  – Transport plans based on black box models, not empirical evidence

• The PSTC assessment
  – CODATU’s new Permanent Scientific and Technical Committee
  – Reached similar views on the barriers
    • To be presented in the PSTC open session tomorrow
The ADB paradigm
(And very similar guidance from the World Bank External Advisory Panel)

• Base transport policy on what is needed and what works
• Use empirical evidence and expertise of stakeholders, users
• Land use planning as part of the solution
  – Support public transport, walking, cycling; reduce need to travel
• Use both demand-side and supply-side measures
  – Restrict car use, support alternatives, encourage behavioural change
• Develop plans to reflect wider city vision and spatial strategy
• Ensure plans are affordable, adaptable and implementable
• Demonstrate policy effectiveness to and with stakeholders
Tackling the barriers

• Conflicting institutional roles
  – Assess applicability of guidance from ECMT, Europe
  – Strengthen role of national government
  – Identify appropriate local governance structures, skill needs
  – But also reconsider the role of the expert

• Hesitant political commitment
  – The aspect on which guidance is weakest
  – Needs a new set of disciplinary skills

• Poor integration between policy sectors
  – Strengthen understanding of role of land use planning
  – Particularly to reflect rapid rate of development
  – Develop guidance in this context
Tackling the barriers

• Inappropriate financing
  – Need to identify funding sources and potential funding at the outset
  – Then optimise the strategy within these financial constraints
  – Decision-support tools already available to help with this

• Lack of skills on option generation
  – Use decision-support tools to help identify suitable policy measures
  – Then consider how best to package those policy measures
  – But those tools must be focused on developing cities’ needs, contexts

• Lack of expertise in stakeholder and citizen engagement
  – Assess applicability of guidance from Europe
  – Identify critical stakeholder groups
  – Develop transferable experience of stakeholder, citizen input
Tackling the barriers

• Poor data, lack of evidence on performance of new policies
  – Strengthen skills in monitoring, data interpretation
  – Establish database of empirical evidence covering those policy measures of most relevance to developing cities
  – Then upgrade option generation decision-support tools

• The proposed approach of PSTC
  – Identify case study cities/regions in each continent
  – Assess the barriers to SUMP development
  – Assess whether current guidance is relevant, comprehensive
  – Develop proposals for enhanced, focused guidance
  – Consider the best ways of disseminating such guidance
For further information

• Comments welcome!
  – a.d.may@its.leeds.ac.uk

• Come to the PSTC open session
  – 1600-1730 on Wednesday