

Oct 2013

Minutes

TRANSFORuM Thematic Workshop:

Clean Urban Transport

24 / 25 October 2013

Oslo, Norway

1 Introduction

Number of participants:	9	
Countries represented:	Germany, UK, Spain, Norway, Romania, Belgium	
Men / women:	6/3	
Policy makers / industry / / civil society:	2/2/1/4	academics

1 moderator and 2 rapporteurs from TRANSFORuM facilitated and took notes at the workshop.

The participants were introduced to Oslo, a location chosen for its success in promoting electric vehicles, and were given guidance as to the proceedings of the two half day event. It was explained that the main goal of the workshop was to examine and discuss how good practices have been delivered, the conditions under which success can be achieved as well as any common challenges and barriers that had to be overcome – and how. Taking the perspectives on these areas, the group moved on to discuss what sharing of good practice currently takes place in Europe and what else could be done to promote sharing across levels. Ideas were taken forward to a discussion on drafting a road-map to fulfil the clean urban transport goal set in the 2011 White Paper.

2 Norwegian Cases

The workshop participants heard insight from a representative at [PostenNorge](#) on the company's Vehicle Strategy and their implementation of electric vehicles for delivery of parcels and letters. They also heard about the experiences and challenges of operating electric passenger car fleets from [Move About](#) a visionary car-sharing company founded in Norway with a unique electric vehicle concept.

3 Transformation is possible!

In this session of the workshop, the criteria developed and utilized by the TRANSFORuM team in selecting the 10 good practice case studies were explained to participants. In addition, 10 shortlisted urban cases were also outlined and discussed. Participants were then offered an opportunity to reflect and comment on both the criteria and the cases. The major points from this discussion include:

It was seen as fundamental that the ultimate test of good (or best) practice is whether something is seen as transformational – and actually delivering against the core objective (i.e. reduced use of fossil fuel vehicles) with a 'lasting and sustainable effect'. However, it was also pointed out that several elements can factor into a transformation and it can be difficult to ascertain exactly what contributes to success. There will often be trade-offs and compromises, or side effects to what has taken place, which may complicate efforts to replicate particular transformations elsewhere.

It was seen that results and 'impact' should be considered when assessing a case and that effectiveness of a policy of measure should be central to assessment. There was agreement that processes should be considered as well as practices in thinking about good practice. The complexity associated with measuring emissions was highlighted – the true criteria for success is reducing

emissions, but this is complicated if we measure things in different ways – so CO₂ per capita, or length of travel were seen as acceptable measures by the group.

Focusing on elements that relate to the particular contexts of any case was seen as potentially relevant – such as innovation, acceptance, and economic benefit. It was also suggested that adding a time context or historical understanding to the case study would be useful (i.e. was this good practice in 2000 versus today). The importance of acknowledging the different starting points of each case was emphasized.

The list of good practices shared with the group was seen as comprehensive by some stakeholders with a good combination of public, privately funded and partnership examples – emphasizing that government cannot act alone. However it was questioned whether the cases on the list would feature in global best practice. Furthermore it was highlighted that active travel measures – such as bike sharing schemes – should be included as they have the potential to change modal shift rapidly. It was suggested that focusing on best in class but also looking at areas where things may not be doing as well is an approach that would yield more interesting and helpful insight. Similarly in terms of lessons to be learned, it is unlikely that successes will be transferred as a whole, but rather that particular elements of projects may be taken and used elsewhere and this was seen as important.

In terms of focus around the goal, participants expressed views that the changing vehicles to cleaner technologies should not be the only element under consideration, but also measures to reduce the use of private cars, improving public transport access to city centres, congestion charges, payment for on-street parking should all be considered alongside promoting alternative fuels– all are necessary contributions for a better and cleaner city. Efforts which improve health and which could also deliver accessibility to people, in some of the more car dependent cities in Eastern Europe for example, where the lack of mobility for certain isolated groups(elderly, disabled, mothers with children were identified) is already a significant problem. Making safe, quiet, attractive environments for all should be a central part for our visions of the European city in the context of the White Paper goal.

Finally it was emphasized that some good ideas significant infrastructure investment as well as expenditure for operation. The case of Autolib in Paris was referenced. Participants questioned how long money needs to be spent in supporting or promoting an idea until it is successful – there is a need for reflection on investments.

4 Context and factors for success

The participants were asked to think about one successful policy/idea and an example of a less successful policy or idea, and consider why these particular initiatives were successful/unsuccessful. After a group discussion, some common factors for success and failure were identified and the group went on to discuss the relevance of these identified factors. The lists of common and other factors are outlined below.

COMMON SUCCESS FACTORS

- Combination/package of measures
- Market success/Viability
- Utilize information/training/knowledge
- More than one objective
- Collaboration/'Ecosystem' approach
- Clear business case
- Expertise/resource mobilisation

- Political leadership (Not always only +)
- Innovative approach/experimentation/pilots
- Fun / Prestige
- Building on past failures

OTHER IDENTIFIED SUCCESS FACTORS

- Fulfilled an identified need
- Changing mind-sets
- Early adopters
- Operating at scale
- Easy to monitor ideas
- Diversity of approach (new/different/more than one thing at once)
- Utilize expertise

COMMON FAILURE FACTORS

- Technology failures: choice, availability, neutrality, competition between
- Financing/price/market confidence
- Treating symptoms rather than causes (e.g. EVs do not solve congestion)
- Inflated expectation of results/unrealistic goals
- Lack of resourcing/infrastructure
- Timing

OTHER IDENTIFIED FAILURE FACTORS

- Unwillingness to take risks
- Changing parameters of focus
- Listening to lobby
- Ineffective measures / rebound
- Lack of political action
- Not transferring knowledge into practice

5 Policy learning and sharing

Participants were asked to reflect on how they currently share information on good practices in their day-to-day role. Some 25 distinct methods were identified including established networks across different government levels and issue specific networks, websites and social media, conferences, existing databases and training. They were then asked to think about any other ideas not covered in the list which could be utilized to share good practice in the future. Among the 18 ideas which were discussed, a need for a standard for knowledge sharing was suggested in order to improve the consistency between information that is circulated. More informal means of communication were advocated based on the idea that people are more likely to share if they trust the source of the information and trust comes from relationship building. In addition, many participants expressed the need to identify and share 'bad practice' in order that lessons could be learned from failure instead of negative experiences being forgotten.

The final element of this session was to identify barriers to sharing. Thirty suggestions were offered by the group and discussed. These included issues of privacy, secrecy and competition – especially from the technology perspective; companies particular may not be able to share ideas and the protection of intellectual property rights prevents such sharing. Time to share was seen as barrier, as were questions of language and a lack of understanding of cultural contexts, which often prevents lower profile or smaller cases from being recognized. A lack of resources was also seen as a factor for

these areas being underserved. Understanding what to share and who the audience is were seen as factors which are not often thought about and getting the balance between too much information and enough right was also identified. It was finally emphasized that the complexity of the world we live in is a significant barrier –things are complicated!

6 Sharing across levels

In the final session focused on WP5, participants were asked to reflect on the roles played by the different levels of government in promoting good practice and scaling up success to the level required to meet the White Paper goals for urban transport. Together the group decided that prioritising the imperative to deliver CO₂ free urban logistics and clean urban passenger transport was important to consider at all levels. In addition to adding emphasis and support to addressing these challenges, the following roles and responsibilities were identified by the group for each level.

EUROPEAN

- Strategy/guidance for member states
- Provide platforms to build on
- Require national statistic reporting across modes – including active travel
- Standard definition for sharing/harmonize data
- Allocate sufficient resources to projects/initiatives
- Learn more from existing networks
- Reflect on local knowledge/real situations before setting targets/objectives
- Sales pitch/vision: WHY are these important issues?

NATIONAL

- Finance for pilot projects
- Capacity building at local level
- Sharing national strategies
- (National and municipal) strategies are not and should be required to be an overview of EU level – need to look up to Europe but also reflect on context

CITY/LOCAL

- Sharing local plans/local contexts
- Different/separate sharing approaches for different sized cities?
- Local expertise: through promoting bottom up approaches cities could propose things through national governments to EU to promote the introduction of strategies/targets that can be achieved/implemented
- Follow through on commitments
- Sharing political successes also important – not just technical

7 Kick-off of the road-mapping process

7.1 Common understanding of the goal

Stakeholders agreed that the direction of the White Paper goal on Clean Urban Transport is pointing in the right direction. Whether the goal is ambitious or not, however, depends on the interpretation of the goal, e.g. which types of road vehicles are considered non-conventional. If a mild hybrid car (electric start/stop assistance) already fulfils the definition of being a non-conventionally fuelled car, then the goal seems clearly under-ambitious at least for the passenger part. If applying a stronger definition of non-conventionality, and as well regarding the freight part of the goal, the goal was considered ambitious.

Generally, missing definitions complicate the understanding, interpretation and application of the goal. The definition is very open and seemingly wants to be “politically correct”, allowing implementers to easily say they were complying with the goal. This applies for the issue of conventionality as well as for the issue of what is considered ‘urban’ transport. Furthermore, the diversity across the European regions is a major challenge. During the workshop, it was mentioned that in Eastern and Southern Europe, for example, many cities are still car-dependent (more than in Northern or Western Europe) and stakeholders urged for clarification that the goal must not only apply in the those parts of Europe where the current state of urban transport is already closer to the White Paper goal. Instead, it has to be balanced across Europe.

Among the represented stakeholders, there was a clear agreement that, in order to achieve the goal, strategies have to be included that aim at a modal shift. Therefore, electrification of car mobility was seen as an important element but not sufficient.

7.2 Measures & priorities

Priority measures were collected from the participants and discussed in the plenum. These proposed measures ranged from fostering technological progress and incentives for a modal shift to strong restrictive measures e.g. regarding parking in city centers. A résumé of the important messages from these proposals is given below.

- Technological measures
 - Improved batteries for electric vehicles and pedelecs
 - Ensuring affordable renewable energy production
 - Standardisation to ensure competitive market
- New hierarchy in transport planning
 - Increase investments in “active transport modes” (walking & cycling)
 - Phasing-out of subsidies that contradict the White Paper goal
 - Prioritize pedestrians and cyclists in the use of public space
 - Prioritize accessibility for all citizens
- Restrictive measures on car mobility
 - Decrease labour taxes and increase pollution taxes instead
 - No free parking for combustion engine cars, multiplied fines for wrongly parked vehicles
 - Prioritize shared use of cars
 - Introduce 'mobility budget' for employees rather than only support to company cars (ensure level playing field across modes)
 - Congestion charges and reduced street capacities in city centres

- Introduce 30km/h as default speed limit in urban centres
- Actual enforcement of existing restrictions
- Planning and policy
 - Compulsory Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans
 - More monitoring and evaluation of implemented projects
 - Participatory planning

It can be concluded that there is a significant openness towards restrictive measures applying to car mobility in city centres that seem inevitable in order to reach the White Paper goal. These measures add to the existing opportunities of alternative propulsion technologies that do not seem to be sufficient. The creation of incentives for the use of alternative modes and particularly improved public transport schemes is another core strategy towards the White Paper goal.

7.3 Expectations, use of the roadmap

The TRANSFORuM road map needs to be a very strong document, including clear statements on what has to happen when and why and how. As it seems difficult to provide one uniform road map for all European regions and policy levels, a “distance-to-target” categorization of urban regions with specifications of what measures to apply where could be useful. In such a categorization, not only size specific challenges for cities (e.g. for provincial towns as opposed to those for metropolises and big urban agglomerations) would matter. Rather, different starting points of e.g. car-dependent cities vs. cities with already highly developed urban transport or cycling infrastructure would be decisive for the selection of appropriate (further) measures towards the White Paper goal.