Since 2002 the CIVITAS Initiative has developed and implemented more than 800 technical and policy-based urban transport measures. Evaluations of the impact and implementation of these measures gave rise to valuable lessons for other cities. CIVITAS offers mobility professionals working for and in cities numerous examples of successful measures that give substance to the transition towards cleaner and better urban transport.
Transferring knowledge is not possible without proper results

Transport is fundamental for growing economies and interconnected societies. However, the negative impacts of transport seriously affect citizens’ quality of life. In response to this, the European Commission, national governments and city authorities have, inter alia, set a number of targets to reduce or mitigate transport’s negative impacts on health, climate, safety, security and accessibility. A tremendous effort is required to meet these targets. In addition to top-down actions supporting new sustainable urban transport systems, it is important to foster bottom-up developments initiated by cities.

The CIVITAS Initiative specifically supports cities experimenting with new and innovative sustainable transport policies. Based on the experience of implementing over 800 urban mobility measures so far, CIVITAS is able to provide potential solutions to the most pressing urban challenges faced by transport professionals. CIVITAS also aims to develop good practice examples for sustainable urban mobility solutions, with the ultimate goal of transferring knowledge and experience to other cities to achieve similar results elsewhere, as provided in the last chapter of this CIVITAS Insight. This includes policies and practices as well as administrative arrangements, institutions, and ideas. CIVITAS has demonstrated that good personal contacts and interactions facilitate knowledge transfer. Furthermore, effective transfer requires appropriate conditions. If the setting is right, a potential transfer of ideas and results can take place, achieving a deeper level of learning and understanding.

Therefore, it is essential to understand the underlying processes necessary for behavioural change to occur, and to use this knowledge for the implementation strategies. One of many examples is the case of mobility management, where success is measured in whether a project has made individuals’ travel behaviour more sustainable. Most relevant to the implementation and evaluation of mobility projects are two key facts related to behavioural change:1

1. Firstly, in any given population some people are more susceptible to changing their travel behaviour than others. This partly relates to more subjective factors such as their attitudes and perceptions towards their current travel choices. For other people the barriers to modal shift are more objective: for example, if there is no bus service operating on the route for their journey, or if they have a disability that prevents them switching car trips to cycling or walking.

2. Secondly, it is increasingly acknowledged that in many instances behavioural change does not occur as a one-step process and can instead be viewed as a series of stages (or steps) which individuals progress through in order to reach the final stage: a new habitual behaviour. Thus, more subtle changes in attitudes and perceptions towards alternative modes (reflecting a greater propensity to change behaviour) will occur simultaneously to obvious behavioural changes.

In order to obtain a ‘fuller picture’ of what the intervention has achieved it is important to measure more subtle changes in attitudes and perceptions as well as overt behavioural change per se; evaluations that focus solely on actual behavioural change would not show this and therefore their success in moving people towards behaviour change would be understated. Measurements of people’s stage position can be used before the project starts to help inform the selection and design of subsequent measures, which may provide the ‘final push’ that will result in the ultimate goal of actual behavioural change. For example, a mass-media travel awareness initiative may increase some individuals’ awareness of and propensity to use alternative transport modes. The information provided may inspire individuals to consider the possibility of using these alternative modes, although further initiatives (perhaps personalised travel advice or reduced fares), may be necessary for them to actually switch to other modes.

Scientifically speaking, evaluation is a systematic determination of a measure’s merit and significance, using criteria governed by a set of standards. It is part of a continuing management process consisting of planning, implementation, and evaluation. In other words: evaluation tells you what really happened in your measure (compared to what was planned), why it happened, and what you can learn from the difference between the plan and reality. To understand the essence of evaluation studies, it is necessary to emphasise that evaluation is not to be confused with auditing or monitoring. These terms do not refer to evaluation, although they can be used (in specific cases) to update the data collected or the needs of analyses carried out during evaluation. An audit is the verification of compliance of the use of resources (generally financial) with the binding legal regulations and specific standards. As such, it is a tool for internal control. Monitoring is usually conducted simultaneously with implementation and is designed to verify this process, particularly the achievement of assumed outputs and results of the measures, as well as the steps taken in their implementation.²

CIVITAS CAPITAL provides guidance from the point of view of practitioners and is building on the experiences of the CIVITAS CATALIST project in long-term evaluation of measures. CIVITAS CATALIST carried out the very first long-term evaluation exercise within CIVITAS between 2007 and 2012, the ‘CIVITAS Guide for the Urban Transport Professional – Results and lessons of Long-Term Evaluation of the CIVITAS Initiative’.³ CIVITAS CAPITAL produced a ‘How-to Guide on Long-Term Evaluation’⁴ that provides the basis for training and assisting members of the CIVITAS Thematic Groups⁵ and others such as former CIVITAS measure leaders in applying long-term evaluation to their chosen measures and delivering the evaluation results.

This CIVITAS Insight mainly refers to the guides mentioned above and provides definitions of evaluation terms, but also advice and ideas on conducting evaluation properly. It then presents lessons learnt from successful implementation of measures and some transfer case studies.

The difference between short-and long-term evaluation

While short-term refers to a short time period, the long-term perspective could be five to ten years or even more. In the CIVITAS context, it can be said that short-term evaluation activities are carried out during the project lifespan, which is typically three to four years, and uses before and after data of the implementation of a measure. Long-term evaluation activities are carried out after the project has ended to do follow up studies.

Long-term evaluation can include projecting impacts into the future through forecasting and scenario-building. It can also involve time-series data for schemes or measures over years, using ongoing surveys or long-term effect surveys repeated at regular intervals. Long-term evaluation can therefore attempt to compare what the long-term impacts of measures have been with those in the short-term, or if the CIVITAS pilot measures have been scaled up as an effect of the successful pilot implementation. In some cases, there may be no evidence of impact in the short-term, but detectable positive impacts in the long-term. For example, the effects of price changes for public transport or fuel are greater in the long-term than in the short-term.

In other cases, there will be impacts in the short-term, but because of poor measure maintenance, ‘rebound’ effects (where people get used to a measure, such as access restrictions), or changes in background conditions (for example, legislation), the impacts decline. In both cases the processes are important to capture and to investigate what has actually happened over time since the measure or scheme was launched.

Another difference may be related to the actual scale of the project and its objectives. Long-term evaluation generally comes into play with large-scale, long-term, multi-site comparative designs compared to short evaluations of a single measure in a city. There are two main approaches – impact evaluation and process evaluation.

The difference between impact evaluation and process evaluation

Impact evaluation seeks to describe the effects of a measure after its implementation in comparison with the situation before the measure was introduced. This method focuses on evaluation impacts related to a measure’s original objectives. The impact is not the actual new scheme itself (the output) but the outcome, such as the impact it has on people’s mobility behaviour the urban environment. To be able to assess the outcome, the objectives have to be expressed as measurable indicators. Following up on long-term evaluation requires access to or at least knowledge of previous evaluation elements and activities and indicator data collection methods and analyses, so that short and long-term impacts can be compared. Impact evaluation is often based on quantitative data, and time-series data may be available and annually updated even after the project has finished.

An example of the latter is fuel consumption data for alternatively-fuelled buses, as most operators collect this data regularly and retain it over time.

Process evaluation focuses on the means and procedures through which a measure is implemented. It tells the story of planning, implementing and operating the new scheme, technology or infrastructure. For this reason, it begins during project development and continues throughout the lifetime of the project. Its intent is to assess all project activities and positive and negative factors which influence the implementation process and thus provide information to monitor and improve the project, as well as information and guidance to followers who may wish to emulate the project.

6 See also CIVITAS Insight 06 - Access regulations to facilitate cleaner and better transport, http://www.civitas-initiative.eu/content/key-publications
A step-by-step approach to long-term evaluation

The following section summarises a step-by-step approach to long-term impact and process evaluation. This requires that background data such as programme or measure descriptions as well as evaluation reports need to be collected and analysed.7

Impact evaluation

- Review policy and measure objectives: Impact evaluation illustrates changes which are attributed to a policy or measure which was designed to reach specific objectives. Reviewing the policy or measure objectives is therefore the starting point of the evaluation process.

- Reflect on causes and effects: The outcome of a measure is influenced by a variety of effects which need to be considered, as some impacts are indirect, with several steps between an activity and its eventual impact.

- Check short-term evaluation indicators: The emphasis is on how indicators are described, and in which units they are measured. They should clearly relate to and measure discrete objectives.

- Analyse or review short-term impact evaluation: Investigate if the results reveal solid rigorous methods, or if poor results can be a consequence of poor design. Good methods can be continued and repeated, but poor methods should be discontinued and replaced.

- Revise and refine indicator descriptions: One reason for inconclusive or ineffective evaluation is an indicator which isn’t clearly defined or which is invalid. Good results often come with well-defined indicators that can easily be followed through reliable data sets. Continuing to use the same indicators for future long-term evaluation is recommended.

- Collect new data for long-term evaluation, including changes in the background situation: It is important to use the same or similar designs, sources, formats, or sample strategies. Acknowledging the background and contextual changes and the other confounding factors8 may have had less or more impact on cause and effect is also crucial.

- Use proper methods for analysis, based on guidelines: Reading existing evaluation reports as well as general evaluation guidelines can help to find out what lessons could be learnt from short-term evaluation.

- See if some indicators are influenced by other measures: Start with short-term analysis and find out how the evaluators interpret their results. The short-term evaluation could have been conducted too soon after implementation began, and it was not yet possible to detect an impact. Related to the cause and effect chain, it is imperative to acknowledge larger changes in infrastructure or to the legal and fiscal framework.

Process evaluation

- Evaluate existing documents: Use the short-term process evaluation as a template for document analysis. Describe the changes in the legal framework in terms of planning, infrastructure and governance. If new policies have come into place, see if they can be detected in the local context and if they have resulted in concrete changes on the ground. It is particularly important to see whether lessons learnt in the short-term and documented in the first process evaluation led to revised strategies or upscaling of measures in the longer term.

- Ask stakeholders to do self-assessment: Key long standing stakeholders in the city administration may be good sources of information and data needed for evaluation. Their expertise and opinion is a prerequisite for interesting qualitative results. Key participants present at the time of a measure’s implementation will be able to explain how internal discussions and decision-making processes will affect future urban planning. Data from qualitative interviews can be collected from individuals and groups for more varied responses.

---


8 A confounding factor is a factor in an experiment that has an effect on the dependent variable (and hence the outcome) that cannot be distinguished from the effect of the independent variable. This may lead to erroneous conclusions being drawn from the results of the experiment.
Lessons learnt and factors for success from CIVITAS long-term evaluation

From the long list of CIVITAS measures carried out and evaluated, lessons can be learnt in terms of which aspects make a measure successful. These factors for success can never be regarded independent of their context. However, a number of aspects can be identified which are, regardless of the actual content of the measure, pre-conditions for a good outcome. These aspects are related to processes, circumstances and quality. Other aspects are criteria that must be fulfilled to achieve a good result; success is unlikely without them.

Quality

Quality refers to the actual content of the measure: only good measures can deliver good results. This is something that can in general be influenced by measure leaders, but not always.

- Technically sound: Measures must work in technical terms. In process evaluations carried out by CIVITAS METEOR10 and CIVITAS CATALIST11, ‘technology’ is reported as an important aspect for success or failure. Technology plays a crucial role in measures related to clean vehicles and where information technologies are involved. It must not fail, otherwise the success and impact of the measure will be limited. This means that serious measures must be more than experiments: proven technology is preferred.

- Market research: Measures must work in market terms. Market research is an instrument to make an adequate estimation of future success. More specifically, before taking measures that involve behavioural change (i.e. modal shift), questions on market potential and market share must be asked. This market research may not only give knowledge on the expected scale and success rate, but also on important details for the final design of the measure.

- Apparent benefits: Many successful measures show that success creates support and consequently more success. Tangible evidence of benefits may resolve the doubts of opponents. For example, the case of Gothenburg’s (Sweden) inner city freight distribution demonstrates this phenomenon. The apparent success of the scheme and clear benefits convinced companies to participate, including those who had initially been hesitant. This process can work for any type of measure, and proves the benefit of monitoring and evaluation when evidence of benefits is produced.

Relevance

Measures must relate to pressing problems and fit the local situation. Relevance touches upon the subject of transferability; measures successful in one city may not be successful in another, if they are not appropriate for the local problem or situation.

- Culture and lifestyle: Culture and lifestyle refer to the end user of measures. The example of car sharing works very well to show how culture may work in for or against the measure. Car sharing requires a certain attitude of end users who are willing to share a car with others, or who are not interested in owning a car. This attitude regards a car functionally and not emotionally and can be found in northern and western Europe such as Bremen (Germany), Aalborg (Denmark), Amsterdam (The Netherlands), Stuttgart (Germany) and Norwich (United Kingdom) all of whom are cities with examples of successful car sharing schemes. So far, there is some evidence to show that this attitude is becoming stronger in southern (Burgos, Spain) as well as central and eastern Europe (Krakow, Poland, and Debrecen, Hungary).

- Urgency and problem pressure: Problems must be large enough and urgent enough to make measures effective. Evaluation shows evidence of problem pressure being one of the strongest drivers for measure development.12 Pressing problems can often motivate political action. This puts an emphasis on the need to present a problem as urgent, as well as having relevance to several policy areas. The air quality problem in Dutch cities is a good example of this phenomenon. Although air pollution from traffic had been a problem for years, it was only after interruptions to urban development due to excessive breaches of European air quality norms that air pollution was seen as an urgent problem. As a result, serious measures against pollution were carried out in several cities.

9 CIVITAS CATALIST, 2012, CIVITAS Guide for the Urban Transport Professional - Results and lessons of Long Term Evaluation of the CIVITAS Initiative
10 CIVITAS METEOR, 2008, CIVITAS I Cross-Site Evaluation
12 Ibid.
The measure fits the problem: The relationship between problem and solution must be obvious and effective. This helps to convince stakeholders, politicians and users, and makes discussions a lot easier. For example, in Bremen’s case the relationship between the problem (high demand for parking13) and the solution (car sharing) is clear, as lower car ownership means less demand for parking space. On the other hand, mobility management schemes usually have a broader set-up and comprise a wider variety of measures, such as marketing and awareness raising14, or public participation. In communicating such a scheme, it is important to relate all steps and sub-measures to specific problems.

Inclusive management

Inclusive management is a strategy to involve all relevant stakeholders in the policy and implementation process. Good inclusive management leads to a policy receiving more support and thus contributes to its success.

Citizen participation and stakeholder involvement: Individual residents are important stakeholders and not all stakeholders are individuals. Stakeholders may be a public transport company, local shops, other companies, financing institutions, car drivers and public transport users, other levels and departments of government, neighbouring municipalities, lobby groups and associations. Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMPs) have participation as a basic characteristic, as is demonstrated in the urban mobility plan of Ghent (Belgium). Residents in Ghent are encouraged to take part in decision-making when planning which measures to implement.

Engagement strategy: Many different ways of involving stakeholders may lead to success. Strategies vary from country to country (following national legislation) and may also reflect the local culture. In any case, it is clear that the strategy must fit the measure and involve all relevant stakeholders. This is essential to ensure support for a measure and increase its chances of success, as well as making the process democratic and transparent.

There is no common blueprint for an engagement strategy, but it is important to distinguish appropriately between different groups of stakeholders and the four levels of participation, from low to high: informing, consulting, co-deciding and cooperating. The examples of Vitoria-Gasteiz (Spain) and Odense (Denmark) demonstrate how good engagement leads to success.

Institutional and regional co-operation: An obvious but challenging factor for success is good cooperation between different departments within the city administration and between neighbouring authorities. Although the way cities are organized varies greatly, cooperation is essential, generally between the departments of transport and mobility and urban planning. Successful measures show good cooperation between these two disciplines on the executive, political and professional levels. Other disciplines or departments that may be involved include environment, communication, finance, health, enforcement, and procurement. It is important to build and nurture relationships with colleagues outside the inner circle.

Personal commitment and persistence: In CIVITAS, there are examples of ‘champions’ or people that have committed themselves personally to a certain objective over a long period of time and have persisted in working to achieve it. These people are mainly professionals within the city administration who have stayed in their jobs for longer periods. Politicians change, politics changes, but policy requires consistency and a constant driving force to gain success. The examples of all clean fuels and vehicles projects in Stockholm (Sweden) which received high levels of attention for over ten years, show that dedication can be essential in achieving results.

13 See also CIVITAS Insight 04 - Developing less congested and safer roads by managing parking. http://www.civitas-initiative.eu/content/key-publication
14 See also CIVITAS Insight 07 - Social marketing for sustainable mobility. http://www.civitas-initiative.eu/content/key-publication
Integrated approach

Measures cannot be regarded individually. When fitted into a larger scheme and a broad policy base there is a better chance of continuity, financing, political support, and success.

- Supporting measures: Measures nearly always come in a ‘package’. For example, car sharing must be supported by providing parking for shared cars, specifically in cities where parking space is limited (such as in Bremen). Clean fuel policies are greatly supported by access restriction and tax and parking fee relief (Stockholm and Gothenburg). As in this case, supporting measures are often of a different nature, under the responsibility of a different city department and with several side-effects. This requires careful planning and communication.

- Inclusion of measures in local Urban Mobility Plans: A SUMP should be the high-level and strategic overarching plan, made concrete by a large number of measures. There is a logical relationship between strategy and action, and therefore each measure fits into the Urban Mobility Plan. In this way, each measure contributes to the high-level objectives of urban mobility policies. This may include objectives such as reducing congestion by 50 percent before 2020, achieving CO₂ neutrality by 2045, or reducing air pollution by 20 percent over the next ten years. Moreover, including measures in the Urban Mobility Plan shows potential conflicts or synergies between different measures.

- Inclusion of measures in Urban Development Plans: This plan will have strategic relevance for the city for a relatively long period of time. Objectives of this plan will relate more to sustainability, growth, economic value, employment, health. This is a larger scope compared to an Urban Mobility Plan, and some specific measures must fit into both documents. This will show conflicts or synergies between measures that relate directly to mobility as well as those that do not.

Finance

A sound financial basis is an essential condition for any policy measure, which has also been demonstrated in CIVITAS. There have been examples of measures for which funding did not extend beyond the lifetime of the project, and which were discontinued as a consequence of this. In CIVITAS, we have seen the following types of projects in terms of funding:

- Funding is required because the policy is regarded as an essential government responsibility. The measure is by definition not a commercial activity and normally does not generate income. The measure contributes to what is considered an essential government aim, which may be a matter of political choice. Measures related to climate policy and pricing schemes are sometimes seen as being politically-motivated. Measures funded because of an essential government responsibility have a greater chance of success; politically-motivated measures can be in danger after political change.

- By funding measures, the government saves costs elsewhere. Measures such as marketing campaigns are usually very cost-effective, because some costs may be saved on infrastructure development. Measures that save costs on other government tasks have a good chance of being funded successfully.

- Initial funding is necessary for start-up, because initial investment is high and revenues are uncertain. Without funding there would be no activity at all, so the government’s responsibility is to initiate and stimulate. Income may be generated later, but there is not enough evidence for a feasible business model yet. Examples of such measures could be car sharing, freight consolidation schemes, and procurement of clean vehicles. In comparison with ten years ago, markets have now grown to a certain level of maturity and government funding is required less often. In CIVITAS, there are examples of measures that succeeded in self-sustainability.

15 See also CIVITAS Insight 05 - Car sharing: New forms of vehicle use and ownership, http://www.civitas-initiative.eu/content/key-publications
16 See also CIVITAS Insight 03 - Cleaner, safer and more efficient freight transport in cities, http://www.civitas-initiative.eu/content/key-publications
Public and political support

Public support is regarded as support outside the group of stakeholders and should be distinguished from stakeholder support. Public support may not be directly essential for the success of a measure as it generally has an indirect effect.

- General awareness, public opinion, and media strategy: Public opinion has many aspects and is difficult to control. The city wants to present a measure as necessary and effective to solve a problem. Good press results in enthusiasm, bad press results in declining political support. Negative press could potentially focus on either (over)spending public money, non-existing problems, unfeasible solutions, or other negative side effects.

  The communication strategy would avoid negative messages and broadcast positive aspects of a measure. In other words, the why, what and the how are important, plus the benefits the measure creates. The content of this message should not be too complex, considering that for a well-prepared measure all the relevant arguments on topics such as funding, support, and cooperation must have been made already. For a media strategy, timing is important. It is crucial that journalists are supplied with information during the preparation phase of the measure. The details of a problem, the possible solutions and the (proven) benefits must be given to the press regularly. This requires permanent open communication with press representatives.

- Local political commitment: Political support is a precondition for a measure. Such support can help to keep the measure on track during the stakeholder engagement and planning phases: if a political party or an influential politician is strongly committed to the measure, there is a better chance for progress. Intelligent programming of measures (for example, by starting the process just before local elections) may also help to get political support. It must be noted that strong political commitment involves a risk; political changes may be very negative for a measure that is associated with a specific political party or platform.

- Legislative support: It is essential that measures that involve access restrictions, tax relief, or financial support are supported by proper legislation. For example, an environmental zone must be legally designated, otherwise it is impossible to enforce. Another example is incentives that were given to Swedish users or buyers of clean vehicles such as tax relief or free parking spaces. Sometimes national legislation is required, and this may take some time before being finally resolved. In the Swedish case, it certainly helped that the top three cities in the country, Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö, were working together on similar measures.
CIVITAS Transfer Case I | Development of Leoben's (Austria) mobility concept based on experiences from Graz and Bremen

Leoben is the second-largest city of the Austrian province of Styria, with about 27,500 inhabitants. It has benefitted greatly from the experience of CIVITAS cities, particularly nearby Graz as well as Bremen, in developing its urban mobility concept. A concept for the reallocation of educational institutions identified the need to establish two school complexes in Leoben. This would be accompanied by significant changes to the urban mobility situation for the entire city, but in particular the most affected target group of around 1,000 students, their parents and teachers as public transport and transport routes would need to be reorganised. The City of Leoben stressed the importance of safety and security within the area, as well as a reduction of private car traffic and implementing more attractive alternatives to travelling to school by car. In close cooperation and under the umbrella of CIVITAS, the City of Leoben worked with the cities of Graz and Bremen – two well-experienced CIVITAS cities. Intense knowledge exchange started early through participation in several CIVITAS workshops offered by the City of Graz, but also in bilateral meetings explaining the benefits of the CIVITAS Forum Network. The idea of implementing activities in the field of clean and sustainable urban transport was developed together with the CIVITAS Initiative. The City of Leoben also cooperated intensely with the City of Bremen. A study visit of delegates, technicians and politicians from Leoben to Bremen was organised. Furthermore, a workshop in Leoben with representatives from Bremen triggered numerous ideas and inputs for a mobility concept that was developed and elaborated within an activity co-funded by the CIVITAS Initiative’s Activity Fund. The knowledge exchange helped to develop an active and sustainable mobility concept for the City of Leoben. The city submitted a proposal for regional funding for the implementation of this mobility concept and it was rated number one among all submitted projects. The experience transfer process guaranteed benefits for all partners. Leoben found itself well accompanied and supported by CIVITAS and the demonstration cities of Graz and Bremen. Leoben has signed the CIVITAS Declaration, is a member of the CIVINET Deutscher Sprachraum, the CIVITAS network for the German speaking area, and further cooperation with other CIVITAS cities on urban mobility is planned.

17 CIVITAS supports the take-up of sustainable urban mobility measures in Europe through an Activity Fund. This co-financing mechanism encourages the transfer of successful measures from ‘pioneer’ cities to take-up cities. Further information can be found at http://www.civitas-initiative.eu/content/activity-fund
Burgos is situated in north-central Spain in the region of Castile and León and has a population of 170,000. It is a leader among Spanish cities in terms of sustainable mobility, making huge efforts to achieve a car-free city centre, the BICIBUR\textsuperscript{18} free bicycle loan system and zero emission public transport. In 2009 the city’s modal share comprised 40 percent of trips on foot, 30 percent of trips by private vehicles and the other 30 percent of trips by public transport, bicycle, carpooling or collective private transport. The city has implemented a new policy of transport over the last seven years after the presentation of the Sustainable Mobility Plan in 2005, partly within its CIVITAS CARAVEL project which included the development of a mobility agency. The nearby municipality of Ponferrada is composed of 18 other localities and 25 neighbourhoods and home to 68,900 inhabitants. The City of Ponferrada is the capital of the El Bierzo region and is situated in the north-west of the province of León. In Ponferrada, a truly new mobility agency opened in spring 2010 on the basis of the strategy as developed in Burgos. Ponferrada has several park and ride facilities available that facilitate access to the bus services that bring the passengers rapidly to the centre. The city also adopted a system for regulated and controlled parking zones for its on-street parking and opened three underground car parks. Even though the measures are much appreciated and have a true impact on the urban mobility, the majority of journeys are still made by private car. This mobility agency is considered a key element for success in attempts to strengthen the promotion and integration of the different mobility services. One of the principal results is that the creation of a mobility agency in Ponferrada had clear positive effects on the usage of alternative forms of mobility such as public transport and cycling. The agency’s website launched in 2010 and has achieved a very stable use of about 10,000 visits per trimester. Positive trends in terms of modal split and environmental indicators have already been observed in Ponferrada, even if it is currently difficult to conclude that the activities of the mobility agencies have produced a sustainable effect taking into account the necessary time span to change behaviour.

The largest World Exposition ever took place in 2010 in Shanghai. It was the first EXPO to focus on urban sustainability with the theme ‘Better City – Better Life’. As part of the concept, an Urban Best Practice Area was reserved for selected projects on urban sustainability. An independent jury led by the director of UN-Habitat selected about 50 projects world-wide to be presented. Two out of three transport-related examples were CIVITAS cities: Odense and Bremen. Whereas Odense presented the measures that make it an attractive city for cyclists, Bremen shared its experiences on car sharing. Both elements are related and are seen as crucial to solve the increasing traffic problems of the growing cities, especially in Asia. Car sharing in particular can play a decisive role for a new balance of mobility needs and urban space, as limited space is an urgent issue in Asian megacities. During the six-month exhibition period, roughly one million people visited the Bremen showcase pavilion in the Urban Best Practice Area of the EXPO. As an important part of the dissemination activities, a two-day CIVITAS workshop was held at the EXPO in September 2010. Car sharing provoked a lot of media attention in China, and, in early 2011, the City of Shanghai also expressed its interest in supporting car sharing – with explicit reference to the CIVITAS City of Bremen.
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