



**CiViTAS**

Cleaner and better transport in cities

**ELAN**

BRNO • GENT • LJUBLJANA • PORTO • ZAGREB

# Evaluation Report on Citizen Engagement

## ELAN Deliverable No. D10.14

**Project acronym:** ELAN  
**Project full title:** Mobilising citizens for vital cities

**Grant Agreement No.:** ELAN TREN/FP7TR/218954/"ELAN"

**Workpackage:** WP10  
**Authors:** Davor Kontić, Begga van Cauwenberge, Marko Matulin, Stefica Mrvelj, Jana Válková, José Pedro Tavares, Cristina Vilarinho, Milena Marega, Matthias Fiedler, Marcel Braun, Dirk Engels, Eliene Van Aken



THE CIVITAS INITIATIVE  
IS CO-FINANCED BY THE  
EUROPEAN UNION

Final

12 November 2012

ELAN deliverable no.	D10.14
Date / Version	Final / 12 November 2012
Dissemination level	CO
Work Package	10
Authors	Davor Kontić, Begga van Cauwenberge, Marko Matulin, Stefica Mrvelj, Jana Válková, José Pedro Tavares, Cristina Vilarinho, Milena Marega, Matthias Fiedler, Marcel Braun, Dirk Engels, Eliene Van Aken
File Name	D10.14 Evaluation Report on Citizen Engagement.docx

## Keywords

General		Work package links	
x	CIVITAS		WP1 Alternative fuels & clean vehicles
x	ELAN Project		WP2 Collective transport & intermodal integration
			WP3 Demand management
			WP4 Influencing travel behaviour
			WP5 Safety, security & health
			WP6 Innovative mobility services
			WP7 Energy-efficient freight logistics
			WP8 Transport telematics
			WP9 Project coordination
		x	WP10 Project management
			WP11 Research and Technological Development
			WP12 Impact and process evaluation
			WP13 Dissemination, citizen engagement, training and knowledge transfer

## Document history

Date	Person	Action	Status <sup>1</sup>	Circulation <sup>2</sup>
8 May 12	Eliene Van Aken, Dirk Engels	Preparation of 1 <sup>st</sup> draft	Draft	PM, CEC
10 May 12	Marcel Braun	Comments on 1 <sup>st</sup> draft	Draft	EM
11 May 12	Eliene Van Aken, Marcel Braun	Agreement on 1 <sup>st</sup> draft	Draft	P
7 Nov 12	Eliene Van Aken	Preparation of 2 <sup>nd</sup> draft	Draft	PM, CEC
8 Nov 12	Marcel Braun	Comments on 2 <sup>nd</sup> draft	Draft	EM
12 Nov 12	Eliene Van Aken	Preparation of final version	Final	PC

<sup>1</sup> Status: Draft, Final, Approved, Submitted

<sup>2</sup> Circulation: PC = Project Coordinator; PM = Project Manager; SC = Site Coordinators; EM = Evaluation Manager; DM = Dissemination Manager; SEM = Site Evaluation Managers; SDM = Site Dissemination Managers; SCo = Scientific Coordinator, P = partners, ML = Measure Leaders

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. AIMS OF THE DOCUMENT	5
1.2. OBJECTIVES OF CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT	5
1.3. EVALUATION APPROACH	6
1.3.1. Quality of the citizen engagement activities	7
1.3.2. Process evaluation of the citizen engagement activities	8
1.3.3. Impact evaluation of the citizen engagement activities	8
1.4. STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT	8
<b>2. Evaluation of citizen engagement activities city per city</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1. LJUBLJANA	9
2.1.1. Objectives	9
2.1.2. Measure 2.1-LJU: Integrated high-quality mobility corridor	9
2.1.3. Measure 3.1-LJU: Implementation of a sustainable congestion charging scheme in cooperation with actors on national and regional levels	13
2.1.4. Measure 4.1-LJU: Individualised mobility marketing	17
2.1.5. Measure 4.6-LJU: Comprehensive cycling strategy	20
2.1.6. Measure 4.9-LJU: Update of the sustainable urban transport plan	23
2.1.7. Measure 5.4-LJU: Safe routes to school	27
2.1.8. Measure 6.1-LJU: Demand responsive service	30
2.1.9. Measure 7.2-LJU: Sustainable freight logistics	33
2.1.10. Conclusions	37
2.2. GENT	41
2.2.1. Objectives	41
2.2.2. Measure 1.9-GEN: Semi-public clean car fleet	41
2.2.3. Measure 2.9-GEN: Participatory development of main train station area	44
2.2.4. Measure 3.3-GEN: Parking and public space management around the main train station	50
2.2.5. Measure 4.2-GEN: Mobility management for companies	53
2.2.6. Measure 4.3-GEN: Mobility management for schools	57
2.2.7. Measure 4.5-GEN: "The House of Bike" and bicycle activities	62
2.2.8. Measure 4.7-GEN: Walking promotion	67
2.2.9. Measure 4.10-GEN: Comprehensive mobility dialogue and marketing campaign	72
2.2.10. Measure 5.6-GEN: Safe cycling corridor	77
2.2.11. Measure 6.2-GEN: Innovative car sharing	82
2.2.12. Measure 6.3-GEN: Holistic event management	85
2.2.13. Measure 7.3-GEN: Institutional platform for city freight management	89
2.2.14. Conclusions	92
2.3. ZAGREB	98
2.3.1. Objectives	98
2.3.2. Measure 2.5-ZAG: Intermodal high-quality mobility corridor	98
2.3.3. Measure 3.2-ZAG: Study on congestion charging and dialogue on pricing	102
2.3.4. Measure 4.11-ZAG: Comprehensive mobility dialogue and marketing	106
2.3.5. Measure 5.3-ZAG: Safety and security for seniors	112

2.3.6.	Measure 7.4-ZAG: Freight delivery restrictions.....	117
2.3.7.	Conclusions .....	120
<b>2.4.</b>	<b>BRNO .....</b>	<b>124</b>
2.4.1.	Objectives .....	124
2.4.2.	Measure 2.7-BRN: Improving bus services for the disabled .....	124
2.4.3.	Measure 4.12-BRN: Comprehensive mobility dialogue and marketing campaigns.....	127
2.4.4.	Measure 4.13-BRN: Integrated Mobility Centre .....	129
2.4.5.	Conclusions .....	133
<b>2.5.</b>	<b>PORTO.....</b>	<b>135</b>
2.5.1.	Objectives .....	135
2.5.2.	Measure 1.5-OPO: Light-weight bus shuttle .....	135
2.5.3.	Measure 2.10-OPO: Participatory planning for new intermodal interchange ...	139
2.5.4.	Measure 3.5-OPO: Integrated accessibility planning in the Asprela quarter ...	142
2.5.5.	Measure 4.14-OPO: The Mobility Shop .....	145
2.5.6.	Measure 6.4-OPO: Flexible Mobility Agency (part of Mobility Shop).....	148
2.5.7.	Measure 8.8-OPO: Mobile mobility information .....	150
2.5.8.	Conclusions .....	154
<b>3.</b>	<b>Quality of citizen engagement activities (on project level) .....</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Impact evaluation of citizen engagement (on project level) ....</b>	<b>158</b>
4.1.	IMPACT ON THE PLANNING AND DESIGN OF MEASURES BASED ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS/ NEEDS .....	158
4.2.	IMPACT ON THE ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF THE MEASURES .....	158
4.3.	IMPACT ON THE AWARENESS OF SUSTAINABLE MOBILITY.....	159
4.4.	IMPACT ON OPENNESS TOWARDS CITIZENS .....	159
<b>5.</b>	<b>Process evaluation of citizen engagement activities (on project level).....</b>	<b>160</b>
5.1.	DRIVERS FOR CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT .....	160
5.2.	BARRIERS FOR CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT .....	160

# 1.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Aims of the document

The CIVITAS ELAN project offered to stakeholders and the interested public the opportunity to get involved in planning, implementing and monitoring sustainable mobility measures. Citizen engagement was at the core of the CIVITAS ELAN project which is also stated in the project's mission: "To mobilize our citizens by developing, with their support, clean mobility solutions for vital cities that ensure health and access for all". Project partners planned and implemented sustainable mobility measures with the notion that citizens must not be regarded as a problem but part of the solution. In most ELAN measures citizen engagement was one of the important preconditions for achieving effective results, that's why in these measures many activities to inform and consult with the public were carried out and also special attention was paid to residents and city visitors, giving them an opportunity to have an equal voice as other stakeholder groups (local government, business sector, operators and experts in the field of mobility, etc.).

Because of the importance of citizen engagement in the project, a special focus has been put on the evaluation of these activities. The main objectives of the evaluation in this respect were:

- getting insight into the activities that were implemented and how many people were reached;
- evaluating the quality of the activities;
- getting insight into drivers and barriers during preparation, implementation and operation of the citizen engagement activities;
- getting insight into the impact of the citizen engagement activities on the decision making process of the measure and general awareness and acceptance on sustainable mobility;
- contributing to cross-site evaluation and policy recommendations on citizen engagement.

The evaluation results are necessary to understand the general evaluation results of the measures in the Final Evaluation Report (D10.11). It provides a detailed evaluation per measure and is therefore complementary to D13.5 "Work and lessons learned related to citizen engagement".

Both documents are expected to be a useful source of information for other projects or cities that plan to engage citizens. They will be able to benefit from the broad experience that has been developed during the ELAN project in the form of lessons learned and recommendations considering citizen engagement.

### 1.2. Objectives of citizen engagement

In the CIVITAS ELAN project, the effectiveness of a large number of measures depended on effects of public involvement, therefore CIVITAS ELAN from the very beginning has been oriented towards citizens. It is obvious from the project's mission statement which was agreed at the initial phase between the representatives of the consortium cities: "To mobilise our citizens by developing with their support clean mobility solutions for vital cities, ensuring health and access for all."

The focus on citizen participation was a very important feature of the work plan. Putting citizens first means the essential shift from perceiving them as a "problem", towards their inclusion as the most important and constructive part of the solution.

The basis for achieving the project's mission was ELAN's Citizen Engagement Strategy, which was the basis for planning citizen engagement activities on the city level – for Citizen Engagement Plans and for measure related engagement plans. The specific objectives of this Strategy are:

- to raise awareness and understanding of citizen engagement,
- to define common principles for citizen engagement in transport planning and implementation,
- to assess the level of citizen participation with regard to transport in individual CIVITAS ELAN cities through situational analyses,
- to identify barriers and needs for capacity-building,
- to prepare guidelines for effective citizen engagement in CIVITAS ELAN cities,
- to support consistent evaluation of the process through identification of indicators.

### 1.3. Evaluation approach

A number of measures have been selected for the evaluation of citizen engagement, based on the importance of citizen engagement in the planning and implementation of the measure. For the selected measures, the evaluation was reported in an additional chapter in the Process Evaluation Forms. The reporting was carried out by the Measure Leaders and the Site Evaluation Managers. They gathered this information through different techniques such as learning history workshops, interviews, focus group meetings, etc.

**Table 1.1: Selection of CIVITAS ELAN measures subject to the evaluation of citizen engagement**

Measure Number	Measure Title
1.9-GEN	Semi-public clean car fleet
2.9-GEN	Participatory re-development of main train station area
3.3-GEN	Parking and public space management around main train station and ELAN corridor
4.2-GEN	Mobility management for companies
4.3-GEN	Mobility management for schools
4.5-GEN	“The House of Bike” and bicycle activities
4.7-GEN	Walking promotion
4.10-GEN	Comprehensive mobility dialogue and marketing campaign
5.6-GEN	Safe cycling corridor
6.2-GEN	Innovative car sharing
6.3-GEN	Holistic event management
7.3-GEN	Institutional platform for city freight management
2.1-LJU	Integrated high-quality mobility corridor
3.1-LJU	Implementation of a sustainable congestion charging scheme in cooperation with actors on national and regional levels
4.1-LJU	Individualised mobility marketing based on public involvement and inclusion in defining city transport policy
4.6-LJU	Comprehensive Cycling Strategy
4.9-LJU	Update of the Sustainable Urban Transport Plan
5.4-LJU	Safe routes to school

Measure Number	Measure Title
6.1-LJU	Demand responsive service
7.2-LJU	Sustainable freight logistics
2.5-ZAG	Intermodal high-quality mobility corridor
3.2-ZAG	Study of congestion charging and dialogue on pricing
4.11-ZAG	Comprehensive mobility dialogue and marketing
5.3-ZAG	Safety and security for seniors
7.4-ZAG	Freight delivery restrictions
1.5-OPO	Light-weight bus shuttle
2.10-OPO	Participatory planning for new intermodal interchange
3.5-OPO	Integrated accessibility planning in the Asprela quarter
4.14-OPO	The Mobility Shop
6.4-OPO	Flexible Mobility Agency (part of Mobility Shop)
8.8-OPO	Mobile mobility information
2.7-BRN	Improving bus services for the disabled
4.12-BRN	Comprehensive mobility dialogue and marketing campaigns – new transport services
4.13-BRN	Integrated Mobility Centre

The CIVITAS ELAN evaluation team developed an approach to evaluate citizen engagement, focusing on three aspects: the quality of the citizen engagement activity, process evaluation and impact evaluation. Evidently, these three aspects were strongly related, the quality and implementation process of the activities was expected to influence their impact on citizens' behaviour.

### 1.3.1. Quality of the citizen engagement activities

The quality of citizen engagement was evaluated considering the following parameters:

- availability of timely, relevant and correct information for citizens (information related to technical aspects of the measure and to engagement process);
- timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation);
- appropriate representatives of all main stakeholder groups during the engagement activity;
- provision of information to appropriate intermediaries/ media;
- provision of appropriate incentives;
- provision of appropriate means/ support that enabled citizens to participate actively (in deliberating problems and solutions with other stakeholders);
- provision of feedback on the taken decisions to stakeholders and citizens after their opinions and comments;
- provision of relevant information on the citizen engagement process to measures partners.

### **1.3.2. Process evaluation of the citizen engagement activities**

Process evaluation of citizen engagement activities consisted of determining the factors that work in favour of the activities (drivers), or against them (barriers).

### **1.3.3. Impact evaluation of the citizen engagement activities**

Impact evaluation consisted of determining the impact of the citizen engagement activities regarding different aspects:

- useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design;
- influence on decision-making and measure implementation;
- increased use and acceptance of the measure;
- increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject;
- increased public trust;
- increased openness of the measure partners towards citizens;
- displays of interest by other parties besides stakeholders;
- increased political support.

## ***1.4. Structure of the document***

This document presents a thorough evaluation of the citizen engagement activities conducted in the CIVITAS ELAN project. Chapter 2 contains all evaluation results, based on the approach described above, for all measures subject to the evaluation of citizen engagement (see Table 1.1), and draws conclusions on city level.

The chapters 4, 5 and 6 bring together the evaluation results of the separate activities and aims to draw conclusions on the project level as well, for the three different aspects of the evaluation: quality, impact evaluation and process evaluation.



## 2. Evaluation of citizen engagement activities city per city

### 2.1. Ljubljana

#### 2.1.1. Objectives

Before ELAN, good practices of citizen engagement could mostly be found in the fields of development and spatial planning and environmental protection, whereas in transport-related issues citizen participation had no tradition at all. Ljubljana joined the ELAN project in order to greatly improve the practice of informing and consulting with citizens and visitors on the key aspects of urban mobility. In this regard Ljubljana's aim in the ELAN project was to introduce numerous awareness-raising and consultation events which would motivate citizens to get involved and would raise mutual trust needed for effective participation. At the beginning it was almost too ambitious to expect that during the project period, Ljubljana would develop optimal participatory practices, however, significant progress in existing engagement practices has been made at the end. Within the four years of ELAN it has been achieved that in many mobility projects of the city administration citizens' opinions are now being considered as a driver, not an obstacle.

The main objectives related to citizen participation at city level during the project were:

- to identify and satisfy the citizens' needs,
- to avoid or reduce conflicts with citizens in the future,
- to improve availability and accessibility of information,
- to promote use of public transport modes against individual car use,
- to raise awareness of clean and sustainable modes of transport of which the use has significant impact on bettering environmental conditions,
- to raise awareness of traffic impacts on the quality of life,
- to combat the feeling of citizens' powerlessness,
- to restore trust in city administration and revive democratic principle "Every voice should be heard."

#### 2.1.2. Measure 2.1-LJU: Integrated high-quality mobility corridor

##### 2.1.2.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To cooperate with strong national networks and stakeholders/ To include major stakeholders into problem defining
Second most important objective	To inform citizens on measure content
Third most important objectives	To raise citizens interest/ To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

##### 2.1.2.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Information giving and gathering	All stakeholders: Residents, Public transport users, Car drivers & Commuters, Cycle/ walking groups

Public discussions	consultation	All stakeholders: Residents, Public transport users, Car drivers & Commuters, Cycle/ walking groups
Workshops	consultation	All stakeholders: Residents, Public transport users, Car drivers & Commuters, Cycle/ walking groups
Presentations and information sessions	Information giving and gathering	All stakeholders: Residents, Public transport users, Car drivers & Commuters, Cycle/ walking groups
Info material – brochures – leaflets	Information giving	All stakeholders: Residents, Public transport users, Car drivers & Commuters, Cycle/ walking groups
Questionnaires	Information gathering	All stakeholders: Residents, Public transport users, Car drivers & Commuters, Cycle/ walking groups

### 2.1.2.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	All stakeholders	Average 50 participants/ event	**
Public discussions	All stakeholders	Average 50 participants/ event	**
Workshops	All stakeholders	Average 50 participants/ event	**
Presentations and information sessions	All stakeholders	Average 50 participants/ event	**
Info material – brochures – leaflets	All stakeholders	500	*
Questionnaires	All stakeholders	100	*

### 2.1.2.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	The workshops were difficult to organise, since the design and deadlines for implementation constantly changed
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	Citizen engagement process started at the beginning of measure implementation, but it was realised that it should start even earlier – already in the planning phases of the measure.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	*	The stakeholders were addressed, but the interest for a direct participation was low.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	All media possibilities except the church services were used. TV announcements / news reports about the corridor were interpreted negatively by the media (see barriers).
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	The public was presented with the appropriate incentives (workshops, radio broadcasts, web pages, leaflets), but the interest for a direct participation was low.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Low participation by the citizens although the measure leader and the site dissemination coordinator used all possible means to attract the citizens.

Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	*	Participants and other citizens were provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments, but in a limited scope.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	Excellent cooperation between the measure and project partners, especially LPP, REC, JSI and COL!
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.1.2.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	*	Sometimes comments are good, but are contradictory to the current traffic legalisation or to the opinions of traffic experts; on the other hand sometimes ideas are not aimed at the general benefit but only to a very specific user group.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	*	The real decision makers were not interested in participation, which resulted in poor influence.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	Recognised in media reporting, clipping; the content of the reports has turned more in favour of CIVITAS measures
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	***	As a result of the citizen engagement activities, the residents in other parts of the city demand the implementation of dedicated bus lanes on other street besides the corridor (Celovška street).
Increased public trust	*	No, probably due to price increase
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	The citizen engagement opened new possibilities to discuss issues with citizens (city quarter conferences, European Mobility Week, Open Academy workshops...), but the reactions were mixed (some events were a great success; at others the impacts were limited).
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	**	Support from traffic experts (traditional constructors) for the implementation of yellow lanes was achieved towards the end of the project.
Increased political support	**	Yes, but still some decisions makers have doubt about the impact of soft measures
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.1.2.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – cooperation with different stakeholders, especially NGOs; this led to fruitful communication and provision of suggestions for Municipal Plan change

**Driver 2** – Open communication with city administration (vice mayors, etc. through PR meetings

**Driver 3** – Providing appropriate and sufficient information has in time turned the stakeholders' opinion about measure implementation

**Driver 4** – Traffic policy of COL (PPP COL) includes the concept of participatory planning (numerous workshops with stakeholders were organised in the process of designing the document and its contents/ formation of policies)

**Driver 5** – Good support for implementation of yellow lanes by the public (based on a public opinion survey conducted under measure 4.1-LJU)

**Driver 6** – Dialogue culture has risen stakeholders have begun to listen to each other instead of just forcing their own opinions and arguments – respect for other opinions/ understanding; stakeholders have started to discuss the issues in question -finding solutions

**Driver 7** – The communication/ info provision has changed the attitudes of traffic planners – transport has found its place as a part of physical/ urban space (not perceived as an independent)

**Driver 8** – A need for communication and citizen engagement in planning is recognised as important (by the city and stakeholders)

**Driver 9** – Public opinion surveys at CIVITAS events show wide public support for measure implementation

### **2.1.2.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities**

**Barrier 1** – Traffic policy of COL acted as barrier in terms of turning the discussions into a political approach, which obstructed a straight-forward decision-making/implementation

**Barrier 2** – Political barriers – insufficient support for the measure; communication about the measure is limited

**Barrier 3** – Measure implementation (the design of P+R North) has resulted in reduced use/acceptance (e.g. dark garage underground); more promotion is needed to attract people – the increased use will attract even more people, because with many users the garage will not be perceived as dark and dangerous.

**Barrier 4** – Bad/negative media coverage at the beginning of the measure implementation has created a significant opposition towards the measure; Negative media coverage about P+R North has resulted in a decision by the city to strengthen the promotion activities for the P+R; Experts opposing the implementation of yellow lanes (against sustainable traffic policy) are deceiving the public – through media – about large congestions in case the yellow lanes are implemented.

**Barrier 5** – Lack of participation culture; bad/poor participation at city quarter events/workshops has obstructed the efficient communication of the measure – information about 2.1-LJU has been difficult to pass on to the citizens; lack of motivation for participation (apathy)

**Barrier 6** – Low level of understanding of the importance of citizen engagement by the city administration/politicians; the city PR services are used of the dissemination (i.e. one way information provision) not acting based on the information gathered.

**Barrier 7** – Distrust – people have the opinion that their voice will not make a difference anyway.

**Barrier 8** – Lengthy decision-making about the measure implementation has prevented strong communication with the public.

**Barrier 9** – Underestimating the public opinion/participation – politicians/experts believe that the public is ignorant about the technical aspects of the measure, therefore they have no reason to be involved in the planning process or decision making.

### **2.1.2.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers**

**Activity 1** – Communication and citizen engagement plan for traffic policy of COL – created by the CIVITAS ELAN SDM and other PR colleagues; this shows that communication/ citizen engagement has been recognised as an important aspect of planning/ decision-making.

**Activity 2** – To overcome the distrust and negative perception of public participation, interesting, fun-based and appealing public events have been organised by COL in order to attract attention in a relaxed environment; the aim was to gain interest and inform the public about the ideas, solutions etc.

**Activity 3** – Overcoming the political/ administrative barriers by organising public events despite the contradictions/ opposition of COL, i.e. co-organising the events with various NGOs as a main organiser.

### 2.1.2.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – Public interest should be gained from the very beginning and gradually (for the controversial topics such as this one); one such example is through the activities of NGOs, also by helping to overcome the political and administrative barriers.

**Lesson 2** – The information can be in such controversial cases - as for instance closing a part of the road for private car traffic - seen as extremely negative or as extremely positive; the media coverage has decided to report the information from the negative perspective (glass half empty), while on the other hand the media should be asked to provide the information from a positive aspect (glass half full).

**Lesson 3** – Extensive marketing campaign should be organised at the beginning of the project (materials for media representatives, events, etc.); Discussions with stakeholders must begin as soon as possible; to plan the measures including their inputs and viewpoints in order to avoid possible problems at later stages

**Lesson 4** – The measures should be implemented quickly; public is in this case invited to participate but only to improve the measure; the implementation of the measure (yes/no) is not a question for debate anymore.

**Lesson 5** – Conduct preliminary analysis/expert opinions to gather the viewpoints about the matter in question; to influence political decisions (lobbying)

**Lesson 6** – Honesty and straightforwardness should be the main prerequisite in communication; openness and direct approaches are crucial parts of communication

**Lesson 7** – A strong communication and relationship with the media and press representatives is needed from the earliest stages of measure planning/implementation/operation and related communication/citizen engagement activities

**Lesson 8** – Events aimed at children are more successful (higher number of participants); parents should be addressed “indirectly”

**Lesson 9** – Clear plan for citizen engagement from the very beginning of the project; this should be a part of initial planning of the measures

## 2.1.3. Measure 3.1-LJU: Implementation of a sustainable congestion charging scheme in cooperation with actors on national and regional levels

### 2.1.3.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To include major stakeholders into measure implementation
Second most important objective	To inform citizens on measure content
Third most important objective	To raise citizens' interest

### 2.1.3.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Public discussions	Information provision, deciding together	citizens
Workshops	Information provision, deciding together	citizens
Presentations and information sessions	Information provision, awareness raising	Citizens, stakeholders
Questionnaires	Acceptance analysis	citizens

### 2.1.3.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Public discussions	citizens	200 participants	**
Workshops	citizens		**
Presentations and information sessions	Citizens, stakeholders	510	*
Questionnaires	citizens	726, 750	**

**Public discussions and workshops** – citizens, 200 participants and the target group have been reached satisfactory.

**Presentations and information sessions** – Citizens, stakeholders, 510 participants and the target group have been reached poorly.

**Questionnaires** – citizens, in two surveys 726 and 750 participants and the target group has been reached satisfactory.

### 2.1.3.4. Evaluation of implementation of citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	*	The workshops were difficult to organise, because the city district offices offered little help in organising the event; information was offered on problems associated with congestion, but the interest was low.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	*	Not all representatives of main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities; the Citizen Engagement activities were aimed only at the citizens
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	Low participation by the citizens although the measure leader and the site dissemination coordinator used all possible means to attract the citizens. The media used were posters in the city quarters and

		the electronic means of distributing information. No large scheme campaigns were organised.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	Low participation by the citizens although the measure leader and the site dissemination coordinator used all possible means to attract the citizens. The incentives were aimed mainly at the city quarters' regular conferences for the citizens
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Low participation by the citizens although the measure leader and the site dissemination coordinator used all possible means to attract the citizens.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	0	Participants and other citizens were not provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	**	
<b>0 = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

**Communication** – Citizens were provided with appropriate means/ support that enabled them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders).

**Involvement of partners** – Relevant information on the CE&D process was provided to the partners of the measure.

**Events** – Not all representatives of main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities.

**Feedback** – Participants and other citizens were not provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments.

### 2.1.3.5. Impact of citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	**	Low participation by the citizens; discussions result in a better understanding of travel habits etc.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation		
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	0	The acceptance has decreased during the measure process; probably due to the financial situation in Slovenia/ Europe (financial crisis)
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject		
Increased public trust		
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	**	The new communication paths (city district conferences) opened new possibilities to discuss issues with citizens, but the reactions were limited.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)		
Increased political support	*	The political support was relatively low because the city administration stated that they will first implement all

		other possibilities (P+R, PT lanes, etc.) to stimulate the use of other means of transport other than private cars.
Other, please describe????		
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory</b>		<b>*** = Excellent</b>

**Citizen engagement** – Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design of the proposed congestion charging scheme.

**Cooperation with citizens** – Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens.

**Political** – Conditional political support. Aware of public opposition to new taxes, politicians declare congestion charging as a last step if all previous activities fail.

### 2.1.3.6. Barriers of citizen engagement

**Barrier 1 - Communication** – City Quarters have bad experiences with the city council, due to the empty promises made in the past (insincere communication), therefore they are reluctant to participate at the events organised by COL. This lack of collaboration/interest from CQ administrators led to difficulties in event organisation and especially attracting workshop participants.

**Barrier 2 - Institutional** – Poor support of different COL departments for CIVITAS ELAN measures; the reluctance to cooperate has obstructed the implementation of the measure as well as the related communication with stakeholders/interest groups.

**Barrier 3 - Cultural** – People support the changes in transport organisation, but do not want to change their own behaviour accordingly (NIMBY effect). They do not want to limit themselves by the introduction of measures as congestion charging. Citizens are more focused on the disadvantages of the measure than on possible advantages.

### 2.1.3.7. Drivers of citizen engagement

**Driver 1 - Involvement/ communication** – The comments/ suggestions made by citizens opened the eyes of the ML for the related topics and solutions and the consistent and persistent communication has resulted in the formation of a kind of soundboard group.

**Driver 2 - Strategic** – European Mobility Weeks (EMW); the workshop/exhibition at the opening of EMW attracts the attention of the mayor and the workshop under a name “Air quality in Ljubljana” attracts a lot of attention (instead of just being “another” CIVITAS workshop).

### 2.1.3.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1 - Organizational** – In order to overcome the event organisation issues, several meetings were held with COL department for local administration; meeting with CQ regarding the organisation of events.

**Activity 2 - Positional** – The construction and successful use of P+Rs has been set as a last resort before implementing the congestion charging (CC) scheme (i.e. if P+Rs fail to reduce the traffic in the city, then the CC scheme will be introduced).

### 2.1.3.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – The citizen engagement was not fully accomplished and it will be very difficult to implement a congestion charging scheme in Ljubljana just based on approval of citizens. A good example is the closure of the city centre for all traffic, also the PT. At first citizens were against the closure, but it



was done anyway and now the acceptance of this measure is very high. A similar model should also be used for the congestion charging – implement the best solution for a period of 6-12 months and evaluate relevant indicators before/after, but for this a strong political support of local authorities is needed.

**Lesson 2** – In case of up-scaling or transfer of such measures, a special focus should be paid to the strategies in organising the promotion events. The first communication should be done on a large scale, so that the citizens become familiar with the issues. This also gives leverage (importance) to the addressed topics and if the public gets the sense of importance of the topics, the interest for the participation is much higher. Afterwards smaller interest group workshops should be organised.

## 2.1.4. Measure 4.1-LJU: Individualised mobility marketing

### 2.1.4.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Second most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
Third most important objective	To enhance the use of the measure

### 2.1.4.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Consultations/ roundtables	Citizens of Ljubljana, local communities
Workshops	Information provision, consulting	Citizens of Ljubljana, local communities
Presentations and information sessions	Consultations/ roundtables	Citizens of Ljubljana, local communities, employed at city municipality, academics, expert groups, NGO's
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information provision	Citizens of Ljubljana, local communities
Questionnaires	Information provision, consulting	Citizens of Ljubljana and Ljubljana region

### 2.1.4.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Workshops	Citizens of Ljubljana, local communities	80 participants (at 3 workshops)	**
Presentations and information sessions	Citizens of Ljubljana, local communities, employed at city municipality, academics, expert groups, NGO's	630 people were attending approximately 15 presentations and information sessions	***
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Citizens of Ljubljana, local communities	2000 leaflets distributed	**
Questionnaires	Citizens of Ljubljana and Ljubljana region	1069 responses (2009) 1245 responses (2012)	***

#### 2.1.4.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	The provided information were correct and accurate although the implementation of Individualised Mobility Campaign had to be adapted accordingly to changes in other measures inside the project CIVITAS ELAN
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	The provision of general information about sustainable transport started immediately at the beginning of the project; afterwards the workshops and public discussions were regularly organised.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	**	The stakeholders included the general public; car drivers; PT users; bicycle users, etc.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	Leaflets, media and public discussions were used to spread the information
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	
Citizens provided with appropriate means/support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	The leaflets and other info materials were distributed; IMMC personnel also spent up to 1h on face-to-face discussions about the sustainable transport topics
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	Participants of the IMMC were provided with feedback during the campaign.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	**	Local CIVITAS consortium meetings and workshops were used to provide the information to project partners
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.1.4.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	**	The survey undertaken provided a large amount of information about citizen/public opinion regarding the acceptance of CIVITAS ELAN measures and traffic in the City of Ljubljana in general – this was the basis for further activities in the project. Measures implementation was adapted to the results of the survey.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	Public opinion has resulted in a change in the design and process of implementation of some measures – e.g. 2.1-LJU “High quality mobility corridor”; high support has changed the politicians’ and experts’ attitudes towards the implementation of the corridor
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	IMMC helped to market some of the measures implemented within CIVITAS; measures were recognised by the people that were not using the public transport or other measures.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	***	More than 630 people were involved in the deep communication campaign, 2000 received various information on project measures and more than 1250 people were involved in the

		questionnaire survey on the transport in Ljubljana and Ljubljana region. Citizens were encouraged to think about their mobility (and re-think their behaviour and travel habits)
Increased public trust	**	Roundtables promoted the open discussion with the general public, which resulted in the increase in a public trust
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	**	Roundtables promoted the open discussion with the general public. The implementation of the mobility shops was a step towards effective communication on the more efficient/cleaner transport modes
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. Construction companies, other cities, ...)	*	This was virtually non-existing in the framework of this measure.
Increased political support	**	High public support for some measures has changed the politicians' and experts' attitudes their implementation, for example on the yellow lanes in the corridor.
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

**Impact 1** – The survey undertaken within the measure 4.1-LJU has provided a large amount of information about citizen/public opinion regarding the acceptance of CIVITAS ELAN measures and traffic in the City of Ljubljana in general – this was the basis for further activities in the project; the survey also gathered the evidence about the public opinion – before the survey, the attitude of citizens towards the sustainable transport measures was only a guess.

**Impact 2** – Citizens were encouraged to think about their mobility (and re-think their behaviour and travel habits)

**Impact 3** – Acceptance of the idea to communicate the more efficient/cleaner transport modes – the implementation of the mobility shops was a step towards this effective communication, which is available to any citizen/visitor.

#### 2.1.4.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – Good quality of gathered survey data that could be easily used by other CIVITAS ELAN measures – this was the basis for good communication/cooperation with other measure leaders.

**Driver 2** – The survey has been an orientation point for further action within the project; since the response was good, the results of the survey clearly showed which measures have good public support, and which of the measures should be redefined.

#### 2.1.4.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – There were many measures in Ljubljana that were changed or significantly delayed, which had an effect on the dynamics, but more importantly, on the content of the information that was to be communicated within the measure 4.1.

**Barrier 2** – Citizens were unwilling to cooperate (resistance towards the long opinion surveys, home visits by the interviewers); misunderstandings of the instructions, aims, and goals of the surveys also played an important part in the rate of success of the measure, although the surveys were scheduled and background information was provided in advance.

**Barrier 3** – Lack of understanding of citizen engagement on the decision-making level (COL administration) as an important tool for a positive acceptance of implementation of other measures

**Barrier 4** – During the implementation of the measure, many barriers appeared so certain adaptations of the measure implementation were needed; main issue was how to motivate people to join/participate in the IMMC campaign.

**Barrier 5** – Long procedures regarding the employment of staff for the mobility centres and the publishing of the transport information brochure (which was distributed to all households in Ljubljana); this also resulted in late information provision and no time to observe the feedback from the public.

**Barrier 6** – Low participation of the CIVITAS ELAN partners resulted in lower attention/addressing of people; MLs of other measures could have also participated at numerous CIVITAS events to enhance the participation of the citizens.

#### 2.1.4.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – Redesign of the IMMC plan/strategy was a key activity to successfully implement the measure (the changes involved the timing and the scope of the campaign – it was spread to a city wide campaign, not only at the CIVITAS corridor).

**Activity 2** – The scope of the IMMC was broadened; the activities were also transferred to the mobility shops and the traffic brochure, which was distributed to every household in Ljubljana.

#### 2.1.4.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** –Time planning has proven to be very important – some sequences of executing a campaign cannot be looked at as individual activities

**Lesson 2** –The preparation of IMMC is an extremely complex and long-term procedure which needs more time and resources in order to engage even more population in the process of transport rearrangement.

### 2.1.5. Measure 4.6-LJU: Comprehensive cycling strategy

#### 2.1.5.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To cooperate with strong national networks and stakeholders
Second most important objective	To include major stakeholders into problem defining, solution and measure implementation
Third most important objective	To improve trust between different stakeholders

#### 2.1.5.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Acting together	Community
Public discussions:	Information provisions, deciding together	Community
Workshops	consulting	City and other officials, decision makers
Presentations and information sessions	Information provisions, deciding together	Various stakeholders relating to cycling
Info-material – brochures – leaflets	Information provisions	Public community
Questionnaires	Information collecting	Public community

--	--	--

### 2.1.5.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	public	From 25 to 300 participants on average on one event	***
Public discussions	Cycling community	20-30	**
Workshops	Officials, decision makers	10-30	**
Presentations and information sessions	Public community, officials, decision makers	50-150	**
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	public	500	**
Questionnaires	Public, focused on cycling community	300 classic on paper 2 on-line	**

### 2.1.5.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	During regular meetings of the City cycling platform; presentations, workshops, public discussions
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	Particularly well implemented, at some occasions with a delay
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	Cyclists, environmental and other NGOs were always present; city administration related to traffic questions was difficult to reach
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	presentations, workshops, public discussions
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Meeting with city quarters could be supported with better communication activities
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	The feedback was provided as roundtables, discussions, public events, presentations, etc.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	The results/impacts of the citizen engagement events were provided through regular staff and project partner meetings
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.1.5.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions	**	Comments for revision of the cycling strategy;

made by citizens, leading to changes in design		inputs were taken into consideration when the cycling strategy was revised
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	Comments for revision of the cycling strategy; inputs were taken into consideration when the cycling strategy was revised
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	The increase in a number of event participants and the number of cyclists was a clear indication of increased acceptance of the measure
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	The increase in a number of event participants was a clear indication of increased acceptance of the measure
Increased public trust	**	Particularly, some delays in implementations lead to public distrust
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	**	The numerous public events helped in increasing the openness towards the citizens
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. Construction companies, other cities, ...)	**	Yes, some interest from other cities, but lack of interest from the administrative bodies
Increased political support	**	Yes, there is certain particular political support but not all levels
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.1.5.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – great expectations of the public in terms of improvement of cycling conditions in Ljubljana

**Driver 2** – good response to the questionnaires that had been circulated for the purpose of research on traffic (cycling) behaviour,

**Driver 3** – many tasks e.g. cycling map on Geopedia had been implemented through by direct involvement of citizens-cyclist users.

**Driver 4** – generally very good participation at all cycling events with a great support of various NGO-s especially Ljubljana Cycling network

**Driver 5** – Various workshops contribute to strong cooperation between different stakeholders in developing city calling strategy and City traffic policy,

**Driver 6** – establishing a position of city cycling coordinator-participation of cycling coordinator at regular weekly meetings at deputy mayor and traffic department.

#### 2.1.5.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – insufficient political support, rigidity of decision making process, lack of support for a proper dissemination relating to cycling strategy; lack of support/cooperation of the most relevant COL departments – e.g. Traffic dept.; permanent structural conflict between the »project« and COL administration – a rigidity in decision making and measure tasks implementation process;

**Barrier 2** –delay of establishing proper city traffic policy contribute to lack of proper implementation of cycling strategy making a document more or less a temporary action plan;

**Barrier 3** – Lack of interest and financial supports (public calls and bids) relating to sustainable mobility that will enable stronger NGOs support; disappointment with a delay of implementing and loose of interest among public; public opinion and support more on a side of NGOs then Municipality due to non-successful experience in the past;

**Barrier 4** – unsuccessful policy/approach to regulate/communicate bicycle traffic in a pedestrian zone (where cycling is allowed at low speeds, but the conflict with the pedestrians still occur, because the pedestrians are not sufficiently informed about this).

### 2.1.5.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – Mobilization of various stakeholders relating to cycling: various NGOs, civil societies, sport groups, education system related representatives, police, politicians and other decision makers...by establishing a cycling platform and their great support at cycling strategy building contribute as much as possible to overcome above mentioned barriers;

**Activity 2** – With collaboration with Ljubljana-cycling network NGO an awareness raising campaign with a purpose to improve cyclist behaviour in a pedestrian zone started in May 2012 and lasted till the end of June 2012. An activity includes delivering of 5000 leaflets with an announcement appealing to cyclists.

**Activity 3** – bicycle parades, delivering gadgets, workshops and other various events contribute to better image of urban cycling and more efficient citizen engagement

**Activity 4** – good cooperation with various NGOs which helped that certain barriers had been bypassed; e.g. meeting with city quarters authorities;

**Activity 5** – some (although not sufficient) impact on better cooperation between “the project” and certain COL departments.

### 2.1.5.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – The establishment of the **Cyclist platform of City of Ljubljana** assured a multi stakeholder engagement in preparation and design of Comprehensive Cycling Strategy of COL (CCS COL) that is aimed to improve conditions for cycling and promote cycling in the city. Cyclist Platform (CP) COL aims to create a field for NGOs, independent experts and interested individual cyclists to take an active standing in defining issues, as well as activities and tasks and their priorities of CCS COL. Engagement of stakeholders created trust, positive attitude and enabled the stakeholders’ contribution of valuable knowledge for improving city traffic and mobility policy.

**Lesson 2** - In future more innovative techniques than workshops should be used; workshops usually attract only the “already convinced” ones. The future events should be organised in a way that the persons who have used a bicycle in the past, but are currently using other modes of transport, to return to using a bicycle for their daily trips, and not just for the recreational purposes (as is the case in Slovenia – a lot of people see cycling as sport and not as a mode of transport). Also the events should be aimed at those that see the bicycle as an inferior transport mode compared to a car. Such events would be something like the “bicycle day” or similar.

**Lesson 3** – **Interactive cycling map on Geopedia had been established with a purpose;** To suit user needs by providing relevant information on cycling in the city based on citizens’ input and thus to create a better “virtual” environment for cyclist in Ljubljana. The map has shown to be a popular and useful online tool, its improvement and continuous updating. Cyclists are using it, but they have to be additionally stimulated/motivated to participate in the forums or submit their suggestions.

Generally an importance of good collaboration with NGOs proved to be of a great importance due to better trust of public relating to municipality rigid decision making system.

## 2.1.6. Measure 4.9-LJU: Update of the sustainable urban transport plan

### 2.1.6.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To include major stakeholders into problem defining solution and measure implementation
Second most important objectives	To raise citizens interest / To inform citizens on measure content
Third most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

### 2.1.6.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Public discussions	consultation, information provision	Citizens, transport experts, local politicians, local administrators, NGOs, public service providers, media
Workshops	consultation	Citizens, transport experts, local politicians, local administrators, public service providers, NGOs, media
Presentations and information sessions with stakeholders	Information provision, consultation	transport experts, local politicians, local administrators, public service providers,
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information provision	transport experts, local politicians, local administrators, public service providers,
Questionnaire	Info gathering	Citizens

### 2.1.6.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Public discussions - Meerschaert	See D2	More than 100 participants	***
Public discussions - Poesch	See D2	17 participants	*
Workshop - Thornton	See D2	57 participants	**
Presentations and information sessions – SUTP	See D2	24 participants / 5 written comments on draft	***/*
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	See D2	200 copies distributed	***
Questionnaires/comment forms		5 comments on SUTP draft received	*

### 2.1.6.4. Evaluation of implementation of citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	*	Despite clear plan of citizen engagement from the start of the project, unclear relation of COL towards SUTP resulted in difficulties to provide relevant, complete and correct information.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	***	Events occurred every few months; they were all implemented before and during the measure implementation.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	All stakeholders were invited but the important stakeholder groups were often missing: politicians and heads of key departments in COL.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	Variety of intermediaries/ media was used. However the number of participants couldn't be predicted (the "invitation method" was the same every time, but the participation varies from one event to another).



Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	Attractive speakers and topics
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Most events were supported with the background document/presentation and had time for discussion and interactive sessions
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	*	Comments were included when appropriate, but no feedback to the participants was provided.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	Information of the CE&D process was provided to partners at regular meetings; also measure partners participated at the events.
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

**Communication** – The results of the impact evaluation of citizen engagement activities show that timing of the information sharing and engagement process was regularly and started in an early phase of measure implementation. Since the events occurred every few months, the sequence of events was set to provide/gather information as the measure was being implemented.

**Involvement of partners** – Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities and therefore invited to participate through events/workshops. All stakeholders were invited but the important stakeholder groups were often missing: politicians and heads of key departments in COL.

**Public participation** - In regard to the public participation events it can be concluded that the events have been successful, however some differences might have been observed – for example, one event (comparison of different European cases) can be described as a major success, one (walking) as successful and one (car-sharing) as a poor success in terms of number of participants. It is difficult to assess the reasons, but the number of participants may indicate, which topics are more interesting to the public.

**Feedback** – the downside of the public engagement in this measure was a lack of providing feedback to the stakeholders and to the public; the reason for this may be pointed towards the issues related to the shift of the SUTP as a stand-alone document to a Ljubljana city transport policy. This shift also resulted that the ML of 4.9-LJU measure was no longer in charge of the measure implementation (i.e. development of the city transport strategy); COL as a new author of the transport policy did not envisage the citizen engagement as a part of the adoption of the policy within the CIVITAS ELAN lifetime, therefore the provision of feedback was not possible.

### 2.1.6.5. Impact of citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Quality/usefulness of comments and suggestions made by citizens	**	From every event some comments and knowledge gained were included in the SUTP.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	At the end the transport policy from other consultant was approved; involving the citizens made a positive contribution to the SUTP, however the efforts to include the stakeholders (city administration) did not result in decision making in favour of the SUTP.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	This depends on the target group. Citizens agreed that SUTP is necessary in city's planning process but politicians on the other hand rejected it as unnecessary. Therefore in this view it can be evaluated as unsuccessful, but a large portion if its content was included in the new city transport policy.
Increased awareness and	***	Citizens realize more and more the importance of sustainable

knowledge of citizens on the subject		transport planning, the subject is also often covered in media.
Increased public trust	**	The trust is bigger among partners and relevant stakeholders
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	The workshops on visions and goals helped to increase the openness; however the transport policy made by the city failed to include the citizens in the preparation of the document.
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

A high/excellent level of impact of citizen engagement can be observed in the “Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject” where the citizens realize more and more the importance of sustainable transport planning, the subject is also often covered in media. Also observed is the increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens as a result of the citizen engagement activities (workshops, open academy, etc.).

Satisfactory impact was gained regarding the influence on decision-making and measure implementation where every event provided some comments and knowledge that was included in the SUTP. It also resulted in the increased use and acceptance of the measure, where the citizens agreed that SUTP is necessary in city’s planning process but politicians on the other hand rejected it as an unnecessary self-standing document. Therefore in this view it can be evaluated as unsuccessful, but a large portion if its content was included in the new city’s SUTP, so compared to the before situation an evident progress in this field in Ljubljana can be recognised. The SUTP process also resulted in an increase of public trust - trust is bigger among partners and relevant stakeholders.

#### 2.1.6.6. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – Lack of political support as only few politicians come to the events, media sometimes give a negative image about the events,

**Barrier 2** - Uncertainty about the success of the event as number of participants fluctuates greatly; Sometimes a very low number of participants despite of the identical method of invitations. The absence of important stakeholder means that do not consider the subject as important. This resulted in a rejection of the SUTP as a self-standing document.

However, despite these barriers, citizen engagement itself is not influenced.

#### 2.1.6.7. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – Interesting topics, citizens are not satisfied with the urban transport and want a change, previous successful events.

**Driver 2** - More participants come to the event than before so measure partners get more input for the measure implementation. More comments, needs, suggestions are given by participants which in the case of SUTP is very useful for creating a “citizen shaped” strategy.

#### 2.1.6.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – Basically, the invitation method was the same for every event and sometimes it proved to be successful and sometimes not. Stakeholders and citizens are invited via various media channels; with every event we tried to include even more people.

#### 2.1.6.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – The success of different citizen engagement events was variable: The workshop on the comparison of different European case studies can be described as a major success, one (walking) as

successful and one (car-sharing) as a poor success in terms of number of participants. It is difficult to assess the reasons. However, the poor general interest in the subject might be the reason.

**Lesson 2** – The number of participants shows which topics are more interesting to the public – that may serve as a guideline for future planning of Open Academy or similar workshops/public discussions.

## 2.1.7. Measure 5.4-LJU: Safe routes to school

### 2.1.7.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Second most important objective	To include major stakeholders into measure implementation/operation
Third most important objective	To include major stakeholders into solution

### 2.1.7.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events		Citizens/mentors/parents
Public discussions	<i>Information provision</i>	Citizens/mentors/parents
Workshops	<i>Information provision/acting together</i>	Citizens/mentors/parents/scholars
Presentations and information sessions	<i>Information provision</i>	citizens
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	<i>Information provision/acting together</i>	citizens
Questionnaires	Acquiring information about the acceptance of suggested safety measures	Mentors/parents of scholars/scholars

### 2.1.7.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	Citizens/mentors/parents	300 participants	**
Public discussions	citizens	650 participants	*
Workshops	citizens	7 workshops	**
Presentations and information sessions	citizens		*
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	citizens	500	*
Questionnaires	Scholars	1900	
Questionnaires	parents	650	***
Questionnaires	Mentors	40	**

#### 2.1.7.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	Information about the portal was provided and about safety measures in general
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	***	In the beginning of each school year
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	**	Parents/pupils/traffic mentors
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	Brochures, leaflets were used as means of distributing the information
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	Invitations were sent to the parents/grandparents to participate as volunteers, but the response was low
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	The workshops were organised within the parent meetings at schools; the response was good
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	0	
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	**	Not apart from the workshops held in this context
<b>0 = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.1.7.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	***	Participatory redesign of 1 pedestrian crossing. Communication with mentors and parents led also to updating/upgrading the portal with new information about traffic situation /dangerous points
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	Participatory redesign of 1 pedestrian crossing; portal updated based on the inputs from parents, mentors
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	After the workshops, the portal was extremely well accepted Also with the volunteer service; starting by including 2 pilot schools and 6 constant volunteers; now there are 13 volunteers, working within school traffic service on 4 elementary schools.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	***	The outreach campaigns at the beginning of each school year 2009-2012 have helped to raise the awareness.
Increased public trust	**	The workshops and events helped to gain the increased public trust
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	The workshops and events helped the measure partners to be in a direct contact with the measure users/citizens.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders	*	Interest by other parties was not observed.

(e.g. Construction companies, other cities, ...)		
Increased political support	**	The success of the measure was also supported by the increased political support; safety of children plays an important role in this regard.
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.1.7.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – Annual activity safe routes to schools results in an increased public interest for the measure and good cooperation and political support (45-50 stakeholders present; police, city wardens...)

**Driver 2** – Press conferences held at the beginning of school year (presentation of mentors and web-portal to the public); general awareness for the topic has risen

**Driver 3** - Large events (e.g. Breathing dance) attract a lot of interest; large audience of schoolchildren – easy way of addressing the public

**Driver 4** - Stakeholders' cooperation in designing safer pedestrian crossings in the vicinity of schools; involvement of parents, scholars

**Driver 5** - Good communication, cooperation and interest from hierarchical higher departments outside COL such as road safety council, police, and traffic warden department are helping in raising awareness about traffic safety.

**Driver 6** - Good communication with mentors/parents – this was a good basis for updating/upgrading the portal with new information about traffic situation /dangerous points

### 2.1.7.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – Lack of volunteers at the beginning – this had an impact on the dynamics of the measure implementation (lower rate of implementation); this is a direct result of low response to calls and invitations for volunteer service. The reason behind it is that volunteers (parents, grandparents) do not want to be at the disposal for all days of the week.

**Barrier 2** – Fluctuation of the mentors – changes in employment and changing of tasks prevents strategic activities in terms of traffic safety at schools

**Barrier 3** - Only theoretical support of the city districts; not practical (very low actual engagement of volunteers)

### 2.1.7.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – Continuous and persistent communication has changed the attitude/acceptance by stakeholders and parents regarding the changes in design for the crossing at M.Pečar school

**Activity 2** – To raise the portal visits rate, notifications and calls were used (flyers, brochures)

**Activity 3** - Use of web-portal to inform the public about road safety and to gain their interest

### 2.1.7.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – Citizens are highly motivated to participate as volunteers in a short time period (40 participated within two-week action in September), but it is extremely hard to interest citizens (our main target group were and are grandparents) to participate in a daily – twice a day – base through the whole school year.

**Lesson 2** - The efforts put on this part of the measure were not without any success – starting by including 2 pilot schools and 6 constant volunteers; at the moment CIVITAS ELAN team in Ljubljana cooperates with 13 volunteers, working within school traffic service on 4 elementary schools throughout the school year.

**Lesson 3** - More efforts should be put into finding and motivating new volunteers to join the team; in May 2011 the problem was presented to presidents of the COL districts by SDM and some of them responded positively (their point of view was that volunteers in their districts won't be difficult to find).

**Lesson 4** - Communication network should be expanded; stronger, more aggressive communication for acquiring volunteers is needed.

**Lesson 5** - More presentations at parents council/elderly citizens homes could attract more volunteers.

## 2.1.8. Measure 6.1-LJU: Demand responsive service

### 2.1.8.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To include major stakeholders into measure implementation
Second most important objective	To inform citizens on measure content
Third most important objective	To support the branding, visibility and familiarity with the CIVITAS project

### 2.1.8.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events		
Public discussions	<i>Information provision, consulting</i>	People with disabilities, NGOs
Workshops	<i>deciding together, acting together</i>	People with disabilities, NGOs
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	<i>Information provision</i>	People with disabilities, NGOs
Questionnaires		
Video/TV promotions	<i>Information provision</i>	People with disabilities, NGOs
Praises/complaints/customer service	<i>Information provision</i>	People with disabilities, NGOs

**Public discussions** – People with disabilities / societies, institutions; Information provision, consulting, 100 participants, high level of penetration

**Events** – no specific target group, 300 participants, significant level of penetration

**Workshops** – People with disabilities, Information provision, consulting, 5, high level of penetration

**Info-material – brochures – leaflets** – People with disabilities, Information provision, planned

**Questionnaires** – People with disabilities, 30 respondents, substantial level of penetration

**Video/TV promotions** – People with disabilities, 1

### 2.1.8.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events		300 participants	**
Public discussions	People with disabilities/ societies, institutions	100	***

Workshops	People with disabilities	5	***
Questionnaires		30	*
Video/TV promotions	People with disabilities	1	
Praises/complaints/customer service	People with disabilities		

#### 2.1.8.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	Lower success due to the problems in measure implementation; the demand responsive service was not operational, almost until the end of the project so it couldn't be disseminated
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	Meeting/workshops were held regularly with the stakeholders/users; the comments suggestions, complaints could be taken into account continuously, however due to the barriers related to the implementation/operation of the software tool, this had a smaller impact than expected.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	In the regular meetings all stakeholders were addressed on one way or another; workshops, site visits by the impaired persons, regular trainings for bus drivers were organised.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	Workshops, telephone discussions were organised to aid communication about needs/solutions
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	***	Stakeholders/users were sent invitation to participate at meetings/workshops and site visits. The high interest for these events has proved that the incentives were appropriate.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	The topics of the workshops were announced in advance, which enabled stakeholders/users to actively participate in the discussions.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	***	After the decisions were made with a direct involvement of stakeholders/users, trainings and workshops were organised to present the final result and to train the new users.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	*	
<b>0 = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.1.8.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	***	Complaints/comments and compliments are leading to more effective two-way communication, expansion of communication channels. It also contributed to increased availability/accessibility of information; these were taken into account by addressing these issues at the bus driver trainings and

		through the upgrading of the system for impaired persons (including also those with hearing, vision impairment)
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	***	Implementation of the measure for the other groups of people with disabilities; e.g. deaf, blind, people with disabilities associated with mental disorders. – the scope of the measure was expanded to these groups of impaired people also, based on the newly established 2-way communication channels (a dispatcher in the demand responsive service and the communicative measure leader). The consequent measures were aimed at the approaches of drivers towards the persons with disabilities at the bus stops, as well as during the bus ride.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	Additional education/training of drivers contributed to more positive relationship between the drivers and passengers and to greater understanding/sensitivity of drivers towards the impaired people.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	*	Since the measure is oriented to a narrow target group, the general public has little knowledge about the services for impaired persons; Kavalir on the other hand is well known, but was not the content of citizen engagement. Additional education/training of drivers contributed to greater susceptibility/sensitivity of drivers to the impaired people.
Increased public trust	**	Because of the efforts and individualised approach of the LPP PT company the trust of the impaired people in these services has increased
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	The open communication between the impaired persons and the LPP PT company proved to be very efficient way of effectively addressing the problems which may evolve.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. Construction companies, other cities, ...)	O	
Increased political support	**	The support was satisfactory, since the idea of the City of Ljubljana also triggered the measure 6.1 to be included into CIVITAS ELAN.
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.1.8.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – Additional education/training of drivers contributed to more positive relationship between the drivers and passengers; this increased the motivation for further cooperation.

**Driver 2** – Introduction of channels for 2 way communication (the service that collects praises, complaints, advices/suggestions) - the addition of various communication channels lead to better accessibility of information

**Driver 3** – Willingness of the PT company to take into account all reasonable suggestions/proposals made by the users.

**Driver 4** – Change in attitude/acceptance/awareness of the LPP employees in relation with passengers in the period since the beginning of the project really helped the measure to become the good example of citizen engagement and communication with the stakeholders/citizens.



### 2.1.8.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** - problems with implementation/operation of demand-responsive-service has obstructed the dissemination of the measure; due to the malfunctions LPP was reluctant to distribute the information about the measure to the public; delay in purchasing and installing of software for demand-responsive dispatcher service (Telargo did not supply and install the system on time) – this caused all major barriers for the measure/bad communication

**Barrier 2** – Registration into the LPP demand-responsive service might be a barrier in up-scaling of the service – some people might find the need for registration unnecessary and might be unwilling to participate/use the service

**Barrier 3** – Interest groups (societies or people with disabilities) are not interested in demand-responsive services, because they have their own transport systems established – vans/cars modified for wheelchair use

**Barrier 4** – One way communication has been a significant barrier in the beginning of the measure implementation and lack of media coverage (the reason is also a delay/barriers in measure implementation)

### 2.1.8.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – Improvement of services, based on the responses from the target/interest group, strengthening of communication with the media (promotional videos have been made and presented to the local TV stations) and a brochure about demand-responsive service is planned to be issued and distributed among target groups

**Activity 2** – Implementation of the measure for the other groups of people with disabilities; e.g. deaf, blind, people with disabilities associated with mental disorders...

### 2.1.8.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** - Successful implementation of the measure is crucial before any dissemination / communication with the public; since the measure was not successfully and timely implemented, LPP at that point did not provide any information about the service to the interested public

**Lesson 2** - Workshops on how to use the bus which is performed continuously proved to be a great success in attracting new passengers with disabilities (topics covered were: how to enter the bus, how to use Urbana contactless card, where is the best location on a bus for wheelchair users, etc.)

**Lesson 3** - Early involvement of all crucial partners is a must

**Lesson 4** - Communication strategy must be made in the beginning of the project/measure implementation; the promotion should be based on a final product; easy access to the information

**Lesson 5** - Demand-responsive service was well accepted by the users – persons that have been helping with the mobility (parents, care-takers, etc.) have now the opportunity to perform other tasks/chores; this means time and money savings...

**Lesson 6** - Good practises will be spread to other societies/institutions for people with disabilities

## 2.1.9. Measure 7.2-LJU: Sustainable freight logistics

### 2.1.9.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To establish and further extend links with strong partners in the sustainable transport field
Second most important objective	To cooperate with strong national networks and stakeholders

Third most important objectives	To raise citizens interest and to increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
---------------------------------	---

### 2.1.9.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events (efficient driving)	Training	delivery companies
Public discussions	Info provision, problem defining/solving,	Stakeholders, shopkeepers, delivery companies, interested public
Workshops		
Presentations and information sessions		
Presentations and information sessions	Info provision, problem defining/solving, acting together	Stakeholders, shopkeepers, delivery companies, interested public
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Article in Ljubljana magazine	public
Questionnaires	Status analysis, needs, requirements	Stakeholders, delivery companies
Questionnaires (for delivery model)	Inputs for delivery model/ needs requirements Info - gathering	Stakeholders, shopkeepers, delivery companies, interested public
Web	Acting together	Stakeholders, shopkeepers, delivery companies
web	Info provision	public

### 2.1.9.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events (efficient driving)	Stakeholders/ delivery companies	25	**
Public discussions			
Workshops (COL Feb 2010 - good practices, efficient solutions)	Stakeholders	20	**
Presentations and information sessions (Murska Sobota 2010)	stakeholders	30	**
Presentations and information sessions (Ljubljana 2011)	stakeholders	60	**
Presentations and information sessions (Portorož 2011)	stakeholders	50	**
Info-material – email	Stakeholders, shopkeepers, delivery companies,	2x100 emails sent (including info materials)	*
Info-material – brochures (Ljubljana magazine)	Public	130000	***
Questionnaires on the consolidation scheme	interested public	7 questionnaires filled	*
Questionnaires (for delivery model)	Stakeholders, shopkeepers, delivery companies, interested	1000	***

	public		
Web (not entirely operational yet)	Stakeholders, shopkeepers, delivery companies,	5	*
Web portal visits	public	100 users/2000 visits	**

#### 2.1.9.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	Portal enhances/encourages communication about sustainable freight deliveries
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	*	Due to the problems/barriers regarding the measure implementation the activities to engage the public were delayed
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	Questionnaire for model takes into account the opinions/needs/ of 1000 (200 travel itineraries) couriers in the city centre; some shopkeepers also participated in the on-field study, but the study itself was oriented towards the couriers – for the purpose of developing the route planner.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	Portal, Ljubljana magazine, email
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	Invitation through the mailing list
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)		
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	○	Not directly, but through the process of web portal updating
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	○	
<b>○ = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.1.9.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	***	Additional topics were included into the web portal.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	Measure changed
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	Changed attitude/ increased acceptance of the measure
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	***	With organisation of workshops and set up Facebook and Twitter accounts the interest of the public concerning these matters has in-

		creased.
Increased public trust		Since the measure was primarily oriented towards the stakeholders, this cannot be assessed.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens		Since the measure was primarily oriented towards the stakeholders, this cannot be assessed.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)		Since the web portal addresses the freight in cities in general, other cities are also invited to use the portal.
Increased political support	*	The newly added sub-measures (web-portal, route planner) have increased the political interest in these issues.
Other, please describe????		
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.1.9.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** - Training for efficient driving; this resulted in a wide interest of the stakeholders (delivery companies, drivers); good response of the stakeholders was a basis for networking/communication; this also resulted in increased rate of visits of the web-portal.

**Driver 2** - The data for the deliveries model was gathered by a large survey among the delivery companies/shopkeepers, which also served as a good tool for communication and dissemination of the measure. This was also a first wide-scale contact with the stakeholders.

**Driver 3** - The report about the training for efficient driving was reported in a local newspaper (Ljubljana city magazine); published in 130.000 copies.

**Driver 4** - The establishment of the web-portal has gained a large public interest; the support for the measure (i.e. consolidation system) is improving.

### 2.1.9.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** - The main barrier was the political decision not to support the implementation of the consolidation centre – the basis for this could be the lack of communication about the measure content in the beginning of the project or even during the planning of the project. As a result of this, no networking and stakeholder involvement was possible during the implementation phase of the measure.

**Barrier 2** - The newly developed traffic policy of COL did not include the sustainable logistics topic in its contents, besides the few comments made by CIVITAS Ljubljana partners.

**Barrier 3** - Stakeholders do not perceive the situation regarding the freight delivery in the city centre as problematic; the support for the measure was not discussed with the stakeholders, even though the CIVITAS survey among the citizens (4.1-LJU) has indicated that a significant number of citizens see this as a problem; COL has no initiatives to change the delivery system in the city centre

**Barrier 4** - ML should present/discuss the measure with COL stakeholders, but the event was cancelled, which also resulted in the cancellation of the measure as initially planned (i.e. consolidated deliveries)

**Barrier 5** - A delay in measure implementation in the beginning, reduces the impact of communication

### 2.1.9.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** - Presentation within the regular meetings at COL were organised, to enhance the communication with stakeholders; also, individual meetings with stakeholders were organised, which results in a high support for establishing the web-portal for freight delivery

**Activity 2** - The portal has proven to be a good place for gathering praises/complaints/suggestions about the relevant topics

**Activity 3** - A mailing list has been created (including stakeholders); invitations to join the portal have been sent, invitation to join the efficient driving workshops were also sent

**Activity 4** - Questionnaires have been distributed among the stakeholders (delivery companies), an on-filed study has also been made in order to gather the information about their perspectives and needs/wishes concerning the delivery system in the city centre

**Activity 5** - The topic has been discussed in Ljubljana magazine; published monthly, sent to all households in Ljubljana (over 100.000) – a large scale dissemination

**Activity 6** - Workshop with presentation on good practises has been organised – the examples from Bristol and other European cities have been presented

### 2.1.9.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – Portal has been proven as a good starting point for the measure implementation; it helped to gain interest from the interested public/stakeholders; increase in general public awareness regarding the problems associated with delivery services in the city centre. The results obtained by the surveys made before the implementation of the web-portal have shown that citizens are not aware of the problems or that they don't see any other possibility but bringing the goods into the shops by vans. After introducing other possibilities through the web portal (consolidation centre, ecological vans, distribution by bicycles), they agreed that Ljubljana should go greener in freight delivery and some solutions would be well accepted.

**Lesson 2** – The on-field study proved to be a very efficient way for spreading information about the measure contents, since the measure partners have used the opportunity of analysing the status – which was primarily based on counting the delivery vehicles as well as on direct interviews with the couriers/shop keepers about the quantities and the types of the delivered – for the measure related dissemination.

### 2.1.10. Conclusions

#### Quality of activities

Improving the availability and accessibility of information is one of the objectives for most of the measures of Ljubljana.

- Relevant, complete and correct information about the high-quality mobility corridor (M2.1), the cycling strategy (M4.6) and the other CIVITAS measures was shared through events in order to reach the larger public. In most cases, large groups of the population attended these events.
- Also brochures and leaflets were used to provide information and raise awareness.
- A web portal enhances and encourages the communication about sustainable freight deliveries. Also a mailing list was set up through which it was possible to send invitations, information, etc. (M7.2).
- In order to be correct and accurate, the information provided in the Individualised Mobility Marketing Campaign (IMMC) had to be adapted accordingly to changes in other measures inside the project (M4.1). The leaflets and other info materials were distributed, and the implementation of the Mobility Shops was a step towards effective communication on the more efficient/ cleaner transport modes.

Another objective was to identify citizens' needs:

- In smaller public discussions and workgroups information was shared with stakeholder groups and feedback was gathered (M4.6, M4.9, M7.2). Unfortunately, workshops tended to attract

people that were already interested or even convinced. That is why workshops alone are not the best way to inform people (M4.6).

- The personnel of the IMMC also spent up to 1h on face-to-face discussions about sustainable transport topics (M4.1)
- The best way to get feedback from the public, however, was found to be the use of questionnaires to target groups (M6.1). However, sometimes citizens were unwilling to cooperate in the surveys because they were too long and there was resistance towards home visits by interviewers. Also misunderstandings of the instructions, aims, and goals of the surveys played an important part in the rate of success of the measure, although the surveys were scheduled and background information was provided in advance (M4.1).

In all measures of Ljubljana a mix of all the different ways to inform and involve the public was thought: large versus small scale, personally versus by letter, general public versus smaller target groups, passive versus active, etc. The IMMC (M4.1) helped to market some of the measures implemented within ELAN.

## Impact evaluation

The main impacts were aimed at identifying and mainly at satisfying citizens' needs.

- Comments and suggestions made by the citizens during the public discussions and other contact moments were taken into consideration when the cycling strategy was revised (M4.6).
- The survey undertaken in the IMMC (M4.1) provided a large amount of information about the public opinion regarding the acceptance of CIVITAS ELAN measures and traffic in the city of Ljubljana in general. The survey has been an orientation point for further action within the project; since the response was good, the results of the survey clearly showed which measures have good public support, and which of the measures should be redefined, e.g. high support of the mobility corridor (M2.1) changed the politicians' and experts' attitudes towards the implementation of the measure.
- Proposals, findings and conclusions of several ELAN measures (M4.6, M4.9, M4.15, M3.1, M2.1, M5.5, M8.1, M8.4, M8.5) were included in the new "Traffic Policy of the City of Ljubljana until 2020" and the new Spatial Master Plan of the City of Ljubljana.
- Input from mentors and parents at schools led to the change of design of a pedestrian crossing and the upgrading of the web portal with new information about the traffic situation and the location of dangerous points near schools (M5.4).
- Remarks from citizens led to a measure being changed. Also, some additional topics were included on the web portal (M7.2).
- Thanks to the public involvement (disability organizations) the public transport provider replaced a rather unambitious plan of purchasing only one vehicle for transporting people in wheelchairs, with a much more ambitious agenda for social inclusion of different groups with special needs. Only on the basis of peoples' input, they took the strategic decision to allow different groups of disabled people an equal use of all their vehicles as their long term business and socially very beneficial decision (M6.1).

The city tried to make clear to the public why all these ELAN measures are implemented and hereby to raise the awareness of traffic impacts on the quality of life and especially the impact of sustainable and clean transport modes on the environmental conditions. This was done during the different information moments (events, roundtables, presentations ...) mentioned above.

- As a result of the citizen engagement activities, residents in other parts of the city demand the implementation of dedicated bus lanes on other streets besides the corridor. This is a clear indicator that the inhabitants are convinced that measures for the public transport are necessary, even at the expense of the car users (M2.1).

- The increase in the number of participants at events was a clear indication of an increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on cycling (M4.6).
- The fact that the subject 'sustainable transport planning' is more often covered in the media is a clear indicator that the citizen engagement activities have raised the public interest (M4.9).
- The 'outreach campaign' where the attention on the increased number of children in traffic was raised with billboards, posters, traffic signs and the presence of numerous volunteers in the vicinity of schools, was a great success. Also, the more important role of safety of children in local politics indicates that it has become a public issue (M5.4).
- Additional education and training of drivers contributed to greater susceptibility and sensitivity of drivers towards impaired people (M6.1).
- With the set-up of Facebook and Twitter accounts the public interest concerning sustainable freight logistics has increased (M7.2).

There were very few measurable impacts from the different measures showing that the use of public transport increased, simply because it's difficult to measure and because it was never the main objective. But it's important to note that almost in every measure new and better ways to involve the citizens were found and how to appropriately communicate with them.

Concerning the feeling of citizens' powerlessness and the trust in the city administration, the CIVITAS ELAN team in Ljubljana knew that the situation would not change overnight. On the other hand the local ELAN partners didn't imagine that it would be so challenging to build up trust among citizens in the city government and the realization of CIVITAS ELAN measures. It took almost four years to mobilize citizens' minds and dismiss the general belief that their opinions have no impact on decision-making. But despite several challenges, citizen engagement experienced some "breakthroughs":

- The citizen engagement activities have created a dialogue culture between stakeholders. Instead of forcing their own opinions and arguments onto each other, they started to respect each other's opinion and tried to find solutions on complex problems by discussions and collaboration (M2.1).
- The city and the different stakeholders recognised that communication and citizen engagement in urban and transport planning are important. This makes the organisation of future citizen engagement activities easier. Fun-based and appealing public events were organised to overcome the distrust and negative perception of public participation (M2.1).
- The willingness of the public transport company to take into account all the reasonable suggestions and proposals made by the users, supports the democratic principle 'every voice should be heard'.
- Establishment of the Cycling Platform where everyone in this open group was offered a chance to constantly express opinions, suggestions and ideas about how to improve cycling conditions (M4.6).
- Thanks to CIVITAS ELAN partners, the "Traffic Policy of the City of Ljubljana until 2020" also includes a concrete communication and citizen engagement plan with activities that will surely boost participatory culture in transport-related issues.

## Process evaluation

In order to reduce conflicts between the citizens and the city administration, communication is one of the most important drivers. It has to be made possible that everyone can share his/ her opinion. Every good suggestion is a new step towards citizen-shaped and well-supported measures.

- The public had great expectations in terms of improvement of the cycling conditions in Ljubljana. There was a good response, a lot of good-will and participation of the public that triggered the drive to implement the measure (M4.6).
- Cooperation with stakeholders and NGOs are often a key to success (M2.1, M5.4, M6.1 and M7.2)

- Good quality of gathered survey data in the IMMC (M4.1) could be easily used by other measures – this was the basis for good communication/ cooperation with other Measure Leaders.
- The change of attitude of the PT providers' employees in relation with the passengers since the beginning of the project really helped the measure to become a good example of citizen engagement and communication with the stakeholders/ citizens (M6.1).
- The earlier the involvement of the public, the stakeholders and all of the crucial partners, the better (M7.2). If everyone is involved from the beginning, the entire process will be more efficient and the chance of success bigger.

There were also a few measures that had some problems with the citizen engagement that made the process more of a struggle to get to the implementation of the measure. These barriers form important lessons for further measures or for other cities.

- Turning the discussions into a political approach obstructed a straight-forward decision-making and/ or implementation (M2.1).
- Negative media coverage (created by experts with other goals and opinions) created an opposition to the measure with the public and has to be avoided at all times (M2.1).
- Lack of motivation for participation (apathy) and the NIMBY (not in my backyard) effect (M3.1) with the citizens is a serious threat in Ljubljana. Some politicians and experts still believe that the public does not have enough technical knowledge to be involved in the planning process or decision-making (M2.1).
- Lengthy decision-making about the measure implementation has prevented strong communication with the public (M2.1, M4.1, M4.6, M6.1 and M7.2). The implementation has to be well-timed and implemented. Only then it is possible to communicate to the public in an efficient, clear and honest way. These changes and delays of measures affected also the dynamics and the content of the information that was to be communicated within the IMMC (M4.1). As a result the IMMC needed to be redesigned: it was spread to a city wide campaign, not only focussing on the CIVITAS corridor.
- Without sufficient political and financial support it is almost impossible to implement a good, well-supported and accepted measure (M4.6 and M4.9).
- Communication has to be a two-way street (M6.1).

Throughout the different measures it becomes very clear that the communication strategy has to be planned and set in motion as early as possible in the process. A communication strategy is more than determining the proper manner to address the public, it is also:

- defining how the measure should be brought to the attention for the media. If there is already a press text and the media is contacted before they find out by themselves, the chance is smaller that the measure will be regarded as a negative development. The media is a very important factor determining the public opinion about a measure.
- timing and planning the citizen engagement activities: who is the target group and what is the most efficient way to inform and mobilize this target group?
- marketing, the measure is like a product. It has to be 'sold' to the public; they must want it to be implemented. A positive campaign is a helpful tool for that.



## 2.2. Gent

### 2.2.1. Objectives

Gent was already a city with high participation of citizens who are influencing decisions on several public matters. The citizens of Gent are active and respond well to invitations from the city authorities for public participation in planning matters, including those related to mobility. Public involvement in Gent has a long tradition and is now well-rooted in the system and functioning of urban institutions. In this respect, Gent significantly stands out amongst the other ELAN partner cities.

However, also in Gent the ELAN project was an opportunity to integrate further improved approaches for the involvement of citizens in the planning and implementation of mobility measures, especially through introduction of new consultation techniques and innovative approaches in the organisation of consultation processes.

The main city objectives on citizen engagement were the following:

- to identify and satisfy the citizens' needs,
- to improve and optimize, taking into account citizens' remarks, future projects and plans,
- to improve availability and accessibility of information in general and about city mobility,
- to raise awareness of clean and sustainable modes of transport of which the use has significant impact on bettering environmental conditions,
- to promote use of public transport modes against individual car use,
- to raise awareness of traffic impacts on the quality of life.

### 2.2.2. Measure 1.9-GEN: Semi-public clean car fleet

#### 2.2.2.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To enhance the use of the measure
Second most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Third most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
Fourth most important objective	To effectively disseminate achievements of the project to international, national and local levels
Fifth most important objective	To establish and further extend links with strong partners in the sustainable transport field

#### 2.2.2.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Presentations and information sessions	Information provision / demonstration of use of electric car	(potential) cambio users
Info-material – brochures – leaflets	Information provision	cambio users, local inhabitants, inhabitants of Flanders
Questionnaires	Feedback on use of electric cambio car/ willingness to use the electric cambio car	cambio users
Media campaign	Information provision	Cambio users, Local inhabitants, inhabitants of Flanders

### 2.2.2.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Presentations and information sessions	(potential) cambio users, employees of city of Gent located at AC Portus	<p>Presentation on carsharing and clean fleet / public fleet management philosophy in Gent (CIVITAS ELAN Consortium Meeting – Nov19 2009): approx. 10 participant</p> <p>Demonstration of the purchased electric vehicle and promotion of sustainable transportation modes during the Car Free Day of 2010. approx. 500 participants</p> <p>1 info session for the city administration on the CIVITAS day: 350 participants</p> <p>2 info sessions for employees at AC Portus : Approx. 24 info sessions for (potential) users and approx. 500 participants</p>	****
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	cambio users, Local inhabitants, inhabitants of Flanders	<p>Newsletters towards cambio-users and potential users (approx. 5 articles in different newsletters)</p> <p>People mailed : approx. 4.500 People reached via ad. : unknown</p>	*
Questionnaires	cambio users	<p>Online survey on clean vehicles - 600 people answered</p> <p>Online survey on the use of the electric vehicle – target group: 46 cambio users - 34 people answered</p> <p>Online survey 'why didn't you use the electric vehicle?' - 407 people answered</p>	***
Media campaigns	cambio users, Local inhabitants, inhabitants of Flanders	<p>Press conference about the launch of the Electric car &amp; publication in newspaper and local and national television + news magazine De Lijn ('Op 1 lijn') + newsletter for cambio-users and cambio relations.</p> <p>Ads in free newspaper Metro</p> <p>People reached via the media and printed ads in Gent : unknown</p>	

### 2.2.2.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	

Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	Communication started in early phase and was repeated frequently.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	0	City of Gent, NMBS (owner of parking at station), were involved to install electric cambio cars in Gent. Potential use of the electric cambio car were analysed by questioning cambio users.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	0	Different newsletters, ads, local television (AVS), ...
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	Small incentive to fill in the general survey as reduction of 15€ for the 100 <sup>th</sup> person.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	0	
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	People that filled in the survey got an email with the main conclusions of this survey (main conclusions: see 1.9 WD4) and there was some communication via email with people which were especially interested. Info from this survey was also used to give feedback to the whole group of cambio users via the cambio newsletter
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	0	
<b>0 = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.2.2.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	**	Answers given in surveys made it possible to make necessary adaptations (integration in 'normal' car-sharing station, paper manual, integration in reservation software).
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	See above
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	*	Despite the adaptations made, people still seem to hesitate in order to use the electric vehicle.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	
Increased public trust	0	
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	0	
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	**	Several other cities asked cambio to start with electric vehicles – one city even proposed to share the electric vehicles of the city with the cambio users.
Increased political support	**	The city agreed to install a charging station at AC Portus (city administration building)
Other, please describe????		

O = None \* = Poor \*\* = Satisfactory \*\*\* = Excellent

### 2.2.2.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – electric vehicles are a hype and get quite some attention

**Driver 2** – people get aware of the environmental problems

### 2.2.2.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – people say to be in favour of ecological vehicles, but it seems not that easy to convince them to use them once they are available.

### 2.2.2.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – better guidelines, integration in a ‘normal’ carsharing station, integration into the reservation software

**Activity 2** – on-going communication. An example started in Oct 2012: All cambio users will get 1 voucher to test the electric Cambio car. The first use of this electric Cambio car will be for free.

### 2.2.2.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – what people say they would do is not necessarily the same as they actually do, so only 95 of the 495 cambio users who asked access to the use of the electric cambio car tried out the vehicle.

**Lesson 2** – new technologies need time to get accepted

## 2.2.3. Measure 2.9-GEN: Participatory development of main train station area

### 2.2.3.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To enhance the use of the measure
Second most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
Third most important objective	To raise citizens interest

### 2.2.3.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Information provision, consulting	Local residents, merchants, commuters and other people interested in Project Gent-Sint-Pieters
Public discussions	Consulting, information	The main target group consists of the local residents, but also other interested people are

	provision	welcome
Presentations and information sessions	Information provision	Local residents, merchants, commuters and other people interested in Project Gent-Sint-Pieters
Info-material – brochures – leaflets	Information provision	Local residents, merchants, commuters and other people interested in Project Gent-Sint-Pieters
Questionnaires	Data collection	Local residents, retailers and commuters.
Website	Information provision	Local residents, merchants, commuters, inhabitants of the city of Gent and other people interested in Project Gent-Sint-Pieters

### 2.2.3.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	Local residents, merchants, commuters and other people interested in Project Gent-Sint-Pieters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Info market: 5 information markets were organised. These 5 events together gathered 930 people, but some of them came more than once. The 5 markets even had a different target group so the number of invited people was not always the same.</li> <li>- Visits to the instruction works were organised 3 till 5 times a month with a group of 20 to 100 people.</li> <li>- The GCC organised two big events every year with e.g. visits to the construction works and a brunch. The exact total number of visitors is not known, but the number of people ranges from 450 to 2000 people.</li> </ul>	***
Public discussions	The main target group consists of the local residents, but also other interested people are welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are organized reduced hindrance meetings on a two weekly basis and during busy periods on a weekly basis. These meetings took place between the project partners and the neighbourhood.</li> <li>- Soundboard groups do meet every 2 or 3 months with an average of 30 to 40 people present.</li> <li>- Two dialogue cafés have been organized with respectively 75 and 95 participants.</li> </ul>	***
Presentations and information sessions	Local residents, merchants, commuters and other people interested in Project Gent-Sint-Pieters	Presentations and information sessions were provided for all the visits to construction works and big events. There were 3 to 5 visits a month with 20 to 100 people. The big events were organised twice a year and were always completely booked.	***
Info-material, brochures and	Local residents, merchants,	Posters and brochures at the railway station & information letters for the	***

leaflets	commuters and other people interested in Project Gent-Sint-Pieters	stakeholders. In total, an average of 7 seven newsletters related to CIVITAS has been distributed in the station area, the central place for information is the info-point near the station which can be visited.	
Questionnaires:	2009-2010: Local residents, merchants and commuters 2010-2011: Local residents, retailers and commuters	2 big surveys were conducted. - 2009-2010: 285 commuters, 260 local residents and 152 retailers were interviewed. - 2011-2012: 250 commuters, 200 local residents and 100 retailers were interviewed.	***
Website & social media	Local residents, merchants, commuters, inhabitants of the city of Gent and other people interested in Project Gent-Sint-Pieters	After the feedback from commuters, local residents and retailers, it was clear that the website on the redevelopment project needed to be more attractive. This website was upgraded during the CIVITAS project. The website got an average of 250 visitors a day.  A call to fill in a questionnaire has been spread by the twitter account of the mayor, the website of Project Gent-Sint-Pieters and the city of Gent. As a result, 473 people did fill it in.	***
Media	Local residents, merchants, commuters, inhabitants of the city of Gent and other people interested in Project Gent-Sint-Pieters	Information was spread through different media: local and national journals, radio and TV.	**

#### 2.2.3.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	Mostly, the delivered information is complete and correct. Nevertheless, the info point depends on the information which is delivered by the (construction) partners. Certainly in the beginning, the communication did not always go very smooth.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	The information sharing is dependent on the (construction) partners. Certainly in the beginning, the information did not reach the info point on time, but this went better during the process. The info point itself was constructed with a delay of around 10 months due to bad weather and soil pollution.

Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	By setting up different kinds of activities with a different approach, the info point tried to address as much stakeholders as possible. Activities were designed with a collective and personal approach, as less articulate people will probably prefer the last approach.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	A wide range of media was used to provide the stakeholders with information: local and national journals, radio and TV, website, information letters, posters at the railway station, brochures and social media. The central place for information is the info point, which can be visited. The survey of 2011-2012 indicated that the people want to receive more information in the railway station itself.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	*	No specific incentives were provided, except of pens and candies, but the fact that the stakeholders got the chance to give their opinion or idea can be seen as an incentive.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	***	The stakeholders were provided with different kinds of support to participate actively. The most important means are the info markets, soundboard groups, visits to the construction works, dialogue café, info-point and newsletter,
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	***	Two big research projects have been set up, the first one in 2009-2010, and the second one in 2011-2012. This survey was designed in order to find out what the stakeholders thought of the used communication and interactive tools and if this did meet their expectations. The results of this research have not been communicated directly towards the stakeholders, but there are done some adaptations. An example is the extra attention for commuters while making the 3D-model without reducing the attention for the other stakeholders. People could always ask questions about the Project Gent-Sint-Pieters on which they always got an answer the same moment (on events, public discussions, etc.) or the latest two weeks after from the info point.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	**	A good cooperation between the partners is essential for a good communication towards the different stakeholders. The partners need to know when they have to provide the info point with changes on the site which affect (one of) the stakeholders so they can be informed. The provision of this information did not always go well in the beginning, but it seems that the situation improved a lot.
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.2.3.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	**	The info point tried to make the communication as interactive as possible and took the comments into account if these were useful and realistic.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	The complaints of the citizens have taken into account as much as possible in the decision-making and

		measure implementation. An example of this influence is the role of the soundboard group in the decision to keep a tunnel under the railway track closed till at least 2016 in order to avoid traffic hindrance in a quarter close by. Other examples are extra zebra crossings or (not) planting of trees.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	The survey of 2011-2012 indicated that all the stakeholders (local residents, retailers & commuters) were more satisfied with the communication than indicated in the first survey of 2009-2010. There is also an increase in the support for the redevelopment project in each target group.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	The info point did set up a lot of visits to the construction works, presentation sessions and interactive methods to increase the awareness and knowledge of the citizens.
Increased public trust	**	The public trust in the project did increase due to the organisation of different kinds of activities and information sessions. The fact that the stakeholders see it as less important to get informed can indicate a certain trust in the project, but also other factors, such as more knowledge about the project, do play their role in this change.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	**	A good cooperation between the partners is essential for a good communication towards the different stakeholders. The partners need to know when they have to provide the info point with changes on the site which affect (one of) the stakeholders so they can be informed. The provision of this information did not always go well in the beginning, but it seems that the situation improved a lot.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	**	There are a lot of partners involved in the project which do have a say in the communication strategy: De Lijn, NMBS-holding and city of Gent. These three entities are fixed partners of the info point. For example De Lijn has a big responsibility as well in order to keep informing his clients.
Increased political support	**	The political support for this project has always been great. The mayor and several aldermen are for example members of the soundboard group.
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory</b>		<b>*** = Excellent</b>

### 2.2.3.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – The cooperation with the citizens led to the design of different interesting new methods. There are not only ‘simple’ presentations, but also different very interactive activities were designed. Some of these methods have a more collective approach, others a more personal approach. In this way, also less articulate people are given the chance to participate more easily in the project.

**Driver 2** – The research conducted by students of the University of Gent, which is done in 2009-2010 and 2011-2012 consisted a lot of useful information, for example to determine on which topics the info point had to focus more. These researches also included recommendations made by the students based on their findings.

**Driver 3** – The info-point team consist of the most important partners, namely De Lijn, the city of Gent, CIVITAS and the NMBS-holding. This makes that they can keep each other updated on their part of



Project Gent-Sint-Pieters and that they work out activities which are not only in favour of one of the partners.

**Driver 4** – The visits to the construction works on the events organised twice a year were a very big success. They were always fully booked. Besides that, there were also 3 to 5 visits to the site of groups of people interested in the site.

### 2.2.3.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – The communication between the construction partners and the info point did not always go well in the beginning. It happened that the construction partners did change the timing, for example due to bad weather or a late delivery. This affected the local residents certainly during the works on the public domain. These changes were not always known by the info point which led to a lot of complaints by the local residents and to a certain loss of credibility.

**Barrier 2** – The info point itself was constructed with a delay of around 10 months due to bad weather and soil pollution.

**Barrier 3** – The architect was reserved to show anything that was not known in detail yet. Comments on any changes could also be avoided this way. This caused a delay in the creation of a 3D-model of the site in 2020. The 3D-model will normally be presented before the end of CIVITAS.

**Barrier 4** – The citizens are involved in different ways, but they only have an advisory role. This caused sometimes a disappointment and is sometimes also difficult to communicate to the stakeholders.

**Barrier 5** – The information markets are a good formal instrument as a first means of informing the public, but the emphasis is put on one-way communication and there is not really the opportunity for the citizens to explain their personal situation. Only the most articulate people will be heard in this case.

**Barrier 6** – It is easier to reach a group of people such as the neighbourhood committee than individual people.

### 2.2.3.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – Reduced hindrance meetings were held on weekly basis instead of on two weekly bases during busy periods. These meetings function as a bridge between the project partners and the neighbourhood. For the technical aspects this meeting is supported by a bureau – Traject – which is specialized in signalization and mobility related aspects.

**Activity 2** – In order to improve the interaction with individuals, different working methods have been designed such as the dialogue café and the soundboard groups.

### 2.2.3.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – Open communication between the different partners of the project is crucial for a good communication with the different stakeholders: local residents, commuters, retailers and other interested people.

**Lesson 2** – For such a big project, it is important not to focus on just one communication tool, but to use a wide range of communication tools for the different stakeholders. It is necessary to make sure that there are interactive tools as well in order to give the stakeholders the chance to give their opinion, complaints and ideas about the project.

**Lesson 3** – Project Gent-Sint-Pieters was by many local residents and retailers perceived as a prestige project and not as a project that could be positive for them as well. Therefore it is important to stress 'what's in it for them'.

## 2.2.4. Measure 3.3-GEN: Parking and public space management around the main train station

### 2.2.4.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	Raising awareness about reducing the use of the private car in the ELAN corridor and especially within the area around the train station.
Second most important objective	Gathering information and data from citizens regarding parking habits and today's situation.
Third most important objective	Jointly discussing the needs, problems and deliberate solutions on the parking policy in the station area.
Fourth most important objective	Building up a general awareness about the new parking policy that will be copied later to other districts and other urban projects in the city.

- **Creating support for tariff zone 4** - A large public should be involved into the philosophy and the planned measures concerning a new parking restriction scheme for on street parking, in relation to the opening of (a part of) the new main train station parking.
- **Creating support for sustainable mobility policy** – To implement the outcomes of the design study on spatial planning, the support of property developers is needed.

### 2.2.4.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Workshops	Discussing possible instruments the lower on street parking pressure (example: no free parking permit for garage owners, combined use of private parking spaces,...)	Property promoters active in Ghent

- **Creating support for tariff zone 4** – To involve a large public into the philosophy and the planned measures concerning a new parking restriction scheme for on street parking, in relation to the opening of (a part of) the new main train station parking, a number of hearings and info sessions were organised. Activities in the field of citizens' engagement are in detail described in Measure 2.9-GEN.
- **Measuring acceptance level of new and durable spatial planning approach** – In February 2012 a workshop was held with the bigger property promoters that are active in the city. In this workshop the objectives of property promoters became clear: how important is parking in a commercial context, what affects the size of a parking in a project, what is their point of view on the measures that the city aims.

### 2.2.4.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Workshops	Property promoters active in Ghent	On February 16th a brainstorm session was held in the city hall. 12 project developers attended the brainstorm session, which was a big success.	***

#### 2.2.4.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

- **Creating support for tariff zone 4** – Evaluation of implementation of citizens' engagement activities is described in detail in measure 2.9-GEN.
- **Measuring acceptance level of new and durable spatial planning approach**

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	A powerpoint presentation explained the context and showed possible new concepts on parking regulations (discussion based on 4 courant building development cases, that were prepared).
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	***	Developers are heard when possible future parking policy of the city is still in concept phase.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	All property promotors active in Ghent were invited. Also representatives of the City Department of Urbanism, the AGSOB (city development company) and the alderman responsible for mobility joined the workshop.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	Discussion was based on a powerpoint presentation.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	*	No specific incentives were provided, but the fact that the stakeholders got the chance to give their opinion or idea can be seen as an incentive.
Citizens provided with appropriate means / support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	***	Size of workshop ensured that all could participate actively. The project developers reacted to these possible measures. It was a very interesting workshop for both the city and the project developers. The city became more aware of the concerns of the project developers, and had the chance to hear the other side of the story. For the project developers, this was the perfect moment to express their concerns and worries. They had the chance to give their opinion on the possible future parking policy of the city.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	*	Feedback wasn't delivered yet, due to long term absence of measure leader.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	*	Feedback wasn't delivered yet, due to long term absence of measure leader.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

#### 2.2.4.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

- **Creating support for tariff zone 4** – Impact of citizens' engagement activities is in detail described in Measure 2.9-GEN.
- **Measuring acceptance level of new and durable spatial planning approach**

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	***	The participants were asked to give feedback on the Mobi week. The concept of the Mobi weeks did not change a lot, but this feedback was taken into account for the organisation of the Mobi week the year after. Also a questionnaire was set up to analyse the mobility behaviour of employees and to determine certain barriers for the use of sustainable transport. This questionnaire was presented to the employees of the Technologiepark, Fnac Gent and Bisdom Gent. The questionnaires formed an important source of information for concrete mobility advice and the completion of the mobility plans.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	***	The questionnaires formed an important source of information for concrete mobility advice and the completion of the mobility plans.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	All contacted companies but one have a company mobility plan. Most of these plans were set up in the framework of the CIVTIAS-project.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	The three editions combined, an average of 9,1% of the total number of employees at the Technologiepark registered for the Mobi weeks. The number of participants didn't vary that much over the three editions. However, there were also a lot of non-registered employees who did participate for a while. Also the modal share of cars decreased by more than 5,5%.
Increased public trust	0	
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	**	The measure partners involved the employees of the different companies in organising questionnaires and the set-up of the mobi-teams. The first edition was mostly set up by the Mobility Company with the help of employees, but the second and certainly the third edition were set up by the employees themselves (mobi-team) with the support of the Mobiliteitsbedrijf when needed.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	**	Bisdom Gent contacted the <b>measure leader</b> for mobility advice for their planned move into the city centre. Bisdom Gent and other companies/organisations interested in setting up mobility plans were referred to Slimweg, an initiative set up by the Flemish government which can be contacted by companies for free information and advice on sustainable mobility.
Increased political support	**	The political support was always there and e.g. the organisation of the Mobi weeks will also be supported by the city of Gent next year.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

#### 2.2.4.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities are in detail described in Measure 2.9-GEN.

#### 2.2.4.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities are in detail described in Measure 2.9-GEN.

## 2.2.4.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

Activities are described in detail in measure 2.9-GEN.

## 2.2.4.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

- **Creating support for tariff zone 4** – Lessons learned in relation to citizen engagement are in detail described in Measure 2.9.
- **Measuring acceptance level of new and durable spatial planning approach**

**Lesson 1** –The workshop was a first reality check for the future parking policy of the city. Project developers accept that rules are necessary. They suggest to take economic rules into account when developing new parking regulations.

## 2.2.5. Measure 4.2-GEN: Mobility management for companies

### 2.2.5.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
Second most important objective	To inform citizens on measure content
Third most important objective	To include major stakeholders into solution

### 2.2.5.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Acting together, deciding together	Employees of Technologiepark, Gent City Council, Fnac
Presentations and information sessions	Information provision	Employees of Technologiepark
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information provision	Employees Technologiepark, Maria Middelaes, Gent City Council, Fnac Gent, Bisdome Gent
Questionnaires	Consulting	Employees Technologiepark, Fnac Gent, Bisdome Gent

### 2.2.5.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	Employees Technologiepark, Fnac	There were respectively 300, 314 and 300 employees registered for the Mobi weeks at the Technologiepark, but the real number of employees present was certainly higher. All the employees of Fnac Gent were present at the Fnac Mobi week.	**

Presentations and information sessions	Employees of Technologiepark, employees Fnac	Approximately 35 participants were present at the info sessions at the Technologiepark; all the employees of Fnac Gent got information about cycling in Gent	**
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Companies, organisations	Accessibility sheets for Technologiepark, Gent City Council, Fnac Gent, Bisdrom Gent	***
Questionnaires	Employees Technologiepark, Fnac Gent, Bisdrom Gent	All the companies with more than 100 employees have to collect information on mobility for the “Federale Diagnostiek”. In total, there are data of respectively 2538 (in 2008) and 2858 (in 2011) employees available, Besides that, there were also conducted surveys during the final events of the Mobi weeks with 64 (2009), 42 (2010) and 41 (2011) respondents. For Fnac Gent, the mobility data for all the employees, 75 in total, were collected.	***

#### 2.2.5.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	The employees of the companies at the Technologiepark and Fnac got the correct information through the use of posters, flyers and a website.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	***	The Mobi weeks have always taken place without any delay and the information was spread on time.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	**	A “mobility workgroup” which consists of mobility managers of several companies was founded in order to discuss the evolution of mobility on the site of the Technologiepark. The employees of the companies were invited to join the mobi-team which organises the Mobi weeks.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	Every company was provided with posters and flyers to spread the information to their employees, a website with mobility related information was set up especially for the employees of the Technologiepark and Fnac Gent. It is the responsibility of the companies to provide this information towards their employees but this didn't always happen. At Fnac Gent, the mobility responsible had meetings with all employees driving by car to motivate them coming by alternative modes to work.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	***	The people who used a sustainable transport mode got presents like a breakfast, foot massage, concert, etc. at the Mobi weeks at Technologiepark and Fnac Gent. The employees could also win a folding bike, group arrangements as a boat trip in city centre, a visit to museum, etc.

Citizens provided with appropriate means / support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	***	The first Mobi weeks were organised by the mobility company, but the second and the third edition were organised by the employees themselves with the help of the mobility company. All the employees at the Technologiepark were invited to the event. There has been conducted a survey every year of the participants to gather some input for the next edition.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	Participants of the Mobi weeks were questioned afterwards and could give feedback. This feedback was taken into account for the organisation of the Mobi week the next year. Also for the set-up of the different mobility plans the feedback of the participants was taken into account.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	**	There was a good cooperation with the mobi-team and the "mobility workgroup" which were kept updated on the process.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.2.5.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	***	The participants were asked to give feedback on the Mobi week. The concept of the Mobi weeks did not change a lot, but this feedback was taken into account for the organisation of the Mobi week the year after. Also a questionnaire was set up to analyse the mobility behaviour of employees and to determine certain barriers for the use of sustainable transport. This questionnaire was presented to the employees of the Technologiepark, Fnac Gent and Bisdom Gent. The questionnaires formed an important source of information for concrete mobility advice and the completion of the mobility plans.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	***	The questionnaires formed an important source of information for concrete mobility advice and the completion of the mobility plans.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	All contacted companies but one have a company mobility plan. Most of these plans were set up in the framework of the CIVTIAS-project.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	The three editions combined, an average of 9,1% of the total number of employees at the Technologiepark registered for the Mobi weeks. The number of participants didn't vary that much over the three editions. However, there were also a lot of non-registered employees who did participate for a while. Also the modal share of cars decreased by more than 5,5%.
Increased public trust	0	
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	**	The measure partners involved the employees of the different companies in organising questionnaires and the set-up of the mobi-teams. The first edition was mostly set up by the Mobility Company with the help of employees, but the second and certainly the third edition were set up by the employees themselves (mobi-team) with the support of the Mobiliteitsbedrijf when needed.

Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	**	Bisdom Gent contacted the <b>measure leader</b> for mobility advice for their planned move into the city centre. Bisdom Gent and other companies/organisations interested in setting up mobility plans were referred to Slimweg, an initiative set up by the Flemish government which can be contacted by companies for free information and advice on sustainable mobility.
Increased political support	**	The political support was always there and e.g. the organisation of the Mobi weeks will also be supported by the city of Gent next year.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.2.5.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – By organising already three Mobi weeks, the employees and employers of the involved companies are engaged to pay attention to (and act upon) the sustainable mobility issue. The engagement of companies and employees in this area grows year by year. The first edition was fully organised by the **measure leader**, with little help from the companies. The second edition, a Mobi-team that consisted of employees organised, together with the **measure leader**, the Mobi weeks themselves. But, the **measure leader** still handled all administration and financial aspects. For the third edition the Mobi-team will not only fully organise the Mobi weeks without help from the **measure leader**, but they will also follow up the whole administrative aspect. This way, we establish an evolution in citizen engagement. The mobi-team is the perfect group of people to motivate their peers (colleagues) to change their mobility behaviour positively.

**Driver 2** - By setting up a mobility workgroup that consists of several employees of business areas, the employers could get convinced easier that it is necessary to take action.

**Driver 3** - A consensus is reached between the GCC, the companies of the Technologiepark and other partners to set up a kind of Gentlemen's agreement which states that every partner engages himself to several tasks in the upcoming years. Because of the expansion of Technologiepark Zwijnaarde, mobility is a big issue that needs the highest priority.

**Driver 4** – A lot of employees who use(d) their car everyday do or did experience the traffic congestion and other mobility issues. Because of the worsening of these problems, some of them are open towards more sustainable mobility modes. An activity like the Mobi week was for some of them the ultimate trigger to really change their mobility behaviour.

**Driver 5** – The different companies already experience a lot of mobility issues since a long time. The fact that they could get the financial support of CIVITAS and the personal guidance focussed on changing the mobility behaviour can certainly be seen as a stimulus to really work on this subject.

### 2.2.5.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – It is not recommended to organise exactly the same activity for the same employees the year after. There is a risk of fatigue for the message of 'sustainable home-to-work transport' amongst companies and their employees.

**Barrier 2** – Many employees are interested in using public transport for their home-to-work travels, but the current timetables of the public transport is not adapted to the wishes of the employees. Moreover, the infrastructure is not adapted to the needs of public transport in the Technologiepark. There are for example no separated bus lanes or enough bus stops.

**Barrier 3** - The current financial crisis makes companies more reluctant to invest in sustainable mobility.



### 2.2.5.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – A mobi-team was created that consists of employees of the different companies. These employees know best which issues their peers experience and on which issues they can focus during the Mobi week. In this way, they can keep the Mobi weeks dynamic and revamped

**Activity 2** – A test period of one year was set up with corporate public transport. Nevertheless, there were not enough employees who really used this bus because of a great variety of working hours.

### 2.2.5.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – It is important to involve the employees and companies as much as possible. They know better than anybody else which mobility issues are experienced in the area. Within this measure, a peer to peer approach is more effective and produces better results than the top down approach.

**Lesson 2** – The help of an external person is very useful, certainly in the start-up phase. Nevertheless, it is important to give the employees immediately the chance to contribute to the activities in order to enthuse them for the sustainability and continuation of the activity.

## 2.2.6. Measure 4.3-GEN: Mobility management for schools

### 2.2.6.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To include major stakeholders into solution
Second most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
Third most important objective	To improve trust between different stakeholders

### 2.2.6.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Deciding and acting together	Pupils of the secondary schools of Gent located in the ELAN-corridor and the target group they have chosen (e.g. a campaign for more respect for elderly people on the public transport, parents, local residents, etc.)
Public discussions	Deciding and acting together	Pupils of the secondary schools of Gent located in the ELAN-corridor and the target group they have chosen
Info-material – brochures – leaflets	Information provision	Pupils of the secondary schools of Gent located in the ELAN-corridor
Questionnaires	Surveying the modal split of the students (one school also let their students elaborate the survey themselves)	Pupils of the secondary schools of Gent located in the ELAN-corridor

### 2.2.6.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	Pupils of the secondary schools of Gent located in the ELAN-corridor and the target group they have chosen (e.g. a campaign for more respect for elderly people on the public transport)	<p>2009 – 2010: seven schools took part in the activity, six of them also participated in the competition</p> <p>2010 – 2011: two schools were willing to participate, but they quit during the year.</p> <p>2011 – 2012: 9 schools were willing to participate wherefrom two departments of the same school, seven of them also participated in the competition where from two departments of schools were presented as one.</p>	<p>2009 – 2010: **</p> <p>2010 – 2011: *</p> <p>2011 – 2012: **</p>
Public discussions	Pupils of the secondary schools of Gent located in the ELAN-corridor and eventually the target group that is chosen by the pupils	The number of pupils differs a lot from school to school and from campaign to campaign.	<p>2009 – 2010: *</p> <p>2010 – 2011: *</p> <p>2011 – 2012: ***</p>
Presentations and information sessions	Pupils of the secondary schools of Gent located in the ELAN-corridor	<p>2009 – 2010: The pupils and teachers organising the activity at the six participating schools.</p> <p>2010 – 2011: The pupils and teachers organising the activity at the two participating schools.</p> <p>2011 – 2012: The pupils and teachers organising the activity at the nine participating schools.</p>	<p>2009 – 2010: ***</p> <p>2010 – 2011: *</p> <p>2011 – 2012: ***</p>
Info-material, brochures & leaflets	Pupils of the secondary schools of Gent located in the ELAN-corridor and the school in general	<p>2009 - 2010: There have been developed eight final reports for the participating schools</p> <p>2010 – 2011: One final report has been developed.</p> <p>2011 – 2012: The final reports will not be developed due to the high pressure of work.</p>	<p>2009 – 2010: ***</p> <p>2010 – 2011: 0</p> <p>2011 – 2012: *</p>
Questionnaires	Pupils of the secondary	2009 – 2010: The six schools or-	2009 – 2010: 0

	schools of Gent located in the ELAN-corridor	<p>organised a modal split questionnaire before the campaign, but not after.</p> <p>2010 – 2011: The two schools organised a modal split questionnaire before the campaign, but not after.</p> <p>2011 – 2012: The nine schools organised a modal split questionnaire before, the number of schools who have organised a modal split questionnaire afterwards is not sure yet. But there are already seven schools that have done this.</p>	<p>2010 – 2011: <b>0</b></p> <p>2011 – 2012: <b>***</b></p>
--	--	---	---

**0** = None **\*** = Poor **\*\*** = Satisfactory **\*\*\*** = Excellent

#### 2.2.6.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	School Year	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	2009-2010	**	The participating schools and pupils got relevant information about CIVITAS and the purpose of measure from the ML and consultancy bureau Mobiel 21.
	2010-2011	*	The participating schools and pupils got an informative presentation about CIVITAS and the purpose of measure 4.3, but this was only given mid February 2011.
	2011-2012	***	The participating schools and pupils got an informative presentation about CIVITAS and the purpose of measure 4.3.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	2009-2010	**	The ML was back to work since the 10 <sup>th</sup> of August 2009. These caused a short delay in the beginning, but most of the deadlines which were set up were reached.
	2010-2011	*	The schools were contacted in December for a first meeting. Unfortunately, 3 of the 5 schools that had agreed to cooperate in June 2010 already had finalized their year planning and CIVITAS was no longer a part of that planning. Only two schools were willing to participate.
	2011-2012	**	The new ML only started her job at the first of September 2011, but she was able to set up a timetable which is followed during the entire school year of 2011-2012 except of a short delay in the delivery of the modal split data after the activity.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	2009-2010	**	The main stakeholders were the pupils. The mobility campaigns that were set up addressed the pupils, and in some cases also

			teachers, parents or local residents.
	2010-2011	*	The main stakeholders were the pupils. Since there were only two schools willing to participate and none of them really did set up something, there were no campaigns in 2010-2011 and the schools quit or postponed the project.
	2011-2012	***	The main stakeholders were the pupils. But not all mobility campaigns were addressed to all pupils of the school. Nevertheless, each mobility campaign had his specific stakeholders, e.g. elderly people, parents or the car drivers in the school area.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	2009-2010	***	Different types of media were used: video, social media, local media.
	2010-2011	0	/
	2011-2012	***	The schools were informed about the project by the ML who also gave a brief introduction of CIVITAS and measure 4.3. Depending on the mobility campaign which was worked out, the schools/ pupils themselves made use of different media.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	2009-2010	***	All the participating schools had to present their mobility campaign to a jury. The first three schools received a sum of respectively €2500, €1500 and €1000 they have to spend on a mobility related subject.
	2010-2011	0	Just like in the first edition, there was promised a financial prize for the first three schools. Due to the fact that the ML passed away in September 2010, the competition didn't take place in 2010-2011.
	2011-2012	***	All the participating schools had to present their mobility campaign to a jury. The first three schools received a sum of respectively €2500, €1500 and €1000 which they have to spend on a mobility related subject.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	2009-2010	***	The participating schools and pupils got the support of the ML and consultancy company Mobiel 21 in the preparation of the mobility campaign. Each school also got a subsidy of maximum €500 to spend on the mobility campaign.
	2010-2011	*	The temporary ML tried to motivate the schools to participate and supported the schools, but it did not work.
	2011-2012	***	Every participating school got a subsidy of maximum €500 to spend on the mobility campaign. Besides that and even more important is the personal support of the ML. Therefore, a first meeting was planned with the teachers and a second one with the pupils. Afterwards, there was a brainstorm session which finally led to the activity itself.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the	2009-2010	*	Mobility plans were set up for every school, but modal split data were not collected after

taken decisions after their opinions and comments			the campaign which makes it difficult to estimate the impact of the campaign.
	2010-2011	0	/
	2011-2012	***	All the participating schools could set up a mobility campaign themselves with the support and feedback of the ML. Their project will also be presented to a jury which will also give some feedback on the prize day. Also (before and after) modal split data was collected.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	2009-2010	**	The schools and pupils were asked to work out a mobility campaign which aimed to address the other pupils of the school or (an)other group(s) of people like local residents or parents.
	2010-2011	0	/
	2011-2012	**	The schools and pupils were asked to work out a mobility campaign which aims to address the other pupils of the school or (an)other group(s) of people like local residents or parents.

0 = None      \* = Poor      \*\* = Satisfactory      \*\*\* = Excellent

### 2.2.6.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	**	Because it were the pupils themselves who had to set up the mobility campaign, it is also clear that their comments and suggestions were crucial for the success of the measure. Nevertheless, the general concept or design did not change.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	***	Because it were the pupils themselves who had to set up the mobility campaign, it is also clear that they had a big influence on the decision-making and measure implementation.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	Since the pupils were directly involved in the project, there was an increased use and acceptance of the measure. The peers-to-peers approach is crucial here.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	Most of mobility campaigns succeeded to increase the awareness and knowledge of the pupils on sustainable mobility. But there were big differences in the reached scale and impact.
Increased public trust	**	Different mobility campaigns were set up with a different target group. As a consequence, the level of increased public trust differed.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	**	The first two editions have proven that it was important to have a personal measure partner open towards new ideas of the citizens. There was thus an increase.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	*	For example the police was willing to support some of the activities when useful and also other schools showed sometimes their interest for the other project. But it is not sure yet which of this interest will really lead to new realisations.

Increased political support	*	There was political support for the mobility campaigns, but it is difficult to say that this support really increased.
Other, <i>please describe?</i>		
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.2.6.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – The first three years have shown that a personal guidance is a very important, even a crucial, element in the process. The fourth year was the most successful one, which can be explained by the presence of a very motivated ML who had a good contact with the schools.

**Driver 2** – By organising a brainstorm session, all pupils of the class or pupils' council could give their view on the mobility issues they experience when they travel to school. All of them were facing mobility issues when they travel to school.

**Driver 3** – By making a competition of the mobility campaigns, the pupils got more motivated when they heard that a prize could get won.

### 2.2.6.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – The first and second year, there was a complete lack of support from the ML due to illness and the fact that he passed away in September 2010. The first three years, the pupils also got the support of a consultancy company, but it was clear that they were less connected to the school life in Gent.

**Barrier 2** – It was sometimes difficult to make the pupils find a subject / theme for the mobility campaign, but this differed from school to school and from year to year.

### 2.2.6.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – A new measure leader was appointed who had to dedicate much of her working hours to measure 4.3 for school year 2011-2012. The ML was very motivated and had a good contact with the pupils and the schools which resulted in a better development of the measure.

**Activity 2** – The measure leader tried to find an idea / concept for the mobility campaign by focussing on the things they are good at. Every school has some certain specialities like informatics or woodcraft.

### 2.2.6.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – A personal guidance by a motivated ML is crucial for the success. It is important that this person has a certain feeling with the school life in Gent.

**Lesson 2** – It is wise to focus on a mobility issue by which most of the students (or other stakeholders) are affected. In this way, it's easier to get them involved.

**Lesson 3** – Organising a competition with more than 10 schools per school year is difficult since the ML has to put a lot of effort into each school. If more schools would participate, a second counsellor would be a good idea.

## 2.2.7. Measure 4.5-GEN: “The House of Bike” and bicycle activities

### 2.2.7.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To enhance the use of the measure
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Second most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Third most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

### 2.2.7.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

	TYPE		TARGET GROUP
	Type of activity	Level of participation	
X	Events (7 models of bicycle bins were displayed so that visitors of the car free day could test them and give feedback)	Information provision and information gathering (consulting)	Visitors of car free day on September 7, 2011
X	Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information provision	Inhabitants of densely populated areas in which bicycle bins were installed and who might be interested in joining the pilot study
X	Questionnaires (before-questionnaire)	Information gathering Consulting	Inhabitants of densely populated areas in which bicycle bins were installed
X	Questionnaires (after-questionnaire)	Information gathering Consulting Co-decision making	Users of the bicycle bins (i.e., participants in the pilot study)
X	Questionnaires (after-questionnaire)	Information gathering Consulting	Inhabitants of densely populated areas in which bicycle bins were installed and who did not join the pilot study

### 2.2.7.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	Visitors Car Free Day	150 visitors tested the models and gave feedback	***
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Inhabitants of densely populated areas in which bicycle bins were installed and who might be interested in joining the pilot study	1.200 flyers asking people to join the pilot study (i.e., renting a place in the bin for 6 months at a price of 25 Euro)  Call in public magazine and other communication channels to send in an application to rent a place in a bicycle bin  A Facebook fanpage GENTFIETST was created for promoting all cycling topics, among other the call to participate in the bicycle bin pilot study  → 300 applications for the new bicycle bin (only 35 places available so that in some neighbourhoods waiting lists had	***

		to be created)	
Questionnaires (before-questionnaire)	Inhabitants of densely populated areas in which bicycle bins were installed	1.130 questionnaires sent out, 277 completed questionnaires sent back → response rate: 24,5%	**
Questionnaires (after-questionnaire)	Users of the bicycle bins (i.e., participants in the pilot study)	31 questionnaires sent out, 19 completed questionnaires sent back → response rate: 61,3%	***
Questionnaires (after-questionnaire)	Inhabitants of densely populated areas in which bicycle bins were installed and who did not join the pilot study	386 questionnaires were filled in	**

#### 2.2.7.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	The general objectives of this measure were communicated to the citizens through the questionnaires. The more specific details of the bicycle bins were communicated through 1.200 flyers in which citizens were asked to join the pilot study (i.e., renting a place in the bin for 6 months at a price of 25 Euro).
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	***	A first questionnaire was sent out <i>before</i> the implementation of the bicycle bins. By doing so, relevant information was gathered on e.g. the willingness-to-pay, the willingness-to-use and the willingness to have a shed within close vicinity (NIMBY-effect). A second questionnaire was organized <i>after</i> the implementation and the pilot-study among two target groups: (i) citizens who did not join the pilot study and (ii) users of the bicycle bins. Moreover, users of the bicycle bins could contact the measure leader with problems, questions and remarks at any time <i>during</i> the pilot study.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	This measure has one important stakeholder group: residents of densely populated neighbourhoods in which parking places for bicycles are rare. Activities were thus mainly addressed towards this group.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	The objectives of this measure were communicated to the citizens through the questionnaires. But citizens could also test and compare the bicycle bins themselves at the Car Free Day (September 19, 2010).
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	The renting fee in the pilot study was kept low (25€ for 6 months). The renting fee after the pilot study will be 4,70€ per month per bicycle. Information from the before and after questionnaires revealed that the willingness-to-pay is not that much higher. Most people (residents as well as users) are willing to pay 5€ per month per bicycle maximum.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables	**	Citizens could participate actively with the measure leader, but not with other stakeholders.



them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)		Citizens could test various models of bicycle bins at the Car Free Day (September 19, 2010) before the bins were installed in the selected neighbourhoods. Citizens were invited to participate in a pilot project in which they could use the bicycle bin for 25 Euros during 6 months.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	***	Personal contact between participants and the measure leader (e.g., the measure leader handed over the key of the bicycle bin to participants).
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	**	During the pilot study, discussion with other city departments was started on how to create a common vision for a follow-up project (March 2011) as there was lack of support from those departments to install the bicycle sheds (providing permits for installation) and results of the pilot-study (comparison before/after questionnaire) were presented at department-level
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.2.7.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	**	Users of the bicycle bins were questioned after the pilot study about, among others, the practical use and the design of the bicycle bins. These remarks were taken into account when the specifications were formulated for the extra 20 bicycle bins in a follow-up project. Also the positive results stimulate the discussion with other departments to come to a common vision.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	From the end of 2011 onwards citizens were invited to suggest a location for one of the 20 new neighbourhood bicycle bins that are being purchased as a follow-up project to the pilot project (call on the cycling website in December 2011 and in the City Magazine in February 2012). More than 300 suggestions were received.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	From the start of the pilot study, demand for renting places in a bicycle bin was higher than the supply. Nearly all places were rented after completion of the pilot study.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	***	A comparison between the before and after questionnaire among citizens revealed an increasing interest in bicycle bins. Before the pilot-study, only 23,1% of the respondents were willing to place 1 bicycle in the bin. This increased to 46,5% after completion of the pilot-study.
Increased public trust	**	The willingness-to-use has certainly increased, but some remarks can be raised related to general public trust. The willingness to have a bicycle bin in close vicinity differs between citizens and users of the bins. Almost 4 out of 10 interested citizens do not have objections (44,1%). No important differences were noticed between the before and after questionnaire. However, the willingness to have bicycle bin in close vicinity is remarkable higher among users who participated in the pilot study

		(84,2% have no objections). Public trust clearly increases with personal use of the bicycle bins.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	- Personal contact between participants and the measure leader (e.g., the measure leader handed over the key of the bicycle bin to participants). - Citizens were asked to suggest new locations for the extra 20 bicycle bins (follow-up project). More than 300 suggestions were received. A list was created of the most likely locations. Citizens who made these suggestions were reformed about future decisions.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	**	- On how to organize the exploitation of the bicycle bins a session of information exchange and best practices was set up amongst Gent, Brussels, Bruges and Antwerp, cities also engaged in this and other types of innovative bicycle parkings. This took place in Antwerp on the 27 February 2012. - In addition to bicycle bins, other forms of bicycle parking near housing in densely built neighbourhoods are being examined. A start for this study was made in the beginning of March 2012 by Mobiel 21.
Increased political support	***	The city of Gent already ordered 20 extra bicycle bins (follow-up project). Also, the positive results stimulated the discussion with other departments to come to a common vision.
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.2.7.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – Close cooperation between measure leader and users of the bicycle bins in the pilot project provided useful insights into evaluation and experiences of these users. These insights will have a crucial impact on the future exploitation of this measure.

**Driver 2** – Due to positive results of the project, the project will be continued. 20 extra bicycle bins will be installed soon.

**Driver 3** – Citizens can make suggestions for the location of the 20 extra bicycle bins. Taken into account some external parameters (e.g., permission of the urban planning department is necessary in historically valuable neighbourhoods), this approach guarantees that bicycle bins will be located in those neighbourhoods where the need is highest and where possible tenants reside.

**Driver 4** – Cooperation with Gent University in organizing various questionnaires among users and residents of the neighbourhoods in which bicycle bins were installed. This resulted in a detailed analysis of user acceptance of bicycle bins (information on, among others, preferences and willingness-to-pay for neighbourhood bicycle bins).

#### 2.2.7.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** - Time consuming. Measure leader must follow up each remark and suggestion made by citizens and users of the bicycle bins.

**Barrier 2** – Measure leader cannot meet each suggestion made by citizens (related to the installation of the extra bicycle bins. We received 300 suggestions for only 20 extra bicycle bins. Taken into account some restrictions (e.g., permission of urban planning department necessary in historically valuable neighbourhoods), some citizens will be disappointed.

### 2.2.7.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

No specific activities necessary in relation to the Citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

### 2.2.7.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – It is quite easy to engage people for something that can really serve them in their *daily life* (parking their bicycle safely and dry for a reasonable renting price)

**Lesson 2** – The project was a pilot and has proven that a lot of support exists for the system of bicycle bins. Although, we can say that this pilot was a bit too successful. We learned that if something turns out to become a real success, you need to be prepared for that. We received many applications and we could not handle all these applications in an acceptable time. People applying for a place in a bicycle bin might become disappointed - certainly if, after all their efforts, they are not selected to participate in the pilot study and will not get a safe parking place for their bicycle.

## 2.2.8. Measure 4.7-GEN: Walking promotion

### 2.2.8.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To include major stakeholders into solution
Second most important objective	To include major stakeholders into measure implementation
Third most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

### 2.2.8.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Workshops	Discussion on priority of Pavement Action Plan	Stakeholders represented by different departments of the city of Gent
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information giving	Citizens and visitors
Questionnaires	Information gathering Consulting	Citizens; Students; Commuters
Questionnaires	Information gathering Consulting	Day-care centres in the corridor Companies situated in the corridor Elderly people living in the corridor
Other: talk by mail and by phone	Information gathering Consulting	Schools in the corridor
Other: walking campaign “Gent, city of my feet – all at walking distance” – a photo competition in which citizens were invited to upload pictures related to	Creating independent community interest	Citizens

walking in Gent at a Facebook page		
------------------------------------	--	--



### 2.2.8.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Workshops	Departments of city of Gent involved in Pavement Action Plan	40 workshops (2 workshops per zone)	***
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Citizens	Inspiring call in the city magazine and on the city website (140 000 copies of the magazine)	**
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Visitors	Visitors of the CIVITAS event on November 21, 2009 were asked to write down suggestions and remarks related to walking in the city. → 200 postcards were send back	**
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Citizens, visitors	10.000 walking map (walking routes indicated in time) were distributed at several information desks, info points, public venues, ...  Citizens and visitors are explicitly invited to give comments. However, no comments were received so far.	**
Questionnaires	Citizens	1000 questionnaires sent out, 284 completed questionnaires sent back → response rate: 28,4 %	**
Questionnaires	Students	Students (at university college or university) were contacted by e-mail and invited to complete an online questionnaire → 3.928 completed questionnaires	*
Questionnaires	Commuters	111 pedestrians were interviewed at the train station Gent Sint-Pieters (target was 150 pedestrians)	**
Questionnaires	-Day-care centres in the corridor  -Companies situated in the corridor  -Elderly people living in the corridor	57 people and organisations were addressed, 12 completed questionnaires returned → response rate: 21,1%	***

Other: talk by mail and by phone	Schools in the corridor	48 primary and secondary schools were addressed, 12 completed questionnaires returned → response rate: 25,0%	***
Other: walking campaign “Gent, city of my feet – all at walking distance” – a photo competition in which citizens were invited to upload pictures related to walking in Gent at a Facebook page	Citizens	30 large posters and 21.000 postcards were distributed in the city inviting citizens to upload their pictures related to walking in Gent. The picture competition was also announced via Facebook, Twitter and other local network sites.  → 168 citizens contributed with valuable pictures for the competition	**

#### 2.2.8.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	Information about the Pavement Action Plan was distributed through press release and the city magazine.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	Target groups were asked to provide input on a regular basis, but feedback to these target groups was also provided on a regular basis
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	A range of target groups (schools, companies, elderly, citizens, students, computers, ...) in the corridor were contacted by mail or by telephone
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	***	A mix of intermediaries/media has been used to provide information (city magazine, city website, Facebook, Twitter, ...)
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	Appropriate incentives were distributed in the campaign “Gent city of my feet – all at walking distance”. Participants at the photo competition could win multimedia vouchers, trip by balloon, walking outfit, boat trip on the canals of Gent. Also six consolation prizes were distributed among the participants.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)		
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	Target groups were asked to provide input on a regular basis. This resulted in a list of 32 action points (e.g. places where walking conditions could be improved). After each completed action point, target groups received feedback.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure		

O = None \* = Poor \*\* = Satisfactory \*\*\* = Excellent

### 2.2.8.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	***	Information gathered by various questionnaires and campaign resulted in a list of 32 action points.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	*	Priorities of this activity list do not always correspond with priorities in other departments, delaying the completion of the activity list.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	Citizens are more familiar with the walking promotion campaign and the functional walking map than students in higher education. Quantifiable targets and objectives related to familiarity are thus only partially achieved.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject		?
Increased public trust		?
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	Communication with citizens through the Department of Citizen's Engagement and the Accessibility official
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	***	Actively involved in the project "Pavement Action Plan"
Increased political support		?
Other, <i>please describe????</i>		
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.2.8.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – This measure is integrated in the existing "Pavement Action Plan" of the Road Department of GCC. Also other departments as "Gebiedsgerichte werking", a department working on citizen engagement, and the social services department (representing e.g. handicapped people) are involved in this project.

**Driver 2** – The many surveys, questionnaires and polls that were carried out amongst all kind of target groups: students, commuters, citizens, pedestrians, employees, etc.

**Driver 3** – The Department of Geography, Gent University, became a new partner within CIVITAS (since September 2009). This facilitated data collection and research among various target groups.

**Driver 4** – Publication of a call to all citizens could be launched in the city magazine and on the city website.

### 2.2.8.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

No barriers related to citizen engagement in measure 4.7 GEN.

### 2.2.8.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

No activities necessary in relation to the Citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers.

### 2.2.8.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – By consulting the public, new and less known “walking problems” rose to the surface.

**Lesson 2** - The objectives of one department do not necessarily correspond to similar priorities in another department. Consequently, a citizen engagement initiative does not always have a direct result.

## 2.2.9. Measure 4.10-GEN: Comprehensive mobility dialogue and marketing campaign

### 2.2.9.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	to increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
Second most important objective	to raise citizens interest
Third most important objective	to inform citizens on measure content

### 2.2.9.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events: ‘Cycle Chic’	Information provision	Visitors / citizens of Gent
Presentations and information sessions: ‘Our district is moving’	Information provision	Inhabitants of 5 districts
Info-material – brochures – leaflets: ‘Our district is moving’	Information provision	Inhabitants of 5 districts
Questionnaires: ‘I keep moving, even without my car’; ‘Cycle Chic’; ‘Our department is moving’	Consulting: Surveying (potential) participants	Inhabitants (18-65 years old) of Gent in the possession of a car; visitors and citizens of Gent; Employees of the City of Gent
Competition: ‘Our department is moving’	Active participation in a competition between (groups of) participants; acting together	Employees of the City of Gent

### 2.2.9.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
------	--------------	------------------------	-------------------



Events: 'Cycle Chic'	Visitors and citizens of Gent	Share of people with a more positive attitude towards biking and who were spurred to bike more often (via questionnaire with 262 respondents).	**
Presentations and information sessions: 'Our district is moving'	Inhabitants of 11 districts	Unfortunately almost no one came to the info market organized in the districts.	*
Info-material – brochures – leaflets: 'Our district is moving'	Inhabitants of 11 districts	In total, there were 51500 brochures distributed over 5 districts	**
Questionnaires: 'I keep moving, even without my car'; 'Cycle Chic'; 'Our department is moving'	Inhabitants (18-65 years old) of Gent in the possession of a car; visitors and citizens of Gent; Employees of the City of Gent	Only 16 (or 7%) of the respondents was willing to participate in the activity "I keep moving, even without my car". In the end, there were only 6 people who really participated in the activity itself. 136 people were interviewed about the Cycle Chic campaign. 257 employees out of a total of 598 working at 18 different departments or 42% joined the activity for the first edition. For the second edition, around 9% of the 5900 people employed at the GCC departments and the OCM Gent joined the activity.	*
Competition: 'Our department is moving'	Employees of the City of Gent	6,4% of the employees did participate in the first edition and 9% of them did participate in the second edition. Respectively 8,27% and 8,24% of the participating employees did change their mobility behaviour positively.	**

#### 2.2.9.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	*	There was information available for all the stakeholders, but it was not always very efficient, certainly not for the "Our street is moving" and "Our district is moving" campaign.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	There have not really been made mistakes on the timing. Some deadlines could not be made due to a lack of interest for the activity. Nevertheless, the timing cannot be regarded as the main reason for the failure of some activities.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	*	There was certainly the intention to address representatives of all the main stakeholders, but they were not always reached. More specifically, it was very difficult to address fervent car users willing to participate.

Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	The channels used to provide information about the failed activities (“Our district is moving” and “Our street is moving”) cannot be regarded as appropriate since a more personal approach was required.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	*	No big incentives for the citizens were foreseen, except for the “Our department is moving” campaign which worked very well. The incentives at the latest campaign were a folding bike and several departments can get some group arrangements like a boat trip or a visit to a museum.
Citizens provided with appropriate means / support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Means and support were foreseen, for example travel advice, for the citizens, but they did not really use it.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	0	
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	0	
<b>0 = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.2.9.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	**	After the failure of the “Our street is moving” campaign, a survey was conducted to find out the reasons. These findings have been taken into account for future campaigns and activities.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	0	
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	0	16% of the interviewees in the cycle chic campaign gave a positive answer on the question “Does this action spur you to bike more often?”.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	*	The purpose of the sub-measures was to increase the awareness of the citizens. Not all the activities were successful, more specifically the “Our district is moving” and “Our street is moving” campaign and to a lesser extent the “I keep moving, even without my car” campaign. The other two campaigns were more successful. For 27 % of the respondents, the campaign of Cycle Chic did lead to a more positive attitude towards biking.
Increased public trust	0	
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	0	
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	0	

Increased political support	0	
Other, please describe????		
0 = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.2.9.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – Using a personal approach made it a lot easier to motivate people. This is what we did for example for the “I keep moving, even without my car”. We didn’t reach the targets of the activity (to find at least 10 people to participate in the activity), but it was already more successful than the first two activities.

**Driver 2** – The “Our department is moving”-campaign did go well. The main reasons were probably the facts that the participants are already connected with each other and that they could win a prize with the whole department. This created a certain group pressure which resulted in a successful campaign.

### 2.2.9.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – It was difficult to find people willing to participate in the activities of “Our district is moving” and “Our street is moving”. It seems that the collective approach which was used for this campaign did not work.

**Barrier 2** - It was even more difficult to reach the suitable group of people (= car users). In general, the few people interested in participating in the activity did already use sustainable transport modes often.

**Barrier 3** – During the process, it became clear that a better result could be obtained if a more personal approach was used. However, this makes the process very time-consuming. Activities with a very personal approach like “I keep moving, even without my car” are very intensive and do mostly not affect that many people.

### 2.2.9.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – In order to find suitable people willing to participate in the activities of this measure, the ML had to work out other activities on other levels than foreseen. There weren’t enough people interested in participating on the district and street level, thus the ML decided to refine the target group and organised an activity on service level “Our department is moving” and on the individual level “I keep moving, even without my car” which attracted more participants.

**Activity 2** – The concept of the action “Our street is moving” (which was cancelled due to a lack of interest) was used for the action “Our department is moving”. In this context, the concept worked quite well. This success can probably be explained by the fact that the people did know each other already (very) well and that they could win a nice prize. This combination led to a bigger solidarity among the employees during the game.

**Activity 3** - The action “I keep moving, even without my car” was set up by using the MaxSUMO method. The stage allocation of MaxSEM was used to determine who of the respondents of the survey before the “I Keep moving, even without my car” were in some way willing to change their mobility behaviour. This would make it easier to find a suitable group for the activity.

### 2.2.9.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** - A preferred evaluation method should be presented before the start of the campaigns. This did not happen with the MaxSUMO method which made clear that it is mostly impossible to integrate an evaluation method in the campaigns when these did already set off.

**Lesson 3** – It is not sufficient to give only general information online or on paper in order to change mobility behaviour. For example almost nobody gave any reaction after the distribution of the information brochure. It is more efficient to approach citizens in a personal way or to approach them as a well-defined cohesive group. When they are approached as a group, there can be created a certain peer pressure and people can be motivated by their peers, for example by colleagues.

**Lesson 4** – Citizens should be approached more on key-moments in their life which cause often big changes in their (mobility) habits. Examples of these moments are moving to another place, a marriage, a divorce, getting children, change of job, etc.

**Lesson 4** - The message of the campaign also has to be clear. The message of for example the Cycle Chic campaign was not clear for everyone. The more focused the message, the more people start thinking about their mobility behaviour.

### Specific lessons of the different sub-measures

**Lesson 1 “Our district is moving”** – The target group of these sub-measures consisted of the inhabitants of the different districts in Gent. Initially, three campaigns were worked out to raise citizens’ interest in using more sustainable transport modes. In the end, only the first campaign, the distribution of tailor-made brochures for different districts in Gent, was worked out. The inhabitants could also get personal travel advice, but in general, only the people who did move already in a sustainable way were interested to participate. The target group, frequent car users, could not be reached. Another idea was to gather the inhabitants of the different districts in order to exchange their ideas on behaviour change towards more sustainable mobility. These gatherings were organised in three different districts, but none of them were very successful and only attracted people who were already interested in sustainable mobility. To conclude, this activity cannot be regarded as a success since the target group could not be reached.

**Lesson 2 “Our street is moving”** - Because the inhabitants of these districts weren’t really keen to collect information on sustainable mobility, another way to enthuse citizens for the project had to be found. Therefore, they tried to motivate the inhabitants of the so called ‘playing streets’, streets which are closed for a day each week during holidays. The inhabitants of 80 playing streets were contacted by a letter and a call in local newspapers and the initiators of the ‘play streets’ were sent a reminder e-mail, but only two families were willing to participate. Because of a lack of interest, the activity was cancelled. A survey has been conducted afterwards to find out the reasons for this lack of interest. The general conclusion is that citizens have to be approached more personal.

**Lesson 3 “Our department is moving”** – The “Our street is moving” campaign was introduced as a game between the different departments of the city council of Gent. The purpose was to make their home-work movements as sustainable as possible by collecting the highest number of sustainable movements and the highest amount of saved CO<sub>2</sub>. The activity could be seen as successful and was repeated in 2011. This success can probably be explained by the fact that the people did know each other already (very) well and that they could win a nice prize. This combination led to a bigger solidarity among the employees during the game.

**Lesson 4 “keep moving, even without my car”** – More than 450 people were interviewed in order to find at least 10 people who were interested to make use of sustainable transport modes during one month as much as possible. The target of the number of interviewees was reached, but the target of 10 people willing to join the activity itself wasn’t reached because finally only six people really joined the activity. However, five of them did already move in a sustainable way often. This activity was more successful than the first two activities, but it still did not reach the target group of frequent car users.

**Lesson 5 “Cycle Chic”** – The Cycle Chic campaign was set up to give a positive image of cycling in the city and thereby to increase public awareness on sustainable mobility. For this activity, there wasn’t really put forward a certain target about ‘the degree of awareness’, but it can be seen as a successful campaign. The survey, which was conducted during the exhibition, did show a positive image from the public on the activity.

## 2.2.10. Measure 5.6-GEN: Safe cycling corridor

### 2.2.10.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To include major stakeholders into solution
Second most important objective	To include major stakeholders into measure implementation
Third most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

### 2.2.10.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events (Car Free Day + CIVITAS day)	Information giving	Citizens and visitors
Workshops	Consulting: In-depth process evaluation of the cycling street with cyclists and the residents	Cyclists driving in the cycling street and inhabitants of the Visserij
Presentations and information sessions (a meeting organized on February 2, 2011 and a focus group on March 13, 2012)	Information giving Information gathering (consulting)	Residents of the Visserij
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information giving	Residents of the Visserij
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information giving	Citizens and visitors
Questionnaires	Information gathering Consulting	Citizens; Students; Commuters
Questionnaires	Information gathering Consulting	Day-care centres in the corridor Companies situated in the corridor Elderly people living in the corridor
Other: talk by mail and by phone	Information gathering Consulting	Schools in the corridor
Other: cycling campaign “Keep on cycling in wintertime” – distribution of free winter gloves to bypassing cyclists in exchange of answering three short questions on their cycling behaviour	Information gathering (consulting)	Cyclists

### 2.2.10.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events (Car Free Day and CIVITAS day)	Citizens and visitors	200 postcards sent back on CIVITAS day and 100 at Car Free Day.	**
Workshops	Cyclists on cycling street	16 volunteers	***
Presentations and	Residents of	100 residents in Visserij	***

information sessions (at an information market)	the Visserij	→ 75 completed questionnaires	
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Residents of the Visserij	2 letters have been send to all residents and asked to give their opinion → almost all residents went to the info sessions to give their opinion	**
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Citizens	Inspiring call in the city magazine and on the city website (140 000 copies of the magazine distributed to all inhabitants of Gent)	**
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Visitors	Visitors of the CIVITAS event on November 21, 2009 were asked to write down suggestions and remarks related to cycling in the city. → 200 postcards were send back	**
Questionnaires	Citizens	1000 questionnaires send out, 284 completed questionnaires send back → response rate: 28,4 %	**
Questionnaires	Students	Students (at university college or university) were contacted by e-mail and invited to complete an online questionnaire → 3.928 completed questionnaires	*
Questionnaires	Commuters	141 cyclists were interviewed at the train station Gent Sint-Pieters (target was 150 cyclists)	**
Questionnaires	Day-care centres in the corridor Companies situated in the corridor Elderly people living in the corridor	57 people and organisations were addressed, 12 completed questionnaires returned → response rate: 21,1%	***
Other: talk by mail and by phone	Schools in the corridor	48 primary and secondary schools were addressed, 12 completed questionnaires returned → response rate: 25,0%	***

Other: cycling campaign “Keep on cycling in wintertime” – distribution of free winter gloves to bypassing cyclists	Cyclists	Cyclists received a free set of winter gloves in exchange of answering three short questions on their cycling behaviour →881 answers collected from bypassing cyclists	***
--	----------	---	-----

#### 2.2.10.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	First success of the citizen engagement activities in the cycling street Visserij. Several personal letters were sent to participate in the workshops on the concept of the cycle street. The outcomes of the workshops were also distributed to the residents of the Visserij.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	Target groups were asked to provide input on a regular basis, but feedback to these target groups was also provided on a regular basis
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	A range of target groups (schools, companies, elderly, citizens, students, commuters, ...) in the corridor were contacted by mail or by telephone
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	***	A mix of intermediaries/ media has been used to provide information (information market, city magazine, city website, Facebook page, ...)
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	Appropriate incentives were distributed in the campaign “Keep on cycling in wintertime” (free winter gloves), but other campaigns could be improved by more appropriate incentives
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)		
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	Target groups were asked to provide input on a regular basis. This resulted in a list of 159 action points. After each completed action point, target groups received feedback, the list of action points were not distributed.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure		
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.2.10.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to	***	Information gathered by various questionnaires and campaigns resulted in a list of 159 action points (e.g.

changes in design		places where cycling conditions could be improved).
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	*	Priorities of this action list do not always correspond with priorities in other departments, delaying the completion of the action list.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure		Due to the cycle street the number of cyclists is increased with 36%. As cycle street is a success, action is already set up to implement new cycle streets in Gent
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject		Still lots of press attention after one year cycle street.
Increased public trust		
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens		Alderman, Martine De Regge, mentioned to press that the investigation is started to implement the concept in other streets. She even suggested implementing the cycle street at the Coupure.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)		The first cycle street in Belgium is officially integrated in Belgian traffic regulations. Lille is interested in the concept
Increased political support		Alderman, Martine De Regge, mentioned to press that the investigation is started to implement the concept in other streets. She even suggested implementing the cycle street at the Coupure.
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory</b>		<b>*** = Excellent</b>

#### 2.2.10.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – the many surveys, questionnaires and polls that were carried out amongst all kind of target groups: students, commuters, inhabitants, cyclists themselves, employees, etc.

**Driver 2** – The Department of Geography, Gent University, became a new partner within CIVITAS (since September 2009). This facilitated data collection and research among various target groups.

**Driver 3** – Publication of a call to all citizens could be launched in the city magazine and on the city website.

#### 2.2.10.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

No barriers related to citizen engagement in measure 5.6 GEN.

#### 2.2.10.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

No activities necessary in relation to the Citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers.

#### 2.2.10.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – By consulting the public, new and less known “cycling problems” rose to the surface.

**Lesson 2** – Inhabitants were involved in the reorganisation of their street (Visserij redesigned as a cycle street). People found it positive that they could have a say in what was going on in their street.



**Lesson 3** – Nearly 95% of the bypassing cyclists were very satisfied with the free gloves of the winter campaign “Keep on cycling in wintertime”. This illustrates that gadgets should be useful in the first place and they are a mean of interacting with the public.



## 2.2.11. Measure 6.2-GEN: Innovative car sharing

### 2.2.11.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To include major stakeholders into problem defining
Second most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Third most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

### 2.2.11.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Questionnaires	Consultation	(Potential) users of cambio
Website	Competition & provision of information via social media	(Potential) users of cambio
Trial offer	Trying out cambio (informing)	Potential users of cambio

### 2.2.11.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Questionnaires:	(Potential) users of cambio	A total of 644 people filled in the questionnaire wherefrom 586 completed it entirely.	***
Website	Competition & provision of information via social media	2621 people visited the website via Facebook and 2041 participated in the game. 484 people spread the message of cambio, 748 people reacted on this,	***
Trial offer	Potential users of cambio	2009: Extra growth of 36% or 30 in number in comparison with the spring months 2010: Extra growth of 32% or 33 in number in comparison with the spring months 2011: Extra growth of 30% or 37 in number in comparison with the spring months	***

#### 2.2.11.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	Citizens are provided with a lot of information on cambio. The questionnaire was complete and clear and the trial offer campaign gave citizens the chance to get to know cambio better in real. It was clear that the trial period was only valid for two months. The website <a href="http://www.cambiokabouters.be">www.cambiokabouters.be</a> contained all the information about the game and info (price, car possibilities, insurance...) about cambio.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	***	Nothing bad can be said about the timing of the information sharing. The trial offer has taken place in the autumn period of three consecutive years and will probably be organised next autumn as well.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	**	The questionnaire did in the first place reach the current cambio users who represent 42% of the interviewees. Nevertheless, 58% of the interviewees are (more or less) potential new users, which can be seen as a success. The campaign on Facebook and the action website did reach a lot of the cambio users, but also non-cambio users did visit the website and Facebook page. Some prizes were reserved to cambio users; other could also be won by non-cambio users.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	***	Cambio has set up a promotion campaign for the trial formula that was published in several newspapers. The campaign "Vote for a car sharing station in your neighbourhood" was announced in the magazine of the city of Gent and was spread by the district leaders of the Gebiedsgerichte werking of the city, Facebook, a website designed for the Facebook-action and mouth-to-mouth promotion. Also the regular communication tools of cambio were used and posters were spread in the city.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	***	The trial offer is an incentive itself because it gives the chance to interested people to try out cambio. For the "Vote for a car sharing station in your neighbourhood" campaign, the fact that the places, which were chosen the most by the interviewees, would be provided with a car sharing station can be seen as an incentive. The participants of the Facebook competition could win several prizes like a folding bike, a subscription of De Lijn, a subscription on cambio, a cartoon...
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Cambio assisted the people who responded to the trial offer. The questionnaire was very clear and as a consequence did not requested extra support.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	The people using the trial offer will always be assisted when they have questions. The places which are chosen the most in the questionnaire will get a car sharing station which is always announced publicly.

Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	**	Cambio did get support of the city of Gent to find relevant information on the CE&D process. Cambio as well informed his partners on information about this.
<b>0 = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory</b>		<b>*** = Excellent</b>

### 2.2.11.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	0	Nothing has changed in the design since there were not really comments on the design itself.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	***	Since local residents know in general better than anyone else which places would be popular for a car sharing station, the suggested places for a car sharing station were taken into account and researched. And if possible, a car sharing station was set up. Up till now, Cambio already started up four new car sharing stations.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	The trial offer was a big success and led to an extra growth of respectively 36%, 32% and 30%. Also the poolcard system was enthusiastically welcomed by the companies since the real amount of poolcard outnumbered the expectations seven times.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	***	From the growth of users, there can be concluded that the awareness and knowledge of cambio increased by the "vote for a car sharing station in your neighbourhood" and the Facebook-action and the trial offer.
Increased public trust	0	An eventually increased public trust cannot be measured directly, but the (potential) new Cambio users appreciated the "vote for a car sharing station in your neighbourhood" campaign and trial offer for sure.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	**	Cambio has already always been open towards citizens because it is their target group. Because of the success of the "vote for a car sharing station in your neighbourhood" campaign, Cambio will probably set up this campaign again in Gent and other cities. The Facebook game also attracted a lot of non-Cambio users.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. Construction companies, other cities, ...)	*	The concept of the campaign will probably also be used by Cambio in other cities.
Increased political support	0	The political support has always been there. The city of Gent supported for example cambio in the creation of new car sharing stations. Cambio users do also get free parking cards for the city of Gent.
Other, please describe?		
<b>0 = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory</b>		<b>*** = Excellent</b>

### 2.2.11.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – The first trial formula offered in 2009 led to an extra growth of 36% in comparison with the spring months. This success incited cambio to organise the action the upcoming years.

**Driver 2** – The questionnaire of the campaign “vote for a car sharing station in your neighbourhood” was completed by 586 people, which can be seen as a big success. Since local residents know in general, better than anyone else, which places would be popular for a car sharing station; the suggested places for a car sharing station will be taken into account and researched.

**Driver 3** – The Facebook-game did attract a lot of cambio users, but also many people who did not use cambio. The action can thus be seen as a big success.

### 2.2.11.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

No barriers were experienced during these activities. The only changes made were behind the scenes, but nothing of the design or concept of the campaigns did change.

### 2.2.11.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

Since there were no barriers experienced in relation to the citizen engagement, no activities were taken to overcome these barriers.

### 2.2.11.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – Local residents know in general better than anyone else which places would be popular for a car share station. The suggested places for a car sharing station can better be taken into account and researched.

## 2.2.12. Measure 6.3-GEN: Holistic event management

### 2.2.12.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
Second most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Third most important objective	To include major stakeholders into problem defining

### 2.2.12.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Info-material – brochures – leaflets: ‘Culture with a low CO <sub>2</sub> emission’, “leave your car at home when you are going out!”, one-to-one guidance for venue managers and event organizers	Information provision	Visitors of events and cultural venues, event organizers, cultural venues
Questionnaires	Deciding together, acting together, sur-	Event organizers, cultural venues, visitors of

	veying visitors	events and cultural venues
Website	Information provision	Event organizers

### 2.2.12.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
<p>Info-material, brochures &amp; leaflets: - 'Culture with a low CO<sub>2</sub> emission'</p> <p>- 'Leave your car at home when you are going out!'</p> <p>- one-to-one guidance for venue managers and event organizers</p>	<p>Visitors of events and cultural venues, Event organizers, cultural venues</p>	<p>500 posters, 5000 postcards, two banners, advertisements on the back of the busses and in the brochure of the Film festival which was printed in 100 000 copies. Only 20 people asked for travel advice.</p> <p>300 posters, 2000 postcards, advertisement in the brochure of the Film festival, 1000 employees saw a video report of the photo shoot for the promotion campaign. Only 20 people asked for travel advice.</p> <p>There were created eight mobility plans and 39 accessibility sheets. In total, 45 stakeholders organised a mobility action(s) in the framework of CIVITAS.</p>	<p>*</p> <p>***</p>
<p>Questionnaires: - 'Culture with a low CO<sub>2</sub> emission' &amp; "leave your car at home when you are going out!" - one-to-one guidance for venue managers and event organizers</p>	<p>Visitors of events and cultural venues</p> <p>Event organizers, cultural venues,</p>	<p>402 people were interviewed at OdeGand in 2011, 224 at the car free day in 2010 and 596 after the video report of the photo shoot.</p> <p>A questionnaire was distributed to 38 event organizers, 15 of them filled it in.</p>	<p>*</p> <p>***</p>
Website	Event organizers	Only 22 users of the DMSS tool did fill in the survey, but a lot of response was received by e-mail as well. The exact number of responses is not known.	**

### 2.2.12.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	The slogan of the first mobility campaign was not clear for everyone. Nevertheless, the provided information and goal of the activities in general were complete and correct.

Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	***	There are no big delays for the implementation of the different sub measures. The event organizers got the information on time and could always reckon on the help of the mobility company or they got referred to another helpful organisation.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	**	Certainly the event organizers and cultural venues were strongly involved in the process; the visitors were more difficult to reach.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	***	Different media were used: posters, video report, websites, postcards, etc.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	*	There were no direct incentives provided except of the VIP-treatment, travel advice and the use of cycle sheds for visitors
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	*	The event organizers and cultural venue managers had the chance to give their concerns on the mobility issues they experience. The visitors on the other hand were not consulted.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	The mobility issues of the event organizers and cultural venue managers have been strongly taken into account to work out the accessibility sheets, mobility plans and the DMSS-tool. There hasn't been given feedback on the taken decisions but this will certainly be organised in the future on a suitable event.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	0	
<b>0 = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.2.12.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	**	The event organizers and cultural venue managers were intensely involved in the process, for example in questionnaires on the specific mobility issues they experience. Because of a certain number of respondents did not understand the slogan of the first campaign 'Culture with a low CO <sub>2</sub> emission', another slogan was chosen for the second edition: 'leave your car at home when you are going out!', which is in fact the second tag line of the first campaign.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	*	There has been a certain influence on decision-making for the supply of public transport and the mandatory use of the DMSS-tool in the near future.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	The indicator "User acceptance by stakeholders" has only been used for the evaluation of the DMSS-tool. The users evaluated it as a very useful tool and will definitely use it in the future again. Moreover the use of the tool will be mandatory for event organizers in the near future.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	The mobility campaigns have increased the awareness and knowledge of the citizens. For example 84% of the interviewees on the 'Culture with a low CO <sub>2</sub> emission' campaign said that it made them think about their own mobility behaviour. 48% of the interviewees on the sec-

		ond campaign said that the message spurs them to make more use of sustainable transport modes.
Increased public trust	**	The participants of the event are more satisfied when they are aware of the fact that organizers give more attention to mobility issues.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	**	Generally speaking, the partners welcomed the mobility campaigns and do make use of the DMSS-tool to increase the attractiveness of using alternative transport modes. But they don't work proactive at the moment, except of the organisation of the Gentse Feesten.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities,...)	**	There were a lot of parties involved in the process like the police, BBL, Slimweg and Traject to contribute to the measure. Also the measure leader of the traffic guidance system was involved as he puts relevant information on the system during events
Increased political support	***	The political support has always been there and there were no complaints about that. Because the support high, it didn't really increased.
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.2.12.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – The photo shoot for the campaign 'Culture with a low CO<sub>2</sub> emission' got a lot of attention. A video report about it was shown on national television and was shown to a public of 1000 employees of the city of Gent. Because of this attention, the message of the campaign was well spread.

**Driver 2** – Launch of the website [www.gentevenement.be](http://www.gentevenement.be) with the DMSS-tool for event organizers to determine which measures can be taken to solve the mobility issues by experienced the organizers and visitors. The website was warmly welcomed by several event organizers.

### 2.2.12.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – A certain number of respondents did not catch the slogan 'Culture with a low CO<sub>2</sub> emission' immediately and did not understand the idea behind the campaign as a consequence.

**Barrier 2** – It was difficult to convince visitors of events and cultural venues to use the tram, bus or train as an alternative transport mode because of a lack of public transport in the evening and at night.

### 2.2.12.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – Because of a certain number of respondents did not understand the slogan of the first campaign 'Culture with a low CO<sub>2</sub> emission', another slogan was chosen for the second edition: 'Leave your car at home when you are going out!'. This slogan was the second tag line of the first campaign.

**Activity 2** – The cooperation with De Lijn got better and they want to cooperate to create integrated culture – PT tickets. But due to savings, De Lijn limited the number of trams and buses in the evening and at night. Nevertheless, there will take place negotiations with private sponsors and the cultural sector to optimize the supply of public transport in the evening and at night and to discuss the possibility of these integrated tickets.

### 2.2.12.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement



**Lesson 1** – Event organizers do not always know that well which tools they can use to reduce the impact. Therefore, it is important for a city to work together with the event organizers in order to estimate the impact of the event on the traffic in the city. In this way, the city can provide the organizers with means to limit the impact as much as possible.

**Lesson 2** – It is very useful for event organizers to have an information point, e.g. a website, with all the information on the different means and possibilities to limit the impact on the traffic. The event organizers seem to view a central point of information, in Gent the holistic event management website, as a very convenient tool.

**Lesson 3** – It is not only important to inform the event organizers itself about possibilities to limit the impact on the traffic. It is the visitors who have to be persuaded to move as sustainable as possible. It is not always easy to reach this target group and to give them good alternatives for the car. For example the public transport doesn't operate that much anymore late in the evening or at night. Therefore, it is important to give visitors the chance to use alternative modes. The best is to approach the visitors personally and not only by making some flyers and a banner.

### Specific lessons on the sub measures

**Lesson 1 - The holistic event management website** can be seen as a success. The event organizers were actually waiting for a website like this because it was often unclear which process they had to follow in order to apply for a permit to organise an event. By entering key information such as timing, estimated number of visitors etc., tailor-made solutions will be suggested. These solutions will always propose a multi-modal approach that takes into account a mix of all possible transport modes. The overall feedback from the press conference was very positive. Moreover, the event organizers had the opportunity to raise suggestions that were taken into account and implemented if this was useful and possible.

**Lesson 2 – One-to-one guidance for venue managers and event organizers:** 35 event organizers and event location managers were interviewed on all kinds of mobility issues they face. They were also asked their opinion on the cooperation they had with city services so far. This information was used to set up mobility plans and accessibility sheets. There has also been foreseen travel information for the visitors of the events and cultural venues to persuade them to use alternative transport modes instead of the car. They were mostly enthusiastic about the idea of alternative transport modes and the offered personal travel advice, but there were not really a lot of people who did ask for it. The one-to-one guidance can be seen as a successful sub-measure, but the idea of personal travel advice did not work out very well.

**Lesson 3 – Mobility campaigns aimed at visitors of cultural venues and events:** Besides the event organizers, the purpose of measure 6.3 was also to show event visitors alternative transport modes. A poster campaign was organised centred on a famous Belgian artist. The campaign reached a lot of people by banners, a video report on the photo shoot for the poster, an advert in the 100.000 brochures for the Film festival of Gent and there were also postcards handed out with contact information to ask for free personal travel advice. In the end, there were only 20 people per edition who really asked for travel advice. If the concept of free travel advice will be used again in the future, it has to be worked out in a different manner. MaxSUMO turned out to be a good evaluation method for the campaign. The different steps in changing behaviour are studied. Do people think about their transport mode? Do they ask for free accessibility advice? And do they really change their behaviour?

## 2.2.13. Measure 7.3-GEN: Institutional platform for city freight management

### 2.2.13.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To include major stakeholders into problem defining
Second most important objective	To include major stakeholders into solution

Third most important objective	To include major stakeholders into measure implementation
Forth most important objective	To establish and further extend links with strong partners in the sustainable field
Fifth most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

### 2.2.13.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Information provision + consulting	Shopkeepers, politicians, city services, distributors, inhabitants, interest groups
Workshops	Deciding together + acting together	Shopkeepers, distributors, De Lijn, city services, interest groups
Presentations and information sessions	Information provision	Shopkeepers and distributors
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information provision	Shopkeepers (and they should inform distributors)
Questionnaires	Consulting	Shopkeepers, distributors

### 2.2.13.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	Shopkeepers, politicians, city services, distributors, inhabitants, interest groups	100 participants	*
Workshops	Shopkeepers, distributors. Also De Lijn, city services and other interest groups were invited	6x 20-25 participants	***
Presentations and information sessions	Shopkeepers and distributors	3x 15 participants	**
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Shopkeepers (and they should inform distributors)	550 receivers	*
Questionnaires	Shopkeepers, distributors	250 responses	**

### 2.2.13.4. Implementation of citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	Because of the www.d-via.be survey we had a lot of info available for our target group. This enforced the engagement.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	Timing was perfect regarding the interest for city distribution and regarding the policy period (in between 2 elections). Unfortunately in 2009/2010 there were a lot of investments in the public domain. Dealing with this nuisance was the prime objective for the target

		group, more than dealing with innovative city distribution. In 2011 interest for city distribution grew.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	The shopkeepers and distributors were not only informed but also were actively involved in the project (feedback gathered during the workshops, with the inquiry, site visits...)
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	*	There was attention in the media for city distribution but could have been more
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	They always had the possibility to put points of (their) interest on the agenda of meetings and workshops.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	We are planning to involve participants even more in 2012 by working out some small scaled practical solutions on the field
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	***	The results of the inquiry were presented to the citizens afterwards.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	See above
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.2.13.5. Impact of citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	**	Especially good suggestion concerning adjustments in streets where participants are active (e.g. Vlaanderenstraat). Discussions on freight management on city level are still difficult (e.g. distribution centre)
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	In the beginning the focus of the decision makers was the public investment (2009/2010). Since 2011 the interest in city distribution is growing.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	*	Although we have good contacts and initiatives it is not easy to reach every shopkeeper of distributor
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	Awareness has grown
Increased public trust	*	Although we have good contacts and initiatives it is not easy to reach every shopkeeper of distributor – more effort need to be done to increase trust
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	*	Until now we focussed more on shopkeepers and distributors then on citizens
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	**	We are consulted by other cities and private companies
Increased political support	**	Especially since 2011
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

### 2.2.13.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – The main driver was the [www.d-via.be](http://www.d-via.be) inquiry. Because there was a lack on info and facts & figures before we could not convince shopkeepers and distributors to work out solutions for loading and unloading activities.

The results of D-via were the start of:

- Political awareness
- Better discussions during the workshops and the platform
- More cooperation with interest groups (Unizo, TLV, Febetra, ...)
- Practical solutions for city distribution
- More interest of shopkeepers and distributors and politicians

**Driver 2** – The possibility (thanks to CIVITAS) to invest time in exploring the theme “city distribution” in Gent.

**Driver 3** – When the construction works were finished, citizen engagement and political awareness grew.

### 2.2.13.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – The lack of knowledge of city distribution.

**Barrier 2** – The lack of political awareness of the advantages to work with the distributors, shopkeepers on freight distribution platform.

**Barrier 3** - The large construction works in the city centre 2009/2010 caused lots of complaints from the distributors and shopkeepers.

### 2.2.13.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – Despite the construction works we kept on organising workshops with shopkeepers and distributors ... on a very practical level (searching for problems and solutions)

**Activity 2** – We decided to cooperate in the d-via study (during the period where the construction works were most heavy) to gather relevant info

**Activity 3** – We always had a good dialogue with the decision maker and convinced them of the importance of city distribution

### 2.2.13.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – What people say they would do is not necessarily the same as they actually do. This was one of the conclusion when comparing the inquiry with the field data collection.

**Lesson 2** – new ideas concerning freight distribution in city centre need time to get accepted, especially the set-up of the freight distribution centre.

## 2.2.14. Conclusions

### Quality of activities

One of the objectives of citizen engagement in Gent was to improve the availability and accessibility of information in general and about city mobility. In this way a high quality of the citizen engagement activities itself was an objective for the city.

An important observation is the wide variety of media used to approach the citizens taking into account the differences in user groups and type of measures supported by the citizen engagement activity:

- Information on walking (M4.7) and cycling (M5.6) possibilities in Gent was provided through a mix of intermediaries/ media (city magazine, city website, Facebook, Twitter, etc.). A call to all citizens was published in the city magazine and on the city website.
- For the participatory redevelopment of the main train station area (M2.9), different kinds of activities with a different approach were set up to address as many stakeholders as possible. The central place for information is the info point, and a wide range of media was used to provide the stakeholders with information: local and national journals, radio and TV, website, information letters and posters at the railway station, brochures and social media. In 2011, all stakeholders were more satisfied with the communication than in 2009-2010.
- Mobility management for companies (M4.2) was organised by providing posters and flyers to the companies to spread the information to their employees; for some companies also a website with mobility-related information was set up. It was the responsibility of the companies to provide this information towards their employees but this didn't always happen. Furthermore, Mobi-weeks were organised yearly. As it is not recommended to organise exactly the same activity for the same employees, these Mobi-weeks changed year after year, in order to avoid the risk of fatigue for the message of 'sustainable home-to-work transport'.
- The general objectives of the bicycle activities (M4.5) were communicated to the citizens through questionnaires. The more specific details of the bicycle bins were communicated through flyers in which citizens were asked to join the pilot study. Citizens could also test and compare the bicycle bins themselves.
- Citizens are provided with a lot of information on the possibilities that cambio gives for innovative car-sharing (M6.2) on the website and the trial offer campaign for car-sharing gave citizens the chance to get to know cambio better in real.
- Holistic event management (M6.3) supported event organisers to solve mobility issues by an online tool to determine which measures can be taken. The event organisers seem to regard this as a very convenient tool with all the information on the different means and possibilities to limit the impact on the traffic. Event visitors were provided with information on alternative transport modes by a poster campaign and the possibility to ask for free personal travel advice.

Here the long experience of the city of Gent was the guarantee of a high quality of the citizen engagement activities using the best method for each measure and target group. Learning from failures in the past the city made good choices in the approach.

Especially for big projects, it was important not to focus on just one communication tool, but to use a wide range of communication tools for the different stakeholders. It is necessary to make sure that there are interactive tools as well in order to give the stakeholders the chance to provide their opinion, complaints and ideas about the project. Also timing was indicated as an important success factor: citizens should be approached more at key moments in their life which cause often big changes in their (mobility) habits, like getting children, change of job, etc.

To improve the penetration level of the activities well-developed incentives were important:

- In the mobility management for companies measure (M4.2) the employees who used a sustainable transport mode got presents like a breakfast, foot massage, concert, etc. at the Mobi weeks at Technologiepark and Fnac Gent. The employees could also win a folding bike, group arrangements as a boat trip in city centre, a visit to museum, etc.
- To organise mobility management for schools (M4.3), each school got a subsidy to spend on the mobility campaign, and the schools with the best results of their mobility campaigns

received an additional sum to spend on a mobility-related subject. Pupils were motivated by making a competition of the mobility campaigns.

- Participants at the photo competition in the campaign to promote walking (M4.7) could win multimedia vouchers, trip by balloon, walking outfit, boat trip on the canals of Gent. Also six consolation prizes were distributed among the participants.
- Participants of the “Our department is moving” campaign (M4.10) could win a folding bike and several departments could get some group arrangements like a boat trip or a visit to a museum.
- In the campaign “Keep on cycling in wintertime” (M5.6) by-passing cyclists received free winter gloves. The high satisfaction rate shows that gadgets are useful in the first place and they are a means of interacting with the public.
- The trial offer gives the chance for interested people to get to know cambio and to try car-sharing (M6.2). The participants of the Facebook competition could win several prizes like a folding bike, a subscription of De Lijn, a subscription on cambio, a cartoon, etc. Facebook proved to be an excellent tool to reach certain target groups like people between 20 and 35 years whose lives often are too busy to spend their evenings in a debate or workshop.

A very difficult target group to reach are the fervent car users because they don't seem to be interested in sustainable transport modes, as they feel good with their car.

### Impact evaluation

The following main impacts were aimed at in the objectives on citizen engagement on city level:

- To identify and satisfy the citizens' needs and to improve and optimize, taking into account their remarks, future projects and plans,
- To raise awareness of clean and sustainable modes of transport of which the use has significant impact on bettering environmental conditions,
- To promote use of sustainable transport modes against individual car use.

In several measures, citizen engagement enabled to better identify and satisfy the citizens' needs. Taking their remarks into account, it was possible to improve and optimize future projects and plans:

- For the mobility management for companies (M4.2), a questionnaire formed an important source of information on the mobility behaviour of employees and barriers for the use of sustainable transport. This information was used for concrete mobility advice and the completion of the mobility plans. For the organisation of the Mobi-weeks, participants' feedback from previous years was taken into account.
- Information from questionnaires revealed the willingness-to-pay for the bicycle bins (M4.5), which was taken into account in determining the renting fees. Also more than 200 suggestions were received about possible new locations for bicycle bins. After the pilot study, remarks from users on the practical use and the design of the bicycle bins were taken into account in the specifications for new bicycle bins.
- Inhabitants were involved in the reorganisation of their street into a cycle street (M5.6).
- By consulting the public, new and less-known walking (M4.7) and cycling (M5.6) problems were identified. Input from target groups resulted in lists of action points for walking and cycling. However, priorities of this action list do not always correspond with priorities in other departments, delaying the completion of the action list.
- Local residents indicated where a car sharing station would be popular (M6.2). The suggested places for a car sharing station were taken into account and researched. Based on this cambio did already start four new car sharing stations.

- In the context of holistic event management (M6.3), event organisers and event location managers were interviewed on all kinds of mobility issues they face. These issues were strongly taken into account to develop accessibility sheets, mobility plans and the decision making support tool. There has been a certain influence on decision-making for the supply of public transport and the mandatory use of the decision making support tool in the near future.
- The [www.d-via.be](http://www.d-via.be) inquiry provided the necessary insights to convince shopkeepers and distributors to develop solutions for loading and unloading. These results were the start of practical solutions for city distribution (M7.3). Stakeholders gave especially good suggestions concerning adjustments on the streets.
- In the workshop with property promoters, the city became aware of the consequences on building projects of possible parking measures and the suggestions of developers will be taken into account when further developing the parking policy of the city.

The awareness of clean and sustainable modes increased for many target groups but not for all:

- All companies but one that were contacted for mobility management (M4.2) now have a company mobility plan, mostly set up in the framework of the ELAN project. A gentlemen's agreement was made between the city, the companies of the Technopark and other partners according to which every partner engages himself in several tasks in the upcoming years.
- Most of mobility campaigns in schools (M4.3) succeeded to increase the awareness and knowledge of the pupils on sustainable mobility, but there were big differences in the reached scale and impact.
- Citizens are more familiar with the walking promotion campaign and the functional walking map (M4.7) than students in higher education.
- For 27% of the respondents, the Cycle Chic campaign (M4.10) led to a more positive attitude towards biking, but the other mobility campaigns were less successful. It was especially difficult to reach fervent car users. The people interested in participating in the action already used sustainable transport modes often.
- Event organisers and cultural venues were strongly involved in the process and as a result evaluated the tool for holistic event management (M6.3) as very useful. The mobility campaigns have also increased the awareness and knowledge of the visitors of the events. For example 84% of the interviewees on the 'Culture with a low CO<sub>2</sub> emission' campaign stated that it made them think about their own mobility behaviour. 48% of the interviewees on the second campaign stated that the message spurs them to make more use of sustainable transport modes.
- Discussions on freight management on city level (M7.2) are still difficult, as new ideas concerning freight distribution in the city centre need time to get accepted.

It was clear that the citizens engagement activities promoted the use of sustainable transport modes, but the direct impact on the real usage is difficult to measure. However for some measures an increased use of sustainable transport modes was clearly observed:

- 16% of the interviewees in the Cycle Chic campaign (M4.10) indicated that the activity spurred them to cycle more often.
- The trial offer for car-sharing (M6.2) was a big success and led to an extra yearly growth of 36%, 32% and 30% respectively. Also the poolcard system was enthusiastically welcomed by the companies since the real amount of poolcards outnumbered the expectations seven times.

## Process evaluation

In many measures, the most important driver was a well-diversified approach to all citizens with a personal contact with citizens. In this way citizens can convince citizens and everybody can express opinions directly. Linking activities with day-to-day experiences of citizens makes them more successful.

- The information markets on the redevelopment of the main train station (M2.9) were a good formal instrument as a first means of informing the public, but the emphasis was put on one-way communication and there was not really the opportunity for the citizens to explain their personal situation. Only the most articulate people were heard in this case. Therefore also more personal activities were designed, to reach less articulate people as well.
- In mobility management for companies (M4.2), it was important to give the employees immediately the chance to contribute to the activities in order to keep the activities dynamic and revamped. Therefore, a mobility workgroup was set up up to organise the mobi-weeks, consisting of mobility managers of several companies from different business areas, which made it easier to convince the employers that it is necessary to take action. These employees know best which issues their peers (colleagues) experience and how to motivate their peers to change their mobility behaviour positively.
- In the mobility management for schools measure (M4.3), the first three years have shown that personal guidance is a crucial element in the process. The fourth year was the most successful one, which can be explained by the presence of a very motivated Measure Leader who had good contacts with the schools. It is important that this person has a certain feeling with the school life in Gent. As it were the pupils themselves who had to set up the mobility campaign, it is also clear that they had a big influence on the decision-making and measure implementation. Furthermore, it is easier to involve people when the mobility campaigns focus on a mobility issue by which most of the students are affected. If the pupils couldn't find a subject for the mobility campaign, the Measure Leader tried to find a concept by focussing on the things they are good at.
- In marketing campaigns (4.10) it is not sufficient to simply provide general information online or on paper in order to change mobility behaviour. After having experienced this in the first campaigns, target groups were redefined and a more personal approach was used. This made it a lot easier to motivate people. The "Our department is moving"-campaign went well. Among the main reasons were probably the facts that the participants are already connected with each other and that they could win a prize with the whole department. This created a certain group pressure which resulted in a successful campaign.
- To show event organisers which tools they can use to reduce the impact of their events (M6.3), it is important for a city to work together with the event organisers in order to estimate the impact of the event on the traffic in the city. Also to reach the visitors themselves it is best to approach them in a personally and not only by making some flyers and a banner.

Furthermore, a good cooperation between different stakeholders is crucial to reach the citizens in an efficient and well-accepted way.

- In the promotion of walking (M4.7) other departments as the community based planning organisation, and the social services department (representing e.g. handicapped people) are involved. In this way their experiences and knowledge could be used.
- In the redevelopment of the main train station (M2.9), bad cooperation between the measure partners was a barrier: the info point near the station depends on the information which is delivered by the (construction) partners. Certainly in the beginning, the information did not reach the info point on time, and changes that were not always known by the info point led to a lot of complaints by the local residents and to a certain loss of credibility.
- In the workshop on durable spatial planning (M3.3), all property promoters active in Ghent were invited. Also representatives of the City Department of Urbanism, the AGSOB (city



development company) and the alderman responsible for mobility joined the workshop. Thanks to this workshop, the importance of parking in a commercial context became clear. On the other hand, the developers understand now better the aims of parking policy.

Political support for citizen engagement has always been great in Gent. Politicians showed their commitment and supported the dialogue with citizens, creating the necessary trust among citizens that their voices will be heard, and they are more motivated to participate.

However, when comments are not taken into account, citizens can be disappointed losing their faith in the approach. This was the case in the redevelopment of the main train station area (M2.9), where the citizens only had an advisory role and the info point took their comments into account if these were useful and realistic. In this case it was important to explain clearly the level of participation and the context of the interaction of the citizen: which elements are already decided, which can be changed and why a specific solution is finally chosen.

Another barrier that was observed is the insufficient available transport supply to convince people to use more sustainable transport modes:

- Many employees that were participating in the mobility campaigns in companies (M4.2) were interested in using public transport for their home-to-work trips, but the current timetables of the public transport operator and the infrastructure were not adapted to the wishes of the employees.
- Visitors of events and cultural venues (M6.3) were difficult to convince to use public transport because of a lack of public transport in the evening and at night.

This indicates that strong citizen engagement activities can only be successful if they can refer to a good sustainable transport system that can be promoted.

## 2.3. Zagreb

### 2.3.1. Objectives

Although participatory policies and regulations were developed on a national level, the implementation of participation in practice was lagging behind in Zagreb, especially at the local level. Citizens could communicate their initiatives through local committees and city districts to the City administration and Council and also in some more direct ways. The most developed practice was in relation to urban planning. Regarding mobility issues, public participation was mostly limited to experts.

What was also noticed is that citizens as well as civil society and business organizations did not have sufficient knowledge and capacity to be involved in decision-making processes. Also, there was no recognizable venue open to citizens on city level – a place where they could get information, attend presentations of plans, offer their views and comments and take part in discussions on mobility issues. Thus, the ELAN project was a challenge to motivate citizens for active contribution in finding answers to mobility problems and an opportunity to raise the level of participatory culture when dealing with City development and upgrading the quality of life in Zagreb.

The main objectives of the citizen participation in Zagreb were:

- to establish regular informing mechanisms in order to raise citizens' interest and to enable them to make well-informed decisions related to transport issues,
- to enhance participation of public in decision-making processes on sustainable mobility issues,
- to show that public participation in decision-making processes leads to better solutions for the city.

### 2.3.2. Measure 2.5-ZAG: Intermodal high-quality mobility corridor

#### 2.3.2.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
Second most important objective	To raise citizens interest and to inform citizens on measure content
Third most important objective	To include major stakeholders into solution

#### 2.3.2.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Public discussions	Information provision, discussion	General public & elderly people
Workshops / round tables	Information provision, working together	Specific target groups and organizations (different PT operators, environmental organizations, cycling organizations, representatives of University, Croatian association for blind persons etc.)
Presentations and information sessions	Presentation, consultations	General public
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information provision, consulting	
Questionnaires	Consulting	
Media appearances	Information provi-	

	sion	
--	------	--

### 2.3.2.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Public discussions	General public & elderly people	2 public discussions, around 50 participants. 1 public discussion in senior nursing home, around 40 participants	***
Workshops / round tables	Specific target groups and organizations (different PT operators, environmental organizations, cycling organizations, representatives of university, Croatian association for blind persons etc.)	6 round tables with different organizations, around 50 participants in total.	***
Presentations and information sessions	General public	One presentation of final solution, around 40 participants Exhibition on final solution, opened by Mayor of Zagreb, around 1680 visitors	***
Info-material – brochures - leaflets		1400 leaflets	***
Questionnaires		1000 correctly fulfilled questionnaires	***
Media appearances		6 newspaper articles, 2 radio and TV appearances	***

### 2.3.2.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	A brochure was prepared to present the concept of the future Intermodal passenger terminal Sava-North to relevant stakeholders and wider public. The scheme and 3D perspective were prepared, together with important facts. The brochure was disseminated on meetings, but it is also available on CIVITAS ELAN Zagreb web site, CIVITAS ELAN Info point and ZgForum. The ppt presentation was also prepared by the measure leader, which was used during the meeting and round tables. The presentation is also available at CIVITAS ELAN Info point and web site. Same was done for newly planned train-station in Buzin. Brochure and presentation can be found on CIVITAS ELAN Zagreb web site.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	***	Citizens and other measure stakeholders were involved in every stage of the measure since the beginning of the project, so their comments were taken into account in the final version of the study of intermodal

		terminal. Several public discussions were organized where participants were encouraged to state their suggestions. Later, when the joined proposal for the Sava-North terminal was reached, everything was presented to the public.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	During production of the Sava-North study following stakeholders were involved: City Transport and Traffic Department, City Department for Land use Regulations, Majors Office, City Department for Legal Affairs, City Self-government Service, public and private transport companies and taxi operators, Croatian Automotive Club, civil society organizations for: cycling, environment, disabled persons and others. Consultations with local committees were organized.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	***	The information about the measure activities was regularly disseminated. Several newspaper articles about the new intermodal terminal were published in local newspapers (fortnightly newspaper was printed in 300.000 copies and delivered to households free of charge). Local and national TV and radio stations reported on the measure findings and results. Apart from standard communication channels which were established for CIVITAS ELAN project (e.g. local webpage, Facebook fun page, project brochures etc.) the information about the measure activities was available on different public events.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	***	On every public appearance or info material which was distributed, citizens were encouraged to involve themselves. This was not limited only on participation during the specific event; an e-mail and postal address was provided where citizens were able to send their comments and suggestions. Feedback which was received proves that citizens were very interested about the topic, especially after it became evident that some of their suggestions would be incorporated into final solution. Other stakeholders (different civil society organizations and city departments) were also motivated to participate in the production of the study about Sava-North terminal. Specifically, their role was to indicate specific needs of specific target groups (e.g. cyclists, elderly or disabled persons). Their suggestions were also incorporated into the final solution of the Sava-North terminal.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	***	At each event the moderator lead the discussion. Citizens were encouraged to make comments or suggestions and to ask questions. Furthermore, citizens were always welcome to state their opinions about mobility issues in the CIVITAS ELAN Info point or via e-mail, post, project webpage and Facebook fun page.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	***	Whenever possible two way communication was cherished. The answers were provided by project partners or questions were forwarded to relevant bodies. All constructive suggestions were later included into final proposition of a new Sava-North terminal. After completing the proposition (the study) the results were publicly presented. Moreover, a 3D computer model

		was built in order to communicate the final solution more efficiently to the general public and stakeholders who were involved in the process. Stakeholders were able to see that their suggestions were taken into account.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	Measure leader and measure partners were not just informed; they were actively participating in public events.
O = None ★ = Poor ★★ = Satisfactory ★★★ = Excellent		

### 2.3.2.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Quality/usefulness of comments and suggestions made by citizens	***	In the final version of the study of Sava-North terminal following suggestions made by citizens were included: pedestrian overpass over Savska cesta Street was added, additional traffic lane for the underground garage was included, horizontal tactile surfaces for visually impaired persons were added, location for the additional underground garage, close to the terminal, was established.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation		
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	From the very beginning of the production of Sava-North terminal study, citizens had a positive opinion about it. This is because there is a significant lack of intermodal infrastructure in Zagreb, and citizens' "sense" that railway has to be somehow better incorporated into traffic system of the city. This measure and the terminal follow that path completely. Hence, the acceptance of the study was never in question, and it is certain that once the terminal is implemented the share of PT journeys will increase.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	***	The constructive suggestions made by citizens prove that they were well aware and informed about the measure activities. As the project moved ahead it became easier to organize public events related to this measure because the topic was interesting for citizens and local media.
Increased public trust	***	Citizens' trust was surely increased because they had a real participating role in this measure and their suggestions were accepted.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	All partners were aware that citizens simply have to be included in this type of activities. This was not always the case prior to ELAN: experts in the field were usually limited to expert solutions and failed to see citizens and other organizations (e.g. civil society organizations) as a part of a solution.
O = None ★ = Poor ★★ = Satisfactory ★★★ = Excellent		

### 2.3.2.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1 - Personal motivation** - All measure partners were highly motivated (particularly City of Zagreb and ODRAZ) to work on this measure and the project, because the measure provided a good opportunity to exchange knowledge and suggestions and to learn how to involve citizens' into the project.

**Driver 2 - Public interest** – even though public inclusion in this type of activities was not a common practice in the past, their interest and motivation to work on this type of measures was stimulating. Their involvement greatly contributed to the successful production of the study of Sava-North terminal.

**Driver 3 - Media** – media contribution in announcing and informing on events and measure achievements was highly valuable and productive, because a wide range of stakeholders were informed. Moreover, ELAN gained on the visibility and recognisability among citizens and visitors.

**Driver 4 - Information provision** – regular information provision has proven to be one of the basic drivers. Different communication channels were used to reach all segments of public.

### 2.3.2.7. Barriers to the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1 - Lack of relevant practices** – lack of relevant practices in organising encounters between citizens and representative of decision-makers and experts in the field was experienced in the beginning of the project.

### 2.3.2.8. Activities in relation to citizen engagement to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1 - Establishing info channels for public** – during the first project year the emphasis was put on establishing various communication channels as a precondition for successful CE. These were: CIVITAS ELAN Info point, civitaselan.zagreb.hr webpage, e-bulletin info service, Facebook fun page, project brochure, project leaflets, forming and updating mailing list, promotional videos, ZAGREB FORUM etc. These channels were used in all measures of our project.

**Activity 2 - Establishing efficient communication among partners** – throughout the whole project ODRAZ organized several workshops on efficient and effective communication in order to enhance information sharing, joined planning and implementation of activities. Furthermore, ODRAZ and REC Slovenia organized workshop on CE planning for partners.

**Activity 3 - Proactive approach toward media** – in order to raise the interest of media representatives (journalist) about the project, the mailing list was created which contained approximately 90 journalists from local and national media (newspapers, radio and TV stations). This list was then used for media involvement in this measure.

### 2.3.2.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1 - Citizens can make significant contribution** – citizens have confirmed themselves as the experts for their local (mobility) conditions and the most interested ones for improvements. They showed the ability to recognize the possibilities for the improvement which was crucial for the public acceptance of the study. However, the most important lesson learned is that citizens want to be included into the process of finding the best solutions.

**Lesson 2 - Project openness** – from the earliest phase of the project citizens have to be informed about the activities, especially when large infrastructural/transport objects are planned to be built. Citizens cannot be ignored during the design and planning phase, because measure acceptance depends on that.

**Lesson 3 - Continuous work** – the information and dissemination activities have to be continuously improved and upgraded, in order to reach wider public and to motivate their interest and potential engagement.

## 2.3.3. Measure 3.2-ZAG: Study on congestion charging and dialogue on pricing

### 2.3.3.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To raise citizens interest and to include major stakeholders into solution
Second most important objective	To inform citizens on measure content

tive	
Third most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

### 2.3.3.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Information provision	General public
Public discussions	Information provision, working together, consultations	Major stakeholders (Zagreb parking company, Croatian Automotive Club, Zagreb Traffic Police, Zagreb Transport and Traffic Department)
Presentations and information sessions	Information provision	General public
Info-material – brochures - leaflets		
Questionnaires	Consulting	
Media appearance	Information provision	

### 2.3.3.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	General public	2 appearances on European Mobility Week, around 50 participants in total	**
Public discussions	Major stakeholders	Two round tables, around 40 participants in total	***
Presentations and information sessions	General public	2 public presentations, around 40 participants in total	**
Info-material – brochures - leaflets		200 distributed leaflets	**
Questionnaires		5 surveys, around 700 responses	***
Media appearance		3 newspaper articles, 15 radio and 10 TV appearances	***

### 2.3.3.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	<p>Apart from project brochures and leaflets which contained the information about CIVITAS ELAN project in Zagreb in general, all relevant information about the measure was provided in the leaflet which was produced specially for that purpose. Wider public was informed via this leaflet about the concept of congestion charging, what are measure objectives in ELAN and what could be possible benefits for different stakeholders and general public.</p> <p>When the feasibility study was near its completion media interest was raised. On more than 20 TV or radio shows the main topic was congestion charging in Zagreb. ML explained in detail the results of the study as well as possible impact of it on traffic</p>

		system of the city but also on overall quality of life.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	In the first ELAN year a lack of CE was present, because all attention was given to the data collection necessary for the feasibility study. The collected data was afterwards used for CE activities. For instance, the data about traffic flows in the city centre was used in public presentations in order to describe the problem of traffic congestion more effectively and to motivate citizens to take more active role. Citizens and other measure stakeholders were involved from the beginning of the production of the study. Several round tables with experts and public discussions were organized on which participants were encouraged to state their comments and suggestions.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	**	During the production of the study on congestion charging following stakeholders were involved: Zagreb parking, Croatian Automotive Club, civil society environmental organizations, Zagreb Traffic Police, Zagreb Transport and Traffic Department, Agency for Commercial Business, representatives of local committees.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	***	During CIVITAS ELAN project standard communication channels for information provision toward general public were established (e.g. local webpage, Facebook fun page, project brochures etc.). Furthermore, around 30 media appearances occurred. Local TV and radio stations reported on the results of the study (information about the technological solution which was chosen, implementation costs, and expected benefits) and measure leaflet was produced and distributed.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	Citizens and major stakeholders of the measure showed good interest for the discussion about the congestion charging. ELAN presented an important "channel" which enabled communication between citizens and experts in the field. However, most of propositions came from stakeholders (e.g. Croatian Automotive Club) and not from citizens, because they formed an expert work group for reaching final results of the study. Primary source of motivation was probably the opportunity to use their expert knowledge in order to improve mobility conditions in the city.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	***	On every event the moderator encouraged the discussion. Furthermore, citizens were always welcome to state their opinions about mobility issues in the CIVITAS ELAN Info point or via e-mail, physical address, project webpage and Facebook fun page.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	***	Whenever possible two way communication was cherished. The answers were provided by project partners or questions were forwarded to relevant bodies. All constructive suggestions were later included into the study on congestion charging. Results of the study (definition of congestion charging zone, price categories and choice of technol-



		ogy) were publicly presented. Thus, citizens and other stakeholders were able to see if their suggestions were taken into account or not.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	Measure leader and measure partners were not just informed; they were actively participating in public events and CE activities.
O = None ★ = Poor ★★ = Satisfactory ★★★ = Excellent		

### 2.3.3.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Quality/usefulness of comments and suggestions made by citizens	***	Based on public discussions and consultations with experts following suggestions made by citizens and stakeholders were included in the study: price categories were defined, as well as congestion charging zone (boundaries), suggestions about where to allocate congestion charging income (e.g. to invest in PT).
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation		
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	Significant improvements were visible because the study was accepted by city municipality. However, only after the implementation of congestion charging in Zagreb, true public acceptance or rejection will be exposed.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	***	The constructive suggestions that were received prove that interested parties were well aware and informed about the measure activities.
Increased public trust	**	The obvious results have been obtained because the communication between experts and decision-makers was established as a result of CE activities on this measure; there is a need to continue the process especially if real life implementation occurs.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	All partners were aware that citizens have to be included in this type of activities. This was not always the case prior to ELAN: experts in the field were usually limited to expert solutions and failed to see citizens and other organizations (e.g. civil society organizations) as a part of a solution.
O = None ★ = Poor ★★ = Satisfactory ★★★ = Excellent		

### 2.3.3.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Personal motivation** – all measure partners were highly motivated (particularly ZFOT and ODRAZ) to work on this measure and the project, because the measure provided a good opportunity to exchange knowledge and suggestions and to learn how to involve citizens' into the project.

**Professional achievements** – measure leader was able to include the work on CIVITAS ELAN into his professional carrier, i.e. his PhD thesis will be from the field of demand management. Therefore, ELAN provided the excellent opportunity for learning new methods which can support project implementation and CE is definitely one of them.

**Stakeholder interest** – stakeholder interest and motivation to work on this type of measures was stimulating. Their involvement greatly contributed to the successful production of the study of congestion charging because several good suggestions were accepted.

**Media** – media contribution in announcing and informing on events and measure achievements was highly valuable and productive, because a wide range of stakeholders were informed. Moreover, ELAN gained on the visibility and recognisability among citizens and visitors.

### 2.3.3.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Lack of relevant practices** – lack of relevant practices in organising encounters between citizens and representative of decision-makers and experts in the field was experienced in the beginning of the project.

**Communication with media representatives** –during the publication of some newspaper articles, the information which was given to the journalists was drawn out of the context. Therefore, measure results and findings were sometimes wrongly presented.

### 2.3.3.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Establishing info channels for public** – firstly it was necessary to establish various communication channels as a precondition for successful CE. These were: CIVITAS ELAN Info point, civitase-lan.zagreb.hr webpage, e-bulletin info service, Facebook fun page, project brochure, project leaflets, forming and updating mailing list, promotional videos, ZAGREB FORUM etc. This communication channels were used for CE activities for the whole project.

**Establishing efficient communication among partners** – throughout the whole project ODRAZ organized several workshops on efficient and effective communication in order to enhance information sharing, joined planning and implementation of CE activities. Furthermore, ODRAZ and REC Slovenia organized workshop on CE planning for partners and measure leader participated that workshop.

**Proactive approach toward media** – in order to raise the interest of media representatives (journalist) about the project, the mailing list was created which contained approximately 90 journalists from local and national media (newspapers, radio and TV stations). This list was then used for the media involvement in this measure.

### 2.3.3.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Stakeholders and citizens can make significant contribution** – measure participants showed the ability to recognize the possibilities for the improvement which was crucial for the public acceptance of the study.

**Project openness** – from the earliest phase of the project, citizens and stakeholders have to be informed about the activities. They must not be ignored during the planning, design and implementation phase, because measure acceptance depends on that.

**Continuous work** – the information and dissemination activities have to be continuously improved and upgraded, in order to reach wider public and to motivate their interest and potential engagement.

## 2.3.4. Measure 4.11-ZAG: Comprehensive mobility dialogue and marketing

### 2.3.4.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To include major stakeholders into problem defining, solution and measure implementation
Second most important objective	To improve trust between different stakeholders

Third most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
--------------------------------	--

### 2.3.4.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Information provision	General public, stakeholders and relevant experts (depending on activity)
Public discussions / round tables	Discussion	
Workshops	Information provision and discussion	
Presentations and information sessions	Information provision, discussion	
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information provision	
Questionnaires	Consulting	
Web site and e-newsletters	Information provision	
Facebook fun page	Information provision, discussion	General public
Promotional movies	Information provision	
Media appearances		
CIVITAS ELAN Info Point	Information provision, discussion	

### 2.3.4.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	General public, stakeholders and relevant experts	3 European Mobility Weeks, around 200 participants in total	**
Public discussions / round tables		5 discussions in local committees, 150 participants in total	***
Workshops		6 workshops on CE, 220 participants in total	***
Presentations and information sessions		22 “Wednesdays-in-Tram” sessions, 337 participants in total	***
Info-material – brochures – leaflets		10.000 brochures	***
Questionnaires		Around 2000 fulfilled questionnaires	**
Web site and e-newsletters		62.021 hits	***
Facebook fan page	General public	1309 fans, 164.806 views of posts, 797 comments and post “likes”	***
Promotional movies		3 short promotional movies on YouTube and Zagreb's official project website, around 3300 clicks	**
Media appearances		40 articles in newspapers, 21 radio appearances, 29 TV appearances and 98 web articles	***
CIVITAS ELAN Info Point		21.630 visitors	***



### 2.3.4.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	<p>A Croatian project brochure was published in 10.000 copies at the beginning of the project, where the CIVITAS initiative, CIVITAS ELAN project and planned activities in Zagreb were explained in detail. The brochure was disseminated on meetings and events and it is also available at CIVITAS ELAN Info point and ZgForum. Later on, a project leaflet was produced, that was updated regularly with new information about the project (results and achievements). Several other leaflets, related to other measures (e.g. safety for elderly, new vehicles for waste management company, public bicycles, etc.) are produced, available at events, CIVITAS ELAN Info point and ZgForum. They are also posted at local project web site. <a href="http://www.civitaszagreb.hr/multimedija/dokumenti/">http://www.civitaszagreb.hr/multimedija/dokumenti/</a></p> <p>Three promo films were produced (Alojz and Vlatka-safety for elderly; Auto za sve-carpooling and Cyclist &amp; pedestrian-the culture of sharing space) and posted on project web site as well. These videos describe how to use new services which were implemented in this project.</p> <p>After the mobility dialogues with citizens along the corridor were conducted, a document was produced capturing main findings. Those encounters were filmed and shown to City Assembly and on round tables. A shorter version is available on the web site.</p>
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	***	<p>CE activities were conducted regularly (for instance “Wednesday in Tram” – a series of workshops in CIVITAS ELAN Info point; CIVITAS ELAN day during European Mobility Week; information provision via newsletters, leaflets, brochures and Facebook fan page; regular announcements of public events in media)</p>
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	<p>On each public event all relevant stakeholders were invited and encouraged to actively participate. For example, apart from general public specific target groups were always informed, such as: Cyclists Union, Croatian Automobile Club, Traffic Police, local committees etc.</p>
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	***	<p>Good cooperation was established with media representatives (around 90 journalists were included in the CIVITAS ELAN mailing list).</p> <p>Almost all events were covered by newspapers and some of them were even on local and national TV and radio stations.</p> <p>CIVITAS ELAN Info point was established as recognizable place for information provision.</p> <p>The CIVITAS ELAN webpage presents all relevant information; various documents are available for free download.</p> <p>E-bulletin info service was regularly sent to interest stakeholders.</p> <p>Relevant project information was available on Facebook fan page (information about upcoming events, discussions about project results and achievements, information about how to get involved into the project etc.).</p> <p>Project brochure was prepared at the beginning of the project; project leaflet was regularly updated; other info materials were prepared; continuous interest for the project of local and national media.</p>

Provide appropriate incentives to participate	***	Citizens showed remarkable interest for the discussion about mobility issues in the city. ELAN presented an important “channel” which enabled communication between citizens and relevant stakeholders.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	***	In every event the moderator encouraged the discussion. Furthermore, citizens were always welcome to state their opinions about mobility issues in the CIVITAS ELAN Info point or via e-mail, web-page and Facebook fan page.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	Whenever possible two-way communication was cherished: either the answers were provided by project partners immediately at the event or questions were forwarded to relevant bodies. If the answer was later received by those bodies, it was forwarded by the means of electronic communication (e-mail, project web site or Facebook fan page). After meetings in Local committees some concrete but smaller activities toward mobility problem solving were taken.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	Measure leaders and measure partners were not just informed; they were actively participating in public events (if the topic was in the scope of their measure / interest).
O = None ★ = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.3.4.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Quality/usefulness of comments and suggestions made by citizens	***	Citizens know the best what kind of mobility issues are present in their neighbourhood. Of course, sometimes the comments or requirements can be irrational, but most of them present a useful input to the project partners and involved stakeholders in specific measure.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	The influence on measure implementation was good, the influence on decision-making will need more time although some concrete activities were undertaken.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	As the project moved ahead it became easier to organize public events related to specific measures. More importantly, the average number of participants on those events was considerably increased. For the most ELAN measures a significant improvement is visible (e.g. 2.5 and 5.3).
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	The obvious results have been obtained because it is clear that CE concept is initiated thanks to the CIVITAS ELAN and some key decision-makers realize that citizens have to be involved in the process, however, there is a need to continue to work on this process because CE has to become a common practice within city municipality.
Increased public trust	**	Same as above. Public has witnessed that sometimes their opinion can make the difference, but this work has to be continued in other projects as well.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	All partners are now aware that citizens simply have to be included in this type of activities. This was not always the case prior to ELAN: experts in the field were usually limited to expert

		solutions and failed to see citizens and other organizations (e.g. civil society organizations) as a part of a solution. Measure partners were present at every public event.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.3.4.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Personal motivation** – ODRAZ as a measure leader and SDM were highly motivated to work on this measure and the project. This resulted in even higher number of different activities in compared what was originally planned in DoW.

**Public interest and motivation** – even though public inclusion in this type of activities was not a common practice in the past, their interest and motivation to work on common mobility solutions, when appropriately addressed, can be stimulating. Their involvement greatly contributed to the successful implementation of the measure.

**Information provision** – regular and actual information provision has proven to be one of the basic drivers. Different communication channels were used to reach all segments of public (the Info point, electronic bulletin, mailing list, webpage, Facebook fan page, brochures and leaflets, posters, face-to-face information provided by volunteers, gadgets, participation on events organized by other organizations, fares etc.).

**Media** – media contribution in announcing and informing on events was highly valuable and productive, because a wide range of stakeholders were informed on measures and mobility issues. Moreover, ELAN gained on the visibility and recognisability among citizens and visitors.

**Problem to be solved** – prior to ELAN citizens were not continuously and properly involved in decision-making process related to mobility. This was recognized and addressed by the project. Positive results of the first efforts to include the citizens confirmed their importance in the solution of the problem.

### 2.3.4.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Lack of relevant practices** – lack of relevant practices in organising encounters with citizens on the level of self-government units was experienced in the beginning of the project. CIVITAS ELAN contributed to the establishment of such practice, but additional efforts had to be invested in order to achieve that target. However, it has to be noticed that this has to become a common practise in the future.

**Low expectations** – due to the lack of practices, citizens and city authorities did not have any particular expectations from the CE process and activities.

**Insufficient work description of public employees** – low level of habit and willingness of city servants and service providers to start “listening to citizens' voice” as this was not detected as one of their mandatory working duties.

**Low interest of media** – in the beginning of the project representatives of the media did not recognized mobility issues as an interesting topic. This was later changed thanks to the considerable efforts of SDM, ODRAZ and other partners.

### 2.3.4.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Establishing info channels for public** – during the first project year the emphasis was put on establishing various communication channels as a precondition for successful CE. These were: CIVITAS ELAN Info point, civitaselan.zagreb.hr webpage, e-bulletin info service, Facebook fan page, project brochure, project leaflets, forming and updating mailing list, promotional videos, ZAGREB FORUM etc.

**Establishing efficient communication among partners** – throughout the whole project ODRAZ organized several workshops on efficient and effective communication in order to enhance information sharing, joined planning and implementation of activities. Furthermore, the importance of CE and

methods for its implementation were presented and discussed. Even more, ODRAZ and REC Slovenia organized workshop on CE planning for partners.

**Proactive approach towards media** – in order to raise the interest of media representatives (journalist) about the project, the mailing list was created which contained approximately 90 journalists from local and national media (newspapers, radio and TV stations). They were invited to each public event which was organized during the project. As the project moved ahead and first results started to show, their interest was raised as well.

**Intensive work with representatives of city neighbourhoods** – each city neighbourhood has the community board. During the ELAN a series of community board meetings and workshops were held in order to raise the awareness about the project and to establish two-way communication between citizens and decision-makers.

**Informing Zagreb Assembly** – ODRAZ has informed Zagreb Assembly about the achievements which were made during the series of community board meetings. The Assembly concluded that local committees have to become more open to the citizens.

**Workshops with citizens** – a series of workshops with citizens were held on how to communicate with city municipality.

### 2.3.4.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Citizens know best** – citizens have confirmed themselves as the best experts for their local (mobility) conditions and the most interested ones for improvements. They showed the ability to recognize local mobility problems and to commonly ask for reasonable improvements mainly dealing with safety and general living conditions. However, most important lesson learned is that citizens want to be included into the process of finding the best solutions for mobility issues in the city.

**Low interest** – representatives of the local self-government bodies (local committee and city district) were given a method on how to organize a local event engaging citizens. This recipe might be used in other situations asking for citizens' involvement, but the relevant City offices and services did not show interest for the activity. This has to be improved in the future.

**Continuous work** – the information and dissemination activities have to be continuously improved and upgraded, in order to reach a wider public and to motivate their interest and potential engagement.

## 2.3.5. Measure 5.3-ZAG: Safety and security for seniors

### 2.3.5.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To include major stakeholders into problem defining, solution and measure implementation
Second most important objective	To improve trust between different stakeholders
Third most important objective	To enhance the use of the measure



### 2.3.5.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Information provision	Seniors
Workshops	Information provision, acting together	Seniors
Presentations and information sessions	Information provision	General public
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information provision	Seniors
Questionnaires	Information provision	Seniors
Promotional video	Information provision	General public
Training of bus and tram drivers	Working together	Bus and tram drivers

### 2.3.5.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	Seniors	2000 participants	***
Workshops	Seniors	17 workshops, around 500 participants	***
Presentations and information sessions	General public	One presentation, around 20 participants and significant media coverage	**
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Seniors	8.000	***
Questionnaires	Seniors	200	**
Promotional video	General public	2000 views	***
Training of bus and tram drivers	Bus and tram drivers	2 trainings, 160 drivers	**

### 2.3.5.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	With the help of City Social Department a series of workshops with seniors were organized at senior nursing homes. On these events seniors were informed about how to safely use PT service, and how to use new ITS systems which were introduced. Apart from that, the <a href="http://civitaselan.zagreb.hr">civitaselan.zagreb.hr</a> webpage presents all relevant information (detail description of measure activities, upcoming events, measure results and achievements etc.); various documents are available for free download (project brochure and project leaflet, measure leaflet, results of the survey regarding safety and security issues etc.).
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	***	CE activities are conducted regularly. Each month, during a period of 1.5 years, a workshop has been organized in different nursing homes. Project brochures, leaflets and webpage were used since the beginning of the project.
Representatives of all main stake-	**	On each public event seniors were invited and encour-

holder groups were addressed by the activities		aged to actively participate. Also bus drivers were targeted by the training courses. The general public was informed as well by promotional video.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	Information on activities and promotional video was provided in newspapers and TV and on the website.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	***	Seniors were motivated for public discussions. Their general opinion was that they were happy because they were not treated as a part of the problem which needs to be somehow solved; instead they were considered as a part of a solution. ELAN is the pioneer in terms of facilitating events for this specific target group, where seniors can ask questions, report on issues or make suggestions.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	On every workshop/training the debate was encouraged.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	Seniors were informed about the activities that were taken after the workshop.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	All measure partners are involved in the CE&D activities
O = None ★ = Poor ★★ = Satisfactory ★★★ = Excellent		

### 2.3.5.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Quality/usefulness of comments and suggestions made by citizens	***	Excellent communication with users about their needs (suggestions and comments) was established.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	The influence on measure implementation was satisfactory, because through CE activities it was recognized that it is necessary to communicate with specific target groups (e.g. elderly people) and explain to them how new systems work and how to use them; the influence on decision-making will need more time, although some concrete activities were undertaken (for instance, in the second production series of new trams more handrails were add in order to increase safety of passengers when they are standing in the moving vehicle).
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	As the project moved ahead it became easier to organize public events related to the measure. More importantly, the average number of participants on those events was considerably increased (e.g. number of participants on workshops in nursing homes). One of the topics on these events was information sharing about how PT operator wants to raise quality standards of the PT fleet, and how new systems have to be introduced in order to achieve that objective. Obvious result of this communication and information provision is recorded in the public opinion surveys where it is undoubtedly clear that new PT vehicles are highly accepted by general public as well as by specific target groups (elderly and disabled persons).

Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	***	Seniors appreciated for receiving the information on how to use PT easier and safer, as well as the information about new e-ticketing system. Most impact on awareness of regular citizens was produced with <u>Alojz &amp; Vlatka</u> promotional video which can be found on civitase-lan.zagreb.hr webpage and Youtube. On the other end of communication line, PT personnel is now also more aware about specific needs of specific users. Clear indication of this is the decision that in future driver trainings on special sessions will always be held, dealing with user needs and requirements.
Increased public trust	**	There is a need to continue the process of communicating with the public in general as well as with specific groups of PT users, but certain results have been achieved. Seniors were particularly satisfied with the extra attention which was devoted to them and surely it can be said that the level of trust was increased among that specific target group.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	This measure really opened ZET toward this specific target group. The number and the quality of public workshops provide a proof for this high score. The intention of PT company is to continue this process of information provision and communication with the public. Furthermore, as it was mentioned above, future driver trainings will contain special sessions on teaching the drivers about the needs of specific users.
O = None ★ = Poor ★★ = Satisfactory ★★★ = Excellent		

### 2.3.5.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Partner motivation (ODRAZ and ZET)** – these two measure partners set an example on personal motivation for work on CE and dissemination. The proof: both of these partners created additional CE activities in this measure (e.g. work in senior nursing homes, driver training etc.).

**Interest of seniors** – immediately after the introduction of this target group into the measure activities, seniors showed very high interest about the topic. This “fed” the personal motivation of key measure partners.

**Good cooperation with stakeholders** – good cooperation was established with City Social Welfare Office and several senior nursing homes.

**Well planned promotional activities** – during the measure implementation a Plan for citizens’ involvement was made, as well as promotional leaflet and a video. The Plan was crucial for the implementation of CE activities within this measure,

**Active role of ZET’s drivers** – during the driver training of ZET’s drivers for the first time the analysis of senior user needs was a part of the training. After the training two drivers (one tram and one bus driver) were regularly involved in the workshops in senior nursing homes, which gave the seniors the sense that someone is thinking about them. This initiative was very well accepted and it had good impact on CE achievements on this measure.

**Innovative approach** – for the first time one specific target group was included into the process of solving mobility issues.

### 2.3.5.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Lack of culture of dialogue** – as it was stated in the drivers section of this report this was a rather innovative approach which was taken in this measure. This means that prior to ELAN there was a lack of culture of dialogue between this specific target group and decision-makers. Considerable efforts had to be taken in order to overcome that barrier.

**Measure consortium** – in the beginning of the project the measure consortium was incomplete. ZET, as a main PT operator in the City of Zagreb, was originally not included in the measure activities. Furthermore, City of Zagreb failed to recognize the importance and possible benefits which could be produced with the implementation of this measure.

**Narrow scope** – ZET and the City of Zagreb had a rather narrow scope in the beginning of ELAN in terms of measure implementation. Specifically, seniors were not considered as a possible source of information which can help in reaching measure objectives. Seniors were treated only as one of the social categories.

**Lack of motivation** – due to the lack of motivation of key measure participants' additional efforts had to be made by ODRAZ and ZET.

**Lack of cooperation** – the absence of key persons in the workshops (etc. representatives from the City Traffic and Transport Office and City Traffic Police) was a barrier because sometimes those representatives should have been key persons in the discussions which followed after each presentation.

### 2.3.5.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Technical training in Salzburg and sharing experience** – the technical training on CE and involvement of specific target groups into the project implementation, which was held in Salzburg, really triggered the CE activities on this measure. More specifically, the training especially helped project partner ZET to realize that a dialogue with the public has to be established, i.e. citizens and specific target groups can significantly contribute to the project. After this training ZET took a major role in the implementation of CE activities.

**Introduction of key stakeholder** – in order to reach senior population and to include them into this measure a City Social Welfare Office was introduced into the measure as one of the key stakeholders. This had a positive impact on the measure and CE implementation, because after this introduction workshops in senior nursing homes were organized relatively easy.

**Reorganizing the work** – ODRAZ and ZET took a leading role in implementation of CE in this measure, which was crucial for measure success.

**Promotional activities** – various promotional activities were carried out as well as CE activities in order to create a habit among seniors to take part in public discussions and decision-making.

### 2.3.5.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Importance of seniors** – seniors have confirmed themselves as good source of information regarding their mobility needs and also for giving suggestion for the improvement. However, most important lesson learned is that seniors want to be included into the process of finding the best solutions for mobility issues in the city.

**Low interest** – representatives of some local self-government bodies (City Traffic and Transport Office and City Traffic Police) showed rather low interest for this type of activities. This has to be improved in the future.

**Continuous work** – the information and dissemination activities have to be continually improved and upgraded, in order to reach wider public and to motivate their interest and potential engagement.

**Driver training** – drivers and other PT employees have to be a (contributing) part of CE activities when these kinds of measures are implemented.

## 2.3.6. Measure 7.4-ZAG: Freight delivery restrictions

### 2.3.6.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To inform citizens on measure content
Second most important objective	To include major stakeholders into problem defining
Third most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

### 2.3.6.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Information provision	General public and media
Public discussions	Information provision / Discussion	
Presentations and information sessions	Presentation, working together, consultations	Experts
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information provision	General public
Questionnaires	Consultation	

### 2.3.6.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	General public and media	3 public events, approximately 60 participants and several media representatives	**
Public discussions		1 (one workshop as a part “Wednesday in tram” cycle), approximately 20 participants	*
Presentations and information sessions	Experts	2 technical meetings, 20 participants	*
Info-material – brochures - leaflets		800 summaries (info materials) were distributed together with the questionnaires	***
Questionnaires	General public	800	***

### 2.3.6.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	Each business subject in the demonstration zone of this measure was provided with a summary of the measure description, measure objectives and expected outcomes. The same summary was provided to several delivery companies which deliver into that area. Apart from that, every business subject was regularly informed about the status of the measure and upcoming activities and events via communication channels which

		were established during the ELAN project (official web page, Facebook fan page and e-newsletter).
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	Information sharing and engagement process was planned and executed in three steps: during 2009 stakeholders were informed about planned activities and goals on the measure; in 2011 they were informed about activities taken and plans for new regulations of freight delivery and they could give suggestions; and during 2012 a Panel discussion was organized in order to inform citizens and stakeholders on final proposal and status of implementation.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	During the implementation of the measure and information provision, representatives of all main stakeholders (shopkeepers, delivery companies and city municipality) were properly addressed and invited to take a participating role in the measure.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	*	As a part of measure 4.11 good cooperation was established with media representatives (around 90 journalists were included in CIVITAS ELAN mailing list). This mailing list was used for dissemination of information about this measure as well. However, the measure did not produce expected media interest. All relevant information about this measure was available to the citizens via civitaselan.zagreb.hr webpage; various documents are available for free download. Apart from that several public events were organized, and info material has been distributed.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	*	Even though freight traffic needs stricter control in the City of Zagreb and its negative impacts were always highlighted in promotional material, citizens showed relatively low interest for the discussion about freight delivery issues in the city.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	***	On every workshop/training the debate was encouraged.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	Whenever possible two way communication was cherished. Some suggestions that were made by stakeholders were later accepted in the new delivery scheme. This was communicated to them in form of a public panel discussion about the new proposal.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	**	Relevant information was provided on regular partner meetings.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.3.6.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Comments
Quality/usefulness of comments and suggestions made by citizens	**	Citizens' comments helped to identify some of measure barrier, e.g. errors in current regulations such as annual delivery of penalties for wrong parking. Some suggestions were included in the design of the measure. For instance,

		an additional time interval for delivery was defined in order to make measure more acceptable to the shopkeepers and other business subjects in the city centre.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	*	Public influence on the creation of the coordinated delivery scheme was substantial, because several suggestions stated by the citizens were taken into account when new delivery scheme was defined. However, measure leader did not have success in convincing the decision-makers that implementation of the measure needs to go forward, ergo the suggestions were not implemented.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	Measure was well accepted by the citizens. However, poor acceptance of stakeholders was present (delivery companies, shopkeepers and restaurant owners in the demo zone). The main reason is the new and more restrictive delivery scheme which would affect their business activities.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	***	Awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject has increased, they were especially interested in experiences from other cities.
Increased public trust	*	Some results have been obtained, but there is a need to continue the process. The gap between public and expert opinions and objectives of decision-maker in the city is too big. This affects public trust because there is a too little evidence that their opinion counts.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	Measure partners are aware that targets can be reached easily if citizens are considered as a contributing partner. Openness of measure partners toward the citizens has increased.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.3.6.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Problem to be solved** – the complexity of a problem which needed to be solved within this measure was a good motivation for measure partners. Specifically, it is a complex task to convince stakeholders to accept more restrictive rules which can reflect on their businesses.

**Citizens as partners** – citizens were recognized as an important measure partner. Initial idea was that new restrictive measures for freight traffic regulation would be accepted by the city municipality easier, if public support was present. Although there was not a large number of participants at the different public events, inclusion of citizens in decision making process created an open discussion between them, policy makers and research institution. The discussions resulted in joined propositions for possible freight delivery coordination.

### 2.3.6.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Level of interest** – during the project a low level of public interest about the issue of freight traffic regulation was present.

**Number of residents** – the plan was to implement this measure in the small demonstration zone in the city centre. Only few people lives in the area. This had an effect on level of interest about the issue, because insufficient number of people (residents of the area) was directly affected by the measure and recognized the benefits which this measure can produce. This also meant that it was difficult to involve citizens into the measure activities.

**Lack of support from key measure participants** – this measure has not been implemented. ZFOT created a new scheme of coordinated delivery which was presented to the general public and publicly discussed. However, city municipality failed to implement this scheme. This probably caused the lack of trust among citizens because a common solution was reached, but it was not implemented.

**Another project** – during ELAN project another project (not related with mobility issues) was implemented in the demonstration zone of this measure. That other project raised quite a lot of revolt among citizens because it caused traffic flow redistribution in the area, reconstruction of old buildings with historical value and opening of one shopping centre. This affected measure 7.4 because citizens' attention was drawn away from the measure and its objectives.

**Incomplete measure consortium** – even though ODRAZ was the leader of CE and dissemination activities in the City of Zagreb, it was not sufficiently included into the measure activities.

### 2.3.6.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Promotion of the measure** – info material was distributed together with the questionnaire (questionnaire investigated public awareness about positive and negative impacts of freight delivery). Apart from that several newspaper articles were published after the public presentations and other events.

**Political lobbying** – measure leader tried to convince key persons in the city municipality to proceed with the measure implementation. Several official and unofficial requests were made toward City Assembly representatives, City Traffic and Transport Office etc.

### 2.3.6.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Timing for CE** – in this kind of measures CE activities have to start at the beginning of the project. Note that the implementation of this measure depended only on political will of the city municipality. Everything was prepared and agreed upon, but the coordinated scheme was never implemented. However, if the critical mass would have been created, that would probably speed up the necessary decisions.

**Measure promotion** – more efforts have to be given to the measure promotion and explaining the measure benefits to the citizens and other relevant stakeholders.

## 2.3.7. Conclusions

### Quality of the activities

In all evaluated measures, regular information mechanisms in order to raise citizens' interest and to enable them to make well-informed decisions related to transport issues were established. In general measure 4.11-ZAG supported the citizen engagement activities on measure level, using various communication channels for the CIVITAS ELAN project: CIVITAS ELAN info point, local webpage, e-bulletin info service, Facebook fan page, project brochure, community board meetings, project leaflets, forming and updating mailing list, promotional videos, ZAGREB FORUM, posters, face-to-face information provided by volunteers, gadgets, participation on events organized by other organizations, fares, etc.

In the beginning of the project the media did not recognize mobility issues as an interesting topic. In some newspaper articles the information which was given to the journalists was even drawn out of the context. Therefore, measure results and findings were sometimes wrongly presented. This was later changed thanks to the considerable efforts of the Site Dissemination Manager and other partners. In order to raise the interest of journalists about the project, a mailing list was created with approximately 90 journalists from local and national media (newspapers, radio and TV stations). This increased media support was highly valuable and productive, because a wide range of stakeholders was informed in this way. Moreover, ELAN gained on the visibility and recognisability among citizens and visitors.



For a lot of measures specific citizen engagement activities were done to involve or to inform the citizen in the best way. Learning also from the experience of the city of Gent the most appropriate approach was chosen:

- The concept of the future intermodal passenger terminal Sava-North and the planned train station in Buzin (M2.5) were presented in several ways: presentations at meetings and round tables, a brochure, a scheme and a 3D model. The constructive suggestions made by citizens prove that they were well aware and informed about the measure activities.
- From the beginning of the production of the study on congestion charging (M3.2), several round tables with experts and public discussions were organized where participants were encouraged to state their comments and suggestions. When the feasibility study was near its completion media interest was raised, by several media appearances and the distribution of a leaflet about the concept of congestion charging to the general public.
- A series of workshops with seniors were organized at senior nursing homes how to safely use PT service, and how to use new ITS systems to improve safety and security (M5.3). Also trainings for bus drivers were organised that included the analysis of senior user needs.
- Business subject in the demonstration zone and delivery companies were provided with information on the measure on freight delivery restrictions (M7.3). In 2009 they were informed about planned activities and the goals of the measure. In 2011 they were informed about activities taken and plans for new regulations of freight delivery and they could give suggestions. In 2012 a panel discussion was organized in order to inform citizens and stakeholders on the final proposal and status of implementation.

This variety of activities addressed all stakeholders of the measures: local committees, several city departments, public and private transport companies and taxi operators, the Croatian Automobile Club, civil society organizations, the Zagreb Traffic Police, the Agency for Commercial Business, shopkeepers, delivery companies, seniors, etc. For the freight delivery scheme (M7.3), it was new that also citizens were seen as partners – it was believed that the acceptance of restrictive measures would be higher if public support was present.

The absence of key persons (representatives from the City Traffic and Transport Office and City Traffic Police) in the workshops how to safely use PT service, and how to use new ITS systems to improve safety and security (M5.3) was the exception. They could have been key persons in the discussions which followed after each presentation.

## Impact evaluation

The objective to enhance the participation of the public in decision-making processes was achieved: especially for the ELAN project in the city there was a stronger participation of citizens in the planning process. For some measure partners it was the first time that citizens were consulted in the design process, encouraged by the moderator to make comments or suggestions and to ask questions. Furthermore, citizens were always welcome to state their opinions about mobility issues at the CIVITAS ELAN info point or via e-mail, post, project webpage and Facebook fan page. This enhanced the participation of the public in the decision-making process.

The city administration considers citizens now much more than before as experts on their local (mobility) conditions and the ones most interested in improvements. Mobility dialogues organised for inhabitants in nine local committees may lead to the introduction of similar encounters as a regular practice. The City coordination adopted the decision that the practice of communication with citizens on the local committee level should be improved. Through the opening of ZAGREB FORUM at the end of 2011 opportunities were created for a joint dialogue where citizens together with other stakeholders, representatives of the public administration, the business, academy and civil sector, could discuss problems and needs and contemplate possible solutions, including mobility-related opportunities.

Citizens know best which mobility issues are present in their neighbourhood. Of course, sometimes the comments or requirements can be irrational, but most of them present a useful input to project partners and involved stakeholders in specific measure. Several examples within the measures showed also that public participation led to better solutions in the city:

- In the final version of the study on the Sava-North terminal (M2.5) the following suggestions made by citizens were included: a pedestrian overpass over Savska Street, an additional traffic lane for the underground garage, horizontal tactile surfaces for visually impaired persons, location for the additional underground garage close to the terminal.
- Based on public discussions and consultations with experts the following suggestions were included in the study on congestion charging (M3.2): definition of price categories and boundaries of the congestion charging zone, suggestions about where to allocate congestion charging. However, most of the proposals came from stakeholders (e.g. the Croatian Automobile Club) and not from citizens.
- Through discussions with elderly people (M5.3) the need to communicate with specific target groups was recognised and public transport personnel is more aware about specific needs of specific users. In the future, driver trainings will continue to deal with specific user needs and requirements. The discussions with elderly people also led to some smaller concrete activities like adding more handrails in the second production series of new trams.
- Citizens' comments helped to identify some problems with the current freight regulations and several suggestions were included when the new delivery scheme was defined (M7.3). The measure was well accepted by the citizens. However, the acceptance of stakeholders was rather poor as the new and more restrictive delivery scheme which would affect their business activities and the critical mass was not sufficiently created from the beginning of the project. Therefore, the Measure Leader did not have success in convincing the decision-makers to implement the suggestions.
- Encouraged by participation and discussions on traffic in their neighbourhood at the meeting in one of the local committees (M4.11), the representatives of parents' councils of the Primary School, together with the head teacher, organised a school meeting on Children's Traffic Safety several days after the workshop, with participants from the Zagreb City Traffic Office, Precinct and chairpersons of local committee councils. They agreed on a field inspection regarding school children's traffic safety in the area that took place shortly after the meeting.
- The other local committee (M4.11) was motivated to resend the request to the City asking for decent space for operation of the Committee including conditions for meeting citizens.

## Process evaluation

During the CIVITAS ELAN project different drivers became more and more important to support the implementation of the citizen engagement activities:

Measure partners became more and more motivated to work on the project and on the setting up of a comprehensive mobility dialogue with the citizen (M4.11) because this approach provided a good opportunity to exchange knowledge and suggestions and to learn how to involve citizens' into the project. All partners were aware that citizens simply have to be included in the measure activities. This was not always the case prior to ELAN: experts in the field were usually limited to expert solutions and failed to see citizens and other organizations (e.g. civil society organizations) as a part of a solution.

Throughout the whole project several workshops were organised on efficient and effective communication in order to enhance information sharing, joint planning and implementation of activities and citizen engagement planning. Representatives of the local self-government bodies (local committee and city district) were given a method on how to organize a local event engaging citizens.

As a result, the interest from citizens and other stakeholders did grow significantly. Especially seniors were motivated for public discussions (M5.3): they were happy because they were not treated as part of the problem which needs to be somehow solved; instead they were considered as part of a solution. It was observed that citizens' interest increases further after it became evident that suggestions could be incorporated into the final solution.

However, when there is too little evidence that their opinion counts, as was perceived in the context of the freight delivery scheme (M7.3), this can be a strong barrier for citizen engagement activities.

Despite the efforts to train decision-makers and experts in the field, they still had limited experience in organising encounters between citizens and representative city servants and were not used to listening to the citizens' voice. Doing this was also not considered as one of their mandatory working duties.

## 2.4. Brno

### 2.4.1. Objectives

Before the CIVITAS ELAN project, good practices regarding citizen engagement in Brno were consultation processes related to the planning and construction of infrastructure as well as spatial and traffic planning. Public involvement in this process was facilitated through public debates, public opinion research, working groups, etc. Citizens were in general not used to making their voice heard and to communicate with transport operators and local authorities. For historical reasons, the participatory culture was at its beginning when ELAN started. First attempts to involve citizens into the implementation of a big project were made. These participatory events were mainly mandatory according to the national legislation.

The objectives on citizen engagement were:

- to improve availability and accessibility of information about city mobility, on the basis of citizens' needs,
- to raise awareness of clean and sustainable modes of transport of which the use has significant impact on bettering environmental conditions,
- to promote use of public transport modes against individual car use,
- to raise awareness of traffic impacts on the quality of life,
- to identify citizens' needs and demands as well as to incorporate them afterwards into the local decision-making processes.

### 2.4.2. Measure 2.7-BRN: Improving bus services for the disabled

#### 2.4.2.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To inform citizens on measure content
Second most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Third most important objective	To effectively disseminate achievements of the project to international, national and local levels

#### 2.4.2.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	300 participants every year	General public, passengers
Public discussions	40 participants	Disabled users
Presentations and information sessions	90 participants	Students and specialized group
The information campaign in newspapers	60000 readers	General public, passengers

### 2.4.2.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	General public, passengers	300 participants every year	***
Public discussions	Disabled users	40 participants	**
Presentations and information sessions	Students and specialized group	90 participants	**
The information campaign in newspapers	General public, passengers	60,000 readers	***

### 2.4.2.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	To introduce the minibuses to the general public, DPMB provided the information about measure implementation and other project activities (European Mobility Weeks realisation) by articles in magazine for passengers and in the regional newspapers
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	To involve the target group into the measure DPMB started to communicate with wheelchair organisations since preparations of the minibuses' technical requirements.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	*	Not all representatives of all main stakeholders were always addressed by the activity. Maybe some schools for disabled and other disabled association could be addressed more.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	DPMB provided the information to introduce the minibuses to the general public in different ways: communication campaign, European Mobility Weeks, exhibitions, public discussion... DPMB published an article about the measure in magazine for passengers and in the regional newspapers as well.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	In this measure, there were appropriate incentives like European Mobility Week or meeting with disabled users.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	***	After the delivery of the first minibus, the disabled users gave their feedback to make some changes in minibus interior.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	After the discussion with the disabled, some their suggestions about changes in timetables were taking into account by DPMB. These changes were announced by magazine for passengers and on PT company web site.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of	**	This type of measure requested very close cooperation between the measure partners.

the measure		
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.4.2.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	***	After the delivery of the first minibus, the disabled users gave their feedback to make some changes in minibus interior. The appropriate changes were done in next four minibuses in cooperation with the minibus producer.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	Minibuses have to suit to the disabled users. DPMB consulted some technical and operating issues with their organisations during the decision-making and measure implementation.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	According to the meeting with the target group, the disabled users appreciate very much the minibus service. According to the number of use, other PT users enjoy the minibuses as well.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	DPMB published several articles in magazine for passengers and presented the minibuses every year on European Mobility Week and CIVITAS day. Maybe the citizens' knowledge increased but there is no data to provide evidence.
Increased public trust	**	The minibuses are very popular referring to the number of use by all groups of passengers.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	O	The openness of the measure partners has not been investigated.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	O	There were no interest groups besides stakeholders.
Increased political support	**	Politicians from the Brno City Assembly were very involved into the minibuses presentation on CIVITAS Day 2009.
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.4.2.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1 - Cooperation with the target group** - It was very important for the measure to cooperate with the group of disabled people. They were motivated to give their comments on the design of the minibus (especially interior) and to help deciding whether the minibuses will operate on special lines, whether these lines should be restricted to the disabled and whether they should function as demand-responsive service.

#### 2.4.2.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

No barriers occurred.

### 2.4.2.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

No activities were needed.

### 2.4.2.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1 - Communicate to your target group!** - Active and positive involvement of the target group of disabled people was a fruitful mean to design the service and adjust it to their needs and to disseminate information on the measure and raise interest. When dealing with specific groups, it is important to choose appropriate method – for communicating to the disabled in Brno a focus groups technique seemed perfectly suitable and gave space to express the needs and suggestions concerning the operation of the buses.

## 2.4.3. Measure 4.12-BRN: Comprehensive mobility dialogue and marketing campaigns

### 2.4.3.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Second most important objective	To inform citizens on measure content
Third most important objective	To include major stakeholders into solution
Fourth most important objective	To support the branding, visibility and familiarity with the CIVITAS project

### 2.4.3.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Public discussions	40 participants	General public, passengers
Info-material – brochures – leaflets	1000 leaflets	General public
Questionnaires	2500 respondents	PT Passengers

### 2.4.3.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Public discussions	General public, passengers	40 participants	**
Info-material – brochures – leaflets	General public	1000 leaflets	**
Questionnaires	PT Passengers	2500 respondents	***

### 2.4.3.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
------------------------	--------	------------

Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	During the campaigns of the European Mobility Weeks, the information about the measure (the ongoing sociological researches) the citizens were informed. Brno City Districts were addressed with the question on what they want to change in PT operations.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	*	The Transport Barometer surveys were organised regularly but workshop with the citizens was held only once during the project course.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	**	Citizens, city districts
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	***	Usage of traditional media in combination with new social media: Internet website, Facebook, Flickr, You Tube, Integrated mobility centre: citizens were informed about the measure during the European Mobility Weeks Events and on the Discussion with citizens where all the CIVITAS ELAN measures implemented in Brno were discussed. The information was published also on the website and via social media. The leaflet about the measure was prepared.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	Workshop for public as a space to participate in the discussion
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Workshop for public as a space to participate in the discussion
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	The explanation of the changes was provided when the Transport Plan was published. Also during the workshop the same issues were addressed
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	Partners of the measure were informed by LDM on the CE&D process. The process was coordinated by LDM
<b>0 = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.4.3.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	**	This is reached through the tool of marketing research
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	***	Results of the marketing research are incorporated into the update of the Transport Plan for the coming year, e.g. two new bus stops were created, one at the Spilberk Castle and another nearby Villa Tugendhat (both are significant monuments and it improved accessibility to it). Another example is that line 67 was rerouted and operates via different streets than before.



Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	Due to campaigning and organisation of the workshop we consider the awareness and acceptance of the measure to be higher
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	Due to campaigning and organisation of the workshop we consider the awareness and acceptance of the measure to be higher
Increased public trust	O	
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	**	Partners of the measure were informed by the local dissemination manager on the CE&D process. The process was coordinated by the local dissemination manager
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	O	
Increased political support	*	The measure had political support since the beginning of the project; however, in all transport measures implemented in the city, this one is rather small and does not generate extra political engagement.
Other, <i>please describe????</i>		
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory</b>		<b>*** = Excellent</b>

#### 2.4.3.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1 – Organisational** – A great cooperation was set up among key stakeholders, especially in the project team which was crucial in the end for citizen engagement activities. Also KORDIS JMK, the key stakeholder cooperated on the dissemination of the measure and engaging citizens.

#### 2.4.3.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

No barriers occurred.

#### 2.4.3.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

No activities needed, no barriers occurred.

#### 2.4.3.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – Cooperation between stakeholders is necessary to implement citizen engagement activities, especially in the environment where this is not a daily practice. Setting up a good cooperation to maintain and proceed with involving citizens is a key issue.

### 2.4.4. Measure 4.13-BRN: Integrated Mobility Centre

#### 2.4.4.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To inform citizens on measure content
Second most important	To enhance the use of the measure

objective	
Third most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
Fourth most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Fifth most important objective	To support the branding, visibility and familiarity with the CIVITAS project

#### 2.4.4.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	300	General public
Public discussions	40	General public, passengers
Info-material – brochures – leaflets	1000 leaflets, 2140 posters, 10 city light cases, 3 billboards, 500 invitation cards	General public
Questionnaires	70 pieces	General public
The information campaign in newspapers and radio	campaign in Salina newspapers (50,000 pieces) and Metropolitan newspapers, spot broadcasted on the radio 3 times a day since mid-August and 5 times a day during the last week before opening of the IMC	General public

#### 2.4.4.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	General public	300	***
Public discussions	General public, passengers	40	**
Info-material – brochures – leaflets	General public	1000 leaflets, 2140 posters, 10 city light cases, 3 billboards, 500 invitation cards	***
Questionnaires	General public	70 pieces	**
The information campaign in newspapers	General public	campaign in Salina newspapers (50,000 pieces) and Metropolitan newspapers, spot broadcasted on the radio 3 times a day since mid-August and 5 times a day during the last week before opening of the IMC	***

#### 2.4.4.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	During the European Mobility weeks campaigns the citizens were informed about the implementation of the measure. At the first campaign in 2009 CIVITAS ELAN info point stood on the place where the IMC was installed and the transport information like the example of the future IMC services were provided. In December

		2010 the discussion with citizens was held, the questionnaires to give suggestions on the requested service were distributed. The discussion was announced on project and city website, the social network was used too. Moreover the questionnaire was available on websites too.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	Campaigning and support of the use of the measure was mostly concentrated around the IMC opening.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	The activities were mainly focussed on general public and other key stakeholders (such as DPMB, KORDIS, TIC and others) were taken on board during preparation and implementation of the measure by standard communication means among project partners/stakeholders (emails, phone calls, meetings). The measure was also strongly supported by political representation.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	***	Usage of traditional media in combination with new social media: Internet website, Facebook, Flickr, YouTube, Integrated mobility centre: citizens were informed about the measure during the European Mobility Weeks Events and on the Discussion with citizens where all the CIVITAS ELAN measures implemented in Brno were discussed. The information was published also on the website and via social media. Leaflets about the measure were prepared.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	Workshop for public as a space to participate in the discussion
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Workshop for public as a space to participate in the discussion
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	The results from the discussion with citizens in December 2010 were published on website. And moreover these recommendations were accepted and used for the operation of the IMC.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	Partners of the measure were informed by Local Dissemination Manager on the CE&D process. The process was coordinated by Local Dissemination Manager
<b>O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent</b>		

#### 2.4.4.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	***	Citizens could express their needs concerning various issues – e.g. opening hours of the IMC that were established according to the information obtained from citizens.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	***	Citizens could express their needs concerning various issues – e.g. opening hours of the IMC that were es-

		established according to the information obtained from citizens.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	Due to campaigning and organisation of the workshop we consider the awareness and acceptance of the measure to be higher
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	Due to campaigning and organisation of the workshop we consider the awareness and acceptance of the measure to be higher
Increased public trust	O	The price of the IMC was higher than expected due to the materials used in the interior and its equipment which partly led to some negative comments in media. This could potentially lower the public trust but in the end this does not seem to be true looking at the number of visitors.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	**	Partners of the measure were informed by Local Dissemination Manager on the CE&D process. The process was coordinated by Local Dissemination Manager
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. construction companies, other cities, ...)	O	
Increased political support	***	This measure was supported by local political representation since the beginning of the project, throughout the implementation and now during operation. The opening of the IMC was assisted by Ladislav Macek, Deputy Mayor and political guarantor of the project, and Robert Kotzian, Deputy Mayor for Technical Issues. Other key stakeholders were also present at the opening of the IMC. In autumn 2012 political representatives increased the budget of the IMC operator TIC to ensure its services after the end of the project.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

#### 2.4.4.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1 – Organisational** – A great cooperation was set up among key stakeholders, especially in the project team which was crucial in the end for citizen engagement activities. Also DPMB, a.s. and KORDIS JMK, the key stakeholders cooperated on the dissemination of the measure and engaging citizens.

**Driver 2 – Financial** – The CIVITAS ELAN Project was crucial for implementation of the measure from the financial viewpoint as it brought extra funding to build the IMC. It was even more important to have the support of the project for dissemination and citizen engagement activities that are not always anticipated when a decision to implement such measure is made. The project funding allowed for promoting the measure, raising the awareness and visibility of the measure and project itself and CE activities.

#### 2.4.4.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

No barriers occurred.

#### **2.4.4.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers**

No activities needed, no barriers occurred.

#### **2.4.4.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement**

**Lesson 1** – Cooperation between stakeholders is necessary to implement CE activities, especially in the environment where this is not a daily practice. Setting up a good cooperation to maintain and proceed with involving citizens is a key issue.

### **2.4.5. Conclusions**

#### **Quality of activities**

During the citizen engagement activities in the city of Brno great efforts have been made to raise the awareness of both traffic impacts on the quality of life and sustainable modes of transport which has significant impact on improving environmental conditions. Events were organized (M2.7 and M4.13) and also public discussions were organised (M2.7 and M4.13). Presentations were given (M2.7), questionnaires were conducted (M4.12) and leaflets distributed (M4.12 and M4.13). There were information campaigns in newspapers (M2.7 and M4.13) and on the radio (M4.13). Given all these activities it can be presumed that citizens' awareness with the objectives above will have increased.

The city of Brno recognizes the importance of improving the availability and accessibility of information about city mobility, on the basis of citizens' needs. Therefore the usage of traditional media in combination with new social media was a good way to inform the citizens about the different measures that Brno was going to implement. These media (website, Facebook, Flickr, You Tube, Integrated Mobility Centre, etc.) will become more important to share information about city mobility.

#### **Impact evaluation**

Several awareness raising and consultation activities that were implemented within the ELAN project tried to improve the opinion on sustainable transport, public transport in particular. CIVITAS ELAN helped to establish the dialogue among all parties concerned which resulted in better solutions:

- Involving the disabled in the measure for the new bus service (M2.7) led to an increased satisfaction of disabled people. But the minibuses can also be used by other citizens and are hence a good economical solution for the problem of the low public transport supply and demand in low population density areas around the city. In this way the decision of the disabled people to preserve the bus service as a regular service (instead of a demand-responsive service) led to a better public transport in the city.

Furthermore, the ELAN approach in citizen engagement was transferred and used by other departments of the municipality. Also for Brno the ELAN project was not only an opportunity to improve the traffic situation, but also to improve the practice of citizen engagement in planning and implementing measures to improve mobility and to make it more sustainable.

## Process evaluation

One of the main objectives of the city of Brno is identifying citizen's needs and demands as well as to incorporate them afterwards into the local decision-making processes. The city succeeded in that, for example through involving disabled people in making the decisions about the type and equipment of minibuses and their operation (M2.7). This kind of active involvement was not only the right way to identify the needs of this target group, it was also a good mean to disseminate information and raise interest within the target group.

Also assembling the different key stakeholders in a project team was used as a way to set up a co-operation among these stakeholders. This is necessary to implement the citizen engagement activities (M4.12).

## 2.5. Porto

### 2.5.1. Objectives

Before the CIVITAS ELAN project, citizen engagement was a weak issue within the public administration. Public participation in Porto is far from rooted. Citizens are not only not used to expressing their opinions, they even reject this. The CIVITAS ELAN project was an important opportunity to involve the citizens and to change a rather traditional indifference towards such processes.

Before ELAN citizens were not consulted for two reasons: firstly, this was an unusual procedure in the city, and also in the country, and secondly, citizens were rather reluctant to give their opinions because they felt that their opinions or suggestions would not be taken into account anyway. However, since the start of the ELAN project this is gradually changing.

The main objectives of the citizen engagement activities in Porto were:

- to satisfy the citizens' needs for the availability and accessibility of information on public management and investment in transport,
- to increase the interest and public debate on sustainable mobility issues,
- to prove that the public participation in the decision making processes is possible in the Portuguese reality and has clear advantages that allow better solutions for the city.

The public participation process aimed at allowing all citizens and users to participate whenever a decision process was open to public review. The communication and engagement strategy was targeted to a wider audience, to boost the public participation with a positive side-effect in terms of project's visibility.

### 2.5.2. Measure 1.5-OPO: Light-weight bus shuttle

#### 2.5.2.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
Second most important objective	To effectively disseminate achievements of the project to international, national and local levels
Third most important objective	To support the branding, visibility and familiarity with the CIVITAS project To include major stakeholders into measure implementation

**Objective 1:** The measure main goal is to reduce the weight of the public transportation vehicles, in order to save fuel consumption that leads to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Consequently, it is possible to improve the quality of the breathable air in the urban areas. The manufacturing of a bus prototype based on environmentally friendly principles, providing complementary means of transportation, aims to make the citizens reflect about the efficiency of the current vehicles (from a general point of view) and about the negative effects on health, worldwide, caused by such kind of pollution. New transportation solutions will increase the awareness of the citizens regarding good practices in a near future on these issues.

**Objective 2:** The possibility to test the prototype on public streets (real service conditions) increases the quality and realism of the results. On the other hand, the prototype is an achievement itself and it is important show it running for those people that have interest in this field.

**Objective 3:** The implementation of the shuttle was possible by means of the partnership between three consortium entities, FEUP, CMP and STCP. Decisions related to the operational phase were taken with agreement of all stakeholders involved, each one with clear responsibilities. The shuttle can

also be considered as a rolling storefront, allowing for the advertisement of the main project, CIVITAS ELAN, along the intervention area.

### 2.5.2.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Presentations and information sessions	Information Provision	Broader Public
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information Provision	All citizens who live, work or study in Asprela area
Questionnaires	Consultation: Interviews on users satisfaction	CiViTAS Shuttle users
Email	Information Provision	Student community

**Activity 1: Flyers and information panels** – The first stage of distribution started on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2012. Flyers were distributed at several Universities which are established on the Asprela area. After the launch of the bus shuttle, also the crew members, during the first two weeks of the shuttle operation, handed flyers, inviting the citizens to try the bus and giving information about the measure objectives.

One information panel (Mupi), containing information about the operation of the CiViTAS shuttle, was placed in front of the mobility shop on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2012. The Mupi remained in the outside area and was visible to everyone who walked in front of the mobility shop, throughout the operational phase.

**Activity 2: Email** – An email was sent on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2012, disseminating the measure and advertising the service offered by the shuttle, to each student with valid registration on one of the several Faculties that are part of Porto University.

**Activity 3: News and Interviews** – During the first half of April several news articles and interviews were published in local and National Newspapers and on generic television channels, allowing for national visibility.

**Activity 4: Questionnaires** – Around 500 questionnaires were answered by the citizens to assess the measure, in terms of the bus features and performance, and also regarding the operational characteristics, timetables, route and location of the bus stops. This activity was conducted during the last weeks of the life time of the operation phase.

### 2.5.2.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Presentations and information sessions	Broader Public	Several news on local and National Newspapers and Interviews on generic television channels from national visibility.	***
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	All citizens who live, work or study in Asprela area	5.000 Flyers and 1 Mupi	***
Questionnaires	CiViTAS Shuttle users	Around 500	**
Email	Student community	Thousands of emails	***



### 2.5.2.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	The citizens were provided with information on timetables, life time of the shuttle operation, route and locations of the bus stops and the objectives of the measure. Crew members provided personalized information as well.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	Two weeks before the start of the operation phase, the first series of flyers were distributed in several universities inside the Asprela area.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	***	Decisions were taken by agreement between FEUP, CMP and STCP. The activities targeted all citizens who live, work or study in Asprela area.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	Flyers were distributed before and during the beginning of the operation phase; Information placed on the bus stops; Mupi in front of the mobility shop; Several information placed on sites; Newspapers news; TV interviews; Email sent to the entire community of the University of Porto (one email to each student).
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	***	The rides were free of charge for all those wished to use the bus.
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Citizens could make suggestions for improvement of the shuttle service in the questionnaires
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	○	
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	○	
○ = None ★ = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

**Strong point 1: Travel without charges for the users** – The fact of the travel being free of charges, allowed for a significant broadening of the level of the Citizen Engagement.

**Strong point 2: Have a crew member** – The crew member was a strong instrument to foster the citizen engagement once he promoted direct contact with the potential passengers, inviting them to participate in the experiment and always focused on trying to clarify any doubts that could subsist on the measure.

**Weak point 1: No Citizen Engagement before the operation phase** – The Citizen Engagement just began simultaneously with the operation phase starts. So the citizens did not have any influence on the decisions taken for the measure.

### 2.5.2.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
------------------------	--------	------------

Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	○	The changes were not directly induced by suggestions from citizens but by taking into account the available resources and the citizens' needs.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	**	The implementation is influenced by the intention to reach / serve/ engage along the largest area as possible, taking into account the available resources, to choose the bus stops, the route and acceptable time tables for the travels.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	The average number of carried passengers increased significantly.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	The intents and operational conditions became clear for the citizens and increased their level of engagement.
Increased public trust	***	Since the information about the measure objectives was transmitted personally by the crew members of the bus, the quality of its perception increased, increasing the people trust for participate in this experiment.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	○	
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. Construction companies, other cities, ...)	**	The team of the CIVITAS MIMOSA from Funchal asked for information about the shuttle. Campus from Vairão (Integrated on Porto University) has also questioned us about the shuttle.
Increased political support	○	
Other, please describe????	○	
○ = None ★ = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.5.2.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – No costs to the shuttle user.

**Driver 2** – The personal contact made for the crew members with the citizens, during all the experimental/operational period.

**Driver 3** – The external and appealing look (decorative vinyl), developed for the bus, which made the bus be noted by everybody.

### 2.5.2.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** – Objectives of the measure focused basically on the results related to the structural concept. Once the main objective of the measure was to reduce the weight of the bus, which is definitely too technical-oriented to allow for a Citizen Engagement in the decision-making procedures.

**Barrier 2** – Lack of expertise of FEUP's team on marketing.

**Barrier 3** – Lack of investment on marketing.

**Barrier 4** – To have only one shuttle available to perform the operation and only one direction of circulation. This constrained the Citizen Engagement since it was impossible to improve the timetables and the route.

**Barrier 5** – During the first two weeks one of the bus stops (FEUP) had to be disabled because of the drivers who parked their vehicles systematically in front of the high platform, even breaking the traffic laws. A lot of travels were denied since the final destination would be the FEUP bus stop.

### 2.5.2.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – Publish information related to the measure focused on strong images/drawings to make the message understanding easier.

**Activity 2** – Hand delivery of flyers, by the crew members, at each shuttle stop, inviting the citizens individually to try the bus and providing information about the measure objectives.

**Activity 3** – Create a circular route, for a single shuttle, on the intervention area (Asprela) to reach to the largest number of institutions placed into Asprela, as possible, with short travel timetable, along the shuttle route.

### 2.5.2.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – Offering the travels to the users, has facilitated the persuasion of the citizens to experiment the bus.

**Lesson 2** – Since the information about the measure objectives was transmitted personally by the crew members of the bus, the quality of its perception increased, increasing the people trust for participate in this experiment. The intents and operational conditions became clear for the citizens and increased their level of engagement.

## 2.5.3. Measure 2.10-OPO: Participatory planning for new intermodal interchange

### 2.5.3.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important reason	To include major stakeholders into solution
Second most important reason	To improve trust between different stakeholders
Third most important reason	To inform citizens on measure content
Fourth most important reason	To raise citizens interest
Fifth most important reason	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

**Objective 1: Include major stakeholders into solution** – The measure is focusing on a strong involvement of all relevant stakeholders starting from the design phase. There were involved stakeholders like Hospital S. João one of the major institutions in the area; all transport operators and the metropolitan authorities. Only the users association weren't involved.

**Objective 2: Improve trust between different stakeholders** - The involvement of all the important stakeholders in the transport field cooperating together in the same project represents an effective step forward in reaching more effective solutions and integrated transport services. It is also a strong indicator of their commitment and interest in the achieved solution.

**Objective 3: Inform citizens, raise citizens' interest and increase public awareness on sustainable mobility** – The measure pretends to involve also the citizens in the planning phase of the transport interchange trough public participation. One of the outcomes of the measure is to increase general interest and public participation in the mobility decision process.

### 2.5.3.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Workshop I	Technical information on citizen engagement in the process of planning intermodal infrastructure Acting together: participants were divided into separate	CiViTAS partners, stakeholders

	groups to work on the citizen engagement strategy for the concrete measure	
Workshop II	Technical information: good practices in planning, design and management of transport interchanges	CiViTAS partners, stakeholders
Info-material – brochures – leaflets	Information Provision about project propose and questionnaire design Raising citizens' interest on the project and motivate them to cooperate in the survey.	Local inhabitants (CiViTAS area)
Questionnaires	Interviews face to face / consulting	Local inhabitants (CiViTAS area)

### 2.5.3.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Workshop I	CiViTAS partners, stakeholders	25 participants	**
Workshop II	CiViTAS partners, stakeholders	43 participants	**
Info-material – brochures – leaflets	Local inhabitants (CiViTAS area)	1500 flyers distributed in households	**
Questionnaires	Local inhabitants (CiViTAS area)	406 (385 valid)	**

### 2.5.3.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	*	The organized activities give general information about the measure and project.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	The workshops were organised in time in order to use the lessons learnt in the actual work of the participants. The survey on the interchange was also done in time to take the comments of the citizens into account in the design process.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	**	Local inhabitants (questionnaire), stakeholders (technical workshop)
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	***	Since CiViTAS inhabitants were the target group, the information was provided in their households.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	0	No incentive
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	*	The questionnaire asked for their opinion about interchange transport infrastructures. There was asked if they know the 2.10 measure, but it did not ask for their opinion on it.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	0	
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	*	A small report of CE results was performed and uploaded on the SharePoint. The different involved partners were also invited in a workshop

		on Citizen Engagement.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

**Strong point 1: Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media** – The target group of the opinion survey was the CiViTAS inhabitants and the information/survey was performed in their households. The surveys were performed in after work hours (6 pm – 8 pm) in order to find people at their homes.

**Strong point 2: Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities** – The workshops organized were disseminated in the main companies interested in the transport interchange in Asprela. More than ten Portuguese institutions participated in the workshop.

**Weak point 1: Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process** – The organized activities gave general information about 2.10-OPO measure and CiViTAS project. The measure name is “Participatory Planning for New Intermodal Interchange” and the designs of transport interchange weren’t presented to citizens in any time.

**Weak point 2: Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments** – The CE activities performed didn’t ask opinions and comments of citizens that could influence the decisions taken.

### 2.5.3.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	*	They were asked about what should it should be included in transport interchange. The contributions given by citizens were in agreement with the infrastructures considered in technical specifications by measure partners for the interface. The contributions were only useful to confirm the needs. Nothing new was suggested
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	0	The contributions gave by citizens were in agreement with the infrastructures considered in technical specifications by measure partners for the interchange. The contributions were only useful to confirm the needs. Nothing new was suggested. So it does not influence on decision-making.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	*	The measure has no implementation, it is only a study. The CE only contributes for inhabitants’ information.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	*	The survey contributed to inform the citizens about the measure.
Increased public trust	*	The little information given trough the survey contributed to raising the public trust.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	*	The little information given trough the survey contributed to increasing openness of the measure partners towards the citizens.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. Construction companies, other cities, ...)	0	No interest was raised.
Increased political support	*	The CE not always was supported by political.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.5.3.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1: Good level of participation of inhabitants** – Asprela inhabitants were responsive to the opinion survey. Citizens were interested and motivated to give their opinion.

**Driver 2: Dates of Workshops** – City of Brno and Porto make possible dates coordination of the 2.8 common measure workshop and 2.10 the measure workshop. In this way enhanced the participation of foreign and Portuguese participants in both workshops.

### 2.5.3.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1: CMP approval** – The CE activities: flyer delivery and opinion survey needed the approval of the municipality (CMP) and it took more than a year.

**Barrier 2: Staff for opinion survey** – CMP used their staff to do the questionnaires. So it was necessary to coordinate with other CMP activities.

### 2.5.3.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1: Motivate the participation of inhabitants** – When preparing citizen engagement activity is important to take some actions in order to “guarantee” the success. To increase the acceptance of opinion survey: 1) there was delivered a flyer describing the importance of the survey; 2) it was performed after working hours.

### 2.5.3.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1:** The delivery of a flyer before the questionnaire increased the acceptance of residents’ participation as well as the possibility of performing the questionnaire in the evening permit to interview the working residents.

**Lesson 2:** Citizen Engagement activities are a delicate subject because it interferes with the image of who is promoting the activity. In this measure the responsible for activities was the Municipality of Porto. In this institution, this type of activity is not a common practice and the project was not sufficient to change this reality.

## 2.5.4. Measure 3.5-OPO: Integrated accessibility planning in the Asprela quarter

### 2.5.4.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Second most important objective	To enhance the use of the measure
Third most important objective	To support the branding, visibility and familiarity with the CIVITAS project

### 2.5.4.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information Provision about: project propose and questionnaire design; cycle paths implemented;	Local inhabitants and area visitors
Questionnaires	Interviews face to face / consulting	Local inhabitants

### 2.5.4.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Local inhabitants and area users	1500 +3000 flyers delivered	**
Questionnaires	Local inhabitants	400 +400 questionnaires	***

### 2.5.4.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	When the first scenario of a circulation plan was approved, a flyer containing the new circulation plan was delivered.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	The information was available immediately after the first scenario was chosen.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	**	All the information on the initial planned circulation plan was periodically communicated to the measure partners, some of them are stakeholders. The local political representative gave a presentation on the municipality to present the new circulation plan. Citizens were addressed by brochures on the project propose and questionnaire design.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	*	Article on national paper – 26/10/11 – Jornal de Notícias Flyers on paper distributed in households in the area describing the circulation plan. Flyer on paper distributed in cars parked on cycle paths describing the new infrastructures.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	
Citizens provided with appropriate means/ support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	The flyer that was distributed had a cuttable piece to gather contributions which were delivered to the Mobility Shop. The flyer also had an e-mail address to collect opinion about the measure activities.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	**	
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	**	All the developments made, since data collection, to traffic simulation and scenarios were periodically communicated to the measure leaders by e-mail and discussed on internal meetings.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.5.4.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	***	The inhabitants' opinion effectively changed the circulation plan design: there were two streets where the people and consequently their representatives didn't accept the change from two way circulation to one way, because of the funeral route from a church to a cemetery that had to change due to the new circulation plan. There was a redesign of the project, using the actual circulation plan, but increasing people's accessibilities, priority to public transports circulation and public access and a cycle-lane. .
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	***	The main reason why the circulation plan was changed is due to the inhabitants' opinion majority.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	**	With the changes made, the circulation plan was generally accepted.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	
Increased public trust	**	
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	*	
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. Construction companies, other cities, ...)	*	The project was presented on CIVINET Forum. The participants showed interest to know the project.
Increased political support	**	When the changes to the circulation plan were made With the changes made, the circulation plan was generally accepted.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.5.4.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – The main driver was to present, to the local inhabitants and all the people that study or work in the Asprela quarter before the implementation stage, the scenario that predicted a new circulation plan to the area. This induced strong reactions from the public that had a strong impact on the design of the measure (see above).

### 2.5.4.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1:** No relevant barriers were found in the citizen engagement process. The planned activities for citizen engagement had been taken into account on the proper way. Although, there was a planned activity that did not occur, that was a public presentation. This activity did not occur because it was planned that it would happen after the flyer distribution and the mobility questionnaires. The public reaction was so strong that the conditions to do the public presentation were not right.

**Barrier 2:** During the door to door questionnaires, one of the aspects that had a relevant impact was that a big part of the inhabitants were elderly people. Those people have mobility problems, for that reason, it was inconvenient to deliver the cuttable paper with their opinion on the Mobility Shop. On other perspective, the communications by e-mail presented the same problem; this age group is not yet oriented to this type of recent communications.



### 2.5.4.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – To overcome the previous barrier the president of the district was received by the city councillor to explain the objectives of the circulation plan. The president talked on the quality of the people’s representative and the plan was not accepted.

### 2.5.4.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – The main lesson that we have learned is that the public approach to a big dimension group like the target groups that are involved has to be done in a more personal way. The flyer that has been distributed had a cuttable paper and an e-mail address in order to receive people’s opinion about the new circulation plan. The flyer had also a description of the main objectives for the measure. During the door to door questionnaires, one of the aspects that had a relevant impact was that a big part of the inhabitants were elderly people. Those people have mobility problems, for that reason, it was inconvenient to deliver the cuttable paper with their opinion on the Mobility Shop. On other perspective, the communications by e-mail presented the same problem, this age group is not yet oriented to this type of recent communications.

**Lesson 2** – The whole experience was very positive: although there were no conditions to implement the first scenario developed by the technicians, the whole project was redesigned to adapt it to the people’s needs.

## 2.5.5. Measure 4.14-OPO: The Mobility Shop

### 2.5.5.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Second most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility
Third most important objective	To improve trust between different stakeholders

### 2.5.5.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Information provision	Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, local businesses, students and general public.
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information provision	Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, local businesses, students and general public.
Questionnaires	Deciding together, information gathering.	Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, students and general public.

### 2.5.5.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	General public: Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, local businesses, students and general public.	More than 500 participants.	**

Info-material – brochures - leaflets	General public: Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, local businesses, students and general public.	More than 5.000 people received info materials	**
Questionnaires	General public: Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, local businesses, students and general public.	More than 500 respondents.	**

#### 2.5.5.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	The mobility shop gave correct and up-to-date information on the different measures
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	**	Depends on the information from the project partners: sometimes it took some time to have the partners' feedback to start the activities, mainly the feedback and authorization of CMP Superiors.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	**	Commuters, shop-keepers, citizens living in the CIVITAS corridor, schools and students were reached through the use of different communication channels.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	CMP uses different media depending on the target audience: information letters, magazines, newsletter, websites, etc.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	*	People who answered to our surveys received some gadgets
Citizens provided with appropriate means/support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Thanks to our surveys we had some usable comments from citizens to improve our information.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	*	Citizens were not provided with any feedback.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	No information was provided
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

#### 2.5.5.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	**	Surveys indicated that it was better to use face-to-face surveys instead of online surveys, which was followed afterwards.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	***	See above.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	After changing the design of the mobility shop, the number of visitors increased significantly.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	Citizens indicated in the survey that the mobility shop is the most visible measure, so it can be said that it increased the awareness on the topic.

Increased public trust	**	The large number of visitors of the mobility shop is an indication for public trust in the mobility shop services.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	Regular meetings with the partners and the local institutions within the Asprela area show that everybody is aware that a good cooperation is the first step to implement with success our activities.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. Construction companies, other cities, ...)	*	There is one organization interested in the mobility shop (speaking about life after ELAN).
Increased political support	*	There is no political support to continue with the mobility shop in CMP management after the end of the project.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.5.5.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – Good cooperation between local partners. Constructive partnership on project level, strong and clear leadership, highly motivated key measure persons.

**Driver 2** – Enthusiastic attitude of the local institutions within the Asprela area (hospitals, public and private faculties) from the beginning.

**Driver 3** – Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design in other measures: The DRT service operation was implemented based on citizen's opinions/answers given by them in the surveys. This motivated the measure partners to further continue with citizen engagement.

**Driver 4** – CiViTAS funding.

### 2.5.5.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** - Lack of political support.

**Barrier 2** - Too much dependency on CIVITAS funding.

**Barrier 3** - Delay in the mobility shop implementation due the problems with land use.

**Barrier 4** – Acquisition of dissemination material: Impeding administrative structures, procedures, rules, hierarchical structure delayed the marketing campaigns organized by CMP.

### 2.5.5.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – Don't give up and try to change the politician's mind, repeating everyday our point of view and our needs for a successful measure.

### 2.5.5.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – Without political support it isn't possible to engage the citizens.

**Lesson 2** – The citizens are interested to gather in their communities to discuss issues of common interest, so this was a first step that could be continued by local committee representatives and other relevant city representatives.

**Lesson 3** – Putting available a suggestion box to collected the citizens opinion doesn't work. In our country, especially in our city, the public participation isn't rooted. We need to be more persuasive.

**Lesson 4** – Good cooperation with the citizens is the most important step for a successful activity.

## 2.5.6. Measure 6.4-OPO: Flexible Mobility Agency (part of Mobility Shop)

### 2.5.6.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	To support the branding, visibility and familiarity with the CIVITAS project
Second most important objective	To raise citizens interest
Third most important objective	To increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

### 2.5.6.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Events	Information provision.	Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, Local businesses, students and general public.
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Information provision, consulting, deciding together.	Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, Local businesses, students and general public.
Questionnaires/Surveys	Information provision, consulting, deciding together.	Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, Local businesses, students and general public.

### 2.5.6.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Events	Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, Local businesses, students and general public.	More than 5.000 participants	**
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, Local businesses, students and general public	More than 5.000 participants	**
Questionnaires	Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, Local businesses, students and general public	4.100 surveys (in total)	***
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	Residents, Public transport users, car drivers, commuters, Local businesses, students and general public	More than 5.000 participants	**

### 2.5.6.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	**	The information material was very detailed which enabled the citizens to give useful comments.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	***	Depends on the information from the project partners: sometimes it took some time to have the partners' feedback to start the activities, mainly the feedback and authorization of CMP Superiors.

Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	**	Commuters, shop-keepers, citizens living in the CIVITAS corridor, schools and students were reached through the use of different communication channels.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	**	CMP uses different media depending on the target audience: information letters, magazines, newsletter, websites, etc.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	**	People who answered to our surveys received some gadgets
Citizens provided with appropriate means/support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Thanks to our surveys we had some usable comments from citizens to improve our information.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	*	Citizens were not provided with any feedback.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	*	No information was provided
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.5.6.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	***	E.g. The DRT service operation was implemented based in the citizen's opinion/answers given by them in the surveys.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	***	See above.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	In the days after the CE activities, the number of carpooling users was rising, but it is unsure if this is only the effect of the CE-activities.
Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	**	Several marketing campaigns had a positive impact.
Increased public trust	**	The car-pooling platform was a good contributor to raise the trust regarding the innovative services.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	***	Regular meetings with the partners show that everybody is aware of the fact that good and open communication is essential for the project.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. Construction companies, other cities, ...)	**	There are some organizations interested in the project.
Increased political support	**	The bike rental system implementation is being managed at political level.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.5.6.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – Good cooperation between local partners. Constructive partnership on project level, strong and clear leadership, highly motivated key measure persons.

**Driver 2** – Excellent cooperation with the local institutions within the Asprela area (hospitals, public and private faculties).

**Driver 3** – Citizens involvement. Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design: The DRT service operation was implemented based in citizen’s opinions/answers given by them in the surveys.

**Driver 4** – CIVITAS funding.

### 2.5.6.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** - Lack of political support induced large delays.

**Barrier 2** - Too much dependency on CiViTAS funding, which threatens the continuation of the measure after the project ends.

**Barrier 3** – Acquisition of dissemination material: Impeding administrative structures, procedures, rules, hierarchical structure delayed the marketing campaigns organized by CMP.

**Barrier 4** – Long time to get political decision for the bike rental system.

### 2.5.6.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – Don’t give up and try to change the politician’s mind, repeating everyday our point of view and our needs for a successful measure.

### 2.5.6.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – Without political support it isn’t possible to engage the citizens.

**Lesson 2** – The public involvement helps us to better understand the citizens’ point of view, as well as their worries and concerns.

**Lesson 3** – Good cooperation with the citizens is the most important step for a successful activity.

## 2.5.7. Measure 8.8-OPO: Mobile mobility information

### 2.5.7.1. Objectives of citizen engagement

Most important objective	Inform and raise citizens’ interest
Second most important objective	To enhance the use of the measure and the responsibility of the local partners
Third most important objective	Increase public awareness on sustainable mobility

**Objective 1 – Inform and raise citizens’ interest** – this was the most important objective of citizens’ engagement activities because the final products of this measure were made to be used by the general public. Based on this, people were involved to directly contribute to the requirements definition of the system and its usability. Then, we’ve presented a system that answers users’ needs and, because people were involved since the beginning, their interest raised and they contributed with more improvements and really felt integrated with the project.

**Objective 2 - To enhance the use of the measure and the responsibility of the local partners** – involving people was important to “convince” the stakeholders and partners that the project was practicable and that it could be a success.

**Objective 3 - Increase public awareness on sustainable mobility** – one of the main objectives of the general project in Porto was to increase the awareness of sustainable mobility and promoting the project and its services really help people to know and accept more the sustainable services available.

### 2.5.7.2. Activities in the field of citizen engagement

TYPE		TARGET GROUP
Type of activity	Level of participation	
Presentations and information sessions	To inform and involve the general public	Stakeholders
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	To inform and involve the general public	General public
Questionnaires (3)	To inform and involve the general public	General public
Interviews and focus group sessions	To inform and involve the general public	General public
Email contact	To inform and involve the general public	General public

**Activity 1 – Presentations and technical sessions** – the target group of these activities were the stakeholders and also the direct partners. OPT promoted a few sessions to present the main achievements during the implementation process, so the partners and main stakeholders could feel real integrated in the project and in the main decisions.

**Activity 2 – Info material – flyers, stickers, posters** – distributed during the marketing campaign (February 2012 to August 2012).

**Activity 3 – Questionnaires** – provided in three stages of the project: before the first prototype implementation (April 2009), allowing people to decide which prototype was better to implement; after the first implementation – InfoBoard – to gather users' opinion about the system and its usability (April and May 2011); and after MOVE ME be provided to collect users' satisfaction with the final service (July 2012). These questionnaires, besides the evaluation of usability of the products and users' satisfaction, also requested for users' opinion.

**Activity 4 – Interviews and focus group sessions** – during the study of the InfoBoard usability (February to July 2011) some interviews and focus group sessions were taken in order to understand how people read the information displayed on the LCD monitor and what measures should be taken to improve the system.

**Activity 5 – Email contact** – OPT has created an email address for people contact directly the company and share with them their opinion about the service MOVE ME. The email was disseminated and it was a success because people really contribute with more ideas and improvements to the system. The better part of this activity was that people weren't obligate to collaborate – the contacts made by the final users were on their own initiative.

### 2.5.7.3. Level of penetration

TYPE	TARGET GROUP	QUANTITATIVE INDICATOR	QUALITATIVE SCORE
Presentations and information sessions	Stakeholders	10 entities	Well succeed
Info-material – brochures - leaflets	General public	More than 50.000	**
Questionnaires (3)	General public	50 + 142 + 203	**
Interviews and focus group sessions	General public	18	***
Email of contact	General public	34	***

#### 2.5.7.4. Implementation of the citizen engagement activities

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Relevant, complete and correct information available to citizens on project activities and on engagement process	***	the material disseminated was always complete and validated by all partners, always containing updated information.
Timing of the information sharing and engagement process (regularly and starting in an early phase of measure implementation)	*	Information was always update and disseminate on time.
Representatives of all main stakeholder groups were addressed by the activities	*	these activities was not considered at the beginning of the project and it was a week point because it has a consequence: we needed to raise their commitment with the project and their belief in its success.
Information was provided by appropriate intermediaries/media	***	The stakeholders involved provided the necessary channels (newsletters, emails, webpages) to disseminate the project and the citizens' engagement activities.
Provide appropriate incentives to participate	0	
Citizens provided with appropriate means/support that enables them to participate actively (deliberate problems and solutions with other stakeholders)	**	Citizens were involved with thte project and its stakeholders through questionnaires, emails, interviews.
Participants and other citizens provided with feedback on the taken decisions after their opinions and comments	***	General public contact OPT to give their opinion and some of their ideas were considered. All contacts were answered.
Relevant information on the CE&D process provided to the partners of the measure	***	This was considered as a very important issue, always assured by the leader of the project, promoting a better communication and commitment from all partners.
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

#### 2.5.7.5. Impact of the citizen engagement activities on the implementation process

Qualitative indicators	Rating	Motivation
Useful comments and suggestions made by citizens, leading to changes in design	***	Some of them contributed with good inputs and improvements.
Influence on decision-making and measure implementation	***	their opinion was always considered and new decisions were assumed when their proposals were possible and considered an improvement to the project. Citizens really influence the decision of take new research activities and additional development, so MOVE ME service could be available for new platforms.
Increased use and acceptance of the measure	***	the indicators shows that after the marketing and involving campaign were initialized the number of users increased. And the email channel really worked and people have communicated with the project's partners. With these proactive activities from the final users, also the partners accept the measure and its success and have started to promote it even more.



Increased awareness and knowledge of citizens on the subject	***	Providing more information about the project and its ways of usability people became more aware of the project but also of the technical developments
Increased public trust	*	With better information (updated) general public trust more in the service.
Increased openness of the measure partners towards the citizens	*	Stakeholders/partners involved always communicate with general public, taking into account their requirements.
Displays of interests by other parties besides stakeholders (e.g. Construction companies, other cities, ...)	**	Other municipalities and transport companies have showed interest in collaborate within the project.
Increased political support	0	
O = None * = Poor ** = Satisfactory *** = Excellent		

### 2.5.7.6. Drivers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Driver 1** – Some of the local institutions ensured that the project was well disseminated and were really committed in this process.

**Driver 2** – The direct partners of the project supported the communication.

### 2.5.7.7. Barriers in the implementation of the citizen engagement activities

**Barrier 1** - The small budget for these activities limited their execution like it was planned and some of them could not be performed.

**Barrier 2** - The lower involvement of some institutions and authorities limited the some communications channels.

### 2.5.7.8. Activities in relation to the citizen engagement strategy to overcome the barriers

**Activity 1** – To overcome the budget barrier we used other means of communications and try to plan focalized activities.

**Activity 2** - Try to assure more commitment from the local authorities and institutions, but even that wasn't a well succeed intervention. So we focused our efforts in some partners and make the most of on their support.

### 2.5.7.9. Lessons learned on citizen engagement

**Lesson 1** – Citizens' engagement activities should be planned for several stages of the project, always related to the launch of services.

**Lesson 2** – Always consider different kinds of users to be interview, this way you'll guarantee a more refined analysis centralized in different public niches.

**Lesson 3** – Citizens' engagement activities contribute to raise awareness and interest in the project and its services, even for your local partner and stakeholders.

**Lesson 4** - With their involvement, we assure a service that is useful and is used by citizens.

## 2.5.8. Conclusions

### Quality of the activities

To satisfy the citizens' needs for the availability and accessibility of information (the first objective of citizen engagement in Porto), a variety of different channels were used, in order to reach different target groups: information letters, magazines, newsletter, websites, flyers, face-to-face contacts, information panels, Mobility Shop, TV interviews, etc. The main lesson learned was that to reach different target groups, a standard approach is not sufficient:

- Citizens could travel on the light-weight bus (M1.5) free of charges. In this way, a big public could be reached. Yet, a personal approach was used, by direct contact between the crew member in the vehicle and the potential passengers, inviting them to participate and trying to clarify any doubts or questions.
- Surveys by the Mobility Shop (M4.14) indicated that it was better to use face-to-face surveys instead of online surveys. This advice was taken up afterwards in the measure.
- Citizens appeared more interested to gather in their smaller communities to discuss issues of common interest, instead of in a general information session. In this way, local committee representatives and other relevant city representatives can secure the interests of their local base on a higher level.
- To reach the inhabitants of the Asprela area for the survey on the new intermodal interchange (M2.10), the survey was conducted in their households after work hours (6 pm – 8 pm), in order to find people at their homes. Also a flyer was delivered describing the importance of the survey. As a result, citizens were interested and motivated to give their opinion.
- The flyer on the circulation plan (M3.5) that has been distributed provided information on the objectives of the measure and had a cuttable paper and an e-mail address in order to receive people's opinion about the new circulation plan. However, a big part of the inhabitants were elderly people, which were difficult to reach: it was inconvenient to deliver their response to the Mobility Shop and they were not familiar with communicating by e-mail.
- OPT created an email address for people contact directly the company and share with them their opinion about the mobile mobility service MOVE ME. The email was disseminated and it was a success because people really contribute with more ideas and improvements to the system. The better part of this activity was that people weren't obligate to collaborate – the contacts made by the final users were on their own initiative.

### Impact evaluation

In a number of cases, the opinion of citizens affected the design of the measure:

- The circulation plan within M3.5 was redesigned after strong opposition of one stakeholder because it has originally been proposal to convert the street which also serves as the funeral route from the church to the cemetery into a one-way street. The circulation plan was adjusted, by increasing the accessibility, giving priority to public transport circulation, better facilities to pedestrians and implementing a cycle lane. After these changes, the public and political acceptance increased significantly.
- The DRT service operation (M6.4) was implemented based on citizen's opinions that were gathered in a survey. This motivated the measure partners to further continue with citizen engagement.
- Thanks to citizens suggestions, new research activities were taken up for additional developments, so MOVE ME service could be available for new platforms (M8.8).
- During the door-to-door questionnaires on the circulation plan (M3.5), it was understood that a large part of the inhabitants in the corridor were elderly people. These questionnaires helped

to better understand their worries and concerns and to optimise the planning. After the implementation of the circulation plan face-to-face interviews were conducted in citizens' households at the end of the working day in order to gather their opinion about the measure implementation and the average score showed that people were satisfied.

This showed that public participation in the decision making processes is possible in the Portuguese reality and has clear advantages that allow better solutions for the city, which was also one of the objectives. However, some activities focused rather on providing information to the citizens, instead of allowing the citizens to actually contribute to the solution:

- In the design of the light-weight bus (M1.5), the main objective was to reduce the weight of the bus which was considered too technical-oriented to involve citizens in the decision-making process. Therefore, citizens were only engaged at the start of the operation phase. At this stage, it was too late to improve the service based on citizens' suggestions, but nevertheless the interviewed people were very satisfied with the measure.
- Only general information was provided about the new intermodal interchange (M2.10) and the ELAN project, but the different design proposals for the transport interchange weren't presented to citizens at all. Citizens were asked about what should be included in a transport interchange. The contributions given by citizens were in agreement with the infrastructures considered in technical specifications by measure partners for the interface. They confirmed the needs, but nothing new was suggested.

In general the public interest in sustainable mobility issues increased, which was one of the objectives of citizen engagement. For example the awareness and public trust in the Mobility Shop (M4.14) is still increasing together with the number of visitors.

Looking back on the four years of ELAN in Porto citizens were engaged successfully in some measures while in other measures citizen engagement had no impact at all. In several cases, citizens were not prepared and not very open to participate in discussions and decisions related to sustainable mobility and the city administration has learned that to involve the citizens it is necessary to meet them personally, otherwise it is difficult to get their feedback.

Although many efforts to get citizens involved were undertaken within the ELAN project, it seems that many citizens are not yet convinced that they can be part of the decision-making process. On the other hand, it must be said that the impact on political support remained limited: the continuation of the Mobility Shop (4.14) and the Demand Responsive Service (6.4) is threatened after the project ends. Further political support and more successful citizen engagement practices are needed to convince citizens of the benefits of participatory processes.

## Process evaluation

The most important driver was the good cooperation between the local partners and the involvement of all stakeholders:

- A constructive partnership on project level, strong and clear leadership, highly motivated key measure persons had a positive impact on the implementation of the Mobility Shop (M4.14) and the Flexible Mobility Agency (M6.4), and on the citizen engagement activities in particular. Regular meetings with the partners show that everybody is aware of the fact that good and open communication is essential for the project.
- The participatory planning of the new intermodal interchange (M2.10) focused on a strong involvement of all relevant stakeholders, like all transport operators, the metropolitan authorities and big institutions in the area like Hospital S. João; only the users association weren't involved. The involvement of all the important stakeholders is an effective step forward in reaching more effective solutions and integrated transport services. Local institutions

displayed also an enthusiastic attitude from the beginning of the project, showing their commitment and interest in the achieved solution.

In order to successfully plan citizen engagement activities, sufficient political support of the municipality proved to be crucial:

- The timing of the citizen engagement activities depended on the information and approval of the project partners: the approval by the municipality caused sometimes serious delays e.g. for the new intermodal interchange (M2.10) and the Mobility Shop (4.14).

In the Municipality of Porto, citizen engagement is still not a common practice. Citizen Engagement activities remain a delicate subject because it interferes with the image of who is promoting the activity.

### 3. Quality of citizen engagement activities (on project level)

This chapter brings together the most important findings related to the quality of the citizen engagement activities that have been implemented on measure and on city level.

The evaluation of the quality of the citizen engagement activities led to the main conclusion that there isn't one ideal or fit-to-all approach to involve citizens. In all cities it became clear that a good quality activity can only be put in place if there is a well-chosen variety of approaches in relation to different types of measures, level of participation (informing, obtaining information, consulting or co-deciding) and the range of target groups (citizens, shopkeepers, bus drivers, etc.), as defined in the Citizen Engagement Action Plans of each city.

A number of recommendations for implementing citizen engagement activities can be formulated:

- Citizens are more willing to get involved when they are acquainted with a concrete engagement plan, which includes objectives, issues for discussion, timing of consultations, and explanations of how their proposals will be considered.
- Citizen participation is most effective when stakeholders and citizens are asked to contribute in identifying needs and problems in discussions and deliberations on various possible solutions, and when they can provide local information and knowledge.
- Citizens need to be provided with all information on the topic that is necessary to formulate a well-considered opinion.
- An early start followed by continuous communication with citizens and stakeholders is crucial for the success of a consultation process.
- Providing feedback to citizens on how their opinion had been taken into account and informing them on the final decision or design of the measure is crucial to prevent that citizens feel neglected and to keep them motivated for further involvement.
- Most detailed information is obtained by using a personal approach.
- Experiments with social media have shown that using this tool can be very fruitful, especially in reaching young people who are too busy to engage in other activities like workshops and focus groups.
- Surveys prove to be the most efficient when using the combination of face-to-face and online methods. Sometimes a personalised approach was needed, while in other cases a generalised approach was more suitable, especially if the aim was to reach a broader public.
- Ensure representativeness of all key stakeholder groups to include different views in the discussion.
- To encourage citizens to share their opinion the right incentives can help significantly. On the other hand, when citizens feel that sharing their opinion can change something in the city in their own interest; this can be seen as an incentive itself.
- It is helpful to find people in important moments of their lives, e.g. birth, marriage, divorce, new job or when moving, etc. as they are more open for changes at such moments.

## 4. Impact evaluation of citizen engagement (on project level)

### 4.1. Impact on the planning and design of measures based on the identification of problems/ needs

Consultation with stakeholders and the public in the scope of CIVITAS ELAN measures resulted in a set of gathered information, data, opinions and suggestions concerning citizen's daily travelling habits and needs as well as their perception of the problems and barriers in the mobility field. In many ELAN measures citizens had an opportunity to test new technical solutions and services. Many citizens proposed practical solutions or commented on the proposed ones.

This feedback was carefully studied by the measure experts and included in the further process of planning and measure implementation. Stakeholders'/ public opinions were thus added to the technical background and had an indirect impact on final decisions and solutions:

- At a dialogue café (M2.9-GEN), the Gent City Council asked the people from the neighbourhood of the central train station to decide whether a new tunnel under the train tracks should be open to traffic or not. Most participants were afraid that opening a new connection would attract a lot of traffic destined for the city centre, which would mean an extra burden on this residential neighbourhood. For this reason it was decided that motorised traffic was excluded from this tunnel.
- A survey among Asprela students in Porto enabled the transport operator to choose the best route and operating times of the DRT service (M6.4-OPO) and to make it a valuable option for students travelling between the city centre and the Asprela quarter.
- After consulting the shopkeepers and delivery companies in Ghent (M7.3-GEN), the most important issue in freight delivery was the lack of loading spaces, and their abuse. For this reason the pilot project was set up for a new type of loading spaces. Shopkeepers got the change to participate in the decision making for the best location of these loading spaces. In the final version of the study on the Sava-North terminal (M2.5-ZAG) the following suggestions made by citizens were included: a pedestrian overpass over Savska Street, an additional traffic lane for the underground garage, horizontal tactile surfaces for visually impaired persons, location for the additional underground garage close to the terminal.
- Local residents indicated where a car sharing station would be popular (M6.2-GEN). The suggested places for a car sharing station were taken into account and researched. Based on this cambio did already start four new car sharing stations.
- Input from mentors and parents at schools lead to the change of design of a pedestrian crossing and the upgrading of the web portal with new information about the traffic situation and the location of dangerous points near schools (M5.4).

An important remark that needs to be made is that it is important to determine from the beginning to which extent changes are possible: Are only changes in the details of the measure allowed, or can the whole measure concept be influenced?

### 4.2. Impact on the acceptance and use of the measures

Mobility policies, plans and measures, formed in a participatory manner and including people's needs, values and opinions, are of greater quality and have greater legitimacy.

Many measures were positively accepted by the public. Although it is not always easy to determine whether this was the direct impact of the citizen engagement activities, some positive results are evident:

- User numbers of the bicycle route planner (M8.10-GEN) increased significantly after promotional campaigns.
- Mobility management for companies (M4.2-GEN & M4.4-ZAG) led to a remarkable shift in the modes of transport used.
- Involving the disabled in the new bus service (M2.7) led to an increased satisfaction of disabled people.
- The trial offer for car-sharing (M6.2-GEN) was a big success and led to an extra yearly growth of 36%, 32% and 30% respectively.
- Citizens' comments helped to identify some problems with the current freight regulations and several suggestions were included when the new delivery scheme was defined (M7.3-ZAG). The measure was well accepted by the citizens.

### **4.3. Impact on the awareness of sustainable mobility**

A common impact of public involvement was raised awareness, namely on problems of urban transport, how to solve them and on the specific solutions brought by the project's measures:

- The CIVITAS ELAN Open Academy (M4.9-LJU) that was organised in Ljubljana in the context of the Sustainable Urban Transport Plan had some positive results. Participants now seem more interested in topics relating to sustainable mobility than before. According to the feedback, they are also more aware of the CIVITAS ELAN project. Also the media recognised the importance of the topic as many of the events were reported.
- the awareness and public trust in the Mobility Shops (e.g. M4.14-OPO) is still increasing together with the number of visitors.
- Nearly all companies that were contacted for mobility management (M4.2-GEN) now have a company mobility plan, mostly set up in the framework of the ELAN project.
- The increase in the number of participants at cycling events (M4.6-LJU) and increased media coverage of sustainable transport planning (M4.9-LJU) are clear indications of an increased awareness and knowledge of citizens in Ljubljana.

### **4.4. Impact on openness towards citizens**

The effects of the citizen engagement activities in the CIVITAS ELAN project improved the participatory culture in all cities considerably. Many examples of good practice and mainly positive effects have contributed to a stronger belief in the usefulness of citizen engagement by the involved technicians and other specialists, as well as the decision makers. In many cases, mutual trust between various stakeholders, the public administration and experts significantly increased:

- In Zagreb many participants of the consultation events that took part during the course of the CIVITAS ELAN project expressed their great appreciation of such participatory approaches, and asked ELAN partners to strongly recommend city authorities to continue and even improve the participation of citizens, not only with regard to mobility but in all areas of public matters. Engaging the elderly was not a common practice but the situation completely changed due to ELAN.
- In Ljubljana politicians who were rather reserved towards citizen participation in the past, started to realize that they can't ignore the opinion of stakeholders and citizens any longer.
- In Brno the director of the city transport department became supportive of direct contacts with the target groups of measures. Furthermore, the ELAN approach in citizen engagement was transferred and used by other departments of the municipality.
- In Porto before ELAN politicians were not involved in citizen engagement activities but due to ELAN the involvement of citizens in decision-making processes will most likely increase.
- In Gent there already an strong participatory culture existed.

## 5. Process evaluation of citizen engagement activities (on project level)

This chapter brings together the most important barriers and drivers that have been perceived on measure and city level.

### 5.1. Drivers for citizen engagement

The most important drivers were a good cooperation between the local partners and the involvement of all stakeholders: the successful implementation of citizen engagement activities was possible thanks to a constructive partnership on project level, strong and clear leadership and highly motivated key measure persons. Regular meetings with the partners showed that everybody was aware of the fact that good and open communication was essential for the project.

Furthermore, the interest of the citizens in the topic was one of the key success factors to citizen engagement. To encourage citizens to participate, it was very helpful to have a good knowledge about the characteristics and interests of stakeholders and citizens' groups. It was observed that citizens' interest increased further after it became evident that suggestions could be incorporated into the final solution.

Professional support for the Measure Leaders proved to be helpful in planning and implementing citizen engagement activities. Throughout the whole project several workshops were organised on efficient and effective communication in order to enhance information sharing, joined planning and implementation of activities and citizen engagement planning. Representatives of the local self-government bodies (local committee and city district) were given a method on how to organize a local event engaging citizens.

### 5.2. Barriers for citizen engagement

The most important barrier was the lack of experience with citizen engagement at the start of the project. In all cities except in Gent there were no previous good practices on public participation in mobility; policies and measures were developed and accepted in the expert and political circles.

This made it difficult for many Measure Leaders to plan and implement citizen engagement measures. Through partners' consultations and trainings this barrier was overcome.

Also on the political level, this lack of experience was obstructing the implementation of citizen engagement activities: it was often difficult to convince politicians to publicly declare their support for citizen involvement and to take a more active role in engagement activities. In some cases, for the citizen engagement activities NGOs were engaged to overcome the lack of political support on the city level. One of the reasons for the successful involvement of citizens and stakeholder in Gent and in Brno was that ELAN partners had full support for the implemented citizen engagement activities from the political level.

But also citizens were not used to being asked and to express their opinions, and therefore are not convinced that participating will have any effect and that their proposals will have any influence. In such cases it will take time and a lot of repeated attempts to establish greater mutual trust.

Another barrier was that the subject of the consultation is not in the citizens' focus. In general it was easier to engage people who were already interested in the measure and are convinced of sustainable mobility. Car drivers and commuters are more difficult to reach. Another case is that citizens fear that



the measure will bring limitations to their lives; in this case it was necessary that citizens were provided with alternative solutions.