



CiViTAS FORUM 2016

CIVITAS ANNUAL CONFERENCE | 28-30 SEPTEMBER | GDYNIA

Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP): Recommendations to EU and national authorities Contribution from the CIVITAS CAPITAL Advisory Group: AG SUMP

28 October, 2016

Session 1: Achievements in Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning in Europe

Dr. Susanne Böhler-Baedeker, Rupprecht Consult



Organisation	NAME, First Name
University of Architecture in Bucharest, Romania	ENACHE, Mircea
CRTM, Madrid, Spain	DELGADO HERNÁNDEZ, Laura GARCÍA PASTOR, Antonio
University of Leeds, United Kingdom	MAY, Tony
Cerema France	DURLIN, Thomas MERLE, Nicolas

Coordination: BÖHLER-BAEDEKER, Susanne; PETERS, Hana

Technical support: VAN DE NADORT, Marjolein; VAN DER PAS, Jan-Willem

The AG SUMP members met four times (2014-2015) and

- defined the task of the group,
 - *Key output will be a policy paper for internal use that provides advice to the Commission on how it can further encourage cities to take up SUMP*s
- identified core topics relevant for the further development of the SUMP concept in Europe and recognized as important by the Commission
 - *national framework; governance structure; funding; implementation / objectives and vision; and quality & monitoring*
- drafted recommendations for EU policy

- **Policy paper AG SUMP**

- Focus is on national framework
 - Identification of barriers of SUMP take-up on the national level
 - Analyses of effects on SUMP generation
 - Suggestions what is needed on national level to support SUMP

- **Scientific publication**

- May, A.; Böhler-Baedeker, S.; Delgado L.; Durlin, T.; Enache, M.; van der Pas, J.-W. (2016) Appropriate national policy frameworks for Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans. Transportation Research

- **Discussion at 3rd European Conference on Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans, Bremen, Germany, 12/13 April 2016**

- Rupprecht Consult (2016): Closing Plenary Discussion Circles. Summaries and Recommendation. (see p. 6-8)

Why is national framework for SUMP important?

- The EU specifically addresses the **Member States as enablers of SUMP** take-up (e.g. urban mobility expert group).
- For the **improvement of the connectivity of the urban transport system** (especially of European urban nodes) with the higher i.e. regional and national network (e.g. TEN-T) SUMP is a key requirement (see Urban Mobility Package, Annex 1, Goals&Objectives (j.)).
- From the side of DG REGIO, **SUMP is mainstreamed and supported financially**.
- The **national approach and appreciation of SUMP can evolve for better and for worse** (e.g. UK).
- Several **Member States support the uptake of SUMPs successfully** through funding programmes (e.g. Flanders), legislation (e.g. Romania), guidance (France) and support.
- SUMP is an essential part of the upcoming urban mobility partnership of the **European Urban Agenda** (expected for 2017/2018).

Principal barriers at the national level for SUMP development

- **Lack of clarity and coordination** in the responsibilities of different government departments
- **Lack of a national policy** on urban transport
- **Lack of continuity or consistency** in the national policy on urban transport
- **Failure to provide a facilitating structure** for decision-making at local government level
- **Failure to provide the legislation and regulations** necessary to facilitate effective local decision-making
- **Lack of political support** for those making decisions at a local level
- **Lack of adequate, unfettered funding** to support local government, or the delegated powers to raise such funding locally
- **Lack of guidance, research and data support** and training to facilitate such delegation
- **Inadequate monitoring of the performance** of cities or, at the opposite extreme, over-prescription and a lack of trust

Analysis of impacts on SUMP development

- Ranking of identified barriers for SUMP generation
 - Showstopper
 - Lack of quality
 - Limited consequences



Showstopper ★ ★ ★

Lack of quality ★ ★

Limited consequences ★

Problem/ Barrier	Relevance for SUMP generation	Effects on SUMP generation	Explanation / Examples
Lack of clarity and coordination in the responsibilities of different government departments	**	There is no automatic effect. 1.2, 2.2, 7.1, and 6.1 are affected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different departments specify different parts of the policy (e.g. land use vs. transport) Policies (made by other departments) have negative impacts on transport (e.g. health or school policies affect ways people travel to hospitals/ schools)
Lack of a national policy on urban transport	** (*)	1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 4.1 and 6.1 are adversely affected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incompatibility of interurban policy with urban policy
Lack of continuity or consistency in the national policy on urban transport	**	1.5, 2.4, 10.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political changes (governments keep changing their plans). Changes in the national framework.
Failure to provide a facilitating structure for decision-making at local government level	** (*) Depends on country's administrative structure and size of municipalities.	1.6, 2.1, 2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This also includes failure effectively to devolve responsibility for local transport to cities. Country example: The era before Transport For London was created as an institution.
Failure to provide the legislation and regulations necessary to facilitate effective local decision-making	**	All of 6, 7.1, 2.2, 1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SUMP's not being given a legal status Legislation: Policy measures can only be implemented if permitted by national legislation (e.g. road pricing, taxation). Inadequate regulation: Vehicle, driver, safety and emission regulations are formulated at a national level. Deregulation, regulatory framework of public transport.

Main results of impact analyses



CiViTAS FORUM 2016
CIVITAS ANNUAL CONFERENCE | 28-30 SEPTEMBER | GDYNIA

- Only few real showstopper
 - Unclear responsibilities at local government level can frustrate to start the planning process
 - Lack of funding is a showstopper for measure implementation
- Risk of ineffective processes through
 - Lack of national policy on urban transport
 - Failure in providing legislation and regulation



Recommendations to European Commission to give guidance to Member States (1)

1. Ensure consistency

- so that skills can be developed, and resources are not wasted in redefining outcomes

2. Coordinate national transport policy

- interactively between ministries and with relevant national departments

3. Support local coordination

- to ensure that local authorities have direct control over all aspects of transport, and land use

4. Carry out national audit

- to assess the performance of cities in developing and implementing their SUMP and encourage them in benchmarking

Recommendations to European Commission to give guidance to Member States (2)



CiViTAS FORUM 2016
CIVITAS ANNUAL CONFERENCE | 28-30 SEPTEMBER | GDYNIA

5. Review skills

- at a national level and develop the skills base at a local level

6. Ensure enforceability

- that laws and regulations are enforceable, and that the resources are available for effective enforcement

7. Develop comprehensive pricing and appropriate signals to users

- to support the selection of most-effective policy measures and thus encouraging users to choose sustainable mobility options



Recommendations to European Commission to give guidance to Member States (3)



CiViTAS FORUM 2016
CIVITAS ANNUAL CONFERENCE | 28-30 SEPTEMBER | GDYNIA

8. Provide coherent funding streams

- to which local authorities have access to enable them to prioritise the most-effective policy measures

9. Avoid infrastructure bias

- to minimise risk that SUMP's will focus on infrastructure projects, despite the evidence that management and information measures are often more cost-effective

10. Support for Monitoring

- to assist performance of SUMP's and the identification of areas for improvement



- Presentations from ENDURANCE Advocacy Workshop on national framework are online
 - www.polisnetwork.eu/events2/endurance-sump
- National frameworks documentation from ENDURANCE is available online
 - <http://www.epomm.eu/endurance/index.php?id=2809>
- On Eltis 23 summaries of urban mobility planning in the EU member states are available
 - <http://www.eltis.org/mobility-plans/member-state-profiles>
- In CH4ALLENGE eight country profiles have been developed
 - <http://www.sump-challenges.eu/content/outputs>
- National level support mechanism in SUMP-UP and Prosperity

Thank you!

Rupprecht Consult

<http://www.civitas.eu>



CIVITAS FORUM 2016
CIVITAS ANNUAL CONFERENCE | 28-30 SEPTEMBER | GDYNIA



THE CIVITAS INITIATIVE
IS CO-FINANCED BY THE
EUROPEAN UNION