



CiViTAS
Cleaner and better transport in cities

GUARD

DTV • FGM-AMOR • TRG • BOKU • ADEME

Review Final Evaluation Reports CIVITAS II

Deliverable: D 3.2

Project co-ordinator: DTV Consultants

Contractors: FGM-AMOR
TRG
BOKU
ADEME

Contract Number: TREN/O4/FP6EN/S07.39318/513559

Start date: January 1 2005

Duration: 54 months

Version: 1.0

Date of preparation: 21/12/2009



THE CIVITAS INITIATIVE
IS CO-FINANCED BY THE
EUROPEAN UNION

CONTENTS

1	GENERAL COMMENTS.....	1
2	COMMENTS ON CARAVEL.....	4
2.0	GENERAL.....	4
2.1	EVALUATION OF THE MEASURE SHEETS	7
3	COMMENTS ON MOBILIS.....	12
3.0	GENERAL.....	12
3.1	EVALUATION OF THE MEASURE SHEETS	14
4	COMMENTS ON SMILE.....	20
4.0	GENERAL.....	20
4.1	EVALUATION OF THE MEASURE SHEETS	22
5	COMMENTS ON SUCCESS	26
5.0	GENERAL.....	26
5.1	EVALUATION OF THE MEASURE SHEETS	28

1 General comments

Three out of the four reports (MOBILIS, SMILE and SUCCESS) have a more or less similar structure; the structure of CARAVEL is different.

Common elements in the structure of MOBILIS, SMILE and SUCCESS are:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- A description of the approach of the evaluation
- Evaluation of the measures (grouped by city)
- Evaluation on city level
- Summary of the results of the 8 technical work packages (topic areas)
- Conclusions

The structure of CARAVEL is different; it contains all elements mentioned above but in another order and sometimes under different headings.

All projects have illustrated the report with maps, photo's and graphs and are well edited. All projects presented the evaluation templates by measure as an annex. These evaluation templates by measure have been made following an agreed common structure.

A description of **the evaluation (impact and process) by measure** is presented by all projects, however not all in the same structure. It gives a summary of the measure evaluation templates. MOBILIS, SMILE and SUCCESS contain a section per measures showing the various aspects of implementation and impact. The detail differs between the projects. The most extensive report is the SMILE one; for each measure extensive tables on cost effectiveness and on transferability are presented. This on top of a summary of the on key results and a summary on recommendations. This makes the chapter "summary of evaluation reports for each measure" containing 385 pages. CARAVEL has chosen for a structure by city and within that on the various stages (aspects) of the measures. Within each city description there are 5 sections; in three of them (measure implementation, targets and summary of measure results) a paragraph per measure is made.

A **summary by type of indicators** (economy, society, energy, environment, transport) is given by all projects except of SUCCESS; SMILE has presented this summary in its chapter on city level, the other two projects under the general conclusions.

In depth process analyses reports are presented within a specific chapter by CARAVEL, and as a separate annex by MOBILIS; SUCCESS and SMILE do not present these in depth reports specifically within the structure of the final evaluation report.

MOBILIS, SMILE and SUCCESS each made a chapter on the results of the **8 Word Packages by topic area** (The areas clean vehicles and fuels, access management, etc), although under different Headings (Technical evaluation assessment, Cross site interpretations). The CARAVEL report does not contain such a chapter, but has given a short section by topic area in the evaluation summary and contains a chapter on transferability with a paragraph per working area.

No specific chapter or section in any of the projects is related to **Costs Benefit Analyses**; in MOBILIS these have been integrated in the measure evaluation templates. SMILE presents a Cost, Revenues and Cost effectiveness section within the description of each measure in the main report. CARAVEL states that CBA have been done by GUARD.

Upscaling is specifically presented by SUCCESS (within the chapter on city results); SMILE presents upscaling as an issue at WP-level. The other projects do report the issues on upscaling only within the evaluation templates.

Transferability has been presented in the main report explicitly by SMILE (by measure) and CARAVEL; CARAVEL has presented a transferability analyses on three of the eight areas. SUCCESS has treated transferability within its “Global assessment of environmental” decision tool, which has been applied on a subset of the measures. The results of applying this tool are however not reported within the main report.

Recommendations are placed by the projects in various chapters; here no common structure is followed.

As a general remark it can be stated that all reports show that a lot of work on evaluation has been done and the results are extensively and well edited in all four cases. In case a common structure in more detail could have been agreed the reports would have been even better comparable.

The **measure evaluation sheets** which are given as an annex have been classified (by the writer of this report) in four groups: very good, good, moderate and problematic. In the sheets classified as moderate or problematic there has been made use of only a limited number of indicators, the indicators were less relevant for the CIVITAS objectives or the report presented only a limited detail. The classification very good is subjective, but very good reports do distinguish from the others by the broad and appropriate choice of indicators and the level of presentation (text, figures and illustrations). The number of sheets is lower than the number of measures, as several measures are reported together; a few measures are not reported.

The measures sheets have been evaluated as follows:

	Caravel	Mobilis	Smile	Success	Total
Very good	3	8	13	6	30
Good	38	20	28	38	124
Moderate	11	19	4	3	37
Problematic	2	1			2
Total	54	48	45	47	193



In general the quality of the measure evaluation sheets was quite acceptable; the lessons from METEOR to guide the process of evaluation more intensive have had its effects. Nevertheless it can be noticed that evaluation has in several cases been under time and budget pressure. Main causes of time pressure are delays of implementation of the measure itself. Furthermore as a general remark it can be stated that in several measures long term effects can be expected which could not be reported during the lifetime of the four projects.

Looking at the several chapters from the measures evaluation sheets in general the B chapter, being the description of the measure and of its implementation is very well described. The C2 section, giving the measured results of the impact evaluation shows a mixed picture. Several are

very good, but some do suffer from the observed time pressure and from a limited choice of indicators. A limited choice of indicators is more the case where the measures are from a softer nature; this type of measures proved to be more difficult to evaluate. The D chapter is in general well developed.

2 Comments on CARAVEL

2.0 General

CARAVEL has a different structure compared to the other projects, especially on the reporting of the individual measures. Description of cases of deepened process evaluation are included. Transferability analyses on three topic areas are extensively described, but not on the other 5 topic areas. A summary or synthesis by topic area is not given.

The report is well illustrated. In some sections the English could have been improved (especially concerning Burgos and Krakow).

The presentation of the results of the individual measures takes place within a chapter by city (4-7). Focus is on impact evaluation, not on process evaluation. Within the impact analyses economic impact has not been worked out extensively; limited data availability is given as the main reason.

Process evaluation is mainly limited to the case studies as presented in chapter 8; lack of an agreed methodology is given as the main reason for this limitation.

Evaluation summary

(1) The evaluation summary gives a nice overview of the objectives of the project (the mobility strategy), the methodology, the main impact results and the result of process evaluation.

(2) The impact summary also includes a short summary of achievements by type of indicator (society, economy, transport, energy and environment). A table with main recommendations on barriers and drivers completes the summary of the process evaluation.

1 Introduction

Within this introduction some sentences on the structure of the report would have been appropriate.

2 Overview of the measures

This chapter only contains a table. Some text could have been added here.

3 Approach to evaluation

(1) Impact analyses: Some text and a summary table would have been appropriate here. Nothing is said on the methodology, on creation of the scenario's, on upscaling and on CBA here.

(2) Process evaluation: This part is well described

4 Burgos

- (1) See the remark on the presentation of the process evaluation of the individual measures above.
- (2) It would have been informative that in relation to the stated targets it had been reported to what extent the targets have been achieved. This has been done in the tables regarding the other cities in chapter 5-7
- (3) The impacts are nicely illustrated.
- (4) In the city findings nothing is reported on economy and upscaling possibilities; furthermore the structure is clear..

5 Genoa

- (1) See the remark on the presentation of the process evaluation of the individual measures above.
- (2) In the city findings some text is very detailed; it could have better been placed in the section on the measure involved. The paragraph could have been better structured.
- (3) The lessons learned section as presented in Burgos is lacking here.

6 Krakow

- (1) See the remark on the presentation of the process evaluation of the individual measures above.
- (2) City findings: good structure, but nothing on upscaling or economy.

7 Stuttgart

- (1) See the remark on the presentation of the process evaluation of the individual measures above.
- (2) here the city findings section has a different structure; less structured on the impact categories. However a section on stakeholders involvement is added here. No section on lessons learned.

8 Process evaluation cases and recommendations

- (1) Interesting case descriptions (8.1); some conclusions/ comments on the overall result could have been added.
- (2) The section on stakeholders involvement (8.2) is also interesting

(3) The section on Recommendations and actions is very well elaborated

(4) In the critical reflection on process evaluation (8.4) it is stated that a widely accepted and commonly used process evaluation methodology within CIVITAS is still missing and this is given as an argument that CARAVEL focused in its reporting only on 7 out of 54 measures. This remark should be taking into account in present and future work within CIVITAS, as the reporting of process evaluation within the CIVITAS initiative is very important.

9 Transferability

(1) This is a chapter that only had been produced by CARAVEL (in the SMILE report there is much attention to transferability on measure level). The description is per working area and is well structured.

(2) The importance of the constraints have been classified (scale 1-4); this contributes to the understanding of the results.

(3) Overall conclusions on this chapter could have been added.

10 Conclusions and the way forward

(1) A summary is given of the 5 impact areas and on the process evaluation. No specific conclusions on city level have been reported here, but these conclusions were already presented in the chapters 4-7. The name of the chapter 10 by this is at the wide side.

(2) As stated on page 235 economic indicators were difficult to obtain and by that the economic analyses have been very limited.

(3) The recommendation table on process evaluation is clearly presented.

2.1 Evaluation of the measure sheets

(some measure sheets not yet available)

The measures sheets have been evaluated as follows:

	Burgos	Genua	Krakow	Stuttgart	Total
Very good	2			1	3
Good	12	11	11	4	38
Moderate	3	3	5		11
Problematic			2		2
Total	17	14	18	5	54

Table evaluation by measure (V=Very good, G=Good, M=Moderate ,P=Problematic)

City	Measure	V	G	M	P	Comment
Burgos	Support for clean fuels & introduction of clean public and private fleets (5.2)	X				

Burgos	Integrated access restriction strategy (6.2)	X			
Burgos	Parking strategy and management (6.5)		X		
Burgos	Clean high mobility services (8.2)		X		
Burgos	Collective mobility services for target users (8.5)		X		
Burgos	New mobility services for visitors (8.7)		X		
Burgos	Car pooling (9.1)		X		
Burgos	City bike scheme (9.6)			X	No m/s indicators; would have been relevant
Burgos	New goods distribution (10.2)		X		
Burgos	Sustainable mobility marketing (11.2)		X		
Burgos	Mobility Forum (11.6)			X	Only arwaareness indicators
Burgos	Access for mobility impaired people (11.11)		X		
Burgos	Safe access for pedestrians to peripheral neighbourhoods (11.12)		X		
Burgos	Increasing bicycle use (11.13)			X	No m/s indicators; would have been relevant
Burgos	Safety & accident prevention plan (11.15)		X		
Burgos	Infomobility tools (12.2)		X		
Burgos	Traffic visualisation system (12.4)		X		
Genova	Transition towards clean vehicle fleets (5.1)		X		
Genova	Integrated access control strategy and road charging scheme (7.1)		X		
Genova	Clean high mobility corridor (8.1)		X		

Genova	Mobility service agency (B 8.4 8.9) [Merged 8.4 & 8.9 as 8.4A]	X			
Genova	Car sharing service (9.4)	X			
Genova	Enlarged goods distribution scheme (10.1)	X			
Genova	Sustainable mobility marketing and Ecopoints (11.1)	X			
Genova	Mobility Forum (11.5)		X		No before and after on society indicators
Genova	Integrated mobility plan for the San Martino Hospital (11.8)	X			
Genova	Integrated mobility strategy for trade fairs (11.10)	X			
Genova	Monitoring centre for road safety & accident prevention (11.14)				
Genova	Decision support tool for environmental impact assessment of traffic planning measures (11.17)		X		Only modeled results
Genova	Intermodal infomobility platform (12.1)		X		Few indicators
Genova	Bus lane control system in Genoa (12.5)	X			
Krakow	Transition towards clean vehicle fleets (5.3)	X			
Krakow	Integrated access control strategy (6.1)	X			
Krakow	Enforcement of access restrictions in Krakow (6.4)		X		Mostly modeled indicators
Krakow	Clean high mobility corridor (8.3)		X		Indicators not very relevant
Krakow	Demand-responsive transport services (8.6)	X			
Krakow	New leisure related mobility services (8.8)	X			
Krakow	Integrated ticketing & tariffs (8.10)	X			
Krakow	Security action plan for PT	X			

	(8.11)					
Krakow	Car pooling system (9.2)		X			
Krakow	Policy options for car sharing (9.5)				X	No dedicated indicators
Krakow	Bike renting (9.7)				X	No indicators on m/s
Krakow	New goods distribution scheme (10.3)		X			
Krakow	Sustainable mobility marketing (11.3)		X			
Krakow	Mobility Forum (11.7)			X		Limited number of indicators
Krakow	Integrated mobility plan (11.9)		X			
Krakow	Monitoring centre for road safety & accident prevention (11.16)				X	Limited number of indicators
Krakow	Intermodal infomobility platform (12.3)				X	Limited number of indicators
Krakow	PT priority system (12.6)		X			
Stuttgart	Policy options for access restrictions (6.3)	X				
Stuttgart	Security action plan for suburban railway (8.12)		X			
Stuttgart	Carpooling and mobility marketing (B 9.3 11.4)		X			
Stuttgart	Sustainable mobility marketing (11.4)		X			
Stuttgart	Event-oriented traffic management in Stuttgart (12.7)		X			

The evaluation sheets assessed as very good were within the chapters clean vehicles and access restriction. Within the sheets assessed as moderate or problematic car sharing measures and measures related to softer measures were overrepresented.

3 Comments on MOBILIS

3.0 General

The report is well structured and the balance between the several elements is good. It is well illustrated. The main chapter 3 (evaluation of measures) is well edited. There is a section by city. After an introduction on city objectives and the relation between the measures of the city all measures are reported in paragraphs using the same headings.

There is no specific reporting in the main part on the issues upscaling and transferability.

Executive summary

A very good summary. The presentation of the impact results using a table with colors is very clear.

1 Introduction

(1) The presentation of objectives and the relation with the WP as well as the key targets is very informative and shows the ambition of the project.

(2) In 1.5 a transferability analyses in chapter 6 is announced; however there is no transferability analyses in chapter 6.

2 Approach to evaluation

(1) Well described; no further comment

3 Evaluation of measures

As already stated the chapter is very well edited; it is very informative on what has happened. The dividing in subchapters would have been (slightly) more logical in case each city had one subchapter instead of 2.

3.1 Toulouse

(1) The introductory part on integration is very helpful in understanding the relation between the measures

(2) Table 8 is symmetric; by this the presentation could have been more simple (leaving out one half)

3.2 Debrecen

- (1) Table 14 is not well edited; in table 12 and 15 mentioning the nature of the partners would have been helpful
- (2) The table on the top of page 125 does not give any additional information to table 12 on page 122/123
- (3) The maps provided with each measure description is very helpful

3.3 Ljubljana

No remarks

3.4 Odense

It is unclear why Odense is city 5 and is reported before city 4 (Venice); it is logical to call Odense city 4 and Venice city 5, as has been done in chapter 4.

3.5 Venice

- (1) On pages 173 and 174 there are two tables 6; the previous table was 17 and on page table 18 appears
- (2) It is not directly understandable why table on page 174 is not symmetric (as table 8 in Toulouse)

4 Overview by city

A table of all the measures is only given for Toulouse; it could have been deleted

5 Cross-site interpretations and conclusions

- (1) section 5.1 is very informative
- (2) Section 5.2 as an overall conclusion on lessons learned is very short and could better be placed within chapter 6. The same applies for 5.3 (gender issues). Chapter 5 would have been more homogeneous by dealing with only the cross-site evaluation by working area (WP)

6 Conclusions

- (1) See remark 2 under introduction: a transferability analyses is announced but not given.
- (2) See remark 2 under chapter 5

Annexe 0

This is a helpful annex

3.1 Evaluation of the measure sheets

The measures sheets have been evaluated as follows:

	Toulouse	Debrecen	Ljubljana	Odense	Venice	Total
Very good	5		1		2	8
Good	8	2	2	2	6	20
Moderate	7	5		4	3	19
Problematic		1				1
Total	20	8	3	6	11	48

A moderate evaluation was given where

- very few impact indicators were reported where others seem to be relevant as well
- or in case the indicators were not clearly related to the CIVITAS chapters of indicators
- or in case only a few lines of text on measure results without quantitative information in table form was given (Odense).

In the one case that is evaluated as problematic a quantitative analyses of the measure (on bicycles) would have been appropriate.

The moderate evaluations are overrepresented in the measures on Telematics; the good and very good reports are overrepresented in the areas Clean vehicles and Access management

Table evaluation by measure (V=Very good, G=Good, M=Moderate ,P=Problematic)

		V	G	M	P	Comment
Debrecen	Operation of bio-fuel and CNG vehicles and framework conditions for alternative fuel use (5.3 D)		x			
Debrecen	Access and parking management (6.5 D)			x		limited indicators
Debrecen	Accessibility scheme for the conference center and pedestrian zone (6.6 D)			x		only a plan
Debrecen	Safety and security training for PT drivers (8.5 D)			x		limited indicators
Debrecen	Car-pooling service for students (9.3 D)		x			
Debrecen	Integrated and extended cycling network (11.5 D)				x	no quantitative results reported
Debrecen	Sustainable city-traffic development plan (11.6 D)			x		few indicators
Debrecen	Tramway priority scheme and real time passenger information system (12.4 D)			x		few indicators
Ljubljana	Implementation and large-scale deployment of bio-diesel and	x				

	CNG fleets (5.4 L)					
Ljubljana	Participatory planning and promotion of sustainable mobility (11.7 L)		x			
Ljubljana	Set-up of information points on clean vehicles and alternative fuels (11.8 L)		x			
Odense	Implementation of environmental zones (6.10 O)		x			
Odense	Integration and quality improvements of sustainable modes (8.7 O)			x		Very short measure results
Odense	Creating alternative mobility options for owners of old cars (9.5 O)		x			
Odense	Interactive traffic training for children (11.10 O)			x		Very short measure results
Odense	Personal transport choice marketing (11.11 O)			x		Very short measure results
Odense	Mobility management service of Odense Harbour (11.12 O)			x		No impact to report
Toulouse	Large-scale operation of clean bus fleets (5.1 T)	x				
Toulouse	Solutions for alternative fuels (5.2 T)	x				
Toulouse	Definition and implementation of a new parking management policy (6.1 T)		x			
Toulouse	Public space redesign (6.2 T)		x			
Toulouse	Implementation of the Urban Mobility Plan (6.3 T)		x			
Toulouse	High-quality bus corridors and development of PT segregated and secured lanes in the city centre (6.4 T)		x			
Toulouse	Innovative multimodal PT contracts, services and electronic ticketing (7.1 T)			x		Only marketing study
Toulouse	Improving quality and structure of PT services (8.1 T)			x		No impact analyses

Toulouse	Development of proximity services at important passenger transport hubs (8.2 T)			x		Not focused on CIVITAS objectives
Toulouse	Improving the accessibility of PT services (8.3 T)		x			
Toulouse	Integration of the demand responsive transport as a complementary service to PT (8.4 T)	x				
Toulouse	Promotion of car-pooling and integration with PT services (9.1 T)	x				
Toulouse	Implementation of a new car-sharing service linked to PT services (9.2 T)			x		Only marketing study
Toulouse	Clean urban logistics and goods distribution platform (10.1 T)	x				Although measure was not succesfull
Toulouse	Awareness raising campaign for changing mobility behaviour (11.1 T)			x		Not focused on CIVITAS issues
Toulouse	Promotion of bicycle use and integration with PT services (11.2 T)		x			
Toulouse	Set-up of a mobility agency and customised services (11.3 T)		x			
Toulouse	Commuter and school mobility plans (11.4 T)		x			
Toulouse	Demonstration of EGNOS/Galileo services use for the PT control and information system (12.1 T)			x		Not focused on CIVITS objectives
Toulouse	Implementation of bus priority scheme (12.2 T)		x			Although still unfinished
Toulouse	Development of an integrated multimodal traveller information system (12.3 T)			x		Not focussed on CIVITS issues
Venice	Deployment of CNG buses and LPG boats (5.5 V)	x				
Venice	Parking management strategies (6.7 V)		x			
Venice	Access management for the city		x			

	centre (6.8 V)					
Venice	Electronic control of restricted access zone (6.9 V)		x			
Venice	Access and traffic management in the Grand canal through Argos		x			
Venice	Introduction of low impact, access-for-all waterbuses (8.8 V)		x			
Venice	Expansion and diversification of the car-sharing scheme (9.4 V)	x				
Venice	Clean urban logistics (10.2 V)			x		No impact assessment
Venice	Promoting safe and increased bicycle use (11.9 V)		x			
Venice	Satellite control (GPS-GPRS) for water PT services (12.5 V)			x		Few indicators

4 Comments on SMILE

4.0 General

This report does contain extensive analyses on transferability and on costs effectiveness on measure level. Both are very interesting. It makes the report very long, but the reader can easily find its way through the report towards the sections that have his specific interest. Only SMILE has produced the result of a consequent approach on cost effectiveness.

The results of the five groups of impact indicators have been reported at city level.

The report is in several occasions rather critical on what happened within SMILE and on the results. In comparison to the other projects it can be stated that SMILE did not perform worse; it is the self-assessment of the results that is more critical.

Executive summary

- (1) The summary could have been a little shorter by omitting some technical details
- (2) Under the conclusions (page ix) at bullet 2 the subject of WP7 could have been mentioned

1 Introduction

No comment

2 Approach to evaluation

This is a good and extensive description. The cost-effectiveness approach as presented at measure level in chapter 3 could have been described as well.

3 Evaluation results by measure

- (1) General: this chapter describes (extensively) the result of each measure in a standardized form. It has been a lot of work to produce this chapter, which contains many details that not have been included in the evaluation measure sheet.
- (2) The transferability analyses contains two indicators that have been measured for each measure; especially the quantification in terms of level of support or constraint is very informative.
- (3) The net present value of almost all measures in negative. One of the main reasons is that external effects not have been included. The fact that most measures have a negative NPV in case externalities are not included is worrying and a main barrier for implementing measures of the nature as done in CIVITAS.

(4) Malmo is in several cases critical towards its own performance and results (especially in the Measure sheets); given the achieved impacts Malmo has in fact relatively performed relatively (to other cities) well.

4 City level evaluation

(1) Also this chapter is very well structured and edited.

(2) It is remarkable that the summary of Tallinn is more extensively compared to the section by measure in chapter 3; it shows that much research has been done to create the section on city level.

5 Technical evaluation (cross site evaluation by WP- working area)

Also this chapter is well elaborated

6 Conclusions and recommendations

There is much overlap between this chapter and the executive summary; the executive summary could have been shorter omitting some detail.

4.1 Evaluation of the measure sheets

The measures sheets have been evaluated as follows:

	Malmo	Norwich	Potenza	Suceava	Tallinn	Total
Very good	6	4		2	1	13
Good	14	9	3	2		28
Moderate	1	2	1			4
Problematic						
Total	21	15	4	4	1	45

The quality of the SMILE evaluation sheets have in general a good quality and several are evaluated as very good. The few moderate report do lack details or there can not be much reported on the results of the measure.

Table evaluation by measure (V=Very good, G=Good, M=Moderate ,P=Problematic)

		V	G	M	P	Comment
Malmö	Clean municipal fleet (5.1)	x				
Malmö	Biogas on the net (5.2)		x			
Malmö	Clean heavy vehicles with CO2 cooler (5.3)		x			
Malmö	Environmentally adopted cars (5.8)		x			

Malmö	Extended environmental zone for heavy vehicle and enforcement (6.1)	x				
Malmö	Marketing of clean vehicles by subsidized parking (7.1)		x			
Malmö	Marketing of new bus route system (8.1)		x			
Malmö	Improved security & safety on buses (8.2)		x			
Malmö	Integration of cycling with public transport (8.3)	x				
Malmö	Car sharing for business & private persons (9.1)	x				
Malmö	Freight driver support (10.1)			x		No impacts could be reported
Malmö	Satellite based traffic management for SME's (10.2)		x			
Malmö	Sustainable SME logistic for the food industry (10.7)		x			
Malmö	Managing mobility needs of private persons and business sector (11.1)	x				
Malmö	Eco-driving for municipal employees (11.2)		x			
Malmö	ECO driving for the hospital employees (11.8)					Not reported
Malmö	Heavy eco-driving (11.9)		x			
Malmö	Use of real time applications for traveller (12.1)		x			
Malmö	Traffic monitoring (12.2)		x			
Malmö	Mobile internet services in connection to bus information (12.3)		x			
Malmö	Internet tool for traffic planning (12.4)		x			
Malmö	Bus priority system (12.7)	x				
Norwich	Alternative fuel vehicle fleets (5.4)	x				
Norwich	Introduction of Low Emission	x				

	Zone (6.2)					
Norwich	Introduction of time controlled access restrictions (6.3)		x			
Norwich	Influencing choice of veh. Towards smaller & more fuel efficient vehicles (7.2)		x			
Norwich	Rail station interchange (8.4)		x			
Norwich	On street ticket vending machines (8.5)		x			
Norwich	Linking individual passenger transport info with healthcare appointments (8.6)			x		Not much to be reported
Norwich	Development of a car sharing club (9.2)			x		Not much to be reported
Norwich	Development of Strategic Freight Holders Club (10.3) [Joint with 10.4 & 10.5]	x				
Norwich	Priority access for clean goods vehicles (10.4) [Joint with 10.3 & 10.5]					see 10.3
Norwich	Urban transshipment centre (10.5) [Joint with 10.3 & 10.4]					see 10.3
Norwich	Goods delivery to P&R sites (10.6)		x			
Norwich	Travel Planning (11.3)		x			
Norwich	Carpooling (11.4)		x			
Norwich	Individual travel advice (11.5)	x				
Norwich	Customised traffic & travel info service for freight operators (12.8)		x			
Norwich	Provision of real time passenger info (12.9)		x			
Potenza	Introduce clean vehicles in a fleet of urban buses (5.5)		x			
Potenza	Demand responsive transport system (8.7)		x			
Potenza	Development of a car pooling (9.3)			x		not much detail given

Potenza	Mobility Management (11.6)		x			
Suceava	Alternative fuel bus fleet (5.6) [Joint with 8.8 & 8.9]	x				
Suceava	Marketing of alternative fuels in the public and private sector (5.7)		x			
Suceava	Extension of low emission zone (6.4)	x				
Suceava	Bus priority measures and other bus improvements (8.8) [Joint with 5.6 & 8.9]					see 5.06
Suceava	Improved public transport information (8.9) [Joint with 5.6 & 8.8]					see 5.06
Suceava	Information and awareness raising (11.7) This is 11.7 not 11.10		x			
Tallinn	PT priority system (12.5) [Joint with 12.6]	x				
Tallinn	Automatic stop calls & info sign in bus (12.6) [Joint with 12.5]					see 12.5

5 Comments on SUCCESS

5.0 General

It is a well structured and well edited report. Although being the smallest of the four projects (“only” 158 pages without annexes) it gives a good insight in what has been done. It is well illustrated.

No mention has been made of any Cost Benefit Analyses. The conclusions on the transferability analyses based on the specific SUCCESS tool are not included in the report.

0 Executive summary

This is a good summary; however a summary of the results by the 5 categories of impact indicators could have been included

1 Introduction

No comments

2 Approach to evaluation

- (1) Specific attention is given to upscaling; no other project has done this to this extend.
- (2) A summary of the results of the SUCCESS tool (section 2.5) is not presented within the main report
- (3) Section 2.6.1 is still written in future terms

3 Project cities- summary of cities targets and results

La Rochelle

From the description in the main report it looks that measure 8.3 has been implemented and its impact being measured. In the measure template however it is stated that the measure is delayed until late 2009. By this the impacts shown in the main report can not be caused by the measure.

Preston

On several measures relating public transport the same impact is given; it could be stated more clearly that the impact is a combined impact of several measures

Ploiesti

No remark

4 Overview of evaluation at city level

- (1) In section 4.2 a topic by city is chosen; by this a combined impact of several measures related to the topic is given.
- (2) The section on upscaling (4.3) is very interesting; it gives an insight in future possibilities and plans in the three cities.
- (3) Section 4.4 is almost an exact copy of section 6.3; it could be deleted in chapter 4 as it is not relevant here.

5 Cross site interpretations

This chapter is presented in tables by working area showing (a) implementation, (b) key findings and (c) conclusions and lesson learned for each measure within the working area. A text containing the main conclusions by working area would have been helpful to get the overall picture.

6 Conclusions

- (1) This chapter could have been elaborated more; it could provide the reader some summarized information about impacts from previous chapters before coming to the overall conclusions in 6.3.
- (2) See remark 3 under chapter 4

5.1 Evaluation of the measure sheets

The measures sheets have been evaluated as follows:

	La Rochelle	Ploiesti	Preston	Total
Very good	4		2	6
Good	20	6	12	38
Moderate	1	1	1	3
Problematic				
Total	25	7	15	47

The general level of the measure evaluation sheets was good. La Rochelle produced separate reports on air quality and on traffic monitoring, which are very informative. From 7 measures there was no template; at least three of them are cancelled.

Table evaluation by measure (V=Very good, G=Good, M=Moderate ,P=Problematic)

		V	G	M	P	Comment
La Rochelle	Development of clean collective transport (5.1)		X			
La Rochelle	Development of clean light vehicle fleet (5.2)	X				
La Rochelle	Implementation of diester fuelling station (5.3)		X			
La Rochelle	Development of hybrid taxi fleet (5.4)					Cancelled
La Rochelle	Cooking oil recycling pilot project (5.5)		X			
La Rochelle	Develop and extend access control zones (6.1)		X			
La Rochelle	Design access control scheme for tourist buses (6.2)		X			
La Rochelle	Implement further integration of ticketing system (7.1)		X			
La Rochelle	Strategies for integrated pricing system (7.2)		X			
La Rochelle	Implementation of a second P&R (8.1)		X			
La Rochelle	Implementation of dedicated bus lanes (8.2)	X				
La Rochelle	Reorganisation of the bus network (8.3)		X			
La Rochelle	Night taxi services (8.4)					Cancelled
La Rochelle	Extension of bike-bus scheme (8.5)	X				
La Rochelle	Infrastructure improvement for collective transport (8.6)		X			
La Rochelle	Deployment of new car sharing fleet (9.1)		X			
La Rochelle	Bike sharing (9.2)		X			
La Rochelle	City logistics strategic extension (10.1)		X			
La	Customers services associated to		X			

Rochelle	goods distribution (10.2)					
La Rochelle	Development of partnership with logistic operators (10.3)		X			
La Rochelle	Implementation of new structure for alternative modes (11.1)		X			
La Rochelle	Business travel plan (11.2)	X				
La Rochelle	Students travel plan (11.3)		X			
La Rochelle	Development of integrated transport management systems (12.1)			X		No impact indicators
La Rochelle	Implementation of a common transport information data base (12.2)		X			
La Rochelle	Real time information systems (12.3)		X			
La Rochelle	Smart card system (12.4)					No template
La Rochelle	Development of an integrated pricing system (12.5)		X			
Ploiesti	Introduction of clean bus fleet (5.7)					Cancelled
Ploiesti	Conversion of buses to lpg (5.8)		X			
Ploiesti	Development of a clear zone (6.6)		X			
Ploiesti	Improved infrastructure for collective transport (8.11)			X		No transport indicators
Ploiesti	Freight partnership, planning, routing, signing (10.6)		X			
Ploiesti	Planning for alternative transport modes (11.9)		X			
Ploiesti	Implementing new infrastructures for walking and cycling (11.10)					See 11.9
Ploiesti	Implementation of a real time information system for PT (12.13)		X			
Ploiesti	Development of the GPS system		X			

	for the PT fleet (12.11)				
Ploiesti	Development of a new ticketing system for PT (12.12)				Cancelled
Preston	Introduction of clean buses (5.6)	X			
Preston	Air quality assessment and clear zone strategy (6.3) [Merged with 6.4]		X		
Preston	Develop clear zones and extend pedestrianisation (6.4) [Merged with 6.3]				See 6.3
Preston	Improve traffic regulation through access control (6.5)	X			
Preston	Develop on and off-street parking pricing policy (7.3) [Merged with 7.5]		X		
Preston	Implement integrated PT ticketing (7.4) [Merged with 12.9]		X		
Preston	Improved parking management (7.5) [Merged with 7.3]				See 7.3
Preston	Creation of an overground network for PT services (8.7)		X		
Preston	Demand responsive and feeder services (8.8)		X		
Preston	Improved infrastructure for collective transport (8.9)		X		
Preston	Information and promotion for PT (8.10)				See 8.7
Preston	Promotion of car sharing and car clubs (9.3)		X		Only car sharing
Preston	City logistics partnerships and strategic planning (10.4)		X		
Preston	Freight routing, signing, etc. (10.5)				See 10.4
Preston	Planning for alternative transport modes (11.4)				See 11.5
Preston	Implement new infrastructure for alternative modes (11.5)		X		
Preston	Personalised travel planning	X			

	(11.6)					
Preston	Business travel plans (11.7)		X			
Preston	School travel plans (11.8)		X			
Preston	Management and control (12.6)					No template
Preston	Data collection (12.7)					No template
Preston	Development of common database (12.8)		X			
Preston	Information dissemination(12.10)			X		Based on limited survey