

BUSTRIP

Helping cities progress towards sustainable urban transport

Peer Review Methodology

Work package 1

Contents

1.0	BUSTRIP - Towards Sustainable Urban Transport.....	5
	Performance Assessment by Peer Review.....	5
1.1	Background.....	5
1.2	What does the peer review involve?	5
1.3	What will the peer review achieve?	5
1.4	Performance assessment by peer review	6
1.5	The performance assessment methodology.	6
1.6	Peer review.....	7
1.7	Stakeholders	7
2.	Sustainable Urban Transport.....	8
2.1	What is a Sustainable Urban Transport Plan (SUTP).....	8
2.2	SUT – Planning.....	8
2.3	SUT - Plan	8
2.4	Basic features of SUTP	8
3.0	Self-Assessment by Partner Cities.....	10
3.0	Self-Assessment by Partner Cities.....	10
3.1	Introduction.....	10
3.2	The process of preparing the self-assessment report	10
3.3	Timetable for the preparation of the self assessment report	10
3.4	Technical support in preparing of the report.....	10
3.5.	Submission of the report.....	10
3.6	Self assessment - Reporting principles	10
3.7	The self assessment report and BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark.....	11
4.0	The performance assessment by peer review.....	12
4.1	Introduction.....	12
4.2	Quality checking of the self assessment report.....	12
4.3	Desk review of the self assessment report	12
4.4	Peer review visit.....	12
4.5	The performance assessment.....	12
4.6	Assessment of the Drivers.....	14
4.7	Assessment of the Impacts	14
4.8	Assessment of the BUSTRIP SUTP benchmark.....	15
4.9	Presentation of the conclusions of the peer review to the Partner city	15
4.10	The Performance Assessment Report	15
4.11	The peer review report template.....	15
4.12	Writing the report.	16
4.13	Release of the report	16

4.14	Team Evaluation of Review and Presentation	16
4.15	Participant Evaluation of Review and Report	16
5.0	Partner cities – organising a successful performance assessment visit	17
5.1	Introduction.....	17
5.2	Who is involved in the BUSTRIP peer review?.....	17
5.2.1	The Visiting Peer review team.....	17
5.2.2	The Peer Review Team Manager	17
5.2.3	The Peer Review Team Members	17
5.2.4	City Partner Co-ordinator	18
5.2.5	Peer review visit - Interviewees and Participants	18
5.2.6	Interpreters/Translators	19
5.3	Timetable of tasks for the partner city.....	19
5.4	Hotel Accommodation.....	20
5.5	Team base room at the Municipality	20
5.6	Things to remember when planning the peer review.....	20
3.6	Who might the team meet representing the municipality?	22
3.7	Meeting other stakeholders.	22
3.8	What questions might the peer review team ask?.....	23
6.	BUSTRIP - Self assessment report template.....	24
6.1	Introduction.....	24
	BUSTRIP Partner City Self Assessment Report (template)	25
	Provenance	25
	Chapter 1 Municipality profile.....	25
	Chapter 2 Drivers	26
	Chapter 3 Impacts	27
	Chapter 4 Plans, policies and actions in the partner city.....	28
	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark.....	29
	Responsibility for SUTP.....	29
	Citizen participation and stakeholder consultation	30
	Gender equity and equality.....	31
	Capacity building.....	32
	SUTP Plan.....	33
	SUTP scope and definition	33
	Analysis of baseline scenario	33
	Definition of a vision, objective and targets.....	34
	SUT Plan – implementing actions and allocating finance.....	35
	SUTP policies and measures	36
	General principles	36

Reducing the need for transport 37
Transport management..... 38
Developing clean and fair transport systems 40
Detailed assignment of responsibilities and resources..... 40
Monitoring and evaluation arrangements 41
Plan adoption, approval and assessment..... 42

1.0 BUSTRIP - Towards Sustainable Urban Transport.

Performance Assessment by Peer Review

1.1 Background

This 'Sustainable Urban Transport Peer Review Methodology' was developed for the BUSTRIP project (insert hyperlink). It is part of the work of the BUSTRIP project.

BUSTRIP is a project co-funded by the INTERREG programme, the participating cities and some member states.

The methodology is designed to assist partner cities in preparing and implementing sustainable urban transport plans and actions. It provides a "SWOT" analysis – "strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats."

Few partner cities have prepared or adopted Sustainable Urban Transport Plans (SUTP). The BUSTRIP peer review will assist the cities in understanding what activities, policies and processes might need to be undertaken to establish a successful Sustainable Urban transport Plan. Subsequent activities by partner cities in BUSTRIP involve preparing a Sustainable Urban Transport Plan and carrying out pilot actions.

1.2 What does the peer review involve?

The peer review involves the following elements;

- Each partner city prepares and publishes a (self assessment) report on its progress towards sustainable urban transport
- Quality check of the self-assessment report
- A peer review team carries out a 'desk review' of the self-assessment report and agrees with each partner city a list of stakeholders they will interview during their visit.
- A peer review team visits each partner city and carries out a review of the published report meeting stakeholders and interested groups.
- The peer review team presents its 'headline' review 'findings' to the municipality stakeholders at the end of the visit.
- The peer review team writes a report and agrees its contents with the partner city, who then publishes this review report.
- Each partner city uses its self-assessment report and the peer review report in designing their sustainable urban transport plans and actions.
- City partners use the report to accelerate progress towards Sustainable Urban Transport Plans (Work package 2)
- City partner use the report to verify their pilot action (Work package 3)

1.3 What will the peer review achieve?

The peer review will:

- Stimulate internal and external discussion about current and future progress towards sustainable urban transport
- Assist in the preparing Sustainable Urban Transport Plans, and within the BUSTRIP project to kick start this work (work package2)

- Provide an independent review of the progress being made in the partner city towards sustainable urban transport
- Allow the representatives from other municipalities as the peers to share their varied skills and experience.
- Allow comparison and exchange of information among municipalities
- Offer a common assessment framework that allows comparative analysis.
- Raise sustainable urban transport issues on the political agenda
- Be supported by a training workshop for all the peers, who can, during a short period, exchange skills and reflect on their own work.
- Provide a framework for understanding how partner cities can make a greater contribution to the Lisbon Strategy¹
- Provide a reporting framework against part of the Aalborg +10 Commitments²

1.4 Performance assessment by peer review

The BUSTRIP peer review is a 'performance assessment'. This is the 'considered judgement' (assessment) of experts, on the 'progress being made' (performance) by municipalities towards a benchmark (or 'ideal').

The benchmark used in this assessment has been developed within the BUSTRIP project. It is substantially based on the work of the European Commissions Expert Working Group on sustainable Urban Transport³. This assessment is carried out by teams of peers from Baltic Sea municipalities and European institutions – 'a peer review'.

This project has emerged from the work of the European Commission on the 6th Environmental Action Plan⁴ and the Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment⁵.

BUSTRIP is designed to assist cities in their work on Sustainable Urban Transport. In particular his performance assessment methodology was developed to assist cities understand their progress towards having a successful sustainable urban transport plan.

1.5 The performance assessment methodology.

This document

- Describes the BUSTRIP method of carrying out a performance assessment.
- Describes what is considered to be a Sustainable Urban Transport Plan
- Describes the self-assessment report, including its purpose, function, form, content, preparation timetable, responsibilities etc.
- Describes the activities that take place before, during, and after a BUSTRIP performance assessment.
- Describes how to prepare the materials needed for a successful peer review.

¹ http://europa.eu.int/growthandjobs/pdf/COM2005_024_en.pdf

² <http://www.aalborgplus10.dk/>

³ http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/urban/pdf/final_report050128.pdf

⁴ <http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/newprg/>

⁵ http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/urban/thematic_strategy.htm

- Defines the roles and requirements of participants, before, during, and after the review.

1.6 Peer review

The BUSTRIP project involves the peer review of the performance of partner cities. The BUSTRIP peers are experienced in aspects of sustainable urban transport; they are technically competent and are trained in carrying out peer reviews. A BUSTRIP training workshop is scheduled for the end of January 2006 for all peers to equip them with a common understanding and approach. The city and technical partners in the BUSTRIP project employ the peers and their role as peers is part of the contribution of each municipality to the BUSTRIP project. External experts from European institutions are also included in the peer review teams. The membership of each peer review team will be agreed with Partner cities. Further details about the roles and responsibilities of the peer review teams can be found in this document.

The peers bring and share their wealth of experience with the municipalities they are visiting and reviewing. They also take back to their municipalities the knowledge and learning from the municipalities they review.

1.7 Stakeholders

Central to the success of sustainable urban transport actions and plans is involving stakeholders and actors in their design and implementation. The ways in which stakeholders are involved in municipalities varies greatly. Some municipalities are only just starting to understand how to involve stakeholders from outside of the municipality administration in taking decisions and carrying out actions with most stakeholders being municipality officers and politicians. Some municipalities have sophisticated methods of involving individuals, action groups and even 'hard to reach' groups often delegating finance for implementing projects to external groups. The peer review team will meet with a wide variety stakeholders and discuss the progress being made in the municipality

2. Sustainable Urban Transport

2.1 What is a Sustainable Urban Transport Plan (SUTP)

The European Commissions Expert Working Group on Sustainable Urban Transport has established a common basis of understanding for what “SUTP” means and how it relates to current practise. The expert working group and The BUSTRIP project has concluded that there are two essential components to a SUTP:

SUT – Planning: the specific qualities of the planning approach in terms of procedures and actor relations

SUT – Plan: the design of planning instrument that ensures the efficient implementation of policies and measures and ultimately target achievement

2.2 SUT – Planning

SUT – Planning is based on close cooperation that delivers integration between all transport modes and policy sectors and geographical coverage of the whole plan area (national/regional plans, other relevant city wide plans, transport companies and providers plans and strategies, neighbouring municipalities

2.3 SUT - Plan

is the movement of goods and people in a more sustainable way, comprehensively addressing public and private transport, motorised and non motorized transport, moving and parked vehicles and well as freight transport and logistics. These transport categories are dealt with in an integrated way.

2.4 Basic features of SUTP

BUSTRIP has prepared further guidance materials on Sustainable Urban Transport Plans, this can be found in this document.

The expert working group defined some basic features of SUTP.

A “level playing field” for cities.

The SUTP should establish the minimum basis and scope for the implementation of environmental legislation. This will remove the competitive advantages of some urban areas by requiring compliance rather than the present sacrifice of environmental quality and environmental capital in providing unsustainable transport systems.

Balancing sustainability

Social, economic and environmental objectives should be balanced in a SUTP and it must not be seen as a threat or obstacle to achieving economic development or social equity, but rather a complementary tool for delivering these objectives.

An innovation of existing practices

SUTP is not meant to be an additional layer of transport planning activities. It is a new way of tackling transport related problems more efficiently and with better legitimacy. However it must evolve over time from within present practice and regulatory frameworks and cannot be imposed.

A review of transport costs and benefits

SUTP assesses transport costs and benefits across the economic, social and environmental sectors. By 'internalising' the external costs of transport, SUTP aims to provide a market mechanism that will regulate the transport sector.

A start from collective visions

SUTP has to be based on the real needs of society, aiming to create sustainable, attractive and vibrant communities. It looks beyond the transport sector and imagines how transport and mobility should support urban life in the future. (possible insert around Aalborg +10 Commitments?) Therefore SUTP has to involve citizens and stakeholders from the start and throughout the planning and implementation process.

Fully integrated planning approach

SUTP is essentially about integration. Without full integration with other plans it is incomplete, if not fundamentally undermined.

- Horizontal integration – between transport /mobility plans and the other municipality plans and programmes
- Vertical integration – between municipality plans and national and EU plans
- Spatial Integration – between related policies of neighbouring administrations

A focus on target achievement.

Setting concrete and realistic targets and achieving them step-by-step is the implementation approach of SUTP. This will need a different use of money, as budget allocation becomes conditioned by target achievement. SUTP is not a master plan.

A feasible and flexible approach

SUTP is a pragmatic approach that delivers concrete results, with a sequence of milestones and with monitoring of implementation risks and achievements. A SUTP package of measures has to be realistic and fully achievable within accepted levels of variation. Whilst considering the long terms vision, the SUTP includes short-term targets and makes successful steps in the right direction.

3.0 Self-Assessment by Partner Cities

3.1 Introduction

Each city partner will prepare a self-assessment report that describes the progress being made in the municipality towards sustainable urban transport. This assessment will include *quantitative and qualitative* data representing objectively verifiable indicators of performance¹

3.2 The process of preparing the self-assessment report

Each city partner should decide how to prepare the self-assessment report and who should compile, edit, and approve this report. In making these decisions, city partners should recognise that the process of preparing the self-assessment report can be used to involve those stakeholders who will have an interest in the development of the SUTP, including the inter-sectoral working group

3.3 Timetable for the preparation of the self assessment report

Each city must complete their self-assessment report by the date agreed with the Project Steering Group (PSG). The timetable for preparing the reports is set out below

Partner cities	Month																
	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A
Beginners	Report preparation ---- quality chk						Peer review										
Intermediate	Report preparation.....q.c					Peer review											
Advanced	Report preparation.qc				Peer review												

3.4 Technical support in preparing of the report

Any questions from partner cities should be directed at UBC Env Com who will provide answers.

3.5 Submission of the report

Partner cities will submit their reports to UBC Env Com who will carry out a quality check that the report is complete. UBC Env Com will discuss with the partner cities any additional information that maybe required. This quality checking will be completed on before the report is due to be with the peer review team

3.6 Self assessment - Reporting principles

The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)², Corporate Social Responsibility³ reports and recent EU funded Peer review projects⁴ have produced a series of

¹<http://www.presud.org>

² <http://www.globalreporting.org/guidelines/2002.asp>

³ <http://www.accountability.org.uk/>

⁴ <http://www.presud.org>

principles that are generally accepted as best practice. The self-assessment reports should demonstrate

1. Transparency – the processes used, the procedures followed, and the assumptions that are made in the report.
2. Inclusiveness – the nature and extent of stakeholder involvement in, and validation of the report including details of the editorial arrangements.
3. Auditability – reports must be structured and referenced to provide an “audit trail” for the review team.
4. Completeness – the report should reflect a complete account of the activities and policies representing the Sustainable Urban Transport in the municipality.
5. Relevance – the report should explain the rationale for inclusion of aspects of performance.
6. Context – the report should contextualise the municipality performance within the regional and national performance.
7. Accuracy – The report should explain the levels of accuracy of performance data.
8. Neutrality – The report must make apparent the nature of political involvement in preparing the report and in the making of decisions.
9. Comparability – reports should facilitate comparison over time and between municipalities and should maintain consistency in their scope disclosing any relevant changes.
10. Clarity – The report should be capable of being understood by the assessment team and stakeholders.
11. Timeliness – the report should be prepared in accordance with an agreed timeline.

3.7 The self assessment report and BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark

The self-assessment report is prepared by each of the partner municipalities. This report is prepared against a template of the “BUSTRIP Sustainable Urban Transport Plan (SUTP) Benchmark”. The benchmark is described below.

A template for the report is at appendix (x) the report should be in English and submitted electronically as a Microsoft word document. The report should contain the following sections:

4.0 The performance assessment by peer review

4.1 Introduction

This section explains the activities involved in the '**performance assessment by peer review**' in BUSTRIP. Following the preparation of the Self-assessment report the following activities take place;

4.2 Quality checking of the self assessment report

UBC Env Com and the peer review manager check the self-assessment report for completeness. This is completed as soon as possible.

4.3 Desk review of the self assessment report

Once any missing sections have been completed the report is passed to the members of the peer review team. Each peer then reads the self-assessment report to:

- Check the completeness of the report against the report template, identifying, and recording unexplained missing entries in the report.
- **Prepare questions** to understand the reason for these omissions
- Understand the organisational, institutional, political structure and focus of the partner city
- Understand the Drivers
- Understand the Impacts
- Understand the Partner city plans, policies, and actions.
- Start to understand the possible gap between the plans policies and actions in the partner city and the BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark and **develop hypotheses** that will be tested during the peer review visit.
- **Identify key stakeholders** to be interviewed during the peer review visit.
- **Prepare draft questions** for stakeholders.

Each peer review member will agree with the team manager the timing of the desk review and when to send to the team manager their hypotheses, questions and list of stakeholders to be interviewed.

4.4 Peer review visit

A team of 4 peers visits each city and conducts a 'performance assessment by peer review' lasting between three and four days. Details of the '**who does what**' to organise this visit is found in this document. The dates for these visits are agreed between each partner city and UBC Env. Com.

4.5 The performance assessment

The performance assessment carried out during the visit will:

- Test the hypotheses developed from the desk review (of the self-assessment report)
- Review the performance of the municipality (as set out in the self-assessment report) through questioning of stakeholders and examination of the evidence presented in the self-assessment report. And in so doing

- Verify (or otherwise) the indicators of evidence of performance

The **purpose** of the meetings should be to test the hypotheses, explore and resolve areas of uncertainty, gather alternative evidence, opinions and views to those already provided (by the municipality). The visit and the review of the self-assessment report seeks to highlight policies that are an “**aspiration**”, those that are a “**commitment**,” and actions that represent an “**achievement**.”

The sufficiency of the evidence to draw particular conclusions will be a judgement of the team. The team is encouraged to ensure that conclusions are based on more than source of evidence. The strength of the conclusions will similarly be a judgement that is based on the divergence of the city’s performance as compared with the performance of other cities’ best practice elsewhere.

*In carrying out the assessment the peer review team will have regard to the fact that municipalities across Europe are struggling to deal with the challenges of urban transport. Cities and municipalities each have a unique mix of drivers and impacts. Equally unique are their mixes of instruments, institutions, governance, and capacity to respond. Whilst some cities and municipalities seem more successful than others do, there are a number of **common shortcomings that affect the ability and capacity of stakeholders to effectively respond to transport problems**. The self-assessment report should explain how partner cities are overcoming these common shortcomings and the peer review team will explore the extent to which the city partner is dealing with these common shortcomings;*

- **A lack of participation and involvement of citizens and civil society** (e.g. relevant business stakeholders, NGO’s and community groups) in all phases of planning. From problem analysis and objective definition to the evaluation of implemented measures. This absence reduces the democratic credibility and technical legitimacy of plans and action programmes.
- **A lack of interdisciplinary thinking and mutual understanding between the essential policy sectors** concerned (transport, land use, spatial development, environmental protection, economic development, social equity, health etc). There is also a separation between the sectoral planning practices and policies and action programmes.
- **Deficits in the coordination and cooperation between other involved administrations particularly neighbouring administrations**
- **A focus on disconnected projects and actions that do not advance towards the achievement of short and long term targets for sustainable transport**. Best practise from projects rarely becomes common practise and rarely impacts on the cause of transport problems.
- **A limited consideration of possible policy options** and measures across all relevant sectors to effectively and efficiently influence transport development and mobility behaviour.
- **A lack of tools and practises** to verify if, and to what degree, real progress is being made towards targets, and if there is a need to modify or change policies.

- *To fully integrate sustainability principles into urban transport requires a particular set of policies and measures to be implemented. It also requires a set of specific procedures for planning, cooperation and management to be implemented. Relevant stakeholders need to be helped to participate in this work. These requirements challenge 'usual' and 'normal' working relationships and the competencies of administrations and stakeholders.*

The peer review team will need to understand why particular policies and programmes have (or have not) been chosen. This understanding will provide an insight into the way in which stakeholders (e.g. communities and businesses) are involved in making and implementing policies. It will also provide an insight into the nature of the "Leadership" being expressed by the political and technical leaders of the municipality. The effectiveness of the response of the municipality in addressing the pressures and improving the state of the economic, social, and environmental resources should be judged. This will provide evidence of the effectiveness of the performance management of the municipality.

The benchmark is very challenging. It includes policies, programmes, and actions that may not be presently part of the approach of the municipality. Some represent political and administrative challenges other technical or economic. One particular challenge of the benchmark is the progress municipalities are (and are not) making towards implementing the "polluter pays principle." The principle of reflecting the full environmental cost of services and products in their price is central to sustainable urban transport. This need for municipalities to internalise the external environmental costs associated with transport related activities and policies will need close assessment.

4.6 Assessment of the Drivers

The team should verify the direct and indirect **drivers** being exerted on the social, economic and natural resources (or capital) of the city as described in the self-assessment report. The peer review team should take care to understand where there are differences in interpretation of the drivers between different stakeholders in the city. These drivers are closely related to transport and economic production and consumption patterns, they often reflect the intensity of emissions and rates at which natural resources are being used. The drivers can arise from policies that de-couple economic growth from the consumption of natural resources and the production of wastes. They can also be illustrations of the progress being made towards achieving European, national and local sustainable transport commitments and targets.

4.7 Assessment of the Impacts

The peer review team should verify and understand the current **impacts** of the transport sector and of the transport sector on the social, economic and environmental resources (or capital) of the municipality as described in the self-assessment report. The peer review team should take care to understand where different stakeholders might dispute the impacts. The indicators show the quality and quantity of the resources of the city. The indicators will show where resources are being consumed at non-renewable rates. The indicators will show concentrations of pollutants relative to critical loads and exposure limits with the trend over time. The indicators will show the quality and quantity depletion/renewal rates of natural resources.

4.8 Assessment of the BUSTRIP SUTP benchmark

The work of the peer review is to carry out a gap analysis – to assess the difference or gap that exists between the actual performance of the city partner and the benchmark. The actual performance of the city will be determined by the peers from their consideration of the self-assessment report, together with the answers given to their questions during the peer review visit. They may supplement their assessment by independent questioning, internet searches etc.

And so for each characteristic in the BUSTRIP SUTP benchmark the peers should agree a judgement on:

“the adequacy, appropriateness and effectiveness of the response of the municipality to the drivers in the city and the impacts”.

This judgement should be constructively critical and be given with the intention of assisting the city partner to accelerate in their work on Sustainable Urban Transport. The assessment should consider the progress the city is making towards its objectives. The team members’ assessment is a judgement of the appropriateness of the response of the city to the mix of “drivers” and the “impacts”

4.9 Presentation of the conclusions of the peer review to the Partner city

The peer review team will carry out their performance assessment and draw conclusions about the progress that the municipality is making towards a sustainable urban transport. At the end of the visit they will provide a headline presentation of their conclusions to the municipality. This will be followed by the submission of a report that will include:

- Verification (or otherwise) of the self assessment report
- Details of the means of verification that have been used for the indicators of performance
- Conclusions and recommendations

4.10 The Performance Assessment Report

The Review manager and assistant review manager will co-ordinate the drafting, editing, and completion of the report. Each member of the review team will be responsible for writing one or more sections in accordance with the agreed report template.

4.11 The peer review report template

The assessment should be a narrative. It should include the judgements of the review team on the:

- *Clarity and appropriateness of the policy objectives and the extent to which they reflect a commitment to move towards the principles of sustainable urban transport.*
- *The nature and extent of stakeholder involvement in agreeing these objectives*
- *The appropriateness of the institutional arrangements (joint working, and strategies) that have been put in place to achieve the objectives and whether they are, or are likely to achieve their objectives.*
- *The appropriateness of the actions being taken to achieve the objectives.*
- *Adequacy of the finance committed to achieve the objectives.*

The report should provide a commentary on the drivers, the impacts and then the individual characteristics of the benchmark.

4.12 Writing the report.

Draft sections should be completed by review team members **within 1 week** after review, preferably as soon as possible upon return. This allows a period of reflection. These various sections should then be finalised by the review team members no later than **two weeks** after the performance assessment ends, when they are sent to the manager (or assistant manager). In a further two weeks the team manager will have produced the draft report – the team members should comment upon and improve this.

The review (or assistant) manager should integrate, complete, edit, and send the **first draft** upon completion (within **2 weeks** of the review) to the city co-ordinator for verification of the factual content and findings.

The city co-ordinator should collate comments and requests for amendments to the report and these should be forwarded to the review team manager within another **two weeks** and send back to the team members and review manager. These corrections are essential to the credibility of the report. If the report is translated into the language of the municipality then great care should be taken to ensure that the translation is accurate. There will be a need to confirm the accuracy through some selective cross checking.

The review manager (with team members) should agree and incorporate factual corrections and complete the final editing and return the report to the city (**in two weeks**). The process from end of review to completed report is therefore **4 weeks maximum in total**.

4.13 Release of the report

The release (or not) of the report to the stakeholders and the general public should be agreed with the peer review team in advance. The peer review team will need to be clear as to the nature of the promotion and publicity that the report will be given within the city.

4.14 Team Evaluation of Review and Presentation

The peer review team and city co-ordinators should evaluate the review visit and presentation following the review. This may be achieved through a web evaluation questionnaire. This feedback should be used to refine the process and qualify the results.

4.15 Participant Evaluation of Review and Report

The participants in the performance assessment should be involved in evaluating the review process and report. This is achieved through a web evaluation questionnaire with a copy of the report (which can be in the original English or a translated version can be produced by the co-ordinators for evaluation). The questionnaire will be sent from the management team to the city co-ordinator to be distributed to all participants with web access. Co-ordinators should record how many individuals are sent the questionnaire. Further guidance will be issued on this in due course.

5.0 Partner cities – organising a successful performance assessment visit

5.1 Introduction

This section explains *'who does what and when'* in a successful performance assessment by peer review. It explains the roles and responsibilities and the timetable.

5.2 Who is involved in the BUSTRIP peer review?

5.2.1 The Visiting Peer review team

A review team is made up of between 3-5 people:

- A peer review manager from a BUSTRIP partner
- Two or three peers from BUSTRIP and city partners
- A reserve peer who will join the team in the event of illness/emergency etc.

5.2.2 The Peer Review Team Manager

The review manager will have prior experience of managing peer reviews. Their role will be to manage the overall review, to act as the primary point of contact during, before, and after the review, to act as advisor to the review team, and to deliver the presentation and final report (and delegation/management required to achieve these). The review manager will spend up to five working days preparing for the review visit. The visit including travel will take up to five days. The preparation of the report for the city will take up to 5 days. A review manager can expect to spend between 10 to 15 days working on each peer review.

The review manager:

- Is responsible for ensuring the venues are suitable and the programme proposed by co-ordinators is adequate, that initial team building and briefing occurs, and that roles are assigned within the team which cover the needs of the review, presentation, and report delivery.
- Initiates and supervises the recording of information and findings, and to chair full team discussions.
- Leads the writing of the report with appropriate delegations to the team for sections within it.
- Contributes to the evaluation

5.2.3 The Peer Review Team Members

The review team members will spend up to two working days preparing for the review visit. The visit including travel will take up to five days. Their contribution to the report for the city will take up to 2 days. A review team member can expect to spend between eight to nine days working on each peer review.

The Peer Review Team Members are:

- Responsible for arranging own travel to and from the city, and to arrive in time for team building and briefing on the evening before the review.

- Required to carry out a desk review of the self-assessment provided by the city in advance of the review and be prepared to present initial findings to the rest of the review team during initial team building session.
- Responsible for preparing for the review, conducting the review, and writing up sections of the final report following the review.
- Must have experience, expertise and training in the investigation of sustainable urban transport, and must be prepared to help investigate, record, and co-ordinate these in the review.
- Required to interview or facilitate workshops, adequately record these, transfer key summary points into group discussions and team recording sessions
- Must be prepared to respond to comments, questions, and criticisms at the presentation, on their areas of investigation.
- Must be prepared to write sections of the overall report from notes taken throughout review process, and to read and comment on the draft report produced for the city by the review team.
- To contribute to the evaluation of the review and report

5.2.4 City Partner Co-ordinator

Each City partner must appoint a BUSTRIP coordinator for the peer review visit. This person is from the host partner city, and is the contact for all communications and organisation. The city partner coordinator will spend fifteen to twenty days preparing the self-assessment report. The city partner coordinator will spend ten to fifteen days organising the peer review visit, five days during the visit and five days following the visit in discussions over the report and evaluation. The city partner coordinator can expect to spend 40-65 days preparing the self-assessment report and organising and participating in the peer review visit.

The City Partner Co-ordinator is

- Responsible for providing the self assessment report
- Responsible for all visit arrangements and logistics for the review team, organisation of city introduction (and tour?), review interviews, workshops, and schedule for both internal and external participants, hotel accommodation and review venues for the review team, lunches and evening dinners, briefing of all city participants, organisation of presentation room and attendees (including media).
- Providing information about BUSTRIP to Interviewees and Participants
- Deciding on the need for interpreters and a making any arrangements for their involvement.

5.2.5 Peer review visit - Interviewees and Participants

The peer review manager and the City coordinator will agree the programme for the peer review visit. This visit will involve meeting actors and stakeholders in the SUTP in the partner city. The **process** of identifying the actors and stakeholders starts with the desk review of the self-assessment report by the team members. The team members suggest to the team manger the individuals that they wish to meet. They should also identify the stakeholders, interest groups, agencies and other interest representatives that they wish to meet. The team members should be clear in expressing their preference for the format of the meetings with these people. In general semi-structured interviews should be used as a method of enquiry. Structured formal interviews are more appropriate for resolving technical and political uncertainties. Workshops and discussion groups are more appropriate for obtaining views from stakeholders, the general public and interested parties.

The review manager should collate the requests from team members and agree with the municipality those who the team will be meeting and the format of the meetings.

- The review process includes interviews and workshops with people from the host city. These may include senior managers and politicians, middle managers and experts within the municipality, representatives of external agencies, business, and communities within the city. The internal and external personnel should provide a balanced view and represent the major stakeholders in SUTP in the city.
- Interviewees and Participants are there to provide their views on sustainable urban transport in the city. They must be briefed on the aims or BUSTRIP, advised that the review is anonymous and that the review is supported by their city (so honest and open views are expected so that the review will be of benefit). Finally they should be aware that the review procedure is under development and they will be asked to comment upon it to improve it.

5.2.6 Interpreters/Translators

The overall project language is English. It is important to allow free and unfiltered communication between the team and stakeholders. Municipalities should consider the costs and benefits of interpretation carefully and agree with the review manager where this will be used. An interpreter is a key player in the success of the review determining the quality of communication with participants and the presentation audience. Interpreters should be treated as members of the team and attend briefings and team building meetings and have a level of understanding or competence in defined technical areas.

5.3 Timetable of tasks for the partner city

The list below contains tasks that should be completed by the time suggested. Section 5 explores some of the tasks in greater detail, so you should refer to section 5 before starting any of the tasks.

	Before the visit...	Task
1.	8 -6 weeks	Receive review team details. Reserve hotel accommodation for review team.
2.	8-6 weeks	Identify internal staff for interviews, and reserve time in their dairies
3.	8-6 weeks	Identify external participants for interviews or workshops, brief them and agree provisional dates and times for their involvement.
4.	8-6 weeks	Consider interpretation needs and discuss with Review manager.
5.	6-8 weeks	Send self-assessment to review team manager and Env Com.
6.	6 weeks	Reserve 'base room' and food, and interview rooms
7.	6 weeks	Reserve final presentation room
8.	6 weeks	Reserve rooms for internal workshops
9.	6 weeks	Reserve rooms for external workshops
10.	4 weeks	Identify person to make introductory presentation
11.	4 weeks	Plan coach tour (optional)
12.	4 weeks	Order Stationary and reserve PowerPoint projector
13.	4 weeks	Agree draft timetable to review manager
14.	4-2 weeks	In-depth briefing to interviewees and participants
15.	2 weeks	Confirm names of review team with hotel
16.	2 weeks	Send out press release about the peer review visit and contact media and remind city politicians about the visit
17.	1 week	Confirm with review manager all arrangements are complete

5.4 Hotel Accommodation

The review team will need to stay in a local hotel, reasonably close to the municipality buildings. As a guide, hotels should not cost more than €100 / night / person. Subsistence costs should not exceed €50/person/day.

5.5 Team base room at the Municipality

The review team will need a '**base**' room at the municipality offices. This should be a room that they can use for their private meetings and should be available for them for all of the time of their visit. If The room should be large enough for 8 people. Ideally, the room should be equipped with:

- A central meeting table to seat up to 8 people, with some space for individual working.
- Telephone, with additional sockets for modem connections
- A PC with internet access
- 2 flip charts with pens and paper
- PowerPoint projector
- 'post-it' note pads, 2 colours (green and yellow, 6 of each)
- Tea / coffee / water available in the room or nearby

5.6 Things to remember when planning the peer review

- **Pre-Review Check.** The day before the review begins the Review Manager will meet with the city co-ordinators to go over and comment on arrangements, rooms, information, participants etc. The co-ordinator should be available for this day to make additional arrangements and rearrangements required.
- **Duration of review.** The review will begin on the morning of day 1, and last until the lunchtime of day 3 or 4, in total, 3 ½ days.
- **Team Building and Briefing Time.** Team building and briefing should be the function of very the first review team meeting. One option is to set aside 2-3 hours on the evening preceding the start of review. This time can be used to allow the team to get to know one another, to present and share their understanding of the self assessment report and to finalise roles in the review.
- **Introduction to the City.** On the morning of day 1, there should be an introductory presentation made to the review team,
- **Involvement of City Participants.** Interviews, workshops, focus groups should take place from the afternoon of day 1, until the around mid afternoon on day 2 (for a 3 day review) or until mid afternoon on day3 (for a 4 day review)
- **Use of Parallel Sessions.** Interviews can take place in two parallel streams, by splitting the review team into two interview teams. In some occasional circumstances three parallel interviews may be possible, alternatively if there is a workshop with many people present the co-coordinator/manager may want all of the review team members to present to spilt into smaller groups
- **Interview and workshop durations.** These depend upon the people involved and the numbers in a session. Single person interviews should be generally scheduled to last for approximately 1 hour, however senior people may

only be available for 30-45 minutes. We recommend most senior people are interviewed individually (but with advisors present if they wish). If interviews include two or more people at the same time then the length of the interview may need to be extended for up to 1 ½ hours. Interviews are suitable for perhaps 1-3 people. For four or more people, you are advised to use a workshop/focus group approach. These may last 1.5-2.5 hours (with breaks) depending upon numbers present and subject.

- **Time between interviews and workshops.** There should be a minimum gap between interviews to allow travel between rooms / venues. Where possible *additional* free time between interviews/workshops should be built into the schedule to allow the review team time to prepare for interviews (15-30 mins) and to record main findings following interviews (15-30mins).
- **Reflection and group discussion time.** The review will function best if the team are encouraged to share and discuss their developing understanding. This requires that time to be set aside. One way to do this without taking additional review time is to utilise working lunches and working evening meals. Where free time is created these can function as reflection, recording, or discussion times.
- **Lunch and Dinners.** Lunch should be delivered to the base room at lunchtime for the team to help themselves; these should facilitate group and individual working. Evening dinners/tables should be conducive towards shared discussion. The final evening is set aside to prepare the presentation and eating arrangements should facilitate this (e.g. by ordering in food, or eating in restaurants where group working can continue).
- **Use of mornings and evenings.** Early mornings and evenings can be used for meeting with external groups such as business and community.
- **Time for developing presentation.** The afternoon and evening of the day before the presentation should be used to prepare for the presentation to be made the next day
- **Presentation, Audience and Media.** The presentation should be made in the morning of the final day. Co-ordinators should invite all review participants to this presentation and encourage them all to attend. Others may also be invited. In particular the local media (e.g. newspapers and radio) should be invited and encouraged to attend to fulfil dissemination requirements of project. The presentation will be around ½ an hour leaving ½ an hour for questions, criticisms, and clarifications.
- **Review End.** Review team members can travel home in the afternoon of the final day.
- **Review Evaluation by Team.** The review will be evaluated by the team (including co-ordinators) the fortnight following the review (but preferably as soon as possible when review team return home.
- **Review Evaluation by Participants.** Interviewees and participants will be asked to evaluate the review process and the report. Mechanisms for achieving this are currently being explored and suggestions would be welcomed.
- **Writing and Distribution of Report.** Roles and responsibilities will be assigned at the end of the review. The report writing will be lead and co-ordinated

by the review manager, with certain aspects delegated to team members. The report will be sent to the city co-ordinators. The city co-ordinator then distributes the report to all participants and asks for comments, feedback, and evaluation of the report and process. The co-ordinator then collects these and returns them to Review Manager

- **Interpretation and Translation** The overall project language is English. However, it is probable that not all the participants will be able to communicate sufficiently in English. An interpreter may be needed. Individual Cities are encouraged to explore, create and test translation and communication options. This should be agreed with UBC Env Com and Review Managers in advance of the review. Cities need to make the case for funding of cost effective translation. Issues to consider include:

- Is an interpreter/ translator required?
- Do interview participants speak adequate English?
- Could municipality staff interpret/translate adequately?
- If required, what type of interpretation/translation?
- What is the cost of interpreter/translator per day?
- Can the time needed be minimised through awareness of real needs for translation and careful organisation of communication events (e.g. translations used in one interview steam only or during only one day or single event?)

The costs of a translator need to be agreed in advance. Cities should seek estimates. These should be presented to BUSTRIP management team.

Note: If an interpreter is to be used, it should be recognised that this is a crucial function of the review. The interpreter will be a key player in the success of the review as they determine the quality of communication with participants and the presentation audience. Interpreters should be treated as members of the team and attend briefings and team building meetings. Interpreters generally need advance warning of the technical areas they will be expected to understand, general interpreters are unlikely to be able to communicate the specialised social-economic-environmental technology so they must be briefed in advance as part of the contract negotiations.

3.6 Who might the team meet representing the municipality?

The peer review team will advise who they wish to meet; this is likely to include internal technical officers and managers, communication and community officers and politicians. The list of interviewees and participants should be agreed at least two weeks prior to the arrival of the team.

3.7 Meeting other stakeholders.

The self-assessment will provide information on the external organisations with which the municipality works in partnership on Sustainable Urban Transport. Representatives of these organisations, agencies, and individuals may be invited to meet the peer review team during the performance assessment.

The peer review team may need to discuss with these people their perspective on the drivers, impacts, and reponses being made by the municipality. For example, those involved with health, police, business development, community groups, voluntary organisations, as well as associated government organisations. The

review team will request interviews/workshops to be arranged with representatives of these organisations. It will be useful if the peer review team is advised if meetings/workshops/seminars involving these people that are taking place during the performance assessment as they may wish to attend these meetings.

3.8 What questions might the peer review team ask?

The municipality has the opportunity to make some policy responses that internalise the external environmental costs associated with transport. In this way the full environmental costs associated with transport can be charged – what action is the municipality taking in this area?

Is the development of a compact city, with sustainable mobility available for all a key objective of the transport plans, show me how your city is reducing urban sprawl?.

Cleaner fuels and vehicles for businesses and citizens can make a significant practical contribution to reducing the environmental impact of transport, what success is your city having with these initiatives?

What are the instruments being used to manage the transport sector, and with what success?

How is the municipality meeting the demand for increased mobility whilst reducing the diverse environmental and health effects of transport, particularly regarding air pollution and climate change?

How effective are the policies in delivering a modal change to sustainable forms of transport and managing down the demand for unsustainable transport.

How is the municipality providing safe cycling for all?

Is it providing affordable public transport for all residents and visitors?

Is it adopting the polluter pays principle especially for private car transport?

Is the development strategy sustainable in the way it reduces the need to travel excessive distances to local services?

Are there emerging political moves to price the cost of transport according to its true environmental costs? (London congestion charge, Co2 emission charges on flights, distance based vehicle charges in Switzerland, Germany and Austria.)

6. BUSTRIP - Self assessment report template

6.1 Introduction.

A self-assessment report is made up of four chapters, these are:

Chapter 1 – Municipality profile

Chapter 2 – Drivers

Chapter 3 – Impacts

Chapter 4 – BUSTRIP SUTP benchmark

The self-assessment report template is set out below. In writing chapters 1-3, partner cities should write a narrative in a word document format. In writing chapter 4 partner cities should write a narrative and inserted this into the relevant part of the table as set out below.

As general guide a BUSTRIP self assessment report should be between 10 - 100 pages long

Please insert diagrams tables and references that you consider helpful.

Please number all pages

Please expand the tables in Chapter 4 to suit your response.

If you have any questions contact UBC Env Com.

BUSTRIP Partner City Self Assessment Report (template)

Provenance

Describe the process used by the municipality in preparing the self-assessment report. Describe the stakeholders and actors involved in its preparation and editing. Provide their contact details.

Chapter 1 Municipality profile

This purpose of this chapter of the self-assessment report is to provide all the essential background information needed by the peer review team. In this chapter it is important to:

1. Describe the geographical location and characteristics of the municipality including any aspects that affect transport and its planning. Please include a map of the municipality.
2. Describe the role of the municipality in the delivery of all public policies and services generally, Please provide a diagram showing the political administrative structure of the municipality with a clear indication of the legal competencies, and scope of activities of departments, operating companies, public private partnerships and joint venture companies that deliver these services.
3. Describe the political decision-making arrangements and political balance of the municipality.
4. Describe in detail the arrangements for joint working between stakeholders e.g. (inter-sectoral) working groups involved in Sustainable Urban Transport.
5. Provide a list all relevant existing plans, strategies, and actions that together contribute towards Sustainable Urban Transport. Provide hyperlinks where available. Indicate where these are available in English.
6. Describe how transport and other development proposals are assessed, explain how Transport Impact Assessments and similar tools are used.
7. Describe the financial budgets that are available for infrastructure investment and to implement actions, including details of funds raised locally, raised regionally and those from National and EU sources. Please provide details of any differences between capital and revenue budgets.

Chapter 2 Drivers

This purpose of this chapter is to both describe **and** provide quantitative data that explains the present local societal 'drivers' (or pressures) affecting mobility and transport planning and development. It is important to include details of future expected changes in these drivers from known 'key events' (e.g. factory closure, new airport runway, new bridges etc). As a minimum this chapter should cover the following drivers:

Urbanisation – represented by:

- *Changes in the physical distances between key functions (housing, workplaces, retailing, public services, leisure),*
- *Present and future developments on green-field land and redevelopments of brown-field land, housing demand and changes in land values.*
- *Trends in spatial and urban development (average household size, average car ownership, variations in urban densities);*
- *Infrastructure endowment and status (e.g. roads, rolling stock and ICT); transport development status and trends (e.g. modal split, vehicle age and maintenance standards)*
- *Development policy priorities, esp. infrastructure expansion and need to overcome perceived lack of transport capacity),*
- *Changes in land values*
- *Displacement of transport infrastructure*

Economic – represented by:

- *Changes in the economic base of the municipality e.g. shift towards a service- based economy and the relocation of business*
- *Changing transport demands from business and commerce e.g. new logistics arrangements, globalisation*
- *Changes in patterns of leisure and shopping.*

Transport – represented by:

- *Changes in the patterns (trends) of 'origin and destination' trips.*
- *Changes in patterns of modal split (personal: walking/cycling/car/flying/ferries/public transport & freight: road/rail/sea/air)*

Chapter 3 Impacts

This chapter must describe and provide relevant data that explains the impacts on, and of, mobility and transport. Please explain which 'drivers' are causing the impacts and how. This chapter should as a minimum cover the following impacts

Noise % of citizen's/ residents exposed to traffic noise above 55dB(A)

Air pollution: % of urban citizens exposed to levels of PM10, ground level ozone, Sox Nox, Vox exceeding EU limits.

Health; trends in premature deaths and higher levels of illness through poor air quality/noise and sedentary lifestyles;

Safety; trends in accidents involving transport

Congestion; trends and patterns

Social equity: trends and patterns in the mobility of different; geographical or ethnic communities, different age groups and different gender groups)

Quality of urban life: patterns and trends as a result of transport related drivers (including any qualitative survey results)

Chapter 4 Plans, policies and actions in the partner city

Partner cities do not have a Sustainable Urban Transport Plan; they have their own locally agreed approved and adopted plans, strategies, actions, and targets. The purpose of this chapter is to describe these collected plans, strategies, actions, and targets.

The first part of this chapter invites partner cities to describe the **processes** they have used in preparing these plans, strategies, actions, and targets. This description is made against the 'ideal' characteristics (or processes) of the benchmark for preparing Sustainable Urban Transport Plans. (SUT – Planning)

The second part of this chapter invites cities to describe the 'cumulative' **content** of their plans, strategies, actions, and targets. This description is made against the 'ideal' characteristics (or content) of the benchmark Sustainable Urban Transport Plans. (SUTP – Plan)

The description in this chapter is a '**gap analysis**'. It allows the peer review team to understand the differences between the current practise in the partner city and the benchmark. In this section partner cities describe the differences between their SUTP 'processes and content' and that in the BUSTRIP SUTP benchmark. Partner cities should include data on their achievements of objectives and targets in their plans and strategies.

The "BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark" is adapted from the ***Final report of the Working Group on Sustainable Urban Transport Plans***¹. The benchmark describes the characteristics that should be evident within Sustainable Urban Transport Plans. It is important to recognise this benchmark as 'aspirational,' representing an entirely new way of thinking and working to address sustainable urban transport. There are few municipalities in Europe that can evidence all the characteristics within the benchmark.

¹ http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/urban/pdf/final_report050128.pdf

Partner Cities should complete this table

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
	SUT - Planning		
1	<p>SUTP and Sustainable Development Strategy;</p> <p>1.1 Describe how the municipality plans, strategies, actions, and targets are (or are not) part of an overall sustainable development strategy with a long-term perspective.</p> <p><i>The sustainable development strategy should integrate transport and mobility planning with comprehensive planning and sectoral plans (especially land use and spatial planning, environment, social inclusion, economic development, safety, health, education and information technologies. The strategy could be an existing one or be developed in the course of the SUTP process</i></p>		
2	<p>Responsibility for SUTP</p> <p>2.1 Describe how the politicians of the municipality (or the executive authority have (or will) agree the allocation of responsibilities for preparing the SUTP.</p> <p>2.2 Describe how the politicians are (or will be) involved in the preparation of the SUTP</p> <p>2.3 Describe how stakeholders have been involved in these decisions.</p>		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
3 3.1	<p>Citizen participation and stakeholder consultation</p> <p>Describe how citizens and stakeholders have been involved in the preparation and implementation of the municipality plans, strategies, actions, and targets</p> <p><i>The Aarhus Convention¹ provides a legal framework that requires that municipalities provide minimum opportunities and levels of information for citizens and stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>Some municipalities involve stakeholders at all stages in setting plan objectives and targets, measuring progress, setting priorities and evaluation.</i></p>		

¹ <http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/aarhus/index.htm>

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
4	<p>Policy coordination through actor cooperation</p> <p>4.1 Describe the arrangements for cooperation between the main 'actors' in sustainable urban transport planning.</p> <p>4.2 Describe how these arrangements effectively coordinate the municipality sustainable urban transport plans, strategies, actions, and targets</p> <p><i>SUTP should deliver integration between all transport modes and policy sectors and geographical coverage of the whole plan area (national/regional plans, other relevant citywide plans, transport companies and provider's plans and strategies, neighbouring municipalities. SUTP should be fully integrated with land use and other plans.</i></p> <p><i>Early work on SUTP's should reference other plans as the starting point towards full integration</i></p>		
5	<p>Gender equity and equality</p> <p>5.1 Describe the ways in which the municipality pursues and promotes gender equity and equality throughout the planning process, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making • Consultation procedures • Employment in the agencies involved • Participation of in the design of policies and measures • Collection and use of gender disaggregated data in monitoring and evaluation of plans and strategies 		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
6 6.1	<p>Capacity building</p> <p>Describe the ways that the local authority key personnel and key stakeholders are provided with the necessary skills for driving and managing the SUT Planning process.</p>		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
	SUTP Plan		
7.	SUTP scope and definition		
7.1	<p>Describe how the plans and strategies of the municipality (collectively) cover: (the scope of a SUTP plan)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The movement of goods and people in a more sustainable way, Comprehensively addressing public and private transport, Motorised and non motorized transport, moving and parked vehicles and well as freight transport and logistics. • Describe how these transport categories are dealt with in an integrated way. 		
8	Analysis of baseline scenario		
8.1	<p>Describe (if and) how plans and strategies have been developed from a comprehensive review of the current situation. (A review of the drivers and their impacts that make up the analysis of a baseline scenario. Some municipalities may carry out a review of each plan/strategy/sector).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a list of the indicators used in this review • Describe the involvement of all actors and stakeholders in this review • Describe how this baseline scenario is used to measure progress. 		
8.2	Describe how the impact and effectiveness of urban transport plans, strategies, actions, and targets is evaluated.		
8.3	Describe (if and) how the review includes forecasting of changes in drivers and impacts		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
9	<p data-bbox="333 253 936 284">Definition of a vision, objective and targets</p> <p data-bbox="237 320 1196 485">9.1 Describe how your SUT Plans and strategies provide a long term vision for transport and mobility development, integrated with all other policies (land use and spatial development, environment, social inclusion and gender equity, economic development, safety, health, education and information technology)</p> <p data-bbox="237 521 1196 619">9.2 Describe how the SUT Plans and strategies combine qualitative and quantitative elements, and is designed to meet local priorities, reflect local attitudes values and emotions.</p> <p data-bbox="237 655 1196 753">9.3 Describe how the SUT Plans and strategies contribute to the sustainability of transport (in accordance with the definition of the EU transport council 2001).¹</p> <ul data-bbox="383 799 1196 1337" style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows the basic access and development needs of individuals, companies and societies to be met safely and in a manner consistent with human and ecosystem health, and promotes equity within and between successive generations; • Is affordable, operates fairly and efficiently, offers a choice of transport mode and supports an competitive economy as well as balanced regional development; • Limits emissions and waste within the planets ability to absorb them, uses renewable resources at or below their rates of generation, and, uses non renewable resources at or below the rates of development of renewable substitutes while minimising the impact on the use of land and the generation of noise. <p data-bbox="237 1374 1128 1437">9.4 The SUT Plans and strategies provide accessibility to all inhabitants, commuters, visitors and businesses in ways that;</p> <ul data-bbox="383 1485 1196 1596" style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the negative impact of the transport system on health, safety, and security of citizens in particular the most vulnerable; 		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
10	<p data-bbox="331 252 1126 284">SUT Plan – implementing actions and allocating finance.</p> <p data-bbox="241 320 1218 384">10.1 Describe the timetable for the implementation of the SUT Plans and strategies</p> <p data-bbox="241 421 1200 485">10.2 Describe the timetable for the review of the actions and budgets of the SUT Plans and strategies</p> <p data-bbox="241 521 1218 799">10.3 Describe how the SUT Plans and strategies:</p> <ul data-bbox="383 560 1218 799" style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate policy measures • Defines solutions to underlying problems • Is focused on target achievement and not the implementation of measures and projects • The action and budget plan part of the SUTP includes the implementation schedule for the of actions and the evidence of financial and technical feasibility 		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
	<p>SUTP policies and measures <i>The SUTP should include and integrate the following policies and measures and provide justification for their inclusion /exclusion;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>General principles</i> • <i>Reducing the need for transport</i> • <i>Transport management</i> • <i>Developing clean and fair transport systems</i> 		
<p>11</p> <p>11.1</p> <p>11.2</p> <p>11.3</p> <p>11.4</p>	<p>General principles</p> <p>Describe how the SUT Plan (and strategies) provide full integration of transport planning and other key planning that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes account of spatial and transport patterns at the urban agglomeration level • Considers the implications for transport arising from all urban development and the potential conflict with the SUTP • Prevents and minimises negative transport growth <p>Describe how the SUT Plan decouples economic growth from transport growth through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The more efficient use of infrastructure to achieve economic growth • Internalising external costs and achieving a level playing field for all transport modes (within constraints of national legislations) <p>Describe how the SUT Plan safeguards local diversity and encourages through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing local solutions and approaches • Participating in benchmarking exercises and good practice exchange and dissemination <p>Describe how the SUT Plan ensures and actively promotes gender equity and equality acknowledging the different implications for women and men of all policies and measures</p>		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
12	<p data-bbox="331 252 786 284">Reducing the need for transport</p> <p data-bbox="241 323 1189 387">12.1 Describe how the SUT Plan provides door to door access choices across the urban agglomeration</p> <p data-bbox="241 427 1081 459">12.2 Describe how the SUT Plan makes efficient use of space.</p> <p data-bbox="241 499 1205 563">12.3 Describe how the SUT Plan promotes a “compact city”, and mixed use development orientated at public transport, walking and cycling</p> <p data-bbox="241 595 1205 659">Describe how the SUT Plan strengthens the use of information and communication technologies;</p> <p data-bbox="241 691 1189 722">12.4 Describe how the SUT Plan protects existing short-route networks</p> <p data-bbox="241 754 304 786">12.5</p>		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
13	<p>Transport management</p> <p>13.1 Describe how the SUT Plan reduces congestion and rationalises the use of vehicles by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimising the individual use of vehicles through general restrictions for cars (access restrictions, parking management) or selective restrictions (energy efficient, low emission, high occupancy, space efficient, mobility impaired persons vehicles only); • Reducing/limiting modal share of motorised vehicles • Optimising speeds of motorised traffic according to objectives • Setting up comprehensive parking management <p>13.2 Describe how the SUT Plan enhances modal shift and intermodality by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reallocating space for Public transport, cycling, walking, avoiding capacity increase for private vehicles as far as possible • Improving the safety, security and dedicated infrastructure for cycling and walking • Developing attractive public transport services (clean fleets, frequent, accessible, comfortable, modern, fair priced, well linked, punctual, dedicated infrastructure/road lanes, decreased operating costs) • Coordinated transport services and improving the quality of interchanges, design, connections, functions; • Providing traveller information (pre-/on trip, reliable, real time) that facilitates travel choices, that is easy to understand (e.g. symbols, language, size, lighting) as well as easy to use (e.g. mobile and online information delivery) 		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
13.3	<p>Describe how the SUT Plan influences mobility by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing the overall supply and demand to optimise the use of infrastructure and transport systems and developing new services • Applying financial instruments such as road and other pricing, incentives, local taxation – charging the use and not the ownership of a private vehicle (including the use of public space for parking); • Promoting behavioural change through awareness raising, information provision, marketing; 		
13.4	<p>Describe how the SUT Plan optimises freight transport and logistics and reconciles the needs of urban freight transport with the wider transport system</p>		
13.5	<p>Describe how the SUT Plan makes use of intelligent transport systems (ITS) as a tool for improving efficiency and strengthening the integration between policies and measures and especially integration with Environmental Management Systems (EMAS & ISO14000).</p>		
13.6	<p>Describe how ITS is used in;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and fleet management • Parking management • Road pricing and access restrictions • Traffic and traveller information • Public transport priority schemes • Speed control 		
14	Developing clean and fair transport systems		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
14.1	Describe how the SUT Plan promotes and favours the use of clean and energy efficient modes, i.e. less energy consuming, noisy, air polluting, GHG emitting transport vehicles.		
14.2	Describe how the SUT Plan improves the quality of the urban environment and public space by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing severances and ensuring social inclusion, taking into account different needs and target groups (e.g. elderly, travelling with children, mobility impaired); • Using and maintaining low-noise road pavements and providing appropriate noise shielding in accordance with both noise and urban design requirements • Improving visual impacts and the design quality • Improve road safety and security for all travellers, considering especially children, women and the elderly. 		
15	Detailed assignment of responsibilities and resources		
15.1	Describe how the SUT Plan allocates responsibilities and budgets for implementation using a business plan that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses potential sources of funding • Ensures a fair cost-benefit distribution between stakeholders (i.e. cost equity) • Involves the implementation agencies (hospitals, factories etc) 		
16	Monitoring and evaluation arrangements		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
16.1	Describe how the implementation of the SUT- Plan is monitored against the agreed set of indicators and how regular progress reports are widely published.		
16.2	Describe any procedures for the detailed transparent and independent evaluation of the <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the plan (including preparatory process and the timetable); • Quality of the implementation process: 		
16.3	Describe how the views of Stakeholders and peers from other cities are used as part of informal benchmarking of the implementation of the SUTP Plan <i>Note; The BUSTRIP peer review will provide each partner city with these benchmark views.</i>		
16.4	Describe how an understanding of the cross-sectoral costs and benefits of SUTP is used in the evaluation, calculating both internal costs and external costs. <i>Note. There should be a clear distinction drawn between costs/benefits of preparing the plan and costs benefits arising from the implemented measures. The detailed basis for calculating costs and benefits should be publicly available and explain the basis of the calculations.</i>		
16.5	Describe how the SUTP provides a logical framework of goals,		

	BUSTRIP SUTP Benchmark	Insert Description	Insert References & And Indicators
	<p>objectives, targets, and actions with a clear interrelationship providing a consistent and comprehensive basis for evaluation.</p> <p><i>Note</i> <i>In the definition of suitable objectives, alternative options should be considered that integrate qualitative and quantitative aspects into the decision making process.</i></p>		
17	Plan adoption, approval and assessment		
17.1	Describe how the SUT plan (and strategies) are adopted and approved by the authorities that have prepared it.		
17.2	Describe how the SUT Plan achievements and the impacts of the policies and measures have been assessed.		
17.3	Explain how the SUT Plan complies with all relevant procedures and in particular the EC directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA. EU 2001)		
17.4	Explain whether and how an independent body that provides credible judgement has carried out an assessment of the plan.		