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European Conference of Ministers of Transport

- Forum for policy discussion and debate among transport ministries.

- 43 Member Countries from all regions of Europe

- 7 Associate Members (Australia, Canada, Japan, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, United States)

- 1 Observer (Morocco)

- Since May 2007: International Transport Forum
FROM ECMT TO THE INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT FORUM
Cities in ECMT/OECD = 80 % of population, 90% economic activity worldwide

Urban transport systems problematic (congestion, road accidents, traffic pollution, CO₂)

Urban travel = not just local government problem
“The Council of Ministers of Transport...emphasizes the urgency of taking measures to regulate where necessary the volume of urban motor traffic, particularly private cars, in the largest towns”

ECMT Resolution No. 1965/15 on Urban Transport Problems

Lisbon, 29-30 June 1965
The Evolving Policy Context For Sustainable Urban Travel
Evolving Policy Context

- Decision-making = increasingly complex;

- Growing demands for policy integration with other sectors.

- maintaining balance in the policy package not always easy; tradeoffs in objectives sometimes necessary.
What impact can transport have on… ?

- Ageing populations;
- Disability;
- Poverty;
- Unemployment;
- Personal security;
- Ethnicity/culture;
- Gender;
- Youth.
The Evolving Institutional Context For Sustainable Urban Travel
Evolving Institutional Context

- Decentralisation of responsibilities for urban travel
  - Local and regional governments – larger role in decision-making;
  - Problem: incomplete or excessive decentralisation:
    - Transfer of authority to lower levels of government must be accompanied by transfer of commensurate resources;
    - Usually requires reform to fiscal and regulatory structures, so difficult, but often necessary to facilitate implementation.
The Integrated Policy Package
Integrated policy strategies

✦ Two principles:
  ➜ Synergy or complementarity of measures
    - Measures reinforce each other
  ➜ Reducing barriers to implementation
    - Measures facilitate implementation of other measures.
Integrated policy strategies

- In isolation: land use measures that focus development in city centres and on public transport corridors = little effect;

- In integrated package: can increase effectiveness of public transport and car use management measures;

- Public transport and car use pricing measures can in combination achieve largest benefits for sustainability.

(Source: PROPOLIS)
Many sustainable transport measures also promote accessibility safety:

- encouraging alternatives to car use;
- lower traffic speeds;
- better urban design;
- public-transport based development…
Re-thinking traffic management and land use planning

– Traffic can divide communities – physically and socially;

– Traffic impacts health and road safety (particularly of children and older people);

– Increasing car dependency increases exclusion for those without cars;

– The legacy of out of town developments reduces choice and opportunity for non-car owners.
ECMT-OECD STRATEGY on URBAN TRAVEL AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (1995)

STRAW 1:  Best Practice Policies

STRAW 2:  Innovations In Policies

STRAW 3:  Pricing Strategy
Best practice

- limit city spread to maintain density/ strengthen urban core;
- steer commercial & retail development to areas served by public transport;
- impose low maxima on the no. of parking spaces;
- shift parking supply from central districts to suburban and peri-urban park- and -ride interchanges;
- encourage residential development in city centre / inner areas.
Innovations

- include:
  - policies to promote **mixed land use or “urban villages”**;
  - tramways threaded through suburban districts; higher residential densities around stations;
  - use of **incentives** to encourage development around existing transit routes, stations.
IMPLEMENTING SUSTAINABLE URBAN TRAVEL POLICIES
ECMT-OECD SURVEY OF TRAVEL IN CITIES
Policies implemented or pursued since 1990

Number of answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land use policy</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services, information, management of mobility</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

number of answers

- Curb urban sprawl
- Land use
- Reduce pollution
- Traffic restraint
- Reduce congestion
- Improvements in PT network
- Road improvements
- Road development
- Management of mobility
- Improvements for cyclists/pedestrians
- Quality of life
- Green area development
- Parking restriction
ECMT National Reviews (2003): Implementing Urban Travel Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL AND REGIONAL GOVERNMENT CAPACITIES</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>RU</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE-CENTRALISED INFRASTRUCTURE AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATION OF REGIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY MAKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL GOVERNMENT ABILITY TO AFFECT LOCAL POLICIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Successful/advantageous instrument/structure**
- **Promising recent initiative**
### ECMT National Reviews (2003):
Implementing Urban Travel Policies – cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC TRANSPORT</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPETITIVE TENDERING FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT WITH EFFECTIVE INCENTIVE STRUCTURES FOR REDUCING COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS PROVIDED TO KEEP FARES DOWN TO PROMOTE RIDERSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFECTIVE COST CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED PUBLIC TRANSPORT PASSES AND SIMPLIFIED FARES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC LIGHT BUS PRIORITY AND REAL TIME ARRIVAL INFO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDED BUSES / DEDICATED BUS LANES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK AND RIDE SCHEMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Successful/advantageous instrument/structure**
- **Promising recent initiative**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>RU</th>
<th>CH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Instruments &amp; Parking Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Charges / Capacity Management City-Wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variabilisation / Differentiation of Road User Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Tolling / Road Pricing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to Transfer of Revenues from Tolls to Other Modes, with a Test of Efficient Use of Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorised Modes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Free Zones in City Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Promotion of Walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Promotion of Cycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Successful/advantageous instrument/structure**: Pink cells
- **Promising recent initiative**: Striped cells
Two key questions:

- Why is implementation so difficult?
- What can national governments do?
Barriers to implementation

- poor policy integration and co-ordination;
- inefficient or counterproductive institutional roles and procedures;
- an unsupportive legal or regulatory framework;
- weaknesses in the pricing/fiscal framework;
- poor data quality and quantity;
- wavering political commitment.
Barriers to implementation

- Inefficient or counterproductive institutional roles and procedures, including incomplete or excessive decentralisation of responsibilities for urban travel.

- Lack of coordination among Ministries/different levels of government creates mixed signals & inefficiencies;

- Withdrawal of national level creates policy vacuum (e.g., Poland, Hungary, Russia, but in EU countries as well!).
Barriers to implementation

- Excessive and incomplete decentralisation

Financial aspects:

- Mismatch between responsibilities and resources;
- Local authorities reliant on state-owned monopolies for transport services;
- Lack of consistency in financing of main operators;
- Complex arrangements for fare concessions and support.

Institutional aspects:

- Political vacuum in authority over/ organisation of demand management, public transport service provision;
- Lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities.
Barriers to implementation

- weaknesses in the pricing/fiscal framework for public transport financing

- No one financing model;
- National government involvement = key factor; coverage of operating costs in addition to capital costs may provide incentives for revenue generation/less for cost efficiency;
- User pays principle = widely accepted, but balancing needs with what user can and will pay, and with public and private funding sources is difficult;
- Public service obligations (reduced fares/other concessions) must avoid distortions in competition/economic prejudice;
- Integrated pricing approach (earmarking transport charges for public transport financing = promising).
KEY MESSAGES FOR GOVERNMENTS
Key Messages for Governments

- Develop national policy framework;
- Co-ordinate national policy approaches on land-use, travel, health, environment;
- Encourage effective public participation, partnerships and communication;
- Provide a supportive legal and regulatory framework;
Key Messages for Governments

- Ensure a comprehensive pricing and fiscal structure;
- Rationalise financing and investment streams;
- Improve data collection, monitoring and research.
APPLYING THE KEY MESSAGES:

Do they hold up?
Applying the Key Messages: Do they hold up?

- Three regional workshops to “test” messages

- Specific studies:
  - National policies to promote cycling
  - Organisation & Financing of Public Transport
  - Collection & Monitoring of Urban Travel Data
“A national cycling policy approach – be it a separate document or elements of a more general transport policy plan – can be a powerful tool for national governments to encourage cycling in urban areas”
Findings: Key Messages do hold up!

- Essential factors in implementation of policies
- Applicable to most decision-making contexts
  - devolved; centralised; deregulated
But...
- Implementation remains slow across countries
Additional barriers to implementation …

Often missing in strategy development process:

- Clear statement of objectives
- Appraisal of policy options
- Effective monitoring and evaluation of results
Additional Key Message to Governments:

- National Governments should support local or regional authorities (...) in development, appraisal, monitoring, evaluation of integrated urban travel strategies.
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