

TEMPLATE

Output factsheet: Tools

Version 1

Project index number and acronym	CE 222
Lead partner	ITL
Output number and title	T2.2 Tool as governance model for energy efficient policy making in urban freight in FUAs (Feb 2019)
Responsible partner (PP name and number)	PP 10 / WRS
Project website	http://www.interreg-central.eu/SULPiTER.html
Delivery date	May, 2019

Summary description of the key features of the tool (developed and/or implemented)

A key element within the SULPiTER project is the establishment of the tool so-called “Freight Quality Partnerships”, or FQP in AT2.2. After checking the available literature in D.T2.2.1, and combining it with the targets of the SULPiTER project, in practice we can come up with the following definition for FQP. Apparently, whatever the local details, the FQPs have all or almost all of the following in common:

- Form of cooperation of stakeholders in logistics.
- The cooperation is formalized, i.e. there is an agreement that it will be continuous and deal about specific topics with specific partners.
- Among the stakeholders are people from the public as well as from the private sector, and each represents his or her institution.
- There may/should be stakeholders from other parts of the society, e.g. research or the broader public.
- The stakeholders meet on a regular base.
- The stakeholders debate questions of logistics in a structured way.
- The target is to make logistics in the area more sustainable. In our case, the area is the “Functional Urban Area”, see next chapter.
- The members of the FQP work towards solutions in projects which may include one or more members, and on which the progress is monitored by the FQP.
- The members of the FQP also work towards solutions that include the public sector, for example through changes in infrastructure and regulations.

NUTS region(s) where the tool has been developed and/or implemented (relevant NUTS level)

The methodological tool “FQP” is implemented and tested in each FUA of the Project (activity 2.1): Budapest & Vecses (HU10, Közép-Magyarország), Maribor (SI02, Zahodna Slovenija), Brescia (ITC4, Lombardia), Poznan (PL41, Wielkopolskie), Bologna (ITH5 Emilia Romagna region), Stuttgart (DE11, Stuttgart), Rijeka (HR03, Jadranska Hrvatska).

Expected impact and benefits of the tool for the concerned territories and target groups

The value of the FQP meetings was especially the opportunity to share between participants the information and the policy already in charge for logistic in the city and the wider metropolitan area. The next steps of the SULP development were discussed and agreed. The meetings had a clear role within the decision making process: The FQPs experiences were all linked to the overall commitment toward the definition of a city logistics plan for the respective city / FUA. In this context, the FQPs have been used for:

- Building the governance of the logistic plan (with authorities),
- Consulting the private stakeholders up to discussing with them the measures of the plan, for getting acceptance.
- Finding solutions for problems of private stakeholders.

At some SULPiTER project partners, participation at meetings varied widely. It also happened that a larger number of invited participants did not show up. Some of the meetings, therefore, do not really qualify as gatherings of a freight quality partnerships. However, it was found that partners after such meetings did better next time.

The sequence of meetings was at least partly defined by the overall needs of the SULPiTER project, and thus not exclusively by the needs of the group members. This resulted in too many meetings at a certain point. Perhaps in some cases the agenda also was defined less by the needs of the participants and more by the needs of the wider project.

Sustainability of the tool and its transferability to other territories and stakeholders

All partners had participants that are willing to continue with the topic of a FQP, with the possible exception of Rijeka. All partners hesitated regarding institutionalization. The reasons cannot be found in the minutes of the meetings, but we can assume the following:

- A signature binds an organization. Therefore, the heads of that organization must approve it. This is not only a lengthy procedure. However, in this process, the representative of that organization must stand for the usefulness of that signature. It means to use up goodwill right from the start, and to focus on legal and administrative matters, instead of making urban logistics more sustainable.
- No partner managed to get an institutional budget attached to the freight quality partnership, although almost all partners opted to continue. This may be a problem in the future. On the other hand, all partners have general budgets. They can easily afford to do two to four yearly meetings for a certain target group. Therefore, it is unlikely that the freight quality partnership will cease to exist because of a lack of budget.
- Many partnerships want to meet just two times a year. That appears to be not really much. However, four times a year often is too much: The year is not “symmetrical”, i.e. the summer holiday break in most countries is not in the middle of the year but afterwards, and December is full of year-end hustle. Therefore, autumn leaves little space for more than one meeting. Spring may allow for two meetings, especially where the summer vacation is rather late. And more than three meetings may result in redundancy.

The political signature does make the FQP sustainable, but the original transfer is not covered alone by that signature.

The consortium therefore designed the FQP to be transferable. That is most necessary, since there is no single authority to implement it within the FUAs. Success therefore depends on transfer into the municipalities across the FUAs (and possibly beyond) in the future.

Lessons learned from the development/implementation process of the tool and added value of transnational cooperation

While the partners have not explicitly stated what they now will do differently, compared to the early stages of the SULPiTER project, the following assumptions about lessons learned can be made:

First, the project partners now know more about the number and scope of stakeholders in urban and regional logistics. Therefore, they know better how to focus measures.

The partners also know the stakeholders better, and they know more of them. This has several implications. The partner learned about the stakeholders:

- Where to find them,
- How to approach them,
- Understanding their interests,
- Negotiating with them,
- And keeping in touch and network with them.

On the other hand, more thought must be given to the initial mapping of stakeholders. It may also be a good idea to repeat the mapping at regular intervals, since the FQP will result in a different view at the scope of potential

stakeholders. Learning about the scope of transport logistics and its stakeholders is a permanent process. The point is not to find a certain number of stakeholders in each category, but to understand the diversity within the category. Partners also understood more about the range of potential measures. This results in improved procedures, institutions and content.

Without the transnational cooperation and the formal pressure of having to establish a SULP, experiences of the different partners made with the several Freight Quality Partnership wouldn't be shared. This led to exchanging experiences and learn from each other.

References to relevant deliverables and web-links If applicable, pictures or images to be provided as annex

SULPiTER deliverables: D.T.2.2.1 (PP KLOK), D.T.2.2.3 - D.T.2.2.5 (PP10-WRS)

<http://www.interreg-central.eu/SULPiTER.html>