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Abstract

In this final deliverable of WP2, the status of the SUMP for all sites is described. All sites have a full SUMP that is ready for implementation, or partly implemented. This report D2.3 gives an overview of what has been established during the lifetime of the project. A short process evaluation is done to explore the biggest challenges, the major changes and the improvements for the sites. All sites have filled in the SUMP self-assessment one more time. Earlier in the project, as part of D2.1, the sites also filled in the self-assessment.

Special attention is paid to a survey on touristic mobility. During the project, it became clear that it would be interesting to gather more specific mobility data from tourism. Therefore, additional questions were added to already planned surveys in all sites.
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Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUMP</td>
<td>Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SULP</td>
<td>Sustainable Urban Logistics Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMTAP</td>
<td>Sustainable Mobility Tourist Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Public Transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Executive Summary

In this final deliverable of WP2 an overview of the state of play of the SUMP of all sites is given. Although assembling a SUMP is a complex, integrated and time-consuming process, all islands and the respective local authorities have managed to realise this. This was especially difficult because the SUMP was established during the timeframe of a complex project: CIVITAS DESTINATIONS. Within a SUMP, policy, politics, finance and stakeholders are involved. In order to combine these aspects and to come up with an ambitious plan to improve the quality of life at the tourist destinations resulted as a big challenge. The SUMP status of all the destinations is as follows:

- The SUMP ARM is completed and was officially adopted by the Regional Government of Madeira on 21st June 2019.
- The SMTAP will be publicly available on the Stratagem and Limassol Municipality websites, once it has been finalized and approved by the Municipality in May 2020.
- Rethymno’s SUMP will be public once approved by the Municipal Council of Rethymno. The SUMP is currently being revised. It was planned to have a finished version in April 2020.
- Elba’s SUMP draft has been sent to people who participated in its development (citizen, stakeholders, technicians and politicians). Municipalities are working on its internal approval, as a concrete reference document to continue with mobility planning process.
- Malta’s SUMP is still under preparation.
- The SUMP of Las Palmas Gran Canaria in place (approved in 2012 by the Municipality with the support of all political parties) is public. The update of the SUMP in place, which is being carried out by the Observatory of Mobility within LPA2.1, is not finalized and therefore has not been approved yet.

The measures that are part of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project appeared to be good real-life examples for future measures and measure packages that are foreseen in the different SUMPs. Realising the measures made clear to all stakeholders that a SUMP is not just a policy paper, but can be the beginning of real actions to change the mobility future for the cities, their citizens and for visitors. To gain an insight into how the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS sites were improved by the quality of their plans, a second SUMP self-assessment has been done by all sites. After a first round of assessments in 2017, now at the end of the process a second round of assessments has been made.

![Figure 1: Overall score of the SUMP self-assessment of all the sites](image-url)
From the overall scores it is clear that all sites have been improved. The smallest improvement has been in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, however, this city had already produced a SUMP before the start of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project and therefore have not realised as large an improvement as in other sites. Other sites even doubled their score. Two sites also have almost achieved a perfect score. This doesn’t mean they have the best city, but they have integrated the different aspects in a good manner. All sites can be very proud of their gained knowledge on the SUMP and on the way they have started to implement the plans to make their Islands better places to live, work and recreate.
2 Introduction

2.1 Objectives of WP2

The CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project has the goal to improve the vitality and liveability of the six demonstration sites. The project consists of cities situated on Islands with a high attraction of tourists, and the sites are therefore specific tourist destinations: Madeira, Limassol in Cyprus, Rethymno in Crete, Elba, Valletta region in Malta, and Las Palmas de Gran Canaria.

Six demonstration sites have been developing a SUMP, or build on an existing SUMP, and submit it for political approval and eventual implementation. SUMPs developed will be considering the needs of both tourists and residents, factoring in the seasonality of mobility demand, economic growth, job creation and environmental sustainability.

2.2 Objectives and target group of this report

In this final deliverable of WP2, the status of the SUMP for all sites is described. All sites have a full SUMP that is already ready for implementation, or partly implemented. This report D2.3 gives an overview of what has been established during the lifetime of the project. A short process evaluation is done to explore the biggest challenges, the major changes and the improvements for the sites.

Special attention is paid to a survey on touristic mobility. During the project, it became clear that it would be interesting to gather more specific mobility data from tourism. Therefore, additional questions were added to already planned surveys in all sites. The outcomes are part of this deliverable.

Finally, all sites have repeated the exercise of filling the SUMP self-assessment tool from ELTIS. This exercise was done earlier in the project, as part of D2.1. The outcomes of each site and the comparisons are part of this deliverable.

2.3 Report outline

In this report all sites report on:
- Consolidation of their respective SUMP;
- The do’s and don’ts and the main challenges and learning points in putting together the SUMP;
- The timing and next steps for the further implementation of the SUMP;
- SUMP self-assessment.
3 SUMP development

The basis for each SUMP is a vision for the city. In this chapter the visions of the different sites are listed as well as the objectives for the SUMP.

3.1 Madeira

3.1.1 Consolidation

(1) Vision and Objectives

The preparation of the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan of the Autonomous Region of Madeira (hereinafter referred to as SUMP ARM) includes Tourism mobility studies and is linked to an existing medium and long-term strategy for the future development of existing transport and mobility infrastructure and services on the island of Madeira and Porto Santo. The main objectives are to improve the accessibility of the entire territory of the Autonomous Region of Madeira towards providing high quality and sustainable mobility and transport to residents and tourists; contributing to the reduction of CO2 emissions associated with the transport and mobility sector; and to improve the quality of the urban environment, job creation and economic growth. In Porto Santo, the main objective is to turn the island into the first ‘smart Fossil Free island’ in the world. French carmaker Renault said it would collaborate with island authorities and grid operator on a project called Sustainable Porto Santo which will include vehicle-to-grid technology. The project challenge is to increase variable renewables on a small island grid.

(2) Process of development of the SUMP

During the development process of the SUMP ARM, the data collection and the involvement of stakeholders are the major steps.

The elaboration of SUMP ARM counted with the collaboration of more than 20 entities, as well as the essential collaboration of all the municipalities, namely the executive bodies and the technical teams who were available to hold various meetings and to provide the necessary data.

Besides the information collected from the stakeholders, it was also implemented questionnaires at the airport and at the port of Funchal, and questionnaires to the hoteliers and to the transport rental services.

(3) Major process changes

The major change is the major package P3 – Promote intermodality between different transport subsystems. The measures of this package are fundamental to improving the public transport service:

- OL 3.1 - Improve the network of bus stops and PT interfaces;
- OL 3.2 - Implement an intermodal tariff;
- OL 3.3 - Implement an integrated ticketing system;
- OL 3.4 - Providing information to the public at PT bus stops.
(4) Experience with stakeholders
The stakeholder engagement occurred through a very interactive process. From all transport, tourism and business sectors, there was a big interest in participating and contribute positively to the plan. However, it was difficult to find a date suitable to meet all the stakeholders together, so small groups were created for discussion and proved to be very efficient.

(5) Biggest wins gained from the process of making the SUMP ARM
The biggest win is the SUMP ARM per se. With this plan, all the stakeholders involved can see their proposals in a concrete action plan. The municipalities of Madeira Region have now a plan to proceed with the implementation and ask for the necessary funding, using the ERDF for example.

(6) What would you do differently if you could do things over?
N/A

(7) Which step was the biggest challenge?
The biggest challenge of the SUMP ARM was to join the information of all municipalities of Madeira in the same plan. There was an initial process to collect data from all sectors and municipalities, and this took a big effort and time.

3.1.2 Roadmap for implementation
The SUMP ARM was officially adopted by the Regional Government of Madeira on 21st June 2019. Only a short time has passed since this approval, so at this stage the municipalities are in the phase of preparing the implementation of the measures of the SUMP ARM.

The CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project measures are also part of the SUMP ARM, which will be evaluated and, according to the evaluation results, the regional team will decide the future activities. The studies and the preparation of the tender process for the new ticketing system was an important result from the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project. Also, the analysis and requirements for a more sustainable public transport fleet, and the test of electrical vehicles, was important.

The implementation of the SUMP ARM depends on the funding available. The SUMP ARM defined the main finance sources to implement the measures package: Regional budget; PO Madeira 14-20 from ERDF; COMPETE 2020, from Portugal 2020; PO SEUR, from Portugal 2020; “Fundo de Eficiência Energética” Energy Efficiency Fund at national level; and other international program funds. Each municipality need to candidate the activities of the plan to these financial programs.

Besides the calendar plan, it is difficult to be completely sure about what will be implemented in the near future. It is planned that 10 years after Madeira will have the following improvements:
Improved transport solutions that promote the region's competitiveness, territorial resilience and the preservation of natural resources;

- Promoting low carbon transport solutions through the use of the most energy efficient and environmentally friendly technologies;
- Reduced CO2 emissions associated with the transport and urban mobility sector;
- Improved quality of the urban environment;
- Increased use of the public transport system;
- Implemented new mobility services, such as car sharing;
- More inclusive mobility, focusing on solutions that favour access to the most vulnerable groups in the system (universal accessibility), and suitable conditions for soft modes (pedestrian and cycling);
- Provision of economically and environmentally sustainable transport options for tourists, while minimizing the negative impact of such mobility by making it compatible with residents' mobility.

Specifically dedicated to tourists, the following improvements are expected:

- Create parking lots for tourist buses, with better use of space;
- Create public transportation circuits for tourists;
- Provide interfaces and public transport stops with information in English;
- Distribute flyers for tourists who purchase transportation tickets, indicating routes, times and descriptions and promotion of the main points of tourist interest;
- Improve some “levadas”;
- Develop and disseminate pedestrian maps;
- Publish an Accessible Tourism Guide;
- Improve the conditions of pedestrian access to the port of Funchal;
- Provide better information at airport and port terminals.

The involvement of the stakeholders continued with regional activities, and with the meetings of the Interreg Europe project DESTI-SMART. During the meeting of January 2021, it was discussed the situation of the SUMP ARM implementation. The plan was well accepted by the municipalities and they are analysing how to implement it, considering their current situation. Some municipalities demonstrated that are not fully aware about the application process to candidate the activities of the plan to the financial programs, as it is complex. The Municipality of Funchal and the Institute for Regional Development explained the process.

### 3.1.3 SUMP self-assessment

All sites have performed a SUMP self-assessment at the beginning of the realisation of the SUMP in 2017 and in January 2020 at the end of the realisation of the SUMP. The SUMP self-assessment is a tool based on 100 questions regarding the SUMP. The questions relate to different aspects of the SUMP. Figure 2 shows the differences between the different self-assessments for six important aspects. Madeira has been improved within the process of the development of the SUMP. They score the highest points on almost all criteria. The biggest gains are on the Participatory approach and on the cost-benefit analysis.
3.2 Limassol

3.2.1 Consolidation

(1) Vision and Objectives
The vision for Limassol is to create a more sustainable, safer and greener city where both tourists and locals can enjoy visiting or living. At the moment, the city is suffering from traffic congestion, bad air quality and noise pollution, traffic accidents and very minimal use of sustainable transport modes such as public transport, electric vehicles, bicycles or walking. The long-term plan is to increase the use of sustainable transport modes, to create a city with less traffic, fewer accidents and cleaner air quality. It will be a city that will attract visitors and promote a new way of living through sustainability. This goal is also shared by the relevant stakeholders such as the Limassol Tourism Company, Limassol Municipality and the Ministry of Transport, Communication and Works, Department of Public Works.

The purpose of the study is to enhance common understanding and commitment about Sustainable Tourism and demonstrate how it is a vehicle to foster economic and social growth, through the achievement of development imperatives, while minimizing negative social, cultural and environmental impacts. More specifically, the aim of the Sustainable Mobility Tourist Action Plan (SMTAP) for Limassol is to meet the mobility needs of tourists and citizens for a better quality of life. A new design philosophy will be able to cope with the challenges and problems of the transport-related urban areas in a more sustainable and integrated way.

This plan will focus on the needs of tourists for a sustainable and better quality of life in Limassol. This action will evolve this area into a more attractive destination for tourists. Tourists will enjoy their holidays and use sustainable modes of transport in an environment with less noise, fewer carbon dioxide emissions, free space for walking or cycling, less congestion and a healthier and safer environment.
(2) Process for the development of the SMTAP

- A Stakeholder and Citizen Involvement Plan

The development of the stakeholder and citizen involvement plan consisted of a number of tasks, starting with the identification of specific target groups where 21 members were identified. Meetings were organized with key stakeholders including Limassol Municipality, Department of Public Works and shopkeepers of Anexartisias Street, St. Andrew Street and Gladstonos / Navarinou Streets. In general, it was easy to find the key stakeholders for the initial steps of the plan as they showed their willingness to help with the development of the plan, understanding the benefits that the plan and its content will bring to their lives.

- Data Gathering and Collection

Data were gathered including collection of questionnaires, evaluation data about the sociodemographic and economic development, an inventory on current transport systems, walking network, cycling network, public transport network and supply, road network for motorized transport as well as data on traffic safety, freight and logistics and tourism. The collection of the data was a challenging task as it was necessary to undertake field work as well as to gather specific information from relevant key stakeholders.

- Touristic Data Collection and Analysis

Touristic data were collected during 2018 and 2019 in Limassol where tourists have responded to questions regarding the means of their transportation within the city and shared their suggestions for the mobility situation of Limassol. The analysis of questionnaires and their results will be included in the final SMTAP report. The collection and analysis of questionnaires was an easy process since tourists showed their willingness to help with the collection of the data.

(3) Major process changes

Through the development of the SMTAP the below measure packages have been selected in order to reach the vision and objectives of the plan:

- Promote Sustainable and Green Mobility
- Improvement of the Public Transport
- Measures for the Urban Centre
- Parking management measures
- Improve Traffic Policy

The measure packages aim to have specific actions where all emission pollutants and noise levels in urban roads will be significantly decreased, and the share for non-motorized use of public urban space will be increased, resulting in a reduction of the negative impacts on safety and the number and severity of accidents as well as the increased walkability of the city.

(4) Experience with stakeholders

A list of stakeholders has been identified and developed. There has been a very good and well-organized collaboration between stakeholders throughout the project lifetime for better and more efficient results of the plan. Several meetings were held with key stakeholders where...
with the opportunity to exchange experiences and knowledge regarding the progress of the plan, its ambitions, priorities, challenges and next steps.

(5) Biggest wins gained from the process of making a SMTAP

Through the development of the plan, several actions will be implemented in Limassol, accomplishing the objectives of the plan. These actions aim to promote green mobility and introduce eco-friendly vehicles in the city, and improve the public transport system (including PT routes, timetables, traveller information and ticket procedure). Moreover, the plan includes actions which aim to manage freight transportation for more efficient distribution of goods and to reduce unnecessary traffic congestion in the city centre, provide traffic information and free parking places guidance to car drivers approaching the centre and also to create a safer and a more secure environment for people with disabilities.

(6) What would you do differently if you could do things over?

N/A

(7) Which step was the biggest challenge?

The biggest challenge through the development of the plan was the difficulty to change the mentality of citizens (behavioural change), to convince them about its positive effects in order to make the acceptance of the changes that will be implemented in Limassol city centre with the development of the SMTAP easier.

3.2.2 Roadmap for implementation

The SMTAP is in the final stage of its development. Measures which are part of the plan are in their operation stage. Additional data gathered from tourism questionnaires will be included in the final report indicating the most frequently used mode of transportation around the city centre, as well as their satisfaction with the transport system and several mobility applications available in the region.

After the implementation of measures there will be a follow-up of activities carried out in Limassol within the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS Project, in order to ensure that all Limassol measures are properly implemented and are functional. There will be also campaigns and networking events in order to raise the awareness of people regarding the sustainable mobility in our city. More specifically, actions will be taken into account for each measure package.

Regarding the promotion of Sustainable and Green Mobility there will be regular meetings and networking activities with representatives of Bike Sharing Combine, NextBike Cy in order to promote cycling as well as e-bikes. Regarding the improvement of Public Transport, there will be regular meetings with representatives of the Ministry of Transport, Communication and Works in order to ensure that bike racks on buses are in good condition, as well as electronic signs on bus stops are properly working. Moreover, there will be regular checks regarding vehicle restrictions and time regulations in order to control freight transportation as well as private road vehicles. There will be also a follow-up regarding the Parking Management...
measures and Traffic Policies where sensors, electronic devices as well as crossing controllers on traffic lights and wheelchairs for people with disabilities will be regularly checked to ensure that they are properly working after the completion of the project.

The impact of the SMTAP in the near future on the basis of the measure packages:

- **Promote Sustainable and Green Mobility:**

  There is a need to increase the cycling activity in Limassol since the bicycle is a convenient mode of transportation. The objective of the cycling measures concept is to provide a framework for the promotion of everyday, as well as recreational / tourist cycling, increasing the importance as well as the modal share of cycling activity of citizens and tourists of Limassol.

  The plan will include Intelligent Transport Systems which will cover the Limassol area for a more convenient transportation system, including the ‘Bus Travellers’ Information System’, the ‘Bus Ticketing System’ and the ‘Bus Fleet Management System’.

- **Improvement of the Public Transport:**

  The general accessibility of public transport infrastructure in Limassol is very good in central areas and adequate in remote areas. Currently only six lines operate according to a timetable at all, offering a frequency of two bus services per hour or more at least in the afternoon peak hours. All other bus lines do not have regular headways. Beyond the central area, the public transport supply is irregular, incomprehensible and in consequence not attractive for potential users compared to the private car. The main objectives of the development of the proposed public transport system is to establish a reliable, convenient and fast alternative to private motorized transport, enhancing the connectivity between areas within the centres of Limassol.

- **Measures for the Urban Centre:**

  Limassol city centre is a place of great concentration of both social and economic activities with logistics being of highest importance for the sustainability and the economy of the city. Therefore, a number of actions should be considered in order to optimize city logistics, preserve the environment and increase the attractiveness of Limassol. The SULP (Sustainable Urban Logistics Plan) aims to reduce negative impacts of freight traffic, including traffic congestion in the city centre as well as noise and pollutant emissions. Furthermore, in order to reduce traffic volumes, it is essential to ensure that unavoidable trips are as short and direct as possible. Another key measure is to reduce the number of trips and therefore vehicles to consolidate the deliveries. There are a number of concepts also referred to as Central goods sorting point, Urban transhipment centre, Urban Consolidation or Distribution Centre. As a result, the number of vehicle trips and delivery time should be reduced.

- **Parking management measures:**

  Parking supply is, in general terms, the trigger for a driver to make his final decision on how long and how close their car is parked in relation to their final destination. Therefore, alternative routes using public transport, walking and cycling have to be considered. Taking into account the strong car dependency of Cyprus, this task is obviously not an easy one and has to be gradually implemented and well-defined. Although safety and security for any large city is obviously very important, it is not directly tackled by interventions related to mobility aspects of our daily life. To this end, the plan suggests an integrated parking policy structure with separate divisions for residential parking permit administration and on street design and enforcement. Consequently, the use of Intelligent Transport Systems will allow efficient
enforcement through sensors, minimizing the time allocated to patrolling to the benefit of their other duties (public order, access control to pedestrian ways, noise levels, health and safety regulations in restaurants). In addition, a parking deficit does not necessarily mean that policy measures should satisfy the remaining parking demand, because this consideration is not in line with the sustainability objectives of a smart modern city that is prepared to address the future mobility challenges in the most environmental, social and economic way. However, due to the loss of on-street car parks as a result of pedestrianisation and the probable loss of private off-street car park areas in the city centre as a result of new building activity, some flexibility could be given to replace this probable loss of private off-street parking spaces outside the pedestrianized area. This action is in line with the feedback received from shop owners as well as from the mayor of Limassol regarding the possibility to include these parking areas outside the pedestrianized areas.

- Improve Traffic Policy:

The traffic policy as part of the plan aims to mitigate the risks for all road users. Therefore, road safety measures are chosen to reduce the number of accidents as well as the number of injuries on the roads of Limassol district. The goal is to create safe infrastructure for all road users, and more precisely to improve the situation for pedestrians and cyclists. A safe road network which considers the needs of all road users and furthers non-motorized and public modes of transport is required to enable the mobility of all generations, especially younger ones. Moreover, regarding people with disabilities to be able to move freely and self-determined, all efforts and measures undertaken in enhancing public transport, pedestrianisation, parking, traffic and road safety are necessary. Therefore, it is required to develop a public transport system both in time and in space. Furthermore, it is mandatory to have coherent access to, in and from the public transport.

### 3.2.3 SUMP self-assessment

All sites have performed a SUMP self-assessment at the beginning of the realisation of the SUMP in 2017 and in January 2020 at the end of the realisation of the SUMP. The SUMP self-assessment is a tool based on 100 questions regarding the SUMP. The questions are related to different aspects of the SUMP.

Figure 3 shows the differences between the different self-assessments for the six important aspects. Limassol scored much better on almost all aspects in the self-assessment of 2020. Much effort and a better score is realised in the Participatory approach and the sectoral and spatial integration.
3.3 Rethymno

3.3.1 Consolidation

(1) Vision and Objectives

Rethymno is an inclusive, resilient, accessible, smart and polycentric city region defined by strong networks of small to medium-sized neighbouring settlements that crucially impact on daily mobility patterns. The significant influx of tourists during the summer months, reaching an 8-fold uptake compared to Rethymno’s permanent population, introduces new travel needs which, due to the inefficient mobility management, further downgrades its urban environment and calls for specific measures to address this seasonal transport problem.

Rethymno’s new vision builds on the existing SUMP, while developing its scope and objectives under CIVITAS DESTINATIONS’ shared vision and strategic goals (improve overall urban accessibility; reduce emissions/ increase air quality; reduce energy consumption; enhance social cohesion; and improve cost effectiveness and integration of transport and mobility services).

Rethymno’s SUMP adopts an integrated approach to face the rising challenges of both growing sectors – mobility and tourism – by introducing sustainable, affordable, smart and reliable mobility solutions. This SUMP demonstrates complementary mobility solutions combining emerging technologies, policy-based and soft measures with a strong replication potential, aiming to improve the city’s image to citizens and tourists alike. It aims to serve as a lighthouse example to other Greek tourist cities as best practice for sustainable mobility solutions.

The SUMP Strategy deals with specific challenges in terms of upgrading the existing transport system, improving the urban environment and achieving behavioural change.

According to the “SUMP Baseline report” (D2.1), the macro-objectives of Rethymno’s SUMP are to:

- improve the quality of life for residents;
• enhance tourists’ travel experience;
• enhance the area’s image as an attractive tourism destination; while
• stimulating economic growth and
• stimulating social development.

According to the vision for the city of Rethymno, the following goals and objectives are set:

**Strategic Goal 1: Inclusive city for all**
- Improvement of city’s accessibility and
- Improvement of citizens’ social inclusion

**Strategic Goal 2: Equity in transport**
- Increase cycling, walking and use of PT,
- Increase the quality of transport service,
- Strengthen the behavioural change towards more sustainable, car-free transport modes
- Increase the cost-effectiveness of the transport service

Sub-objectives: reduce car dependency; increase the efficiency, attractiveness, and accessibility of public transport; offer and optimise alternative transport options in the entire city; increase traffic safety; improve disabled accessibility in transport modes; reduce transport costs for access and mobility; minimize infrastructure costs; increase the capacity of regional urban planners and PT operators; introduce a sharing mobility culture; and manage mobility demand at tourist destinations through sustainable solutions.

**Strategic Goal 3: Clean city – towards zero emissions transport**
- Reduce fuel consumption, GHG emissions, traffic congestion and noise

Sub-objectives: cleaner public transport; enhance shared mobility; reinforce smart and clean urban freight logistics at tourist destinations; preserve the natural environment; maintain human health and safety; boost the uptake of electric vehicles for public transport; and enhance e-mobility.

### 3.3.2 Roadmap for implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package of measures</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Measure leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Package 1 – Smart Mobility Management</td>
<td>Rethymno Municipality + Private stakeholders (Taxi Union + Car Rental Companies)</td>
<td>706.918€</td>
<td>Rethymno Municipality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Specific objectives, responsibility and investment involved in Rethymno*
The timeplan (Figure 4) remains as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Package</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Package 1 - Smart Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Smart systems for urban planners, PT operators and users (RET 2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building a sharing mobility culture (RET 4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable mobility agency for tourists/visitors (RET 6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low emission zones study (RET 6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green mobility card (RET 6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free floating sharing System of 300 electric bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package 2 - Inclusive City for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>Active healthy and inclusive mobility for all (RET 3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility plan for schools/ university's communities (RET 3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sea-track for disabled at 2 seaside areas in the city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4:** Time plan per specific objective and orientation line of Rethymno

Rethymno’s SUMP is ready to be implemented and adopted by the local Government and based on the time plan, the implementation of the full SUMP will have been completed by the end of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project.

The Municipality of Rethymno, by using the knowledge and the experience of measure leaders, is responsible for monitoring SUMP/measure packages progress and evaluating results. To this direction, the CIVITAS indicators used and the additional ones proposed (or to be selected), need to be updated. Via the comparison with existing measurements, the differences will be revealed (significant progress, no progress, satisfying progress, etc.).

The proposed schedule for updating these indicators via new measurements, researches and future use of adequate ICT tools – if possible – is every 2 years for the first decade (from 2020 to 2030) after the project’s end and every 5 years after that. In this way, Rethymno can be focused on achieving the goals set, make its objectives real in everyday life and bring the change needed for the city. This can be described as follows:

Updates can be done – according to city needs – also during the summer/touristic period in order to clear out city’s needs, in service of this important economic and mobility-demanding period of the year.

### 3.3.3 SUMP self-assessment

All sites have performed a SUMP self-assessment at the beginning of the realisation of the SUMP in 2017 and in January 2020 at the end of the realisation of the SUMP. The SUMP self-assessment is a tool based on 100 questions regarding the SUMP. The questions relate to different aspects of the SUMP.
Figure 5 shows the differences between the different self-assessments for six important aspects.

Rethymno has scored much better on all aspects in the self-assessment of 2020. Much effort and a better score is realised for points 3, 4 and 5, with exceptional wins on the integration and the cost-benefit analysis.

### 3.4 Elba

#### 3.4.1 Consolidation

A draft of the SUMP for the Island of Elba has been developed within the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project in 2018. Prior to the preparation of it, a detailed data collection was launched into local mobility and tourism and a good consultation process, involving local stakeholders, citizens and public decision-makers.

In absence of a proper tool for mobility long-term planning in the Island of Elba, it can be said that the SUMP elaborated in the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project has offered to the territory a valuable opportunity to launch a process aimed to define future strategies and identify needs and possible operational measures.

The draft of the SUMP currently contains a first overview of the demographic and socio-economic situation referring to the whole island of Elba, and a description of how mobility is actually organized, both the incoming/outgoing and within the island. The document then continues with a brief examination of different modes of transport on the Island, including useful comments on future planning; it also contains hypotheses for future implementations of some mobility services.

**(1) Vision and objectives**

A strategic vision of future mobility on the Island has been collectively defined during meetings and laboratories held in Portoferaio and Rio, involving citizens, relevant stakeholders and public decision-makers as part of the consultation and participation process.
As an island with a strong touristic vocation, during the meetings much attention was paid to inconveniences and solutions related to the high season. Participants agreed that the reduction of traffic congestion in summer and the de-seasoning (more guests throughout the year) could be desirable scenarios for the future.

In general, sustainability was considered as a key aspect for local economy and environment, as well as for quality of life on the island, both for tourists and residents, and second-home owners too. Despite the different needs related to each mentioned target, sustainable mobility and, above all, collective transport services, resulted to be a good solution to many problems of accessibility, traffic and pollution. Indeed, one of the most relevant future objectives is the improvement of public transport service, which should be:

- More accessible (availability of infrastructure and mobility services);
- More convenient (costs per user) and competitive (compared to the solutions available in other places where you can choose to live or stay for tourism);
- More pleasant (comfortable), simple (through exhaustive information, signalling, information about mobility), fluid (avoiding congestion) and safe (punctuality and low risk of accidents);
- Not polluting and harmful to health (presence of clean vehicles), and, over a longer perspective, no longer based on conventional fossil fuels.

As mentioned above, in the future, mobility on the island should be better suited to pursuing objectives of expanding the tourist season and improving the liveability of the territory for all targets, reducing road congestion and decreasing the number of private cars circulating.

In this regard, key objectives to be pursued in the future can be specified, such as the implementation of public transport services, the provision of integrated transport information (info-mobility) and enhancing electric mobility and bike mobility.

Specifically, the draft of SUMP developed within the CIVITAS DESTINATION project indicates three main hypotheses of intervention, to be better detailed and developed by local and regional key-stakeholders and public decision-makers:

- A re-organization of the public transport service during the summer season, with an improvement proposal of the extra-urban service integrated with other local transport services. This new proposal has been developed thanks to the cooperation of the local transport operators and already informally delivered to the representatives of the Province of Livorno – Observatory of Mobility.
- The activation of a local permanent service in order to cover some strategic functionalities such as design, mobility observatory, and networking among operators for info-mobility. This proposal is mainly related to the Shared Elba Mobility Agency developed within CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project.
- The proposal to implement bike mobility, taking part in the Ciclovia Tirrenica regional project.

(2) Process of development of the SUMP

The working group involved in the SUMP drafting for the Island of Elba has worked both on the consultation process and in the collection and analysis of data on mobility, as well as in the identification of desirable future strategies and actions.

First, a phase of knowledge improvement was carried out, which included the meticulous data-collection on socio-economic issues, tourism and mobility. An articulated archive was made, containing data from the National Statistics Institute, local public transport operators (bus and
ferries), Province of Livorno, the seven Municipalities, Traffic Police, Port Authority, etc. In addition, a survey on tourism mobility has been prepared and made in order to better understand strengths and weakness on the issue.

At the same time, the staff involved in the SUMP drafting measure were committed to the mapping and involvement of local stakeholders: a detailed mailing list has been developed for this purpose, including politicians and public decision makers, relevant stakeholders, local NGOs and a number of active citizens.

(3) Major process changes

A structured dialogue with stakeholders has been developed; thee main meetings have been managed in order to collect ideas and opinions about mobility and elaborate on a common vision for future mobility on the Island of Elba and a shared agenda of changes (Figure 6). In detail:

- 27 February 2017: launch of the Laboratory process; meeting with active citizens in order to discuss the goal and the process itself (Laboratori Elba Condivisa);
- 27 March 2017: second meeting aimed at defining the current situation about mobility and the main important themes of interest (Laboratori Elba Condivisa);
- 10-11 May 2017: “Future Lab” (Laboratorio Del Futuro): meeting and laboratory session involving active citizens, relevant stakeholders, politicians and public decision-makers aimed to discuss and identify the future vision and a strategy for the implementation of mobility in the territory.

A phase of gestation of the draft plan followed, with the co-planning of the interventions involving the actors more directly interested in their realization.

---

1 The 4 main steps includes : Step 1: Mapping and Involvement (in Italian: Mappatura & Coinvolgimento); Step 2: Dialogue (Dialogo), Step 3: Co-design (Co-progettazione), Step 4: Co-Production (Co-Produzione)
(4) Experience with stakeholders

The stakeholders’ engagement process carried out for the drafting of the SUMP was very useful and satisfactory. Three main moments of involvement and discussion were organized.

In the first two meetings, participants discussed priority objectives and actions to be taken – general and specific – in order to improve the sustainable mobility on the Island. The current situation and the prospect of future transformation in the short, medium and long term were outlined. In this way, priority objectives and main areas of intervention have been defined.

The third meeting was called “Future Lab”, a two-day workshop aimed at outlining the agenda for the future of mobility on the island of Elba. The Laboratory of the Future was held in May 2017 and involved active citizens, relevant stakeholders and public decision-makers.

Until now, the SUMP has contributed to the vibrancy of the public discussion on mobility issues among the local community. In addition, it represented a valid opportunity for public and private bodies and citizens to meet each other and to jointly reflect on future perspectives of transport issues for residents and tourists.

The involvement of public and private bodies for several meetings already represented an important challenge for the context of Elba, given the administrative and political fragmentation of the island. For this reason, the municipalities of Portoferraio and Rio are really satisfied with this first result achieved.

(5) Biggest wins gained from the process of making the SUMP

The involvement of the territory in a deliberative and participatory process was certainly one of the main wins obtained by the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS staff. Active citizens, relevant stakeholders and public decision-makers have worked effectively and jointly identified future strategies.

In addition, the SUMP was an opportunity to make an archive of data on mobility: a virtual “Dropbox” archive currently contains biographical data on the Elban population, statistics on tourism, files reporting the number and location of the hotspots of the island, data on arrivals and departures, etc. This knowledge base, managed by the staff of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project in the two municipalities of Portoferraio and Rio, certainly represents a useful tool for understanding the local context, and also for planning purposes.

To increase the level of knowledge of the context, 2 surveys were conducted between 2018 and 2019, focused mainly towards tourists. In addition, another survey on mobility was launched with the support of local transport companies. These surveys are important because they directly collect people’s opinions on mobility on the island and their travel habits.

(6) What would you do differently if you could do things over?

N/A

(7) Which step was the biggest challenge?

The development process of the SUMP is planned to be carried out in the coming months and years by integrating technical and political actions. On the one hand, other contents could enrich the draft of the SUMP considering new studies and demonstration actions, which in the
meantime have been made within the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project. On the other hand, new political level meetings will be envisaged to confirm the future strategies outlined in the SUMP and to reach a real formal adoption by the Municipalities of Elba. In fact, after the renewal of many political administrations on the Island of Elba, is it now possible to involve them in the new development of the SUMP.

In sum, the biggest challenges to be faced are to ensure the political commitment among the 7 Municipalities of the Island to jointly pursue the development, and implementation of the SUMP defined in the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project.

A possible inspiration to tackle this challenge came after participation in the Work Placement in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (11-13 December 2019) by two representatives of the Municipality of Portoferraio, who learnt good SUMP development practices implemented by the Spanish partners. In particular, it was learnt that the political stakeholders involved in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria first signed an act by which they agreed on some general issues and then agreed with the intention to proceed with the development of a joint strategic document on mobility.

3.4.2 Roadmap for implementation

In line with the identified objectives already described, some concrete measures have been considered crucial for the local territory, defining 5 main measure packages, such as:

- Improvement of the public transport service and making it more efficient;
- Activation of additional seasonal services for tourists;
- Improvement of e-mobility;
- Improvement of bike mobility;
- Providing an informative and monitoring tool (Elba Shared Mobility Agency).

With reference to the time plan, the actions related to the implementation of public transport are proceeding successfully as planned. In addition to various interventions in the area to increase travel comfort and service functionality, supplementary public transport services have been launched in the two municipalities of Portoferraio and Rio during the summer period.

Concerning electric mobility, the project envisaged the installation of 2 charging stations in Portoferraio and 1 in Rio, but thanks to an agreement with Enel-X, the National Board for Electricity, up to 15 charging stations will be installed in Portoferraio and 6 in Rio. The location of future recharging stations has been defined taking into account the content of the draft SUMP. For instance, specific indications were given to the National Board for Energy, Enel-X, to develop designs of installation, in accordance with the objectives of the SUMP.

Bike mobility has been promoted through the ELB6.1 measure of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project, related to integrated packages “mobility+tourism”. The two municipalities of Portoferraio and Rio supported hoteliers in the long-term rental of 40 e-bikes for two years. The measure has been successfully developed. In addition, the island of Elba has been included in the “Ciclovia Tirrenica”, a regional project aimed at implementing a long bike lane along the coastline of the Tirrenian Sea.

Another requirement that emerged from the preliminary phase of the SUMP draft is to provide an integrated info-mobility system, particularly dedicated to tourists. For the next high season, the Shared Elba Mobility Agency, developed within the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project
(measures ELB4.1, ELB4.2, ELB4.3 and ELB4.4), will be available for tourists; it will provide integrated information on mobility and connect people for enabling shared trips.

3.4.3 SUMP self-assessment

All sites have performed a SUMP self-assessment at the beginning of the realisation of the SUMP in 2017 and in January 2020 at the end of the realisation of the SUMP. The SUMP self-assessment is a tool based on 100 questions regarding the SUMP. The questions relate to different aspects of the SUMP.

Figure 7 shows the differences between the different self-assessments for six important aspects.

When the self-assessment questionnaire was first elaborated, the draft of the SUMP had not been developed yet, although some stages of the process had already started. The second questionnaire was completed after the draft SUMP was developed (2020).

Since the Elba SUMP is still in draft form and does not constitute a real plan, the score obtained with the self-assessment cannot be very high. However, compared to the first questionnaire compilation, dating back to 2017, the score has now doubled; a 2017 score of 24 out of 100, compared to 48 in 2020.

The overall scores are revealed in the figure below, with a clear difference between the assessment in 2017 and 2020.

---

3.5 Malta

3.5.1 Consolidation

(1) Vision and objectives

Malta, including the Valletta region, are suffering from traffic congestion, noise and air pollution where the main modality used is the private car. Due to the great number of cars, the pressure on the infrastructure is increasing heavily, roads are overcrowded, and parking is a huge
Parking policies are ad hoc and leading to an overspill of parking. The growth in the number of tourists to Malta and Valletta is exacerbating such problems.

The long-term plan is to improve the quality of life (health and environment) for residents and commuters to the area, and to make the region more attractive to tourists via better planning and providing a mixture of sustainable transport solutions.

The vision for Malta and especially for the Valletta region is to provide a sustainable transport system which is efficient, inclusive, safe, integrated and reliable for people and freight, and which supports attractive urban, rural and coastal environments and communities where people want to live and work: now and in the future.

During the discussions with municipalities and other stakeholders, this objective is fine-tuned to the following comprehensive vision: “A better quality of life for residents and tourists. From a mobility perspective!”

An operationalisation of this vision led to 4 clear objectives:

- Getting to your job on time
- Valletta is an attractive place to live in
- Valletta is an economically viable place to start/maintain your business
- It is a safe place to get around

Target groups that are addressed:

- Residents and employees that work in the Valletta region;
- Residents that live in the Valletta region and tourists that visit the Island;
- Businesses, shops, restaurants and hotels that rely on customers in the Valletta region;
- Families, residents, and tourists that live and stay in the Valletta region.

The SUMP for the Valletta Region will test and propose a number of initiatives which are not only innovative for the region, but also as yet untested at a national level. The aim is to create a shift in the modal share towards cleaner, more sustainable modes of transport and hence improving the air quality in this highly congested area.

The objective of the SUMP is, in general, to reduce the role of the private car, especially in vulnerable parts of the Valletta region (UN heritage). The SUMP also aims to improve the quality of life; to improve intermodal seamless mobility; to have better transport planning at the local level; and to include sustainable logistics into the plans.

(2) Process of development of the SUMP

The Valletta region consists of over 30 municipalities, many of which are small, and all have their own policy framework, goals and visions. The overall vision in the field of transport is under the responsibility of Transport Malta and the Ministry of Transport of Malta. The making of a SUMP is very new for Malta and especially for the different local authorities.

A very good approach within the SUMP, and new for Malta, is the engagement of stakeholders within the process of making a transport policy. The different stakeholders’ meetings proved to be a great success. The specific target groups had the possibility and opportunity to engage within the meeting and they all were informed about the SUMP. During the different parallel sessions, stakeholder groups had the possibility to discuss their specific topic or concerns: e.g.
logistics, parking, accessibility, modalities, traffic safety. The outcomes of the meeting are considered during the next steps of compiling the SUMP.

Following these stakeholder meetings, special workshops and interviews were organised to discuss the local issues with the different local authorities (Local Councils). This has led to a variety of topics and issues that are of interest at the local level. When the measure packages were assembled these aspects were incorporated in the plans.

The implementation of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS measures gave the opportunity to show that a SUMP is not just a policy plan for long term development, but that actual things are produced and put into action. A good example is the SULP, which is a co-operation between TM, the local authorities and stakeholders like shops, hotels and restaurants. Another example is the promotion of sustainable transport modes to tourists, where in cooperation with different stakeholders, effective communication has been started with this target group.

(3) Major process changes

The SUMP has introduced integrated planning in Malta. To have incorporated different topics within a measure package to create an effective plan, that has real impact. Projects and measures are introduced in a less ad hoc style and integrated within a bigger scheme. Stakeholders are brought together, and a broad acceptance is created before the real implementation of the plans or measures.

(4) Experience with stakeholders

The special attention to different stakeholders has led to a more integrated way of introducing and implementing plans. Bringing together the stakeholders and discussing each other’s point of view and goals has improved the balance between different topics and measures. The SUMP has proven to be a good start for these kinds of activities. The time invested in this has proven to be worthwhile. Over 80 different stakeholders have been identified and incorporated in the process. The exchange of experience and knowledge on the SUMP and the different target areas was appreciated widely.

(5) Biggest wins gained from the process of making the SUMP

The SUMP process and implementation of the sustainable measures has shown that good alternatives for a car-oriented society exist and can make the difference for the future. The SUMP process also showed that a balanced mixture of measures is needed. You need measures that attract people to new more sustainable modes, and on the other hand you need push measures that are of discomfort to the car-users. The pedestrian area within the city centre of Valletta is a good example, where cars are banned, and the area is more attractive for residents and tourists.

(6) What would you do differently if you could do things over?

The SUMP is a time-consuming and complex process. It is not easy to pinpoint things that should have be done differently. Most crucial is the timing and keeping the time schedule.
Timing could have been done more accurately. On the other hand, sometimes, you need more time for the process.

(7) Which step was the biggest challenge?

Malta has faced different challenges. At first the Maltese are in love with their car. The car is by far the most favourite method of transportation. Changing this behaviour is a mega challenge that has started during the SUMP, but it will take years for real changes. The other big challenge was the co-operation between different levels of authorities and the co-operation with many local authorities. Each authority has its own problems, challenges and this makes the realisation of a SUMP an even bigger challenge.

3.5.2 Roadmap for implementation

The SUMP has been slightly delayed because of governmental changes. The final Stakeholder meeting in which the draft SUMP will be discussed is postponed from January until the end of March or beginning of April because of this.

This has an impact on the implementation of the different measure packages; most measures will be implemented some months later than originally planned.

The timing of the packages is to start with the implementation of the first measures in late spring 2020. Based on the allocated budget, the real implementation will start sooner or later. In the scheme given below is an indication of the duration of the different packages. The measures that are part of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project will all be implemented before the end of 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package of measures</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localization and implementation of local transport hubs.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car sharing and On Demand transport services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Emission zone</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Logistics – SULP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8:** Time plan per measure package, Malta

The financial plan is based on national plans for Malta:

- National Transport Strategy 2050;
- National Transport Master Plan 2025;
- SMITHS Implementation Plan;
- CIVITAS DESTINATIONS grant agreement;
- National cycling strategy and action plan.

Within the different schemes and plan, budget is allocated for certain measures within the shown packages.
### 3.5.3 SUMP self-assessment

All sites have performed a SUMP self-assessment at the beginning of the realisation of the SUMP in 2017 and in January 2020 at the end of the realisation of the SUMP. The SUMP self-assessment is a tool based on 100 questions regarding the SUMP. The questions relate to different aspects of the SUMP.

Figure 9 shows the differences between the different self-assessments for six important aspects.

![Figure 9: SUMP Characteristic Valletta](image)

In the figure above, the score of Valletta for the SUMP self-assessment is revealed. Next to the score of Valletta, the maximum score and the benchmark are shown. The biggest win is on the monitoring, plan revision and reporting.

### 3.6 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

#### 3.6.1 Consolidation

As explained in previous deliverables, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria has a SUMP in place (2012). During the SUMP drafting process (2012), city planners (Municipality of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria) and representatives of the key local stakeholders (Guaguas Municipales, Sagulpa, etc.) came up with a clear vision, objectives and targets of sustainable mobility in the city.

The CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project has been an opportunity to update that plan and to adapt it to the new challenges of the city, including issues like tourists’ mobility and freight.

(1) **Vision and objectives**

Las Palmas de Gran Canaria is looking forward to promoting sustainable mobility to citizens and visitors by offering them alternatives to private cars. One of the most important challenges
nowadays is to remove the private car from the main streets and return that space to the citizens and visitors to enable them to enjoy a friendlier and healthier city.

In that sense, the improvement of the public transport network is seen as the backbone of the whole sustainable mobility policy in the city. By improving this, the city will be able to implement other sustainable mobility measures such as traffic restrictions, parking management or sharing systems that would foster a modal shift amongst citizens and visitors.

The updating of the current SUMP that is being done thanks to CIVITAS DESTINATIONS is aligned with the approach and overall objectives of that plan. As agreed by all stakeholders involved in the drafting process, the SUMP objectives strengthen a territorial balance between the transport system and environmental, energetic and social issues.

Therefore, the strategic objectives of the SUMP are the following:

▪ Promotion of sustainable mobility among citizens and visitors;
▪ Increase private transport effectiveness by reducing traffic congestion and solving traffic problems;
▪ Efficient and coordinated use of sustainable transport modes (walking, cycling and public transport).

During the implementation and operational stage of the former SUMP (between 2012 and 2016), all stakeholders involved identified the need for strengthening leadership in order to speed up the decision-making process, and enhance the cooperation between all stakeholders involved and the evaluation and monitoring activities.

Therefore, it was agreed to set up a Mobility Office to be in charge of coordinating, monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the SUMP objectives and measures. The CIVITAS DESTINATIONS funding gave the opportunity build up that Mobility Office with the following roles:

▪ To coordinate the update of the former SUMP during the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project lifetime and beyond;
▪ To monitor and evaluate the implementation of all measures to support sustainable mobility in the city:
  - Packages of measures already included in the Action Plan of the former SUMP (2012);
  - Measures included in the Implementation Plan of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project (WP2);
▪ To build up a common framework for mobility data collection for all target groups (citizens, tourists, etc.) and transport modes (walking, cycling, public transport, private car, etc.);
▪ To foster a better integration of all kinds of urban mobility purposes (commuting, other work, education, shopping and personal business, leisure, other including escort, etc.) into the policy making process;
▪ To set up a collaboration and cooperation framework with the tourism sector;
▪ To support the Municipality in all communication and participatory activities regarding sustainable mobility.

(2) Process of development of the SUMP

The process of preparing and implementing the new SUMP of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria has been inspired by the guidelines for developing and implementing a Sustainable Urban
Mobility Plan of the European Commission (ELTIS, https://www.eltis.org/mobility-plans/section-2-developing-and-implementing-sustainable-urban-mobility-plan) (Figure 10):

**Figure 10**: Process of preparing and implementing a SUMP

**Phase 0**: To assess the former SUMP (2012):
- To evaluate capacities and resources in order to ensure political and institutional ownership.
- Up-to-date and real implementation of the packages of measures of the former SUMP.

**Phase 1**: To set up the working structures:
- To agree a timeline and a work plan.
- To set up a wide range of working groups.

**Phase 2**: To analyse the current mobility situation (general overview):
- To identify information and data sources.
- To define a cooperation framework with data owners.
- To update the strategic objectives of the plan.

**Phase 3**: To analyse the current mobility situation (detailed assessment):
- Geographical scope of the plan.
- Data collection campaign.
- Socio-economy and demography.
- Urban planning.
- Modelling.
- Environment and energy.

**Phase 4**: Strategy development:
- Develop scenarios for potential futures.
- Agree a common vision.
- Specific objectives.
Identify indicators for all objectives.
- Packages of measures.
- Economic assessment (cost sharing, financial plans, funding opportunities, etc.).
- Implementation plan.
- Monitoring plan.

Phase 5: Approval and implementation of the new SUMP:
- Final approval of the SUMP's review
- Implementation stage.

Phase 6: Monitoring and evaluation:
- Monitoring Committee (monitoring programme).

Giving information, establishing a communication plan and involving citizens is part in the overall process of preparing and implementing the SUMP.

The Mobility Office (LPA2.1) is currently working on the Phase 2 of the process and it is expected to finish Phase 3 (detailed assessment of the current mobility situation) by the end of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project lifetime (2020).

Up to now the activities carried out by the Mobility Office (LPA2.1) within the framework of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project are summarized below:

Phase a: To assess the former SUMP
- New urban mobility regulations (August 2019). The Mobility Office supported the Municipality to update the local regulations about mobility (called Mobility Ordinance), taking into account the suggestions made by both public (Guaguas Municipales and Sagulpa) and private stakeholders.
- Mobility indicators (May 2019). The Mobility Office updated a wide range of key performance indicators in order to monitor and evaluate the impact of the packages of measures of the former SUMP. Based on that assessment, the Mobility Office proposed a new list of mobility indicators that are being updated regularly (once a quarter approximately).
- Traffic Control Centre (June 2019). The Mobility Office drafted the technical specifications for the tender process to subcontract a company that will manage the traffic control centre. This activity was carried out in coordination with Sagulpa.

Phase b: To set up the working structures
- Interviews with stakeholders related to urban mobility (January 2019, ongoing). The aim of the interviews is to get to know, understand and harmonise the interests of different institutional stakeholders related to urban mobility such as public bodies, associations, etc.
- To organize the new inter-departmental core group. The Mobility Office’s representatives attend weekly meetings of the inter-departmental core group where all major activities that have an impact on urban mobility are discussed.
- Benchmarking of inter-departmental core groups in Spain. The Mobility Office collected information about the way that other Spanish Municipalities organize and manage that kind of working groups.

Phase c: To analyse the current mobility situation (general overview)
- Data collection (November 2018). On the one hand, the Mobility Office obtained O-D matrices for the whole island of Gran Canaria using mobile data provided by a major mobile
network operator (Telefónica). On the other hand, the Mobility Office also obtained the O-D matrix of the urban bus users using ticket validation data provided by Guaguas Municipales.

- **Zoning (September 2018).** Within this activity, the Mobility Office carried out all necessary tasks in order to define the proper zoning to be used in the different simulation models.
- **Update of the traffic and transit simulation models.** The Mobility Office is developing a transport macro-model of the whole functional urban area. Its objective is to be able to simulate the impact of different scenarios in the public transport network.
- **Report on traffic light priority (October 2018).** The Mobility Office made some recommendations about the traffic light priority for the new BRT system (called Metroguagua).
- **Micro-mobility assessment (January 2018).** The Mobility Office drafted a report about the challenges and opportunities of the city with regards to micro-mobility. The report showed that micro-mobility is becoming a key piece for sustainable urban mobility policies and planning in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria for two main reasons:
  - Short distance car trips account for a large share of motorized travel (including traffic looking for parking), and most of them could (and should) be walked or cycled.
  - The public transport network struggles to offer door-to-door trips due to the hilly conditions of the city, which raises the question of what happens in the first and last miles of each trip.
- **Report about the implementation of sharing services (February 2019).** The main aim of this report was to analyse the legal framework and the existing regulations for mobility sharing services in the city. The success of the Sítycleta bike sharing scheme (LPA4.1) made clear to entrepreneurs that there was potential demand waiting to be served and some companies showed their interest to implement shared services in the city.

**Household mobility survey (April 2019).** The Mobility Office coordinated a household mobility survey in order to collect updated information about mobility flows and travel patterns of residents in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. That information will be compared with the average daily traffic (ADT) registered by the Municipality in several points of the city’s road network.

### (3) Major process changes

The CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project entailed some significant process changes regarding mobility planning in the city of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, most of which are related to how citizen and stakeholder involvement is managed. Thanks to the project it has become a tool for policymakers to convince citizens and other stakeholders of ambitious measures to understand what might be acceptable, and to reduce the political risks associated with non-acceptance.

The following is a short description of the major process changes that happened in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria regarding mobility planning:

- **Stakeholders’ involvement.** The consultation and involvement of stakeholders outside the Municipality, including civil society and private industry, has increased support for mobility actions. The CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project helped policymakers to understand that mobility planning should be linked with other political priorities such as employment, education and health. In particular, it showed how important it is to include the views, fresh ideas and insights of stakeholders of two key economic sectors such as tourism and freight.

- **Citizens’ involvement.** Intensive public debate involving citizens has helped to minimise opposition towards some key measures such as the new Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Besides helping to convince people, the Municipality of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria found that this
cooperation in planning a new SUMP (and implementing the old one), both internally and with the public, can provide significant insights and fresh ideas.

- Inter-departmental collaboration. A new inter-departmental core group has been organized within CIVITAS DESTINATIONS under the coordination of the Mobility Office. The Municipality and all its public bodies realized that the goals and objectives of the mobility policies are achieved most effectively with the buy-in of many different government departments and different levels of government – something that planning together makes possible.

- Working towards targets. The update of the former SUMP (2012) within the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project has helped policymakers to manage uncertainty and to define clear metrics of working step by step towards targets. Almost all stakeholders involved in the process have understood that a SUMP involves a long-term commitment and wide agreement on goals.

4) Experience with stakeholders

As mentioned before, the Mobility Office (LPA2.1) is continuously holding meetings with key local stakeholders in the framework of a wider consultation and participation with stakeholders’ engagement strategy.

The Mobility Office organizes bilateral meetings without inviting politicians and policymakers that are registered with the purpose of informing both political representatives and the general public about stakeholders met in the course of policy-making activities. This register additionally serves as a practical tool for the Municipality staff when tracking stakeholder related activities and may assist them in pursuing a forward-looking stakeholder policy.

At this stage of the policy-making process (planning), it has been decided that the most important issue is to collect stakeholders’ ideas and opinions as an input to the decision-making process. Stakeholders feel more comfortable speaking with a neutral body such as the Mobility Office and are more focused on providing fresh ideas and suggestions rather than in caring too much about the problems and threats. Therefore, the desired output of these meetings is to map out the diversity by getting a wide range of options and information.

Then the Mobility Office reports all these meetings to the inter-departmental core group that meets on a two-week or monthly basis. By doing this, all Departments of the Municipality involved – as well as the other public bodies such Guaguas Municipales, Sagulpa or the Local Police – receive the same feedback regarding those meetings.

5) Biggest wins gained from the process of making the SUMP

Besides better citizen and stakeholder involvement, and as well as a better inter-departmental coordination, the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project provided some other big wins for the city.

For instance, there has been an increase in citizen’s awareness of the need for more liveable streets in all parts of the city. Citizens are now continuously demanding changes in the streets shape in order to make them more attractive and liveable. There is a common view that this approach improves the image of a city, helps local shops, and encourages tourism, local regeneration, and investment. There is always a concern regarding the more disadvantaged groups in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria and thanks to the SUMP approach it became evident
that improved mobility leads to greater social equity by pushing up standards for everyone, rather than benefiting one group at the expense of another.

One great example of this approach is the reconstruction of *Fernando de Guanarteme* Street (Figure 11), the backbone of the *Isleta-Puerto-Guanarteme* neighbourhood and the main connection of this area of the city with the main transport network. The reconstruction – widening sidewalks, building new crosswalks, decreasing car-speed (30 km/h) and introducing a new bike lane – brought some other benefits to this area:

- Boosting attractiveness of the area. More tourists are visiting this area, which is now well connected to the main touristic hotspots such as Santa Catalina Park or Las Canteras beach.
- Unlocking of private investments. The area is now a fancy area for restaurants and bars.
- Increasing safety and reducing environmental issues. This street was used as an undercut to avoid congestion and traffic jams in the main avenues of the city. Thanks to a new mobility management approach this is no longer possible, leading to a reduction of cars passing through and a reduction of noise and pollutants.

![Before and After images of Fernando de Guanarteme Street](image)

**Figure 11:** Reconstruction of Fernando de Guanarteme Street

(6) **What would you do differently if you could do things over?**

N/A

(7) **Which step was the biggest challenge?**

The main challenges regarding sustainable mobility in the city of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria in the coming years are summarized below:

- Monitoring and evaluation of the new SUMP. The implementation of the measure packages of the former SUMP (2012) – 5 out of 6 are currently fully operational – has been
successful. However, this has been thanks to the will of individuals rather than a great planning and management structure. The Mobility Office is trying to solve this lack of organization in order to better monitor and evaluate the impact of the new measures.

- Mobility data collection. One of the main weaknesses of Las Palmas de Gran Canarias’s planning strategy is the lack of information about travel patterns and mobility behaviour of different target groups (citizens, tourist, urban freight, etc.). The CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project helped policymakers to identify, collect and analyse all kinds of data sources in order to obtain valuable insights.

- Better integration of leisure trips into policy making. Traditionally, policymakers have usually been focused only in assessing commuting and education purposes trips. The CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project showed to policymakers the increasing importance of other kinds of mobility purposes such as shopping and personal business, leisure and escort.

3.6.2 Roadmap for implementation

The improvement of sustainable urban mobility during the lifetime of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project is being achieved through the following:

- By implementing the 6 packages of measures proposed in the former SUMP (2012). Additionally, there are two more packages that have been added to these ones within the framework of the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. They are related to urban freight and tourists’ mobility, since the former SUMP did not address these issues.

- The Mobility Office is carrying out activities to update the existing SUMP.

The charts (see Annex) show the status of implementation of the actions.

The Local Investment Plan (WP8) drafted at the beginning of the project has helped policymakers to define an integrated and shared business model taking into account all local measures and local stakeholders. The Business Model Canvas approach has also supported local policymakers to create sustainable business solutions in a cross-fertilization context.

All these activities have helped to unlock both public and private funding for sustainable mobility measures such as:

- LPA 4.1 Public bike sharing scheme. The CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project has funded a large part of the brand new bike sharing scheme of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (called Sítycleta: https://www.sitycleta.com/en/). After a successful first year in an operational stage – the kick-off of the new service was in April 2018 – Sagulpa plans to scale it up with additional e-bikes that will enlarge its accessibility to the hilly neighbourhoods of the city.

As part of their business plan to increase revenue, Sagulpa reached sponsorship agreements with private companies – Hiperdino (a large supermarket chain in the Canary Island), Language Center (a language school) and Centro Comercial Los Alisios (the biggest shopping mall of the city) – to fund some stations and bikes of the bike sharing system.

Up to now (December 2019), 5 stations and 50 bikes are under this kind of sponsorship agreement. The goal of Sagulpa is to get each of the 42 bike stations sponsored which will return a total of €126,000 p.a. which would support to face the current cost of operations (€675,000).
Besides this, Sagulpa applied to a national funding programme called MOVES in order to enlarge the number of e-bikes. MOVES is based on ERDF funding, managed by the Spanish Ministry of Industry and the application decision is pending (more info: https://www.idae.es/en/node/13603).

- **LPA 7.2 Electric/ Hybrid buses in the urban bus fleet.** Thanks to CIVITAS DESTINATIONS funding, three hybrid buses and one electric bus are currently in service in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (at a cost of €1.8m).

These energy-efficient vehicles are being tested as pilot projects and are constantly monitored and evaluated. As the results are meeting all the expectations in terms of greenhouse gas emission reduction and high-quality service, Guaguas Municipales plans to purchase 10 new hybrid buses by 2020 (the required budget of €3,250,000 for the procurement of these buses has already been agreed).

- **LPA 7.3 Real time mobility and tourism information services.** The CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project has funded 20 real time information screens for bus stops powered by solar energy. This measure has been subsequently scaled up with the installation of 40 additional real time information panels at a cost of €400,000 taking the total to 60 across more areas of the town. This funding has been unlocked from own resources of Guaguas Municipales thanks to a quicker installation process and to lower overall costs compared to previous panels.

The brand-new BRT system is now being equipped with the same solar powered information panels. This is being funded as part of the EIB investment programme meaning the unlocking of €400,000 for 40 more kits, with 10 more panels expected to be introduced at normal bus stops each year from now.

Additionally, the packages of measures for the updated SUMP will be coordinated and integrated with the two flagship projects of the city in the coming years. On the one hand, the smart city strategy (funded by the European Commission through ERDF funding) that is called Inteligencia Azul. On the other hand, the new Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) that will transform the public transport network of the entire city (called Metroguagua).

- **Metroguagua: The Metroguagua is a Bus Rapid Transit system that combines the benefits of a light train (capacity and speed) and a bus system (low cost, flexibility and simplicity). It is a sustainable and modern high capacity transport system that has neither rails nor catenaries.**

Its implementation is scheduled for 2021 and it will organize the traffic, reduce traffic congestion and encourage an intermodal transport model. The project will be carried out thanks to a loan of 50 million EUR from the EIB (European Investment Bank).

The Metroguagua will use an exclusive lane with traffic light priority and will cover 11.7 km through the city, where 75% of city trips occur. It will have 21 stops and 3 new stations between Hoya de la Plata and Manuel Becerra. Moreover, it will have an average speed of 20 km/h (compared to 11 km/h of the current buses) and a frequency of 4-5 minutes. The fleet will consist of around 22 vehicles and each one of them will be able to transport up to 200 passengers.

The Metroguagua is a strategic linchpin in the new SUMP for the city, which among its objectives aims to encourage public transportation.

In addition, the Metroguagua will provide some other benefits such as:
- Transformation of the shape of many public spaces in the city. Improvement of accessibility, more space for pedestrians and cyclists, new leisure and green areas, etc.
- Enhancement of the public transport network. Improvement of the connection of some neighbourhoods and important hotspots of the city.
- Boost of multimodality. The fare integration with the bus network, P&R, public parking facilities and the bike sharing scheme (Sítycleta) will boost multimodality.

**Inteligencia Azul:** The LPA Inteligencia Azul project is partially funded by the European Commission through ERDF funding (https://www.laspalmasgc.es/es/areas-tematicas/innovacion/lpa-inteligencia-azul/). This project includes measures that fall into four categories:
- Mobility. The aim is to optimize costs and integration of all public transport systems.
- Tourism of the Sea. The aim is, among others, to attract new visitors and to increase the average expenditure per tourist, as well as to promote the beaches and water sports.
- Urban services. The aim is to integrate all urban services, computerize the management of all services with an external platform and promote new ordinances that promote energy efficiency.
- E-Government. The aim is to create new common platforms in order to guarantee a certain degree of homogeneity in the services provided and to offer better attention to the citizen.

Some of the measures included in the Inteligencia Azul program are the following:
1. Smart City Platform
2. Customer Relationship Management (CRM)
3. Intelligent payment in public transportation
4. Intelligent management of public ground-level parking spaces.
5. Prioritisation of urban public transport
6. Smart Beach Control Panel
7. Fleet Management System
8. Intelligent management of parks and gardens
9. Intelligent management of sanitation network
10. Transformation of the waste collection service
11. Technical Infrastructure of Information (TI)

### 3.6.3 SUMP self-assessment

All sites have performed a SUMP self-assessment at the beginning of the realisation of the SUMP in 2017 and in January 2020 at the end of the realisation of the SUMP. The SUMP self-assessment is a tool based on 100 questions regarding the SUMP. The questions relate to different aspects of the SUMP.

Figure 12 shows the differences between the different self-assessments for six important aspects.

During the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project lifetime the city of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria started the process of updating its SUMP.

The overall results of the SUMP self-assessment tool have not changed much (score of 88 in 2017 vs. score of 89 in 2019):

However, there have been some improvements regarding the SUMP cycle steps that should be highlighted:
- Developing effective packages of measures. As explained before, the former SUMP (2012) did not address some important issues properly such as urban freight or tourism. The CIVITAS DESTINATIONS project showed to policymakers how important it is to define effective packages of measures that cover all transport modes and all issues linked to urban mobility in the city.

- Monitoring and assessment. The Mobility Office assessed the impact of the former SUMP in order to learn from the planning experience and understand what has worked well and less well. By doing so, the Mobility Office realized that monitoring and assessment should strengthen in the updated SUMP.

Moreover, there have also been some improvements regarding the SUMP characteristics: balanced consideration of all transport modes and monitoring, plan revision and reporting.

![Figure 12: SUMP Characteristic Las Palmas](image)

The scores of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria are close to each other. Some aspects score a bit higher than others.
4 SUMP and touristic mobility

4.1 Introduction

Touristic mobility is, in general, observed as a spatial phenomenon, within a time container that might be a year, a smaller time interval or even the length of a single trip (Oliveri et al., 2012, 214). Tourists who are staying for a concentrated period at one destination express a demand for services and facilities to which a city, regional or national body needs to answer, in terms of performance, amenities and space (La Rocca, 2015, 315).

Tourist movements are a key element for interpreting the characteristics of the tourism experience and, consequently, they provide fundamental information for the sustainable management of the destinations (Ivars et al., 2016, 128). The mobility of tourists within the destination is the result of the interaction of various factors, which can be the geomorphology of the destination, the spatial location of attractions and accommodation nodes, transport routes, mode and accessibility, tourist time budgets, tourist motivation and place knowledge (Ivars et al., 2016, 129).

Transportation in tourism is most often seen as just part of the tourism system which brings the tourists to the destinations, a means of getting around the place and leaving it once the duration of the trip is over. The improvement in transportation modes and low fares has increased the accessibility of areas which haven’t been visited much by tourists before (Sorupia, 2005, 1768).

As tourism can be considered a component of urban mobility, the SUMP should indicate possible sustainable strategies and measures to reduce the impact of tourist flows on the urban mobility system (La Rocca, 2015, 319). Tourism can play a strategic role acting as an accelerator of change promoting more sustainable lifestyles (La Rocca, 2015, 324).

The aim of this chapter is focused on analysing the mobility of tourists in the six different destinations. The objective is to determine which modes of transportation are used by tourists and how satisfied they are with the mobility services offered. With the results of the surveys, an overview of the touristic mobility of each destination and a comparison of the six destinations is provided.

4.2 Overview of surveys

The six destinations were asked to provide questionnaires on touristic mobility. Even if each destination had a different approach to set up a survey on touristic mobility, some common questions were retrieved to make comparisons.

The questions which were included in almost all the surveys were:

1. Location and duration of stay
2. Mode of transport on arrival
3. Attractions visited and transport mode(s) used
4. Mode of transport frequently used
5. Satisfaction with the touristic information material and services
6. General questions (Age, Gender, Profession, Origin, Mode of transport used at home, Group size etc.)
To be able to make some comparisons between the different destinations, the assessment and analysis was concentrated on question (3) and question (5). The aim of these surveys was to get to know the mobility behaviour of tourists during their stays in the different destinations as well as their knowledge about the different mobility services that the city/islands offer.

All the surveys asked which mode(s) of transport was/were used for visiting the different attractions or doing the different activities. Multiple answers were possible. With these related questions, the modal share of the city and/or island was calculated.

As defined by ELTIS, the model share is the share of people using a particular mode of transport within the overall transport usage of an area. The modal share of different modes of transport is typically displayed as a %age value for each mode. In this case, the modal share was measured for the total of all journeys taken in each of the different destination islands or cities. Some destinations concentrated on the city and some included the whole island. In addition, the destinations decided on the categories of mode of transport. To be able to make a comparison between the different islands, the number of categories of the different modes of transport used was reduced.

The modal share is relevant to the SUMP as it can be utilised as an indicator when preparing a SUMP by analysing the current mobility situation, developing targets and undertaking monitoring and evaluation.

As all the questionnaires include a part based on the satisfaction of the mobility material and services provided, the satisfaction level was assessed by the %age of people answering the questions. A five-point Likert-scale was used ranging from very poor to very good. It was more reasonable to transform the five-point Likert scale to a score (ranging from -2 to +2), calculating the average by adding the numeric value of each response, and then dividing by the number of respondents.

### 4.3 Outcomes

#### 4.3.1 Madeira

During December 2019 it was applied touristic surveys at the main gateways of the Region, at the airport, through which Madeira receives yearly around 1.500.000 tourists and at the port of Fungal receiving on average 500.000 day visitors yearly, both targeting tourists on their departure, after experiencing their visit. In one hand, the surveys intended to fully understand tourist’s profile and their mobility patterns, in the other hand, they were destined to evaluate a set of measures implemented under DESTINATIONS, also in line with the SUMP Packages.

The airport survey was applied to 200 tourists, through which it was possible to understand that they are staying on average eight days and that 78% of them are staying in Funchal.

Most of the trips performed by the tourists (180 out of 969) were conducted to visit the city center (main touristic attraction), giving preference to walking transport mode (44%), followed by the rented car (25%) and the public bus (15%) (Figure 13). Following the city centre, the Market was the second most visited touristic point, being again the pedestrian mode, the preferential transport choice representing 50% of the trips to this destination. The rented car is the second choice with 20% followed by the public bus with 11% of the trips. Although, the sustainable transport modes choice (walking and public transport) lose modal share when looking to distant touristic attractions, to which, the preferential transport mode is the rented
To Porto Moniz, 62% of the trips were performed using rented car, similarly to Santana, that 53% of the trips were done with rented car. The same for Levadas activities (54%).

![Modal share of the main touristic attractions in Madeira (asked at the airport)](image)

Figure 13: Modal share of the main touristic attractions in Madeira (asked at the airport)

Considering the total 15 main touristic attractions and all transport modes surveyed, the overall model share is overtaken by the rented car, which represents 34% of the total trips performed by the tourists. The second transport mode most used was the pedestrian mode with 26%, with the public transport being the third choice with 10% of the trips.

All the participants were asked to rank their public transport experience, which was scored between -2 as very poor experience and 2 as a very good experience (Table 2). The participants were also asked to rank their satisfaction with walking conditions in Funchal (Table 2) which was scored as -2 very poor experience and 2 a very good experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction level Public Transport</th>
<th>Average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of the buses</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT network</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT punctuality</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking accessibility next to bus stops</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility at the entrance/leaving the bus</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and safety of bus stops</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information at bus stops</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security inside bus</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort of buses</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of driving</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of using PT tickets</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price ticket</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information provided by PT staff</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness of PT staff</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction level Walking conditions</th>
<th>Average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional Signs</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lightning</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Day Time</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Night</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Daytime</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Night</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volumes</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Satisfaction level with PT and Satisfaction level with walking conditions in Funchal

Even if the overall modal share of public transport among tourists is not significant in Madeira (10%), there is a positive satisfaction with the use of PT. The highest satisfaction level (1.51) concerns the easy usage of the PT ticket (29 bought inside bus, 11 at the vending machines, 6 at sales and information office, 5 at pay shop agents and 3 at the hotel). This is followed by the politeness of public transport staff (1.48) and the information provided by the PT staff (1.34). The results with these parameters, reflect the outcome of the trainings (English,
defensive driving and customer service) provided to bus drivers and front office staff. 27% more workers stated that their capacity to express in English is now Good or Excellent as more 17% capacity to understand. In addition, HF over the years have been focusing on PT information, developing more and clearer flyers and brochures to provide better information to tourist, that also support the PT staff providing information. This were initiatives developed under DESTINATIONS (MAD 6.3 and MAD 7.2), also part of SUMP Package 9 – Improving Tourism Mobility.

The least favourable experiences are related with the conditions at the bus stops. Mainly the information on PT at bus stops (0,87) and walking accessibility next to bus stops (0,94). Improvements to face bus stops lack of conditions are to be addressed under DESTINATIONS (MAD 7.2) and are also part of the SUMP ARM Package 3 – Promote intermodality between different transport subsystems. The accessibility at the entrance and leaving the bus was another aspect with reduced satisfaction (0,90), that was addressed under DESTINATIONS (MAD 7.1). The project supported the acquisition of 30 new buses, more energy efficient with improved accessibility characteristics (low-entry and capacity for wheelchairs) with ERDF funds. 5 mini electric buses are already under operation, the remaining 25 regular buses will be received during 2020, increasing accessibility in PT from 26.7% to 43.2%. This initiative is also in line with SUMP ARMA Package 6 – Enhancing the energy efficiency in the transport sector.

In parallel with the airport survey, it was conducted a shorter survey at the port of Funchal and intended to survey tourists arriving by cruise ship, regarding their short stay (on average, one day). From the 212 surveys collected it was possible to see that 46% explored Funchal by walking, followed by 13% that used the taxi, and 9% that took the rented bus. Most of the tourist’s surveys (66%) were over 61 years old, from which 12% had physical limitation (35% crutches, 31% could even move independently and 31% wheelchair). This reality reinforces the need for more adapted buses. Hence, under DESTINATIONS (MAD 7.2), HF acquired 1 adapted bus (PMR), with capacity for 9 wheelchairs. The service was running between the port and city center and used by several tourist, 5 of them rated the service as 5,00 in a scale (1-Very bad;5- Excellent) also stating that “The HF PMR bus is the best one where I've ever been. The best dedicated bus. They are easy and safe. Perfect!!”. This initiative is also in line with the SUMP Package 9 - SO9 – Improving Tourism Mobility.

4.3.2 Limassol

From mid to end of October 2019, 85 persons responded to the touristic survey, regarding the different modes of transportation used during the stay, in Limassol city centre. 54 out of 85 have visited Limassol for the first time and left the island after one week. Results (Table 3) indicate that the most frequent mode of transport was by walking (43%), followed by the public bus (32%), rented bicycle (21%), rented car (3%) and taxi (1%) Moreover, 56% of tourists have travelled to Limassol city centre from the airport by public bus, 26% by rented car and 18% by chartered bus (Table 3).
Table 3: Most frequent mode of transport used overall and at the airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Mode of transport</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Bus</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Bicycle</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Car</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of transport Airport</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Bus</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartered Bus</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Car</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most visited place was the old town of Limassol with 82 out of 85 participants visiting. Based on Figure 14, it can be stated that 77 % of the participants visited the old town by walking, followed by bike with 13 %. The second most visited attraction, with 80 out of 85 participants, is the Amathus Archaeological Site, which is located approximately 10 kilometres from the Limassol city centre. 69 % of the participants used the public bus to visit the site, followed by 11 % by bike. Troodos, the largest mountain range in Cyprus, located approximately 45 kilometres from the city centre of Limassol in the centre of the island, was visited by 36 out of 85 participants where 92 % used the public bus. To conclude, the tourists preferred to explore the city centre by walking or by renting a bike rather than using a rented car or a taxi. However, for the villages, mountains and other archaeological sites far away from city centre, they mostly used the public transport to reach their destinations.

Table 4: Satisfaction with information material and Satisfaction with mobility services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Information Material</th>
<th>N of Users</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Satisfaction Mobility services</th>
<th>N of Users</th>
<th>Average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIVITAS promotion material</td>
<td>77 (91%)</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>Bike Sharing</td>
<td>62 (72%)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map of PT routes</td>
<td>74 (87%)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>Rural bus</td>
<td>13 (15%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional visitor guide</td>
<td>74 (87%)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>New bus line</td>
<td>56 (66%)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVITAS electronic material</td>
<td>64 (75%)</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>Shuttle service</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limassol Mobility app.</td>
<td>44 (52%)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility inform. package</td>
<td>24 (28%)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 4, it can be stated that besides the CIVITAS DESTINATIONS promotion material for sustainable travel, the participants were most satisfied with the mobility application (1.89 between -2 and 2), which, however, has only been used by 44 participants (out of 85 participants). Followed by the CIVITAS promotion material (used by 77 participants) with an average score of 1.74. All the mobility services were ranked as very good. 62 out of 85 participants used the bike sharing system (Nextbike) offered in Limassol once during their stay and 55 participants stated to be very satisfied with their experience (Table 4). The new bus
line from Limassol to Troodos was used by 56 participants only once, 53 of them stating to be very satisfied with this service. The rural bus and the shuttle service to main interregional gateways were used by 18 participants in total.

### 4.3.3 Rethymno

The surveys were conducted at attraction points in the city centre of Rethymno for at least 10 days and during two different periods in the day to cover a wide range of visitors achieving the sample stratification. From end of July to mid-August 2019, out of 431 persons who answered the survey in Rethymno, 411 arrived by plane and are staying on average 8 days on the island. The participants had been asked to provide the origin(s) and the destination(s) of their trips they did the day before they were asked to participate in the survey. Only 193 trips could be retrieved, due to incomplete answers to the survey. Out of these trips the modal share of the different destinations was calculated (Figure 15).

Rethymno was visited by 67 % using PT, followed by car with 10 % as a passenger and 8% as a driver. Only 2 % used the bike to explore Rethymno. For the rest of the island, neither public nor shared bikes have been used. For Heraklion and Chania, where the two international airports are located, 40 (for Heraklion) and 64 (for Chania) % used public transport. The modal share of the car for Chania is 18 % as driver and 9 % as passenger. Heraklion has a higher share of car use, where 40 % visited as a car driver and 20 % as a car passenger. Adelionos Kampos, located approximately 8 kilometres from the city centre of Rethymno, where most of the tourists are staying in hotels, is especially visited by walking (40%) and public transport (40%), followed by 20 % of using a taxi.

![Figure 15: Modal share of the most visited destinations in Rethymno](image)

The participants were asked how important the different aspects mentioned in Figure 16 were for their transportation. 162 out of 431 participants stated that it is important for them that the situation concerning obstacles while walking need to be improved. Followed by the narrowness of sidewalks for pedestrians (154 out of 431), delays in public transportation (151 out of 431) and the low frequency of public transportation (146 out of 431). The least important aspect to discuss is the quality of the bicycle infrastructure, which can be explained by the low number of trips done by bike.
The overall results of the touristic surveys showed that the vast majority of the trips conducted in Rethymno were with public transport despite the fact that the frequency of the service was considered relatively low with routes not covered by PT. Rethymno’s modals shift differed from the island’s modal shift indicating Rethymno’s efforts to sustainable mobility proving effective.

4.3.4 Elba

From begin August to mid-September 2019, 200 persons responded to the questionnaire, out of which 143 are leaving the island within one week. The questionnaires were collected in very frequented places, such as the Port area of Portoferraio, the bus terminal area where tourist information offices or ticket offices are located, the most popular beaches and in some urban areas (f.ex. the weekly open-air market, the seafront, etc).

They were asked to indicate for beach activities, evening activities and other activities, the share (%) of the time they have stayed in the same place of accommodation and the time they have moved to other places. They were also asked which mode of transport they used for the different activities. However, there was no link made between the different destinations and the modes of transport used. For beach activities, 47% of the trips made were by walking (Figure 17). Followed by 28% using the bus and 14% the car to get to the beach. The main beach destinations were Portoferraio (24%), which is also the main place to stay for the tourists, followed by Marina Di Campo (14%) and Lacona (14%). For the “beach” activities, in 111 out of 200 tourists are “sedentary tourists”, people who remain in the same place of stay and 82 are “dynamic tourists”, people who usually move around and do not stay at the same place of stay.

For the evening activities, 45% of the trips made were by walking, followed by 20% by car, 12% by taxi and 11% by motorbike/scOOTer. The main evening destinations were Portoferraio (25%), Marina Di Campo (18%), Lacona (8%) and Porto Azzurro (8%). The use of the public bus is low, which can be explained by the fact that the public bus service ends at 7 or 8 pm. In some communes additional shuttle services are provided until midnight, but they usually connect parking areas or extra-urban areas with the city centre and no connections are guaranteed among different municipalities. For the evening activities, 119 out of 200 were sedentary tourists and 69 were dynamic ones.
The majority of sedentary tourists in the sample can be an explanation of why many persons are walking. They prefer to visit the nearest beaches or to have dinner in the nearest restaurant, so they don’t need to use their own car very much. In other words, sedentary tourists used to walk around because their destinations were near. For example, staying in a very popular and comfortable seaside resort could lead many people to remain there for the most part of the holiday. If, moreover, this place is not well connected with the other municipalities (bad roads, no or few LPT, etc.), this behaviour could also be more frequent.

Destinations for other activities, which includes for example strolling around, sports, shopping or cultural activities, were visited by 40 % by walking, followed by 26 % using the bus and 15 % the car. The destinations chosen for other activities were Porto ferraio (28%), Marina Di Campo (14%) and Capoliveri (12%).

The participants were asked about the necessary mobility services on Elba (Table 5). 47 % of 197 respondents stated that public transport services need to be improved. Followed by 14 % stating that the bike rental should be developed, 11 % for improvements in car/motorbike rental services and 11% for improvements in taxi sharing services. The participants were also asked to mention the main mobility limits/problems on the island (Table 5). The most mentioned aspect (with 57%) was the poor Local Public Transport services (departures, tickets, routes, etc.), followed by few parking areas (15%) near the points of interest like beaches and the town centres and few bike lanes (10%). The overall satisfaction was stated by the 197 respondents to be good (41%), followed by 25 % of the respondents stating that the overall situation is neither poor nor good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services identified with needs for improvement</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public transport service</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recharging stations for e-vehicles</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike rental</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car sharing</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/motorbike rental</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi sharing</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility limits/problems</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few parking areas</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient LPT</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low accessibility of pedestrian routes</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few bike lanes</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Necessary Mobility services and Mobility limits/problems in Elba

4.3.5 Malta

In Spring 2019, 339 face-to-face interviews were carried out with tourists leaving the island at the Malta International Airport, Cruise Liner Terminal and Virtu Ferries Terminal (the site for the Malta-Sicily ferry). The aim of this was to measure the modal split of the tourists. The most visited destination was Valletta with 96 trips. The most used mode of transport is the bus with 67%, followed by 13 % of walking and 13 % using the ferry. The second most visited destination is Gozo with 64 trips. The most used mode of transport is the ferry with 48 %, followed by bus
with 33%. The third most visited destination is Mdina with 62 trips, made by bus with 67%, followed by 19% by car (Figure 18).

The participants were asked what would make them consider using more sustainable transport options like using public transport, walking or cycling. 52 out of 338 respondents stated that improved reliability would make them consider using more sustainable transport like bus and ferry. This is followed by the increased frequency of buses or ferries, of which 45 out of 338 participants think is important. Considering walking and cycling more often, increased road safety (74 out of 256 participants), improved infrastructure (46 out of 256), and reduced speeds of motorized vehicles (37 out of 256 participants) would make them consider changing their mobility behaviour the most. Out of 27 destinations/attractions, 8 have been illustrated.

The participants were asked about their satisfaction with the most frequently used transport services during their stay, stating how positively, neutrally or negatively they think about the different modes of transport. This includes the punctuality, cost, comfort, convenience, safety and information of each mode of transportation. A score ranging from +2 to -2 was calculated to have an overview of the different factors influencing their satisfaction (Table 6). The taxi has the highest average score (9.56 of 61.66), with punctuality and comfort being the factors having the highest satisfaction level. This is followed by the private car (8.80) and inner-harbour ferry (8.40). The participants are especially satisfied with the convenience (1.75 from 2) they have when driving their private car. Considering the inner-harbour ferry, the punctuality (1.83) and the costs (1.61) are the factors the participants are most satisfied with. The factors which the participants are satisfied with (7.92) when walking are the punctuality (they are not dependant on a time schedule) and the costs (in this case there are no costs). Negative values have been witnessed with the rented bicycles having an average of only 2.17, with comfort having the lowest score (-0.67). The bicycle sharing service has an average negative score, due to safety and information (-0.67).

Table 6: Satisfaction with the most frequently used transport service during their stay
The popularity of the bus with tourists can be attributed to the fact that the most visited attractions are well connected by bus. However, congestion impacts the punctuality of the service and over-crowding is common especially during peak tourist months and times. Both the car sharing and bike sharing services are new to the islands and tourists might not always be aware of their existence. While shared vehicles are more commonly available in the more touristic areas, visiting places around the island is not hindered. Bike sharing on the other hand, is still mostly focused in the Valletta Region especially in the towns which see most tourists such as Sliema, and St. Julians. Thus, reaching areas in other parts of Malta by shared bikes is hindered by this lack of availability of evenly distributed bike sharing stations around the island.

4.3.6 Las Palmas de Grand Canaria

The survey was conducted during one week-end mid-November 2019 in three touristic hotspots of the city: Santa Catalina Park, Las Canteras promenade and Vegueta (the old town). 80% of the 211 participants are tourists staying in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria for an average of 7 nights, leaving the island of Gran Canaria after 1 week (78% arrived by plane). Walking is the main transport mode used in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria at 45%, followed by the use of public transport, in this case the use of the public bus by 26% and the use of a rental car by 14% (Figure 19).

The most visited attraction is the old town of Vegueta with 94 visits, 44% of whom travelled by bus and 23% by rental car. Calle Triana had 69 visited of whom 49% travelled by bus. 157 tourists travelled to the Las Canteras Beach and promenade of whom 61% by walking and 18% by bus to get to the beach. Santa Catalina Park and the Alfredo Klaus auditorium are the attractions visited where the modal share of walking is the highest, for the Santa Catalina Park it was 63% and for the Alfredo Klaus Auditorium is 71%.

![Figure 19: Modal share of Las Palmas](image)

All touristic attractions with a high modal share of walking, such as Las Arenas shopping mall, the Alfredo Kraus auditorium, Las Canteras promenade, Santa Catalina Park or the new Aquarium have something in common: they are located in pedestrian areas or traffic-calming zones. Besides that, the Municipality has done a great effort in connecting all these touristic attractions with accessible walking paths (it is a measure included in the SUMP of 2012), which has made walking much more attractive for tourists. The high share of public transport in some other touristic attractions, as f.ex. Vegueta and Calle Triana, could be explained because the old town is located in the south of the city, far away from the area where most hotels are located.
located. The easiest and most convenient way to move between these two hotspots is public transport.

The categories of electric scooter, car sharing service and other had low number of users and were not included in the graph. In addition, the illustration of the attractions/destinations visited was limited to 8 from a total of 23 attractions/destinations.

Based on Table 7, 127 out of 221 participants used the information about transport options in the city and out of which 80 participants stated the information to be good (1,00). The second most used information was the public transport map of the city, which was used by 47 people stating to be good (1,04). 33 participants stated to have used the touristic bus and have had a good to very good experience (1,44). The Live tourist pass, the guided tours by bike and the rental bikes were the least used mobility services, with fewer than 10 participants using it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction mobility information and services</th>
<th>N of Users</th>
<th>Average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information about transport options</td>
<td>143 (65%)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport map of the city</td>
<td>55 (25%)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility App</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided walking tours</td>
<td>9 (4%)</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike sharing system of the city (Sítycleta)</td>
<td>14 (6%)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renting bike at accommodation</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided tours Bike</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live tourist pass</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touristic bus</td>
<td>33 (15%)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7:** Satisfaction with the mobility information and services

Moreover, the results of the survey also shed light upon the opinion of tourists regarding some tourist-addressed services or products developed within CIVITAS DESTINATIONS. In some cases, such as the new bike sharing service, Sítycleta, they have succeed in attracting tourists towards sustainable mobility while in some others the survey shows that some other products or services were not properly designed or promoted, such as the Live tourist pass that Guaguas developed within measure LPA 7.4. This feedback is very useful for Guaguas, as well for the other local partners involved in tourism and mobility, in order to fine-tune some products and services focused on tourists.

### 4.4 Benchmark and conclusion

Figure 20 below gives an overall view of the modal share in all the destinations. The modal share of the different destinations allows an analysis of where improvements are needed to have a more balanced modal share and to be able to implement sustainable mobility measures and actions. As there are differences in the number of participants of the different destinations, it has to be considered that the scale of the modal share is not the same in the different destinations. However, some key statements can be made:

- The use of the bike is very low in most of the islands, especially in Malta, Funchal and Rethymno. In Malta, the satisfaction level of the transport modes used also stated that the rented bicycles are less comfortable and the bicycle sharing service has an average negative score due to safety reasons and not enough information. However, in all the destinations, there
is room for development, and it needs to be considered that destinations like Funchal, where the area and surroundings are hilly, make it less inviting for tourists to rent bikes;
- The public transport offer in the different destinations is stated to be good, however, there is potential to attract even more tourists to use public transport. This can already be done by improving the dissemination and information material provided to tourists;
- Walking is strong in all the destinations except Malta and Rethymno. In the case of Malta, people stayed in accommodation outside of Valetta and to visit attractions they had to travel longer distances, so they used more public transport. This was also the case for Rethymno;
- The usage of rented cars or privately-owned cars was very strong in each destination. As mentioned above, long distances and comfort are important factors that tourists rely on. The number of people travelling in one car is an important factor, which needs to be considered. For families it is more reasonable to rent a car, considering the comfort and the costs. At this point, e-vehicles could replace some of the rented cars, which however doesn’t reduce congestion, but reduces the pollutant emissions;
- Motorbike and Scooters are especially favourable in Elba;
- The ferry is a favourable mode of transport in Malta, for visiting the three fortified cities of Birgu, Senglea and Cospicua, as it is the most convenient mode of transport to visit these three cities located close to each other.

Figure 20 represents the overall modal share of the different destinations. As an overall remark on modal share, it can be stated that a potential tourist is likely to visit multiple destinations on a single trip. In this case, it is not sure how many transport modes have been used for one trip. The multi-modal mobility, the mobility behaviour that is characterised by flexible usage and a combination of different transport modes according to the situation and to the available transport means, would have been interesting to take into account to get the overall situation of touristic mobility in the different destinations.

Figure 20: Modal share of all the destinations

(Other includes: Hotel Shuttle, Privately organised sightseeing tours, e-vehicles, cable-cars etc.)

Movement or mobility is a significant element in tourism research and especially in sustainable tourism as it represents a key aspect, since it is the one that allows us to travel from a place of origin to a chosen destination, and also to move within a destination.

Regarding sustainability, and sustainable development as part of it, it is relevant to understand the behaviour of visitors in a particular tourist area. They provide information on infrastructure needs, transport and new product development.
Bibliography


Annex

The self-assessment questionnaires can be found in the PDF handed in with this document.
SUMP Self-Assessment Scheme

Madeira

Overall score: 99 out of 100.

Congratulations, based on the answers you have provided the authority's plan is an Excellent Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan.

A planning process in full compliance with the European Commission's SUMP concept and guidelines as presented in the Urban Mobility Package has been followed. The resulting plan is a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan of excellent quality.

Foundation and Excellence Questions

You have answered Yes to 13 out of 13 Foundation Questions. These questions test the basic requirements a mobility planning process must fulfil to be in line with the SUMP concept.

You have answered Yes to 14 out of 15 Excellence Questions. These questions highlight planning activities particularly advanced cities might undertake, to motivate and award processes and plans of exceptionally high quality.

Copyright information

Rupprecht Consult GmbH has developed the SUMP Self-Assessment Scheme which is disseminated through the EU co-funded project CH4LLENGE.

Copyright: The self-assessment is made available free of charge for non-commercial use and is subject to a Creative Commons licence ("attribution, non-commercial, no derivatives").
### SUMP Cycle Steps

The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to each of the steps in the SUMP planning cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Define the development process and scope of the plan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Set priorities and measurable targets</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Develop effective packages of measures</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMP Characteristics

The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to the main characteristics of a SUMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMP Characteristic</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term vision and clear implementation plan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory approach</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced consideration of all transport modes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral, vertical and spatial integration</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of current and future performance &amp; cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, plan revision and reporting</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome to the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool

Some basic questions about your city

You are invited to begin the SUMP Self-Assessment by providing some general information about your city or planning authority, including the name of the city which will appear on the final results page (which can be downloaded).

The SUMP Self-Assessment can be completed on an anonymous basis. However, if you do not wish to name the city it is helpful if you do provide some basic information on country and population of the city, to enable analyses of results at an aggregated level.

In no case will we publish the results of individual cities or identify individual cities in any publications based on such analyses. None of these questions are mandatory, so if you believe that the questions identify your city too clearly, then you do not need to provide answers.

I. What is the name of the city, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Madeira

II. In which country is the city located, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Portugal

III. If a Non-EU country, please specify which one.

IV. What is the population of the city (based on geographic area covered by the SUMP), for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

- [ ] Below 50,000
- [ ] Between 50,000 and 100,000
- [ ] Between 500,000 and 1 million
- [ ] Between 1 and 2 million
V. How many SUMPs or equivalent mobility plans has the city prepared before?

- [ ] Between 100,000 and 200,000
- [ ] Between 200,000 and 400,000
- [ ] Between 400,000 and 600,000
- [ ] Between 2 and 4 million
- [x] Over 4 million

Thank you for providing this information!

Step 1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP

At the beginning of the sustainable urban mobility planning process, it is necessary to determine the potential to elaborate a successful Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. Framework conditions should be analysed including internal and external factors that have an impact on the planning process and plan implementation.

For more information please read the section on Step 1 in the SUMP Guidelines

1. Have you, the responsible planning authority, made a formal commitment to make sustainable mobility principles the underlying basis for the SUMP?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

2. Has the city council reinforced its commitment to sustainable urban mobility by signing a covenant (e.g. the Covenant of Mayors) or joining a network (e.g. the CiViTAS Forum)?

Excellence Question

Between 100,000 and 200,000
- [ ] Between 200,000 and 400,000
- [ ] Between 400,000 and 600,000
- [ ] Between 2 and 4 million
- [ ] Over 4 million
3. Have you reviewed relevant regulations and plans from the European, national and regional level that have implications for the SUMP?

- Yes
- No

4. Have you reflected on the strengths and weaknesses of your existing local planning practices with regard to developing the SUMP?

- Yes
- No

5. Have you used a peer-review methodology for analysing the strengths and weaknesses?

- Yes
- No

6. Have you undertaken a gap analysis of qualifications and skills within the planning authority in order to identify capacity building needs?

- Yes
- No

7. Have you assessed the sources for funding the process of developing the SUMP?

- Yes
- No
8. Have you examined how the SUMP preparation timeframe could be aligned with the development and implementation of other existing policies and strategies (e.g. the land use plan)?

**Foundation Question**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

9. Have you defined a timeframe for the preparation and implementation of the SUMP?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

10. Have you identified relevant stakeholders, their impact and role early on in the SUMP preparation process?

**Foundation Question**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

11. Have you carried out an analysis of stakeholder constellations (e.g. incorporating assessments of stakeholders’ objectives, power, capacity and planning resources)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

12. Have you involved stakeholders within the "vulnerable users" group in the SUMP process?

**Excellence Question**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
Step 2 - Define the development process and scope of plan

The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan development process needs to be tailored to the local situation. This includes as a crucial step the definition of the geographical scope of the plan, which should cover the functioning urban area. Stakeholder cooperation and policy integration are other fields that need to be addressed in this phase, which should be concluded with an agreement on the work plan and management arrangements.

For more information please read the section on Step 2 in the SUMP Guidelines

13. Has a cooperation process been established by all neighbouring authorities on the spatial coverage of the SUMP?

   **Foundation Question**
   - Yes
   - No

14. Does the SUMP cover the ‘functional city’ (i.e. an area defined by main commuter flows) that goes beyond administrative boundaries?

   **Yes**
   - No

15. Have you and neighbouring authorities agreed on roles and responsibilities for SUMP development?

   **Yes**
   - No

16. Have you established a SUMP development team across neighbouring authorities that has met on a regular basis?

   **Yes**
   - No

17. Does the SUMP refer to policies and plans, which already exist or are being developed on the local level?

   **Foundation Question**
   - Yes
   - No
18. Have you regularly involved institutions representing policy areas closely related to mobility (e.g. land-use, environment, health)?

Foundation Question

19. Have you developed a participation strategy suggesting a mix of involvement formats for the SUMP development process?

Yes

No

20. Have you created a SUMP development team driving the preparation and monitoring of the SUMP development process?

Yes

No

21. Have you drafted an internal work plan for the planning process, indicating steps to be taken, responsibilities and milestones?

Yes

No

Step 3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios

The last step of preparing well for the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan is to analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios of possible future mobility situations. This provides the basis for setting goals in a rational and transparent way. As a first activity, a thorough analysis is needed of the problems and opportunities in the field of urban transport and mobility. This is an important milestone as it feeds into the development of different scenarios. These scenarios help in understanding the full picture of related issues.
the development of different scenarios. These scenarios help improve our understanding of what urban mobility could look like in the future.

For more information please read the section on Step 3 in the SUMP Guidelines

22. Have you conducted a diagnosis of the main urban transport and mobility related problems?

   Foundation Question

   ○ Yes
   ○ No

23. Have you selected suitable indicators to describe the mobility situation in the spatial area covered by the SUMP and to reflect the objectives of the plan?

   ○ Yes
   ○ No

24. Have you assessed the availability and quality of existing data, relevant for example for scenario development?

   ○ Yes
   ○ No

25. Have you conducted an analysis of transport and mobility problems for each transport mode?

   ○ Yes
   ○ No

26. Have you conducted an analysis of the accessibility to services, employment and education?

   ○ Yes
   ○ No

27. Have you conducted an analysis of journey time reliability and network congestion (all modes)?

   ○ Yes
   ○ No
28. Have you conducted an analysis of safety and security, including its perception?

- Yes
- No

29. Have you conducted an analysis of air quality and noise pollution, including identification of hotspots?

- Yes
- No

30. Have you prioritised the identified problems?

- Yes
- No

31. Does the SUMP describe a business-as-usual scenario?

- Yes
- No

32. Does the SUMP explore alternative policy scenarios to understand the likely effects of different combinations of mobility measures and policies?

- Yes
- No

33. Have you used qualitative analysis techniques, (e.g. through expert judgement) to support scenario development and appraisal?

- Yes
- No
34. Have you used appropriate quantitative and transport modelling analysis techniques to support scenario development and appraisal?

- Yes

35. Did the analysis of SUMP scenarios include an appraisal of the resilience of the mobility system in relation to expected and unexpected events for the spatial area of the SUMP?

- Yes

36. Have you discussed the different policy scenarios and their impacts with a group of key stakeholders?

- Yes

37. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the different policy scenarios and their impacts, and invited them to provide feedback on these?

- Yes

Step 4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens

Developing a common vision is one of the cornerstones of every Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. It provides the basis for all subsequent steps that will define concrete targets and measures. The vision can only be the guiding element if it is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens; therefore it is crucial to create a common ownership of the vision.
38. Does the SUMP contain a long-term vision of urban mobility?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

39. Have you developed the long-term vision of urban mobility in cooperation with a representative group of key stakeholders?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

40. Does the SUMP explain, which scenario serves the vision in the most efficient and effective way and why?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

41. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the vision building process and given them the opportunity to provide feedback?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

42. Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in the development of the vision?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

Step 5 - Set priorities and measurable targets

For more Information please read the section on Step 4 in the SUMP Guidelines
A vision is an important qualitative description of the desired future. This alone is not sufficient. A vision needs to be specified by concrete objectives, which indicate the type of change desired. Finally, these changes also need to be measureable. This requires selecting a well-thought-out set of targets that focus on selected areas (indicators).

For more Information please read the section on Step 5 in the SUMP Guidelines

43. Does the SUMP clearly set out overall objectives?  

44. Have you assessed the overall objectives of the SUMP together with a group of key stakeholders?  

45. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the overall objectives of the SUMP and invited them to provide feedback?  

46. Does the SUMP describe a set of SMART targets?  

47. Do the targets allow monitoring of progress towards the achievement of objectives and assessed of the efficiency and effectiveness of the measures?  

48. Have you involved a group of key stakeholders in developing targets?
48. Have you involved a group of key stakeholders in developing targets?

- Yes
- No

---

**Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures**

The development of effective packages of measures is at the core of sustainable urban mobility planning. Only well-selected measures will ensure that the defined objectives and targets are met. The selection of measures should build on discussions with key stakeholders, consider experience from other places with similar policies, ensure value for money and exploit as much as possible synergies between measures. Essentially, at this stage, measures are identified in response to the questions: what, how, where and when?

For more information please read the section on **Step 6** in the SUMP Guidelines.

49. Does the SUMP make clear how the selected measures will contribute to the achievement of the agreed vision, objectives and targets?

- Yes
- No

---

50. Have you discussed measure identification and selection with a group of key stakeholders?

- Yes
- No

---

51. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the process of measure identification and selection and invited them to provide feedback?

- Yes
- No

---

52. Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in discussing the identified measures?

- Yes
- No
53. **Public transport:** Does the SUMP suggest how to enhance the quality, integration and accessibility of public transport services (covering infrastructure, rolling stock, and services)?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

54. **Public transport:** Does the SUMP lay out how public transport should be addressed as an integral element of all relevant transport modes in the urban area?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

55. **Non-motorised transport:** Does the SUMP incorporate infrastructure measures to raise the attractiveness of walking and cycling?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

56. **Non-motorised transport:** Are infrastructure measures complemented by regulatory and organisational as well as soft measures?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

57. **Safety and security:** Does the SUMP present measures to improve safety and security of all modes?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

58. **Safety and security:** Do the SUMP’s safety and security measures address the specific needs of vulnerable travellers?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]
59. **Road transport (flowing + stationary):** Does the SUMP aim at optimising the use of existing road infrastructure?

- Yes
- No

60. **Road transport (flowing + stationary):** Does the SUMP explore the potential for reallocating road space to other modes of transport or other public functions?

- Yes
- No

61. **Urban logistics:** Does the SUMP present measures to improve the efficiency of urban logistics and freight delivery, while reducing related externalities (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions, pollutants and noise)?

- Yes
- No

62. **Urban logistics:** Does the SUMP set out how private and public stakeholders should be involved in developing and implementing mutually acceptable measures?

- Yes
- No

63. **Mobility management:** Does the SUMP include mobility management actions to foster a change towards more sustainable mobility patterns (reflecting the needs of e.g. citizens, employers or schools)?

- Yes
- No
64. **Mobility management**: Does the SUMP foresee educational, awareness-raising and promotion activities for sustainable travel behaviour for identified target groups?

- Yes
- No

65. **Intelligent Transport Systems**: Does the SUMP include Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures?

- Yes
- No

66. **Intelligent Transport Systems**: Does the SUMP include Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures to connect transport modes (e.g. through payment and real-time information functions)?

- Yes
- No

---

**Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures II**

67. Have you contacted other cities to exchange information about the planning and implementation of one or more measures considered for inclusion in your SUMP?

- Yes
- No

68. Have you taken elected representatives and decision makers to visit other cities with the proposed measures in place?

   *Excellence Question*

- Yes
- No

69. Have you appraised the proposed measures for their costs and related benefits?
70. Have you assessed the long-term costs of proposed measures (e.g. maintenance costs)?

- Yes
- No

71. Have you assessed the external costs and benefits associated with the implementation of measures and packages of measures?

- Yes
- No

72. Have you appraised costs and benefits of all transport modes on the basis of a common approach?

- Yes
- No

73. Have you discussed the development of measures related to public transport and intermodality with transport operators?

- Yes
- No

74. Does the SUMP suggest combining certain policy measures, i.e. proposing integrated packages of measures to achieve better results?

- Yes
- No

75. Does the SUMP incorporate measures to be implemented in partnership with organisations from...
75. Does the SUMP incorporate measures to be implemented in partnership with organisations from other sectors?

- Yes
- No

76. Does the SUMP incorporate cross-boundary measures to be implemented in partnership with neighbouring authorities?  

- Yes
- No

---

**Step 7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding**

Closely connected to the selection of (packages of) measures is the determination of clear responsibilities and the elaboration of an action and budget plan. This is a key part of the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan and requires formal approval by all key stakeholders. Essentially, at this stage answers are found to the questions: who and how much?

For more Information please read the section on Step 7 in the SUMP Guidelines

77. Have you allocated responsibilities for the implementation of measures?

- Yes
- No

78. Have you identified potential funding sources for the implementation of measures?

- Yes
- No

79. Have you involved key stakeholders in the assignment of responsibilities and resources?

- Yes
- No
80. Have you prepared an action plan, outlining e.g. implementation priorities, schedules, risks and contingency actions?

- Yes  - No

81. Have you prepared a budget plan, setting out funding requirements and sources?

- Yes  - No

82. Was a formal agreement reached by decision makers and key stakeholders on the action and budget plan?

- Yes  - No

**Step 8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan**

Monitoring and evaluation need to be built into the plan as essential management tools to keep track of the planning process and measure implementation, but also so that you can learn from the planning experience, understand what works well and less well, and to build the business case and evidence base for the wider application of similar measures in the future.

For more information please read the section on **Step 8** in the SUMP Guidelines

83. Does the SUMP foresee a regular monitoring and performance-based revision process (e.g. every 3 to 7 years)?

- Yes  - No

84. Have you performed a data audit to account for available data and possible gaps?

- Yes  - No
85. Have you selected a subset of indicators for monitoring purposes linked to SUMP targets?

- Yes
- No

86. Have you considered both the planning process and measure implementation for monitoring and evaluation?

- Yes
- No

87. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation scheme that includes both output and outcome indicators?

- Yes
- No

88. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation scheme that includes qualitative and quantitative indicators?

- Yes
- No

89. Have you developed a data collection strategy?

- Yes
- No

90. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation plan?

- Excellence Question

- Yes
- No
91. Have you discussed arrangements for SUMP monitoring and evaluation with a group of key stakeholders?

Yes

92. Does the SUMP explain how stakeholders and citizens will be kept informed about SUMP measure implementation, monitoring and evaluation?

Yes

93. Have you foreseen mechanisms for the interactive engagement of stakeholders and citizens during SUMP monitoring and evaluation?

Yes

Step 9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan

The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan summarises the outcomes of all previous activities. After a final quality check, the document, including the action and budget plan, needs to be formally adopted by the political representatives. It is also important to ensure that the plan is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens.

For more information please read the section on Step 9 in the SUMP Guidelines

94. Have you asked a group of key stakeholders to review the draft version of the SUMP?

Yes

95. Have you published a final draft of the SUMP to provide stakeholders and citizens with the opportunity to make final comments?

**Foundation Question**

- Yes
- No

96. Does the SUMP demonstrate compliance with the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive (2001/42/EC) and EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC)?

- Yes
- No

97. Have you discussed the proposed SUMP with the city council or its equivalent committee?

- Yes
- No

98. Was the SUMP formally adopted by the city council or its equivalent committee?

**Foundation Question**

- Yes
- No

99. Was the SUMP formally approved or adopted by the elected representatives of neighbouring authorities that fall within the functional city? 

- Yes
- No

100. Have you ‘celebrated’ the adoption of the SUMP with stakeholders and citizens (e.g. in the form of a public event)?

- Yes
- No
SUMP Self-Assessment Tool Feedback

Thank you for completing the SUMP Self-Assessment! We hope that you found this a valuable exercise. We would like to continue improving the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool in the future, both in terms of the content of the self-assessment and the ease of using the online tool. Your feedback in relation to the four questions below will therefore be appreciated.

Did you find the instructions helpful?

Not helpful: ____________

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Yes, helpful

How would you assess the clarity of the assessment questions?

Not clear: ____________

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Very clear

Do you have any suggestions for improving particular questions or the content of the SUMP Self-Assessment overall?

Did you find the online tool easy to use?

No: ____________

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Yes

If you experienced any technical difficulties, please describe these below:
You have now reached the end of the questionnaire. Once you press "Submit" you will be offered a final opportunity to check that you have completed all sections of the questionnaire.
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SUMP Self-Assessment Scheme

Limassol

Overall score: 98 out of 100.

Congratulations, based on the answers you have provided the authority's plan is an Excellent Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan.

A planning process in full compliance with the European Commission's SUMP concept and guidelines as presented in the Urban Mobility Package has been followed. The resulting plan is a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan of excellent quality.

Foundation and Excellence Questions

You have answered Yes to 13 out of 13 Foundation Questions. These questions test the basic requirements a mobility planning process must fulfil to be in line with the SUMP concept.

You have answered Yes to 14 out of 15 Excellence Questions. These questions highlight planning activities particularly advanced cities might undertake, to motivate and award processes and plans of exceptionally high quality.

Copyright information

Rupprecht Consult GmbH has developed the SUMP Self-Assessment Scheme which is disseminated through the EU co-funded project CH4LLENGE.

Copyright: The self-assessment is made available free of charge for non-commercial use and is subject to a Creative Commons licence ("attribution, non-commercial, no derivatives").
**SUMP Cycle Steps**

The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to each of the steps in the SUMP planning cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Define the development process and scope of the plan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Set priorities and measurable targets</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Develop effective packages of measures</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMP Characteristics**

The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to the main characteristics of a SUMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMP Characteristic</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term vision and clear implementation plan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory approach</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced consideration of all transport modes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral, vertical and spatial integration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of current and future performance &amp; cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, plan revision and reporting</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome to the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool

Some basic questions about your city

You are invited to begin the SUMP Self-Assessment by providing some general information about your city or planning authority, including the name of the city which will appear on the final results page (which can be downloaded).

The SUMP Self-Assessment can be completed on an anonymous basis. However, if you do not wish to name the city it is helpful if you do provide some basic information on country and population of the city, to enable analyses of results at an aggregated level.

In no case will we publish the results of individual cities or identify individual cities in any publications based on such analyses. None of these questions are mandatory, so if you believe that the questions identify your city too clearly, then you do not need to provide answers.

I. What is the name of the city, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Limassol

II. In which country is the city located, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Cyprus

III. If a Non-EU country, please specify which one.

IV. What is the population of the city (based on geographic area covered by the SUMP), for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

- [ ] Below 50,000
- [ ] Between 50,000 and 100,000
- [ ] Between 600,000 and 1 million
- [ ] Between 1 and 2 million
Step 1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP

At the beginning of the sustainable urban mobility planning process, it is necessary to determine the potential to elaborate a successful Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. Framework conditions should be analysed including internal and external factors that have an impact on the planning process and plan implementation.

For more information please read the section on Step 1 in the SUMP Guidelines

1. Have you, the responsible planning authority, made a formal commitment to make sustainable mobility principles the underlying basis for the SUMP?

   • Yes
   • No

2. Has the city council reinforced its commitment to sustainable urban mobility by signing a covenant (e.g. the Covenant of Mayors) or joining a network (e.g. the CiViTAS Forum)?

   Excellence Question

V. How many SUMPs or equivalent mobility plans has the city prepared before?

   • This is the first
   • This is the second
   • This is the third
   • The city has prepared four or more SUMPs in the past

Thank you for providing this information!
3. Have you reviewed relevant regulations and plans from the European, national and regional level that have implications for the SUMP?

○ Yes  ◯ No

4. Have you reflected on the strengths and weaknesses of your existing local planning practices with regard to developing the SUMP?

○ Yes  ◯ No

5. Have you used a peer-review methodology for analysing the strengths and weaknesses?

○ Yes  ◯ No

6. Have you undertaken a gap analysis of qualifications and skills within the planning authority in order to identify capacity building needs?

○ Yes  ◯ No

7. Have you assessed the sources for funding the process of developing the SUMP?
8. Have you examined how the SUMP preparation timeframe could be aligned with the development and implementation of other existing policies and strategies (e.g. the land use plan)?

   **Foundation Question**

   - Yes
   - No

9. Have you defined a timeframe for the preparation and implementation of the SUMP?

   - Yes
   - No

10. Have you identified relevant stakeholders, their impact and role early on in the SUMP preparation process?

    **Foundation Question**

    - Yes
    - No

11. Have you carried out an analysis of stakeholder constellations (e.g. incorporating assessments of stakeholders’ objectives, power, capacity and planning resources)?

    - Yes
    - No

12. Have you involved stakeholders within the "vulnerable users" group in the SUMP process?

    **Excellence Question**

    - Yes
    - No
Step 2 - Define the development process and scope of plan

The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan development process needs to be tailored to the local situation. This includes as a crucial step the definition of the geographical scope of the plan, which should cover the functioning urban area. Stakeholder cooperation and policy integration are other fields that need to be addressed in this phase, which should be concluded with an agreement on the work plan and management arrangements.

For more information please read the section on Step 2 in the SUMP Guidelines.

13. Has a cooperation process been established by all neighbouring authorities on the spatial coverage of the SUMP?

- Foundation Question
  - Yes
  - No

14. Does the SUMP cover the ‘functional city’ (i.e. an area defined by main commuter flows) that goes beyond administrative boundaries?

- Yes
- No

15. Have you and neighbouring authorities agreed on roles and responsibilities for SUMP development?

- Yes
- No

16. Have you established a SUMP development team across neighbouring authorities that has met on a regular basis?

- Yes
- No

17. Does the SUMP refer to policies and plans, which already exist or are being developed on the local level?

- Foundation Question
  - Yes
  - No
18. Have you regularly **involved institutions** representing policy areas closely related to **mobility** (e.g. land-use, environment, health)?

*Foundation Question*

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

19. Have you developed a **participation strategy** suggesting a mix of **involvement** formats for the **SUMP** development process?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

20. Have you created a **SUMP** development team driving the preparation and **monitoring** of the **SUMP** development process?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

21. Have you drafted an internal work plan for the planning process, indicating steps to be taken, responsibilities and milestones?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

### Step 3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios

The last step of preparing well for the **Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan** is to analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios of possible future mobility situations. This provides the basis for setting goals in a rational and transparent way. As a first activity, a thorough analysis is needed of the problems and opportunities in the field of urban transport and mobility. This is an important milestone as it feeds into the development of different scenarios. The process also helps in resource understanding and timeline planning.
the development of different scenarios. These scenarios help improve our understanding of what urban mobility could look like in the future.

For more information please read the section on Step 3 in the SUMP Guidelines

22. Have you conducted a diagnosis of the main urban transport and mobility related problems?
   **Foundation Question**
   - Yes
   - No

23. Have you selected suitable indicators to describe the mobility situation in the spatial area covered by the SUMP and to reflect the objectives of the plan?
   - Yes
   - No

24. Have you assessed the availability and quality of existing data, relevant for example for scenario development?
   - Yes
   - No

25. Have you conducted an analysis of transport and mobility problems for each transport mode?
   - Yes
   - No

26. Have you conducted an analysis of the accessibility to services, employment and education?
   - Yes
   - No

27. Have you conducted an analysis of journey time reliability and network congestion (all modes)?
28. Have you conducted an analysis of safety and security, including its perception?

- Yes
- No

29. Have you conducted an analysis of air quality and noise pollution, including identification of hotspots?

- Yes
- No

30. Have you prioritised the identified problems?

- Yes
- No

31. Does the SUMP describe a business-as-usual scenario?

- Yes
- No

32. Does the SUMP explore alternative policy scenarios to understand the likely effects of different combinations of mobility measures and policies?

- Yes
- No

33. Have you used qualitative analysis techniques, (e.g. through expert judgement) to support scenario development and appraisal?

- Yes
- No
34. Have you used appropriate quantitative and transport modelling analysis techniques to support scenario development and appraisal?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

35. Did the analysis of SUMP scenarios include an appraisal of the resilience of the mobility system in relation to expected and unexpected events for the spatial area of the SUMP?

Excellence Question

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

36. Have you discussed the different policy scenarios and their impacts with a group of key stakeholders?

Foundation Question

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

37. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the different policy scenarios and their impacts, and invited them to provide feedback on these?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

Step 4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens

Developing a common vision is one of the cornerstones of every Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. It provides the basis for all subsequent steps that will define concrete targets and measures. The vision can only be the guiding element if it is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens; therefore it is crucial to create a common ownership of the vision.
38. Does the SUMP contain a long-term vision of urban mobility?

- Yes
- No

39. Have you developed the long-term vision of urban mobility in cooperation with a representative group of key stakeholders?

- Yes
- No

40. Does the SUMP explain, which scenario serves the vision in the most efficient and effective way and why?

- Yes
- No

41. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the vision building process and given them the opportunity to provide feedback?

- Yes
- No

42. Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in the development of the vision?

- Yes
- No

Step 5 - Set priorities and measurable targets
A vision is an important qualitative description of the desired future. This alone is not sufficient. A vision needs to be specified by concrete objectives, which indicate the type of change desired. Finally, these changes also need to be measureable. This requires selecting a well-thought-out set of targets that focus on selected areas (indicators).

For more Information please read the section on Step 5 in the SUMP Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. Does the <strong>SUMP</strong> clearly set out overall <strong>objectives</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Have you <strong>assessed</strong> the overall <strong>objectives</strong> of the <strong>SUMP</strong> together with a group of <strong>key stakeholders</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Have you informed <strong>stakeholders</strong> and <strong>citizens</strong> about the overall <strong>objectives</strong> of the <strong>SUMP</strong> and invited them to provide feedback?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Does the <strong>SUMP</strong> describe a set of <strong>SMART targets</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Do the <strong>targets</strong> allow monitoring of progress towards the achievement of <strong>objectives</strong> and assessed of the <strong>efficiency</strong> and effectiveness of the <strong>measures</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Have you involved a group of <strong>key stakeholders</strong> in developing <strong>targets</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
48. Have you involved a group of key stakeholders in developing targets?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

**Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures**

The development of effective packages of measures is at the core of sustainable urban mobility planning. Only well-selected measures will ensure that the defined objectives and targets are met. The selection of measures should build on discussions with key stakeholders, consider experience from other places with similar policies, ensure value for money and exploit as much as possible synergies between measures. Essentially, at this stage, measures are identified in response to the questions: what, how, where and when?

For more information please read the section on Step 6 in the SUMP Guidelines

---

49. Does the SUMP make clear how the selected measures will contribute to the achievement of the agreed vision, objectives and targets?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

50. Have you discussed measure identification and selection with a group of key stakeholders?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

51. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the process of measure identification and selection and invited them to provide feedback?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

52. Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in discussing the identified measures?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
53. Public transport: Does the SUMP suggest how to enhance the quality, integration and accessibility of public transport services (covering infrastructure, rolling stock, and services)?

- Yes
- No

54. Public transport: Does the SUMP lay out how public transport should be addressed as an integral element of all relevant transport modes in the urban area?

- Yes
- No

55. Non-motorised transport: Does the SUMP incorporate infrastructure measures to raise the attractiveness of walking and cycling?

- Yes
- No

56. Non-motorised transport: Are infrastructure measures complemented by regulatory and organisational as well as soft measures?

- Yes
- No

57. Safety and security: Does the SUMP present measures to improve safety and security of all modes?

- Yes
- No

58. Safety and security: Do the SUMP's safety and security measures address the specific needs of vulnerable travellers?
59. **Road transport (flowing + stationary):** Does the SUMP aim at optimising the use of existing road infrastructure?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

60. **Road transport (flowing + stationary):** Does the SUMP explore the potential for reallocating road space to other modes of transport or other public functions?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

61. **Urban logistics:** Does the SUMP present measures to improve the efficiency of urban logistics and freight delivery, while reducing related externalities (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions, pollutants and noise)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

62. **Urban logistics:** Does the SUMP set out how private and public stakeholders should be involved in developing and implementing mutually acceptable measures?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

63. **Mobility management:** Does the SUMP include mobility management actions to foster a change towards more sustainable mobility patterns (reflecting the needs of e.g. citizens, employers or schools)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
64. **Mobility management:** Does the SUMP foresee educational, awareness-raising and promotion activities for *sustainable* travel behaviour for identified target groups?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

65. **Intelligent Transport Systems:** Does the SUMP include Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

66. **Intelligent Transport Systems:** Does the SUMP include Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures to connect transport modes (e.g. through payment and real-time information functions)?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

**Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures II**

67. Have you contacted other cities to exchange information about the planning and implementation of one or more measures considered for inclusion in your SUMP?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

68. Have you taken elected representatives and decision makers to visit other cities with the proposed measures in place?  

**Excellence Question**

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

69. Have you *appraised* the proposed measures for their costs and related benefits?
70. Have you **assessed** the long-term **costs** of proposed **measures** (e.g. maintenance costs)?

71. Have you **assessed** the **external costs** and benefits associated with the implementation of **measures** and packages of measures?

72. Have you **appraised** costs and benefits of all **transport modes** on the basis of a common approach?

73. Have you discussed the development of **measures** related to public transport and **intermodality** with transport operators?

74. Does the **SUMP** suggest combining certain **policy measures**, i.e. proposing integrated packages of measures to achieve better results?

75. Does the **SUMP** incorporate **measures** to be implemented in partnership with organisations from...
75. Does the SUMP incorporate measures to be implemented in partnership with organisations from other sectors?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

76. Does the SUMP incorporate cross-boundary measures to be implemented in partnership with neighbouring authorities?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Step 7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding**

Closely connected to the selection of (packages of) measures is the determination of clear responsibilities and the elaboration of an action and budget plan. This is a key part of the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan and requires formal approval by all key stakeholders. Essentially, at this stage answers are found to the questions: who and how much?

For more Information please read the section on Step 7 in the SUMP Guidelines

77. Have you allocated responsibilities for the implementation of measures?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

78. Have you identified potential funding sources for the implementation of measures?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

79. Have you involved key stakeholders in the assignment of responsibilities and resources?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
80. Have you prepared an action plan, outlining e.g. implementation priorities, schedules, risks and contingency actions?

- Yes  
- No

81. Have you prepared a budget plan, setting out funding requirements and sources?

- Yes  
- No

82. Was a formal agreement reached by decision makers and key stakeholders on the action and budget plan?

- Yes  
- No

Step 8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan

Monitoring and evaluation need to be built into the plan as essential management tools to keep track of the planning process and measure implementation, but also so that you can learn from the planning experience, understand what works well and less well, and to build the business case and evidence base for the wider application of similar measures in the future.

For more information please read the section on Step 8 in the SUMP Guidelines

83. Does the SUMP foresee a regular monitoring and performance-based revision process (e.g. every 3 to 7 years)?

- Yes  
- No

84. Have you performed a data audit to account for available data and possible gaps?
85. Have you selected a subset of indicators for monitoring purposes linked to SUMP targets?

- Yes
- No

86. Have you considered both the planning process and measure implementation for monitoring and evaluation?

- Yes
- No

87. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation scheme that includes both output and outcome indicators?

- Yes
- No

88. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation scheme that includes qualitative and quantitative indicators?

- Yes
- No

89. Have you developed a data collection strategy?

- Yes
- No

90. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation plan?

- Yes
- No
91. Have you discussed arrangements for **SUMP monitoring** and **evaluation** with a group of **key stakeholders**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

92. Does the **SUMP** explain how stakeholders and **citizens** will be kept informed about **SUMP measure** implementation, **monitoring** and **evaluation**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

93. Have you foreseen mechanisms for the interactive **engagement** of stakeholders and **citizens** during **SUMP monitoring** and **evaluation**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

**Step 9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan**

The **Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan** summarises the outcomes of all previous activities. After a final quality check, the document, including the action and budget plan, needs to be formally adopted by the political representatives. It is also important to ensure that the plan is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens.

For more information please read the section on **Step 9** in the SUMP Guidelines

94. Have you asked a group of **key stakeholders** to review the draft version of the **SUMP**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
95. Have you published a final draft of the SUMP to provide stakeholders and citizens with the opportunity to make final comments?

- Yes
- No

96. Does the SUMP demonstrate compliance with the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive (2001/42/EC) and EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC)?

- Yes
- No

97. Have you discussed the proposed SUMP with the city council or its equivalent committee?

- Yes
- No

98. Was the SUMP formally adopted by the city council or its equivalent committee?

- Yes
- No

99. Was the SUMP formally approved or adopted by the elected representatives of neighbouring authorities that fall within the functional city?

- Yes
- No

100. Have you ‘celebrated’ the adoption of the SUMP with stakeholders and citizens (e.g. in the form of a public event)?
SUMP Self-Assessment Tool Feedback

Thank you for completing the SUMP Self-Assessment! We hope that you found this a valuable exercise. We would like to continue improving the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool in the future, both in terms of the content of the self-assessment and the ease of using the online tool. Your feedback in relation to the four questions below will therefore be appreciated.

Did you find the instructions helpful?

Not helpful
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Yes, helpful
9 10

How would you assess the clarity of the assessment questions?

Not clear
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Very clear
9 10

Do you have any suggestions for improving particular questions or the content of the SUMP Self-Assessment overall?

n/a

Did you find the online tool easy to use?

No
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Yes
9 10

If you experienced any technical difficulties, please describe these below:

n/a
You have now reached the end of the questionnaire. Once you press "Submit" you will be offered a final opportunity to check that you have completed all sections of the questionnaire.
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SUMP Self-Assessment Scheme

Rethymno

Overall score: 85 out of 100.

Congratulations, based on the answers you have provided the authority's plan is an Excellent Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan.

A planning process in full compliance with the European Commission's SUMP concept and guidelines as presented in the Urban Mobility Package has been followed. The resulting plan is a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan of excellent quality.

Foundation and Excellence Questions

You have answered Yes to 13 out of 13 Foundation Questions. These questions test the basic requirements a mobility planning process must fulfil to be in line with the SUMP concept.

You have answered Yes to 10 out of 15 Excellence Questions. These questions highlight planning activities particularly advanced cities might undertake, to motivate and award processes and plans of exceptionally high quality.

Copyright information

Rupprecht Consult GmbH has developed the SUMP Self-Assessment Scheme which is disseminated through the EU co-funded project CH4LLENGE.

Copyright: The self-assessment is made available free of charge for non-commercial use and is subject to a Creative Commons licence ("attribution, non-commercial, no derivatives").
### SUMP Cycle Steps

The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to each of the steps in the SUMP planning cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Define the development process and scope of the plan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Set priorities and measurable targets</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Develop effective packages of measures</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMP Characteristics

The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to the main characteristics of a SUMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMP Characteristic</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term vision and clear implementation plan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory approach</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced consideration of all transport modes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral, vertical and spatial integration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of current and future performance &amp; cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, plan revision and reporting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome to the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool

Some basic questions about your city

You are invited to begin the SUMP Self-Assessment by providing some general information about your city or planning authority, including the name of the city which will appear on the final results page (which can be downloaded).

The SUMP Self-Assessment can be completed on an anonymous basis. However, if you do not wish to name the city it is helpful if you do provide some basic information on country and population of the city, to enable analyses of results at an aggregated level.

In no case will we publish the results of individual cities or identify individual cities in any publications based on such analyses. None of these questions are mandatory, so if you believe that the questions identify your city too clearly, then you do not need to provide answers.

I. What is the name of the city, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Rethymno

II. In which country is the city located, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Greece

III. If a Non-EU country, please specify which one.

IV. What is the population of the city (based on geographic area covered by the SUMP), for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

- [ ] Below 50,000
- [ ] Between 50,000 and 100,000
- [ ] Between 600,000 and 1 million
- [ ] Between 1 and 2 million
Step 1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP

At the beginning of the sustainable urban mobility planning process, it is necessary to determine the potential to elaborate a successful Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. Framework conditions should be analysed including internal and external factors that have an impact on the planning process and plan implementation.

For more information please read the section on Step 1 in the SUMP Guidelines

1. Have you, the responsible planning authority, made a formal commitment to make sustainable mobility principles the underlying basis for the SUMP?

   - Yes
   - No

2. Has the city council reinforced its commitment to sustainable urban mobility by signing a covenant (e.g. the Covenant of Mayors) or joining a network (e.g. the CiViTAS Forum)?

V. How many SUMPs or equivalent mobility plans has the city prepared before?

   - This is the first
   - This is the second
   - This is the third
   - The city has prepared four or more SUMPs in the past

Thank you for providing this information!
3. Have you reviewed relevant regulations and plans from the European, national and regional level that have implications for the SUMP?

Yes  

4. Have you reflected on the strengths and weaknesses of your existing local planning practices with regard to developing the SUMP?

Yes  

5. Have you used a peer-review methodology for analysing the strengths and weaknesses?

Yes  

6. Have you undertaken a gap analysis of qualifications and skills within the planning authority in order to identify capacity building needs?

Yes  

7. Have you assessed the sources for funding the process of developing the SUMP?
8. Have you examined how the SUMP preparation timeframe could be aligned with the development and implementation of other existing policies and strategies (e.g. the land use plan)?

   **Foundation Question**

   - Yes  
   - No

9. Have you defined a timeframe for the preparation and implementation of the SUMP?

   **Foundation Question**

   - Yes  
   - No

10. Have you identified relevant stakeholders, their impact and role early on in the SUMP preparation process?

    **Foundation Question**

    - Yes  
    - No

11. Have you carried out an analysis of stakeholder constellations (e.g. incorporating assessments of stakeholders’ objectives, power, capacity and planning resources)?

    **Foundation Question**

    - Yes  
    - No

12. Have you involved stakeholders within the "vulnerable users" group in the SUMP process?

    **Excellence Question**

    - Yes  
    - No
Step 2 - Define the development process and scope of plan

The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan development process needs to be tailored to the local situation. This includes as a crucial step the definition of the geographical scope of the plan, which should cover the functioning urban area. Stakeholder cooperation and policy integration are other fields that need to be addressed in this phase, which should be concluded with an agreement on the work plan and management arrangements.

For more information please read the section on Step 2 in the SUMP Guidelines

13. Has a cooperation process been established by all neighbouring authorities on the spatial coverage of the SUMP?  
   
   Foundation Question
   
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

14. Does the SUMP cover the ‘functional city’ (i.e. an area defined by main commuter flows) that goes beyond administrative boundaries?  
   
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

15. Have you and neighbouring authorities agreed on roles and responsibilities for SUMP development?  
   
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

16. Have you established a SUMP development team across neighbouring authorities that has met on a regular basis?  
   
   Excellence Question
   
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

17. Does the SUMP refer to policies and plans, which already exist or are being developed on the local level?  
   
   Foundation Question
   
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No
18. Have you regularly involved institutions representing policy areas closely related to mobility (e.g. land-use, environment, health)?

**Foundation Question**

19. Have you developed a participation strategy suggesting a mix of involvement formats for the SUMP development process?

20. Have you created a SUMP development team driving the preparation and monitoring of the SUMP development process?

21. Have you drafted an internal work plan for the planning process, indicating steps to be taken, responsibilities and milestones?

---

**Step 3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios**

The last step of preparing well for the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan is to analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios of possible future mobility situations. This provides the basis for setting goals in a rational and transparent way. As a first activity, a thorough analysis is needed of the problems and opportunities in the field of urban transport and mobility. This is an important milestone as it feeds into the development of different scenarios. The process should help ensure an understanding of relevant issues.
the development of different scenarios. These scenarios help improve our understanding of what urban mobility could look like in the future.

For more information please read the section on Step 3 in the SUMP Guidelines.

22. Have you conducted a diagnosis of the main urban transport and mobility related problems?

Foundation Question

- Yes
- No

23. Have you selected suitable indicators to describe the mobility situation in the spatial area covered by the SUMP and to reflect the objectives of the plan?

- Yes
- No

24. Have you assessed the availability and quality of existing data, relevant for example for scenario development?

- Yes
- No

25. Have you conducted an analysis of transport and mobility problems for each transport mode?

- Yes
- No

26. Have you conducted an analysis of the accessibility to services, employment and education?

- Yes
- No

27. Have you conducted an analysis of journey time reliability and network congestion (all modes)?

- Yes
- No
28. Have you conducted an analysis of safety and security, including its perception?

- Yes
- No

29. Have you conducted an analysis of air quality and noise pollution, including identification of hotspots?

- Yes
- No

30. Have you prioritised the identified problems?

- Yes
- No

31. Does the SUMP describe a business-as-usual scenario?

- Yes
- No

32. Does the SUMP explore alternative policy scenarios to understand the likely effects of different combinations of mobility measures and policies?

- Yes
- No

33. Have you used qualitative analysis techniques, (e.g. through expert judgement) to support scenario development and appraisal?

- Yes
- No
34. Have you used appropriate quantitative and transport modelling analysis techniques to support scenario development and appraisal?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

35. Did the analysis of SUMP scenarios include an appraisal of the resilience of the mobility system in relation to expected and unexpected events for the spatial area of the SUMP?  

Excellence Question

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

36. Have you discussed the different policy scenarios and their impacts with a group of key stakeholders?

Foundation Question

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

37. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the different policy scenarios and their impacts, and invited them to provide feedback on these?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Step 4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens

Developing a common vision is one of the cornerstones of every Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. It provides the basis for all subsequent steps that will define concrete targets and measures. The vision can only be the guiding element if it is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens; therefore it is crucial to create a common ownership of the vision.
38. Does the SUMP contain a long-term vision of urban mobility?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

39. Have you developed the long-term vision of urban mobility in cooperation with a representative group of key stakeholders?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

40. Does the SUMP explain, which scenario serves the vision in the most efficient and effective way and why?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

41. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the vision building process and given them the opportunity to provide feedback?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

42. Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in the development of the vision?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

Step 5 - Set priorities and measurable targets
A vision is an important qualitative description of the desired future. This alone is not sufficient. A vision needs to be specified by concrete objectives, which indicate the type of change desired. Finally, these changes also need to be measureable. This requires selecting a well-thought-out set of targets that focus on selected areas (indicators).

For more Information please read the section on Step 5 in the SUMP Guidelines

43. Does the SUMP clearly set out overall objectives?

- Yes
- No

44. Have you assessed the overall objectives of the SUMP together with a group of key stakeholders?

- Yes
- No

45. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the overall objectives of the SUMP and invited them to provide feedback?

- Yes
- No

46. Does the SUMP describe a set of SMART targets?

- Yes
- No

47. Do the targets allow monitoring of progress towards the achievement of objectives and assessed of the efficiency and effectiveness of the measures?

- Yes
- No

48. Have you involved a group of key stakeholders in developing targets?
Have you involved a group of key stakeholders in developing targets?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

**Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures**

The development of effective packages of measures is at the core of sustainable urban mobility planning. Only well-selected measures will ensure that the defined objectives and targets are met. The selection of measures should build on discussions with key stakeholders, consider experience from other places with similar policies, ensure value for money and exploit as much as possible synergies between measures. Essentially, at this stage, measures are identified in response to the questions: what, how, where and when?

For more information please read the section on Step 6 in the SUMP Guidelines.

---

Does the SUMP make clear how the selected measures will contribute to the achievement of the agreed vision, objectives and targets?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

Have you discussed measure identification and selection with a group of key stakeholders?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the process of measure identification and selection and invited them to provide feedback?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in discussing the identified measures?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
53. **Public transport:** Does the SUMP suggest how to enhance the quality, integration and accessibility of public transport services (covering infrastructure, rolling stock, and services)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

54. **Public transport:** Does the SUMP lay out how public transport should be addressed as an integral element of all relevant transport modes in the urban area?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

55. **Non-motorised transport:** Does the SUMP incorporate infrastructure measures to raise the attractiveness of walking and cycling?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

56. **Non-motorised transport:** Are infrastructure measures complemented by regulatory and organisational as well as soft measures?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

57. **Safety and security:** Does the SUMP present measures to improve safety and security of all modes?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

58. **Safety and security:** Do the SUMP’s safety and security measures address the specific needs of vulnerable travellers?
59. **Road transport (flowing + stationary):** Does the SUMP aim at optimising the use of existing road infrastructure?

- Yes
- No

60. **Road transport (flowing + stationary):** Does the SUMP explore the potential for reallocating road space to other modes of transport or other public functions?

- Yes
- No

61. **Urban logistics:** Does the SUMP present measures to improve the efficiency of urban logistics and freight delivery, while reducing related externalities (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions, pollutants and noise)?

- Yes
- No

62. **Urban logistics:** Does the SUMP set out how private and public stakeholders should be involved in developing and implementing mutually acceptable measures?

- Yes
- No

63. **Mobility management:** Does the SUMP include mobility management actions to foster a change towards more sustainable mobility patterns (reflecting the needs of e.g. citizens, employers or schools)?

- Yes
- No
64. **Mobility management:** Does the SUMP foresee educational, **awareness-raising** and promotion activities for **sustainable** travel behaviour for identified target groups?

- Yes
- No

65. **Intelligent Transport Systems:** Does the SUMP include **Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures**?

- Yes
- No

66. **Intelligent Transport Systems:** Does the SUMP include **Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures** to connect **transport modes** (e.g. through payment and real-time information functions)?

- Yes
- No

**Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures II**

67. Have you contacted other cities to exchange information about the planning and implementation of one or more **measures** considered for inclusion in your SUMP?

- Yes
- No

68. Have you taken elected representatives and decision makers to visit other cities with the proposed **measures** in place?

   *Excellence Question*

- Yes
- No

69. Have you **appraised** the proposed **measures** for their **costs** and related benefits?
70. Have you assessed the long-term costs of proposed measures (e.g. maintenance costs)?

71. Have you assessed the external costs and benefits associated with the implementation of measures and packages of measures?

72. Have you appraised costs and benefits of all transport modes on the basis of a common approach?

73. Have you discussed the development of measures related to public transport and intermodality with transport operators?

74. Does the SUMP suggest combining certain policy measures, i.e. proposing integrated packages of measures to achieve better results?

75. Does the SUMP incorporate measures to be implemented in partnership with organisations from
76. Does the SUMP incorporate cross-boundary measures to be implemented in partnership with neighbouring authorities?

Excellence Question

☐ Yes  ☐ No

---

**Step 7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding**

Closely connected to the selection of (packages of) measures is the determination of clear responsibilities and the elaboration of an action and budget plan. This is a key part of the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan and requires formal approval by all key stakeholders. Essentially, at this stage answers are found to the questions: who and how much?

For more Information please read the section on **Step 7** in the SUMP Guidelines

77. Have you allocated responsibilities for the implementation of measures?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

78. Have you identified potential funding sources for the implementation of measures?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

79. Have you involved key stakeholders in the assignment of responsibilities and resources?

☐ Yes  ☐ No
80. Have you prepared an action plan, outlining e.g. implementation priorities, schedules, risks and contingency actions?

- [ ] Yes  - [ ] No

81. Have you prepared a budget plan, setting out funding requirements and sources?

- [ ] Yes  - [ ] No

82. Was a formal agreement reached by decision makers and key stakeholders on the action and budget plan?

- [ ] Yes  - [ ] No

---

**Step 8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan**

Monitoring and evaluation need to be built into the plan as essential management tools to keep track of the planning process and measure implementation, but also so that you can learn from the planning experience, understand what works well and less well, and to build the business case and evidence base for the wider application of similar measures in the future.

For more information please read the section on Step 8 in the SUMP Guidelines

83. Does the SUMP foresee a regular monitoring and performance-based revision process (e.g. every 3 to 7 years)?

- [ ] Yes  - [ ] No

84. Have you performed a data audit to account for available data and possible gaps?

- [ ] Yes  - [ ] No
85. Have you selected a subset of indicators for monitoring purposes linked to SUMP targets?

- Yes
- No

86. Have you considered both the planning process and measure implementation for monitoring and evaluation?

- Yes
- No

87. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation scheme that includes both output and outcome indicators?

- Yes
- No

88. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation scheme that includes qualitative and quantitative indicators?

- Yes
- No

89. Have you developed a data collection strategy?

- Yes
- No

90. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation plan?

- Yes
- No
91. Have you discussed arrangements for **SUMP monitoring** and **evaluation** with a group of **key stakeholders**?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

92. Does the **SUMP** explain how stakeholders and **citizens** will be kept informed about **SUMP measure** implementation, **monitoring** and **evaluation**?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

93. Have you foreseen mechanisms for the interactive **engagement** of stakeholders and **citizens** during **SUMP monitoring** and **evaluation**?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

---

**Step 9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan**

The **Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan** summarises the outcomes of all previous activities. After a final quality check, the document, including the action and budget plan, needs to be formally adopted by the political representatives. It is also important to ensure that the plan is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens.

For more information please read the section on **Step 9** in the SUMP Guidelines

94. Have you asked a group of **key stakeholders** to review the draft version of the **SUMP**?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No
95. Have you published a final draft of the **SUMP** to provide stakeholders and **citizens** with the opportunity to make final comments?

*Foundation Question*

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

96. Does the **SUMP** demonstrate compliance with the **EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive (2001/42/EC)** and **EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC)**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

97. Have you discussed the proposed **SUMP** with the city council or its equivalent committee?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

98. Was the **SUMP** formally adopted by the city council or its equivalent committee?

*Foundation Question*

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

99. Was the **SUMP** formally approved or adopted by the elected representatives of **neighbouring authorities** that fall within the **functional city**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

100. Have you ‘celebrated’ the adoption of the **SUMP** with **stakeholders** and **citizens** (e.g. in the form of a public event)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
**SUMP Self-Assessment Tool Feedback**

Thank you for completing the SUMP Self-Assessment! We hope that you found this a valuable exercise. We would like to continue improving the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool in the future, both in terms of the content of the self-assessment and the ease of using the online tool. Your feedback in relation to the four questions below will therefore be appreciated.

Did you find the instructions helpful?

- Not helpful
  - 0
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - Yes, helpful
    - 9
    - 10

How would you assess the clarity of the assessment questions?

- Not clear
  - 0
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - Very clear
    - 9
    - 10

Do you have any suggestions for improving particular questions or the content of the SUMP Self-Assessment overall?

- 

Did you find the online tool easy to use?

- No
  - 0
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - Yes
    - 9
    - 10

If you experienced any technical difficulties, please describe these below:

- 

You have now reached the end of the questionnaire. Once you press "Submit" you will be offered a final opportunity to check that you have completed all sections of the questionnaire.
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**SUMP Self-Assessment Scheme**

**Portoferraio**

Overall score: 48 out of 100.

Based on the answers you have provided the authority's plan is **not a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan**.

A planning process in compliance with several aspects of the SUMP concept has been followed. However it does not sufficiently comply with all basic criteria of the European Commission's SUMP concept and guidelines as presented in the Urban Mobility Package. Therefore, the resulting plan should not be considered a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan.

**Foundation and Excellence Questions**

You have answered Yes to **10** out of 13 Foundation Questions.
These questions test the basic requirements a mobility planning process must fulfil to be in line with the SUMP concept.

You have answered Yes to **5** out of 15 Excellence Questions.
These questions highlight planning activities particularly advanced cities might undertake, to motivate and award processes and plans of exceptionally high quality.

**Copyright information**

Rupprecht Consult GmbH has developed the SUMP Self-Assessment Scheme which is disseminated through the EU co-funded project **CH4LLENGE**.

Copyright: The self-assessment is made available free of charge for non-commercial use and is subject to a Creative Commons licence ("attribution, non-commercial, no derivatives").
**SUMP Cycle Steps**
The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to each of the steps in the SUMP planning cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Define the development process and scope of the plan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Set priorities and measurable targets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Develop effective packages of measures</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMP Characteristics**
The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to the main characteristics of a SUMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMP Characteristic</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term vision and clear implementation plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory approach</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced consideration of all transport modes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral, vertical and spatial integration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of current and future performance &amp; cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, plan revision and reporting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome to the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool

Some basic questions about your city

You are invited to begin the SUMP Self-Assessment by providing some general information about your city or planning authority, including the name of the city which will appear on the final results page (which can be downloaded).

The SUMP Self-Assessment can be completed on an anonymous basis. However, if you do not wish to name the city it is helpful if you do provide some basic information on country and population of the city, to enable analyses of results at an aggregated level.

In no case will we publish the results of individual cities or identify individual cities in any publications based on such analyses. None of these questions are mandatory, so if you believe that the questions identify your city too clearly, then you do not need to provide answers.

I. What is the name of the city, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Portoferraio

II. In which country is the city located, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Italy

III. If a Non-EU country, please specify which one.

IV. What is the population of the city (based on geographic area covered by the SUMP), for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

- [ ] Below 50,000
- [ ] Between 50,000 and 100,000
- [ ] Between 100,000 and 200,000
- [ ] Between 200,000 and 1 million
- [ ] Between 1 and 2 million
- [ ] Between 600,000 and 1 million
Step 1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP

At the beginning of the sustainable urban mobility planning process, it is necessary to determine the potential to elaborate a successful Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. Framework conditions should be analysed including internal and external factors that have an impact on the planning process and plan implementation.

For more information please read the section on Step 1 in the SUMP Guidelines

1. Have you, the responsible planning authority, made a formal commitment to make sustainable mobility principles the underlying basis for the SUMP?

   - Yes
   - No

2. Has the city council reinforced its commitment to sustainable urban mobility by signing a covenant (e.g. the Covenant of Mayors) or joining a network (e.g. the CiViTAS Forum)?
3. Have you reviewed relevant regulations and plans from the European, national and regional level that have implications for the SUMP?

- Yes
- No

4. Have you reflected on the strengths and weaknesses of your existing local planning practices with regard to developing the SUMP?

- Yes
- No

5. Have you used a peer-review methodology for analysing the strengths and weaknesses?

- Yes
- No

6. Have you undertaken a gap analysis of qualifications and skills within the planning authority in order to identify capacity building needs?

- Yes
- No

7. Have you assessed the sources for funding the process of developing the SUMP?
8. Have you examined how the SUMP preparation timeframe could be aligned with the development and implementation of other existing policies and strategies (e.g. the land use plan)?

   **Foundation Question**

   - Yes
   - No

9. Have you defined a timeframe for the preparation and implementation of the SUMP?

   - Yes
   - No

10. Have you identified relevant stakeholders, their impact and role early on in the SUMP preparation process?

    **Foundation Question**

    - Yes
    - No

11. Have you carried out an analysis of stakeholder constellations (e.g. incorporating assessments of stakeholders’ objectives, power, capacity and planning resources)?

    - Yes
    - No

12. Have you involved stakeholders within the "vulnerable users" group in the SUMP process?

    **Excellence Question**

    - Yes
    - No
Step 2 - Define the development process and scope of plan

The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan development process needs to be tailored to the local situation. This includes as a crucial step the definition of the geographical scope of the plan, which should cover the functioning urban area. Stakeholder cooperation and policy integration are other fields that need to be addressed in this phase, which should be concluded with an agreement on the work plan and management arrangements.

For more information please read the section on Step 2 in the SUMP Guidelines.

13. Has a cooperation process been established by all neighbouring authorities on the spatial coverage of the SUMP?

   Foundation Question

   ● Yes  ○ No

14. Does the SUMP cover the ‘functional city’ (i.e. an area defined by main commuter flows) that goes beyond administrative boundaries?

   ● Yes  ○ No

15. Have you and neighbouring authorities agreed on roles and responsibilities for SUMP development?

   ○ Yes  ● No

16. Have you established a SUMP development team across neighbouring authorities that has met on a regular basis?

   ● Yes  ○ No

17. Does the SUMP refer to policies and plans, which already exist or are being developed on the local level?

   Foundation Question

   ● Yes  ○ No
18. Have you regularly involved institutions representing policy areas closely related to mobility (e.g. land-use, environment, health)?

Foundation Question

- Yes
- No

19. Have you developed a participation strategy suggesting a mix of involvement formats for the SUMP development process?

- Yes
- No

20. Have you created a SUMP development team driving the preparation and monitoring of the SUMP development process?

- Yes
- No

21. Have you drafted an internal work plan for the planning process, indicating steps to be taken, responsibilities and milestones?

- Yes
- No

Step 3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios

The last step of preparing well for the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan is to analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios of possible future mobility situations. This provides the basis for setting goals in a rational and transparent way. As a first activity, a thorough analysis is needed of the problems and opportunities in the field of urban transport and mobility. This is an important milestone as it feeds into
the development of different scenarios. These scenarios help improve our understanding of what urban mobility could look like in the future.

For more information please read the section on Step 3 in the SUMP Guidelines

22. Have you conducted a diagnosis of the main urban transport and mobility related problems?

   *Foundation Question*

   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

23. Have you selected suitable indicators to describe the mobility situation in the spatial area covered by the SUMP and to reflect the objectives of the plan?

   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

24. Have you assessed the availability and quality of existing data, relevant for example for scenario development?

   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

25. Have you conducted an analysis of transport and mobility problems for each transport mode?

   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

26. Have you conducted an analysis of the accessibility to services, employment and education?

   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

27. Have you conducted an analysis of journey time reliability and network congestion (all modes)?

   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
28. Have you conducted an analysis of safety and security, including its perception?

- Yes
- No

29. Have you conducted an analysis of air quality and noise pollution, including identification of hotspots?

- Yes
- No

30. Have you prioritised the identified problems?

- Yes
- No

31. Does the SUMP describe a business-as-usual scenario?

- Yes
- No

32. Does the SUMP explore alternative policy scenarios to understand the likely effects of different combinations of mobility measures and policies?

- Yes
- No

33. Have you used qualitative analysis techniques, (e.g. through expert judgement) to support scenario development and appraisal?
34. Have you used appropriate quantitative and transport modelling analysis techniques to support scenario development and appraisal?

- Yes
- No

35. Did the analysis of SUMP scenarios include an appraisal of the resilience of the mobility system in relation to expected and unexpected events for the spatial area of the SUMP?  

- Yes
- No

Excellence Question

36. Have you discussed the different policy scenarios and their impacts with a group of key stakeholders?

- Yes
- No

Foundation Question

37. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the different policy scenarios and their impacts, and invited them to provide feedback on these?

- Yes
- No

Step 4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens

Developing a common vision is one of the cornerstones of every Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. It provides the basis for all subsequent steps that will define concrete targets and measures. The vision can only be the guiding element if it is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens; therefore it is crucial to create a common ownership of the vision.
38. Does the SUMP contain a long-term vision of urban mobility?

*Foundation Question*

- Yes
- No

39. Have you developed the long-term vision of urban mobility in cooperation with a representative group of key stakeholders?

- Yes
- No

40. Does the SUMP explain, which scenario serves the vision in the most efficient and effective way and why?

- Yes
- No

41. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the vision building process and given them the opportunity to provide feedback?

- Yes
- No

42. Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in the development of the vision?

- Yes
- No

**Step 5 - Set priorities and measurable targets**
A vision is an important qualitative description of the desired future. This alone is not sufficient. A vision needs to be specified by concrete objectives, which indicate the type of change desired. Finally, these changes also need to be measurable. This requires selecting a well-thought-out set of targets that focus on selected areas (indicators).

For more Information please read the section on Step 5 in the SUMP Guidelines

43. Does the SUMP clearly set out overall objectives?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

44. Have you assessed the overall objectives of the SUMP together with a group of key stakeholders?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

45. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the overall objectives of the SUMP and invited them to provide feedback?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

46. Does the SUMP describe a set of SMART targets?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

47. Do the targets allow monitoring of progress towards the achievement of objectives and assessed of the efficiency and effectiveness of the measures?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
48. Have you involved a group of key stakeholders in developing targets?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

---

**Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures**

The development of effective packages of measures is at the core of sustainable urban mobility planning. Only well-selected measures will ensure that the defined objectives and targets are met. The selection of measures should build on discussions with key stakeholders, consider experience from other places with similar policies, ensure value for money and exploit as much as possible synergies between measures. Essentially, at this stage, measures are identified in response to the questions: what, how, where and when?

For more information please read the section on Step 6 in the SUMP Guidelines.

49. Does the SUMP make clear how the selected measures will contribute to the achievement of the agreed vision, objectives and targets?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

---

50. Have you discussed measure identification and selection with a group of key stakeholders?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

---

51. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the process of measure identification and selection and invited them to provide feedback?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

---

52. Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in discussing the identified measures?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No
53. **Public transport:** Does the SUMP suggest how to enhance the quality, integration and accessibility of public transport services (covering infrastructure, rolling stock, and services)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

54. **Public transport:** Does the SUMP lay out how public transport should be addressed as an integral element of all relevant transport modes in the urban area?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

55. **Non-motorised transport:** Does the SUMP incorporate infrastructure measures to raise the attractiveness of walking and cycling?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

56. **Non-motorised transport:** Are infrastructure measures complemented by regulatory and organisational as well as soft measures?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

57. **Safety and security:** Does the SUMP present measures to improve safety and security of all modes?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

58. **Safety and security:** Do the SUMP's safety and security measures address the specific needs of vulnerable travellers?
59. **Road transport (flowing + stationary)**: Does the SUMP aim at optimising the use of existing road infrastructure?

- Yes
- No

60. **Road transport (flowing + stationary)**: Does the SUMP explore the potential for reallocating road space to other modes of transport or other public functions?

- Yes
- No

61. **Urban logistics**: Does the SUMP present measures to improve the efficiency of urban logistics and freight delivery, while reducing related externalities (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions, pollutants and noise)?

- Yes
- No

62. **Urban logistics**: Does the SUMP set out how private and public stakeholders should be involved in developing and implementing mutually acceptable measures?

- Yes
- No

63. **Mobility management**: Does the SUMP include mobility management actions to foster a change towards more sustainable mobility patterns (reflecting the needs of e.g. citizens, employers or schools)?

- Yes
- No
64. **Mobility management**: Does the SUMP foresee educational, awareness-raising and promotion activities for sustainable travel behaviour for identified target groups?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

65. **Intelligent Transport Systems**: Does the SUMP include Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

66. **Intelligent Transport Systems**: Does the SUMP include Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures to connect transport modes (e.g. through payment and real-time information functions)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

**Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures II**

67. Have you contacted other cities to exchange information about the planning and implementation of one or more measures considered for inclusion in your SUMP?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

68. Have you taken elected representatives and decision makers to visit other cities with the proposed measures in place?

*Excellence Question*

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

69. Have you appraised the proposed measures for their costs and related benefits?
70. Have you assessed the long-term costs of proposed measures (e.g. maintenance costs)?

Excellence Question

71. Have you assessed the external costs and benefits associated with the implementation of measures and packages of measures?

Excellence Question

72. Have you appraised costs and benefits of all transport modes on the basis of a common approach?

73. Have you discussed the development of measures related to public transport and intermodality with transport operators?

74. Does the SUMP suggest combining certain policy measures, i.e. proposing integrated packages of measures to achieve better results?

75. Does the SUMP incorporate measures to be implemented in partnership with organisations from
75. Does the SUMP incorporate measures to be implemented in partnership with organisations from other sectors?

- Yes
- No

76. Does the SUMP incorporate cross-boundary measures to be implemented in partnership with neighbouring authorities?

- Yes
- No

---

**Step 7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding**

Closely connected to the selection of (packages of) measures is the determination of clear responsibilities and the elaboration of an action and budget plan. This is a key part of the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan and requires formal approval by all key stakeholders. Essentially, at this stage answers are found to the questions: who and how much?

For more Information please read the section on Step 7 in the SUMP Guidelines

---

77. Have you allocated responsibilities for the implementation of measures?

- Yes
- No

78. Have you identified potential funding sources for the implementation of measures?

- Yes
- No

79. Have you involved key stakeholders in the assignment of responsibilities and resources?

- Yes
- No
80. Have you prepared an action plan, outlining e.g. implementation priorities, schedules, risks and contingency actions?

- Yes
- No

81. Have you prepared a budget plan, setting out funding requirements and sources?

- Yes
- No

82. Was a formal agreement reached by decision makers and key stakeholders on the action and budget plan?

- Yes
- No

**Step 8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan**

Monitoring and evaluation need to be built into the plan as essential management tools to keep track of the planning process and measure implementation, but also so that you can learn from the planning experience, understand what works well and less well, and to build the business case and evidence base for the wider application of similar measures in the future.

For more information please read the section on Step 8 in the SUMP Guidelines

83. Does the SUMP foresee a regular monitoring and performance-based revision process (e.g. every 3 to 7 years)?

- Yes
- No

84. Have you performed a data audit to account for available data and possible gaps?
85. Have you selected a subset of **indicators** for **monitoring** purposes linked to **SUMP targets**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

86. Have you considered both the planning process and **measure** implementation for **monitoring** and **evaluation**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

87. Have you developed a **monitoring** and **evaluation** scheme that includes both output and outcome **indicators**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

88. Have you developed a **monitoring** and **evaluation** scheme that includes qualitative and quantitative **indicators**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

89. Have you developed a **data** collection **strategy**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

90. Have you developed a **monitoring** and **evaluation** plan?

**Excellence Question**
91. Have you discussed arrangements for **SUMP monitoring** and **evaluation** with a group of **key stakeholders**?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

92. Does the **SUMP** explain how stakeholders and **citizens** will be kept informed about **SUMP measure** implementation, **monitoring** and **evaluation**?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

93. Have you foreseen mechanisms for the interactive **engagement** of stakeholders and **citizens** during **SUMP monitoring** and **evaluation**?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

---

**Step 9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan**

*The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan summarises the outcomes of all previous activities. After a final quality check, the document, including the action and budget plan, needs to be formally adopted by the political representatives. It is also important to ensure that the plan is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens.*

For more information please read the section on **Step 9** in the SUMP Guidelines

94. Have you asked a group of **key stakeholders** to review the draft version of the **SUMP**?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
95. Have you published a final draft of the SUMP to provide stakeholders and citizens with the opportunity to make final comments?

- Yes
- No

96. Does the SUMP demonstrate compliance with the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive (2001/42/EC) and EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC)?

- Yes
- No

97. Have you discussed the proposed SUMP with the city council or its equivalent committee?

- Yes
- No

98. Was the SUMP formally adopted by the city council or its equivalent committee?

- Yes
- No

99. Was the SUMP formally approved or adopted by the elected representatives of neighbouring authorities that fall within the functional city?

- Yes
- No

100. Have you 'celebrated' the adoption of the SUMP with stakeholders and citizens (e.g. in the form of a public event)?

- Yes
- No
SUMP Self-Assessment Tool Feedback

Thank you for completing the SUMP Self-Assessment! We hope that you found this a valuable exercise. We would like to continue improving the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool in the future, both in terms of the content of the self-assessment and the ease of using the online tool. Your feedback in relation to the four questions below will therefore be appreciated.

Did you find the instructions helpful?

Not helpful
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8  Yes, helpful 9 10

How would you assess the clarity of the assessment questions?

Not clear
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8  Very clear 9 10

Do you have any suggestions for improving particular questions or the content of the SUMP Self-Assessment overall?


Did you find the online tool easy to use?

No
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8  Yes 9 10

If you experienced any technical difficulties, please describe these below:


You have now reached the end of the questionnaire. Once you press "Submit" you will be offered a final opportunity to check that you have completed all sections of the questionnaire.
14 Feb 2020

**SUMP Self-Assessment Scheme**

**Valletta Region**

*Overall score: 85 out of 100.*

![Score Bar] 85 out of 100

**Congratulations, based on the answers you have provided the authority's plan is an Excellent Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan.**

A planning process in full compliance with the European Commission's SUMP concept and guidelines as presented in the Urban Mobility Package has been followed. The resulting plan is a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan of excellent quality.

**Foundation and Excellence Questions**

You have answered Yes to 13 out of 13 Foundation Questions. These questions test the basic requirements a mobility planning process must fulfil to be in line with the SUMP concept.

You have answered Yes to 10 out of 15 Excellence Questions. These questions highlight planning activities particularly advanced cities might undertake, to motivate and award processes and plans of exceptionally high quality.

**Copyright information**

Rupprecht Consult GmbH has developed the SUMP Self-Assessment Scheme which is disseminated through the EU co-funded project [CH4LLENGE](#).

Copyright: The self-assessment is made available free of charge for non-commercial use and is subject to a [Creative Commons licence](#) (“attribution, non-commercial, no derivatives”).
## SUMP Cycle Steps

The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to each of the steps in the SUMP planning cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Define the development process and scope of the plan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Set priorities and measurable targets</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Develop effective packages of measures</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMP Characteristics

The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to the main characteristics of a SUMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMP Characteristic</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term vision and clear implementation plan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory approach</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced consideration of all transport modes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral, vertical and spatial integration</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of current and future performance &amp; cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, plan revision and reporting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Score

100
Welcome to the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool

Some basic questions about your city

You are invited to begin the SUMP Self-Assessment by providing some general information about your city or planning authority, including the name of the city which will appear on the final results page (which can be downloaded).

The SUMP Self-Assessment can be completed on an anonymous basis. However, if you do not wish to name the city it is helpful if you do provide some basic information on country and population of the city, to enable analyses of results at an aggregated level.

In no case will we publish the results of individual cities or identify individual cities in any publications based on such analyses. None of these questions are mandatory, so if you believe that the questions identify your city too clearly, then you do not need to provide answers.

I. What is the name of the city, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Valletta Region

II. In which country is the city located, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Malta

III. If a Non-EU country, please specify which one.

N/A

IV. What is the population of the city (based on geographic area covered by the SUMP), for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

- [ ] Below 50,000
- [ ] Between 50,000 and 100,000
- [ ] Between 600,000 and 1 million
- [ ] Between 1 and 2 million
V. How many SUMPs or equivalent mobility plans has the city prepared before?

- This is the first
- This is the second
- **This is the third**
- The city has prepared four or more SUMPs in the past

**Thank you for providing this information!**

---

**Step 1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP**

*At the beginning of the sustainable urban mobility planning process, it is necessary to determine the potential to elaborate a successful Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. Framework conditions should be analysed including internal and external factors that have an impact on the planning process and plan implementation.*

For more information please read the section on **Step 1** in the SUMP Guidelines

1. Have you, the responsible planning **authority**, made a formal commitment to make **sustainable mobility** principles the underlying basis for the **SUMP**?

- **Yes**
- No

2. Has the city council reinforced its commitment to **sustainable urban mobility** by signing a covenant (e.g. the Covenant of Mayors) or joining a network (e.g. the CiViTAS Forum)?
3. Have you reviewed relevant regulations and plans from the European, national and regional level that have implications for the SUMP?

- Yes
- No

4. Have you reflected on the strengths and weaknesses of your existing local planning practices with regard to developing the SUMP?

- Yes
- No

5. Have you used a peer-review methodology for analysing the strengths and weaknesses?

- Yes
- No

6. Have you undertaken a gap analysis of qualifications and skills within the planning authority in order to identify capacity building needs?

- Yes
- No

7. Have you assessed the sources for funding the process of developing the SUMP?
8. Have you examined how the SUMP preparation timeframe could be aligned with the development and implementation of other existing policies and strategies (e.g. the land use plan)?

Foundation Question

Yes ☐ No ☐

9. Have you defined a timeframe for the preparation and implementation of the SUMP?

Yes ☐ No ☐

10. Have you identified relevant stakeholders, their impact and role early on in the SUMP preparation process?

Foundation Question

Yes ☐ No ☐

11. Have you carried out an analysis of stakeholder constellations (e.g. incorporating assessments of stakeholders’ objectives, power, capacity and planning resources)?

Yes ☐ No ☐

12. Have you involved stakeholders within the "vulnerable users" group in the SUMP process?

Excellence Question

Yes ☐ No ☐
Step 2 - Define the development process and scope of plan

The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan development process needs to be tailored to the local situation. This includes as a crucial step the definition of the geographical scope of the plan, which should cover the functioning urban area. Stakeholder cooperation and policy integration are other fields that need to be addressed in this phase, which should be concluded with an agreement on the work plan and management arrangements.

For more information please read the section on Step 2 in the SUMP Guidelines.

13. Has a cooperation process been established by all neighbouring authorities on the spatial coverage of the SUMP?

   Foundation Question

   ● Yes  ○ No

14. Does the SUMP cover the ‘functional city’ (i.e. an area defined by main commuter flows) that goes beyond administrative boundaries?

   ● Yes  ○ No

15. Have you and neighbouring authorities agreed on roles and responsibilities for SUMP development?

   ● Yes  ○ No

16. Have you established a SUMP development team across neighbouring authorities that has met on a regular basis?

   Excellence Question

   ● Yes  ○ No

17. Does the SUMP refer to policies and plans, which already exist or are being developed on the local level?

   Foundation Question

   ● Yes  ○ No
18. Have you regularly involved institutions representing policy areas closely related to mobility (e.g. land-use, environment, health)?

   Foundation Question

   • Yes  • No

19. Have you developed a participation strategy suggesting a mix of involvement formats for the SUMP development process?

   • Yes  • No

20. Have you created a SUMP development team driving the preparation and monitoring of the SUMP development process?

   • Yes  • No

21. Have you drafted an internal work plan for the planning process, indicating steps to be taken, responsibilities and milestones?

   • Yes  • No

---

**Step 3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios**

The last step of preparing well for the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan is to analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios of possible future mobility situations. This provides the basis for setting goals in a rational and transparent way. As a first activity, a thorough analysis is needed of the problems and opportunities in the field of urban transport and mobility. This is an important milestone as it feeds into
the development of different scenarios. These scenarios help improve our understanding of what urban mobility could look like in the future.

For more information please read the section on Step 3 in the SUMP Guidelines

22. Have you conducted a diagnosis of the main urban transport and mobility related problems?

   Foundation Question

   ○ Yes  ○ No

23. Have you selected suitable indicators to describe the mobility situation in the spatial area covered by the SUMP and to reflect the objectives of the plan?

   ○ Yes  ○ No

24. Have you assessed the availability and quality of existing data, relevant for example for scenario development?

   ○ Yes  ○ No

25. Have you conducted an analysis of transport and mobility problems for each transport mode?

   ○ Yes  ○ No

26. Have you conducted an analysis of the accessibility to services, employment and education?

   ○ Yes  ○ No

27. Have you conducted an analysis of journey time reliability and network congestion (all modes)?

   ○ Yes  ○ No
28. Have you conducted an analysis of safety and security, including its perception?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

29. Have you conducted an analysis of air quality and noise pollution, including identification of hotspots?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

30. Have you prioritised the identified problems?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

31. Does the SUMP describe a business-as-usual scenario?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

32. Does the SUMP explore alternative policy scenarios to understand the likely effects of different combinations of mobility measures and policies?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

33. Have you used qualitative analysis techniques, (e.g. through expert judgement) to support scenario development and appraisal?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
34. Have you used appropriate quantitative and transport modelling analysis techniques to support scenario development and appraisal?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

35. Did the analysis of SUMP scenarios include an appraisal of the resilience of the mobility system in relation to expected and unexpected events for the spatial area of the SUMP? *Excellence Question*

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

36. Have you discussed the different policy scenarios and their impacts with a group of key stakeholders? *Foundation Question*

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

37. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the different policy scenarios and their impacts, and invited them to provide feedback on these?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Step 4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens**

*Developing a common vision is one of the cornerstones of every Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. It provides the basis for all subsequent steps that will define concrete targets and measures. The vision can only be the guiding element if it is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens; therefore it is crucial to create a common ownership of the vision.*
For more Information please read the section on Step 4 in the SUMP Guidelines

38. Does the SUMP contain a long-term vision of urban mobility?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

39. Have you developed the long-term vision of urban mobility in cooperation with a representative group of key stakeholders?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

40. Does the SUMP explain, which scenario serves the vision in the most efficient and effective way and why?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

41. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the vision building process and given them the opportunity to provide feedback?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

42. Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in the development of the vision?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

Step 5 - Set priorities and measurable targets
A vision is an important qualitative description of the desired future. This alone is not sufficient. A vision needs to be specified by concrete objectives, which indicate the type of change desired. Finally, these changes also need to be measureable. This requires selecting a well-thought-out set of targets that focus on selected areas (indicators).

For more Information please read the section on Step 5 in the SUMP Guidelines

43. Does the SUMP clearly set out overall objectives?

   Foundation Question

   Yes   No

44. Have you assessed the overall objectives of the SUMP together with a group of key stakeholders?

   Yes   No

45. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the overall objectives of the SUMP and invited them to provide feedback?

   Yes   No

46. Does the SUMP describe a set of SMART targets?

   Yes   No

47. Do the targets allow monitoring of progress towards the achievement of objectives and assessed of the efficiency and effectiveness of the measures?

   Yes   No
48. Have you involved a group of key stakeholders in developing targets?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

**Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures**

The development of effective packages of measures is at the core of sustainable urban mobility planning. Only well-selected measures will ensure that the defined objectives and targets are met. The selection of measures should build on discussions with key stakeholders, consider experience from other places with similar policies, ensure value for money and exploit as much as possible synergies between measures. Essentially, at this stage, measures are identified in response to the questions: what, how, where and when?

For more information please read the section on **Step 6** in the SUMP Guidelines.

---

49. Does the SUMP make clear how the selected measures will contribute to the achievement of the agreed vision, objectives and targets?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

50. Have you discussed measure identification and selection with a group of key stakeholders?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

51. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the process of measure identification and selection and invited them to provide feedback?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

52. Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in discussing the identified measures?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
53. **Public transport:** Does the SUMP suggest how to enhance the quality, integration and accessibility of public transport services (covering infrastructure, rolling stock, and services)?

- Yes
- No

54. **Public transport:** Does the SUMP lay out how public transport should be addressed as an integral element of all relevant transport modes in the urban area?

- Yes
- No

55. **Non-motorised transport:** Does the SUMP incorporate infrastructure measures to raise the attractiveness of walking and cycling?

- Yes
- No

56. **Non-motorised transport:** Are infrastructure measures complemented by regulatory and organisational as well as soft measures?

- Yes
- No

57. **Safety and security:** Does the SUMP present measures to improve safety and security of all modes?

- Yes
- No

58. **Safety and security:** Do the SUMP's safety and security measures address the specific needs of vulnerable travellers?
Vulnerable travellers?

59. **Road transport (flowing + stationary):** Does the SUMP aim at optimising the use of existing road infrastructure?

- Yes
- No

60. **Road transport (flowing + stationary):** Does the SUMP explore the potential for reallocating road space to other modes of transport or other public functions?

- Yes
- No

61. **Urban logistics:** Does the SUMP present measures to improve the efficiency of urban logistics and freight delivery, while reducing related externalities (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions, pollutants and noise)?

- Yes
- No

62. **Urban logistics:** Does the SUMP set out how private and public stakeholders should be involved in developing and implementing mutually acceptable measures?

- Yes
- No

63. **Mobility management:** Does the SUMP include mobility management actions to foster a change towards more sustainable mobility patterns (reflecting the needs of e.g. citizens, employers or schools)?

- Yes
- No
64. **Mobility management**: Does the SUMP foresee educational, awareness-raising and promotion activities for sustainable travel behaviour for identified target groups?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

65. **Intelligent Transport Systems**: Does the SUMP include Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

66. **Intelligent Transport Systems**: Does the SUMP include Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures to connect transport modes (e.g. through payment and real-time information functions)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

### Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures II

67. Have you contacted other cities to exchange information about the planning and implementation of one or more measures considered for inclusion in your SUMP?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

68. Have you taken elected representatives and decision makers to visit other cities with the proposed measures in place?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Excellence Question**

69. Have you appraised the proposed measures for their costs and related benefits?
70. Have you assessed the long-term costs of proposed measures (e.g. maintenance costs)?

Excellence Question

71. Have you assessed the external costs and benefits associated with the implementation of measures and packages of measures?

Excellence Question

72. Have you appraised costs and benefits of all transport modes on the basis of a common approach?

73. Have you discussed the development of measures related to public transport and intermodality with transport operators?

74. Does the SUMP suggest combining certain policy measures, i.e. proposing integrated packages of measures to achieve better results?

75. Does the SUMP incorporate measures to be implemented in partnership with organisations from the public sector?
75. Does the **SUMP** incorporate **measures** to be implemented in partnership with organisations from other sectors?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

76. Does the **SUMP** incorporate cross-boundary **measures** to be implemented in partnership with **neighbouring authorities**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Excellence Question**

---

### Step 7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding

*Closely connected to the selection of (packages of) measures is the determination of clear responsibilities and the elaboration of an action and budget plan. This is a key part of the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan and requires formal approval by all key stakeholders. Essentially, at this stage answers are found to the questions: who and how much?*

For more information please read the section on **Step 7** in the SUMP Guidelines

---

77. Have you allocated responsibilities for the implementation of **measures**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

78. Have you identified potential funding sources for the implementation of **measures**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

79. Have you **involved** **key stakeholders** in the assignment of responsibilities and **resources**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
80. Have you prepared an action plan, outlining e.g. implementation priorities, schedules, risks and contingency actions?

- Yes
- No

81. Have you prepared a budget plan, setting out funding requirements and sources?  

**Excellence Question**

- Yes
- No

82. Was a formal agreement reached by decision makers and key stakeholders on the action and budget plan?

**Excellence Question**

- Yes
- No

---

**Step 8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan**

**Monitoring and evaluation need to be built into the plan as essential management tools to keep track of the planning process and measure implementation, but also so that you can learn from the planning experience, understand what works well and less well, and to build the business case and evidence base for the wider application of similar measures in the future.**

For more information please read the section on Step 8 in the SUMP Guidelines

83. Does the SUMP foresee a regular monitoring and performance-based revision process (e.g. every 3 to 7 years)?

- Yes
- No

84. Have you performed a data audit to account for available data and possible gaps?
85. Have you selected a subset of indicators for monitoring purposes linked to SUMP targets?

- Yes
- No

86. Have you considered both the planning process and measure implementation for monitoring and evaluation?

- Yes
- No

87. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation scheme that includes both output and outcome indicators?

- Yes
- No

88. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation scheme that includes qualitative and quantitative indicators?

- Yes
- No

89. Have you developed a data collection strategy?

- Yes
- No

90. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation plan?

- Yes
- No
91. Have you discussed arrangements for SUMP monitoring and evaluation with a group of key stakeholders?

- Yes
- No

92. Does the SUMP explain how stakeholders and citizens will be kept informed about SUMP measure implementation, monitoring and evaluation?

- Yes
- No

93. Have you foreseen mechanisms for the interactive engagement of stakeholders and citizens during SUMP monitoring and evaluation?

- Yes
- No

---

**Step 9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan**

The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan summarises the outcomes of all previous activities. After a final quality check, the document, including the action and budget plan, needs to be formally adopted by the political representatives. It is also important to ensure that the plan is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens.

For more information please read the section on Step 9 in the SUMP Guidelines

94. Have you asked a group of key stakeholders to review the draft version of the SUMP?

- Yes
- No
95. Have you published a final draft of the SUMP to provide stakeholders and citizens with the opportunity to make final comments?

- Yes
- No

Foundation Question

96. Does the SUMP demonstrate compliance with the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive (2001/42/EC) and EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC)?

- Yes
- No

97. Have you discussed the proposed SUMP with the city council or its equivalent committee?

- Yes
- No

98. Was the SUMP formally adopted by the city council or its equivalent committee?

- Yes
- No

Foundation Question

99. Was the SUMP formally approved or adopted by the elected representatives of neighbouring authorities that fall within the functional city?

- Yes
- No

100. Have you ‘celebrated’ the adoption of the SUMP with stakeholders and citizens (e.g. in the form of a public event)?

- Yes
- No
Thank you for completing the SUMP Self-Assessment! We hope that you found this a valuable exercise. We would like to continue improving the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool in the future, both in terms of the content of the self-assessment and the ease of using the online tool. Your feedback in relation to the four questions below will therefore be appreciated.

Did you find the instructions helpful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not helpful</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Yes, helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How would you assess the clarity of the assessment questions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not clear</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Very clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you have any suggestions for improving particular questions or the content of the SUMP Self-Assessment overall?

Did you find the online tool easy to use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you experienced any technical difficulties, please describe these below:


You have now reached the end of the questionnaire. Once you press "Submit" you will be offered a final opportunity to check that you have completed all sections of the questionnaire.

Powered by Qualtrics
Overall score: 89 out of 100.

Congratulations, based on the answers you have provided the authority's plan is an Excellent Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan.

A planning process in full compliance with the European Commission's SUMP concept and guidelines as presented in the Urban Mobility Package has been followed. The resulting plan is a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan of excellent quality.

Foundation and Excellence Questions

You have answered Yes to 13 out of 13 Foundation Questions. These questions test the basic requirements a mobility planning process must fulfil to be in line with the SUMP concept.

You have answered Yes to 11 out of 15 Excellence Questions. These questions highlight planning activities particularly advanced cities might undertake, to motivate and award processes and plans of exceptionally high quality.

Copyright information

Rupprecht Consult GmbH has developed the SUMP Self-Assessment Scheme which is disseminated through the EU co-funded project CH4LLENGE.

Copyright: The self-assessment is made available free of charge for non-commercial use and is subject to a Creative Commons licence ("attribution, non-commercial, no derivatives").
**SUMP Cycle Steps**
The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to each of the steps in the SUMP planning cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Define the development process and scope of the plan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Set priorities and measurable targets</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Develop effective packages of measures</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMP Characteristics**
The table below provides a breakdown of your score in relation to the main characteristics of a SUMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMP Characteristic</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term vision and clear implementation plan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory approach</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced consideration of all transport modes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral, vertical and spatial integration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of current and future performance &amp; cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, plan revision and reporting</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome to the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool

Some basic questions about your city

You are invited to begin the SUMP Self-Assessment by providing some general information about your city or planning authority, including the name of the city which will appear on the final results page (which can be downloaded).

The SUMP Self-Assessment can be completed on an anonymous basis. However, if you do not wish to name the city it is helpful if you do provide some basic information on country and population of the city, to enable analyses of results at an aggregated level.

In no case will we publish the results of individual cities or identify individual cities in any publications based on such analyses. None of these questions are mandatory, so if you believe that the questions identify your city too clearly, then you do not need to provide answers.

I. What is the name of the city, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

II. In which country is the city located, for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

Spain

III. If a Non-EU country, please specify which one.

IV. What is the population of the city (based on geographic area covered by the SUMP), for which you are completing the Self-Assessment?

- [ ] Below 50,000
- [ ] Between 50,000 and 100,000
- [ ] Between 1 and 2 million
- [ ] Between 600,000 and 1 million
V. How many SUMPs or equivalent mobility plans has the city prepared before?

- This is the first
- This is the second
- This is the third
- The city has prepared four or more SUMPs in the past

Thank you for providing this information!

Step 1 - Determine your potential for a successful SUMP

At the beginning of the sustainable urban mobility planning process, it is necessary to determine the potential to elaborate a successful Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. Framework conditions should be analysed including internal and external factors that have an impact on the planning process and plan implementation.

For more information please read the section on Step 1 in the SUMP Guidelines

1. Have you, the responsible planning authority, made a formal commitment to make sustainable mobility principles the underlying basis for the SUMP?

- Yes
- No

2. Has the city council reinforced its commitment to sustainable urban mobility by signing a covenant (e.g. the Covenant of Mayors) or joining a network (e.g. the CiViTAS Forum)?
3. Have you reviewed relevant regulations and plans from the European, national and regional level that have implications for the SUMP?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

4. Have you reflected on the strengths and weaknesses of your existing local planning practices with regard to developing the SUMP?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

5. Have you used a peer-review methodology for analysing the strengths and weaknesses?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

6. Have you undertaken a gap analysis of qualifications and skills within the planning authority in order to identify capacity building needs?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

7. Have you assessed the sources for funding the process of developing the SUMP?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
8. Have you examined how the SUMP preparation timeframe could be aligned with the development and implementation of other existing policies and strategies (e.g. the land use plan)?

Foundacion Question

- Yes
- No

9. Have you defined a timeframe for the preparation and implementation of the SUMP?

- Yes
- No

10. Have you identified relevant stakeholders, their impact and role early on in the SUMP preparation process?

Foundacion Question

- Yes
- No

11. Have you carried out an analysis of stakeholder constellations (e.g. incorporating assessments of stakeholders' objectives, power, capacity and planning resources)?

- Yes
- No

12. Have you involved stakeholders within the "vulnerable users" group in the SUMP process?

Excellence Question

- Yes
- No
Step 2 - Define the development process and scope of plan

The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan development process needs to be tailored to the local situation. This includes as a crucial step the definition of the geographical scope of the plan, which should cover the functioning urban area. Stakeholder cooperation and policy integration are other fields that need to be addressed in this phase, which should be concluded with an agreement on the work plan and management arrangements.

For more information please read the section on Step 2 in the SUMP Guidelines

13. Has a cooperation process been established by all neighbouring authorities on the spatial coverage of the SUMP?

Foundation Question

- Yes
- No

14. Does the SUMP cover the ‘functional city’ (i.e. an area defined by main commuter flows) that goes beyond administrative boundaries?

- Yes
- No

15. Have you and neighbouring authorities agreed on roles and responsibilities for SUMP development?

- Yes
- No

16. Have you established a SUMP development team across neighbouring authorities that has met on a regular basis?

Excellence Question

- Yes
- No

17. Does the SUMP refer to policies and plans, which already exist or are being developed on the local level?

Foundation Question

- Yes
- No
18. Have you regularly involved institutions representing policy areas closely related to mobility (e.g. land-use, environment, health)?

Foundation Question

19. Have you developed a participation strategy suggesting a mix of involvement formats for the SUMP development process?

Yes

No

20. Have you created a SUMP development team driving the preparation and monitoring of the SUMP development process?

Yes

No

21. Have you drafted an internal work plan for the planning process, indicating steps to be taken, responsibilities and milestones?

Yes

No

Step 3 - Analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios

The last step of preparing well for the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan is to analyse the mobility situation and develop scenarios of possible future mobility situations. This provides the basis for setting goals in a rational and transparent way. As a first activity, a thorough analysis is needed of the problems and opportunities in the field of urban transport and mobility. This is an important milestone as it feeds into the development of different scenarios. The process should begin with an understanding of the situation.
the development of different scenarios. These scenarios help improve our understanding of what urban mobility could look like in the future.

For more information please read the section on Step 3 in the SUMP Guidelines

22. Have you conducted a diagnosis of the main urban transport and mobility related problems?  

   **Foundation Question**

   - Yes
   - No

23. Have you selected suitable indicators to describe the mobility situation in the spatial area covered by the SUMP and to reflect the objectives of the plan?

   - Yes
   - No

24. Have you assessed the availability and quality of existing data, relevant for example for scenario development?

   - Yes
   - No

25. Have you conducted an analysis of transport and mobility problems for each transport mode?

   - Yes
   - No

26. Have you conducted an analysis of the accessibility to services, employment and education?

   - Yes
   - No

27. Have you conducted an analysis of journey time reliability and network congestion (all modes)?
28. Have you conducted an analysis of safety and security, including its perception?

- Yes
- No

29. Have you conducted an analysis of air quality and noise pollution, including identification of hotspots?

- Yes
- No

30. Have you prioritised the identified problems?

- Yes
- No

31. Does the SUMP describe a business-as-usual scenario?

- Yes
- No

32. Does the SUMP explore alternative policy scenarios to understand the likely effects of different combinations of mobility measures and policies?

- Yes
- No

33. Have you used qualitative analysis techniques, (e.g. through expert judgement) to support scenario development and appraisal?

- Yes
- No
34. Have you used appropriate quantitative and transport modelling analysis techniques to support scenario development and appraisal?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

35. Did the analysis of SUMP scenarios include an appraisal of the resilience of the mobility system in relation to expected and unexpected events for the spatial area of the SUMP?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

36. Have you discussed the different policy scenarios and their impacts with a group of key stakeholders?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

37. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the different policy scenarios and their impacts, and invited them to provide feedback on these?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Step 4 - Develop a common vision and engage citizens**

*Developing a common vision is one of the cornerstones of every Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. It provides the basis for all subsequent steps that will define concrete targets and measures. The vision can only be the guiding element if it is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens; therefore it is crucial to create a common ownership of the vision.*
For more Information please read the section on Step 4 in the SUMP Guidelines

38. Does the SUMP contain a long-term vision of urban mobility?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

39. Have you developed the long-term vision of urban mobility in cooperation with a representative group of key stakeholders?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

40. Does the SUMP explain, which scenario serves the vision in the most efficient and effective way and why?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

41. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the vision building process and given them the opportunity to provide feedback?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

42. Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in the development of the vision?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

Step 5 - Set priorities and measurable targets
A vision is an important qualitative description of the desired future. This alone is not sufficient. A vision needs to be specified by concrete objectives, which indicate the type of change desired. Finally, these changes also need to be measureable. This requires selecting a well-thought-out set of targets that focus on selected areas (indicators).

For more Information please read the section on Step 5 in the SUMP Guidelines

43. Does the SUMP clearly set out overall objectives?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

44. Have you assessed the overall objectives of the SUMP together with a group of key stakeholders?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

45. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the overall objectives of the SUMP and invited them to provide feedback?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

46. Does the SUMP describe a set of SMART targets?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

47. Do the targets allow monitoring of progress towards the achievement of objectives and assessed of the efficiency and effectiveness of the measures?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

48. Have you involved a group of key stakeholders in developing targets?
48. Have you involved a group of key stakeholders in developing targets?

- Yes
- No

---

**Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures**

The development of effective packages of measures is at the core of sustainable urban mobility planning. Only well-selected measures will ensure that the defined objectives and targets are met. The selection of measures should build on discussions with key stakeholders, consider experience from other places with similar policies, ensure value for money and exploit as much as possible synergies between measures. Essentially, at this stage, measures are identified in response to the questions: what, how, where and when?

For more information please read the section on Step 6 in the SUMP Guidelines.

---

49. Does the SUMP make clear how the selected measures will contribute to the achievement of the agreed vision, objectives and targets?

- Yes
- No

---

50. Have you discussed measure identification and selection with a group of key stakeholders?

- Yes
- No

---

51. Have you informed stakeholders and citizens about the process of measure identification and selection and invited them to provide feedback?

- Yes
- No

---

52. Have you enabled stakeholders and citizens to get actively involved in discussing the identified measures?

- Yes
- No
53. **Public transport**: Does the SUMP suggest how to enhance the quality, integration and accessibility of public transport services (covering infrastructure, rolling stock, and services)?

- Yes
- No

54. **Public transport**: Does the SUMP lay out how public transport should be addressed as an integral element of all relevant transport modes in the urban area?

- Yes
- No

55. **Non-motorised transport**: Does the SUMP incorporate infrastructure measures to raise the attractiveness of walking and cycling?

- Yes
- No

56. **Non-motorised transport**: Are infrastructure measures complemented by regulatory and organisational as well as soft measures?

- Yes
- No

57. **Safety and security**: Does the SUMP present measures to improve safety and security of all modes?

- Yes
- No

58. **Safety and security**: Do the SUMP’s safety and security measures address the specific needs of vulnerable travellers?
59. **Road transport (flowing + stationary):** Does the SUMP aim at optimising the use of existing road infrastructure?

- Yes
- No

60. **Road transport (flowing + stationary):** Does the SUMP explore the potential for reallocating road space to other modes of transport or other public functions?

- Yes
- No

61. **Urban logistics:** Does the SUMP present measures to improve the efficiency of urban logistics and freight delivery, while reducing related externalities (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions, pollutants and noise)?

- Yes
- No

62. **Urban logistics:** Does the SUMP set out how private and public stakeholders should be involved in developing and implementing mutually acceptable measures?

- Yes
- No

63. **Mobility management:** Does the SUMP include mobility management actions to foster a change towards more sustainable mobility patterns (reflecting the needs of e.g. citizens, employers or schools)?

- Yes
- No
64. **Mobility management:** Does the SUMP foresee educational, awareness-raising and promotion activities for sustainable travel behaviour for identified target groups?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

65. **Intelligent Transport Systems:** Does the SUMP include Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

66. **Intelligent Transport Systems:** Does the SUMP include Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) measures to connect transport modes (e.g. through payment and real-time information functions)?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

---

**Step 6 - Develop effective packages of measures II**

67. Have you contacted other cities to exchange information about the planning and implementation of one or more measures considered for inclusion in your SUMP?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

68. Have you taken elected representatives and decision makers to visit other cities with the proposed measures in place?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

---

69. Have you appraised the proposed measures for their costs and related benefits?
70. Have you **assessed** the long-term **costs** of proposed **measures** (e.g. maintenance costs)?

71. Have you **assessed** the **external costs** and benefits associated with the implementation of **measures** and packages of measures?

72. Have you **appraised** **costs** and benefits of all **transport modes** on the basis of a common approach?

73. Have you discussed the development of **measures** related to public transport and **intermodality** with transport operators?

74. Does the **SUMP** suggest combining certain **policy measures**, i.e. proposing integrated packages of measures to achieve better results?

75. Does the **SUMP** incorporate **measures** to be implemented in partnership with organisations from
76. Does the SUMP incorporate cross-boundary measures to be implemented in partnership with neighbouring authorities?

Excellence Question

● Yes

☐ No

---

Step 7 - Agree on clear responsibilities and allocate funding

Closely connected to the selection of (packages of) measures is the determination of clear responsibilities and the elaboration of an action and budget plan. This is a key part of the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan and requires formal approval by all key stakeholders. Essentially, at this stage answers are found to the questions: who and how much?

For more Information please read the section on Step 7 in the SUMP Guidelines

77. Have you allocated responsibilities for the implementation of measures?

● Yes

☐ No

78. Have you identified potential funding sources for the implementation of measures?

● Yes

☐ No

79. Have you involved key stakeholders in the assignment of responsibilities and resources?

● Yes

☐ No
80. Have you prepared an action plan, outlining e.g. implementation priorities, schedules, risks and contingency actions?

- Yes
- No

81. Have you prepared a budget plan, setting out funding requirements and sources?

- Yes
- No

82. Was a formal agreement reached by decision makers and key stakeholders on the action and budget plan?

- Yes
- No

---

**Step 8 - Build monitoring and assessment into the plan**

Monitoring and evaluation need to be built into the plan as essential management tools to keep track of the planning process and measure implementation, but also so that you can learn from the planning experience, understand what works well and less well, and to build the business case and evidence base for the wider application of similar measures in the future.

For more information please read the section on Step 8 in the SUMP Guidelines

83. Does the SUMP foresee a regular monitoring and performance-based revision process (e.g. every 3 to 7 years)?

- Yes
- No

84. Have you performed a data audit to account for available data and possible gaps?
85. Have you selected a subset of indicators for monitoring purposes linked to SUMP targets?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

86. Have you considered both the planning process and measure implementation for monitoring and evaluation?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

87. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation scheme that includes both output and outcome indicators?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

88. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation scheme that includes qualitative and quantitative indicators?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

89. Have you developed a data collection strategy?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

90. Have you developed a monitoring and evaluation plan?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
91. Have you discussed arrangements for SUMP monitoring and evaluation with a group of key stakeholders?

- Yes
- No

92. Does the SUMP explain how stakeholders and citizens will be kept informed about SUMP measure implementation, monitoring and evaluation?

- Yes
- No

93. Have you foreseen mechanisms for the interactive engagement of stakeholders and citizens during SUMP monitoring and evaluation?

- Yes
- No

Step 9 - Adopt Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan

The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan summarises the outcomes of all previous activities. After a final quality check, the document, including the action and budget plan, needs to be formally adopted by the political representatives. It is also important to ensure that the plan is widely accepted among stakeholders and citizens.

For more information please read the section on Step 9 in the SUMP Guidelines

94. Have you asked a group of key stakeholders to review the draft version of the SUMP?

- Yes
- No
95. Have you published a final draft of the SUMP to provide stakeholders and citizens with the opportunity to make final comments?

Foundation Question

- Yes
- No

96. Does the SUMP demonstrate compliance with the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive (2001/42/EC) and EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC)?

Foundation Question

- Yes
- No

97. Have you discussed the proposed SUMP with the city council or its equivalent committee?

- Yes
- No

98. Was the SUMP formally adopted by the city council or its equivalent committee?

Foundation Question

- Yes
- No

99. Was the SUMP formally approved or adopted by the elected representatives of neighbouring authorities that fall within the functional city?

- Yes
- No

100. Have you 'celebrated' the adoption of the SUMP with stakeholders and citizens (e.g. in the form of a public event)?

- Yes
- No
SUMP Self-Assessment Tool Feedback

Thank you for completing the SUMP Self-Assessment! We hope that you found this a valuable exercise. We would like to continue improving the SUMP Self-Assessment Tool in the future, both in terms of the content of the self-assessment and the ease of using the online tool. Your feedback in relation to the four questions below will therefore be appreciated.

Did you find the instructions helpful?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

How would you assess the clarity of the assessment questions?

- [ ] Not clear
- [ ] Very clear

Do you have any suggestions for improving particular questions or the content of the SUMP Self-Assessment overall?

---

Did you find the online tool easy to use?

- [ ] No
- [ ] Yes

If you experienced any technical difficulties, please describe these below:

---

---
You have now reached the end of the questionnaire. Once you press "Submit" you will be offered a final opportunity to check that you have completed all sections of the questionnaire.