**SMARTA**

**Sustainable shared mobility interconnected with public transport in European Rural Areas (developing the concept of ‘smart rural transport areas’ (SMARTA)**

**No. MOVE/B4/2017/473**

**Task 1**

**Template for the capture of Good Practices**

**Prefatory note**

The SMARTA project, under sub-task 1.1.2, aims to analyse the main characteristics of good practices in rural areas in each of the 28 EU countries and in third countries.

The Consortium decided to include, in the overview, all the aspects mentioned in the ToR (section 2.3.1, page 9). Additional sub-categories have been identified that include all the 9 aspects and other aspects that could be addressed:

1. **Transport and mobility services in rural areas**
2. *TRANSPORT SERVICES ADDRESSING TARGET USER GROUPS*
   * *Solutions usable by all the population and especially the disadvantaged (in terms of accessibility, availability, costs, tools etc.), focusing on the social and economic dimension of transport: for elderly people, unemployed, people with reduced mobility and low-income households;*
3. MOVING FORWARD WITH ICT IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND SHARED MOBILITY
   * *Technologies that enable more efficient planning of journeys*
   * *Simulation of advantages and disadvantages*
   * *Fleet management and real time information*
   * *Multimodal travel planners*
   * *Integrated ticketing*
   * *Etc.*
4. INTERMODAL SERVICE COORDINATION
   * *Transport solutions at bus/train stations for last mile connectivity*
5. EASY MOBILITY
   * *Active modes, including sharing of bikes and e-bikes*
6. **Good Governance Enabling Sustainable Rural Mobility**
7. SYSTEMS AND SOLUTIONS FOR SMART RURAL AREAS
   * *Financially viable systems*
   * *New business concepts and solutions for improving the accessibility of rural areas*
8. STRATEGIES FOR INCREASE RIDERSHIP
   * *Good marketing campaigns*
   * *Improvement of the systems reliability*
   * *Attractive fares*
9. COMMUNITY-BASED TRANSPORT SERVICES
   * *Local initiatives involving the community to identify transport solutions*
   * *Needs assessment campaigns*

The target number of GPs we are looking for still has to be defined; as overall guidance for this initial phase, each partner has to look at least for one good practices per country; in addition, each partner has to include in its analysis at least one good practice for each of the categories identified (A1-A4; B1-B3), where applicable.

The Good Practice case studies will also identify potential candidates to be selected for the demonstration activities (Task2).

The template for gathering the information of the good practice cases has been developed. With respect to the different categories (A1-A4, B1-B3), it’s up to each partner to decide the amount of information to collect for the different sections included in the template. Note that, in the sub-category A.2, for example, the paragraph “supporting technology” should be elaborated in detail.

In this template, we have also included a page related to the *innovation aspects* (which is formally related to Task 1.2).

If it is considered that the Good Practice case study could be involved in Task 2 activities, the partner who have added the case is invited to complete the “author’s note” on the last page (adding some overall consideration about the possible involvement of the GP site in task 2) and the other template (provided by TML) regarding the pilot site selection.

With respect to the Insight Papers, we’ll have a “work in progress” approach towards fine tuning the template after we complete the first set of GPs cases.

**Definition of “Good Practice”**

*What is a good practice? Who defines good practice?*

At its most basic *good practice* may be defined as “a good or wise thing to do”[[1]](#footnote-1).

In mobility and public transport, it is not so trivial to define **what a good practice is**. This is because mobility and public transport practice is deeply influenced by the **reference context** (institutional level, actors involved and their interactions, regulation, territorial context of the rural area, features of the operated services, operational procedure and organization, business aspects, etc.) and by the **local needs**. Thus a solution which is proven successful in one context should not be assumed to be replicable in another (different) context with the same level of performance. Indeed, the key concept on assessing the benchmark of existing evidence and good practice is to consider **comparable experiences** in terms of context and needs.

A relevant study[[2]](#footnote-2) on transferability of “best practices” in transport policy delivery detailed 3 key criteria for successful transferability of mobility measures, based on numerous case studies around Europe:

* The first is the *reference context* in terms of area type, mobility offer, socio-economic indicators and target users;
* The second are the *needs/gaps* of the current situation compared to the evolving demand, the objectives of the implementation of mobility measures and the existence of policies within the region that are already in support of the planning of mobility measures;
* The third is the *scheme of regional structure and local cooperation* between mobility stakeholders in the region, be it voluntary or formal.

The failure of the take-up of policies or the implementation of good practices can be the result of negation of these criteria. In general this will be either a *lack of cooperation* (or clear opposition) between key stakeholders and / or inadequate funding. **Overreliance on technological solutions should also be avoided**. Successful products and services of all kinds rely on having the right organisational arrangements, planning, marketing and business case in place.

**Innovation in the GPs**

**Innovation** is a word used often; it is both a verb, describing (for example) the sustainable mobility planning and implementation process, as well as a noun, referring to an innovative product or service. It is arguable that until a sustainable mobility idea delivers desirable results and growth in the long-term, it cannot be considered a successful innovation[[3]](#footnote-3).

Innovation rarely fails due to the lack of a good concept, but rather due to one or more barriers during the innovation process that can diminish the full impact and potential of the measure. It is relevant therefore to identify known and potential barriers to innovation.

In section 4.3.3. of the proposal we noted that when recording the innovation levels for the good practice examples, **key framework conditions** should be recorded to assist assessment of the reasons for success, including:

* *Organisational responsibilities* and partnership working arrangements
* Level of *public sector financial support*
* Interconnections between shared and public transport services (e.g. innovative schemes, integration of service, etc.)
* Quality of *ICT connections* (internet and mobile connectivity)
* Role and impacts of the *technological solutions* implemented

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title of the Good Practice [TEMPLATE, for sub-categories A1-A4 and B1-B3]** | | | |
| **Country** | | | |
| **Overview**  *Short description of the Good Practice Case:*   * *Where is the GP implemented?* * *Which are the main characteristics of the GP rural area?* * *Which are the main characteristics of the GP?* * *Which are the stakeholders involved?* * *What’s the added value provided by the GP?* * *Are some kind of innovation implemented?* | |  | |
| **Main aspect/issue addressed by the good practice** | | **Main objectives of the good practice** | |
| * *Which of the selection criteria (TOR, page 9) is addressed by the GP?* * *Which are the main mobility needs of the GP target rural area?* * *What are the gaps in service provision the GP is addressing?* | | * *How the GP tries to meet the needs and requirements of the target users?* * *Is the GP addressing a specific “shared mobility” objective or a specific “collective transport” objective?* * *Are the main objectives of the GP free-standing or part of a broader initiative beyond the scope?* | |
| **Description of the area** | | | |
| *Region* | *Target area* | *Population* | *Population density* |
| *Please indicate the Region where the GP is implemented* | *Please indicate the extent of the target rural area*  [Km2] | *Please indicate the population in the target rural area* | *Please indicate the population density in the target rural area*  [inhab. /Km2] |
| ***Other*** | | | |
| *e.g. adjacent city/cities, predominant type of activity in the rural area, etc.* | | | |
| **Target user groups and needs** *(where applicable)*   * *Which is (are) the target user group(s)? (Young, Elderly, Immigrant, People with disabilities, etc.). Which are the target users main characteristics? (rate of car ownership, access to private transport, etc.)* * *Which is the population of the target group in the rural area?* * *Which is the trip motivation of the target group?* * *Which are the main needs and requirements of the target users?* | | | |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
| **Detailed description of the practice** (where applicable) |
| **Timeframe(s)** |
| *If the Good Practice is related to multiple timeframes (e.g. a pilot followed by an implementation), please indicate all of them.* |
| **Bodies involved** |
| * *Please indicate the Public Transport Operator/Moibility Authority/Mobility Provider involved (if any)* * *Local stakeholders involved (Users associations, institutional bodies, etc.) (if any)* * *Please indicate the bodies involved under State level (e.g. Ministry of Infrastructure, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Transport, etc.) (if any)* * *Private companies and Consultancy team (if any)* |
| **Mobility services provided/addressed** |
| * *Please describe the overall characteristics of the Good Practice* * *Is the GP a specific mobility service? If yes, please describe its main charactheristics (name of the Operator, Type of operator (e.g. commercial, community transport, municipality/authority), number of lines/fleet dimensions, extent of the services, etc.* * *Is the GP related/connected to a specific mobility service? If yes, please detail* |
| **Legal Framework** |
| * *Procurement/contracting procedures* * *What is/are the main regulatory instrument(s) for passenger transport services relevant to the rural area where the GP is implemented? Which is the Public Transport Law relevant to the rural area where the GP is implemented?* |
| **Cost and Financing sources** |
| * *Which is the funding/business models which the GP currently operate under?* * *Which is the relation with the fares scheme/policies?* * *Where do GP obtain their revenues from?* * *Do they require or receive subsidies/grants to maintain the service provision?* * *What are these subsidies/grants and on which factors/parameters are these based?* |
| **Organizational set-up** |
| * *How is the GP organised? Which is the management structure?* * *Which are the resources involved?* * *Who is the responsible/coordinator of the implementation of the GP?* * *Is there a volunteer or community-based system under implementation?* |
| **Supporting technologies** |
| * *Which are the ITS systems supporting the operation of the service? (e.g. Real-time localization and monitoring system, e-ticketing sytem, etc.)* * *Which is the technological and ITS background?* * *Are there other specific services provided by the supporting technologies? (e.g. travel information systems, payment tools, booking reservation, etc.)* * *Implementation of crowdsourcing tools?* |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
| **Innovation aspects** (where applicable) |
| **Organisational responsibilities and partnership working arrangements**  *LoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsum*  **Interconnections between shared and public transport services**  *LoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsum*  **Level of public sector financial support**  *LoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsum*  **ICT connections and impacts of the technological solutions implemented**  *LoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsum*  **Other (e.g. social innovation, etc.)**  *LoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsum* |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
| **Assessment** |
| Ridership and other key metrics/results (through key-indicators, where applicable) |
| * *Preliminary evaluation: Good outcome? Could it be better? Could have done more?* * *Quality of the mobility service provided (in terms of efficiency, comfort of the vehicles, easiness and speed of booking, appropriate fare policies, etc.)* * *Optimization of vehicle usage (e.g. increasing the number of users per trip, decreasing the number of kilometres operated, etc.)* * *Results coming from focus groups with some user categories and associations, main operational, technical and company stakeholders, service data collection from the system* * *Results coming from on-line surveys (data collection on passengers/users opinions, quality elements of the service provision chain)* * *Week and strong points in the actual GP* * *Improvement of the citizen attitudes towards PT in general* * *Potential transferability of the GP* * *Expectations for the future*   Good Governance   * *Does the GP involve new business concepts and solutions for improving the accessibility of rural areas?* * *Has the GP demonstrated a contribution from effective marketing campaigns, improvements to system reliability, or innovative fares strategies to increased ridership?* * *Does the GP demonstrate effective community engagement?* * *Does the GP study exhibit any other aspects of good governance not yet described (e.g. evidence of effective working relationships between different planning processes, evidence of integrated policies and “joined up” thinking”)?* |
| Success factors/strengths |
| * *Good co-ordination of services among multiple service providers or funding agencies* * *Understanding of real needs of users and development of services specifically tailored to meet these needs* * *Implementation of innovative promotion, marketing and awareness raising strategies* * *Others* |
| Difficulties encountered/weakness |
| * *Conditionality/dependency on some other activity, project, event, etc.* * *Requirements for negotiations with others stakeholders, including communities* * *Changes in work practices which have required negotiation and reaching acceptance by labour force or contractors* * *Financial difficulties encountered in maintaining active the service* * *Requirement for a new/amended regulation, order, etc. that had to be prepared and approved by law-makers/decision takers* * *Opposition from stakeholders, including existing or target users, that have caused delay or have blocked the GP for a specific period* * *Others* |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
| **Features that are considered to be Good Practice (Lesson(s) learnt)**  ***Please summarize the results of the analysis of the GP that has been carried out, the conclusions coming from the assessment of the impacts and give an overview of the lesson(s) learnt from the GP*** |
| **References for further details** |
| *Contact of the operator and of relevant stakeholders (please seek permission to include)* |
| Organization:  Person contact:  Email / Mobile:  Organization:  Person contact:  Email / Mobile:  Organization:  Person contact:  Email / Mobile: |
| Key references |
| * *LoremipsumLoremipsum* * *LoremipsumLoremipsum* * *LoremipsumLoremipsum* * *LoremipsumLoremipsum* |
| Websites |
| * *LoremipsumLoremipsum* * *LoremipsumLoremipsum* * *LoremipsumLoremipsum* * *LoremipsumLoremipsum* |
| Other info and/or pictures |
| *LoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsumLoremipsum* |
| **Author’s note**  *(to be completed only if the site where the GP is implemented could be a potential candidate for the demonstration activities of task 2)*  ***Please add some overall consideration about this Good Practice in relation to the possibility of involving the site for the demonstration activities (e.g. interest of stakeholders to work with SMARTA, innovation measures that are going to be implemented and in compliance with SMARTA timing and objectives, etc.)*** |

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/good%20practice> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Transferability of Best Practice in Transport Policy Delivery : Final Report, prepared for Scottish Executive by Buchanan and partners, 2003 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. CIVITAS PORTIS Innovation E-Brochure 1, October 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)