



Co-funded by the Intelligent Energy Europe
Programme of the European Union

BUMP – Boosting Urban Mobility Plans



Report on preparation and implementation of training activities Deliverables 3.1 and 3.2

European coordinator



IRPUD

DE  www.raumplanung.tu-dortmund.de/irpud/



BG  www.csdc.org



ES  www.fcirce.es



RO  www.alea.ro



UK  www.swea.co.uk

VIAALTA

CZ  www.via-alta.cz



REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER

HU  www.rec.org

PL  www.poland.rec.org

BUMP - Boosting Urban Mobility Plans IEE /12/672/SI2.644735

The sole responsibility for the content of this document lies with the authors.

It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Sommario

PP1 – AREA Science Park	5
PP2 – TUDO	16
PP3 – CSDCS.....	19
PP4 – CIRCE.....	29
PP5 – ALEA.....	38
PP6 – SWEA	46
PP7 – VIA ALTA	62
PP8 – REC HU	69
PP9 – REC PL	75
Selection of the trainees.....	80
Selection of trainers	80
Performance of the national training modules.....	80
Aggregated results of the Questionnaire 2	81
Main lessons learnt	82

General introduction

BUMP training path's development starts with the definition of a common supporting package, developed by the German partner, IRPUD, the Institute for Spatial Planning of the Technical University of Dortmund (TUDO), benefitting from existing guidelines, tools and materials, re-elaborated and assembled for the purpose of creating an ad-hoc tool, at once providing a satisfactory mix of theory and practical, hands-on approach and flexible enough to adapt to different specific national requirements and features in the involved countries.

The original model supporting package is available in the attachments.

The supporting package was translated in all partners' languages to make it readily available for prospective training participants. However, the partnership was well aware from the very beginning that a range of adaptations would be necessary to make the package suited to a wide scope of national-specific environments. With the purpose of gathering suggestions and indications from relevant actors and stakeholder representative organizations, focus group sessions were organized in each participating country. The feedback from these sessions was used to guide the localization process of the common supporting package and shape individual training programs to respond in the best possible way to the country's specificities.

Moreover, focus group sessions also provided guidance and useful tips for the selection of prospective trainees and trainers and, on some occasions, on national and international networks that may be of help in several ways (disseminating information, connecting local authorities, make best practices and tools available).

Common models were then developed both to collect applications from local authorities interested in participating in BUMP's activities and to recruit experienced trainers, where external expertise was deemed essential to guarantee the best possible quality standards. Models were translated and adapted, when needed, to suit individual country-specific requirements. Once trainers and trainees were selected and all necessary logistic and organizational details were cleared, training started and was implemented with varying timing depending on different national conditions.

Details can be found in the individual national sections in the following report.

Once the training had been completed, mutual learning activities were organized to provide training participants with the opportunity to share and compare approaches, points of view and experiences with delegations of local authorities' representatives in homologous positions from all the countries involved in the project on a day dedicated to international BUMP participants. The four mutual learning events, furthermore, envisaged a second day hosting a public conference open to the public, an opportunity to foster connections with other international and national projects dealing with sustainable mobility planning and, on occasions, with innovative enterprises and institutions offering practical technological solutions for the implementation of concrete measures.

A final training session in each country, gathering all training participants, then provided the opportunity to share conclusions and lessons learnt in the four events, discuss and compare points of view and impressions, prepare for the following steps in BUMP's work-plan.

In the attachments, a final report can be found, summarizing the activities, outputs and lessons learnt with the implementation of mutual learning activities.

After the implementation of mutual learning activities, the next step in BUMP's work-plan is coaching local authorities in the development of their SUMP, an activity that is currently ongoing, and is expected to lead to the development of at least 35 new SUMP in the countries involved in BUMP. These will all be published

in the project's website and given publicity through the main national and international networks and portals, to serve as a spur for the development of further plans in new local authorities. To aid the process, among other actions, BUMP will organize visits of foreign delegations of local authorities' representatives to meet BUMP's best achievers, those cities that will have developed the most promising SUMP to foster further replication.

You will find more details in the following documents:

- BUMP's model supporting package with national translations and guidelines for replication (D 2.2);
- Country reports on focus group sessions (D 2.1);
- Final report on mutual learning activities.

Reports of the project partners

PP1 – AREA Science Park

1. Process for the selection of trainees

Suggestions from focus group session for the selection of trainees

Traffic planning for people and freight has a reasonably long-established tradition in Italy, with national legislation envisaging compulsory PUTs (Urban Traffic Plans) and detailed sector planning tools for cities with more than 30,000 inhabitants. PUMs (Urban Mobility Plans, small ‘s’ meaning the ‘sustainability’ element was not fully developed in the definition and guidelines issued by the Ministry for Transport and Infrastructure in the year 2000) are simply recommended (and therefore not mandatory) for cities and aggregations of municipalities with more than 100,000 inhabitants.

The absence of compulsoriness has implied that, even when funding was available to produce PUMs in the aftermath of the guidelines published in 2000, only a very small number of highly motivated local authorities actually acted and produced their PUMs. Today, given the extreme shortage of resources to support sustainable mobility planning, it is even more essential to involve seriously motivated local authorities, with appropriate commitment from political decision makers for the development of SUMP.

Furthermore, the production of traffic and mobility planning tools up until recently were very often entirely entrusted to consultants external to local authorities. Nowadays, with increasingly scarce resources to subcontract planning functions externally, providing directors and technical officers with a sound working methodology and an adequate store of knowledge and practical know-how is even more crucial.

Suggestions from the focus group sessions recommended targeting cities and aggregations of municipalities with some existing planning tools and policies in place, but in need of updating and scope-enlargement to be achieved with a systemic, comprehensive and inclusive approach and a more general and overarching view.

Motivation and awareness in local authorities was highlighted as an essential element for the successful structuring and implementation of a SUMP. Participation and commitment within a local authority should be achieved vertically (from decision makers to technical officers, going through senior levels and vice-versa) and horizontally (transversally involving different departments of the local authority, all dealing one way or the other with mobility-related issues), cooperation between different departments being usually the most critical step.

Conclusions: BUMP beneficiaries will be cities or aggregations of municipalities with the following features:

- population ranging from 40,000 to 350,000 inhabitants to assure adequate coverage and representativeness of involved local authorities;
- political commitment expressed when applying for participation from the legal representative (Mayor or Mayor Cabinet Councilor);
- serious motivation proved through an official decision of the Mayor Cabinet addressing the issues of sustainable mobility;
- applicant cities/aggregations of municipalities should have some existing planning tools in place (ideally in need of renovation and not too recent) with a limited scope leaving room for range-

widening actions and integration with new planning tools and measures with an integration-bound approach;

- existing SEAP developed in the framework of the Covenant of Mayors.

Further elements to be considered when selecting beneficiaries:

- geographical position to assure distributed territorial coverage; size of the city/ aggregation of municipalities;
- type of city (mono-centric or poly-centric; characterized by important daily commuters or seasonal tourists' flows; active economic sectors and/or dismissed industrial areas, etc.);
- local authorities in Italy may be represented by their appointed mobility agencies performing technical and planning tasks, while city councils retain administrative and political decision making roles.

Guidelines on the selection of trainees: participants will be appointed by their local authorities to participate in training, mutual learning and pilot-action development activities with the final aim to increase wide-ranging, mobility planning capacity in local authorities and to develop local SUMP.

Participants shall be 2 per each local authority, they will have to be motivated and with relevant and influential positions and duties. They may for instance be a senior officer (e. g. head of the traffic and mobility department) and a technical officer working for the same department to achieve critical mass within the local authority. Another option can be having 2 senior officers running different, complementary departments (e. g. traffic and mobility, urban planning, environment management), who will in turn, indirectly involve their staff.

Selection of the trainees

As envisaged in BUMP's Annex 1 and compliant to AREA Science Park's internal regulations and procedures, participating local authorities in Italy were selected using a public transparent procedure implemented as follows.

In November 2013 a general model for the selection of participating local authorities was produced in English for the entire project consortium and then fine-tuned for the Italian context. It is worth highlighting that a decision was made, whereby local authorities are the actual 'beneficiaries' of services and opportunities offered by BUMP and the local authorities appoint individual representatives among their mobility managers and senior technical officers to actively participate in project activities.

The Italian call and application form, complete with admission requirements, details on participants' allowances, selection criteria and instructions on how to apply were published in the BUMP website and intensively promoted nationwide. The set deadline was January 23, 2014.

37 applications were received by individual cities/towns and their aggregations (for a total of 76 cities and towns) with populations in the 40,000-350,000 range, representing overall approximately 3.5 million inhabitants. Out of these 15 individual cities/towns and 2 aggregations (including respectively 3 and 11 towns), representing approximately 2 million inhabitants were selected. The total number of participants in the training was 29.

Full list of the trained people, their cities and their contacts:

No	Institution	Cities or towns involved	Population
1	City of Padova	1	213,358
2	City of Ravenna	1	160,243
3	City of Novara	1	105,574
4	City of Alessandria	1	95,000
5	City of Cremona	1	71,509
6	City of Parma	1	190,000
7	City of Pavia	1	68,500
8	City of Pesaro	1	94,705
9	City of Brescia	1	192,637
10	City of Prato	1	185,456
11	City of Ferrara	1	131,842
12	City of Arezzo	1	98,144
13	City of Livorno	1	157,052
14	City of Pordenone	1	52,000
15	Monfalcone - Ronchi - Staranzano (aggregation of 3 towns)	3	47,000
16	City of Vasto	1	41,400
17	Federazione Camposampierese (federation of 11 towns)	11	100,238
	TOTALS	29	2,004,658

Specific lessons learned in the selection of trainees

It is very important to communicate properly with political decision makers and officers alike to make sure the overall goal of the project is adequately understood from the very beginning (i.e. BUMP being about actually developing SUMP and not merely a training opportunity, although of significant importance). Local authorities, then, need to commit through official documents that bind them to follow suit.

Local authorities need clear and complete information to be able to decide whether to apply. Providing a full picture with, for instance, set dates for training sessions and information on trainers' expertise is a major selling point. It is also important to provide a general overview of milestones in the implementation of the work-plan and related time-planning.

Covering travelling expenses and clarifying immediately which costs will be covered and for whom, in all stages of work-plan implementation, is of crucial strategic importance.

In case local politicians change due to local elections, it is important to establish contact with the newcomers as soon as possible to try and guarantee continuity.

2. Process for the selection of trainers

Suggestions from focus group session for the selection of trainers

Having experienced trainers with relevant professional expertise and a proven record of hands-on practice in the field of sustainable mobility planning and management is essential to guarantee credibility and quality of the training provided. This is particularly true because they are called to train the recruited local

authorities' high-ranking representatives (senior technical officers and directors), a demanding audience expected to have positions of responsibility and to be influential in decision-making. In this framework, among the main skills trainers should have is the capability to facilitate the exchange of know-how and experiences, as well as the capability to establish a common planning methodology.

It is important that all trainers work in a coordinated manner, referring to a common framework of reference (in this case, mainly the BUMP supporting package and the guidelines to develop and implement a SUMP). This way, participants follow an integrated learning process, aimed at providing theoretical foundations along with practical examples and applications; promoting good practices highlighting potential for replication, strengths and weaknesses; disseminating useful results and outputs from other programs, projects and initiatives.

Selection of trainers

As envisaged in BUMP's Annex 1 and compliant to AREA Science Park's internal regulations and procedures, trainers in Italy were selected using a public transparent procedure implemented as follows.

The general training program developed for the BUMP consortium, adapted to the national context using feedback from focus groups sessions, was used as reference to organize the public selection; a call and the related application form were published in the BUMP website.

The general principles to be followed were:

- valorization of existing know-how and expertise of participants through class interaction, group work and individual study
- promotion of national and international good practices
- connection(s) with other national and international initiatives
- practical exercises functional to the development of the second stage of the project's work-plan (development of PUMS for involved local authorities).

The training program was based on a mix of in-class work and interactive training sessions, group work and further elaboration of discussed contents, individual study and elaboration of participants on how to adapt presented tools and measures to their respective territories.

Candidates for the trainers' assignments were asked to apply for each individual module/sub-module they wanted to teach and evaluated based on three criteria:

- 1) Relevance of their CVs;
- 2) Previous professional and didactic experience and specific knowledge/expertise relevant to the module;
- 3) A proposal for the teaching program for the module describing briefly how the candidate intended to organize the teaching, based on the general guidelines contained in each relevant section of the application form.

The call was published on 15/11/2013. Applications were received and, following a formal meeting of the appointed evaluation committee, trainers were selected on 29/11/2013. All prospective trainers were formally informed of the results and sent a formal letter of appointment for the training activity.

All trainers were then sent an updated version of the training program to be implemented in Italy, detailing what each trainer would deal with in each individual module/sub-module, complete with a preliminary reference to training materials to be used. Since it was difficult to have all trainers available on one single day, after a Skype conference at the beginning of January, a decision was made to have individual

conversations on the phone with each of them, asking for their opinions on the program in general and the organization of each module in relation to the overall structure and to theirs. Feedback was then exchanged with all trainers and all necessary measures adopted to avoid duplications/repetitions and foster a complementary, synergetic approach in the teaching.

As training started, each trainer was informed about what their colleagues had done, providing all training materials and presentations used. They were also informed about group work carried out in class during all previous sessions.

Specific lessons learned in the selection of trainers

Experts involved as trainers need to have an overarching vision on the process leading to the production and implementation of a SUMP, including having an idea of the areas falling not immediately within their scope of competence.

It is important to select trainers with experience acquired at an international and national level, to avoid excessive regional specialization, which may make them unsuitable to interact with local authorities representatives coming from all parts of the country.

Trainers also need to make themselves available to provide additional materials and distance support through the project in case training participants need further details or clarifications.

Full list of the trainers (see program for further details)

Session 1: 27, 28/02/2014 (2 days – 16 hrs)

Module 1a: Patrizia Malgieri

Module 1b: AREA Science Park – Luca Mercatelli, Fabio Tomasi

Meeting with a best practice: Bruna Cavaglià – City of Turin

Session 2: 19, 20, 21/03/2014 (3 days – 24 hrs)

Modules 2a and 2b: Lorenzo Bertuccio

Session 3: 9,10,11/04/2014 (2.5 days – 20 hrs)

Module 3a: Patrizia Malgieri

Module 3b: AREA Science Park – Luca Mercatelli, Fabio Tomasi

Session 4: 21, 22, 23/05/2014 (2.5 days – 20 hrs)

Module 4: Alessandro Meggiato

Module 5: Silvia Gaggi

Module 6: Fabio Torta

Module 7: AREA Science Park – Luca Mercatelli, Fabio Tomasi

3. Description of national training modules

As in all countries, the preparation of the training program in Italy started from the elaboration of the supporting package, following a range of requisites, among which the need to have a manageable number of training sessions, with an adequate period of time separating one from the other; integrating harmonically different experts, approaches and solutions; focusing on existing best-practice cases and real-life solutions and approaches; fostering cooperation with relevant networks and other sustainable mobility projects to learn from; valorizing participants' know-how and expertise, to share in class in a number of activities.

The leading principle was, therefore, to have a mix of in-class interactive lectures, in which, starting from the contents, methodologies and links provided by the supporting package, yet richly integrated with materials provided by individual trainers, participants had the opportunity to enrich their knowledge base and experience a hand-on approach to a wide range of applied tools and case studies. For each aspect dealt with in class, then, participants were invited to apply concepts and methods to their reality, trying to understand strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

A description of the way the modules were organized is reported to follow, showing how the original subdivision suggested by the supporting package was rearranged to suit the above-mentioned needs.

A decision was made to hold the entire training in Trieste and to have 8-hour instead of 6-hour days.

Module	Duration (days)	Session	Duration (days)
1. Introducing SUMP	1	Session 1)	
		Module 1a) Introduction to SUMP as an integrated plan, process and methodology; Module 1b) SUMP in action: a Project Cycle Management framework of reference for the plan and an example of best practice	1 1
2. Assessment and targets	2	Session 2)	
		Module 2a) How to structure, monitor and evaluate a SUMP Module 2b) Evaluation and monitoring exercises	2 1
3. Measures of integration and innovation	2	Session 3)	
		Module 3a) Concrete sustainable mobility actions and measures Module 3b) contextualizing sustainable mobility measures	2 0,5
4. Coordination on political, legal, financial and procedural levels	2	Session 4) Module 4) Legislation, procedures and writing techniques	1
5. Implementation	2	Module 5) Participatory processes and time-planning	0,5
6. Avoiding traps and getting a pilot action started	1	Module 6) Funding opportunities and financing modes	0,5
		Module 7) Coordination of the next steps and organization of pilot actions	0,5
Total	10	Total	10

A description of sessions/modules, contents and work done

For each session, a brief description is reported to highlight the most significant issues dealt with in class and autonomously by training participants. For a more detailed and comprehensive analysis of the work carried out, the full collection of training materials is attached.

Session 1: the first module started by introducing the main features of urban mobility, critical issues, impacts and evolution patterns, analyzing the main strategic, sector-bound and implementation planning tools, in their vertical and horizontal interactions with other tools. The new approach introduced through the concept of SUMP and their life-cycle analysis was then introduced, along with the Eltis guidelines and best practice cases (among others, Milan, Dresden, Ile de France). Group work activity was addressed to highlight strengths and weaknesses of the national legislation and system in relation to the SUMP concept and the national PUM (Urban Mobility Plan) guidelines issued by the Ministry of Public Works in the year 2000. The second day was dedicated to the introduction of project cycle management elements for the structuring of SUMPs: from problem analysis to the definition of strategic objectives and specific goals; definition of indicators and sources for data to be used for monitoring/evaluation purposes; a first definition of relations between activities, expected outputs and their repercussions. A meeting with an Italian best practice case (the City of Turin) was the opportunity to describe in detail the process that led to the definition of their SUMP and compare approaches, solutions and hindrances met in the process. Participants were then invited to re-elaborate the work done in class, focusing particularly on existing planning tools and implementation measures in their cities.

Connections with other projects/programs: PUMAS, CIVITAS, ELTIS, PATRES

Session 2: the second module started with the introduction to parameters and methodologies to be used for quantitative and qualitative evaluation and the establishment of monitoring systems. Starting with the analysis of the existing status quo/context, examples were introduced of analyses to describe which actors, sectors and parameters were involved. A further step was the evaluation of supply and demand and the setting of scenarios, taking into account existing plans, infrastructure, policies and measures for their integration. The MAX tools (MAX SUMO, MX TAG, MAX EVA, MAX LUPO) were introduced to describe how to subdivide complex objectives in specific and measurable (SMART) goals. The following step was to describe how to perform appropriate monitoring using the following methodologies: control group, comparison group, sole comparison group. The work carried out during module 1 (objectives-goals-actions-performance monitoring) was re-elaborated and additional elements provided: SWOT analysis, improved integration techniques, structuring of monitoring systems. A role play helped participants to experience the point of view of different actors in the process of preparation of a SUMP and related measures.

Connections with projects/programs: EPOMM, ENDURANCE, QUEST

Session 3: the third module introduced concrete measures and actions for sustainable mobility, describing those involving public, private actors and the local authority as a decision-making and technical body. Issues were analyzed including the various aspects and dimensions of demand (passengers and goods), considering hard and soft solutions. Moreover, in the framework of the integration of sustainable mobility with the other strategic planning tools, the various dimensions of the individual actions were considered, (times for realization, costs - both financial and social -, short and mid-to-long-term impacts, etc.). Specific reference was made to the connections at various levels between a SUMP and the traffic planning and management tools envisaged by the national legislation, as well as with public transport planning, home-to-

work and home-to-school systematic journeys, asystematic journeys and specific issues (e.g. gender-related). The module involved, as usual, in-class lectures and group work on the following themes:

- Sustainable mobility measures for urban passengers mobility and freight transport, in relation to the various dimensions of sustainability (environmental, economic, social, etc.)
- Levers to govern mobility demand: pricing, regulation, supply of infrastructure and services for mobility, road safety, urban logistics, technological innovation, participatory process management and sharing of mobility policies
- Presentation of national and international best practices and of European databases offering useful and significant examples (Eltis, CIVITAS, ADVANCE, etc.)
- Introduction to the results of the evaluation of CIVITAS, the main European funding program for sustainable urban mobility actions, to highlight potential impacts of the various policies in terms of sustainability, potentials or drivers, critical issues or barriers, parameters for transferring best practices.

Work group: comparison through a PEST (Political, Economic, Social and Technological) analysis of drivers and barriers in policies and measures. Sharing and comparison of results and approaches.

Re-elaboration of the work carried out in modules 1 and 2 in the light of the presented cases and methodologies, with a critical analysis and prospects for improvement. A first analysis is carried out of possible steps and relevant timing and actors to be involved in the structuring of a SUMP. Participants are invited to carry out further individual analysis of these issues in their territories, trying to import approaches and lessons learned from other national and international experiences.

Connections with other projects/programs: ADVANCE, CIVITAS, ELTIS, TRANSPORT LEARNING

Session 4: this session, scheduled to be closing the in-class training stage, at once completing through contents and solutions the path covered thus far and preparing the ground for the following steps, was subdivided into four different modules to cover a range of issues as listed to follow:

- legislation, procedures and writing techniques;
- participatory process management and time-planning;
- funding opportunities and financing modes;
- coordination of the next steps in the project's work-plan and organization of coaching actions.

As for the legislation, procedures and writing techniques, the module started with an overview of EU-level and national references (White paper, SUMP guidelines, national legislative framework, multi-level relations with urban planning and territorial management documents, aspects related to the highway code, issues connected with local authorities' budgeting provisions). An analysis of internal processes, reviewing all steps from the drafting to the preliminary and final formal approval of a SUMP, including the attribution of responsibilities, the constitution of an internal work-group, relations with political decision-making bodies, etc.

In relation to participatory processes' planning and management and timing in the structuring of a SUMP, specific attention was paid to the actors to involve, strategies and techniques for effective participatory processes, starting from the SUMP guidelines to examples of best practices at EU-level ('Do the right mix' campaign, case studies. Aberdeen, Toulouse, Ljutomer; Move Together; Polysump).

As for funding and financing solutions, the focus was on available resources at an international, national, regional and local level, highlighting what is or can be funded by each individual program and/or available solution, introducing case studies to show examples of realized actions and measures, stressing the funding modes used.

To link the training with the following stages a final module was dedicated to take stock and prepare for the following stages, particularly as concerns the preparation of the mutual learning events and the

implementation of coaching in each local authority, highlighting the advantages of the territorial grouping system. In this context, an idea for further optimization of the system was brought forward, discussed and promptly accepted: instead of keeping the coaching of each territorial grouping isolated to a certain extent, coaching actions will be carried out separately depending on the requests of each individual grouping. Outputs will be made available to all local authorities, thus multiplying the effect and further enhancing the impact of the coaching.

Connections with other projects/programs: DO THE RIGHT MIX, POLYSUMP, MOVE TOGETHER, CIVINET ITALY.

Feedback on national training modules

Partner	Module 1		Module 2		Module 3		Module 4	
	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised
Time of conducting (dd/mm)	27 and 28/02/14	27 and 28/02/14	19, 20 and 21/03/14	19, 20, 21/03/14	9, 10, and 11/04/2014	9, 10, and 11/04/2014	21, 22 and 23/05/2014	21, 22, and 23/05/2014
Actual days (1 day = 8 hrs)		2		3		2.5		2.5
Place of conducting	Trieste	Trieste	Trieste	Trieste	Trieste	Trieste	Trieste	Trieste
Number of participants	29	27 (27/2); 28 (28/2)	29	28 (19/3); 29 (20/3); 27 (21/3)	29	26 (9/4); 27 (10/4); 25 (11/4)	29	23 (21/5); 23 (22/5); 22 (23/5)
Problems (if any)	Excellent feedback (majority of evaluations in questionnaires between 5 and 4): participants very happy with the logistics and general organization.		Excellent feedback (majority of evaluations in questionnaires between 5 and 4): participants very happy with the logistics and general organization; some issues appear to be a little too technical and need further in-depth analysis for practical application.		Excellent feedback (majority of evaluations in questionnaires have a score of 5 and some 4s): participants very happy with the logistics and general organization; the lecturer is particularly good and experienced, manages to get people very involved and keeps attention high all the time.		Very good general feedback on the entire course. Participants are aware of difficulties but all willing to work on developing a PUMS for their city.	
Lessons learned	Participants are not used to materials in English and need translations/guidance; participants are not fully used to implementing project cycle management procedures (strategic setting of objectives, choice of relative measures and setting of targets/indicators) .		Participants find interactive sessions very useful and want more real-life simulations and further investigation on specific issues.		A model structure for SUMP has been created based on the concept that some contents can be common (or very similar) for all and others need to be specifically developed - the class confirms they particularly enjoy working on something very practical with a hands-on approach.		Well-structured pilot actions with territorial clusters of local authorities promise significant benefits, synergies and economies of scale. Coaching can be well shared among all beneficiaries to maximize impact. Participants are very willing to learn and do when offered the opportunity to do so.	

Aggregated results of Questionnaire 2

A table summarizing the feedbacks given at the end of the 4 modules can be found below.

In general, results can be considered very good, with participants strongly agreeing or mostly agreeing with all statements. Enthusiasm of the trainees is recorded also in the final session, where the majority of them feel ready to commit for the creation of a SUMP in their city and would enjoy sharing their knowledge with their colleagues and other cities.

	Q2	1 Disagree strongly	2 Disagree	3 Neither agree nor disagree	4 Agree	5 Agree strongly	abstentions	
Module 1 28 participants	I now know more about the concept of SUMP	0	0		1	12	15	
	I now know more about the benefits of SUMP	0	0		2	14	12	
	I feel confident about promoting the benefits of SUMP	0	0		2	8	18	
	I am decided to work for elaborating and implementing a SUMP in my city	0	0		3	4	21	
	to ensure that my city implements more sustainable transport policies and measures	0	0		2	5	21	
	I will share the information I gained with my colleagues	0	0		1	3	23	1
Module 2 28 participants	I now know more about the concept of SUMP	0	0		1	12	14	1
	I now know more about the benefits of SUMP	0	0		0	15	12	1
	I feel confident about promoting the benefits of SUMP	0	0		1	9	17	1
	I am decided to work for elaborating and implementing a SUMP in my city	0	0		2	5	20	1
	I will use the information received during the trainings to ensure that my city implements more sustainable transport policies and measures	0	0		0	7	20	1
	I will share the information I gained with my colleagues	0	0		0	5	22	1
Module 3 24 participants	I now know more about the concept of SUMP	0	0		0	6	17	1
	I now know more about the benefits of SUMP	0	0		0	5	18	1
	I feel confident about promoting the benefits of SUMP	0	0		1	4	18	1
	I am decided to work for elaborating and implementing a SUMP in my city	0	0		3	4	16	1
	I will use the information received during the trainings to ensure that my city implements more sustainable transport policies and measures	0	0		1	5	17	1
	I will share the information I gained with my colleagues	0	1		2	3	17	1
Module 4 19 participants	I now know well the concept of SUMP and its features and development stages	0	0		0	11	7	1
	I now know the benefits of SUMP and can promote them to others	0	0		1	8	10	
	I want to work so that my city has a SUMP	0	0		1	3	15	
	I am decided to work for elaborating and implementing a SUMP in my city	0	1		0	4	14	
	I can revise and improve transport and mobility plans for my city	0	1		4	12	2	
	I will use the information received during the training to ensure that my city implements more sustainable transport policies and measures and will transfer the information to my colleagues	0	0		0	5	14	
	I am ready to exchange experiences with cities at a more advanced stage and transfer good practices	0	0		3	7	9	

Main lessons learned – summary and conclusions

- Cooperation with other sustainable mobility projects is very useful and allows a wide range of synergies;
- Participants are not used to materials in English or EU programs (they need translations/guidance);
- Participants are not fully used to implementing project cycle management procedures (strategic setting of objectives, choice of relative measures and setting of targets/indicators)
- Participants find interactive sessions very useful and want more real-life simulations and further investigation on specific issues
- A model structure for a SUMP has been created based on the concept that some contents can be common (or very similar) for all and others need to specifically developed i.e. a common structure was outlined but the specific contents of each sections are to be defined at local level for each city
- All local authorities will need close guidance and a tight monitoring system to stay within schedule in the development of their SUMPs

4. Final training session

The final training session was held in Italy on December 3, 2014 as planned. Attendance was very good as shown in the attached attendancelist.

The main topic was to share the lessons learned during the four mutual learning events, which was accomplished through group work: the delegations of participants that were present at each mutual learning event were asked to gather together, collect the main impressions and the most important issues and contents dealt with during each events and present the results to the others, triggering a debate. Attached are also the minutes of the session. Because all participants had gathered in Trieste after the first meetings of the territorial grouping had taken place and expressed their first, most immediate needs, the final training session was also the opportunity to meet two experts providing extensive and practical assistance on the definition of indicators for SUMPs and practical participatory process planning and management tips for SUMP.

PP2 – TUDO

1. Process for the selection of trainees

As envisaged in BUMP's Annex 1 and compliant to TU Dortmund's internal regulations and procedures, participating local authorities in Germany were selected using a public transparent procedure implemented as follows.

In November 2013 a general model for the selection of participating local authorities was produced in English for the entire project consortium and then fine-tuned for the German context. The German call and application form, complete with admission requirements, details on participants' allowances, selection criteria and instructions on how to apply were published on the BUMP website and intensively promoted nationwide. It is worth highlighting that a decision was made, whereby local authorities are the actual 'beneficiaries' of services and opportunities offered by BUMP and the local authorities appoint individual representatives among their mobility managers and senior technical officers to actively participate in project activities. Thus, letters of invitation were sent to persons in local authorities with description and schedule of the training programme attached.

Selection of trainers

Not applicable due to cancellation of trainings.

2. Promotion activities

- Participation of local authorities by letter of intention at the start of BUMP: Before BUMP started in April 2013 four local authorities sent a letter of intention for participation in the BUMP project (Stadt Dülmen, Stadt Gütersloh, Stadt Iserlohn, Stadt Lüdenscheid). During WP2 two of them withdrew their intention in participation. All the four authorities hesitated in engaging in the BUMP project when it was clarified that the training programme consists in ten days of training at Dortmund University.
- Early stage promotion activities (May until October 2013): The BUMP approach with stages of training and coaching was disseminated by newsletter (RP news 31; August 2013) and focus groups (3 meetings at Bonn, Gütersloh, Lüdenscheid). At this time the binding confirmation of local authorities in participation could not be reached because of the lack of available information about the training concept (detailed information about training topics, contents and methods).
- Wide spread promotion (November 2013 until June 2014): Information about the offers of BUMP was disseminated by newsletter (RP news 33; February 2014) and distribution of BUMP flyers (Dortmunder conference 13./14.02.2014; Kolloquium Energiewende 29.04.2014, 20.05.2014, 17.06.2014 at Dortmund University).
- Targeted promotion, top down approach (December 2013 until June 2014): In order to get local decision makers involved in BUMP, the attempt was carried out to get in touch with mayors and high rank officers who then should send their staff to the training sessions. Contacts by phone calls did not effect the envisaged motivation. Moreover a personal contact was hardly possible.
- Targeted promotion, Bottom up approach (December 2013 until June 2014): In order to find staff of local authorities which is interested in the BUMP training programme, heads of department or sections and staff on the working level (municipal planners, officers) were addressed by phone calls and letters and asked if they were interested in detailed information about the training programme provided by a

formal invitation letter. This process happened within several waves and resulted in a set of 73 targeted authorities with contact data of persons (see recruitment file). The enclosed local authorities were selected by researching their engagement in mobility approaches or envisaged planning process referring to urban mobility.

- Last wave of promotion (May/June 2014): Within the last wave the targeted authorities were provided with a detailed training schedule and information about the organisation of the training sessions and the envisaged international workshops. Based on promising feedbacks the addressed persons were requested to send a confirmation of attendance by e-mail (with announcement of participating persons).

Result of promotion activities

Five cities/towns showed interest in and intended to send an application. Of these 5 cities/towns 2 applications finally were received. 3 more cities were interested in the programme but attendance was not possible for different reasons. All other cities answered that they were not interested or did not reply at all (see also feedback comments from local authorities below). Until the application deadline (27.06.2014) TUDO got confirmations of attendance for the envisaged training sessions from:

- Stadt Bottrop (116.498 inh.), Abteilung Verkehrsplanung, Mrs. Natascha Dietz (attendance of second person was announced);
- Stadt Lünen (84.798 inh.), Stadtplanung, Mr. Wolfram Ernst.

The awaited confirmation feedback of Stadt Soest (46.685 inh.), Stadt Gütersloh (94.973 inh.), Stadt Bergkamen (48.534 inh.) was not received.

The envisaged dates of the training sessions were not possible for the interested authorities Stadt Lüdenscheid (73.336 inh.), Stadt Erkrath (43.786 inh.), Stadt Hürth (56.435 inh.).

As there were only 2 cities who finally applied for the trainings it was decided to cancel the trainings.

3. Description of the national training modules

See attached programme for planned (but cancelled) trainings.

Aggregated results of the Questionnaire 2

Not applicable due to cancellation of trainings.

4. Main lessons learned

Feedback of the promotion activities and conclusions

As the promotion activities of TUDO resulted in confirmed applications from only two local authorities, lessons learned on the project structure are as follows:

- The amount of 10 training days is not comfortable for most German municipal staff. Persons are not willing or are not able to stay overnight. In this context it was mentioned that a distance learning/training concept (e-tutorials with only one last presence meeting) could be an innovative alternative (saving travel costs and emissions).
- Municipalities which are requested for a letter of intention at the very beginning of a project should state a binding confirmation of participation and should be informed about the necessary efforts in detail.

- There is no conviction that there is a deep training need for local staff in Germany. The interest of local authorities is focused on more special topics like conception of mobility management projects, consultation of application for funding. The BUMP approach as a more general view on sustainable mobility planning does not fulfill these very specific needs. The more general view of sustainable mobility was expressed regarding the obvious lack of political awareness and pressure.
- Persons from municipalities are not able to assure that the elaboration of a SUMP will be carried out within the duration of the project.. It was pointed out that local authorities do not see the need for additional planning but acting and implementing. Moreover it was stated that only projects which are able to provide financial subsidies in order to carry out status quo analysis/surveys, project conception and implementation or for (external) personnel resources are able to foster visible results within short time.

PP3 – CSDCS

1. Process for the selection of trainees

Suggestions from focus group session for the selection of trainees

After joining the EU in 2007 Bulgaria made many efforts to meet the European standards for a modern, ecological and safe transport system. There have been measures taken for the harmonisation of Bulgarian legislation to the European conditions for responsible changes in the transport sector, which can bring increase service quality standards. During the First programming period 2007-2013 the state institutions focused mainly on infrastructure measures, thus neglecting the mobility management.

Since 2007 the urban mobility development in Bulgaria is mile-stoned by the implementation of several EU-projects at municipal, regional and national level. After the creation of the Bulgarian EPOMM network and the strong information and communication campaign conducted, the Mobility Management was introduced as term and policy in the new planning documents. In the **Strategy for Development of the Transport Sector till 2020** was planned to develop Integrated Urban Transport Plans for the 7 largest Bulgarian cities through the Operational Program “Regional Development”. In the **National Programme for Reforms in Bulgaria 2011-2015**, adopted in April 2011, the elaboration and implementation of SUMP is planned for 35 municipalities till the end of 2015. The “Sustainable development of urban passenger transport” is already included as a *Priority 8* in the new **Transport OP 2014-2020**. However, the SUMP concept is still new in Bulgaria and it is not required by law.

Urban transport planning is usually considered as planning only the urban transport lines and the corresponding vehicles without including policies for walking, cycling, parking, inter-modality and information technologies application. The urban transport plans were entirely entrusted to consultants external to local authorities. Nowadays, with increasingly scarce resources to subcontract planning functions externally, providing directors and technical officers with a sound working methodology and an adequate store of knowledge and practical know-how is crucial.

All these factors described above were explained in details to the focus group participants. As the SUMP-concept was completely new for transport and planning experts in Bulgaria, there were no any suggestions for the structure of modules and key topics of the training course (which should be performed according to the proposal of WP2 leader TUDO). The participants had no suggestions about the consistence and completeness of learning objectives but agreed there was a need for national adapted learning objectives and national emphasis. There were no supplementary suggestions and it was clear the training should start from zero level of knowledge and competences.

The focus group agreed on the criteria for cities selection:

Number of inhabitants: 40,000 – 350,000

Commitment of the local authority

Existence of urban transport network (some smaller cities in Bulgaria do not have PT)

Number of passengers of PT

Level of development of the technical transport infrastructure

Cities situated close to touristic areas (tourism causes big traffic)

Cities with close zones for recreation and leisure activities

Cities representing regional centres

Cities which already implemented some actions guiding to sustainability

Cities with universities and other educational establishments.

Further elements to be considered when selecting beneficiaries:

- geographical position to assure distributed territorial coverage; size of the city/aggregation of municipalities
- type of city (mono-centric; characterized by important daily commuters or seasonal tourists' flows; active economic sectors and/or dismissed industrial areas, etc.)
- local authorities may be represented by their urban mobility centers or transport departments performing technical and planning tasks, while city councils retain administrative and political decision making roles.

The expert focus group agreed on criteria for selection of trainees: participants will be appointed by their local authorities to participate in training, mutual learning and pilot-action development activities with the final aim to increase wide-ranging, mobility planning capacity in local authorities and to develop local SUMP.

Participants shall be 2 per each local authority, they will have to be motivated and with relevant and influential positions and duties – deputy mayors on transport, heads of transport department, heads of economic department, city architects or at least technical officers working for the same departments to achieve critical mass within the local authority.

Selection of the trainees

As envisaged in BUMP's Annex 1, participating local authorities in Bulgaria were selected using a public transparent procedure implemented as follows. In November 2013 a general model for the selection of participating local authorities was produced in English for the entire project consortium and then fine-tuned for the Bulgarian context. It is worth highlighting that a decision was made, whereby local authorities are the actual 'beneficiaries' of services and opportunities offered by BUMP and the local authorities appoint individual representatives among their mobility managers and senior technical officers to actively participate in project activities.

The Bulgarian call and the application form complete with admission requirements, details on participants' allowances, selection criteria and instructions on how to apply were disseminated to all Bulgarian cities with population among 40,000 and 350,000 inhabitants. The set deadline was published in the BUMP website and intensively promoted nationwide. The set deadline was December 10, 2014.

14 applications were received by individual cities/towns meeting the requirements and 10 of them with approximately 1.5 million inhabitants were selected. The total number of participants in the training was 28.

Full list of the trained people, their cities and their contacts:

No	Municipality	Position/Department	Population in the city
1	Ruse	Junior expert, European Development Directorate	235,252
2	Ruse	Executive Manager, Regional Energy Agency	235,252
3	Pleven	Manager, Urban Mobility Center (Municipal Enterprise)	131,152
4	Pleven	Chief Expert, Europrojects Directorate	131,152
5	Pleven	Chief Expert, Europrojects Directorate	131,152

6	Montana	Director, European Integration and Economic Development	60,808
7	Montana	Head of Transport department	60,808
8	Veliko Tarnovo	Director, Directorate "Municipal Development"	128,867
9	Veliko Tarnovo	Chief Architect	128,867
10	Gabrovo	Deputy Manager of Municipality Enterprise "Transport"	65,903
11	Gabrovo	Deputy Mayor "Finance and Property"	65,903
12	Gabrovo	Chief Architect, Gabrovo Municipality	65,903
13	Gabrovo	Chief Expert, "Projects and Economic Development"	65,903
14	Burgas	Director, Economy and Business Directorate	219,267
15	Burgas	Head of Department "Environment policies and Programms"	219,267
16	Burgas	Senior Expert, Territorial Cooperation	219,267
17	Burgas	Expert "Programms"	219,267
18	Stara Zagora	Head of Transport department	164,970
19	Stara Zagora	Director, "Economic policy" Directorate	164,970
20	Haskovo	Chief Architect	184,731
21	Haskovo	Chief Expert, Urban Development	184,731
22	Haskovo	Chief Expert, Urban Development	184,731
23	Pazardjik	Chief Expert "Transport"	77,000
24	Pazardjik	Head of department "Urbanization"	77,000
25	Kardjali	Chief Expert, Department "Investment control and construction"	149,661
26	Kardjali	Legal Advisor, Municipality of Kardjali	149,661
27	Kardjali	Chief Specialist, Department "Architecture and registration on building sites"	149,661
28	Ruse	Expert Transport	235,252

Specific lessons learnt in the selection of trainees

It is very important to provide complete information to be able to decide whether to apply, communicating properly with political decision makers and officers alike, to make sure the overall goal of the project is adequately understood from the very beginning (i.e. BUMP being about actually developing SUMP and not merely a training opportunity, although of significant importance). Local authorities, then, need to commit through official documents that bind them to follow suit. Covering travelling expenses and clarifying immediately which costs will be covered and for whom in all stages of work-plan implementation was of crucial strategic importance. The project team explained to the local governments they will not have any financial obligations during the process of implementation of the project.

As the political situation in Bulgaria has changed twice during the first phase of the project, it was important to establish contact with the newcomers as soon as possible to try and guarantee continuity and to explain in details their profit from the project.

2. Process for the selection of trainers

Suggestions from focus group session for the selection of trainers

The experts of the focus group agreed that it is very important to have experienced trainers with relevant professional expertise and a proven record of hands-on practice in the field of sustainable mobility planning and mobility management. Having in mind that in Bulgaria there were no expertise on mobility and SUMP, the only experts in these fields were the CSDCS members that have been participating in many international trainings and have implemented a number of European mobility projects. It was agreed the trainers would be the CSDCS expert staff.

Working in the same organizations, all trainers have been working in a coordinated manner, referring to a common framework of reference (in this case, mainly the BUMP supporting package and the guidelines to develop and implement a SUMP). This way, participants have followed an integrated learning process, aiming at provide theoretical foundations along with practical examples and applications; promoting good practices highlighting potential for replication, strengths and weaknesses; disseminating useful results and outputs from other programs, projects and initiatives.

Selection of trainers

The trainers were members of CSDCS (in-house consultants) with relevant CVs and professional experience, trained on SUMP and mobility management via internal and external (national and international) training courses. The main trainer was prof. Lucia Ilieva – Certified SUMP-expert and QUEST-Auditor. A preliminary meeting was conducted in CSDCS premises in Sofia on 13th of January 2014 with the participation of all trainers and both coordinators of the training process:

Prof. Lucia Ilieva - main trainer

Veselin Grozdanov - trainer

Pepa Rizova - trainer

Lachezar Rosenov - trainer

Lora Sarkisyan - trainer

Zdravka Yakimova - coordinator

Maria Stoycheva - coordinator

Specific lessons learned in the selection of trainers

All the trainers' team has been previously trained by Prof. Lucia Ilieva and has been implementing several mobility projects (BENEFIT, EPOMM PLUS, SEEMORE, ENDURANCE, TRANSDANUBE, etc.). The trainers have been working with many municipalities and transport experts in the processes of implementation of mobility measures and educational activities. The CSDCS team of trainers was also recognized and very actively working with the *Association of Municipalities of Bulgaria (NAMRB)*, which encompasses all the 265 municipalities in the country. This cooperation has assured the large dissemination and replication of the project's results.

Trainers declared to be available to provide additional materials and support as coaches through the project in case training participants need further details or clarifications during the education phase and afterwords during the coaching phase.

3. Description of the national training modules

The preparation of the training program in Bulgaria started from the elaboration of the supporting package, considering the very beginning level of knowledge of the trainees. The ELTIS site was consulted and many supplementary cases and short movies were included in the training programme. Prof. Ilieva had a number

of discussions about the training process with experts from leading European organizations like Ruppecht Consult (Mr. F. Weffering), FGM AMOR (Mr. R.Pressl), PUMA (Mr. A.Piotrowski), etc. Some European cities having good SUMP-practice were contacted by Prof. Ilieva and kindly sent their SUMPs in order to serve as models (Ljubljana, Toulouse, Lion, etc.). The previous experience of the CSDCS-team and the synergy from other mobility projects were used in the preparation of the PPT presentations, where some approaches and solutions and existing best-practice cases and real-life solutions and approaches were used.

It was decided to have 6 separate training modules shaping in total 10 working days as it was planned in the project. The leading principle was to conduct the trainings in different places all over the country in order to balance the transport distances for the trainees. Hotels with good training facilities were chosen in order to keep the auditory far from the every-day duties and to be entirely devoted to the learning process. The training modules were conducted once per month starting from January 2014 thus leaving enough time for the trainees to prepare their homework and to really reflect their needs.

The training process was a mix of lectures with PPT presentations, interactive discussions, case-studies, movies watching and comparing different city cases in order to show different approaches of European cities in mobility planning. There were one leading trainer and one or two co-trainers for each topic. The participants had the opportunity to enrich their knowledge and experience both by listening to the trainers and by preparing their own presentations. Trainees were invited to present the cases of their own cities. Since the 2nd module, every time one or more people had presentations of their problems and solutions for city transport and mobility planning. The homework was thoroughly discussed and solutions of particular cases were found by group discussions and suggestions. In such a way 8 out of 10 cities had already the 1st draft of their SUMP by the end of the training.

A description of the way the modules were organized is presented below. The last 2 modules: 5th and 6th were merged and conducted in May because many participants would have summer holidays in June.

Partner	Modul 1		Modul 2		Modul 3		Modul 4		Modul 5		Modul 6	
	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised
Time of conducting (dd/mm)	28-29/01	28-29/01	20-21/02	20-21/02	20-21/03	20-21/03	24-25/04	24-25/04	19-20/05	19-20/05	19-20/06	21.05.
Place of conducting	Sofia	Sofia	Ruse	Ruse	Chiflika	Chiflika	Chepelare	Chepelare	Sl.briag	Sl.briag	Balchik	Sl.briag
Number of participants	20	18	20	20	20	19	20	18	20	20	20	20
Problems (if any)	The road from Kardjali to Sofia was closed due to the winter storm and the participants couldn't come		No any problems		One representative from Haskovo was sick and couldn't attend the session.		One representative from Haskovo was in hospital. The Dep.mayor of Gabrovo was participating in a high-level meeting in the MOEW.		No problems		No problems	
Lessons learnt	The participants had some basic knowledge about SUMP, but nobody had ever developed such plans. The interest was very high. It is relevant to present some MM examples from other projects implemented in the country. As an example for introducing MM in Bulgaria, the SEMORE-project was presented.		All trainees did their homework: they were bringing maps of their cities and reported about the transport problems, some even with their own PPT. The first 3 steps (purple circles in the SUMP-cycle) were fulfilled with relevant information. On that basis the main topics of the second session were presented. As an example of collecting and presenting data the TRANSDANUBE project and Ruse Masterplan were presented by the trainers.		The interest to SUMP is raising with every next training session. All trainees did their homework - they have prepared the city profiles with proposals of some measures to be implemented in the frames of SUMP. During the group work they produced city posters with the necessary measures and shortly presented them to the auditory. The trainers prepared many PPT-presentations with MM and demonstrated their impact on the city environment. Videos with examples of many European cities were also demonstrated and discussed.		The interest to SUMP is resting enough high. All participating cities joined the ENDURANCE SUMP network and declared their interest to develop a SUMP.		Cities presented their draft SUMPs. 7 cities will have SUMPs ready for implementation before the MLW.		Successful end of the training	
Trainers	Prof. Lucia Ilieva	V.Grozdanov, P.Rizova	Lora Sarkisyan		Prof. Lucia Ilieva, Pepa Rizova	Prof. Lucia Ilieva	Prof. Lucia Ilieva, Pepa Rizova	Prof. Lucia Ilieva, Pepa Rizova	Prof. Lucia Ilieva, Pepa Rizova	Prof. Lucia Ilieva, Pepa Rizova	Prof. Lucia Ilieva, V.Grozdanov, P.Rizova	

A description of sessions/modules, contents and work done

For each session, a brief description is reported to highlight the most significant issues dealt with in class and autonomously by training participants. For a more detailed and comprehensive analysis of the work carried out, the full collection of training materials is attached.

Session 1 (1 day): It was held in Sofia and started by introducing the training organization CSDCS, the trainers, the trainees and the BUMP-project, its goals and objectives. The European policy on Mobility was presented as well as the main features of urban mobility, critical issues, impacts and evolution patterns, analyzing the main strategic, sector-bound and implementation planning tools, in their vertical and horizontal interactions with other tools. The new approach introduced through the concept of SUMP and their life-cycle analysis was then introduced, along with the ELTIS guidelines and best practice cases (ELTIS movie SUMP 1, 2, 3). The training approach was explained. Group discussion was held about the cities' needs in mobility planning and the national legislation in relation to the SUMP concept emphasizing on the lack of the Ministry that leads the urban planning process in Bulgaria and the role of municipalities as a main decision-maker on SUMP.

The prepared materials (translated SUMP-Guidelines, BUMP-leaflets, notebooks, pens and folders) were distributed to the trainees. The place and time of the 2nd module were announced. As homework trainees were asked to prepare a short presentation about the existing mobility situation in their cities and to bring maps.

Session 2 (2 days): The second module was held in Ruse – the Danube “capital” of Bulgaria. It started with the introduction of data collection methodologies to be used for SUMP elaboration. The participants from Ruse, Stara Zagora, Pazardjik and Veliko Tarnovo presented their homework – the problems and possible solutions in their cities. The SWOT analysis was approved as the most convenient tool to present the problems to be solved. Starting with the analysis of the existing status quo/context, examples from Ruse, Turku and Helsinki were presented to describe which actors, sectors and parameters were involved. A further step was the evaluation of supply and demand and the setting of scenarios, taking into account existing plans, infrastructure, policies and measures for their integration.

In the afternoon of the first day representatives from the Ruse municipality, city council, local NGOs, companies and trade unions were invited and a public discussion was held on the TRANSDANUBE plan for sustainable mobility and tourism development for Ruse.

During the second day the MAX tools (MAX SUMO, MAX EVA, MAX LUPO) were introduced to describe how to subdivide complex objectives in specific and measurable (SMART) goals. IT-supported exercise of MAX EVA was performed. The next step was to describe how to perform appropriate monitoring using several methodologies. A role play for discussing the different scenarios was held the second day helping participants to experience the point of view of different actors in the process of preparation of a SUMP and related measures. Connections with projects/programs: EPOMM, ENDURANCE, QUEST, SEEMORE was done.

The next homework was: from problem analysis to the definition of strategic objectives and specific goals; definition of indicators and sources for data to be used for monitoring/evaluation purposes of the SUMP.

Session 3 (2 days): The 3rd session was held in the middle of the country – in Troyan mountain resort area. It was a very important module because it focused on the mobility measures that could be included in

SUMP. The measures were presented by groups in 8 separate PPT encompassing: MM; Collective PT; Demand management strategies; Car independent lifestyle; Safety and Security; Urban freight logistics; ITC in urban transport; Clean fuels and vehicles. Examples of mobility measures successfully introduced in Budapest, Lyon, Madrid, Freiburg and Munich were demonstrated by video presentation and discussion.

The second day the cities presented their goals and objectives of the planned SUMPs and had then the possibility to choose the convenient measures. Discussion on costs and impact of the measures was held and each city tried to choose the most convenient measures for meeting the SUMP goals. An analysis was carried out on possible steps and relevant timing and actors to be involved in the structuring of SUMP measures within each city. A practical work on EPOMM-choice of measures was conducted. Participants were invited to carry out further individual analysis of these issues in their territories, trying to import approaches and lessons learnt from other national and international experiences.

Connection with other projects: EPOMM, BENEFIT, TRANSPORT LEARNING, CI-LIEGE

Homework: SUMP-coordination on political, legal, financial and procedure level.

Session 4 (2 days): The session was held in Chepelare town in the south part of Bulgaria. The training programme covered a range of issues – legislation, procedures and writing techniques, participatory process management in relation to time-planning, funding opportunities and financing modes. As far as there was no any Ministry involved and no legislative frame for SUMP in Bulgaria, CSDCS entertained a pioneer work to conduct the process on municipal level. The legislation related to the transport sector in Bulgaria was summarized. A short overview of EU-level legislation and relevant documents was made. The participants presented their homework containing the selected measures for their cities and how the responsibilities for their planning and implementation were allocated. The first day of this module finished with an analysis of the internal process, reviewing all steps from the drafting to the preliminary and final formal approval of a SUMP, including the attribution of responsibilities, the constitution of an internal work-group, relations with political decision-making authorities, etc. Specific attention was paid to the political support in Bulgaria although a leading Ministry for the SUMP-process and local support is crucial is missing.

The second day focused on funding and financing solutions with description of available national resources under the OPRD and international programs. The funding possibilities of H2020 were presented and discussed. A group work was performed (4 groups) for selecting measures and finding financial and institutional support.

Connection with other projects: ENDURANCE, DO THE RIGHT MIX, ELTIS

Homework: Finishing the first draft for SUMP with distribution of responsibilities, coordination, monitoring and evaluation.

Session 5 (2 days): The session was held in Sunny beach resort near Burgas. It was dedicated to the implementation and coordination of SUMP and the participants were asked to present their drafts that were thoroughly discussed. The Burgas representatives presented some already implemented small mobility measures from their Integrated Transport Plan that could be part of the SUMP. The first day finished with a brainstorming. The topic focused on the barriers to SUMP-implementation and how to overcome them. The common conclusion was that the main obstacle is the old-fashion way of thinking of transport experts (planning for vehicles and not for people) and the lack of funding for implementing SUMPs.

The second day started with the demonstration of Brussels SUMP. A long discussion on the difference between the ordinary 'old fashion' transport planning and SUMP took place. Participants proposed different approaches on how to transform and upgrade the existing compulsory Integrated Transport Plans (required by the MRD) in order to become SUMP. Another discussion was held about the link between space planning process and SUMP, the conclusion was that SUMP are related to many sectors, so a multi-sectoral approach is necessary for their successful implementation.

Connection with other projects: ELTIS, CIVITAS

Session 6 (1 day): The last session was conducted during the third day of the Sunny beach event. It linked the national trainings with the following stages of Mutual Learning Workshops (MLW). Each trainee expressed his preferences for MLW depending on the topics to be discussed in each city and the time for conducting the international trainings. Four groups were formed, according to the needs of the participants.

The trainers organized a "world café session", thus preparing the trainees for the MLW methodology. During this session, the cities representatives presented to their colleagues how they would deal with barriers and traps in the process of SUMP development and implementation. The session was organized "open air" at the beach cafeteria in the front of the hotel and the participants really enjoyed the discussion that took place during 90 min.

The coaching process was also discussed in the afternoon and the trainees were invited to inform and prepare their manager for the elaboration of SUMP. 8 of 10 cities declared they wanted to prepare SUMP in the frame of BUMP. 2 cities (Pazardjik and Haskovo) said they were at the very beginning stage of urban transport planning and did not have enough technical skills for SUMP development at that moment.

Aggregated results of the Questionnaire 2

Questionnaires were disseminated via internet to the trainees after each module. We had nearly 95% of responses (there were some missing feedbacks due to illness). The aggregated results showed the following:

The trainees highly appreciated the content of the presentations and the way of communication, as well as the interactive sessions and the discussions on the ELTIS videos (95% of highest scoring). 100% were fully satisfied with the organization before and during the workshops. 100% also declared "I now know more about the concept and the benefits of SUMP" and 75% answered they will contribute to the elaboration and implementation of SUMP in their city. 95% promised they will share the received information with their colleagues.

The most difficult for the majority of the participants (70%) was "To persuade the Municipal council to assign money from the city budget for elaboration of entire SUMP". 20% of the trainees declared for them MM and SUMP are very new as terms and concepts, and that in their city nobody has ever worked in this area.

4. Main lessons learned – summary and conclusions

- Municipalities are interested in SUMP if the benefits are well explained; main motivation is EU funding for cities
- Permanent contacts with the trainees, dissemination of many SUMP materials, case studies and all PPT presentations during the modules are compulsory for the success
- The ELTIS videos with examples of SUMP implemented in European cities are very useful during the training process

- The SUMP drafts should be written on paper in order to be enlarged afterwards and to become a base for real planning documents
- International training sessions and contacts with foreign experts are strongly appreciated by the trainees and are one of the main drivers for their participation
- Trainings should be organized outside of the workplaces of participants, with good training facilities and possibilities for informal discussions during meals and evening events. The team spirit is very important for the progress of the learning process.
- Municipal representatives require a reimbursement of their travel expenses otherwise they will not come. The municipal budgets are very restraint and are not able to cover the travel costs of participants. For most of modules the project had to pay two or three overnights in order to have 2 full days for training

Conclusion: The first stage of the BUMP training process – the national training was conducted successfully in Bulgaria. The training was highly appreciated by the cities and minimum 6 of the participating cities manifested their interest to elaborate their SUMP drafts.

5. Final training session

The final training session was held in Pleven on March 12th 2015. Attendance was good as shown in the attached attendance sheets. The main topic was to share the lessons learnt during the four mutual learning events, which was accomplished through group work. The cities developing SUMP invited other colleagues from their municipal teams and some exchange of experience took place between BUMP cities. As Pleven is the most advanced with the SUMP elaboration, they presented the main measures of their SUMP.

PP4 – CIRCE

1. Process for the selection of trainees

Suggestions from focus group session for the selection of trainees

The main conclusions about the selection of trainees collected during the focus group sessions are:

- It was suggested that in Spain the level of penetration of sustainable mobility is so high that maybe the selection process would not have been necessary
- During the project dissemination phase, to obtain the attention of potential participants, it is necessary to explain clearly the benefits of elaborating a SUMP and the advantages of participating in BUMP (coaching, training)
- There are many municipalities that need to develop a SUMP but their technicians have lack of knowledge to do it so BUMP could be very useful for them
- The concept of urban mobility responsible still needs to be clarified. In some municipalities are local police is in charge, in others there are environmental departments. In order to assign the competences of urban mobility to a technician, it should be useful to coordinate all measures that affect mobility
- Involving politicians in cities has great relevance. In small and medium cities it is easier to have contact with councilors and mayors so this fact has to be used as strength.
- There are several regions in Spain (mainly in the south) in which there is a strong political interest in promoting SUMP among their municipal technicians, Because a 10-day course could be too long for municipal technicians the experts suggested it is important to clearly explain the trainees the benefits and the opportunities of joining BUMP activities
- Some cities have already presented SUMP but they should be checked due to the fact that some measures have not had the expected impact
- In small municipalities and cities (from 10.000 inhabs to 50.000 inhabs) a large extent have not done SUMP yet, however they want to do it
- It is very common that some cities have not implemented all measures that were presented in SUMP due to financial barriers. For this purpose, economy feasibility and advantages of SUMP have to be highlighted during BUMP lifetime
- Important benefits can be result of the involvement of politicians in urban mobility strategies. In cities where politicians have used SUMP like an electoral tool and have been committed in implementing measures the result has been successful
- It is important to define clear competencies in mobility and to assign them in public administration, promoting among participants the creation of these positions
- Establishing a platform of municipalities and cities that want to improve their mobility, can have great impact (CIVITAS initiative as key net to do it)
- Energy agencies could promote and disseminate BUMP's activities
- By means of IDAE (National Institute of Energy Savings and Diversification) it is also possible to promote project at national level in the referenced platform
- One of the most important aspect collected in the focus group sessions is that, due to the great knowledge about sustainable mobility measures between the Spanish municipalities, it could be a

good idea to organize a final workshop for all participants, where exchange progress about their municipality on sustainable mobility, is in order to make the most out of the BUMP training.

Selection of the trainees

As envisaged in BUMP’s Annex 1 and compliant to CIRCE Foundation internal regulations and procedures, participating local authorities in Spain were selected using a public transparent procedure implemented as follows.

In November 2013 a general model for the selection of participating local authorities was produced in English for the entire project consortium and then fine-tuned for the Spanish context and language. It is worth highlighting that a decision was made, whereby local authorities are the actual ‘beneficiaries’ of services and opportunities offered by BUMP and the local authorities appoint individual representatives among their mobility managers and senior technical officers to actively participate in project activities.

The Spanish call and application form, complete with admission requirements, details on participants’ allowances, selection criteria and instructions on how to apply were published in the BUMP website and intensively promoted nationwide. The set deadline was January 23, 2014.

17 applications were received by individual and aggregation cities/towns with populations in the 40.000-350.000 range, representing overall approximately 1.5 million inhabitants. The total number of participants in the training was 30.

Full list of the trained people, their cities and their contacts:

	Role in the organisation	Town	Inhabitants
1	Responsible for Mobility	SORIA	41,000
2	Councilor for Environment and Mobility	CALATAYUD	22,000
3	Responsible for Mobility	CALATAYUD	22,000
4	Councilor for Mobility	HUESCA	53,000
5	Responsible for Mobility	HUESCA	53,000
6	Responsible for Mobility	BARBASTRO	18,000
7	Responsible for Urbanism	BARBASTRO	18,000
8	Responsible for Urbanism	BARBASTRO	18,000
9	Responsible for Mobility	SABIÑANIGO	11,000
10	Responsible for Urbanism	SABIÑANIGO	11,000
11	Responsible for Mobility	UTEBO	19,000
12	Responsible for Mobility	UTEBO	19,000
13	Responsible for Mobility	UTEBO	19,000
14	Councilor of Urbanism	MERIDA	59,000
15	Responsible for Energy	MERIDA	59,000
16	Responsible for Urbanism	MERIDA	59,000
17	Responsible for Urbanism	HUELVA	149,000
18	Responsible for Urbanism	HUELVA	149,000
19	Responsible for Mobility	CEUTA	85,000
20	Responsible for Environment and Mobility	RIVAS-VACIAMADRID	76,000
21	Manager for Environment and Mobility	RIVAS-VACIAMADRID	76,000
22	Responsible for Environment	PALENCIA	82,000
23	Responsible for Urbanism	PALENCIA	82,000

24	Responsible for Mobility	SABADELL	208,000
25	Councilor for Environment and Mobility	CIUDAD REAL	75,000
26	Responsible for Urbanism	CIUDAD REAL	75,000
27	Responsible for Mobility	CIUDAD REAL	75,000
28	Responsible for Mobility	ALCALA DE HENARES	204,000
29	Responsible for Environment	JACA	14,000
30	Responsible for Mobility	JACA	14,000

Specific lessons learned in the selection of trainees

In Spain the most important lesson learned was that is necessary a good communication and dissemination plan to achieve a good group of trainees able to learn and work on sustainable mobility. For this, the recruitment of participants for the training has been the main focus of communication activities, using the proper channels, selecting the right public for dissemination and using a press expert in the development of the campaign.

It is also important to speak with the right person in the council to ensure the proper development of BUMP. Local authorities need clear and complete information to be able to decide whether to implement it. Providing a full picture with, for instance, set dates for training sessions and information on trainers' expertise is a major selling point. It is also important to provide a general overview of milestones in the implementation of the work-plan and related time planning. Also, covering travelling expenses and clarifying immediately which costs will be covered and for whom, in all stages of work-plan implementation, is of crucial strategic importance.

2. Process for the selection of trainers

Suggestions from focus group session for the selection of trainers

In the two focus groups, the experts agreed that it is very important to try to involve external mobility professionals, as other technicians or union trades representatives, to explain participants their experience developing SUMP or Working Transport Plans. In Spain, the great development of sustainable mobility planning since 2000 allowed us to find an expert able to prepare good training sessions for the municipalities involved in BUMP project. In this sessions it was important to speak about the need to create a balanced team, including not only engineers, but also economists, architects and legal advisors with experience in the field of sustainable mobility. All trainers should work in a coordinated way, referring to a common framework of reference (in this case, mainly the BUMP supporting package and the guidelines to develop and implement a SUMP). Last, all experts involved in the focus group sessions agreed that CIRCE staff had the right skills to become trainers in the training sessions and act as training coordinator.

Selection of trainers

The general training program developed for the BUMP consortium, adapted to the national context using feedbacks from focus groups sessions, was used as reference to organize the public selection; a call and the related application forms were published in the BUMP website.

Due to the great experience of CIRCE leading sustainable mobility projects and their expertise in energy, three trainers were chosen among its staff (they are also personnel in charge of project BUMP in Spain). Previous experience in training management for municipalities' employees and professional educational

work in different aspects related to sustainable mobility, guaranteed the trainers suitability to a better implementation of the BUMP model.

Following the focus group suggestions, 5 external teachers able to complement CIRCE staff were hired during the training process of municipalities involved.

Candidates to the trainers' position were asked to apply for each individual module/sub-module they wanted to teach and evaluated based on three criteria:

- Relevance of their CVs
- Previous professional, didactic experience and specific knowledge/expertise relevant to the module
- A proposal for the teaching program for the module describing briefly how the candidates intended to organize the teaching, based on the general guidelines contained in each relevant section of the application form.

The available budget to hire external staff for training tasks, made the applications only possible for Spanish mobility experts, mainly from the area where the training took place. It did not harm the training, since the experts were enough qualified to perform their work in the proper way.

The general principles to be followed were: taking advantage of existing know-how and expertise of participants through class interaction, group work and individual study; promotion of national and international good practices; connection with other national and international initiatives; practical exercises oriented to the development of the second stage of the project's work-plan (development of PUMS for involved local authorities).

The training program was based on a mix of in-class work and interactive training sessions, group work and further elaboration of discussed contents, individual study and elaboration of participants on how to adapt presented tools and measures to their respective territories.

An updated version of the training program was sent to all trainers in Spain, detailing what each trainer would deal with in each individual module/sub-module, completed with a preliminary reference to the training materials to be used. As the training started, each trainer was informed about what their colleagues had done, providing all training materials and presentations used. They were also informed about the group work carried out in class during all previous sessions.

During this training period, educational tasks were coordinated and monitored by internal trainers from CIRCE, ensuring the quality of the training, accompanying and supporting the teachers. The BUMP training team was formed by:

- Sergi Paris – The Molino Projects
- Fernando González – The Molino Projects
- Javier Otín – The Molino Projects
- Andrés Navarro – The Molino Projects
- Pedro Corvinos – Legal Expert
- Sabina Scarpellini – CIRCE Foundation
- Abel Ortego – CIRCE Foundation
- Jesús Valero Gil – CIRCE Foundation

Specific lessons learned in the selection of trainers

It was necessary the help of an external expert in the training development to have an overarching vision of the process leading to the production and implementation of a SUMP, including having an idea of the areas falling not immediately within their scope of competence. It is very important to select trainers that have experience in the sustainable mobility planning at national level and a knowledge on the European context, in order to be able to transmit the European concept where the sustainable mobility is being developed. Finally, in the Spanish context we believe it has been very important that trainers also helped the municipalities in the coaching phase, because their acquired knowledge, the personal relationships created and the mutual learning make the task easier.

3. Description of the national training modules

As for all the other countries, the preparation of the training program in Spain started from the elaboration of the supporting package, following a range of requisites, among which the need to have a manageable number of training sessions, with an adequate period of time separating one from the other; integrating harmonically different experts, approaches and solutions; focusing on existing best-practice cases and real-life solutions and approaches; fostering cooperation with relevant networks and other sustainable mobility projects to learn from; valorizing participants' know-how and expertise, to share in class in a number of activities.

The leading principle was, therefore, to have a mix of in-class interactive lectures in which, starting from the contents, methodologies and links provided by the supporting package, yet richly integrated with materials provided by individual trainers, participants had the opportunity to enrich their knowledge base and experience a hand-on approach to a wide range of applied tools and case studies. For each aspect dealt with in class, then, participants were invited to apply concepts and methods to their reality, trying to understand strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats. A decision (the same of the Italian partner) was made to hold the entire training in Zaragoza and to have 8-hour instead of 6-hour training days. A description of the way the modules were organized is reported to follow, showing how the original subdivision suggested by the supporting package was rearranged to suit the above-mentioned needs:

Date	Module	Topics
08/07/2013	1	Introduction to BUMP and to Sustainable Urban Mobility
09/07/2013	1	Introduction to Sustainable Urban Mobility
17/02/2014	1	Introduction to Sustainable Urban Mobility
18/02/2014	2	Evaluation and objectives of SUMPS
19/02/2014	2	Evaluation and objectives of SUMPS
20/02/2014	3	Integration and innovative measures for SUMPS
21/02/2014	3	Integration and innovative measures for SUMPS
31/03/2014	4	Politic, legal and economic coordination of Urban Mobility
01/04/2014	4	Politic, legal and economic coordination of Urban Mobility
02/04/2014	5	Implementation of SUMPS
03/04/2014	5	Implementation of SUMPS
04/04/2014	6	Introduction to Pilot Actions in local authorities

A description of sessions/modules, contents and work done

For each session, a brief description is reported to highlight the most significant issues dealt with in class and autonomously by training participants. For a more detailed and comprehensive analysis of the work carried out, the full collection of training materials is attached.

Session 1: the first session focused on information about Project BUMP as a whole: overview of project goals, urban sustainable mobility terms, social and environmental facts that made the transport planning the sustainable mobility planning. A workshop with a short presentation of each attendant (city and the mobility problems they needed to tackle) also took place. The aim was to bring up some questions that would find their answers later on the training.

Session 2: participants were introduced with the SUMP concept, understanding its operation, main goals and the essential information that should be included. Once all terms and the information they should include were clear, successful cases in Spain were presented (Zaragoza, Rivas Vaciamadrid, Vitoria...), ELTIS guidelines and other European best practice cases as well (Milán Dresden, Ile de France...). To increase the power of this kind of tools the attendants were suggested to have a workshop to compare the content of several ongoing Spanish SUMPS (already in execution phase), using ELTIS guide to analyze the properness of the content, taking into account the main cities analyzed. This module, also presented and gave directions to use several tools created in European context: the MAX tools (MAX SUMO, MX TAG, MAX EVA, MAX LUPO) were introduced to describe how to subdivide complex objectives in specific and measurable (SMART) goals.

This session showed participants all European projects relating to urban mobility and how to find support on their tools when it came to municipal mobility planning.

Session 3: The training included in this module was oriented to the complete and integrated presentation of different real sustainable mobility measures implemented by several European SUMPS. For each one of them, methodology and planning, main features and suggestions from experts were presented. A workshop about introduction and managing of traffic simulation tools raised interest among attendants. In particular, a professional from TSS Info presented the software Aimsun and its potential to help with the planning of sustainable mobility, allowing an in advance simulation of the operation of each measure to implement.

Session 4: This module was focused on increasing the knowledge of political, legal and economic matters to approach mobility. In Spain the knowledge of national regulation is still reduced and it is developing new regulation fined- tune with european goals. Along with the theory, attendans were immersed in two practical workshops: a set out of a real case with legal issues in SUMP creation and the previous documentation management. Besides, in this module attendants were introduced to the main dilemma developing a SUMP, weighing the different measures included in economic, social, environmental and political matters. Also, an interesting role play of a municipal plenary session simulation with the aim to reach consensus for the approval of a new SUMP took place. Within it, four groups defending opposed opinions were listened.

Session 5: It focused on the deep study of the implementation phase in the SUMP (in the first place, the importance of previously approaching citizen participation. In this training session, the different methods of citizen participation can be used (traditional and innovative ones). A real case from Huesca was presented

followed by several final recommendations to take into account when analyzing results, as well as suggestions on citizen participation systems.

Besides, the module included information to tell differences between a SUMP with conventional mobility plan, analyzing differences from different point of views.

Finally, it was showed to attendants the partial implementation of Barcelona SUMP in the perimeter zone. It was analyzed measure by measure its implementation and its consequences were studied from the urban sustainable point of view and the adequateness with global and specific goals in the previous planning document.

Session 6: At last, this module was used to explain the following steps in Project BUMP, collecting feedback from each attendant about their problems and suggestions on Mutual Learning Workshops and Coaching phase, with the aim to properly plan the municipalities participation in next stages of the project BUMP. During this sessions, each municipality was able to present in advance its Pilot Actions and how they would fit project BUMP goals. Finally, an assessment of the training was carried out, highlighting the main contents and answering last questions from all attendants. This session raised great interest, since it was a long training, this activity was very useful to recap the overview of urban sustainable mobility, main purpose of the BUMP training.

Feedback on national training modules

Questionnaires were disseminated in situ to the trainees after each module. We had 100% of responses (there were some missing answers due to illness). The aggregated results showed the following:

The trainees highly appreciated the content of the presentations and the way of communication (4,5/5 average scoring). Also the trainees appreciated the quality and usefulness of the training materials (4,4/5 average scoring). 100% were fully satisfied with the organization before and during the workshops. 100% also declared “I now know more about the SUMP’s planning” and 70% answered they will contribute to the elaboration and implementation of SUMP in their city. 95% promised they will share the received information with their colleagues.

The most difficult for the majority of the participants (70%) was “To persuade the Municipal council to assign money and staff from the city budget for elaboration of entire SUMP”. All teachers had average satisfaction ratings above 4.3/5 which highlights the good choice of trainers.

Partner	Module 1		Module 2		Module 3		Module 4		Module 5		Module 6	
	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised
Time of conducting (dd/mm)	8-9/07/2013 and 17/02/2014	8-9/07/2013 and 17/02/2014	18-19/02	18-19/02	20-21/02	20-21/02	31/03-01/04	31/03 and 01/04	02 and 03/2004	02 and 03/2004	4.4.2014	4.4.2014
Place of conducting	Jaca (8-9) and Zaragoza (17)	Jaca (8-9) and Zaragoza (17)	Zaragoza	Zaragoza	Zaragoza	Zaragoza	Zaragoza	Zaragoza	Zaragoza	Zaragoza	Zaragoza	Zaragoza
Number of participants	29	24	29	26	29	26	29	21	29	23	29	21
Problems (if any)	The third day (17/02) there was 1 hour of class more than expected duration											
Lessons learnt	<p>The mobility presentations in the participant's cites give us information about the high level of work and knowledge about mobility and sustainable mobility that municipal responsible have. In fact, it was the winner of the best European PMUS 2013 (Rivas-Vaciamadrid)</p> <p>Growing interest about how is the both evaluation and objectives fixing process in other European regions. For that, it is very useful the platform ELTIS, where exist a lot of cases studies, about measures in relation with sustainable mobility through Europe. It is highlighted the both necessity and utility of mutual learning sessions planned for late</p> <p>Great disorientation technological field technicians. The extensive catalogue of technology solutions to improve mobility in cities and to make it more friendly to the environment creates confusion among municipalities, making it more difficult to integrate certain measures in the</p> <p>In general, exist very little knowledge by both technicians and mobility municipal services politics about the PMUS legal requirements in Spain.</p> <p>All participants were confused about methodologies and tools assess the level of integrated utility and acceptance of SUMP and and how it are evaluated and audit.</p> <p>Great willingness by all cities to participate like pilot action of BUMP project. Some cities have a very clear and interested ideas about the project to present like pilot actions. Notes are taken to make a better plan for coaching activities.</p>											

4. Main lessons learned – summary and conclusions

The mobility presentations in the participants' cities give us information about the high level of work and knowledge about mobility and sustainable mobility that municipal responsible have. In particular the presentation from the city of Rivas-Vaciamadrid, the winner of the best European SUMP 2013 was extremely appreciated.

A list of other lessons learned to follow:

- Growing interest about both the evaluation and the objectives fixing process in other European regions. For this purpose, the platform ELTIS is very useful, in order to have an overview of existing case studies and measures in relation to sustainable mobility through Europe. It has been highlighted the need and utility of mutual learning sessions planned for late 2014.
- Great disorientation among technicians about the most suitable solutions to implement. The extensive catalogue of technology solutions to improve mobility in cities and to make it more eco-friendly creates confusion among municipalities, making it more difficult to integrate certain measures in the SUMP.
- Very scarce knowledge about the SUMP's legal requirements in Spain exists by both technicians and mobility city councilors.
- General confusion of participants about the methodologies and tools to assess the level of integrated utility and acceptance of SUMP, criteria for evaluation and how audits are performed.
- Great willingness by all cities to participate as "pilot action" of the BUMP project. Some cities have very clear ideas and proposals to present and implement. Notes are taken to make a better plan during coaching activities.

5. Final training session

The final training session was held in Madrid on November 25, 2014, in occasion of the Annual Environment National Congress. One of the major topics to be approached was sustainable mobility, this explains why such a successful attendance, as shown in the attached attendance sheets. The main topic was to share the lessons learnt during the four mutual learning events, which was accomplished through coffee sessions: a delegation of participants present at each learning event was asked to gather together, collect the main impressions and the most important issues and contents dealt with during each event and present the results to the others, triggering a debate. The final training session was centered on how the technology plays a role in the process of planning mobility and in the processes of SUMP's development. For this reason, several IT companies involved in sustainable mobility attended the conference. Other participants were leading experts in mobility, as the coordinator of the Civitas Network in Spain and Portugal, who spent a brief period time debating whether the role of technology is crucial in sustainable mobility or is a simple help.

PP5 – ALEA

1. Process for the selection of trainees

Suggestions from focus group session for the selection of trainees

In Romania, generally speaking, there are several difficulties related to urban mobility planning and among these the most crucial ones are insufficient legislation and financial and staff related shortages, especially in medium and small cities. The limited resources unevenly distributed, favor Growth Poles to detriment of smaller cities. Moreover, the lack of commitment of decision makers mainly due to the misunderstanding of the usefulness of a SUMP, made it hard to find the consensus of the municipalities involved. As a matter of fact, the majority of local authorities lack in long-term vision when it comes to mobility, and the local staff responsible for transportation in the municipality is not able to explain the benefits of a SUMP to the mayor. Given this status quo, the focus group recommended to involve the municipalities who have some existing actions planned, and also smaller municipalities who would be able to learn from their colleagues, and who would benefit with them from the approach and practical know-how of the BUMP training activities. It was also suggested that the best way to obtain commitment is by approaching the key decision maker, namely the mayor, who, if properly motivated can appoint the most appropriate staff from the existing technical/transportation departments of the municipality, to attend the course. The persons should be chosen in consideration of his/her influential position in the municipality, relevant duties and his/her own motivation. The involvement in the elaboration of the upcoming SUMP, would then be ensured by all concerned departments working together, cooperation between them being the key of a successful implementation of the plan.

Another element that was considered when proposing participants, was represented by the existing measures that were already put in place in some cities. As for who should be the most suitable participant from a municipality it was suggested that the best solution is to be appointed by the mayor itself taking into consideration mostly the future participants influential position in the municipality, relevant duties and the motivation of the person. Participating staff should be recruited mainly among transport officers, heads of departments, chief architects etc., those who deal with traffic safety and traffic, and from other dedicated departments to mobility/transport in municipalities. Some argued that participants should also come from the urban planning or the technical department. On the other hand there were also arguments in favor of the idea that one of the participants should be a generalist, in order to better communicate with the policy makers.

Moreover, it was said that it is desirable to have at least 2 participants per each municipality. Representatives of local public transport operators (which are subordinated to the local council) as well as specialists in planning were other suggestions to be part in the training as factors which could strengthen the team for the elaboration of the SUMP. They were perceived as having a theoretical and operational background that allows them to easily accumulate important transfer of know-how generated by the training program.

Other criteria regarding the choice of participating municipalities agreed on by the focus group:

- Number of inhabitants: 40,000 – 350,000

- Commitment of the local authority

- Cities representing regional centers

Further elements that should be considered when selecting beneficiaries:

- Signatory municipalities of the Covenant of Mayors taking into account the fact that elaboration of a SUMP is already a measure in their SEAPs.
- cities that have already proven valuable initiatives through measurable impacts

Selection of trainees

The process of the selection of trainees started with the setting up of an internal committee whose first step was to identify the municipalities that correspond to the profile of the BUMP training target group. Namely, the first criteria taken into account was the number of the inhabitants; the selection was based on the analysis of the last census conducted in 2011 on national level. As the number of the municipalities were really high (45), further actions were needed to identify interested parties in sustainable development and especially in the mobility domain, leading to numerous contacting efforts through email and phone. The second step resulted in the selection of 26 municipalities that showed interest to whom official invitations and application forms were sent. Based on the municipalities applications received, the committee analysed the supporting documents and, according to the selection criteria, 11 municipalities were chosen to participate in the training course.

Full list of the trained people, their cities and their contacts:

No	Municipality	Position/Department
1	Alba Iulia	Director AIDA – Association for Intercommunitary Development Alba
2	Alba Iulia	Technical Expert, Alba Iulia Municipality
3	Alba Iulia	Technical Expert, Alba Iulia Municipality
4	Constanța	Executive Director, Programmes and Development Department
5	Constanța	Counsellor, Pproject management
6	Constanța	Inspector, Programmes and development Department
7	Oradea	Counsellor Project Management Department
8	Oradea	Director, Project Management Department
9	Oradea	Head of Office, Project Management Department
10	Tîrgu Mureș	Head of office, SC Transport Local
11	Zalău	Senior Counsellor
12	Zalău	Counsellor
13	Bistrița	Chief Architect
14	Bistrița	Head of Department, Transport and Traffic
15	Cluj Napoca	Monitoring Inspector for Autonomous Admsitrations
16	Ploiesti	Director, Association for Intercommunitary Development Ploiești
17	Ploiesti	Director , International Relations Department
18	Baia Mare	Director, Programmes and Strategies Department
19	Baia Mare	Director, Programmes and Strategies Department
20	Bucuresti	Director, Agency for Energy Management București
21	Sighisoara	Director, Agency for Energy Management Sighisoara

Specific lessons learned in the selection of trainees

- Approaching the key decision maker (the mayor) with proper motivation and good communication so as to ensure that understanding of the necessity of a SUMP is achieved.
- Specific accreditation requirements, the elaboration of a certification method for the training participants (ideally: mobility manager) would increase motivation of the trainees and perhaps of local authorities' as well.
- Commitment through official documents would further ensure the success of the plan.

2. Process for the selection of trainers

Suggestions from focus group session for the selection of trainers

It was considered that the complexity of the learning objectives set in the BUMP Training Guidelines made it necessary to use a team of private consultants rather than a single expert; it was also noted that, unfortunately, due to some financial constraints, more efforts should be made by the BUMP national partner to put the training phase into place with maximum success.

It was agreed that an important ability of the trainers is to show how obsolete procedures and existing traffic studies are, compared to new methods and tools used in the process of elaborating the SUMP. The trainers should not only be good consultants, but they must have the ability to educate as well, and pave the way for the following pilot actions.

Selection of trainers

The trainers were identified as specialists with experience in different sectors related to urban mobility/transport. Due to the fact that Romanian professionals working in the transport domain are not familiar with urban mobility planning under a sustainable point of view, it was necessary to look for specialists with a solid background in urban mobility in the wider European area.

Specific lessons learned in the selection of trainers

It is difficult to find in Romania trainers with expertise in the above-mentioned sector, as urban mobility planning is relatively new a domain. There were several profiles that matched a few criteria. It is important to be sure that the selected trainers have a strong competence and experience in teaching adults. Also trainers must be available to continue their collaboration with trainees in the periods between modules, by offering them further explanations, details about training materials and exchanging ideas about particular situations of each participant city. The best would be if the collaboration and exchange of ideas between trainees and trainers would continue in the coaching phase.

Full list of the trainers

Adrian Vilcan
Eugen ionescu

3. Description of the national training modules

As a general approach among partners, the preparation of the training program in Romania started with the elaboration of the supporting package, whose structure was kept as recommended, however it was adapted according to the Romanian situation and, most important, it was altered having in mind that there is almost no experience in implementing a SUMP among the municipality staff. Thus, it was necessary to use many good practice examples which would serve as models in the development of the skills in the domain. The training was to be set up in such a way in which the participants could learn using real life situations and mainly taking as examples their own city as cases to be approached. Also, a great deal of emphasis was put on the fact that they could learn from each other's experience.

The main characteristics of the Romanian situation which were taken into account when the course structure was set up are as follows:

- Urban mobility is a new concept in Romania which is not dealt with professionalism and accuracy as there is no systematic and structured urban mobility planning. There is also little data about the mobility demand in the cities
- The existing plans are mainly based on the design of the infrastructure without an accurate evaluation of the effects of the different projects implementation on the urban transport system.

It was decided that the best place to hold the sessions is Alba Iulia given the geographical position of the city; situated in the center of the country, it would be easily reachable for all participants and it would mean a better control on the organizational activities. The training was structured in 4 sessions, once per month starting from February 2014, thus leaving enough time for the trainees to prepare their homeworks and to get better hold on the new knowledge - Session 1 (Modules 1 and 2), Session 2 (Module 3), Session 3 (Module 4), Session 4 (Modules 5 and 6).

The training process consisted of presentations, interactive discussions, problem solving, solution finding, in various formats – in groups and individually. Homework was also a compulsory activity after each module. A description of the way the modules were organized is presented in the table below:

	Modul 1	Modul 2	Modul 3	Modul 4	Modul 5	Modul 6
Time of conducting (dd/mm)	18 February	19-20 February	18-19 March	28-29 April	02-03 June	04 June
Place of conducting	Alba Iulia	Alba Iulia	Alba Iulia	Alba Iulia	Alba Iulia	Alba Iulia
Number of participants	20	21	17	12	19	19
Problems (if any)	None	None	None	Due to the upcoming public holiday, which was extended at short notice by the government, made it difficult for some of the participants to attend the training course	None	None
Lessons learnt	<p>There is little knowledge about the concept of sustainable urban mobility plans among key decision makers. It is important that decision makers gain good knowledge in this field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Module 1 would be useful to include an introduction to aspects of urban transport planning and be extended to two days of training. - Should be BUMP project conducted by a summary of the training materials that are sometimes exhaustive, to enable analysis of 5 cases BUMP by course participants. 	<p>It is important to identify specific methods, analysis and development of scenarios in each municipality. In a limited number of hours it is difficult to create and build capacity of participants who in many cases do not possess previous knowledge in the field</p>	<p>The type of actions are similar in each municipality but there is a need of deeper analysis of the situation so as to identify the appropriate measures in each municipality and to prioritize them. It is essential to develop the capacity of the participants in promoting integrate packages of measures.</p>	<p>More application examples of concrete financing schemes are needed. The analysis of the new programmes (ex.H2020) is also important for the participants to be able to identify SUMP financing opportunities.</p>	<p>Development, implementation and monitoring related work of local sump must be done on a permanent basis by a team from the local authority.</p> <p>Collection of initial data and ones available after the implementation of certain measures is of major importance in order to effectively monitor the implementation results.</p>	<p>The elaboration of a common structure of SUMP at national level would be useful, which to be considered by all cities and municipalities that want to carry out the project;</p> <p>It would be useful to establish financing schemes of a SUMP at national level and, possibly with the help of European funds in ROP 2014 - 2020, most cities and municipalities not having the necessary funds for the development, implementation, monitoring and maintenance of the SUMP at its specific level of detail.</p>
Trainers	Adrian Vîlcan Eugen Ionescu	Adrian Vîlcan Eugen Ionescu	Adrian Vîlcan	Adrian Vîlcan	Adrian Vîlcan	Adrian Vîlcan

Brief description for each session:

Session 1 (Modules 1,2; 2 days – 18h): the first module started with a short introduction session in which ALEA presented the BUMP project, its goals, the activities, the objectives of the training session, the trainers and the overall proposed agenda of the sessions. The trainers presented the approach they would be using in the sessions with a strong emphasis on the practical aspects. The European and Romanian policies on mobility were briefly presented, followed by the SUMP concept (with a special attention on the SUMP cycle), illustrating it with best practice cases from European cities. Four best practice cases were presented (Orebro, Koprivnica, Cambridgeshire, Vitoria-Gasteiz, each one selected for their own specificity). The participants were then asked to analyze in groups the four examples based on 4 requirements: the starting point of the SUMPs, the elements and strategic/operational methods applied to the objectives, the relationships with existing practices, identification of the basic principles that could be transferred to their own cities. The second day the Utopia Workshop was conducted: divided in groups, the participants had to identify existing shortcomings in mobility in their cities, the drafting of a long-term vision on urban mobility and the feasible options to make that vision a reality. The second day started with the revision of the SUMP cycle and continued with the group activity in which the municipality needs and local regulations were discussed. The second module started at the middle of the second day with a feedback on the homework, then moving towards the presentation of methodologies for quantitative and qualitative evaluation and monitoring systems. The participants were introduced into the use of data bases and methods of evaluation of existing data on transport. Instruments and applied models were then presented (transport models, SWOT analysis, impact on the environment, specific software). At the end of the second day two examples (transport plan in Helsinki, BUSTRIP in Turku were presented as best practice cases regarding the evaluation of mobility management and effects in terms of CO₂ emission reductions. The MAX tools were introduced in order to describe how to subdivide complex objectives in specific and measurable SMART ones. The second module continued with different scenario settings in order to achieve objectives. Best practice cases from Parma and West Yorkshire were presented to illustrate the development of scenarios. The session ended with a workshop whose goal was to simulate evaluation of a real case.

Session 2 (Module 3, 2 days – 12h): The third module focused on innovation and integration measures, activities for sustainable mobility, decision making and prioritization. At the beginning of the day, feedback was given on the homeworks, moving then towards the introduction of the common measures to be included in a SUMP. The participants were asked to make groups of 2 persons to select and analyze examples of measures. Best practice cases were shown to illustrate the development of packages of measures (Krakow, Budapest and Dundee). The trainer then moved on presenting the MaxExplorer instrument allowing the participants to make use of it. The second day started with a group work on 4 best practice cases (Freiburg, Hasselt, Tallinn and Gent). The participants were given the task of analyzing examples of mobility measures successfully introduced in these cities. Module 3 ended with a workshop whose goal was to develop operational and strategic framework for local SUMPs. The participants had to develop a strategic concept and operational packages of measures for local SUMPs. The interactive approach involved presentations, discussions and group work.

Session 3 (Module 4, 2 days – 12h): The third session dealt with issues of coordination at political, legislative, financial and procedural level. The first day started with the feedback on the homework given and revision of the information presented in the previous sessions. The module gave the opportunity for the participants to recognize requirements and approaches to involve key actors, to gain knowledge about

the instruments and methods to coordinate the SUMP process and to learn about responsibilities, budgeting and funding opportunities.

Legislative measures at EU and national level was overviewed continuing with the analysis of the internal process, starting from the drafting to the preliminary and final formal approval of the SUMP, including the attribution of responsibilities, the constitution of an internal work group, relations with political decision-making bodies.

At the end of the day a buzzgroup was organized so as the participants to find solutions for fund raising from different programs or by involving private entities to ensure resources.

Session 4 (Modules 5, 6; 2 days – 20h): The final session was dedicated to the development, implementation and monitoring related work of a local SUMP. Each participant presented its plan and the others expressed their opinions and comments. At the end of the first day the participants analyzed the problems that are most common in the implementation of a SUMP, reaching the conclusion that funding and the traditional approach of a transport planning are the main difficulties in the process.

The second day offered the opportunity for the participants to present the concept of the pilot action and the framework of its implementation. At the end of the session, final conclusions were drawn on the training course, a test was conducted on the participants, and also some issues were discussed related to the mutual learning workshops.

Aggregated results of the Questionnaire 2

Training course was highly appreciated by all the participants, both for the contents and the organization. The actual information and the quality of the materials were constantly appreciated with minor fluctuation among stages. The SUMP guidelines proved to be useful for almost 75% of the participants, the remaining 25% giving the second biggest mark to show the usefulness of the document. The presentation of the materials and interactivity was constantly improved throughout the sessions; in the final session almost 90% of the participants ranked the item with the highest mark.

Participants showed greater interest and built their confidence in elaborating a SUMP, moreover, being ready to share experiences with other colleagues. They found that the training offered the possibility of gaining more and more knowledge about the concept and benefits of a SUMP up until the end of the course.

The main trainer was given a high level of appreciation, given the fact that throughout the sessions 58% gave the highest score and 30% chose to rank his performance with 4 marks out of 5. What is outstanding and worth mentioning is that the communication with the trainer was appreciated unanimously at the highest level.

4. Main lessons learned – summary and conclusions

In Romania, the training should focus more on a quantitative approach of the collection and use of data on specific aspects of the transport modeling and development of measure scenarios.

The training should put more emphasis on the adaptation of goals and objectives of sustainable urban transport system and mobility to the specific situation of each urban area. Targets are generally transferable, but setting a specific target depends on the characteristics of each urban area.

The training should be adapted to each country taking into account the specific level of development of urban transport planning in that country.

Each participant appreciated the added value of this course considering that in the future there is a need of training sessions such as this in mobility, domain which is relatively new in Romania. These sessions should concentrate on practical knowledge and direct exchange of experience. According to the feedbacks received, it is difficult to involve all stakeholders including the general public; also, gathering necessary data for the elaboration of a SUMP proves to be a hard process in our country.

1. Final training session

The final training session was held in Alba Iulia on December, 10th 2014 and had as goals:

- The analysis of the 4 mutual learning workshops
- The establishment of the steps regarding the elaboration of SUMPs in the municipalities which participated in the training sessions.
- The proposal of a coaching plan template.

The participants individually presented their experiences in the MLWs. The coach presented the proposed planning documents of the coaching phase and asked the opinions of the participants about the steps that requiring the most support. After analyzing the planning documents, some conclusions were drawn regarding each municipality needs, and a deadline for launching the unanimously accepted coaching plan was set in the coming weeks.

PP6 – SWEA

1. Process for the selection of trainees

Suggestions from the focus group session for the selection of trainees

Discussions with focus group participants led to several suggestions for the selection of the trainees. They felt that it may be difficult to recruit Local Authorities for two main reasons:

- 1) Staff cuts meant that LA staff were working at full capacity and were unlikely to attend the training.
- 2) Potential future staff cuts meant that LAs were reluctant to train staff who may leave in the near future.

However, they made several suggestions in order to increase the possibility to recruit Local Authorities.

Firstly, it was suggested to target a wide range of departments in addition to transport including land use planning, economic development, regeneration, health and well-being, sustainability and education. It was also suggested to invite decision-makers (councillors) to take part in order to avoid a 'silo approach' common among Local Authorities. In particular, it was felt that this would help avoid transport becoming a bolt-on afterthought to the planning of new developments.

Focus group participants suggested that it was important to show how a SUMP differs from a Local Transport Plan so that LAs could see that the training would add something new to their existing approaches. It was also felt it was important to emphasise that the SUMP approach can be used in poly-centric regions and can be used to improve the sustainability of transport links among cities and between cities and their hinterlands, as well as within cities.

It was also suggested to include in the training 'soft' behaviour change measures as well as 'hard' infrastructure measures as these are often neglected, highlighting the positive social impacts of implementing SUMPs, as this would extend the appeal of the training to a wider audience.

Focus group members emphasized that in order to make the training attractive to Local Authorities, we needed to show clearly how it would tie in with, and help LAs to meet the requirements of national legislation such as the Active Travel Bill and Future Generations Bill in Wales and Local Transport Planning and Local Sustainable Transport Fund in England. It was also suggested to highlight the fact that part of the training will be dedicated to how to access European funding, a key incentive for LAs to take part.

In addition to showing how the Local Authorities would benefit from taking part in the training, it was suggested that gaining 'Continuing Professional Development' (CPD) accreditation would make the training more attractive to individual employees.

Due to the limited availability of time of trainees to attend all of the course, the modules were organized in basic and advanced levels, so to allow training days. Therefore, it was suggested that for modules 2-5 one of the days was presented at a basic level giving a good overview of the topic with a second day delving into the content in much more detail. In this way, differently skilled participants could attend different days but still gain the information required at an appropriate level. This would extend the potential audience from 'on the ground' staff to higher level decision-makers.

In terms of who to approach, two of the Local Authorities recruited (Gloucestershire and Wrexham) were recommended by the focus group, because of the stage they were currently at in their transport planning processes.

Selection of the trainees

As envisaged in BUMP’s Annex 1, participating local authorities in the UK were selected using a public transparent procedure implemented as follows.

In December 2013, a general model for the selection of participating local authorities was produced and then fine-tuned for UK Local Authorities. This ‘call’ was put onto the BUMP website and Severn Wye disseminated details of the project to its contacts. Due to Christmas and New Year holidays, the response was low so from January to April 2014 two press releases went out, ‘replicant’ organizations helped to circulate details of the project (including Civitas, Welsh Local Government Association) and over 100 emails were sent to selected individuals at over 50 local authorities. Initially, efforts focused on local authorities that met the criteria, but then interest was shown by local authorities that did not fit the criteria, and their applications were considered. Due to a contracting public sector in the UK, funding cuts and general uncertainty, the response was modest. So Severn Wye had in-depth phone calls with all the local authorities that applied to take part, gathered detailed information about each one and tailored the training course around their needs as far as possible – so they would not have cause to drop out. After the conclusion of the training, two more local authorities expressed an interest in signing up for the coaching. One local authority (West Berkshire) expressed interest in the training stage but could not release staff to attend the training. Two of the participating Local Authorities (Gloucestershire and Wrexham) were currently working on their transport planning processes.

Full list of the trained people, their cities and their contacts:

Local Authority	Job Title	Modules attended					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Bristol City Council	Senior Transport Planning Officer	x	x	x	x	x	x
Bristol City Council	Traffic Surveys Officer	x			X		
Bristol City Council	Senior Transport Planning Officer			x	x	x	x
Bristol City Council	Transport Intelligence Team Manager					X	
Gloucestershire County Council	Planner – Strategic Infrastructure	X				x	
Gloucestershire County Council	LSTF Project Officer	X					
Gloucestershire County Council	Senior Planning Officer – Strategic planning		x	x			x
Gloucestershire County Council	LSTF Project Officer		X		x	x	x
Tewkesbury Borough Council	Planning Policy Officer	x		x	x		x
Wrexham County Borough Council	Integrated Transport Unit Manager	x	x	x	x	x	x
Wrexham County Borough Council	Senior Sustainability and Climate Change Officer	x			x		x
Wrexham County Borough Council	Highways and Transportation Officer		x				
Wrexham County Borough Council	Service Manager Public Protection				x	x	

Specific lessons learned in the selection of trainees

It is important to provide potential trainees with clear evidence of how the training can positively influence their Local Authority (particularly in terms of what it adds to their current approaches). One strong point is based on the fact that the SUMP approach helps Local Authorities to meet the requirements of national legislation and may lead to further opportunities to access European funding.

Local Authorities were informed about the project and the training through blanket emails, but this approach is not recommended. It would be better to create a detailed database of contacts of Local Authorities.

It is important to understand that the SUMP approach can be of great interest also for those working in the land-use planning, economic development, regeneration, health and well-being, sustainability and education fields. To this end, it is important to highlight the positive social impacts of implementing SUMPs as this extends the appeal of the training to a wider audience.

The SUMP approach can be used in poly-centric regions and can be used to improve the sustainability of transport links between cities and between cities and their hinterlands, as well as within cities. This is because in UK there are many areas hosting a number of smaller cities with rural areas in-between.

The training structure must be flexible due to time constraints of Local Authorities, who cannot attend the full 10-day course.

A suitable location for the training should be identified, as to minimise distances travelled by participants.

It is also important to be clear about which costs will be covered by the project.

2. Process for the selection of trainers

Suggestions from focus group for the selection of trainers

The focus group identified the trainers as skilled professionals in their field, having a good level of professional knowledge and technical expertise, and where possible, belonging to organisations known by Local Authorities. Moreover the trainers should have a good overview of the current situation within Local Authorities, including some of the challenges they face.

In the UK, both England and Wales' Local Authorities were approached, so the focus group participants' opinion was that the trainers should have a good knowledge of key policy and procedures across the two regions.

As well as transferring their own knowledge and experience, the trainers should be able to stimulate participants to share their own expertise, as mutual learning is considered a key factor for successful training.

Selection of trainers

Severn Wye did not have the in-house expertise to provide any of the training, so an internet search was conducted to find consultants. In the UK, urban mobility is a relatively niche area of expertise. The search showed that there are not many qualified experts and that training courses are expensive: Newcastle University runs a week-long course costing over £ 1,000 per delegate. A call was put onto the BUMP website but did not generate any interest, so Severn Wye staff got in contact with specific organizations. The idea, though, was to not involve only a single organization to deliver all the training (in case the service was unsatisfactory), or one too distantly located (such as Newcastle University). Moreover, different approaches would provide a more valuable learning experience for the delegates. So three different were identified, qualified to deliver different elements of the training, and close to the training venue: Sustrans Wales, PTRC and the University of the West of England. Sustrans is an NGO that provides training on sustainable mobility with a focus on active travel. PTRC is the training department of the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport, a respected organisation among transport planners in the UK. The University of the West of England runs a transport planning Masters course that incorporates sustainable mobility.

There were other reasons for employing several organisations to deliver the training; Severn Wye thought a mixture of approaches would provide a more valuable learning experience for the delegates. Severn Wye also wanted to better evaluate which of the trainers might be a potential candidate for delivering the coaching, hence why three were employed. Separate meetings were held with the trainers (for practical

reasons – as they could not make the same dates), where Severn Wye staff went through the course materials and learning objectives with them. Meetings with trainers were also held between modules, debriefing on the previous module, and checking the progress made with the delegates, deciding how the approach for the following module needed to be adapted (if necessary).

Specific lessons learned in the selection of trainers

Trainers should have a good knowledge of how to implement the various stages of the SUMP process. They must also have a comprehensive and up-to-date knowledge of the national legislation of the regions of the Local Authorities involved. They should be flexible in their approach, able to adapt the course contents and approach to meet participants' needs. They also need to have a clear overview of the project in its whole, so that they can see how the training fits into the 'bigger picture'.

In terms of the selection process itself, it is important to research a wide range of potential trainers in order to gain an overview of the possibilities available. In our case, it was important to recruit more than one trainer in order to spread the risk, allow for a diverse range of expertise and ensure that between them trainers had a good working knowledge of both the English and Welsh systems.

Full list of the trainers

Name	Organisation	Modules Delivered
Jon Harris	<p align="center">PTRC Education and Research Services Ltd</p> <p align="center">'A leading organiser of training for the transport industry in the UK'</p> <p align="center">PTRC specialise in training and staging events on all matters relating to transport and travel planning for consultants, local authorities, government bodies and universities.</p> <p align="center">See: www.ptrc-training.co.uk</p>	1, 4, 6
Professor John Parkin	<p align="center">University of the West of England (UWE)</p> <p>John is a Professor of Transport Engineering based within the Centre for Transport and Society at the University of the West of England. His research interests include; cycling, transport planning, transport appraisal and transport monitoring. John leads the University's post graduate courses on Transport Planning and Transport Engineering and Planning. John and his team are engaged in research, consultancy, and often advise national and local government. For a full list of John's publications, click here: http://people.uwe.ac.uk/Pages/person.aspx?accountname=campus%5cj3-parkin</p>	2
Ryland Jones	<p align="center">Sustrans</p> <p>Sustrans work with communities, policy-makers and partner organisations so that people can choose healthier, cleaner and cheaper journeys and enjoy better, safer spaces where they live.</p> <p>They help Local Authorities and transport bodies to develop strategy and vision for the delivery of ambitious but achievable cycling, walking and sustainable travel change. They have over 30 years' experience in delivering walking and cycling infrastructure and travel behaviour change projects. Together with a specialist research and monitoring unit dedicated to understanding all aspects of sustainable travel behaviour, they are well placed to help Local Authorities develop meaningful strategies that focus effort and justify investment.</p> <p align="center">See: www.sustrans.org.uk</p>	3, 5

3. Description of the national training modules

The first step in structuring the training programme was to decide which trainers would deliver which modules in accordance with their areas of expertise. We met with each of them and discussed what they could offer in terms of subject expertise and resources in each of the key areas of training. This enabled us to allocate trainers to the modules according to their specific areas of expertise.

A second step was made to go through the supporting package in detail together with the trainers, in order to look not just at the modules they would be delivering but the training package as a whole in order that they could see how the modules they would deliver tied in with the training package as a whole.

During this meeting we looked at the suggested content and resources and discussed how this could be adapted to meet the needs of our specific audience. As a result, additional case studies, activities and resources were added and existing ones adapted. The leading idea was to develop a real partnership approach where the LAs could share their knowledge and expertise and support each other through the process. Therefore, activities were specifically designed to encourage this.

Following the feedback from the focus group discussions, modules 2-5 were run during two consecutive days with the first day exploring the module content at a basic level and the second exploring the content in detail.

We tried to leave at least a week between modules in order to give LAs a chance to work on tasks between modules.

Because our Local Authorities were keen to get started with their plans, we ensured that the course offered them the chance to apply the approaches and principles they were learning directly to their local area. This meant that by the end of the training, each Local Authority had a clear plan of action for the development of their SUMP and a clear idea of how they wished to use the coaching time available in order to help them to so implement it.

The training was structured as follows:

Module	Sessions	Content	Duration	Date delivered
1	Single session	An introduction to the SUMP process An exploration of the SUMP process investigating its key features and how it differs to 'traditional' transport planning	6hrs	04/04/14
2	Basic level	Assessment and target setting Developing key indicators and operational targets	6hrs	28/04/14
	Higher level		6hrs	29/04/14
3	Basic level	Development of measures Identifying and developing an integrated package of measures	6hrs	08/05/14
	Higher level		6hrs	09/05/14
4	Basic level	Navigating the political, legal, financial and procedural waters Assessing potential barriers to success; successful stakeholder engagement; working within your country's legal and political framework	6hrs 15 mins	21/05/14
	Higher level		6hrs 15 mins	22/05/14
5	Basic level	Project Management An exploration of project management approaches, processes and tools	6hrs	12/06/14
	Higher level		6hrs	13/06/14
6	Single session	Identifying and overcoming potential barriers to progress Checking for gaps, identifying potential barriers and maintaining project momentum	6hrs 15 mins	26/06/14

A description of sessions/modules, contents and work done

Module 1: An introduction to the SUMP process

Module 1 started with a brief presentation of the trainer and of Severn Wye Energy Agency.

These introductions were followed by an 'ice-breaker' activity where each participant was asked to place a model car on a race track to show where they thought their local authority was in terms of sustainable mobility, how much influence they felt in terms of getting their local authority to adopt a SUMP and where their local authority could be if the SUMP had senior management/political buy in. Putting vehicles near the start line suggested they felt little power/buy in, near the end the opposite and so on.

As well as providing us with a better understanding of each Local Authority's starting point, this activity enabled participants to get to know us and their fellow participants.

Participants were then paired up with people from another Local Authority and introduced their areas, any activities undertaken to promote sustainable mobility and the main mobility issues in their area. These were then reported back to the whole group. This provided a good knowledge of the main issues in each area.

These introductory activities were followed by an overview of the training programme and the BUMP project as a whole.

The SUMP process was then investigated in detail, followed by a group discussion focused on identifying the differences between SUMP and travel planning, and by a similar discussion on potential key outcomes resulting from an application of the SUMP process.

Participants then discussed on how to 'sell' the idea of a SUMP to possibly sceptical colleagues and leaders. The trainer emphasised that simply calling it a transport related plan means it gets a transport label, so its wider applicability is missed. As a result of this discussion a list of keywords was produced that could act as 'hooks' for various audiences.

In mixed LA groups participants then looked at a range of European SUMP case studies and were asked to give a feedback on the main strengths and weaknesses of each of these approaches. They were asked to consider:

- Where is the starting point in each case study for the SUMP process?
- How relevant is the SUMP process to the location?
- What strategic and operational elements matter the most?
- How do approaches overlap or differ from what you're doing now in your own area?
- What principles could apply to your area?

Each LA was then asked to consider possible application of the SUMP process to their own areas. Each identified the SUMPs that they would ideally like to produce. Once they had an outline vision of what they hoped to achieve, they were asked to identify potential gaps in knowledge and potential barriers in terms of 'buy-in' that may prevent this. This gave us some indication of aspects that would need to be covered in later sessions.

The session was rounded off with each LA assessing their current levels of effectiveness in terms of each stage of the SUMP process. They were also asked to record their SUMP commitments on 'torch cards' to include:

- One action they needed to instigate prior to the next module
- An action dependent on someone they could influence/work with and...
- An action that needs others' commitment

This gave each participant some clear targets and activities that they could start working on in the short term.

Module 2: Assessment and target setting

Day 1: Basic

Module 2 began with a brief introduction and re-cap of module 1.

Each Local Authority shared with the new trainer their SUMP plans and some of the steps they felt needed to be taken to get these off the ground.

This was followed by a discussion and comparison of the assessment and target setting that already took place in each LA.

The trainer then explored how transport objectives tie into wider objectives and a wider vision for the area. He also explored the role of indicators and why indicators are needed.

Participants then split into groups to discuss what makes a good indicator and potential issues relating to the use of indicators. These were fed back and shared with the wider group.

Following this, the participants were paired up and given an exercise to complete. Participants noted which problems they thought ought to be prioritized and what benefits might be brought by a SUMP. The outcome from this was a list of up to three to five clearly defined objectives for each local authority area. Each group produced 1-2 slides detailing their thoughts and after each task, the pairs presented back to the group.

Using the objectives they developed, each local authority then defined the indicators they considered to be relevant. Participants were encouraged to think about inputs, outputs and outcomes. Again, they produced slides detailing their ideas. As they talked through their ideas, the trainer linked inputs to outputs.

Day 2 – advanced

Day 2 began with a quick re-cap of day 1.

The trainer then led a session on modelling, discussing required sample sizes and potential issues. This was followed by a question and answer session where participants had the chance to ask questions of the trainer.

Four stage, disaggregate and social psychological models were then explored in some detail.

Following this, participants worked in pairs on a 20 mph case study. Each group considered the following: a) what problems 20 mph limits might tackle? What benefits 20 mph limits might bring? The outcome from this was a list of up to three clearly defined objectives for introducing 20 mph limits. Each pair developed slides for their local authorities. These objectives were then presented to the group before being given to the other group to work on.

Using the objectives they received from the other group, each pair then defined the indicators they considered to be relevant, thinking about inputs, outputs and outcomes. They considered how 20 mph limits will achieve those outcomes. They considered issues such as casualty reduction, mode share, quality of life, severance, townscape, street activity and so on.

Using lowering the speed limit on a road as a mobility improvement measure, the trainer then drew a map of the potential impacts of such a measure, the synergies and the potential indicators.

The session concluded with participants extending an existing spreadsheet calculator to account for diesel as well as petrol engined cars.

Module 3: Development of measures

Day 1

Module 3 began with a quick re-cap of module 2 and showing how this module fits into the wider SUMP process. It was also emphasized at this stage that when it comes to selecting measures a holistic approach is required rather than focusing on a single measure at a time.

Participants then worked in Local Authority teams to discuss the main strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to the development of SUMPs. These were then fed back to the group as a whole.

Following this, participants formed 2 groups comprising 2 LAs each. Each pair reviewed case study and supporting material and selected several examples of measures relating to integration of land use with transport and mobility management at new developments. Pairs analysed examples and noted the following:

- Key target and approach
- Effects
- The efforts required (political, financial, acceptance).

Again, this was fed back to the whole group.

In the afternoon, working in their own LA groups, participants reviewed case study materials (Krakow and Dundee in particular) and identified some typical sustainable mobility targets and actions for their own areas.

Participants then looked at MaxExplorer as a tool for selecting measures according to target audience. They considered it useful as a way to help get buy-in for measures internally because it's an impartial, independent EU tool.

The trainer outlined examples of some typical interventions stemming from focussing on target audiences, namely Sustrans' Personalised Travel Planning (households and employers) and Bike It (schools) programmes.

Day 2

Participants reviewed case studies of Freiburg and Gent as a group; there was a discussion on differences, attractive features and transferable elements.

Paired up in cross-LA pairs, each pair then picked several measures and discussed which ones could potentially be feasible for their areas.

They used the 'BUMP assessment and evaluation tool' spreadsheet to help them to identify which measures may be most suitable.

As 'homework' participants were asked to complete the spreadsheet prior to Module 4, where the feasibility of measures identified would be further tested.

Module 4: Navigating the political, legal, financial and procedural waters

Day 1

Module 4 started with a quick re-cap of module 3. The trainer then gave a general introduction to consultation highlighting 3 main areas of acceptability:

- 1) Technical
- 2) Public acceptance
- 3) Acceptance to funders

The trainer then repeated the 'race track' activity used in module 1 asking participants to show where they lay on the race track in terms of

- a) Their level of technical progress (following last few sessions)
- b) Public engagement – explaining a new concept to the public
- c) Knowledge around funding and resources

This enabled the trainer to see where further support may need to be provided.

The trainer then allocated one person to judge each LA's measures that they had selected in their spreadsheet (homework from last time). This was fed back to the group.

This was followed by participants working in LA groups to consider previous stakeholder engagement. They were asked to consider things that had gone well and things that had not gone so well. This was fed back and discussed with the wider group

The trainer then presented on the Disability Discrimination Act and street functionality looking at how the function of a street may change over the course of the day.

This was followed by an activity where mixed LA groups discussed what they felt was involved in effective consultation and who they felt needed to be consulted.

The final activity involved each Local Authority starting to produce a stakeholder engagement plan using a template prepared by the trainer. They were asked to complete this prior to the following module.

Day 2

The 'race track' activity was again used to introduce day 2. This time participants were asked to show where they felt they lay in terms of:

- a) Their knowledge and competence on fund-raising
- b) Their knowledge and competence of capacity building

This was followed by a budgeting brainstorm conducted in mixed LA groups. Each group was asked to consider:

- Where the money might come from for their SUMP actions.
- What other budgets were in place that could help.
- Where else they might go for help.

Groups fed back and from this a table was produced showing possible funding sources at the following levels:

- Local / neighbourhood level
- Local Authority level
- Other local bodies / national bodies with local presence
- National level
- EU level

Following the training day this table was typed up and distributed to participants

The group then made a list of key words to be used in funding searches and experimented with using these to see which proved most effective.

Back in LA groups participants then discussed:

- Which funding sources would be best for them locally
- How their SUMP could be delivered through 'help in kind' for:
 - The planning and development stage
 - The implementation stage
- Where the barriers to delivery lay and what they needed to do to 'convince' key stakeholders?

Again this was fed back to the whole group.

The trainer then presented a spreadsheet that he had prepared that enabled participants to develop a project budget and participants started to fill this in to develop their own budget plans.

By the next module participants were asked to complete:

- Menu of measures (framework spreadsheet) with 'sensecheck' (**do-ability**)
- Consultation checklist and list of target stakeholders (**sell – ability**)
- Stakeholder management plan (**expectation – ability**)
- Budget plan and funding sources list – linked to measures (**fund – ability**)

Module 5

Day 1

Module 5 began with a quick re-cap of module 4 followed by the trainer 'framing' the workshop by looking at where work on this module fitted in reference to the SUMP diagram.

This was followed by a review of each of the elements that participants had been asked to complete following the previous module. LA participants were mixed up so that each LAs plans were 'sense-checked' by a participant from a different LA.

The trainer then went over some project management basics. This was followed by a brainstorm of the current project management processes and tools that LAs were using. The trainer emphasised that there was no need to be prescriptive and that LAs should use whichever processes and tools worked best for them.

The trainer then introduced a range of project management tools including:

- Logic Tables
- MS project
- Stage-gate template and Gateway tracker
- Flowcharts / breakdown structure
- Risk register / Issue log
- Lessons learned log

The trainer then introduced some further material on monitoring and presented several European case studies looking at successful monitoring.

Following this, each LA discussed and then presented, for a few of their main measures, some potential barriers and some of the possible ways of overcoming these

The day ended with each LA working a 'Master' spreadsheet bringing all of their project ideas together.

Day 2

Day 2 began with a brief overview of what had been covered the previous day.

LAs then went straight into continuing their overview plans that they started during day 1.

Following this, the trainer compared sources of funding in England and Wales.

The session was rounded off with each LA feeding back on their current progress, the tools they had used and their next steps.

Module 6

The trainer introduced this module by indicating that this was the final push to make sense of all outputs, look at gaps and start to develop a plan for the coaching/mentoring phase of the project.

This was followed by a review of progress to date.

Having looked in detail at each LAs plans prior to the session, the trainer presented some key issues for each to consider and they were provided with time to consider these in their LA teams.

Each LA was then tasked with producing a 4 page summary on SUMP to show cabinet members etc and further refine their own thinking. This would ensure that the SUMP process was well understood by all involved.

The trainer then introduced a further UK case study that may provide a good template for LAs own plans.

In mixed-LA pairs, participants were then asked to challenge each other on where they thought each other's plans could be de-railed by lack of staff resources. Participants then went back into their Local Authority teams to enter the identified risks into their pro forma.

Participants then brainstormed possible additional sources of support that could be followed up following the training.

Finally participants produced an over-arching timeline as well as a coaching plan detailing how they planned to use the coaching support available. This left all LAs in a good position to commence work on their SUMPs, with a clear plan of action for taking things forward

Feedback on national training modules

Partner	Module 1		Module 2		Module 3		Module 4		Module 5		Module 6	
	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised	Planned	Realised
Time of conducting (dd/mm)	04-Apr	04-Apr	28 & 29 April	28 & 29 April	8 & 9 May	8 & 9 May	20 & 21 May	20 & 21 May	12 & 13 June	12 & 13 June	26-Jun	26-Jun
Place of conducting	Cardiff											
Number of participants	8	7	7	5	6	5	7	7	6	6	7	7
Problems (if any)	One participating local authority only has one delegate. One participating authority sent someone too junior.		Illness and holiday meant fewer delegates than planned. One local authority struggling with getting two staff to each training session. One local authority has replaced junior delegate with someone more senior.		Illness and holiday meant fewer delegates than planned. One local authority struggling with getting two staff to each training session. One local authority has replaced junior delegate with someone more senior.		Good turnout and most had participated in previous sessions. Two participants on holiday though.		Again, not all delegates there due to holiday/staff shortages/illness.		Not all delegates there due to holiday.	
Lessons learnt	Good, interactive session with lots of scope for collaboration and SUMP development. Drawing on EU case studies.		More of a lecture style with guided exercises. Day two was particularly taxing, but a good grounding in techniques for prioritising, monitoring and evaluation. Delegates on first steps to mapping out their SUMPS, producing indicators, outputs. Drawing on EU case studies.		More interactive this time, SWOT analyses conducted, emphasis on creating and prioritising integrated measures using a traffic light system with same tool. Analysis and review of European materials and case studies and working with each other to identify strengths, weaknesses, targets, stakeholders and potential measures. More consistency now in terms of staff from each authority.		Filtering actions, putting them through a 'do-ability' filter, identifying EU funding and looking at engaging local stakeholders. Discussing examples of successful and unsuccessful engagement. Developing stakeholder management plan, budget plan.		Further sense checking of measures and translating action plan into project management structures and resources. All local authorities have different project management tools. Building and working on plans developed in previous module and outside the training.		Delegates worked up the plans they had been developing. Had a challenge session where participants looked at another authority's SUMP and helped identify weaknesses and gaps. Each team completed a pro forma containing different 'to do' lists for technical tasks that need to be completed over the next several months. Also addressed risks, how to maintain focus and keep buy in from senior. Drafted time plan for coaching.	

Aggregated results of the Questionnaire

Question 1

Question	Average score Module 1	Average score Module 2	Average score Module 3	Average score Module 4	Average score Module 5	Average score Module 6	Average score across all modules
1) Please rate each of the following attributes of the workshop on a scale of 1 very poor to 5 excellent							
a) Content of presentations	4.4	4.25	4.2	4.3	4	4.4	4.3
b) Way in which presentations were communicated	4.8	3.6	4.4	4.7	4	4.7	4.4
c) Interactive sessions	4.6	4.25	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
d) Good balance between presentations + interactive sessions	4.6	4.25	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.5
e) Quality of other materials made available	4	4.5	4.2	4	4.3	4.4	4.2
f) Clarity of workshop objectives	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.5
g) Organisation before the event	4.8	4	4.6	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.6
h) Organisation at the event itself	4.6	4.25	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6
i) Venue	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.6

As can be seen, the only score to fall below 4 across all 6 workshops was the ‘way in which presentations were communicated’ in Module 2. We feel this can (at least in part) be explained by the highly technical nature of the content of this module which focussed on assessment and target setting (see Training PowerPoint and Outline). This meant that the subject matter for this module was difficult to communicate in an easy to understand manner.

Overall, however, the scores indicate that participants were very much satisfied with all aspects of the training delivered.

Question 2

Question	% agree or agree strongly Module 1	% agree or agree strongly Module 2	% agree or agree strongly Module 3	% agree or agree strongly Module 4	% agree or agree strongly Module 5	% agree or agree strongly Module 6	% agree or agree strongly across all modules
2) Please rate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements							
a) I now know more about the concept of SUMPs	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
b) I now know more about the benefits of SUMPs	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
c) I feel confident about promoting the benefits of SUMPs	60	100	100	100	100	100	100
d) I want to develop an action or suite of actions for my area following the SUMP process	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
e) I will share what I have learned with my colleagues	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

As can be seen above, the only statement with which 100% of participants failed to agree (or agree strongly) was the statement ‘I feel confident about promoting the benefit of SUMPs’ following Module 1.

This is not surprising given that only a single day of training had been delivered at this stage. It is interesting to note that from Module 2 onwards, participants felt much more secure in their ability to do so.

Overall, these results show that participants gained a very good understanding of the SUMP process and the benefits it may bring and were well motivated to develop SUMPs for their areas in cooperation with colleagues within their Local Authorities.

Question 3

Question	% positive response Module 1	% positive response Module 2	% positive response Module 3	% positive response Module 4	% positive response Module 5	% positive response Module 6	% positive response across all modules
3) Do you think the information gained today will help you in any of the following ways?							
a) I have come up with new ideas to develop further	100	50	100	100	100	100	97
b) I have some clarity on how we might develop and implement ideas we already have	60	100	80	88	100	86	85

It was only in the early stages that a significant proportion of participants did not feel that they had come up with new ideas they could develop further or were clear on how they might develop and implement existing ideas. From Module 3 onwards, these scores remained consistently high (above 80% positive responses).

Question 4

Question	Average score Module 1	Average score Module 2	Average score Module 3	Average score Module 4	Average score Module 5	Average score Module 6	Average score across all modules
4) Please evaluate the quality of the trainer on a scale of 1 very poor to 5 excellent	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.6

As you can see, the scores awarded to trainers were consistently high across all 6 modules, never dropping below an average of 4.5 out of 5.

Average score Jon Harris	Average score Ryland Jones	Average score John Parkin
4.7	4.5	4.5

It can be seen that Jon Harris of PTRC scored higher than Ryland Jones (Sustrans) and John Parkin (university of the West of England). However, all three trainers scored highly.

5) Do you have any other feedback about the training day or suggestions as to how we may improve future training sessions?	
--	--

Module 1	None
Module 2	None
Module 3	Perhaps needed more time for the exercises on this one
Module 4	None
Module 5	Need a better projector
Module 6	Very good; Excellent - thanks!

In terms of qualitative feedback, the only suggestions for improvement were allowing more time for practical exercises during Module 3 and the need for a better quality projector highlighted in Module 5. In both cases, steps were put in place to rectify the issue highlighted and it was not identified as being an issue for future modules.

4. Main lessons learned – summary and conclusions

- It is important that staff attending are not too junior if they are to make best use of the training.
- Interactive group activities result in more effective learning than simply listening to trainers.
- It is important to have case studies from the home country as well as other European countries to show how SUMP principles and approaches can be applied to meet national legislation and guidance.
- There needs to be some consistency in staff attending otherwise the work becomes very fragmented.
- Local Authorities can learn from each other as well as from the trainers.

5. Final Training session

The final training session was held in Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire on 1st December and was attended by 7 Local Authority staff with all 4 Local Authorities represented.

Delegates ran through the car track exercise they did at the start of the training to gauge where they felt they were in terms of technical, operational, resourcing and political aspects. This was followed by an activity where participants indicated where they felt they were on the ‘SUMP journey’ referring back to the SUMP process diagram.

The trainer talked people through the importance of considering the personality traits of key people from which you are attempting to secure buy-in.

He outlined four main personality traits and emphasised that people may come into more than one of these. We discussed what aspects may appeal to each group:

- Cool blue – Focus on structure and process
- Fiery red – Focus on business case
- Earth Green – Focus on team-work
- Sunshine yellow – Focus on relationships

He also emphasised that opposites on the spectrum may clash and that it may be useful to speak to people who know a person beforehand (if you don’t know them well) in order to find out which key messages they are likely to respond to.

We then reviewed the Mutual Learning Workshops. Participants were reminded of the format of the workshops. Delegates then discussed their learning and recorded key learning points they thought would be of benefit to others on ‘post its’. For those that didn’t attend the workshop, they shared learning from other relevant events. This learning was fed back to the group.

We then had a presentation on the progress Gloucestershire County Council had made to date followed by a short field study looking at the area of focus for the Tewkesbury SUMP.

The trainer encouraged participants to 'think outside the box' considering elements of their SUMP that could be more / encourage more...

Radical

Innovative

Stretch

Kudos

Identifying key barriers / opportunities

The trainer had previously provided participants with a spreadsheet – they used this to record potential challenges and opportunities, considering everything they had learnt during the day, under the following headings:

- TECHNICAL PROCESSES
- OPERATIONAL/MANAGERIAL
- POLITICAL/CULTURAL/ENGAGEMENT
- RESOURCES AND FUNDING

We then discussed how we can best support each other / support best practice from this point onwards and identified each LAs priorities in terms of carrying their SUMP forward.

PP7 – VIA ALTA

1. Process for the selection of trainees

Suggestions from focus group session for the selection of trainees

Sustainable mobility in Czech Republic is starting to be an important topic in strategic development of urban areas. Nowadays the urban mobility is evaluated and planned just as a transport topic without strong respect of environmental and energy consumption impact. The sustainable mobility is considered as a very important step in development of urban areas by all involved partners of focus group. Cities addressed within the project, need to be interested in training and coaching in SUMP preparation, because they realize the importance of sustainable mobility in their regions and areas. The main restriction is imputable to the increased costs of sustainable mobility – local authorities do not fully realize the benefits of lowering the environmental and energy consumption impacts.

Sustainable urban mobility is not realized as the most important task in urban development of cities and urban areas of Czech Republic. In large cities, where the integrated transport systems came into operation and in the last years started to be operated effectively from the transport point of view, the issue of sustainability, environmental impact and energy consumption is becoming a point of interest. But in general this is valid only for some regions (Prague, Brno, Ostrava). Czech Republic is divided into 14 administrative regions and only in some of them the integrated transport system is in operation. The experience with strategic transport planning and sustainable urban mobility is decreasing rapidly with the size of the city or urban area. In cities/towns below 100,000 inhabitants the awareness of sustainable urban mobility is very low and experiences are nearly zero.

Using the EU funds, some partial actions contributing to sustainability of urban mobility are being realized. Mainly they are focused on simple change of vehicle portfolio (new EURO5 emission limit buses, CNG buses), but not on strategic actions changing whole principles of transport, leading to sustainability of urban mobility.

Nearly every city/town in Czech republic (more than 15,000 inh.) have created their Transport Master Plans – but these are mainly technical documents with nearly no interest in solution of sustainability of urban transport and mobility.

The individual skills of local staff (meant staff of local authorities) are very low in sustainable urban mobility planning. The skills are more or less technical, with very low inclusion of environmental, sustainable and energy topics.

In general all the selection criteria from BUMP project proposal could have been kept, except the number of inhabitants. In Czech Republic only 26 cities have more than 40,000 inhabitants. For the success of the project it has been lowered the bottom level to 20,000 inhabitants. These cities/towns have the municipal transport systems, they have to solve the urban mobility planning and the sustainability issues.

Selection of the trainees

The process was started by identifying cities that may participate in the BUMP project. On the basis of the original used section criteria identified, only 24 cities were meeting the conditions in Czech Republic. Project Officer was asked to change the lower limit from 40,000 to 20,000. This expanded the number of possible cities to 61.

Ways of contacting potential interested public officers:

- by approaching heads of departments of local development, transport, etc., individually by email and directly by phone.
- by activating the cooperation with the organization 'Transport Research Center' (leader in sustainable mobility in CZ) and capitalizing on their already established contacts.
- by presenting the activities of the project in the event organized by the Ministry of Transport CZ for 30 cities.

All cities with a focus on project activities had been contacted with the application form. Forms were evaluated and all cities were invited to BUMP activities.

Full list of the trained people, their cities and their contacts:

No	Municipality	Position/ Department
1	Statutární město Jihlava	Specialist of spatial planning
2	Statutární město Jihlava	Cyclocoordinator
3	Statutární město Jihlava	Councillor
4	Statutární město Most	officer - Department of Development and subsidies, Cyclocoordinator
5	Statutární město Most	Head of the Department of Transport
6	Statutární město Karlovy Vary	Cyclocoordinator
7	Město Třinec	Cyclocoordinator and officer of the Department of Transport
8	Město Třinec	Office - preparation and implementation of investment
9	Statutární město Zlín	Head of the concept and implementation of transport engineering department
10	Statutární město Zlín	Officer of the concept and implementation of traffic engineering department - preparation and implementation of traffic signs
11	Statutární město Pardubice	Coordinator of the development of cycling
12	Statutární město Pardubice	Officer of the Chief Architect Department
13	Statutární město Hradec Králové	Officer of the Chief Architect Department, Cyclocoordinator
14	Statutární město Hradec Králové	Officer - project planning - Department of Development
15	Statutární město Hradec Králové	Officer of the Department of Development
16	Statutární město Olomouc	Transport specialist
17	Město Břeclav	Vice mayor
18	Město Břeclav	Officer, cyclocoordinator
19	Město Třebíč	Head of the Department of Development and Spatial Planning
20	Město Třebíč	Head of the Department of Transport

Specific lessons learnt in the selection of trainees

It is very important to get an overview of activities in the field of sustainable urban mobility and to communicate with political decision makers and officers about their understanding of project goals. Covering travel costs and accommodation was not necessary, but the city was a pleasant bonus. Quality of trainers team was very good motivation for trainees. It is very good to combine officials and politicians due to their differing view of the topic.

2. Process for the selection of trainers

Suggestions from focus group session for the selection of trainers

In the process of selection of teachers emphasis was placed primarily on their expertise in the development of sustainable mobility plans. The process began publishing the call with requirements for teachers on the project website. This was followed by communication with persons who are public known as experts in sustainable mobility in the Czech Republic. VIA ALTA received applications from teachers who are actively involved in other projects with the theme of sustainable mobility realized by Transport Research Center. With these teachers were subsequently consulted entered cities, and especially training content.

Currently it is possible to state that a teacher has been successful.

A group of experts on the topic of sustainable mobility in the CZ is too wide. It was recommended to focus on professionals who were previously involved in the topic of sustainable mobility and known by the trainees. Having experienced trainers with relevant professional expertise and a proven record of hands-on practice in the field of sustainable mobility, planning and management is essential to guarantee credibility and quality of the training provided.

Specific lesson learned in the selection of trainers

The trainers' team has been implementing several mobility projects (EPOMM PLUS, SEEMORE, ENDURANCE, etc.). The trainers have been working with many municipalities and transport experts in the processes of implementation of mobility measures and educational activities. Trainers also need to make themselves available to provide additional materials and distance support through the project in case training participants need further details or clarifications.

All sessions alternated theoretical contents and practical exercises.

Full list of the trainers:

Radomíra Jordová

Zbyněk Sperat

Hana Brůhová Foltýnová

Petr Kurfürst

3. Description of the national training modules

The preparation of the training program in Czech Republic started from the elaboration of the supporting package, having in mind the very beginning level of knowledge of the trainees. The ELTIS site was used as source of many cases and short movies were included in the training programme. The previous experience of trainers on other mobility projects was very useful in the preparation of the PPT-presentations, full with examples, approaches and solutions of existing best-practice and real-life cases.

It was decided to have 6 separate training modules shaping in total 10 working days as it was planned in the project. Training sessions were held in different places all over the country in order to balance the transport distances for the trainees. The modules were organized in 4 blocks consisting of 2 or 3 days of training activities.

The training process was a mix of lectures with PPT-presentations, interactive discussions, case-studies and comparing different city cases in order to show different approaches of European cities in mobility planning. There were no leading trainer, but 4 trainers with different topics. The homework was thoroughly discussed and solutions of particular cases were found by group discussions and suggestions.

	Modul 1	Modul 2	Modul 3	Modul 4	Modul 5	Modul 6
Time of conducting (dd/mm)	19/03/2014 20/03/2014	20/03/2014 21/03/2014	17/04/2014 18/04/2014	15/05/2014 16/05/2014	18/06/2014 19/06/2014	19/06/2014 20/06/2014
Place of conducting	Třebíč	Třebíč	Brno	Praha	Pardubice	Pardubice
Number of participants	15	15	14	14	14	14
Problems (if any)	Train delay due to failure					
Lessons learnt		3 participants missed for work load. 5 cities thinkin about SUMP. Half of cities has primary traffic data. Training was too intensive.	Participants now understand importance of communication during SUMP cycle.		Time required for SUMP is higher than participants expected	2 participants missed for work load. Language skills will be problem during mutual learning for most participants
Trainers	Radomíra Jordová Zbyněk Sperat Hana Brůhová Foltýnová Petr Kurfürst	Radomíra Jordová Zbyněk Sperat Hana Brůhová Foltýnová Petr Kurfürst	Radomíra Jordová Zbyněk Sperat Hana Brůhová Foltýnová Petr Kurfürst	Radomíra Jordová Zbyněk Sperat Hana Brůhová Foltýnová Petr Kurfürst	Radomíra Jordová Zbyněk Sperat Hana Brůhová Foltýnová Petr Kurfürst	Radomíra Jordová Zbyněk Sperat Hana Brůhová Foltýnová Petr Kurfürst

A description of sessions/modules, contents and work done

First session Module 1 - Module 2 (3 days): it was held in Třebíč, it started by introducing training organization, trainers, trainees and the BUMP project. All trainees introduce themselves and get an overview of their cities and biggest problems related to sustainable mobility. SUMP process was introduced using SUMP Guideline, and 5 case studies (Koprivnica, Orebro, Odense, Vitoria-Gasteiz and Cambridgeshire) were shown and described and practical exercise followed.

The MAX tools (MAX SUMO, MAX EVA, MAX LUPO) were introduced to describe how to subdivide complex objectives in specific and measurable (SMART) goals. Each trainee should try to set own goals with relation to MAX tools. Group leader developed visions and targets for their city with the support of other participants. Main topics:

- View on Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning by practice cases
- Utopia workshop on local SUMPs
- Assessment and Targets
- Use of data and assessment approaches
- Assessment tools on SUMP
- Scenarios to support targeting
- Assessment simulation workshop
- Develop a common vision, set measurable targets

Second session Module 2 (2 days): It was held in Brno with the support of the Transport research center (scientific research public institution under the Ministry of Transport) with the main topic 'Measures of Integration and Innovation'. Trainees learned how to identify main target groups and stakeholders and how to set measures to meet their expectations. Re-elaboration of the work finished during modules 1 and 2 in the light of the presented cases and methodologies improve outputs of first 2 modules. Main topics:

- Pool of measures
- Practice cases of developing packages of measures
- Measures for target groups
- Strategy workshop

Third session Module 4 (2 days): It was held in Prague, the main topic was 'Coordination on Political, Legal, Financial and procedural Levels'. Trainees learned how to find important actors, target groups and SUMP process partners and how to involve them in the SUMP process.

Motivation of decision makers on the local, regional and national political level was the subject of the lesson. The participants tried to find prerequisite of the SUMP cycle starting. Financial budgeting and sourcing was combined with public/private funding brainstorming activities. Main topics:

- Uptake of essential procedural elements
- Budgeting
- Fund raising

Fourth session Module 5 - Module 6 (3 days): It was held in Pardubice. Main topics were 'Implementation' and 'Pilot actions starting'.

Module 5 focused on the last stage of a SUMP process based on the conception of measures and actions, embedded in a local network of actors and national framework. Participants learned how to use management theories during SUMP cycle, what are the most suitable instruments and methods of management, communication and coordination, which are the optimal organizational structures within the local authority to support implementation of SUMPs, what are typical traps and risks, dealing with traps and risks include also a discussion on a feasible scope of the planning approach. Main topics:

- Implementation
- Project management
- Monitoring of implementation
- Implementation business case
- Avoiding Traps and Getting a Pilot Action Started
- Review of training path
- Modification of the pilot action
- Preparation of the mutual learning workshops

Agregated results of the Questionnaire 2

Q1	1	2	3	4	5	Avg
Content of presentations				1	13	4,928571
Way in which presentations were communicated				2	12	4,857143
Interactive sessions				1	13	4,928571
Achieving a good balance between presentations and interactive sessions					14	5
Quality and usefulness of training materials					14	5
Quality of visualisation					14	5
Possibilities to work in between workshops (home-works)					14	5
Communication with trainers					14	5
Final results (SUMP drafts)					14	5
Organisation at the events				1	13	4,928571
Q2	Agree strongly - 1	Agree - 2	Neither agree nor disagree - 3	Disagree - 4	Disagree strongly - 5	Avg
I now know well the SUMP process development	14					1
I now know and can explain what are the benefits of SUMPs	14					1
I will work to ensure that my city has a SUMP	13	1				1,071429
I will be able to revise and improve the existing Transport plans of my city	13	1				1,071429
I will share the information I gained with my colleagues in order to raise the SUMP awareness among them	14					1
I am ready to exchange experience with advanced cities and transfer the good practices	14					1

Q3	Yes
Give us entirely new ideas to implement SUMP	13
Show us in more detail how to improve our existing SUMPs or ITPs	12
Provide arguments to convince key decision makers and politicians	5
Provide data on impacts and costs	10
Convince us to implement soft measures together with the infrastructure ones	11
Help to make the case for more sustainable urban transport in our area	13

Q4	Yes
We have had an SUMP in place and have followed SUMP processes for several years	0
We will adopt an SUMP and SUMP processes in the near future	8
We do not have a SUMP but follow many elements of the process	4
We do not have a SUMP but follow a few elements of the process	2
We have no SUMP and do not follow SUMP processes	0

Q5	1	2	3	4	5	Avg
Radomíra Jordová					14	5
Zbyněk Sperat				1	13	4,928571
Hana Brůhová Foltýnová				5	9	4,642857
Petr Kurfürst				1	13	4,928571

4. Main lessons learned – summary and conclusions

- Half of the cities has primary traffic data
- 5 cities thinking about SUMP implementation (before BUMP training)
- Participants understand importance of communication during SUMP cycle
- Time required for SUMP is higher than participants expected
- Lack of English proficiency by the participants was a main problem during mutual learning for most participants

5. Final training session

The final training session was held in Třebíč at 2nd half of December as planned. Attendance was not very good because high workload and short time after municipal elections. Main topic was to share the four mutual learning events experiences, which was accomplished through group work. Short presentation of every MLW was made by participants to other participants with main findings and recommendations for implementation in Czech Republic.

PP8 – REC HU

1. Process for selection of trainees

Suggestions from focus group session for the selection of trainees

In Hungary the REC organized two focus group meetings to introduce the concept of the BUMP training, the mutual learning and the pilot project at the municipalities. The focus groups discussed the content of the BUMP training modules prepared by the German partner of the BUMP project, training needs and important mobility issues in Hungary. The focus group supported the selection procedure of the BUMP project and asked for good visibility of the BUMP training in Hungary. The focus group proposed a tailor-made training for the selected Hungarian municipality representatives. The BUMP training modules are very well described in English version as concept and cases. The Hungarian BUMP training modules needed to be updated with Hungarian relevant information and cases.

Selection of the trainees

As envisaged in BUMP's Annex 1, participating local authorities in Hungary were selected using a public transparent procedure, applicable in Hungary, implemented as follows.

In November 2013 a general model for the selection of participating local authorities was produced in English for the entire project consortium and then fine-tuned to the Hungarian context. It is worth highlighting that a decision was made, whereby local authorities are the actual beneficiaries of services and opportunities offered by the BUMP project, so the local authorities appointed individual representatives among their mobility managers and senior technical officers to actively participate in project activities (training and local SUMP development).

The Hungarian call for participation and the application form was complete with admission requirements, details on participants' allowances, selection criteria and instructions on how to apply were disseminated to the Hungarian cities with population among 40,000 and 350,000 inhabitants. The set deadline for the applicants was published in the BUMP website and intensively promoted nationwide. The set final deadline was the end of January 2014.

Fourteen applications were received by individual cities/towns meeting the requirements and 11 of them were selected according to the call. The total number of participants in the training was 20.

The mayor of the cities signed the required document of participating applicant at the BUMP training to ensure the active and official participation of the selected applicants. Asking for the signature was not a traditional way for participation at the BUMP training. REC had to explain in additional emails the need of the signature of the mayor. Finally, REC was able to collect all required documents.

Full list of the trained people, their cities and their contacts:

No	Municipality	Position/Department	City population
1	Dunaujvaros	Department of Transport and development	46,810
2	Dunaujvaros	Department of Transport	46,810
3	Erd	Department of Transport	63,330

4	Kaposvar	Department of Transport	65,340
5	Kaposvar	Department of Transport and development	65,340
6	Kaposvar	Department of Transport and development	65,340
7	Pecs	Department of Transport	147,720
8	Pecs	Department of Transport and development	147,720
9	Salgotarjan	Department of Territorial Planning	40,310
10	Szekesfehervar	Department of Transport, PhD	99,250
11	Szekesfehervar	Department of Transport	99,250
12	Szekesfehervar	Department of Transport	99,250
13	Szentendre	Office of Major	35,270
14	Szentendre	Department of Transport and development	35,270
15	Szentendre	Department of Transport	35,270
16	Szombathely	Department of Transport	77,550
17	Tatabanya	Department of Environment	67,880
18	Veszprem	Office of Major	60,880
19	Gyor	Department of Transport and other services	128,000

Specific lessons learned in the selection of trainers

In Hungary only a few transport experts have certificate to deliver SUMP training. Technical universities can offer short term courses for sustainable transport and mobility trainings. The training offer of the BUMP project was new and innovative in Hungary. The whole work on the preparation of SUMP was new in Hungary.

Most of the selected municipal representatives was happy to join to the training with some expectation on their own SUMP.

2. Process for the selection of trainers

Selection of trainers

The trainers were members of the REC HQ (in-house consultants: Eva Csobod, Gabor Heves, Peter Szuppinger) with relevant CVs and professional experience, trained on SUMP and mobility management at national and international training courses.

The external trainers were selected according to their CV and willingness to participate in the Hungarian BUMP training course in March - June 2014 (see the details of the Hungarian modules, the schedule of the training course and the trainers in the table below). The external trainers participated in the focus group interviews when the needs of the Hungarian training were discussed during autumn 2013.

One of the trainer, Andras Ekes was certified as international SUMP trainer at a European SUMP training course. The other external trainers were selected according to the content of the BUMP training modules and their personal experiences.

Full list of the trainers

The main trainer was Andras EKES, Urban Researcher – Certified SUMP-expert. The coordinators of the training were Eva Csobod and Peter Szuppinger from the REC HQ Hungary. Other selected trainers were:

- Tamas FLEISCHER, Hungarian Academy, Transport and Mobility Unit
- Tunde Hajnal, Budapest Transport Company
- Laszlo Molnar, international expert, T&M, Budapest
- Janos Viragh, External Transport service of Municipality of Szentendre
- Peter Rudnai, National Environment and Health Research, Budapest
- Peter Schuchmann, PESTTERV, Budapest
- Ilona Kovacs Palne, Hungarian Academy, Unit in Pecs
- Ferenc Konig, Pecs Municipality, transport unit
- Zsuzsa Bibok, National Environmental Institute, Budapest
- Marton Varga, Clean air working group, Budapest
- Sabina Popit, Transport Unit, Ljubljana Municipality, Slovenia
- Ildiko Angerer, Dunaujvaros Municipality, Environmental Department

Over the plenary presentations the group work was conducted by the REC HQ team: Eva Csobod, Gabor Heves, Peter Szuppinger and Reka Prokai.

The lectures and group work were carried out by the listed experts in hand in hand. The group work was conducted by the REC HQ team: Eva Csobod, Gabor Heves, Peter Szuppinger and Reka Prokai. The group work was built on the national needs and the suggestions of the BUMP training support package.

3. Description of the national training modules

Adaptation process:

The adaptation of the general BUMP training modules to the Hungarian needs and circumstances built on the feedback of the focus groups on the content and methodology of the training. The national needs on the SUMP trainings were identified during the focus group discussion. The experts proposed that the topics of the training and the methodology in general need to be connected to the assessment of the actual situation in Hungary. The BUMP trainings should be a less generic training and it should deliver the EU good practices. In addition, great emphasis should be given on evaluating actual Hungarian examples.

The Hungarian city representatives (technical staff and planners) should share their own experiences with the other training participants at the BUMP training. The focus group experts suggested that the involvement of civil organisations and other stakeholders in the training to present some practical cases at the trainings.

Due to the involvement of the REC health and environment topic in the BUMP project, it is important to strengthen the health and environment scenarios in the planning process based on the available data bases. The air quality and health, cycling as physical activity and alternative movement was mentioned by the experts in connection to the cycling routes and mobility planning. Health and environment experts offered their participation in the BUMP training in Hungary (Dr Peter Rudnai, Zsuzsa Bibok). REC was the coordinator of the communication of the European CIVITAS networks. Due to this fact the CIVITAS network in the Hungary is motivating. The CIVITAS cities of this network are eager to participate in the sustainable urban planning process. The CIVITAS cities, such as Pecs, can present useful examples at the BUMP training in Hungary.

Concerning the methodology of the training, the focus group experts supported the concept of the BUMP support package which proposed a mixture of in-class training and interactive learning sessions with group work. The proposal for designing 'homework' between the training modules was elaborated in the training

program in Hungary. The 'homework' is influential for personal capacity building in different fields, in this case learning about integrated sustainable mobility planning in local circumstances. The focus group experts supported the 'homework' component of the training between the modules.

The details on the training modules are described in the table below. The agenda of the training sessions and the presentations are on the project website.

Module 1: Introduction of the SUMP Cycle, steps and conditions.

The SUMP cycle was introduced via the Hungarian BUMP support package slides. The participants had in-depth discussion on the possible steps of the SUMP at the actual local level of the municipalities.

Module 2: Goals and targets of the SUMP for the cities.

The training participants received hand on knowledge on identification of the overarching goals and targets of SUMP fitting to the local needs of the cities.

Module 3: Measures of integration and innovation. Working with transport, environment and health sectors.

Integration is a key tool in the SUMP preparation process. The training participants were able to learn about the tools of integration, the challenges of different sectors to cooperate on the joint process of SUMP.

Module 4: The need of coordination, political, legal, financial and procedural levels.

The module is very important for the real SUMP preparatory process. The training participants could learn about the complexity of the process, the political, legal, financial and procedural aspects.

The group work was very important to identify issues and challenges.

Module 5: Steps of implementation, management options. The need of evaluation.

Implementation means real work and practical steps. The Slovenian case study on Ljubljana provided an in-depth experience besides the general learning on implementation stages. The evaluation stages and use for further progress of SUMP were discussed at the plenary and in the groups.

Module 6: Pilot actions. Planning the SUMP planning process at local level. The role of planners and the municipality staff.

This module is more process oriented and planning the next steps on pilot projects. The participating municipalities are ready to start the pilot phase of SUMP. They explained the next steps they can take.

	Modul 1 Introduction of SUMP SUMP Cycle	Modul 2 Goals and targets, assessment	Modul 3 Measures of integration and innovation	Modul 4 Coordination, political, legal, financial, procedural	Modul 5 Implementation, management	Modul 6 Pilot actions, planning Presenting pilot actions
Time/place of conducting (dd/mm) 19-20 March, 2014 Szentendre	19-20 March Trainers: -Andras EKES, Urban Research Academy, Transport and Mobility -Eva Csobod, Gabor Heves, Peter Szuppinger, Reka Prokai, REC HQ	19-20 March Trainers: -Tunde Hajnal, Budapest Transport -Laszlo Molnar, international expert, T&M -Janos Viragh, Transport service, Szentendre -Eva Csobod, Gabor Heves, Peter Szuppinger, Reka Prokai, REC HQ	16-18 April Trainers: -Peter Rudnai, National E&H Research - Andras EKES, Urban Research -Peter Schuchmann, PESTTERV -Eva Csobod, Gabor Heves, Peter Szuppinger, Reka Prokai, REC HQ	16-18 April Trainers: -Ilona Kovacs Palne, Hungarian Academy, Pecs -Ferenc Konig, Pecs Municipality, -Eva Csobod, Gabor Heves, Peter Szuppinger, Reka Prokai, REC HQ		
16-18 April 2014 Pecs						
4-5 June 2014 Dunaujvaros Trainers					4-6 June 2014 Trainers: -Andras EKES, Urban Research -Zsuzsa Bibok, National Environmental Institute -Marton Varga, Clean air working group -Sabina Popit, Ljubljana Municipality, Slovenia -Ildiko Angerer, Dunaujvaros, Environment Department - Eva Csobod, Gabor Heves, Peter Szuppinger, Reka Prokai, REC HQ	4-6 June 2014 Trainers: Trainers: -Andras EKES, Urban Research -Zsuzsa Bibok, National Environmental Institute -Marton Varga, Clean air working group -Sabina Popit, Ljubljana Municipality, Slovenia -Ildiko Angerer, Dunaujvaros, Environment Department - Eva Csobod, Gabor Heves, Peter Szuppinger, Reka Prokai, REC HQ
24 June 2014 Szekesfehervar						24 June 2014 Closing, presentation of SUMP preparation framework and topics/municipality

Aggregated results of the Questionnaire 2

Questionnaires were disseminated via email to the trainees after each module. We received nearly 90% of responses.

The aggregated results showed the following: The trainees highly appreciated the content of the PPT presentations and the level of training, as well as the interactive sessions and the discussions. They liked the case studies and local practices presented by the lecturers.

They were fully satisfied with the organization before and during the workshops and with the preparation of the “homework”. The role of the “homework” was to bridge between the delivery of modules and build up in depth capacity of the training participants. The “homework”, which focused on local information, was influential at the local municipality level and motivation for the local team work.

The participants declared the benefit of SUMP for their municipality and almost 80% are ready to contribute to the elaboration and implementation of SUMP in their city. All of them promised that they will share the received information and the presentations with their colleagues.

The political support is very important. Besides that the participants expressed the need of cooperation between departments (80%) and strong partnership with the planners and the civil society (70).

The financial conditions of the SUMP planning and implementation are challenging, as the participants pointed out. They believe in the benefit of international cooperation in the BUMP project and other similar projects. The national fund is limited but there is a possibility it will be increased during the new planning period 2014-2020.

4. Main lessons learned – summary and conclusions

- SUMP is very interesting for the cities and ready to start the concrete steps of the SUMP Cycle
- The current conditions are optimal due to the integrated national development strategy and planning in the larger cities
- Municipalities are missing planning expert knowledge because external experts are usually subcontracted
- Working with stakeholders is a key element of the SUMP process. The municipalities are ready to create conditions for joint planning.
- There is more money for infrastructure development in cities but less for planning and for a SUMP. Hopefully it will change in the future.
- The municipalities are happy to participate in the international project, such as the BUMP project, and learn the preparation of local SUMP.
- The municipalities found that health and environmental priorities and indicators need to be integrated in the SUMP.

5. Final training session

Final training session was organized by the REC in Budapest on 17 December 2014. According to the agenda of the meeting, the representatives of the municipalities evaluated the BUMP training program. Special attention was given to the mutual learning workshops of the project. The feedback on the international workshops was very positive. The participants said that the mutual learning workshops gave added value to the training on sustainable mobility and networking in Europe.

The training participants are prepared to start the work on their local SUMP with the help of the REC and the external experts (Andras Ekes)

The certificate about the attendance at the BUMP training was delivered to the municipal participants.

PP9 – REC PL

1. Process for the selection of trainees

As envisaged in BUMP’s Annex 1, participating local authorities in Poland were selected using a public transparent procedure applicable, implemented as follows.

In November 2013 a general model for the selection of participating local authorities was produced in English for the entire project consortium and then fine-tuned to the Polish context. It is worth highlighting that a decision was made, whereby local authorities are the actual ‘beneficiaries’ of services and opportunities offered by BUMP project, so the local authorities appointed individual representatives among their mobility managers and senior technical officers to actively participate in project activities (training and local SUMP development).

The Polish call for participation and the application form were complete with admission requirements. Details on participants’ allowances, selection criteria and instructions on how to apply were disseminated to the Polish cities with population among 40,000 and 350,000 inhabitants. The set deadline for the applicants was published in the BUMP website and intensively promoted nationwide. The set final deadline was the end of January 2014.

Selection of the trainees

26 applications were received by individual cities/towns meeting the requirements and 10 of them were selected according to the call. The total number of participants in the training was 16 due to internal constraints of the municipalities (where possible/applicable two representatives were selected from different departments of the municipality that play a role in SUMP process. In this way, greater impact can be achieved, and also stronger political support across municipalities. Furthermore, it allows that at least one of the two representatives can follow the development, in case the other is assigned to other tasks).

Full list of the trained people, their cities and their contacts:

City	Job at the municipality	Population of the city
Lublin	Mobility planner (cycling)	348,961 (2010)
Kielce	Mobility planner (cycling)	201,363 (2012)
Ciechanów	Strategist and transport planner / Head of the dept	44,741 (2010)
Starogard Gdański	Urban planning specialist	48,690
Starogard Gdański	Urban planning specialist	...
Świdnik	Planner	40,186
Świdnik	Planner	...
Puławy	Urban planning specialist	49,839
Puławy	Urban planning specialist	...
Łomża	Road planning specialist (head of the department)	60,197 (2012)
Łomża	Road planning specialist (head of the department)	...
Biała Podlaska	Urban planning specialist / EU projects manager	59,280
Biała Podlaska	Urban planning specialist / EU projects manager	...

Pułtusk	Head of roads and infrastructure dept.	19,000 (SUMP with Ciechanów)
Ostrołęka	Head of the department for strategic planning	53,572
Ostrołęka	Head of the infrastructure department	...

2. Process for the selection of trainers

Selection of trainers

Selection of trainers was discussed during the preparatory meeting in Warsaw. BUMP supporting package was presented. Different scenarios were illustrated by the moderator, Mr. Jerzy Rzędowski. REC Head Office offered participation in the selection of trainers. The CIVITAS case studies were proposed to use as good examples on sustainable mobility. Core SUMP training was delivered by Michał Brennek, an expert in mobility matters. The choice of candidates was limited due to exceptionally high cost per person. Where applicable (ie. Health, traffic planning, real life scenarios) the presentations were done by top class experts with strong background in their respective fields.

Full list of the trainers

Please refer to the table below.

Time of conducting (dd/mm)	Modul 1 Introduction of SUMP SUMP Cycle	Modul 2 Goals and targets, need assessment	Modul 3 Measures of integration and innovation	Modul 4 Coordination, political, legal, financial, procedural	Modul 5 Implementation, management	Modul 6 Pilot actions, planning Presenting pilot actions
26-28 March 2014 Warsaw	Trainers: Michał Brennek Jerzy Rzędowski, Agata Rzędowska	Jerzy Rzędowski				
29-30 May 2014 Lublin			Trainers: Michał Brennek Lublin municipality team			
24-26 June 2014 Kielce				Jan Freidberg Piotr Brewczyński	Sabina Popit Michał Brennek	Presentaion of the municipalities
Problems (if any)						

3. Description of the national training modules

The BUMP training support package provided the framework for the Polish training. The structure and method of the training modules were adopted to the local conditions.

A description of sessions/modules, contents and work done

Adaptation process:

The adaptation of the general BUMP training modules to the national needs and circumstances built on the feedback of the focus groups on the content and methodology of the training. The national needs on the SUMP trainings were identified during the focus group discussion. The experts proposed the next:

Strong motivators to introduce SUMP are needed, both from practical and political level: ie. Need for high level documents stating that SUMP is needed, important, „the next big EU thing”. High level “political will should be gained. But the biggest opposition we might get from mid-level managers across municipalities so higher management should be well informed about advantages of introducing SUMP.

There is limited capacity to plan strategically (over 5 yrs).

Cities with traffic/air quality problems and having strong NGOs are easily approached and interested in SUMP. It is good to play on ‘emotions’ (being the first group of municipalities with SUMP etc). It is also good to gather good practice/results evidence from both municipalities, companies etc.

The content and methodology of the general BUMP support package was supported by the transport/mobility experts. The topics included are complete as focus group members said. What was highlighted is that in Poland municipalities there is a lack of any methodologies so they would like to know the whole methodology as is with possibility to consult operational issues at the development stage. Most of the local actors are interested in concrete good practice examples of implementation. There are few regions in Poland where SUMP would be backing the clean air efforts such is the situation in Kraków and Katowice. So most efforts should be placed on “how to solve/avoid problems. In terms of authority structures it is important to train not only one department in municipality but to use more holistic approach and to engage both technical and political staff from various departments that deal with transport issues or are working in parallel (so health departments, spatial planning departments, economy departments etc.). The proposals of the focus group experts were used in the adaptation of the general BUMP training. The REC HQ staff provided professional support to the development of the Polish training modules specially on the adaptation aspects. Strong need for transferring good practices was identified by the experts. It would be best to approach municipality that already have good practices in terms of biking and sustainable transport inclusion and is keen on learning ie. Gdańsk. Finally good practice transfer was identified and integrated in the training, such as CIVITAS cases.

Environment and health topics and integration of them to the planning was highly supported by the focus group experts. The sectoral integration is important is the overall SUMP preparation, as it was said.

Concerning the methodology of the training, the focus group experts supported the concept of the BUMP support package which proposed a mixture of in-class training and interactive learning sessions with group work. The proposal for designing ‘homework’ between the training modules was elaborated in the training program. The ‘homework’ is influential for personal capacity building in different fields, in this case learning about integrated sustainable mobility planning in local circumstances, The focus group experts supported the ‘homework’ component of the training between the modules.

The UK examples were welcomed by the Polish experts as cases in the BUMP training.

Module 1: Introduction of the SUMP cycle, steps and conditions in general and at local level

Training 1 in Warsaw:

BUMP supporting package was used as a presentation. Workshop tasks were conducted on scenarios, using maps and drawing tools.

Module 2: Goals and targets, the need of assessment for the innovative process

Mr. Jerzy Rzędowski worked on real life examples (workshops) and on CIVITAS website case studies. He also described strategic role of SUMP and delivered a workshop on defining strategies, assigning tasks and working on the tasks.

The training participants received hand on knowledge on identification of the overarching goals and targets of SUMP fitting to the local needs of the cities.

Module 3: Measures of integration and innovation. Working with transport, environment and health sectors. The training participants were able to learn about the tools of integration, the challenges of different sectors to cooperate on the process of SUMP.

Training 2 in Lublin:

Michał Brennek worked with Excel tool for assessing SUMP action plan measures

Michał Przepiórka gave a presentation on “Year of Jan Gehl” with city materials

Michał Przepiórka conducted city mobility tour on bikes

Module 4: The need of coordination, political, legal, financial and procedural levels. How to deal with integration on transport, environment and health sectors.

The module is very important for the real SUMP preparatory process. The training participants could learn about the complexity of the process, the political, legal, financial and procedural aspects.

Module 5: Steps of implementation, management options. The need of evaluation.

Implementation means real work and practical steps. The Slovenian case study on Ljubljana provided an in-depth experience besides the general learning on implementation stages. The evaluation stages and use for further progress of SUMP were discussed at the plenary and in the groups.

Module 6: Pilot actions. Planning the SUMP planning process at local level. The role of planners and the municipality staff.

This module is more process oriented and planning the next steps on pilot projects. The participating municipalities are ready to start the pilot phase of SUMP. They explained the next steps they can take.

Training 3 in Kielce:

Michał Brennek used BUMP tool for presenting the SUMP contents and tasks. Maps and drawing tools as well as case studies, were reassessed in the second part. Also a workshop on city’s policies and documents was carried – the potential and gaps were defined in each participating city. Stakeholder management was also described and worked through as an important part of constructing SUMP. PMI methodology was used in a form of interactive workshop.

Mr. Jan Freidberg, a university professor, used presentation in module 4 (attached)

Mr. Piotr Brewczyński, an environment and health expert, used presentation on integration of environmental health to the planning process (attached)

Sabina Popit, Slovenia, used presentation on the Ljubljana case, learning from practice (attached)

The presentations have been uploaded on the project website.

Aggregated results of the Questionnaire 2

The trainees highly appreciated the project’s topic in general, the content of the presentations and the level of training, as well as the interactive sessions and the discussions. They liked the concrete examples, the positive and negative case studies and local practices presented by the lecturers.

They were fully satisfied with the organization of the training sessions and were able to prepare the “homework”.

The participants declared the benefit of SUMP for the municipality are clear and they are ready to contribute to the elaboration and implementation of SUMP in their cities. All of them promised sharing the received information and the presentations with their municipal colleagues.

Besides that, the participants expressed the need of cooperation between municipal departments (90%) and strong partnership with the planners and the civil society (80%).

The financial conditions of the SUMP planning and implementation are crucial for the success. The political support is very important. The Polish national funds are limited but perhaps they will increase during the new planning period.

4. Main lessons learned – summary and conclusions

- It is important to start negotiations with trainers as soon as possible as there is low number of specialists on mobility issues in Poland, and they can have tight schedules.
- The cities participating in the project are interested in doing practical examples and case studies. The training was shaped towards their expectation. BUMP Supporting Package was used as introduction but then detailed cases of participating cities were discussed which resulted in fruitful work within the cities. Transfer of knowledge between the participants and sharing information about their cities was also very appreciated. This allowed to form kind of a network of BUMP Cities which act as a “network of excellence” providing scaled BUMP tools to their regions and solving problems during SUMP creation.
- It is very hard to persuade political staff to attend the meetings. Sometimes they also want to prevent their workers from participating in Mutual Learning Sessions because of different political, ambitions or personal issues.

5. Final training session

The final training session was organised by the REC Poland in Warsaw on 28 January 2015. According to the agenda of the meeting, the representatives of the municipalities gave feedback on the BUMP training program. Special attention was given for the mutual learning workshops of the project. The feedback on the international workshops was positive. The participants said that the workshops was an added value to the training on sustainable mobility and networking.

The participants would be ready to exchange experiences on SUMP preparation during the piloting period. A certificate of attendance of the BUMP training was given to the participants within a small ceremony.

SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

Selection of the trainees

The partners selected the trainees following their national rules. In general, the selection process was performed professionally and in a transparent way. Three partners have trained more persons than planned in the project (CIRCE 30 p., AREA 29 p. and CSDCS 28 p.), this shows the high interest to SUMP in Spain, Italy and Bulgaria and the excellent promotional policy held by the corresponding PPs.

ALEA has trained 21 p., VIA ALTA and REC-HU – 20 p. as it was planned.

Partners REC-PL (16 trained persons) and SWEA (7 trained persons), were underperforming. In average, the Polish partner received 26 applications but only 10 cities were selected and afterwards, the training sessions were attended only by 16 trainees due to different political ambitions at the municipality or for personal reasons. In UK the training process was not very successful with only 7 participants and a lot of problems due to illness or vacation period.

TUDO did not perform the training as there were only 2 cities who finally applied in Germany. TUDO made an intensive promotional campaign but most of the German cities in regions neighboring Dortmund were already advanced in SUMP and did not need any further training.

In total, 171 persons from 86 cities were trained, which is close to the project plan of 180 persons from 90 cities. The number of people trained and cities involved was achieved at 95% as a whole for the project.

Selection of trainers

In total, 46 trainers were involved in the training process (nearly 6 per country in average). REC-HU had the biggest number of trainers (13) and ALEA had only 2. Each PP selected the trainers according to the convenient national procedures and the availability of SUMP experts in the countries. SWEA had some difficulties because of the very high costs of SUMP training in the UK, where the introduction of SUMP is compulsory for the cities. The trainers were asked to provide CVs and proofs of their expertise. About 2/3 of the trainers were external experts (34 to 74%), the remaining 1/3 was in-house consultants of the PP organizations. CSDCS used only its internal staff (5 p.) because of the lack of any other SUMP experts in Bulgaria. Internal staff used as experts also by AREA (2 p.), CIRCE (3 p.) and REC-PL (1 p.).

In most CEE countries the SUMP expertise is still low and there are very small number of local experts.

There are university experts at the transport and mobility departments who designed training courses for university students. These courses are applicable to the SUMP training needs in Hungary and Poland.

Performance of the national training modules

The training process, according to the elaborated methodology, encompassed 6 modules spread on 10 working days. It was planned to start the training process in January-February 2014 and to finish by the end of June (before summer holidays). The performance of the training process was defined in the project methodology and the partners respected it delivering the training material of the 6 modules for 10 working days. All PPs except SWEA merged some modules in order to minimize the transport costs of participants.

All PPs respected the starting and finishing time schedule of the training.

AREA divided the material on 4 sessions for 10 days and conducted all the trainings sessions in its premises in Trieste.

CSDCS merged the last two modules and conducted each of the five sessions in different regions in the country following the requirements of the mayors of participating cities, as they were sending some supplementary participants from the neighboring city as “listeners”.

CIRCE started with an introduction session in Jaca in June 2013 and continued later with two more training sessions from February to April 2014 in Zaragoza.

ALEA conducted four trainings sessions in Alba Iulia, merging the first two and the last two modules.

SWEA conducted the six sessions in Cardiff.

VIA ALTA performed four training sessions in Trebic, Brno, Praga and Pardubice, merging the first two and the last two modules.

REC-HU conducted four trainings merging the 1st module with the 2nd, as well as the 3rd with the 4th one. They took places in Szentendre, Pecs, Dunaujvaros and Szekesfehervar. The cities offered the training places to provide visibility to the BUMP training and giving relevance to SUMP in general.

REC-PL merged the first two and the last three modules and performed the three training sessions in Warsaw, Lublin and Kielce.

To sum up:

- a) Number of training sessions conducted
 - **SWEA** conducted 6 sessions
 - **CSDCS** conducted 5 sessions
 - **AREA, ALEA, VIA ALTA and REC-HU** conducted 4 sessions
 - **CIRCE and REC-PL** conducted 3 sessions
- b) Places of the trainings
 - **CSDCS** in 5 regions
 - **VIA ALTA and REC-HU** in 4 regions
 - **REC-PL** in 3 regions
 - **CIRCE** in 2 regions
 - **AREA, ALEA and SWEA** in 1 region

Aggregated results of the Questionnaire 2

The questionnaires were disseminated via internet or on-site to the trainees after each module. PPs received between 90 and 100% of answers (95% in average). The aggregated results showed the following:

- The trainees highly appreciated the content of the presentations and the way of communication, as well as the interactive sessions and the discussions on the ELTIS videos (95% of highest scoring).
- 100% were fully satisfied with the organization before and during the workshops.
- 100% also declared to know more about the concept and the benefits of SUMP after the trainings
- 75% answered they will contribute to the elaboration and implementation of SUMP in their city

- 95% promised they will share the received information with their colleagues.
- All teachers were rated above 4.3/5, which highlights the good standards of trainers
- The financial conditions of the SUMP planning and implementation are challenging, the participants said. They believe in the benefit of international cooperation in the frames of BUMP and other similar projects.
- The national funds are limited or missing, said most of the participants from CEE.
- The most difficult for the majority of the participants (70%) was “To persuade the Municipal council to assign money and staff from the city budget for elaboration of entire SUMP”.
- For 100% the political support is very important.
- There is a need of cooperation between different departments of the municipality (90%)
- A strong partnership with the planners and the civil society is needed (80%).

Main lessons learned

The first stage of the BUMP training process is now ended. The national trainings were conducted successfully in 7 of the 9 PP countries.

In general, the SUMP training was more appreciated in the CEE-countries, because of the new concept it represents. Also, the main motivation of the LG was the EU funding.

All trainees appreciated very much the training methodology, because most of them were not fully used to implement project cycle management procedures (strategic setting of objectives, choice of relative measures and setting of targets/indicators). They found the interactive sessions very useful and preferred more real-life simulations and further investigations on specific issues. The permanent contacts with the trainers, dissemination of many SUMP materials, ELTIS case studies and all PPT-presentations during the modules were very important for the success of the training. As a result, the participants became able to create a model structure for SUMP based on the concept that some contents can be common (or very similar) for all cities and others need to be developed following the local specifics.

Some partners noticed the training should put more emphasis on the adaptation of goals and objectives of sustainable urban transport system and mobility to the specific situation of each urban area. Targets are generally transferable, but setting a specific target depends on the characteristics of each urban area separately.

The training should be adapted in each country taking into account the specific level of development of the field of urban transport planning in that country.

International training sessions and contacts with foreign experts were strongly appreciated by the trainees and were one of the main drivers for their participation. By the end of the national trainings most of the participating cities declared their willingness to participate like pilots in the BUMP project. Some cities had very clear and interested ideas about the pilot actions thus defining the need of very clear planning of coaching activities.

There were some obstacles to the success of the action, too. All PPs realized in each country the interest to infrastructure projects is much higher because there is more money for infrastructure development in cities than for planning and SUMP development. So, somewhere the LG was not fully convinced that there was a deep training need for local staff.

On the other hand, some municipalities did not find realistic the elaboration of SUMP in the frames of the project and it was stated that only projects which are able to provide financial subsidies in order to carry out status quo analysis/surveys, project concept and implementation, are able to foster visible results within a short time.

The lack of political support and the unstable political environment in some countries can create difficulties during the training process, which were overcome successfully but will be crucial for the success of the following project phase (implementation).

The lack of primary data and knowledge in the technology field could also be considered an obstacle during the training and during the planning process.

Poor English skills of some participants could undermine their further communications on the international platforms and the use of original SUMP-materials published only in English.