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NEE IS NEE, KRISS
GEEN LANGE WAPPER DOOR ONZE STROT
SO WHERE DID WE GO WRONG?
Kingdon model

**Problem Stream**
- Indicators
- Focusing events
- Definitions
- Values
- Comparisons
- Categories

**Policy (Alternative) Stream**
- Alternatives
- Policy Communities
- Advocacy
- Policy Entrepreneurs
  - "softening up"
  - "testing the waters"
- Criteria for survival:
  - Technical feasibility
  - Value acceptability
  - Political feasibility
  - Emergence of consensus

**Politics Stream**
- Power
- Resources
- Symbolism
- Timing
- National mood
- Organized forces
Role of entrepreneur
1. Continued dialogue with actors representing the ‘problem stream’ is of strategic importance.
2. It is up to the ‘entrepreneur’ to create policy windows.
3. Continuous dialogue does not remediate a flawed technical or political process.
ORGANISING A CONTINUOUS DIALOGUE IN SUMP
• Countries with legal planning procedures generally have principles or instruments when and how to involve the public into transport planning processes.
• These forms are frequently insufficient for complex and long-term urban development processes like SUMP.
• Flexibility – cities can usually add and combine additional procedures and tools.
• A great number of different techniques and tools are available.
• But: how to organise stakeholder involvement and public participation effectively and efficiently? How to integrate it into strategic planning processes like SUMP?
Stakeholder Involvement and Public Participation in SUMP

Why?

- SUMP is a long-term vision about the economic and social development of a community
- Fundamental decisions need public legitimisation
- Public money is spent on the realisation of infrastructure and measures
- Solutions for local problems can only be found locally

http://www.mobilityplans.eu/docs/SUMP_guidelines_web0.pdf
Examples from Germany

City of Bremen: Transport Master Plan Re-launched with Strong Participation Approach

- Target: Open the “Black Box” Transport Master Plan
- Development of public involvement concept based on political approval
- Europe-wide tender, contracting an external consultant to support the process
- Main elements of participation process:
  - Project advisory board
  - Decentralized organized citizens’ forums
  - Consultation of regional committee and of the bodies with a statutory consultative role
  - Internet survey – What is good? What is bad? 35,000 visitors and 4,200 comments within three months.
- Process was very complex, demanding and time-consuming.
Examples from Germany

City of Bremen: Results of Internet Consultation
Examples from Germany

City of Berlin: Transport Master Plan 2040 (2003-2011)

- Initiation of a Round Table for the whole planning duration
- Function of the Round Table:
  - Development of planning targets (Vision 2040)
  - Consensus on basic planning principles
- Impact: Long-lasting commitment among stakeholders
Examples from Germany

City of Dresden: Transport Development Plan 2025+

• Tools for involving – Round Table
• Balance in reaching the citizen, and reaching stakeholders
• Tackle the Bremen ‘participation paradox’
• Development of specific formats which suit the city and are in line with general requirements: there is not one solution.
• External know-how and neutral moderator might be necessary, extra budget for tender and contracting.
TRANSITION TAKES SHAPE THROUGH PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
Co-creation in Ghent and Antwerp
Level of involvement

- **Transmitting information** (one-way information)
- **Consultation** (bi-direction + views)
- **Active participation** (bi-direction + participation in decision-making – votes/consensus)
- **Co-creation**
Gent’s evolving approach to public involvement (1)

In the 90’s

• One way information:
  – Start of communication in the city – communication bicycle plan
  – Telling people about the plans and upcoming works

• Classic tools:
  – Press releases
  – Advertisements, local TV
  – Information evenings
  – Websites
  – ...
Gent’s evolving approach to public involvement (2)

Up to 2012...

- **Two way information:**
  - Telling people about plans and work
  - Asking for ideas, suggestions, comments

- **Classic tools + new tools**
  - Public hearings
    - General
    - Specific projects
  - Dialogue cafés (for instance railway station development)
  - Workshops on different themes
  - Sound board groups for large projects
  - Start using social media
From 2012 on...

- **Co-creation**
  - plans and ideas come from citizens – transition thinking

- **Tools**
  - Small working groups on different subjects
  - City administration is facilitating, **NOT** steering
  - Spreading the virus
Transition arena - The living street

• **Pilot of 2 streets**
  – Cars were banned for one month
  – Instead: picnic tables, swings, mobile trees, grass,…
  – New forms of mobility were tried out (e-bikes, carrier bikes, ..)

• **Results**
  – One month is too short for a pilot
  – Most people were very positive
  – People who were sceptical became more positive
  – Social contact was increased
  – Children loved it
An example
Antwerp
• http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UGSH_e71j1s
FINALLY:

THE ROLE OF THE PLANNER
Role of entrepreneur
The Hybrid planner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional strategist</td>
<td>‘the beautiful plan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>The politically appropriate plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market planner</td>
<td>The financially feasible plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process planner</td>
<td>The right democratic process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional strategist</td>
<td>Professionalism and policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Policy Efficient implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market planner</td>
<td>The market and competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process planner</td>
<td>Establishment of community Consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you recognize the Bremen paradox?

What are your cities current objectives when it comes to public involvement?

How would you improve your current public involvement strategy?

Are you the right person to do the job? Who would you involve to better cover the challenge of continuous dialogue?

Are you ready for co-creation? What could be a topic for co-creation in your city?
• Strong dominance of official actors (decision-makers)
• Variety of actors involved and tools used in participation
• Countries provide a certain and sometimes limited degree of legal regulation for participation in urban and regional transport projects
• Most frequently used tool: public announcements (minimum requirement of participation); public meetings, consultation documents, complaints and hearings were often legally prescribed.

• Barriers in 'strategic city-wide transport plans' and 'local traffic management schemes' mainly encountered in the early planning stages and less during 'implementation'
• In 'major infrastructure projects' and in 'major demand management projects' barriers encountered during 'implementation' play an important role.
• Expectation: Planners (focus on 'project management' and 'decision making process'); Transport non-professionals (focus on 'communication strategy' and 'participation')
## Classifications
- Generally applicable
- Partially applicable

### Who to engage?

- **Wider audience**
  - T12: O
  - T13: ●
  - T14: ● ●
  - T15: ● ●
  - T16: ● ●
  - T17: ● ●
  - T18: ● ●

- **Targeted audience**
  - T12: ●
  - T13: ●
  - T14: ● ●
  - T15: ● ●
  - T16: ● ●
  - T17: ● ●
  - T18: ● ●

### When to engage?

- **Problem definition**
  - T12: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T13: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T14: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T15: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T16: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T17: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T18: ● ● ● ● ●

- **Option generation**
  - T12: ●
  - T13: ●
  - T14: ● ●
  - T15: ● ●
  - T16: ● ●
  - T17: ● ●
  - T18: ● ●

- **Option assessment**
  - T12: ●
  - T13: ●
  - T14: ● ●
  - T15: ● ●
  - T16: ● ●
  - T17: ● ●
  - T18: ● ●

- **Formal decision taking**
  - T12: ●
  - T13: ●
  - T14: ●
  - T15: ●
  - T16: ●
  - T17: ●
  - T18: ●

- **Implementation plan**
  - T12: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T13: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T14: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T15: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T16: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T17: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T18: ● ● ● ● ●

- **Monitoring and evaluation**
  - T12: ●
  - T13: ●
  - T14: ●
  - T15: ●
  - T16: ●
  - T17: ●
  - T18: ●

### Type of Project?

- **Strategy**
  - T12: ○
  - T13: ○
  - T14: ●
  - T15: ●
  - T16: ●
  - T17: ●
  - T18: ●

- **Scheme**
  - T12: ●
  - T13: ●
  - T14: ●
  - T15: ●
  - T16: ●
  - T17: ●
  - T18: ●

### Duration of engagement

- **Restricted**
  - T12: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T13: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T14: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T15: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T16: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T17: ● ● ● ● ●
  - T18: ● ● ● ● ●

- **Continuous**
  - T12: ○
  - T13: ○
  - T14: ●
  - T15: ●
  - T16: ●
  - T17: ●
  - T18: ○

---

**NOTE:** To be most effective, Engagement Tools should be used in conjunction with the development and implementation of a Marketing Strategy (Tool T5, FS15-FS17) and a Marketing Strategy (Tool T6, FS18-FS21).
Stakeholder consultation: the integration of the opinions and concerns of relevant stakeholders in the decision-making process.

Aims: making the decision-making process more transparent; gathering more input on which to base decisions; creating support for the decisions that are made.

Initiated by decision makers or project team; stakeholder consultation can also be solicited by the stakeholders themselves.

Involvement of stakeholders = a permanent and long-term activity.

Participation in planning
Participation in implementation
Participation in evaluation
icre@polisnetwork.eu
Contact for CH4LLENGE

Dr.-Ing. Susanne Böhler-Baedeker
Miriam Lindenau
Rupprecht Consult – Forschung & Beratung GmbH
Clever Straße 13-15, 50668 Köln (Cologne), Germany
Tel +49 221 60 60 55 – 14
s.boehler@rupprecht-consult.eu

www.rupprecht-consult.eu
www.sump-challenges.eu
(CH4LLENGE website launched in autumn 2013)