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This replication manual is developed by GO SUMP for the Interreg Med Urban Transport Community. It is inspired by similar publications developed in the framework of other EU-funded projects which had a strong focus on replication, including for example Sharing Cities, Cascade or Guidance.

As defined by the Interreg Med glossary, replication is the activity of ‘duplicating, copying, reproducing or repeating’ what has been successfully introduced in other areas or programmes in another territory. The purpose of this manual is therefore to provide effective methodologies, inspiring examples and useful references to support this process.

Based on the principles of ‘peer-to-peer exchange’ and ‘learning by doing’, the GO SUMP replication manual is designed as a practical tool for practitioners that have the ambition to transfer innovative low-carbon transport measures and strategies to other cities and regions in the Mediterranean area.

The mission of GO SUMP is to accelerate the take-up of sustainable urban mobility plans or SUMP's. Users of this manual are therefore encouraged to move beyond replication of single measures and technologies, such as introducing electric vehicles and charging infrastructure, developing multimodal journey planners or setting up of public bicycle schemes. Instead they should also consider how these can be embedded within a long-term vision and strategy on sustainable urban mobility, and designed bottom-up in consultation with citizens, NGOS, companies and stakeholder organisations.

1 http://www.eltis.org/mobility-plans/sump-concept
GO SUMP - Improving Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans & Measures in the Mediterranean Area - is a horizontal project under the Interreg Med Priority Axis 2 which aims to increase the capacity of Mediterranean cities to use existing low carbon transport systems and optimise multimodal connections amongst them. Through a specialised partnership, GO SUMP offers guidance and support to modular community projects co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund to build on, increase the visibility of, and mainstream their results through joint strategies based on synergies and networking.

To stimulate cooperation and cross-fertilisation between the different modular projects, GO SUMP established an Urban Transport Community (UTC), where modular project partners are invited to promote their results and opportunities, and to discuss common challenges and solutions. The exchange is facilitated through a dedicated online platform, webinars, workshops and events, and structured along five thematic areas including tourist destinations, specific sub-areas of trip generation/attraction, participatory planning and processes, intelligent transport systems and electric mobility, and low carbon transport modes and services.

The Interreg Med Urban Transport Community represents seven modular projects which are briefly described in the following chapter, more projects are expected to join in the future. The UTC can be considered as a permanent and growing community of Mediterranean transport experts and practitioners that – building on the results and experiences of the modular projects - will drive the transition towards low carbon urban mobility patterns in the Mediterranean area.

For more information on GO SUMP and the Interreg Med Urban Transport Community, please visit https://urban-transports.interreg-med.eu/
Overview of modular projects

**CAMPSUMP** - Campus Sustainable University Mobility Plans in MED Areas (September 2016 – February 2018) aimed to improve and complement sustainable urban mobility plans by developing innovative mobility strategies for student flows inside university campuses and through better integration in the functional area. The main outputs of the project consist of an action plan for developing mobility plans for university campuses, a roadmap for decision makers and an ICT model for management and communication.

Project partners: Magna Graecia Foundation Catanzaro University (lead partner), National Technical University of Athens, University of Malta, University of Valencia, University of Split, University of Cyprus, University of Bologna, Local Councils Association, Promet d.o.o., Cyprus Ministry of Transport, Communications and Works, Metropolitan City of Bologna, InnDEA, Amministrazione Provinciale di Catanzaro.

**LOCATIONS** - Low Carbon Transport in Cruise Destination Cities (November 2016 – October 2019) aims at supporting local public administrations in drafting low-carbon transport and mobility plans (LCTPs) with measures dedicated to cruise passengers and freight flows, contributing to decongestion of urban transport systems and a lower production of greenhouse gases.

Partners: Area Science Park (lead partner), Malagaport, Lisboa E-Nova - Lisbon’s Energy And Environment Agency, Municipality Of Ravenna, Port of Ravenna Authority, Emilia Romagna Region, Research Centre For Energy Resources And Consumption, Regional Energy Agency Kvarner, Port of Rijeka Authority, Durres Port Authority, City of Zadar, Zadar County Development Agency - Zadra Nova, City of Durres, Albanian Institute of Transport, Comune di Trieste, Port of Zadar Authority, Malaga City Council, Port System Authority of The Eastern Adriatic Sea, Autonomous Region Friuli Venezia Giulia, Lisbon City Council.

**EnerNETMob** - Interregional Electromobility Network for the Mediterranean Coastal Areas - (February 2018 - January 2022) is designing parallel ‘Sustainable Electromobility Plans' to enable a Mediterranean-wide network connecting cities of the coastal area and maritime with land transportation. The project will implement several pilot networks of Electric Vehicles Supply Equipment (EVSE), also co-powered by renewable energy, to test interurban and interregional mobility plans and land-sea intermodality using electric transport systems. EnerNETMob will also develop pilot actions to overcome medium-trip limitations and to coordinate future investments in electric transport in the Mediterranean area.
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MOBILITAS - Mobility for Nearly-Zero CO2
In Mediterranean Tourism Destinations (September 2016 – April 2019) - involves regions affected by intense tourism flows with great pressure on transport infrastructure and mobility, causing air pollution, noise, health risks, road accidents and loss of cities' attractiveness.

Partners: Regional Development Centre Koper (lead partner), City of Dubrovnik, Municipality of Misano Adriatico, Paragone Europe, University of Venice, Pano Platres Community Council, ENERGIES 2050, Municipality of Piraeus, Rimini Strategic Planning Agency

SUMPORT (February 2017 – July 2019) aims to improve sustainable mobility in Mediterranean port cities by fostering the uptake of SUMPs - with a specific focus on integrating city and port-related traffic – and complemented by pilot actions in Limassol (CY), Kotor (ME), Thessaloniki (GR), Koper (SI), Durres (AL and Valencia (ES).

Partners: Central European Initiative (lead partner), Region of Epirus - Regional Unit of Thesprotia, Igoumenitsa Port Authority S.A., Institute for Transport and Logistics Foundation, City of Limassol, Valenciaport Foundation for Research, Promotion and Commercial Studies of the Valencian region, Municipality of Koper, Foundation of the Valentian Community to Promote Strategic Urban Development and Innovation, Autoridad Portuaria De Valencia, Cyprus Ports Authority, City of Kotor, Luka Koper, Port and Logistic System, d.d., Port of Kotor

**MOTIVATE** (September 2016 – April 2019) promotes a new model of SUMP development across the MED area, based on the exploitation of social media and crowdsourcing apps, helping decision makers to gain a strong understanding of the main mobility problems.

Partners: Câmara Municipal de Almada (lead partner), Centre for Research and Technology Hellas, MemEx Srl., Rhodes Municipality, Aegean Energy and Environment Agency, Tiemme Spa, Larnaka Municipality, Municipality of Ioannina, Network of Sustainable Aegean and Ionian Islands, Municipal Company of Transports 'RODA'

**REMEDIo** (November 2016 – April 2019) tests alternative mobility solutions for highly congested mixed-used roads by creating 'horizontal condominiums', a form of participatory governance that actively engages institutions, stakeholders and citizens, with which the Municipality can directly interact to improve multi-modal and low carbon mobility, freight logistics and environmental quality.

Partners: ARPA Veneto - Regional Agency for Environment Protection in Veneto Region, Municipality of Treviso, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Instituto Superior Técnico, University of Seville, Metropolitan Development Agency Of Thessaloniki S.A., City of Split, Municipality of Loures, Metropolitan City of Venice, Municipality of Villorba, Province Of Treviso, Association of Artisans Marca Trevigiana, Municipality of Seville, Municipality of Kalamaria, Thessaloniki Public Transport Authority, Municipality of Pavlos Melas, Veneto region, City Of Thessaloniki (municipality), Climate Alliance, Loures water and waste services, County of Split-Dalmatia

**MOTIVATE** (September 2016 – April 2019) promotes a new model of SUMP development across the MED area, based on the exploitation of social media and crowdsourcing apps, helping decision makers to gain a strong understanding of the main mobility problems.
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Partners: ARPA Veneto - Regional Agency for Environment Protection in Veneto Region, Municipality of Treviso, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Instituto Superior Técnico, University of Seville, Metropolitan Development Agency Of Thessaloniki S.A., City of Split, Municipality of Loures, Metropolitan City of Venice, Municipality of Villorba, Province Of Treviso, Association of Artisans Marca Trevigiana, Municipality of Seville, Municipality of Kalamaria, Thessaloniki Public Transport Authority, Municipality of Pavlos Melas, Veneto region, City Of Thessaloniki (municipality), Climate Alliance, Loures water and waste services, County of Split-Dalmatia
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Replicable solutions from the Interreg Med Urban Transport Community

This section provides a flavour of the many innovative sustainable transport measures and planning methodologies that were piloted by the modular projects in the Interreg Med Urban Transport Community. A more comprehensive description and analysis of all project results is provided in the GO SUMP Results Analysis Reports, of which the final version will be available by October 2019. In addition, the GO SUMP replication manual will be complemented by the MOBILITAS handbook on sustainable tourist mobility, which includes a selection of transferable solutions from the wider Urban Transport Community.

Apart from the many practical tools and guidelines produced within the Urban Transport Community - including for example the REMEDIO integrated modelling tool for assessing low carbon mobility solutions, the LOCATIONS operational model for low carbon transport plans for cruise destination cities, the MOBILITAS future mobility scenarios for touristic regions, and the REMEDIO participative governance model for roads of medium-sized Mediterranean cities – a lot of valuable experience was gained by testing new transport services and technologies, by improving road infrastructure or by developing new methodologies to engage stakeholders in the sustainable urban mobility planning process. Loures (Portugal) redesigned part of its road network to accommodate cycling and walking. Nice (France) promoted soft mobility through a dedicated app, e-bikes and e-bike infrastructure for both locals and tourists. In Greece, the city of Thessaloniki upgraded one of its main roads to prioritise bus transport and green taxis. Treviso (Italy), Split (Croatia) and the port of Valencia (Spain) introduced bike sharing, while Koper (Slovenia) upgraded its traffic management centre using new Intelligent Transport System solutions. Thespria (Greece) improved and harmonized its existing SUMP, while Durrës (Albania) initiated the process for elaborating its first-generation SUMP. LOCATIONS partners Malaga (Spain),
Lisbon (Portugal), Zadar (Croatia), Trieste (Italy), Ravenna (Italy), Rijeka (Croatia) and Durrës (Albania) each developed a low carbon transport plan to better manage passenger transport from cruise ships.

This is just a limited selection of the many actions that could be potentially replicated by applying one of the described methodologies in this manual. For a more complete and detailed overview – and the contact details of the responsible technical partners - it is recommended to consult the GO SUMP Results Analysis Reports or the MOBILITAS Handbook, which will be made available on the Urban Transport Community section of the Interreg Med website.
Replication methodologies

As described in the introduction, replication is the activity of ‘duplicating, copying, reproducing or repeating’ what has been successfully introduced in other areas or programmes in another territory. This section describes different methodologies that support urban transport practitioners that either want to transfer or adopt innovative sustainable transport measures and strategies. The focus will be on methodologies that support the replication process between peers, and build on the tried-and-tested guidance and processes that have been developed in the framework of other European projects and initiatives such as CIVITAS, Sharing Cities, Cascade or Guidance. Five different exchange formats will be highlighted, including:

» Peer Review
» Mentoring
» Study Visits
» Work Placement
#1 PEER REVIEW

**Introduction**

The peer review methodology implies that a group of experts from different cities working on similar issues evaluates local policies, programmes and practices being implemented in a specific city and gives recommendations on possible areas of improvement. Those making the evaluation are called ‘peers’ or ‘equals’ because they come from backgrounds similar to colleagues whose work is reviewed. A key strength of the process is that – as peers – they can readily understand the goals of their counterparts in the host city, the pressures on them, and the complexity of their environment. As an example for this manual, we will assume that the peer review exercise involves 5 cities, who are each represented by maximum 3 experts and local stakeholders.

**Glossary of terms**

- **BENCHMARK**: a standard to aspire to and a reference against which performance can be measured.
- **EVIDENCE**: the material which peers and city officials across Europe can use to verify whether the key factor is present in the city’s practices or structures.
- **CONTEXT**: factors outside the city’s control that could affect its ability to meet the benchmark.
- **CITY EXPERTS**: City officers/practitioners from participating cities responsible for the implementation of sustainable mobility measures and policies.
- **LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS**: Experts on the thematic area of their peer review visits who actively cooperate with the cities in developing and implementing their sustainable mobility policies. They can be experts from other local or regional administrations, energy service providers, operators, NGOs, universities, research institutes, etc.
- **PEER REVIEW TEAM**: The group of peers participating in a peer review visit. The peer review team is made up of the peers from city administrations (city experts) and local stakeholders. In the context of a modular project, the work of the peer review team could be steered jointly by an appointed thematic leader/expert and the project partner that is responsible for coordinating the replication process.

**Self-assessment report**

The host city writes a critical report:
- describing the city context
- describing its own practices
- assessing its performance against a pre-identified benchmark

**Desk review**

The peers read the city report and complete a ‘desk review’ of it

**Peer learning visit**

The peers meet and interview local stakeholders from the host city. The purpose of the visit is to understand how well the city is implementing its sustainable mobility policies

**Feedback and recommendations**

The peers present their initial findings and recommendations to the host city on the last day of visit. One month after, they deliver a feedback report.
The four steps of the peer review methodology are:

Besides assessing the performance of cities against a specific benchmark, this is also a process of learning and exchange. Peers share their wealth of knowledge with the cities which they visit and review. They take back to their cities new knowledge from the places they visited, strengthening their understanding. This methodology thus offers them an opportunity to share experiences and to reflect on their own work.

The Peer Review Process

The peer review methodology is divided into a sequence of tasks and follows a clear schedule. Both the peer review team and their host city need to follow this sequence carefully, because each of its steps prepares for the next one. We can list them according to their order - before, during and after the peer review visit:

**Before the visit**
- **Tasks for the host city**
  - gathering evidence
  - writing the self-assessment report
  - contacting people to be interviewed,
  - making practical arrangements for the visit
- **Tasks for the peers**
  - understand the benchmark
  - do a desk review of the host city’s self-assessment report

**During the visit**
- **Tasks for the peers**
  - testing evidence through conducting interviews and workshops
  - collating and evaluating the evidence
  - contributing with their experiences during the ‘peer exchange seminar’
  - making a preliminary presentation of findings

**After the visit**
- **Tasks for the peers & the host city**
  - conduct an evaluation of their peer review experience
- **Tasks for the host city**
  - producing a feedback report, including specific recommendations for the host city and practical examples on how other cities are tackling similar problems
Replication methodologies

Before the Peer Review Visit

Understanding the benchmarks
As a first step in preparing for the peer review visit, participants will need to get a clear understanding of the benchmark, its key factors and examples of evidence. In the context of urban mobility, a benchmark could be related to the successful deployment of specific measures or technologies (e.g. introducing access restrictions, parking schemes, Mobility-as-a-Service, ...), the development of adequate infrastructure (e.g. to create better conditions for cycling, electric mobility, public transport, ...) or the implementation of a more comprehensive policy (improving accessibility and road safety, stimulating shared mobility...). Last but not least: a benchmark could also be related to the sustainable urban mobility planning (SUMP) process of a city, or to a specific sub-strategy which focuses on the management of tourist and freight flows, the development of an e-mobility plan or the involvement of stakeholders in the planning process. Ideally, the selected benchmark is presented in connection with a city’s wider SUMP and other relevant measures and policies.

Self-assessment report – host city
Before the peer review visit, the host city prepares a report based on a common template which takes a critical look at its own practices and assesses its performance against the benchmark. Host cities have the opportunity to put the focus on one or several specific initiatives they are implementing. By doing so, the host city can define the focus of the assessment and draw the attention of the visiting cities to these specific topics. The self-assessment report also briefly describes the context in which the local authority operates (national and regional legislation, competences and resources, characteristics of the urban transport system, etc). This report is done under the guidance of a thematic leader/expert and submitted to the peers six weeks before their visit.
**Desk Review**

Peers will carefully read the self-assessment report prepared by the host city, and complete a ‘desk review’ of it. This will serve as a foundation for preparing the peer review visit. Visiting peers should be able to get a general idea on how the host city seems to compare with the benchmark. For each key factor, peers should reflect on:

- the way the city compares with the benchmark;
- whether the report has provided enough evidence to make this assessment;
- questions that need to be asked to find out to what extent the city is really meeting the benchmark.

A common template should be provided to complete the desk review, this can be structured as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key factors</th>
<th>Key factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key factor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Desk review assessment</strong></th>
<th>Your first assessment of how the city’s performance compares against the different key factors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
<td>What is your feeling at this stage, about how close the city has come to the benchmark?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For each key factor: what questions or issues would you like to ask colleagues in the host city, when you meet them? e.g. to clarify or complete the information provided in the self-assessment report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For each key factor: which city staff, stakeholders, interest groups, agencies and others would you wish to interview in the visit, to put these questions to them – to find out if your first impression was correct?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peers need to complete their desk review within two weeks (about one month before the visit) and return it to the thematic leader of their peer review team. All the desk reviews will be collated into one single document. This document will help both the host city and the peers to prepare for the visit.
During the Peer Review Visit

Peer review team

Each peer review team is made up of 15 peers including experts from 5 cities and their invited local stakeholders. The work of the peer review team will be steered jointly by a thematic leader/expert and the project partner that is responsible for coordinating the replication activities.

Programme

The thematic leader will coordinate the visit programme together with each host city. The host city will prepare a draft programme. This will then be refined and amended, to include, as far as possible, the list of people whom peers have identified for interview in their desk review. The final version of the programme should be agreed at least one week before the peer review visit takes place.

Each peer review visit will last for 3 days (preferably Wednesday to Friday) during which peers will assess specific sustainable mobility measures and policies the host city is implementing.

Peers will interview between 15-20 local stakeholders from the host city (staff from local administration, politicians, service providers, NGOs...). As a result of these interviews, the peer review team will provide recommendations to the host city on possible areas of improvement. The last day of the visit will include a 'peer exchange' seminar where all peers will have the opportunity to relate the findings of their assessment to current practices in their own cities.
An outline sample programme of a peer review visit is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00-10.00</td>
<td>Introduction, team building and peers’ briefing</td>
<td>Interviews in parallel</td>
<td>Presentation of initial recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-12.00</td>
<td>Workshops in parallel</td>
<td>Peer exchange seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-13.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00-14.30</td>
<td>Interviews in parallel</td>
<td>Team working on conclusions and recommendations</td>
<td>Peer exchange seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-16.00</td>
<td>Workshops in parallel</td>
<td>Site visit</td>
<td>End of the visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-17.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00-18.00</td>
<td>Debrief session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00-21.00</td>
<td>Team dinner</td>
<td>Team dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the day/evening before the visit, the thematic leader/expert will meet with the host city to jointly go through the details of the visit.

**Conducting interviews and workshops**

Peers will gather evidence and assess the implementation of sustainable urban mobility measures and strategies in the host city by means of interviews, workshops and presentations from key actors of the host city. These actors may include senior managers and politicians, middle managers and experts from the local authority, representatives of external agencies, business and communities within the city. The aim is to obtain evidence on how well the city is implementing their local urban mobility policies compared against particular key factors (benchmark). After having read the self-assessment report produced by the host city, peers already have a good knowledge of the mobility policies in the host city. However, the evidence peers gather in interviews and workshops is crucial to fully understand how policies are implemented and be capable of drawing conclusions and recommendations.

Probably no other skill is as important to the peer review process as the ability to conduct good interviews and workshops. These include putting the respondent at ease, asking questions in an interested manner, noting down the responses without upsetting the conversation flow or giving support without introducing bias.

Be prepared for your interviews and workshops: Before an interview or a workshop, peers should know who they are going to meet and their role/
responsibilities. They should also have a clear idea of the theme of the interview/workshop and have 3-6 questions prepared in advance. Normally in interviews, peers will work in pairs, so one of them will be designated to ask the questions and the other to take notes. In workshops, three or more peers will participate; one of them will be in charge of the introduction and each of them will lead a break-out group. Interviewees and workshop participants must be briefed on the aims of the peer review visit, how long the interview/workshop will last and its structure, and be advised that the review is anonymous. Host cities should take care of briefing them.

Make the interviewee feel comfortable: Before asking the questions it is important to meet and greet the person or people which are interviewed and make them feel comfortable. Peers should also spend a few minutes introducing themselves and explaining the purpose and structure of the interview/workshop. This will help build trust so that the interviewee is as open and honest as possible. Peers should also assure the interviewee/s that any answer or information given in the interview/workshop is confidential – so it will inform the report but will be ‘non-attributable’ to them.

Ask the right questions and in the right manner: The main purpose of the interviews/workshops is to obtain evidence (‘facts’) to help peers to draw conclusions against the benchmark. When formulating questions, peers should keep this in mind and focus on asking high level ‘probing’ questions. The evidence gathered through the interviews can be a factual answer given in reply to a factual question, or an opinion (for example, why/how certain practices are carried out).

---

How to conduct interviews, workshops and presentations

Interviews are with a single person, either an internal or external stakeholder from the host city. Two peers ask a set of prepared questions that will lead into an open semi-structured discussion. These interviews should be timetabled for 50 minutes but may need to be scheduled for 90 minutes if the interviewee is a key actor or if an interpreter needs to be used.

Workshops are interviews with two or more stakeholders. Three or more peers prepare an introduction and ask a series of open questions to the local actors. Depending on the numbers participating, these questions are then discussed either in the whole group or in break out groups, with each break out group being led by a single peer. The ideal number in a break out group is 4 people with a maximum of 6.

Presentations and site visits can also be used to gather evidence. Three or more peers listen to a presentation of a key actor in the host city or are taken to a site visit to see how a specific measure or initiative is implemented. Questions are asked during or at the end of presentations to clarify issues. This is the easiest way of disseminating information to a group of experts; however, it is sometimes difficult to focus on details.
To help prepare the interviews and workshops, here is an overview of the type of questions which are useful to ask:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of question</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th><strong>Example</strong></th>
<th><strong>When to use</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>A question which asks the interviewee to give a broad answer</td>
<td>“Please could you explain how the administration works with the public transport operator?”</td>
<td>Good use as starting questions, allows interviewees to explain or describe areas of their work. Use it frequently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>A question which requires only a single response, e.g. Yes/No/‘x’%</td>
<td>“What proportion of citizens is making use of the car share scheme?”</td>
<td>Good for determining factual information. Do not rely too often on these questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>Used to ensure you have understood what the interviewee has stated</td>
<td>“So my understanding is that you carry out household travel surveys every three years?”</td>
<td>Use to bring together key facts before moving on to another topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probing</td>
<td>Usually a follow-up question to the open one. Seeks to explore deeper a point that the interviewee has mentioned</td>
<td>“You said that the number of cyclists is lower than you predicted, can you explain why this might be?”</td>
<td>Good for helping to understand why something is happening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Used to classify areas of fact</td>
<td>“Please describe as carefully as possible how you ensure mainstreaming of transport accessibility issues in other policy areas.”</td>
<td>Use with caution - similar to open questions, but with a specific, fact based, area you are aiming to explore/determine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show me</td>
<td>This invites the interviewee to provide you with the hard evidence to support their answers</td>
<td>“Show me the energy savings potentials related to this refurbishment programme.”</td>
<td>You can finish an interview or series of questions with show me questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peers should try to avoid questions that are hypothetical (‘what if’), questions that lead the interviewee to an obvious answer, long and multiple questions, or questions that start with ‘Why’ (these tend to make people feel the need to justify the reasons they do things).

Translators/interpreters: In some cities, the interviewees will not be able to communicate in English. In those cases, more time should be dedicated to the interview/workshop to allow enough time for interpretation. The interpreters should attend the team briefings and have a good level of competence or understanding in specific technical areas. Host cities will be responsible for arranging interpretation, if needed.

Recording the answers: The notes peers make during the interview are crucial for the success of the peer review visit. At the end of each interview/workshop, the peers that have participated will review together the notes and decide how to record the evidence they have gathered.

Evidence

The purpose of the visit is to understand how far the host city meets the benchmark. This assessment started during the desk review and is verified during the peer review visit, mainly by questioning practitioners and stakeholders in interviews or workshops, but also by looking at reports and other documentation supplied by the host city.

Recording evidence: As soon as possible after the interview finishes, peers will meet in order to agree on what evidence is and how to interpret it. Peers will record their answers in a reporting database.

Each entry in the database will include:

» The facts of the evidence
» Key factor reference number
» Interview reference number

For each piece of evidence, the peer review team will decide which of the following three categories it belongs to:

| Yes | Performance meets benchmark (defined as achieving the benchmark) |
| Partly | Performance partly meets benchmark (defined as moving towards achieving the benchmark) |
| No | Performance does not meet benchmark (defined as not meeting the benchmark) |
| Inconclusive | Evidence is not sufficient to draw a conclusion |
In addition, peers will have to capture facts (‘evidence’) that give clues about why the city works as it does. Facts can be:

- either qualitative (a description) or quantitative (numbers - either data or estimates)
- what is happening or not happening
- where activity takes place e.g. name of a department, office, institution
- when it happened e.g. current financial year, every year, last year
- why it takes place e.g. political commitment, users’ needs, financial constraints
- how the event happens. e.g. through personal meetings, initiative of individuals, agenda on working group.

Finally, it is important to keep in mind that an answer related to a certain key factor may also provide evidence for other key factors. The more pieces of evidence gathered, the stronger will be the conclusions and recommendations.

Interpreting the evidence: Analysing the evidence from interviews and entering it into the database is a job which peers have to tackle together. Some answers given by the interviewees will convey a clear message. But often they will be ambiguous or inconclusive. Some will contradict one another. With guidance from its thematic leaders, the peer review team will be responsible for reconciling and interpreting this evidence. The goal is to obtain an assessment of each key factor of the benchmark on whether the city has met the benchmark or not. The results from all interviews and workshops will be collected in the team’s database. When all evidence is collected, the peer review team will be able to tell how the city compares to each key factor in the benchmark, which are its areas of strength, relative to the benchmark, and which areas most need improving.

**Drawing conclusions and presenting recommendations**

One of the most important outputs of the visit will be the feedback the host city will receive from the peer review team. This should offer valuable learning to the host city. The results of the peer review experience will provide validated solutions on how to improve sustainable urban mobility measures and strategies. The feedback to the host city will be collected in a short report produced by the peers one month after its visit, but preliminary feedback is given also by the team as its visit draws to a close on Day 3. After finishing interpreting all the evidence from interviews and workshops, the peer review team will meet to draw its conclusions about how the city compares with the benchmark. Peers will deliver an initial summary of key findings and recommendations to decision-makers in the city administration. The scope, format and venue for this feedback session will have been agreed in advance between the host city and the thematic leader/expert. Its audience might be just the relevant director and one or two officials, or it could include other key practitioners and stakeholders. Usually the feedback will be presented by the thematic leader or a peer, with other team members then joining the discussion on the issues it raises.

For city decision-makers, the findings of the peer review visit can be quite challenging and may be politically sensitive, raising questions about the city’s policy choices. Peers will need to plan the feedback session with great care. Their presentation will be better accepted if it gives the right emphasis to areas where the city is doing particularly well, as well as areas where some improvements might be needed. The recommendations should also recognise the particular circumstances and needs of the host city, suggest ‘quick wins’ (things that can
be changed with little investment) and acknowledge those problems and needs that require long term investment and political commitment before progress can be made.

**Peer exchange seminar**

Peers will have the opportunity to share experiences from their own cities by contributing to a one-day seminar which will take place on the last day of the visit. The objective of this seminar is to allow peers to apply the learning of the visit to their own work and provide examples from their own practice in a structured and interactive way.

The peer exchange seminar is aimed at peers participating in the peer review visits and their host. However, the host city will decide whether they open this seminar to relevant staff from the municipality or other stakeholders. All members of the peer review team and host are expected to participate in this event, but presentations will be done on a voluntary basis.

**Programme preparation**

As part of the peer review process, peers will be invited to think about their own practice and how this relates to the benchmark. After reviewing the self-assessment report of the host city, peers will be asked to identify:

» An innovative approach or project from their own work that they could use to illustrate one or more key factors of the benchmark – if possible one that can be transferrable to other cities;

» A particular challenge they are facing with respect to meeting the benchmark. The most relevant experiences will be presented during the peer exchange seminar. To prepare this, peers will be asked to provide information (in the form of a short case study) about their chosen example at least three weeks before the peer review visit. This information will be used to organise the event programme in a coherent fashion. Peers will be encouraged to use these case studies to form the basis of their presentation. At least two weeks before the visit, peers will be given a series of questions to help shape their presentation. Although presentations will be prepared before the visit, it is possible that the content of these may change in the light of the learning taking place during the first two days of the peer review visit.

**Format**

The content of the peer exchange seminar will depend on the examples provided by the peers. Nonetheless, each presentation will contain a similar structure and elements linked to the respective theme of the peer review visit and the local initiatives and projects assessed during the visit. 3-5 peers will give a 10-minute presentation, using the following format:

» Set the context (background on project/practice)
» Which key factor(s) it relates to
» Approach
» Assessment
» What worked as well as constraints
» Challenges ahead
» Future plans
» Success factors and transferability
After the Peer Review Visit

Feedback report

After the visit, the peers compare and agree on their findings and compile a report on the city’s performance against the benchmark, highlighting the city’s key strengths and good practices, and making recommendations on areas of improvement. The report writing will be led and coordinated by the thematic leader, with the input from the other team members. This report will be sent to the host city one month after the visit.

Evaluation of the peer review experience

At the end of the visit, peers will complete an evaluation form to reflect on the peer review experience and the lessons learned. Once the host city receives the final report, they will complete an evaluation, asking local colleagues for comments and feedback on the report and the peer review process in general.

One year after the visit, and as part of the impact monitoring and evaluation of the project, the host city should be asked to deliver a report that evaluates the impact of the peer review visit. The main purpose of this impact report is to assess the take-up of the peers’ recommendations into current energy policies in the host city.
Introduction

Mentoring visits are meant to assist with the process of passing on experience and knowledge and exchanging good practices between the ‘experienced’ and ‘learning’ partners. The activity involves a mentoring partnership between project partners, with the ‘experienced’ partners acting as the mentors and the ‘learning’ partner as the mentee.

Mentoring can be described as a host city receiving a visit by one or two ‘mentors’ from one to two other cities. Based on detailed request for advice on specific projects/initiatives from the mentee, the mentors prepare and spend around two to three days in the city to advise and give feedback to city officials (technical experts, politicians and policy makers) involved in the area of focus.

Mentoring is a positive relationship based upon mutual benefit. Some mentoring relationships benefit from the familiarity of shared concerns; others benefit from differences in perspective and others from the combined achievement of developing new, innovative solutions to problems.

The mentoring visits aim to provide the opportunity for the mentor and mentee to together build an understanding of the issues, situations and challenges and then to exchange and explore new ideas, options and solutions that will help the hosts in their work. The visits also aim to provide the mentors with new enriching perspectives and experiences that will be beneficial in their own professional role.

The sections below outline the expectations from mentees and mentors respectively, along with some pointers that might be useful when preparing the visit.

Expectations from mentees

The mentees are the natural beneficiaries of this visit, but some care needs to be taken to maximise the benefits of a mentoring visit for all participants. The mentee’s role in general is to be proactive in identifying his/her needs, questioning processes and methodologies, seeking answers and solutions to specific problems and issues faced by their city. Information on these issues should be submitted to the mentors (before the visit) in the form of a detailed programme, as well as a document describing the current situation and practice.

Take advantage of the mentor’s knowledge and experience but do not hold back from challenging them in a constructive way where necessary; this can make the relationship healthy and stimulating.

At the end of the visit, a concrete action plan should be developed describing the next steps to improve local initiatives and projects.
Activities for the mentees

The checklist below is intended to help the mentees in the planning and implementation of the hosted visit:

- **8 weeks**
  - Prepare a travel and accommodation guide to send to the participants of the visit, with brief information on arrival and logistics in the host city. Also attach a draft agenda for the visit. Book venues and plan for the logistics ahead of time.

- **5/-7 weeks**
  - Take care of the logistics of the meeting, booking venues, dinners, interpreters etc.

- **4 weeks**
  - It is important to be as thorough and specific as possible about the topics/initiatives/projects on which advice is needed. To achieve this, the mentees should prepare a programme for the visit describing the initiatives/projects the visit will focus on, and submit this to the mentors. Remember to be as thorough and detailed as possible in the programme, while keeping in mind the time constraints of the mentors. Try to keep it to three to five pages. Maps and other relevant documentation can be attached as annexes. Send the programme to the mentor.

- **3 weeks**
  - Organise the information-gathering sessions. Identify which people (officials, politicians, stakeholders) the mentors should meet to better understand the problem and the local situation. If the project is already in place, it is a good idea to organise site-visits.

- **2 weeks**
  - Make sure that all colleagues who are going to participate in the mentoring visit activities are well-informed about the aim and objectives of the mentoring visit. It is better to organise an internal info session for this purpose.

- **1 week**
  - The mentees respond to the two to three questions submitted by the mentors.

  - Organise a summary session, planned for the last day of the visit, where the mentors will present their recommendations. Invite the relevant audience.

  - Remember that the mentors are not going to provide ‘tailor-made’ solutions. They will help with their experience and knowledge to find an appropriate solution in a given context.

  - Therefore make sure that at the end of the visit there will be a discussion session with the mentors, during which the conclusions of the visit will be summed up, and a realistic action plan will be drafted.
Replication methodologies

Prepare a list of participants; get the list signed by everyone at the start of the visit.

The main city staff and officials involved in the mentoring visit should receive an evaluation form that is prepared in advance.

The mentees are expected to maintain a brief log of communications. The log will include:

- signed list of participants
- the agenda
- presentations
- photos
- summary of conclusions drawn at the end of the visit

Evaluation forms and communication logs should be returned to the thematic leader/expert and the project partner that is responsible for coordinating the replication activities.

Expectations from mentors

Although a mentoring relationship is usually focused on the mentor assisting the mentee, there are many benefits for the mentor including the development of their own skills, an opportunity to reflect on issues raised and to address their own thinking and organisational methods to make improvements in their work. Furthermore, the mentors can directly benefit from the expertise of other mentors and the thematic experts in their interactions.

The mentor’s general role is to support, develop, stimulate and challenge the mentee to explore new ideas and solutions. A mentor should ask questions, while sharing experience and knowledge and providing encouragement. A mentor will also need to be a good listener. The first step to a good mentoring partnership is to understand the mentee’s point of view.

Mentees should be challenged constructively. The focus should be on providing advice and guidance rather than pre-defined answers and prescriptive solutions. Sometimes a few practical pointers can produce dramatic improvements.
**Activities for the mentors and thematic experts**

The checklist below is intended to help the mentors maximise the benefit to all participants in their preparation for, and participation in the visit:

- **7 weeks**
  - The host city provides guidance on travel and accommodation to the mentor.

- **3 weeks**
  - It is important for mentors to be as prepared as possible for participation in the visit and the best place to start is to understand what the mentee’s needs and aspirations are. Therefore, the mentees will submit a detailed programme outlining the issues/projects to be focused on during the visit to all participants, as well as a document describing their expectations and the current situation and practice in their city. Mentors are expected to carefully read these documents and submit two to three questions/requests per delegation regarding the areas of focus to the host. These could be requests for further information on specific aspects or perhaps official document/plans related to the area of focus. Define which people have to be involved on the side of the host city in order to gather relevant information.

- **2 weeks**
  - Mentors provide the mentees with a detailed information sheet on their relevant expertise and activities, and an overview of their mentoring strategy describing what kind of information they would like to receive/gather during the mentoring visit, which persons they would like to meet, how they would like to transfer their experience (i.e. power point presentation, interactive discussion) etc.

- **1 week**
  - Preparation of presentations on the mentoring topics based on the experience and current practices.

- **Day 1 & 2**
  - Information gathering in the host city (discussion with key personnel, site visits), internal discussions in the mentoring group on the mentoring strategy to follow during the visit (beginning of the visit) as well as on recommendations (after the end of the gathering information phase), presentations for transferring their own experience to the host city.

- **Final day**
  - Present preliminary findings and recommendations to the host city. Assist the city to draft a realistic action plan.

- **+1 week**
  - Based on the presentation and summary session discussions, a short report with recommendations from the mentor should be sent to the host city.
#3 STUDY VISITS

**Introduction**

Study visits are successful knowledge transfer schemes which allow site visitors to interact with key local stakeholders and see how projects are implemented in reality. During the study visit, the visitors (officers, politicians, other stakeholders) are able to learn from the host city through short presentations, site visits and peer-to-peer discussions.

The study visit should be a dynamic and interactive 1.5 day event that provides participants with a better overview of local projects and initiatives.

**Expectations from hosts**

One of the main advantages of a study visit is the opportunity for an interactive and direct exchange of experiences between hosts and visitors. Combine a balance of presentations, site visits and discussions to get the most of out the visit.

While case studies and presentations usually give the impression of a ‘perfect world’, the audience is often more interested in learning about the problems and barriers encountered and how they were overcome.

The study visit should last 1.5 day; this is enough time for visitors and hosts to get to know each other and to exchange knowledge and experiences. Enough time should be devoted to introductions, explaining everybody’s tasks and responsibilities in his/her city.

In case of site visits and meetings in different locations, make sure there’s enough time to get from one site to another (offer transport if necessary), and allow enough time for the visits themselves.

Hosts should keep in mind that not all participants will be equally competent or comfortable in English. Speakers should set an example by using simple, clear language and if applicable, allow enough time for interpretation.
Activities for the hosts:
The checklist below will help the hosts in the planning and execution of the visit:

- Prepare a travel and accommodation guide to send to participants, with brief information on arrival and logistics in the host city (maps, directions, list of hotels, etc.). Also attach an agenda for the visit. Don’t forget to include a summary session at the end of the visit during which the hosts and visitors can discuss the main outcomes of the visit. Try to provide enough information about the content of the different presentations/site visits included in the agenda as well as practical information (maps, directions, etc.). Also include the name and contact details of a local representative. Book venues and plan for the logistics ahead of time.

- Take care of the meeting logistics, book venues, dinners, interpreters, etc. Remember that you have to host a dinner for the visitors.

- You will receive three to five questions per delegation. Try to adapt your activities in a way that will answer these questions. A question and answer session at the end of each visit is essential.

- A city representative should accompany participants throughout the duration of the study visit, facilitate the visit, answer questions, etc.

- Prepare a list of participants; get the list signed by everyone at the start of visit.

- At the end of the visit, participants may need to rush to get their train or flight back home. However, it is very important to have a summary session at the end of the visit. During this session, the hosts and visitors will have the opportunity to discuss the outcomes of the visit, the lessons learnt and how to use the knowledge gained to further improve existing projects in their home cities and/or to initiate new ones.

- Evaluation forms should be filled-in by the main city staff and officials participating in the study visit.

- The host city or organising partner should compile a feedback report and brief log of communications for general project reporting purposes. This log may include:
  - signed list of participants
  - the agenda
  - presentations
  - photos
  - summary session notes
The working day during a study visit can be rather long and exhausting; plan the agenda so there is enough time for breaks and refreshments to allow for informal discussions and try not to finish too late.

Although the visitors are the main beneficiaries, the visit can be beneficial for the host city as well. The visitors bring with them their experiences and new ideas that could help to further improve your projects/initiatives. Thus, visitors should be encouraged to ask questions and share their knowledge and experience.

Expectations from visitors

The study visit can be beneficial for both municipal staff and politicians; cities may also decide to bring along local stakeholders (managers of public transport operators, retailer associations, etc.).

Participants should preferably be decision makers or staff who can use the knowledge gained to change working patterns in their own city. Participants should be experts in the field; if their command of English is not good, consider bringing along an interpreter or someone who can translate.

Finally, study visits should be interactive; so be ready to ask questions, discuss and share knowledge with your hosts, as well as make recommendations and suggestions for improvements.
Introduction

Work shadowing is a training technique that involves spending a period of time with an expert working in the same field, observing what he or she does in his or her professional role. The aim is to facilitate a transfer of knowledge and expertise, to provide an opportunity to see first-hand how things are done elsewhere, and to provide inspiration and new ideas for ways of working.

During the work shadowing placement, the visiting ‘learning’ partner representative(s) will act as observer(s), and an ‘experienced’ partner representative(s) will function as demonstrator(s). However, this doesn’t always mean that visitors are less ‘experienced’ than hosts, as in many cases, work shadowing could take place between two ‘experienced’ cities that just want to share knowledge, experiences and ways of working.

A work shadowing visit typically involves one host and one visiting city (visitor), with one to two representatives from each city taking on the role of demonstrator and observer respectively, and will last up to three days.

Expectations from visitors

A city is allowed to send one to two people per visit. Choose wisely: focus on a specific area/issue and send a person who can use the new insight in his/her professional role.

Consider potential language barriers: if the visitors and hosts don’t speak the same language, an interpreter should be arranged.

Finally, work shadowing visits should be interactive; so be ready to ask, discuss and share knowledge with your hosts. Moreover, don’t hesitate to make comments on their way of working, as well as recommendations and suggestions for improvements.

The checklist below is intended to help the visitors in the organisation of the visit:

- It is important to be as thorough and specific as possible about the initiatives/projects visitors need help with. To achieve this, they should prepare a document outlining professional challenges and learning objectives and submit this to the hosts. Remember to be as thorough and detailed as possible, while keeping in mind the time constraints of the hosts. Try to keep it to three to five pages. If possible, include a short CV in English.

- Visitors should receive a travel and accommodation guide from the host city and book their flight and accommodation.
Expectations from hosts

Although the work shadowing is usually focused on the host assisting the visitor, there are many benefits for the host including development of their own skills; an opportunity to reflect on issues raised; and to address their own thinking and organisational methods to make improvements to his or her way of working.

A host will need to be a good listener. The first step to a good partnership is to understand the visitors' point of view and the challenges he/she is facing.

The checklist below is intended to help the hosts organising the visit:

- Prepare a list of participants; get the list signed by everyone at the start of visit.
- Take advantage of the hosts' experience. Ask questions, ask for more information, explore new ideas and ways of working in your home city. Try to get as much as possible from the visit. Don't forget to take photos!
- Compile a feedback report with feedback from the host city and send it to the project partner that is responsible for coordinating the replication activities.

Prepare yourself for the visit. First of all try to understand the visitors' needs and aspirations. The visitors will send you a document outlining the issues/projects they need help with and their learning objectives. Use this document to tailor the programme of the visit to their needs as much as possible. Send the programme to the visitors.

Provide input to the draft feedback report prepared by the visitor.

Try to facilitate the visit. Answer questions, describe clearly and thoroughly your role and way of working, help the visitors to explore new ways of working suitable for their city. Remember to take advantage of the visitors' experience and ask for recommendations to improve your own ways of working.

Prepare a travel and accommodation guide to send to the visitors, with brief information on arrival and logistics in the host city (maps, directions, list of hotels, etc.).
Inspiring replication activities from the Interreg Med Urban Transport Community

**LOCATIONS: Supporting the roll-out of Low Carbon Transport and Mobility Plans**

LOCATIONS – an Interreg Med project with a specific focus on replication-supported local public administrations in drafting low-carbon transport and mobility plans (LCTPs), i.e. dedicated sectoral plans focusing on specific passengers and freight flows generated by cruise tourism, to be developed in the wider framework of other local strategic spatial, energy and transport/mobility plans.

The project was based on strong local networks of institutional actors (e.g. local authorities, port authorities, regional/county authorities) joining forces to tackle mobility issues in a coordinated effort by engaging local actors, business communities, service providers, cruise companies, passengers, etc., and by applying a common operational methodology based on the approach used for the development of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans.

LOCATIONS consisted of two different phases: the first phase focused on the development and testing of the methodology, while the second phase was dedicated to capitalisation and replication activities.

During the first phase of the project, a sound operational model - jointly developed by a consortium of technical partners, local and port authorities from five MED-ETC countries (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Croatia, Albania) – was applied to produce a set of seven LCTPs in as many cruise-destination cities (Trieste and Ravenna, Malaga, Lisbon, Rijeka and Zadar, Durres).

The second phase had a double focus. On the one hand, it supported LCTPs’ implementation at local level, investigating encountered difficulties and identifying finding suitable options, often including financing solutions. On
the other hand, it triggered a replication procedure to develop new LCTPs, capitalizing on experience and materials developed during the testing phase.

A ‘transfer package’ was developed, comprising the operational model and its practical implementation in the seven LCTPs. It included a set of modular packages describing technical measures and solutions for producing new LCTPs, and practical tips and suggestions from previous LCTP implementation experiences.

LOCATIONS’ technical partners, supported by institutional partners, developed two complementary approaches: in the same five MED-ETC countries, they selected five new cruise-destination port cities (one per country) and directly followed the development of new LCTPs there. In six new MED-ETC countries, experienced technical organizations were selected which – assisted by LOCATION’s knowledge and expertise and advised by project partners - produced six new LCTPs in their respective countries.

Additional replication cities were selected in the project partners’ countries, taking into account criteria such as cruise-related passengers and freight flows affecting the area and related impacts on local transport systems, and the availability of a strong local networks of institutions committed and prepared to support the process.

Technical organizations supporting the replication process were selected through a transparent procedure based on their specific expertise, receiving significant capacity building services and ongoing support throughout the process to ensure a qualitative and satisfactory implementation of the LOCATIONS approach. This also allowed to gather significant feedback on the application of the methodology in new environments. Each new city and replicating organization applying the methodology in their territory signed an official cooperation agreement with LOCATIONS’ partners, defining purpose, timing, respective commitments and obligations, and expected results.

The strong commitment of LOCATIONS to supporting the roll-out of LCTPS was demonstrated by the fact 20% of the project budget was reserved for replication activities. Moreover, the replication process allowed project partners to further test, apply and validate the methodology and adapt it to a wider range of specific local contexts. For more information, please visit https://locations.interreg-med.eu/