TRAM Project

Towards new Regional Action plans for sustainable urban Mobility

Index Number: PGI00208

Marche Region Action Plan

ENGLISH EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

March 2019

General information

Project: **TRAM**

Partner organisation: Marche Region

Country: Italy

NUTS2 region: Marche Region

Contact person:

Team Leader Andrea Pellei , email: andrea.pellei@regione.marche.it

Raffaella Triponsi, email: raffaella.triponsi@regione.marche.it ,   tel.:   +39   071 806 3823

Website: https://www.interregeurope.eu/tram/

Facebook: @InterregEuropeTRAM

Twitter: @europaTram

Policy context

The Action Plan aims to impact: ☑ Investment for Growth and Jobs programme

☐ European Territorial Cooperation programme

☐ Other regional development policy instrument

Name of the policy instrument addressed:

Marche Region Growth & Jobs ERDF Regional Operational Programme 2014/2020 PRIORITY AXIS 4 "Supporting the shift towards a low carbon economy in all sectors", Investment Priority 4.e "Promoting low - carbon strategies for all types of territories, in particular for urban areas, including the promotion of sustain-able multimodal urban mobility"

Introduction

This document is the English Executive summary of the Action Plan delivered by PP1 – Marche Region. The PP1 policy instrument targeted by the TRAM Project is the Marche Region Growth & Jobs ERDF Regional Operational Programme 2014/2020 PRIORITY AXIS 4.

The present executive summary comprises two sections. *Section 1* briefly reports the methodology used to define the actions of the Action Plan. *Section 2* describes the actions using the template made available by the INTERREG Joint-Secretariat.

The full Action Plan is available in Italian. Further information, among which the full Action Plan, can be found in the TRAM Project web site https://www.interregeurope.eu/tram/

Section 1. The methodology executive summary

The Interregional Team of Regional Experts (ITRE) Panel defined the methodological guidelines which are available on TRAM website. The methodological guidelines aimed at defining a structured and standardized approach – scientifically grounded – to help the different project partners (PP) in the learning process linked to the "exchange of experience" activities of the TRAM Project.

The exchange of experience activities included: 1. The International Thematic Workshops (ITWs) design and documentation; 2. The Study Visits (SVs) design and documentation; 3. The Good Practice (GPs) Templates; 4. The conduction of the Local Stakeholder Groups (LSGs); 5. The main criteria to assess and define the Best Practices (BPs) to be implemented in the action plan of each PP; 6. The Peer-reviewed Workshops (PRWs) design and documentation.

Each PP had a certain degree of flexibility in adapting each activity to the local context. The flexible elements are described in the methodological guidelines.

This section briefly describes how the learning process was structured in the PP1 process towards the definition of the Action Plan. The learning process was structured in five steps. Further information about each step can be found in the ITRE methodological guidelines and in the PP1 presentation at the PRW held in Ancona.

Step 1 performed the "Gap Analysis" which aimed at defining the lively issues associated to the policy instrument linked to the TRAM Project. The lively issues started from the definition of the initial issues – as defined in the original Application Form – that were further detailed following the exchange of experience activities in the TRAM Project. In addition, the lively issues were ranked in case it was needed to narrow down the list of interesting GPs. PP1 identified six lively issues, referring to the three thematic areas of TRAM Project.

*Table 1. The lively issues. *Priority rank in decreasing importance: 1. critical; 2. important; 3. useful*

TRAM Theme	Issue	Priority*
Policy	1. Complementary measures (e.g. intermodality) to make public transport more competitive	Important
Policy	2. Actions to increase commercial speed of public transport	Useful
ITS	3. ITS development and regulatory framework to define public tender.	Important
ITS/Low Carbon	4. Additional measures, beside charging infrastructure, to promote eMobility.	Important
Policy	5. Criteria and indicators to assess SUMP	Important
Policy	6. Inputs to the Regional cycling mobility plan	Critical

Step 2 aimed at identifying those GPs which could have contributed to solve one or more of the above-mentioned issues. PP1 identified 4 GPs that could have given a contribution to the 5 lively issues. A lively issue[1] was not covered by any of the GPs, so it was discarded.

Table 2. The link between GPs and lively issues. Lively issues are sorted for a convenient lay-out

Issue 6	Issue 1	Issue 3	Issue 2	Issue 4
-	-	11. Travel card of Andalusia	-	
13. Cycling Plan of Andalusia	-	-	-	
-	-	-	17. Electric mini-buses in Cordoba	
-	-	-	-	39. Pony – car sharing system

---

1   The identification of criteria and indicators to assess SUMP.

Step 3 aimed at writing down the proposals about how to implement the GPs (or a part of them). The proposals – for each PP - came from the interaction between the PP, the ITRE Panel, and the LSG.

Step 4 aimed at evaluating each proposal – through structured dialogue techniques conducted by the ITRE Expert - according to the following phases: 1. Defining the contribution to the relevant lively issues; 2. Defining the overall sustainable impact; 3. Defining the most relevant barriers to be considered; 4. Defining the most relevant strategies to achieve an effective implementation; 5. Defining the specific actions to develop the strategies. The interaction with the LSG group has been guaranteed by the following two stages:

- First stage: individual stakeholders' assessment by filling a specific questionnaire defined by the ITRE expert;

- Second stage: a common evaluation, carried out during a LSG meeting and facilitated by the ITRE Expert, which focused at discussing the most diverging evaluations as resulting from the individual questionnaires.

The collective debate held during the LSG workshop was able to sum up a common position about all the diverging evaluations, so the ITRE Expert was able to deliver the results as in Table 3.

Table 3. The visual representation of the final evaluation of the four proposals, as resulting from the work done in Step 3 and Step 4. Detailed information about each evaluation are presented in the full Italian version of the AP.

🟢🟢 Very positive   🟢 Positive   🟡 Warning   🔴 Negative   ❓ Not defined

Proposal	Sustainability assessment			Objectives					Barriers
	Environm	Economic	Social	ITS	Commercial speed	Intermodality	Cycling	E-mobility	
				Important	Useful	Important	**Priority**	Important	
E-ticket	🟢	🟢	🟡	🟢	🟢	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	🚦
Regional cycling plan	🟢🟢	🟢	🟡	n.d.	n.d.	🟢	🟢🟢	n.d.	🚦
Electric mini-buses	🟢🟢	🟡	🟢	n.d.	🟢🟢	n.d.	n.d.	🟢🟢	🚦
Electric car-sharing	🟢	🟡	🟢	🟢	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	🟢🟢	🚦

Step 5 framed the four proposals in terms of the two actions presented in the LP Action Plan. Three main criteria were followed to define the two actions from the proposals. First, each action had to be framed within the scope of TRAM project. TRAM project aims at strengthening the urban mobility policymaking process and at improving the institutional capability to adopt innovative mobility solutions. Considering such premises, actions do not focus on promoting a specific technology or technical solutions, but they aim at stressing the institutional innovative outcome. Second, each action had to be framed within the timeframe of TRAM project second phase, lasting two years. Therefore, actions need to develop measurable policy outcomes within two years, although those actions are not required to be finalized in that time frame. Third, an action is likely to be more effective if it is able to leverage on other related ongoing regional policies. TRAM project does not include enough financial funds to develop new technologies or the widespread diffusion of technological applications. A strategy was therefore to guarantee an effective implementation of TRAM actions making a clear link with other plans which might gather a benefit from the TRAM experience.

Following these three criteria, the action plan has identified two actions which resemble the four proposals. Action 1 focuses on the development of e-ticket system, almost fully overlapping with the first proposal. Action 2 focuses on the policy innovation required to promote multimodal electric mobility, summarizing some policy conclusions coming from the other three proposals, each of them partially dealing with electric mobility issues in connection with a specific means of transport. The next section presents the two actions in details.

Section 2. The Action Plan

The Action Plan includes the two actions which finalize the learning process developed through the exchange of experience activities promoted by TRAM Project. Each action aims at improving the policy instrument of the TRAM project, giving evidence of the institutional learning outcome which may take place, for example, in the form of new objectives, indicators, targets, governance models, organizational and management routines, allocation of funds.

The coherence between the identified actions and the TRAM exchange of experience activities is guaranteed by the methodological guidelines, followed by PP1, which explicitly link all the different phases of the process, starting from the GAP analysis and showing the process ending with the description of the final actions.

As already explained, an action represents one or more proposals which has been adapted to fit with the scope, aim, and timeframe of the TRAM Project. The action is therefore a way to build an institutional environment – through the designed policy instrument - which creates the positive conditions to implement one or more proposals.

In PP1 Action Plan, action 1 focuses on the e-ticketing system with a directly link to the first proposal as evaluated by the LSG. Action 2 links different parts of the other three proposals, each focusing on the specific need for electrification of three different means of transport. Actions 2 sums up the common elements of the different proposals, providing the policy framework to encourage the widespread diffusion of electric mobility, leveraging the ongoing regional eMobility ReMa Plan.

The Action Plan defines a monitoring system for each action. The monitoring system includes the definition of measurable outcomes, and deliverables. Those monitoring objects can refer to the process – in terms of changes to the policy/organizational aspects – or to the outcome

– in terms of impacts on the relevant mobility patterns. Both monitoring approaches take place in the definition of each action.

Action 1. Development of the e-ticket system

The background

Marche Region has already started the development of the e-ticket system as a tool to improve the attractiveness of the public transport. The experience shared with the Andalucía Partner has been very useful to understand that the attractiveness of the e-ticket system depends on the capability to offer a unique and integrated access, and on a deep knowledge of the need of the different public transport users, so that the development of the e-ticket system needs to be tailored keeping in mind who is going to use it. The discussion about E-ticket solutions held in the ITW in Ancona pointed out that e-ticket system shall always be seen as a tool to better the governance of the urban mobility, so it is important that e-ticket systems are able to provide data to the public authorities which need to develop a governance system to manage such information. These insights need to be taken in account since the publication of the technical guidelines for the definition of the IT infrastructure.

Actions to be developed.

The proposed action includes the following measures to be implemented:

1. The technical guidelines for the e-ticket system must require the use of a communication technology that is standardized and used by a wide audience of potential users. The use of the Near Field Communication (NFC) technology is seen as a plus, although other solutions might take the place;

2. The technical guidelines and the call for tender must require the interoperability and accessibility of the E-ticket system, so that public authorities can access useful data for mobility planning;

3. The IT-system must be modular, so that other public institutions might join other

services in the future (especially in the field of mobility);

4. The social assessment shall be evaluated together with relevant stakeholders to avoid that the e-ticket system might reduce the accessibility to public transport for specific segments of population (e.g. elderly people);

5. A stakeholder table with touristic stakeholder will be used to evaluate how the e-ticket system can become attractive for tourists, and how it might promote touristic attractiveness of less-popular destinations

Justification of the action. The e-ticket system shall not be seen simply as a technical solution, but it needs to be built with a strategic design which keeps in mind the need of the potential users, and the contribution to other regional policies (in this case touristic development and social inclusion). Overall speaking, the proposed measures shall guarantee that the e-ticket system will be accessible and will be evaluated by several angles and perspectives, enhancing the possibility to gather the potential positive impacts on all the dimensions of sustainability.

Implementation. The specific actions to be implemented have been already described, and the further details are presented in the timeframe section.

Effects of the action. The main effect of the action is to guarantee that the future e-ticket system is developed keeping in mind the different needs of the specific stakeholders. In this case, the specific stakeholders are: i. the public authorities which manage urban mobility policies and solutions; ii. The tourist stakeholders which can see the potential benefits from having an easy-to-access public transport network; iii. the weak social group suffering of a potential digital divide which may experience e-ticket system as a barrier. Finally, the dematerialization of the public transport ticket can be seen as a symbolic measure towards the dematerialization of disposable goods, such as a single-way ticket.

Case of non-actions. Two main risks might occur. First, the e-ticket system might be developed in closed and bounded IT-infrastructures and ecosystems which may not guarantee accessibility from the potential users and may limit the capability of public authorities to use the data for the governance of the sector. Second, the risk is to develop a

system without considering the need of the tourist policies and the needs of the weak social groups, so that the e-ticket system will create a new barrier to the use of public transport, and will represent a lost chance to promote a more inclusive, sustainable, and diffuse tourist development.

Main actors

Main actors are Marche Region, Trenitalia, and the public transport companies. Tourism stakeholders and the Regional social Department are expected to be engaged as well to support the evaluation of the e-ticket system.

Time-frame

The time-frame includes the following measurable indicators and steps:

Approval of technical guidelines and the call for tenders	
Year: 2019	Monitoring Logic: YES/NO
This step tracks whether the technical guidelines and the call for tenders have been approved. It is the first step towards the development of the e-ticket system.	

Developing of the IT-platform	
Year: 2019	Monitoring Logic: Completed/Ongoing/Not started
This step tracks the development of the IT system. It is expected to be concluded in 2019.	

Testing Phase of the E-ticket system	
Year: 2019-2020	Monitoring Logic: Completed/Ongoing/Not started
This step will track the evolution of the testing Phase.	

Setting of the working group with tourist stakeholder	
Year: 2019-2020	Monitoring Logic: NO/YES
This step will track the formal constitution of a stakeholder group which is going to	

evaluate the e-ticket system attractiveness for tourists and the potential impact on tourist development. It will be mentioned the participating stakeholder and the relevant deliverables produced by the group

Setting of the working group with the Regional Social Department	
Year: 2019-2020	Monitoring Logic: NO/YES
This step will track the opening of a communication channel with the Regional Social Department in order to evaluate the impacts of the E-ticket system for specific social groups. It will be mentioned the participating stakeholder and the relevant deliverables produced by the collaboration	

In addition, the following quantitative indicators are expected to be tracked:

Indicators	2019	2020
Number of e-ticket trips (by typology of ticket)		V
Quota of population reached by the e-ticket system (calculated on the number of residents in municipalities where it is possible to buy a transport service via e-ticket)		V
Quota of population (by socioeconomic profile) owning a smart card for e-ticket		V

Indicator 3 might provide additional data about the use of e-ticket by specific social groups.

Cost and funding

The cost of the action is estimated around 1.75 million Euro, and funded by POR FESR, action 14.2.2 – "Purchase of E-ticket machines and devices".

Action 2. Development of multi-modal electric mobility

The background

Marche Region has already approved a main plan to foster the development of electric mobility (the eMobility ReMa Plan). The exchange of experience activities performed in the TRAM project has proven being a useful context to share experiences and main issues with the other partners which showed specific electric mobility measures for the different means of transport. The experiences showed both common issues – such as the adequate electric infrastructures – and specific issues to be taken into account to develop effective policies.

The PP experiences especially refer to the Andalucía bike plan (ID n.13), to the development of e-buses in Cordoba (ID n.17), and to the development of e-car-sharing in Cluj (ID n.39). The following actions come from the common experience gathered by the PP for each of these practices. These experiences add relevant knowledge to the ongoing eMobility ReMa Plan.

Action to be developed.

The action includes three specific measures which deserve a clear focus in the regional plan for electric mobility:

- Measure A – to develop a common regional and integrated charging infrastructure. The aim of the first measure is to provide a critical mass of charging points which enable the demand of electric mobility. The regional infrastructure will be designated according to the needs of 3 different means of transport: electric bike (with focus on bike-sharing urban systems), electric buses (focusing on mini e-buses running in historical city centres), and electric cars (focusing on car-sharing). The infrastructure will allow the development of the different means of transport;

- Measure B – support to electric mobility through preferential parking and circulation schemes and rules (e.g. access to preferential lanes, or limited traffic zones). The measure focuses on non-financing incentives which make electric mobility more attractive than the traditional vehicles;

- Measure C – mobility management measures focusing on electric vehicles. The experiences of other partners showed that transition to electric mobility might require new mobility habits which need a support from local authorities. Mobility managers are the best positioned experts and structures to support users towards electric mobility.

Justification of the action.

As known, the development of electric mobility faces several technological, economical, and organizational barriers which require effective public policies to be overcome. The above-identified three measures are designed to address the main barriers as discussed in the local stakeholder group. Measure A focuses on building the essential electric infrastructure which enables the demand for electric mobility. The measure B builds private incentives to use e-mobility vehicles, encouraging the competitiveness of e-vehicles in respect to conventional ones. In some cases, these incentives might also compensate - or at least reduce - the disadvantage coming from the high up-front costs for the purchase of an e-vehicles. The measure C focuses on the mobility management measures which help users to shift towards the electric mobility.

Implementation of the action.

The development of the electric charging infrastructure relies over the development of both public- and private-owned (but open to public) charging points. The preferential private-owned places are those important mobility and traffic attractors (such as shopping mall), or high-value tourist destinations, with the aim of developing more sustainable mobility patterns associated to tourism.

The development of the measure B focuses on traffic limited zone, free access on parking-paid areas, and tax property exemption for e-infrastructures. The development of the mobility management measures (measure C) will focus on the development of informative systems which make easier to access e-charging points, and on the setting up of an Eco-point

scheme which will reward more sustainable mobility habits, among which the use of electric vehicles.

The implementation takes place in three main phases. Phase one develops a basic e-mobility network which includes 44 charging points – some of them also accessible by bikes - in the main municipalities. Phase two spreads the charging network. Phase three completes the charging network and adds both co-financing and demand-side measures, focusing on electric buses and electric car-sharing systems.

A special attention will be given to electric bikes. Available charging points for e-bikes will be placed along the main cycling networks and near to intermodality hubs. The charging points will be complemented by other services for cyclists (e.g. Maintenance points).

Case of no actions

Only a hundred e-vehicle circulate at the regional level at the time being, about 0.01% of the total number. At the same time, about 13% of cars belong to Euro 0 and Euro 1, the worst emission standard classes. Similar figures exist about commercial vehicles and buses. Without a clear and effective strategy, electric mobility is expected to slowly increase, giving the bottleneck of the lack of an adequate infrastructure, the risk of having non-standardized charging plugs, and the high upfront cost in the purchase of an e-vehicle. The proposed actions aim at increasing the speed of the transition and encourage the reach of a critical mass which will enable the quick development of the electric mobility market.

Main actors

Main actors are the region and the local authorities. In the second phase, the involvement of relevant traffic generators (e.g. shopping mall or oil stations) will be essential to promote an effective charging infrastructure which includes charging plugs in high attractors of traffic.

Time frame and monitoring

The timeframe includes three main phases which will be developed in the next two years. In 2019, the focus is on the initial diffusion of the electric network - including 22 charging stations including 44 charging plugs in the main regional cities. The charging stations can be

used also to charge e-bikes. Meanwhile, the project aims at building the IT infrastructure needed to manage the system and to develop further applications for users. Afterwards, the focus shifts on financing the diffusion of the charging infrastructures, the mobility management measures, and the co-funding of e-vehicles (electric minibuses and electric car sharing as first options). For the bike mobility, the plan focuses on providing charging stations in the main public transport hubs and alongside the main regional cycling network, where maintenance points will be set.

The following indicators are going to be used to monitor the progress of the action:

Development of the IT system to manage the charging points	
Year: 2019	Monitoring logics: No/Ongoing/Completed
This step tracks the development of the IT system which will manage the e-charging network and access.	

Development of the initial e-charging network	
Year: 2019	Monitoring logics: No/Ongoing/Completed.
This step tracks the finalization of the basic e-charging network and its operational status.	

Consolidation of the regional e-charging network	
Year: 2020	Monitoring logics: No/Ongoing/Completed
This step tracks the final consolidation of the regional e-charging network which includes 350 charging infrastructures at the regional level.	

In addition, the following quantitative indicators are expected to be tracked:

Indicators	2019	2020
Financial		
Allocated funds (In EUR)	V	V
Infrastructural		
Nr. of running e-charging infrastructures.	V	V
Nr. of running e-charging points.	V	V
Nr. of e-mobility car-sharing points	V	V
Nr. of municipalities with at least a e-charging infrastructure.	V	V
Market oriented		
Electric circulating vehicles (by typology)	V	V
Vett*km of e-mobility (by means of transport)		V
Nr. of municipalities with at least a preferential treatment for e-mobility (e.g. parking rules, LTZ access, preferential lanes)		V
% of electric buses (at regional level)		V

Cost and funding

The e-mobility plan is funded with both national and European funds for an overall value of 4.6 million EUR. European funds come from ERDF Regional Operational Programme 2014/2020 action 14.3.2 – "Purchase and installation of electric charging infrastructures for public and private vehicles, running on renewable energies".