

JULY, 2014

Freight Quality Partner- ships around the world

1st report on a survey

Maria Lindholm, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

Michael Browne, University of Westminster, UK



This report is the result of a research collaboration between Chalmers University of Technology in Sweden and University of Westminster in the UK within the framework of VREF centre of Excellence for Sustainable Urban Freight Systems (CoE-SUFS).

Authors: Dr. Maria Lindholm (maria.lindholm@chalmers.se) and
Prof. Michael Browne (m.browne@westminster.ac.uk)

Date: 13th of May, 2014

CHALMERS
UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

**UNIVERSITY OF
WESTMINSTER** 

Table of content

1. Introduction 3

2. Approach 3

3. Results of the survey 4

3.1 Partnership start-up 4

3.2 Reasons to implement a partnership..... 5

3.3 Meetings and attendants 5

3.4 Funding and governmental status 5

3.5 Outcomes and achievements 5

3.6 Strengths 6

3.7 Weaknesses 6

4. Discussion 7

5. Acknowledgements..... 7

6. Useful references 8

7. List of partnerships..... 9

1. Introduction

Freight partnerships are being developed in different cities and countries as a means of including freight stakeholders in the process of tackling problems or issues occurring regarding urban freight transport. After an in-depth study of some partnerships in northern Europe (Lindholm and Browne, 2013), a survey was put together with the aim of mapping different approaches to freight partnerships involving local authorities and private industry around the world, in order to make a comparison of the various approaches to partnerships. The results are now summarised and presented in this report.

A Freight Quality Partnership (FQP) as presented in this report can be seen as a more flexible partnership concept than that of a Public Private Partnership (PPP) in traditional meaning. In a PPP several public and private partners are brought together with the focus on the financial agreements - for example to carry out large construction projects. With the term FQP we refer to long-term partnerships between freight stakeholders concerned with urban freight, that on a formal or informal basis meet regularly to discuss (and sometimes find solutions to) problems and issues that occur in the urban area.

It has been noted that such partnerships gain more and more interest by both local authorities and other stakeholders of urban freight, in order to address urban freight. There are many reasons for this and among the most important appear to be: (i) growing awareness of the need to understand problems from different perspectives if stable solutions are to be found in an urban context (ii) the acknowledged complexity of the range and variety of stakeholders involved in urban freight (iii) the opportunity to achieve worthwhile results at a relatively modest cost.

2. Approach

The approach to this study has been to use a simple process of a survey sent to academic researchers concerned with urban freight, to ask about their knowledge of freight partnerships. The framework for the survey builds on the previous study as presented above by Lindholm and Browne (2013). The list of contacts is built on:

- Members of the Volvo Research and Educational Foundations Centres of Excellence (www.vref.se);
- World Conference on Transport Research Society, Special Interest Group for Urban Goods Movement (SIG 9) (wctrs.ish-lyon.cnrs.fr); and,
- The Institute of City Logistics: a centre of excellence for research in city logistics and urban freight transport as well as providing a platform for exchange of knowledge, experience and information within the area (www.citylogistics.org).

The contacts were asked to complete the survey with information about partnerships, as well as forward the survey to anyone that they felt could contribute to the study.

A total of 16 completed survey forms were received and in addition the results from three partnerships studied earlier have been included in this report. The map below shows the partnerships. In Appendix 1 there is a list of the names of the partnerships as well as contact information that could be useful for further information.

Locations of respondents



3. Results of the survey

The results of the survey are grouped into headings based on the questions that were asked.

3.1 Partnership start-up

Most of the partnerships have been initiated in the last 4-5 years, but there are also some examples of partnerships that have been initiated earlier. Two of the partnerships have been documented but no longer exist. For most of the partnerships, it is the local authority that is the initiator. For one partnership, the initiator(s) has been the local freight stakeholders.

The Gothenburg partnership had its first meeting in 2005 as a part of a EU project (START). The partnership ("The local freight network") have since then had almost 30 meetings on a regular basis, discussing problems and possibilities in city logistics. Many of the participants have been attending the partnership meetings since the beginning. The partnership has no specific funding, but are run by the local traffic authority and chaired by a representative from Chalmers University of Technology. The partnership has around 25 participants at meetings.

The East Osaka partnership was initiated in 2006, in order to tackle the following problems:

- in East Osaka distribution district and surrounding area, there was significant on-street parking by freight vehicles, blocking main roads;
- many freight vehicles would park during the night and early morning as they waited in order to deliver parts and materials to factories in East Osaka distribution area, in time for the start of operation;

Dealing with these issues in partnership was a much better way to tackle the problems and enabled suitable and secure parking spaces to be developed and to discourage illegal parking of vehicles.

3.2 Reasons to implement a partnership

The reasons to implement a partnership on urban freight are often because of the recognition of a need to address problems and issues occurring in the urban area in a different way requiring the inclusion of more stakeholders. A small number of the partnerships in this study, have been started as a part of a specific demonstration project and have then continued to operate after the project ended. For some partnerships it has been a very specific problem that has been the main reason for implementation while in other cases the trigger appears to be a feeling that a range of issues needs to be addressed. The main reason is always connected to the possibility to improve the freight transport situation in the urban area.

3.3 Meetings and attendants

The number of meeting per year varies, but it seems to be common to have 2-4 meetings per year. Some of the partnerships also have additional meetings for subgroups of the partnership in order to discuss specific issues. This is also relevant for the number of participants. The largest partnership has reported as many as 80 participants, whilst the smallest are only 5-10 participants, but many reporting numbers of 15-25 participants. For the larger partnerships it is evident that some meetings will be in a plenary format but for discussions about specific topics sub-groups may be formed.

3.4 Funding and governmental status

In general funding for the partnerships is limited. Most partnerships do not receive any funding while in other cases some partnerships have received funding through a project. In a few cases funding has been obtained by tackling small-scale projects that have received joint public and private funding. The governmental status of the partnerships is mainly non-formal, without any formal agreements or responsibilities. However, there are some partnerships where the members have signed a charter or terms of reference of the partnership. Four of the partnerships have formal status.

3.5 Outcomes and achievements

Outcomes and achievements of the partnerships are of course valuable to all stakeholders involved. The outcomes and achievements are grouped into four main areas: Collaboration/cooperation; Information; Regulations, and Projects. Collaboration between stakeholders is an important output and also one of the reported strengths of the partnerships (see below). The partnership approach offer a neutral platform for engagement of freight stakeholders in projects, but also creates and positive discussion of freight in the city. The platform provide a possibility for the stakeholders and the authority to share views on freight in the urban area during meetings, but as the partnership participants get to know each other, it also creates an indirect possibility to meet and discuss issues between partnership meetings.

The Tyne and Wear Freight Partnership has a non-formal status, but since its start in 2005 it has contributed to an improved project collaboration in urban freight. Practical outputs have been e.g. multilingual delivery and information points for truck drivers as well as interactive roadmaps for drivers. The partnership has also taken part in running annual European conferences, developed case studies on delivery and service point, and, to deploy FORS (Freight Operations Recognition Scheme) in Tyne and Wear.

Outputs that focus on information are important and this is seen from almost all partnerships. The outputs are typically guidance for freight operators in the form of maps and routing information, dissemination of information through pamphlets, parking guides etc.

Input to issues of regulation represents a further output arising from partnerships. The main regulations mentioned are connected to loading and unloading zones in the urban area, but also to providing a simpler regulation for distribution activities, to address problems with parking fines and to deploy different certification schemes.

The Central London Freight Quality Partnership (CLFQP) supported the preparation of loading and unloading guidance that reduced some of the friction between businesses and public authorities in the regulation of parking to load and unload. This guidance was then used nationally.

The CLFQP has also provided a forum to exchange views about more strategic developments such as the introduction of segregated cycle lanes (that have an impact on loading arrangements)

There are also many projects reported as outcomes of the various partnerships. These include: case studies of specific issues in order to study implications of tackling freight issues in different ways, research studies, initiatives on urban consolidation centres and electric vehicles.

3.6 Strengths

The respondents identified several strengths relating to the freight partnership reported. Overall there is lot of emphasise on the cooperation and information sharing. An important note is that information is not just shared as a one-way communication from the stakeholders to give input to the authorities, but also for the authorities to share information among themselves (i.e. for different local administrative areas to share details of good practices or changes they are implementing).

In **The Greater Lyon** it has been noticed that it is difficult for private practitioners to understand the context of multi layers administrative organization. The partnership is an opportunity for the transport operators to know whom to contact when a problem occurs. But, from the other side, the partnership also helps the public authority to be informed of the new practices, organizations, aims, and constrains of the private operators

All partnerships highlight that the network and the cooperation between the participating stakeholders that the partnership encourage is an important strength. On the one hand, the local public authorities get input to policy making, through dialogue and information from freight stakeholders regarding problems as well as possibilities. On the other hand, the freight stakeholders get information from the

authorities and have the possibility to ask questions regarding on-going and coming plans and in that way being better informed and prepared (e.g. forthcoming changes in legislation). The final group of strengths that is reported on in the survey are the physical outcomes of the partnership (the maps, signs, guides and so on referred to above). The outputs in general bring real benefit to all stakeholders involved in the discussion.

3.7 Weaknesses

There are several weaknesses reported by partnerships in the survey. Weaknesses could be grouped into five main areas: Outputs (e.g. a slow implementation of initiatives, politicians are not included in the process, suboptimal solutions); Meeting structure (e.g. many stakeholders come to meetings without sharing information, no active discussions including all partners); The partnership group/members (e.g. lack of participation of stakeholders from certain industry

sectors, it is hard to reach consensus within the group, the group is either too large or too small); Authority activities (e.g. there is a general lack of understanding of freight activities amongst authorities) and Resources (e.g. there is a lack of funding to hold meetings, lack of resources in time to attend meetings).

Respondents noted that participation can sometimes be unbalanced with some participants being much more active than others. A specific concern raised by respondents was that when some participants are not fully involved and engaged in a decision or plan then there can be difficulties later. It seems that the need to find ways to engage the full membership of a partnership remains a challenge.

4. Discussion

The results of this survey are in line with previous results from partnership studies. A specific issue that many of the responding partnership have raised is the focus on outcomes is connected to the specific loading and unloading situation in the urban area. Often to reduce risk of penalty charge notices (parking fines), but also to improve the accessibility to the shops and restaurants in the urban area that are dependent on heavy goods deliveries.

It is important to note that the outputs reported in the survey are more or less equally distributed between physical outputs and soft results (outputs). Examples of the soft outputs include improved communication and the indirect better cooperation between stakeholders that takes place outside the partnership meetings because they have got to know each other through the partnership.

A review of the responses illustrates very clearly that almost all the partnerships are achieving valuable results often with relatively limited budgets. The results from the partnerships highlight the importance of a much better engagement between the public and private sectors. Partnerships are not the only way to achieve this interaction but the survey from various countries does show that freight partnerships are a key approach to work together to improve urban freight practices.

5. Acknowledgements

All the respondents of the survey and Diana Diziain – Grand Lyon – in particular for your very helpful efforts in gathering survey respondents from all over France. Trafikverket in Sweden and VREF CoE-SUFS for funding the work. The guest professorship programme at University of Gothenburg.

6. Useful references

Reports and scientific papers that might be useful regarding freight partnerships:

Allen, J., Browne, M., Piotrowska, M. & Woodburn, A. (2010) *Freight Quality Partnerships in the UK - an analysis of their work and achievements*. In Green Logistics project (Ed.). Transport Studies Group, University of Westminster, London, UK.

Browne, M., Nemoto, T., Visser, J. and Whiteing, T. (2003). *Urban freight movement and public-private partnerships*. Paper presented at the City Logistics, Madeira, Portugal.

Dablanc, L., Diziain, D. and Levifve, H. (2011). *Urban freight consultations in the Paris region*. European Transport Research Review, 3, pp. 47-57.

Department for Transport (2003). *A guide on how to set up and run Freight Quality Partnerships, Good Practice Guide 335*. UK.

Department for Transport (2003). *Freight Quality Partnerships: Case Studies, Good Practice Case Study 410*. UK.

Lindholm, M. & Browne, M. (2013) *Local authority cooperation with stakeholders: A comparison of partnership approaches*. European Journal of Transport and Infrastructure Research, Vol. 13(1), pp. 20-38.

Metrolinx (2011) GTHA Urban Freight Study. Toronto, Canada.

START (2009) Future solutions for goods distribution: START Final report. Gothenburg, Sweden.

7. List of partnerships

This is a list of the partnerships that have been basis for this study. There are more partnerships existing and this study just shows a part of them to show examples and disseminate some of the experiences that exist (many exists in France and the UK, and many are under development in for example Sweden on both local and national level).

1. City/name of partnership: Newcastle upon Tyne, UK/Tyne and Wear Freight partnership
Contact: Thomas Zunder, tom.zunder@newcastle.ac.uk
Contact: John Bourn, john.bourn@newcastle.gov.uk
www.tyneandwearfreight.info
2. City/name of partnership: Greater Lyon, France/GLA
Contact: Diana Diziain, ddiziain@grandlyon.org
3. City/name of partnership: Belo Horizonte, Brazil/BHTRANS
Contact: Geraldo Abranches Mota Batista, Geraldo.batista@pbh.gov.br
4. City/name of partnership: New York, USA/NYCDOT
Contact: Ms. Stacey Hodge, shodge@dot.nyc.gov
5. City/name of partnership: Toronto, Canada/Metrolinx
Contact: Anthony Caruso, Anthony.caruso@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com/en/regionalplanning/goodsmovement/goods_movement.aspx
6. City/name of partnership: Rome, Italy/Sapienza
Contact: Paolo Delle Site, paolo.dellesite@uniroma1.it
7. City/name of partnership: Oslo, Norway
Contact: Helge Jensen, helge.jensen@bym.oslo.kommune.no
8. City/name of partnership: Paris, France/Paris Charter
Contact: Sylvain Benjamin, sylvaine.benjamin@paris.fr
9. City/name of partnership: East Osaka, Japan
Contact: - no contact name available
10. City/name of partnership: Toulouse, France/Toulouse Delivery Charter
Contact: Serge Mathieu, serge.mathieu@toulouse-metropole.fr
11. City/name of partnership: West Australia, Australia (regional partnerships)
Contact: - no contact name available
12. City/name of partnership: Gothenburg, Sweden/Gothenburg local freight network
Contact: Maria Lindholm, maria.lindholm@chalmers.se
13. City/name of partnership: Central London, UK/Central London Freight Quality Partnership
Contact: Michael Browne, m.browne@westminster.ac.uk

<http://www.centrallondonfqp.org/>

14. City/name of partnership: Utrecht, The Netherlands
Contact: Mark Degenkamp, m.degenkamp@utrecht.nl
15. City/name of partnership: Montpellier, France/
Contact: Vincent Meyer, Vincent.meyer@ville-montpellier.fr
16. City/name of partnership: Nantes, France
Contact: Amélie Ranty, amelie.ranty@nantesmetropole.fr
17. City/name of partnership: CG93 La Seine-Saint-Denis (regional partnership)
Contact: Département de la Seine-Saint-Denis Direction de l'Aménagement et du Développement
18. City/name of partnership: City of Leiden, The Netherlands
Contact: n/a since not existing any more.
19. City/name of partnership: Lidköping, Sweden
Contact: n/a since not existing anymore