Executive Summary

Many cities in South East Europe suffer from an outdated approach to transport planning, which prioritises the construction of infrastructure for cars. In contrast, Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMPs) shift the focus towards an increased quality of life and environmentally-friendly transport modes like public transport, walking, and cycling. It is a core principle of SUMPs to actively engage citizens in the planning process. This helps decision-makers to better meet the needs of the community and increase the democratic legitimacy of the plan.

The report “Putting Citizens at the Centre of Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning. Lessons Learnt in South East Europe” reflects on SEE Change Net’s experiences with engaging citizens during the development of SUMPs in the capital cities of Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and Tirana (Albania) in 2019/2020. The initial lessons learnt in these cities - as well as other examples from South East Europe - may be a helpful starting point for other cities in the region who are just getting started with their own path towards Sustainable Urban Mobility and public participation.

The main lessons learnt are:

1) Investment of time and effort in listening to citizens pays off: the more dialogue, consideration, resources and time you dedicate to the engagement of citizens, the better results and “buy in” you will achieve.

2) Public participation is only worth as much as its results are clearly and systematically integrated into the analysis and measure definition of the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan.

3) Giving clear timely feedback to stakeholders is essential. Genuine and transparent communication about what happened to stakeholders’ inputs, suggestions and ideas is key to strengthening the confidence of citizens in participatory activities.

4) Citizen participation is a learning process for everyone involved: participants, planners, and city authorities. Not everything may go smoothly at the first attempt, but an honest assessment of the process will lead to better outcomes in the next cycle of public participation.

The report by SEE Change Net is available in English, Albanian, and Bosnian/ Croatian/ Serbian. The publication is an outcome of the project “Sustainable Urban Mobility in SEE Countries II” under the Open Regional Fund for South East Europe - Energy Efficiency. The project is implemented by GIZ and funded by the German Government.

When I first arrived in the Western Balkans in 2015, I discovered the enormous energy saving potential. I realised that it was feasible to place the real needs of the cities and their citizens at the centre of urban development instead of sacrificing precious space to the relentless growing traffic. Hence together with SEE Change Net, a regional think tank, and other international experts, GIZ embarked on the development of the SUMSEEC project.”
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1. Introduction

Traditionally, transportation planning was the domain of traffic engineers, and was focused on the construction of infrastructure.

The results are cities that are built mainly for cars, where citizens suffer the effects of congestion, economic inefficiencies, unsafe walking environments, air pollution, and where rapidly growing emissions from traffic accelerate the global climate crisis.

In 2009, the European Commission introduced the concept of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMPs) as an approach to tackle these issues. This concept shifts the focus from infrastructure planning to prioritising quality of life and putting citizens and their needs at the centre. By 2018, 1,000 SUMPs had been adopted in the EU alone.

The instrument is also being increasingly applied in South East Europe, where so far at least 150 SUMPs have been adopted. With Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning, environmentally-friendly modes of transport like walking, cycling, and public transport are prioritised. Public health is improved by increased levels of exercise and reduced noise and air pollution; streets become safer; and it becomes easier for citizens to access employment or public services.

At the same time, cities lower their carbon footprint, face less congestion, and reap economic benefits.

It is a core principle of SUMPs to actively engage citizens in the planning process. Citizens are directly affected by urban mobility and can contribute valuable “local expertise” based on their daily experiences navigating the transportation system. Involving the public through participatory activities helps decision-makers to better understand the needs of the community, find creative solutions for existing problems, and increase the democratic legitimacy of the plan.

This publication reflects on experiences involving citizens during the development of SUMPs for two capital cities; Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and Tirana (Albania) in 2019/2020. The initial lessons learned in these cities - as well as other examples from South East Europe - may be a helpful starting point for other cities in the region who are just getting started with their own path towards Sustainable Urban Mobility and public participation.

This publication by SEE Change Net is an outcome of the project “Sustainable Urban Mobility in SEE Countries II” (SUMSEEC II) under the Open Regional Fund for South East Europe - Energy Efficiency (ORF-EE). The project is implemented by GIZ and funded by the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ).

---

2. The Alphabet of Challenges for Urban Mobility in South East Europe

Like many other regions around the world, South East Europe faces complex challenges in the field of transportation and urban mobility.

This chapter touches on some of the most important ones - though by no means all - to provide some context before the following chapters discuss the role citizens can play in finding solutions.

Air Pollution

South East European cities are often among the most polluted cities of the world, especially in winter time. On some days, it is dangerous to even go outside, in particular for the most vulnerable groups (like older adults). And the human cost is high.

The mortality rate from air pollution in South East Europe is two to three times higher than the European average. In Bosnia and Herzegovina alone, 3,300 people die prematurely each year because of PM 2.5 air pollution. There is unequivocal scientific evidence that toxic air pollution has life-long effects on our bodies and increases the risk of cardiovascular diseases, respiratory diseases, and lung cancer. Research suggests that air pollution may even be associated with diabetes, neurological diseases and health risks for unborn children.

While not the only source, the transport sector is one of the biggest contributors to air pollution. Conversely, as the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 has shown, greatly reduced traffic has led to massively reduced air pollution in urban areas around the globe. It is shocking to see that citizens in Sarajevo and other South East European cities suffer from extreme high levels of air pollution. We need to do everything possible to develop also in those metropolitan areas a zero-emission society and remove carbon from the energy mix used for transport.”

4 Royal College of Physicians (2016): Every breath we take: The lifelong impact of air pollution. URL: https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/every-breath-we-take-lifelong-impact-air-pollution
Cars

Cars still dominate cities in South East Europe and around the world, at the expense of green spaces, safety of pedestrians and cyclists, and everybody's health. This is to a large extent the consequence of an outdated transportation planning approach called “Predict and Provide”? (that is, predict how much traffic will grow and increase the road capacity accordingly). This model leads to excessive construction of new road infrastructure, which in many cases does not alleviate congestion, but leads to even more traffic because people are encouraged to drive more. This effect is called “Induced Demand”8 or “Induced Traffic”: “Rather than thinking of traffic as a liquid, which requires a certain volume of space to pass through at a given rate, induced demand demonstrates that traffic is more like a gas, expanding to fill up all the space it is allowed.”9.

A representative public survey in Tirana10, which was conducted by Ipsos in 2019 during the SUMP development, reveals that 65% of adults don’t drive themselves (in Sarajevo11 almost half of the adults). This is especially true for women, older adults, students, and households hardly covering the basic needs. Nevertheless, 100% of the population is affected by the detrimental effects of car traffic like congestion, air and noise pollution, increased energy consumption and dependency on fossil fuels. Nearly half of the population of South East Europe consider their roads to be unsafe due to poor road infrastructure, unsafe vehicles, and inadequate driver training.12 In 2016, 1,500 people were killed and almost 55,000 injured in Western Balkan countries13. This equals almost 84 road deaths per million of population, compared to the EU with just over 50 road deaths per million of population.

Following up on the 1970s programmes of air pollution reduction, the Sarajevo City Plan from 1990 banned high rise buildings and provided for a significant increase in green areas, up to 48 m² per resident. Three decades later, the city green areas have shrunk eight times and high rise buildings exploded, thus interfering with air dispersion. Unless there is a momentary and radical turn in city planning, Sarajevo will lose any possibility of fighting air pollution.”

---


---

8 Ibid.
13 The data refer to Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Kosovo.
Environmental and Climate Crisis

Climate change hits closer to home than you might think. According to the European Environment Agency (EEA), South East Europe and Southern Europe will be hit harder by severe droughts and heat waves than the rest of the continent. The region “is projected to be a climate change hotspot as it is expected to face the highest number of adverse impacts.”

Similarly, a study of the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC) from 2018 shows an “alarming increase of temperature over the whole [Western Balkans] territory with observed temperature increase of 1.2 °C in the near future and destined to warm further by 1.7 – 4 °C by the end of the century, depending on the global effort in GHG [i.e. greenhouse gas] emission reduction.”

Climate change is already increasing the severity of severe weather events, for example:

- In 2012, a drought heavily affected the Western Balkan region and in particular Bosnia and Herzegovina. This led to massive damages, including an agricultural production loss of circa 1 billion Euro and a 70% drop in the yield of grains and vegetables.

- In 2014, heavy floods in Serbia caused damage and losses estimated at 1.7-1.8 billion Euro.

---


15 Regional Cooperation Council (2018): Study on Climate Change in the Western Balkans Region. URL: https://www.rcc.int/pubs/67/study-on-climate-change-in-the-western-balkans-region


According to WHO data, greenhouse gas emissions from transport are growing faster than any other sector and are a massive contributor to climate change. In 2016, at least 33% of the final energy consumption and 24% of greenhouse gas emissions in the EU stemmed from transport. A similar pattern has been modelled for South East Europe by the South East Europe 2050 Carbon Calculator.

Gender Inequality

Like in society in general, there are still significant gender inequalities in the field of mobility. For example, women are widely underrepresented as employees in the transportation sector. In the EU, only 22% of the transport workers are women. While there is no exact data available for South East Europe, anecdotal evidence suggests that this number might be even lower. This is especially true for decision-making positions. The low participation rate is not only discriminatory, it also has a negative impact on the quality of project and policy outcomes.

Also as transport users, women are in a different position to men. Often, their travel paths are more complex: on a typical day, they don’t just go from home to work and back, but also make stops at the grocery store, at child care, etc., because they are responsible for a lot of unpaid care work. At the same time they have fewer financial resources available due to the pay gap, drive less often, and rely more heavily on public transportation or walking. In the public space, they are disproportionately affected by harassment and violence.

Institutional Challenges

Cities may face a variety of challenges at the institutional level. For example, the political climate is not always beneficial and the majority of public institutions in South East Europe are perceived as corrupt by the population (see Chapter 4). Many decision-makers or public officials might be used to “old paradigms” when thinking about mobility and transport in cities. National transport laws are not always fully implemented and strategies often lack monitoring and implementation plans.

Reliable transport data are often not collected systematically. This includes for instance:

- Origin-destination studies, which determine traffic patterns;
- Data on the modal split, which is the percentage of trips by a particular mode of transport;
- Induced demand modeling, which calculates to what extent new road infrastructure leads to additional car traffic.
Public Transport

Data from Sarajevo and Tirana shows that about every second person uses public transport always or very often. Many more people would be willing to shift to public transport if the service was better. Despite this clear demand, many South East European cities don’t sufficiently prioritise public transport. Key concerns for citizens in both Sarajevo and Tirana in relation to public transport were the poor quality of vehicles, lack of safety measures, unreliable timetables, and long travel times. While this data has limited geographic scope, they indicate a pattern which probably applies throughout the region. Additional problems are that the public transport fleet often consists of very old, highly polluting vehicles; that it is difficult for passengers to find accurate information; and that the different environmentally-friendly modes of transport are not well integrated.

Walking and Cycling

Despite challenging conditions and a lack of infrastructure, walking plays a large role in Sarajevo, Tirana, and likely many other cities in the region. Over half of the population in Sarajevo (55%) say that they walk always or very often, in Tirana the proportion is higher again (74%). However inhabitants of those cities also express high dissatisfaction with the environment for pedestrians with, for example, 57% of people in Tirana saying that they don’t feel safe as pedestrians. Residents of both cities were critical of the poor conditions of footpaths, the lack of green spaces, pedestrian zones and opportunities to rest. Over two thirds also complained about drivers not demonstrating safe driving behaviour and of parked cars blocking footpaths. Given the dangerous traffic situation, only few people regularly cycle in both cities.

For an additional analysis of barriers, opportunities, and the legislative framework, see the “Roadmap on Sustainable Urban Mobility in SEE Countries”, which is available in six languages.

---

26 Ibid.
27 Ibid.
3. The Instruments of SUMPs and their Use in South East Europe

What are SUMPs?

In 2009, the concept of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMPs) was introduced by the European Commission to address these common challenges in transportation planning. Since then it has been applied to over 1,000 cities in the EU and at least 150 cities across South East Europe.

A SUMP is a strategic plan designed to satisfy the mobility needs of people and businesses in cities and their surroundings for a better quality of life. It builds on existing planning practices and takes due consideration of integration, participation, and evaluation principles.

In contrast to traditional transport planning, a SUMP focuses not on traffic and infrastructure, but on the movement of people and goods, and the involvement of citizens and stakeholders.

The graphic illustrates key phases and milestones in the development of a SUMP, from preparation and analysis, through strategy development and measure planning to implementation and monitoring.

The 12 Steps of Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning: image by Rupprecht Consult (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)
In the newly updated, step-by-step SUMP Guidelines\(^{28}\), you can learn more about:

- The aim of each activity and what questions need to be answered in the process;
- The main tasks that need to be completed for each step;
- Important tips for timing and coordination;
- And a handy checklist for practitioners.

To get a quick overview, key characteristics of SUMPs are summarised in this chapter:

1) Ideally, a SUMP is designed for a “functional urban area”: People and goods not only move within certain administrative boundaries, but beyond. For example, someone might work in the city centre, live with their family outside of the city, and commute every day.

2) A SUMP not only aims at overcoming boundaries between city and periphery, but also institutional borders. That means to establish close cooperation between different levels of government, policy sectors, and public and private institutions.

3) People need to have a say. Those most affected should be involved during every step along the way, otherwise the resulting plan will not be truly sustainable.

4) It is characteristic for a SUMP to start with a comprehensive analysis of the current situation to address a number of questions. How does the transportation system look at the moment? What are its strengths and challenges? In what areas does it meet the needs of the people and where is potential for improvement? What relevant plans and policies are already in place? What resources are available? What are our options for the future? How do we determine success? Understanding this and defining clear objectives and targets will help you to see the progress achieved with a SUMP later on.

5) What type of city do you want your children to live in? Creating together with the public a widely supported, long-term vision will provide orientation throughout the whole SUMP process that you are still going into the desired direction. To make sure you are actually coming closer to this vision, a clear implementation plan is needed, which defines a timeline, budget, responsibilities, and an integrated set of regulatory, promotional, financial, technical, and infrastructure measures.

6) Through a SUMP, all transport modes will be developed in a balanced and integrated manner with a clear priority for sustainable solutions. This includes not only public transport, walking, and cycling, but also “shared mobility” forms like bike-sharing.

7) Systematic monitoring and evaluation is key: to what degree was it possible to achieve your objectives and targets? Is it necessary to “course correct” or adjust the targets? Transparent reviews and public reports will keep everyone in the loop about the progress and challenges along the way.

---

EBRD was glad to participate in the SEECN hosted public discussion on the relationship between transport and air pollution in Sarajevo Canton. The EBRD-supported Green Cantonal Action Plan and the SUMP, are now important documents to guide investments of the Canton, including EBRD loans financing the upgrading of the tram system, new efficient trams, and trolleybuses. These measures will get people out of their cars and into public transport and in that process greatly reduce air pollution in the city, increasing the quality of mobility for everybody along the way.

---

Many South East European Cities are Already on the Way

South East Europe is on the move! Many cities already have proto-SUMPs in place and public awareness for Sustainable Urban Mobility is growing in the wider region - from Kosovo29 to Greece and Romania. Some cities - like Skopje - have even started work on the 2nd generation of a SUMP.

Here are just a few examples from the region:

**Pedestrians First** in Ljubljana (Slovenia)

Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia with around 288,000 inhabitants, was one of the earliest adopters of the SUMP concept (2012). One of its best known successes is the transformation of a city centre formerly crowded by cars into ten hectares of a car-free pedestrian zone. While Ljubljana as a whole is still struggling with air pollution, this urban transformation shows that restricting cars can lead to significant improvements of air quality in the vicinity of the streets closed for traffic. According to Dr. Griša Močnik, in these areas the local air pollution was reduced by 70%. Ljubljana was the first South East European City to be awarded as European Green Capital by the European Commission (in 2016), recognising that big changes were achieved in a short period of time.

**Successful Citizen Participation** in Kruševac (Serbia)

Kruševac with a population of almost 130,000, is located in central Serbia and was the first city of the country to develop a SUMP in 2017. Kruševac was shortlisted for the EUROPEAN MOBILITY WEEK Award 2019 for its remarkable citizen participation in the redesign of public spaces, removal of parking places and creation of urban parks.

**Changing the Modal Split** in Turda (Romania)

Turda is a small town of 55,000 inhabitants in Cluj County (north-west Romania) and a popular tourist destination. Its first SUMP was adopted in 2017 and won one year later the 6th SUMP Award of the European Commission for its clear planning vision, robust financing strategy and measurable targets. The city expects to motivate seven out of ten residents to choose alternative modes of transport instead of going by car. The jury noted the potential of the strategy to be replicated in other small and medium-sized cities.

**Thessaloniki Really Involving Stakeholders** (Greece)

Thessaloniki, the second-largest city in Greece with over one million inhabitants, developed its first SUMP in 2014. This was a major achievement, especially because the SUMP was developed during a deep financial crisis. Thessaloniki received a special prize from the jury during the 3rd SUMP Award of the European Commission. A so called “Mobility Forum” is in charge of monitoring and evaluating the SUMP and gathers all involved stakeholders, such as the public transport authority, traffic management organisation, regional authorities, and the nine Municipalities of the metropolitan area.1

---

29 This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSC 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of independence.

The development of SUMP in Ljubljana succeeded in transferring the discussion about the future development of mobility from a narrow circle of transport engineers to a broader group of experts and the public. With this set of solutions has increased considerably and the decision has become more transparent and inclusive.”
4. Planning for People Means Planning with People:
Why We Need to Put Citizens and Stakeholders at the Centre

What is public participation? In this chapter you will hear more about what is behind this approach, what you can gain from it and how to tackle common challenges.

For a more detailed look who exactly the public is and what you can do to organise involvement, wait for Chapters 4 and 5.

Mobility Affects Everyone

A college student in Tirana, crossing an intersection on his bike to get to university, is suddenly forced to an abrupt stop by a car cutting across his path. The staff at a local supermarket in Pristina is waiting for the delivery truck to bring fresh produce. In Sarajevo, a young girl enjoys the walk with her grandparents along the river and kicks her ball across the road - possible because it is closed for cars on the weekends. Meanwhile an ambulance driver in Skopje is getting ready to respond to an emergency of a patient who had a heart attack and wonders if she will arrive in time to save a life or will she be stuck in traffic again. A tourist in Belgrade wonders whether they made a mistake coming here, stuck behind a blocked tram, their Air Quality App is showing the city to be amongst the most polluted in Europe.

What do all of them have in common? They are deeply affected in their daily lives by urban mobility: the way we organise how people and goods move around in cities. “Mobility” is far more than an abstract, theoretical concept. It is a basic requirement for participation in social life, access to healthcare, education, work and much more – in short, for a liveable city.
Benefits of Public Participation

As public participation we understand the process of systematically including citizens and stakeholders through a variety of means into the decision-making about Sustainable Urban Mobility. Public participation empowers those who are potentially affected by or interested in a decision. Public participation should be “an ongoing and dynamic relationship, rather than a specific policy, event, or output.”30 That means that public involvement takes place throughout the entire SUMP process, from planning to implementation.

As Prof. Vivien Lowndes put it aptly in her research about citizen participation in South East Europe: “Participation is not just the ‘icing on the cake.’ It can become the ‘yeast in the dough’!”31

The main potential benefits of public participation – when conducted correctly – include:

- A stronger democratic process and more transparent decision-making;
- Better public education and raised awareness about sustainable urban mobility;
- Improved social inclusion through opportunities for individuals and groups to participate in public life;
- Clearer understanding of the needs of a community.
- Better understanding of the benefits and risks of proposed policies as perceived by the public;
- Best possible results and creative solutions achieved through the “local expertise” of citizens and stakeholders;
- Reduced costs and increased speed through more effective delivery of public services;
- Increased legitimacy of the plan and better acceptance of its results;
- A sense of ownership among the public with regards to mobility projects;
- Politicians and the public are brought closer together.

---

31 Ibid., p. 9.
Especially when far reaching citizen participation methods like Participatory Budgeting are applied, it is proven that citizens are more likely to pay their taxes. This is the result of a World Bank Study from 2019, which involved 65,000 individuals in 50 countries. The researchers concluded that citizens are more committed to tax compliance when they are able to voice their preferences about government spending and learn about government oversight of public resources. This proved to be true regardless of government systems, levels of development, and culture.

Russel J. Dalton, Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Irvine, further shows in his research comparing 20 democracies that nations with higher levels of citizen participation also have better performing governments. This is true for example for Norway, New Zealand, Canada, and Denmark. “This supports the general logic that an attentive and involved public press the government to be more responsive and effective. Simply put, good citizens make for good democratic governance.”

Achieving high-quality public participation which brings these benefits is not an easy process and many countries in South East Europe face challenges on their way. Experiences in recent history still influence public attitudes. People who grew up in the former Yugoslavia might be used to a different tradition and culture, in which the state was in charge of deciding on many aspects of one’s life “behind closed doors” with less opportunities for citizens to play an active role. Deep political changes after the breakup of Yugoslavia “brought a new concept of active citizenship. This however, required a complete shift in mentality.”

Unsurprisingly then, citizens in South East Europe have little trust in public institutions and government. Half of the population (49%) say they never discuss government decisions and about one quarter (27%) discuss these only in a private setting. Even fewer give their comments on social networks or elsewhere on the internet (9%), take part in protests (6%), or participate in public debates (3%). This speaks of an overwhelming apathy and sense of powerlessness among the population. Many people perceive that becoming involved would be pointless as it would have little impact.

“This is chiefly the result of years of engagement neglect and half-hearted attempts by governments to appease activist non-governmental actors and international donor organisations. With near-recorded levels of citizen apathy and passivity, governments need to become better at promoting, enabling and supporting civic participation in decision making – starting with making the process accessible, open and transparent.”

Attitudes towards public participation are closely related to the general health of democracy, the level of corruption and the freedom of press in the countries of South East Europe. A number of global reports about these issues help us assess the state of each of the factors. The World Democracy Index 2019 uses a scale of 0 (“authoritarian regime”) to 10 (“full democracy”) to analyse the state of democracy world-wide. This is determined on five categories: electoral process and pluralism; functioning of the government; political participation; political culture; and civil liberties. On average, South East European countries have a score of 6.38 (compared to 8.35 in Western Europe), which means none of them can be considered a “full democracy”. The best scores in the region are achieved by Slovenia, Greece, Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania, and Serbia, with these countries defined as “flawed democracies”.

---

Balkan Barometer 2019; details see above.

Ibid.

Hazardous air pollution makes it dangerous for the elderly, children, and people with respiratory or heart disease to go outdoors. Photo taken on January 13th, 2020 in Sarajevo; 378 μg/m³ PM2.5.

Photo: © Nerma Sofić
In contrast, other countries are seen as “hybrid regimes”, between flawed democracies and authoritarian regimes. This applies to North Macedonia, Albania, Montenegro, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Corruption is another serious issue in the region. The countries of South East Europe score an average of only 45 on a scale in the Corruption Perceptions Index 2019, where 0 stands for “highly corrupt” and 100 for “very clean”. The World Press Freedom Index assesses media pluralism and independence, the quality of the legislative framework and the safety of journalists in each country, placing each into one of five categories. In 2019, in most SEE countries the freedom of the press was categorised as “problematic”, with Bulgaria categorised as “bad”. The only exception was Slovenia where the freedom of press was “fairly good”.

Best Practices for Public Participation

Ideally, public participation should be deeply embedded in any policy-making process, for example, through a code of good practice that is adopted by the parliament. Genuine political will and the commitment of local government are both essential. We understand from a study in Bosnia and Herzegovina that “the more effective and more sustainable results are achieved in municipalities […] where new solutions were not imposed by external actors but were created inside the community”. It is also vital to find an approach that suits the local context. Are there laws on the national or municipal level that make public participation mandatory? What local traditions for citizen participation exist? (For example, the “Local Communities”, which were an expression of local democracy in the pre-war socialist Yugoslavia.)

Developing a SUMP can be seen as an excellent opportunity to experiment with new interactive participation formats and reorganise established structures.

Based on the rich experience of different countries, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Good preparation and development of a participation and communication strategy is key. Questions to ask include:
  - What are your needs? What are the communications challenges you face?
  - What is your audience? How familiar are they with the topic? What are the best media channels to reach them?
  - What are your objectives and key messages? What do citizens need to know?
  - What communication tools do you want to use?
  - Which methods are appropriate and affordable?
  - What are the rules of participation?
  - Who is responsible for what?
  - How can financial and human resources be secured?
  - What timeline is realistic?
  - How do you compile and document the results?
  - How do you evaluate and measure success?

---


● To be able to do this, public servants need to acquire proficiency in a range of **skills**, which can be supported through **capacity building** activities and practical guidance.

● To get anything done, someone needs to be in charge and take on responsibility - this means **staff need to be assigned**. Ideally, each municipality should create a **focal point for citizen participation**. A **fixed budget** for this is immensely helpful.

● When done right, public participation means the **communication goes in two directions**: Top-down (that is, planning authorities inform the public proactively) and bottom-up (citizens give input and share their needs and ideas).

● **Inform** citizens and stakeholders **early** about any participatory activities through both formal and informal communication channels.

● **Citizens** are most likely to engage when they are **interested in the issue**. To participate in a meaningful way, they also need to get a good understanding of what the government is working on.

● It is important to explain to citizens and stakeholders in advance what the **rules** of the participation process are, what their **role** is, and what will happen with their **input**. But never promise more than can actually be achieved. Be honest about which decisions already have been taken and which are still open for discussion.

● All voices need to be considered in a non-discriminatory way, allowing **equal participation** of men and women, young and old people, people with and without disabilities, etc.

● At events, create an atmosphere where everyone can honestly exchange their viewpoints and where there is **mutual respect** between all participants. A **neutral, professional facilitator** can help with this. And wherever possible, make it fun and entertaining.

● When it comes to the logistical aspects of planning events, make sure that the **venue is accessible** for people with disabilities and that the time and day of the meeting is convenient for the target group you are trying to reach.
● Sometimes small incentives might be helpful to encourage participation (e.g., free tickets for public transport, or tickets for a cultural event).

● A clear strategy needs to be put in place to systematically include the outcome from public participation accurately at every phase in the development of a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. Consider the best ways to accurately record and review the input, for example through publishing meeting minutes, a comment log, and/or a summary report. Shortly after an event, give the citizens feedback about the results and explain why certain suggestions were not integrated into the SUMP. “Quick wins” – easy measures that can be implemented right away and make a meaningful impact – are a good way to build trust among citizens and encourage future participation.

● And last but definitely not least, continuous quality control of the participatory process is essential. This includes monitoring of the methods, objectives, stakeholder identification and involvement, costs, impact, and more. This helps you to do even better next time.

For more in-depth explanations and examples, have a look at the participation manual developed by the European project CH4LLENGE (available in nine languages) and their manual on institutional cooperation.


Photo: © Zoltan Balogh / EPA
Different Levels of Public Participation

Clearly, not all participation is of the same quality. Participation can be thought of as a ladder with different rungs that symbolise different levels. As far back as 1969, Sherry Arnstein developed a simplified model based on her observations in the United States which remains relevant today across the globe: “There is a critical difference between going through the empty ritual of participation and having the real power needed to affect the outcome of the process.” Arnstein illustrates vividly how – if there is no redistribution of power – citizen participation can easily be used as a smokescreen, which “allows the powerholders to claim that all sides were considered, but makes it possible for only some of those sides to benefit. It maintains the status quo.” Let’s have a look at the ladder step by step:

Rung 6 – 8: “Citizen power”

The highest form of citizen participation is a partnership where power is partially delegated to citizens or where they are even in complete control of a certain decision. Examples are joint policy boards or planning committees where citizens’ groups might even hold the power of veto. Another example is the creation of new community institutions that are governed by residents.

Rungs 3 – 5: “Tokenism”

On the lower rungs of this symbolic ladder are activities where citizens are informed and consulted on issues, for example through surveys or public hearings. Their voices are heard, which is an important first step. But they shave no guarantee that their opinions will be properly taken into consideration.

Rungs 1 – 2: “Non-participation”

In some cases, instead of genuine citizen involvement, participation can instead become a tool to distract rather than inform the public. For example, if meetings are used as a mere PR activity to persuade the public of a project without giving them all relevant information. Another example would be if the participation process distracts from the major problems a group faces and diverts the discussion to less relevant topics.

Of course, the reality is more complex than a simple model. Informing and consulting citizens are legitimate and important steps along the way. But this, in itself, is not sufficient to achieve full public participation. It will take time, work, and probably growing pains to move up the ladder, but it is most definitely worth it.

---

5. Leaving No One Behind: Who Needs to be Included in the Process

Stakeholder Mapping

In this chapter we will have a closer look at who needs to be involved in public participation for Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning.

First of all, let’s clarify some key terms: By “citizens” we mean individual members of the public, for example people who live or work in the city where a SUMP is being developed. Meanwhile, “stakeholders” are all individuals, groups, or organisations that are affected by the SUMP and/or able to affect it (for example, NGOs, companies, etc.). Obviously, any stakeholder is also usually a citizen unless a large external partner is involved/benefitting from decisions.

The participants who need to be included in the decision-making process will vary from city to city. The following questions help you to identify the most important participants:

☐ Who can guarantee political support and resources?
☐ Who manages the transport network?
☐ Who has the data and skills needed for the SUMP?
☐ Who understands public and stakeholder opinions?
☐ Who are the key personalities in the local networks that are well organised and recognised?
☐ Who is affected by the outcomes of the SUMP?
☐ Who has participated in previous mobility projects in the city?
☐ Who do you find difficult to reach?
Key Stakeholder Groups

It helps to think of this in very broad terms as the impact a SUMP has on a city and its surroundings goes far beyond just the transport sector. Here are some concrete examples who you might want to involve throughout the process:

- National authorities;
- Ministries/Departments (Transport, Urban Planning, Economy, Environment, Health, Infrastructure, Tourism, Energy, Communications, etc.);
- Mayors, political parties, and politicians;
- Municipalities;
- Citizens, especially vulnerable or marginalised groups (low income households, women, children and youth, older adults, single parents, people with disabilities, minority ethnic communities like Roma, language minorities...);
- Civil society (environmental NGOs, kindergartens and schools, parents’ associations, cycling associations, youth NGOs, labour unions...);
- Employees of the transport sector (bus drivers, tram drivers, ambulance drivers, taxi drivers, etc.);
- Public and private companies in the transport sector (public transport companies, taxi agencies, bike-sharing companies, etc.);
- Other public and private companies (industry and manufacturing, services, retailers, housing associations, hotels, tourist agencies, tourism-related businesses, etc.);
- Academia (universities, research institutes...);
- Traffic police;
- Influential international stakeholders (UN, European Commission, Energy Community, Transport Community, Regional Cooperation Council (RCC), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), World Bank, Covenant of Mayors, Members of EU Parliament Delegations, etc.).

Keep in mind that those groups will bring many different opinions to the table – even people who belong to the same group (for example, environmental NGOs) might have opposing ideas about what is best for their city. To better understand these stakeholder groups, think about what interests and objectives they have, and what power and capacities they hold. Also try to identify what possible alliances or conflicts between those stakeholders might exist.

---

Ermelinda Mahmutaj
Executive Director EDEN Center

On behalf of EDEN Center, we are very happy to be engaged in the Tirana SUMP which considered a broad and specific community target to bring advanced reality into existing outdated policies and result into a modern participatory mobility vision and action plan to suit sustainable cities and communities. I am proud to say that in Albania it is the people who build the models and bring the sustainable alternatives, and then the policy makers follow!
It might be convenient to keep working with the same individuals and groups you know from previous interactions. But it is important to pay special attention to those who haven’t been involved much before and identify what barriers they face and how they can be overcome. For instance, if you mainly offer online participation options, this is difficult for anyone who is not very experienced with using computers and the internet or who has only limited access to it. On the other hand, if the only option is to provide written comments, this might be a challenge for people with a lower level of formal education or people who are non-native speakers. Research shows that public participation is disproportionately dominated by “better-educated and higher income citizens who possess politically valuable skills and resources”46 Prof. Russel J. Dalton calls this the “participation gap”.

If this is all new to you and you think some further guidance might be helpful, consider inviting external support for a staff training on topics of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Now you have a long list of citizens and stakeholders, but how do you decide whom to involve to what degree? Visual tools can help you to gain clarity, which is why this process is also called stakeholder mapping.

---

For example, use the matrix to categorise the citizen and stakeholder groups\(^{47}\).

Try to be very realistic with these categories. Make sure to put each group into the category it belongs to in reality, rather than where you would like to see them. This analysis will help you to define a closer circle and a wider circle for your participation activities (see Chapter 5). Think also about the different hierarchy levels in institutions and who are the most appropriate people to address. Of course, it is important to have the leadership level on board. But while for example in the political system, the highest ranks fluctuate regularly, staff on the next-lower level often stay in their position for much longer and can play a key role in retaining the “institutional memory” of practices of public participation and sustainable urban mobility. If the planning process goes on over an extended period of time, have a look once in a while at your stakeholder analysis and reassess if anything has changed.

As described in the SUMP Participation Manual, there are two approaches to involving citizens and stakeholders:

**BLENDED participation of stakeholders and citizens**

- Citizens and stakeholders are invited to participate in the same activities.
- Advantages:
  - Dialogue between experts and citizens;
  - Citizens get a better awareness about Sustainable Urban Mobility;
  - Experts become more sensitive to the views of citizens.
- Risks:
  - Can be difficult to implement;
  - Stakeholders might be more dominant in the discussion than citizens, which can lead to a power imbalance.
  - Marginalised groups might be overlooked.

**SEPARATE participation of stakeholders and citizens**

- Citizens and stakeholders are invited to participate in different activities.
- Advantages:
  - It is easier to address varied levels of knowledge and different interests.
  - The participation format can be tailored towards the needs of marginalised groups.
- Risks:
  - It can be difficult to harmonise the different activities and bring together the results.

---

\(^{47}\) The graphic is adopted from the SUMP Guidelines, all details above.
6. Tools You Can Use for Citizen and Stakeholder Engagement

Successful public participation combines a variety of different tools.

The key to success is to carefully decide which instruments to use with which target groups and during which phase of the SUMP development. Crucially, agreement is required about how to feed all these various inputs transparently into the planning process: “Sometimes one method will build on another, as confidence and capabilities grow, or something new may be needed in responding to changing moments in the policy cycle, or new issues arise.” Don’t get stuck either trying to find the one “correct” tool or trying to do everything all the time.

Tips for Communication Campaigns

In South East Europe, over one third (37%) of citizens say that they find written information provided by the government difficult to understand. This shows the importance of creating captivating communication campaigns that use a variety of communication channels. Think outside the box about how you can reach people in a more personable way. Perhaps in addition to posters and a website, you could send a personalised letter or make a phone call? You would be surprised how much of a difference this can make. Don’t forget about the local bakery, hair salon, or neighbourhood library to spread the word and ask people to share news with their friends and family.

People tend to be flooded by information, so your campaign needs to wake them up and show them what is in it for them. How will it make their lives better if they engage with you? Having only a few simple and catchy key messages works best. The language should be very clear and understandable, avoiding acronyms and technical jargon like “SUMP” or “GHG”. If you try to reach non-native speakers (for example, refugees and immigrants), think about translating materials into the most common languages in those communities and provide professional interpretation at your events.

---


49 Balkan Barometar 2019, details see above.
Pictures and graphics are the best way to explain the topic. For example, the infographics shown here were developed to communicate the results of Population Sample Surveys in Sarajevo and Tirana where citizens were asked about their attitudes towards different modes of transport and what would motivate them to drive less often.

Creating a visual identity and “brand” expressed through a logo and consistent colour scheme makes your work recognisable. A good example is the EUROPEAN MOBILITY WEEK – a brand that is used all across Europe to promote Sustainable Urban Mobility through decentral activities in thousands of cities (#mobilityweek).

There are plenty of fun ways to get your message across, such as quizzes about interesting facts (“Did you know that brisk walking for 25 minutes a day can add up to seven years to your life?”) or competitions (“Take your bike to school for a month and win a prize!”). For more tips, see the CIVITAS handbook on effective communication and marketing⁵⁰.

Public Participation Toolbox

Below you will find an overview of selected participation tools which have proven to be effective in Sarajevo, Tirana and other cities in South East Europe. Of course, this list is by no means exhaustive - other fundamental activities like the establishment of a SUMP Steering Committee, campaigns based on print materials (such as posters, brochures, etc.), websites, strategic involvement of the media, etc. are meant to accompany these activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Involvement of Politicians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Gain political support for sustainable urban mobility and ensure the topic is on their political agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible reach</strong></td>
<td>10-50 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tips</strong></td>
<td>Involve politicians both from governing parties and the opposition. Meet early in person to secure support and organise activities like awareness-raising workshops where politicians engage with the public and experts in open settings, or study tours to model cities. Where the opportunity arises, respond to requests for support from politicians to strengthen their initiatives for Sustainable Urban Mobility (see example below).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel Discussion on Air Pollution and Transport in Sarajevo

During the EUROPEAN MOBILITY WEEK 2019, SEE Change Net was approached by then Prime Minister of the Canton of Sarajevo, Edin Forto to support his initiative to fight the dangerous levels of air pollution the city experiences every year. As part of a day-long event with GIZ*, SEE Change Net coordinated a panel discussion with the then Prime Minister as well as local and international experts on the burning issue of air pollution and transportation. The panel discussion reached a large audience and gained considerable media attention.

Focus Groups SUMP Sarajevo**

In 2019, a series of five Focus Groups was implemented in Sarajevo with employees of the transport sector: bus and minibus drivers, tram and trolleybus drivers, traffic police, ambulance drivers, taxi drivers and dispatchers. In semi-structured discussions in a relaxed atmosphere, they were invited to share their thoughts on the most pressing transportation issues and – most importantly – their ideas for solving the identified issues.

---

* GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit) is the German development agency which provides services in the field of international development cooperation.

** The full report is available under: http://seechangenetwork.org/sustainable-urban-mobility-plans-sumps/
**Stakeholder Workshops**

**Purpose**
Develop a jointly-agreed, long term vision for a desired urban future; jointly define the problems and needs; discuss objectives and measures of the SUMP; discuss possible scenarios.

**Possible reach**
25-60 citizens and stakeholders

**Tips**
Often Stakeholder Workshops are used at strategic milestones of the SUMP development, for example as Visioning Workshops, Analysis Workshops, Scenario Workshops, etc. They should be organised as interactive as possible, for example through group works, role-plays, world café exercises, etc.

---

**Example in Action:**

**SUMP Visioning Workshops Sarajevo and Tirana**

In Summer 2019, both Sarajevo and Tirana held - amongst other stakeholder workshops throughout the year - Visioning Workshops with a broad spectrum of stakeholders. As thinking about a planning horizon of ten years might be an unfamiliar task for some workshop participants, a so called “back-casting” methodology* was applied to help people escape from the constraints of their everyday concerns and imagine an ideal future city in terms of transport. Attendees were invited to close their eyes and to imagine traveling by time machine to the year 2030. The time travel transports you to some high level EU event - imaginary of course - at which Sarajevo/Tirana won a prestigious award for its dedicated work on Sustainable Urban Mobility. Within this scenario, participants were asked to complete interview questions about this success story from the perspective of 2030. Some of the questions asked were:

- What are the successes and achievements in urban mobility that you are most proud of?
- What are the benefits of implementing a comprehensive mobility plan in terms of quality of life, economy, health, spatial planning, etc.?
- When looking back at the last ten years of work, what were the most important approaches and measures that have contributed to sustainable mobility in your city?

In another exercise, participants took the role of editors preparing statements for the evening TV show, so that each table distilled the programme output into intelligible but succinct messages. The different messages were collected from workshop participants, and prioritised through a sticker exercise. The professional facilitators then formulated a vision statement based on this input.

---

* Backcasting is a planning method that starts with defining a desirable future and then works backwards to identify policies and programmes that will connect that specified future to the present. It is guided by the question: If we want to attain a certain goal, what actions must be taken to get there?
### E-Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Receive public input on needs; gather ideas for measures; raise awareness and provide public education.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible reach</td>
<td>Large parts of the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tips | It is not always possible to meet citizens and stakeholders face-to-face - as we discovered during the global pandemic in 2020. Online participation formats have a great untapped potential to provide alternatives. However, it should be kept in mind that this will exclude those who do not have access to the internet or are not comfortable with the use of such technology.  
Over half of the population in the Western Balkans (54%) use the internet as a communication tool, and over one third as a source of news (37%) or entertainment (35%). On the other hand, about one in four persons (26%) don't use the internet at all, although internet coverage is no longer an issue in the region. Especially e-government services are used very rarely (2%), mostly because people have not enough confidence in these e-services yet and have doubts about online security. 
E-participation can take place in many different ways:  
- Webinars;  
- Online town halls/ online neighbourhood forums;  
- Focus Groups via video call;  
- Apps;  
- Online surveys;  
- Use of GIS-based online maps for interactive exercises (for example, users may locate on the map unsafe areas, insufficient cycling routes, etc.) |

---

51 Balkan Barometar 2019; details see above.
### Tool: Social Media

**Purpose:** Disseminate information to the public, build engagement, foster low-barrier dialogue.

**Possible reach:** Large parts of the public, especially younger people.

**Tips:**
- Using social media like Instagram, Twitter, Facebook or YouTube is a modern and affordable way to engage the public. To be effective, it is necessary that someone is in charge of regular maintenance (posting, responding to comments, etc.). When it comes to urban mobility issues, the main aim is to use social connections to improve citizens’ experience and to create information flow in both directions. This may require a significant effort on a daily basis. Because it takes time to build up a following, it is recommended to start this early on in the SUMP development process and use it continuously.
- Citizens easily get overwhelmed by a large amount of information so keep social media channels simple and easy to navigate. Content can be presented in diverse forms, for example photos and quotes from events, announcement of SUMP milestones, opinion polls, short videos, podcasts with personal stories of transport users, etc. Social media activity should bring the public sector agenda and activities closer to citizens. News and information should be provided on the platform the citizen prefers, be it Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc. This way, citizens no longer need to go to the agency’s own website to get the same information.
- Before creating any social media accounts, a clear content management process should be agreed to avoid a delay in the approval of messages.

---

**Example in Action:**

**Sarajevo: Video clips with employees of the transport sector**

During the development of the SUMP for Sarajevo, a series of short video clips was recorded with voices from employees of the transport sector. Bus drivers, tram drivers, traffic police officers, taxi drivers, and ambulance drivers shared their experiences, encouraged citizens to use environmentally-friendly modes of transport more often, and pointed out where improvements in the system are needed from their point of view. This short video format is ideal for distribution on social media.
## Public Opinion Surveys

### Purpose
Data collection about attitudes and perceptions among citizens; needs assessment; prioritisation of potential measures; etc.

### Possible reach
Hundreds (or even 1000+) of people

### Tips
Decide carefully what type of public survey is most appropriate in your case. Online surveys are cheaper to implement, but might not reach all parts of the population.

Survey results have the highest value if they are based on a representative population sample, i.e. covering a certain percentage of the population and being representative in terms socio-demographic aspects such as gender, age, education level, household income, location (centre vs. periphery, or even hilly vs. flat terrain). Representative surveys are best implemented via phone or face-to-face through a professional research agency. A careful statistical analysis is essential.

---

### Attitudinal Surveys
**Sarajevo & Tirana**

During the SUMP development for Sarajevo and Tirana in 2019, representative Population Sample Surveys were conducted by SEE Change Net and EDEN Center in cooperation with Ipsos Albania, Ipsos Bosnia and Herzegovina, with questionnaire design advice provided by Dragana Petrović (previously Ipsos Serbia). The surveys explored the perceptions and attitudes of citizens towards different modes of transportation. They provided insights into motivating factors to drive less by car and to use more environmentally-friendly modes like walking, cycling, or public transportation.

*Full reports are available under: http://seechangenetwork.org/sustainable-urban-mobility-plans-sumps/

---

### Mobility Questionnaire in Bijeljina
**(Bosnia and Herzegovina)**

In cooperation with the Association of Cities and Municipalities RS and local experts, the City of Bijeljina also conducted a questionnaire with citizens during the development of its SUMP. The collected data provided insights into the mobility behavior of citizens and their use of and opinions about different modes of transport.
### Tool: EUROPEANMOBILITYWEEK (EMW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Foster public awareness for Sustainable Urban Mobility; experiment with practical solutions to tackle urban challenges such as air pollution, and test new transport measures. Reach an international audience for your activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible reach</td>
<td>Up to several thousand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tips</td>
<td>EUROPEANMOBILITYWEEK is not a tool in itself, but an overarching campaign which provides an opportunity to apply any of the other mentioned participation activities each year from September 16(^{th})-22(^{nd}). Running since 2002, EMW seeks to improve public health and quality of life through promoting clean mobility and sustainable urban transport. In 2019, 3,135 towns and cities from 50 countries around Europe and the world participated in the campaign - a new record. Some of the most popular activities during EMW include Car-Free Day and the implementation of new measures, such as bike facilities, pedestrian infrastructure, or public transport improvements. Comprehensive campaign resources and a communication toolkit are provided for all participating partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Example in Action:

**Rethymno (Greece)**

In 2019, the Greek city of Rethymno was a finalist for the EUROPEANMOBILITYWEEK Award. The jury commended the city’s actions: “Giving new meaning to the phrase ‘vote with your feet’, citizens were put in control with ‘let’s vote for pedestrians’ workshops where they came together to decide on the future shape of their city. The Ancient Greek tradition of peripatetic dialogue was reawakened with walking conferences to give the brain a kick-start in the morning, following by kicking balls about and a range of sports and a crescendo of concerts and cinema. With a new e-bus, clearly marked 30 km/h zones, thermal traffic sensors and cameras to keep track of cars, it’s clear that this move towards a healthier future is right on track.”

---

* EUROPEANMOBILITYWEEK Awards. URL: [https://mobilityweek.eu/emw-awards/](https://mobilityweek.eu/emw-awards/)

---

Social media posts about urban mobility in Sarajevo
### Tool: Info Centre/Info Kiosk

**Purpose:** Provide information on Sustainable Urban Mobility services and projects; provide a platform for dialogue

**Possible reach:** Thousands of people

**Tips:** Info centres are often located near the city hall or in the city centre and can be of different sizes – from a small info point to a larger room that provides space for meetings and presentations. Ideally, at an info centre the visitors have free access to the internet.

---

**Example in Action:**

**Zagreb’s Info Tram (Croatia)**

When thinking about innovative ways to create an opportunity for dialogue with the public, the City of Zagreb decided to take one of their old trams, redecorate it, and transform it into an “information point” in the city centre. It was launched by the Mayor of Zagreb during the EUROPEAN MOBILITY WEEK 2009. Together with local partners, a regular programme was created, including the weekly event “Wednesdays in the Tram”. Citizens had a chance to learn more about Sustainable Urban Mobility, participate in questionnaires and talk to staff. This format was a huge public success: 21,630 visitors came to the Tram Info-Point, 1,400 participants attended more than 30 events, and the Tram-Info Point appeared about 200 times in the media. Later the Info-Point was upgraded as the city recognised the need for a larger space.


---

Photo: © LUAS Dublin
**Tool:** Citizen Advisory Boards  

**Purpose:** Advise citizens through the whole SUMP development and implementation process.

**Possible reach:** 10-15 people

**Tips:** Citizen advisory boards are local government entities consisting of citizens who volunteer to represent their communities. Members of citizen advisory boards may either be selected by public call or be nominated by civil society organisations, local businesses, or local government staff. They meet regularly to develop recommendations to be taken into consideration by the local government. This may include examining critical issues together, receiving public testimony and reviewing staff reports. Typically, citizen advisory boards are active over an extended period which goes beyond single initiatives.

---

**Tool:** Citizens’ Jury  

**Purpose:** Receive informed collective recommendations about a proposed transport policy or strategy.

**Possible reach:** 12-25 persons

**Tips:** “A Citizens’ Jury is a small group of randomly selected citizens, representative of the demographics in the area, that come together to reach a collective decision or recommendation on a policy issue through informed deliberation.” Members of Citizens’ Juries are “everyday people”, not individuals who have a strong political agenda or material stake in the process. Experts, stakeholders and diverse witnesses present different perspectives and evidence to the Jury. Typically lasting 5 days, the Jury format allows for in-depth discussion of the topic, which is why it is often used for complex or controversial issues. The impact of a Citizens’ Jury depends on how much power it has been granted. Sometimes such Juries only have an advisory capacity, sometimes they present their recommendations directly to the parliament, and in some cases the decision-making authority pledges in advance to accept and implement the Jury’s decision.

---

Rijeka Youth Council (Croatia)

In Rijeka, a Youth Council serves as an advisory body to the city. Its members are between 15 and 30 years old and promote the rights, needs and interests of young people at a local level. For example, the Youth Council takes part in the preparation, implementation and monitoring of local youth programmes. It also initiates decisions at City Council sessions which are of relevance for young people.*

---

A recent example from Europe is a research project to gather the views of citizens about the transition to renewable energy sources. Citizen Juries were conducted in France, Ireland, Italy, Spain, and the UK. Members of the Citizens’ Juries discussed the social impacts of energy transition in their area and then deliberated on the types of future energy options they would prefer to see being rolled out.**

---

* Participedia: Citizens’ Jury. URL: https://participedia.net/method/155  
7. Getting the Timing Right

Before rolling out the main activities of the SUMP development, decide which phase each of the selected participatory activities will take place in, bearing in mind the following:

- **Start planning the engagement of citizens and stakeholders early.** At the beginning of the planning process, citizens and stakeholders can make the biggest influence because the process is still relatively open. However, often they don’t engage at this point. Towards the end of the planning process, the public tends to be more engaged and may ask for fundamental changes that are difficult to integrate because the plan is now well advanced.

- **Select strategic milestones of the SUMP development to involve the public, but avoid stakeholder fatigue.** Asking the same group of people over and over again to participate in similar activities may exceed their capacities. Important milestones for participation include: vision development, analysis, selection and validation of measures, discussion of scenarios and finalisation of the SUMP (see graphic).

- **Adapt your timeline to the schedule of the city government,** e.g. take into account holiday periods such as the summer, the time when new legislation is adopted, etc.

- **Coordinate with similar projects** that take place at the same time that are engaging a similar target audience.

- **Be flexible:** Realistically, timelines need to be adapted throughout the process. Whether it is a longer feedback loop with partners or a global pandemic like in 2020 - be willing to adjust your methods to the current situation and be creative in developing alternatives.
8. Conclusions

This publication shares reflections on experiences from the involvement of citizens in the SUMP development in Sarajevo and Tirana.

Not everything went to plan, but some activities brought even better results than expected, and the result was a rich set of lessons learnt. Sharing them in three different languages (English, Albanian, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian) through this publication contributes to a knowledge exchange in South East Europe. Hopefully it provides some helpful tips to assist other cities in the region. With the benefit of hindsight, the following observations stand out:

1) **Investment of time and effort pays off.** By actively engaging citizens through dialogue, resources and time, you will reap rewards through better quality results and greater “buy in”.

2) **Public participation is only worth as much as its results are clearly and systematically integrated** into the analysis and measure definition of the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan. Doing this leads to a better outcome which accurately reflects the needs of the community.

3) **Giving clear timely feedback to stakeholders is essential.** Genuine and transparent communication about what happened to stakeholders’ inputs, suggestions and ideas is key to strengthening the confidence of citizens in participatory activities. If you can do something, say why - if you can’t, it’s even more important to say why not.

4) **Citizen participation is a learning process for everyone involved:** participants, planners, and city authorities. Not everything may go smoothly at the first attempt but an honest assessment of the process will lead to better outcomes in the next cycle of public participation.
9. Resource Library

Selected Networks and Training Platforms

- CIVITAS (City ViTality and Sustainability Initiative): www.civitas.eu
- Eltis - The Urban Mobility Observatory: www.eltis.org
- EPOMM (European Platform on Mobility Management): www.epomm.eu
- POLIS: www.polisnetwork.eu
- TUMI (Transformative Urban Mobility Initiative): www.transformative-mobility.org

Selected Guidelines and Toolkits
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