Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities provide data on the progress of the planning process and the impact of policy measures. They happen before, during and after the implementation of a SUMP, and are therefore intervention measures. They provide information to planners and decision makers, allowing them to identify problems, potential successes or needs for readjusting a SUMP and its measures.

**EXAMPLES**

It is important to develop an M&E plan that describes the current and baseline situation, planning objectives, intended activities, responsibilities and processes. It can be part of the SUMP itself or a freestanding document. A key part for a SUMP M&E plan is defining indicators for which to collect data during and after implementation. These need to clearly link to the SUMP's objectives.

The EU-funded CH₄LLERNGE project has developed an M&E plan template for urban transport planners. The M&E plan should be a living document that is adapted to new developments and knowledge gained during the SUMP process.

M&E activities should happen regularly, although their frequency might vary, with evaluation at longer intervals. At the start of the planning process, cities should collect data to identify problems and establish a baseline against which they compare impacts. Cities should conduct monitoring at key moments during the SUMP process as a minimum. Continuously monitoring and routinely collecting core data and information should happen for the whole SUMP. Evaluation generally happens at the end of planning cycles, but in practice monitoring and evaluation activities often occur in parallel with implementation (for example, to review intermediate outcomes).

CH₄LLERNGE also designed a SUMP Self-Assessment Tool to enable planning authorities to check and demonstrate the...
compliance of their planning authority’s mobility plan with the SUMP concept. The tool validates the planning process, together with certain content of the plan. The feedback from the self-assessment helps authorities understand where they have strong SUMP characteristics and where they can improve the planning process. The primary use of the Self-Assessment Tool is when the planning authority has finalized and approved its SUMP. It can also evaluate an earlier mobility plan to find out whether it contains the principles of sustainable urban mobility planning.

RESULTS
M&E is important for developing and implementing SUMPs. It provides regular information to decision makers, potential funding bodies and local stakeholders. These can help to convince them that a SUMP has delivered, or will deliver benefits to the community, provides value for money and is worth continuing, or requires modifications to be successful.

However, current monitoring and evaluation practice differs widely across cities and countries in Europe. Many cities report a lack of experience, funding and institutional cooperation that are necessary to successfully carry out M&E activities.

POLICY/LEGISLATION
Only a few European countries have legal obligations for monitoring and evaluating SUMPs (these include France and Belgium). Other countries monitor activities to provide background information for formalised planning processes or to ensure they comply with environmental regulations. If evaluation requirements exist, they are often driven by financial considerations in the framework of project funding but there is generally little systematic integration of evaluation into the decision-making processes.

INSTITUTIONS
When awarding funding for mobility purposes, the European Commission wishes to ensure that the projects and initiatives proposed are the result of a sound planning process. Various operational programmes within the EU’s Structural and Investment Funds now require planning authorities to develop SUMPs. As a result, cities and regions, their stakeholders as well as EU member states and European institutions require a clear set of criteria to decide whether a given plan does indeed meet the criteria of a SUMP as presented in the European Commission’s Urban Mobility Package (December 2013) and ‘Guidelines – Developing and Implementing a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan’ (January 2014).

Stakeholders and the public should have the opportunity to provide their feedback about the planning process and their involvement in a systematic manner and should be entitled to receive information about the quality of the process in which they have participated. Process evaluation should be understood as an opportunity to reflect upon the planning process self-critically during and after the SUMP development phase. A systematic reflection is important as the quality, political relevance and stability of a SUMP partly depends on the details of the process.

TRANSFERABILITY
In general, M&E techniques and methodologies are highly transferable even if they have to be adapted to the local environment. There are good practice examples of relevant urban indicators that are available for reference as well. However, identifying specific indicators that may be relevant for each city’s unique context or how to inform the public about the progress is a political issue that may depend upon bureaucratic processes and local legislative frameworks.
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CASE STUDY: OUTPUT AND PROCESS INDICATORS IN KRAKÓW (POLAND)

Context
Kraków developed a tool to evaluate actions related to its 2017-2015 Transport Policy. The tool allowed the city to evaluate subjects such as spatial planning, public transport, the road system, parking, cycling, organisation and management, financial and economic policy, environmental protection, travel behaviour, communication with citizens and community education.

In action
Kraków carried out a three-stage evaluation for each of the above-mentioned subjects. In the first stage, it evaluated each individual instrument separately as part of each area. To this end, experts assess the total degree of implementation of policies. There are three degrees of the implementation of specific policy instruments with assessments: 1. Low; 2. Average; 3. High.

In the second stage a cumulative indicator value for the implementation of the given policy subject is determined by calculating the ratio of the actual implementation of policies to the maximum possible value in percent.

For example, a possible eight instruments planned for spatial planning result in a maximum score of 24.

In the third stage, the city uses a four-point scale to rate each policy subject based on the implementation achievement:
- 0 - 30% (the transport policy is not implemented);
- 31 - 50% (risk of insufficient implementation of the transport policy)
- 51 - 70% (transport policy is implemented reasonably well);
- Over 71% (transport policy is properly carried out).

Results
Kraków conducted a first trial assessment in 2014, mainly among local experts from the Technical University of Kraków and city representatives. The overall average score (46%) showed, according to Stage III criteria, that there is an overall risk of insufficient implementation of the transport policies. Due to some general issues and the necessity to discuss and improve the procedure details, the city does not consider the score valid for now. Krakow is in plans to update procedure and organise another assessment.
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