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Background

• Two demonstrations planned in the Green Urban Distribution project
  – Electric distribution vehicles (finished in 2012)
  – Urban Consolidation Center (planned for spring 2014)

• Plans for UCC in Nedre Slottsgate in the city center
• Last-mile transport by electric cars or cargo bikes

• Several obstacles to the implementation process -> failure to establish UCC within the project period

• Two questions to prepare for successful implementation of UCC in Oslo:
  – What kind of barriers did the implementation meet?
  – How can these be overcome?
Urban Consolidation Center (UCC)

- Not a new idea – many UCCs have been implemented

- UCC may respond to several political aims:
  - Reduced emissions from last-mile transport
  - Alleviate problems of congestion, parking and maneuvering
  - Better road safety in inner city streets
  - Contribute to more attractive city centers for people and businesses

- Not straightforward to implement
Implementation of transport policy measures

- Implementing measures is "more easily said than done" (May et al. 2006)

- The consensus that is present during policy formation often shifts to conflict upon realization

- In the Green Urban Distribution project, most partners agreed on UCC as a second demonstration

- Still – not carried through
Theoretical framework

• Useful as a guide to potential factors
• Increase general relevance of specific cases

• Implementation theory in political sciences – top-down and bottom-up perspectives
• No comprehensive theory of policy implementation

• Transport policy implementation – mostly concerned with support systems for designing policies

• Less focus on frameworks for evaluating barriers to implementation
A framework for barrier evaluation in urban freight policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial and practical barriers</td>
<td>How is this particular barrier described?</td>
<td>What is the plausible timeframe for overcoming the barrier?</td>
<td>Is the barrier likely to pose an important obstacle to implementation?</td>
<td>Who is the appropriate institutional actor(s) to take relevant action?</td>
<td>What actions must take place in order to achieve implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural barriers</td>
<td>(acceptability among stakeholders)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguished between Not important, Quite important and Highly important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional barriers</td>
<td>(issues of coordination between administrative and policy entities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal barriers</td>
<td>(requirements or constraints in laws and regulations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on D. Browne et al. (2012)*
Data material

• The analysis is based on research activities and findings in the Green Urban Distribution project:
  – Literature studies
  – Stakeholder surveys
  – Focus group seminars
  – Project meetings with involved stakeholders
Identified barriers

• Financial and practical barriers:
  – A UCC requires both investments and operational costs
  – Lack of a business model for how costs would be financed
    • The City of Oslo would not subsidize operating costs
    • No carrier motivated to operate without volume guarantees

• Social and cultural barriers:
  – Carriers and end-receivers not motivated to change a distribution system that they have invested in
  – Present situation "works well enough"
  – Expecting increased costs, increased delivery time and reduced security for goods
  – Not perceived as "fair" that private actors should pay more for contributing to a living city that we all want
Identified barriers

• Institutional barriers:
  – Many public bodies involved in the process within the city administration and the police
  – All bodies have their own priorities and targets
  – The City procurement office would not allow deliveries of goods to City offices to pass through a UCC
  – The Police used several months to process an application of new sign regulations where the UCC would be placed

• Legal barriers:
  – Procurement regulations
  – Road sign regulations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial and practical</td>
<td>Lack of business model</td>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>Highly important</td>
<td>City and private stakeholders</td>
<td>Agree upon business model (proposed model is ready at present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coverage of initial and operative costs</td>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>Highly important</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Make possible sources of income visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Find a private actor who can take the responsibility for implementation and operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding an appropriate localization</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Quite important</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Traffic analysis, search of available consolidation and storage room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural</td>
<td>Private stakeholders unwilling to pay for freight externalities</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Quite important</td>
<td>City and private stakeholders</td>
<td>Enhanced focus on collaboration for greener urban freight through establishment of formalized network of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived negative impacts from UCC on carrier economy and delivery predictability</td>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>Quite important</td>
<td>City and carriers</td>
<td>Integration of carrier concerns in plans for UCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End-receivers have low problem perception, satisfied with present arrangements</td>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>Quite important</td>
<td>City and end-receivers</td>
<td>Advantages with UCC (e.g. predictability and added value services) must be made visible to end-receivers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Barrier matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>Conflicts of interest between different governmental bodies</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Quite important</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Environmental concern must be lifted and prioritized by higher political levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal</strong></td>
<td>Procurement legislation</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Quite important</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Procurement contracts for deliveries to City entities must be changed to route deliveries via UCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road sign legislation</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Application for new regulation must be filed in good time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• What have we learned?
  – Establishing a UCC takes time!
  – Many issues that need to be solved
  – The most important barriers:
    • Unclear business terms
    • Low acceptability among private actors

• The study unites approaches to urban freight with implementation theory and research on acceptability from passenger transport
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