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Abstract
In line with the increasing urban population in cities across Europe, the pressure on urban transport systems increases. The demand for efficiency faces the challenges of sustainable urban development. In this regard, European knowledge organisations promote partnerships between cities in order to work together on urban issues. This thesis investigates the function of three knowledge organisations, EUROCITIES, URBACT, and CIVITAS regarding their utilisation for sustainable urban mobility projects. The concept of policy mobility provides a theoretical frame for the thesis, while the qualitative research design combines semi-structured interviews with experts and a content analysis of organisational documents. The results display similarities between the purposes and main targets of the organisations: the establishment of city networks, transferring and sharing of good practices, and fostering collaborations are the main drivers. Increasing importance is attributed to knowledge exchange between European cities and the possibilities that arise from such cooperation. Also, the identification of the citizens as the priority of sustainable urban mobility is emphasised and indicates the shift that proceeds in urban mobility planning. The thesis generates a new understanding for the interplay of key indicators for sustainable mobility planning and the important role of organisations in facilitating knowledge exchanges between cities.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGM</td>
<td>Annual general meeting (Eurocities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APUM</td>
<td>Action Plan for Urban Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoR</td>
<td>Committee of the Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUMP</td>
<td>Concept for Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EaSI</td>
<td>Employment and Social Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDF</td>
<td>European Regional Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC</td>
<td>European Territorial Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTE</td>
<td>Knowledge Transfer and Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable development goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>Sustainable urban mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMP</td>
<td>Sustainable urban mobility plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTP</td>
<td>Traditional transport plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART I: Conceptual frame

1. Introduction

“What[ever] happens in one city can have effects on other places that may physically be located on the other side of the earth” (Metzger/Olsson, 2013).

The quote introduces the research topic of this thesis, which investigates the interplay between policy mobility, knowledge transfer, the role of knowledge organisations, and sustainable urban mobility across European cities. According to Metzger/Olsson (2013), development in one city can affect practices in other cities. The idea is based on the assumption that knowledge travels from one location to another, quasi from one city to another.

Current literature and numerous research articles forecast that 80% of Europeans will be living in urban areas by 2020 (EC, 2014), linking the population growth to the demand for sustainable urban development of cities. Generally, sustainable development encompasses of economic, environmental, and social aspects (WCED, 1987), which have to be balanced to create sustainability. Caused by the growth of urban population growth, the pressure on urban mobility systems and the demand for efficient transport systems increase. In this regard, sustainable urban mobility plans (SUMPs) address the challenges of urban mobility by combining transport planning with innovative, sustainable aspects of mobility, such as integrated sustainable transport modes, or public participation, in order to develop a more efficient urban transport system. The development and implementation of SUMPs is trending, resulting in an increasing need to learn about solutions and practices to solve urban issues. The European Union (EU) signed off the Urban Mobility Package1, which constitutes general mobility guidelines for cities, and provides financial support to development projects.

In order to meet the demands for sustainable development and mobility, collaborations between cities have to be facilitated in order to work together on common solutions to urban challenges, which often show basic similarities. European knowledge organisations2, such as EUROCITIES, CIVITAS, and URBACT provide the chance for cities to be part of a city network, giving space to work together collaboratively. These networks are fundamental for knowledge exchange, cooperation, and partnerships, which anon are necessary for making policies ‘mobile’ and transferable (Reagans/McEvily, 2003; McCann, 2011). Quoting Banister (2000), who refers to “motion [a]s the driving force of progress” (ibid: 13), illustrates the general frame of this thesis, where ‘mobility’ describes movement in multiple meanings.

Until today, there is a lack of comprehensive approaches on the function of knowledge organisations of facilitating policy mobility of sustainable urban mobility (SUM) projects. Moreover, it is not fully explored to what extent SUMPs are transferable. Another gap is mentioned by Wolman/Page (2002), who reflect on the lack

---


2 For simplification and to minimise interruption of the reading flow, EUROCITIES, URBACT, and CIVITAS are referred to as ‘knowledge organisations’, although the different internal structures remain acknowledged.
of research on the providers and senders of policies, because it is mainly focused on the recipient and local adjustments (ibid).

In this regard, this thesis is an approach to combine different topics and scrutinising the role of knowledge organisations regarding policy mobility of SUM projects across European cities. The thesis investigates how involved stakeholders perceive their work in knowledge organisations, how knowledge exchange and policy mobility influence the development and implementation process of SUMPs, and how the transferability of SUMPs across Europe proceeds. The thesis topic targets the research gap by examining both senders and receivers of knowledge, because stakeholders can take on both roles. Furthermore, the utilisation of knowledge organisations and policy mobility is analysed.

In order to address the topic, the following research question is developed: What is the purpose and function of European knowledge organisations regarding policy mobility of sustainable urban mobility plans?. Thereby three sub-questions arise: How and to what extent can SUMPs be transferred and adopted across European cities?, How is the development and implementation process of SUMPs influenced by knowledge exchange?, and What is the perception of stakeholders involved in knowledge organisations regarding policy mobility?

![Figure 1: Interplay of topics of interest regarding the research question.](image)

The graphic indicates the aim of the thesis, which is to 1) investigate the interplay between the different topics, 2) the role of knowledge organisations regarding policy mobilities, and 3) how sustainable urban mobility planning is influenced by knowledge exchange activities. The thesis strives for a deeper understanding of policy mobilities, regarding the binary meaning of the policies being ‘mobile’, and the utilisation for European cities of being involved in knowledge organisations and SUM projects.

The thesis is split in three parts, of which Part I presents the topic, reviews the literature covering the field of research and describes the conceptual background. Part II introduces the three knowledge organisations EUROCITIES, CIVITAS, and URBACT and their SUM projects. Since the role of knowledge organisations is the focus of the research, they are initially described to the research design, which combines the analytical steps of interviewing and content analysis. In Part III of the thesis, the results are presented and discussed, according to emerging themes of the analyses. The thesis closes with a critical reflection on the research process, ethical considerations, concluding thoughts, and opportunities for further research.
2. Literature and thematic approach

As indicated above, current academic literature on European knowledge organisations is rare. There is a gap in the examination of the purpose and utilisation of knowledge organisations working on urban issues. The following literature review explains how and to what extent European organisations are mentioned in recent literature in the context of knowledge exchange and SUM. To understand the concept of SUM as it is used in the thesis the key indicators of SUMPs are described. Following this, the theoretical background for the analysis, based on relevant concepts of policy mobilities and knowledge sharing and exchange is explained.

2.1 Knowledge transfer / exchange

The topic of knowledge transfer and exchange can be described as an interdisciplinary issue. Ilić (2012) differentiates between knowledge exchange and knowledge transfer. Knowledge transfer is defined as the provision of information to stakeholders, whereas knowledge exchange combines the collaboration of stakeholders to work through occurring difficulties and barriers in the implementation process in regard to the internal structure of organisations. Even though Ilić’s article is situated in the field of public health, the findings are regarded as relevant for urban planning as well, because knowledge exchange between individuals happens cross-sectoral (ibid). Reychav/Te’eni (2009) describe a quantitative approach to measure the scale of knowledge in informal versus formal settings. The researchers thereby distinguish between formal settings like workshops or lectures, and informal interactions as coffee breaks or social events. Findings indicate that more knowledge is shared in formal settings than at informal interactions. Results are found for seven knowledge content categories, such as subject, academic and practical implications, methodology, conclusions and results, and presenters. The article concludes with the reflection that knowledge-seekers deliberately join lectures to obtain new knowledge, whereas the knowledge-providers find themselves eager to share knowledge. Formal settings provide the attendees with a common base for further informal interaction and therefore with the opportunity to shape social relationships, which can foster future research or academic exchange (ibid).

Networks of knowledge exchange can be understood as consistent because these networks or communities possess the ability to transfer complex practices and ideas to other actors inside and outside the network (Reagans/McEvily, 2003). Knowledge exchange is regarded as simpler if the recipient and the sender of knowledge refer to a mutual knowledge base. Also, the influence of social cohesion within networks is mentioned regarding knowledge transfer, where it is understood as a positive multiplier for individuals to work closely together with people who share the same values (ibid).

The differentiation of sharing knowledge with one person or a group of people is illustrated in Figure 2, which is adapted from the illustration by Contandriopoulos et al. (2010: 448). The figure differentiates between the effects that result from top-down knowledge exchange, like a conference or formal setting, and the systematic effects that arise from the information exchange on a singular scale, displaying an informal setting among individuals or small groups.
Both figures describe knowledge exchange by emphasizing the level where the exchange occurs. Knowledge exchange systems are described as “[...] complex because they are made up of complex human actors” (ibid: 456). Networks for knowledge exchange are also the focus of an article by Bernstein et al. (2015), who acknowledge the impact of knowledge exchange networks on learning effects within organisations. The researchers develop a quantitative approach to the establishment of knowledge exchange networks.

### 2.2 European knowledge organisations

Literature reflects on EUROCITIES and URBACT and their role as knowledge organisations, whereas CIVITAS is not mentioned in the reviewed literature. However, all three organisations are solely examples in the thesis, therefore the results can be carefully generalised and applied to all three organisations.

The comprehensive approach by González Medina/Fedeli (2015) to urban policies in Europe describes the process of the EU towards an ‘Urban Agenda’, which was first introduced in 1997 (COM (97) 197 final). The informality of the implementation process through the combination of governmental institutions and individual urban actors, such as stakeholders, knowledge organisations, or networks is explained. EUROCITIES and URBACT are mentioned as examples for promoting and supporting knowledge exchange on urban issues. Also, the role of URBACT for strengthening the exchange between cities and stakeholders by using the informal setting to work around national or regional dependency is emphasised. Paradowska/Platje (2015) describe that the interactions within the URBACT programme facilitate the exchange of good practices and learning from each other.

To assess current literature on knowledge organisations, a reflection on the Europe 2020 strategy (see 4.2.1) and sustainable development and mobility (see 2.3) is valuable. While both topics are discussed in the course of this thesis, a few arguments
are mentioned incidentally. In summary, the Europe 2020 strategy states priorities for sustainable, integrative, and smart urban development of European cities, balancing economic, environmental, and social issues on the way to foster sustainability. It is important to note that the Europe 2020 strategy is supposed to be used by cities as a reference framework for the development of their individual sustainable urban development plans (EU, 2017). The results of Naterer et al. (2018), who examine the measurements taken towards the Europe 2020 strategy, indicate that there is a lack of successful implementations regarding sustainable development. The article triggers the question if European cities neglect certain urban challenges in their development plans.

As mentioned before, EUROCITIES, URBACT, and CIVITAS function as knowledge exchange networks to operate towards sustainable urban development in Europe. D’Onofrio et al. (2018) describe the partnerships and interactions of local or national actors as a main part in the process of the EU to work towards some common Urban Agenda for European cities. Due to partnerships and the involvement of stakeholders, action plans are developed aiming for improvement and efficiency. The partnerships and networks work on both the EU level as well as the local level. The current draft of the Urban Agenda, published in 2018, is a collection of mobility actions for cities (EC, 2018). Payre (2010) reflects on the change of EUROCITIES over the last decades regarding its role and influence because the organisation established itself as an influential organisation for urban development and inter-urban networks. The circulation and exchange of knowledge is stated as one of the main drivers of EUROCITIES.

2.3 Sustainable urban mobility

The concept of sustainability is being used almost inflationarily in recent urban development plans. Based on the Brundtland report (WCED, 1987) the definition as “Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” is used in this thesis as a general definition of sustainability. The term is based on the interplay of economic, environmental, and social factors, which have to be in balance for sustainable development (Richardson, 1999, as stated by Isaksson et al., 2017).

Emerging from the concept of sustainability, sustainable mobility is approached by Banister (2008), stating that “sustainable mobility has a central role to play in the future of sustainable cities, but it is only through the understanding and acceptance by the people that it will succeed.” (ibid: 80). The quote emphasises the orientation of sustainable development towards the people and their needs. According to Gudmundsson (2003), the aim of urban sustainability and sustainable mobility can be described as a common goal in transport planning and policy-making. The issue can be addressed on local, national, and global levels. Holden (2012) also describes the understanding of the society as a basis for individual attitude change, leading to collectively shared values and finally to sustainable behaviour (ibid: 222). Paradowska (2010) forges a bridge from the influence of the EU to the implementation of policies targeting SUM. By describing the mainly negative and far-reaching impacts of urban transportation, the author builds a foundation to explain EU
interventions. Local authorities are responsible for developing and subsequently executing urban development projects according to the local conditions (COM (2007) 551 final, as stated by Paradowska, 2010). The author makes a key addition on what is necessary when striving for SUM: the focus shall not only be on the environmental and economic factors, but it must also target improvements for people, such as accessibility and provision of social facilities within the ‘commuting zone’. While nowadays sustainability is a common aspect in transport planning, Kyamakya/Mitrea (2010) emphasise the role of the citizens as the fundament for improvements. The customer’s opinions for urban transport shall not be neglected, as they resemble the social aspects of the sustainability goal. Paradowska (2010) states that public transport should be enhanced, for example through the integration of other transport modes to enlarge the public transport system. Sustainable transport modes include for example bicycles or car-sharing (Roller, 2016: 77). Furthermore, Paradowska (2010) mentions different interventions of the EU are mentioned, such as the CIVITAS Initiative (see 4.3) or the Action Plan on Urban Mobility (APUM) (see 2.3.1).

As a key topic of the thesis, a comprehensive assessment of the concept of SUM is important. Because of the lack of a universally accepted definition, the following description of sustainable transport by the United Nations (UN) is used for the analysis in this thesis: “Sustainable transport is the provision of services and infrastructure for the mobility of people and goods—advancing economic and social development to benefit today’s and future generations—in a manner that is safe, affordable, accessible, efficient, and resilient, while minimizing carbon and other emissions and environmental impacts.” (UN, 2016: 10). The definition describes the interdisciplinarity of sustainable transport, which combines economic, environmental, and social aspects. In this context, the main objectives of the APUM (COM (2009) 490) are sketched, which is part of the Urban Mobility Package of the EU. Also, the principles of Traditional Transport Planning (TTP) and SUM planning are compared, in order to illustrate the differences between the two approaches to mobility planning (Eltisa, accessed 2018-02-04).

2.3.1 Action Plan on Urban Mobility

The APUM introduces the different steps and interventions of the European Commission (EC) to cope with the steady growth of European cities and the challenges that are linked to the increase of urban population. Among other results3, the Flash Eurobarometer (2007) identifies urban mobility and transport as a key challenge for urban areas and indicated the need for sustainable development in the future (Flash Eurobarometer 206b, 2007 as stated in COM (2009) 490). According to this, the APUM sets a coherent framework on urban mobility for EU cities, while acknowledging that significant differences can occur between cities, regarding location, size, and economy. The necessity to adjust and individually shape the framework is recognized. As part of the Common Transport Policy under Articles 70 and 80 EC, the influence of the EU on urban transport systems is important. Urban mobility can be understood as one part of a network, which comprises of

3 Also: car use, environment, personal mobility, and rights.
different urban objectives for example environment, social aspects, economy, or public health. This means, by approaching one objective, the reciprocal influence of other objectives has to be considered (COM (2009) 490: 3). Good practices and successful developments are promoted through the EU, resulting in the transfer of knowledge on policies, strategies, and practices. Hence, an integrated approach to urban mobility planning that combines different disciplines and objectives is needed.

The APUM states different interventions towards more sustainability, such as the promotion of integrated policies, the focus on different actor groups like citizens and stakeholders, the greening of urban transport, strengthening the funding and investment in SUM, support the sharing of knowledge and experience among stakeholders, and the betterment of urban mobility through integration and interconnection of transport modes.

### 2.3.2 Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning and Plans

Generally, a SUMP can be defined as a strategic plan with the purpose to address the mobility needs of different actors in cities and urban areas to improve the quality of urban life (Eltis b, accessed 2018-05-31). SUMPs are created based on existing planning practices and principles like integration, participation, and evaluation (Eltis c, 2015, accessed 2018-02-04). It is worthwhile to distinguish between TTP and SUM planning as illustrated in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Transport Planning (TTP)</th>
<th>Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning (SUMP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on traffic</td>
<td>Focus on people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary objectives: Traffic flow capacity; speed</td>
<td>Primary objectives: Accessibility; quality of life; sustainability; economic viability; social equity; health; environmental quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal-focussed</td>
<td>Balanced development of all relevant transport modes and shift towards cleaner and more sustainable transport modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectorial planning document</td>
<td>Sectorial planning document that is consistent and complementary to related policy areas (i.e. land use planning, social services, health, enforcement and policing, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short- and medium-term delivery plan</td>
<td>Short- and medium-term delivery plan embedded in a long-term vision and strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning by experts (such as traffic engineers)</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary planning teams with the involvement of stakeholders (using a transparent and participatory approach)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Differences between planning processes [selected indicators] (based on Eltis c, 2015, accessed 2018-02-04)
The TTP indicates a straightforward but narrow way of planning transport, addressing urban mobility issues by mainly focusing on infrastructure. The focus on infrastructure is evident in traffic flow and speed as the main objectives. The TTP thereby neglects the importance of the interplay of multiple other objectives such as accessibility, environmental, and health quality, which are included in the SUMP. The SUMP generally incorporates related urban topics, such as land planning and social services of the planning process, aiming for a more balanced urban development by involving interdisciplinary stakeholders instead of exclusively planning experts. Another significant difference is the long-term vision behind SUMPs, ensuring the relevance of the implementations for future generations. This long-term perspective of planning can be understood as fundamental for sustainable development of cities and urban areas.

The literature review and description of SUM planning constitutes the basis for the theoretical concepts, which are subsequently explained. The literature and thematic approaches provide an overview about the research topic and how it is located in the field. The concepts of knowledge sharing and exchange as well as policy transfer and policy mobilities represent the theoretical frame for the thesis and the analysis. The concepts are used to examine the role of knowledge organisations on facilitating the exchange activities between cities, in order to understand the mechanisms behind exchange activities and the mobilisation of policies.

3. Theoretical concepts
3.1 Knowledge transfer, sharing, and exchange

A central theoretical concept, which is used for further analysis, is the concept of knowledge. In this regard, it is useful to distinguish between knowledge transfer and knowledge sharing, because according to Wang/Noe (2010), the concepts differentiate. The researchers describe knowledge transfer as the “movement of knowledge between different units, divisions, or organizations”, while knowledge sharing is synonymous with knowledge exchange and refers to the provision of knowledge and information to others (ibid: 117). Following Wang/Noe (2010), the terms of knowledge sharing and exchange are used interchangeably throughout this thesis. The focus of knowledge research is on organisational knowledge sharing (exemplary Bock/Kim, 2001; Cummings, 2004; Hansen, 1999). Subsequently, the concepts are explained, whereby it is necessary to remain alert of the differences of sharing knowledge within an organisation and sharing with external actors. According to Nonaka (2000), the function of an organisation is to manage information and develop solutions to problems through processing knowledge and information. Based on this, innovation is defined as a key process of organisations for approaching problems and knowledge creation. The individual is assigned the main role in the process of creating organisational knowledge through her*his personal experiences and knowledge. For the process of building and sharing of knowledge, interactions with others are significant (ibid).

Knowledge transfer in organisations through internal and external groups is a key factor for the effectiveness of the organisation itself (Argote et al, 2000, as stated by Cummings, 2004). The necessity for organisations to transfer knowledge aiming to
foster productivity and efficiency is increasing. The process of knowledge transfer is thereby described as the interference of the recipient and knowledge-provider, for example between individuals, actor groups, or other organisational actors (Argote et al., 2000). The difference of the social processes that constitute knowledge transfer on individual and organisational levels is explained (ibid).

The article by Wang/Noe (2010) summarises the literature on different types of knowledge sharing. The article characterises knowledge sharing as the distribution of know-how and information via written exchange (documents, articles, summaries), or oral exchange, such as direct (face-to-face) and indirect (telephone) communications of stakeholders or experts. The sharing of information forms itself through sharing activities and the development of strategies, ideas, or practices (Bartol/Srivastava, 2002). Interactions are regarded as significant for the exchange of knowledge and the creation of innovative ideas (Nonaka, 2000). Bartol/Srivastava (2002) introduce mechanisms for organisations for knowledge sharing, such as organisational databases, formal and informal interactions, and communities of practice, gathering individuals interested in a specific topic. Based on this, Cummings (2004) distinguishes between different forms of structural diversity regarding knowledge sharing. Hypotheses state that sharing knowledge is both internally and externally valuable for organisations, as external knowledge sharing enlarges the chance to acquire new knowledge. This is based on the assumption that knowledge in a working group is shared with all group members, where external knowledge constitutes an additional, positive effect. Similar to this, knowledge of individuals can be understood as part of the organisational knowledge, which becomes ‘collective’ through sharing (Lam, 2000). The positive influence of organisational influence is mentioned by Lin (2007), noting the effect of collaborations and interactions among co-workers and group members. Furthermore, different locations of work group members create the possibility to sharing knowledge and information of other networks and experiences. The structural diversity is also evident in the different disciplines and backgrounds of the group members as well as including more stakeholders and actors in the exchange process increases the value of the shared knowledge (Cummings, 2004).

3.2 Policy transfer and policy mobilities

In the following, different approaches to policy transfer and the conceptual transition to policy mobilities, as well as assemblages of circuits of knowledge are described. The concepts are described in based on their relation to each other and illustrate how the concept of policy mobilities emerged from policy transfer, whereby both describe the movement of ideas and practices.

3.2.1 Policy transfer

As following explained, the concept of policy transfer describes the process of transferring an idea, policy, or practice from one location to another. The transfer is based on the assumption that a successful policy in one city is likely to be as successful in another. Therefore, the transfer process comprises of only few adaptations of the transferred object. According to Dolowitz/Marsh (1996), policy transfer is a “process by which knowledge of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and
ideass in one political system (past or present) is used in the development of similar features in another” (ibid: 344). Dolowitz/Marsh (1996) as well as Wolman/Page (2002) identify transfer as an exchange within a country as well as among countries. Referring to this, the literature often names globalisation or Europeanisation as possible reasons for the increase of policy transfer (exemplary Künkel, 2015; Benson/Jordan, 2011; McCann/Ward, 2013). Categories of transfer can be distinguished, for example policy goals, structure and content, ideas and concepts, policy instruments or administrative techniques (Dolowitz/Marsh, 1996). These categories stretch across diverse groups of actors engaged in the transfer process, such as experts and policy entrepreneurs, supra-national and nongovernmental institutions, or elected officials (Dolowitz/Marsh, 2000). Policy transfer can therefore be understood as a process of policy learning, drawing knowledge and utilisation from successful policies somewhere else (Wolman/Page, 2002).

The transformation from the term ‘policy transfer’ to ‘policy mobilities’ refers to the importance of acknowledging the mobile character of policies, which can rarely be adopted as a ‘whole package’ (ibid). According to McCann (2011), the model of policy transfer by Dolowitz/Marsh (2000) can be criticised in different points. The focus on transfer within nations is criticised, as it neglects the international transferability of policy models. Also, the changeability of policies during the transfer process should be further emphasised, as it refers to the fundamental meaning of urban policy mobilities.

3.2.2 Policy mobilities

Based on the conceptualisation of policy transfer, the concepts of urban policy mobilities and circuits of knowledge are developed by McCann (2011) who made significant additions to the concept of policy transfer. Policies are understood as models that consist of multiple ‘ideal’ policies, whereas knowledge refers to the expertise about ‘best practices’ and the implementation of policies (ibid). The transfer of knowledge and policies is made possible through circuits of knowledge and policy mobilities. Policy mobilities are defined as “fixed in and mobilized through communities of social actors and their associated institutions” (ibid: 114). Policy mobilities can be experienced within three different categories: local policy actors, global consultants, and the reproduction through informal infrastructures (ibid).

The literature on urban policy mobilities is similar in the sense that the term emphasises the changeability and flexibility of policies. McFarlane (2011) introduces the idea of picturing a city as a machine, from which policy-makers can learn. The city-machine builds on the idea of policies being existent because they ‘move’ from one location to another. This ‘movement’ or ‘mobilisation’ of policy models changes the content and character of the models, policies, and ideas, requiring adaptations to local conditions (McCann, 2011). According to McCann/Ward (2015), the mobility of policies can be understood in a dual way – describing the transfer as a mobilisation of policies, but also refer to the attribution of policies as ‘mobile’. In this regard, policies possess an interactive character, being both constructed and transferred through communication, for example in form of documents, (in)formal talks or meetings (Freeman, 2012). The author argues that mobility, flexibility, and
adaptation is necessary for policies, because policies “must change in order to move, and [they] must move in order to exist” (ibid: 20).

In this context it is relevant to note that policies mutate and adjust through their transfer from one site to another. Within this transfer process, they can be divided in incoming and outgoing policies (McCann, 2011). Also, the idea of ‘learning from each other’ is introduced as an important part of policy mobilities, whereby the learning processes within can be divided in the categories of translation, coordination, and dwelling (McFarlane, 2011). In this regard, Wood (2016) introduces three procedures how policy actors can learn from each other: firstly, by following the people and understandings of mobile policies; secondly, by following the materials; and thirdly, by following the meetings, conferences, or seminars. While the framework recognizes the theoretical, physical, and social mobility of policies, it also accentuates the “ephemeral” (ibid: 393) character of policy movements.

### 3.2.3 Assemblages and circuits of knowledge

Literature understands cities as ‘assemblages’ of exchange of ideas and transformations through actors (exemplary Affolderbach/Schultz, 2016; Künkel, 2015; McCann/Ward, 2013). These assemblages of knowledge often refer to a specific spatial scale, for example the local scale refers to a policy or city. McCann/Ward (2013) state that policies, as gatherings of assemblages of multiple ideas, are influenced and constructed for specific purposes and interests. The argument emphasises the approach to policies as mobile assemblages of knowledge that change ‘along the way’ instead of being packed and shipped. Wood (2016) discusses assemblages of learning by stating that individuals are influenced by ideas, innovations, and experiences, which circulate around and are exchanged through interactions, documents, etc. This leads to the development of own assemblages of learning and subsequently to the sharing through documents, academic interactions, or research journals. Resulting from this, the idea of constant reproduction of assemblages of learning arises (ibid). Circuits of knowledge are formed by social connections of actors, shaping, and depending on epistemic communities of transfer and utilisation (McCann, 2011). Healey (2013) describes circuits of knowledge, among actor-network theory and interpretive policy analysis, as a possible theory strains for approaching planning ideas and practices. Firstly, circuits refer to dynamics as globalization, Europeanisation and political and economic forces. Secondly, networks are also relevant and can be understood as strong forces to influence mobile ideas, practices, and policies (ibid). Emerging from this, a change from ‘transfer to ‘mobility’ is performed, resulting in an urban policy mobilities perspective that acknowledges the mobilisation of policies.

Part II of the thesis introduces three European knowledge organisations, which are the examined in the analysis. Also, the research design, which combines the methods of semi-structured interviewing and content analysis, is described.
PART II: European knowledge organisations and empirical methods

4. Organisations

To address the research questions, stakeholders from different cities around Europe are interviewed about their perception on knowledge exchange and the transfer of SUM projects between cities. EUROCITIES, a city network, the URBACT programme, and the CIVITAS Initiative are selected to exemplify European knowledge organisations. The organisations are selected based on their efforts to facilitate collaboration between European cities, the number of member cities, relevance, and current SUM projects. Also, the partnerships between the organisations influenced the selection, sparking the idea to examine possible links between them. In regard of the research question, it is necessary to examine multiple organisations, in order to analyse knowledge exchange between European cities. Table 2 illustrates an overview about the organisations and SUMP projects that constitute the focus of the empirical analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EUROCITIES</th>
<th>URBACT</th>
<th>CIVITAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CREATE project</td>
<td>CityMobilNet project</td>
<td>PROSPERITY project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUMPs-Up project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Overview organisations and projects.

4.1 EUROCITIES

As one of the relevant European knowledge organisations, subsequently EUROCITIES is introduced according to general information, internal structure, the Mobility Forum, and the urban mobility and transport project CREATE. EUROCITIES is a network of European cities which was founded in 1986 at a conference in the Netherlands, where eleven cities participated. In 1989, the mayors of Barcelona, Birmingham, Frankfurt, Lyon, Milan, and Rotterdam developed the EUROCITIES network, which was mainly based on existing relationships among European institutions, critical political thinking, and the focus on urban issues. In 1990, a third conference was held in Lyon and resulted in working groups on social and economic topics, working towards establishing an integrated urban model in Europe.

Nowadays, EUROCITIES counts about 140 large cities and 45 partner cities across 38 countries. In recent years, especially the strong partnership and close collaboration between the cities of Rotterdam and Leipzig led to an increase of the network, regarding its influence, relevance, and the number of member cities. The members are the elected municipal and local governments involved in six thematic forums. Simply said, the mission of EUROCITIES is to connect its members through events, conferences, working groups, etc. for the purpose of exchanging knowledge and experiences. EUROCITIES brings the city mayors and leaders together, aiming to make
an impact on EU policy-making through joint actions and the Urban Agenda of the EU. Because the organisation works closely with the EU, it strives to empower city governments to share their know-how, policies, practices, and strategies about urban challenges and sustainable development. EUROCITIES emphasises the importance of connecting not only European cities, but also targeting urban challenges of local and EU level (EUROCITIES, 2017).

EUROCITIES’ internal structure consists of an Executive Committee, which has twelve elected stakeholders, who work in groups on interdisciplinary topics such as public services, neighbourhood issues, and governance. The Executive Committee is responsible for the coordination and the current president and leader is Daniël Termont, the mayor of Ghent. The other members are the mayors or active leaders of member cities, meeting three times a year to decide on finance, the programmes work, or internal rules and is affirmed at the annual general meeting (AGM). At the AGM, a representative of each member city is present. As mentioned above, EUROCITIES consists of six thematic forums, which are divided into 40 working groups of relevant member cities. The forum topics are culture, economy, environment, knowledge society, mobility, and social affairs. The main target of the forums is to develop strategies and policy papers for specific urban challenges, manage activities, and report to EUROCITIES. Similar to the Executive Committee, the forums working groups meet three times per year and elect their own leader and vice chair.

The importance of EUROCITIES is also illustrated by the partnerships that are established through the network. Cooperation, for example with the Committee of the Regions (CoR), the Employment and Social Innovation (EaSI) programme of the EU or the Metropolis policy transfer platform, strengthen the relevance of EUROCITIES and its impact on knowledge exchange within Europe (EUROCITIES a, accessed 2018-02-05).

4.1.1 The Mobility Forum

Following, the work of the Mobility Forum will be further explained. Mobility is one of the six topics the forums are working on. EUROCITIES acknowledges the importance of the close connectivity between mobility, economy, and the environment. The Mobility Forum is concerned with the development of smart, sustainable, and long-term strategies to urban mobility. It also provides the opportunity to share know-how, ‘best practices’, and learn about linked energy efficiency projects what are already implemented in cities. This indicates the multidisciplinary approach of the EUROCITIES network - providing a platform for sharing experiences and emphasise the holistic approach behind sustainable development (EUROCITIES b, accessed 2018-02-05). The cities involved in the Mobility Forum are Berlin, Lisbon, Copenhagen, London, Uppsala and Netwerkstad Twente. The topics of the member cities are thereby diverse and range from accessibility to smart city development (EUROCITIES, 2017).

---

4 last updated November 2017.
4.1.2 The CREATE project

The CREATE project ran over a period of three years between June 2015 until May 2018. The main objective is the transition of infrastructure in European cities from cars to more sustainable transport modes with the aim of reduction road congestion. The project is based on the results on an analysis of traffic and car use patterns, identifying successful interventions for transport mode shifts. The involved members are five Eastern European, Mediterranean, and 5 capital cities in Western Europe, working in close partnerships within a wider EUROCITIES network. The CREATE project aims to delink economic growth from traffic growth for the development of a sustainable transport system. The project is thereby based on a three-stage approach which corresponds to the different phases of transport policy development processes in cities. Stage 1 includes cities with a high share of car use, urban economic growth, and a focus on development of new roads and car parking. Cities of Stage 2 experience urban problems due to a high model split of cars, such as pollution or congestion, and react with respective policies. The final Stage 3 describes ‘liveable cities’, where the main transport mode is public transport, walking, and cycling, whereas road space is relocated. CREATE provides support and know-how to cities of Stage 1 to achieve the evolutionary progress to the next stages. Furthermore, the project fosters interactions among cities of Stage 3 to exchange their strategies and innovations to create a Stage 4 in the future (Create, accessed 2018-02-06). While the member cities are spread across Europe, the goals and issues regarding transport are fairly similar, but differ locally. Therefore, the challenges are approached from a unique stance in the CREATE project.

4.2 URBACT

URBACT is a European programme supporting the exchange of knowledge and learning about sustainable urban development. It offers the opportunity for cities to work together in the development of innovative and sustainable solutions for urban development, integrating the following main urban topics of economy, environment, inclusion, and governance. Resources and know-how are used to provide policies and strategies for cities to approach their urban challenges. URBACT substantiates the key role of cities in solving urban and societal issues. The programme was founded in 2003 by the European Commission and consists of 550 cities across 30 countries, counting about 7000 actively involved local stakeholders (URBACT a, accessed 2018-02-03). The aim of URBACT is to foster knowledge and integrated urban development across European cities and find solutions to common urban issues, build transnational networks, and learn from each other. Also, the identification of ‘good practices’ is promoted by sharing successful practices with all practitioners across Europe. These practitioners are stakeholders, elected representatives, or planners, who secure different perspectives and the engagement of a diverse actor group in the programme (URBACT b, accessed 2018-02-03).

Regarding the internal structure, URBACT is organised and partly funded by the EC, who is responsible for the coordination of the activities of structural fund use in Europe. The Secretariat’s main task is the monitoring of URBACTs activities such as the
management of financial and administrative aspects, supervising the capitalization and communication by sharing knowledge to practitioners across Europe, and encouraging network and capacity building among the member cities. The Secretariat is responsible for everyday activities and the implementation of policies and decision made by the Monitoring Committee (URBACT c, accessed 2018-02-05). The Monitoring Committee of URBACT is placed by the EC, acting as the Regional and Urban Policy Directorate General. The role of the Monitoring Committee is setting URBACT’s strategic direction and decision-making process. The Monitoring Committee consists of two representatives of each URBACT member state, who are meeting three times a year with an annually changing president. The Monitoring Committee’s duties range between launching proposal calls, approving URBACT networks and progresses to the supervision of the budget. Similar to EU principles, the activities are completely transparent. Additional to the Monitoring Committee, there is the Managing Authority. Responsibility for implementing the URBACT programme lies with the General Commissariat for Territorial Equality. The Managing Authority supervises the compliance of the programme with the law and European financial procedures (URBACT d, accessed 2018-02-04).

Establishing partnerships and working closely with EU-wide organisations is an important pillar of URBACT. Together with three other interregional cooperation programmes, EPSON, Interact, and Interreg Europe, URBACT works towards the goals of the European Territorial Cooperation (ETC), addressing and developing urban and regional policies (URBACT e, accessed 2018-02-05).

4.2.1 URBACT in detail: The ETC Programme URBACT III

The URBACT programme has different stages and challenges, for example the focus of URBACT I (2003-2006) and URBACT II (2007-2013) was on municipalities and cities with ≥20.000 (URBACT I), respectively ≥10.000 (URBACT II) inhabitants. The wider scope of URBACT II allowed more cities to be eligible for applying to the programme (BBSR, accessed 2018-02-02). The overall success of the URBACT I and II programmes became visible in the knowledge exchange and development of networks across European cities, and therefore the ETC Programme URBACT III became effective for the period of 2014-2020. Jointly funded by the ERDF with EUR 74.3 million and the 28 EU member states (as well Norway and Switzerland) together (URBACT b, accessed 2018-02-03), the mission of the URBACT III programme is to further develop integrated sustainable urban development, while working towards the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy (U III OP, 2014). Implemented by the EC, the Europe 2020 strategy is a reference framework to foster sustainable and inclusive growth within the EU.

---

5 Total budget of EUR 96.3 million (URBACT b, accessed 2018-02-03).
The main targets are employment, research and development, climate change and energy, education, poverty, and social exclusion\(^7\). In course of the Europe 2020 strategy, EU governments develop viable national goals, in order to reach the EU targets collectively. It is emphasised that the EU targets are a common goal instead of a burden - all national governments play their role by achieving national targets and working towards Europe 2020 (EC, 2017). According to URBACT, the agenda highlights smart, sustainable, and inclusive growth as the main drivers to shape the EU in the coming years (U III OP, 2014). Smart growth describes the aim to base economic growth on innovation and knowledge; sustainable growth is to be achieved through the efficient use of resources and greener economy; and inclusive growth strives towards a high employment economy with strong social and territorial aspects. For the purpose of achieving the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy, URBACT III contributes with the provision of mechanisms to develop sustainable strategies and urban policies, bringing stakeholders and involved actors together (URBACT b, accessed 2018-02-03).

The structure of the currently active URBACT III programme is illustrated by the flow chart. The flowchart shows the correlation between URBACT II and III as well as the main mechanisms and objectives of both programmes. The flowchart illustrates how positive results were drawn from URBACT II, and thus are implemented in URBACT III.

![Flowchart: URBACT II and III](image)

**Mechanisms of URBACT II**
- Transnational exchange
- Capacity building
- Capitalisation and dissemination

**Main objectives of URBACT III**
- Capacity for policy delivery
- Policy design
- Policy implementation
- Building and sharing of knowledge

**Types of intervention**

**Figure 3:** Mechanisms of URBACT II and main objectives of URBACT III.

URBACT III consists of four main objectives, which are approached through different types of interventions. These types resemble the main mechanisms of the URBACT II programme such as *transnational exchange, capacity building and capitalisation and dissemination*. As mentioned above, the impact of URBACT II was inter alia a reason to continue and implement URBACT III. Hence, it is legit that main drivers and positive results are used and strengthened in the next programme stage. The main objectives of URBACT III are the improvement of the *capacity for policy delivery* of cities to integrate sustainable policies for urban developments; the progress of *policy design* and *policy implementation* of sustainable practices, policies, and strategies in cities; as is the enlargement of *building and sharing of knowledge* about sustainable urban policies between practitioners (URBACT b, accessed 2018-02-03).

\(^7\) The Europe 2020 targets are stated more detailed, respectively Employment: employment rate of 70% for people aged 20-64; Research and development: investment of 3% auf EU’s GDP in R&D; Climate change and energy: 20% renewable energy, 20% increase in energy efficiency, 20% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions; Education: maximal 10% of early school leavers, 40% higher education for people aged 30-34; Poverty and social exclusion: reduction of a minimum of 20 million people in / in risk of poverty and social exclusion (EC 2014, accessed 2018-02-04).
Additional to URBACT III, most of the involved members created National URBACT Points which are similar to the National Dissemination Points of URBACT II. These ‘Points’ can be described as platforms working on national level, supporting knowledge and ‘good practice’ exchange. The aim of the platform is to coordinate the communication and influence the implementation of policies and practices on local, regional, national and EU levels (URBACT e, accessed 2018-02-05). Consecutively, the CityMobilNet project of URBACT is explained in detail, which is concerned with the development of sustainable urban transportation.

4.2.2 The CityMobilNet project

Due to the focus of this thesis on SUM, the CityMobilNet project of URBACT was selected for the empirical analysis. CityMobilNet is a network for cities to collaborate, develop, and implement innovative transportation systems and SUMPs. The main objective of the project is to facilitate the key role of urban transportation has for cities regarding employment, growth, and welfare of citizens. Urban transportation systems reveal issues, for example the lack of efficiency or high GHG emissions in cities. The CityMobilNet project connects eleven European cities of ten different countries, such as Bielefeld (Germany), Burgos (Spain), Braga (Portugal), Morne-à-l’Eau (France), Aix Marseille Provence (France), Palermo (Italy), the South East Region of Malta (Malta), Agii Anargyri Kamatero (Greece), Zadar (Croatia), Slatina (Romania) and Gdansk (Poland). The city of Bielefeld is thereby the lead partner of the project, which ran over a 2.5-year period between its launch in September 2015 to its completion in May 2018.

CityMobilNet offers the opportunity for member cities to develop strategies, exchange knowledge and support in order to address transport related problems. The projects’ focus is on the production of SUMPs with a 10-15-year scope which combines transportation aspects as well as other relevant urban policy fields. The involvement of all stakeholders in the development and implementation process is thereby ensured. The CityMobilNet project utilizes the URBACT background to take full advantage of the know-how and expertise of the URBACT programme. The member cities produce plans based on specific, local urban transportation challenges and also use the network for knowledge exchange and learning (URBACT f, accessed 2018-02-04).

4.3 CIVITAS Initiative

The EU-founded network CIVITAS aims for urban development in the sector of transportation and infrastructure in Europe and beyond. CIVITAS, which name is an acronym for ‘City VITAlity and Sustainability’, is a network of European cities to bring practitioners and stakeholders together to learn about strategies and solutions for urban mobility issues. The knowledge exchange is between experts in the field, learning from each other as well as through peers-trainings. The key objective is to develop, support, and promote urban transport solutions based on projects and
The objective is approached through ten thematic areas\(^8\), ‘Living Labs’\(^9\), city networks, as well as the promotion of partnerships and political engagement. For example, the thematic group for ‘Integrated Planning’ is concerned with SUM planning. Hereby, the integration of stakeholders as well as fostering the usage of all transport modes is promoted. The group targets the development of SUMPs (CIVITAS a, accessed 2018-03-05).

Since its founding in 2002 by the EC, the CIVITAS Initiative has been involved in more than 800 transport measures. The background of the EC is evident, as the projects of CIVITAS work towards the EC’s Urban Mobility Agenda (see 2.3.2 and 2.3.3). The transportation solutions, which are developed across 19 projects and 18 Living Labs, reach approximately 52.4 million citizens. Partly funded by the EC with around EUR 180 million\(^10\), the CIVITAS network consists of 85 cities. The network is managed by the Political Advisory Committee (PAC), which is responsible for CIVITAS main activities, such as the collaboration between the EC and CIVITAS, coordinating peer reviews and the work of the thematic groups, developing policies, and promoting the involvement of the main actors like stakeholders and politicians (CIVITAS b, accessed 2018-03-05).

Currently, CIVITAS is in its fifth stage called CIVITAS 2020, which tackles the period of 2016-2020. The key objective is the building and coordination of a knowledge network with the focus on urban transport, which is based on three pillars: testing new solutions, exchanging good practices, and convincing politicians of the interventions. The thematic areas provide a base for dissemination and knowledge exchange among practitioners. Knowledge exchange and learning processes through CIVITAS 2020 include study visits, E-learning, or webinars (CIVITAS c, accessed 2018-03-05).

The CIVITAS SUMP projects PROSPERITY, SUITS and SUMPs-Up are part of CIVITAS 2020 and target developments in the field of SUM. The umbrella project CIVITAS SATELLITE is coordinated and managed by EUROCITIES, as a project partner, and supports all current and future projects of CIVITAS 2020 (EUROCITIES c, accessed 2018-02-06). All CIVITAS SUMP projects connect over 80 stakeholders working together towards the implementation of additional SUMPs in European cities. The SUITS project is excluded from further analysis because of its focus on both users and freight (Suits-project, accessed 2018-03-05). But since the focus of this thesis is mainly on passenger transportation development, therefore consecutively only the PROSPERITY and SUMPs-Up projects are subsequently explained and part of further analysis.

4.3.1 CIVITAS PROSPERITY

CIVITAS PROSPERITY is selected because of its focus on (e-)learning, webinars, and exchange of know-how among involved stakeholders. Capacity building, knowledge

---


\(^9\) Living Lab cities implement and test integrated transport solutions, with a focus on urban space, citizens, and the environment (CIVITAS c, accessed 2018-03-06).

\(^10\) Total budget of EUR 250 million (CIVITAS b, accessed 2018-03-05).
exchange, and the establishment of expert networks hereby outline the main goals of the project. The launch was in July 2016 for a period of 4.5 years (EUROCITIES c, accessed 2018-02-06). The PROSPERITY project concentrates on both local and national stakeholders for developing better SUMP\(_s\)s, connecting local authorities like cities with higher administrative institutions or mobility experts. Especially countries or cities, which currently lack of SUMP\(_s\)s are targeted in the project. While cities strive to implement SUMP\(_s\), they need the support of national institutions and programmes for the realisation of the developments. PROSPERITY offers a two-step plan to bring local and national authorities to collaborate achieving a successful implementation. The project supports knowledge exchange on a national level, in order to learn from other countries with similar urban issues. Also, the cooperation between cities and the national institutions is intensified to foster prosperous interactions (Eltis 2018, accessed 2018-02-06). The aim is to change the cooperation between cities and the national level to be able to develop better SUMP\(_s\) based on the needs and demands of the cities (SUMP-Network a, accessed 2018-02-06). The PROSPERITY project emphasises the interdisciplinary setting of urban transportation and includes other topics such as health, environment, or the quality of life in the discourse of sustainable mobility planning (SUMP-Network b, accessed 2018-02-06).

The project is managed by the Austrian Mobility Research FGM-AMOR, bringing together different organisations working with the development and implementation of SUMP\(_s\). Examples of cities working on the project are Dubrovnik in Croatia, Kassel in Germany, and Limassol in Cyprus. Summarising, member cities are concerned to improve SUM in their cities (SUMP-Network c, accessed 2018-03-05).

### 4.3.2 CIVITAS SUMP\(_s\)-Up

Similar to the PROSPERITY project, the CIVITAS SUMP\(_s\)-Up project is also concerned with the development and implementation of SUMP\(_s\). With the majority of European citizens living in urban areas, the pressure on cities increases to acknowledge the importance for sustainable development of urban mobility. Although, the key objective of the SUMP\(_s\)-Up project goes further than the betterment of urban mobility and transport. The continuous improvement of the quality of (urban) life is the purpose of the project. Through the integration of other disciplines in practices and policies, SUMP\(_s\)-Up aims for integrated transport modes, mitigation of traffic congestion and pollution, and increasing the overall efficiency of urban transport systems.

The SUMP\(_s\)-Up project consists 15 partners, counting seven cities and eight organisations. The purpose of the project is to flourish sustainable mobility in the partner cities, by helping planning authorities with the implementation process of SUMP\(_s\). By enhancing information and capacity building, local authorities get the opportunity to gather knowledge on how to develop and realise a SUMP. The partners of the project are mainly from countries and urban areas with a low SUMP uptake and extensive transport issues.

The cities involved in the project can be divided into three groups. Firstly, seven SUMP-\_Up Partner cities compose the project base as ‘role models’; secondly, 100 cities are part of the Cities in the Innovation Pilot Pool, fostering knowledge exchange among experts and leaders; thirdly, 600 Outreach Cities are selected throughout the
process of the project. The Outreach Cities’ focus is thereby on capacity building (SUMPs-Up, accessed 2018-03-05).

5. Methods

In Part I of the thesis, the literature and conceptual frame is presented to place the topic within the academic context. Before this literary background, the research questions are addressed through a qualitative methodological approach. A content analysis of organisational documents as well as semi-structured interviews with experts are used to answer the questions and subsequently, the methods are separately explained. Preliminary results of the content analysis are used for the development of the interview guide, therefore the synergy of both methods is mentioned throughout the method part of this thesis.

A qualitative research design was developed to analyse and understand the function and role of European knowledge organisations, as well as the utilisation of the organisations through the examination of social interactions. Through qualitative methods, perceptions, opinions, social relationships as well as complex social contexts can be measured (Mack et al., 2005: 1). The decision to combine a content analysis and semi-structured interviews for the research design is based on the different data types that are collected and examined through the research process, requiring suitable methods (ibid: 2). Open-ended questions and textual data allow the exploration of the “human side” (ibid: 1) of a phenomenon by analysing relationships and experiences of individuals. Both analyses were conducted simultaneously due to the scope and timeframe of the paper.

5.1 Semi-structured interviews with stakeholders

Qualitative semi-structured interviews are conducted to address the research questions, by providing the opportunity to understand and retrace “what the interviewee sees as relevant and important” (Bryman, 2012: 470). Since the aim of the thesis is to understand the function and perceptions of knowledge organisations, telephone interviewing is applied as the main method by questioning involved stakeholders. Qualitative interviews tend to be flexible and adapt to the individual interview situation, because the interviewee influences the course of the interview by giving detailed and in-depth answers to explain her*his perspectives and perceptions (ibid: 471). To secure the cross-case comparability of the interviews, an interview guide is developed, which is fundamental when conducting a multiple case study (ibid: 472). The conversations follow the overall structure of the interview guide, which serves as a general outline of the talk, covering the topics of interest. Because the interviewees are involved in different organisations and projects, the interview guide was adjusted individually. Either English and German guides were used based on the language of the interviewees and was send to the participants approximately one week before the interview to give time for specification and clarification of the questions. The interview setting was planned to be one-on-one.
5.1.1 Telephone interviewing

While Bryman (2012: 488) states that telephone interviews are not yet common in qualitative research, many researchers describe the advantages and opportunities, telephone interviews provide and how the method established itself as a qualitative research method (exemplary Burnard, 1994; Carr/Worth, 2001; Irvine et al., 2012). Hence, the decision to conduct all interviews via telephone and Skype can be explained from two sides. On the one hand, methodological, academic arguments, and on the other hand personal reasons as a researcher warrant this step considering time, funding, and location (Sturges/Hanrahan, 2004). Regarding both the academic and personal reasons for choosing telephone interviews, which are based on the schedule of this thesis calculating approximately six weeks of producing data, the reasons did not allow to conduct face-to-face interviews with participants across eight different European countries. Also, the money and time needed to visit all interviewees was regarded as not proportional to the time actually spent to conduct the interviews with an estimated timespan of 30-45 minutes. Also, the research topic does not consist of sensitive or personal questions that would make a face-to-face interview, with a personal, comfortable setting necessary.

Apart from one interview, all interviews were conducted via Skype, a programme that allows to make both ordinary telephone calls to landlines and online calls via an internet connection. They were recorded with the integrated MP3 Skype Recorder programme and transcribed immediately after the interview to be able to recall the conversation and include interview notes (Mack et al., 2005: 31-32). The webcam was never activated during the interviews, so mimic and gestures were not observed. However verbal factors, like laughter and the stressing of words were noted and added to the interview transcript for highlighting important phrases.

Regarding the informed consent (Bryman, 2012: 495), the interviewees were asked at the beginning of the conversation whether recording was allowed and afterwards how to handle their anonymity regarding their job position and name. Hence, the informed consent is oral and recorded. The idea to split the topic of confidentiality is abstractly based on the guidelines by Mack et al. (2005: 31). The recording of an interview is a plausible part of an interview for academic purposes, whereas the wish for anonymity might differ depending on the answers given during the interview. By asking about anonymity after the interview, the participants are fully aware of their answer during the conversation and can freely decide if or if not they want to reveal their persona and position, depending on the responses. Some interviewees gave consent to have their name stated if they could to read through the quotes again. The relevant paragraphs were sent to the interviewees in late April, asking again for their written consent.

---

5.1.2 Sampling

**Purposive sampling**

To get hold of relevant interviewees for the semi-structured interviews, purposive sampling was used, which can be defined as a strategic way of gathering participants based on specific characteristics (Bryman, 2012: 418). Preliminary, the key characteristic of potential participants was their active or former engagement at URBACT, EUROCITIES, or both. During the research process, the CIVITAS Initiative with its corresponding projects on SUM caught attention and the decision was made to enlarge the analysis by including CIVITAS. Hence, a characteristic, on which the purposive sampling was based is the involvement (active or past) in one of the European knowledge organisations, EUROCITIES, URBACT, and CIVITAS. Another, though less strictly enforced criteria, was the engagement in a SUM project. Mack *et al.* (2005) describe that purposive sampling works best when data is collected, reviewed, and analysed. The limited sample size of the employees at the organisations as well as the few stakeholders involved in the relevant projects lead to a small sample to begin with. The scope was enlarged by including ad-hoc and external experts, resulting in a final number of 15 interviewees. The sample size is regarded as appropriate, both for answering the research questions and ensuring the saturation and representativeness of the sample (ibid: 426).

**Snowball sampling**

Moreover, snowball sampling was used to recruit additional interviewees through the networks of the already-acquired participants (Bryman, 2012: 42; Mack *et al.*, 2005: 5). A positive snowball effect was particularly evident for the CityMobilNet project, which consists of external experts, and CIVITAS, which was included due to snowball references of experts. The decision to include stakeholders of CIVITAS was made in an early stage of collecting data and conducting interviews, which made it possible to get in contact and get hold of additional participants. The stakeholders referred to colleagues during the interviews, which lead subsequently to snowball sampling and enlargement of the original sample.

In the recruitment process, emails were sent to potential participants, based on the information on the webpages of the organisations as well as the projects. All three knowledge organisations follow a transparent organisational structure which allowed to identify involved persons and approach them through personalized email addresses. Moreover, the general contact form on the websites was used to secure reliability and actuality of the contact information on the organisations’ webpages. The emails were sent in either English or German, depending on the nationality of the counterpart, mentioning the purpose and aim of the research topic, as well as emphasizing the significance of every person as a potential interviewee for the overall success of this thesis.

Table 3 illustrates the organisations and the projects, giving an overview of the distribution according to the involvement of the stakeholders. The sample aims to be a general representation of stakeholders across European knowledge organisations, hence the interviewees are almost equally distributed across the organisations. Both active and former employees and stakeholders were considered as suitable interviewees. The decision is based on the assumption that perceptions are relevant for
the research topic, independent from active involvement in an organisation or project. As mentioned above, former stakeholders as well as externals were incorporated in the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Eurocities</th>
<th>URBACT</th>
<th>CIVITAS</th>
<th>Other/ External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CREATE</td>
<td>Holve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityMobilNet</td>
<td>Diez</td>
<td>Lewald</td>
<td>Moreira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kolioussis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Köllinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSPERITY</td>
<td>Pressl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMPs-UP</td>
<td>Chinellato</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dragutescu</td>
<td>Böhler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Caballero</td>
<td></td>
<td>Radojčić</td>
<td>Fedderke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal/ external</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Projects and belonging of the interviewees.

**Conducting the interviews**

The table illustrates 13 telephone interviews with 14 interviewees that were conducted throughout the research process. One stakeholder, who was formerly engaged in the CityMobilNet project and responded to the questionnaire via email and the answers were also included in the analysis. Chinellato, a stakeholder of EUROCITIES offered to answer on the behalf of herself and an associate. Due to personal interaction between the colleagues of EUROCITIES, this interview eventually turned out to be a conversation with two stakeholders, Chinellato and Caballero at the same time, differing from the originally interview setting of one-on-one. All the other interviews were one-on-one, following the personalised interview guide (see Appendix 1-3), and were conducted in February, March and early April. The average timespan of each interview was between 25-45 minutes, slightly depending on the position and involvement of the interviewees. Also, when the interviews were conducted in German, the interview partners tended to talk for a longer time, although there is no distinct variation in the timespans indicating a real correlation between the chosen language and the willingness to talk\(^{12}\).

\(^{12}\) No statistical validation, mere the comparison of interview times regarding which language was used. The result is not based on statistical evidence.
Analytical steps and coding

For a systematic analysis of the interview transcripts, the methodological tools of the grounded theory are used (Bryman, 2012: 568). The process of the grounded theory consists of the theoretical sampling, coding, theoretical saturation, and constant comparison. The coding process is the main step by combining coding, theoretical saturation, and constant comparison and can be understood as the labelling of parts of the text data. The grounded theory allows for the codes to be flexible, so the researcher has the possibility to rethink, rename or adjust the codes during the coding process by constantly comparing them. In this thesis, the coding scheme of inductive and deductive coding (Forman/Damschroder, 2007) (see 5.2.2) is applied for both methods in order to identify links and examine interactions within both data sources and, subsequently analyse the findings in relation to each other.

Although a different coding scheme is applied, the procedural steps of the grounded theory are used for the analysis of the interview data. The grounded theory offers the identification of concepts and categories and reveals connections between those. The aim of applying grounded theory is the discovery of a substantive theory through the process of theoretical saturation (Bryman, 2012: 571). This thesis does not aim for developing a new formal theory, but grounded theory is regarded a useful qualitative method for approaching textual data.

5.2 Content analysis

Conducting semi-structured interviews with stakeholders is the main method of this thesis, although to analyse the phenomenon of knowledge transfer within the organisation, it is useful to additionally examine organisational documents to understand the context of the topic and how it is approached from the organisational side. Hence, content analysis was selected as an additional qualitative method and is explained based on academic articles and research papers, which examine the opportunities and possibilities of qualitative content analysis. Hsieh/Shannon (2005) describe content analysis as a commonly used method in qualitative research, which established itself as “a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes and patterns” (ibid: 1278), and Krippendorff (2013) defines “content analysis [as] a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts [...] to the contexts of their use” (ibid: 24). The coherence between these definitions defines the method as a scientific tool and approach to text data with the aim to understand phenomenon and their context. The context is loaded with expectations and perspectives of the researcher and follows the aim to answer to the research questions (ibid: 30). The relevance of texts is based on content, meanings, and symbols, which shape the conceptual environment and context of the text, through which it is interpreted. Furthermore, Forman/Damschroder (2007) emphasise the theoretical approach and the interest in the identification of a specific phenomenon through the textual analysis rather than aiming for the formulation of a theory. In this thesis, the content analysis is based on official, organisational documents of URBACT,

13 see Grounded Theory of Glaser/Strauss (1967)
EUROCITIES, and CIVITAS. The documents consist of both text and graphics that are used to visualize and deliver information. Bryman (2012: 551) emphasises the importance of these official documents when conducting studies on organisations. By analysing organisational documents, the researcher has to bear in mind that the documents follow the purpose to inform and portray the specific opinion of the organisation itself. Scott’s (1990: 6 as stated by Bryman, 2012: 544) four criteria of assessing documents based on the authenticity, credibility, representativeness, and meaning provide a conceptual framework for the content analysis. For example, the credibility and the authenticity of the documents can be verified through interviews with the authors. This indicates the coherence and relevance of choosing interviews and the content analysis as the research design of this thesis.

5.2.1 Sampling and selection of the data

As Bryman (2012: 427) mentions, purposive sampling can also be applied for the selection of documents for the content analysis. In this regard, the purposive sampling is used to identify and differentiate between relevant and irrelevant organisational papers for further analysis. With the fundamental goal to understand the function and utilisation of knowledge organisations regarding knowledge transfer and policy mobilities, it is necessary to have a specific perspective on the organisational documents. The sample is based on the decision to either have an in-depth analysis of a small sample or to cover a big sample with the analysis being less deep (Forman/Damschroder, 2007: 43). Since the content analysis of the text documents is the minor method in this thesis, the sample consists of a smaller selection of text data. The scope of this thesis and the number of interviews that constitute the main part of the analysis do not allow for a full elaboration of a content analysis of organisational documents, because the sample would possibly include hundreds of relevant documents. Bowen (2009) comments on the sheer amount of available data, stating the sampling process is rather based on selection than collection. In line with purposive sampling, the documents, which are part of the analysis are selected based on specific key characteristics, such as publication date, topic of the title or keywords, and representativeness of the organisation or project. The possibility of bias, because of the selectivity of the sample is an important criterion to reflect on (see 7.2.2) (ibid: 32).
Table 4 shows which organisational documents are selected of which organisation and project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URBACT</th>
<th>EUROCITIES</th>
<th>CIVITAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing Europe’s urban model – 25 years of EUROCITIES [report]</td>
<td>Welcome to CIVITAS 2020 [leaf sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10 years of Sustainability on the move [leaf sheet]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Selected organisational documents for the content analysis.

The decision to exclude EU policy papers, for example on Horizon 2020 (CIVITAS, 2013, accessed 2018-05-14), is based on the scope of the content analysis. The focus is clearly on the official documents of the organisations, which are comparable in the sense, that all are directly published by the officials and specifically address the topics of interest. The table illustrates the consistent distribution of the selected documents across the organisations and projects. The analysis of CIVITAS is based on five, EUROCITIES is based on four, and URBACT on three documents.

5.2.2 Analytical steps

Erlingsson/Brysiewicz (2017) identify different steps that are applied throughout the process of the content analysis. The following explanations are based on their summary on how to approach text data in order to formulate meaning units, codes, categories, and themes.

**Meaning units**

The first step of the content analysis is breaking up the text into smaller parts for a better overview of the text and the meanings within. These meaning units should neither be too broad nor too small, what could lead to loss of important data. As a preliminary step, the meaning units divide the text into basic topics.
Coding

Afterwards, the meaning units are labelled with different codes. According to Hsieh/Shannon (2005), a successful content analysis requires a clear and structured coding process. The codes offer the opportunity to connect meaning units while working directly with the text data. They can be understood as the classification system of the data with the function to represent, for example concepts, topics, meanings, or symbols mentioned in the text. Codes can be divided in deductive codes, or a priori codes, that are derived from other data sources or theoretical considerations; and inductive codes, which are formulated based on the data itself (Forman/Damschroder, 2007: 48).

To be able to compare the interview responses with the organisational documents, the coding and identification process of categories and themes is done in the same way as the coding of the interview transcripts. This is an important step to be able to identify connections between both data types through different methods. The coding process can be described as both inductive and deductive, since the codes, which were used for the deductive coding needed the preliminary step of the identification of ‘keywords’ used in the research field. Hence, during the research process, these keywords shape the fundament for developing deductive codes. This coding scheme is based on the concept of Hsieh/Shannon (2005), who identify starting points for the research and coding process, by describing the analytical way to start with previously identified keywords, extracted from the topic of interest (ibid: 1286). The deductive codes that are used are SUMP, sustainable urban mobility, knowledge exchange, sharing and training, and networks.

Categories and themes

After the codes are formulated and applied, they are pooled together in overlapping categories. These categories are useful to understand connections and links between the codes across the text. According to Bryman (2012: 570), categories subsume two or more codes and answer to questions like who, when or what and are part of different themes, which describe the latent meaning and content of the text (Erlingsson/Brysiewicz, 2017). The results of the content analysis are used for comparison and to increase validity of the interview responses.
Table 5 illustrates themes, which emerged from the deductive coding process of the interview transcripts, interview notes, and the content analysis. The codes are pooled together in different themes, according to topics the interviews and organisational documents touched upon. Potentially, the deductive codes were expanded during the analyses. The themes of Targets and Perceptions and opinions only apply for the results of the interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability/ sustainable development/ sustainable urban mobility/ SUMP/ sustainable transport</td>
<td>Urban sustainability and mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning/ knowledge/ training/ education</td>
<td>Learning and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge transfer/ sharing/ exchange</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing, transfer and exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability / adaptation/ implementation</td>
<td>Transferability and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network/ involved actors/ stakeholders/ member states/ members/ partner cities</td>
<td>Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding/ legitimation/ EU/ EC</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key goals/ targets/ aims</td>
<td>Targets [only interview results]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal perception/ opinion/ assessment/ reflection</td>
<td>Perceptions and opinions [only interview results]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Codes and themes of the interviews and content analysis.
PART III: Results and discussion

6. Results

6.1 Results of the interviews

Subsequently, the results of the semi-structured interviews are presented according to identified themes. By using interview guides, the conversations were directed to the main topics of interest, whereas the open character of the interview situation allowed for elaborated and in-depth responses. Most themes are represented without differentiation between the organisations, to which the stakeholders belong. Occasionally, if the differentiation and attribution is meaningful, the organisations are described separately, for example regarding key goals or personal perceptions. Quotes are used throughout the presentation of the results based on their exemplary nature for the theme and the overall responses. As the interviews were conducted in English and German, all German quotes are translated by myself as literally as possible. The original quote is stated in a footnote to ensure full transparency.

Theme: Urban sustainability and mobility

Since the majority of the interviewees is involved in SUM projects, most interviews are directed towards sustainability. Some German participants compared the SUMP to the Verkehrsentwicklungsplan (VEP), a German version of a mobility plan (Forschungsinformationssysteme, 2013), which fulfils the criteria of the EU SUMP guidelines. Therefore, the indicators which are further explained refer to both plans. The transition in transport planning, which occurred in recent years, is mentioned repeatedly in reference to the increasing influence of factors like digitalization and automatization of transport. The rapid change of mobility displays in the need for mobility plans to allow for reasonable adjustments based on changing demands. The respondents emphasise the dualism in the processuality of SUM planning, which refers to SUM planning a generic process and an implementation process regarding the changing mobility in the city. Transport planning is based on the identification of relevant indicators and the fundamental purpose of mobility planning: "This is where we are now, this is what we want to have in the future – let's see how we get there" (Köllinger).

The interviewees mention the importance to understand SUMPs as multi-political concepts that need the support of politicians and local governments for a successful realisation. SUMPs should be regarded as the "smarter way" (Koliouisis) for inner city transport planning, as it combines all modes of inner city transportation with at least one sustainable element (Koliouisis). As another characterization of SUMPs, the identification of a specific target for development measures is named. Furthermore, the shift of the centre of attention in transport planning is discussed frequently. Putting the people in focus is stated as the main attribute of a SUMP, which can be experienced, for example in the interest in supporting public

---

14 Own translation of: "[…] das ist es wie wir’s jetzt haben, so ist es wie wir’s in Zukunft haben wollen, und jetzt gucken wir mal, wie wir dahin kommen.” (Köllinger).
participation. This “new people-oriented planning” (Dragutescu) accredits people as a main priority for development. The strategy is to improve the accessibility of the urban space and allows the people to “go wherever they want, whenever they want” (Koliouisis). This demands for restructuring the urban transport system according to the structure of the city and understanding it as a cross-cutting issue. This is explained by the linkage between demand and distribution of transport and following example: because people and freight depend on an urban mobility system, there is a transport system to meet the demand. Hence, other disciplines make a market for transportation. SUM planning is described as an interdisciplinary and holistic approach, which combines social, economic, environmental, political, and technological aspects. Mobility has an impact on the other disciplines, which all have to be considered in an integrated approach towards more sustainability. This integrated approach to planning focuses on the betterment of intermobility and the promotion of soft modes. Also, the interurban and regional planning strategies should be coordinated. The interviewees envision for SUMP to be a part of the general urban planning process, which is also a strategy of how to promote SUM further. The participants describe the need for behavioural change of the public, in order to convince the people about the benefits of less traffic in cities. Campaigning for the usage of public transport and non-motorized transport modes, cleaner air, fewer cars and less congestion, or the idea of the walkable city, shall persuade people to rethink their attitude towards urban mobility. As an important campaign, the European Mobility Week, which is organised by EUROCITIES is mentioned frequently. The European Mobility Week is described as a celebration of SUMP and SUM measures, as it contributes to the promotion of SUMP for changing cities into urban spaces that are owned and shaped to people, not cars.

Theme: Learning and training

Another key theme refers to the topic of learning, knowledge, and training. As a common target of the knowledge organisations, the enhancement of knowledge and expertise through learning and training is frequently stated. The organisations foster the collaboration of different cities and stakeholders to share approaches and experiences for supporting practically-oriented exchange. The main driver of the mobility projects is thereby the support of engagement, development, and implementation of SUMP. For example EUROCITIES, in its function as a city network brings cities together, which are concerned with similar urban challenges, to support the collaboration between the cities that have been dealing with the specific issues in the past and those that want to approach them. Additionally, there is a focus on identifying the main characteristics and needs when adopting a SUMP. The uptake and implementation of SUMP needs to be further promoted and supported, while taking the opinion of the citizens and their feedback into account. It is emphasised, that the awareness of the citizens needs to be raised regarding the measures that were taken, so they learn about improvements in the cities. The topic of learning and training is mostly mentioned in connection with ‘knowledge’. Knowledge can be garnered through the exchange of expertise and

15 CityMobilNet (URBACT), CREATE (Eurocities), PROSPERITY and SUMP-s-UP (CIVITAS).
functional advancement, which is described as “profiting from the whole treasure of experience”\textsuperscript{16} (Lewald) of all invited stakeholders and cities at a dissemination event. Furthermore, the knowledge of other organisations can be used to learn from each other and to increase the assemblages of knowledge in cities. Moreover, the stakeholders should profit from the know-how and information they get from different departments in order to develop their own tools. Cities and stakeholders have to be aware of the assemblages of knowledge around them and have to “acknowledge the mutual strengths, in order to see how to rededicate problems into chances”\textsuperscript{17} (Köllinger) by using and sharing knowledge. It is necessary to understand that knowledge is still valid after the official project periods and that the “expanding of knowledge has no real limit to a specific period of time” (Caballero). EUROCITIES works against the loss of knowledge with the development of a Legacy Action Plan, so knowledge gaining does not expire with the project’s termination. As mentioned above, many interviewees draw a link between knowledge and training. Talking about training always happens in reference to the involvement in the projects the interviewees are part of. The trainings are generally described as a tool to develop knowledge through learning from the experiences of other cities, with the goal to inform interested stakeholders about the development process of SUMP\textsc{s} or other topics. The outcome of the trainings should be the building of expertise on how to develop a SUMP. During the training sessions of URBACT, the cities are trained with the goal to learn how to engage with private actors. Teaching cities is also part of the work of CIVITAS SUMP\textsc{s}-Up, which is generally described as a patience- and time-consuming process (Dragutescu). In course of the PROSPERITY project, face-to-face trainings in all project countries are conducted. Also, PROSPERITY provides support to its partners in multiple directions, for example covering the travel costs for interested stakeholders to be able to participate in events or offering trainings in the local language to overcome language barriers. The trainings distinguish from others through their focus on tandem-trainings or fostering an interactive exchange in discussions, group works, etc. Multiple advantages of training and learning are described in the interviews, with ‘advancing the capabilities of participation’ and ‘capacity building’ being mentioned most often. Capacity building is based on two pillars, firstly through input of different experts and secondly, through ‘learning by doing’ of the practitioners themselves. The personal capabilities are improved in the trainings, which aim to raise awareness among the participants on how to draft, develop, and implement SUMP\textsc{\textsc{s}}. Sharing expertise and good experiences are highlighted as important aspects for collaboration and learning from each other. These exchanges of experiences can help cities in finding solutions to urban issues based on the knowledge of trainers from other cities. For example EUROCITIES emphasises the need for facilitating the circulation of knowledge of cities to “not just keep the knowledge in their own city, but also to share it on regional and national level, [...] where they teach the others” (Holve). Stakeholders of the CREATE project are involved in dissemination events and organised trainings with approximately 150 people, where drafts of campaigns for sustainable mobility are shared. Moreover, one target of the CREATE project is the development of

\textsuperscript{16} Own translation of: “von diesem ganzen Erfahrungsschatz zu profitieren” (Lewald).

\textsuperscript{17} Own translation of: “gegenseitige Stärken im Endeffekt erkennt, dass man schaut, wie man auch Problemstellungen zu Chancen umwiden” (Köllinger).
academic toolkits for training schools and universities on subjects as SUM and transport planning.

Summarising, trainings and learning aim to raise awareness of cities about good examples for urban mobility across Europe. These good practices are an important indicator for all cities in the learning process and, as multiple respondents state, there is a demand for good examples to orientate and learn from. However, also mistakes and ‘lessons learned’ are regarded as valuable for the learning process, because they illustrate what should be avoided. In the context of good practices, similar circumstances and problems are often mentioned, indicating that urban challenges are alike in small and big cities. Therefore, being part of a project provides access to good ideas and practices of other cities in the network. Generally, the building of know-how and expertise is based on the identification of experiences, which emerge from the local circumstances in the country or city in order to understand what the parameters for development and interventions are. The process of identifying gaps and developing measures to close these gaps are prioritised. Also, critical voices are mentioned in the interviews, stating that some cities were less engaged in the projects, possibly due to a lack of funding, insufficient political support, or deficient learning outcomes.

The focus of mobility projects is to encourage cities to develop their own SUMP, while orienting on experiences of others. With urban mobility issues being multifaceted, the integration of different disciplines in the development process is fundamental. Also, reconsidering common procedures and the adjustment to improvements is vital. A change of contact persons can bring a ‘fresh wind’, inspiration, and new impulses for reflective assessment. Conclusively, one interviewee reflected on the future of learning and discussed the changes regarding the increasing importance of e-courses, webinars, or blended learning, aiming to make urban development and planning more tangible for both stakeholders and citizens.

**Theme: Knowledge sharing, transfer, and exchange**

In close connection to learning and training, the topic of sharing and exchanging knowledge emerged repeatedly. Often, the terms are mentioned in the same sentence or paragraph. However, the theme of exchanging and sharing knowledge describes a different objective, which is subsequently explained.

As mentioned before, the respondents talked about cities working closely together in order to build knowledge based on good experiences. Cities can learn from each other by following rules, knowledge, and experiences acquired by other cities. Diez states that “everything is related to knowledge exchange, as basically cities have to learn from each other [by] applying new policies thanks to the interchange of knowledge”. Exchange is described as a key aspect across all European projects, compelling members and cities to work together. For example, although all projects of EUROCITIES are concerned with a specific topic, there is a general shift towards strengthening exchange activities. In general, knowledge organisations are accredited with knowledge, procedures, processes, and experiences, that they share with the aim to help cities and other organisations. Knowledge exchange is described as “essential to have a wider view of the mobility politics we can have for our country” (Moreira).
The interviewees repeatedly emphasise the significance for stakeholders to share their experiences. Both horizontal as well as bottom-up exchanges between cities and stakeholders are described. Bottom-up processes are more common, referring to the exchange between stakeholders (or cities) up to the supporting national and international programmes. Generally, cities share their knowledge with other cities or administrations about challenges that affect small-scale and metropolitan areas. The quote "We want, that one learns from the other. So, those who have already made good experiences should share these experiences with interested people and exchange"\(^{18}\) by Pressl indicates the willingness of stakeholders to gather knowledge and benefit anon from the exchange with others. Consulting the expertise of others can be valuable regarding challenges and obstacles along the way to develop SUMPs. As mentioned in the context of learning, the detection of similarities of urban issues between cities can also help throughout the development process. The interviewees reflect on the formation of networks which are established through exchanging processes. These networks are considered as useful for further knowledge sharing and transfer. By working together in projects, individuals get to know each other, whereby learning from each other is described as better and easier, as indirectly through media or books. Asking a colleague about her\(^{*}\)his opinion to solve a potential problem is more convenient than researching the knowledge through literature. This indicates the benefits of collaborative working in finding solutions. Köllinger introduces the term of “transfer networks”\(^{19}\), referring to the transfer of good practices through a network, based on communication and interactions. Different ways to share knowledge are explained, whereas most commonly, forms of physical meetings and virtual platforms are mentioned. Physical, face-to-face meetings, such as trainings, dissemination events, workshops, or study visits, bring stakeholders together on a regular basis and provide the opportunity for profitable exchange and thought-provoking impulses. These meetings “allow to open up eyes in different formats, meetings, or workshops […] to exchange knowledge between cities” (Caballero). For example, study visits support the collaboration of cities and can lead to an interactive and stimulating, long-lasting exchange. It is mentioned, that medial exchange becomes easier if people already know each other personally. Hence, the exchange through virtual platforms, like webinars or Elits, a platform collecting SUMP examples, can be easier when used within a network that interacted at a physical meeting before. New communication technologies and the increase of digitalization help to incorporate communication tools into day-to-day work, where constant exchange is key. One pillar in sharing activities is the sharing of best practices and good examples as a straightforward practice for stakeholders to learn from. EUROCITIES “ensure[s] there is a good exchange of best practice that cities can learn from each other” (Holve). Especially for new member cities from Eastern and Central European, the orientation on best practices is considered useful. Joining workshops should lead to innovative ideas that can be implemented at home. Some respondents emphasised that both good and worst practices are

---

\(^{18}\) Own translation of: “Sondern wir möchten, dass die einen von den anderen lernen. Also, die die schon gute Erfahrungen gemacht haben, sollen diese Erfahrungen an Interessierte weiterleiten und sich austauschen.” (Pressl).

\(^{19}\) Own translation of: “Transfernetzwerke” (Köllinger).
helpful and valuable for the learning process. Sharing mistakes or ‘lessons learned’ is stated as “one of the most important issues in sharing knowledge” (Koliousis). The exchange can thereby be experienced on different levels, both nationally and internationally. EUROCITIES facilitates the exchanges of city networks, while encouraging cities to continuously work together through knowledge transfer, communication, and dissemination. Apart from sharing knowledge with stakeholders, the interviewees frequently mention the necessity to engage with the citizens by promoting measures, the cities have taken. Again, the European Mobility Week, organised by EUROCITIES, is highlighted as an event that targets both cities and citizens as recipients of knowledge. Raising awareness of the public through presenting the implemented measures is important, because no implementation can make a change if nobody knows about it.

Asking about the transferability of knowledge, the answers indicate that “knowledge is perfectly transferable” (Diez), while considering the local circumstances in the cities (see Theme: Transferability and implementation). The transfer activities take place within networks and organisations, focusing on the exchange of successful factors between cities. Language barriers can evolve as a possible obstacle throughout the transferability process. Concluding, the interviewees accentuate the wish for further collaboration of knowledge sharing networks after the life circle of the projects. Some are convinced about the continuity of exchanges beyond the project, describing it as the launch for further interactions.

**Theme: Transferability and implementation**

In coherence to knowledge transfer and learning is the discussion about the transferability and implementation of SUMPs. Questioning the stakeholders about their perception of the transferability of policies and SUMP projects, the answers tended to be similar. Generally, transferability and implementation of new policies often consist of sustainable aspects. The entire implementation process is dependent on the agreement and support of stakeholders and local authorities, who are the main actors for fostering the transferability and replicability of SUMPs. The possibility of transferring SUMPs is emphasised frequently, referring to the value of sharing practices and knowledge among stakeholders to make transfers and replications of policies easier. As mentioned before, knowledge exchange exerts a strong influence on the implementation process, for example in sharing activities in transnational dissemination events. Strategies and practices are thereby presented, that can be transformed into local applications. Learning about important elements and aspects that can be transferred is discussed. The similarities between cities are also applicable regarding mobility and transport, although the “specific differences [of the local context] are different. Essentially different.” as Moreira stresses. Hence, while it is possible to accredit cities with similar circumstances and problems, it is important to acknowledge that “every city is unique, so it’s a question of to what extent things are transferable or not” (Jones). The local context and the individual structure of cities determinate the measures and priorities for development. Fedderke claims that “every city has their own circumstances, different structures, different political
relationships that need to be closely examined to identify the needs of a city to develop and implement realistic measures. The development and implementation process of SUMP leads inevitably to the identification of similar problems between cities, therefore the local background shows differences that are important to consider for the transfer of policies.

For example, the CREATE project arranges study visits between the project partners to examine and comprehend the taken measures in turn of the project. Looking at other cities is described as inspirational and sparking innovative ideas. Transferring and copying these practices ask for modifiable ‘implementation paths’ to understand which strategy works best locally. These strategies can be basic things for the effective enforcement of the implementation, which is based on specific, local regulations. The local authorities make the final decision whether an idea or practice is realised. As an example, the case of London and Budapest, two cities involved in the CREATE project, are used to illustrate possible difficulties that can occur when transferring policies from one city to another. Budapest showed interest in the urban transport system of London, whereas the local context of the cities is fundamentally diverse. Therefore, Budapest did not copy the whole system of London, but merely selected ideas to reform and restructure the mobility management (Holve). The example illustrates that implementations target concrete problems and solutions and have to be adjusted to the local context. In the London-Budapest case, the scale of the city had to be considered and adapted from a large scale metropolitan city to a medium-sized city.

Nevertheless, it is described as helpful to look at solutions of other cities and examine to what extent the implementations are. Böhler, Lewald, Dragutescu, and Köllinger emphasise that an “one-to-one transfer” of policies is not possible, because they have to be adjusted to local conditions. The transferability of policies implies the adaptation to make them suitable for the recipient city through the identification of transferable and non-transferable indicators. Köllinger explains that the local background can be the reason to make a policy successful and a policy might have aspects that are not transferable, whereas ‘the rest’ is. This illustrates the fundamental challenge for transferring policies and solutions, which is to consider the significant influence of project outlines and local circumstances. Böhler illustrates that solutions of other cities can serve as ‘learning examples’ for orientation, to understand to what extent policies are dependent on local circumstances, or whether they can be abstracted. These deliberations are described as a separate process, sparking questions about the transferability of good practices. The considerations hereby refer to the question which indicators ‘make’ the practice good and are relevant for the success in another city. The variables have to be identified, which have a lasting influence on the successful transfer and can vary from local to person-specific aspects. As described above, best practices are generally regarded as valuable examples for orientation. Nevertheless, using urban ‘trends’ as guidelines has to be critically assessed to see if the implementation is actually useful regarding the local circumstances of the city.

---

20 Own translation of: “Jede Stadt hat ihre eigenen Randbedingungen, andere Strukturen, andere politische Verhältnisse” (Fedderke).

21 Own translation of: “Eins-zu-eins Transfer” (Böhler, Lewald, Köllinger).
With the majority of the participants being engaged in the knowledge organisations EUROCITIES, CIVITAS, and URBACT, which support networking activities among their cities and partners, the topic of network and relationships among members is mentioned a lot throughout the interviews. Often, the topic is stated in connection with knowledge sharing or training, but also for describing general collaborations. Overall, cities are brought together in networks to exchange experiences and practices, in order to support each other and benefit from shared knowledge. Cities across Europe are targeted to become part of a wide-spread city network.

Cities are described as influential actors regarding urban issues, economic growth, democratic ways, and closeness to citizens as an important part of networks. These networks encompass all levels of governance and comprise of the European, national, regional, and local level. Cities are differentiated by their type and size, location, whereas the corresponding stakeholders are private actors such as local authorities, city administrations, representatives of different departments, policy makers, or politicians. The respondents emphasise that a key characteristic of stakeholders is their actual influence in the decision making and implementation process. The inclusion of citizens is mentioned frequently and raises the inference that citizens are a part of the network as well. The growing influence of private actors in the sustainable urban development process forces cities to invest in capacity building to be able to properly deal with private actors.

The establishment of networks between cities leads to a profound change in the role and function of cities. Being part of a network allows member cities to take on a stronger, more independent, and separate role by working in close collaboration with other cities of the network instead of only with the central government. The statement by Jones that “cities have much stronger networks now, where they relate to each other and where they compete [...] to be a liveable city, or a smart city” describes the strong partnerships between European cities. Cooperation in these city networks provide the opportunity to support cities in countries where the national support is not so elaborated yet. Moreira highlights that “this kind of networking between cities from all over Europe really achieves the vision of the unique Europe [by] trying to bring the best practices to some cities”. The interviewees emphasise that networking activities are commonly based on active participation of stakeholders and organisations to work towards cohesion and partnerships in Europe. Similar urban challenges and the aim to find and share successful solutions is the basis for the entire network of cities to participate.

Examining the networking activities of EUROCITIES, CIVITAS, and URBACT, a common line is noticeable. EUROCITIES, as a “go-to network for major cities” (Caballero) consists of more than 185 members and provides a link for external actors to an established network of European cities. EUROCITIES provides the opportunity for big cities to share their challenges and practices with cities of all scales. Regarding the development of SUMP’s, EUROCITIES’ added value is the interdisciplinary approach that gives its members the opportunity to establish synergies among different themes and thus tackle them in a holistic way (Chinellato). Since EUROCITIES is a membership organisation, it is based on the funding and personal involvement of its members. Answering to the question, to what extent EUROCITIES and CIVITAS relate, Chinellato accentuates that EUROCITIES is one of the organisations running
the CIVITAS Initiative through a contract awarded by the EC in the framework of the Horizon 2020 framework. URBACT is mentioned as the only programme that is actively working with cities instead of merely focussing on networking activities. Cities are the main beneficiaries of URBACT projects and the number of cities in the network constantly increases. Being part of the URBACT network provides the possibility for member cities to learn and understand how to work with private actors, attend trainings, learn from the experience of others, and transform their mindset. Also, the “very very strong, personal relationships”22 (Lewald) between URBACT and the project partners of the CityMobilNet project are emphasised. Moreover, the endurance of relationships after the official project period are discussed. The members benefit on being part of a network and getting help in solving urban challenges. Members of the CityMobilNet project emphasise the personal relationships that were estabished in the project and the common goal to continue the networking of cities beyond the project and URBACT. Lewald goes one step further states that it “HAS to be the goal for such cooperation to remain”23, highlighting again the significance the interviewees ascribe to the exchange of knowledge and the profit of being part of a city network.

**Theme: Funding**

A recurring topic in the interviews is the funding and background of the EU. Mostly, the topics are mentioned in reference to the organisations or to the development process of SUMP.

Financial support offers the opportunity for cities to engage in projects, even if the local and national budget does not allow it. The interviewees mention, that especially small and medium size cities tend to lack sufficient resources like money or knowledge to expedite urban development projects. This lack of funding can lead to the forced abolishment of development goals because money is spent on other issues than urban mobility. For example, the PROSPERITY project aims to support cities that are striving for development but failing due to local conditions such as political set-up, funding, or legal problems. The project is concerned to close the emerging gap between cities and national support.

Generally, the EU is funding the Horizon 2020 programme, which has a focus on mobility research. Mobility projects, like PROSPERITY or SUMP-Up, which receive financial support by the EU are working towards to goals of Horizon 2020. The interviewees acknowledge the help they receive through the EUs funding of development projects. Also, the financial support for municipalities enables more cities to participate in projects. EUROCITIES tries to identify occurring gaps in the funding and based on this, proposes recommendations for the upcoming 7-year funding period to the EC. The recommendations are non-binding, yet EUROCITIES attempts to “shape the next EU budget and say where money is needed” (Holve). EUROCITIES relies on the financial support of the EU and acknowledges the need for constant improvement. The continuation of the URBACT programme is also pending of financial support of the EU to consider and legitimize the next URBACT programme period based on previous outcomes and achievements. Regarding the CityMobilNet project,

---

22 Own translation of: "sehr sehr starke, persönliche Beziehungen" (Lewald).
23 Own translation of: "muss das Ziel sein, dass solche Kooperationen einfach bestehen bleiben." (Lewald).
the respondents emphasise that working towards the Urban Agenda of the EU and facilitating transnational exchange of knowledge and experiences is an important aspect for receiving EU funds.

The increasing importance for cities to develop SUMP:s is elaborately explained above. Although it is significant, to examine the link between EU funding and the uptake of SUMP:s further. Many interviewees accentuate that the eligibility for any European funding is based on cities having a SUMP. The principles for SUMP:s, as stated by the EU, are adopted by the countries to guide them through the development process. Financial support is crucial for cities to be encouraged on their way to development SUMP:s and change their understanding from TTP to SUM planning.

In this context, the PROSPERITY project is highlighted with its contribution to SUMP supporting programmes in countries that have structural difficulties. Furthermore, interviewees involved in the CityMobilNet project emphasise that EU funding was both an incentive and necessity to develop SUMP:s, because of a lack of national funds. EU funding is supposed to launch a project and aims for contributions to continue after the project periods.

**Theme: Targets**

In the interviews, the targets of the organisations are discussed. Overall, the interviewees assess the holistic approach to SUM planning as “the way forward” (Koliouisis), which has to be further promoted. The interdisciplinarity also reflects in the goals of the organisations and corresponding mobility projects.

The main idea of URBACT is to bring cities from different countries together to share their experiences with others to improve the local standing of actors, like stakeholders or municipalities. Also, building assemblages of knowledge and capacity in the cities is defined as a key target, for promoting integrative planning. Problems and possible solutions are identified, whereby the work is targeted towards a defined vision. Goals are clearly set and strategies are developed to reach them in a long-term perspective. A similar target underlies the CityMobilNet project, where “the main concepts, the main goals are the same” (Koliouisis). The aim of CityMobilNet is to improve the sustainability of urban transport and to develop SUMP:s across all project cities. To achieve the target the CityMobilNet project basically works in two pillars: firstly, personal capability building of stakeholders through workshops and trainings, and secondly, supporting cities to implement development techniques for SUMP:s. The collaborative work tries to reduce the gap between advanced and follower cities to promote sustainable mobility in the cities and convince the citizens of the benefits of the taken measures. The project follows the approach that the public space should prioritize pedestrians, public transport, and sustainable modes while reducing inner city traffic. A common conclusion of the interviewees is the wish for partnerships of the CityMobilNet to continue and that the value for the participants remains beyond the project period.

The city network EUROCITIES offers the opportunity for major cities to share their capital with small cities through knowledge transfer, dissemination, or communication. The facilitation of exchanges is defined as the key function of city networks, as is the encouragement of cities to work together. The six thematic forums are described as EUROCITIES’ “core activity” (Chinellato) and address diverse urban topics, allowing members to share their practices and experiences with others. The
cooperation between cities empowers them and portrays a "strong voice in the heart of Europe" (Chinellato). As mentioned above, the organisation tries to influence the EU budget and is described as "a public NGO", which is "lobbying for [...] cities" (Holve) and working towards the goals of Horizon 2020. To ensure that both project outcomes and knowledge exchange remain, EUROCITIES works on developing a legacy strategy. Generally, EUROCITIES aims for more sustainability in cities and wants to improve the urban life of the citizens, which also becomes evident regarding their contributions towards the uptake of SUMP.s. The organisation supports cities in the development process of national frameworks and SUMP.s, based on the vision of "the SUMP as part of the rest of urban planning" (Caballero) and "members work[ing] together in a cross-sectoral number of topics" (Caballero). The European Mobility Week is stated as an example, which illustrates how implementations towards SUM give cities the chance to share their measures with stakeholders and citizens. Examining the CREATE project, the main target group consist of city officials and policy makers, while fostering learning activities between the project cities through mentoring visits and trainings. Until its termination in May 2018, CREATE achieved its goal to help cities develop campaigns to convince citizens of SUM as an alternative to TTP and how to launch their own SUMP.s. Also, the development of a toolkit for cities to learn how to develop a SUMP and using it for academic purposes is repeatedly stated.

The targets of CIVITAS are the facilitation of knowledge exchange and transfer in the context or urban development. Supporting networking activities is stated as an important purpose as well as the knowledge sharing between all CIVITAS projects. Hence, the goals are very similar to those of URBACT and EUROCITIES, as they are also promoting knowledge exchange. The PROSPERITY project focuses mainly on Eastern European cities and the national level. The idea is to close "the gap between the expectations of the cities and the support of the countries"24 (Pressl) in order to help cities in the development and implementation process of SUMP.s. Since the local circumstances of cities influence their ability to develop SUMP.s, the PROSPERITY project supports cities to create a sufficient structural setting, which is fundamental for the development process. The PROSPERITY and the SUMP.s-Up project basically aim towards similar targets. SUMP.s-Up strives for cities to collaborate, increase the uptake of SUMP.s, and raise awareness for SUMP.s. As a CIVITAS project, SUMP.s-Up naturally promotes the knowledge exchange and networking activities between project partners. Moreover, an inventory tool for cities has been developed to support the SUMP development and uptake. Conclusively, the SUMP.s-Up project aims to improve the quality of urban life through its strong and innovative outcomes.

**Theme: Perceptions and opinions**

The final theme refers to personal perceptions and opinions the interviewees shared throughout the interviews. Often, the personal opinions were mentioned in connection to their engagement in the project or knowledge sharing activities. During the interviews, the exchanges are cherished as "great" (Holve) and a "very good idea"25 (Köllinger), because they evidently help cities to spark inspiration and innovation.

---

24 Own translation of: "die Lücke schließen möchten, die zwischen den Ansprüchen der Städte und den Hilfestellungen der Länder, bzw Staaten entstanden ist." (Pressl).
Sharing good approaches and practices with other cities is viewed as a helpful, interdisciplinary exchange, which facilitates new, visionary ideas. The role of good practices is “an important one in the learning process. It’s a right, an important component to say that one needs a learning example to orientate at” (Böhler). Assemblages of good practices, like the Eltis platform, are a significant contribution to the facilitation of exchanges, since models from other cities “are simply inspiring” (Böhler) and it is “always helpful to see how other cities did it” (Böhler).

Overall, respondents emphasised the benefits and advantages of being involved in the organisations and projects. Especially practitioners of URBACT and the CityMobilNet project accentuate the profitable collaboration within the programme and the project. URBACT is described as “unique” (Köllinger) regarding their efforts towards integrated planning, knowledge exchange, and the work atmosphere. Also, the strong support and personal supervision is mentioned as a motivating aspect of being involved in the programme. The engagement in URBACT and CityMobilNet is experienced as “very useful” (Moreira) regarding the development of SUMPs, seeing that representatives of URBACT are attending most project meetings to support both network and project. The appreciation of this engagement is illustrated in the quote of Lewald, who states that “URBACT is something very very special. Something very extraordinary.”. The efforts of URBACT towards strengthening collaboration in Europe is highly valued, as Lewald stresses “I love it. I think it is great.”.

6.2 Results of the content analysis

Consequently, the results of the organisational documents are presented. The selected documents are introduced; whereby the presentation combines the results of the documents of URBACT, EUROCITIES, and CIVITAS based on similarities and differences of topics and foci. Five different themes are identified, which structure the presentation of the findings: Sustainable urban development and SUMP; Membership and network; Knowledge sharing and exchange; Learning and training; and Funding. As previously mentioned, the content analysis is the minor method of this thesis and targets to identify similar themes as mentioned in the interviews. The titles of the documents are abbreviated for the analysis.

6.2.1 URBACT

With only three documents about general facts of the programme and the CityMobilNet project, the sample of URBACT constitutes the smallest part of the content analysis.

Initially, it is important to note that the selected documents very different in their content. One is a PDF file of a ‘Call for Good Practice’ (CGP) (URBACT g, 2016) which

26 Own translation of: “Eine richtige, eine wichtige Komponente das man sagt, dass man Lernbeispiel braucht an denen man sich orientiert.” (Böhler).
27 Eltis a (accessed 2010-02-04).
28 Own translation of: “einfach weil sie inspirierend sind” (Böhler).
29 Own translation of: “immer hilfreich da zu gucken, wie haben die anderen das denn gemacht.” (Böhler)
30 Own translation of: “einzigartig” (Köllinger).
31 Own translation of: “Urbact ist wirklich etwas sehr, sehr Spezielles. Etwas sehr Besonderes.” (Lewald)
32 Own translation of: “Ich liebe es. Ich finde das ganz toll.” (Lewald)
consists of general information about URBACT while promoting to apply with a good practice case. The document mainly describes the advantages of URBACT, such as being part of a network of cities, where cities act as receivers or senders of good practices and knowledge. It is stated which cities are eligible for applying for funds and projects. The second document ‘URBACT III Operational Programme’ (U III OP) (U III OP, 2014) describes the basic outline of the URBACT III programme regarding members, projects, funding, development targets, and the internal coordination. The third document summarises the ‘CityMobilNet: State of the Art on Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans’ of the CityMobilNet project (CMNP) (URBACT h, 2016). The documents are selected based on their relevance for the research topic and because they cover a broad range of URBACT and the mobility project CityMobilNet.

6.2.2 EUROCITIES

Four organisational documents are selected for the analysis of EUROCITIES. Two leaf sheets provide a general overview of the EUROCITIES (LSE) (EUROCITIES, 2017) and the CREATE project (LSC) (EUROCITIES d, n.d.). The leaf sheets accentuate in different graphics and illustrations which cities are part of the city network and how the main goals are connected. Arranged similar to a public transport network, the LSE explains the pillars of EUROCITIES. The LSC displays the idea of the CREATE project and its approach. The third document is the ‘EUROCITIES Strategic Framework 2014-2020’ (SFE) (EUROCITIES, 2015) for the period 2014-2020, stating the different foci of development, such as urban innovation or sustainable urban growth. The SFE document shows, which thematic forums are involved in the objectives and explains the key targets. The fourth document is a report on ‘Developing Europe’s urban model - 25 years of EUROCITIES’ (DEUM) (EUROCITIES, 2011). Starting with an introduction of the beginning of EUROCITIES, the report describes how the objectives of EUROCITIES evolved over time, what the achievements and obstacles were, and concludes with a vision for the future. The content of the documents informs about the targets of EUROCITIES as well as of the CREATE project.

6.2.3 CIVITAS

For the analysis of CIVITAS and the SUM projects PROSPERITY and SUMPs-Up, five organisational documents are selected. The ‘SUMPs-Up Need Assessment – Main Results’ (SNA) (CIVITAS d, 2017) explains the approach of the SUMPs-Up project and the main results from a survey that was conducted in European cities to measure the uptake of SUMPs. The results of the survey are the basis for the projects measures. ‘PROSPERITY: Higher Level of Government - their Support for SUMP in the EU’ (PHLG) (CIVITAS e, 2018) summarises the results of a survey on the implementations of SUMPs in cities. National SUMP programmes as well as SUMPs in EU member states are described. The other three documents are leaf sheets, summarising general information about CIVITAS. While some graphics or contents are similar (or even the same), the focus of all leaf sheets are different. ‘Welcome to CIVITAS 2020’ (WTC) (CIVITAS f, 2017) introduces transport as the key target and illustrates the distribution of CIVITAS’ Living Labs across Europe. ‘CIVITAS 2020 - PROSPERITY and SUMPs-Up’ (CIVPS) (CIVITAS g, 2017) provides and overview on SUMPs and the benefits of being part in the SUMPs-Up or the PROSPERITY project. The WTC and
the CIVPS leaf sheets replicate the same illustration on how to get involved with the project, but the rest of the content differs. The final document used for the analysis is the ‘More than 10 years of sustainability on the move’ (YSM) (CIVITAS h, n.d.) document, which gives general information about the CIVITAS Initiative, mapping the member cities, and naming good examples of cities which implemented innovative urban transportation measures.

6.2.4 Findings of the organisational documents

Subsequently, the five themes present the findings of the organisational documents. The quotes illustrate the most common terms and topics which emerged throughout all organisational documents. This allows for a combined presentation of the themes and to understand the similarities and coherence among the knowledge organisations.

**Theme: Sustainable urban development and SUMP**

After using different codes for sustainability and SUMP, the coherence of the topics lead to the development of a combined theme for sustainable urban development and urban mobility. Generally, sustainable development is explained as the interplay of economic, cultural, social, and technical objectives (DEUM: 7). The main challenges for urban mobility are described as the local and global environment, liveability, and efficiency (PHLG: 11-12). The connection between the terms of urban mobility and development is exemplified by the goal to “develop urban mobility in a sustainable way” (CMNP: 2). Urban mobility is emphasised as an action to foster urban sustainability, as the targets and interventions of mobility plans are directly linked to sustainable development in the same sentence. The focus of SUMP on people rather than traffic is mentioned (CMNP: 9), so is the need for sustainable urban development (U III OP: 19-22, 35; GPC: 3). The URBACT documents refer to sustainable development documents as “integrated and sustainable urban development” (U III OP: 8, 31; GPC: 3). The aim is to make cities “more liveable and sustainable” (LSC: 2) and “improv[e] urban life through sustainable integrated solutions” (SFE: 4), striving for a “stronger, more sustainable Europe, closely connected to its citizens” (SFE: 2). This puts the people in the centre of sustainable development and indicates that cities should be build cities for the people instead of building around them. This is explained as a positive impact on the quality of life (SFE: 4; CIVPS: 2). Other goals of sustainable development are stated, such as urban renewal, revitalization of urban space (DEUM: 6), supporting economic growth, or decoupling SUM from traffic growth (LSC: 2). The need for a shift of the behaviour of citizens, using sustainable transport modes like walking, public transport, or cycling instead of the car to create “green, free-flowing and healthy cities” (SFE: 4) is described. The YSM document states that CIVITAS pursues an integrated approach to SUM with the key target to include different transport modes in the process (YSM: 2). CIVITAS is described as “dedicated” to develop an “efficient and competitive transport system in Europe”

---

33 The term of “integrated and sustainable urban strategies” serves as a pool for similar or slight modified terms (exemplary “sustainable urban policies”, “strategies and action plans in an integrated and sustainable way”, or “integrated and sustainable urban strategies/plans”) used in the same way (U III OP, 2014).
The implementation of a local SUMP has an impact on CO2-emissions and air pollution and supports the attractiveness of a city for both residents and visitors (SNA: 4, PHLG: 93). Again, this action illustrates the shift in transport planning from the vehicles to putting the people in the focus of developing sustainable urban mobility (SNA: 3).

**Theme: Membership and network**

Both CGP and U III OP of the URBACT documents refer to the member states of the programme, as all 28 EU member states, Norway and Switzerland. Across all URBACT documents, cities are named as the target of both the programme and the project. This includes actors on EU, national, regional, and local levels, such as practitioners, stakeholders, urban authorities, elected representatives, city officials, private agents, etc. Repeatedly, urban practitioners and decision/policy-makers (CGP: 4, 5; U III OP: 20, 28, 35) are identified as the key persons targeted by the URBACT programme.

While these actors represent the members of URBACT, the network and networking activities also reach “beyond cities directly involved in URBACT networks” (U III OP: 19). The importance of the ‘network’ is evident since the term is used to describe the cities in the programme. This indicates that an involvement in the URBACT programme allows cities to be part of a broad network and benefit from the connection members. ‘Network’ is partly used in sentences with direct connection to ‘URBACT’ or ‘partner’. A similar finding results for the EUROCITIES’ documents. The cities in the network are mostly addressed as “member states” or “member cities” (DEUM: 8,9), composing a network of cities of all sizes across Europe, which share mutual interests in each other (DEUM: 8). The emphasis is engagement across all levels, respectively the EU, national, regional, and local level (SFE: 2). EUROCITIES established itself as a “political platform” (SFE: 6) and a “network [for] local governments” (SFE: 6) working towards combined population of approximately 130 million, with the overarching goal of “reconnecting the EU with its citizens” (LSE: 2). The term ‘connectivity’ is also used other networking activities of EUROCITIES: influencing policy making and working on urban issues on the EU level (LSE: 2). The “centrality of cities to Europe’s future” (DEUM: 8) also highlights the key role, EUROCITIES accredits to the cities within the network, whereby problem solving on the local level in cities “benefits for the EU as a whole” (SFE: 5).

CIVITAS is described as “a network of cities for cities” (WTC: 2) and a platform across 31 countries and over 200 cities, bringing together “key actors from Europe and beyond” (YSM: 1), with different backgrounds and on national/regional level (PHLG: 7), for example experts and politicians (YSM: 1). It is emphasised that “ambitious cities” are eligible for a membership (YSM: 2).

**Theme: Knowledge sharing and exchange**

In reference to the theme ‘Membership and network’, the process of sharing and exchanging knowledge is mentioned frequently in the organisational documents. The network provides the base for exchanging knowledge among the members. Knowledge sharing can be distinguished in education and training activities and as
“stand-alone activities” (PHLG: 78). The emphasis is thereby on the exchange and education on good and bad practices from other cities, with a “high level of transferability (regarding each local context)” (PHLG: 76). URBACT names the sharing of “experiences/ problems/ solutions”, recommendations, and good practices (GPC: 5) through narrative or textual exchange, such as documents, dialogues, seminars, publications (U III OP: 40), platforms on urban mobility, the European Mobility Week, or conferences and seminars (PHLG: 76). The exchange can be on nationally or internationally (PHLG: 79). Sharing activities (U III OP: 6) are one of the overarching terms used in the URBACT documents. Peer-to-peer-exchange, workshops, trainings sessions (LSC: 1) are mentioned as possible activities for exchanging knowledge at EUROCITIES. These sharing activities happen for example in circuits of knowledge among member states, who collaborate and exchange good practices among each other (DEUM: 13). Results from a CIVITAS SUMPs-Up survey indicate that pictorial and detailed examples of successful cases are highly appreciated by cities. Other findings show the acknowledgement of the reciprocal benefits of knowledge sharing (SNA: 5). The six thematic forums of EUROCITIES are mentioned as important spaces for knowledge exchange, which are “focused on sharing new thinking” (DEUM: 13). The CIVITAS initiative promotes learning activities from experts and peers (WTC: 2) and supports the interaction of “like-minded cities” (CIVPS: 2). The term ‘like-minded’ can be understood as referring to a similar urban and cultural context of the cities, that simplifies and supports exchange or transfer activities (PHLG: 79). The “accumulated know-how and experience of other participants” of the network allows to engage in the dialogue with stakeholders and key actors, aiming to learn from each other and share “knowledge, solutions and results” among the members (YSM: 1).

**Theme: Learning and training**

The theme emerged from codes like know-how, training, or expertise, which all describe a similar form of learning activities. URBACT states the capacity building, development of “innovative approaches [with a] focus on the creation and implementation or urban strategies” (U III OP: 59) and “learning from one another” (GPC: 5; LSE: 2) as part of the organisation’s’ activities. The training consists of transferring knowledge to the cities, which is linked to sharing activities as well (CMNP: 7). This expertise can be described as influential regarding the decision-making on EU level (DEUM: 8) and the development process of policies (ibid: 13). Capacity building and the consolidation of expertise manifest through learning and training activities (YSM: 1; PHLG: 8), similar to knowledge, which is acquired through realised measures (WTC: 2). Pilot projects, small-scale activities, and further research complement the learning process (CIVPS: 1). The coherence between learning/ education, SUM planning, and knowledge sharing/ exchange becomes evident in the close links between knowledge exchange and the resulting training about SUM practices (PHLG: 76). Identifying areas of improvement is fundamental for the uptake of measures for development (PHLG: 8).
Theme: Funding

The funding of the programmes and projects takes up a surprisingly big part of the organisational documents even if it is not mentioned in any of the selected EUROCI-TIES’ documents. The CMNP and the U III OP provide an overview about financing and funding of projects provided by the EC and the EU. The CMNP explains with city and country examples which funds are provided and what requirements must be fulfilled.

The topic of funding is mentioned throughout the CIVITAS leaf sheets, for example highlighting the funding of technicians that support the SUMP- Up and PROSPERITY project with their expertise (CIVPS: 2). Results from the SUMP- Up survey show the demand of cities for national funding and assistance through the development and implementation process of SUMP- (SNA: 4, 5). This search for additional guidance is also stated in the PHLG document, stating that cities not only look for national and regional support (PHLG: 8). Financing support is mentioned as one of the key drivers for the development of SUMP- , as it further “stimulate[s] SUMP elaboration” (PHLG: 93). On the other hand, a lack of sustained resources can also limit the ability of cities in the SUMP development process (PHLG: 94, 95).

6.3 Comparison of the results

Subsequently, the results of the interviews and content analysis are compared and discussed. The results of the content analysis, as a complementary method, helps to understand the perspectives of the interviewees and to substantiate their responses. The themes, which are identified in both analyses are Sustainable urban development and SUMP- ; Learning and Training; Knowledge sharing and exchange; Network; and Funding.

Both in the interviews and the organisational documents, the differentiation between TTP and SUMP- is frequently emphasised. The documents describe mobility as one measure to improve urban sustainability, by being close to the citizens and putting the people in the focus of the development process. Sustainable cities are accredited for facilitating the transition towards more quality of urban life through the people-oriented approach of SUM planning. A similar picture is painted in the interviews, where putting the people in the centre of the intervention is understood as the main attribute of SUMP- . Hereby, the similarity between the interviews and documents becomes evident, which both emphasise the need for people-centred planning to realise urban sustainability and SUM. By constituting citizens as part in the transfer networks, for example through public participation, allows them to engage as active actors in development, implementation, and knowledge exchange processes.

Regarding the learning theme, the interviews define ‘learning’ as the enhancement of know-how and expertise. Profiting from the knowledge of others and learning new things help to build up personal capacities. This is similar to the results of the documents, which understand individual capacity building and the development of innovative approaches as the core of learning activities. According to the documents, trainings are used to transfer and share knowledge, which is in line with the interview responses. Here, training sessions with cities are described as a tool to develop knowledge, for example the expertise how to develop a SUMP. A significant aspect,
which was only mentioned in the interviews is raising the awareness of cities to learn about good practices. Trainings are repeatedly named as possible events for knowledge sharing and exchange. Based on the interviews, exchange activities are regarded as a key aspect of all European projects and facilitate the collaborations of cities with each other. This helps to develop a broader, open-minded view on mobility solutions.

Two types of exchanges are described in the interviews: personal or virtual exchanges, referring to either face-to-face interactions or virtual platforms. Throughout both interviews and documents, the topic of networks is emphasised. An interviewee states that sharing of knowledge occurs through transfer networks, just as findings from the organisational documents indicate similarly. Here, networks are also described as the base for knowledge exchange, which can be narrative or textual. These networks allow to form circuits of knowledge among the members and foster the reciprocal benefits of sharing knowledge. The documents indicate that the exchanges especially happen for cities where culture and circumstances are alike, an aspect which is recurrently discussed in the interviews but with no clear outcome. According to the interviews, cities make a fundamental transition in their role and establish strong, independent positions through increasing collaboration and working together. This is in line with the basic idea of Europe about bringing together cities and countries for cooperation and close partnerships. It is related to the results of the documents, which acknowledge cities as key players for shaping the future of Europe.

Comparing the theme of funding, the results of the analyses are alike. Both findings illustrate that financial support of the EU provides cities with the opportunity to develop their SUMP, be part of a widespread city network, and subsequently work towards the goals of Horizon 2020. Lack of funding might decrease the ability of cities to continue (or even launch) the process of develop SUMP, which are described as a basic aspect to be eligible for supports. While ‘funding’ is not part of the sample of EUROCITIES’ documents, it is repeatedly mentioned in course of the interviews, which indicates the importance of the topic for the organisation. Therefore, I suggest this to be an occurrence of the limited sample of organisational documents for the content analysis. Also, the demand of cities for assistance and external funding is a common result.

Summarising, the results of the interviews and documents illustrate a similar picture, not only are the topics of interest the same, but also the wording indicates the close affiliation the stakeholders have to the organisations. Furthermore, the coding process showed that topics like knowledge sharing and network, or SUMP and trainings, are often used in the same sentence, respectively in the same context. Again, this indicates the close coherence between the themes and the need to see the topics from a bigger perspective.

The main difference between the two analyses is the different focus they have. The interviews cover a broad range of topics but the core theme is the emphasis of the importance of facilitating knowledge sharing and exchanges between the cities. Whereas the documents focus more on the impact of sustainable development and fostering networking activities. In this regard, using two methods for addressing the research question is valuable, since the results are complementary and illustrate different angles of the same challenge.
7. Discussion and reflection

7.1 Empirical results

Consecutively, the empirical results are discussed in the light of the theoretical concepts and literature which are introduced before. The discussion thereby combines the data of both analyses. The main theoretical concepts, knowledge exchange and sharing, and policy mobilities constitute the basis for the discussion of the empirical results. The discussion addresses how and to what extent the findings answer to the research question: *What is the purpose and function of European knowledge organisations regarding policy mobility of sustainable urban mobility plans?*. The main findings regarding networks; knowledge sharing and exchange; policy mobilities; circuits and assemblages of knowledge; and SUM structure the discussion.

**Networks**

In course of the analysis, organisations are accredited with the function of enabling networking activities, facilitating knowledge exchanges, and promoting and supporting the uptake of sustainable urban development. This goes in line with the role Nonaka (2000) introduces for organisations, which is the management of knowledge through development of solutions and processing of information. Both in theory as well as in the empirical results, interactions are described as fundamental for the exchange of knowledge and sharing of ideas. According to Cummings (2004), sharing with both internal and external groups influences the significance and effectiveness of organisations. Especially external knowledge is ascribed as profitable regarding the development of solutions and innovative ideas. This effect is frequently mentioned by the interviewees, who emphasise the benefits of learning from each other and getting inspired by attending dissemination events. These events provide the opportunity for many stakeholders to engage in exchange activities, which increases the value of the shared experiences. A similar effect is stated by Cummings (2004) about the influence of structural diversity. According to the researcher, stakeholders from different locations have diverse experiences and knowledge, which adds to the value and content of the shared knowledge. The effect is also discussed by Reagans/McEvily (2003), who state that it is easier for stakeholders to build knowledge if the provider and recipient of knowledge share common expertise. In this context it is understandable that the stakeholders describe that they tend to ask colleagues in their field for help, because of sharing common knowledge. As mentioned in the interviews, it is easier and faster to ask colleagues for help than using literature to solve a problem.

**Knowledge sharing and exchange**

Moreover, cities and stakeholders have a key role in the exchange process because they share practices and knowledge. This finding directly addresses the research question by illustrating the profitable function of knowledge organisations. The idea is similar to the concept introduced by Nonaka (2000) about individuals sharing personal experiences with others. Throughout the interviews, different types of exchanges are discussed, from personal exchanges, like face-to-face interactions,
workshops, or dissemination events, to virtual exchanges, for example through internet platforms like Eltis (Eltis a, accessed 2018-02-04), where good examples from cities are collected and distributed. With the raise of communication technologies, indirect exchanges will most likely increase in the coming years. Nevertheless, the majority of the interviewees name personal, direct interaction as the easiest and fastest way to get the required information from a colleague. The differentiation between types of exchanges is also mentioned by Wang/Noe (2010), who distinguish between direct and indirect exchanges, based on either oral or textual exchanges. This categorisation can be found in the findings of the organisational documents about ways to share knowledge among actors.

**Policy mobilities**

Based on the concept of policy transfer as introduced by Dolowitz/Marsh (1996), which is defined as the process of transferring knowledge from one place to another, the process of learning and building knowledge through the exchange of successful policies between different locations is one of the main results of the empirical analysis (Wolman/Page, 2002). Transfer can occur within a country or between countries (Dolowitz/Marsh, 1996; Wolman/Page, 2002). This matches the empirical results, which promote the transfer of knowledge between cities and countries across Europe. Especially the interviewees frequently emphasise that knowledge is transferable and how valuable learning from different locations is. As a reason for the increase of exchanges between cities, forces like globalisation and Europeanisation are stated in the literature (Künkel, 2015; McCann/Ward, 2013). Although these forces are not mentioned in the interviews, the respondents describe the work of the organisations as a contribution towards the realisation of the European idea of partnership and collaboration between European countries. In this regard, the theoretical concepts and empirical results take a similar stance, stating that collaborations within European cities strengthen Europe as a whole.

Emerging from the concept of policy transfer, McCann (2011) developed the concept of policy mobilities. The concept is based on the binary meaning of the ‘mobility’ of policies, firstly by being ‘mobile’ because of their transferability, and secondly being ‘mobile’ in adjusting to local circumstances. Throughout the interviews, the need for local adaptations is mentioned repeatedly. The respondents emphasise that one-to-one transfers are not possible, which corresponds with the concept that policies have to be of mobile character and adapt to local circumstances. Literature describes that policy mobility mainly happens through local policy actors, global consultants, and informal infrastructure (McCann, 2011). This corresponds with the empirical results, which identify stakeholders on the local, regional, and national level as the key actors in the sharing process. The formation of networks between cities is frequently described as an achievement of the projects, with long-lasting relationships that continue beyond the official project period. One interview question specifically scrutinizes the perception of stakeholders on the utilisation of ‘policy mobility’, a term some stakeholders had never heard of and which had to be clarified. This might be due to policy mobility serving more as a theoretical concept, which the stakeholders rather refer to as ‘transfer’ or ‘exchange’ of practices, instead of an actual term in conversations. Nevertheless, the concept of policy mobilities, turned out to be
purposeful for the development of the research questions as well as grounding the empirical part theoretically.

Circuits and assemblages of knowledge

The concept of circuits of knowledge (McCann, 2011; Healey, 2013), refers to networks and the exchanges of transfer within. Exchanging knowledge and experiences through ‘transfer networks’ allow for reciprocal benefits of sharing knowledge with other network members, all based on social connections between the actors. The wish of many stakeholders for continuous exchanges after the end of the projects indicates the profitable utilize. The concepts of circuits of knowledge is suitable, as it literally describes the circles through which knowledge travels - in and beyond organisations. Results from the interviews indicate that citizens can be regarded as part of the networks as well, who represent an important factor for sustainable urban development.

Finally, not only networks are used for exchange activities, which are mostly personal, but also different kinds of assemblages of knowledge and exchange foster the sharing of knowledge. For example, virtual assemblages of knowledge are mentioned throughout both interviews and documents, such as online knowledge platforms as a collection of good practices. Künkel (2015) and Affolderbach/Schultz (2016) understand cities as assemblages of exchanges of ideas, which are formed through actors, a concept that becomes evident in examples of good practices that are shared between cities. Also, Wood (2016) introduces assemblages of learning, which are shaped through ideas, experiences, and information garnered from documents. All three types of assemblages promote the exchange of knowledge and support the distribution to a wide target group. Through the assemblages, new knowledge is developed and passed on, what again leads to a reproduction of the assemblages.

SUM

The topic of sustainability and SUM is consistently important throughout the analysis. The definition of sustainability from the Brundtland Report (WCED, 1987) is used as a theoretical outline, describing that development needs to combine economic, environmental, and social factors. To ‘fulfil’ the social aspect of SUM goals, a people-oriented approach is fundamental (Kyamakya/Mitrea, 2010). Putting people in the focus is a key aspect of SUM planning and frequently mentioned throughout literature and empirical results (exemplary Banister, 2008; Paradowska, 2010). This specific shift in the focus of transport planning constitutes one of the main results of the analysis, as well as the need for a holistic approach to urban mobility planning. In the interviews, different disciplines which influence urban mobility are discussed, with the résumé that interdisciplinary exchanges have to be further facilitated. The influence of the EU on urban mobility planning, for example through funding SUM projects, indicates the impact European knowledge organisations and their projects can make.

Subsequently, the methodology is critically assessed, reflecting on the reliability, validity, and robustness of the research methods, ethical considerations, and the position as a researcher.


7.2 Methodological reflections

In order to critically reflect on the chosen methods, reliability and validity are selected as criteria for qualitative research (Bryman, 2012). While the criteria are extracted from quantitative research, they can also be applied to qualitative research to assess the credibility of the selected methods. Generally, reliability is defined as the replicability of scientific research findings (LeCompte/Goetz, 1982). The validity of a qualitative research method refers to the ‘appropriateness’ of the tools, processes, and data (Leung, 2015) on answering to the research question. According to Golafshani (2003), the criteria of validity and reliability are used to measure the rigor, quality, consistency, and eventually the trustworthiness of qualitative research.

7.2.1 Reliability and validity

Reliability refers to the possibility to replicate a research study. While a qualitative study can never be repeated identically, because of the uniqueness of its social setting and empirical nature, several aspects of a research process are replicable (LeCompte/Goetz, 1982). That basically means, another researcher obtains similar results by using the same methods. Regarding the research process of this thesis, reliability can be achieved by approaching the same (or similar) organisations for potential interviewees, which are involved with SUM projects or knowledge exchanges on the organisational level. Stenbacka (2001) states that the quality of qualitative research should be understood as “the purpose of generating understanding” (ibid: 551) instead of explaining phenomenon.

Validity assesses if the chosen methods are suitable for the conducted measurement and observation (Golafshani, 2003). Triangulation is a common strategy in qualitative research to increase the validity and reliability of the empirical results by combining different types of data or sources (Flick, 2004). Flick (2004) suggest to use visual data to complement verbal data, like interviews, so in this regard, two methods and different types of data were chosen for the research design. By complementing the main method of semi-structured interviews with a content analysis of organisational documents, the results from both analysis can be validated and compared both ways. While the documents are not accountable as ‘visual data’, they constitute a different data source, resulting in new perspectives and the identification of internal linkages, between and within the different sources. The documents represent an objective, independent data source and are a contrast to the subjective responses of the interviews. By using both methods, the research questions are addressed from the ‘inside’ by asking about the perceptions of the stakeholders, but also from the ‘outside’ through the organisational documents. This allows to critically reflect upon the results of the interviews, but also to compare them with the organisational documents in order to understand, which answers could be stirred by the affiliation to the organisation. In summary, the research process displays both reliability and validity, which are increased through triangulation of the methods. The replicability of the study as well as the suitability of the methods result in the careful conclusion of validating the criteria for qualitative research.
7.2.2 Robustness

Leung (2015) introduces the evaluation of the quality and robustness of a qualitative research according to its validity, reliability and generalisability. In this regard, the methodological steps taken in the research process (from the theoretical concepts, empirical design, sampling, data acquisition, to the analysis and results) are subsequently reflected based on their consistency, appropriateness regarding the measures, and results. Hence, the positive aspects and challenges throughout the research process are discussed.

Semi-structured interviews with stakeholders constitute the main method to gather data. To narrow the sample of potential interviewees, European knowledge organisations were selected in advance. Also, the focus of the research, knowledge transfer regarding SUM, was decided preliminary to approaching both organisations and stakeholders. Due to comprehensive information in the internet, relevant stakeholders could be identified and contacted directly. This allowed to establish a personal relationship with the contact persons in an early stage of the research, providing the opportunity to enlarge the sample through snowball sampling and personal reference to other experts in the field. Contacting potential participants in English or German, based on their mother tongue, might also have simplified the contacting. Sending out the individualised interview guides provided the opportunity for the interviewees to prepare their answers and clarify unclear terms. This allowed to conduct pointed and target-oriented interviews, where the interview guide was mostly used as a loose guideline, framing the conversation. The interviewees are spread across Europe, therefore conducting telephone interviews was the only solution to be able to talk to such a diverse sample. While the majority of interviews ran smoothly, some technical troubles (like disfunction of recording or interruption of the call due to service) occurred. The involvement of the stakeholders in the SUMP projects allowed to get insight in the personal perception of the topic, as well as to hear about the endeavours of the organisations. Some stakeholders described their notion on the influence of the EU and working on a European scale. Summarising, the interviews provided the chance to analyse the work on different levels (personal, city, national, organisational, and EU level) and hence, provided a much deeper insight and understanding for the function of circuits of knowledge exchange.

The content of the organisational documents also referred to the organisational and EU-level. The documents provide a relatively objective data source to assess the organisations, although one has to reflect on the fact, that the documents are published by the responsible organisation. Therefore, they transport the information and message, the organisations want to share. Also, the selection of the documents was very pointed and selective, aiming to have a sample composed of documents about the projects and the organisation. The possibility of bias regarding the sample is acknowledged. Selecting documents, based on key words, title, and relevance might have influenced the results. Nevertheless, they are a significant addition to the responses of the interviews and a chance to understand the background of the key targets further.

Overall, the combination of the two methods turned out to be purposeful. Using semi-structured interviews as the main method allowed to get a deep understanding of the function and utilisation of knowledge organisations. The need to facilitate
knowledge exchange and promote SUM planning was a main topic of the interviews. Using a content analysis with a small sample of organisational documents increased the knowledge and general understanding of the topic and also proved valuable to critically assess the answers of the interviews and distinguish between personal and organisational perceptions of the participants.

7.2.3 Ethical considerations

Considering ethics in qualitative research is an important aspect of the research process. Bryman (2012: 135) defines four overlapping principles to be considered when doing research. The principles are: harm to participants, informed consent, invasion of privacy, and deception. In this thesis, ethical considerations are limited due to multiple reasons. To prevent harm to the participants, the interviewees are asked in the end of every interview if they want to be anonymised. All stakeholders agreed to have their name stated if relevant. Furthermore, the confidentiality of the records is secured because the interviews were transcribed by myself and stored on an external hard drive. The issue of lack of informed consent does not apply for this thesis, because the interviewees get fully informed about the study beforehand and can terminate their participation at any point of time.

Another ethical concern that Bryman (2012) states is the potential invasion of privacy. It overlaps with the issue of informed consent and describes the degree of privacy the participants reveal through their participation. This issue is also linked to anonymity and confidentiality and is ensured by giving full information to the participants and thus the chance to be anonymised. No personal or difficult questions are asked, so the interviewees are not endangered to reveal personal or sensitive information. Regarding the ethical issue of deception, the research conducted for the thesis does not deceive the participants in any way. Full disclosure and information about the research is provided to the participants before the interview, by describing the research project, which organisations are approached, and what the aim of the project is.

In the context of ethical considerations and positionality, I want to reflect on the chance for the interviewees to use me as a source for promotion and dissemination. Being mentioned frequently in the thesis, which is published on the website of the Stockholm University, provides the chance for the organisations to distribute their work to a large group of students in the field of urban planning.
7.2.4 Positionality

For every research process, a constant reflection on one's position as a researcher is important to limit the influence of subjectivity and personal opinion. Berger (2015) defines reflexivity of the researcher as the analytical stance and position throughout the research process. The social position is influenced by factors like gender, nationality, age, earlier experiences, academia, or personal values and beliefs. In this regard, constant reflection on the positionality of the researcher is important to understand if the experiences of the participants are shared. Hence, reflecting on myself as a researcher and my positionality in the research process is very important to understand how the research and results are impacted by my personal perceptions of the topic.

The topic is a result of personal interest and earlier studies and highly influenced by my wish to conduct research in a field that is both contemporary and substantial. Generally, it is purposeful to do research based on personal interests, although the result is likely to be influenced or stirred into a specific direction. Based on different types of reflexivity as described by Berger (2013), I position myself as a researcher on the outside with a general understand of the background of the topic. As a 24-year-old female student, raised in an EU country, aware of the partnerships and collaborations, I can relate to the benefits of exchanging knowledge and seizing opportunities to learn from other cities. As a German citizen, I am aware about the advantages of the free movement in Europe because it matches my personal experiences. These previous experiences influence my position as a researcher and allow me to reflect on the fundamental target of facilitating exchanges between cities, because of the profits I experienced myself. Yet, I am not involved with urban planning or any European organisation, which results in having a neutral perspective that I can remain throughout the research process. Addressing all organisations and stakeholders from the position as a graduate student, provides me with an objective, unbiased view on the topic.

Based on the data from the interviews and documents, which focuses mainly on the positive aspects of being part of exchange activities, the results can be criticised as one-sided. I acknowledge that this thesis is taking a favourable position towards facilitating knowledge exchange and that the beneficial aspects are prioritised. Nevertheless, apart from my personal perception of the topic, the results are based on the consistently positive responses of the interviews and documents. Throughout the interviews, I remained in a neutral position and asked for challenges of being involved in the projects or potential difficulties regarding knowledge transfer. Besides the probing, the answers remained benevolent. Therefore, I concede the positive light this thesis shines on the role of the work of European knowledge organisations, but it is not a result of nonreflective research but merely of positive responses. Hence, the thesis can be criticised for accentuating the positive aspects, although I tried to remain unbiased and simply replicate the positive resonance I met throughout the whole research process.
8. Conclusions

In conclusion, the main arguments and results of the empirical part are summarised and the future direction of further research is indicated.

In course of the research, three knowledge organisations and their SUM projects are examined by approaching involved stakeholders. Through the research design, which combines conducting semi-structured interviews with experts and a qualitative content analysis, the topics of 1) knowledge exchange, 2) policy mobility, and 3) SUM were addressed in order to investigate the role of European knowledge organisations. The interviews allowed to get insight in the process of knowledge sharing and exchange between actors on all administrative levels. The content analysis of organisational documents, as a textual data source, provides an objective perspective and additional information to the research topic.

Regarding the research questions, which address the function and utilisation of knowledge organisations, the findings indicate the strong facilitation of knowledge exchange through the organisations, which is a clearly stated target in both organisational documents and the interviews. The organisations describe and are described as bringing cities together, supporting practical, success-oriented exchange, and encouraging collaborations of cities. Multiple similarities between the work and targets of the organisations can be identified. EUROCITIES, as a city network, can be characterised by being a partner in different projects, with the responsibility to coordinate and manage the exchanges between the project cities. Additionally, collaborations between cities are promoted and the members profit from the long experience of the network. The CIVITAS Initiative endorse cities to work closely together and the work of the SUM projects, PROSPERITY and SUMP-s-Up, helps cities in the development and implementation process of SUMP-s, by targeting all governmental levels. The URBACT programme brings cities together and supports them in various urban development projects. URBACT distinguishes itself through its strong involvement in the projects and the strong networks that are established between the cities.

Sustainability, and arising from this SUM, is a relevant and significant topic, especially for cities and urban spaces. For example, all SUM projects target the further development and uptake of SUMP-s across European cities. SUMP-s are the result from a shift from TTP, with the main focus on transport and traffic, to the inclusion of multiple other disciplines that influence the urban space. The interdisciplinarity of urban mobility demands for a holistic approach to SUM planning, which is centred around people as a priority for development. This people-oriented development is significant to fulfil the social dimension of sustainable development. Referring to Banister (2008), citizens have to be integrated in the development process, which becomes evident in different aspects. Generally, mobility is identified as an important factor that is not only shaping the urban space, but also strongly influences the quality of (urban) life. Accordingly, I claim that the people should create and shape the urban space, not traffic or transport, referring to the transition in SUM planning and the inclusion of cross-sectoral topics.

Another finding are the benefits of knowledge exchange, which combines the value of learning from each other and sharing good and worst practices. Learning and
sharing activities take place in dissemination events or workshops, which are accessible for many stakeholders. Those events provide the possibility for interested stakeholder to attend, to hear successful examples, get inspiration, and take innovative impulses ‘back home’. However, while examples of other cities are used as inspiration, the difficulties of transferring practices between cities refers to another important result. A successful transfer process encompasses of the identification of successful indicators, consideration of local circumstances, and the adjustment to these factors. The findings indicate the collaborative work of cities towards the EU targets of Horizon 2020, whereby the goals are targeted through bottom-up developments on the local level and not through top-down decisions. Conclusively, funding represents a relevant part of SUM planning and being part of a knowledge organisation, as well as for the organisations themselves. Financial support of the EU and EC allows cross-sectoral projects to be carried out with the goal to support European cities on their way to more sustainability and creating better urban spaces. Overall, the findings of the thesis demonstrate which indicators are important considering knowledge exchange, policy mobilities, and SUM planning in Europe. Whether being a member of a knowledge organisations or an involved stakeholder in a development project, by establishing networks of cities, working in collaborative partnerships, sharing knowledge, and developing SUMPṣ, European cities are building strong ties between each other. These networks can be used for further cooperation and support.

Further research is necessary to investigate the citizens and their needs. For the development of SUMPṣ, the people should be further engaged to understand, how the public participation can be strengthened. More research on the transfer processes of policies are valuable to understand why some practices travel and others not, what to learn from good practices, and how cities can be further supported regarding the promotion of good examples. Reflecting on the positive stance of the interviewees and affirmative conclusion of the thesis, so additional research is necessary to validate and contrast the findings with other results. Potential difficulties and challenges of exchanging and sharing knowledge can be further investigated, potentially with questioning former stakeholders about the legacy of transfer networks and knowledge exchanges after the official project periods. The research was explorative by combining interlinked topics, which should be enlarged and deepened in further research. Also, to investigate knowledge organisations outside Europe and to consider the impact of global forces in the urban planning processes of the coming years illustrates potential research topics. Summarising, the focus of the thesis is the examination of the role of European knowledge organisations. The thesis presents an example how policy mobility between cities works, and how the development of SUM projects and the exchange of knowledge is facilitated. Cities need to adopt the prominent role they have to shape the future of Europe and beyond in order to shape sustainable urban spaces, where everybody wants to live in.
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Appendix

Appendix 1 – Example interview guide EUROCITIES

EUROCITIES
What is the function and utilize of EUROCITIES as a European knowledge organisation?  
What are the purpose and main targets of EUROCITIES?  
How would you describe your role and function at EUROCITIES?  
How would you describe the mode of operation and day-by-day work of EUROCITIES?  
How strong is the influence of the EU and European Commission on the work of EUROCITIES?

The CREATE project and Mobility Forum
How do you define and perceive sustainable urban mobility?  
What is your involvement in the CREATE project and the Mobility Forum?  
Could you describe the purpose and main targets of the CREATE project and the Mobility Forum?  
What is the mode of operation and how are sustainable development plans (and especially SUMPs) implemented, adopted and developed through the CREATE project and the Mobility Forum?

Policy Mobility and conclusive questions
How do you perceive ‘knowledge exchange’ and ‘policy mobility’ regarding urban development?  
Do you feel that the role of urban planning and involved stakeholders has changed over recent years, regarding the process of developing (sustainable) urban development plans?  
How do you perceive the holistic and interdisciplinary approach of knowledge organisations regarding urban challenges and for the planning of future cities?
Appendix 2 – Example interview guide URBACT

URBACT
What is the function and utilize of URBACT as a European knowledge organisation?
What are the purpose and main targets of URBACT?
How would you describe the mode of operation and day-by-day work of URBACT?
The CityMobilNet project
How do you define and perceive sustainable urban mobility?
What is your involvement in the CityMobilNet project?
Could you describe the purpose and main targets of the CityMobilNet project?
How are SUMPs implemented, adopted and developed through the CityMobilNet project?
How do you assess the transferability and adoption of SUMPs across European cities?
Policy Mobility and conclusive questions
How do you perceive ‘knowledge exchange’ and ‘policy mobility’ regarding urban development?
Do you feel that the role of urban planning and involved stakeholders has changed over recent years, regarding the process of developing (sustainable) urban development plans?
How do you perceive the holistic and interdisciplinary approach of knowledge organisations regarding urban challenges and for the planning of future cities?

Appendix 3 – Example interview guide CIVITAS

Policy Mobility and SUMPs
How do you define sustainable urban mobility and mobility planning?
In your opinion, what are the key points and the utilisation of a SUMP?
How do you perceive the transferability and adoption of SUMPs?
CIVITAS SUMPs-Up
What is your involvement in the CIVITAS SUMPs-Up project?
How is ICLEI involved in the SUMPs-Up project?
What are the main targets and aims of SUMPs-Up and what are the main measures to achieve them?
How do you perceive the function and utilize of the SUMPs-Up project regarding knowledge transfer and exchange?
What is the role of SUMPs-Up for the development, adoption and implementation of SUMPs in Europe?
Conclusive questions
How do you perceive ‘knowledge exchange’ and ‘policy mobility’ regarding urban development?
Do you feel like the role of urban planning and involved stakeholders has changed over recent years, regarding the process of developing (sustainable) urban development plans?
How do you perceive the holistic and interdisciplinary approach of knowledge organisations to approach urban challenges and for the planning of future cities?