



DOCUMENTATION OF  
THE FIFTH PEER REVIEW  
AT THE CONSORTIUM MEETING  
ROME | 14.10.2015

---

## OVERVIEW

OVERVIEW .....	1
1. Peer Review in Smartset .....	2
1.1. Introduction: .....	2
1.2. 5 <sup>th</sup> Peer Review Meeting, 14.10.2015 .....	3
1.2.1. Preparation: .....	3
2. Peer Review Sundsvall .....	4
2.1 Introduction.....	4
2.2 Presentation at the Peer Review.....	4
2.3 Points discussed .....	5
3. Annexes.....	7

---

# 1. PEER REVIEW IN SMARTSET

## 1.1. Introduction:

Within SMARTSET a regular peer review among the project partners - notably between lead and follower cities – is implemented within WP 5.

Such peer reviews are performed by meetings established back-to-back with project consortium meetings and deal with relevant actions and challenges in the course of project implementation.

Within SMARTSET such peer reviews are not a matter of simply judging an activity – but rather a form of know-how exchange, “external” evaluation and support of the reviewed/discussed application site in a high quality manner – carried out within the project consortium.

In SMARTSET, peer reviews are applied for following reasons:

- To ensure and increase the quality of the SMARTSET project implementation
- Every application site gets acquainted with an external, yet informed perspective
- To engage in mutual learning and know-how transfer with trusted peers
- SMARTSET is the perfect platform for understanding, following, evaluating and helping each other to further develop the application sites’ concepts and implementation with freight distribution systems.
- SMARTSET partners are lead and follower cities, thematic experts, from different backgrounds and working in different contexts. Thus a comprehensive advise can be jointly built
- There is no judging of situations in a theoretical manner. Peers and evaluated application site “sit in the same boat” have and get “first-hand-experience”; therefore it is easier to give assessments on how a specific application site’s activity was dealt with and how it can be improved.

To allow every application site to be transparent and open in the peer review discussion, all SMARTSET consortium partners commit to:

- Putting the focus on the specific application site’s needs/interests
- Being objective
- Keeping all information exchanged confidential
- Promoting openness, integrity and sincerity for mutual learning in the peer review
- Keeping in mind that there are different cultural influences and different contexts influencing the respective project partner’s implementation work
- Promoting an open enquiring and critical attitude (both in the peers and the reviewed application site)

For getting the most out of the time for a peer-review meeting an intensive preparation phase (e.g. by questionnaire to application sites) is followed by different interactive settings at the peer review meeting itself.

## 1.2. 5<sup>th</sup> Peer Review Meeting, 14.10.2015

### 1.2.1. Preparation:

The 5<sup>th</sup> SMARTSET Peer Review meeting was held on the 14<sup>th</sup> of October 2015, back-to-back with the 6<sup>th</sup> Consortium Meeting in Rome, Italy.

In previous phone conferences of the PMG and of the Work Package Leaders as well as in the course of reporting it had become evident that it proved to be a challenge for Sundsvall to further substantiate some activities planned and to achieve pre-defined target values (performance indicators) accordingly.

Therefore it was decided to put Sundsvall into the center of the 5<sup>th</sup> Peer Review meeting to support this application site team in the implementation and the achievement of results.

The 5<sup>th</sup> Peer Review meeting was prepared as follows:

- Consultation with the Work Package Leaders and the Lead Partner (that visited Sundsvall in August 2015),
- Information of Sundsvall including a request to present their issues in the peer review along a template provided by FGM-AMOR,
- FGM-AMOR sent out a preparation mail including the presentation of Sundsvall to the whole SMARTSET partner group for preparation.

Figure 1 below describes the sequence of the 5<sup>th</sup> SMARTSET Peer Review.



**Figure 1: Sequence of the 5<sup>th</sup> SMARTSET Peer Review**

## 2. PEER REVIEW SUNDSVALL

### 2.1 Introduction

A need to further substantiate the Sundsvall site application was identified as outlined in the previous chapter. Therefore Sundsvall was requested to prepare a presentation (along a template provided by FGM-AMOR) for the peer review – addressing following points:

- Application site activities that shall be implemented - and how they shall be implemented,
- Most important steps for the achievement of different pre-defined goals,
- Critical factors in the plan,
- Alliances with key players and target groups still needed,
- Questions to the Peer Review group.

This presentation was received and sent out to all project partners for presentation (see *Annex I SMARTSET\_WP5\_\_5\_Peer Review\_Sundsvall\_Final.pdf*).

### 2.2 Presentation at the Peer Review

Hans Dunder held the presentation for Sundsvall at the Peer Review meeting.

Following questions were raised to the Peer Review Group:

- *Activities until project end*
  - What is your opinion about using a waste handler to finance the last mile deliveries? They will make use of or modify their existing transport of goods i.e. cardboard and such. And they are fairly independent and not a traditional competitor to the already existing transportation organizations.
  - Any key activities in the last mile delivery that you find especially important for the last month of the project?
  - What is your opinion about the proposed activities for the intermodal train transport? These companies are individual and independent so is that the most an actor can do without any legal powers? To encourage and nag?
- *What will be the most important steps for the achievement of different goals?*
  - Do you propose any other major way to further reduce CO2 and energy consumption than to increase the good in the intermodal transport?
  - Do you propose any other objectives that are of greater importance that should be prioritized at the end of this project?
- *Critical factors and alliances*
  - What is your opinion about the critical points and factors, is the workshops the way to go? We would be an third part agent if this works out as it should, because the deals and agreements would then be strict professional and it will also have an greater possibility to last longer than just this project. Any suggestions and tips for third part agents?
  - Any other critical factors that we are missing out?
- *What regional/national co-operations with key actors and target groups are further needed?*
  - Any further suggestions of co-operations on a national level that is missing?

## 2.3 Points discussed

Following points were discussed respectively feedback was given after the presentation:

Sundsvall:

- There is a potential of CO<sub>2</sub>-savings of 9,000 tons.
- Not enough focus was put on the inner city logistics target groups so far.
- Sundsvall started producing biogas from waste – thus they have gas driven vehicles involved as well.

Rome:

- The concept needs to be viable in the long-term. Players need to accept that at the beginning they will not earn money. As Sundsvall is rather small, there is not such pressure as in Rome – therefore it is harder to convince the key players.

Gothenburg:

- Try to engage as many shop-holders as possible. So far the inner-city logistics part is certainly the weakest part of the Sundsvall application part. More focus should be put on that, other-wise the implementation proceeds too slowly.
- Gothenburg offers to welcome representatives of Sundsvall for site visit to Gothenburg any time. Then these players can see that it works in reality.

FGM-AMOR:

- There are studies on city centres that prove that shifting deliveries to sustainable modes of transport are not weakening the business. These studies can also support convincing the key players in Sundsvall.

Gothenburg:

- Sundsvall also wants to include waste handling into the SMARTSET site application and Ragn-Sells is involved in an early stage (<http://www.ragnsells.se/sv/>). For further cooperation Sundsvall needs to have a concept ready for Ragn-Sells.

TRIVECTOR:

- If the focus is not on waste handling alone, Sundsvall seems to address a little bit of everything. Therefore demand studies are important.
- Sundsvall explains that the person working for SMARTSET in Sundsvall before Tomas Widenfalk brought a good picture on how the market works and how many actors there are, as he had worked with the postal service before. Sundsvall still receives information from him on this issue.

Sundsvall/intermodal train transport:

- The part of the site application on intermodal train transport is up and running. Except for the re-cargo issue it works well. Cooperation with Trafikverket is in place.
- Duo locomotive becomes a case study. It is not yet included in the real rail solution today.
- HCT-trucks form also a case study. Big trucks take away market shares from the rail. A lot of ships are working as well. The wood industry is very conservative and hard to convince of new modes.

- There is a large potential of bringing truck to train. But as the lack of quality is an issue, the next step must be to introduce another train.

#### Sundsvall/city logistics:

- Sundsvall can now focus totally on city logistics. Shopkeepers are already aware of the city logistics plans. But so far no solution could be found that everyone can accept.
- Maybe the City of Graz can come to Sundsvall and convince players on the spot.
- City logistics is considered to be rather for improving the local climate. It will not have a huge impact on CO2 reduction.
- The city logistics scheme must not increase the cost for the shops, as they are struggling for their survival anyway.
- Most potential customers do not yet think of home delivery.

#### Gothenburg:

- It is crucial to have a solution ready for the city logistics.
- Therefore not that many more discussions should be made but rather an offer/a concept for the shopkeepers shall be presented. This offer can be integrated into a bigger picture, e.g. the vision of more parking spaces for customers or the increase of green areas in the city.

#### Sundsvall:

- It is crucial to stop talking and to start implementing.
- There is an agreement with Trafikverket, that diesel-/hybrid busses will be introduced. This shall also be communicated to the shop-keepers.
- Steps to reach 9000 CO2 savings will also comprise lobbying and the Bothnian Green Logistics Corridor Project (<http://www.bothniangreen.se>), in which the City of Sundsvall is a partner.

### 3. ANNEXES

- [Annex I\\_SMARTSET\\_WP5\\_\\_5\\_Peer Review\\_Sundsvall\\_Final.pdf](#)