



**Derby City Partnership – Response to the Consultation  
on the Draft East Midlands ERDF Operational Programme**

Derby City Partnership, as the Local Strategic Partnership for Derby, welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposed ERDF Operational Programme for the East Midlands. Our vision is to make Derby into a city for all ages by 2020, which we are seeking to achieve by focusing on five priority themes - children and young people, city growth, stronger and safer communities, culture, and health.

We see potentially strong linkages between the ERDF Operational Programme (OP) and our city growth strategy, which aims to create a prosperous, vibrant, inclusive and sustainable economy through:

- building Derby’s portfolio of higher value, knowledge based employment,
- ensuring Derby is a location of choice for the most talented, attracting and retaining creative, imaginative and forward thinking people, and
- energising all of Derby’s communities, capturing their full economic potential.

The aim of our comments, therefore, is to ensure that EU Structural Fund programmes are effectively aligned with our local priorities. In addition, we would wish to see the OP building on and supporting the collaborative work between the three cities of Derby, Leicester and Nottingham which is aimed at ensuring that the 3 cities sub-region becomes a more effective engine of growth for the benefit of city residents and the East Midlands region as a whole.

Our response has been informed by local consultation and discussions with Leicester City Council and Nottingham City Council colleagues. A local consultation event was held in Derby on 30 January 2007, which was attended by 51 delegates representing 34 partner organisations. We have also contributed to the development of a joint three cities response to this consultation exercise and support the three city position.

The DCP responses to the specific consultation questions are given below.

**Socio-Economic Analysis Summary**

**1. Do respondents agree that the socio-economic analysis accurately reflects the current regional context?**

We agree that the socio-economic analysis set out in the OP broadly reflects the current regional context as described in the Regional Economic Strategy (RES), however, we are concerned that there is a significant omission in terms of the urban areas in the East Midlands and their importance to the development of the region. In addition, the OP takes little account of the EU and national policy context with regard to urban areas and the EU Structural Funds.

The OP states that the key strategic documents that have been used to inform the OP are the Community Strategic Guidelines (CSG), the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) and the RES (pp. 25-28). All of these documents make specific reference to the importance of urban areas as engines for growth and jobs.

<b>Policy Document</b>	<b>References to Urban Areas</b>
European Commission guidance that underpins the CSG	<i>‘Cities ... are key players in regional development, including the development of neighbouring rural areas. Cities and regions need each other. A region will be successful if</i>

	<i>its cities are successful and cities will flourish if the wider region flourishes ... They are the home of most jobs, businesses and higher education institutions and are key actors in achieving social cohesion. Cities are the centres of change, based on innovation, entrepreneurship and business growth ... This is why policy at the national and European level needs to have an urban dimension.</i> <sup>1</sup>
UK National Strategic Reference Framework for the Structural Fund programme 2007-13	<i>'The Government believes that cities and city regions are important drivers of productivity and economic growth, and wants to improve their economic performance. Stronger links between cities and city regions mean that economic performance can be tackled within a wider strategy where strong cities and strong regions combine to deliver full employment, prosperity and opportunity.'</i> <sup>2</sup>
The RES states that one of the key challenges faced by the region is realising the full potential of urban areas:	<i>'As centres of a significant proportion of economic and social activity our towns and cities are key drivers of regional economic performance. Cities offer ready access to large numbers of consumers of goods and services and inputs to the production process and provide a range of employment, leisure and cultural activities, creative knowledge and innovation. Many urban areas in our region are not achieving their full potential and all continue to contain deprived areas characterised by economic and social exclusion.'</i> <sup>3</sup>

The Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI) bid submitted by Derby City Council on behalf of the cities of Derby, Leicester and Nottingham sets out the significance of the three cities sub-region to the regional economy and the scale of the challenges posed. Jointly the three cities account for 18% of the total population of the East Midlands and provide 26% of the Gross Domestic Product.<sup>4</sup> Major investment in the physical environment of the cities over the next five years will upgrade the retail, leisure and office offer of the city centres and the planned expansion of the East Midlands Airport is expected to result in an additional 9,000 jobs by 2015. New Growth Point status is planned to deliver 26% growth over and above current trends by 2026. Despite these opportunities, the cities are not 'punching their weight' in terms of economic performance and face a number of significant linked challenges:

- poor performance in enterprise development, growth and survival, with an enterprise gap of 8,000 firms that needs to be closed before we attain the UK average for business density and 6,400 VAT registered businesses. This gap is a product of both low levels of business formation rates (in Derby and Nottingham) and high levels of business failure rates (in Leicester)

<sup>1</sup> *Cohesion Policy and cities: the urban contribution to growth and jobs in the regions* [COM(2006) 385 final] (p.5)

<sup>2</sup> *UK National Strategic Reference Framework, 2007-13* (DTI) (p.32)

<sup>3</sup> *A Flourishing Region: Regional Economic Strategy for the East Midlands 2006-20* (emda) (p.28)

<sup>4</sup> *The Three Cities Knowledge Economy 2005, Local Futures Group 2005*

- communities that represent the region's biggest concentration of economic disadvantage, where over two-thirds of its most deprived areas are situated, and areas where unemployment is seven times the national average, coupled with high levels of lone parenthood and incapacity benefit claimants, and
- concentrations of people with low skills and poor qualifications, which prevent them from moving into job opportunities and constrains business growth and competitiveness.

At current trends, the position of the cities relative to the national average is set to decline further.

The available data on enterprise provides compelling evidence of the underdevelopment of enterprise and entrepreneurship across the whole of Derby. The growth in the total number of businesses between 1998 and 2003 was 4.7%, lower than the growth across England as a whole. The City has 29 businesses per 1000 residents and would need an additional 2,400 firms to match the national rate.

We believe that the OP currently overlooks the urban policy dimension and omits to address the key opportunities and challenges presented to the region by its urban areas.

**Q2. Do respondents feel that the proposed focus of the Programme is consistent? with the socio-economic analysis and the SWOT?**

While we agree that the focus of the OP is consistent with the socio-economic analysis and SWOT as presented in the OP, the fundamental omissions in the analysis section, which we have commented on in Question 1, have resulted in weaknesses in the SWOT and the focus of the OP. The SWOT makes very limited reference to the opportunities and challenges faced by urban areas. The RES makes reference to collaborative working between the three cities on key economic and spatial issues in order to support the cities in fulfilling their role as the main drivers of economic growth in the region. We would expect the SWOT to reflect some of the opportunities and challenges highlighted in documents such as:

- 'The Three Cities Knowledge Economy Report' (Local Futures, 2005) which recommends closer collaboration to generate 'smart growth', including raising productivity through the use of technology and knowledge; developing gateways; and creating conditions for choice and growth through improved living environments and infrastructure
- 'The Three Cities Scoping Study: Building a Complementary Development Framework', which includes proposals for re-positioning and marketing the sub-region, building the knowledge economy, developing culture and creativity, and improving physical and virtual links between the cities.

We feel that the overall aim of the Programme, i.e. *To become a region of highly productive, innovative and sustainable businesses and enable all communities to realise their economic potential*, is appropriate. However, we think that the focus on supporting deprived areas through improving the physical environment should be widened to include the improvement of social capital in these areas in order to achieve a more holistic approach to regeneration in these areas.

**Strategy**

**Q3. Do respondents feel that the proposed focus of ERDF activities is in line with the overall regional vision and key priorities as set out in the RES?**

The RES states that:

*'The three cities themselves (Derby, Leicester and Nottingham) are not 'punching above their weight' in economic and competitiveness terms. The need to optimise the performance of the region's cities as principal engines of economic growth whilst addressing the economic exclusion of deprived communities who seem not to benefit from the huge economic opportunities on their*

*doorstep, is increasingly recognised as important. Low levels of functional specialisation across the cities suggest a pressing need to build the functional linkages and complementarity of the cities.*<sup>5</sup>

We believe that the OP needs to incorporate a coherent urban dimension and we recommend that an additional priority axis is included in the OP focused on realising the full potential of the three cities as the engine for growth and jobs in the East Midlands. This priority should focus on developing functional linkages and complementarity between the cities, closer collaboration to generate ‘smart’ growth, and improving living environments and infrastructure. A suggested draft priority axis is attached at Annex 1.

**Q4. Do respondents feel that the proposed Programme structure and areas of activity are appropriate to meet the overall Programme Objective?**

We feel that, with the inclusion of an additional three cities priority axis, the proposed Programme structure would be appropriate to meet the overall aim of the Programme, however, we have a number of concerns regarding alignment with sub-regional and local strategies and initiatives, which are set out in our response to Q5 below.

There is an assumption in the OP that the development of people and skills will be resourced through the European Social Fund (ESF) programme and this raises the issue of alignment between the ERDF and ESF programmes. The OP refers to the long-standing ‘low pay low skills equilibrium’ in the East Midlands and to the potential constraint on the future economic development of the region posed by the high proportion of the economically active population who have no qualifications at all (particularly in the cities) and the low proportion with higher level qualifications (level 4) (p.16).

The RES identifies skills development as one of the key economic drivers for raising productivity in the region and this is reflected in the SWOT in the OP, but does not flow through to the strategy and priorities. The OP states that ERDF and ESF will be aligned in the following manner:

<b>ERDF (East Midlands)</b>	<b>ESF (National)</b>
<p><b>Priority Axis 1:</b> <i>Raising productivity through innovation, diversification and the embedding of sustainable business practice</i></p> <p><b>Priority Axis 2:</b> <i>Increasing sustainable economic and enterprise activity in disadvantaged communities</i></p>	<p><b>Priority 2:</b> <i>Improving the qualifications and skills of people without basic skills and with no or low qualifications</i></p>
<p><b>Priority Axis 2 only:</b> <i>Increasing sustainable economic and enterprise activity in disadvantaged communities</i></p>	<p><b>Priority 1:</b> <i>Improving the employability and skills of unemployed and inactive people and tackling barriers to work faced by those who are disadvantaged</i></p>

Whilst we recognise that ESF Priority 2 will assist in reducing the proportion of the region’s population that has no qualifications, the primary focus on intermediate level skills means that ESF will not effectively address the higher level skills gap in the region. Given the importance of higher level skills to the activities proposed under Priority Axis 1, the strategy in the OP could be seriously undermined unless this issue is addressed. Similarly, allocation of funds under ESF Priority 1 needs to take account of spatial targeting under Priority Axis 2, if alignment is to be effective. We

<sup>5</sup> *A Flourishing Region* (p.147)

recommend that emda, as the RDA with the national lead for European issues, takes up the issue of alignment between ESF and ERDF with DWP (the national managing authority for ESF) to ensure that potential flexibilities are maximised.

We believe that it is helpful that the East Midlands Employment, Skills and Productivity Partnership (esp) will take a lead responsibility in developing the regional ESF strategy and that this will help support effective strategic alignment. We would also support a joint ERDF / ESF programme management committee that will help ensure that effective alignment is maintained throughout programme delivery.

We would also wish to see a thorough assessment of the JESSICA (Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas) and JEREMIE (Joint European Resources for Micro to Medium Enterprises) financial initiatives, with a view to their adoption under the Programme.

**Q5. Do respondents feel that the structure of the Programme allows sufficient consistency and alignment with sub-regional and local initiatives e.g. Local Area Agreements and the Local Enterprise Growth Initiative?**

We believe that there is a partial alignment between the proposed Programme and the DCP City Growth key themes, which consist of:

- stimulating enterprise and innovation
- generating the liveable city
- nurturing the skills base
- inspiring ambition
- transforming perceptions, and
- providing the infrastructure for growth

The strongest potential linkage relates to enterprise and innovation where our ambition is to close the enterprise gap in terms of business formation, realise hidden creativity and innovation, achieve greater diversification and achieve greater self reliance and independence. We would welcome broad and flexible definitions of innovation and diversification, so that Programme support can be tailored to meet specific local and sub-regional needs. We also welcome the explicit inclusion of support for social enterprises that deliver services which improve the economic, social and environmental capacity of the local area, but feel that Priority Axis 2 emphasises economic development, but omits reference to social development. We believe that the scope of Priority Axis 2 needs to be expanded to include indicative actions that improve community cohesion and capacity building, as these are fundamental to the successful implementation of economic development initiatives.

We also have some concerns about the key sectors specified in the OP (transport equipment, construction, food and drink, and health). We recognise that transport equipment and health care are relevant to Derby, however the proposed key sectors do not align with the DCP City Growth priority clusters of manufacturing / engineering, creative industries, tourism and retail, which were identified by the Derby City Growth board following extensive research and mapping by ECOTEC Consulting. Whilst we recognise that reduced ERDF resources means that difficult choices need to be made in relation to priorities, we believe that it is important that there is sufficient flexibility in the Programme to support local priority sectors and clusters which can demonstrate positive economic benefits at regional or sub-regional level.

Under our key theme of nurturing the skills base, our ambition is to broaden the city's skills base, address employers' recruitment difficulties, bring latent pools of labour into productive use, and develop skills for the knowledge economy. The importance of skills development to the future growth of the city emphasises the importance of ensuring that the ESF Programme is effectively aligned with sub-regional and local strategies and initiatives (see comments above).

As mentioned previously, we would wish to see the OP building on and supporting the collaborative work between the three cities of Derby, Leicester and Nottingham. Our recent 'Enterprise Cubed' bid for LEGL funding was focused on transforming the three cities sub-regional economy through connecting our most disadvantaged communities to expanding market opportunities. As we have not been successful in securing LEGL funding, we hope that a number of the proposed workstreams can be taken forward with ERDF support, including:

- the provision of information and advice for supply chain businesses in order to support them in securing opportunities linked to the planned expansion of the East Midlands Airport
- support for business networks (including virtual networks) in order to promote the development of a dynamic three cities market and access to emerging global market opportunities, particularly those in Asia, where our BME communities have unique and diverse links, and
- the development and testing of models of specialist business support that meet the identified needs of city 'enterprise ecologies'.

We would, therefore, like to see these activities incorporated into a separate three cities priority axis.

### **Priority Axes**

#### **Q6 Do respondents feel that the spatial targeting approach outlined for Priority Axis 2 will ensure that funds are targeted on the region's most disadvantaged Areas?**

The focus of Priority Axis 2 in the draft Operational Programme is to provide support and resources to localities with high levels of deprivation and low levels of economic activity in order to increase sustainable economic and enterprise activity. The indicators put forward to identify target areas should therefore include those that define deprivation as well as economic and enterprise activity.

10 local authority districts have been selected that are the worst performing in the region in terms of deprivation and economic activity and these will be targeted for support.

- Nottingham City
- Leicester City
- Bolsover
- Lincoln
- Ashfield
- Chesterfield
- East Lindsey
- Derby City
- Boston
- Mansfield

At this stage it is not clear what the ratio of funding allocated to each of these districts will be. Is it intended to be split equally between the 10 districts regardless of their rankings above or will there be a methodology that allocates funding according to the scale, extent and levels of deprivation in an area?

**Selection of Indicators** - Derby is ranked 8<sup>th</sup> in the selected indicators used which include:

- unemployment rate
- economic activity rate
- employment rate
- proportion of working age with no qualifications
- VAT registrations per 10,000 people
- Self employment rate
- Average earnings

Derby would agree with the use of 5 of the proposed indicators – unemployment rate, economic activity rate, employment rate, the self employment rate which can be derived from the Annual Population Survey as well as the VAT registrations.

But two indicators and their current data sources – % of people of working age with no qualifications and full time median weekly earnings, we would want to substitute or remove.

**% Of people of working age with no qualification** – this has been derived from the 2003/2004 Labour Force Survey but we feel a more up to date source – the Annual Population Survey (2005) should be used. This has already been used to source 4 of the emda indicators and can be readily updated as well as being a larger sample with better confidence intervals.

**Full time median weekly earnings** – this is derived from the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (2004) and is an analysis of residents updated annually. Our main concern is that this is more an assessment of the sectors of the local economy – high tech. high skilled – rather than deprivation or enterprise activity. We would argue that those claiming Income Support would be a better measure of overall levels of deprivation instead of earnings. Data on the numbers and proportion of people over 16 claiming Income Support is available on a quarterly basis from the Department of Work and Pensions.

Derby's position is that we would:

- support the substitution of data on people with no qualifications from the far more recent Annual Population Survey 2005.
- Substitute data on Income Support claimants for median earnings.

The second stage of the spatial targeting exercise proposed in the Operational Programme still remains vague. While we don't yet know whether the European Commission will expect to see a regional 'map', the region will need to set out the process, timescales and methodology used for targeting resources as soon as possible. In the RESPE papers published in October 2006, the next stage of the spatial targeting exercise is likely to be completed by the Programme Monitoring Committee (PMC) which has been the delivery rather than the strategic body for EU Structural Funds.

So far no account appears to have been taken of the scale and extent of deprivation in each of the Local Authority areas. This should be a critical factor in determining the level of ERDF funding received. Derby's 13 most deprived Priority Neighbourhoods identified in the DCP Community Strategy are estimated to include a total population of between 115,000 and 121,500 people. This is larger than the **entire** population of Bolsover, Lincoln, Ashfield and Chesterfield based on the Mid-Year Estimates for 2003.

Analysis of the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2004 based on the number of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA's) falling within the worst 20% nationally shows Derby ranked third with 44 areas. Only Nottingham with 115 and Leicester with 74 exceed this total,

We feel that the levels and scale of deprivation needs to be a major determinant in allocating funding under Priority Axis 2 within the Operational Programme. We would propose that the targeting of funding within Priority Axis 2 should reflect the scale and levels of deprivation in the 3 cities and the need to focus on achieving real impacts and transformation of the lives of our disadvantaged communities.

#### **Q7 What steps can be taken to ensure maximum sub-regional/local alignment and coherence between ERDF and other funding streams?**

The addition of our proposed third "Three Cities" Priority Axis would aid alignment, particularly if a resubmitted LEGI bid is successful. We would also support devolution of the programme to sub-regional or local levels where appropriate; for example, the proposed Priority Axis 2 would be most

appropriately managed at sub-regional level by SSPs or LSP's , who have experience at managing the current programme. This will be especially important for management of the separate Urban Development strand as this would offer a more local and accountable focus.

We welcome the recognition of the need to integrate specialist support into the regional business model under Priority Axis 2, in order to ensure that hard to reach groups are able to access support. We believe that the principle of tailored business support should be applied to all Priority Axes. Our work on 'enterprise ecologies' has identified a number of different types of enterprises in the three cities, each of which has particular requirements in relation to business support. We would, therefore, wish to see sufficient flexibility in the Programme to allow for the design of provision tailored to the needs of particular types of business.

We note the suggestion that ERDF resources may be allocated through the commissioning of activities, rather than through a bidding process. We recognise the potential benefits of this approach in terms of ensuring the strategic alignment of activities supported by ERDF, however, we would not wish to see a top-down approach or large scale regional projects that do not take account of local or sub-regional requirements. We believe that DCP and DDEP need to be involved at all stages of the planning and implementation of the Programme in order to ensure that ERDF is effectively aligned with local and sub-regional strategies and funding streams.

We believe that the representation of DCP and DDEP on the Programme Monitoring Committee would facilitate the alignment of ERDF and, in line with our proposal for a separate three cities Priority Axis, we would wish to see a three cities representation on the PMC. In order to support the integration of ERDF and ESF, we would also wish to see a joint ERDF / ESF Programme Monitoring Committee.

### **Cross Cutting Themes**

#### **Q8 Do respondents feel that the Cross-Cutting themes have been effectively mainstreamed into the Operational Programme?**

While we generally agree with the content of section 5 of the OP, we believe that it requires much more development. We agree that the mainstreaming of the crosscutting themes across all activities is the right approach and that these should be considered at every stage of the life of a project from inception to evaluation. Beyond this, however, the OP says little about how the crosscutting theme objectives will be practically delivered.

Environmental sustainability and equality are both important Programme objectives, which are of fundamental importance to the achievement of the aims of the Programme and the individual Priority Axes. It is encouraging to know that the 2000-06 Programme has demonstrated a wealth of good practice. However, the OP points out that the region's progress towards environmental improvement tends to be slower than the nation as a whole, implying that the region is falling behind. (The OP does not appear to include an assessment of progress towards equality of opportunity). We believe that a more proactive approach is required, beyond the citation of good practice and opportunities for the integration of the crosscutting themes into the Priority Axes.

We suggest that a practical strategy is developed as a basis for the pro-active implementation of both the environmental sustainability and equality crosscutting theme objectives. In addition to mainstreaming activities, this strategy should include practical approaches to:

- ensuring that best practice, from both the current Programme and other sources, is promoted and replicated in the 2007-13 Programme
- promoting the use of impact measurement methodologies and tools in the design, delivery and evaluation of individual projects

- establishing measurable targets and appropriate performance indicators<sup>6</sup> for the cross-cutting themes and
- developing review and monitoring processes in order to assess progress.

We believe that these steps are required in order to ensure that the cross-cutting theme objectives are actually realized, as opposed to remaining commendable aspirations.

### **Financial Allocations**

#### **Q9 Which of the two options for allocating funds between the Priority Axes do respondents feel is most appropriate, and will support delivery of the Programme Objective?**

There is an assumption that the 2 priorities are “given” as the best way forward for the Operational Programme and the Region to deliver against the UK’s NSRF / the East Midlands RES. The 3 cities believe that this is not the most effective way and therefore cannot support either option 1 or 2 as set out in the OP

To assist in the development and improvement of the regions economic performance, the 3 cities would welcome a number of inclusions into the Programme document:

- A separate and distinct Urban Development strand that has both “thematic” and “spatial” elements that would allow the 3 cities the flexibility and discretion to work together when needed
- Scope for transnational activity to be included within the Programme structure (together with allocated funding for activities to take place) in order that local and regional partnerships can benefit from transnational innovation projects and experiences from other members of the European Union
- More detail around JEREMIE and JESSICA (OP, Page 68) as these could be very beneficial to 3 Cities because they allow the potential to recycle funds and become sustainable. The 3 cities all have existing Community Development Finance Institutions and Urban Regeneration Companies which could make effective use of these new financial instruments

With the addition of a third priority based on the Three Cities sub-region we would argue for resources to be split on a **40:40:20** basis. This would reflect the smaller area that the third priority would be addressing and is based on a similar approach in the Yorkshire and Humber draft OP where 23% of ERDF has been allocated to a city-regional area of Sheffield, Rotherham, Barnsley and Doncaster.

---

<sup>6</sup> BREEM rating, cited in the OP, will be less relevant to the 2007-13 Programme, due to the reduced focus on building

## Annex 1 – Draft Three Cities Priority Axis

### Realising the full potential of the three cities as the engine for growth and jobs in the East Midlands region

#### Preamble

This sub-area comprises the cities of Derby, Nottingham and Leicester, and their surrounding districts, including parts of Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire. The cities act as the region's major administrative, commercial and cultural centres, although they exhibit substantial pockets of deprivation.

This sub-area accounts for the largest proportion of the region's population, a total of 2,059,600 estimated residents in 2004, almost half the total East Midlands' population. Estimates of GVA per head for Nottingham City are 32% above the UK average, the highest in the region, whilst GVA per head also exceeds the national average in both Leicester and Derby. However, historic and forecast GVA and employment growth rates are below the regional average, suggesting that the sub-area is not maximising its opportunities for growth.

Labour market indicators for the sub-area suggest significant challenges relating to acute deprivation in all three major conurbations. The Three Cities sub-area has the highest unemployment rate of the five sub-areas, and both employment and economic activity rates are below the regional average.

The three cities themselves (Derby, Leicester and Nottingham) are not 'punching above their weight' in economic and competitiveness terms. The need to optimise the performance of the region's cities as principal engines of economic growth whilst addressing the economic exclusion of deprived communities who seem not to benefit from the huge economic opportunities on their doorstep, is increasingly recognised as important. Low levels of functional specialisation across the cities suggest a pressing need to build the functional linkages and complementarities of the cities.

#### Aims and Objectives

- Develop the functional linkages and complementarities of the cities
- Closer collaboration to generate 'smart' growth - raising productivity through the use of technology and knowledge
- Creating conditions for choice and growth through improved living environments and infrastructure

#### Indicative actions

Focus of activity	Indicative actions
Developing linkages and complementarity of the Three Cities	Technology transfer and improvement of cooperation networks between SMEs and other businesses and universities, etc.
	Cluster support and development
Closer collaboration in the knowledge economy	Services and applications for the citizen ( <i>e-health, e-government, e-learning, etc.</i> )
	Services and applications for SMEs ( <i>e-commerce, education and training, networking, etc.</i> )
	Energy efficiency, co-generation, energy management

Improving the attractiveness of the sub-regional environment and infrastructure	Energy efficiency, co-generation, energy management
	Promotion of clean urban transport systems