

Making better choices

— an investigation of collaborative stakeholder dialogue as
catalyst for consensus building and learning in the transport
policy process

Christiane Baumann
Institute for Sustainable Futures
University of Technology, Sydney

Thesis submitted for the award of Doctor of Philosophy
February 2012

Certificate of authorship/originality

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student

Acknowledgements

Conducting this doctoral research was a challenging but nonetheless exciting and delightful journey, which it would not have been without the support a number of people and institutions.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my supervisors at the Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF). Prof Stuart White helped organise and clarify my thinking on countless occasions through his intelligent questioning and his profound understanding of the concept of sustainability. He instilled in me the confidence that I would be able to finish this project within three years, and he was extremely supportive and pragmatic during the unexpected turns this research took. Dr Michelle Zeibots introduced me to the worlds of systems thinking and transport planning, which was instrumental in enabling me to intellectually grasp the complexity of the *wicked problem* of sustainable transport development. She also tirelessly helped me to improve my writing skills.

The supportive structure within the ISF postgraduate community made a great contribution to my research journey, and made me feel at home from the first day I started my research in a foreign country. In particular I would like to thank the members of my peer support groups as well as other students who provided valuable academic and moral support throughout my research journey: Chris Dunstan, Carlia Cooper, John McKibben, Rachel Watson, Wil vanDeur, Nicole Thornton, Andrew Glover, Dena Fam, Keren Winterford, Jennifer Kent, Sarina Kilham and Dr Dana Cordell.

A number of people inside and outside of ISF have contributed specialist feedback to particular parts of this thesis. I came originally from a background in engineering and business administration, and the enlightening discussions with Dr Betsi Beem helped me feel less of an impostor in the world of political science, and they helped me to navigate through the vast field of theory. Dr Beem's input and feedback was particularly valuable for Chapters 4, 6 and 7. Dr John Stone provided feedback on a draft version of the final thesis, in particular on Chapter 5. Dr Tim Prior and Dr James Goodman provided helpful critical feedback on the paper that was the foundation for Chapter 7. Prof Lyn Carson reviewed the paper that was the foundation for Chapter 8 and made important clarifications. Jessica Minshall reviewed the journal article that was the foundation for Sections 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4. Dr Tim Prior and Prof Ortwin Renn commented on the conference paper that was the foundation

for Section 6.3 and the related journal publication. John Revington provided editorial advice on the draft version of the final thesis.

The research also benefited from early discussions with Prof Regine Gerike, Dr Sven Kesselring, Dr Craig Townsend, Prof Ortwin Renn, Dr Felix Laube, Prof Jeff Kenworthy, Dr Dominic Stead, Dr Carolyn Hendricks, Ivo Cré, Marcel Rommerts, Wolfgang Breithaupt, Dr Rolf Bergmeier, and Sally Stannard.

The empirical research would not have been possible without the generous contributions in terms of time and insights provided by my interview and discussion partners in Munich and Sydney, and the friendly help from City of Munich employees which enabled me to gain access to archived documents.

I greatly appreciate all comments and contributions that sparked and evolved many of the ideas in this thesis. Still, any errors and omissions in the research are completely mine.

I also want to thank my family and friends who provided an incredibly supportive environment for me to conduct my research. Most importantly, I thank my partner Johannes for being a patient sounding board for my ideas and for cheering me up and bringing me chocolate whenever I had a 'PhD crisis'. I also thank my family for being supportive when I decided to quit full-time employment and become a student again, and for always being there to listen despite the time difference between Germany and Australia.

Finally, this study would not have been possible without the financial support of the University of Technology, Sydney (International Research Scholarship and UTS President's Scholarship) and the Australian Government (Endeavour Europe Award). In this regard, I am especially indebted to Prof Maximilian Simon at Munich University of Applied Sciences and Dr Juliane Wolf and Holger Braess at BMW for their untiring support during the scholarship application process.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	viii
List of publications	ix
Abbreviations.....	xi
Abstract.....	xii
Graphic abstract	xiv
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Urban transport systems and sustainable development — a wicked problem ...	1
1.2. Aim and scope of the thesis.....	10
1.3. A transdisciplinary and systemic research framework.....	12
1.4. Structure of the thesis.....	15
1.5. Significance of the research for elected government, practitioners and sustainable transport advocates	18
CHAPTER 2. THE HUMAN ACTIVITY SYSTEM IN THE TRANSPORT POLICY ARENA	19
2.1. The human activity system embedded and interrelated	20
2.2. Values, worldviews, interests and influence	29
2.3. Evolution of transport planning paradigms	33
2.4. Conclusion and resulting research questions	42
CHAPTER 3. APPROACH TO RESEARCH.....	44
3.1. Case study methodology	45
3.2. An adaptive theory approach to knowledge generation	47
CHAPTER 4. HOW AND WHY DOES POLICY CHANGE?	50
4.1. A theoretical framework that reflects the wicked problem.....	51
4.2. Analysing implementation barriers for sustainable transport policies.....	61
4.3. Pathways to policy change	67
4.4. Conclusions for the case study research.....	72
CHAPTER 5. TRACING POLICY CHANGE IN MUNICH.....	74
5.1. Munich — a case study in sustainable urban transport development	75
5.2. Research design.....	83
5.3. Events and effects surrounding policy change in Munich	91
5.4. Success factors for collaborative stakeholder dialogue.....	113
5.5. Conclusions from the case analysis.....	122

CHAPTER 6. PLACING THE EMPIRICAL FINDINGS IN A THEORETICAL CONTEXT	128
6.1. Mapping the Inzell-Initiative within the theoretical framework	129
6.2. Classifying preconditions and process criteria for consensus building.....	133
6.3. Revisiting sustainability barriers: consensus as a pragmatic way forward	140
6.4. Redefining sustainable transport development: a process- and systems-based definition	144
 CHAPTER 7. A SYSTEMATIC COMPARISON OF ADVERSARIAL AND COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES TO THE TRANSPORT POLICY PROCESS.	146
7.1. Establishing a sustainable transport governance framework	147
7.2. Comparing the change creation potential of adversarial and collaborative pathways to policy change	149
7.3. CSD as a pragmatic pathway to policy change in wicked problem situations.....	157
 CHAPTER 8. ENGAGEMENT OF CITIZENS AND ORGANISED INTERESTS IN THE TRANSPORT POLICY PROCESS — COMPLEMENTARY OR MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE?.....	159
8.1. Approaches to engaging the public in the process of public policy making..	161
8.2. Comparing the strengths and weaknesses of citizen and interest group participation with regards to social goals.....	168
8.3. DIP and CSD — complementary or mutually exclusive?.....	172
 CHAPTER 9. INVESTIGATING THE TRANSFERABILITY OF COLLABORATIVE STAKEHOLDER DIALOGUE TO OTHER CITIES	176
9.1. The transferability of a governance process.....	177
9.2. Testing the preconditions framework in Sydney.....	183
9.3. Conclusions on guidelines for the transferability of governance procedures	190
 CHAPTER 10. CONCLUDING REMARKS	192
10.1. Developing answers to my research question	193
10.2. Significance of the findings for policy making practice	194
10.3. Creating change — an epilogue on developments in Sydney	197
10.4. Areas for further research.....	198
 Appendix 1: Munich interview partners	199
Appendix 2: Initial Munich interview guideline.....	200
Appendix 3: Transport indicators for Munich and Sydney	202
References.....	204

List of Tables

<i>Table 1:</i> Historical overview of the evolution of dominant transport planning paradigms: Predict and Provide, Predict and Prevent/ New Realism and Sustainable Mobility.....	35
<i>Table 2:</i> Comparison of elements of three theories of the policy change that are relevant to this thesis: the Advocacy-Coalition-Framework, the Multiple-Streams-Model and Institutional Theory	52
<i>Table 3:</i> Synthesis of the characteristic differences in the mechanisms and outcomes of policy change based on collaborative and adversarial styles of political debate.....	68
<i>Table 4:</i> The effects and outcomes of the Inzell-Initiative mapped against a synthesis of Innes and Booher's outcome criteria for consensus building.....	131
<i>Table 5:</i> Preconditions and process criteria for successful consensus building in a collaborative stakeholder dialogue	134
<i>Table 6:</i> Relevance of claims for efficiency, effectiveness, legitimacy and social cohesion for the policy process and its outcomes in the sustainable transport governance framework.....	149
<i>Table 7:</i> Synthesis of the comparative assessment of collaborative versus adversarial approaches to the policy process in the light of a sustainable transport governance framework	151
<i>Table 8:</i> Characteristics of citizen and interest group participation in the transport policy process.....	162
<i>Table 9:</i> The International Association for Public Participation's Spectrum of Public Participation	163
<i>Table 10:</i> Assessment of the likeliness of citizen and interest group participation mechanisms in the transport policy process to meet social goals.....	171
<i>Table 11:</i> Incentives or preconditions for decision makers and non-government organised interests to support and engage in collaborative stakeholder dialogue	181
<i>Table 12:</i> List of interview partners in Munich and their in-text descriptions	199
<i>Table 13:</i> Comparative transport indicators for Munich and Sydney, 1995.....	202

List of Figures

<i>Figure i</i> : 50 of the 59 most common words used in the body of the thesis, with word size indicating the relative frequency of use.....	xiv
<i>Figure 1</i> : Structure of the thesis.....	16
<i>Figure 2</i> : The urban transport function as embedded in a systems-based conception of sustainability	22
<i>Figure 3</i> : The ‘eternal triangle’ of boundary judgments, facts, and values.....	31
<i>Figure 4</i> : The relative weight of advocacy coalition (AC) value priorities influences the direction of policy development	32
<i>Figure 5</i> : Sustainable transport clusters.....	41
<i>Figure 6</i> : Total private passenger mobility (passenger km) per capita by sustainable transport cluster.....	41
<i>Figure 7</i> : Adaptive Theory, contrasted with Grounded Theory and strict hypothesis testing.	49
<i>Figure 8</i> : 2007 Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) flow diagram	55
<i>Figure 9</i> : The pyramid of belief systems in the ACF	56
<i>Figure 10</i> : Three parallel streams in the policy process and opening policy windows as opportunities for coupling of the streams	58
<i>Figure 11</i> : Major roads in the Munich city area: <i>Altstadtring</i> (inner circle), <i>Mittlerer Ring</i> (middle circle, dark grey) and <i>Autobahnring</i> (outer circle).....	77
<i>Figure 12</i> : Development of vehicle traffic in Munich.....	100
<i>Figure 13</i> : Development of traffic performance along the <i>Mittlerer Ring</i>	101
<i>Figure 14</i> : Development of traffic load at the city boundary and at the major north-south and east-west crossings	101
<i>Figure 15</i> : Public transport development in Munich (MVV area)	102
<i>Figure 16</i> : Main means of transport across all travel purposes on a reference day in 2002 and 2008.....	102
<i>Figure 17</i> : The platform of the Inzell-Initiative: shared principles for transport development.....	118
<i>Figure 18</i> : Lash's six-sided triangle of the interconnections between planners, elected decision makers, and the public integrated in Kingdon’s parallel streams.....	142
<i>Figure 19</i> : A model of the coexistence of DIPs and CSD in the transport policy process....	174
<i>Figure 20</i> : Sydney’s motorway network	184

List of publications

The discussions and findings from this doctoral thesis have been published throughout the research process. These publications are listed below in chronological order.

- 1) Baumann, C. & Zeibots, M.E. 2009, 'Beyond tradition: a systems-based definition of sustainable transport development', paper presented to the *Solutions for a Sustainable Planet Conference*, 23- 24 November 2009, Melbourne, Australia.
- 2) Baumann, C. & Zeibots, M.E. 2010, 'Urban transport systems and their place in macroeconomic conceptions of sustainability', paper presented to the *3rd Kuhmo-Nectar Transport Economics Conference*, 5-7 July 2010, Valencia, Spain.
- 3) Baumann, C. & White, S. 2010, 'Enhanced dialogue in the transport planning and decision-making process: enabling change through citizen/stakeholder deliberation.', *Selected proceedings of the 12th World Conference on Transport Research Society*, ISBN 978-989-96986-1-1, 11-15 July, Lisbon, Portugal.
- 4) Baumann, C. & White, S. 2010, 'Learning from the world — adding a strategic dimension to lesson-drawing from successful sustainable transport policies', paper presented to the *Australasian Transport Research Forum 2010*, 29 September – 1 October 2010, Canberra, Australia.
- 5) Baumann, C. & White, S. 2011, 'Collaborative stakeholder dialogue: a pragmatic pathway towards sustainable urban transport development', paper presented to the *3rd World Planning Schools Congress*, 4-8 July 2011, Perth, Australia.
- 6) Baumann, C. & White, S. 2011, 'Pathways towards sustainable urban transport development. Investigating the transferability of Munich best practice in collaborative stakeholder dialogue to the context of Sydney', paper presented to the *State of Australian Cities National Conference 2011*, November 29-December 1, Melbourne, Australia.
- 7) Baumann, C. & White, S. forthcoming, 'Pathways towards more sustainable urban transport development: a systematic comparison of adversarial and collaborative approaches to the transport policy process', *Transport Policy*, accepted for publication.
- 8) Baumann, C. & White, S. forthcoming, 'Overcoming implementation barriers to sustainable transport policies through collaborative stakeholder dialogue ', *Transportation Research Part A*, accepted with revisions, first revision in preparation.

- 9) Baumann, C. & White, S. forthcoming, 'Collaborative stakeholder dialogue: a mechanism for policy change towards more sustainable urban transport development', *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation*, accepted with revisions, first revision submitted.
- 10) Baumann, C. & White, S. forthcoming, 'Engagement of citizens and organised interests in the transport policy process — complementary or mutually exclusive?', in preparation for submission to *Planning Theory and Practice*.

Abbreviations

ADAC	German Motorists' Association (<i>Allgemeiner Deutscher Automobilclub</i>)
CSU	Christian Social Union
SPD	Social Democratic Party
IHK	Chamber of Industry and Commerce (<i>Industrie und Handelskammer</i>)
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
GDP	gross domestic product
ACF	Advocacy Coalition Framework
PRM	parking space management (<i>Parkraummanagement</i>)
MVV	Munich Transport Association (<i>Münchner Verkehrsverbund</i>)
MVG	Munich Transport Company (<i>Münchner Verkehrsgesellschaft</i>)
NGO	non-government organisation
DIP	deliberative inclusive procedure
CSD	collaborative stakeholder dialogue
Vkt	vehicle kilometres travelled
BMW	Bavarian Motor Works (<i>Bayerische Motorenwerke</i>)
TUM	Munich Technical University (<i>Technische Universität München</i>)
APT	Active and public transport
MRT	Motorised road transport
CoM	City of Munich (<i>Landeshauptstadt München</i>)
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
NRMA	National Roads and Motorists' Association
CBD	Central business district

Abstract

This research investigates strategies to achieve a broader focus in urban transport development that better integrates environmental, social and economic considerations.

In the past, the primary objective of urban transport policy was to facilitate economic growth by expanding capacities for motorised road transport (MRT). However, recent decades have made it apparent that a preoccupation with growth has negative impacts on sustainable urban development. This awareness produced new stakeholder groups who are demanding that social and environmental priorities be included in urban development by promoting active and public transport (APT) policies.

Efforts by local governments to implement APT policies are a source of major conflict between the advocates of change and stakeholders who want to maintain the focus on MRT expansion. This is because APT and MRT policies compete for limited public space and funding and so implementing APT policies often compromises the transport-related interests of MRT groups and vice versa. If MRT stakeholders have more resources to influence policy development — more money, more access to people in power, and more know-how in advocacy and mobilising public support — they can create barriers to the implementation of APT policies.

This research builds on an empirical case study conducted in Munich, using data from interviews with government and non-government stakeholders. It reveals that a process of collaborative stakeholder dialogue (CSD) was a catalyst for policy solutions which better balance active, public and motorised transport. The collaboration created shifts in the way stakeholders interacted, resulting in cooperation rather than confrontation. It resulted in the adoption of consensus views rather than extreme positions, and in learning based on an integration of stakeholder value and knowledge systems.

To demonstrate the practical and theoretical advantages of CSD for facilitating better policy choices, the research systematically compares CSD to the traditional adversarial style of stakeholder interaction in the transport policy process. To improve the process and application of CSD in the transport policy process, the research investigates whether CSD can coexist with procedures for lay citizen engagement. Finally, it discusses under what conditions CSD can be transferred to other cities, using Sydney as case study.

The research concludes with suggesting CSD as a pragmatic strategy to counterbalance the difference in influence competing stakeholder groups have in the urban transport policy process, and to so facilitate better policy choices. This strategy is most appropriate in problem situations with high levels of conflict between competing stakeholder groups that all have influence.

