VREF conference Gothenburg (19/10/2016)

Break-out session: Construction logistics and the role of smart governance

(Tom van Lier, Vrije Universiteit Brussel – MOBI & Anna Fredriksson, Linköping University)

After the presentation, the workshop consisted of two series of questions to be discussed in small groups. The first part looked at how the concept of smart governance should look like with relation to construction logistics and the second part discussed the role MAMCA could play in a smart governance concept. Below, we first give the main outcomes of the discussion, followed by a more detailed description of the outcomes per discussion group.

1. Smart governance

General conclusions:

Q1: Smart Governance should focus on collaboration between stakeholders, a process for inclusion of different perspectives in order to be an arena for stakeholders to meet each other. It should help plan the future, often many years ahead. It should be proactive and enable ownership of the development process. It should provide rules to follow and enable knowledge sharing between professionals and also between different projects.

Q2: It should be administrated by a neutral and hopefully detached organization. An organization that could manage a learning cycle between uses. There is a carrot needed for it to be used, but it also needs to be enforced. However the one who could initiate its use is the one who bares the main costs (the one who orders the construction works), in many cases it is/are the municipalitie(s) in question. Which municipality depends on what is constructed and where.

Summary of the slides:

A. *What do you consider smart governance to be and especially related to construction logistics. Please provide examples from own experiences.*
   a. Susanne's group: Susanne Balm, AUAS; Richard, RPA, XX, City of Stockolm; Yvonne, PostNord; Anders, Trafikverket; Stane Bozichik, University of Maribor.
      i. Governance = regulations, rules guidelines
      ii. Smart = intelligent
      iii. Planning of the future, planning across projects, think ahead,
      iv. Example Royal Seaport Stockholm,
      v. optimized multi stakeholder concept of sustainable project planning and execution
   b. Kajsa's group: Kajsa Hulthén, Chalmers; Mathias Gardat, LAET; Adeline Heitz, University of Paris East; Bjarte Baktveit, Norwegian Road Administration; Eric Stens, Deudekom; Cindy Guerlain, LIST; Erik Sigvardsson, YRGO; Wasim Haji, AUAS
      i. Governance gives association to: public decision making, collaboration among stakeholders, level of control, leading processes, rules to follow, formal/strict.
      ii. Smart Governances gives associations to: Transparent, data driven, dynamic, flexibility, in-time, taking ownership of all parties involved, creating ownership of the process, more collaborative than directives, efficiency.

      c.   Michael's group: Castrell, Bogota Logsitics office; Maya, planning Colombia; Bechans, University of Antwerp; Mats Janné, LiU; Michel Berden, AUAS; Pamela Nolz, AIT

             i.   Focus should be on stakeholder participation, technology secondär

           ii.   Processes of inclusion, including citizens, open decision making and open innovation

         iii.   Knowledge sharing

B. *What do you think a smart governance concept should include? Please provide specific examples of tools or decision.*

      a.   Susanne's group. Not only one project, need to see the great picture and complete picture, detailed planning as well, 20-40 years sometimes (long and short time spans), restrictions, regulations, incentives, enforcement

      b.   Kajsa's group.

             i.   Paris – Logistics Charter – Guidelines

           ii.   Meetings with stakeholders

         iii.   Platforms fro experience sharing among stakeholders

         iv.   Dialogues with logistics business

          v.   Arenas to meet industries – make documents that affect decision makers and politics in Norway

         vi.   Sustainability – how to govern or to create sustainability

        vii.   Smart for which stakeholder?

      c.   Michael's group.

             i.   Bogota Abierta (open bogota) – open innovation

           ii.   Tools for knowledge sharing between projects

         iii.   Tools for knowledge sharing from professionals

C. *Who (what organisation) should own the smart governance concept and be responsible for developing it after the CIVIC project?*

      a.   Susannes group. Independent organisations, NGO facilitate, the investor.

      b.   Kajsas group.

             i.   A neutral organization – expertise/state/?

           ii.   Learning cycle involved – Projects=> Civic =>?

         iii.   Local government – operated by neutral organization

         iv.   Who is the neutral organization?

          v.   State-level/Local-level?

         vi.   A carrot is needed!

        vii.   Who defines the carrot?

       viii.   The city should be involved in owning

      c.   Michaels group. A new neutral and objective actor

D. *Who should be responsible for initiating the use of a smart governance process? Could anyone do it and if so why? Please provide examples of when and how to use the smart governance concept!*

      d.   Susannes group. The city should facilitate it. People will accept solutions in the end.

      e.   Kajsas group. Citeis should implement/initiate it. It is in the cities interest. The only one that could enforce it due to the costs it adds.

  f. Michaels group. The government should own it to obligate a smarte governance decision.

2. Role of MAMCA in smart governance

General conclusions:

Q1: Integrating the MAMCA into a smart governance concept aims to improve decision making and to enable better and more broadly supported implementation of solutions. Incorporating this tool in the smart governance concept allows to take the concerns of more vulnerable stakeholders into account, but is only deemed appropriate for projects of a certain dimension. There is no consensus with regards to the weighing of stakeholders.

Q2: Applying the MAMCA makes sense both at the higher strategical level (tendering) and the lower operational level (implementation), however seems to add most value when applied from the start (even for the beginning of the project) in order to avoid complaints at a later stage.

Summary of the slides:

 A. *How can the identification of stakeholders and their criteria within MAMCA benefit a smart governance concept? Can or should the weighing of stakeholders or criteria be integrated in a smart governance concept (some criteria are more important to certain stakeholders, and some stakeholders might be more important than others)?*
  a. Susanne's group
   i. Important for protection of vulnerable stakeholders within the population
   ii. Usefulness depends on the project and size of the stakeholder groups affected
   iii. Weighing of stakeholders is not reflected in the standard version of MAMCA where overall score of alternatives is not given (but might be interesting to add to see how it influences results → sensitivity analysis)
  b. Michael's group
   i. No: weigh everyone on the same level (or variation within certain limitation)
   ii. Yes: but you have to make the interrelation between stakeholders clear as certain stakeholdesr are more effective (eg have more information)
 B. *At which governance level can MAMCA add (most) value? At the higher strategical level (tendering) or the lower operational level (implementation)? Before the start of the construction works or during the construction works?*
  a. Kajsa's group.
   i. in both – but different
   ii. Strategic level: important to point out from the start
   iii. Example of Stavanger tunnel: many are affected → 5 hour delay before underground works continued due to funeral above
   iv. Strategic level: before the beginning of the project – related to the budget : who will pay? Who will own it?
   v. Complaints can be avoided if used early

C. *Should the MAMCA include treshholds for certain criteria? Can you think of examples (eg excessive additional costs for contractor, environmental burdens for citizens,…) How should these tresholds be identified?*
    g. Kajsas group.
        i. Depends on the nature/preferences of the city
        ii. Same criteria in a city (e.g noise levels)