

INTERNATIONAL
JOURNAL OF
TRANSPORT
ECONOMICS

MEMBERS OF THE EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Founder: GIANROCCO TUCCI, University of Rome “La Sapienza”, Italy

Editor in Chief: ENRICO MUSSO, University of Genoa, Italy

RICHARD ARNOTT, University of California, Riverside, USA

MOSHE E. BEN-AKIVA, MIT (Boston), USA

ANGELA STEFANIA BERGANTINO, University of Bari, Italy

ANNA BOTTASSO, University of Genoa, Italy

ALAIN BONNAFOUS, University of Lyon, France

MARY R. BROOKS, Dalhousie University Halifax, Canada

PABLO COTO-MILLAN, Universidad de Cantabria, Spain

CESAR DUCRUET, CNRS, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, France

GEORGE C. EADS, Vice President of CRA International, Inc. Washington, USA

CLAUDIO FERRARI, University of Genoa, Italy

HERCULES HARALAMBIDES, Erasmus School of Economics, The Netherlands

DAVID HENSHER, University of Sydney, Australia

HILDE MEERSMAN, University of Antwerp, Belgium

CHRIS NASH, University of Leeds, Great Britain

PETER NIJKAMP, Erasmus University of Rotterdam, The Netherlands

LARA PENCO, University of Genoa, Italy

MICHEL SAVY, University of Paris 12, France

WILLIAM SJOSTROM, National University of Ireland (Cork), Ireland

ALESSIO TEI, Newcastle University, United Kingdom

THIERRY VANELSLANDER, University of Antwerp, Belgium

JOSÉ MANUEL VIEGAS, Instituto Superior Tecnico Lisboa, Portugal

EDDY VAN DE VOORDE, University of Antwerp, Belgium

★

www.ijte.org

INTERNATIONAL
JOURNAL OF
TRANSPORT
ECONOMICS

VOL. XLV · No 3 · NOVEMBER 2018



SERRA

© Copyright by *Fabrizio Serra editore*, Pisa · Roma.

Four issues a year

*

Print and Online official subscription rates are available
at Publisher's web-site www.libraweb.net

Subscriptions:

Fabrizio Serra editore, casella postale 1, succ. 8, I 56123 Pisa, Postal account 17154550,
tel. +39 050 542332, fax +39 050 574888, fse@libraweb.net
Via Carlo Emanuele I 48, I 00185 Rome, fse.roma@libraweb.net

www.libraweb.net

*

© Copyright 2018 by *Fabrizio Serra editore*, Pisa · Rome.
Fabrizio Serra editore incorporates the Imprints *Accademia editoriale*,
Edizioni dell'Ateneo, *Fabrizio Serra editore*, *Giardini editori e stampatori in Pisa*,
Gruppo editoriale internazionale and *Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali*.

Under Italian civil law this publication cannot be reproduced, wholly or in part (included offprints, etc.), in any form (included proofs, etc.), original or derived, or by any means: print, internet (included personal and institutional web sites, academia.edu, etc.), electronic, digital, mechanical, including photocopy, pdf, microfilm, film, scanner or any other medium, without permission in writing from the publisher.

*

ISSN 0391-8440
E-ISSN 1724-2185

★

CONTENTS

SPECIAL ISSUE IAME 2017 CONFERENCE

“MARITIME TRANSPORT QUALITY IN THE EVOLVING WORLD TRADE”

OKAN DURU, JASMINE LAM SIU LEE, ALESSIO TEI, <i>Editorial</i>	363
VALENTIN CARLAN, TREVOR HEAVER, CHRISTA SYS, THIERRY VANELSLANDER, <i>Oil spill response in port areas: Governance and the polluter-pays principle</i>	367
AMIR GHAREHGOZLI, OKAN DURU, EMRAH BULUT, <i>Input Data Range Optimization for Freight Rate Forecasting Using the Rolling Window Testing Procedure</i>	393
DAVID GUERRERO, FERNANDO GONZALEZ LAXE, MARIA-JESUS FREIRE SEOANE, CARLOS PAIS MONTES, <i>Inland accessibility and foreland specialization of European regions</i>	415
ABHISHEK NAIR, MICHELE ACCIARO, <i>Alternative fuels for shipping: optimising fleet composition under environmental and economic constraints</i>	439

ESSAYS

ISMAIL CAGRI OZCAN, <i>Transport infrastructure and the geography of foreign direct investments in Turkey</i>	463
LARA PENCO, GIORGIA PROFUMO, MARCO REMONDINO, <i>Negative events and corporate communication strategies in the cruise industry</i>	485
GUILLEM SANZ, RAFAEL PASTOR, ERNEST BENEDITO, BRUNO DOMENECH, <i>Evaluating urban freight transport policies within complex urban environments</i>	515

EVALUATING URBAN FREIGHT TRANSPORT POLICIES WITHIN COMPLEX URBAN ENVIRONMENTS

GUILLEM SANZ* · RAFAEL PASTOR** · ERNEST BENEDITO***
BRUNO DOMENECH****

ABSTRACT: Urban Freight Transport (UFT) entails significant advantages for the economic growth of cities, but can also hamper population quality of life, obstructing vehicles and people movements while exacerbating environmental problems. Many initiatives have been engaged by many city administrators in order to efficiently manage UFT, evaluating different policies at a global scale. From the perspective of operators, most works analyze a limited set of policies or only focus on the benefits of companies. In this work, a decision-making process is used to evaluate a large set of UFT policies, through different attributes representing the advantages and limitations of each policy over promoter companies and the society. To do so, an ex-ante procedure in five steps is proposed to classify the policies: (1) attributes definition, (2) attributes weighting, (3) policy-attribute assessment, (4) policy ranking, and (5) feasibility threshold satisfaction. The whole process is supported on consultations to 26 experts regarding shop supply and restocking activities within complex urban environments. Results show a classification of the analyzed policies, according to their suitability for implementation; which could be extended (directly or with small adjustments) to other contexts, given the flexibility of the decision-making procedure developed.

KEYWORDS: urban freight transport, city logistics, ex-ante procedure, sustainability.

JEL CLASSIFICATION: R4, L91, C80.

1. INTRODUCTION

NOWADAYS many cities face a dilemma between the desire to maintain (or increase) commercial activities in the city center and the need to reduce the negative impacts caused by traffic (Sánchez and Albert, 2015; Savelsbergh and van Woensel, 2016). Many towns are becoming into 24-hour cities, which implies a great difficulty when designing city logistics to achieve a reliable and quick access to products and services (Browne *et al.*, 2007; Lindholm and Behrends, 2012). In

* Bebitus, Barcelona, Spain.

** Industrial Engineering and Logistics Group (IOC), Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC), Spain.

*** Industrial Engineering and Logistics Group (IOC), Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC), Spain.

**** Corresponding Author. Serra Hunter Fellow; Industrial Engineering and Logistics Group (IOC), Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC), Spain; bruno.domenech@upc.edu

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions on improving the paper.

particular, Urban Freight Transport (UFT) is an essential activity to satisfy citizen needs, but can also be detrimental in terms of environmental sustainability (Nuzzolo and Comi, 2014). Over 80% of the European UFT can be found within the urban and suburban areas; where around 25% of the traffic congestion and an estimated 21% of the CO₂ emissions are caused by UFT activities (BESTUFS, 2007; Dablanc, 2007; ALICE/ERTRAC, 2014).

Freight transport generates conflicts between carriers and other stakeholders involved in urban traffic (Vieira *et al.*, 2015). On the one hand, public interests focus on improving population quality of life: a good mobility management, respecting the environment and promoting the economic development, among others. On the other hand, private interests pursue achieving company objectives such as reducing inventory costs, increasing competitiveness and attracting customers. However, while municipalities expect companies to lead new logistics services, companies wait for municipalities to start such services that could be poorly profitable and highly risky (Dablanc, 2007; Lindholm and Behrends, 2012). Although the preferences of both parts may sometimes be confronted, they should be complementary in order to accomplish sustainable urban systems from a social, environmental and economic standpoint (Taniguchi, 2014; Guimaraes *et al.*, 2017).

In this context, the imposed restrictions by Public Administrations aiming to protect citizens' interests heighten the challenge of finding appropriate policies for UFT (Stathopoulos *et al.*, 2012). Such constraints, not always sufficiently evaluated (Quak and de Koster, 2009), can have negative impacts on goods distribution costs and may not solve the main problems of urban logistics (Vieira and Fransoo, 2015). For instance, nighttime UFT activities can entail many benefits, such as a reduction in traffic congestion, but need from a deepen assessment in each city or context to avoid environmental impacts, depending on traffic speeds and meteorology (Sathaye *et al.*, 2010). Other policies as urban tolls or city access restrictions have also shown limitations (Kopp and Prud'homme, 2010; Cantillo and Ortúzar, 2014).

Many works in the literature compare the policies implemented by city administrators in different urban contexts. For example, Browne *et al.* (2007) investigate the measures taken in London and Paris during five years, focusing on vehicle units: loading/unloading (from now on l/u) activities, city access times, clean vehicles and modal shifts. Gammelgard (2015) analyze the emergence and evolution of city logistics in Copenhagen. Nuzzolo *et al.* (2016) compare the measures implemented in Rome, Barcelona and Santander based on retailers and transport operators surveys. Vierth *et al.* (2017) compare freight transportation policies implemented in Sweden and Germany. On their behalf, Russo and Comi (2011a) consider the involved stakeholders and outcomes for different policies implemented in European cities in order to compare the expected goals and the obtained results. From a wider perspective, Lindholm (2013) performs a review of UFT research over the last 15 years, focusing on the perspective of city administrators. Kant *et al.* (2016) compare and identify the lessons learned from UFT initiatives in many contexts, grouping the analysis into policy, logistics and technology projects. Other investigations compile, analyze and compare many city logistics solutions implemented in different contexts and regions worldwide (Muñuzuri *et al.*, 2005; van Duin and Quak, 2007).

Possibly, the most known projects reviewing and analyzing the impacts of UFT measures implemented in Europe are BESTUFS I and II (BESTUFS, 2005, 2007).

One of the main conclusions highlighted by many reviewed projects is the need of ex-ante assessments to avoid applying policies leading to undesired or unexpected results (Filippi *et al.*, 2010; Ibeas *et al.*, 2012). In other words, methodologies are necessary to evaluate the impacts of UFT measures in each city or region before their implementation; even more assuming that extrapolating results from an area to another one is not straightforward (Ambrosini *et al.*, 2013).

With this regard, many models for assessing UFT policies are proposed in the literature (Anand *et al.*, 2012; Gonzalez-Feliu and Routhier, 2012; Gonzalez-Feliu *et al.*, 2014). These approaches conceive city logistics as a global problem with many stakeholders involved and study a set of measures that can be applied to a specific context in order to determine their appropriateness, mainly in terms of environmental sustainability. Among other examples, Filippi *et al.* (2010) propose a methodology for ex-ante assessment and quantification of the impacts of UFT policies, particularizing the study on city access limitations and urban distribution centers. The authors evaluate the environmental externalities of such measures as well as if they attain the objectives for which they were designed. Tamagawa *et al.* (2010) use a multi-agent model to assess city logistics solutions considering stakeholders' behavior. In particular, they focus the study on truck bans and toll changes to analyze their influence on environmentally damaged areas. Russo and Comi (2011b) develop a model system to show that end-consumers' behavior can be influenced by material infrastructures or governance measures, since both can modify the travel cost between the consumption and the buying zones. However, they demonstrate that the restocking process can be influenced by material, non-material, equipment and governance infrastructures, when designing paths or in the number of stops. Ambrosini *et al.* (2013) propose a methodology for scenario construction and assessment, defining the elements of a policy-based scenario and developing a procedure to build the inputs of models to simulate the impacts of measures on urban goods transport flows and land-use. In particular, they analyze four scenarios that use peripheral platforms and/or urban distribution centers, studying their influence on the distance travelled per vehicle types. Balm *et al.* (2014) develop a step-by-step assessment framework that starts from an understanding of the context, stakeholders' objectives and indicators to define feasible and suitable UFT solutions. Nuzzolo and Comi (2014) present a three-stages method that allows analyzing UFT policies considering the level of transport service, the time periods in deliveries, and the itinerary and the type of vehicle used. Nordtømme *et al.* (2015) present an ex-ante analysis of seven measures applied in the city of Oslo, based on stakeholder surveys, and a generic ex-post evaluation framework that enables designing efficient and environmentally-friendly city logistics measures. On their behalf, Nuzzolo *et al.* (2013) review models using a different approach: to adapt UFT solutions in diverse contexts through the modification of infrastructures, services or regulations.

In general terms, most works develop interesting models to assess UFT policies before implementation; but the amount of policies studied is generally limited while many works consider large-scale problems, while the local context has been

less studied (Filippi *et al.*, 2010). A key issue is to develop methods for ex-ante evaluation of policies to be implemented by city administrators and logistics operators, responding to companies and society needs (Ibeas *et al.*, 2012). In this context, this paper presents an ex-ante procedure to evaluate and prioritize the suitability of 38 existing UFT measures, considering the advantages and limitations of policies over promoter companies and the society. For this purpose, a five-step process is developed: (1) 30 attributes are defined for policy evaluation; (2) the relevance of each attribute is determined; (3) each pair policy-attribute is assessed; (4) the policies are ranked considering the previous steps; and (5) some feasibility threshold are considered to discard non-qualified measures.

The decisions taken at each step are supported by surveys and interviews to 26 experts in the field of UFT, as an appropriate analysis of stakeholders' perspective is a key issue to ensure policies success (Domínguez *et al.*, 2012). In particular, the experts are consulted regarding shop supply and restocking activities within complex urban environments, such as most European cities. Hence, as a result, a ranking of the 38 analyzed UFT policies is obtained, from the most to the least suitable; which could be extended (directly or with small adjustments) to less complex contexts, given the flexibility and adaptability of the research and the decision-making process developed.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the methodological approach used in this work is clarified and justified. In Section 3, the five-step evaluation procedure for the 38 UFT policies is described. In Section 4, the process is applied to classify the identified measures, based on expert opinions. Finally, in Section 5, main conclusions are summarized.

2. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

As detailed in the introduction, UFT is a challenge faced by many companies when conceiving the supply or restocking chain of shops located in complex urban environments, characterized by traffic congestion, high population density and narrow streets. In this context, Sanz *et al.* (2013) performed a literature review to compile 38 policies aiming to ease UFT activities (TABLE 1). Some solutions can be directly applied by companies (for example: implementing information systems, updating equipment or redesigning the supply chain), while others require the involvement of city administrators (for example: to set up physical spaces or to adapt city conditions). In the first case, companies are expected to directly engage the policies; while in the second case, companies are expected to adapt their activity according to administration constraints or to seek cooperation to achieve global solutions.

TABLE 1. List of policies.

M1	Urban tolls	M20	Shuttle areas
M2	City access time restrictions	M21	Use of public and private parking
M3	City access restricted to max. weight	M22	Last mile with electric vehicles
M4	City access restricted to vehicles age	M23	Urban railway for freight
M5	City access restricted to the cargo	M24	Special vehicle positioning systems
M6	Close city center to private vehicles	M25	Logistics containers easily management
M7	Time restriction in l/u zones	M26	Suitable equipment for l/u zones
M8	Use of reserved places	M27	Communication equip. in vehicles
M9	Use of controlled parking zones	M28	Advanced transport management systems
M10	Combined use of l/u zones	M29	Intelligent transport systems
M11	Multi-use lane	M30	Night delivery
M12	L/u exclusive zones to UFT vehicles	M31	Sharing vehicles with other loaders
M13	Reservation of l/u zones	M32	Urban logistics services
M14	Vigilance of l/u zones	M33	Self-storage space for cargo unload
M15	Temporary closure of streets	M34	Providers central. in dist. centers
M16	Logistic platform out-of-town	M35	Efficient integration of reverse logistics
M17	City terminals	M36	Home delivery logistics
M18	External delivery zones	M37	Time scheduling in the l/u zones
M19	Underground logistics platform	M38	Agreements for sharing l/u zones

Nevertheless, when the logistics responsible of a specific shop has to take the decision about the UFT measure (or set of measures) to implement, there is a lack of methods to assist in decision-making and unintended negative effects can appear (Filippi *et al.*, 2010). In fact, many authors focus on an assessment of policies to be implemented by city administrators, evaluating the impacts globally. Other works look at logistics operators, but focusing on a short set of solutions and evaluating the advantages and limitations for the own company, but not the urban environment.

Therefore, this paper focusses on an assessment of the large set of UFT policies detailed in TABLE 1, to be engaged by logistics managers in order to improve the efficiency of supply or restocking chain activities, while minimizing the negative impacts over the citizens. The analysis is performed under an ex-ante approach, aiming to analyze the policies before their implementation in order to avoid unintended results (Filippi *et al.*, 2010; Ibeas *et al.*, 2012). In addition, a classical multi-attribute decision-making perspective is sought, particularly used in the transportation field (Tsamboulas *et al.*, 2007; López and Monzón, 2010; Macharis and Bernardini, 2015). In this work, starting from the list of 38 UFT policies compiled in Sanz *et al.* (2013), first, a set of attributes is defined. Each attribute is defined in order to evaluate a specific aspect of the policies, which can be beneficial or detrimental

for the target company or the society. Second, the attributes are weighted; i.e. a value is assigned to each one representing its importance regarding the others. Third, each policy is assessed in order to determine the accomplishment regarding each attribute. Fourth, from the weights and assessments, an overall score is calculated for each policy, representing its suitability for the studied context, ranking policies accordingly. Finally, some feasibility thresholds are defined, which allow discarding policies not satisfying certain quality standards in some attributes.

One of the main conclusions from works as Stathopoulos *et al.* (2012), Lindholm (2013) and Macharis and Bernardini (2015) is the relevance of stakeholder integration into the decision-making process of transport problems. In this regard, the whole decision-making process is supported by 26 surveys and 12 detailed interviews conducted with UFT experts, including:

- Freight transport: 5 logistics directors and 4 executives from Spanish food distribution companies, and 3 executives from other companies.
- Transport operators: 2 managers from Spanish logistics operators: executives from transportation, storage and distribution companies.
- Freight forwarder: 4 logistics executives from the Spanish food manufacturers and 1 manager of a company association.
- Research institute: 5 researchers in Spanish universities and logistics-specialized centers.
- City administrator: 1 political decision-maker and 1 city mobility officer.

The aim of the expert selection is to have a wide representation of the UFT, as it has been done in the literature (Lindholm and Behrends, 2012). As observed, most experts are linked to the food sector, which is expected to lead the changes in supply and restocking policies. Indeed, the food industry concentrates the largest and most complex movement of goods, managing perishable products at three temperatures (ambient, fresh and frozen), reverse logistics and recycling (Aung and Chang, 2014). In addition, managers and executives related to city logistics were included to have a wider perspective of UFT. Complementarily, politicians and researchers were also included in order to take into account the perspective of city administrators, in charge of defining the regulatory framework for city logistics, as well as the point of view of citizens, who coexist with the impacts of UFT activities.

It should be noted that the experts surveyed and interviewed had experience in complex areas for UFT activities, such as Spanish cities between 50,000 and 2 million inhabitants. The morphology of such cities is particularly complex, having historical centers where the commercial activity is concentrated and vehicles' mobility is a handicap (Muñuzurri *et al.*, 2012). Therefore, the results of this research are suitable for complex urban environments characterized by historical centers with traffic congestion, narrow streets and high population density, such as many cities in European countries. In addition, given the flexibility of the decision-making process developed, the results could be easily extended directly (or with small adjustments) to conceive the supply or restocking chain of a target shop in less complex contexts; for example cities with large avenues, dispersed population,

space for intermediate warehouses, commercial activity concentrated in shopping centres, etc. In fact, company managers do not look for a general assessment of UFT solutions, as usually done in the literature, but to be assisted in the decision-making faced when deciding about the solutions to be implemented in their particular shop.

3. PROCEDURE TO EVALUATE UFT POLICIES

In this Section, the proposed procedure for evaluating UFT measures is described. The process is made up of five steps. First, a set of attributes for policy evaluation is defined. Second, the attribute weights are determined. Third, the policies are assessed regarding the attributes. Fourth, an overall score is calculated for each policy, ranking them accordingly. Finally, fifth, some minimum feasibility thresholds allow discarding policies not satisfying quality standards. The whole decision-making process is supported by expert surveys, the literature review, and authors' knowledge and experience.

Step 1: Attributes definition

As observed in TABLE 2, thirty attributes were defined to assess the impacts (whether they are beneficial or detrimental) of the policies analyzed in this paper. This list emerged from the literature review, the professional and research experience of the authors and discussions with UFT experts surveyed and interviewed along this work.

TABLE 2. List of attributes.

A1	Decrease of road occupation	A16	Increases the control of operations
A2	Reduces the ambient noise	A17	Reduces operating costs of vehicles
A3	Reduces congestion in the area	A18	Smooth work load in dist. centers
A4	Respects the urban landscape	A19	Investment costs for Public Admin.
A5	Increases roads safety	A20	Maintenance costs for Public Admin
A6	Reduces CO ₂ emissions	A21	Hard application for Public Admin.
A7	Reduces damage to urban pavement	A22	Delayed goods deliveries to shops
A8	Appropriate unloading systems	A23	Second deliveries
A9	Qualified personnel for unloading	A24	Increases handling costs
A10	Fast unloading in the shop	A25	Investment costs for companies
A11	Synergies with other loads	A26	Operating costs for companies
A12	Reduces the travel time	A27	Difficult reverse logistics
A13	Reduces occupational risks	A28	Difficult operational management
A14	Reduces energy consumption	A29	Difficult supply management
A15	Increases flexibility in management	A30	Difficult to implement by companies

Step 2: Attributes relevance

The aim of this work is to classify the reported policies according to some attributes that evaluate the benefits and disadvantages over the society. For this purpose, an overall score is calculated (Step 4) as the weighted average of the scores for the corresponding attributes. Therefore, first the attributes must be weighted to determine the relevance of each one in the evaluation process (Step 2) and then they must be rated for each measure (Step 3).

To determine the weights of the attributes the surveys of the 26 experts were taken into account. However, assessing the relevance of 30 attributes all together could be too complex and confusing, so a shorter amount, 22, was presented to them. The least representative attributes were discarded: (A1) decrease of road occupation, (A4) respects the urban landscape, (A7) reduces damage to urban pavement, (A8) appropriate unloading systems, (A9) qualified personnel for unloading, (A15) increases flexibility in management, (A23) second deliveries and (A29) difficult supply management. Thus, each expert was asked to evaluate the relevance of each of the 22 attributes.

Finally, the global relevance of each attribute was calculated. If only the arithmetic mean was considered, a global good relevance could be obtained for an attribute having high values assigned by most experts but also very low values assigned by the rest of them. Therefore, to avoid tradeoffs, a calculation algorithm was developed (FIGURE 1) based on three indexes: the arithmetic mean, the median (numerical value separating the higher half of the set of answers from the lower half) and the mode (most repeated value in the answers). The three indexes allow considering the global relevance assigned by all the experts as well as the dispersion between the answers. If the median and the mode take the same value, the most repeated value separates the higher half of the answers from the lower half. Thereafter, if the mean takes the same value, this is considered as the relevance of the attribute (objective value). In exchange, if the mean is different, the average between the median and the mean is considered. In any other case, an average between the three indexes is considered. Note that the expression *round.multiple 0.5 (a)* is used to round the value *a* to the nearest half; i.e. obtaining only whole or half numbers.

Let be *me* = mean, *md* = median, *mo* = mode, *ov* = objective value

if *md* = *mo* **then**

if *md* = *mo* = *me* **then** *vo* = *me*

else *vo* = round.multiple -0.5 (average(*md*,*me*))

end if

else *vo* = round.multiple -0.5 (average(*md*,*mo*,*me*))

end if

where round.multiple -0.5 (*a*) means rounding to the nearest half of a

FIGURE 1. Algorithm used to calculate attributes' relevance.

The algorithm described in FIGURE 1 was used for the 22 attributes asked to the experts. In exchange, the relevance for the remaining 8 attributes (discarded for the sake of clarity) was determined from the authors' professional experience. Nevertheless, such values were validated along the detailed interviews with 12 of the experts.

Step 3: Attribute-policy rating

In order to assess the accomplishment of the attributes with the policies assessed, the experts were surveyed and interviewed. In particular, a reduced list of 12 policies was selected from TABLE 1 (M1, M2, M11, M13, M16, M22, M25, M28, M30, M31, M32 and M34), to reduce the length of the consultations (less than 25 minutes for surveys and 60 minutes for interviews), thus ensuring accuracy in the answers. Hence, the list of policies was presented and, for each one, the most relevant attributes were asked to be evaluated from 0 to 4. This scale represents whether the attribute is not (0), occasionally (1), usually (2), often (3) or always (4) accomplished by the policy. For instance, the policy urban tolls (M1) was evaluated regarding the reduction of congestion in the area (A3), and the experts assessed the 0-4 value according to their experience.

Then, to calculate the global rates of each attribute for each policy, as in Step 2, an algorithm was developed (FIGURE 2) based on three indexes to consider experts' dispersion in the answers: the arithmetic mean, the median and the mode. As shown in the algorithm, if the three indexes coincide, this is the considered rate, while if only the median and the mode coincide, the considered rate is the integer immediately greater or lower than the median, depending on whether the mean is greater or lower than the median, respectively. In exchange, if the median and the mode are not the same, the considered rate depends on the absolute difference of the three indexes.

```

Let be me = mean, md = median, mo = mode, ov = objective value
if  $md = mo$  then
  if  $md = mo = me$  then   vo = me
  else
    if  $md > me$  then
      if  $integer(me) < md - 1$  then   vo = md - 1
      else   vo = md
      end if
    else
      if  $integer(me) \geq md + 1$  then   vo = md + 1
      else   vo = md
      end if
    end if
  end if
else
  if  $|md - mo| > 1$  then   vo = round.greater(average(md,mo))
  else
    if  $|md - me| \geq |mo - me|$  then   vo = mo
    else   vo = md
    end if
  end if
end if

```

FIGURE 2. Algorithm used to calculate attributes' rate for each policy.

Complementarily, the authors rated each couple attribute–policy, based on their professional experience and previous to experts' surveys and interviews in order to avoid being influenced by their opinions. After analyzing authors and experts' results, the obtained values were similar for most of the 22 attributes and 12 policies evaluated by the experts, so authors' opinion was considered valid for the remaining attribute-policy couples. However, for an appropriate validation, the rates proposed by the authors were presented in detail to the 12 experts interviewed, who confirmed the reliability of authors' choices. Thus, a global rate was finally obtained for the 30 attributes and the 38 policies.

Step 4: Policies overall score

As explained before, once the relevance of the attributes (Step 2) and the rates of each attribute for each policy (Step 3) have been calculated, the overall score for each measure is calculated as the weighted average of the scores for the corresponding attributes. The average is used but not the sum, since the attributes defining each measure do not necessarily coincide in all cases. The overall score allows classifying the UFT existing measures.

Step 5: Minimum feasibility thresholds

In the previous steps, a procedure has been described to obtain an overall score that allows classifying the set of existing UFT measures studied in this paper. However,

basing decisions only on the overall score of each policy could be counterproductive. In some cases, a low attribute rate described as very bad could be compensated by high positive rates obtained in other attributes. In such cases, the measure would be completely inapplicable (e.g. high investment requirements or outright opposition from neighbors and Public Administrations) but, instead, it would be scored with a good overall score. To avoid this possibility, some minimum feasibility or viability thresholds of the attributes are defined. This means that a policy is considered feasible if the rates of all the corresponding attributes are within such preset margins. Otherwise, it is recommended to discard it. The thresholds proposed in this research were established based on the values of the next attributes: (A21) Hard application for Public Administration and (A30) Difficult to implement by companies. More specifically, if a policy achieved the top score in either of these two attributes, it was considered infeasible and was consequently discarded.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this Section, the results obtained by applying the procedure described in Section 3 are presented and discussed.

4. 1. *Attributes relevance*

To evaluate the attributes' relevance, experts were asked to assign a weight from 0 to 4 to the 22 attributes presented to them (as explained in Section 3). This scale was used assuming a qualitative assessment: 0 for a not relevant attribute, 1 for a not much relevant attribute, 2 for a relevant attribute, 3 for a very relevant attribute and 4 for an essential attribute.

Little consensus was found among experts in the assigned weights to each attribute. Thus, a cluster analysis was realized to identify whether some experts had similar response patterns with significant statistical differences regarding the others. The analysis was performed using SPSS 16.0 and confirmed the existence of 2 clusters according to experts' profile. The first group was identified as the companies cluster and included 19 experts with the following profiles: managers from food distribution companies, logistics operators, executives from the food industry and a company association. The second group was identified as the social cluster and included 7 experts with the following profiles: a mobility city officer, researchers and a political decision-maker on urban logistics. A different opinion was observed for each group depending on whether the attribute to evaluate was related to benefits for UFT businesses or citizens. Thus, for the companies cluster, the attributes entailing inconveniences for businesses operating in UFT were more relevant than for the social cluster. In exchange, the attributes representing an inconvenience for citizens and their daily life were more relevant for the social cluster than for the companies cluster.

Although initially the scale to evaluate the attributes' relevance was defined from 0 to 4 (to represent a qualitative assessment), the range was extended to a scale from 0 to 10 multiplying by 2.5. This change was realized to make results easier to analyze from a mathematical point of view. TABLE 3 shows the relevance obtained

by using the algorithm from FIGURE 1 for the 22 attributes surveyed by experts and the 8 attributes evaluated by the authors (marked with *).

TABLE 3. Relevance of the attributes.

Attributes		Relevance
1. Attributes that benefit citizens		
A3	Reduces the congestion in the area	8,5
A2	Reduces the ambient noise	7,5
A6	Reduces CO ₂ emissions	7,5
A1	Decrease of road occupation*	7,0
A5	Increases roads safety	6,5
A7	Reduces damage to urban pavement*	5,5
A4	Respects the urban landscape*	5,0
2. Attributes that benefit UFT companies		
A12	Reduces the travel time	8,5
A10	Fast unloading in the shop	8,5
A17	Reduces operating costs of vehicles	8,5
A18	Smooth work load in distribution centers	7,5
A16	Increases the control of operations	7,5
A11	Synergies with other loads	7,0
A14	Reduces energy consumption	7,0
A15	Increases flexibility in management*	6,0
A13	Reduces occupational risks	5,5
A8	Appropriate unloading systems*	4,0
A9	Qualified personnel for unloading*	4,0
3. Attributes prejudicial for citizens		
A21	Hard application for Public Administration	7,5
A19	Investment costs for Public Administration	7,0
A20	Maintenance costs for Public Administration	6,5
4. Attributes prejudicial for UFT companies		
A22	Delayed goods deliveries to shops	8,5
A25	Investment costs for companies	8,5
A26	Operating costs for companies	8,0
A24	Increases handling costs	7,5
A30	Difficult to implement by companies	7,5
A28	Difficult operational management	7,0
A23	Second deliveries*	5,5
A27	Difficult reverse logistics	5,5
A29	Difficult supply management*	4,0

The attributes are presented in 4 groups depending on whether they are beneficial or detrimental for the citizens and the companies operating in UFT. In general terms, citizens look for a friendly coexistence with the derivative impacts of UFT activities. That means the attributes that are beneficial for citizens are related to a pollution free environment, the avoidance of unnecessary noise, low traffic congestion, safe streets, etc. In exchange, attributes that entail a difficult implementation (for example due to high investment or maintenance costs) for Public Administrations, in charge of ensuring a friendly city environment, are considered detrimental for citizens. On the other hand, companies aim to reduce costs wherever they appear along the supply chain. Therefore, the attributes related to faster, cheaper and more efficient UFT activities are beneficial for them while the attributes in the opposite direction are detrimental.

4. 2. Policies overall score

This Section presents the overall score of each policy, which was obtained by combining the elements described previously: the ratings of the attributes for each measure (Step 3), the relevance of each attribute (Section 4. 1.) and the minimum feasibility thresholds (Step 5).

The overall assessment of the policies was finally obtained by averaging the advantages and disadvantages for the two clusters of experts. In other words, to calculate the overall score of each policy, the average of advantages minus the average of disadvantages was calculated for both clusters, and then the average of these two values was assumed. Depending on the intended use of the evaluation, another averaging way could have been used to assign, for example, a greater significance to the advantages over the disadvantages or to the companies cluster over social cluster. In that case, a different score would have been obtained for each policy, mainly representing companies' interests. However an equally weighted way to calculate the overall score was chosen since it represents a global assessment, where the benefits and impacts over the companies and the society are considered with the same significance in order to avoid any preference when evaluating UFT policies. Therefore, the evaluation is expected to be more impartial, considering all the stakeholders involved in the problem.

TABLE 4 shows, for each policy, the next information: the ratings in terms of advantages and disadvantages (both for the social and the companies clusters); the overall scores, calculated as the average evaluation of the advantages minus the average evaluation of the disadvantages; and, last but not least, the classification, from better to worst overall score. In order to validate these results this ranking was shown to the experts interviewed, who confirmed results' coherence and consistency. Note that policies considered infeasible (with attributes not reaching the minimum feasibility thresholds) are marked with a symbol **.

TABLE 4. Overall score of policies.

	Policies	Provides benefits		Provides inconveniences		Overall score	Position
		Soc.	Com.	Soc.	Com.		
M28	Advanced transport management systems	2.16	1.81	0.00	1.14	1.42	1
M35	Efficient integration of reverse logistics	1.88	1.12	0.00	0.30	1.35	2
M30	Night delivery	3.13	1.99	1.38	1.27	1.23	3
M37	Time scheduling in the l/u zones	1.62	1.13	0.00	0.48	1.14	4
M33	Self-storage space for cargo unload	1.78	2.09	0.36	1.27	1.12	5
M26	Suitable equipment for l/u zones	1.34	1.50	0.00	0.66	1.09	6
M38	Agreements for sharing l/u zones	1.62	1.13	0.00	0.60	1.08	7
M27	Communication equip. in vehicles	1.00	1.64	0.00	0.52	1.06	8
M6	Close city center to private vehicles**	3.28	1.82	3.05	0.00	1.03	9
M11	Multi use lane	1.34	1.33	0.67	0.00	1.00	10
M34	Providers centralized in distribution centers	2.03	1.22	0.00	1.25	0.99	11
M12	L/u exclusive zones to UFT vehicles	1.48	1.16	1.02	0.00	0.81	12
M31	Sharing vehicles with other loaders	2.18	0.95	0.00	1.58	0.78	13
M4	City access restricted to vehicles age	1.46	0.68	0.00	0.78	0.68	14
M36	Home delivery logistics	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.90	0.62	15
M22	Last mile with electric vehicles	1.74	0.51	0.00	1.04	0.61	16
M9	Use of controlled parking zones	1.00	0.93	0.67	0.13	0.57	17
M24	Special vehicle positioning systems**	1.48	0.93	0.00	1.29	0.56	18
M8	Use of reserved places	1.18	1.25	1.38	0.00	0.52	19
M10	Combined use of l/u zones	1.00	1.05	1.02	0.00	0.51	20
M5	City access restricted to the cargo	3.00	0.52	1.69	1.04	0.40	21
M14	Vigilance of l/u zones	1.04	0.71	1.02	0.00	0.36	22
M15	Temporary closure of streets	1.47	0.15	0.71	0.25	0.33	23
M1	Urban tolls	1.59	1.02	1.71	0.65	0.13	24
M2	City access time restrictions	2.21	0.56	1.02	1.61	0.07	25
M29	Intelligent transport systems**	2.75	1.78	3.69	0.77	0.04	26
M25	Logistics containers easily management	1.05	0.82	0.00	1.93	-0.03	27
M7	Time restriction in l/u zones	1.18	0.94	1.33	0.90	-0.06	28
M13	Reservation of l/u zones	1.00	1.17	1.69	0.79	-0.16	29
M16	Logistic platform out-of-town	2.06	1.73	2.69	2.20	-0.55	30
M3	City access restricted to max. weight	1.61	0.70	1.02	2.41	-0.56	31
M23	Urban railway for freight**	2.86	1.96	3.69	2.37	-0.62	32
M17	City terminals	1.73	1.64	2.69	2.02	-0.68	33
M32	Urban logistics service	2.64	1.01	2.38	2.90	-0.81	34
M19	Underground logistics platforms	1.73	1.64	3.02	2.02	-0.84	35
M20	Shuttle areas**	2.47	0.76	2.36	2.65	-0.89	36
M21	Use of public and private parking**	1.59	0.89	2.41	2.32	-1.12	37
M18	External delivery zones**	1.18	1.34	3.00	3.08	-1.78	38

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper a set of policies found in the literature applicable to UFT activities is evaluated. The assessment is carried out following a proposed procedure organized in 5 steps. First, a list of attributes to evaluate the impacts of each policy is defined (Step 1). Then, the attributes are weighted to determine their relative significance (Step 2). Next, each policy is evaluated according to each attribute (Step 3). Finally, an overall score is calculated for each policy using the results from the two previous steps (Step 4). Additionally some minimum standard thresholds that represent unacceptable values in the policy-attribute evaluation are considered (Step 5). This whole process was realized together with a group of experts in the field of UFT, who were surveyed and interviewed to assess the attributes weights and the attribute-policy evaluation, giving a very practical approach to the research. At the end, the proposed procedure allowed obtaining a final ranking of policies according to their appropriateness and priority to be implemented in an urban context.

This research expects to bring theoretical investigations and UFT reality closer. Most of the works found in the literature study the impacts of a specific policy (or set of policies) or develop ex-ante assessments to evaluate measures, but understanding cities as a uniform whole. In exchange the proposed procedure pretends to study a large amount of policies directly affecting to the supply chain of urban shops, including the opinion of companies and society experts, which is a key issue for the success of the measures to be implemented. The proposal can be easily applied to new contexts or new measures that may arise, obtaining an indicator (an overall score) of their appropriateness and suitability in front of other policies.

As future research, a comprehensive methodology to assist logistics managers across the design or improvement of the supply or restocking chain of a target shop could be developed. Such methodology would start from the policy ranking here obtained and guide along the decision-making process, taking into account the shop features and surroundings, as well as the perspective of all stakeholders involved.

REFERENCES

- ALICE/ERTRAC (2014), "Urban freight research roadmap", *Alliance for Logistics Innovation through Collaboration in Europe*, European Road Transport Research Advisory Council.
- AMBROSINI, C., GONZALEZ-FELIU, J. & TOILIER, F. (2013), "A design methodology for scenario analysis in urban freight modeling", *European Transport / Transporti Europei*, Vol. 54 No. 7, pp. 1-21.
- ANAND, N., QUAK, H. J., VAN DUIN, J. H. R. & TAVASSZY, L. (2012), "City logistics modelling efforts: trends and gaps. A review", *Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 39, pp. 101-115.
- AUNG, M. M. & CHANG Y. S. (2014), "Temperature management for the quality assurance of a perishable food supply chain", *Food Control*, Vol. 40, pp. 198-207.
- BALM, S., MACHARIS, C., MILAN, L. & QUAK, H. (2014), "A city distribution impact assessment framework", *Transport Research Arena 5th Conference: Transport Solutions from Research to Deployment*, Paris.

- BESTUFS (2005), "Best practices handbook", *Best Urban Freight Solutions II*, European Commission, available at: www.bestufs.net (accessed 4 May 2016).
- BESTUFS. (2007), "Good practice guide on urban freight", *Best Urban Freight Solutions II*, European Commission, available at: www.bestufs.net (accessed 4 May 2016).
- BROWNE, M., ALLEN, J. & ATTLASSY, M. (2007), "Comparing freight transport strategies and measures in London and Paris", *International Journal of Logistics*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 205-219.
- CANTILLO, V. & ORTÚZAR, J. D. (2014), "Restricting the use of cars by license plate numbers: a misguided urban transport policy", *DYNA*, Vol. 81 No. 188, pp. 75-82.
- DABLANC, L. (2007), "Goods transport in large European cities: Difficult to organize, difficult to modernize", *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 280-285.
- DOMÍNGUEZ, A., HOLGUÍN-VERAS, J., IBEAS, A. & DELL'OLIO, L. (2012), "Receivers' response to new urban freight policies", *Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 54, pp. 886-896.
- FILIPPI, F., NUZZOLO, A., COMI, A. & DELLE SITE, P. (2010), "Ex-ante assessment of urban freight transport policies", *Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 6332-6342.
- GAMMELGAARD, B. (2015), "The emergence of city logistics: the case of Copenhagen's Citylogistik-kbh", *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, Vol. 45 No. 4, pp. 333-351.
- GONZALEZ-FELIU, J. & ROUTHIER, J. L. (2012), "Modeling urban goods movement: how to be oriented with so many approaches?", *Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 39, pp. 89-100.
- GONZALEZ-FELIU, J., CEDILLO-CAMPO, M. G. & GARCÍA-ALCARAZ, J. L. (2014), "An emission model as an alternative to O-D matrix in urban goods transport modelling", *DYNA*, Vol. 81 No. 187, pp. 249-256.
- GUIMARAES, V. A., RIBEIRO, G. M., DO FORTE, V. L. & LUCENA, A. (2017), "A location-allocation model for logistics integration centers", *International Journal of Transport Economics*, Vol. 44 No. 2, 75-108.
- IBEAS, A., MOURA, J. L., NUZZOLO, A. & COMI, A. (2012), "Urban freight transport demand: transferability of survey results analysis and models", *Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 54, pp. 1068-1079.
- KANT, G., QUAK, H., PEETERS, R. & VAN WOENSEL, T. (2016), "Urban freight transportation: challenges, failures and successes", in Zijm, H., et al. (eds.), *Logistics and Supply Chain Innovation*, Springer, pp. 127-139.
- KOPP, P. & PRUD'HOMME, R. (2010), "The economics of urban tolls: lessons from the Stockholm case", *International Journal of Transport Economics*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 195-221.
- LINDHOLM, M. & BEHREND, S. (2012), "Challenged in urban freight transport planning – a review in the Baltic Sea region", *Journal of transport geography*, Vol. 22, pp. 129-136.
- LINDHOLM, M. (2013), "Urban freight transport from a local authority perspective – a literature review", *European Transport / Transporti Europei*, Vol. 54 No. 3, pp. 1-37.
- LÓPEZ, E. & MONZÓN, A. (2010), "Integration of sustainability issues in strategic transportation planning: a multi-criteria model for the assessment of transport infrastructure plans", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, Vol. 25, pp. 440-451.
- MACHARIS, C. & BERNARDINI, A. (2015), "Reviewing the use of multi-criteria decision analysis for the evaluation of transport projects: time for a multi-actor approach", *Transport policy*, Vol. 37, pp. 177-186.
- MUÑOZURI, J., LARRAÑETA, J., ONIEVA, L. & CORTÉS, P. (2005), "Solutions applicable by local administrations for urban logistics improvement", *Cities*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 15-28.

- MUÑOZURI, J., CORTÉS, P., GUADIX, J. & ONIEVA, L. (2012), "City logistics in Spain: why it might never work", *Cities*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 133-141.
- NORDTØMME, M. E., ANDERSEN, J., SUND, A. B., ROCHE-CERASI, I., LEVIN, T., EIDHAMMER, O. & BJERKAN K. Y. (2015), "Green urban distribution: evaluation of adapted measures for the city of Oslo", *International Journal of Transport Economics*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 61-88.
- NUZZOLO, A., COPPOLA, P. & COMI, A. (2013), "Freight transport modeling: review and future challenges", *International Journal of Transport Economics*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 151-181.
- NUZZOLO, A. & COMI, A. (2014), "Direct effects of city logistics measures and urban freight demand models", in Gonzalez-Feliu, J., Semet, F. & Routhier, J. L. (Eds.), *Sustainable urban logistics: concepts, methods and information systems*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 211-226.
- NUZZOLO, A., COMI, A., IBEAS, A. & MOURA, J. L. (2016), "Urban freight transport and city logistics policies: indications from Rome, Barcelona and Santander", *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation*, Vol. 10 No. 6, pp. 552-566.
- QUAK, H. J. & DE KOSTER, M. R. B. M. (2009), "Delivering goods in urban areas: how to deal with urban policy restrictions and the environment", *Transportation Science*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 211-227.
- RUSSO, F. & COMI, A. (2011a), "Measures for sustainable freight transportation at urban scale: expected goals and tested results in Europe", *Journal of Urban Planning and Development*, Vol. 137 No. 2, pp. 142-152.
- RUSSO, F. & COMI, A. (2011b), "A model system for the ex-ante assessment of city logistics measures", *Research in Transportation Economics*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 81-87.
- SÁNCHEZ P. C. & ALBERT, M. G. (2015), "Transport infrastructures, CO₂ emissions and economic growth: new evidence from OECD countries", *International Journal of Transport Economics*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 251-270.
- SANZ, G., PASTOR, R., BENEDITO, E. (2013), "Urban freight transport: description and classification of existing measures and implementation of two novel solutions", *DYNA*, Vol. 80 No. 179, pp. 6-13.
- SATHAYE, N., HARLEY, R. & MADANAT, S. (2010), "Unintended environmental impacts of nighttime freight logistics activities", *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, Vol. 44 No. 8, pp. 642-659.
- SAVELSBERGH, M. & VAN WOENSEL, T. (2016), "50th anniversary invited article – City logistics: challenges and opportunities", *Transportation Science*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 579-590.
- STATHOPOULOS, A., VALERI, E. & MARCUCCI, E. (2012), "Stakeholder reactions to urban freight policy innovation", *Journal of Transport Geography*, Vol. 22, pp. 34-45.
- TAMAGAWA, D., TANIGUCHI, E. & YAMADA, T. (2010), "Evaluating city logistics measures using a multi-agent model", *Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 2, pp. 6002-6012.
- TANIGUCHI, E. (2014), "Concepts of city logistics for sustainable and liveable cities", *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 151, pp. 310-317.
- TSAMBOULAS, D. A., YIOTIS, G. & MIKROUDIS G. (2007), "A method for multi-criteria analysis in transportation infrastructure investments", *International Journal of Transport Economics*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 113-131.
- VAN DUIN, J. H. R. & QUAK, H. J. (2007), City logistics: a chaos between research and policy making? A review, in Brebbia, C. A. & Dolezel, V. (Eds.), *Urban transport and the environment in the 21st century*, WIT Press, Southampton, pp. 135-146.
- VIEIRA, J. G. V. & FRANSOO, J. C. (2015), "How logistics performance of freight operators is affected by urban freight distribution issues", *Transport Policy*, Vol. 44, pp. 37-47.
- VIEIRA, J. G. V., FRANSOO, J. C. & CARVALHO, C. D. (2015), "Freight distribution in megaci-

ties: perspectives of shippers, logistics service providers and carriers”, *Journal of Transport Geography*, Vol. 46, pp. 46-54.

VIERTH, I., SCHLEUSSNER, H. & MANDELL, S. (2017), “Road freight transport policies and their impact: a comparative study of Germany and Sweden”, *International Journal of Transport Economics*, Vol. 44 No. 2, pp. 213-234.

SET IN SERRA DANTE BY
FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE, PISA · ROMA.
PRINTED AND BOUND BY
TIPOGRAFIA DI AGNANO, AGNANO PISANO (PISA).

★

November 2018

(CZ 2 · FG 13)



© Copyright by Fabrizio Serra editore, Pisa · Roma.