



Appendix 9

Knowledge Review of the Social and Distributional Impacts of DfT Climate Change Policy Options



Final Report to Department for Transport

ED46894

Issue Number 1

June 2011



Title	Knowledge Review of the Social and Distributional Impacts of DfT Climate Change Policy Options
Customer	Department for Transport
Customer reference	SRE002
Confidentiality, copyright and reproduction	<p>This report has been produced by AEA under a contract with the Department for Transport. Any views expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the Department for Transport.</p> <p>© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO - 2011.</p> <p>All enquiries relating to the copyright in the work should be addressed to HMSO, The Licensing Division, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich, NR3 1BQ.</p> <p>AEA Technology plc accepts no liability whatsoever to any third party for any loss or damage arising from any interpretation or use of the information contained in this report, or reliance on any views expressed therein.</p>
File reference	
Reference number	ED46894 - Issue 1

Gill Wilkins
AEA group
The Gemini Building
Harwell
Didcot
Oxfordshire
OX11 0QR

t: 0870 190 6374
f: 0870 190 6318

AEA is a business name of AEA Technology plc

AEA is certificated to ISO9001 and ISO14001

Author	Name	Ian Skinner ¹ , Alison Pridmore, Sarah Halsey, Gill Wilkins (AEA) Philip Barham, Sam Jones and Vicky Edge (TTR) Karen Lucas (TSU)
	Name	Sujith Kollamthodi
Approved by	Name	Sujith Kollamthodi
	Date	30 June 2011

¹ Ian is an AEA Associate

Appendix 9: Rapid evidence assessments

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Chorus, CG, Molin, EJE and van Wee, B,	Year of publication 2006
Title/publication	Travel information as an instrument to change car drivers travel choices: a literature review	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	World wide
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	N/A
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No, the article discusses reaction of car drivers in general to improved travel information
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes, improved travel information measures
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes the paper explains the effects of travel information on travel choice, especially when (time and trip wise) individuals are most susceptible to change.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Yes, the paper also discusses the impact of travel information on attitudes.
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Based on 15 years of research so quite robust.	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Parkin, J.	Year of publication 2003
Title/publication	Comparisons of Cycle Use for the Journey to Work from the '81, '91 and 2001 Censuses	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Census data review
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes, promotion of cycling
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Not sure as can only see the summary
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Not sure as can only see the summary
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Not sure as can only see the summary	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Sarah E. West	Year of publication 2002
Title/publication	Distributional effects of alternative vehicle pollution control policies	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Journal of Public Economics Volume 88, Issues 3-4 , March 2004, Pages 735-757
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Evidence base review
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	US
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	7,000 households
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes, it describes the effects of transport policy measures on low income households
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes, tax on petrol and subsidising new vehicles.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes the effects of the above policies on low income households
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Yes the effects of the above policies on low income households
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Very robust as based on 7,000 households	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Heffner R.R., Kurani K.S. Turrentine T.S	Year of publication 2007
Title/publication	Symbolism in California’s Early Market for Hybrid Electric Vehicles	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	In-depth interviews
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	US
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes it describes the reaction of different social groups to electric vehicles.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes, electric vehicles
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes, the paper tries to explain why people are attracted and purchase electric vehicles.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Yes, the paper tries to explain why people are attracted to electric vehicles
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Based on 25 in –depth interviews with owners of electric vehicles so not extremely robust	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Ian Shergold & Dr Graham Parkhurst	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	The Treatment of Social and Distributional Impacts in Appraisal and Evaluation.	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	For DfT
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	The aim of the research is to gain a better understanding of the range of SDIs arising from transport schemes. The groups considered are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low income groups • Young people • Old people • Minorities
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Yes, the above mentioned groups.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	No
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	The transport scheme effects the research is concentrating on are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental effects • Economic effects • Safety • Accessibility • Integration
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Very robust as DfT research
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		On DfT website

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	O' Garra T. , Mourato S. Pearson P.	Year of publication 2004
Title/publication	Analysing awareness and Acceptability of Hydrogen Vehicles: A London Case Study	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Survey
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	400
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes awareness to hydrogen by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender • Age • Education • Environmental knowledge
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Hydrogen fuel
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Attitudes to Hydrogen fuel of the above groups
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Large sample so quite robust	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Zia Wadud , Robert B. Noland and Daniel J. Graham	Year of publication 2008
Title/publication	Equity analysis of personal tradable carbon permits for the road transport sector.	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review + model
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	US
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes, the paper investigates the effects of personal carbon trading on different income groups.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes, the policy of personal carbon trading
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes the impact of personal carbon trading on travel behaviour.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Yes the impact of personal carbon trading on different income groups
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	Yes
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Paper appears to assess a large number of articles so seems quite robust	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	T Litman	Year of publication 2002
Title/publication	Evaluating Transportation Equity Guidance For Incorporating Distributional Impacts in Transportation Planning	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Canada / US
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	Literature review
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age • Gender • High /Low income • Ethnicity
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Yes see above
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes, road user charging, parking fees and emissions fees and improved PT
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Yes, it describes the distributional effects from a large number of policies in a table.
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Discusses a large amount of literature so it appears to be very robust
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		Internet?

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	T Litman	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	Evaluating Transportation Affordability	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	US
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	Literature review
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes it looks at the impact of transport policy measures on different income groups.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Yes it explains the true costs of transport for different income groups and people living in different areas (inner urban / suburban etc).
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes Pt improvement, sustainable modes, RUC and other financial incentives
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes impact of the above on behaviour
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Yes
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	Internet?	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Gardiner C. & Hill R.	Year of publication 1997
Title/publication	'Cycling on the Journey to Work: Analysis of Socioeconomic Variables from the UK 1991 Population Census Samples of Anonymised Records	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Survey based on 1991 census (11 cities) also literature review of other studies about cycling and minority groups.
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes it tells us about cycling to work amongst: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender • Ethnicity • Education • Social class
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Yes, it explores low cycling rates amongst specific groups such as ethnic minorities
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Cycle promotion policies
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes, it contests some basic ideas about cycle policies such as that increased cycle provision increases cycling.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No but states that impact of any cycling policies need measuring by group.
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Looks at cycling statistics in 11 British cities and extensive literature research so quite robust.	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	ODPM	Year of publication 2005
Title/publication	Tackling Social Inclusion through New Technologies	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No but It explains about ICT and different social group
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No but it explains access problems to ICT for different social groups.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	ICT
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	No but it does explain that via ICT personal development and active inclusion in employment, social groups, and community participation can be achieved without the need to travel.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	It explains attitudes to ICT for different social groups
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	See above, ICT can help reduce transport problems for different groups
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Bristow, Pridmore, Tight, May, Berkhout and Harris	Year of publication 2004
Title/publication	How can we reduce carbon emissions from transport?	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Expert interviews, household survey, calculations and estimations
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Pricing • Fuel Pricing • Public Transport • Telecommunications • Land use Technology
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes, it calculates expected effects of the main Co2 reduction measures
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Yes, the household survey explored attitudes to various climate change measures
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	The research appears to be robust due to the different methods and the large amount of data analysed	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Skinner I, Fergusson, Kroeger K., Kelly C., Bristow A,	Year of publication 2004
Title/publication	Critical Issues in Decarbonising Transport:	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review and consultation with experts
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes: • Alternative fuels • ITS • ICT
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes, it tries to predict the effects of new technologies (ICT, alternative fuels, ITS) on CO2 reduction
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Yes, it tries to predict the effects of new technologies (ICT, alternative fuels, ITS) on attitudes
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	The research appears to be robust due to the different methods and the large amount of data analysed	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	TRL	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	Mapping the life cycle, environment impacts, interventions and tradeoffs for cars	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Consultation with experts
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • alternative fuels • scrappage • high occupancy rates • eco driving • road user charging
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes, the paper describes CO2 impact reduction potential of the above measures but also social, economic and environmental trade offs of these measures.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Yes, the paper describes effects of the above measures on attitude
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	The research appears to be robust due to the different methods and the large amount of data analysed	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Aaron Golub and Jason Kelly	Year of publication ?
Title/publication	Exploring potential inequities between the burdens and benefits of climate change abatement policies in the transportation sector	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	US / World wide
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes, it describes the distributional effects of climate change abatement policies on high and low income households.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax rebates for hybrid and alternative fuel vehicles. • Rail transit projects • High Occupancy vehicle lanes • Rod user charging
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	No
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Yes, it describes the equity effects of abatement methods but it poses more questions than it answers.
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	A through review of previously published literature. It mentions the Litman research in detail as well.	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:PROFROMA
FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Anable J., Boardman B. And Root A.	Year of publication 1997
Title/publication	Transport Emissions Profiles	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	ECI Report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Survey and focus groups
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Chalgrove and Chalsey villages, South Oxfordshire
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	99 car drivers in 44 households
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes – speculatively based on the recorded behaviours of the survey sample and focus group evidence. Rural households, income, car ownership, age, gender, economic activity status.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	It talks about constraints on behaviour change in terms of public transport, employment opportunities, escort journeys and short journeys.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	It offers a driver emissions profile for each respondent by journey type and considers the effect of cold starts, speed, vehicle type, engine type, etc.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes – awareness raising and targeted advice
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	Yes
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Empirical research
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		N/k

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Bayliss D. For the RAC Foundation	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	RAC Foundation (2009) Low Income Motoring in the UK	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Web-based report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	NTS analysis
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK wide
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	Sub-sample of NTS
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	It offers a broken down analysis of low income drivers behaviours by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of family • Tenure • Ethnicity
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access difficulties • Health difficulties How car ownership affects journeys – distances and number of trips and travel spending.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Motoring tax measures
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Indirectly through the data
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Yes the likely distributional impacts of increased driving costs
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Secondary data analysis of NTS and FES	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	None	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Brand C.	Year of publication
Title/publication	Personal Travel and Climate Change	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Book (based on PhD research)
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Survey and model
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Oxfordshire
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	900 households
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes Income, gender, age, household composition – all by mode
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	By implication by looking at who emits what in terms of Co2 and so who will be affected by different measures
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	By implication by looking at different behaviours and who does what
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Yes
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	Yes
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Empirical study	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	Validated through PhD examination	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	D. Gorman, M. J. Douglas, L. Conway, P. Noble and P. Hanlon	Year of publication 2003
Title/publication	Transport policy and health inequalities: a health impact assessment of Edinburgh's transport policy.	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Journal – Public Policy
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Health Impact Assessment with key professional stakeholders
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Edinburgh, Scotland
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	n/a
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes but based on stakeholder perceptions only
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Yes – based on literature review
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes – based on literature review
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes – based on the perceptions of the professional stakeholders involved
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Informed opinion
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		Peer review

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Heiskanen e., Johnson M., Robinson S., Vadvics E., Saastamoinen M.	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	Low carbon communities as a context for individual behaviour change	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Journal article
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Case studies
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Manchester, WWF green office, Hungary, San Francisco
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	4 case studies
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Different communities of place and identity
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Regulation and incentives, education and awareness raising; community management of environmental resources, moral and ethical principles.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	It identifies how community –based actions can help to support behaviour change in different types of communities.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Public acceptability and social norms at the community level
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	It talks about the impact of different community information and participation type measures on CO ₂ reduction
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Empirical evidence	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	Double blind peer review	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Suzanne King, Mark Dyball, Tara Webster, Angela Sharpe, Alan Worley, Jennifer DeWitt	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	Exploring public attitudes to climate change and travel choices: deliberative research	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	DfT Report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Deliberative surveys and travel diaries
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	150 people in 5 locations
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Sample recruited and data analysed by SEGs A-E Also by age and gender
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	It talks about how travel behaviours might be affected by travel planning, walking and cycling measures, improved public transport, vehicle fuels and air tax.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	As for 1b above
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Mostly information provision
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	It covers attitudes to climate change and
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	Yes anecdotally about the impact of different communication messages on travel behaviours and attitudes
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Empirical study	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Tim Knight, Josie Dixon, Martha Warrener and Stephen Webster	Year of publication 2007
Title/publication	Understanding the travel needs, behaviour and aspirations of people in later life	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	DfT report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	In-depth interviews
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Older people in four age groups: 50-59 years old, 60- 69 years old, 70-79 years old and 80 years old and over.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Experiences of different forms of transport at different stages of older age from post retirement to over 80 years
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost reduction • Driving cessation • Concessionary fares
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health • General activity patterns • Isolation • Confidence and independence
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Yes (as for 2a above)
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Empirical
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		Not known

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Litman T.	Year of publication 2004
Title/publication	Evaluating Mobility Management Strategies for Reducing Transportation Emissions in the Fraser River Basin	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Web-based report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Case study review
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Canada (Fraser River Basin)
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	N/a
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	It looks at the likely equity impacts of different strategies
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	As above
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Various public transport, car and van pooling, travel planning and land use measures are included across 24 case studies
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Yes
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Equity effects
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Empirical study
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		Not known

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFOMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Litman T.	Year of publication 2007
Title/publication	Evaluating Transportation Equity: Guidance For Incorporating Distributional Impacts in Transportation Planning	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Web-based report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	In terms of equity evaluation variables: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographics (age, gender, race, ethnic group, family status, etc.) • Income class. • Geographic location. • Ability (e.g., people with disabilities, licensed drivers, etc.). • Mode (walkers, cyclists, motorists, bus users, etc.). • Vehicle type (cars, trucks, buses, etc.). • Industry (truckers, transit, taxis, vehicle manufactures, etc.). • Trip type and value.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	It identifies the following key policy impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price or fare structure. • Tax burdens. • Transportation service quality. • External costs (crash risk, congestion, pollution, etc.). • Economic opportunity and development. • Transport industry employment and business opportunities.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	As for 1b above
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes in terms of access to key services, ability to participate generally
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Evaluation methodology
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		Not known

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Litman T.	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	Evaluating Transport Affordability	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Web-based report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Methodology
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Canada
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	N/a
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	It looks at the affordability of transport by the need for access to services
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Affordability – it identifies travel budget thresholds for different income levels
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Affordability
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Affordability
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Equity effects
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Data analysis and evaluation methodology	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	Not known	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Lucas, K, Grosvenor, T, Simpson, R,	Year of publication 2001
Title/publication	Transport, the environment and social exclusion	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Published report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review, focus groups, interviews with policy makers
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Bristol, Consett, Hastings, Liverpool, Lincolnshire
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	12 groups
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school children • Young people 16-25 • Unemployed (men) • Low income shift workers (women) • People with physical disabilities • Minority ethnic groups (Yemeni & Chinese) • Older people • Poor people in affluent communities
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Yes about their experiences of public transport in terms of suppressed travel needs, cost, driver behaviour, etc By implication - how these could be improved
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Concessionary fares, walking and cycling, crime reduction measures, local planning and congestion charging (Bristol only)
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Anecdotally only
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	As 2c above
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Empirical evidence	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	Advisory Group	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Lucas and Jones	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	The Car in British Society	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Published report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review, data analysis, focus groups, interviews with policy makers
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK wide; FG's Banbury and Nottingham
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	5 focus groups
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Data analysis by income, gender, age plus focus groups with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Older drivers • Young drivers • Banned drivers • Voluntary mode switchers • Non-car households
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Yes in Banbury and Nottingham in relation to public transport
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	3 scenarios <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased petrol costs • Congestion charging • Travel rationing (PCTs)
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Anecdotally only and inconclusively
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Yes
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No but this could be extrapolated from the NTS data analysis to a certain degree of accuracy
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	As FOR 2d above
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Empirical research
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		Steering Group

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Clarissa Penfold, Nicky Cleghorn, Chris Creegan, Hayley Neil and Stephen Webster	Year of publication 2008
Title/publication	Travel behaviour, experiences and aspirations of disabled people	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	DfT report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Qualitative interviews
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	45 people
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	People with physical and/or sensory disabilities, and/or mental health and learning support needs
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Yes – travel behaviours and experiences of affected groups
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue Badge scheme • Motability scheme • 'ServiceCall' • Using other modes of transport • Planning • Physical access and facilities • Approach of transport staff
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes by different disabled groups
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Yes by different disabled groups
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Empirical research
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		Not known

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Noel Smith et al.	Year of publication 2006
Title/publication	Evidence Base Review on Mobility - Choices and Barriers for Different Social Groups	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	DfT report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Focus groups
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Various UK locations
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • children and young people, • adults, with specific attention to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ people on low income, ○ people living in rural areas, ○ people from black and minority ethnic groups, ○ women, and ○ disabled people, and ○ older people
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Yes . It covers travel behaviours by mode and travel choices, barriers to mobility including personal safety, and the measures to overcome barriers.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Road building, road user charging and car use, public transport measures
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	To a certain extent
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Yes
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Empirical research - qualitative
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		Unclear

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Jean Taylor, Matt Barnard, Hayley Neil and Chris Creegan	Year of publication 2008
Title/publication	The Travel Choices and Needs of Low Income Households: the Role of the Car	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	NatGen Report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	In-depth interviews and focus groups
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Various
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	44 interviews & 15 focus groups
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Predominantly drivers across different income groups
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Impacts of car use on people's ability to participate in activities
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Increased costs of car ownership and use
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Impacts on key activities and family budgets
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Attitudes to other transport is covered
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	It talks about different experiences of different income groups
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No but by implication the effect of increased cost of driving on this
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Empirical research	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	Not known	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Jean Taylor, Matt Barnard, Clarissa White and Jane Lewis	Year of publication 2007
Title/publication	Understanding the travel aspirations, needs and behaviour of young adults	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	DfT Report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	In-depth interview and focus groups
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Various
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	36 interviews & 12 focus groups
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	16-25 year olds
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	About their experiences of travel and public transport use. Not directly.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Reducing cost; increasing frequency of services; reducing overcrowding; improving reliability and predictability; improving the internal environment and transport officials' customer service skills; and addressing young people's safety concerns
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	No
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	As for 2a
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Empirical research	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	Not known	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Tom Rye, William Mykura	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	Concessionary Bus Fares for Older People in Scotland - Are They Achieving their Objectives?	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Journal article
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Surveys
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Scotland
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	Amongst other things, this research included a postal self-completion questionnaire sent out to a random sample of around 2500 pass holders before 2002 and 3700 after 2003, as well as bus stop surveys and focus groups. The second survey sample included 612 people who responded to both before and after self-completion questionnaires. In each case, the response rate was around 39%, yielding 978 useable questionnaires in the before sample, 1145 in the after, and 241 in the matched sample who responded to both questionnaires. A total of 144 questionnaires was completed at a series of locations, selected to obtain a cross section of seniors in Edinburgh. <i>Scottish Executive (2006)</i> surveyed a representative sample of 850 disabled people across Scotland
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Elderly people Taking up concessionary pass to travel at a reduced fare on public transport before 2002 and after 2003 , the proportion aged 60-64 taking up travel concession increased from 15% to only 18%. Some 42% of before but only 34% of after respondents had an income of £500 per month or less. The sample 144 age range 58 (disabled) to 92 for fare concession users: survey, only 24% of respondents had access to a car that they could use, but the majority of respondents had a bus stop within a 5 min walk of their home. Of those with a pass, 58.3% have a bus service of 15 min frequency or better, whereas this is true of only 53.8% of those with a less frequent service. Disabled people Some 22% of the Scottish population has a (self-reported) long term illness or disability. Take up travel concession Area Glasgow conurbation Disabled (SHS) under 60 take up 23.19 % People 60 and over (2001 census) 75.08% Take up travel concession Area Glasgow conurbation East of Scotland urban area Disabled (SHS) under 60 15.85% People 60 and over (2001 census) 85.71%
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Problems experienced by disabled people travelling by bus: Are not able to use buses at all due to their disability (20%). "I have not used my bus pass for about 2 years as I am now confined to a wheelchair." Have problems using buses due to their disability (they cannot negotiate the steps, or do not have enough time to sit down, etc.) (16%). "I find using the buses an ordeal. Boarding and getting off difficult because of my disabilities and failing eyesight. Most drivers

		are considerate some are downright indifferent.” Live too far from the bus stop (8%). The latter research (also revealed that the physical state of footways, crossings and bus stops is a significant barrier to the use of “conventional” (i.e. non door-to door) public transport by disabled people.
2. Different transport policy measures	a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?	This paper discusses concessions that are arranged by the government for social policy reasons, and the groups that are eligible include retired or older people, and disabled people. The increase in total concessionary trip making has been driven to a great extent by people who did not have a pass when the concession was not free acquiring one when it became free.
	b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?	Vaguely: He found that there is a steady decline in overall travel from the age of 60 upwards, so that by the age of 85 people are only making 35% of the trips they were making when they were 60. However, the decline in car usage is greater than of travel generally over the same age range. Generally the elderly will not acquire a car but, as their age increases, they will continue to have a car which they acquired at a younger age (the ‘baby boomer’ generation will join the elderly fully equipped!). This appears to be a major influence on the number of concessionary trips made. Concessionary pass ownership – that is, the number of eligible people who actually take-up the concession for which they are eligible – may rise slightly as bus fares rise. It should also noted that many more people now report changing buses more frequently before , which is a rational response when there are no fare penalties for interchanging onto more convenient/faster services.
	c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?	Impact of concessionary fares on the lives of the people who use the concession: Examining the effect of fare concessions on quality of life in relation to income group, there is a link between improved life quality and the lower income groups. The lower income groups said that they gained a greater improvement in quality of life than the higher income groups, the majority of whom are unaffected by the fare concessions. Significantly, some 25% of respondents reported that they now get out of the house more as a result of the free concession, and 80% of this group have incomes of less than £10,000 per year.
	d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?	The area – bus service and congestion characteristics – within which the concessionary passenger resides. Higher bus service levels and higher levels of congestion and central area parking charges would both tend to be associated with a higher demand for bus travel amongst the group who are eligible for a concession.
	e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO ₂ emissions of different social groups?	No

PART C – ROBUSTNESS

To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Qualitative and quantitative research: The paper draws primarily on three sources: the Scottish Executive’s own evaluation of the impacts of the introduction of a national minimum concessionary entitlement (the free concessionary bus fare within existing scheme areas) (Scottish Executive, 2004); a smaller, local evaluation carried out in Edinburgh by Mykura (2003); and recent work for the Scottish Executive examining the needs of disabled people for public transport (Scottish Executive, 2006).
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	N/A

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	EC	Year of publication 2000
Title/publication	A Sourcebook in Good Practice in Freight Transport	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	European Commission publication on freight best practice
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Recommendations to freight/transport operators
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	European Union
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	N/A
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	More like best practice actions: <i>Reducing the impact of each mode through cleaner engines, cleaner fuels, new fuels and in the case of road freight, energy efficient truck design; Driver training and behaviour; Switching to environmentally friendly modes of transport, e.g. rail, coastal shipping, waterways and any of these in combination with road transport; Reducing the actual number of vehicles running, vehicle kilometers and tonne kilometres by increasing load factors (reducing empty or partly loaded running of lorries), improving routeing, utilising new information technology to maximise backloading, consolidate deliveries, sharing loads and pick-up deliveries with other companies; City Logistics;</i>
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Vaguely on drivers' behaviour: <i>Satellite positioning systems, real-time data logging and direct communications with drivers can all ensure that fuel consumption and drivers' hours conform with company policy and with legal requirements (the case of driving time and rest periods). These logging systems can also contribute to improvements in health and stress reduction amongst drivers as they remove the pressure to make up time and encourage a culture of doing the job well within legal requirements. Reductions in driver stress and improvements in driver health are of advantage to the company in minimizing driver training budgets and maximising the use of the most skilful and reliable drivers.</i>
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on</i>	No

	<i>attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Based on best practice actions in freight transport. It is a good source for best practice for logistics and transport operators.	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	N/A	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Atkins Ltd for DfT	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	Assessing Social and Distributional Impacts in Transport Scheme Appraisal and Evaluation	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Final Report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review and qualitative research
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	N/A
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No. The aim of the study is to understand SDIs of different transport schemes and make methodological recommendation on how SDIs to be included in the appraisal process of the schemes.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	<i>Towards a Sustainable Transport System: Supporting Economic Growth in a Low Carbon World' (TaSTS)₃ sets out the Government's future approach to transport policy, outlining five clear goals: Address climate change, by cutting emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other greenhouse gases; Maximise the competitiveness and productivity of the economy; Protect people's safety, security and health; Improve quality of life, including through a healthy natural environment; and Promote greater equality of opportunity.</i>
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	General: how to assess travel behaviour: <i>The SDI appraisal may require further quantitative data, to fill evidence gaps and examine people's travel behaviour. Household surveys provide a robust approach to collating such data and will enable assessments of peoples travel behaviour in conjunction with the impacts of the proposed transport scheme highlighting areas at risk from negative social impacts particularly in terms of accessibility and affordability issues.</i> General: environmental appraisal on noise levels <i>As well as the distribution of noise effects on different social groups, it is also important to understand whether any of the groups identified are particularly vulnerable to or damaged by the effects of noise. The literature review identified that young people are more prone to negative impacts of noise increases including detrimental blood pressure and stress hormone levels in children who are exposed to high noise levels on a regular basis.</i> Personal Safety and Security General:

		<p><i>Previous research on passengers' perceptions of personal security, identified how people feel about their personal security on public transport and what makes people feel unsafe. The literature review identified that gender and age dimensions were significant for personal security. This suggests that, based on those who may be deterred from travelling, the only group not regarded as experiencing an SDI is adult males aged between about 20 and 50 (although this may reflect perceptions of vulnerability rather than the actual incidence of crime). In terms of transport mode, public transport users emerge as vulnerable as their travel routines are constrained by the transport system requiring them to board/alight at specific points, wait for services, and walk for interchange along specific routes.</i></p>
	<p><i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i></p>	<p><i>There may also be urban-rural issues to consider as SDIs can take different forms in different areas. For example, in rural areas additional public transport capacity may increase accessibility and reduce exclusion, whilst in urban areas the effects may be more equivocal in SDI terms, increasing accessibility to some whilst altering land values, and hence accommodation costs, for others. Noise is likely to be particularly important in tranquil rural areas, for instance if increased by a new bypass, but air quality is much more likely to result in negative SDIs in urban areas.</i></p> <p>Accessibility Strategies General Recommendations:</p> <p><i>Scheme promoters should use the analysis to consider whether it is possible to improve the accessibility of potentially vulnerable groups and/or areas through scheme design and/or mitigation measures.</i></p> <p><i>Analysis of accessibility should also address the other barriers to access such as perceived personal security and affordability.</i></p> <p><i>Thus analysis should highlight any areas of physical or perceived accessibility limitations such as a hilly environment or crime issues.</i></p>
	<p><i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i></p>	<p>The impact of a scheme on local noise levels:</p> <p><i>The overall conclusion is that the lower income households experience greater noise impacts both in absolute and relative terms. It is such conclusions that are recommended for the AST as part of the appropriate sub-objective with quantitative evidence reported separately.</i></p> <p>Air quality assessment:</p> <p><i>As well as the distribution of air quality effects on different social groups as described above, it is also important to understand whether any of the groups identified are particularly vulnerable to or damaged by the effects of air quality.</i></p> <p>Unemployed/Low income households – <i>low income groups have been found to be more susceptible to the impacts of poor air quality and studies have shown a relationship between poverty and air pollution is important.</i></p> <p>Affordability/Financial Impacts General:</p> <p><i>The literature review confirmed that lower income groups already spend a disproportionate amount of disposable income on travel, despite travelling significantly less than wealthier groups. It also identified that in practice low income public transport users did not particularly take advantage of discounted tickets and period tickets, so the</i></p>

		<p><i>analysis should not assume that they do.</i></p> <p>Road Safety</p> <p><i>Literature review identified that those who are more vulnerable to road accidents are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Younger people – children are one of the most vulnerable groups in terms of road accidents;</i> • <i>Low income Groups – there is a disproportionate relationship between social class and accidents;</i> • <i>Minority Ethnic Groups/high density housing (on street parking) – studies have shown particularly high rates of accidents amongst young Asian children living in inner city areas. This can also be attributed to the characteristics of the area in traditional ethnic areas having low levels of off street parking and resulting in hazardous conditions for children to play in.</i> • <i>Non-car users – pedestrians and cyclists are more likely to suffer serious injuries as a consequence of an accident.</i> <p><i>The analysis of road safety will need to consider vulnerable groups and plot these socio-demographic sub-groups across the transport scheme alignment and area likely to be affected by the scheme. The analysis should then consider where accidents could potentially occur (i.e. desired crossing points and desired pedestrian routes, for example, from residential areas to key locations such as schools or local shops. and identify any hazards as an outcome of the scheme.)</i></p>
	<p><i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i></p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>PART C – ROBUSTNESS</p>		
<p>To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?</p>	<p>Literature review identifying SDIs as part of NATA (New Approach of Transport Appraisals) refresh programme in response to changes in the DfT goals since 1998.</p>	
<p>Method of publication review (please specify if known)</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	DfT	Year of publication 2007
Title/publication	Cycling Personal Travel Factsheet	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Factsheet publication
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Survey
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	Not given; data from National Travel Survey (NTS) adults and children of all ages ONS Omnibus Survey and the British Social Attitudes Survey (BSAS)
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	<p>Across all age groups males make more cycle trips on average than females. This difference is greatest among people aged 17-20, with men in this age group making more than five times as many cycling trips as women.</p> <p>Cycling trip rates are highest among boys aged 11-16 years. However, men aged 30-49 travel the greatest distance by bicycle.</p> <p>The majority of adults agree that everyone should be encouraged to cycle to help their health (87%), help the environment (79%) and to ease congestion (73%).</p>
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	<p>However, many adults are concerned about the safety of cycling. Almost half (47%) strongly agree that 'the idea of cycling on busy roads frightens me', with a further 27% tending to agree with this. Women are more likely to express concerns about safety (85%) than men (61%).</p>
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	<p>Among males, trip rates by bicycle decrease as household car ownership increases whereas among females, there is no correlation between car ownership and cycling.</p> <p>Over two thirds (68%) of all trips and over half (58%) of car trips are under 5 miles, approximately a half hour cycle ride.</p> <p>37% of adults agree that 'Many of the short journeys I now make by car I could just as easily cycle, if I had a bike' (BSAS).</p> <p>Around 3 in 10 car users say they would reduce their car use 'if there were more cycle tracks away from roads' (31%), 'if there were more cycle lanes on roads' (27%) or 'better parking facilities for cycles' (30%) (Omnibus).</p> <p>Around a quarter of car users say they would cycle more 'if congestion charging was introduced' (26%), 'if it was more expensive to park' (23%) and 'if it was difficult to park [a car]' (26%).</p>

		<i>Car users who already cycle frequently are more likely to agree such measures would reduce their car use.</i>
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	<i>The majority of adults agree that everyone should be encouraged to cycle to help their health (87%), help the environment (79%) and to ease congestion (73%). The main reasons for making a cycling trip are leisure or social purposes (38% of cycling trips) and commuting (30% of cycling trips). However, overall only 3% of commuting trips are made mainly by bicycle. 2% of trips to and from school by secondary school children (aged 11-16). Just over two-thirds (68%) of respondents agree that 'cyclists should be given more priority', while only 11% felt that 'cycle lanes on roads simply reduce space'</i>
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	<i>People living in households with lower levels of income make, on average, fewer bicycle trips and travel shorter distances by bicycle than those in higher income households. On average people in the highest income quintile cycle 49 miles per person per year compared with 29 miles among people in the lowest income quintile. This contrasts with the pattern for walking, which is a more important form of transport for lower income households than higher income households.</i>
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No. Just general reference to cycling being beneficial to environment.

PART C – ROBUSTNESS

To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Qualitative and quantitative research for 2002 - 2005 and 1996 - 2004.
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	N/A

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFOMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	DfT	Year of publication 2008
Title/publication	Delivering a Sustainable Transport System	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Government publication – consultation document
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Strategy to tackle economic effects of climate change
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	<i>We consulted informally with over 250 stakeholder organisations on our goals and approach at the start of this year (2008). The responses we received were very supportive. We have now refined these goals and they will be the basis on which we build future transport and infrastructure policy.</i>
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Vaguely: <i>Historically, older drivers have made fewer and shorter trips, but today older people are increasingly likely to own cars and to continue driving for longer.</i>
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes, particularly those relating to Eddington and Stern, e.g. <i>we are working with local authorities who are developing proposals to manage demand on their roads by congestion charging.</i> New rail lines, the London – Manchester strategic corridor, freight, Crossrail, climate change,
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Not really, but it outlines that land use planning influences peoples transport choices.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No

PART C – ROBUSTNESS	
<p>To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?</p>	<p>This document is a consultation document, following on from the earlier publication Towards a Sustainable Transport System, which was formed in response to the Stern and Eddington reports.</p> <p><i>We outlined our proposed approach to long-term transport planning in our publication Towards a Sustainable Transport System, which we published in 2007, in response to the Eddington study and the Stern review. This document explains how we are putting this into action in a way that both tackles our immediate problems and also shapes our transport system to meet the longer-term challenges that are critical for our prosperity and way of life.</i></p>
<p>Method of publication review (please specify if known)</p>	<p>N/A</p>

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	DfT	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	Good Practice Guidelines – Delivering Travel Plans through the Planning Process	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Report (guidelines)
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Best practice guidelines
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Mainly Travel Plans, with some other general Smarter Choices measures.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	A few case studies, which indicate that implementing a 'good' TP can reduce single occupancy car use.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Solely a review of best practice. <i>These guidelines were commissioned by the Department for Transport, in consultation with Communities and Local Government, to give further impetus to the use of travel plans as a means of promoting sustainable transport. They bring together some of the best of current practice from examples around the country, drawing on the results of recent research.</i> <i>They particularly focus on the way in which planning and travel plans currently interrelate and how this could be made more effective.</i>	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	DfT (Sally Cairns, Lynn Sloman, Carey Newson, Jillian Anable, Alistair Kirkbride and Phil Goodwin)	Year of publication 2004
Title/publication	Smarter Choices – Changing the way we Travel	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Research Report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review and case studies
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No, but it does detail general reactions to smarter choices measures through case studies.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Travel Plans, PJP, Car Clubs, Information and Marketing, Car Sharing, Teleworking, Teleconferencing, Home Shopping
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Summarises studies undertaken on the effect smarter choices measures have in reducing car traffic. The document highlights the likely difference between a weak or strong implementation of a range of smarter choice measures in the second chapter, and then move onto more detailed case studies. For example, some information about the behaviour changes experienced after some travel awareness campaigns. Sections included entitled ‘effects of xxxx (measure) on car use’.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No, focuses on the measurable reduction in car use, rather than attitudes to travel plans.
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No, just general effects
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂</i>	No

	<i>emissions of different social groups?</i>	
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
<p>To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?</p>	<p>Review of case studies/best practice, which includes statistics relating to the cost and benefits of the implementation of policies and the likely % reduction in car travel from policies.</p> <p>Nationwide reduction in traffic estimated to be 11% if high intensity policies were to be introduced, however based upon the results of 25 case studies.</p> <p>Some caveats included by authors, on the percentage changes reported, and assumptions made about the wider smarter choices policy field.</p> <p><i>The report draws on earlier studies of the impact of soft measures, new evidence from the UK and abroad, case study interviews relating to 24 specific initiatives, and the experience of commercial, public and voluntary stakeholders involved in organising such schemes.</i></p>	
<p>Method of publication review (please specify if known)</p>		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Drs Jillian Anable, Ben Lane & Tanika Kelay for the DfT	Year of publication 2006
Title/publication	Review of public attitudes to climate change and transport: Summary report	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Report for the DfT.
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Summary report of literature review.
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK.
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	This was a review of existing literature and the number of references reviewed is not specified. There may be more information on this in the full report, although it is not available on the DfT's website.
PART B – FOCUS (NB REA conducted on <i>summary</i> report only – additional relevant information may be contained in the full report.)		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes, but limited. The report explores general public attitudes to climate change (chapters 1 and 2). It also refers to segmentation of the population by psychographic and socio-demographic variables, in order to define different groups in terms of their use of the private car, attitudes to the environment and energy consumption (chapter 5).
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	The following measures are covered in a fairly limited way: Cleaner fuels and vehicles (chapter 2) Pricing (chapters 2 and 6) Energy/car labelling (chapter 6) Carbon offset services (chapter 6) Travel awareness campaigns (chapter 6) Travel plans (chapter 6) Carbon neutral cities (chapter 6).
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	The following measures are covered in a fairly limited way: Energy/car labelling and energy use feedback (chapter 6) Travel awareness campaigns (chapter 6) Travel plans (chapter 6) In addition, some general conclusions are drawn about features of measures which are most likely to transform behaviour (chapter 6).
	<i>c. Does the document tell us</i>	The following measures are covered in a

	<i>about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	fairly limited way: Cleaner fuels and vehicles (chapter 2) Pricing (chapter 2) Energy/car labelling (chapter 6) Travel awareness campaigns (chapter 6)
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No.
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No.
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Based on a review of existing evidence. A main conclusion was that attitudes, climate change and travel behaviour had not been comprehensively examined in any consistent and robust way to warrant a comprehensive analysis of links between them. Consequently, the review drew upon literature from environmental psychology, public understanding of science, travel behaviour research, marketing and sociology to achieve its aims. The review used a search strategy designed to capture all aspects of travel behaviour, including modal choice, car purchasing, frequency and amount of travel, and support for transport policies. Only a small amount of literature emerged concerning attitudes to air travel and climate change. Hence the conclusions pertain mostly to private surface passenger transport. The report also identified evidence gaps meriting further research (as requested by DfT).	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	Not known.	
CONCLUSION ON RELEVANCE	Quite relevant.	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION			
Author(s)	European (5 th RTD Framework Programme)	Year of publication	2002-4
Title/publication	VELO.INFO: the European Network for Cycling Expertise		
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Further investigation reveals this is a network rather than a publication. There appears to be no overall report on the Network activities. However, the Network has an online database of publications on cycling, including its own briefings on different aspects of cycling. This REA reviews the key results and policy implications arising from Network operation, as reported on the Transport Research Knowledge Centre website.	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	See above.	
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Europe.	
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>		
PART B – FOCUS			
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No.	
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No.	
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes, the Network itself is a transport policy measure and its various activities are described.	
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	No.	
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No.	
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No.	
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No.	
PART C – ROBUSTNESS			
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?			
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		Not known.	
CONCLUSION ON RELEVANCE		Of little relevance. However, if REAs of other cycling-related literature indicate these are not so relevant, a search could be undertaken of the VELO.INFO publication database to try and identify more relevant references.	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION			
Author(s)	European (5 th RTD Framework Programme)	Year of publication	2003-4
Title/publication	BYPAD (Bicycle Policy Audit)		
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Further investigation reveals this is an instrument for evaluating local and regional cycling policies, rather than a publication. There appears to be no overall report on this instrument. This REA reviews the key results and policy implications arising from use of BYPAD, as reported on the Transport Research Knowledge Centre website.	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	See above.	
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Europe.	
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	Over 100 cities and regions in 20 European countries are using BYPAD.	
PART B – FOCUS			
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No.	
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No.	
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes, BYPAD itself is a transport policy measure and its operation is described.	
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	No.	
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No.	
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No.	
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No.	
PART C – ROBUSTNESS			
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?			
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		Not known.	
CONCLUSION ON RELEVANCE		Of little relevance.	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Dr Tim Jones	Year of publication 2008
Title/publication	The Role of national cycle network traffic-free paths in creating a cycling culture; The case of NCN route 5 Stafford	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	PhD thesis
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Secondary research + surveys
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Secondary research examined the social and cultural context of cycle planning in the UK, the development of the National Cycle Network (NCN), and factors inhibiting cycling. Surveys conducted in two neighbourhoods in a town (Stafford), to compare attitudes to cycling, and current and planned cycling behaviour.
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	111 survey responses at a neighbourhood adjacent to a traffic-free section of the NCN and 94 responses at a control neighbourhood less accessible to the NCN.
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Reactions to cycling in general covered to some extent in chapter 4, exploring differences relating to age, gender, and socio-economic status.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Covered to some extent in chapter 4, e.g. differences in problems experienced attributable to gender, age and living in urban areas, and linkage of these problems to use of cycling.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Yes - the NCN, especially traffic-free routes (chapter 3 in particular).
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Yes - the impact of the NCN on behaviour is considered in chapter 7. Little impact was revealed, other than increased cycling for leisure. Chapter 10 states that a marketing strategy aimed at changing behaviour - by providing information and targeting sections of the community predisposed to cycling - has an important role to play in replacing short trips by car, but must be reinforced by hard measures to encourage cycling.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Yes - the impact of the NCN on attitudes is considered in chapters 7 and 10. The public were largely supportive of measures that plan cycling into the transport system and enable cycling for short journeys. However this had

		not translated into behavioural change in terms of increased cycling for practical, routine journeys. Also, there was no evidence that provision of a traffic-free route had led to more positive attitudes to cycling.
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Chapter 10 suggests that women were more likely to place above average importance on cycling being impractical and dangerous.
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No.
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	The PhD is based on secondary research and surveys, as indicated above. Author notes that ideally surveys should have been conducted before and after the establishment of the local section of the NCN, surveys did not take account of frequency of travel, and other factors as well as proximity of the NCN could impact on cycling behaviour,	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	Normal review procedure for PhDs.	
CONCLUSION ON RELEVANCE	Quite relevant.	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	DfT (UWE, Parkhurst G.)	Year of publication 2006
Title/publication	Developing guidance and advice to address the social and distributional impacts of road pricing (Understanding the Social and Distributional Impacts of Road Pricing)	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Rapid evidence assessment of the Social and Distributional Impacts of Road Pricing
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature Review (Rapid evidence assessment)
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Covers schemes worldwide
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	Over 100 reports, papers and other articles addressing research in the UK and Europe, North America, and Asia.
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	<p>Yes, but only in relation to road pricing:</p> <p>Demographic groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different genders • Children and young people (up to the age of 25) • Middle generational people (aged between 26 and 50) • Older people (aged over 50) • Families (with dependent children aged 15 and under). <p>Groups prone to social exclusion on accessibility grounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled people • Households without access to cars • People unaware of travel opportunities • Low-income households <p>Geographically defined groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural • Suburban/peripheral estate • Urban core <p>Economically or occupationally-defined groups using Socio-economic Classification occupation classes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People in education • People in unpaid or voluntary work • People seeking work • Part-time workers • Key workers • Carers • Retired people <p>Groups defined through their transport choices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus users • Car users

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrians • Cycle users • Users of powered two-wheel vehicles
	<p><i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i></p>	<p>Yes, considers many different groups, including lower income, ethnic minorities and different genders. Also investigates the equity of scheme design, pricing etc.</p> <p>The issue of equity is found to be a serious obstacle in terms of implementing pricing schemes. Considers some measures trialled to solve this problem, e.g. toll vouchers for lower income households.</p> <p>There are major gaps in understanding the reasons why people on low incomes do not have (or consider themselves not to have) an alternative to car use.</p>
2. Different transport policy measures	<p><i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i></p>	<p>Road pricing only, but including five types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fixed area charging • Fixed cordon charging • Route-based charging • Nationwide congestion charging • Nationwide universal distance-rated charging
	<p><i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i></p>	<p>Yes, with regards to road pricing - those on lower incomes less likely to pay the charge, but more likely to benefit through improvements to public transport, e.g:</p> <p><i>Those travelling on urban highways at peak periods in the peak direction are substantially more affluent than the population as a whole, and those who choose to pay the toll more affluent still.</i></p> <p>Goes into detail about the profile of users of toll roads/charged areas. For example, middle-aged most likely to pay a toll:</p> <p><i>A large-scale survey in the Norwegian capital, Oslo, found that the great majority of motorists crossing the cordon at peak times were middle-aged men with above-average incomes.</i></p> <p>Uses London charge zone as an example of before and after behaviour, and concludes:</p> <p><i>Little is known about the underlying reasons that may induce people to switch modes as a result of road pricing.</i></p>
	<p><i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different</i></p>	<p>Small section on 'consultation and public acceptability' (4.3), but this is short and</p>

	<i>transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	sweeping.
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Yes, nine key themes are drawn out, covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income groups, • Age, • Gender, • Ethnicity, • Household type, • Disabilities, • Scheme design and boundary questions, • Spatial issues, and • Transport modes.
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	<p>The overall aim of the study was to evaluate the available evidence on the social and distributional impacts of existing and 'near market' road pricing schemes. A desk based literature review, taking examples from all around the world.</p> <p>Study seems to cover a large variety and number of studies. Within the recommendations section, the main report outlines the chief evidence gaps</p> <p><i>First, a search of academic and policy literature was conducted, using relevant proprietary databases and open-access internet search engines. Second, direct contact was made with electronic (international) networks of transport professionals, including the Universities Transport Study Group, with specific requests for assistance in identifying further bibliographic listings and potentially relevant literature. Reference was also made to recent conference proceedings.</i></p>	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	DfT	Year of publication 2007
Title/publication	Transport Assessment Guidance (TAG) Unit (3.12.4), Measuring the Social and Distributional Impacts of Road Pricing Schemes	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Government document – currently ‘for consultation’
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Government Guidance
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK wide
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	N/A
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No, but it explains (to local authorities) how these can be investigated in terms of road pricing schemes using research methods and lays out some example survey questions.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No, but it explains (to local authorities) how these can be investigated in terms of road pricing schemes using research methods and lays out some example survey questions.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Road pricing schemes only. <i>This Unit provides guidance on requirements for measuring social and distributional impacts using social research methods when projects include road pricing schemes.</i>
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	No, only that we do not yet fully understand the social and distributional impacts of road pricing. It outlines to local authorities how research and surveys can be undertaken in order to collect and analyse this information.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No, as above.
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No, as above.
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No, as above.
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	References to National Travel Survey, Local Travel Surveys and best practice in order to outline how data collection should be carried out. More of a document about how to undertake research, than publishing results of research. The document is currently out for consultation, and recognises that things may change due to the rapidly changing nature of the topic.	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	N/A	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION			
Author(s)	TfL	Year of publication	Annual (2008)
Title/publication	Central London Congestion Charging: Impacts Monitoring		
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Report	
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Monitoring Report	
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	London	
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	16,600 roadside surveys 1,000 resident telephone surveys 300 drivers using the congestion zone telephone survey On street surveys prior to western extension 3,966 before and after surveys of western extension users 84 ‘hard to reach’ surveys, e.g. the elderly ‘Londoners survey’ of 2,400 people living across Greater London 500 key workers 120 shift workers 60 disabled people and carers	
PART B – FOCUS			
1. Different social groups	<p><i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i></p>	<p>Some comparison of travel and scheme impacts between low income and high income households, and the impact of the charge amongst the disabled, carers and the elderly (chapters 6 and 7) e.g:</p> <p><i>Lower income respondents were more likely to report that their travel by car had increased or decreased, and less likely to say it had remained the same. This suggests that those on a lower income place a higher value on the cost of the charge, both encouraging them to avoid paying it but, where this is not possible, to ensure that it is not ‘wasted’.</i></p> <p><i>In general, those disabled people surveyed were largely unaffected by the introduction of charging and TfL found no evidence of any impact on the provision of services to disabled people. However, carers and visitors appear to have reduced the frequency of visits made during charging hours.</i></p>	
	<p><i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social</i></p>	<p>The report details topics such as ‘access to services’ (grocery shopping etc) and outlines how the central charge zone has affected</p>	

	<p><i>groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i></p>	<p>residents within it in relation to accessing these services (chapter 7).</p> <p>The document also reports on the affordability of transport and the scheme, stating:</p> <p><i>Around one third of London residents reporting having reduced the number of car or van journeys that they make because of the increasing cost.</i></p> <p><i>London residents who said that they found travel more difficult to afford were more likely to say that the overall impact of congestion charging on them had been negative than the population as a whole, although a significant majority (70 percent) said that the impact had been neutral or positive.</i></p>
<p>2. Different transport policy measures</p>	<p><i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i></p>	<p>It provides an analysis and valuation of the benefits of the original congestion charging scheme in central London.</p>
	<p><i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i></p>	<p>One chapter included (chapter 6) on Travel Behaviour and Travel Behaviour Change relating to the London Congestion Charge – this is new to the latest monitoring report (2008). This survey was specifically designed to provide a ‘before and after’ picture of intended and actual behavioural change among those driving into, within and through the western extension zone.</p> <p><i>This section describes travel behaviour patterns of those travelling to and from the western extension by road and identifies changes made as a result of the introduction of congestion charging. The introduction of charging encouraged travellers to think about the trips they make and discouraged the use of the car (as driver) during charging hours.</i></p> <p>An e.g. of driver behaviour:</p> <p><i>Drivers who had chosen to continue driving in the western extension after the introduction of charging and pay the charge tended to do so because they were travelling on behalf of their employer, because they felt they had no choice, or because it was easier or more convenient and to save time.</i></p>
	<p><i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i></p>	<p>Yes, in relation to the London Congestion Charge, and details attitudes on transport and the environment after the introduction of the charge, e.g:</p>

		<p><i>Eight percent of those who choose to 'stay and pay' say that they now travel in the western extension zone less often than prior to the introduction of charging, while 20 percent say that they travel more often. Most were not anticipating any changes in the frequency of travel in the longer term. This reflects the fact that those who continue to drive in the zone after the introduction of charging are relatively price-insensitive and committed to travel by car.</i></p>
	<p><i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i></p>	<p>Briefly discusses this in terms of the impact of the congestion charge on low and higher income households, the elderly and disabled and their willingness to travel into the zone, or use an alternative to the car.</p>
	<p><i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>PART C – ROBUSTNESS</p>		
<p>To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?</p>	<p>Based on roadside surveys, telephone surveys, traffic survey data etc. The report is a summary of results, and some deeper analysis into the reasons behind these results, which is based on informed opinion.</p>	
<p>Method of publication review (please specify if known)</p>		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Barham, P, and May, A (University of Leeds)	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	CURACAO: State of the Art Review, Ch.10: Equity	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Review of literature and practice
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Looks at schemes worldwide, e.g. UK, America, Paris
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children; • Young adults; • Unemployed people; • People in low paid work; • People from minority ethnic communities; • Disabled and mobility-impaired people; and • Older people.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	<p>Section on how the adverse equity effects may be reduced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modifying the design to overcome localised adverse impacts • Reducing charge levels and introducing subsidies and exemptions • Adopting complementary measures, often using hypothecated revenues.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Road pricing only
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	<p>Some impacts of the introduction of road pricing discussed, e.g. using the London congestion zone as an example:</p> <p><i>The annual Central London Congestion Charge Impacts Monitoring Report has so far come up with no evidence of traffic volumes increasing in areas just outside the charging zone, which is a phenomenon that was widely expected prior to the scheme's implementation.</i></p>
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	<p>Yes, some information about acceptability of case studies, e.g. London congestion zone.</p> <p><i>Generally, there has been a consensus that improvements have been made to air quality, the environment in general, the provision of bus services, bus journey times, traffic</i></p>

		<i>congestion and car journey times.</i>
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	<p><i>The importance of the equity aspect of urban road user charging lies in the fact that the “winners” and “losers” as a result of a scheme might come from different socioeconomic groups.</i></p> <p>With the introduction of a charging scheme, the most likely to be disadvantaged are those who have least flexibility in making life changes.</p> <p>Describes the effect a scheme may have on residents compared to non-residents, and car users and public transport users who enter the charging area.</p> <p>Makes comparisons between the effects on lower income and higher income groups – the distributional effects of road pricing depend on the reinvestment of monies into public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>Some summary of other studies of the issues:</p> <p><i>One slightly surprising outcome of Bureau and Glachant’s analysis was that there was no difference in the distribution of impacts whether toll revenues were used to reduce public transport fares, or whether they were given as a lump sum to all commuters.</i></p>
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	<p><i>Evidence on equity impacts comes in the main from three sources: predictive modelling, attitudinal research and empirical evidence from implemented schemes.</i></p> <p>Report is based on evidence collated from research and practice over the period to the end of 2008.</p> <p>Looks at models and surveys undertaken including both implemented schemes and proposed schemes.</p>	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	David Levinson	Year of publication 2009
Title/publication	Equity Effects of Road Pricing: A Review	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Working paper
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes, briefly, in terms of which social groups use the toll, those which are reluctant to use for particular case studies.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Only after the implementation of road pricing schemes, not generally.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Road pricing (congestion charging, national road pricing, cordons, toll roads etc).
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Briefly, in relation to case study schemes, e.g.: <i>...while the Singapore Area Licensing Scheme reduced peak hour traffic by 65%, and bus ridership increased from 35.9 to 43.9%; more travelers (44.1%) saw longer travel time and fewer (36.1%) saw a reduction as slower (and now more crowded) buses substituted for faster cars.</i>
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Briefly, in relation to case study schemes e.g.: <i>...found lower-income drivers approved of the lanes almost as much as wealthier drivers, though wealthier drivers did make more use of the facility.</i> <i>A study of SR91 by Sullivan (2000) found lower-income drivers approved of the lanes almost as much as wealthier drivers, though wealthier drivers did make more use of the facility.</i> Also, a short section (6.1) entitled ‘public

		acceptability', which includes results of focus groups in the UK.
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	<p>Yes, road pricing – chapter 6.2 is entitled 'Assessing Winners and Losers'.</p> <p><i>Many low income travelers do not own a car, and thus won't pay user charges, (and may benefit from revenue recycling if the money is invested in transit modes), while those low income travelers who do use a car spend an above average share of income on travel.</i></p> <p><i>All measures indicate that the welfare is distributed more unequally after the introduction of road pricing than before. Both components of the welfare changes analysed before contribute to this effect. The toll itself as well as the travel time gains separately enlarge inequality. Revenue recycling can remedy the inequity provided the toll collection costs are not too high.</i></p>
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Solely a review of previously published literature, case studies and simulated findings	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Peter Bonsall and Charlotte Kelly	Year of publication 2005
Title/publication	Road user charging and social exclusion: The impact of congestion charges on at-risk groups	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Journal article
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review and investigation of a synthetic population (charging in Leeds)
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Case study of Leeds
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Most at-risk groups (in terms of congestion charging) identified. <i>The literature identifies a number of groups who are potentially at-risk from the introduction of road charges. The main one will be those low-income drivers who either have to stop travelling, so lowering their mobility levels, or have to pay the charge (if they have no alternative) so putting an extra strain on their already limited resources.</i>
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Yes, briefly with regards to charging: <i>The introduction of charges gives additional choice to affluent groups but may present serious problems to those for whom the new charges represent a significant part of their available income.</i> <i>However, if the revenues are used to improve the transport system, to provide alternative modes of transport or to provide alternative means of participating in the normal activities of society, this immediate effect may be offset and the net effect may even be to reduce the number of people who are socially excluded.</i>
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Congestion charges (6 different methods tested): <i>Cordon crossing charges at each of three cordons, distance-related charges within two charge areas, and time related charges within an inner area.</i>
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Using the modeling technique, it identifies groups of people likely to pay the charge, and those not likely to. <i>If road user charging is introduced some</i>

		<i>drivers will reduce their car use due to the charge and others will have to make economies elsewhere. Either eventuality could have serious consequences for some people and could make it difficult for them to continue to participate in society.</i>
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	<p>Theoretically, yes using a modeled population. Tells us about the potential impact of different charging schemes upon different sections of society, e.g. the disabled, lone parents, over 60's.</p> <p>Six different schemes are tested within the model, and the number of people effected by each different scheme is assessed and compared.</p> <p><i>The spatial distribution of the origins or destinations of trips affected by the charges can be very helpful in understanding the distribution of impacts. This is considered in terms of the Leeds model.</i></p>
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	<p><i>A new technique, based on generation and investigation of a synthetic population is introduced and used to establish the impacts on at-risk groups of six congestion charging schemes in Leeds.</i></p> <p><i>The Popgen-T methodology uses iterative proportional fitting and monte carlo simulation to 'generate' the characteristics of travellers from probabilities derived from a variety of sources but most particularly the small-area-statistics available from the National Household Census. The method then uses select-link-analysis and other routines from a standard traffic assignment package to identify which individuals would be affected by a given policy.</i></p>	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Gordon Mitchell	Year of publication 2005
Title/publication	Forecasting environmental equity: Air quality responses to road user charging in Leeds, UK	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Journal article
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review and modelling results
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Comparisons made between most and least affluent communities in Leeds, if theoretical congestion charge scenarios were to be introduced – all comparisons relate to environmental justice – air quality etc.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	No
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Congestion charging via a cordon in central Leeds.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	No
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Looks at equity and environmental impacts of different charging scenarios in Leeds, and the base (1993) situation. Makes a comparison of the environmental effect of schemes upon the most and least deprived communities in Leeds. <i>The analysis shows that there is social inequity in the distribution of NO₂ in Leeds, with deprived areas experiencing significantly higher atmospheric concentrations than communities of average or above average affluence.</i> <i>Road user charging also reduces inequity in</i>

		<p><i>exposure to NO₂, with the extent of the reduction varying according to the charge option.</i></p>
	<p><i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i></p>	<p>Yes, discusses equity issues of the introduction of different charging scenarios in Leeds. Compares lower and upper Townsend quartiles (Townsend index comprises the following variables: unemployment; overcrowding; non-car ownership; nonhome Ownership).</p> <p><i>This paper investigates the relationship between urban air quality (as NO₂) and social deprivation for the city of Leeds, UK. Results indicate a significant degree of environmental inequity exists in Leeds. Analysis of the transport strategies indicates that this inequity will be reduced through natural fleet renewal, and, perhaps contrary to expectations, road user charging is also capable of promoting environmental equity. The environmental equity response is, however, sensitive to road pricing scheme design.</i></p>
<p>PART C – ROBUSTNESS</p>		
<p>To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?</p>	<p><i>Through application of a series of linked dynamic models of traffic simulation and assignment, vehicle emission, and pollutant dispersion, the environmental equity implications of a series of urban transport strategies, including road user cordon and distance-based charging, road network development, and emission control are assessed.</i></p>	
<p>Method of publication review (please specify if known)</p>		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Fiona Raje´	Year of publication 2003
Title/publication	The impact of transport on social exclusion processes with specific emphasis on road user charging	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Journal article
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature review and summary of focus group research
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Bristol
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	105 people
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	Yes, through the results of focus groups. <i>The focus group research described in this paper has been carried out in Bristol to facilitate an examination of how gender, ethnicity and lifecycle influence travel and participation behaviour.</i> Focus groups were undertaken with different groups, e.g. one with solely older people, one with members of the African–Caribbean community and women.
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Yes, through questions in the focus groups relating to travel problems. However, answers are usually specific to the Bristol area, e.g. residents from Easton having trouble visiting the nearby area of St. Paul’s.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Congestion charging (Bristol)
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	Analysis of different people’s probable behavioural responses to road user charging – how would they like to see a scheme operate, where should revenue be targeted etc.
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Questions in the focus group related to perceptions of charging, existing knowledge of charging and attitudes towards the introduction of a scheme in Bristol: <i>Public acceptability requires that residents feel that they are involved in the process of policy-making and introduction.</i> <i>They do not want to see large scale engineering projects but need adjustments and enhancements to existing services: more</i>

		<i>flexibility in demand responsive transport and extension of its hours of service, accessible bus fleets, readily available and appropriate forms of public transport information, security improvements, public transport routes shaped along lines that reflect community connections.</i>
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Makes some observations on this which come out as a result of the focus groups, also makes recommendations for further work. <i>The focus group evidence indicates that there is a clear need for local authorities to consider the wider impacts of proposed congestion charging schemes on different social groups. An equity audit would facilitate the examination of the key issues that need to be addressed in introducing such a scheme.</i>
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	The research is part of a larger project funded by the Department for Transport on the impacts of road user charging and workplace parking levies on social inclusion/exclusion. Based on focus groups undertaken in Bristol, and also some literature review in the introduction section. Focus groups were undertaken with 105 people in 2002. Study also involved focus group participants to complete a travel diary.	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Stantchev, D, Menaz, B	Year of publication 2006
Title/publication	Equity and Accessibility (Third Annual Thematic Research Summary)	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Research report
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Literature/policy review
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	Europe
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	<p>Yes, briefly describes some problems faced by disabled, non-drivers elderly people and other disadvantaged groups. Outlines some 'solutions' from other research/projects. Other examples:</p> <p><i>European research identified various barriers that hinder the development and the integration of the transport services in rural areas.</i></p> <p><i>European research provided insight into the various obstacles to cross-border mobility of people at local and regional level. Three main categories of obstacles were identified that hinder the operation of cross-border public transport.</i></p> <p><i>Norwegian research was conducted into how public transport can be better adapted to users' needs. Good physical accessibility (low floor buses, etc) and good "mental" accessibility (simple network, easy-to-understand information, simple fares structure, etc) were acknowledged as important factors which increase public transport use.</i></p>
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	<p>Three factors affect physical accessibility and thus must be taken account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobility • Mobility substitutes • Land use <p>Some, very briefly, used to overcome social exclusion, mobility or accessibility problems, e.g. public transport, walking and cycling.</p>

	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	No
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?	Solely a review of European projects and current policies. All based upon work of other authors.	
Method of publication review (please specify if known)	Peer review	

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Beacon Council Research Report (ODPM)	Year of publication 2001
Title/publication	Better Access and Mobility	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Government Report – Advisory to Local Authorities (best practice, what should they be doing etc)
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Best Practice
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	UK
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Very briefly – outlines groups which Local Authorities should consider when trying to understand access and mobility needs, e.g. mobility impaired, different age groups.
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	Mainly just emphasises that land use planning and transport should have accessibility at their heart, no detail about specific measures. Some brief suggestions about what Councils should do to encourage accessibility, but vague, e.g: <i>Targeting public transport improvements on commuter routes such as putting in bus priorities, developing park and ride or providing feeder services to commuter rail.</i>
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	No
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	No
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	No
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Some best practice, but mostly guidelines to Local Authorities
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		

**KNOWLEDGE REVIEW OF SDI OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY OPTIONS:
PROFROMA FOR RAPID EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION		
Author(s)	Professor John Adams	Year of publication 2001
Title/publication	Hypermobility: too much of a good thing (PIU Transport Seminar)	
Context	<i>Type of publication e.g. journal article, other article, book, book chapter, working paper, report, conference paper, response to government consultation</i>	Transport seminar paper
	<i>Type of study e.g. literature review, survey</i>	Review of current practice
	<i>Geographic – country, region, city</i>	International
	<i>Sample size (if relevant)</i>	N/A
PART B – FOCUS		
1. Different social groups	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about the reaction of different social groups to transport policy measures (which groups are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us anything about travel problems experienced by the different social groups? If so, does it also tell us how transport policy measures might impact on them?</i>	Some review of transport problems experienced by the poor. <i>Barriers – in the form of stringent visa requirement, difficult-to obtain work permits, and obstructive immigration requirements – are being raised to contain the numbers who seek to take advantage of the mobility afforded by technology.</i>
2. Different transport policy measures	<i>a. Does the document tell us anything about different transport policy measures (which measures are covered)?</i>	No
	<i>b. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on behaviour?</i>	No
	<i>c. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on attitudes, including acceptability?</i>	Not really, more of a warning about the type of society which will materialise if we are to continue to promote car use.
	<i>d. Does the document tell us about the distributional effects of different transport policy measures?</i>	Some description about the differences which will be experienced by the poor and wealthy within a hyper mobile society, e.g. if transport policy continues to promote car and air travel.
	<i>e. Does the document tell us about the impact of different transport policy measures on CO₂ emissions of different social groups?</i>	No
PART C – ROBUSTNESS		
To what extent is the document evidence based e.g. is it based on empirical research, best practice or informed opinion; comment on any limitations acknowledged by authors; if research based, how representative is sample, are results interim?		Some mention to statistics within the UK, but predominantly based on the opinion of the author.
Method of publication review (please specify if known)		



AEA group
The Gemini Building
Harwell
Didcot
Oxfordshire
OX11 0QR

Tel: 0870 190 6374
Fax: 0870 190 6318