

1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of CURACAO is to coordinate research and monitor the results of the implementation of road user charging as a demand management tool in urban areas. The project is doing this by working with cities interested in pursuing road pricing to identify the barriers to their doing so, and providing evidence on ways of overcoming those barriers. That evidence is being provided in two forms: through a series of case studies and in an annually updated State of the Art Report, both of which will be disseminated through the project website (<http://www.CURACAOproject.eu>) and a series of workshops.

This is the second version of the State of the Art Report, and is based on evidence collated from research and practice over the period to the end of 2007. It addresses a series of themes which were included in the proposal for the project, together with others which were identified in the Users Needs Assessment Questionnaire (UNAQ). This document is organised around the resulting list of issues thus identified

1. the possible objectives of road pricing schemes (Chapter 2)
2. the ways in which road pricing schemes can be designed to meet those objectives (Chapter 3)
3. the technologies available to support such scheme designs (Chapter 4)
4. the business systems affecting the technology choice and operation of the scheme (Chapter 5)
5. techniques for predicting the effects of road pricing schemes (Chapter 6)
6. techniques for appraising/evaluating the effects of road pricing schemes (Chapter 7)
7. specific evidence of impacts on the economy (Chapter 8),
8. the environment (Chapter 9)
9. and equity (Chapter 10)
10. factors affecting the acceptability of road pricing schemes (Chapter 11)
11. the potential transferability of experience from one city to another. (Chapter 12)

The themes are covered in the order listed above in the next eleven chapters of this report. Figure 1-1 illustrates the linkages between them. While this is generally a logical order in which to consider them, it should be noted that there will be some feedback between them. For example, problems identified at the appraisal stage could justify changes in the scheme design, while factors which make the scheme less acceptable could lead to changes either in the scheme design or in the underlying objectives. These feedback issues are raised as they arise and each chapter ends with a discussion of the implications for other themes.

Each section is structured around a series of questions which cities might ask, and answers to those questions based on available evidence. End User Cities were asked to comment on an initial list of these questions in November 2006. The resulting list of questions reflects their suggestions and concerns. A few of the issues which they raised then are being considered within the separate Work Package 3, since it is anticipated that the evidence will be more practical and city-specific in nature. More generally, the empirical evidence from case studies is also principally included in Work Package 3, though summary material is included in this Report.

Each question is answered based on research and practical evidence available to the study team, and information sources are provided as appropriate. In this second version, we have also benefited from evidence from outside Europe provided by four international reviewers. Given the number of consultancy studies into road pricing, it is probable that there will be other relevant evidence of which the study team is unaware. We would very much welcome information on other evidence which could be included in the final version of the Report.

We hope that this second version of the State of the Art Report will prove helpful to cities considering the introduction of road pricing. We would be grateful for comments, and suggestions for enhancements which might be made to the final version to be published in spring of 2009. In particular:

- Are there other themes which we might usefully cover?
- Are there other questions which we should attempt to answer for the issues which we do consider?
- Is there other evidence of which you are aware which could be incorporated?
- Are there particular issues on which you would welcome evidence from outside Europe?

This updated version of the State of the Art Review also includes a glossary and a further reading list. If you have any comments or suggestions for improving these or any other parts of the report, please send any comments and suggestions to Andrew Koh at the Institute for Transport Studies at the University of Leeds, England: a.koh@its.leeds.ac.uk.

Figure 1-1 Linkages between the themes covered with chapter number for themes

