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Abstract – Utilizing the results of the local SWOT analyses conducted in actions 3.1-3.9, this summary report analyses the similarities and differences between the partners' situations in order to develop a transnational analysis of the state of the art: what works best to fulfill the BICY project's overarching goals.

Cover photo: Working meeting for BICY SWOT analysis of cycling mobility in Košice, July 7, 2010. (Photo by Mr. Tomaš Palo).
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Overview
To best fulfill the BICY project goal of understanding the factors influencing the quality and quantity of bicycling across Central Europe, partners have conducted their own process for identifying Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) affecting bicycling in their areas (Partner Areas), for comparison here (Figure 1, below).

**SWOT analysis** is a strategic planning method used to evaluate the *Strengths*, *Weaknesses*, *Opportunities*, and *Threats* involved in a project or plan. It involves specifying the objective of the project or plan and identifying the internal and external factors that are favorable and unfavorable to achieve that objective.

A SWOT analysis must first start with defining a desired end state or objective. A SWOT analysis may be incorporated into the strategic planning model.

1. **Strengths**: attributes of an institutional and/or territorial context helpful to achieving the objective(s).
2. **Weaknesses**: attributes of an institutional and/or territorial context harmful to achieving the objective(s).
3. **Opportunities**: *external* conditions helpful to achieving the objective(s).
4. **Threats**: *external* conditions which could do damage to the objective(s).

Identification of SWOTs is essential because subsequent steps in the process of planning for achievement of the selected objective may be derived from the SWOTs.

**Figure 1. SWOT analysis described.**

Internal and External Factors
The aim of any SWOT analysis is to identify the key internal and external factors that are important to achieving the objective. SWOT analysis groups key pieces of information into two main categories:

- Internal factors – The *strengths* and *weaknesses* internal to the organization or institutional process (in our case, planning, implementation and development of cycling policies).
• External factors – The *opportunities* and *threats* presented by the external environment to the organization or institutional process. The internal factors may be viewed as strengths or weaknesses depending upon their impact on the institution's objectives. What may represent strengths with respect to one objective may be weaknesses for another objective. The external factors may include macroeconomic matters, technological change, legislation, and socio-cultural changes, as well as changes in the marketplace or competitive position. The results are often presented in the form of a matrix.

**Methodology**

The analysis of SWOT submissions is qualitative, solicited from groups of stakeholders gathered in person for brainstorming. The groups are typically comprised of representatives (e.g., politicians, municipal agencies, and cycling lobby groups). The form of a dialog is a key opportunity for launching a dynamic process where stakeholder become aware of the advantages of cycling, such that problems associated with it become first recognized and then addressed.

**Typology of Place**

BICY partners represent governmental institutions of different levels (Regions, provinces and cities), adding dimensionality to comparative analysis. While the quantitative Common Indicator Report analysis (WP3.2.3) is based on the city level, where regions and provinces (Košice, Ravenna and Ferrara) have conduct their analyses in representative cities of their choice, the SWOT methodology provides an opportunity for all geographic and municipal levels to discuss actions and needs. This also has the positive side-effect that smaller provincial cities become aware of the BICY project and its analysis methodology. However, the level of participation differs from partner to partner; please consult the summary table in the Annexes for details.

The specifics of place and their mathematical relationships are discussed in great detail in the Common Indicators Report (WP3.2.3). Maps of Partner Places are elaborated in detail in the Annexes of this report.

**Study Areas**

The BICY Project study area includes sixteen (16) *Partner Areas*, spanning seven of the eight countries within the Central Europe Programme (*all but Poland*). These Partner Areas include one region and two provinces, larger areas which contain *Partner Places*. These Partner Places are comprised of thirteen (13) cities and towns, and are the primary places of study, for which indicator, survey and geospatial data have been obtained.

Although larger areas include provinces and regions, because urban cycling is the focus, most of BICY Project’s numerical indicator-based *analyses* utilise only the data from the level of cities and towns. Qualitative assessments and some numerical *analyses* may also include the levels of region and province.

A comparison of the array of sizes, by population, of both Partner Areas and Partner Places, is below (Figure 2),
including an inset showing the diversity of sizes (Region/Province, City (population > 100,000), and Towns.

Figure 2: places studied in BICY project, sorted by population size. Larger areas, and their sub-areas, are both included. Inset, a graph showing the quantity of each type of place or area.

Survey methodology
A common methodological template was generated in WP3.1.1, including directions as to “How to Carry out a SWOT” (Figure 3) and a collection of 18 BYPAD questions (Figure 4) which were intended to be adapted to the area and supplied to participants in advance, to facilitate their familiarity and ability to best contribute meaningfully to the dialogue. BYPAD refers to the “Bicycle Policy Audit” tool, “developed by an international consortium of bicycle experts as part of an EU-funded project.” [1]

Methodology Manual
The methodology for carrying out the SWOTs was specified to all partners as follows:
HOW TO CARRY OUT THE SWOT

A) Composition of the group

Composition of the local/regional SWOT analysis group for bicycle mobility in the respective region, representatives of the following groups will be present:

- Politicians – in charge of cycling policies
- Administrators – like bicycle representatives of towns and cities
- Cycle lobby groups – or, if not available – selected citizen that are cyclists
- And one moderator – a Bypad auditor that could be contracted from the budget of the respective partners (see external subcontractors – swat)

B) Execution of SWOT analysis

Steps of the procedure:

1. Find and Commission a moderator
2. Choose participants of analysis group
3. Carry out first meeting – SWOT analysis
4. Carry out second meeting – Quality plan, action plan (Who? What? When?)
5. Additional activities – Bicycle traffic concept, Bicycle plan, Intervention measures

The questioning should happen in one room that is big enough to allow the different groups to fill out their questionnaire alone at first, or to have 3 different rooms for the start and then to get the three groups together into one room.

If there are other important groups in the area available and would have an interesting input. E.g. tourism or economy, companies.
Materials: Questionnaires, pin boards, small cards, stickers, camera for photo documentation.

It is important to make sure that the mixture of the interviewees is considered well.

The stakeholder interviews could also be carried out at the same day after the SWOT analysis.

The three groups will have to fill in the strength and weaknesses at first on their own, then they will together work through it with the help of the moderator to reach more unified results. In the end the group will attribute a level of importance to the various strength and weaknesses (only the decision makers are allowed to assign the importance level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From the nine different areas of the Bypad audit; the 18 questions should be adapted slightly to the needs of the partners and examples should be included in the instructions to spark ideas.</td>
<td>Same as strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See 18 questions(categories above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible opportunities are discussed from the outcome of the strength and weakness analysis at the same day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second meeting the points with the highest level of importance and the list of options are used to define an action plan.

Figure 3. Methodology for SWOT process as supplied to all project partners.

Note that some partners did not carry out their analyses in a discussion, but by writing. Partners who have chosen the written SWOT analysis instead of conducted facilitated stakeholder meetings were: Ravenna and Ferrara, Italy (and their smaller partner cities), Erfurt, Germany; and Prague, Czech Republic.
BYPAD Questions

The collection of 18 “starter questions” were given as follows: To carry out the SWOT analysis in a structured and comprehensive way it will be helpful to use the questions/categories developed in the BYPAD project. These are:

1. How does the city government receive information about the needs of cyclists?
2. What are the possibilities for bikers to actively participate in the decision making process of transport policy?
3. What is the significance of the bicycle in politics and administration?
4. How effective is the co-operation with external organisations (integrated public transport system, state, etc.)?
5. How is bicycle traffic anchored in transport policies?
6. How is the funding of bicycle traffic policies guaranteed?
7. Who is responsible for the implementation of bicycle traffic policies?
8. Please select the most accurate description of the bicycle traffic network in city/town?
9. How is the maintenance of the bicycle traffic infrastructure organized?
10. What is done to increase the safety of cyclists?
11. What is done to optimize the combination of public transport and bicycle traffic (inter-modal transportation)?
12. How well is the public informed with regard to bicycle traffic, policy & events?
13. What is done in the areas of traffic education and bicycle training?
14. What initiatives are taken to encourage cycling of various age groups?
15. What is done to ensure equal rights in mobility cyclists and motorists?
16. To what extent does current city development policy support bicycle traffic?
17. How are data for bicycle use collected and adopted?
18. How does the municipality/region collect and use data concerning the safety of bicycle traffic?

Figure 4. BYPAD starter questions for SWOT process as supplied to all project partners.
The SWOT reports are thus unique products of the people and each place, yet within a framework which can be analysed for comparison of similarities and differences between respondents. In this manner we seek insights into common issues to help inform and develop the transnational strategies.

Analysis of SWOT tables
Respondents' reports were reviewed and their SWOT tables combined under general categories for evaluation and comparison. The SWOT reports for each place are not provided in this report, however, as they are, in general, much more extensive and complex documents which typically include local background information on the Partner Areas. These were provided by each partner as WP3 deliverables.  

Reports often incorporated additional information as to each area which, while not standardised, provide valuable information for consideration. The SWOT tables were thus the primary standardised qualitative data for analysis.

SWOT tables are comprised of numerous general statements under each of the four sections, which can be simplified under a general heading along with similar statements from other partners or even from the same SWOT report. By simplifying the variety of information received in this way we can begin to distill the data into something more manageable in order to quantitatively assess the qualitative data, such as by observing how many partners have seen it important to report the same type of issue.

When considering the reports, it is important to recognize that each respondent group may be getting at similar issues if in different ways, with varying language; and of course each area will face more issues affecting cycling than those mentioned. One additional step, were it feasible, could be to take all the SWOT issues identified by respondents here and feed every group's issues back to all the participants for the first time, such as in a survey asking whether each issue from other areas is applicable to the concerns of their area. Because this is not presently feasible the best we can do in analysing the qualitative data is to harmonise it into general categories for comparison. This affords a quantitative view of the results, which helps in understanding patterns and assessing the intensity of each issue.

Summary Categories
After reviewing all reports, an analysis was conducted to consolidate issues into groups, from which Summary Categories were created.

For example, a Summary Category was created for identified issues of “Weakness” that could be considered “Political/Cultural Barriers.” Five of the eight partners reported at least one issue of this type. One Project Partner, Graz, identified multiple issues under this banner such as “There is no mutual respect” and “Mood against cyclists,” as well as issues of governance such as “Authorisation and approval is dependent on third parties.” The qualitative nature of the SWOT allows any number of issues to be raised, which in some cases only provide more detail about a general type of problem. By joining all these under one header, it is hoped that the summary comparison between places will be more standardized (“apples to apples”).

---

1 For the Košice SWOT, a summary found in the BICY: Cities & Regions of Bicycles publication was used in this analysis.
The Summary Categories were uniquely generated for each of the four areas of inquiry (S, W, O and T), even though similar issues sometimes appear across areas.

Categories were generated by an iterative process. Issues identified in Project Partners' SWOT tables were added to a new summary table one at a time, by generating a general category to describe the issue. Each additional issue added was then assessed for inclusion under a previously identified Summary Category. If no appropriate category existed, a new category was added to the summary table, and the process continued. Periodically the table was reviewed for its meaningfulness and sensibility in summarising the issues, and changed as needed such that similar issues were grouped together as best as possible.

These issues were then available for quantitative analysis, such as summing the total number of issues (equally weighted). In this way a means emerges for identifying the relative importance of the general categories to each Project Partner, and across all Partners.

**Limitations**

One limitation of this process is that the relative number of issues provided by Project Partners may not be representative of their relative situations. It is important not to ascribe too much meaning to such indicators. One area might identify 20 Weaknesses and another only four, but in fact we cannot say from those numbers which is in a weaker or worse situation for cycling.

Moreover, of course, this form of categorisation is subjective, as is the generation of the qualitative data. Every effort was made to make the categories fairly and in light of the pragmatic realities of cycling and its environment (social, political, physical, etc.). Value judgments had to be made.

**Example summary categorisation**

For example, in the case of categorizing the issues submitted representing Prague's “Strengths,” the question arose: is the issue “most of the residents claim they would ride a bike to work/school if the conditions were better” best summarised as one of “Cultural Support,” “Existing Infrastructure,” “Growing Popularity,” or an entirely new category? Or does it count as multiple categories?

In general any one issue was strictly translated into only one Summary Category, and the meaning of the categories was strictly followed to ensure they remained useful. “Infrastructure” here was meant to refer to its standard meaning in the field: that of the hardscaped public built environment (bikeways, bike lanes, bike parking, etc.), and not to mobile personal possessions. The existence of bicycles ready for use does not necessarily imply growing popularity, but rather, latent or unrealized existing potential for popularity given the opportunity. Thus the best of the three was “cultural support.” The possibility of changing that category was then considered, or of adding a new one, but given only five issues to represent all the strengths of Prague, this broad category seemed ideal.

Another example of a difficult categorisation, under Weaknesses, “Hilly terrain” might be given a new category, “Geographic limitations,” but if there are few of these, it may make more sense to incorporate this under “Land Use barriers” which is a more general category, if arguably imprecise, but for this general treatment it may be as useful to say it is difficult to bicycle because of hills, as because of sprawling developments.
BYPAD responses

BYPAD Question Results

Based on the BYPAD Audit system, a modified set of questions were offered to partners to be “helpful” in conducting the SWOT interviews. Lest there be any confusion, it is important to recognize the differences between the BYPAD Audit and the SWOT methodology developed for the BICY project.

In Request 5.3.1, the BICY Project was asked to provide results of the 18 questions for each partner, and committed to do so. In fact, some partners’ places have completed an entire official BYPAD Audit in the past, and some attempted to follow at least parts of the BYPAD Manual methodology in pursuit of their BICY project’s SWOT results for their study areas. However, the use of the 18 questions was left fairly open, so harmonizing across all responses is difficult (and best left to the SWOT summary process).

In some cases partners had to construct “desk answers” to the 18 questions, as allowed; in some the 18 modified questions were distilled to 9 BYPAD Summary Modules based on the BYPAD process; in at least one City, 30 questions were used as directed by the BYPAD system; in others, the 18 official BYPAD questions were used (as translated to their language); there are also a set of questions for regions. To add to the variation, one partner converted the questions to a multiple choice form.

Results from each partner, and answers to the 18 questions, are provided in the Annexes.

Relating SWOT and BYPAD

Because of the relationship of the 18 questions and the SWOT methodology to the BYPAD method, which finds numeric rankings (Levels) for each question, DICAM attempted to obtain numerical rankings from all partners, for each of the 18 questions offered. If done in the manner of a BYPAD audit, in theory this would supplement the information and allow some comparison with the world of BYPAD results. In the end, there were too many inconsistencies between the partners’ responses to do so, although valuable information was obtained from partners. For example, there is no clear map between the 9 BYPAD Summary Modules and the 18 modified BYPAD questions offered to be “helpful” in the BICY methodology. There is also no known map between the 18 modified questions and the various sets of questions used in a BYPAD Audit of such places; the BYPAD Audit questions are protected.

BYPAD Methodology is partially cloaked by design to protect misapplication (and the variation in results here validates that concern). The questions themselves are confidential and may only be administered by trained BYPAD auditors. Here BICY was given a modified version of the shortest list of questions (the larger the city, the more questions; regions also have a larger number).

The lack of such standardized, trained administration in BICY helps explain why there were inconsistent approaches the 18 BYPAD questions provided. The variation is expected for such an effort, but has the unfortunate effect of further hindering cross-partner tabulation, comparison and evaluation.

In any case, a full BYPAD process has not been foreseen in the BICY project. This SWOT process approximates the intention of the BYPAD process, and borrows some mechanisms from that process. This was in fact chosen because it was determined there were not the resources to conduct a true BYPAD Audit for each Partner Area. The specification to tailor the 18 questions in pursuit of the SWOT process was very much influenced by the
need to approximate a BYPAD style internal audit involving key stakeholders and decision makers.

The SWOT does succeed in distilling and organizing the varied and sometimes extensive – and multiple – responses to each question. From 18 categories, responses of any length with many possible sources, are tabulated to just four Summary Categories with a shortlist of bullet points.

The SWOT, like the BYPAD process, is very much qualitative, although certain ratings can emerge which do have a numerical value and can be considered, cautiously, in a quantitative analytical light.

In this SWOT analysis, there has already been a quantitative method developed for summarizing the qualitative responses. A numerical ranking was given, different from the BYPAD Levels (as described below), found by a unique process of organizing SWOT summary statements by category, and then looking for patterns and raw sum interest across all partners. Thus it finds for the quantity of issue types, not the quantity of issues, as provided by each SWOT process. These can then be compared, certainly with reservations and qualifications.

In contrast, the BYPAD Audit is in fact sensitive, even confidential, due to the internal nature of the inquiry. The BYPAD system is predicated on the idea that decision makers are most likely to be honest in their assessment if the discussion is for internal use only. However, the BYPAD process has resulted in some public rankings (a single average of all questions’ levels serves as a summary of discussion), illustrated in Figure 5, below:
Although not intended for quantitative analysis, the temptation to compare results numerically, and experiment with them in the Common Indicators process (WP3.2.3) was great, given the potential to compare similar rankings in BICY with many cities where a BYPAD Audit has been completed, as in the table above.

These public rankings result from numerical assignment to thematic areas or issues.

In the BYPAD Manual, the rankings are defined:
- Level 0: no cycling
- Level 1: Ad-hoc approach
- Level 2: Isolated approach
- Level 3: System oriented approach
- Level 4: Integrated approach

However, in other BYPAD materials and in discussion with BYPAD representatives, there are now only four levels, 1-4, and all partners used 1-4 except where asked to provide desk Levels.

**SWOT Analysis**

In the following sub-sections, each of the SWOT inquiries (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) are illustrated graphically in an effort to assist visualization, understanding and comparison for next steps and strategising. The full SWOT reports for each place have been deliverables in WP 3.1-3.9.

First the results are illustrated in matrix form, with color representing at least one issue for that Project Partner for that type of general issue. There can be more than one issue summarised here. In some cases, brief notes adapted from the Project Partner’s SWOT report are included in a cell of the graphical representation, either to illustrate that more than one issue was summarized, or to note the special nature of the issue.

Secondly, the number of general issues raised is tallied and used to generate a bar chart, showing the relative number of issue types raised by each Project Partner. This can help understand which Project Partners see themselves facing more or fewer of each type of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. It does not necessarily allow us to compare between Project Partners without further understanding their relative situations, but is a helpful first step.

Where multiple issues were raised in the same sector, the total did not increase, although that would be a useful secondary quantification. However, where the lists grew long, the additional detail was not seen as so expansive as to demand quantification; greater detail speaks more to the awareness of the parties, not of the breadth of the issue. Instead, where deemed useful or noteworthy, notes were put in each summary cell to mention various issues. Such notes were also inserted in cases where the SWOT issues seemed unclear. Notes were also inserted where the issue was deemed to need further explanation to be understood beyond label of the Summary Category. This process was admittedly subjective, but was performed with the benefit of expertise and extensive experience with international issues in bicycle transport.
**Strengths**

The following types of Internal Strengths were identified by the partner areas (Figure 6). These Summary Categories were generated after evaluating all issues raised.

![Bar Chart](image)

**Figure 6. SWOT Strengths: Summary Categories by Project Partner.**

These are also illustrated in another way as a bar chart, below, to show sorted overall magnitude by category (Figure 7):
Figure 7. SWOT Strengths: Summary Categories (number of Partners with at least one such type of issue).
The relative number of types of issues raised by each partner area is pictured in Figure 8:

![Figure 8. SWOT Strengths: number of Summary Categories identified for each Partner Area.](image)

**STRENGTHS MOST ASSOCIATED WITH SUCCESS: (in order of overall importance as reported)**

1. Political support
2. Cultural support
3. Assigned staff
4. Existing infrastructure
5. Supportive land use (proximity/density)
6. TDM Support/Traffic Calming
7. Notoriety/Well-Known Reputation

**Weaknesses**

The following types of Internal Weaknesses were identified by the partner areas (Figure 9). These Summary Categories were generated after evaluating all issues raised.
Figure 9. SWOT Weaknesses: Summary Categories by Project Partner.

These Internal Weaknesses are also illustrated in another way as a bar chart, below, to show sorted overall magnitude by category (Figure 10):
Figure 10. SWOT Weaknesses: Summary Categories (counting Partners with at least one issue).
The relative number of types of issues raised by each partner area is pictured in Figure 11:

![Figure 11. SWOT Weaknesses: number of Summary Categories identified for each Partner Area.](image)

**INTERNAL WEAKNESSES, TOP CONCERNS:**  *(in order of overall importance as reported)*

1. Infrastructure/network
2. Parking lacking
3. Funding lacking
4. Automobile dominance
5. Land use barriers
Opportunities
The following types of External Opportunities were identified by the partner areas (Figure 12). These Summary Categories were generated after evaluating all issues raised (Figure 13).

---

**Figure 12. SWOT Opportunities: Summary Categories by Project Partner.**
Figure 13. SWOT Opportunities: Summary Categories (counting Partners with at least one issue).

The relative number of types of External Opportunity issues raised by each partner area is pictured in the following graph (Figure 14):
OPPORTUNITIES MOST SOUGHT:  \textit{(in order of overall importance as reported)}

1. Support healthy lifestyle
2. Higher-level policy support
3. Regional Opportunities
4. Cultural acceptance
5. Boosting Tourism
6. Economic Benefits

\textbf{Threats}

The following types of External Threats were identified by the partner areas (Figure 15, below). These Summary Categories were generated after evaluating all issues raised (Figure 16).
Figure 15. SWOT Threats: Summary Categories by Project Partner.

Figure 16. SWOT Threats: Summary Categories (counting Partners with at least one issue).
The relative number of types of issues raised by each partner area is pictured in the following graph (Figure 17):

![Figure 17. SWOT Threats: number of Summary Categories identified for each Partner Area.](image)

**THREATS MOST FEARED: (in order of overall importance as reported)**

1. Lack of funding
2. Political/cultural barriers
3. Automobile dominance
4. Infrastructure bad

**Comparative analysis**

A summary chart and table (Figures 18 and 19, below) illustrate the relative Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats faced by the various municipalities using their self-reported SWOT reports.
### Figure 18. Summary table of total SWOT Summary Categories for each Partner Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erfurth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Košice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koper</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velenje</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budaörs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These varying self-reported characteristics and categories can now be further analysed in light of other analyses (e.g., indicators and survey) in the Transnational Strategy Report.

### Figure 19. Graph comparing total SWOT Summary Categories between municipalities
Conclusions

The SWOT process has revealed clear patterns of importance across the diverse array of BICY partner places:

- The top strengths are **existing support** (cultural, political, assigned staff, and existing infrastructure/land use); TDM support and already having a cycling identity. Places hoping to build their strengths can look to those as goals and metrics of attainment.

- The top weaknesses are lack of a bicycling environment (routes, facilities, harshness of road traffic, and land use) and lack of **funding** to build one.

- Top opportunities: **health and economic benefits**, including tourism; and featuring opportunities for **higher level policy support**.

- Top threats: **lack of funding, sociopolitical barriers and hostile environments**.

Independent of the insights from the analysis, an important accomplishment of the SWOT process has surely been that of bringing together the diverse stakeholders and decision makers, and the time they have spent collectively considering the current conditions for cycling, and future steps needed to increase cycling – the ultimate goal of the BICY project. Unfortunately, quite a few partners neglected hosting facilitated meetings, missing this key opportunity.

Each of the collected SWOT reports contained additional information particular to each place, which is worthy of further consideration and which is not summarized herein.

Further conclusions are best made in conjunction with the outcomes of other BICY work products, in the final WP3 Report: the Final Revision of the Transnational Strategy (WP3.4.3).
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Annexes
Due to their size and complexity, the Annexes are presented separately. See separate Annexes document, SWOT Transnational Analysis: ANNEXES.