Public consultation on the evaluation of the Urban Mobility Package

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

Mobility within cities in the EU is often difficult, inefficient, and associated with considerable negative externalities - including because transport is still heavily reliant on the use of conventionally-fuelled private cars. Many European towns and cities share common urban mobility challenges. In particular, they suffer from chronic traffic congestion – which is estimated to cost 270 billion euros annually – as well as poor air quality (with over 500 000 premature deaths/year in the EU due to poor air quality) and road accidents, with all the negative effects for citizens, environment and economy. Rising transport CO_2 emissions are also an increasing problem, with urban transport representing ¼ of them.

Tackling these challenges is primarily a responsibility of the relevant local authorities. However, targeted support from the EU and national level can be an important facilitator for more decisive and more efficient local action.

For decades, the European Commission has been supporting sustainable urban mobility through its policies and funding programmes. In 2013, the European Commission adopted the EU Urban Mobility Package (UMP2013). Its aim was to catalyse joint action towards more sustainable urban mobility and to reinforce the support provided to European cities through coordinated measures at EU level and in the Member States.

The Urban Mobility Package has been implemented by the Commission together with cities, Member States and stakeholders since 2014.

In the last few years, we have witnessed important developments with direct and indirect impact on urban mobility, such as:

- Continuous increase in economic and political importance of cities and urbanised areas and their relations with rural and peri-urban areas;
- Disruptive changes in transport and mobility of both technological (digitalisation, automation, "Mobility as a Service", new propulsion systems etc.) (Related to this: new entrants (often from outside the traditional transport sector) that offer mobility services and new types of vehicles) and societal nature (increasing popularity of shared mobility solutions, new collaborative business models, greater orientation towards quality of life, rising awareness of negative consequences of private car ownership, rise of e-commerce, etc.);

- Rising challenges on mobility (congestion), health (air and noise pollution, accidents) and climate (emissions) in urban areas, with important negative economical and societal impacts, and political consequences;
- New or revised EU-level objectives and related initiatives concerning climate change, decarbonisation, energy, alternative fuels, digitalisation and automation, road safety etc. with direct and important influence on cities and their transport systems;
- Compelling scientific evidence on climate change, as well as effects of pollution and sedentary life style on humans, in connections with the dominant transport model; New sectoral EU-level regulation increasingly affecting the way urban mobility is/will be shaped in the future, notably in the areas of alternative fuels of transport and clean vehicles (Such as Clean Vehicle Directive and Alternative Fuels Infrastructure Directive, with extensive efforts needed from actors in urban areas) energy, data, natural resources (waste) and climate change;
- New approaches to governance at EU level, in particular the EU Urban Agenda, with Partnership on Urban Mobility (PUM) as one of its 12 partnerships;
- Need for improved road safety (in view of stagnating figures) and security.

Against this background, the Commission has decided to undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the 2013 Urban Mobility Package (The central element of the Urban Mobility Package is the Communication 'Together towards competitive and resource efficient urban mobility'). More information can be found here: https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/initiatives/ares-2018-5942636_en.

This public consultation is designed to support the evaluation by gathering the views of citizens and stakeholders. It will help the Commission to determine whether the EU urban mobility framework is fit for post-2020 developments and challenges.

About you

*Language of my contribution
- ◎ Bulgarian
- ◎ Croatian
- ◎ Czech
- ◎ Danish
- ◎ Dutch
- ◉ English
- ◎ Estonian
- ◎ Finnish
- ◎ French
- ◎ Gaelic
- ◎ German
- ◎ Greek
- ◎ Hungarian
- ◎ Italian
- ◎ Latvian
- ◎ Lithuanian
- ◎ Maltese
- ◎ Polish

- ⊙ Portuguese
- ⊙ Romanian
- ⊙ Slovak
- ⊙ Slovenian
- ⊙ Spanish
- ⊙ Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as
- ⊙ Academic/research institution
- ⊙ Business association
- ⊙ Company/business organisation
- ⦿ Consumer organisation
- ⊙ EU citizen
- ⊙ Environmental organisation
- ⊙ Non-EU citizen
- ⊙ Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- ⊙ Public authority
- ⊙ Trade union
- ⊙ Other

* First name

> Delphine

* Surname

> GRANDSART

* Email (this won't be published)

> delphine.grandsart@epf.eu

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

> European Passengers' Federation

* Organisation size
- ⦿ Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- ⊙ Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ⊙ Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ⊙ Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

532739823521-44

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

○ Afghanistan	○ Djibouti	○ Libya	○ Saint Martin
○ Åland Islands	○ Dominica	○ Liechtenstein	○ Saint Pierre and Miquelon
○ Albania	○ Dominican Republic	○ Lithuania	○ Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
○ Algeria	○ Ecuador	○ Luxembourg	○ Samoa
○ American Samoa	○ Egypt	○ Macau	○ San Marino
○ Andorra	○ El Salvador	○ Madagascar	○ São Tomé and Príncipe
○ Angola	○ Equatorial Guinea	○ Malawi	○ Saudi Arabia
○ Anguilla	○ Eritrea	○ Malaysia	○ Senegal
○ Antarctica	○ Estonia	○ Maldives	○ Serbia
○ Antigua and Barbuda	○ Eswatini	○ Mali	○ Seychelles
○ Argentina	○ Ethiopia	○ Malta	○ Sierra Leone
○ Armenia	○ Falkland Islands	○ Marshall Islands	○ Singapore
○ Aruba	○ Faroe Islands	○ Martinique	○ Sint Maarten
○ Australia	○ Fiji	○ Mauritania	○ Slovakia
○ Austria	○ Finland	○ Mauritius	○ Slovenia
○ Azerbaijan	○ France	○ Mayotte	○ Solomon Islands
○ Bahamas	○ French Guiana	○ Mexico	○ Somalia
○ Bahrain	○ French Polynesia	○ Micronesia	○ South Africa
○ Bangladesh	○ French Southern and Antarctic Lands	○ Moldova	○ South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
○ Barbados	○ Gabon	○ Monaco	○ South Korea
○ Belarus	○ Georgia	○ Mongolia	○ South Sudan
⦿ Belgium	○ Germany	○ Montenegro	○ Spain
○ Belize	○ Ghana	○ Montserrat	○ Sri Lanka
○ Benin	○ Gibraltar	○ Morocco	○ Sudan
○ Bermuda	○ Greece	○ Mozambique	○ Suriname
○ Bhutan	○ Greenland	○ Myanmar /Burma	○ Svalbard and Jan Mayen
○ Bolivia	○ Grenada	○ Namibia	○ Sweden
○ Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	○ Guadeloupe	○ Nauru	○ Switzerland

- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao

- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos

- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda

- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara

⊙ Cyprus	⊙ Latvia	⊙ Saint Barthélemy	⊙ Yemen
⊙ Czechia	⊙ Lebanon	⊙ Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha	⊙ Zambia
⊙ Democratic Republic of the Congo	⊙ Lesotho	⊙ Saint Kitts and Nevis	⊙ Zimbabwe
⊙ Denmark	⊙ Liberia	⊙ Saint Lucia	

* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

⊙ **Anonymous**
Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

⦿ **Public**
Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

☑ I agree with the personal data protection provisions

EU urban mobility policy

Over the years, the EU urban mobility policy has emerged, aiming at supporting cities and towns in making local transport more effective and sustainable, with a view of increasing the quality of life for citizens. This non-regulatory approach stresses the need to work together at EU, national and local levels, with the European Commission facilitating sharing of experiences and promoting best practices and providing targeted financial support and investment funds (including for research and innovation). At local level, the concept of Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning (SUMP) was developed and promoted. The development of a SUMP is seen as an important tool for implementing on the ground a long-term, multi-sectoral, comprehensive approach (supported by local residents) to help tackling transport issues.

The EU approach to urban mobility has inspired many cities within and beyond Europe, with over 1000 SUMPs in place now.

At the same time, we witness continuing – and in some cases even deteriorating – mobility, health and climate challenges in European cities.

The persisting problems and recent developments affecting urban mobility call for examination of the EU policy basis and for evaluation of whether the current non-regulatory approach delivered as intended, or whether there are gaps or needs that the framework in place does not already address.

* 1. We have identified traffic congestion, poor air quality and road accidents as the most important transport-related problems that cities in the EU face.
Please let us know what are your views on key challenges related to urban mobility:

The path dependency in planning, policy and decision-making processes within urban mobility is still making the choice for owning and driving your own car the most convenient way for a great share of the citizens in the European urban areas today. The main challenge would therefore NOT be the conversion of the car fleet to become autonomous and electrified in the long term, because the transport system is already well designed for cars. The real challenge would rather be the achievement of a modal shift to a greater share of transport modes that are more energy and space efficient than cars, even if they are 100% electric and self-driving. Public transport, cycling and walking would still be a far better mode of transport in dense urban areas in comparison to cars, in order to create livable cities that are sustainable in an economic, social and environmental context. During several decades, infrastructure for public transport, biking and walking has been neglected from investments. In order to shift the conditions for people to choose sustainable transport modes, major societal efforts will be required. The principles for financing and planning transport infrastructure must therefore be challenged and revised.

*2. In your view, how important is it to have an urban mobility policy at EU level?
- ◉ Very important
- ○ Important
- ○ Somewhat important
- ○ Not important
- ○ No opinion

3.1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements that refer to problems you encountered over the last 5 years (2014-2019) in the city or town you live /work/study in?

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know
* When moving around, I often encounter mobility problems (such as no/bad connected public transport, congested roads, no adequate cycling infrastructure) to access activities, goods or services	◉	○	○	○	○	○
* Air quality seems to have worsened	◉	○	○	○	○	○
* Road congestion has increased	◉	○	○	○	○	○
* Traffic-related noise has increased	◉	○	○	○	○	○
* I feel less safe when in traffic thank I was 5 years ago	◉	○	○	○	○	○

3.2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements that refer to changes that occurred over the last 5 years (2014-2019) in the city or town you live/work/study in?

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know
* A large number of innovative transport and mobility services such as shared e-cars/e-bikes /e-scooters schemes, autonomous and /or on-demand shuttles are available	○	●	○	○	○	○
* There is a better institutional cooperation in relation to urban mobility (between different levels of government, with private actors, with authorities of neighbouring areas)	○	○	○	●	○	○
* The central government is supporting – legally, financially, organisationally – urban mobility planning	○	○	○	○	●	○
* Favourable legal conditions for safer and more sustainable transport system, have been created	○	○	○	○	●	○
* Sufficient financial means have been allocated for safer and more environmentally friendly transport system	○	○	○	●	○	○

4. Effective urban mobility policy should contribute to many benefits such as less congestion, better road safety, better air quality, less transport-related climate emissions and more business opportunities for innovative transport solutions. In your view, to what extent have the benefits of the urban mobility policy been attained over the last 5 years (2014-2019) :

	To a large extent	Moderately	To a small extent	Not at all	Don't know
* Transport emissions have decreased	○	○	○	●	○

* Congestion has decreased	○	○	○	●	○
A shift towards more sustainable transport modes has been realised	○	○	○	●	○
* Business opportunities for developing innovative transport and mobility services, have been created	○	○	●	○	○
* Quality of life thanks to better transport in cities has improved	○	○	●	○	○
* Mobility along long-distance transport network (TEN-T) has improved	○	○	○	●	○

* 5. To realise the above benefits financial, human and organisational resources are needed. To what extent are the costs of the urban mobility policy as a whole justified given the benefits that could be achieved?

- ● Fully justified
- ○ Largely justified
- ○ Somewhat justified
- ○ Not justified at all
- ○ Don't know

6. There is a number of measures dealt with at local/national level, for example: lower prices for public transport/free public transport/more public transport connections/zero-emission public transport/improved cycling conditions/improved walking conditions/incentives for zero-emission city logistic solutions/access restrictions for certain types of vehicles (e.g. trucks, diesel cars etc.)/incentives for carpooling or car sharing/lower speed limits/access restrictions at certain times /charges for road use (e.g. city tolls)/reducing the number of parking places/traffic management prioritising public transport and active modes/connected vehicles/air mobility solutions for transporting people and freight.

Do you think that leaving to local/national level the choice of suitable measures is more effectively addressing the problems at local level? Or does it lead to divergent policies and further fragment the respective markets?

> The local level has the best local knowledge; however, the financial situation is often not that solid to cover costs related to make a modal shift. Infrastructure investments often have to compete with other social expenses at local level. Enabling permanent EU funding for local investigations and investments in planning for sustainable transport would be crucial to empower a modal shift. In addition, a central register, tentatively managed by an EU institution, could collect and spread knowledge about best practice within existing transport systems for urban infrastructure investments, city conversions, service improvements within public transport to make them more efficient rather than only focusing every research resource on unproved technologies and solutions.

7. Given the recent developments and changes (see description in the introduction above) affecting urban mobility, to what extent are the various measures below still relevant?

	Fully relevant	Substantially relevant	Partially relevant	Almost irrelevant	Not relevant
* EU support to exchange of good practices and information (European Mobility Week, Urban mobility observatory ELTIS, data and statistics)	●	○	○	○	○
* EU support to research and innovation in urban mobility (CIVITAS, Smart Cities and Communities)	●	○	○	○	○
* EU financial support to sustainable urban mobility (EU structural, investment and Connecting Europe (CEF) funds)	●	○	○	○	○
* Sustainable urban mobility plans (SUMP)	●	○	○	○	○
* Coordinating public and private-sector intervention in the area of Urban logistics	●	○	○	○	○
* Coordinating public and private-sector intervention in the area of Urban access vehicle regulations	●	○	○	○	○
* Coordinating public and private-sector intervention in the area of Deployment of intelligent transport system (ITS) solutions	●	○	○	○	○
* Coordinating public and private-sector intervention in the area of Urban road safety	●	○	○	○	○

Please explain your answers on the questions above and provide comments, if any.

Sustainable urban mobility plans (SUMP)

The concept of SUMP is at the center of the EU urban mobility policy. It aims at a balanced development and a better integration of the different urban mobility modes, to improve quality of life in cities. The concept of SUMP encourages citizen and stakeholder engagement, as well as changes in mobility behaviour.

* 8. How familiar are you with the concept of Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning?
- ◉ I am very familiar with the concept of SUMPs
- ◯ I have heard of it before, but I am not too familiar with it
- ◯ I have not heard of it before

* 9. Are you aware of a SUMP being prepared or implemented in your town or city?
- ◉ Yes
- ◯ No

* 10. Do you agree that the SUMP is an effective mechanism to plan and deliver sustainable urban mobility at a city level?
- ◯ Yes, fully agree
- ◉ To a large extent
- ◯ To a minor extent
- ◯ Neither agree nor disagree
- ◯ I don't agree
- ◯ I don't agree at all
- ◯ Don't know

11.What are your views on the following statements?

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know
* SUMPs are sufficiently linked to EU funding	◉	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
* SUMPs are adequately linked to the size of the cities	◯	◯	◯	◯	◉	◯
* The fact that SUMPs are not mandatory allows sufficient flexibility to authorities	◯	◉	◯	◯	◯	◯
* Cities receive sufficient support for the development and implementation of SUMPs	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◉

12. How important do you think is the EU involvement in the following aspects of sustainable urban mobility plans?

	Very Important	Moderately important	Not Important	Don't know
* Encourage uptake of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans	◯	◉	◯	◯
*				

	Very Important	Moderately important	Not Important	Don't know
Support national, regional and local authorities to develop and implement SUMPs, including through funding instruments	◉	○	○	○
* Coordinate EU cooperation on developing the SUMP concept and tools	◉	○	○	○

Please explain your answers on the question above and provide comments, if any.

Coordinating public and private intervention

Achieving systemic improvements in the urban transport sector requires joint efforts of public actors across all levels of governance, as well as private-sector involvement. We identified the following areas where this could be needed: urban logistics; urban access regulations and road user charging; coordinated deployment of urban intelligent transport systems; urban road safety.

13. How important do you consider the EU involvement in the following aspects of coordinating public and private-sector interventions:

	Very Important	Moderately important	Not Important	Don't know
* Foster an exchange between Member States and experts on urban access regulations across the EU and provide non-binding guidance	◉	○	○	○
* Improve the dissemination and uptake of urban logistics best practice and provide non-binding guidance	◉	○	○	○
* Disseminate good practice examples for road safety planning and other measures to reduce accidents in urban areas	◉	○	○	○
* Facilitate the deployment of intelligent transport systems (ITS) in urban areas	◉	○	○	○

Please explain your answers on the question above and provide comments, if any.

The private sector provides lots of services for organizing life in cities all over the world. The public sector preserves some kind of public services to be operated by public bodies or under the formula of concessions. This is particularly relevant in the field of transportation. So, cooperation is therefore absolutely necessary. Another topic is the contracts based on PPP schemes. In our view PPP schemes must only be created when there is a lack of knowledge of public authorities in a given project or when there is a lack of financial capacity.

Reinforcing EU support

The Commission proposed in 2013 to reinforce EU support in the area of urban mobility by:

- encouraging the sharing of experiences and show-casing best practices;
- providing targeted financial support through the European structural and investment funds;
- providing financial support for research and innovation.

* 14. To what extent is the support from EU in achieving successful local action in urban mobility still relevant?
- ⦿ Completely relevant
- ○ Relevant
- ○ Somehow relevant
- ○ Relevant to a limited extent
- ○ Not at all relevant
- ○ Don't know

15. How important do you think is the EU involvement in the following aspects of reinforcing EU support?

	Very Important	Moderately important	Not Important	Don't know
* Encourage Member States to take more decisive and better coordinated action	⦿	○	○	○
* Facilitate the exchanges of experiences and best practices	⦿	○	○	○
* Focus research and innovation on delivering solutions for urban mobility challenges	⦿	○	○	○
* Create business opportunities for developing innovative transport and mobility services	⦿	○	○	○
* Provide targeted financial support	⦿	○	○	○
* Support urban mobility policies in international cooperation activities	⦿	○	○	○

16. In your opinion, what should be the preferred approach of the urban mobility policy at EU level? What are your views on the following statements?

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know
* EU should not interfere with urban mobility at all; it is a local matter	○	○	○	⦿	○	○

Statement	1	2	3	4	5	6
* EU and MSs should reinforce their support to the local authorities (cities and towns) and catalyse a "joint effort" for better and more sustainable urban mobility	●	○	○	○	○	○
EU should provide guidance to local, regional and national authorities on issues of particular relevance when it comes to urban mobility	●	○	○	○	○	○
* EU should support coordination of joint actions by local, regional and national authorities as well as private actors	●	○	○	○	○	○
* EU should focus research and innovation on delivering solutions for urban mobility challenges	●	○	○	○	○	○
* EU should support the share of experiences, promote best-practices and foster cooperation	●	○	○	○	○	○
* EU should propose binding targets for key aspects of urban mobility (such as minimum share of public transport, active mobility and zero-emission vehicles)	○	●	○	○	○	○
* EU should Regulate key aspects of urban mobility (such as: a mandatory SUMP; minimum share of public transport, active mobility and zero-emission vehicles; harmonised rules for introducing restrictions for cars) in order to meet EU-level objectives on climate, emissions and energy	○	●	○	○	○	○

Please explain your answers on the questions above and provide comments, if any.

Further information

17. Please explain your answers on the questions above and provide comments, if any.

3000 character(s) maximum

> We are conscious of the need to take the Subsidiarity principle into account but at the same time it would be a waste of tax revenues if the EU wouldn't facilitate good initiatives in order to make urban mobility more sustainable in an economic, social and environmental context.

18. Please feel free to upload a concise document, such as additional evidence supporting your responses or a position paper. Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire which is the essential input to this public consultation. The document serves as additional background reading to better understand your position.

The maximum file size is 1 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Contact

MOVE-UMP-REVISION@ec.europa.eu