Date: 01/06/2015 22:49:48

# Stakeholder consultation on the mid-term review of the 2011 White Paper on transport

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

Please provide information to help us build your profile as a respondent. In accordance with Regulation 45/2001, all personal data collected through this survey will be kept securely and will ultimately be destroyed.

\*Please note that the questionnaire will only use your full contribution if your name, organisation (if you answer on behalf of an organisation or institution) and contact details are provided. If you choose to not provide your name, organisation and contact details, you have the option of submitting a general comment only.

If you do choose to provide us with your name, organisation and contact details, you can still opt for your answers to remain anonymous when results are published.

- Yes, I will provide my name and contact details
- No, I prefer to provide a general comment only

### A. Respondent details

- \*1. Are you answering as an individual or on behalf of an organisation/institution?
  - I am answering as an individual
  - I am answering on behalf of an organisation

Individual citizen	
A November 1 and 1	
<ul> <li>National public authority</li> </ul>	
Central public authority	
Local public authority	
Private company	
Consultancy	
<ul> <li>International organisation</li> </ul>	
Workers organisation/association/ trade union	
Industry association	
Other interest group organisation/ association	
Research organisation/university	
Other (please specify)	
2.1. Please specify "Other"	
A federation of national and regional passenger organisations	
established as an international non-profit organisation under Belgian	
law to promote the interests of public transport users at European	
level.	
4. Please indicate whether the organisation/company you represent deals primarily with transposissues:	rt
<ul><li>Yes</li><li>No</li></ul>	
<ul><li>No</li><li>5. Main transport area(s) represented:</li><li>road transport</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>No</li> <li>5. Main transport area(s) represented:</li> <li>road transport</li> <li>rail transport</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>No</li> <li>5. Main transport area(s) represented:</li> <li>road transport</li> <li>rail transport</li> <li>maritime transport</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>No</li> <li>5. Main transport area(s) represented:</li> <li>road transport</li> <li>rail transport</li> <li>maritime transport</li> <li>inland waterways transport</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>No</li> <li>5. Main transport area(s) represented:</li> <li>road transport</li> <li>rail transport</li> <li>maritime transport</li> <li>inland waterways transport</li> <li>air transport</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>No</li> <li>5. Main transport area(s) represented: <ul> <li>road transport</li> <li>rail transport</li> <li>maritime transport</li> <li>inland waterways transport</li> <li>air transport</li> <li>urban transport</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>No</li> <li>5. Main transport area(s) represented: <ul> <li>road transport</li> <li>rail transport</li> <li>maritime transport</li> <li>inland waterways transport</li> <li>air transport</li> <li>urban transport</li> <li>transport logistics services</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
5. Main transport area(s) represented:  road transport rail transport maritime transport inland waterways transport air transport urban transport transport logistics services manufacturing of transport equipment	
<ul> <li>No</li> <li>5. Main transport area(s) represented: <ul> <li>road transport</li> <li>rail transport</li> <li>maritime transport</li> <li>inland waterways transport</li> <li>air transport</li> <li>urban transport</li> <li>transport logistics services</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

# \*5.1. Please specify "Other"

Users and potential users of public passenger transport by land, sea or air

*6. Transp	port segment represented:
between	1 and 2 choices
pas	senger transport
freiç	ght transport
*7 Places	e provide your country of residence/establishment:
	ring as an individual, please provide your place of residence.
	ring as an mandata, please provide your place of residence. ring on behalf of an organisation/institution, please provide the place of establishment o
	nisation/institution.
Belgiur	m <b>✓</b>
8. Can yo	ou please identify which organisation or association you represent?
Europ	pean Passengers' Federation
	indicate if your organisation is registered in the Transparency Register of the Europea
Commiss	
Yes	
No	
<b>*</b> 0.4 DI	
9.1. Pleas (numbers	se enter your registration number in the Transparency Register
528296	60910737
10. First r	name
Chris	stopher
11. Last r	name
Irwir	n
12. Addre	988
Kortr	rijksesteenweg 304
13. City	
Gent	

*14	4. Email address
	christopher.irwin@epf.eu

- \*16. May the Commission contact you, in case further details on the submitted information in this questionnaire are required?
  - Yes
  - No
- \*15. Contributions received from this survey may be published on the European Commission's website, with the identity of the contributor. Do you agree to your contribution being published under your name?
  - My contribution may be published under the name indicated
  - My contribution may be published but should be kept anonymous
  - I do not wish any of my contributions to be published

### B. Analysis of the situation

 The aim of this section is to obtain stakeholders' views on the most important challenges affecting the transport sector in the EU.
 How do you rate the importance of the challenges for the transport sector in the EU in the upcoming years?

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Fairly important	Very important	No opinion
Oil dependency	0	0	0	•	0
Oil and energy prices	0	0	0	•	0
Air and water pollution	0	0	0	•	0
GHG emissions	0	0	0	•	0
Congestion	0	0	0	•	0
Market barriers	0	0	•	0	0
Administrative and regulatory burden	0	0	•	0	0
Infrastructure development	0	0	0	•	0
Financing of infrastructure	0	0	0	•	0
Safety	0	0	0	•	0
Security	0	0	0	•	0
Passenger rights	0	0	0	•	0

Working conditions	0	0	•	0	0
Social responsibility	0	0	•	0	0
Internalisation of external costs	0	©	•	0	0
Affordability of transport services	0	©	0	•	0
Accessibility to transport services (availability and proximity)	0	•	0	•	0
Competition from third countries	0	•	0	0	0
Increasing competitiveness	0	0	•	0	0
Urban mobility	0	0	0	•	0
Management and control of increasing traffic	0	0	0	•	0
Cross-border transport services	0	0	•	0	0
Innovation	0	0	•	0	0
Technological change	0	0	•	0	0
Multimodal transport	0	0	0	•	0

2. Please elaborate on your answers to the above statements and indicate any other challenges that should be taken into account.

We have given priority to those challenges that reflect desired outcomes for end-users and society generally rather than the particular measures designed to deliver them. We would add to these challenges:

- Transport's role in ensuring improved spatial planning and optimised land use;
- Growing concerns about the wider health aspects of transport,
   noting recent estimates from both OECD and the EEA that estimate the
   annual avoidable death toll in the hundreds of thousands

## C. Assessment of the approach taken

The White Paper presents a long-term vision for transport with specific targets that are to be reached through various initiatives. Although, the impacts of the White Paper initiatives have in most of the cases not been visible so far, we would like to know your general impression on the approach taken. The objective of this section is also to verify if the strategy is well-balanced and properly addresses the challenges for transport sector and if it brings value added to transport policies in the EU.

#### 1. What is your assessment of the following aspects of the White Paper?

	Very low	Low	High	Very high	No opinion
Progress achieved so far	0	•	0	0	0
Relevance of the priorities set	0	0	0	•	0
Level of ambition	0	0	0	•	0
Clarity of the strategy	0	0	0	•	0
Coherence of the strategy	0	0	•	0	0
Cooperation with MS	0	•	0	0	0
Involvement of stakeholders	•	0	0	0	0
Communication of the strategy	•	0	0	0	0
Costs of implementation	0	0	0	•	0

#### 2. Please elaborate on your answers to the above statements.

We admire and support the strategy but have serious concerns about the extent to which adequate provision was made for its implementation — either in the way in which it needed to be communicated to a wider audience or in anticipating and rebutting the institutional hostility of some stakeholders (especially incumbent commercial interests) and member states whose ultimate acceptance of it could prove crucial to its realisation. We are also critical of its failure to address adequately the enormity of the costs of implementation.

# 3. Do you think that the most urgent challenges are adequately addressed in the White Paper? Is the list of priorities in the White Paper well-balanced? Please explain.

We do not consider that the White Paper addressed adequately the need for the culture of transport provision to become more demand focussed. The admirable targets for shifting passenger and freight to more sustainable modes imply a multi-fold increase in rail's share. That can't be achieved by diktat. To meet this target rail must make itself the mode of choice. This can only be achieved if the needs of customers are understood and if suppliers and governments strive to maximise user satisfaction. This will help sustain the political will that is essential to securing the investment necessary to ensure the sufficiency of the system.

4. Do you see any contradictions/incoherencies in the objectives or in the implementation of the White Paper? Please specify.

The White Paper was weak in addressing the impact of congestion. According to the Joint Research Centre, the estimated cost of road congestion is currently around 110 bln €, equivalent to 1% of GDP. The White Paper expected that by 2050 congestion costs would have increased by 50% but it failed to present any specific initiatives for dealing with this burden. Greater integration of transport investment with spatial planning is vital to urban mobility, accessibility and the optimisation of scarce resources. Public (collective) transport provision is key to this: e-cars won't reduce congestion, however much they may or (when viewed in whole-life terms) may not reduce emissions.

5. Are the impacts resulting from the current implementation of the White Paper fairly distributed? Are there any regions, stakeholders, modes of transport that are affected differently than others? Please elaborate.

Unfortunately it remains the case that users of public (collective) transport remain the weaker party to transport contracts and transport provision despite the early development of passenger rights' legislation. It is difficult to see how a multi-fold increase in the modal shares provided by more sustainable forms of transport can be achieved until the primacy of end-users is accepted by the sector. Their needs and aspirations need to be sought out, systematically, identified and worked into transport provision. For example, in practical terms, any development of Regulation 1370/2007 needs to make specific provision to reflect user needs and aspirations.

6. Are the White Paper initiatives and other European policies compatible with each other? Are the Member States policies compatible with the White Paper? Please specify..

We do not consider that the priorities of the White Paper have been fully understood and appreciated by Member States. We believe that there is much more to be done in communicating the reasoning behind the White Paper to national and regional authorities, as well as to commercial stakeholders, throughout the Union. We consider that the long term costs of not dealing with the challenges identified by the White Paper - greenhouse gas emissions, lack of energy security, unacceptable congestion and - additionally - the health impacts of fossil fuel based transport and increasing land take for transport infrastructure are ultimately unacceptable for all citizens.

7. Overall, do you think that the White Paper on transport has made a difference? What are the main achievements of the White Paper strategy? Please explain.

The White Paper did much to present a coherent narrative that demonstrated the links between economic growth, social cohesion and the improved provision of sustainable transport with reduced dependency on oil. But while it was succinct in the goals that it presented in some respects it lacked in addressing the means of implementing them. Sustainable transport modes such as rail will only succeed at the heart of Europe's mobility strategy if user-needs are encouraged to drive their provision, thereby winning popular support for the investment that is essential to underpin reliable delivery.

### D. Expected impacts and implementation

The White Paper set a long-term vision for the EU transport system and a 10 year programme which should help achieving the transport policy objectives. Given the wide areas of intervention we would like to know your opinion, if the proposed mix of measures and the approach taken are appropriate. We would also like to verify if the goals set are a good benchmark for the transport policy or they need to be revised. In addition, this section should provide us with your opinion on potential obstacles and catalysts for the implementation of the White paper strategy.

# 1. How do you assess the impact of the White Paper initiatives proposed, adopted and implemented so far by the Commission in the following areas?

	Very low	Low	High	Very high	No opinion
A single European transport market	0	0	•	0	0
Promotion of quality jobs and working conditions	0	•	0	0	0
Secure transport	0	•	0	0	0
Transport safety	0	0	0	•	0
Service quality and reliability	0	•	0	0	0
Research and innovation in transport	0	0	•	0	0
Promotion of more sustainable behaviour	0	•	0	0	0
Integrated urban mobility	0	•	0	0	0
Modern transport infrastructure	0	•	0	0	0
Modal integration	0	•	0	0	0
Funding framework for transport infrastructure	0	0	•	0	0
Smart pricing and taxation	0	•	0	0	0
External dimension	0	0	0	0	0

#### 2. Please elaborate on your answers to the above statements.

It is still early days: transport decision-making is notoriously cumbersome. The White Paper, so far, has failed to generate a popular ground-swell of support. This is partly because it seems to have been communicated inadequately, both within Member States and within the sector, despite the urgency of the environmental, economic and social challenges that it seeks to address. The CEF, the joint technology initiatives and the work and attempts to strengthen the competences of the relevant agencies in the safety field stand out as areas where Commission action has already made a difference.

# 3. Are the White Paper initiatives coordinated well enough to deliver the expected results? Please explain.

No: there is an absent 'coordinating hand' combined with a lack of wider understanding, amongst authorities, corporate stakeholders and the public about the urgency of what it is seeking to address.

										•	
	_	provide	clear	targets	even	if	they	leave	their	achievement	

4. Are the ten goals useful benchmarks for the EU transport policy? Please explain.

5. Do the current goals for transport respond to the strategy's overall objective of more sustainable and competitive transport? Please explain.

Yes			

6. How do you assess the importance of the aspects listed below as potential obstacles to the implementation of the White Paper strategy?

	Very low	Low	High	Very high	No opinion
Approach taken (objectives, division of competences, areas of intervention, timing,)	0	0	0	•	0
Tools chosen (design of initiatives, legal form, scope,)	0	•	0	0	0
Different policies at MS level	0	0	0	•	0
Lack of support from the stakeholders	0	0	0	•	0
Conflicting priorities	•	0	0	0	0
Insufficient financial means	0	0	0	•	0
Insufficient consideration of local specificities	0	0	•	0	0
Social costs	0	•	0	0	0
Economic costs	0	0	0	•	0

7. Please elaborate on your answers to the above statements and indicate any other potential obstacles to the implementation.

There is an absent 'coordinating hand' combined with a lack of wider understanding, amongst authorities, corporate stakeholders and the public about the urgency of what it is seeking to address. The White Paper, so far, has failed to generate a popular ground-swell of support. This is partly because it seems to have been communicated inadequately, both within Member States and within the sector, despite the urgency of the environmental, economic and social challenges that it seeks to address. The CEF and other targeted investments are potentially valuable to leveraging wider investment. However the scale of funds required means that more far-reaching and innovative funding initiatives are required.

8. What factors have stimulated the implementation of the White Paper strategy? Have the proposed approach and tools been optimal?

Innovative funding - e.g., the CEF and the JTIs and appropriate legislative initiatives such as the Fourth Railway Package.

#### E. Way forward

Considering the review of the 2011 White Paper, we would like to receive your feedback on the focus of the strategy for its further implementation and improve its effectiveness and efficiency.

- 1. What would best be done at the EU level to ensure that the strategy delivers results? What would best be done at the Member States level?
  - $\bullet$   $\,\,\,$  Demonstrate the linkage between users' needs and aspirations and EU initiatives
  - ${\boldsymbol \cdot}$  Communicate the thinking and the strategies underlying the White Paper more effectively to citizens
  - Develop mechanisms that encourage outcome-focused thinking,
     beyond immediately local horizons (cf the successes with the development of the SCANMED TEN-T corridor)
  - · Create the legal framework for innovative funding schemes
  - Develop 'coordinating hand(s)' as with TEN-T corridor coordinators, executive agencies, etc.

• Added-Value of EU-level seed financing in project development • Communication and the exemplification of successes • Enforcement of existing acquis  What adjustments within the strategy would you suggest to improve its efficiency and flectiveness?  The strategy urgently needs to address the emerging evidence on the deleterious public health aspects of transport. It also needs to adapt to the challenge of congestion and its implications for health, efficient land use and spatial planning generally. Further work needs to be done if the goals for a massive shift to sustainable transport modes are to be credible: a 50+8 modal share of medium-distance traffic for more sustainable modes means a multi-fold increase in quantitative terms. This will require extraordinary levels of infrastructure investment and exceptional political and public support.  How could the strategy be better linked with other EU policies?  Other questions  Are there any other issues you would like to highlight in relation to the White Paper?	•	
What adjustments within the strategy would you suggest to improve its efficiency and fectiveness?  The strategy urgently needs to address the emerging evidence on the deleterious public health aspects of transport. It also needs to adapt to the challenge of congestion and its implications for health, efficient land use and spatial planning generally. Further work needs to be done if the goals for a massive shift to sustainable transport modes are to be credible: a 50+% modal share of medium-distance traffice for more sustainable modes means a multi-fold increase in quantitative terms. This will require extraordinary levels of infrastructure investment and exceptional political and public support.  How could the strategy be better linked with other EU policies?  Other questions	_	Added-value of EU-level seed financing in project development
What adjustments within the strategy would you suggest to improve its efficiency and fectiveness?  The strategy urgently needs to address the emerging evidence on the deleterious public health aspects of transport. It also needs to adapt to the challenge of congestion and its implications for health, efficient land use and spatial planning generally. Further work needs to be done if the goals for a massive shift to sustainable transport modes are to be credible: a 50+% modal share of medium-distance traffic for more sustainable modes means a multi-fold increase in quantitative terms. This will require extraordinary levels of infrastructure investment and exceptional political and public support.  How could the strategy be better linked with other EU policies?  Other questions	•	
The strategy urgently needs to address the emerging evidence on the deleterious public health aspects of transport. It also needs to adapt to the challenge of congestion and its implications for health, efficient land use and spatial planning generally. Further work needs to be done if the goals for a massive shift to sustainable transport modes are to be credible: a 50+% modal share of medium-distance traffic for more sustainable modes means a multi-fold increase in quantitative terms. This will require extraordinary levels of infrastructure investment and exceptional political and public support.  How could the strategy be better linked with other EU policies?  Other questions	·	Enforcement of existing acquis
deleterious public health aspects of transport. It also needs to adapt to the challenge of congestion and its implications for health, efficient land use and spatial planning generally. Further work needs to be done if the goals for a massive shift to sustainable transport modes are to be credible: a 50+% modal share of medium-distance traffic for more sustainable modes means a multi-fold increase in quantitative terms. This will require extraordinary levels of infrastructure investment and exceptional political and public support.  How could the strategy be better linked with other EU policies?  Other questions	-	
Other questions	delete to the effici to be modes for mo terms.	rious public health aspects of transport. It also needs to adapt challenge of congestion and its implications for health, ent land use and spatial planning generally. Further work needs done if the goals for a massive shift to sustainable transport are to be credible: a 50+% modal share of medium-distance traffic re sustainable modes means a multi-fold increase in quantitative This will require extraordinary levels of infrastructure
·	How could	I the strategy be better linked with other EU policies?
·		
Are there any other issues you would like to highlight in relation to the White Paper?		
Are there any other issues you would like to highlight in relation to the White Paper?	Other	questions
		·
		·
		·
		·

2. Please give reference to any studies or documents that you think are of relevance for this consultation, with links for online download where possible.

```
Please see the European Passengers' Federation's submissions to the Transport & Tourism Committee of the European Parliament, to the European Economic & Social Committee and to the Committee of the Regions. They can be found at:
http://www.epf.eu/wp/position-papers/
(2015 section)
```

3. Please upload any additional contribution (e.g. position papers).

#### **Useful links**

Background document

(http://ec.europa.eu/transport/media/consultations/doc/2015-white-paper-2011-midterm-review/background.pc About this consultation

(http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/consultations/2015-white-paper-2011-midterm-review\_en.htm)

#### Contact

Attp://ec.europa.eu/transport/contact/index\_en.htm