Contribution ID: dd14f852-32c0-424f-91ae-e09ad755fca2

Date: 23/02/2022 20:26:41

Multimodal digital mobility services

Fields marked with * are mandatory.



Introduction

Multimodal digital mobility services (open public consultation)

Planning and buying tickets for journeys combining different operators or means of transport is often facing barriers in terms of lacking information and limited options, especially when travelling cross-border. Multimodal digital mobility services, such as route-planners or ticket vendors, help to compare different travel options, choices and prices, and in some cases facilitate the purchase of mobility products.

The goal of the public consultation on multimodal digital mobility services (MDMS) is to allow the general public and all stakeholders to express their views in a structured way on the current state of play and needs for additional policy action at European level. The consultation helps to better understand the concerns of EU travellers as regards information and ticketing applications and whether further EU action is necessary in this field to ensure a smooth use when travelling, particularly across borders.

The Commission announced an initiative on multimodal digital mobility services in the Sustainable and Smart Mobility Strategy (Action 37). Such an initiative would also support a shift towards the most sustainable transport modes. Further discussions will be held through targeted consultations and via a new expert group (European Forum on Multimodal Passenger Mobility).

About you

- *Language of my contribution
 - Bulgarian
 - Croatian
 - Czech
 - Danish
 - Dutch

Engli	ish
© Esto	nian
Finni	sh
Fren	ch
Gern	nan
Gree	k
Hung	garian
Irish	
Italia	n
Latvi	an
Lithu	anian
Malte	ese
Polis	h
Portu	uguese
Rom	anian
Slova	ak
Slove	enian
Spar	nish
Swed	dish
*I am giving	g my contribution as
Acac	lemic/research institution
Busin	ness association
Com	pany/business organisation
Cons	sumer organisation
© EU c	itizen
Envi	ronmental organisation
Non-	EU citizen
Non-	governmental organisation (NGO)
Publi	ic authority
Trad	e union
Othe	r
*First name)
Delphine	

*Su	rname			
	GRANDSART			
*Em	nail (this won't be pu	blished)		
	delphine.grandsart@epf.e	u		
*Org	ganisation name			
	55 character(s) maximum			
	European Passengers' Fe	deration		
*Orç	ganisation size			
(Micro (1 to 9 emp	oloyees)		
(Small (10 to 49 e	mployees)		
(Medium (50 to 24	19 employees)		
(Large (250 or mo	re)		
	ansparency register	number		
	55 character(s) maximum eck if your organisation is o	n the transparency registe	<u>r</u> . It's a voluntary database	for organisations seeking to
	uence EU decision-making.			
	532739823521-44			
* •	untry of oxidin			
	untry of origin ase add your country of origin	gin or that of your organis	ation	
(Afghanistan	Djibouti	Libya	Saint Martin
(Aland Islands	Dominica	Liechtenstein	Saint Pierre and
				Miquelon
(Albania	Dominican	Lithuania	Saint Vincent
		Republic		and the
				Grenadines
(Algeria	Ecuador	Luxembourg	Samoa
(American Samoa	∟ [©] Egypt	Macau	San Marino
(Andorra	FI Salvador	Madagascar	São Tomé and

Equatorial Guinea Malawi

Angola

Príncipe

Saudi Arabia

0	Anguilla	0	Eritrea		Malaysia		Senegal
0	Antarctica		Estonia		Maldives		Serbia
0	Antigua and		Eswatini		Mali		Seychelles
	Barbuda						
	Argentina	0	Ethiopia		Malta		Sierra Leone
0	Armenia	0	Falkland Islands	0	Marshall Islands		Singapore
0	Aruba	0	Faroe Islands	0	Martinique		Sint Maarten
0	Australia		Fiji		Mauritania		Slovakia
0	Austria	0	Finland	0	Mauritius		Slovenia
	Azerbaijan	0	France	0	Mayotte		Solomon Islands
	Bahamas	0	French Guiana	0	Mexico		Somalia
0	Bahrain		French Polynesia		Micronesia		South Africa
	Bangladesh	0	French Southern	0	Moldova		South Georgia
			and Antarctic				and the South
			Lands				Sandwich
							Islands
0	Barbados	(O)	Gabon	0	Monaco	0	South Korea
0	Belarus	(iii)	Georgia	0	Mongolia	0	South Sudan
•	Belgium	0	Germany	0	Montenegro	0	Spain
0	Belize	0	Ghana	0	Montserrat	0	Sri Lanka
0	Benin		Gibraltar	0	Morocco		Sudan
	Bermuda	0	Greece		Mozambique		Suriname
	Bhutan	0	Greenland		Myanmar/Burma		Svalbard and
							Jan Mayen
0	Bolivia		Grenada	0	Namibia		Sweden
0	Bonaire Saint		Guadeloupe	0	Nauru	0	Switzerland
	Eustatius and						
	Saba						
0	Bosnia and	0	Guam	0	Nepal	0	Syria
	Herzegovina						
	Botswana		Guatemala		Netherlands	0	Taiwan
0	Bouvet Island		Guernsey	0	New Caledonia	0	Tajikistan
0	Brazil	0	Guinea	0	New Zealand	0	Tanzania
	British Indian		Guinea-Bissau		Nicaragua		Thailand
	Ocean Territory						

British Virgin Islands	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
Brunei	Haiti	Nigeria	Timor-Leste
Bulgaria	Heard Island ar McDonald Islan		Togo
Burkina Faso	Honduras	Norfolk Island	Tokelau
Burundi	Hong Kong	Northern	Tonga
Baranar	riong rong	Mariana Islands	•
Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea	Trinidad and
Gamboala	riangary	Horarica	Tobago
Cameroon	Iceland	North Macedon	
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	Turkmenistan
© Cayman Islands	© Iran	Pakistan	Turks and
	🚛 .		Caicos Islands
Central African	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
Republic			
© Chad	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New	United Arab
		Guinea	Emirates
Christmas Island	Italy	Paraguay	United Kingdom
Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	United States
Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	Philippines	United States
Islands			Minor Outlying
			Islands
Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands	Uruguay
Comoros	Jordan	Poland	US Virgin Islands
Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal	Uzbekistan
Cook Islands	Kenya	Puerto Rico	Vanuatu
Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar	Vatican City
Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion	Venezuela
Croatia	Kuwait	Romania	Vietnam
Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	Wallis and
			Futuna

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

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. Fo r the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published. Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

*Contribution 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 organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

This consultation is divided in two sections:

- a general section for travellers
- a detailed section addressing detailed issues on Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/1926 and market challenges for multimodal digital mobility services.
- *Let's begin! Which questionnaire would you like to fill in? (you can select both)
 - General section (for travellers and citizens)
 - Detailed section (for experts and stakeholders)

General section (travellers)

This public consultation aims to better understand the use of digital services when planning, booking and purchasing multimodal transport services in the EU.

- *1) When you plan a trip, do you find it difficult to get information on travel options online?
 - Yes.
 - No.

1a) If yes, what are the problems you encountered?

You can select multiple answers.

- I could not find sufficient information digitally on the mobility options to plan my trip.
- The price of the trip was not available, or only for parts of the trip.
- There was no or insufficient information on transferring to other modes (such as transfer times or available transport services at the destination).
- I could not find information on whether bicycles are allowed on-board or how to book a space for my bicycle.
- There was no information on potential journey continuation or the entity responsible in case of a disruption (such as a missed connection).
- I could not find information on the carbon footprint of the different mobility services on offer.
- I had to visit several different websites/apps to get information about the different options.
- There was no or insufficient information on the accessibility of the station /airport/bus terminal for passengers with disabilities and/or reduced mobility.
- The information was not available in an accessible format for visually impaired users.
- Others please explain.

*2) Have you experienced difficulties who mobility services for a trip combining of	·
air, ship/ferry) online?	initial initia initial initial initial initial initial initial initial initial
Yes.	
No.	
*2a) If yes, which difficulties did you face	e?
You can select multiple answers.	
The mobility product could not be boo	
The ticket could not be retrieved digit The booking required a paper ticket a home.	ally (e.g. as an e-ticket or via an app). It the ticket desk or printing the ticket at
Difficulty to find and compare all the a chosen.	available prices/offers for the journey
$^{ m I\hspace{1em}I}$ I had to book the different parts of the	e journey through different websites.
I needed multiple tickets for the journ ticket.	ey or the journey was not covered by one
Difficulties with booking through an a another Member State (e.g. difficultie in personal data, difficulties with the r	s with the language, difficulties with filling
Others - please explain.	
*3) Do you use mobile applications/webs	sites to plan and book your trips?
Yes.	
No.	
3a) If yes, which applications and website EU? Please separate entries by commass Skyscanner, Trainline, Citymapper) 200 character(s) maximum	,
Operators' websites and third party websites	
,	
3b) Why do you use these applications?	•
These applications enable my planning	ng only, I had to use another application

for the booking.

 These applications enable my planning and booking. These applications enable my planning, booking and provide me with relevant information during the trip in case of delays or missed connection.
3c) The applications you use provide you with information on (if none, leave
empty):
You can select multiple answers.
Carbon footprint of your journey.
Accessibility of the trip (in case of reduced mobility, special needs or impairments) and booking of assistance services.
Passenger Rights (right to compensation in case of delays/cancellations; right to re-routing, etc.).
Information about cycling/walking alternatives/other transport means.
3d) If you are visually impaired, is the information available in an accessible format?
Yes.
No.
Not applicable.
Detailed section
The detailed questionnaire is open to all participants, but addresses mainly expert views with specific questions on the current legislation and the different objectives and options.
1) Please specify which interests you (the organisation on behalf of which
you respond) represent
National public authorities (transport ministries, agencies)
Regional or local public authorities / public transport authorities
Public transport operator
Private transport operator
Digital mobility service providers (travel intermediaries, travel information
services, ticket vendors, global distribution systems, metasearch engines,
Mobility-as-a-Service applications)
Car rental and/or car sharing service provider

Micromobility providers (bikeshare, e-scooter, scooter etc.)

	Digital solution providers
	Digital map providers
	Research/Academia/Consultancies
0	Societal interests and/or consumer rights
	Others (please specify)

Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/1926

Currently, Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/1926 on EU-wide multimodal travel information services establishes the necessary specifications to ensure that multimodal travel information services are accurate and available across borders to users.

- *2) In your view, how fit for purpose is the policy on multimodal travel information services at EU level as established by the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/1926 to support the uptake of these services?
 - Very relevant
 - Relevant
 - Irrelevant
 - Very irrelevant
 - No opinion

3) In your view, what is the EU-added value of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/1926 in comparison with what could be achieved at Member States national and/or regional level activities?

600 character(s) maximum

For passengers, different national and regional systems represent a significant barrier to obtaining optimal information on timetables and fares. Access to data – on timetables, but also fares – is an essential enabler for creating multimodal integrated information, ticketing and payment systems. It allows service providers – this can be transport operators, or third parties – to put together travel (MaaS) packages combining different modes to enable door to door travel and offering passengers the possibility to book and pay for all legs of their multimodal trip in a one stop shop.

Data availability and data sharing

4) If you make use of multimodal travel data, please rank these access points of data in terms of importance to your work?

	1st (most important)	2nd	3rd	4th (least important)
National Access Points	0	0	•	•
Operator / data producer website	0	•	0	•

Third-party tool / data intermediary	•	0	0	•
Others - please explain	0	0	0	•

4a)	lf	you	selected	others,	please	explain:
-----	----	-----	----------	---------	--------	----------

200	0 character(s) m	naximum			

5) Which additional data types should be made accessible on the EU National Access Points to facilitate sharing of multimodal data?

You can select multiple answers.

- data on occupancy of the vehicle
- dynamic data on fare availability
- dynamic data on seat availability
- data on disruptions (all modes)
- real-time status information (e.g. estimated arrival times)
- availability of parking spaces
- historic data (beyond statistical purposes currently covered), e.g. data on delays for the submission of passenger complaints)
- Others (please specify)

5a) If you selected others, please explain:

200 character(s) maximum

Accessibility (for PRM)		

6a) Regarding data accessibility and data sharing, have you faced any of the following challenges?

You can select multiple answers.

- Limited amount of data
- Limited data quality
- Lack of open standards (e.g. standards for booking and ticketing interfaces)
- Lack of willingness to enter into commercial agreements to provide data
- Lack of access to real-time data
- Lack of access to other type of data (please explain)

6b) Do you have any comments on these problems or other potential problems that should be considered?

600 character(s) maximum

There is a need to integrate historic, static and dynamic data from both users and transport providers. Data must not only be available but also reliable and coherent.

For the usability of real-time data, their fastest possible transmission to suitable interfaces is essential.

Open standards and interoperability are needed to ensure scalability and 'roaming' across borders.

Ownership and governance of data is a crucial topic to be addressed for all involved parties (including operators, ticket vendors, infrastructure managers, authorities, ... and end-users).

7a) What should be the main priorities for a joint European data exchange standard on ticketing (please rank them in order of importance):

	1st priority	2nd priority	3rd priority	4th priority
being future proof and able to provide the basis for ticketing by 2030 and beyond	0	0	0	•
being best able to advance the digitalisation of rail while enabling multimodal ticketing	0	0	•	0
providing a basis for developing multimodal electronic ticketing involving short and long distance, urban and regional offers, within one mode or more	0	•	0	0
being open and transparent, enabling operators, retail and ticket vendors to build on in a fair and non-discriminatory manner.	•	0	0	0

7b) For each of the above option, please justify your option:

600 character(s) maximum

Passengers need a neutral, comprehensive and reliable overview of available travel options to make an informed choice. Buying multimodal tickets should be easy, affordable and offer protection in case something goes wrong.

Access to data on FRAND conditions is a key enabler for this.

An open, multi-player distribution market, based on interoperability, non-exclusive partnerships between transport service providers and aggregators / MaaS providers, will encourage competition both between TSPs and distributors, which would eventually lead to a better offer to end-users.

7c) Should the legislator further mandate data exchange standards for booking and ticketing to meet the multimodality objective, which of them should be mandated in your view? Please justify your choice.

600 character(s) maximum

L			

Market challenges for multimodal digital mobility services

The Commission has identified a non-exhaustive list of problems, objectives and impacts (as explained possible remedying measures in the Inception Impact Assessment) when it comes to the development of multimodal digital mobility services[1]. This consultation seeks to gather your views on these aspects.

[1] "systems providing information about, inter alia, the location of transport facilities, schedules, availability and fares, of more than one transport provider, with or without facilities to make reservations, payments or issue tickets" (e.g. route-planners, Mobility as a Service, online ticket vendors, ticket intermediaries)

Identified problems regarding the commercial relationships between operators and multimodal digital mobility services and sustainability

8a) Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	Neutral / no opinion
Lack of data sharing hampers the deployment of multimodal digital mobility services between modes	•	0	0	0	0
Opaque conditions for combining and reselling mobility products (in land and waterborne modes) prevents the development of multimodal digital mobility services	•	•	•	©	•
Multimodal digital mobility services do not fully provide sufficient information on the sustainability of travel options	•	0	0	0	0
Multimodal digital mobility services are limited, in particular in the rail sector, due to market power imbalances	•	0	0	0	0
Fair access for all operators to relevant multimodal digital mobility services is not granted	•	0	0	0	0
Limited uptake of journey continuation agreements is an element hindering the provision of combined rail offers	•	0	0	0	0

8b) Do you have any comment on these problems or other potential problems that should be considered?

600 character(s) maximum

Digital mobility solutions need to be accessible and user-friendly so that also persons with disabilities, elderly people and people with limited digital skills are able to use them. It is important that there are alternatives for those people who are not able to use digital tools.

In the absence of through tickets, there is no guaranteed arrival at the final destination. A missed connection may leave passengers stranded and forced to buy new tickets. Adequate protection is needed for passengers using combinations of different transport modes.

Possible measures to pre-identified problems

9a) When it comes to business-to-business commercial agreements for multimodal digital mobility services in land-based and waterborne modes, how important are these measures for you? Requirements for the commercial agreements on...

	Very important	Moderately important	Not important	Neutral / no opinion
the type of mobility products that can be re-sold	•	0	0	0
the technical limitations imposed (such as look-to-book ratios)	0	•	0	0
the commission fees	0	•	0	0
the marketing conditions	0	•	0	0
the liability towards the passenger (e.g. in case of disruption)	•	0	0	0
avoiding misuse of data reuse by third parties (reusing commercially-sensitive information for own interest)	•	0	0	0

9b) To ensure fair access for all operators to relevant multimodal digital mobility services, how important are these measures for you?

Note: an operator may also simultaneously operate a multimodal digital mobility service

	Very important	Moderately important	Not important	Neutral / no opinion
Mandate neutral display when the service displays offers Neutral display: ranking of mobility offers for instance based on journey time, price, CO2 emissions and avoiding operators to advertise on the display page of the intermediary.	•	•	0	•

Establish obligations on the integration, on reasonable terms, of operators willing to be part of a multimodal digital service	•	0	0	•	
Integrate a provision to ensure non-discriminatory treatment of the parties across commercial agreements	•	•	•	•	

9c) When it comes to ensuring that multimodal digital mobility services enhance the efficiency and sustainability of the transport system, how important are these measures for you?

	Very important	Moderately important	Not important	Neutral / no opinion
Provide information on carbon footprint of the journey	0	•	0	0
Walking and cycling should be part of displayed options (when first-mile and last-mile services are concerned)	0	•	•	•
Establish obligations on services to ensure that data on usage of transport services, critical for mobility management, are shared with public authorities	•	•	0	•

9d) Do you have any comments on these measures or other potential measures to consider?

600 character(s) maximum

The CRS CoC was introduced to ensure that airlines did not promote their own services over those of competitors. Its underlying principles – transparency, fair competition, neutral display – are also relevant for other distribution channels and modes.

Access to transport data on FRAND conditions is a key enabler for creating an open, multi-player distribution market.

New business models are needed that strike a balance between the interests of passengers, transport service operators and distributors / aggregators and, from the consumer side, guarantee data portability.

Relevance of action at European level

10) The objective of this new initiative would be best accomplished...

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	Neutral / no opinion
through legal obligations / legislative action by the European Commission	•	0	0	0	0

through non-binding guidance or recommendations by the European Commission	©	•	•	•	•
through increased funding opportunities from European Union programmes	0	•	0	0	•
through increased coordination and harmonisation with other (non-EU) areas of the world	0	•	0	0	0

Final remarks

Please indicate any reports or other sources of information that provide evidence to support your responses. Please provide the title, author and, if available, a hyperlink to the study/report.

300 character(s) maximum			

You can also upload any document(s) to provide evidence to support your responses

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

- 11) In addition to this general consultation, targeted follow-up will be organised with key professional stakeholders on certain topics. Would you be interested in participating in this targeted consultation?
 - Yes
 - No

Contact

move-multimodal-digital-mobility-services@ec.europa.eu