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

*2. Please specify your main field of activity
- ○ Individual citizen
- ○ National public authority
- ○ Central public authority
- ○ Local public authority
- ○ Private company
- ○ Consultancy
- ● International organisation
- ○ Workers organisation/association/ trade union
- ○ Industry association
- ○ Other interest group organisation/ association
- ○ Research organisation/university
- ○ Other (please specify)

*4. Please indicate whether the organisation/company you represent deals primarily with transport issues:
- ● Yes
- ○ No

*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
- ☐ multimodal/all transport modes
- ☐ Other (please specify)

*6. Transport segment represented:
between 1 and 2 choices
- ☑ passenger transport
- ☐ freight transport

*7. Please provide your country of residence/establishment:
If answering as an individual, please provide your place of residence.
If answering on behalf of an organisation/institution, please provide the place of establishment of the organisation/institution.

France ▼

*8. Can you please identify which organisation or association you represent?

> European Metropolitan Transport Authorities

*9. Please indicate if your organisation is registered in the Transparency Register of the European Commission.

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

*9.1. Please enter your registration number in the Transparency Register
(numbers only)

> 31315981760220

*10. First name

> Ruud

*11. Last name

> van der Ploeg

*12. Address

> 41 rue de Chateaudun, 75009

*13. City

> Paris

*14. Email address

> ruud.vanderploeg@emta.com

*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

1. 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	○	○	○	◉	○
Oil and energy prices	○	○	◉	○	○
Air and water pollution	○	○	○	◉	○
GHG emissions	○	○	◉	○	○
Congestion	○	◉	○	○	○
Market barriers	○	○	○	◉	○
Administrative and regulatory burden	○	○	◉	○	○
Infrastructure development	○	○	◉	○	○
Financing of infrastructure	○	○	○	◉	○
Safety	○	◉	○	○	○
Security	○	○	○	◉	○
Passenger rights	○	◉	○	○	○
Working conditions	○	○	○	○	◉
Social responsibility	○	○	○	○	◉
Internalisation of external costs	○	○	◉	○	○
Affordability of transport services	○	○	○	◉	○

Accessibility to transport services (availability and proximity)	○	○	○	●	○
Competition from third countries	○	○	●	○	○
Increasing competitiveness	○	●	○	○	○
Urban mobility	○	○	○	●	○
Management and control of increasing traffic	●	○	○	○	○
Cross-border transport services	○	○	○	●	○
Innovation	●	○	○	○	○
Technological change	○	○	●	○	○
Multimodal transport	○	●	○	○	○

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

```
From the point of view of transport users the primary goal should be
building a transport network that is accessible and affordable to all
societal groups, reliable and safe to use. Financing infrastructure and
control and management of traffic are prerequisites but not the
essentials. Urban transport should be deployed and governed on the
correct level (all business is local) close to the ones who use it.
Technological progress and innovation are only useful if it allows
better solutions that are supportive of easy access into cities by smart
mobility solutions.
Looking at the intrinsic added value of public transport it has to
guarantee accessibility and improve network quality. Interaction with
stakeholders in other sectors and fields of society is indispensable to
foster an integrated development of local fields. Energy efficiency,
land use planning and transport network development are 3 sides of the
basic triangle that should be coordinated and geared from one hand.
Consistent governing with solid  and effectiveness of urban transport.
PTA's need to develop a broad overview to analyse and be proactive on
movements in relevant sector and markets. The toolkit of PTA's in larger
cities is becoming  more varied, effective and expanded. Urban
intermodality and cross border connectivity determine largely the
successful development of cities and their metropolitan transport
networks. Congestion in traffic without a proper alternative will be
detrimental to cities and their competitiveness to attract new
businesses and generate employment and prosperity.
Land use planning, sustainable energy strategies and consistent urban
network development are strongly interrelated. The strength of this
tripod will build a crucial factor to stimulate the local economy,
business development employability and investments. Together they make a
determinant for functional integration that will benefit or detrimental
to the power of city's and their communities. To manage this ambitious
goal urban authorities need to transform into forceful and integrated
urban mobility agencies with the capability of being decisive to turn
around growth of private car news.
```

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	○	●	○	○	○
Relevance of the priorities set	○	○	●	○	○
Level of ambition	○	○	○	●	○
Clarity of the strategy	○	●	○	○	○
Coherence of the strategy	●	○	○	○	○
Cooperation with MS	○	○	○	○	●
Involvement of stakeholders	○	○	○	○	●
Communication of the strategy	○	●	○	○	○
Costs of implementation	○	○	○	○	●

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

We welcome the increased focus in the White Paper on cities and the challenges they face as part of the wider challenges facing Europe's transport system. However, this needs to be translated into concrete action in terms of involving cities in the policy making process, offering support and guidance to those with limited capacity and funding, both in terms of innovative demonstration projects and much needed infrastructure development. Greater coherence with other policy areas, in particular with air quality, energy and climate policy are needed. This also applies for the combat against urban sprawl by fostering housing plans in vicinity of high quality (sub)urban transport nodes. They constitute the capacity and capability to move city dwellers, workers and visitors around. Tourism is an ear that is easily overlooked and should be integrated in local and national transport strategies. Liberalisation of the cross border coach transport is not just a threat but also provides opportunities to further sustainable transport and guarantee accessible door-to-door networks. The last mile provisions strongly determine the strength of a whole chain of links into the mobility chain.

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.

As the Green Paper, Towards a new culture for urban mobility stated: "Towns and cities are the drivers of the European economy". We are pleased that the Commission has placed creating jobs and growth at the heart of its agenda. Investment in our cities is an essential ingredient in kick starting economy growth and job creation. Investment in transport is the catalyst, providing access to employment, training and health care opportunities, unlocking areas for regeneration and development and delivering the connectivity on which prosperity is based. The White Paper rightly talks about the importance of improving cross-border connections and the reference to urban nodes in the new TEN-T Regulation is welcome but to date there is scant evidence that this is being taken seriously. If we really want to make our continent more competitive and build a prosperous, secure future for all our citizens then the EU must play its part in facilitating more effective integrated urban transport networks. The mid-term review is an opportunity to gear the EU's transport policy into the creation of a jobs and growth agenda.

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

1. Transport policy should be integrated and coherent and cannot be developed separately from other strategies particularly those related to the environment, energy efficiency and air quality in particular.
2. EU emission values should be more compelling and enforced on local level.
Urgent action is required to reduce vehicle emissions and meet the White Paper's aim of de-carbonising of local transport mainly for heavy vehicle like lorries and buses.
3.The role of cities in delivering the White Paper's objectives should be outlined stronger. Instruments should be deployed with more power and have to prevail. With a greater emphasis on the importance of cities and subsidiarity there can be more clarity that the principle of decision making should be conducted to the most appropriate level.
4. Overarching EU legislation in establishing parameters or operating conditions of urban access restriction schemes including LEZ's would set an example of inappropriate policy action.

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.

```
As a principle that is the case. How strong certain regions,
stakeholders or modes are affected by the policy is a field that is
still bare surveyed. There are tools to be developed to measure what
added values are  levered by the White Paper strategy. In general the
progress on development of innovative solutions is stagnating in
countries where the financial crises have impacted the level of public
funding. The users of rail transport in the UK for example are suffering
from the free setting of fares of regional rail transport franchisers,
that are also not really integrated in the metropolitan transport
strategies. Competition in rail transport and cross border connections
in European corridors have a very different impact in some cities,
depending on the strength of local government.
```

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..

```
Air quality poses an example where greater consistency in EU policy
making would be helpful. Many cities currently breach EU limit values,
many despite taking difficult and sometimes contentious decisions, for
example by implementing access restriction schemes. Integrated strategy
with transport, climate policy and vehicle regulation embedded has to
fully involve cities and governing bodies in larger metropolitan areas.
```

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.

```
- EMTA welcomes the White Paper's recognition of the importance of
cities in meeting the EU's transport challenges. However this needs to
be developed as a result of the mid-term review.
- The "urban node" concept in the TEN-T new guidelines provides good
opportunities that need to be further elaborated and instrumented to be
implemented clearly. Smart cities need to be fully developed with
adequate financial firepower if they are to make a meaningful difference
and contribute to the White paper's goals.
- EU smart cities policy overall needs to be driven by cities.
```

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	○	○	○	○	◉
Promotion of quality jobs and working conditions	○	○	○	○	◉
Secure transport	○	○	○	○	◉
Transport safety	○	○	○	◉	○
Service quality and reliability	○	○	○	○	◉
Research and innovation in transport	○	○	◉	○	○
Promotion of more sustainable behaviour	○	◉	○	○	○
Integrated urban mobility	○	◉	○	○	○
Modern transport infrastructure	◉	○	○	○	○
Modal integration	○	◉	○	○	○
Funding framework for transport infrastructure	○	◉	○	○	○
Smart pricing and taxation	○	○	○	○	◉
External dimension	○	○	○	○	◉

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

```
•       Much greater progress needs to be made in achieving the
aspiration of a road safety "zero vision", particularly in terms of
pedestrians and cyclists
•       Greater focus on demonstration projects such as ZeEUS on
electric buses with larger scope and longer duration projects in this
area
•       There needs to be more rapid progress towards achieving zero
emission vehicles and a shift to sustainable modes.
```

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

> The pillar of funding transport infrastructure, clean vehicles etc.
> should be put to broader use and accelerated. In this time of monetary
> policy opportunity knocks for speeding up investment in new rail
> infrastructure and bus vehicles, provided they are driven by energy
> efficient powertrains and the overall balance over sustainability is a
> positive one.
> Coordination with the Juncker investment package and promotion of
> investments from the EIB leaves an unexplored field of underachieved
> opportunities the White Paper could instigate.

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

> The focus on 40 priorities and 10 aspirational goals have been helpful
> in shaping detailed policy making. The Commission could best narrow down
> to the paramount objectives by working on a condensed realistic set of
> policy aspirations to guide policy making at every step

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

> As far as urban areas are concerned, the White Paper must have modal
> shift from private vehicles to public transport, walking and cycling at
> its core. Despite advances in technology, the only way we will be able
> to make progress on air quality, GHG emissions, noise reduction and
> congestion in order to improve people's lives is through more
> sustainable transport choices. Public transport operators have a part to
> play too and must make their services as simple and easy to use, with
> accurate, real time travel information and multi-modal integrated
> ticketing.
>
> With new evidence and greater awareness of the negative consequences on
> human health of poor air quality, improving Europe's air needs a higher
> profile. In addition to continuing regulatory progress on vehicle
> emissions, the absolute priority must be the deployment of real world
> driving condition testing. We are extremely disappointed at the slow
> rate of progress since the White paper highlighted this as a priority
> issue.

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,…)	○	○	○	●	○
Tools chosen (design of initiatives, legal form, scope,…)	○	●	○	○	○
Different policies at MS level	○	●	○	○	○
Lack of support from the stakeholders	○	○	○	○	●
Conflicting priorities	○	○	○	●	○
Insufficient financial means	○	○	○	●	○
Insufficient consideration of local specificities	○	○	●	○	○
Social costs	○	○	○	○	●
Economic costs	○	○	○	○	●

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

```
•       Coherence within the Commission's policy making and the
recognition that strategies such as transport promotion, energy use and
air quality are not to be seen in isolation is pivotal
•       EMTA welcomes the approach so far taken in respect to urban
initiatives of best practice and guidance and would be concerned if the
Commission decided to mandate urban transport policies and planning (as
opposed to technical harmonization) through legislation
•       In terms of the organization of urban public transport
services, above all the sector needs regulatory stability and despite
the best of motives, the current revision to Regulation 1370/2007 is
creating potential instability and insecurity in the local transport
community and therefore disruptive and not instrumental.
```

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

```
Yes. The appreciation that cities and urban authorities in the
metropolitan areas should benefit from grades of freedom and flexibility
to develop policies that will address their unique problems is crucial
and therefore applauded.
```

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?

```
1. Decision making must take place at the most appropriate level were
the impacts are directly conceivable and experienced.
In general terms in relation to urban transport policy, we believe the
Commission is best placed to provide guidance, best practice and
technical assistance to cities where needed. Cities must be involved in
this process from the outset. It is for member states to provide cities
with detailed regulatory frameworks for issues such as access
restriction schemes.
2. It is not the role of the Commission to mandate initiatives and
practices in such areas. Moreover, the precise design and implementation
of urban transport schemes should be left to cities themselves which are
democratically accountable to the communities they serve.
```

2. How could Member States be better encouraged to follow and implement the common transport policy set in the White Paper?

```
By setting a flexible policy framework, allowing member states after
consultation with their cities and other stakeholders, the freedom to
design and implement transport policy which best meet their unique
circumstances, is the most appropriate way to foster a common transport
policy. This fits into the new Commission's philosophy of legislating
only where it is necessary to take action at EU level.
```

3. What adjustments within the strategy would you suggest to improve its efficiency and effectiveness?

```
A greater role for cities in the development of the strategy with
genuine consultation would improve its efficiency and its chances of
success. This should be done within the framework of the Commission's
focus on jobs, competitiveness and growth and a recognition of the
crucial place of cities in the implementation of that agenda.
```

4. How could the strategy be better linked with other EU policies?

F. Other questions

1. Are there any other issues you would like to highlight in relation to the White Paper?

```
We welcome the White Paper's commitment to help "promote the development
and use of intelligent systems for interoperable and multimodal
scheduling, information, online reservation systems and smart
ticketing". We would not support legislation to create a top-down
EU-wide ticketing solution. Many cities have already developed
integrated, multi-modal smart card ticketing schemes and it would be a
tremendous waste of public resources if these were ignored. As we have
shown in London where contactless payment based on standard issue bank
cards already account for over a million journeys a day on our transport
network (March 2015), barely six months after it was introduced,
technology is evolving so rapidly that legislating in this area would
hinder rather than help innovation. The role of the Commission is to
help foster innovation in the rea of ticketing and travel information
and in this regard we support moves to require railway undertakings to
make available their real time travel, traffic and fare data.
```

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.

```
Submitting of a short paper delivered for a meeting of the COST project
last september might give a flavour or the way EMTA perceives the role
of metropolitan areas and authorities in cities to cater for a
sustainable quality network, innovations that are complying with users
abilities and to an environment with an encompassing transport strategy.

Urban transport should therefore be embedded in broader policies to be
inclusive and geared to long term liveable goals and the needs of city
dwellers.
```

3. Please upload any additional contribution (e.g. position papers).
   - **f9a4d97d-cdfc-4fbb-b82c-c930f73edda2/Report COST 0210_2014_RVDP.pdf**

Useful links

Background document
(http://ec.europa.eu/transport/media/consultations/doc/2015-white-paper-2011-midterm-review/background.pd

About this consultation
(http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/consultations/2015-white-paper-2011-midterm-review_en.htm)

Contact

http://ec.europa.eu/transport/contact/index_en.htm