

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 CO₂ 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

Filip

* Surname

Boelaert

* Email (this won't be published)

jules.deneve@mow.vlaanderen.be

* Scope

- ☐ International
- ☐ Local
- ☐ National
- ☒ Regional

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Vlaamse overheid - Departement Mobiliteit & Openbare Werken

* 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.

* Country of origin

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

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

● Bhutan	● Greenland	● Myanmar /Burma	● Svalbard and Jan Mayen
● Bolivia	● Grenada	● Namibia	● Sweden
● Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	● Guadeloupe	● Nauru	● Switzerland
● Bosnia and Herzegovina	● Guam	● Nepal	● Syria
● Botswana	● Guatemala	● Netherlands	● Taiwan
● Bouvet Island	● Guernsey	● New Caledonia	● Tajikistan
● Brazil	● Guinea	● New Zealand	● Tanzania
● British Indian Ocean Territory	● Guinea-Bissau	● Nicaragua	● Thailand
● British Virgin Islands	● Guyana	● Niger	● The Gambia
● Brunei	● Haiti	● Nigeria	● Timor-Leste
● Bulgaria	● Heard Island and McDonald Islands	● Niue	● Togo
● Burkina Faso	● Honduras	● Norfolk Island	● Tokelau
● Burundi	● Hong Kong	● Northern Mariana Islands	● Tonga
● Cambodia	● Hungary	● North Korea	● Trinidad and Tobago
● Cameroon	● Iceland	● North Macedonia	● Tunisia
● Canada	● India	● Norway	● Turkey
● Cape Verde	● Indonesia	● Oman	● Turkmenistan
● Cayman Islands	● Iran	● Pakistan	● Turks and Caicos Islands
● Central African Republic	● Iraq	● Palau	● Tuvalu
● Chad	● Ireland	● Palestine	● Uganda
● Chile	● Isle of Man	● Panama	● Ukraine
● China	● Israel	● Papua New Guinea	● United Arab Emirates
● Christmas Island	● Italy	● Paraguay	● United Kingdom
● Clipperton	● Jamaica	● Peru	● United States
● Cocos (Keeling) Islands	● Japan	● Philippines	● United States 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

- | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo | <input type="radio"/> Réunion | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait | <input type="radio"/> Romania | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan | <input type="radio"/> Russia | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao | <input type="radio"/> Laos | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus | <input type="radio"/> Latvia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy | <input type="radio"/> Yemen |
| <input type="radio"/> Czechia | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Zambia |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark | <input type="radio"/> Liberia | <input type="radio"/> 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:

De huidige mobiliteitssystemen hebben hun limieten bereikt en zetten leefbaarheid onder druk. Een van de grootste problemen betreft de verkeerscongestie op onze wegen en in onze steden. Om een vlotte doorstroming te behouden, moet worden ingezet op duurzame alternatieven (zoals binnenvaart), mobiliteitsdiensten, verknopen van netwerken en deelsystemen.

ITS kan helpen bij het doen dalen van de verkeersongevallen, het verbeteren van de doorstroming en daarbij ook het doen dalen van de uitstoot gerelateerd aan verkeer. Door in te zetten op bijvoorbeeld MaaS kan het autogebruik dalen. Slimme multimodale routeplanners, park&rides, knooppunten/mobihubs, real time info en data-uitwisseling kunnen bijdragen tot het aanpakken van deze problemen. Het stimuleren van duurzame modi, het uitrollen van slimme verkeerslichten en C-ITS diensten kan hier ook toe bijdragen. Publieke - private samenwerkingen moeten hierin bijdragen.

- * 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	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Air quality seems to have worsened	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Road congestion has increased	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Traffic-related noise has increased	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* I feel less safe when in traffic thank I was 5 years ago	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* There is a better institutional cooperation in relation to urban mobility (between different levels of government, with private actors, with authorities of neighbouring areas)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* The central government is supporting – legally, financially, organisationally – urban mobility planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Favourable legal conditions for safer and more sustainable transport system, have been created	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Sufficient financial means have been allocated for safer and more environmentally friendly transport system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Congestion has decreased	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* A shift towards more sustainable transport modes has been realised	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Business opportunities for developing innovative transport and mobility services, have been created	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Quality of life thanks to better transport in cities has improved	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Mobility along long-distance transport network (TEN-T) has improved	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 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?

Versnippering is een probleem. Goede samenwerking tussen de verschillende niveaus is belangrijk, met evenwicht tussen lokale en nationale maatregelen. Algemene beleidslijnen zouden de richting moeten geven, maar soms kan men sneller schakelen op een lager/stedelijk niveau. Er dient afstemming tussen de verschillende beleidsmaatregelen te zijn. Door het lokale niveau tools te geven, kunnen de noden kenbaar gemaakt worden en vertaling vinden op nationaal niveau. Het nationale beleid moet erover waken dat er geen versnippering op lokaal niveau ontstaat, en tegelijk de autonomie van het lokale niveau respecteren. Samenwerking is van belang voor harmonisatie, standaardisatie,...

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)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* EU support to research and innovation in urban mobility (CIVITAS, Smart Cities and Communities)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* EU financial support to sustainable urban mobility (EU structural, investment and Connecting Europe (CEF) funds)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Sustainable urban mobility plans (SUMP)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Coordinating public and private-sector intervention in the area of Urban logistics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Coordinating public and private-sector intervention in the area of Urban access vehicle regulations	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Coordinating public and private-sector intervention in the area of Deployment of intelligent transport system (ITS) solutions	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Coordinating public and private-sector intervention in the area of Urban road safety	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

Er is reeds een belangrijke dynamiek in gang gezet, maar een eerste planningsgolf dient te worden opgevolgd in uitvoering en evaluatie. Daarnaast blijven nieuwe recente ontwikkelingen en wijzigingen tot nieuwe uitdagingen leiden zodat coördinatie, innovatie, uitwisseling van ervaring en expertise belangrijk blijven.

CEF-steun dient in dit kader niet enkel te worden gezien als EU-steun voor duurzame stedelijke mobiliteit. Ook andere CEF-projecten die inzetten op een verbetering van het Trans-Europees netwerk voor Transport en die inzetten op duurzame transportmodi, zoals binnenvaart, zijn van belang in het kader van stedelijke mobiliteit. Investeren in een verbetering van een slimme, efficiënte en betrouwbare transportmodus als binnenvaart, betekent dat er vrachtvervoer van de weg kan worden gehaald en er bijgevolg sprake is van

minder congestie op de weg.

Dit is echter niet alleen het geval bij internationaal transport maar ook op transportaders binnen de Lidstaten. Binnenvaart speelt echter ook een belangrijke rol in het kader van stedelijke logistiek. Hierbij kan er worden gedacht aan projecten als City Logistics,

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
* SUMP's are sufficiently linked to EU funding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* SUMP's are adequately linked to the size of the cities	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* The fact that SUMP's are not mandatory allows sufficient flexibility to authorities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*						

Cities receive sufficient support for the development and implementation of SUMPs	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

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	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Support national, regional and local authorities to develop and implement SUMPs, including through funding instruments	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Coordinate EU cooperation on developing the SUMP concept and tools	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

Een sterke beklemtoning van SUMP's vanuit EU blijft belangrijk als stimulans om de dynamiek te onderhouden. De EU kan ook een belangrijke trekkersrol opnemen in het afstemmen van beleid over (bestuurs-)grenzen heen. Het is belangrijk dat de EU het groter kader rond duurzame stedelijke mobiliteit uiteenzet, innovaties die dit ondersteunen financiert, en voorstellen tot beleidsmaatregelen op lokaal, regionaal of nationaal niveau uitwerkt.

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	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Improve the dissemination and uptake of urban logistics best practice and provide non-binding guidance	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*				

Disseminate good practice examples for road safety planning and other measures to reduce accidents in urban areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Facilitate the deployment of intelligent transport systems (ITS) in urban areas	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

De uitwisseling van goede praktijken tussen overheden en steden van de Lidstaten is een belangrijk gegeven om duurzame mobiliteit in meerdere steden over diverse Lidstaten te laten groeien of aan te zetten tot groeien.

Wat de invoering van ITS betreft, is de coördinatie tussen publieke en private sector relevant voor data-uitwisseling en verrijking tussen beiden. Stedelijke gebieden vormen de eerste plaatsen waar ITS zal worden uitgerold, bv. autonome shuttles, intelligente verkeerslichten, ... Steden vormen goede testbeds voor pilootprojecten. Project Socrates 2.0 onderzoekt bv. samenwerkingsmodellen voor verkeersmanagement tussen publiek-privé.

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	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Facilitate the exchanges of experiences and best practices	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Focus research and innovation on delivering solutions for urban mobility challenges	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*				

Create business opportunities for developing innovative transport and mobility services	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Provide targeted financial support	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Support urban mobility policies in international cooperation activities	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 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	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* EU should provide guidance to local, regional and national authorities on issues of particular relevance when it comes to urban mobility	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* EU should support coordination of joint actions by local, regional and national authorities as well as private actors	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* EU should focus research and innovation on delivering solutions for urban mobility challenges	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* EU should support the share of experiences, promote best-practices and foster cooperation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* EU should propose binding targets for key aspects of urban mobility (such as	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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.

Stimuleren, richting geven, coördineren en ervaringsuitwisseling vanuit EU naar steden (en ook landen, regio's) lijkt ons ok en relevant. Een regulering vanuit de EU kan steden en gemeenten aanzetten tot een ver gevorderd initiatief om bij te dragen aan de (mobiliteits)doelstellingen. Kanttekening hierbij is evenwel dat voldoende (financiële) ondersteuning voorzien wordt om naar deze doelstelling toe te werken en deze te behalen. Dit zal ten dele moeten komen uit het stedelijk budget, budget van de lokale/regionale/nationale overheid en EU-budget. Wanneer de EU stedelijke mobiliteit reguleert, moet dit ook binnenvaart omvatten. Het opleggen van bindende bepalingen en richtsnoeren gaat dan wel te ver. Er moet nog altijd een zeker haalbaarheid bewaakt worden (incl. draagvlak) en anderzijds blijven de budgettaire implicaties 'bepalend'. Het is ons echter niet duidelijk waarom innovatie en onderzoek inzake duurzame mobiliteit zou beperkt blijven/worden tot stedelijke mobiliteit...

Further information

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

3000 character(s) maximum

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