Minutes from the Informal stakeholders Meeting with the Urban Mobility unit from the European Commission

2nd October 2015, European Commission, Brussels

Present: Polis, Eurocities, EMTA, CEMR, EMTA, ICLEI

EC: AFI Directive Unit, ITS Directive Unit, Clean vehicle Unit, Road Safety Unit.

Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans

The Urban Mobility Package end of 2013 tried to give a push to the SUMP process by adding annex with summary on how SUMP should be developed and what they should contain. It’s a summary of a much more extensive guide published in 2013 and republished in 2014¹ to support cities developing SUMP.

The EC set up a platform on SUMP with also an internal working group. It collects 12 EU co-financing projects that are related to SUMP, including Civitas Projects, Endurance, Solutions… They now try to exploit synergies and address common gaps and barriers, to further feed in the Eltis portal which act as a one-stop-shop for SUMP.

Attention was made to the Endurance project which trained 400 people from 50 cities on SUMP last year. The EC also organize twice a year a conference on SUMP. It started in June 2014 in Poland², in Romania in 2015³. Next meeting in Bremen, Germany, on April 2016⁴.

The EC also set up an expert group on urban mobility, representatives of Member States, meeting twice a year. This group aims at giving national experts the tools to support their cities. Two meetings were held already. During the second meeting, there was some political perspective by Karima Delli, and specific presentations and in-depth discussion on urban area, including cycling (ECF), national strategy for cycling (AustriaTech) and car-sharing example in The Netherlands. Work was also made on how some countries pull together tools to implement SUMP. Presentation from Spain, which introduced conditionality for funding based on the development of SUMP; also Bremen presented how they did some leverage on national guidance for implementing SUMP nation-wide. The next meeting will be in November, date remaining to be confirmed.

² [http://www.eltis.org/participate/events/1st-european-conference-sustainable-urban-mobility-plans](http://www.eltis.org/participate/events/1st-european-conference-sustainable-urban-mobility-plans)
European associations requested to join this group, but the current financial capacity does not allow to involve all representatives at the moment. However, EU associations will be associated to future meetings where specific topic that are at the core of the association might be addressed.

Finally, the EC also worked intensively over the last two years to merge mobilityplans.eu and eltis together, in order to provide a real one-stop-shop solution with clean information, update on finances opportunities and policy background.

Q&A

Polis: do you set specific priorities for SUMP, such as electromobility or urban freight? If so, how can we collaborate with your service to provide support and inputs from members?

EC: While we started working on specific topics, including electromobility and freight, we also began to work on ITS and access restrictions. We also might have additional work to reshape the SUMPs guidelines and potentially tailor them to better fit big or small cities requirements. This will be part of the revision of the SUMP guidelines in 2015, with work coming into life in 2017. But we still believe everything is still important, it’s just that due to some circumstances we had to focus on certain elements. Decarbonisation for example, access restriction also. But that does not mean these topics are more important than the others.

Polis: Polis advocated for quite a long time to cover some transversal elements that are of importance for urban transport, particularly when it comes to health issues. At the United Nation level, a tool was developed, the HEAT Tool. How do you see such tool being implemented in future SUMPs?

EC: this tool is indeed one of the element in the SUMP revision.

Other EU association’s questions

a) Eltis as one-stop-shop is a good point. But reducing by 20% the budget for it in 2015 does not seem to fit with the initial ambitions...

EC: Indeed Eltis budget was higher before, but mostly because we had to redesign the website and do some technical work, hence its budget. Now the modules are the right one and we don’t plan on changing that anymore, and therefore we will focus on developing the content. We also worked a lot on case studies. However, in 2017, Eltis will have a way higher budget, and this also links with H2020 Work Programme 2016 and 2017 where specific financial lines on urban mobility are included.

b) Is there anything else than just exchange of good practices in the national Expert group on urban mobility?

EC: no, nothing concrete aside from supporting their local authorities on SUMP, just good practices. There will be work in the near future to divide the work into some specific subtopics, but that will come later.

c) Why differentiating big and small cities in SUMPs? Most of big cities actually work on SUMPs by neighborhood...

EC: There are quite a lot of concerns from the ground, which indeed made some difference content wise for small cities. But this is just technicalities, there will be no distinction at the policy level.
Financial opportunities for SUMP

EC Presentation: please refers to the document on Polis website for full presentation⁵.

Additional input regarding “Innovative Action in Sustainable Urban Development”: It will start this year and be linked to the EU urban agenda⁶.

Additional detail regarding the “European Fund for Strategic Investment”: for solid EU projects, cities should come together and take direct contact with EIB and national promotional banks. They already exists on most countries, the list being completed by the end of October. These promoters will assess projects for their eligibility. To support the cities in developing their project, they should also liaise with their national advisory hub⁷.

Q&A

Polis: The EFSI is definitely something we would like to have further information for our members and support them building projects. But how do you see the transport sector benefiting from this programme if one crucial element of eligibility is based on short term return on investment?

EC: We must recognize that urban mobility is definitely not the easiest area to benefit from the EFSI. However, some elements could be eligible, such as car-sharing or charging infrastructure.

Polis: another point of interest to our members is the Connecting Europe Facility Programme, particularly on urban nodes. However, we lack information on eligibility, process, financing and support. On top of that, being a national scheme, what added value do you see for EU association?

EC: There are no real place apart from your associations to put cities together so they could apply for CEF in a common project, in the same corridor but from different member states. We see here an excellent added value to address bottlenecks such as border regions. As for the lack of information, we will liaise with the INEA in charge of the CEF Infoday on November 30th so they do include a specific session on urban nodes.

Other EU association:

a) Formal combination of all EU financing opportunities? We lack information in that regard for EFSI and we would like to see a more concrete collaboration between the EIB & DG MOVE...

EC: There will indeed be a more formal document, but I don’t think that such document will develop further than what is presented here. It’s even truer regarding EFSI, as private investors are the one eventually deciding the projects’ eligibility.

Update on AFI Directive

EC Presentation: please refers to the document on Polis website for full presentation⁸.

---

⁷ http://www.eib.org/eiah/index.htm
Additional inputs from EC: this directive sets minimum infrastructure identified with targets in the national policy framework. The Member States finally accepted the adoption of this directive and are currently preparing their national plans which they shall submit by November 2016. To support them in doing so, the EC hired a consultant which will provide Member States guidelines for these national framework by December this year.

The directive also mandates a build-up of recharging and refueling point EU wide, with a mandatory implementation of technologies and proper information to consumers. CEN-CENELEC is currently working on normalization and standardization of the technical specification (Annex 2 of AFI Directive). As for the user information, the EC will draft a methodology on fuel price comparison.

In terms of future developments, there will be a workshop with Member States and selected road transport stakeholders later in October, and this event will also include the urban mobility aspect.

Finally, the AFI Sustainable Transport Forum Expert group has been created before summer 2015. It gathers Member States and main stakeholders (nota: Polis is a member). This expert group will provide advice and technical expertise on the implementation of the AFI Directive, projects and deliver opinion, submit report, even propose new innovative solutions. The next meeting is set for December. There will be a chance for new stakeholders to join the subgroups that are foreseen to be created at a later stage. (nota: Polis proposed to create a new subgroup on urban nodes).

Q&A

Polis: While the STF will be providing inputs for the AFI Directive Guidelines, we see room here to formulate recommendations on how to liaise the national framework with the cities perspective.

*EC noted this point, recalling that Article 3 paragraph 3 do specify the need for Member states to consult local authorities.*

Other Associations:

a) Questions regarding joining the STF expert Group

EC: There are 60 members, 28 MS + 32 stakeholders. More than 100 applications. Polis represents cities. You can of course cooperate with them to propose new inputs and there will be possible new cooperation within subgroups.

b) Questions regarding the guidelines
   a. Charging stations being not only present at main railway stations also put in outskirts rather than city centres → EC noted this point
   b. Detailed report on how these plans were developed, who was consulted, what were the outputs → EC noted this point
   c. Question regarding technical connectors used → EC answering that this is CEN-CENELEC role, Type 2 being the main plug while Type 3 can be used (multi-connectors)

Clean vehicle

EC: the review of this directive is set for 2017. In December last year, an external evaluation was undertaken. The final report was recently approved by the EC and will be published in the following weeks. The results are mostly that this directive has a concrete added value in public procurement, but it lacks efficiency, the impacts of this directive are lower than expected and there is a partial lack of coherence in some parts of the directive in terms of the calculation methodology for fuels.
In terms of follow-up, this directive will be amended on specific points, but the decision from the EC side has not been taken yet. There are various options, including an ex ante analysis to be carried out before the revision in 2017.

Last point: auxiliary measures, e.g the clean vehicle portal. There will be some modifications here, but this will happen only after the evaluation result.

**Q&A**

Polis: In the review, will you also address specific questions regarding the definition of what a “clean” vehicle really is, as mentioned in the Clean Feet Project, as well as regarding some specific exemption laid in Article 3?

Other associations:

a- Potential overlap between the Clean Vehicle Directive and the Public Procurement directive 2014/24 and 2014/25?

EC: The horizontal procurement directive (2014/24) incorporate life-cycle approach, but it is a voluntary element. In the clean vehicle directive, it is compulsory and part of the horizontal directive. There will be no contradiction between the two.

**City logistics and access restriction non-binding guidelines**

Part A – City Logistics

*EC Presentation: please refers to the document on Polis website for full presentation*.10

Part B – Access restriction guidelines

This derives from the Transport White Paper goals and is included in the Urban Mobility Package. The aim here will be to propose non-binding guidelines on access regulation schemes, which will touch upon vehicle type and emissions. While a first stakeholder workshop was done on September 25th, the aim is just to do some “rapprochement” amongst different schemes and how to best inform citizens on their existence, particularly for travelers. Subsidiarity will apply and cities are most definitely the one deciding on this opportunity.

**Q&A**

Other Associations:

a- Guideline applying on parking management? Do they foresee any specifics for regional bus drop-off zones being on the outskirt of cities?

EC: for parking management, we will have to check again the document. But as to the drop-off zones, it would be seen as a restriction for tourists and travelers, so that is very unlikely.

---


Road safety

EC: We don’t have specific mandate on road safety in urban areas. Currently, we are working on Road Safety Plan until 2020 to tackle injuries, mostly by promoting exchange of good practices. We don’t have any specific financing for road safety, but there is always a specific aspect on road safety under H2020 and CEF.

Based on the principle of responsibility, we monitor Member States performances based on different factors (decrease of fatalities depending on the transport mode used, etc.). As a result, urban areas have less fatalities but higher much more accident, mostly with Vulnerable Road Users (“VRUs”), compared with other areas.

To tackle VRUs issues, we have to address first and foremost the infrastructure at the TEN-T level. In urban, it will only be soft measures. For the latter, we have launched two studies: one on elderly people and one on distractions (smartphones, tablet, etc.). Both studies results’ will be published in January 2016.

As when it comes to the data usage, we saw discrepancies between data collected from the EC and the one from Member States. There will therefore be additional work to be done to jointly have a common set of datas. This is most particularly true when it comes to the new definition on medical aspects on serious injuries (MAIS3+): we expect to have the first data collection by end of this year, to be published early 2016. This is the first time we do that, so that it needs some time. The follow-up will be handed over to the Member States, and no EC actions are foreseen at the moment. Brochure available11, which compares urban and rural areas.

Q&A

Polis: There was a joint call for serious injuries target at the EU level for the next 2011-2020 Road Safety Orientations review. Apparently, this was not taken onboard in Commissioner Bulc agenda due to the fact that the EC lacks data. What are you views on this topic?

EC: we had several discussions with Member States and National experts about this. It was decided to wait in order to have a common definition, have data collection and then go for a target that is achievable. It took quite a long time to have the new set of data. We’re still however going to monitor and benchmark in order to come up with a good dataset collection.

Other EU associations: Is speed limit a topic that you are working on, be it regulation or guidelines?

EU: no, due to the subsidiarity principle, we do not work on this, but we do promote it in good practices. If Guidelines would have to be adopted, it would rather be the United Nation level, within the Road Safety Group and under the Vienna Convention. However, we are not aware of any work done in this group on this topic.

11 The whole toolbox for data is available here: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/specialist/toolbox/index_en.htm
Multimodal travel information

EC Presentation: please refers to the document on Polis website for full presentation\(^{12}\).

Additional inputs:

EC: The vision of seamless travel was initiated by former European Commissioner for Transport, Mr Sim Kallas. Multimodal travel information is key to that regard. It is now quite fragmented at the moment, limited to specific geographical areas. Most of users do have access to static info, but substantial work remains to be done in terms of dynamic information (delays, PRMs access…), and it is believed that such access is a right for passengers/users.

The legal framework adopted in 2010 within the ITS Directive gave 6 priorities areas to the EC, the EU Wide multimodal travel information being the first priority (action a). It aims at harmonizing standards across the EU in terms of information. It is of importance to underline the fact that we would build on the existing market in place locally and nationally, not create a new EU multimodal travel information/journey planner.

Public consultation on this topic is opened until 25/11/2015\(^{13}\).

While we’re currently focusing on open-data for traveler’s information, the EC will not focus on ticketing at the moment.

In terms of implementation process, there is an ITS expert group, each Member States having a national expert. We had already 6 meetings.

The will be a stakeholders meeting scheduled for 4\(^{th}\) November.

As for EU Projects, we keep a close look at the OPTICITIES Project, most particularly regarding software tools\(^{14}\).

Urban ITS mandate

EC Presentation: please refers to the document on Polis website for full presentation\(^{15}\).

EC: This Urban ITS Expert Group operated for two years (2010-2012). At the end of 2012, they provided with a set of guidelines with key ITS applications for urban areas on multimodal travel information, urban logistics and traffic management, alongside with a pre-study and active involvement of urban authorities, as they saw a need to properly understand the user needs and comes with standards.

To that end, in 2014-2015, a whole consultation process was undertaken with all relevant stakeholders, including Member States, ESOs, urban ITS stakeholders and the members from the committee of standardization (within CEN-CENELEC).

---


\(^{14}\) Report soon to be available on [http://www.opticities.com/](http://www.opticities.com/)

In terms of follow-up, the EC launched the pre-study, with results by the end of the year, which focuses on gap/overlap analysis, a real stakeholder mapping and a case definition approach. This will result as potential items that will be brought up in the mandate for standards requirements.

After this, the EC will then ask stakeholders to provide deliverables on the three area of urban ITS (multimodal information services, traffic management and urban logistics).

**Update on other institutions on Urban Mobility**

Council: Informal council on cycling. Declaration on cycling (non-binding) on October 7th.


EC Smart Cities: DG Move is now leading the EC steering group on Smart Cities since October and for one year.

*Timeline of different events foreseen at this stage:*