

# 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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](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

Christian

\* Surname

Paral

\* Email (this won't be published)

christian.paral@svmc.se

\* Organisation name

*255 character(s) maximum*

Sveriges MotorCyklister, SMC

\* 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 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                                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Bhutan                           | <input type="radio"/> Greenland                           | <input type="radio"/> Myanmar /Burma   | <input type="radio"/> Svalbard and Jan Mayen                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Bolivia                          | <input type="radio"/> Grenada                             | <input type="radio"/> Namibia          | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Sweden                            |
| <input type="radio"/> Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba | <input type="radio"/> Guadeloupe                          | <input type="radio"/> Nauru            | <input type="radio"/> Switzerland                                  |

- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
  
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
  
- Cambodia
  
- Cameroon
  
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
  
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
  
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
  
- Colombia
- Comoros
  
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
  
- Curaçao
  
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
  
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
  
- Hungary
  
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
  
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
  
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
  
- Jersey
- Jordan
  
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
  
- Laos
  
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
  
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
  
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
  
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
  
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
  
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
  
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara

- Cyprus
- Latvia
- Saint Barthélemy
- Yemen
- Czechia
- Lebanon
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Zambia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Lesotho
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Zimbabwe
- Denmark
- Liberia
- 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:**

- more people and more means of transport have to share an ever smaller space on urban roads, causing accidents.
- efficient public transport
- the need of individual transport in major cities. As a NGO for motorcyclists we see powered two wheelers as a THE alternative to cars for individual transport when distances are too long to cope with a cycle.
- however, we do also see the challenge that vehicles need to be used more efficient in ways such as car (vehicle) pools so that a lesser number of vehicles transports a larger number of people.
- on all levels in Sweden little effort is made as well as limited resources are given to improve road safety for powered-two-wheelers.

\* 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Road congestion has increased	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 than 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Congestion has decreased	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Mobility along long-distance transport network ( <a href="#">TEN-T</a> ) has improved	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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?

Knowledge about the local circumstances is crucial for an efficient transport planning. However, our experience is that policies are followed which might be popular, or not be questioned in a larger extent just for the sake of a political programme. E.g. in Stockholm it is popular, like in many cities to improve the conditions for cyclists, however often at a large cost for other groups such as cars, pedestrians or motorcyclists. The circumstances in the Greater Stockholm Area are a low density of population, and a large part of its population has to cope with long distances, spending hours on commuting every week and public transportation is not always efficient enough. Plus, no efforts are made for powered-two-wheelers. Quite the opposite is the case, the situation has gotten worse over the last couple of years in Stockholm in terms of mobility and safety for motorcyclists as well as mopeds.

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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Sustainable urban mobility plans (SUMP)	<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 Urban logistics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Coordinating public and private-sector intervention in the area of Urban access vehicle regulations	<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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

## 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 are sufficiently linked to EU funding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* SUMP are adequately linked to the size of the cities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* The fact that SUMP are not mandatory allows sufficient flexibility to authorities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Cities receive sufficient support for the development and implementation of SUMP	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Support national, regional and local authorities to develop and implement SUMP, 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

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

Always remember to include powered-two-wheelers in SUMP.

## 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

Always remember to include powered-two-wheelers in ITS!

## 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Provide targeted financial support	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 minimum share of public transport, active mobility and zero-emission vehicles)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

## Further information

---

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

*3000 character(s) maximum*

We find that member states should cooperate and share information and experience when it comes to urban transport, as well as learn from each other. SMC:s position concerning these questions is that the most effective and sustainable solution for every mean of transport shall be considered. Further, we advocate individual transportation when public transport is not efficient enough, or simply because of the individual freedom it provides. Powered-two-wheelers are therefore part of the solution and must not be forgotten. For further reading, please see our position paper.

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

**5ec31ce1-11fc-4e09-852e-cf0223672cf3/urban\_transport.pdf**

## Contact

MOVE-UMP-REVISION@ec.europa.eu