URBAN AGENDA FOR THE EU

Partnership for Urban Mobility

Final Draft Action Plan

(v1.0., 12.02.2018)

**** The Pact of Amsterdam states that the Action Plan "can be regarded as non-binding". Therefore, the actions presented in this Action Plan are not compulsory. ****

DEFINITIONS

Actions should address a real need: an important issue, have real and visible impact and concern a larger number of Member States and cities;

Actions should be new: no 'recycling' of elements which have already been done or which would be done anyway;

Actions should be ready to be implemented: Clear, detailed and feasible; a study or a working group or a network is not considered an action.

Recommendations: are meant to suggest good policies, good governance or good practices examples which could be used for inspiration. For instance, these can be projects that have already been implemented and that are considered successful. The aim of such recommendations is to encourage their mainstreaming (implementation at a wider scale) and transfer (implementation in more Member States and cities).

Responsible: is meant the institution (EU/national/local) to who the action is addressed. It is not specifically any of the members of the partnerships. To describe why one institution should be responsible means that the partnership wen into the analysis of the action and reached the conclusion that an action fits the purpose.

Deadline: refers to the timeframe where the action should take place in order to be meaningful. A deadline refers to a specific calendar.

Contents

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objectives

The 'Pact of Amsterdam' of May 2016 has established the Urban Agenda for the EU; a new working method of thematic partnerships seeking to optimise utilisation of the growth potential of cities and to address social challenges. It aims to do so through better cooperation between Cities, Regions, Member States, the European Commission and other stakeholders. Following the 12 priority themes outlined in the Urban Agenda for the EU, 12 thematic partnership have been established. The Partnership on Urban Mobility is one of these Partnerships.

The aim of the Partnership is to develop a multilevel governance approach in an open and transparent was in order to achieve the wider objectives of the Urban Agenda for the EU, which is to realise the full potential and contribution of urban areas towards achieving the objectives of the Union and related national priorities, in full respect of subsidiarity and proportionality principle and competences.

The Urban Agenda and the partnerships strive to involve urban authorities in the design of policies, to mobilise urban authorities for the implementation of EU policies, and to strengthen the urban dimension in these policies. By identifying and striving to overcome unnecessary obstacles in EU policy, the Urban Agenda for the EU aims to enable Urban Authorities to work in a more systematic and coherent way towards achieving overarching goals. Moreover, it will help make EU policy more urban-friendly, effective and efficient.

The Urban Agenda for the EU focuses specifically on three pillars of EU policy making and implementation: better regulation, better funding, and better knowledge.

The Partnership of Urban Mobility seeks to facilitate a joint effort for more sustainable urban mobility. The focus of the Partnership is on the mid- and long-term perspective on urban mobility. In order to deal with this, the Partnership has established four topics that need to be addressed:

- Active modes of infrastructure and public space
- New mobility services and innovation
- Public transport (including clean buses) and accessibility
- Governance

This action plan aims to put forward an elaboration of actions necessary to address the challenges experienced in line with the topics outlined above. Furthermore, it indicates what is necessary for the implementation of these actions and it provides an overview of the associated actors and timeline. The Partnership is now entering the public feedback phase, in which stakeholders will be approached and several outreach workshops will be organised. Following the completion of the public feedback phase, the actions will be

revised and updated where necessary and appropriate, according to the outcomes of this phase.

1.2 Governance of the Partnership

The members of the partnership are:

- Member states: Czech Republic (Co-coordinator), Cyprus, Finland, Romania, Slovenia
- Cities: Karlsruhe (Co-coordinator), Bari, Bielefeld, Burgas, Gdynia, Malmö, Nijmegen, Torres Vedras,
- Regions: Skåne, Wallonia
- Stakeholders: CEMR, EIB, EUROCITIES, European Cyclist Federation, POLIS, UITP
- European Commission:
- Observers: URBACT

The Partnership meets frequently in Partnership meetings to work on next steps and discuss the progress that has been made. For the purpose of establishing and elaborating the actions, the Partnership was organised in working groups which all collaborated in drafting the actions.

1 ACTIVE MODES OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND PUBLIC SPACE

1.1 ACTION N° 1 – Developing guidelines on infrastructure for active mobility supported by relevant funding (Knowledge / Funding / Regulation)

Developing walking and cycling as active modes of mobility in urban areas offers great socio-economic benefits: it assists in reducing the emission of noise and air pollutants, as well as greenhouses gases. It encourages a healthy lifestyle and creates a more attractive urban environment. It can also increase the accessibility of public transport, by covering first & last mile of the journey and increasing the catchment areas of public transport stops. The reduction of car traffic and thus congestion (better accessibility, reduction of loss of travel time) improves the economic competiveness of the urban area. In monetary terms, investing in active modes can bring a very high return: as an example, one Euro invested in a cycle highway generates between two and 14 Euro in health benefits alone[1].

Getting more people to walk and cycle helps reduce congestion not only within city centres but also within functional urban areas and, especially where cycling highways are built, along the main road arteries such as the TEN-T corridors. Within poly-centric areas, cycling helps to get a more accessible region, where in cities walking and cycling may become a mobility alternative for socially excluded - in this way also tackling transport poverty.

- **What is the specific problem?**

In order to develop the full potential of the active modes of transport, cycling and walking have to be taken seriously in urban mobility policies, including in the allocation of space and in the allocation of budgets.

A comprehensive network of active mobility infrastructure which is well-designed and safe, is a not only l but also a basic requirement for making cycling or walking a viable and attractive option in daily travel.

Currently in many cities, pedestrians and cyclists must deal with incomplete networks, unnecessary detours, inappropriate surfaces, bad or no signage of routes, insufficient or inconvenient crossings, long waiting times at traffic lights. In many cities, safety concerns – often linked to the absence or poor development of walking and cycling infrastructure, as well as inconsiderate driver behaviour and poor traffic law

[1] "Health impact model for modal shift from car use to cycling or walking in Flanders: application to two bicycle highways"; Jurgen Buekers; Evi Dons; Bar Elen; Luc Int Panis. Many national and regional governments started to provide subsidies for cycle highways exactly because of this return on investment (see also: https://nationaler-radverkehrsplan.de/de/aktuell/nachrichten/bund-will-radschnellwege-staerker-foerdern and http://deredactie.be/cm/vrtnieuws/binnenland/1.3027275).

enforcement – remain a major barrier for more people to walk or cycle to work or school.

Walking and cycling infrastructure is developed mostly using local and regional resources and knowledge. In some parts of Europe, there is a long and successful history for implementing ambitious cycling polices. In other parts of Europe, however, there is little experience with the development of cycling policy and the design of good cycling infrastructure, never mind walking. There are no European level standards or recommendations on how to design safe, comfortable, direct and attractive infrastructure for the active modes and the knowledge is missing in several Member States and cities. Most of the member states do not have a good national standard for walking and cycling infrastructure. The quality of implemented projects varies. It prevents a quicker increase of the share of walking and cycling and decreases the effectiveness of the public (including EU) funds used for financing such projects. This applies both to dedicated active mobility projects and elements of pedestrian or cycling infrastructure in other investments (e.g. in public spaces, road or public transport).

- **Which action is needed?**

In light of the above, the action should focus on two areas:

A. Infrastructure for active modes:
    a. Develop European guidelines for walking and cycling infrastructure, with minimum quality standards and with examples of good implementation practices. The infrastructure guidance should take into account the increasing variety in the types of bicycles (size, speed, etc.), as this creates both new challenges as well as opportunities.
    b. Encourage Member States to develop their own standards on this basis, taking into account varying environmental and historical context.
B. Financing for active modes:
    a. For the current 2014-2020 programming period, keep the EU Funding Observatory for Cycling[2] updated in order to inform about funding opportunities for cycling, highlight successful cycling projects and best practices. Take the different development stages of countries / cities into account when defining good practices as well as the impact of good practices on well-defined indicators.
    b. For the next financial period (2021-2027), ensure that funding for active modes of transport to support the development of comprehensive walking and cycling policies, relevant research and innovation activities, and the large-scale implementation of high quality walking and cycling infrastructure is properly included in the relevant European funding programmes, and encourage Member States, regions and cities to propose ambitious targets in that regard.

- **How to implement the action?**

[2] https://ecf.com/what-we-do/european-funding/eu-funds-observatory-cycling

What has to be done:

A. Infrastructure for active modes:
    a. Develop European guidelines with minimum quality standards for safe, attractive, direct and comfortable walking and cycling infrastructure, in particular: [3]
        i. Explore, evaluate and compare the current regulations, standards and practice in different member states regarding walking and cycling infrastructure.
        ii. Elaborate guiding principles on the EU level regarding the different types and parameters of cycling infrastructure components (e.g. bike path, cycle lane, advanced stopped line, signed cycle route etc.) and walking infrastructure (i.e. walking paths, devices/infrastructure elements of pavements). The principles should be linked to expected cycle and pedestrian traffic and ambitious, motivating enough for more pedestrian friendly and developed cycling cities, regions, but feasible for starters as well.
        iii. Provide examples of good practice in implementing high quality walking and cycling infrastructure in challenging conditions (e.g. high density/ tight-knit historical city centre, low budget), including e.g. trial closures of streets for cars (to open them for cyclists and pedestrians) and integrated design of public spaces.
        iv. Encourage possible application of guidelines outside design and build, e.g. in spatial planning (where and how much space needs to be reserved for walking and cycling infrastructure) or route planners (common dictionary of walking and cycling infrastructure, assessing the quality of a route and prioritising routes with higher quality) should be encouraged.
        v. Encourage taking the guidelines into consideration in relevant EU and national funding regulations and programmes
        vi. Disseminate the knowledge (university curricula, trainings etc.) and develop a tool to validate the correct application of the guidelines and/or standards and help monitor the quality and quantity of walking and cycling infrastructure and measure the impact of the different investments.

B. National standards for active modes:
    a. Member States should adapt their national (regional, local, if relevant) standards and regulations regarding walking and cycling infrastructure, or elaborate them, on the basis of the EU guidelines[4].
    b. All relevant national (regional, local) regulations of EU Member States (for example regarding roads, new and existing buildings, public spaces) should include norms for walking and cycling.

[3] The work on the EU guidelines for cycling was initiated by the Commission in January 2018, with a support of external contractor

[4] Not applicable in case of national standards being more ambitious than the EU-level guidelines

C. Financing for active modes:
    a. Keep the EU Funding Cycling Observatory updated to include references to relevant EU funding instruments and effective cycling projects.
    b. Aim to ensure increased level of funding for active modes of transport in the new programming period 2021-2027[5], in particular by:
        i. encouraging Member States, regions (including functional urban areas) and cities to propose ambitious targets in that regard, taking into account the recommendations of WHO and UN
        ii. increasing the amount of references to walking and cycling in relevant funding instruments (especially the European ones);
        iii. including the guidelines for active mobility infrastructure (with related indicators) in the relevant programming documents of funding instruments.

<u>Implementation risks:</u>

A. Infrastructure for active modes:
    a. Due to historical structures of city centres, limited space and money, lack of standards for walking infrastructure made it very complicated to create adequate dedicated cycling infrastructure in cities. The limited space will raise resistance against the change, but with the right arguments (including effectiveness) and solutions it is possible to handle it. These historical city centres are absolutely unable to handle high volume of individual motorised traffic and active mobility is the only solution which solves, their mobility challenges.
    b. Some aspects of standards need to be adapted to climate conditions, e.g. north and south countries may need different materials and maintenance routines.
    c. National, regional and city authorities and cities should define enforcement procedures and appoint staff responsible for checking that investments are in line with standards for walking and cycling infrastructure, in other case we risk that the guidelines are not applied. The process of approving could be a factor which lengthens the total time of planning and implementation.
    d. Lack of political will to apply the new guidelines and/or regulations and the lack of knowledge about the solutions in relation to policy objectives should be handled via training and dissemination activities.
    e. Difficulty and/or lack of political will to ensure effective traffic law enforcement to protect high quality active mobility infrastructure and users from e.g. illegally parked vehicles and high/ incompatible auto vehicle speeds.
    f. There are doubts, if walking and cycling should be considered separately or as the same kind of activity. While in some areas walking and cycling infrastructure can be combined (especially outside built-up areas, in

[5] It is advised that the appropriate level of financing for cycling related investments in European urban areas should reach 15-20% of the transport budget

some larger parks etc.), it is important to understand the different needs of those user groups.

g. The action does not address spatial planning which is very important for developing the infrastructure. However, good guidelines will form a solid basis for more active mobility oriented spatial planning (e.g. where and how much space should be reserved for cycling infrastructure).
h. Cycling is more in focus and currently guidelines on cycling infrastructure principles are being elaborated, as EC has commissioned a study on "Guidance for Cycling Projects in the EU". The same should be done for walking.
i. Furthermore no dedicated partners for the walking mode are among the PUM partners and therefore there is no balance to deliver measure related description for active modes.

B. Financing for active modes:
   a. The transport / mobility sector generally may receive less EU Funds in the next period and in that case it will be harder to advocate for more investments into active mobility. In this case we have to use the arguments regarding the cost effectiveness and environmental, quality of life, social and health benefits of active mobility investments.
   b. In all cases it should be ensured that the external costs of individual motorised traffic and benefits of active mobility are fully taken into account when calculating the return on investment and deciding about financing transport projects. Otherwise there is a risk that socio-economic benefits are underestimated, e.g. during cost-benefit analysis and option analysis for relevant projects.
   c. The development of cycling and walking infrastructure is usually connected to new motorised transport infrastructure (to make the investment more sustainable). The funds allocated for the part of investment related to active modes is often a small fraction of the total costs of the investment. This should be reversed and during the evaluation of proposals, these proportions should be taken more into account. There are a few projects which are dedicated to building/modernising infrastructure related specifically for active modes and these should have higher priority.

- **Which partners?**

Partner	Role
European Cyclist Federation and other relevant thematic organisations (Walk21, European Transport Safety Council)	Provide expertise, keep the EU Funds Observatory for Cycling up to date,
Regional/Local Stakeholders	Provide expertise
National Associations of Local and Regional Authorities	Promote regulations, provide expertise/input

- **Which timeline?**

Preparation: June 2018 – September 2018
Implementation: October 2018 – October 2019
Finalisation: November 2019 – December 2019

1.2 ACTION N ˚ 2 – Promoting sustainable and active mobility behaviour (Knowledge)

- **What is the Specific Problem?**

Walking is considered by many as the most basic, natural and independent form of transport, followed by cycling. Walking, in particular, is the backbone of and a prerequisite for every other mode of transport (e.g. walking is required to catch a bus, access a bike sharing facility or reach your final destination after exiting a transit terminal). Despite the above, active modes are still not perceived as serious and fully-fledged as complementary to other modes. This causes many other issues, such as often being neglected in policy, biased allocation of space and funding, and results in rising negative social, economic and environmental costs due to over-utilisation of polluting transport modes.

There are also many definitions as to what walking means and when we particularly perceive it as transport mode. Diversity of opinions causes misunderstandings in calculating walking/pedestrian indexes and modal splits in cities. Without detailed research on walking and cycling, it is difficult to prepare solutions to change transport behaviour into more active modes.

Many people also do not change their transport behaviour towards a more active one – even when infrastructure (physical barrier) is in place - due to mental barriers: a lack of knowledge of the availability of options, lack of motivation, lack of positive attitude towards active modes, safety and comfort aspects, perceived travel time aspects, lack of understanding of the benefits, lack of incentives from work / school and general resistance to change. Changing behaviour through soft incentives is often not evaluated, thus its effects are not known and neglected. Positive health benefits of walking and cycling are already well known for experts, with a lot of evidence supporting it, however often citizens are not aware of them. Sedentary life-style, on the other hand, is not only bad for health, but also brings concrete losses to the economy: estimated over €80 bln[6] is lost every year in the EU due to lack of physical activity.

Currently, the EU-wide European Mobility Week (EMW) campaign has as one its main objectives the awareness rising when it comes to sustainable and active mobility. It is used by national, regional and local authorities as an opportunity to encourage cycling and walking in close cooperation with relevant stakeholders such as schools, NGOs and

[6] Centre for Economics and Business Research, http://inactivity-time-bomb.nowwemove.com/download-report/The%20Economic%20Costs%20of%20Physical%20Inactivity%20in%20Europe%20(June%202015).pdf

companies. Experiences and best practices of the EMW should be used to reinforce this action.

- **Which action is needed?**

Unfortunately, a key role of 'soft' policies such as sustainable mobility campaigns is often simply to inform people who are using their car for the majority of trips about other modes. A combination of measures, linking 'hard' and 'soft' transport policies in a co-ordinated strategy, has the greatest chance of success.

Data needs to be systematically gathered on mobility behaviour and preferences as well as barriers and drivers of mobility patterns. Traffic generators such as schools and companies should be primarily addressed because of their high potential for influencing commuting patterns. Children are most prone to transport behaviour change and have a large influence on the transport behaviour of their parents. Therefore focus is needed on introducing mobility plans for schools. In particular, the following is needed:

A. Collection of best practices on mobility plans and drivers of transport behaviour change.
B. Development of a toolkit on collecting data (focusing on increasing cycling and walking) to support elaboration of sustainable mobility plans for schools and companies.
C. Development of a tool for systematic monitoring and evaluation of mobility plans for schools and companies.
D. Dissemination of results to stakeholders and decision makers to give walking and cycling higher priority and higher funding.
E. Reinforcement of mobility plans process (i.e. stakeholders to be included, scope, process, data needed, most successful methods of awareness raising and mobility behaviour change, allocated funds) for schools and companies.

Many cities have a lot of valuable experience with the European Mobility Week campaign that could be useful in the context of the current action; both processes should be mutually reinforced and eventual overlaps – avoided.

- **How to implement the action?**

<u>What needs to be done:</u>

A. Analysis of the experiences of the European Mobility Week campaign in order to collect relevant best practices and other useful learnings.
B. Analysis of different types of campaigns (traditional campaigns, image or brand building, social & cultural events, education programmes, bike to work campaigns) and dedicated of active modes application to collect good practices.
C. Analysis what challenges addressed above can be addressed in upcoming *Raising Awareness of alternatives to private car study* of DG MOVE 2018.

D. Development of a toolkit on collecting data (focusing on increasing cycling and walking) to support elaboration of sustainable mobility plans for schools and companies.
E. Development of a guideline with a set of key indicators for systematic monitoring and evaluation of mobility plans for schools and companies.
F. Making mobility plans for schools and companies obligatory at relevant level (legal requirement over established employees) –
G. Develop courses & training on active mobility to be included to schools' programme.
H. Provision of training/capacity building on mobility plans elaboration for schools, large companies (e.g. 100+ employees), institutions, based on the best practices.
I. Mainstreaming active mobility in national strategies for health, environment, education, transport/mobility and climate change.

Implementation risks:

It could be difficult to prepare universal tools of data collection and evaluation for mobility plans for all countries, due to different levels of walking and cycling culture and available infrastructure (cycling, walking network).
In order to increase attractiveness of cycling and walking as transport modes in schools and at workplaces, the involvement of employers, parents and school staff is needed. In many cases they do not participate due to lack of time, interest and understanding of the benefits of healthy and happy people.

Mobility plans are linked with infrastructure – without quality network of cycling and walking paths as well as proper maintenance and enforcement (e.g. illegally parked vehicles), and only soft measures implemented, mobility plans might be not effective. The action is focusing mainly on schools and companies, other members of society are not included.

It will be difficult to oblige companies to elaborate a mobility plan for new investments and into societal business cases.

- **Which partners?**

Partner	Role
Cities	Analyse experiences of the Urban Mobility Week
National governments	Mainstreaming active mobility in national strategies for health, environment, education, transport/mobility and climate change
Local, Regional & National Governments	Develop courses & training on active mobility for schools Develop regulations obliging companies to develop mobility plans.

Partner	Role
European Commission	Analysis of challenges to be addressed in Raising Awareness to Alternatives of Private Car Study. Analyse mobility campaigns for active modes and the implementation of initiatives put forward in actions. Commissioning the development of a toolkit on collecting data to support elaboration of sustainable mobility plans for schools and companies and a relevant guideline document.
ECF, WALK 21, other stakeholder organisations	Provide expertise

- **Which timeline?**

Preparation: June 2018 – September 2018
Implementation: October 2018 – October 2019
Finalisation: November 2019 – December 2019

1.3 ACTION N˚3 – Reducing diversity of Urban Vehicle Access Regulations (UVAR) (Knowledge / Regulation)

- **What is the Specific Problem?**

Following on the Action Plan on urban mobility of 2009, the Commission published a Study on Urban Vehicle Access Restrictions[7] (UVARs) which found that the situation in Member States varied considerably when it comes to legal basis and practices. The Commission's Urban Mobility Package[8] (UMP) of 2013 recognised the important role that Member States play in providing the right framework conditions for local action.

For very good reasons, cities across the EU are implementing, or considering implementation of UVARs, such as congestion or Low-Emission Zones (LEZs). This is due to growing evidence and awareness of effects of air pollution on health, rising congestion (and related negative costs to the society) and the fact that real world driving emissions in a number of cases exceed the limits set down in EU legislation. It is also because cities need to take such action to comply with legal obligations set down in the EU Ambient Air Quality Directive. Growing number of schemes may create confusion for citizens and businesses, and is seen by some as a limitation to the freedom of movement. It is also difficult, and in some cases impossible, to enforce UVAR rules against vehicles from other Member States.

The European Commission currently receives many inquiries concerning the diversity among urban access regulation schemes in the EU and the lack of their harmonisation;

[7] https://ec.europa.eu/transport/sites/transport/files/themes/urban/studies/doc/2010_12_ars_final_report.pdf
[8] COM(2013) 913 final

fragmentation of approaches leads to inefficiencies. This suggests there may be a need to examine the various schemes to see if any actions could be taken at the relevant level to address such concerns.

Finally, the effectiveness of existing schemes is not systematically assessed and communicated.

- **Which action is needed?**

A. Ensuring transparency of UVAR schemes locally in effect and making available relevant centralised information to the public/travellers/commercial traffic: this is already being supported by the Commission[9], however new, more effective means could be necessary.
B. Beyond technical issues, the decision of setting up a scheme should also include all aspects of planning and implementation. This means ensuring an effective consultation with the public and other relevant stakeholders.
C. Public authorities should make accurate real time traffic information available to users through effective implementation of EU specifications for Intelligent Transport Systems as per Directive 2010/40/EU[10] and its delegated regulations.
D. Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning (SUMP) can provide the overarching context and rationale within which a UVAR can be placed and promoted.
E. There seems to be a need for guidance at the EU level; already a support study has been performed to help cities implement UVAR schemes effectively and is available on the Commission website[11].
F. It should be explored whether common technical standard, based on interoperability of IT solutions, could be found EU-wide for implementing and charging for the schemes, so that there is no need for separate stickers, vignettes etc. anymore. The Directive *on the interoperability of electronic road toll systems*,[12] could constitute a basis or source of inspiration for achieving such interoperability. It should be recalled, in this regard, that the Commission recently proposed[13] to extend the scope of the Directive to electronic toll systems using automatic number plate recognition (ANPR), a technology suitable for and used in many city-based access regulation schemes.
G. More effective enforcement is necessary, with increased visibility for pan-European service for collecting fines from UVARs and LEZs violation; this could be ensured with the EETS Directive above.

- **How to implement the action?**

What has to be done:

[9] A Commission-funded online platform provides all information required in one place and in multiple languages: www.urbanaccessregulations.eu
[10] http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:207:0001:0013:EN:PDF
[11] The study was published in October 2017 and is available at the following link: https://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/studies_en
[12] OJ L 166, 30.4.2004, p.124. Also referred to as the "EETS Directive".
[13] COM(2017) 280 final: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52017PC0280

A. Increase transparency of the schemes and make available relevant information to the public easier, more effective and increasingly digital, by e.g. using the existing tool (www.urbanaccessregulations.eu) as a starting point (Local-National-EU levels);
B. Member States to effectively implement EU Directive on Intelligent Transport Systems in order to make accurate real time traffic information available to users and encourage cities to go beyond by making data available at national access points (Local-National levels).
C. Collect the evidence on existing schemes and assess their effectiveness and impact when it comes to attaining the stated goals such as reduction of congestion and air pollution (subject to availability of resources) (EU level).
D. Address fragmentation and patchwork of the schemes while respecting the subsidiarity principle *inter alia* by:
    a. Member States and cities to work together on addressing the issue, working on commonalities, facilitating the exchange of data in the context of Low Emission Zones (LEZs) and the exchange of vehicle data pertaining to infringements in context of UVARs and LEZs; Commission to facilitate this via the Member States Expert Group on Urban Mobility and to explore the possibility to set-up (digital) information exchange platform involving cities, manufacturers and users. (Local-National-EU levels)
    b. Revise the guidelines on Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning (SUMP) to better include UVARs so that they can be properly designed, placed and promoted. (EU level)
    c. Issue guidance at the EU level exploring possible commonalities of the schemes. The thematic recommendations of the recently published Commission study on UVAR[14] could be used as a starting point. (EU level)
    d. Analyse the possibility of a common interoperable standard and more effective enforcement of cross-border violations of UVARs and LEZs, by exploring common grounds with the legal framework for EU tolling system and the EU-wide database of vehicles (Local – National – EU levels).

Implementation risks:

A. Diverging interests between cities, Member States and industry;
B. Complexity linked with cooperating at various levels of governance.
C. Address public scepticism and ensure enough flexibility for municipalities to respond appropriately according to the local context

- **Which partners?**

Partner	Role
European Commission (DG REGIO & DG MOVE)	Revise guidelines on SUMPs and issue guidance
Local, national & EU actors	Provide visibility into existing UVARs and LEZs

[14] https://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/studies_en

Partner	Role
	Action implementation, enforcement of agreed initiatives

- **Which timeline?**

Preparation: December 2017 – October 2018
Implementation: November 2018 – May 2019
Finalisation: June 2019 – October 2019

2 NEW MOBILITY SERVICES AND INNOVATION

2.1 ACTION N° 4 – Exploring the deployment of New Mobility Services (Knowledge / Funding / Regulation)

- **What is the Specific Problem?**

Today's cities face many challenges in terms of congestion, lack of space, air quality, noise, liveability, social inclusion and health. This action aims to investigate how deployment of New Mobility Services (NMS) can deliver solutions to citizens and support transport authorities in dealing with these challenges.

The future transport system will be a combination of transport services aggregating travel data and communicating with the infrastructure around it. The new mobility services theme reflects a dynamic change in the sector. It is also a broad concept covering many new types of transport services based on new forms of vehicle sharing (e.g. car sharing/clubs, ride-hailing/car-pooling and bike sharing), as well as new ways of providing access to such new transport services and conventional transport services (buses, trams, etc) through integrated platforms, such as the Mobility as a Service (MaaS) approach.

Besides the service innovation, a key issue for cities is the impact that these services are having on the overall urban transport system and the urban area. Also, the growing role of the private sector in instigating and operating mobility services represents a paradigm shift for city and regional authorities and is leading to questions such as to what extent should authorities support and/or regulate these services? And, how will the role of the transport authority evolve?

There is a lot of knowledge that needs to be implemented and assigned value in 'learning by doing' concepts and real life test environments. Moving from pilots to practice and encouraging deployment of NMS should be done with delivering social, economic and environmental benefits in mind. Small- and medium sized cities (50,000 – 400,000 inhabitants) can benefit from using NMS largely because of their dependency on car mobility and often reduced access to public transport services. However, NMS should not be seen as a reason to decrease funding in infrastructure as public transport modes should remain the backbone of cities and regions.

Digitisation in urban mobility is not new for cities. This is happening already through provision of real-time travel information, integrated ticketing and payment options and improved multimodal journey planning and shared based services, sometimes thorough a single card, implemented with various degrees of success.

Discussion of NMS (including MaaS), driven partly by business and technology priorities, is beginning to have an impact on policy thinking, including at EU level. For aligning the development of NMS with the sustainability goals and local mobility agendas it is

important that city and regional authorities shape the debate, as they play a key role in regulating and/or providing transport services. The key factor for sustainable urban mobility is effective integration of planning and services. The Urban Agenda's Partnership for Urban Mobility would like to ensure that this integration is developed collaboratively with local and transport authorities and supports city and regional transport priorities and policies.

In summary, the specific challenges that the PUM wishes to address under this action are:

- Support cities and regional authorities to develop new approaches for well-functioning new mobility services
- Support pilots, research and innovation actions in small and medium sized cities for NMS as well as potential for rural and poly centric areas
- Find adequate legislation frameworks for integration of new transport operators
- Support research on New Mobility Service impacts and their potential for decarbonisation, cleaner air, urban and rural transport, social inclusion, use of road space behaviour and changing commuting/travel/freight & logistics patterns in relation to a digitalisation of production.

- **Which action is needed?**

<u>Setting up actions on New Mobility Services & Urban Mobility in cooperation with existing networks:</u>

It is important that the EU builds on the ongoing work for a comprehensive, strategic and ambitious analysis on the new multimodal mobility services looking into its potential for developing sustainable urban mobility. It is also important to monitor and evaluate the effects of the new services by benchmarking different kinds of already existing new mobility services in order to prevent a rise of undesirable effects, e.g. those conflicting the general societal objectives or priorities.

The PUM recommends using the existing New Mobility Services initiative of the European Innovation Partnership in Smart Cities and Communities to work with the PUM community to create an active partnership dedicated to new mobility services to elaborate the action. This partnership should include the European Commission, regions, cities, transport authorities, several providers of new mobility services and MaaS platforms, experts on open data, start-ups / scale-ups and academics with knowledge of this issue. There should also be links to existing knowledge-platforms that have explored this topic.

To this end, the PUM should commence a formal cooperation with the New Mobility Services Initiative as part of the European Innovation Partnership on Smart Cities and Communities which is currently taking shape. The PUM could use this partnership to implement and provide answers to some of the sub-topics outlined below. Alternatively, the PUM can lead a working group within the initiative to elaborate challenges and pilot solutions. In this way, the PUM will create a legacy beyond December 2019. Overall, the PUM recommends continuing the NMS initiative activities in the EIP-SCC or any future activity on smart cities market creation.

In order to address the specific challenges, the PUM is suggesting one main action that is further explained through sub-actions as outlined below.

<u>The actions should focus on the following five sub-topics:</u>

A. Impact assessment of new mobility services for urban travel behaviour – a study on this topic will be undertaken (ERANet Cofund on Urban Accessibility and Connectivity, starting mid-2019)
B. Investigate regulatory and financial frameworks needed for effective integration of new mobility services in the transport offer of cities and regions.
C. Develop the testing and piloting concepts in co-creation with all partners (led by New Mobility Services initiative of the European Innovation Partnership in Smart cities and communities)
D. Encourage the availability of open data and exploring the role of the government.
E. Take stock of existing work done on new mobility services from CIVITAS and MaaS for EU and in existing European platforms.

- **How to implement the action?**

A. Impact assessment of new mobility services for urban travel behaviour
    a. Research into the effects on urban travel behaviour of new mobility services is needed. Possibly, the planned Horizon2020 ERANET Cofund in Urban Accessibility and Connectivity (starting mid-2019) would drive this action with competitive calls paid from funding pooled by a large number of national/regional funding agencies and the European Commission. Any independent European assessment should consider evidence on new services and modal split, public transport services satisfaction, and what determines the people's preferred modes of transit and commuting. The study should target a wide array of cities (in terms of size and density) and in a broader context, looking at the national taxation policies of company owned diesel cars. Any EU wide research work undertaken on this should harvest the results of recent attitude surveys on MaaS/NMS measuring people's perception of MaaS and public transport that have been performed in many European capitals already.
    b. Explore the business case and cost-effectiveness for new mobility services through seeing what initial motivation of early adopters was and monitor the implementation of such services and its effects.

B. Investigate regulatory and financial frameworks needed for effective integration of new mobility services in the transport offer of cities and regions.
    a. A study looking at regulatory and operational facilitators for new mobility services. Case studies of incentives and disincentives from local authorities that are already facilitating or regulating access of new mobility services on the mobility market should be mapped

out. Looking at the private operators and their incentives to implement MaaS will be sought out – as the moment they seem to run better with separate/competing programmes.

C. Develop the testing and piloting concepts in co-creation with all partners (led by New Mobility Services initiative of the European Innovation Partnership in Smart cities and communities)
    a. Implementation of pilot schemes through European grants, based on the recommendations of the partnership on new mobility services.
    b. PUM-partners can host a pilot to support testing NMS in the midsized city scenario and especially in rural areas. Small and mid-sized cities can also be a test bed for implementing NMS. In addition, develop the testing and piloting concepts in co-creation with all partners.
    c. Find and agree about sites and smart cities for deployment and real life test beds. A programme based on scaling up successful approaches such as the one in Vienna can also be encouraged.
    d. Organise financing and find investors for the deployment and piloting.
    e. The New Mobility Services initiative of the European Innovation Partnership in Smart cities and communities will collect and disseminate results of these pilots.

D. Encourage the availability of open data and explore the role of the government
    a. The Intelligent Transport System Directive was adopted in 2010 in order to encourage the deployment of innovative transport technologies across Europe. The PUM supports its implementation and takes stock of the May 2017 delegated act under the ITS Directive on the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services.
    b. City-regions and smaller municipalities need guidance in this field. The PUM recommends a funded programme of applied research, to provide a “Phase 1” set of actions and guidance. Within this arrangement, costs and issues associated with open data can be assessed and any subsequent business model will be realistic.

E. Take stock of existing work done on new mobility services from CIVITAS and MaaS for EU and in existing European platforms
    a. Start a collaboration with the New Mobility Services initiative - Action Cluster Sustainable Urban Mobility - EIP SCC
    b. Extract evaluation results and insights by monetising available resources from Innovation Actions in particular the CIVITAS SUMPs-UP and CIVITAS ECCENTRIC
    c. The New Mobility Services initiative of the European Innovation Partnership in Smart cities and communities will serve as the

recurrent platform for discussion by bringing together public and private stakeholders similar to the C-ITS working group or the Expert Groups of Member States.

Implementation risks:
MaaS is a dynamic topic that is still evolving and seen to have potential, despite not yet having been proven successful for the wider sustainability goals of cities and regions. For this reason the PUM argues that:

A. This action should be seen as a way to assess the role of public authorities, explore business cases and how MaaS type of concepts and new services can contribute to the wider sustainability goals of cities and better travel experience for customers.
B. In general, practitioners believe that NMS are disruptive to the transport system, decelerating sustainable travel (shift from using sustainable modes like public transport to using a shared vehicle), while requiring public resources (parking spaces, subsidies)
C. Risk that poly centric / rural areas are not part of the current PUM partnership action plan.
D. From a practical point a view, there is a risk of finding a critical number of committed partners dedicated to implementation.
E. Without a financing plan the more ambitious actions of this activity risk not to be implemented.

- **Which partners?**

Partner	Role
EC through research funds in 2019: possible lines through Horizon2020, ERANET, Cofund in Urban Accessibility and Connectivity etc	Perform a study of NMS impact on urban travel behaviour. Local and national frameworks as well as financing schemes for NMS should be investigated where available.
PUM Task Force eg: POLIS, Arnhem Nijmegen, Finnish Ministry of Transport and Communication	Ensure a cross over between the PUM and the New Mobility Services initiative of the European Innovation Partnership in Smart cities and communities with the goal of developing of testing and piloting concepts
CIVITAS SATELLITE through POLIS and EC	Provide a platform for discussion and exchange of experience from existing European projects
Cities, Regions and Member States	Provide expertise

- **Which timeline?**

Preparation: January 2018 – April 2018
Implementation: To be defined
Finalisation: 2019 and beyond through the EIP-SCC collaboration

2.2 ACTION N˚ 5 - Setting up a European framework for fostering urban mobility innovation (Funding / Knowledge)

Successfully tackling the problems arising from current urban mobility and transport patterns cannot be achieved with a business-as-usual approach. New solutions are needed to transform urban mobility systems in a way that makes them more attractive to the users and more sustainable.

Innovative solutions need to be developed, tested and then successfully deployed on the ground. This includes new technologies, as well as new service concepts and business models. Innovation is also needed in urban mobility governance and planning including the functional urban area.

For many years, the European Commission has been fostering innovation in urban mobility by supporting research, technical development and innovation through initiatives like CIVITAS[15] and Smart Cities and Communities [16](funded by the EU's research framework programme) or the Urban Innovative Actions[17] and Smart Specialisation Strategies[18] (funded from the European Regional Development Fund).

EU funded projects and initiatives have fostered cooperation and exchange of experiences and good practices, both at the local and regional level and across the EU, e.g. through the Civitas Forum, the Urban Development Network[19] or the URBACT programme[20].

The ELTIS website[21] provides an online Urban Mobility Observatory which collects and disseminated good practice examples and case studies across the Union.

In 2018, the European Institute for Innovation and Technology (EIT) launched a call for proposals for the launch of a Knowledge and Innovation Community (KIC) in the field of urban mobility[22].

Member States, in turn, are coordinating relevant innovation actions through the Joint Programming Initiative Urban Europe[23].

Regional policy – primarily through the Cohesion Fund and the European Fund for Regional Development – is the Union's principle tools for supporting the broad uptake of innovative solutions for sustainable urban mobility on the ground: in the 2014—2020 period around EUR 12.5 billion have been programmed in EU co-financing for investment in clean urban transport infrastructure and promotion. Additional co-financing is available for e.g. the deployment of Intelligent Transport Systems in urban areas.

Support for innovation (e.g. in the field of alternative fuels infrastructure) is also available through the Connecting Europe Facility.

15 http://civitas.eu/
16 http://ec.europa.eu/eip/smartcities/
17 http://www.uia-initiative.eu/en:
18 http://s3platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/
19 http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/themes/urban-development/network/:
20 http://urbact.eu/urbact-glance
21 http://www.eltis.org/
22 https://eit.europa.eu/interact/bookshelf/eit-2018-call-proposals
23 https://jpi-urbaneurope.eu/:

- **What is the Specific Problem?**

Although the existing framework as described above provides several possibilities for funding innovative mobility solutions and for knowledge-sharing, there seems to be room for improvement to match them even better to the needs of the cities and functional urban regions.

The following bottlenecks can be identified:

A. Lack of knowledge at local governments about existing funds and their objectives
B. For employees working for cities, especially the cities that are not involved in European projects regularly, it's not always clear what the existing framework is and which fund is suitable for their specific project. The difficulty arises inter alia from the number and complexity of the existing instruments.
C. The desired scale of the projects and the lack of flexibility
    a. Most of the funds focus on bigger projects, worth multiple millions of Euro's. For example: the indicative EU contribution per project in the Urban Innovative Action is € 5 million. This is challenging for many cities and regions, because:
    b. Most innovative projects need less funding than multiple millions, but cannot be implemented without external funding.
    c. Cities frequently lack funding to co-finance large projects.
    d. Some of the smaller cities lack the capacity and the knowledge to manage such an extensive project.
    e. There is the need for subsidy in phases: first start off with a relatively small pilot and if that is successful: more money for a scale-up.

D. Occasionally, the ERDF allows smaller projects, but is not always open for (innovative) mobility projects. This is a matter of regional priorities of the ERDF-funds.

E. Heavy administrative burden and low success rate
F. Cities perceive a heavy administrative burden to apply for a subsidy and the success rate is often quite low. That is discouraging for some cities. An extra administrative burden is for voluntary co-operating municipalities in poly-centric regions, not being a formal regional authority. Most funds require a consortium with several international partners. That is difficult and time-demanding to arrange. UIA doesn't ask for those partnerships, but out of the 93 applications, only five projects were granted funding. Therefore, a lot of cities won't apply at all. Although the failed UIA actions are in principle still eligible for "regular" ERDF support, we notice that not all ERDF-funds are able or willing to fund these kind of projects. In the exploration phase of this action, we want to get more clear what the perceived bottlenecks are.
G. New business and governance models, many actors, different interests
H. We note that mobility-solutions are increasingly becoming the responsibility of several private and public partners, rather than just the local government. It is a shared task and a shared interest and risk for all interested parties involved:

a. the cities and regions (interest: getting better results for less resources);
b. the businesses (interest: development of new, successful business);
c. the state / federal government (interest: supporting activities connected to achieving national or international goals, and promoting businesses with new innovative ideas of global potential);
d. the larger employers (interest: making sure their employees, students, customers can access their company).

I. This means that the framework must be flexible enough to deal not only with technical innovations, but also take new business and governance models and partnerships into account. That could lead to local authorities investing in providers of new mobility services that can help them solving their specific problems.

J. Follow-up of pilots: upscaling and dissemination

K. Pilots can provide us with a lot of useful information and insights, whether the pilot was successful or not, but we don't always learn from the lessons learned. When a pilot is successful, you might want to scale it up in the same city or apply in other cities with other characteristics to see if the innovation also works there. That could help improving the innovation. Documenting the knowledge at an accessible location could help other cities to identify what measures are most promising for their specific conditions. When a pilot is not successful, it may be even more valuable to learn from the experience, although it is difficult to admit failures.

L. The problem with upscaling is that the initial pilot is innovative, but the upscaling is no longer eligible for funding as it is not a completely innovative project anymore. A staggered subsidy could be a solution. Or maybe a funding-percentage that is depending on the degree of risks and innovative character of the project. We shall focus further on this problem in the exploration-phase of this action.

- **Which action is needed?**

A. Create an overview of the existing funds and their objectives and create a flow chart to help cities and regions to pick the right fund for their project.
B. Write recommendations to optimise existing funding-schemes to make it easier for cities and regions to apply for and get funding for smaller innovative projects, e.g. for UIA.
C. Write recommendations to make the upscaling of successful pilots in the same city and in other cities easier in order to elaborate those innovations, e.g. by a staggered form of funding, or a subsidy to consolidate initiatives in a slightly altered manner, so there are still lessons learned. This could give EC-funding more of a red thread.
D. Create a more innovative approach on funding aspects, considering the fact that mobility-solutions are the responsibility of a consortium of partners (such as Public Private Partnerships) and new business models are created.

E. Write recommendations to improve the dissemination of knowledge about successful and unsuccessful pilots.
F. Support private sector driven innovation and establish mechanisms to harvest the successes.

- **How to implement the action?**

What has to be done:

Phase 1: exploration
The first phase is the further exploration of the bottlenecks that authorities and innovative businesses experience. The main bottlenecks are described in this document, however we need a more detailed insight in the general bottlenecks and specific bottlenecks per funding-scheme, and collect ideas for improvements.
We aim to do this in three ways:

A. A questionnaire will be distributed among the PUM-partners with the request to complete it and to distribute within their own networks. As multiple actions have proposed a questionnaire, it would be wise to combine some of them in order to reduce the amount of questionnaires. We could add some questions to the questionnaire of action 4.1.
B. In-depth interviews with a maximum of ten specialists of European subsidies from regions and cities and the Commission.
C. This might be supplemented by desk analysis.

Although the response rate of questionnaires is usually low, we still want to use this method to explore the bottlenecks and possible solutions with European stakeholders. The in-depth interviews will provide us with a more specific insight in the bottlenecks and possible solutions.

Phase 2: elaborate draft-recommendations
We want to create a taskforce to elaborate the recommendations. This taskforce will consist of members of the PUM. If needed, they will consult external parties like mobility-innovators.

Phase 3: consultation
We will consult a broader group of experts and other stakeholders, so they can react to the draft-recommendations.

Phase 4: finalise the recommendations
The recommendations will be finalised with the input from phase 3, and this will be the starting point for the implementation of the recommendations.

Implementation risks:

A. Funding more and smaller projects can be more demanding for the Commission. The member states should play a bigger role in the process.
B. Insufficient political support could be a risk. Usually bigger projects create more visibility and attention than smaller projects.

C. If it is easier to apply for funding, more cities will apply and the success rate will stay low.
D. The Commission is working on the design of post 2020 schemes right now. This means that analysing current schemes could be inadequate because the schemes are dated at the end of the PUM-period. This means that the bottlenecks and the recommendations should already be addressed in the update of the post 2020 schemes.

- **Which partners?**

Partner	Role
Taskforce of PUM Members eg. POLIS, Nijmegen, Finland and others	Exploration of bottlenecks for innovation funding and development of recommendations for initiatives
European Commission	Contribute to the exploration and consultation phase of the action

- **Which timeline?**

Exploration: September 2018 – November 2018
Draft recommendations: December 2018 – May 2019
Consultation: June 2019 – September 2019
Finalizing Recommendations: October 2019 – December 2019

3 PUBLIC TRANSPORT (INCLUDING CLEAN BUSES) AND ACCESSIBILITY

3.1 ACTION N° 6 - Evaluating best practices in convenient access to public transport (Knowledge)

- **What is the specific problem?**

In most cases, cities and regions are still designed for car transport. This has created a situation that is not sustainable: severe congestion, urban sprawl, poor air quality, noise and high levels of carbon dioxide emissions. Access to quality public transport systems is a good way to reduce these negative externalities. The Partnership encourages improved access to public transport as it aims at bringing mobility right to where, when and how it is needed in the cities and the regions and offers an alternative to private transport.

The absence of access to public transport systems can cause problems and inconveniences for users and authorities, such as a lack of services, information and travel times. According to Eurostat, 20.4% of people in the EU report 'high' or 'very high' levels of difficulty of access to good public transport. This means that one in five of EU citizens have a high lack of access to basic urban services, like jobs, schools and so on. On the flip side, a high level of accessibility to public transport is an important pillar for solving the challenges individuals and cities face, including delivery of the EU Urban Agenda and wider international agreements, including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)[24].

- **Which action is needed?**

Improving the accessibility to public transport, as measured by the supply and ease to accessing public transport, is particularly important for gauging progress towards the EU Urban Agenda and SDGs. The Goals include a target to enhance access to urban and regional (multi-modal) public transport systems[25] but in many cases, cities and Member States often lack the necessary data and information on how accessible their public transport systems are. Without this information, the impact of investment decisions and policies cannot be tracked. A key action under the Urban Agenda should be to better understand how accessible public transport systems are in cities and regions as well as nationally and across Europe. This is important for the latter as both the EU and Member States have committed to report progress against the SDG target on public transport which the EU Urban Agenda aims to support.

A new method of analysing access to public transport has been developed by the European Commission, taking into account the extent of the urban centre, the

[24] http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/

[25] Public transport is defined as a shared passenger transport service that is available to the general public. It includes buses, trolleys, trams, trains, subways, and ferries that are shared by strangers without prior arrangement. See: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata

distribution of population density, the location of public transport stops, the modes of public transport (bus, tram, subway, etc.) and the frequency of service[26]. It is an important step forward because it allows cities and regions to measure in a comparable way which can help identify the impact of different best practice strategies to improve public transport which in turn can improve the decision making at all levels. It can also help to identify the impacts of higher public transport frequencies, extension of lines, new lines and networks etc. Therefore, by complementing the European Commission's methodology with public transport supply data, it can provide city and national governments with an enhanced understanding of their public transport access and offer. Furthermore, by scaling up the use of the methodology across European cities, the impact of EU investment decisions linked to Cohesion Policy can also be better tracked alongside enhanced SDG reporting.

- **How to implement the action?**

What has to be done?

A. Raise awareness of the SDGs, EU Urban Agenda and the important links to enhancing access to public transport. This will help to promote the need/benefits and how to measure access to public transport using the Commission's methodology. This can be done through events and guidance to be distributed through relevant networks (e.g. EUROCITIES, CEMR, UITP, etc).
B. Increase the number of cities analysing access to public transport.
C. Develop a tool to facilitate the monitoring of multi-modal public transport service provision in cities to further complement the European Commission's methodology.
D. Develop recommendations on how local and regional level data can be aggregated up to the national level for SDG reporting.

Implementation risks:

A. A lack of available data.
B. Different interpretations of access - infrastructure and services, temporal, spatial, and personal. This action will be limited to access to public transport services and their provision as determined by the SDGs.

- **Which partners?**

Partner	Role
PUM	Develop recommendations
European Commission	Development of a tool to facilitate monitoring. Increase awareness of analysing access to public transport
National and Local Governments	Increase awareness of analysing access to public transport
Public transport authorities, operators and city administrations/networks (EUROCITIES, CEMR, etc)	Raise awareness of SDGs, Urban Agenda and links between them in events

[26] http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/work/2015_01_publ_transp.pdf

- **Which timeline?**

Preparation/Consultation: Begin of January 2018 – July 2018
Implementation: Begin of September 2018 – September 2019
Finalisation: Begin of September 2019 – December 2019

3.2 ACTION N° 7 – Scaling up innovative clean buses (Funding / Knowledge / Regulation)

- **What is the Specific Problem?**

It is widely recognised that serious effort is needed in the EU to break the current dependence of the transport sector on oil. The present dependence undermines our efforts to mitigate the effects of climate change and global warming, it raises serious concerns about our energy supply security, and it undermines our efforts to protect human health and the environment.

In July 2016, the Commission presented a low-emission mobility strategy, in order to drive a transition towards low-carbon, circular economy in the transport sector[27]. The introduction of clean vehicle and the infrastructure to recharge/refuel them is a key element of this strategy:

"The potential to introduce low or zero emission technologies differs among categories of such vehicles. For some categories – such as city buses – early adoption of zero emission technologies seems in reach […]. Public procurement is a powerful instrument to create markets for innovative products and it should be used to support take up of such vehicles. Since a significant part of public procurement is undertaken by municipal and local authorities, there is particular potential for public transport vehicles, such as buses, using low-emission alternative energies."

The present action seeks to support the market introduction of clean buses.

Clean (alternatively fuelled) buses in urban areas can offer considerable advantages. Reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases, air pollutants and noise bring about considerable public health benefits. Moreover, moving around quietly and smoothly means greater passenger comfort and new opportunities for routes, making public transport more attractive.

However, the potential of these innovative technologies is far from being fully utilised in the EU, owing also to ongoing wide-spread concerns over technical maturity and high costs, particularly of battery-electric and fuel-cell electric buses.

Many important implementation issues remain to be resolved, including legal, organisational, technical and financial. Any decision to invest large-scale into alternatively fuelled bus technology needs to be based on a sound, well-understood business model

[27] https://ec.europa.eu/transport/sites/transport/files/themes/strategies/news/doc/2016-07-20-decarbonisation/com%282016%29501_en.pdf

that leaves all involved partners with sufficient confidence into its financing model and its funding strategy seen from a total cost of ownership perspective.

Moreover, there needs to be trust in the ability of the market to deliver products at larger scale and fitting specific local requirements. In addition, public and private stakeholders raised the issue of better coherence of different policy and financial levers[28].

- **Which action is needed?**

The current share of alternatively fuelled buses in the European bus fleet is roughly 10 - 12 percent. The action should focus on increasing this share by creating relevant enabling conditions and promoting the application of innovative clean buses at all levels of governance.

- **How to implement the action?**

What has to be done:

A. EU level:
    a. Support through EU regional policy and relevant EU funding sources
    b. Clean Buses Deployment Initiative:
        - The Clean Bus Deployment Initiative was launched on the 13th of July 2017 during the plenary session of the Committee of the Regions; It consists of the following:
            1. Clean Buses Declaration
            2. Expert Group under the Sustainable Transport Forum
            3. Hub/deployment platform (will rely on inputs from the Expert Group)
            4. The website of the European Alternative Fuels Observatory (EAFO) will be used as a dissemination tool (www.eafo.eu)

B. National level: create ambitious enabling conditions:
    a. Member States to set-up and implement relevant financing and taxation schemes, such as national financial support programmes and tax incentives for alternatively-fuelled buses.

C. Local/regional level: create awareness of relevant tools
    a. Local and/or regional authorities being aware and use total cost of ownership models in contracting public transport.

Implementation risks:

A. Lack of understanding of all operational and financing challenges, and
B. Availability of funding models to set-off the initial higher CAPEX vs the lower OPEX bus

[28] See https://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/cleanbus_en

The end result may mean that there will not be sufficient clean buses introduced in Europe.

- **Which partners?**

Partner	Role
European Commission	Clean Buses Deployment Initiative, Support clean buses through EU regional policy and relevant EU funding sources
Member States	Set-up and implement relevant financing and taxation schemes, such as national financial support programmes and tax incentives for alternatively-fuelled buses
Local and/or regional authorities	Increase awareness and use of total cost of ownership models in contracting public transport

- **Which timeline?**

Preparation: December 2017 – June 2018
Implementation: January 2018[29] – May 2019
Finalisation: June 2019 – October 2019

[29] at EU level, ongoing, with the following elements:
- The Expert Group had its first meeting on 26th of October 2017, next meeting on 9th of February 2018. The aim is to have a first set of deliverables (including recommendations) by mid-2018.
- The Hub/Deployment platform to be launched early 2018 – taking into account the recommendations of the Expert Group
- The actual deployment of clean buses will be monitored through the EAFO website.

4 GOVERNANCE

4.1 ACTION N° 8 – Reinforcing multi-level cooperation and governance (Knowledge / Funding / Regulation)

- **What is the Specific Problem?**

Developing and implementing comprehensive and integrated urban mobility policies for towns and cities, as well as the functional urban area, requires close cooperation between different levels of government (in particular municipal) and across administrative boundaries. Furthermore, the key players for different policy areas, sectors, and modes of transport need to be brought together. This includes public authorities with explicit responsibilities in the field of mobility and transport, but also other relevant actors such as urban planners, schools and universities, major employers, representatives of civil society.

Last but not least, an effective cooperation with national and EU-level institutions is needed to ensure that local and regional mobility policies, on the one hand, and the development of national and EU transport networks, on the other hand fit together. A smooth cooperation with national and EU institutions is also needed to ensure that the regulatory and financial framework created at these levels responds to local and functional urban needs and circumstances. This is also particularly relevant in the case of cross-border cooperation for mobility projects.

There is broad agreement today that tackling urban mobility requires multi-level governance and partnership approaches which ensure a high degree of horizontal and vertical integration.

The questions remains as to how to implement such integrated, multi-partner approaches in practice, in a way that respects the respective competences and responsibilities of all involved actors and delivers good results in a timely and efficient manner.

So, what working structures, formal or informal, have been or could be put in place to facilitate the planning and funding processes for local and regional authorities?

- **Which action is needed?**

The present action seeks to collect and share examples of practical experiences with multi-level governance and partnership approaches that have been implemented on the ground, in urban and functional urban areas (including poly centric, urban / rural areas) across Europe.

Formal and informal multilevel cooperation mechanisms, including planning and financing schemes, e.g. for the development and implementation of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans and the further implementation of transport infrastructure, including on the Trans-

European Transport Networks (TEN-T) will be collected in order to identify solutions to better collaborate between different levels of governments and transport authorities in terms of funding and legal frameworks.

In doing so, it will be important to point out the added value of multi-level governance for cities / municipalities and to provide practical recommendations. Challenges and barriers of multi-level governance should also be included. In addition, we recommend to ensure that links and synergies are made with other EU urban agenda partnerships.

The PUM high-level political meeting in Karlsruhe on 6 March 2018 should help to raise awareness on this action and provide some initial feedback.

- **How to implement the action?**

    A. Literature review and desktop research on existing materials available on multi-level governance in urban mobility policies (studies, EU projects, SUMP awards, URBACT, etc.)
    B. An external expert to develop a questionnaire with the partners of WG4
    C. Widely circulate the questionnaire to the partnership members and their relevant networks (Member States, urban areas, EUROCITIES, UITP, ECF, Polis, CEMR, EC Directorates-General, etc.). The questionnaire should be addressed to all levels of governance and cooperation (EU, Member States, regions, cities, and also the cross-border level). Possibly organise bilateral meetings, interviews and focus group meetings.
    D. Compile and analyse all the contributions
    E. Formulate recommendations on national and local authorities' involvement
    F. Develop a joint publication
    G. Dissemination of the publication to national, local and regional authorities

Many actors, including the European Commission, have actively promoted the concept of multi-level governance for several years. Cooperation across different levels of government should be fostered. However concrete examples of mechanisms need to be found out and shared between functional urban areas and Member States to develop the right conditions for such cooperation. Such analysis does not exist yet.

<u>Implementation risks:</u>
Gathering a wide range of local experience with a geographic balance: The key issue of this action is to ensure that we compile an extensive collection of materials, both in terms of quantity and quality.

    A. To achieve it, the mobilisation of the stakeholders for the dissemination of the questionnaire relies on a sound cooperation of all the members of the partnership, including the networks (CEMR, EUROCITIES, Polis, UITP), as well as the Member States with their national stakeholders and cities, in order to reach a high level of participation from local authorities. The support of DG REGIO and DG MOVE will also be instrumental in this respect. The dissemination of both the questionnaire and the final publication should be as

broad as possible. It should also reach relevant departments and experts within each level of governance.

B. Local authorities are faced with heavy workloads and resource pressures and may struggle to reply to the questionnaire that the team will prepare as part of the data collection process. The action leaders will address this challenge by ensuring that the length and the technicality of the questionnaire is not a barrier for the cities and municipalities. A two page questionnaire, with non-mandatory fields and where possible, closed-ended questions, will facilitate both the work of the contributor and the analysis of the data received. For each question however, it is important to leave an open field to allow the municipalities to share more in detail their experience if they wish to do so.
C. According to the action leaders' experience, the collection of data and good practice among local authorities also depends on the language of the form, particularly in certain areas in Europe. Translation of the form could be done via the members of the partnership, however, thought should also be given as to how to analyse the contribution received in national languages.
D. Ensuring that the partnership has the financial capacity to mobilise the relevant expertise: while the dissemination of the form is mainly based on the capacities of the partnership members to reach out to local and regional authorities in their networks, an external expertise is requested to prepare the drafting of the form and the analysis of the contributions. The expert must be carefully selected by the action leaders based on his/her knowledge of the mobility issues in terms of governance and of the local context.

- **Which partners?**

Partner	Role
European Commission	Contract study on best practices on multi-level governance
PUM Taskforce	Steer the development of the study
Local and regional authorities, urban mobility local or regional stakeholders, European and national associations of local and regional authorities	Provide input to the study, provide feedback to study recommendations
EU networks of municipalities, cities and regions	Disseminate the outcome of the study to national, regional and local authorities

- **Which timeline?**

Preparation: (mobilise political engagement, identifying the expert, elaboration of a concept form): Spring-Summer 2018, mostly after the consultation phase of the action plan
Implementation: (finalisation of the form, dissemination to stakeholders, collection of the data and good practices, analysis of the contributions, preparation of recommendations): October 2018- September 2019
Finalisation: (communication of the study outcome with a brochure, assessment and follow-up of the action): October-November 2019

4.2 ACTION N° 9 – Reinforcing the uptake of sustainable urban mobility planning (Knowledge)

- **What is the Specific Problem?**

As highlighted in the European Commission's Communication "Together towards competitive and resource-efficient urban mobility" [COM(2013) 913 final], new approaches to urban mobility planning are emerging as local authorities seek to break out of past silo approaches and develop strategies that can stimulate a shift towards cleaner and more sustainable transport modes, such as walking, cycling, public transport, and new patterns for car use and ownership.

The Commission has actively promoted the concept of sustainable urban mobility planning for several years, e.g. through the EU Platform on Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans. The concept has gained considerable momentum in recent years, and an increasing number of towns and cities from the EU and beyond have used this to make good progress in developing and implementing such plans, often (within the EU) benefiting from significant support from e.g. the European Structural and Investment Funds. In other urban areas, however, the efforts for more sustainable urban mobility could be reinforced.

In many urban areas, urban transport planning is still primarily focused on infrastructure projects, rather than fostering new urban mobility paradigms and patterns. It is important to link successfully political vision, strategic planning, and the needs and expectations of citizens and businesses.

A clearer picture is needed regarding the state-of-play of the SUMP implementation across the EU; about where the main bottlenecks lie for the broader implementation of sustainable urban mobility policies; and about what is and should be done at EU and national level in support of municipalities. Currently there are many approaches to SUMPs at national level, and municipalities indicate that the lack of national/regional support (including financing) and adequate regulatory framework are among the main barriers to develop SUMPs.

EU targets and policies, and national frameworks have an impact on the way and capacity of local authorities to develop adequate mobility policies in their municipalities. Thus the EU and national governments need to create an enabling environment to support action by local authorities.

- **Which action is needed?**

Reinforce, update and disseminate information on the SUMP framework – at both EU level and in the Member States – in order to encourage more urban areas to adopt and implement SUMPs, in particular:

- Present an analysis of the national frameworks (policy, regulatory, knowledge, financing) that exist in the 28 MS (to update/replace the country profiles available via the SUMP platform.

- Based on above, strengthen the national framework to facilitate and support implementation of SUMPs.
- Create an overview of the state-of-play for implementing urban transport plans (to feed into a single city database of the SUMP platform on ELTIS – the urban mobility observatory). Analyse both the good practice and the shortcomings for SUMP implementation.
- Update the guidelines and tools available from the Platform on Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans in line with recent developments in transport and mobility (digitalisation and automation, shared mobility and new mobility services, alternative fuels (including a link to planning of energy infrastructure), urban vehicle access regulation schemes/low emission zones, urban logistics, regional SUMPs etc.). The planning concept has to accommodate the need to shift the focus from the needs of the transport sector to the needs to people (quality of life; health, etc.).
- Provide targeted EU financial support for the development, revision, and implementation of comprehensive sustainable urban transport plans.

- **How to implement the action?**

What has to be done:

- Present an analysis of the national frameworks that exist in the 28 MS in order to create a complete overview of the state-of-play for implementing urban transport plans and complete country profiles available via the SUMP platform, on ELTIS – the urban mobility observatory.
- Provide appropriate framework conditions in the Member States at national level (so that planning authorities have suitable technical, legal, financial and other tools at their disposal) in order to accelerate the take-up of SUMPs for the urban areas (including small and medium-sized; poly-centric, etc.) in every EU Member State.
- Populate a single SUMP city database on ELTIS – the urban mobility observatory.
- Produce a set of examples of good practice with regard to SUMPs, from across the EU, covering towns and cities of different sizes.
- Publish updated SUMP guidelines (and other related documents, if needed).
- Strengthen the SUMP Platform, including its Coordination Group, and ensure its future continuity in order to provide quality support to all SUMP-related actions and projects. Assess the tools made available by the Platform and improve as required e.g. in order to accommodate better accelerated innovation cycles and data-based planning.

Implementation risks:

- lack of will to cooperate at various levels of governance;
- insufficient resources/capacity.

- **Which partners?**

Partner	Role
European Commission	Prepare an analysis of the national frameworks that exist in the 28 MS.

Partner	Role
	Complete country profiles available via the SUMP platform Support the population of a SUMP city database and prepare a set of good practices Strengthen the SUMP Platform, including its Coordination Group, and ensure its future continuity
Member States	Provide appropriate framework conditions at national level to accelerate the take-up of SUMPs for the urban areas

- **Which timeline?**

Preparation: November 2017 – May 2018
Implementation: May 2018 – December 2018
Finalisation: January 2019 – May 2019

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Recommendation 1: Involve municipalities, cities and regions in the multi-annual financial planning

The European Commission announced its proposals on the post-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework for the summer of 2018, and the preparation of the next programming period has already commenced.

Partners of the EU urban agenda partnership on urban mobility call for enhanced partnership with municipalities, cities and regions in the multi-annual financial planning. We are convinced of the necessity to involve local and regional authorities in the development of the multi-annual financial planning, in order to achieve integrated urban strategies and improved transport systems. The rural-urban connection should also be taken into account.

The European Commission should ensure the continuity of support from the EU budget for the deployment of sustainable transport project in the post 2020 period, while also securing the level of its funding in the next multiannual financial framework.

The urban agenda for the EU introduced a model for partnership and direct dialogue between cities, regions, national and European institutions to address common urban and regional challenges. This practice could be replicated at EU, national, local and regional level in the development of the multi-annual financial planning.

Also, the European code of conduct on the partnership principle under cohesion policy was an important step in this direction, however it was not fully applied across the EU in the designing phase of the operational programmes. There is ample room for development in the partnership approach both in terms of the range of partners and the level of their involvement.

Detailed recommendations:

- National policy priorities should be identified based on a comprehensive partnership dialogue with cities and regions. It is also crucial to ensure an integrated planning approach with the rural level.
- Urban and regional authorities should be directly involved in selecting the thematic priorities and the instruments to implement the support to sustainable territorial development.
- The European code of conduct on the partnership principle should be integrated in the regulatory framework of cohesion policy. An *ex-ante* conditionality on the full application of the partnership principle should be introduced with the fulfilment of which being a condition to the adoption of each operational programme.

Despite showing leadership and having the right competences and hands-on experience, municipalities, cities and regional authorities are rarely involved in setting programme

priorities and in selecting the most suitable implementation tools under the multi-annual financial planning. This has led to a mismatch between needs and resources and prevented the use of a bottom-up integrated approach. To improve the effectiveness of the policy in addressing challenges on the ground, local and regional authorities must be meaningfully involved in shaping the policies and programmes.

6 LINKS WITH OTHER COMMITMENTS

6.1 Link with the cross-cutting issues

In the Pact of Amsterdam, it was stated that the complexity of urban challenges requires integrating different policy aspects to avoid contradictory consequences and make interventions in Urban Areas more effective. In line with the competences and responsibilities of the different participants and taking into account that the EU does not have competences on some of these issues, the Partnerships shall consider the relevance of cross-cutting issues for selected priority themes.

Below it is described how these themes were taken into account in the development of the Partnership's Action Plan.

1. ***Good urban governance, sound and strategic urban planning and an integrated approach***

The first three themes are highly relevant and important issues for the partnership. Especially in the actions on multi-level governance (action 8) and reinforcing sumps (action 9) thee following are mentioned:

- There is broad agreement today that tackling urban mobility requires multi-level governance and partnership approaches which ensure a high degree of horizontal and vertical integration. But how to implement such integrated, multi-partner approaches in practice, in a way that accounts for the respective competences and responsibilities of all involved actors and delivers good results in a timely and efficient manner? So, what working structures, formal or informal, have been or could be put in place to facilitate the planning and funding processes for local and regional authorities?
- Many actors, including the European Commission, have actively promoted the concept of multi-level governance for several years. Cooperation across different levels of government should be fostered. However concrete examples of mechanisms need to be found out and shared between functional urban areas and Member States to develop the right conditions for such cooperation. Such analysis does not exist yet.
- In many urban areas, urban transport planning is still primarily focused on infrastructure projects, rather than fostering new urban mobility paradigms and patterns. It is important to link successfully political vision, strategic planning, and the needs and expectations of citizens and businesses.
- A clearer picture is needed regarding the state-of-play of the SUMP implementation across the EU; about where the main bottlenecks lie for the broader implementation of sustainable urban mobility policies; and about what is and should be done at EU and national level in support of municipalities. Currently there are many approaches to SUMPs at national level, and municipalities indicate that the lack of national/regional support (including financing) and adequate regulatory framework are among the main barriers to develop SUMPs.

The following activities have been proposed to address these issues:
Regarding reinforcing the uptake of SUMPs

1. Present an analysis of the national frameworks that exist in the 28 MS in order to create a complete overview of the state-of-play for implementing urban transport plans and complete country profiles available via the SUMP platform, on ELTIS – the urban mobility observatory.
2. Provide appropriate framework conditions in the Member States at national level (so that planning authorities have suitable technical, legal, financial and other tools at their disposal) in order to accelerate the take-up of SUMPs for the urban areas (including small and medium-sized; poly-centric, etc.) in every EU Member State.
3. Populate a single SUMP city database on ELTIS – the urban mobility observatory.
4. Produce a set of examples of good practice with regard to SUMPs, from across the EU, covering towns and cities of different sizes.
5. Publish updated SUMP guidelines (and other related documents, if needed).
6. Strengthen the SUMP Platform, including its Coordination Group, and ensure its future continuity in order to provide quality support to all SUMP-related actions and projects. Assess the tools made available by the Platform and improve where found necessary, e.g. in order to accommodate better accelerated innovation cycles and data-based planning.

Regarding reinforcing multi-level cooperation and governance

7. Literature review and desktop research on existing materials available on multi-level governance in urban mobility policies (studies, EU projects, SUMP awards, URBACT, etc…)
8. An external expert to develop a questionnaire with the partners of WG4
9. Widely circulate the questionnaire to the partnership members and their relevant networks (Member States, urban areas, EUROCITIES, UITP, ECF, Polis, CEMR, EC Directorates-General, etc.). The questionnaire should be addressed to all levels of governance and cooperation (EU, Member States, regions, cities, and also the cross-border level). Possibly organise bilateral meetings, interviews and focus group meetings.
10. Compile and analyse all the contributions
11. Formulate recommendations on national and local authorities' involvement
12. Develop a joint publication
13. Dissemination of the publication to national, local and regional authorities

2. Urban-rural, urban-urban and cross-border cooperation;

The partnership recognises that developing and implementing comprehensive and integrated urban mobility policies for towns and cities is not limited to cities, but also includes the functional urban area. It requires close cooperation between different levels of government (in particular municipal) and across administrative boundaries. The urban-rural cooperation also closely related to the polycentric concept is described under point 5.

3. Innovative approaches

The partnership did focus on a better framework for innovations (action 5), as well as on how to use and promote implementation of existing innovative approaches and tools. For example the action on New Mobility Services (action 4) aims to investigate how deployment of New Mobility Services (NMS) can deliver solutions to citizens and support transport authorities in dealing with challenges in terms of congestion, lack of space, air quality, noise, liveability, social inclusion and health. Also, the partnership focused on assisting the take-up of innovative clean vehicles (action 6)

For the creation of a better framework for innovations the partnership proposes to:

- Create an overview of the prevailing funds and their objectives and create a flow chart to help cities and regions to pick the right fund for their project.
- Write recommendations to optimise existing funding-schemes to make it easier for cities and regions to apply for and get funding for smaller innovative projects, e.g. for UIA.
- Write recommendations to make the upscaling of successful pilots in the same city and in other cities easier in order to elaborate those innovations, e.g. by a staggered form of funding, or a subsidy to consolidate initiatives in a slightly altered manner, so there are still lessons learned. This could give EC-funding more of a red thread.
- Create a more innovative approach on funding aspects, considering the fact that mobility-solutions are the responsibility of a consortium of partners (such as Public Private Partnerships) and new business models are created.
- Write recommendations to improve the dissemination of knowledge about successful and unsuccessful pilots.
- Support private sector driven innovation and establish mechanisms to harvest the successes.

4. Impact on societal change, including behavioural change

Behaviour is a major factor influencing the negative effects of urban mobility. The Partnership is focusing on societal and behavioural change through promoting more active modes of mobility (through action 1 and action 2).

Modal choice, sustainable use of energy, waste treatment, etc. have a direct impact on air quality. The support of authorities for mobility measures which have a positive impact is of major importance. These themes were therefore assessed as being of major importance for achieving a better quality of life, including air quality, health, less congestion and social inclusion.

Many people do not change their transport behaviour towards a more active one – even when infrastructure (physical barrier) is in place - due to mental barriers: a lack of knowledge of the availability of options, lack of motivation, lack of positive attitude towards active modes, safety and comfort aspects, perceived travel time aspects, lack of understanding of the benefits, lack of incentives from work / school and general resistance to change. Changing behaviour through soft incentives is often not evaluated, thus its effects are not known and neglected. Positive health benefits of walking and cycling are known for experts, with a lot of evidence supporting it, but often citizens are not aware of them. Sedentary life-style, on the other hand, is not only bad for health but

also brings concrete losses to the economy: estimated over €80 bln is lost every year in the EU due to lack of physical activity.

The following activities are proposed:

- Analysis of the experiences of the European Mobility Week campaign in order to collect relevant best practices and other useful learnings.
- Analysis of different types of campaigns (traditional campaigns, image or brand building, social & cultural events, education programmes, bike to work campaigns) and dedicated of active modes application to collect good practices.
- Analysis what challenges addressed above can be addressed in upcoming Raising Awareness of alternatives to private car study of DG MOVE 2018.
- Development of a toolkit on collecting data (focusing on increasing cycling and walking) to support elaboration of sustainable mobility plans for schools and companies.
- Development of a guideline with a set of key indicators for systematic monitoring and evaluation of mobility plans for schools and companies.
- Making mobility plans for schools and companies obligatory at relevant level (legal requirement over established employees) – courses & training on active mobility should be included on school level.
- Provision of training/capacity building on mobility plans elaboration for schools, large companies (e.g. 100+ employees), and institutions, based on the best practices.
- Mainstreaming active mobility in national strategies for health, environment, education, transport/mobility and climate change.

5. Challenges and opportunities of small- and medium-sized cities; and polycentric development.

The partnership did define special city size related issues, for example in the action of New Mobility Services: Small- and medium sized cities (50.000 - 400.000 inhabitants) can benefit from using NMS largely because of their dependency on car mobility and often reduced access to public transport services.

The partnership recognizes also that the provision of appropriate framework conditions might vary between size of cities and poly centric developments. The partnership did specify this in action 9:

1. Provide appropriate framework conditions in the Member States at national level (so that planning authorities have suitable technical, legal, financial and other tools at their disposal) in order to accelerate the take-up of SUMPs for the urban areas (including small and medium-sized; poly-centric, etc.) in every EU Member State.
2. Produce a set of examples of good practice with regard to SUMPs, from across the EU, covering towns and cities of different sizes.

6. Urban regeneration

Urban renewal and regeneration is the transformation of existing urban areas to accommodate much denser and generally mixed used environments. It enables the use and development of an area to better align with the current and future needs of a

growing city. The partnership did not focus directly on the relation of urban mobility and urban regeneration, however improving walking and cycling infrastructure (action 1) is directly linked to improving urban areas. Also, an improved accessibility (action 6) is considered a means of enhancing the potential of neighbourhoods and lifting social exclusion.

7. Adaptation to demographic change

Demography seeks to understand population changes by investigating such demographic components as gender, age, ethnicity, home ownership, mobility, disabilities, language knowledge, employment status and location. Adaptation to demographic change in mobility was indirectly addressed by the partnership via the actions on behaviour (action 2), new mobility services (action 4) and access to public transport (action 6).

8. Availability and quality of public services of general interest

There is a direct link between urban mobility and the availability of public services of general interest. When citizens doesn't have access via modes to public services, these services become unavailable. Therefore there is a direct link between the accessibility (action 6) and availability of public services.

9. International dimension (Habitat III and the Sustainable Development Goals).

See next paragraph – 6.2.

6.2 New Urban Agenda & Sustainable Development Goals

The EU and its Member States agreed on the New Urban Agenda and committed to implement it through the Urban Agenda for the EU. In this paragraph it is indicated which actions contribute to their achievement (cross-referencing).

Goal 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere

Urban mobility policies and -measures and policies aiming at reducing poverty might be related to each other. Accessible and affordable mobility has a positive impact on social inclusion.

Goal 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture

There is a limited connection between the urban mobility actions and sustainable agriculture.

Goal 3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages

This a major objective of the proposed actions of the partnership on urban mobility. Special consideration is placed the health impacts of active modes infrastructure (action 1) and on promoting a more healthy lifestyle through promoting waling and cycling (action 2)

Goal 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all
Urban mobility policies and -measures are not related to this goal nor do they have a positive or negative impact on this goal.

Goal 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
Urban mobility policies and -measures are not related to this goal nor do they have a positive or negative impact on this goal

Goal 6. Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all
Urban mobility policies and -measures are not related to this goal nor do they have a positive or negative impact on this goal

Goal 7 Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all
This can be an indirect impact of the proposed actions and recommendations of the partnership on urban mobility. Especially the promotion of innovative clean buses (action 7) is promoting the use of alternative energy sources.

Goal 8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
Urban mobility policies and -measures can contribute to a sustainable and inclusive economic growth. Promotion of sustainable urban mobility plans (action 9) and improvement of accessibility (action 6) can have a relevant impact in this respect.

Goal 9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation
Resilient infrastructure is one of the main objectives of the SUMP (action 9) and therefore of the urban mobility policies.

Goal 10. Reduce inequality within and among countries
Urban mobility policies and -measures can contribute to reducing inequality. Improvement of accessibility for all via the provision of quality public transport (action 6) can have a catalytic impact in this respect.

Goal 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable
These are the main objectives of most urban mobility policies. The support to the development of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (action 9) is particularly contributing to this direction. Action 6 on measuring access to public transport and Action 8 on disseminating best practices of multi-level governance have a direct link to supporting reporting targeted under SDG 11.2 that targets the monitoring and expansion of public transport at all levels. SDG reporting is a formal requirement which member states have committed to.

Goal 12. Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns
The proposed actions of the partnership should contribute to this goal. In specific, the promotion of innovative clean busses (action 5) which would be running on alternative, and thus more sustainable fuels should be a significant contributor to this goal.

Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
The proposed actions of the partnership are bringing a significantly positive impact on this goal with the promotion of a more sustainable and thus less CO2-emitting transport patterns (actions 1, 2, 3, 7 and 9).

Goal 14. Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development
The proposed actions of the partnership are not focussed on this topic, will not have a negative impact on this.

Goal 15. Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss
The proposed actions of the partnership are not focussed on this topic, will not have a negative impact on this.

Goal 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels
Action 8, focusing on best practices for multi-level governance, aims to address this goal by improving the effectiveness and accountability of institutions.

Goal 17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development
The proposed actions of the partnership are not focussed on this topic, but will not have a negative impact on this.