

Nov 2013

# Minutes

---

TRANSFORuM Thematic  
Workshop:

ITS

European Intermodal Information,  
Management and Ticketing System

11 / 12 November

Reading, United Kingdom

---

---

## 1 Introduction

Number of participants:	11
Countries represented:	Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, the UK
Men / women:	9/2
Policy makers / industry / academia:	5/3/2

1 moderator and 2 rapporteurs from TRANSFORuM facilitated and took notes at the workshop.

The participants were welcomed to Reading, a location chosen for its contribution to and involvement in a number of successful and relevant EU projects, particularly the Co-Cities project. A round of introductions took place and participants were given guidance as to the proceedings of the two half day event. It was explained that the main goal of the workshop was to examine and discuss how good practices have been delivered, the conditions under which success can be achieved as well as any common challenges and barriers that had to be overcome – and how. Taking the perspectives on these areas, the group moved on to discuss what sharing of good practice currently takes place in Europe and what else could be done to promote sharing across levels. Ideas were taken forward to a discussion on drafting a road-map to fulfil the goal on intermodal information, management and payment systems set in the 2011 White Paper.

---

## 2 UK Cases

The workshop participants heard insight from Transport for London representatives who discussed the city's experience implementing the Oyster card as well as future smart ticketing and payment systems. Reading Borough Council also shared their insight into their contribution to EU projects promoting ITS transport systems in the town, particularly the current Co-Cities project.

---

## 3 Transformation is possible!

In this session of the workshop, the criteria developed and utilized by the TRANSFORuM team in selecting the 10 good practice case studies were explained to participants. In addition, 10 shortlisted ITS cases were also outlined and discussed. Participants were then offered an opportunity to reflect and comment on both the criteria and the cases. The major points from this discussion include:

The need for open systems to ensure standardisation, as well as the replicability of initiatives and ideas were seen as important. Furthermore, there is a need to look at what is already happening in Europe and to continue to reflect on current good practice as developments are occurring all the time. Access to and availability of data was similarly flagged as key areas of importance for the thematic group.

Transferability and scalability were seen as key issues – some key problems were flagged with regards to the levels at which services should be implemented. With a total trip chain, there needs to be an element of localism, but it is difficult to determine how to distribute the payment between local areas, across modes and wider. Indeed, the transfer of money was seen as a barrier to the wider EU goals. It was suggested that this isn't possible without standard rules and interfaces, so perhaps a good practice example could be some sort of clearing house set up to delineate between these levels and systems. It was suggested that the common denominator for making decisions about interfaces was likely to be financially based – i.e. necessary to pick the cheapest, which might not always be the best, which will continue to be a problem.

The need to differentiate between every day travel and one-off journeys, seasonal differences and different user groups were all flagged as important. Generally more consideration of the user side was seen

as a priority. The single ticket is a great vision, but an open-minded approach would be required from all stakeholders involved, which is very unlikely in the given timeframe. Leaving it to the market to happen was advocated by some participants.

---

## 4 Context and factors for success

The participants were asked to think about one successful policy/idea and an example of a less successful policy or idea, and consider why these particular initiatives were successful/unsuccessful. After a group discussion, some common factors for success and failure were identified and the group went on to discuss the relevance of these identified factors. The lists of common and other factors are outlined below.

### COMMON SUCCESS FACTORS

- Listening to users/obtaining and providing reliable information
- Public private partnership / politics and business together
- Improvement of present situation / attractive solution
- Cooperation / getting right stakeholders together
- Expertise / insight utilised
- Leadership
- Standard interfaces/basis to build on
- Many small steps (iterative process)

### OTHER IDENTIFIED SUCCESS FACTORS

- Combination/package of measures
- Realistic goals
- Good business case
- Separate ticketing from information

### COMMON FAILURE FACTORS

- Lack of data/information
- Wrong participants and stakeholders/bad partners
- No clear objectives to start/outcomes at end
- Poor understanding of actual user needs
- Poor integration:
  - Non-universal application
  - Lack of availability
  - Different business models

### OTHER IDENTIFIED FAILURE FACTORS

- Timing
- Project/product not fit for purpose
- Regional elections – lack of sharing
- Lobby power of logistics sector
- Trying to do too much at once
- Trying to establish common standards on a voluntary basis in a deregulated market without the necessary power to steer and co-ordinate

## 5 Policy learning and sharing

Participants were asked to reflect on how they currently share information on good practices in their day-to-day role. Some 22 distinct methods were identified including established networks across different government levels and conferences on specific subjects, working groups and personal meetings. They were then asked to think about any other ideas not covered in the list which could be utilized to share good practice in the future. Among the 13 ideas which were discussed, getting cities and companies together to share knowledge was seen as a positive way to yield results, as was exploring interoperability – developing business models and frameworks that would yield more synergies between companies. It was suggested that a single initiative was possible, if ownership of particular areas and issues was promoted.

The final element of this session was to identify barriers to sharing. Twenty-three suggestions were offered by the group and discussed. These included issues of closed data, lack of transparency and competition. In certain areas, industry has a monopoly and therefore a reticence to share, which is an insurmountable barrier in these contexts. The amount of data was also flagged as a barrier – the idea that there was too much information available and it is difficult to know which is relevant or worth sharing. Political decisions, language, lack of commitment to sharing and time constraints were all identified.

## 6 Sharing across levels

In the final session focused on WP5, participants were asked to reflect on the roles played by the different levels of government in promoting good practice and scaling up success to the level required to meet the White Paper goals. These discussions were framed around the concepts of scalability and transferability as identified in the first session as important for the ITS goal. The following ideas were identified by the group.

### SCALABILITY

- Step-by-step: opening up of data towards full integration/(inter)operability
- Start with what is possible and work on goal in mean time
- Transparency and open information
- We are not making the best use of work that's already been done. More dissemination across levels and sectors to share ideas
- Business-driven processes?

### EUROPEAN

- EU subsidiarity: what is appropriate? "Light legislation" – guidance not prescription: not strict rules
- EU cautious rather than taking lead. Does this need to change?
- Supporting communication is not enough – should have the role of moderation?

### NATIONAL

- Member states: each country has different policy – difficult to identify roles consistently
- Art 47: White paper => standardisation

### TRANSFERABILITY

#### EUROPEAN

- What role would EU like to play? Facilitator/moderator?
- Fund projects that member states/cities want (to do anyway) Horizon 2020 (2014)
- Active role through legislation ("light legislation") (ITS directive) standards
- Standard setting (policies can differ) at local levels: would it slow progress/developments? No reason not to/inaction
- WISETRIP project

## NATIONAL

- National initiatives and funding resources
- Provide data to private companies to make use of this => especially data which contains no personal details
- Privacy legislation resides with member states

## LOCAL

- ITS should not be isolated but integral to all other areas – application to all other areas – application of tech – common knowledge base

Finally, a list of keywords was drawn up to highlight the primary themes that have emerged through the discussion:

- Trust – payments
- Privacy
- Competition
- Data (ownership)
- Security

---

## 7 Kick-off of the road-mapping process

---

### 7.1 Measures and priorities

---

From the good practice sessions, it became obvious that also small steps can deliver good practice and that good practice does not necessarily imply complete achievement or fulfilment of the ambitious White Paper goal. However, in the road-mapping perspective, a small-step approach will hamper with the danger of missing the broader overall goal. Thus, a certain idea of the final destination strived for has always to be carried through the process. Similar considerations apply to a focus on no-regret measures. While such an approach is likely to exclude more risky measures or policies, such measures should be kept in an open range of considerations in order to finally select the most promising approach.

Specifically in the ITS field, there is already considerable regulation at the European and at national levels, and yet there is quite a differentiated implementation landscape of ITS frameworks. It therefore seems necessary to bring stakeholders together on a broader basis and to bring them on a common ground of understanding the existing challenges, taking their different needs into consideration. Currently, instead, it seems as if the European Commission does sometimes not know what is happening at stakeholder platforms – and vice versa.

It seems particularly noteworthy that a European ITS framework has to correspond with respective national and city-level frameworks as 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> level goals. On the European level, this framework must not be too prescriptive, as different ways to achieve the goal are still possible. Still, it must not only provide a strategy or vision as these are not enforceable and strict regulation with the character of laws is necessary. More technical specifications may also be necessary, particularly of (commercial) stakeholders' own interests that most frequently deviate at least partly from overarching public interests.

For many issues in the field of European ITS, there is no good answer yet. For example, data security and privacy issues can be expected to receive increasing attention, a possible European obligation of open data sharing would conflict with legislative responsibilities as defined in the European treaties, and conflicts may also arise with competition law. A comprehensive inventory of the current state of ITS strategies and implementation status in all European countries – considering local contexts as well – therefore seems to be an important step back and a starting point to plan European action. This could allow to better coordinate a vision of the final destination of a European ITS system in order to not later regret decisions that are to be taken in the near future. The need for a step back is for example underpinned by the current state of

reporting following the European ITS directive, where a lack of definition of the required structure and content character leads to a situation where national reports are not very useful and hardly comparable.

---

## 7.2 Expectations, use of the road map

---

The lack of actual implementation and coordination of existing regulation seems to be a major challenge in the ITS field. It is therefore – beyond the content of the road map which should mainly define a toolbox-like range of actions to be taken and responsibilities – most important that the road map actually has an impact aiming at changing this unsatisfying situation. The road map therefore needs to focus on non-covered issues and must be open to also criticise existing actions and policies. In answering the question of which role the European Commission should usefully have in the future it should also be open for criticism regarding the current role and actions of the Commission. Aiming at not allowing the Commission to just stack the road map away, this is fully in line with the intended stakeholder-driven character of the TRANSFORuM road map.