

Vienna, Austria

28 & 29 Jan 2014

Minutes

2nd Joint Forum Meeting

This document provides a summary of the discussion results from TRANSFORuM's 2nd Joint Forum Meeting. The document follows the structure of the meeting, reporting the main issues from both the Thematic Groups and the Cross-cutting issue Groups as well as from the final plenary discussion.

1	Day 1: Thematic Groups (parallel sessions, 28 Jan 2014)	2
1.1	TG1: Urban Mobility	2
1.2	TG2: Long-distance Freight.....	5
1.3	TG3: High-speed Rail	7
1.4	TG4: Multimodal Information, Management and Payment.....	8
2	Day 2: Cross-cutting issues (parallel sessions, 29 Jan 2014)	11
2.1	Funding, financing, pricing	11
2.2	Policy packaging	13
2.3	Governance, standards & regulation	14
3	Final discussion (29 Jan 2014)	16

1 Day 1: Thematic Groups (parallel sessions, 28 Jan 2014)

The four parallel sessions of the Thematic Groups were each moderated by the respective Thematic Group leader (TG1 / Urban Mobility: Henrik Gudmundsson; TG2 / Long-distance Freight: Jonas Åkerman; TG3 / High-speed Rail: Yves Crozet; TG4 / Intermodal Information, Management and Payment: Florian Kressler). In each group, two other members of TRANSFORuM's project team took minutes of the discussions and consolidated the present document.

1.1 TG1: Urban Mobility

Six stakeholders with different backgrounds (urban logistics and passenger transport; European and city level; research and practice; north and south of Europe; male and female) participated in the urban thematic group session. A member of the TRANSFORuM Consortium, Henrik Gudmundsson, facilitated the session; two additional consortium members took notes. Gudmundsson asked the participating stakeholders to give their comments and ideas on developing a roadmap in the urban area: Which kind of measures should be included in such a roadmap? Which degree of concreteness is possible/useful? To what extent can a roadmap be generic? Does it have to be adapted to the specific context? Considering the wide diversity among European cities, is it possible to use the same targets for all? What criteria for differentiation could be useful: size, degree in centrality, economic situation, topography etc.? What did the stakeholders think about the roadmap, given as an example in the briefing document and sent to the participants in advance of the workshop?

In the beginning the facilitator briefly connected to previous discussions on the urban goal that had taken place at the same day and in former TRANSFORuM events. Earlier in the day it had been discussed that the urban goal was particularly challenging because the European Community is having limited legal competences in this field. Participants generally agreed that a kind of European roadmap for the urban transport goal could be meaningful even considering that the European Union has limited powers in this area. A roadmap would not necessarily mean a common 'master plan'.

This was followed by a discussion about the goal of reducing CO₂ emissions. The stakeholders agreed in line with stakeholder feedback from earlier TRANSFORuM events and surveys that the goal should not only be discussed in the context of fuels and propulsion technologies, but should rather be understood as part of a broader strategy for sustainable urban mobility. The stakeholders seemed to agree that technology solutions are necessary, but cannot be the only solution. Further, it was suggested that the goal should not be taken too strictly. It should rather be understood as vision than as precise yardstick.

The stakeholder feedback circled around both character as well as contents of the roadmap. Starting with *character*, two key points were addressed:

- Flexibility and EU support
- A ladder of development

First, it was emphasised that the roadmap needs to be partly fixed and partly flexible. Some elements may work well for most cities, while other elements need to be tailored to the specific characteristics of each city, country or culture. It was suggested that the roadmap should be looser and more flexible than the example given in the briefing document. Flexibility was highlighted as cities differ from each other and need to take different pathways, giving each city the opportunity to achieve the target in ways that are appropriate to each of them. For example, electrification of road transport might be an option for some cities (e.g. Oslo), whereas modal shift may be a more appropriate way for other cities. City-specific interim targets could be helpful to guide the cities on their way. However, it was also mentioned that the roadmap should not be too 'fluffy'. Although there is a need for flexibility and the goals and measures in each city may be different, the EU may contribute by introducing some interim goals and support in certain aspects. For example, it was suggested that the EU could support the use of sustainable urban mobility plans. Such mobility plans should take consideration of mobility needs, as the solution of such plans is not necessarily to reduce mobility in inner cities, because this may induce urban sprawl, which may be neither beneficial for reducing emissions nor for creating a sustainable city (i.e. if people and industry move out of the city centres, then the cities are no longer sustainable). The concern with ensuring sustainable mobility is also included in the White Paper.

Second, as several stakeholders were concerned with the different points of departures of different cities (i.e. some cities have achieved considerable reduction in CO₂ emissions, while others have not implemented such goals), the facilitator suggested that the roadmap could be seen as a "ladder" of progression or as an "evolutionary scale", where cities find useful advice for their respective stages of progress. It was suggested that the roadmap should be viewed as a framework for action and not as a strict timetable or 'master plan' that determines what exactly needs to be done in what order. In this context it was also highlighted that the roadmap should not only focus on best practices of successful front-runner cities, but include more useful information for less advanced, "average" cities.

The discussions about *content* of the roadmap addressed four key points:

- focus on processes;
- the relevance of education and culture;
- responsibilities at different political levels;
- push and pull measures.

First, the most important message regarding content was that the draft roadmap in the briefing paper puts too much emphasis on technical approaches; it was argued that the focus on processes should be larger. It should include answers to questions like: how to generate a political momentum; what are the necessary steps to move forward; which actors/stakeholders need to work together and how can this be organised; how can the necessary policy agreements be achieved; given that only few cities have a clear long-term vision, how can such visions be developed in more cities with support from the relevant stakeholders? It was mentioned that cities that achieve ambitious targets often have charismatic leadership. However, when such leadership is lacking, initiatives that build on “solidarity” among cities could be encouraged. Cities may find it easier to create “political momentum” by working together with other cities (e.g. Covenant of Mayors, which could be extended). It was suggested that the European Commission could support such initiatives, for example, with a secretariat.

Second it was argued that education may be an important lever. This is a national or regional competence, but it was questioned whether a European-wide educational approach could contribute to transformation. It was argued that behavioural change is crucial for achieving the targets and that education for sustainable mobility can be a means to support such change. Travel behaviour is complex; culture, context and habits are important factors. It was pointed at recent trends that show that changes in travel behaviour are possible: Younger people in many urban areas are less inclined in taking driving licences today. They want to be able to get to their destination fast, but not necessarily by driving a car. It was mentioned that also freight transport may be influenced by changes in perceptions and culture, if, for example, increased demand for regionally produced goods would reduce the need for heavy lorry traffic in cities.

Third, it was argued that the roadmap should map out what different political levels (i.e. local, national and European) may contribute with, including the competencies and interests of the different political levels. It was argued that the European Commission may play an important role, as shown with initiatives such as the “Urban Mobility Package” and the “Clean Power for Transport: A European alternative fuels strategy”. It was suggested that the European Union could contribute to creating a “culture” that enables achieving the goal, for example by extending efforts to influence the cultures surrounding mobility behaviour and mobility planning. The question was raised whether there is a missing link between the EU and the lower political levels. In general, cities and regions will gain in importance in the future since these are the economic engines.

Fourth, the facilitator asked the question whether it is helpful to talk about push and pull measures – whether both kinds of measures are needed, and whether it is possible to move forward without sticks. Different stakeholders were of the opinion that it is impossible to reach the targets without some kind of sticks, but sticks alone are not enough – there is a need for people to experience

certain benefits of changing travel behaviour. Otherwise, the necessary political support cannot be achieved. The stakeholders differentiated between passenger transport and city logistics, disagreeing about whether behavioural change can more easily be reached within urban logistics or passenger transport. Perhaps freight is “easier” to target, because it is strictly following economic calculations. It was put forth that there is a need for some kind of sticks in particular for the last mile delivery in city logistics and that regulation would contribute to reach the targets. The main feedback was that “Policy Packages” are needed which combine sticks with measures that bring clear benefits for the users (carrots). A sort of “toolkit” is helpful, but these policy tools need to be embedded in an overall framework.

1.2 TG2: Long-distance Freight

Regarding the structure of the roadmaps, it was stated that there is no sufficient literature review and references to other projects are missing (e.g. NEW OPERA; TIGER; SPIDER PLUS). Various research approaches and documents have to be considered in order to achieve a comprehensive analysis. A survey on new markets and technologies even outside the EU was suggested to obtain a complete view on the freight market. On the other hand it was doubted if technology changes will be so radical that they have to be included in the roadmap.

While the roadmap currently emphasizes more the rail sector, the influence of a specific group was seen as problematic so there is a high demand for a broader range of stakeholder views. Furthermore the definition of waterborne transport in the White Paper was not clear to all participants. It was questioned which kind of calculations can be used to understand the modal shift. Moreover, the look for additional policies as well as the reflection on past policy failures were stated as important methods to build a complete roadmap. There is a need to further examine if the measures foreseen in the roadmap can be achieved within the foreseen timeframe.

As for the second part of the draft roadmaps, participants further discussed the table of measures as well as the balance between sticks and carrots. Currently the table displays only sticks from the road sector towards other modes of transport and carrots only for the rail sector, so there is a need to see carrots as well for other modes, i.e. mainly waterborne transport. In addition, there is a need to examine additional kinds of measures, such as to improve data availability regarding the length and weight of trains or the utilization of the full network. It was stressed that coordination of policy initiatives has to be accomplished across different policy levels. Another important aspect is the increasing need of capacity in the future. Focusing not only on competitiveness between individual modes but also on the global competition the expected market growth should be reflected as well. In this context the future drivers of competition between rail and road have to be defined carefully.

Beyond that, other potential drivers for modal shift resistance also need to be considered. In this context it was questioned if high wages of multimodal cargo operators are the reason for the resistance to shift modes and one participant suggested to invite members of trade unions in the upcoming consultation phase.

It was concluded that the table of roadmap measures is useful, but stakeholders urged for more concrete policy examples not just within the EU. It was suggested that there should be a ranking of the options and a highlighting of the top 3 issues. These issues should be expressed as clear activities with specified responsibilities. In addition it should be considered that there will be a new Commissioner at the end of the year – a reflection on the current situation in Europe is helpful before proceeding with measures in the roadmap, particularly considering existing but not yet (fully) implemented legislative acts. Some participants furthermore reported that the terms ‘security’ and ‘safety’ need to be differentiated.

The participants were then asked about how the roadmaps could provide added value. In the context of the White Paper goals there is a demand to define intermediate goals to monitor the process towards each target. These key indicators of progress could as well be used as political instruments. It was questioned if the EU or the national governments are ready to learn from the roadmap. There was agreement that public acceptability issues (e.g. noise) also must be taken into account and need to be addressed properly. Another suggestion was to look at national roadmaps and to focus the perspective of the TRANSFORuM roadmap on cross-border transport from a European perspective. It was argued that TRANSFORuM should enter into a dialogue with the outside world to ensure a wider participation and get perspectives from other actors (e.g. shippers of different sorts of freight). The multimodal corridor approach should also be taken into account.

It was stressed during the meeting that there is a need for incentives in the rail sector to evolve into a market – rail is not yet working as a fully integrated part of the freight transport market. The separation of infrastructure operators from service operators remains a challenge in order to provide fair and efficient market conditions. Harmonized standards and regulations are particularly needed to facilitate cross-border freight transportation, also contributing to a level playing field with road transport where different standards apply.

Several questions of financing were raised. The need to understand infrastructure investment was identified – how do we fully reflect externalities in future projects? It was suggested that whilst a lack of funding for new projects may be a problem in particular areas, there is a need to actually understand where this is or is not an issue. It was identified that a funding gap is likely to be there in the future – cross-border initiatives are perhaps less of an issue than renewing/upgrading national networks in the mid- to long-term. Finally it was flagged that we need to better understand public-

private partnerships – is there actually money in this approach or is it simply a way to distribute the risks?

1.3 TG3: High-speed Rail

High-speed Rail lines are an integral part of the European and national transport systems. At the same time, railway infrastructures – and high-speed lines in particular – are an expensive asset. It is therefore particularly relevant in the High-speed Rail theme to have a close look at the economic feasibility of proposed infrastructure investments. Because strategic railway infrastructure development is always embedded in a wider transport policy perspective, there will most probably always be a need to subsidize infrastructure investments, which requires a public debate about how much and in what to invest. As well expressed at TRANSFORUM's previous High-speed Rail workshop in Lyon, time gains are important, but not the key issue. The management of capacity remains crucial; in corridors, for example, congestion can be reduced by increasing the maximum density of the traffic – without necessarily leading to time gains for the individual passengers, but still improving service quality.

Contexts for railway services differ across Europe and there will thus be no one-size-fits-all approach. The White Paper goal is not only about tripling the High-speed Rail network, but also calls for maintaining a dense European railway network. Contrary to this part of the goal, regional railway traffic has declined in some regions where High-speed Rail services were introduced. Such developments need to be avoided and analyses are required that highlight where High-speed Rail services are most performing – instead of following national, regional or lobby interests. One important variable is population density which varies significantly across the European regions and calls for specifically adjusted concepts of providing railway services. High-speed Rail lines are therefore most efficient only in specific corridors. In particular, a good planning of railway stations is needed in order to link the different transport modes in the most efficient way and to facilitate multimodal journeys.

Beyond infrastructure provision, a perspective on service quality is essential, specifically taking into account user needs. This includes a rethinking of investments by targeting them at those infrastructure investments that contribute most efficiently to a reduction of delays, to a higher density of services and to better reliability of railway services. Removing the discontinuity of the European railway network – missing links at borders – is one such approach, and also contributing to the extension of the network length. These characteristics need to be considered in cost-benefit analyses as well – instead of putting too much focus on reduced travel times. This new kind of service orientation is not only an issue for targeted investments, but also for the day-to-day business of railway operators being in touch with the actual travellers.

Regarding funding and financing, stakeholders recommended a dedicated focus on cross-border links. National infrastructure projects often also lie within the scope of national transport policy interests and do therefore receive more public attention and interest. Cross-border links, instead, are in many cases not top priorities from the respective national perspectives. Particularly from a European perspective, they should therefore deserve special attention because improved cross-border links are essential for completing a truly European railway network. One participant suggested that a vision of this kind could also provide a transparent rationale to argue for certain funding priorities. Cross-border links could then receive additional dedicated EU funding or via EU directives infrastructure operators could maybe even be obliged to provide sufficient cross-border links in order to receive funding for projects within national borders.

It was stressed in the meeting that the future development of deregulation and liberalisation is crucial, but not necessarily privatisation. Italy, where two companies (Trenitalia and NTV) are now operating HSR trains in competition, is an interesting example for this issue. The separation of infrastructure operators from service operators remains a key challenge in order to provide fair and efficient market conditions. This is also to say that full deregulation is not a good way to follow in every part of railway regulation, as it can also have negative effects. Harmonized standards, for example regarding ticketing compatibility among operators, and strong regulations are particularly needed to facilitate cross-border operation and travel. Recalling the user perspective mentioned above, regulations and clearance institutions are as well needed in order to not let customers get lost in a labyrinth of competing offers. For example, in the United Kingdom a common system is available where customers can buy tickets that are valid on all trains on the selected route, regardless of their operator. While train operators can still sell cheaper special offers with restricted validity, revenues from the flexible tickets are distributed among the different operators according to the so-called 'Rail Settlement Plan' along common agreements. This example also illustrates how – from a governance perspective – user-friendly railway services need to be linked with intelligent ITS frameworks (see below).

1.4 TG4: Multimodal Information, Management and Payment

The vision formulated in the WP goal is extremely vague. It is unclear what is meant by a “framework”? A legal framework, technical architecture, societal vision? For instance, what would a legal framework mean? What kind of goals should be achieved through this? Some participants argued that the framework was more like a cascade of agendas; or an agenda that brought the different actors together. In other words, such a “framework” could be useful to set agendas and trigger coordination but would never replace actual decision making. The group concluded that the White Paper goal should be regarded as a framework for agenda setting and political decisions. It could also represent a

common understanding with a strong policy behind it. They argued that it is the role of the EU to learn from member states. However, the question remained whether it should be a top-down or bottom-up approach. Some form of structure and cooperation were seen as necessary. Today it is very fragmented, one country is not aware of what happens in another. This was regarded as a problem, especially when talking about cross border information.

At the most basic level, the participants argued that the goal should be understood as consisting of three different ones. Multi-modal travel information systems should be distinguished from travel management systems, which are again different from payment/ticketing systems (incl. road charging). In all three (sub-) systems, different actors are involved and need to be consulted. In essence, travel information provision and payment might require different management approaches, different action levels, different consensus building processes. Furthermore, it was observed that there probably will not be one European system but rather a combination of different systems.

For concrete and coordinated action, however, a common vision of how a multi-modal future should look like is needed – with full endorsement by all member states – as well as an agreement about general service quality criteria. The development of such a shared understanding should be the focus of future efforts by policy makers and the practitioner community. Among the current problems is that the discussion is quite often driven by mainly technological issues and not enough thought is given to non-technological (“soft”) issues such as management challenges, data protection, user needs etc.

The above has implications about the focus of the TRANSFORuM roadmaps: They should not take means and methods as their starting point but rather focus on real expected impact. The current structure of the roadmaps 1.0 was also perceived as rather weak and reactive; they should be strengthened by proactively assigning much clearer roles to respective actors. What would it mean to have these systems in use for a transport system of the future?

All studies on cost efficacy show that measures improving information, management and ticketing are more cost effective than others (good value for money => opportunities for the private sector). However, the group wondered why financing is being discussed when the money should be there. They believed that it would be easy to get private funding since this would be something the private sector is likely to be interested in. The participants did not believe that EU funding was needed or a realistic policy option.

The participants pointed out that a common understanding, vision and framework was necessary if different services should be implemented on a large scale. According to them we already have a multitude of services especially in urban transport. Even if we added safety related information the question was how this should be exchanged. It is difficult to manage a large number of actors but we

need common approaches and standards. A bottom-up approach was needed but it was also important to provide open data and services. However, the group added that the barrier, which might prevent this, is that there is not always trust between industry and countries. If technical solutions come before a clear vision: Danger of new “lock-in” and undesired “path-dependencies”.

The White Paper’s underlying assumption is unclear with regards to the question whether the “multimodal travel and payment information service” should be a public service or a private commodity? The group also discussed whether it *should* be privatized and, vice versa, whether it is necessary to use tax money for this. If it is privatized then pricing could be seen as another cause of social injustice; i.e. if it is too expensive for some people. However, it was also stated that a company like Google does not have to charge its customers since they can get an income from other sources like advertising. Google sells information and the question was whether it is plausible to challenge their business model. Some would argue that they are not genuinely interested in improving the sustainability of transport or mobility per se. The question was also if their service is seen as a public service or private business case. Perhaps both but they argued that it has had to be decided what is to be public and what is private since they follow very different logics.

A danger with allowing the private sector to be in control of what kind of information is to be provided to whom was discussed. The group believed that it was a question of good governance. It was important to present a policy before the private sector got involved. A number of criteria have to be decided well in advance.

Regarding the role of the EU it was suggested that it should define and enforce minimum service standards across all of Europe; e.g. basic timetable information - that is the easy part but not even those have yet been defined. (Real-time information can follow later). These questions that came up are what level of service should be provided, and how the service quality can be guaranteed and controlled, especially if it is left to the open market.

With regards to user needs, some of the participants wondered whether people really only want up-to-date information before they start a journey. Quite possibly, it is more important to have reliable information during the journey, not at home. Some also argued that many people today are worried about being late to an appointment and believed that they would be happy to subscribe to a system which helped them to avoid this. Engagement with users (likely beneficiaries) was generally perceived as missing or too unsystematic.

2 Day 2: Cross-cutting issues (parallel sessions, 29 Jan 2014)

The three parallel sessions concerned with cross-cutting issues were each moderated by a representative of TRANSFORuM (Funding, financing, pricing: Yves Crozet; Policy Packaging: Jonas Åkerman; Governance, standards & regulation: Karen Anderton). In each group, two other members of TRANSFORuM's project team took minutes of the discussions and consolidated the present document.

2.1 Funding, financing, pricing

The discussions in the cross-cutting session on funding, financing and pricing circled around nine key points:

- paying back investments over a life time
- the difference between 'financing' and 'funding'
- attribution of risk
- traffic forecasts and the need of projects
- individual versus network projects
- external costs
- other sources
- an EU project to move ahead
- the EU White Paper goals

First, there was an emphasis on the importance of organising projects in such a way that investments are guaranteed to be paid back over a life time. It means that expected actual traffic has to be taken into account when planning for investments. Public financing is and does not always have to be organised this way. However, in areas where there is a lack of demand or insufficient demand to pay back the investments, investments spill huge costs on the citizens – resources that could have been spent on alternative projects.

Second, it was pointed out that 'financing' and 'funding' have different meanings. While financing refers to how a project is organised, funding is the source. It means that there are always ways to finance a project. In contrast, funding creates difficulties. However, no matter how public or private bodies choose to organise the financing, eventually the users and/or tax payers are the funders. An example is Private Public Partnerships (PPP). When the treasury is empty, investments can proceed by organising projects as PPPs. There are certain benefits of such partnerships. PPPs in the form of state-owned companies (for example in Denmark) may provide benefits in terms of project handling, as PPPs put risk where risk is handled in the best way. Given the state guarantee (i.e. the state will cover any

loss), the project benefits from lower interest rates than in cases where the company is not state-owned. However, in the end either the users or the tax payers pay for such investments (see point seven for other funders).

Third, there was a discussion about attribution of risk. It was argued that the private sector cannot easily carry traffic risk. Traffic is dependent on factors such as economic development, taxation and alternative routes. The quality of the infrastructure does not influence consumption as much as these other factors. Furthermore, it was questioned whether it makes sense at all to talk about risk allocation to the private or public sector: it was argued that when problems arise, the public sector eventually has to rescue the project anyway. On the one hand, this is in conflict with the desire to reduce public deficits. On the other hand, if the public authorities are not willing to subsidise, there is no possibility to invest in infrastructure where the users are not willing to pay. Today most major infrastructures have already been built. Where these cover the most important travel needs, additional investments may not be so profitable. They may therefore increase the need for subsidies (unless being important for certain private interests, who may be willing to pay for such new investments).

Fourth, there was a debate about traffic forecasts and the estimation of the need of a project. While a project, technically seen, may be a success (e.g. a bridge has been built), the traffic may be less than planned for and therefore it may not be a success. It was suggested that we sometimes have to accept the fact that traffic forecasts are wrong. For example, there were issues related to the forecasts of the Øresund bridge between Sweden and Denmark. It was expected that people would be willing to pay the expenses to cross the bridge. However, this assumption turned out wrong. Perhaps the traffic would have been different if it had not been between two different countries. In the discussion it was highlighted that such lack of willingness to pay is part of the rationale for having some state funding. Moreover, it was distinguished between mega projects with big risk and low traffic and smaller projects (e.g. tramways), where local politicians make decisions under the conditions of 'normal' risk.

Fifth, there is a need to differentiate between individual projects and network projects. Where road tolls finance infrastructure, the result may be plentiful individual projects such as bridges and tunnels of high quality, while the road network between those bridges and tunnels may be poor. An alternative solution that may contribute to avoid such issues is network-based pricing.

Sixth, there was a discussion about external costs. It was argued that hauliers in many areas cover most of the external costs that they impose on the society, but not the marginal costs of the infrastructure. In contrast, the private car does not cover the external and marginal costs. However, it was suggested that the existing pricing system is not too far away from the balance between actual costs imposed and what the drivers/operators pay.

Seventh, other sources than user charges and subsidies were mentioned. Such sources include land tax or other ways that landowners may contribute with funding, for example when businesses pay for an extra metro line serving their location (as is the case in the UK).

Eighth, it was suggested that in cases of new technology, sometimes no one is willing to take the risk. In such cases it could help if the EU introduced a project. An example is road pricing for an entire network (km-based road charging for private cars), which is an issue in the entire EU, but nobody wants to be the first to invest in the necessary infrastructure.

Finally, the discussion ended with a reference to the White Paper, which includes a formulation that the cost of transport should not increase as a result of reaching the target of reducing CO₂ emissions. It was suggested that user charging to build infrastructure goes against this White Paper formulation. The group questioned whether the items included in the White Paper are compatible with each other and whether the White Paper is too optimistic, given the pressures on public budgets. Perhaps increasing the transport costs is necessary in order to change habits?

2.2 Policy packaging

The session was attended by 5 stakeholders and members of the consortium who took notes. It was facilitated by Jonas Åkerman and David Banister, both members of the consortium. The facilitators started with explaining the background and the motivation for selecting the issue of policy packaging. It is widely acknowledged that isolated policy measures are not sufficient for achieving ambitious political goals such as the ones stated in the EU White Paper. In this session, the process of policy packaging with references to the FP7 project OPTIC¹ was introduced and discussed with the stakeholders.

Based on the approach developed in OPTIC, the facilitators presented the core stages of policy packaging to the plenum. At first, there is a need to identify appropriate objectives and to develop targets. In a next step an inventory of potential measures for achieving the targets is compiled. Some primary measures then have to be identified and assessed with regards to effectiveness, efficiency, acceptance and feasibility. If necessary, these measures have to be adjusted or complemented by additional measures in a second step.

In the session, the White Paper goal on Urban Mobility was selected as an example. The selection of adequate measures was discussed. It was stated that policy packaging is to a great extent about creating public acceptance. This is in particular relevant on local and national levels. Urban transport is a good example where decision-making is mainly taking place on these levels and where politicians are

¹ Optimal Policies for Transport in Combination, <http://optic.toi.no/>

close to the electorate. This means that in terms of a holistic approach, the focus has to lie not only on EU level measures but also on national and local level measures. If the EU sets standards for a fuel infrastructure (plug-ins etc.) there is a high demand for corresponding activities also on a national level such as bonus/malus systems. Looking at the local level, giving incentives like reduced congestion or parking fees would complete an integrated level approach. In this context, it is important to consider timing and phasing of different measures. In consideration of different measures, it was questioned if the enforcement of existing rules (e.g. regulations against air pollution) is already sufficient.

When it comes to urban access regulations, the importance of a transparent timeline was underlined by the participants. If a regulation is explained well in advance, it might be easier to establish it. An implementation is easier if the EU can negotiate a European view together with the industry and other stakeholders. In addition to that, urban planning must concentrate on improving not only the public transport system but also the needs for cyclists and pedestrians. Furthermore, different objectives and demands of cities have to be included thoroughly. It was stated that it is already helpful to work on issues in the same way, even if it is not done at the same pace. As an example, looking at the diverse infrastructure of cities in whole Europe, there are many different measures needed to achieve the White Paper goals.

It was emphasized that decision makers have to consider a multitude of objectives among which climate is one. In some cases policy packages could be used to achieve several objectives simultaneously (e.g. safety, health, climate impact) and the climate issue could then “hitchhike” on other goals. In addition, it was stated that European goals need to be translated to local level goals. Another difficulty was seen in short political cycles; a four or five year term does hardly comply with long-term goals for the next thirty years.

In terms of acceptability and feasibility, some additional measures were discussed. It was argued that better utilization of existing capacity has much potential, e.g. by using differentiated pricing measures. Furthermore, a proper monitoring is needed to measure the target achievement. A better communication of win-win situations has to be ensured as well as better a better visibility of benefits. In summary, it can be stated that coordination is a key issue to move towards the EU White Paper goals and building promising policy packages is a key element in the process of coordination. Policy packages need to take into account that long-term coalition building is needed for huge transitions such as the one envisioned for urban transport.

2.3 Governance, standards & regulation

Governance, standards & regulation are important across all of TRANSFORuM’s four thematic areas. However, the challenges are not identical across the four themes, but some are overlapping the

different themes. It is therefore useful to provide a common ground of understanding that is valid for all four themes.

In the Urban Mobility and ITS themes, the existing multi-actor and multi-level settings require complex governance processes. For example, cities provide infrastructure and it is at the city level that political will and courage is most needed, but member states and the EU level can provide ideas, guidance and frameworks. This means a need for soft governance innovations. In the ITS theme, a particular risk arises from potential technological lock-in situations.

In the High-speed Rail theme, liberalisation – not necessarily privatization – is a major issue which is expected to contribute to developing services, increasing passenger frequencies, reducing costs and therefore limiting subsidy levels. However, in the perspective of maintaining and improving an integrated service from a user perspective – and particularly looking at ticketing issues, where the High-speed Rail theme links with the ITS theme – regulation is still required. Together with the Long-distance Freight theme, inconsistent regulation and standards across Europe remain a challenge and a burden for rail operators, in particular with regard to cross-border links. Taking a look at air and sea transport, even international standards are touched and illustrate the need for integrated governance.

In an overarching role across all four themes, governance, standards & regulation are needed to provide a framework of fair and efficient conditions for all transport modes and multimodal solutions in particular. A common understanding of an integrated multimodal transport system is needed, including the user perspective. This requires building up political awareness and providing information about, e.g., the environmental impact of different transport modes and infrastructure needs. An integrated perspective is of particular importance because transport policy is not only about legislative acts but includes ‘soft’ policy measures such as guidelines and standards agreed by non-governmental actors. One possible approach was illustrated by an example from Sweden, where the administrative authority for transport is now integrated in only two bodies for all transport modes, one for infrastructure and planning and one for regulation.

Furthermore, policy is always about deliberation which requires a good coordination and broad involvement of actors, and this also calls for a societal debate about the goals. As certain conflicts in transport policy will most probably persist, it remains an open question how these conflicts will be dealt with: Will nudging be used to incentivize actors? Will the approach be mainly libertarian? And what about distributional justice: Will priority be given to competitive markets for businesses / economic feasibility or to the public interest / social desirability? Compliance with regulation is another important issue, as regulation and standards need to be enforced in order to become effective. This enforcement is not a given thing and for any actor concerned with a specific regulatory measure, the willingness to comply may depend on its perception of the quality and appropriateness of the measure.

3 Final discussion (29 Jan 2014)

In the final discussion, a number of recommendations on how to proceed with the roadmapping process were brought up. In contrast to the thematic session and the cross-cutting issue session these recommendations related more to the general approach of the roadmapping process, taking into consideration a close look on how to make the roadmaps and their contents most fruitful, and how to bring the discussion about the implementation of the Transport White Paper forward.

A first recommendation related to the importance of good practices. Good practice cases can serve to illustrate ways towards the implementation of the White Paper goals, and it should therefore be specifically outlined how the respective good practices contribute to the fulfilment of the goals and what can be learnt from them in order to be applied in a wider scale.

The engagement of stakeholders is crucial for the TRANSFORuM project. A wider involvement of stakeholders in the project activities is recommended, taking a particular look at who has not been represented in the process until now. It was also recommended by one participant that it could be worthwhile to invite representatives of 'real people' instead of only having the 'usual suspects' on board, particularly not only professional lobbying organisations.

Looking at the White Paper goals themselves, a challenge arises from the fact that already these goals are not free of inconsistencies. These inconsistencies should be clearly addressed and they require an interpretation of the overarching vision of the White Paper which should be made explicit in the roadmaps. One important step towards the required integrative perspective is to take the perspective of intermodality, thinking the different transport modes together instead of dealing with them separately and playing them off against each other.

In order to take the necessary step back from what is given in the existing policy documents, it is therefore recommended by stakeholders that the TRANSFORuM team should have confidence in its own expertise. Beyond the stakeholder-driven character of the roadmaps, the work carried out by TRANSFORuM should as well conclude with an own assessment of future European transport policies and respective recommendations.

Still, one stakeholder recommended to be pragmatic and to look mainly at catalyst actions, not at lengthy lists of detailed measures. A focus could also be given to policy trajectories towards the fulfilment of the White Paper goals instead of linear roadmaps with single packages. An analytical perspective on political processes could also be worthwhile. Overall, the general framework conditions of transport policy will have changed in 2050, and the background vision of getting the transport system away from its current oil dependency should also not be forgotten.

Further Questions?

General questions about TRANSFORuM:

Ralf Brand

Direct: +49 221 60 60 55 - 18

Email: r.brand@rupprecht-consult.eu

Logistical questions about the Vienna meeting

Ulla Kaisa Knutsson

Direct: +46 13 20 43 18

Email: ullakaisa.knutsson@vti.se

RUPPRECHT CONSULT - Forschung & Beratung GmbH

Clever Str. 13 - 15

50668 Köln (Cologne)/ Germany

Tel +49 221 60 60 55 - 18 (direct)

Tel +49 173 7263683 (mobile)

www.rupprecht-consult.eu

www.transforum-project.eu