1. **BACKGROUND**


- The ITS Action Plan foresees the **set-up of a specific ITS collaboration platform** between Member States and regional/local governments to promote ITS initiatives in the area of urban mobility (Action 6.4).

- The Action Plan on Urban Mobility offers **assistance on ITS applications for urban mobility**, possibly in the form of a guidance document, to complement the ITS Action Plan (Action 20).

The European Commission (DG TREN and RTD) will initiate a platform (working group) of cities and their partners to promote the deployment of ITS in urban areas. This platform will exchange best practice and develop guidance (see Annex 1).

As a first step bilateral meetings have been held with nine important stakeholder associations and projects, which deal with urban issues and/or ITS (see Annex 2). This paper gives a summary of the outcome and first conclusions for the next step, a wider stakeholder workshop.

2. **ASSESSMENT OF URBAN ITS**

2.1. **General assessment**

ITS is an **instrument** to achieve policy goals, e.g. to save costs, to cut CO₂ emissions etc. The problems and potential for ITS is highest in urban areas. A number of organisations (Eurocities, EMTA, CONDUITS) stated that ITS should be used to achieve modal shift to sustainable modes.

An **integrated approach** is needed, including different transport modes and both technical and policy issues. The citizen should be in the centre of attention. Many local initiatives exist but with limited scope. Further work should build on the existing basis and should not neglect legacy systems.
Support from the European level is welcome but local authorities should retain independence to decide on ITS deployment (subsidiarity).

While technical solutions exist, the main barriers to further deployment are of organisational, institutional or financial nature.

2.2. Key applications

Except where stated all key applications should be multi- and/or intermodal.

- Travel and traffic information (for journey planning and in real time)
- Electronic payment and ticketing
- Traffic management, including intersection safety and efficiency
- Demand management, including parking, access control and traffic management for large events
- Public transport priority and demand responsive public transport
- Urban logistics
- Enforcement

2.3. Important issues

The participants mentioned a number of issues but there was little overlap:

- Geographical scope should be the urban region (core city plus catchment area).
- The interface between urban and inter-urban applications needs to be an issue. There was disagreement whether the urban trip as first and last mile of a long-distance trip or the genuine urban trip should be in the focus. The city representatives stressed the latter because of its sheer number of trips.
- User-friendliness should be a main principle.
- The role of the car in urban transport policy plays an important role for ITS policy.
- The transport authorities have a key role to coordinate ITS deployment.
- The conflicting requirements of cooperation and competition between transport modes and operators make it more difficult.
- Awareness about the impacts of ITS and assessment of success needs to be improved.
- Pre-commercial procurement is an important issue.
- The role financing and incentives needs to be explored.
2.4. **Barriers to urban ITS deployment**

The three most important barriers mentioned are:

1. The (administrative) **complexity** of the urban transport situation with spread responsibilities and many different stakeholders makes coordination and consensus difficult.

2. There is a widespread lack of **political will** and culture of ITS use. Often there is no interest in harmonised solutions as local and sector specific thinking dominates.

3. The lack of **interoperability** is a major issue to overcome.

Furthermore, the following barriers were identified:

- variation in city size and urban situation/context > need for adjusted solutions
- lacking standards or lacking will to adopt them; lack of overarching ITS architecture
- unsolved privacy, data security and liability issues
- modal tension (especially car and public transport)
- perceived high costs
- lack of ITS expertise at city level

2.5. **Examples for successful ITS deployment**

All stakeholder organisations supplied further information on the general background, specific projects or member activities. The material will be used for the work of the platform.

A number of larger cities were mentioned as good practice examples for urban ITS deployment, mainly in Northern and Central Europe, Italy and Spain:


3. **Views on the Urban ITS Platform**

3.1. **Scope and Content**

There was agreement about the basic scope of the planned urban ITS platform: It should be **multi-modal, broad** in nature and cover the **urban region** taking into account the **interfaces between the urban and inter-urban mobility**. Both **passenger and freight** issues should be considered. A **dialogue between public and private** stakeholders should be foreseen.
Several topics were explicitly suggested from one or the other organisation. These range from the need for a general urban ITS architecture to interoperability issues to evaluation and quality of services and identifying new, innovative applications. Although the platform should work on deployment of mature applications, the near future of cooperative systems with vehicle to infrastructure communication should not be left out.

A number of links were suggested to urban planning in general, mobility plans in particular and the internalisation of external costs.

A main activity of the platform should be the exchange of best practice and sharing of experience in a bottom-up approach. But it was clearly stated that the platform should go beyond. A possible extension would be a benchmarking approach. The development of guidelines including roadmaps for deployment was also mentioned. Especially the city associations (CEMT and Eurocities) proposed that training for local authorities could be part of the platform activities. Finally, the issuing of political recommendations and outreach to motivate politicians was suggested.

3.2. Governance

It was rather clear that no new organisation should be developed for the platform. It should build on the existing initiatives and be guided and/or chaired by the Commission. With regard to participation there has to be a balance between being inclusive and effective. There was more support for a smaller group, but also a call to find ways of being open to all stakeholders.

- Main target group and drivers of the platform should be the local authorities in charge of public transport, roads and parking, who are the main local decision makers for ITS deployment.
- Also very important are public transport operators.
- There was no clear view on how to address the ITS industry and service providers. They could either be directly involved in the exercise to facilitate the dialogue or be associated somehow in the process.
- The same applies to the national transport authorities, which hold the responsibility for the inter-urban infrastructure and influence local deployment decisions through regulation, funding and other incentives.

To tackle the variety of local circumstances it was suggested to make use of some kind of structuring. This could be according to size of the city or the nature of the transport problems. The concept of "champion cities" for different ITS applications to lead the debate and to learn from was mentioned by several organisations.

An important framework condition is the reimbursement of travel costs for the platform members, especially coming from local authorities. How to deal with the language issue should also be considered.
3.3. Expectations from European Commission Guidance

With regard to the expectations on the outcome of the platform in terms of guidance the following four issues were raised during the meetings:

- It was stressed many times that the work should be **pragmatic and practical** linking both technical and policy issues of urban ITS. Cities are looking for a voluntary approach which leaves them the right of decision. Direction and long-term vision is however appreciated especially with regard to the EU dimension. The work could lead to some form of deployment guidelines or recommendations.

- A **toolbox or handbook** could be a valuable product if it is derived from the best experience and could be used for self assessment as well.

- The urban ITS platform should assess the need for **standardisation** with the aim of harmonisation and interoperability.

- It is considered to be useful to explore the scope for **synergies and data sharing** between different ITS applications for different modes and fostering an "open-systems" approach to interfacing.

- Some organisations mentioned the need for **funding** schemes, especially for pilots or other incentives for local deployment.

4. CONCLUSIONS

For the work of the urban ITS platform, the following seven key ideas can be seen as consensus from the stakeholders. They should guide the further process to establish the platform.

1. The current **main barriers** to ITS deployment are more organisational, institutional and financial and less technical. They stem from the complexity of urban transport governance and the lack of political will.

2. Support from the **European level** is highly welcome if local authorities can retain their independence to manage their ITS deployment. All consulted organisations have expressed their interest (or their members' interest) to take part in the initiative.

---

1 The work of the European initiative "ITS City Pioneers" in the 90s was mentioned as an example of such a toolbox.
(3) **Guiding principles** for the work of the platform should be: a pragmatic approach, an integrated work (policy and technical; passenger and freight transport), multimodality, the wider urban region as a basis, inclusion of interfaces to inter-urban transport and fostering the public-private dialogue.

(4) The **key applications** mentioned are traffic and travel information, traffic management (including parking), electronic payment and urban logistics. In order to concentrate the effort, the Commission proposes to consider these as the basis of the work without precluding any further topics.

(5) For an integrated approach an overarching ITS framework architecture is vital to coordinate the system development. The platform should elaborate on this issue.

(6) The **platform** should include but go beyond exchange of best practice. The development of guidance should be a main task. Potentially also benchmarking or training issues could be discussed. One end-product could be a toolbox, including decision support for urban ITS based on best experience.

(7) Main **target group** and drivers of the platform should be local authorities in charge of public transport, roads and parking. The most appropriate way to include ITS industry/service providers and national authorities needs to be decided.

5. **Next steps**

Next step will be a **workshop** on the scope of the urban ITS platform to allow for a broader participation of cities and further stakeholders. This meeting would not mark the kick-off of the platform but is needed to clarify the detailed aspects of the planned platform. The workshop is planned for the **18 March 2010 (full day) in Brussels**.

Next step would then be the set up of the collaboration platform and drafting of the terms of reference and work programme.
## ITS for Urban Mobility – Briefing for Consultation Meetings

### Objective
The European Commission plans to initiate a **working group (platform) of cities** to promote the deployment of ITS solutions in urban areas. This platform would exchange best practice, develop guidance and work towards improved interfaces between urban and interurban ITS for continuity of services.

### Background
Both the EU Action Plans on Intelligent Transport Systems (COM 2008 886) and on Urban Mobility (COM 2009 490) include complementary action on the issue of ITS for urban areas.

- In the ITS Action Plan Action 6.4 foresees the **set-up of a specific ITS collaboration platform** between Member States and regional/local governments to promote ITS initiatives in the area of urban mobility.
- In the Action Plan on Urban Mobility, Action 20 offers **assistance on ITS applications for urban mobility**, possibly in the form of a guidance document, to complement the ITS Action Plan.

### Scope
The working group should look into all relevant issues on a multi-modal basis, travel information, electronic ticketing and payment, traffic management, access regulation and demand management.

Main target group are the local and regional authorities, but also representatives from national authorities, transport infrastructure managers, service providers and user groups could be included.

For support the Commission has recently launched a study on improving the interoperability of ticketing and payment systems across services and transport modes, including the use of smart cards in urban transport.

### Planned Steps
1. Individual meetings with key stakeholder associations working on urban ITS
2. Clarification of scope and most suitable governance of the planned collaboration platform
3. Set up of the collaboration platform: Terms of reference and work programme
4. Discussion on best practices and draft guidelines on urban ITS and on urban/interurban interfaces
5. Conclusions and recommendations
6. Consultation of the European ITS Advisory Forum (new under the ITS Directive)
7. Preparation and issuing of a guidance document on urban ITS including the urban/interurban interfaces

### Timing
The working group should be set up in **April 2010** and the guidance should be ready in 2012. A more detailed timetable needs to be elaborated.

### Contacts
- Guido MÜLLER, DG TREN, G4 (ITS)  
guido.mueller@ec.europa.eu, Tel.: +32 229 80337
- Patrick MERCIER-HANDISYDE, DG Research, H2 (Surface Transport)  
patrick.mercier-handisyde@ec.europa.eu; +32 229 68329
- Bill Borthwick, DG TREN A4 (Urban Transport)  
william.borthwick@ec.europa.eu; Tel. +32 229 65025

### More Information
# Meetings and Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12 Nov 2009 | ECTRI        | Guy Bourgeois (President)  
                          Caroline Almeras (General Secretary)                                | GM, MR, PMH  |
| 23 Nov 2009 | ERTICO       | Hermann Meyer (CEO)  
                          Vincent Biervaque (Director Development and Deployment)                | GM, BB, PMH  |
| 23 Nov 2009 | POLIS        | Sylvain Haon (Executive Director)  
                          Suzanne Hoadley (Leader Mobility & Traffic Efficiency Pillar)      | GM, BB, PMH  |
| 23 Nov 2009 | CEMR         | Angelika Poth-Mögele (Director of Policy)  
                          Marie Bullet (Policy Officer Transport)                           | GM, MR       |
| 23 Nov 2009 | Eurocities   | Vanessa Holve (Policy Officer Mobility)  
                          Jan Franke (Policy Officer Knowledge Society)                 | GM, MR, BB   |
| 1 Dec 2009  | UITP         | Brigitte Ollier (Director EuroTeam)  
                          Yves Amsler (Projects & Development Advisor)  
                          Ulrich Weber (Expert EuroTeam)                              | GM, MR       |
| 1 Dec 2009  | EasyWay      | Bernard Lucas (Chairman)  
                          Fahim Belarbi (Leader, Traveller Information Services Expert Group)   | GM, MR       |
| 1 Dec 2009  | EMTA         | Sabine Avril (EMTA Secretary-General)  
                          Hans Fiby (ITS Vienna Region)  
                          R.M.J.M. van der Ploeg (Stadregio Amsterdam)  
                          Joost Van Os (Stadregio Amsterdam)  
                          Piotr Izdebski (Warsaw Urban Transport Authority)  
                          Ioannis Douratsos (Consorcio Transportes Madrid)  
                          Thierry Duquesne (Brussels Region)                       | GM, MR, PMH  |
| 1 Dec 2009  | CONDUITS     | Maurizio Tomassini (ISIS; Project Co-ordinator)                          | GM, PMH      |

GM Guido Müller (TREN G4)  
MR Marcel Rommerts (TREN A4)  
BB Bill Borthwick (TREN A4)  
PMH Patrick Mercier-Handisyde (RTD H2)