



MOVING TOGETHER
TOWARDS A NEW CULTURE FOR URBAN MOBILITY
Citizens statement

Members of the Move Together citizens' group:

Adem Durmushev - Bulgaria
Afroditi Zouzia – Greece
Anthony Zammit - Malta
Arto Kekki – Finland
Artwell Cain – Netherlands
Cezary Michal Kozlowski - Poland
Claude Leloup - Belgium
Daniel Egonsson – Sweden
Desmond O'Toole – Ireland
Ditu Sebastian Gorge – Romania
Dominik Rielp – Austria
François Cathelineau – France
Eduardo Malagon – Spain
Gabriella Taborossy - Hungary
Gausas Simonas – Lithuania
Habiba Boughaba – Luxembourg
Hanne Malmborg – Denmark
Harry Militos – Cyprus
Kate Pressmann – Estonia
Karol Herian – Slovakia
Ilze Gabrane – Latvia
Linda Hadfield – United Kingdom
Marika Mirtic - Slovenia
Marzia Tamburrino – Italy
Noemi Baumblatt – Germany
Nuno Gouvela – Portugal
Petra Zallmannova – Czech Republic

Table of contents

Our Group.....	3
Our task and work.....	3
Our concept of "mobility freedom"	4
Our appreciation of EU research to ensure sustainable urban mobility	5
Our recommendations to raise the awareness of European citizens.....	8
Conclusions.....	9

Our Group

The Move Together Group embodies and epitomises diversity and unity. The group is significant because each of its 27 members comes from a different European Union country. The basic strength of this group lies in its possession of diversity as a norm. By diversity, we mean the group members' differences in terms of country of origin, ethnicity, culture, gender, age, educational qualifications, professions, social class, way of life and personal needs.

The group provides its contribution on a voluntary basis, nurtured by a clear vision and mission. Even though they possess diverse ambitions regarding developments in their own communities, countries, Europe and the rest of the world, they have in common the desire to present one single message:

'We are citizens and regular users of urban transport both public and private on a frequent basis. We seek to encourage ourselves and others to pay continuous attention to our collective health and well-being in relation to urban transport. This also means paying due attention to fostering genuine partnership with other stakeholders regarding mobility decisions and quality of life in the city.'

The various differences within the Move Together Group are an asset. Diversity enriches. The members of the group are prepared and willing to use their knowledge, talents, social skills and efforts to help to create a better Europe. A Europe of today, tomorrow and the future where we can go beyond theoretical thoughts of a better standard of living for all to practical, meaningful results, which do not compromise nature or the quality of life in urban areas.

The diversity of the Move Together Group has evolved into unity, which makes the group strong. Unity is the will to work together on a common purpose. We inspire and empower each other to obtain results which are bigger and more reflective than we could achieve on an individual basis. The group members were prepared to listen, engage and share, leading to cooperation, meaningful outputs and sensible solutions.

We use both private and public transport, and we wish to be more involved in the processes that influence our and other citizens' mobility in the city. We feel that our general objectives, commitment and hands on attitude qualify and equip us to work in cooperation and partnership with groups, institutions, organisations and other individuals towards a wholesome way of life on the issue of transport and other urban development topics.

We are here today to listen, cooperate and share experience and knowledge with you which could eventually generate benefits for all our citizens and our cities. In the end we are all citizens with a strong desire to save our communities and by doing so, we are hopefully making a contribution with your cooperation towards improving mobility and life within our cities.

Our task and work

The aim of the Move Together process is to synthesise the opinions of the 27 European citizen representatives on EU-research into urban sustainable mobility. It uses a participatory approach to discuss citizens' main concerns about mobility issues and the implementation of the research at a day to day level from the citizen's point of view.

For four days, over two workshops, we lay citizens left our families, jobs or studies, our cities and countries, and travelled thousands of kilometres to meet and create a consensus.

At the first workshop we had feedback from stakeholders about EU Research. We developed our understanding of the task of raising awareness and appreciation of EU research on urban transport. For us by “appreciation” was meant: a) to recognise and value the investment that has been made in this research by both the European Commission and the research community, b) to deepen our understanding of the various research projects and their conclusions, and c) to subject the urban transport research and its conclusions to their critical judgement as to the prioritisation and selection of research topics and the usefulness to the citizens of the conclusions presented.

In between the two workshops, we were sent a digest of research compiled by the organisers, which we studied at home. We were also each asked to review websites pertaining to one of the areas of research. Finally, as additional home work, we agreed to give also our individual appreciation of the single urban research fields presented to us in the digest, by answering to the question if we perceive that the research effort undertaken by the EU on each topic will improve our life in the short term or future generations’ life in the long term.

When we met in the workshops, starting from different individual points of view, and working individually, in small groups and in plenaries, we developed together the group appreciation, sharing our thoughts and debating, trying to find common points but avoiding commonplaces.

There were neither winners nor losers, just people thinking and learning together.

Our concept of “mobility freedom”

We **lay citizens** identify certain problems that are damaging the quality of life in the cities. The social and economic context is now sharing importance with the environmental pressures that modern consumption society has created. Cities are becoming **bigger but not better**.

We have **less time** for it is used in traffic congestion and in trying to avoid it in advance.

We have **less space**, because it is used by parked vehicles and major road intersections within the city. Space that citizens need to live without constraints, not only in terms of the amount but also the quality of space, threatened by noise, air pollution and lack of green spaces. These problems generate lasting barriers and segregation, for mostly poorer areas have to face the worst problems.

We have **less health** in the urban and road environment; we feel the increasing number of people suffering from allergies, asthma, etc. We can also see and share the human and economic costs of those who are injured in the traffic.

We have **less freedom** to move. Urban sprawl and ghettos caused by economic gaps create fears of the stranger and generate non-city areas, urban black holes that promote further degradation, anti-social behaviour and vandalism in public spaces and transport. Also, vehicles can move faster than decades before, but pedestrians and bicycles still reach the same human speeds. We see certain urban spaces becoming more hostile to the slower modes and we feel that laws are often non-enforced.

Mobility freedom to us no longer means the ability to drive our cars wherever we need to go and park them wherever we wish. We acknowledge that such freedom for all is not genuine, because it leads to the problems described above, and makes life worse for everyone.

Instead, we believe mobility freedom means having more options, more services, more information, more comfort and safety. We wish not to be forced to use our own cars because there are no other options, but to have the choice to walk, cycle, travel on buses or trains, or to share car rides.

In order to **regain** that **mobility freedom** we need to boost four major axes: **walking, cycling, public transportation and integrating these with the movement of cars and trucks.**

To do that we need:

- **More space** to walk and to cycle and more and better connections between successive pedestrian zones and bicycle lanes.
- **More reliability** in our public transportation systems in order to better compete with individual car use.
- **More social integration** in public transport through more open minded politicians, managers and drivers and better social pricing systems for the less privileged. Exclusion of a group may undermine social coherence and could be the source of antisocial behaviour.
- **More accessibility** for the elderly, the young and the disabled.
- **More guarantees** that laws will be enforced, creating equal and accountable relationships between pedestrians, bike users and drivers.
- **More safety** to prevent traffic accidents. Concern should start with the slower and more fragile; these are also the more sustainable ones. A new perspective towards infrastructure could solve part of this, but regulations and attitude changing must also play a part.

As citizens, we defend that the car should not always take priority when designing pavements, sidewalks and other urban space elements. Nature is urging us to accept that "MY CAR IS NO LONGER MY FREEDOM".

Our appreciation of EU research to ensure sustainable urban mobility

We consider the achievement of more liveable cities should be the overall goal of all EU research programmes on urban mobility. But it is only the citizens who can know, decide and define whether or not a city is truly 'liveable', through their everyday experience. Therefore we think it is important that researchers and policy makers should not make assumptions about what makes a 'liveable city', but should consult the lay citizens to establish what exactly this term "more liveable cities" means to them.

Citizens' involvement should already take place in defining the problems on which to do research. We think that the citizens can appreciate the research much more, and the research outcomes can be used /implemented much better, if citizens play a part in the whole process instead of just being confronted with the results.

The large number of different research approaches greatly increases the overall complexity. Stronger central coordination and more "umbrella" research programmes might help to avoid interference and duplication among the different programmes and increase the transparency of the research programmes. The group supports therefore the EU centralisation of research and development, in order to save duplication of effort and expenditure, but it is very important that local context is recognised and the social aspects are also considered. The best practice examples are a great opportunity to share progress. Towns facing a certain problem can look up if there have been any other cities that have the same problem and what has been done to solve this. This correlates strongly with the idea of the European Union that countries benefit from each other.

Research connected to transport within the boundaries of the EU should not just attempt to optimise current transportation modes in terms of technology, fuel economy or minimisation of environmental impact. More fundamental research should also take place, that will address the whole matter of transportation from scratch, including sociological and anthropological research into the need for and implications of travel within cities. This research will have a better chance to give long term solutions.

It is important to mention however that the primary objective of this research should be to bring about sustainable improvements in the quality of life of the EU citizen. Therefore, there must be mechanisms and regulations ensuring that the main beneficiary of the scientific research is the lay European citizen in addition to the industries, corporations or institutions that conduct the research. A balance must be reached between the interests of the lay citizen and the interests of industrial institutions.

Two key changes are needed to the way that research topics are selected and prioritised for funding:

(a) The projects need to be much more closely aligned with the real interests of European citizens. That means a much earlier engagement of citizens in the projects and a more intensive involvement of citizens during the project life-cycle, and

(b) There needs to be a move away from an exclusive reliance on technology solutions towards solutions that are informed by the social and cultural contexts of the problems that are facing public transport. This does not mean that technology or industry has no role in transport research. But it does mean that a greater balance needs to be introduced in order to ensure that research output addresses real needs and hence is more likely to be successfully adopted.

More effort needs to be made to understand ways of changing people's behaviour rather than technologies, and particularly by improving education and increasing people's understanding of the implications of continuing on our existing, unsustainable course. People need to understand why it is so important that things must change. Greater involvement of citizens is vital for this to happen.

Besides the above general appreciation of EU research, we were asked about our perceptions of the usefulness of EU research undertaken on a number of topics. Specifically, we were asked to assess how useful these research topics may be to improve our life in the short term or future generations' life in the long term. A summary of our statements for each research topic is provided below (a more complete sample of the individual responses is also attached):

- **New vehicle concepts (automated transport + new vehicles + intelligent car):** the research addressed under this topic was enough clear to many of us (75%) and relevant in the long term, but we wonder if the research outcomes will be used only to improve car technologies for the individual drivers or if they are thought to affect the traffic as a whole. The real use of this research will still depend not only on technological readiness but also on public funding, social and environmental situation, municipal policy, etc.
- **New fuels concepts (hydrogen buses, fuel cell cars, renewable fuels):** the purpose of this research was clear to many of us (80%), but to understand the details without any scientific knowledge remains difficult. Many of us believe that using affordable alternative fuels which cause less environmental damage is imperative, and it will improve the quality of life in the long term. However, there are also critical opinions, pointing out in particular that this research is not addressing the underlying problem, but merely acknowledging that we have to accept an ever-increasing problem of congestion caused by too many vehicle movements.
- **Freight innovative delivery in European urban space:** we all believe that this research can improve the quality of urban life already in the short term, and a majority of us (67%) see also long term benefits. This approach is at least looking at innovative ways of changing the management of traffic, rather than just technology. Freight transport is getting everyday more important, and the question has to be seriously thought: it's not something that has to be "innovative"; better sharing best practices than always looking for something new.
- **Quiet city transport:** many of us (90%) believe that the research will be relevant in the long term, but only half of us consider that the research results will be applied in the short term. Of course the reduction of noise level is critical for the quality of life in urban areas, and research

for more quiet cities will be an important investment for all EU cities. However, we wonder why air traffic pollution seems not included in the urban transport field (while not “urban” transport, airport noise affects mostly our cities). We wonder also if similar kind of research – while developing technological as well as conceptual solutions – may have a very slow and modest application in practice. Noise pollution is part of a very complex problem depending on our civilisation development, so that the proposed outcomes may have a very limited effect. In the short term, the application of this research will depend on how the results are spread among all the city managers of Europe, and their sensitivity to noise pollution. We welcome in particular the involvement of the citizen in one of the projects reviewed (SILENCE).

- **Urban transport pricing:** although complex, the research focus was clear to all of us. We all believe this research is useful to improve the quality of life in the short and long term. This approach actually tackles the main problem, which is trying to change people’s behaviour with relation to transport, and hence offers hope of actually cutting down on the number of vehicle movements. While the issues discussed in the research are not directly relevant to the citizens it is clear that when the research output is turned into pricing plans then citizens will be very interested indeed. However, we see also the major problem in applying urban transport pricing, which is that it favours the people with more money. So, urban transport pricing systems should bear in mind these social factors. Finally, it is true that this kind of measure takes a long time to root among the citizens, but the traffic problems are growing so fast that soon most of the people will ask for more restrictions to the traffic flows inside the cities or on the main roads.
- **Development of strategies for high-quality urban transport, sustainable urban transport, integrated transport and land use:** the problems addressed by this research are not always clear to us (25% didn’t really catch the focus). However, all of us believe the research purpose is relevant for improving the quality of life in the long term, and half of us see potential benefits also in the short term. This research at least is taking a high level strategic approach to tackling transport in cities. One concern is that it appears to be reviewing current/past practice rather than generating innovative solutions, but if it is acted upon, and helps to spread best practice and increase cooperation between cities, this is a positive approach. We just do not understand why there is no citizen participation in this approach.
- **Public transport improvement (urban rail transport systems, accessible urban public transport, flexible collective mobility services):** this topic – as presented in the Citizens Digest – mixes together two different approaches to public transport improvement. The first – urban rail transport systems – is a kind of highly technological research in which the interest and participation of the lay citizen would be limited. The second approach includes instead accessible urban public transport and flexible services which are both very important for the citizens’ life. We understand that already a lot can be done with actual infrastructures and on road lighter investments (tram, trolley, etc.). Of course, high-quality transport means an improvement of the life quality, but the main problem is the equal access of all to the transports. Investment should be done in order to reduce the price of public urban transport. We wonder why there is no citizen participation in the research on flexible collective mobility services.
- **Walking and cycling:** the subject is clear to us, but the research is not clear in the same way. Of course, cycling and walking are, especially in dense city areas, the best and most sustainable ways of transport. They should get much more space in comparison to what they have now. And they should not be forgotten in the whole context of urban mobility, but taken into account already in city planning. So the issue is clear but not the research needs and results. We wonder if it is only to be considered a political question: who is going to favour the cycling transport (and consequently reduce the attractiveness of cars) ... no need of research. However, raising awareness campaigns are very important, as it is also important, aside from mobility, to raise the question of health in societies that are more and more sedentary. Subject

to an effort on the communication of this active travel topic, which may concern any lay person, this could improve our lives if it is included in a global thinking, taking into account other health concerns that are directly linked thereto.

- **Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS):** although technical, the purpose and scope of this research was clear to many of us (80%). We all perceive this research as mainly relevant in the long term, although better exploiting all the possibilities these systems will offer for achieving sustainable, secure, environmentally-friendly transport may render visible the results of this research also in the short term. However we have some concerns about the impact of these modern technologies on human beings. Increasing the intelligence of technology tends to have the side-effect of reducing the intelligence of its users, as they rely too much on the technology and stop thinking for themselves. The perfect example is satellite navigation, which, when used blindly causes all sorts of problems.
- **Urban transport security:** the purpose of this research is relevant both in the short and long term. We all believe security is a must for human friendly cities. However, when it comes to the priority to give to such research, we noted that it is still too much focused on the fear of terrorist attacks. Terrorists are not the only security risk in European public transport systems: the number of people likely to be affected by any potential terrorist attack is minimal by comparison with people affected by day to day dangers such as violent attacks from individuals, or at least incivilities and badly behaved people in buses, trams and trains. We wonder if it would not be more useful taking a wider approach, asking why is transport unsafe. This we believe would be mainly a social issue that has little to do with current research.

Our recommendations to raise the awareness of European citizens

We find that remarkable research is being conducted within the EU concerning the improvement of transportation. However, the specialised terminology and high level scientific language used in some of the projects' web pages makes it difficult for many lay citizens to understand either the objectives or the results.

We believe indeed that better communication and shared understanding between the stakeholders and lay citizens would facilitate the dissemination, acceptance and implementation of the solutions proposed by different projects for making the urban transport more sustainable.

Taking into consideration the complex scientific nature of most projects dealing with urban transport that we reviewed and the fact that such complex notions are beyond the scope of expertise of ordinary people, we put forward that in order to address the lay citizens in an effective way other tools / language than used among the expert community are needed. Communication professionals (eg advertisers) should take over the task of dissemination of research objectives and outcomes to lay citizens, in order to communicate the outcomes and objectives of the scientific projects in a simplified manner using an understandable language.

To reach the ordinary person we encourage you to give your communication a "human face", i.e., to personalise the key message you wish to reach the people. Giving examples from everyday life would help you in this process, because people relate best to issues they experience in their everyday life.

We have seen from our own experience in this project that it is important to keep the messages meant for ordinary citizens expert-free, using simple, transparent words with clear meanings. We believe that adopting some methods used in marketing or lobbying might make it easier to reach this goal.

We have noticed that there is little "celebration of successes", meaning spreading the word among

the non-expert community on the successful initiatives and solutions found and tested. People will be more willing to accept solutions proposed to them, if they see that those solutions have already worked successfully in another city or community and that they have improved the city life of their fellow citizens.

We would like to also encourage you to use different kinds of media available, at the same time making very sure that the key message is clear. It might be very effective, for example, to put the information on urban transport solutions proposed by your research project, directly in the public transport concerned, by using posters in buses, trains, metro.

During the process of reviewing the results of the different urban transport projects, in parallel we also did a quick review of all the projects' websites. From this experience we learned that the information contained in many of the websites is not structured clearly enough. Therefore we would recommend you to put more efforts into consolidation of the research projects' information as well as into simplification of the language they use. It would be great to have a single database containing all Framework Programme projects that would also allow interactive dialogue between stakeholders and citizens. This not only could possibly lessen the current democratic deficit we experience in Europe but also improve the quality and impact of research by linking it to our daily lives.

Another suggestion from our side would be to use partnerships with the local stakeholders to disseminate the message to the people.

And last, but not least, we would encourage you to involve ordinary citizens in decision making in the early stages of programme preparation and during the whole process of implementation as we strongly believe that the citizens should have their say in deciding about the future of their cities.

Conclusions

Our group embodies the principles of diversity and unity in action. By sharing our different backgrounds and experience, we have learnt from and empowered each other to take our ideas further and create a consensus which reflects the diverse nature of our community.

We believe that cities are becoming bigger but not better, and that this is degrading our quality of life because we have less time, less space, less health and less freedom to move.

Mobility freedom for us no longer means just driving a car, but having a choice between public and private, walking, cycling and motorised forms of transport, and having the confidence that we will be able to travel safely, comfortably and economically however we choose to travel.

In our evaluation and appreciation of existing research, we found that much good research is being done, but the emphasis is mainly on optimising existing technologies, and the motivation for the research often seems to be to create a technological solution without fully analysing the needs that exist. We believe that the citizens should be consulted at all stages of research, and that there should be much greater emphasis on including anthropological and sociological research in the scope of technological projects. A more holistic approach needs to be taken, with greater coordination of projects, involvement of citizens, and recognition of the need for a balance between the interests of citizens, researchers and industry.

In addition, attempts to communicate the results of research to the lay public are often too technical, and more emphasis should be put on finding better ways of educating and involving citizens. Using professional communicators to find better ways of putting messages over, using real, local examples that people can relate to and celebrating successes, while acknowledging past mistakes, all have a part to play. However, this should not be a one-way message, or token

consultation process. Citizens should be included at every step of the way.

In summary, we, as citizens, recognise that the problems of mobility and un-liveability in our cities are bad and going to get worse unless we all work together to solve them. We are no longer prepared to sit back and assume that these problems are someone else's responsibility, and that all we have to do is wait for new technologies to come along which will solve the problems for us. We acknowledge that 'my car is no longer my freedom', and that freedom is bound up not only with being able to choose how to travel, but with having a say and making a contribution to the options available to us all. Therefore, we ask that we be allowed to play our part in deciding issues of transport not just as passive consumers or survey participants, but as partners. Allow us to help you, so that you can help us.

Annex: Results of the citizens on-line survey on the EU urban transport research fields

The 27 members of the Move Together citizens' focus group were asked to fill in an on-line questionnaire, answering two questions related to the EU research on ensuring sustainable urban mobility:

- *Is the EU research as presented to you clear enough ?*
- *Do you think the research effort undertaken by the EU may improve your life (short term) or next generations life (long term) ?*

Some of the more significant citizens' answers are provided in the table below for each research field:

RESEARCH FIELD	<i>QUESTION 1: Is the EU research as presented to you clear enough ?</i>	<i>QUESTION 2: Do you think the research effort undertaken by the EU may improve your life (short term) or next generations life (long term) ?</i>
New vehicle concepts (1. Automated transport + 2. New vehicles + 15. Intelligent car)	<p>The research addressed under this heading was enough clear to the great majority of the focus group (75%). However, for at least one of them it was unclear if the research outcomes will be used only to improve technologies of cars for individual car drivers or if they are thought to affect the traffic as a whole.</p>	<p>For almost all the citizens (90%) the research on new vehicle concepts will produce benefits only in the long term.</p> <p><i>"If the research led to a more economical and intelligent use of vehicles - that means, reduce their number - it would definitely improve my life and the next generations life in long term. If it just aims to get as many vehicles as possible as fluently as possible on the streets, it would affect my life in a bad way, in long term, and even worse for the next generation."</i></p> <p><i>"I consider this research to be very important, it has its relevance, it tends to designing and following new approaches, new and innovative technologies in urban transport, but I see a time gap between releasing research results and their wider applications. This new concepts will be used first at some trendy, attractive places and the majority of EU cities population will use it in some way only much later. It's use will still depend not only on technological readiness but also on public fundings, social and environmental situation, municipal policy..."</i></p> <p><i>"In my opinion, this research is based on the same model of mobility, oriented to private car. We could achieve good results in some issues, like reducing pollution or CO2 emissions but the congestion problems could maintain without changes."</i></p> <p><i>"The ADAS systems could definitely be an asset. Some of the benefits are the reduction of time spent in traffic jams; the reduction of CO2 gases; the reduction of noise due to the limiting of the speed limits; the encouragements pertaining to the use of public transport and the general effect on the environment because of overall users behaviour."</i></p> <p><i>"Technological research in this field isn't the key to a more sustainable transport system. People won't stop to use their car if those are more "intelligent"</i></p> <p><i>"In the short term as a citizen of Lithuania, living in Vilnius, I am pessimistic regarding the impact of this research programme. It is because of a lack of political will, low political culture and low awareness of environmental and related problems (e.g., negative effects of consumerism on the environment) in the society. In the long term, after we will use all gas and oil resources, the results of research of hydrogen technologies, renewable fuels, clean urban transport, walking and cycling, intelligent car, etc. will become vital for citizens and widely applied in society as there will be no way to continue on the same consumerism path as on which we are walking today."</i></p>

<p>New fuels concepts (3. hydrogen buses and fuel cell cars + 4. renewable fuels)</p>	<p>The research is enough clear for the majority of the focus group (80%), but some of them claims that it's very difficult to understand the details, without any scientific knowledge (<i>"I understand that solar energy is renewable and more eco, but hydrogen must be obtained from something ... and can it blow? Or whatever ..."</i>)</p>	<p>Again for almost all the citizens (90%) the research on new fuels will improve the quality of life in the long term. There is an appreciation that the use of affordable alternative fuels which cause less environmental damage is imperative, and that this will improve EU citizens' life. However, there are also critical opinions: <i>"The new fuel concepts may lead to less pollution in the short term. But just changing the energy source is no sustainable way of dealing with the urban transport problems. The new sources bring new problems with them".</i> <i>"This research is not addressing the underlying problem, but merely acknowledging that we have to accept an ever-increasing problem of congestion caused by too many vehicle movements. It allows us to pretend that we continue as we are for a little longer without facing up to the real problems."</i> <i>"Well, the rise of the prices of petrol shows us that any research to find any alternative sources of energy for transport is absolutely necessary, and it will be even more necessary in a couple of decades. Anyway, the use of biofuels generates me some doubts in terms of true sustainability, due to its consequences to rise of foodstuff prices in poorer countries."</i></p>
<p>Freight innovative delivery in European urban space</p>	<p>The problems addressed under this heading are clear to all the members of the focus group.</p>	<p>All the citizens think that this research can improve the quality of life already in the short term, and the benefits will last over the long term too for a majority of them (67%). <i>"Outcomes of these projects can be implemented and seen in European towns and cities in short term. While proposed solutions are based on a mixture of different approaches (sharing info, best practices, different policies, transport schemes as well as different technological innovations, e.g. appropriate urban vehicles...) they can be implemented in our towns very flexibly."</i> <i>"On a short term basis citizens will be benefited from this research results due to the reduced traffic volume and congestion. However, I am not sure if the research results will apply in the long term future as expected. It seems to me that the techniques derived have as a point of reference nowadays modern cities. Future cities may differ and thus, the techniques derived possibly will be obsolete and will not meet future requirements"</i> <i>"Freight transport is getting everyday more important; the question of intermodality has to be really seriously thought, and it's not something that has to be "innovative"; better sharing best practices than always looking for something new"</i></p>
<p>Quiet city transport</p>	<p>The research focus – urban noise – is clear enough, but one citizen claims that air traffic pollution seems not included in the research, and that noise maps are useful only if really applied to better traffic management or city planning</p>	<p>The research is seen as relevant mainly in the long term (88%), while is considered relevant in the short term too only by half of the focus group. <i>"I think that the noise is the pollutant which we don't attach importance enough, but it is a problem which will attain more and more importance for our society. By me we don't evaluate the damages yet and these problems will occupy more and more space in a life quality interpretation. The noise pollutant is in direct tie with some sectors like public health service and prevention of the public health."</i> <i>"Similar kind of research developing technological as well as conceptual solutions (planning, management...) is important, but its application in practice may be very slow and modest. A noise pollution is part of a very complex problem depending on our civilization development, so that the proposed outcomes may have a very limited effect."</i> <i>"I hope, the research effort may improve next generations life, but I am not very sure. What makes be hope is the citizen involvement in the SILENCE project."</i> <i>"The reduction of noise levels is critical for the quality of life in urban areas. Quiet cities will be an important investment for all the EU citizens on a short term and long term basis."</i> <i>"Noise looks like the principal touchable goal for all auto industry. A less noisy car looks more eco..."</i> <i>"YES the research is addressing a concrete issue which all of us face each day, having therefore an immediate impact on the quality of each other's life."</i> <i>"Silence shouldn't be one of the most important research fields. It can be mainly solved by local urbanism. Air pollution is more important and</i></p>

<p>Urban transport pricing</p>	<p>Although complex, the research focus was enough clear to the whole focus group.</p>	<p><i>dangerous for human being."</i></p> <p>This research is seen as useful to improve the quality of life in the short term (90%) and in the long term (100%). However, the opinions are mixed:</p> <p><i>"This approach actually tackles the main problem, which is trying to change people's behavior with relation to transport, and hence offers hope of actually cutting down on the number of vehicle movements."</i></p> <p><i>"This is a complex and very dry subject. However, it is immensely important in order to be able to identify and take into account the real costs of providing different types of private and public transport. While the issues discussed in the research are not directly relevant to the citizens it is clear that when the research output is turned into pricing plans then citizens will be very interested indeed."</i></p> <p><i>"Any tax for so called congestion parking access pollution etc. is nothing more than an abuse first of all. For example taxation of trucks for entering the city means that subsequently the citizen is paying for this tax which suppliers will add to goods. Ex: Many years ago when first minister of Romania introduced the VAT tax and he said on TV : "this tax will be paid by the firms , companies etc... not by the citizens" - and now every citizen is paying it regardless and not the companies."</i></p> <p><i>"I see a major problem in urban transport pricing: It favors the people with more money: They get even more power and advantages. They stay in the position of being free in their decisions, while the rest is reduced. So, urban transport pricing systems should bear in mind those social factors and maybe think of adjusting the prices to different economical levels."</i></p> <p><i>"Pricing policy and measures may be an immediate and effective way to manage traffic in urban areas. Outcomes of the research can bring good ideas, suggestions or solutions for many municipalities throughout Europe and their implementation will depend on local social, economic and political situation. This policy must be not only effective but also (socially) fair!"</i></p> <p><i>"Honestly, I think that this kind of measures take long time to root among the citizens. Anyway, the traffic problems are growing so fast that soon most of the people will ask for more restrictions to the traffic flows inside the cities or the main roads."</i></p> <p><i>"The results of this CURACAO project could mean that it is more economical and environmental friendly for me to use public transport more often than I presently do."</i></p> <p><i>"Personally I believe that aggressive urban pricing policies would be the most efficient tool to change people habits towards more environment friendly ones. Another question is what ruling politicians can possibly have such strong political will to enforce these kind of decisions onto the public?"</i></p>
<p>Development of strategies (for high-quality urban transport, sustainable urban transport, integrated transport and land use)</p>	<p>The problems addressed by this research are not always clear (25% of negative answers)</p>	<p>This research is considered relevant for improving the quality of life in the long term (100%) and partly also in the short term (50%)</p> <p><i>"This research at least is taking a high level strategic approach to tackling transport in cities. My concern is that it appears to be reviewing current/past practice rather than generating innovative solutions, but if it is acted upon, and helps to spread best practice and increase cooperation between cities, this is a positive approach."</i></p> <p><i>"I think, that research is very important. I just don't understand, why there is no citizen participation? And why it is "not relevant" who pays (as mentioned in the summary provided to us)?"</i></p> <p><i>"These projects are providing a kind of "software" solutions for urban transport management – they are important – but again! – a weak point of their implementation lies in political will at local/ municipal level. (But this is not a task for researchers...)"</i></p> <p><i>"It looks like the results of this kind of research will be noticed just in the long term., if the results are really applied by city and public transport managers."</i></p>
<p>Public transport improvement (urban rail transport)</p>	<p>The problems addressed by this research are not always clear (25% of negative answers). In one case the mix of projects was</p>	<p>This research is seen as useful both in the short and in the long term (86%).</p> <p><i>"Already a lot can be done with actual infrastructures and on road light(er) investments (tram, trolley, etc)"</i></p> <p><i>"Why there is no citizen participation in the research on Flexible</i></p>

<p>systems, accessible urban public transport, flexible collective mobility services)</p>	<p>considered confusing: <i>"What the Citizens Digest says about accessible urban public transport and flexible services - even if they are two very different topics - I would say is both very important. On the other hand, the urban rail transport systems research, is much more a self-made technological matter and I cannot really see the interest of the lay citizen in it."</i></p>	<p><i>collective mobility services?"</i> <i>"Investment in improvement of railway and tram infrastructure systems as well as in systems for disabled people, is very needed and has a significant impact on citizens. I have more doubts about FTS – flexible transport services, while I don't know how they work – they will be used at some specific places with specific tasks – and not answering, in my view, to the needs of general public. In addition, I don't prefer projects aimed primarily on providing info, guidelines, recommendations..."</i> <i>"Of course, high-quality transport means an improvement of the life quality. But the main problem is the equal access of all to the transports. Investments should be done in order to reduce price of urban transport."</i></p>
<p>Walking and cycling</p>	<p>This research is clear to almost all the members of the focus group. However, for at least one of them: <i>"The subject is clear. The research is not really. Did they studied any complex bike road? or super bikes? Or just statistics if there are more and more bikers.... Is there any single project for walking? I mean not to make 70 percents of the city asphalt walking which destroy your knee and Achille's tendon."</i></p>	<p>The research in this field is deemed to produce a better quality of life in the long term (100%) and partly also in the short term (75%). <i>"Walking and cycling are very important part of the new mobility culture construction. Easy applicable, not so expensive in comparison with other projects and with long-lasting, useful and effective results. New mode of living and thinking. Short and long term perspectives."</i> <i>"This area appears to have been given a very low priority amongst the research topics. Is this because it is not a technology-led area or because it does not have a powerful industrial lobby arguing its case?"</i> <i>"Creation of pedestrian zones and cycling lanes is not a big investment and gives a quick benefit to the citizen who is changing its habits. Initiate a new life style and citizenship. Increases safety and security."</i> <i>"I have no doubts about significance of walking and cycling, they are really improving our transport culture, but I have little doubts about the real impact of this research on situation in our cities and towns. I support it and wish, its outputs are effectively spread and thus addressing general public."</i> <i>"Easy, cheap and sustainable. But it needs a bigger effort to persuade people to shift to these ways of transport, making it safer (biking principally)."</i> <i>"The issue is clear but not the research results. Aside from the mobility, I think this could raise the question of health in societies that are more and more sedentary. Subject to an effort on the communication of this topic, which may concern any lay person, this could improve or lives (long term) if it is included in a global thinking, taking into account other concerns that are directly linked thereto."</i> <i>"It's only a political question: who's going to favour the cycling transport (and consequently reduce the attractivity of cars to move)... no need of research."</i> <i>"Cycling is a way of life in the Netherlands. Almost all households have one or a few bicycles. The infrastructure for walking and cycling is reasonably developed. However this research could provide added information leading to improvements."</i></p>
<p>Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS)</p>	<p>The research is enough clear for the great majority of the focus group (78%).</p>	<p>This research is considered relevant for the quality of life mainly in the long term (100%). The opinions are mixed: <i>"Modern technologies have offered a lot in humanity. It is important to exploit all the possibilities they offer for achieving sustainable, secure, environmentally-friendly transpiration media. Therefore I consider that the benefits derived by this kind of research will be "visible" to our generation and the generations that will come."</i> <i>"Difficult. On one hand I can see some positive impacts on urban transport (We have to invest into new technologies, innovations! no doubt, if Europe wants to develop its competitiveness, If we want to have better cars on our roads) but on the other hand I feel, mainly car industries will benefit from the research and the major transport problems will be solved only in a very limited way."</i> <i>"Increasing the intelligence of technology tends to have the side-effect of reducing the intelligence of its users, as they rely too much on the technology and stop thinking for themselves. The perfect example is satellite navigation, which, when used blindly (as it often is) causes all sorts of problems."</i> <i>"They fail again to take into account the cultural and social context of transport use and the needs of the citizens."</i> <i>"In the long run everyone will profit from the results of this information"</i></p>

		<p><i>system, because it will provide information, which could be use to endow better planning in the field of traffic management. One needs to know that one could get from point A to point b without to much hassle and stress."</i></p>
<p>Urban transport security</p>	<p>The research focus is well understood by many (89%)</p>	<p>This research is seen as relevant in the short term (100%) and in the long term as well (80%). Security is seen as a must for human friendly cities, but there are also opinions against giving too much priority to this research, or at least to focus it only on the fear of terrorist attacks.</p> <p><i>"The number of people likely to be affected by any potential terrorist attack is minimal by comparison with people affected by day to day dangers such as traffic accidents and violent attacks from individuals. This is clearly not a priority and should not be treated as such in terms of research investment."</i></p> <p><i>"I am afraid of total camera observation and I don´t think, that terrorists are the only security risk in European public transport systems".</i></p> <p><i>"Albeit ensuring a high level of safety in public transport is important as regards some terrorist attacks that could have happened in the past, I believe that on a day-to-day basis it impacts less people than the incivilities and badly behaving people in buses, trams and trains."</i></p> <p><i>"Security transport is a wrong problem; the question is: why is transport unsafe? It's a social issue that has nothing to do with research."</i></p>