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Mobility is being transformed throughout Europe

SUMPs
ITS systems
Smart cities
Low emission zones
White Papers on urban transport
Conventional vs TNCs on demand services

Urban

Rural...? ✗

Fragmented or none Policy
Fundings dispersed across multiple sources
Low quality public transport services
High car-dependency
Mobility in rural areas needs attention

27% of Europe’s population means 137 million people, which equates to the population of the 40 largest Metropolitan areas in Europe.

Same level of attention not been paid in transport policy, innovation, capital investment and ongoing subsidy for rural mobility needs.

24% of EU’s rural population at risk of poverty or social exclusion.

Distribution of population (%) by degree of urbanisation, EU-28 Eurostat 2017.
The SMARTA Project

Explore ways to ensure **sustainable mobility** by improving **shared mobility integrated** with **public transport services** across **different European rural areas**

**3 Main strands of activities**

- Research
- Demonstration
- Networking

**Recommendations and Policy Guidelines**
“Insight Papers”

Analysis of the challenges of mobility in rural areas and the framework in each of the 28 EU countries (including selected EEA states, North America and Australia)

“Good Practices”

Comprehensive overview of Good Practices in rural shared mobility from around Europe and beyond
Pilot Demonstration Sites

Validation and evaluation in real-field conditions of effectiveness, efficiency, response, impacts and prospects for shared mobility services connected with public transport

Combining travellers more efficiently by different service schemes

Improving the availability and integration of transport offer and mobility options

Support ITS such as user info, booking, ticketing, fleet control, .... MaaS schemes

Specific Call for Tender has been launched by EU-DGMOVE for selecting 4 sites; SMARTA Consortium support the selected sites
Gain a deep understanding about the **key findings**, **lessons learnt** and **transferability issues** of different mobility experiences in rural areas across Europe.
Insight Papers

Why are Frameworks so important?

Frameworks set all the primary parameters
- Vision, strategy, programs, what is to be done
- Who is responsible, who is permitted, where are the limits
- If you want to implement mobility services, both public and private entities are bound to work within them
- If you want to innovate, you may find barriers or boundaries
- If you wish to change the Framework, you must understand how it works

Mapping the diversity within European frameworks

1) Which is the layer of Government at which rural mobility is primarily determined?
2) Is there a common framework throughout the country?
3) Is there a specific rural mobility/transport policy with objectives and targets?
4) Are there Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMPs) or equivalent for rural areas?
5) On what basis does the public transport give coverage of villages and rural areas?
6) Are additional mobility services provided for (school, healthcare)?
7) Is there comprehensive territorial coverage by transport/mobility units which coordinate a range of mobility services?
8) Is there widespread provision of “bottom up” and community mobility services?
9) At what level are DRT and other forms of shared mobility services linked to the regular public transport system?
10) To what extent does the regulatory framework provide for DRT and emerging forms of rural shared mobility?
Which is the layer of Government at which rural mobility is primarily determined?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus, Czech Republic, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Luxemburg, Malta, Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Region</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria, Belgium, Croatia, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality/County</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Romania, Scotland, UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is there a specific rural mobility/transport policy with objectives and targets?

- Yes, with specified objectives and target outcomes
  - Latvia

- Yes, but only with aspirational goals and without target objectives
  - Estonia, Hungary, Scotland, Slovenia

- No
  - Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, UK

- Other
  - Portugal
Are there Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP) or equivalent for rural areas

Yes, SUMP (and similar tools) includes rural areas (in most cases)
Slovenia

Yes, occasionally (i.e. there are few examples of SUMP including rural areas)
Belgium, Italy, Latvia, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain

No
Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, Scotland, Sweden, UK

Other
Croatia, Greece
A. Transport and mobility services in rural areas

A.1 TRANSPORT SERVICES and TARGET USER GROUPS
- Solutions for all the population especially the disadvantaged (in terms of accessibility, availability, costs, tools etc.)

A.2 ICT IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND SHARED MOBILITY
- Technologies that enable more efficient planning of journeys
- Simulation of advantages and disadvantages
- Fleet management and real time information
- Multimodal travel planners
- Autonomous shuttles

A.3 INTERMODAL SERVICE COORDINATION
- Transport solutions at bus/train stations for last mile connectivity

A.4 EASY MOBILITY
- Active modes, including sharing of bikes and e-bikes

B. Good Governance Enabling Sustainable Rural Mobility

B.1 SOLUTIONS FOR SMART RURAL AREAS
- Financially viable systems
- New business concepts and solutions for improving the accessibility of rural areas

B.2 STRATEGIES FOR INCREASE RIDERSHIPS
- Good marketing campaigns
- Improvement of the systems reliability
- Attractive fares

B.3 COMMUNITY-BASED TRANSPORT SERVICES
- Local initiatives involving the community to identify transport solutions
- Needs assessment campaigns
Good practice: some examples

**Bürgerbuses, Germany**

*Volunteer-based community transport service; Based on a set of timetable and defined stops (conventional service); Ticket payed directly to the driver and booking in advance is not necessary*

---

**Rezo Pouce, France**

*Successful hitch-hiking service active in more than 1500 municipalities in France. IT platform for subscription avoiding subjective feeling of unsafety and uncertainty*

---

**Shared Use Mobility Agency, Italy**

*First “step” of a future MaaS scenario in Elba; Center for planning, managing and coordinating ride sharing services, infomobility and transport services networking*
Key findings (1)

There is near-total **absence** of **specific policy** for mobility in rural areas

- Most countries do not have any policy at all on rural mobility
- Some countries have aspirational statements, but lack targets
- No country has specified levels of rural mobility, let alone any for which a public agency could be held accountable if they are not met

There are **different arrangements** for the primary actor in rural mobility

- There is a mix among national, regional and local authorities
- Local authorities are often limited by dependency on central budgets
Key findings (2)

There are **few hard obligations** to provide rural mobility services

- Some countries ensure that villages are served from legacy sense of obligation
- In some countries, villages and rural areas are only served by through-routes
- Provision of schools transport is the exception, which is strongly mandated

The organisational **arrangements** for rural shared mobility are **weak**

- Only a few countries have comprehensive coverage by mobility coordination units
- DRT is widely provided as a social safety net, but not well integrated to PT networks
- Very few regulatory frameworks explicitly provide for rural shared mobility

**Frameworks** are **not conducive** to developing rural **shared mobility**

- Lack of directives and policy are the key issue, as institutions and mechanisms are there
**Time to Rethink rural mobility?**

Things managed, organised and regulated as they are today

Remaining local services continue to be closed

Residents travel in the same way as they do now

Private cars continue to be predominant transport means as now

---

**No thanks**

**New vision**

Stakeholders at different levels work together to redesign and optimise the transport offer. They take account of the different mobility demand segments with the perspective to improve the shared travelling experience.
Rural areas could look different

People **shift** from **private** to **shared** mobility options

Residents benefit from **better access** to **health** and **education** services

Likely, in some countries rural **depopulation** trend can be **slowed** and even **halted**
Thank you
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