



EUROCITIES STATEMENT ON SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY PLANS: AUDIT, CERTIFICATION AND FUNDING CONDITIONALITY

The Urban Mobility Package is to be published soon, including a legislative proposal on making Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMPs) a mandatory condition for access to regional and cohesion funds for urban transport measures. This is our position on the audit and certification of SUMPs and on funding conditionality based on the development of SUMPs:

Mandatory SUMP audit and certification

- **We oppose mandatory rules or plans that could stifle innovation in cities. City authorities need flexibility and solutions tailored to their specific needs.**
- **Mandatory audit and certification of SUMPs involve financial and human resources that most city authorities would prefer to use on solving urban mobility problems. Quality management frameworks are a more efficient option.**

Sustainable mobility is about more than just transport and requires an integrated approach. The central issue for city authorities is encouraging modal shift in favour of more sustainable transport modes. An integrated long-term strategy, developed and implemented through a SUMP, is key to achieving significant modal shift. SUMPs are either independent documents (urban mobility/transport plans), or may be part of wider urban development plans, as it is often the case for larger cities. However, they must set out a vision, goals and measures to achieve sustainable, effective and accessible mobility.

The EU has the potential to add value in many of these areas. But it is essential that action at the EU level does not restrict the flexibility of cities to design, implement and, if necessary, adapt such tools according to local circumstances. Urban mobility often involves city authorities in much local political controversy and democratic engagement.

The role of the European Commission therefore should be to support all cities in developing SUMPs. Guidance from the Commission is useful but city authorities must be free to decide how to put this into practice.

In particular, costly mandatory procedures could hamper SUMP development and implementation. The time and cost burden imposed by audit and certification could actually outweigh the benefits of the SUMP concept. In addition, audit and certification does not necessarily guarantee the delivery of quality SUMPs or progress towards better sustainable mobility. On the contrary, these instruments might lead to additional red tape with little benefit.

The European Commission should not expect or require all cities to produce the same type of detailed plans. The existing SUMP guidelines are helpful for urban planners, and quality management frameworks/tools are a more efficient option. There are a number of EU projects currently developing such frameworks, based on quality targets.

Funding conditionality based on SUMP

- **We oppose the requirement for a standardised and/or certified SUMP to access EU funding.**
- **The aim should be to encourage city authorities to tackle their unique mobility challenges in a more holistic way.**

We agree it is important that EU funding should be spent on sustainable projects. And clearly those local authorities seeking EU support will understand the advantage given by the ability to demonstrate an integrated approach to urban mobility planning.

However the audit and certification of SUMP as a condition for funding eligibility would be counter-productive. This has to be seen in the context of the ever-increasing burden on recipients of EU funding to demonstrate that the money has been spent in specific ways. Transparency in this respect is essential, but the administrative burdens imposed by the European Commission must be proportionate.

Instead the European Commission should help facilitate the development and implementation of SUMP based on an integrated approach. The use of quality management frameworks, without making them mandatory, could be a useful option.