

1. VISIONARY SURVEY

After targeted interactions with experts and stakeholders, notably the visionary workshop to help shaping and characterizing the Vision, an online survey was conducted to gather the feedback of a wider range of stakeholders and serve as a basis for the validation of the Vision.

A total of 142 responses were received, 94% of which belong to European citizens. Significantly, more than 60% of the participants are younger than 40, something that will be reflected particularly in a couple of questions of the survey. Regarding the relation of the respondents to the transport sector, there is an almost perfect split between professionals and non-professionals. The consortium is a bit less satisfied with the gender balance of the survey, being the male turnout more than 14 points higher than the percentage of female voters.

1.1. Survey results

The respondents were asked about their preferred feature of several mobility aspects. The questionnaire was refined by the consortium, and this resulted in 13 questions out of the previous 16 being posed due to the focus on pure mobility concepts. As was done in the visionary workshop, the choices were listed in alphabetical order to avoid undue influence towards any particular scenario. The obtained results are the following:

1. In an ideal world, which of these characterisations of mobility takes priority?

- Fair 14%
- Fast 14%
- Sustainable 54%
- Useful 18%

Comment: Same result than in the visionary workshop.

2. The mobility system provides a service. If you had to pick one and only one fundamental quality of the mobility service, which one would you select?

- Accessibility 45%
- Proximity 25%
- Safety & security 21%
- Seamlessness 9%

Comment: Same result than in the visionary workshop (lower majority).

3. How can mobility best respond to our future needs and aspirations?



- Affordable services 34%
- Convivial services 12%
- Premium services (supply differentiation according to needs) 3%
- **Reliable services 51%**

Comment: Same result than in the visionary workshop (bigger majority).

4. The quality of mobility services depends on a variety of factors. Which of these principles do you perceive as the fundamental driver to achieve service quality?

- **Low environmental impact 32%**
- Minimum level of service to all groups and places 20%
- Network density 21%
- Saving time to all travellers 26%

Comment: In this question the responses were much more scattered than before, but the votes of the under 40 give priority to the environmental approach.

5. Is mobility inextricably correlated to growth? To wellbeing? What does this mean in terms of how and how much we will actually need to move?

- Increased mobility among distant key origin and destinations 6%
- Increased mobility coupled with growth: We move more 20%
- **Mobility decoupled from growth: We move differently 63%**
- Reduced mobility. We move less 11%

Comment: Same result than in the visionary workshop (lower majority).

6. Alone or together? Mobility has a social dimension. Which of these options corresponds best to your ideal mobility experience?

- **Communitarian (focused on the needs of specific communities, geographically or functionally defined) 52%**
- Customized to groups (according to socio-economic status, to mobility purpose...) 26%
- Individual 13%
- Massive 9%

Comment: Same result than in the visionary workshop (bigger majority).



7. Is the trade-off between cost and quality of service inevitable? Is price differentiation the solution?

- Cheap but low quality 1%
- Different prices for different groups 23%
- Different prices for different purposes 73%
- Expensive but efficient 3%

Comment: Different prices continues to be the preferred options. In this case, with a majority for different purposes, while in the workshop the participants were equally inclined towards different groups.

8. With the massive advent of artificial intelligence and other ICT-based solutions, is there a threat to our privacy? And how should we deal with it?

- No privacy concerns 14%
- Opt-in for the sake of accessibility 20%
- Opt-in for the sake of profit 27%
- Opt-out 39%

Comment: Same result than in the visionary workshop (lower majority).

9. There is in general consensus on the need to reduce the prevalence of private car use, especially in the urban context. Policy packages may include a variety of options to do so, but what should be the priority lever?

- Active mobility 16%
- Public transport 30%
- Services customized to the needs of users' diversity 20%
- Smart multimodal mobility 34%

Comment: Same result than in the visionary workshop (lower majority).

10. How important is the truthfulness of prices? Is there an inevitable trade-off between fairness and efficiency?

- Getting market prices right by internalizing all social and environmental impacts 52%
- Getting market prices right with partial internalization and customized to each traveller 24%
- Prices not a key tool to induce new behaviours 16%



- Transport prices decided politically to generate income 8%

Comment: Same result than in the visionary workshop.

11. Freedom of movement is an incontrovertible right of EU citizens. Is it sensible, and feasible, to temperate it in the name of sustainability and wellbeing?

- Essential mobility only 20%
- Free mobility from/to everywhere 50%
- Mobility on demand 23%
- Priority to long-distance mobility 7%

Comment: Free mobility is now the sole preferred option, while mobility on demand loses some support.

12. How should we modulate people’s mobility choices and behaviours to achieve an “ideal” mobility of the future?

- Behaviours increasingly reflecting emergence of new values 46%
- New behaviours mandatory because of regulations 25%
- Nudged behaviours 17%
- Old behaviours persist, enhanced by technologic evolution 12%

Comment: Totally different result than in the visionary workshop. Nudged behaviours give way to reflecting emergence of new values, mostly among people under 40.

13. Technology - and the understanding of its implications - are inherently complex. What is the role of technology and what is the best way to introduce and promote advanced technology-based mobility solutions?

- Human-centered technology serves the interests of local communities 45%
- Technology enhances system efficiency 33%
- Technology ensures growth 3%
- Technology solves environmental problems 19%

Comment: Same result than in the visionary workshop (lower majority).

Disclaimer: The sole responsibility for the content of this document lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

