



Brussels, 8.11.2017  
SWD(2017) 359 final

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

*Accompanying the document*

**Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council  
amending Regulation (EC) No 1073/2009 on common rules for access to the  
international market for coach and bus services**

{COM(2017) 647 final} - {SWD(2017) 358 final}

<b>Executive Summary Sheet</b>
Impact assessment on the revision of Regulation (EC) No 1073/2009 on access to the international market for coach and bus services
<b>A. Need for action</b>
<b>What is the problem and why is it a problem at EU level?</b>
The main problems are: 1) operators are facing obstacles in national markets to develop inter-urban coach services and 2) a low share of sustainable passenger transport modes. Citizens are faced with a lack of connectivity and also face more road accidents and fatalities, emissions and congestion due to greater use of car.
<b>What should be achieved?</b>
The general objectives are making inter-urban mobility and connectivity easier for all Europeans and increasing the share of sustainable transport modes.
<b>What is the value added of action at the EU level (subsidiarity)?</b>
Across the EU there is a patchwork of rules for access to national markets for coach and bus services which constrain carriers' ability to develop services into pan-European coach networks. Member States acting alone cannot introduce or ensure the coherence and coordination of uniform market access rules.
<b>B. Solutions</b>
<b>What are the various options to achieve the objectives? Is there a preferred option or not? If not, why?</b>
<p><b>Option 1:</b> open access to the market for regular services with the possibility to refuse authorisation if the viability of a public service contract (PSC) is compromised.</p> <p><b>Option 2:</b> open access to the inter-urban market for regular services over distances of 100km or more. Authorisation can be refused if the viability of an urban PSC is compromised.</p> <p><b>Option 3:</b> open access to the inter-urban market for regular services without an authorisation process for long distance services.</p> <p><b>Option 4:</b> soft regulation encouraging fair and non-discriminatory access to terminals.</p> <p><b>Option 5:</b> equal access rules requiring fair and non-discriminatory access to terminals.</p> <p>Preferred option is a combination of 2 and 5.</p>
<b>What are the different views of the interested parties? Who supports which option?</b>
Interested parties generally support the establishment of a common EU framework but the views of national authorities were mixed. Mixed opinions were also expressed on the issue of guaranteeing access to national regular service markets without discrimination and the abolishing of the requirement for occasional services to hold a journey form (mainly PO1, PO2, & PO3) There was broad agreement that the authorisation procedure should be maintained (mainly PO1 & PO2) and that a definition of coach terminals should be devised (mainly PO4 & PO5). Most interested parties also supported providing common requirements to ensure that access to coach terminals is fair.
<b>C. Impacts of the preferred option</b>
<b>What are the benefits of the preferred option (if any, otherwise of main ones)?</b>
EUR 183 million net cumulative CO <sub>2</sub> emission costs savings and net cumulative savings in air pollution costs of EUR 590 million; create 85,000 new jobs in 2030; reduction in fares, increased frequency and improved availability of services; savings for businesses and administrations in the range of EUR 1,560 million; increase transport activity of coach by about 11 % in 2030 relative to the baseline and by almost 1 percentage point in terms of modal share; improve connectivity of disadvantaged social groups by 62 billion passenger-kilometres in 2030 relative to the baseline; and contribute to lower accident costs of EUR 2.8 billion.
<b>What are the costs of the preferred option (if any, otherwise of main ones)?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Negative but limited impact on other modes of transport with an estimated 4.8 % reduction for rail transport activity in 2030 relative to the baseline due to improved performance of coach services.</li> <li>- Negative impact on some PSCs with a loss of PSC rail revenue of about 1.4 %.</li> </ul>
<b>What are the impacts on SMEs and competitiveness?</b>
Most measures are not expected to have particular impacts on SMEs but greater market stimulation is expected to result in more opportunities.
<b>Will there be significant impacts on national budgets and administrations?</b>

The preferred options would entail additional costs for national authorities to enforce the rules on terminals (but far less significant than the savings for businesses).

**Will there be other significant impacts?**

Increase in inter-urban travel. Improve mobility for people who otherwise could not afford to travel. Reduce the negative impacts of inter-urban passenger transport, such as emissions, accidents and fatalities, road congestion as well as improve the efficiency of use of transport resources.

**Proportionality?**

The preferred options do not exceed what is necessary to solve the original problem and meet the objectives of the proposal.

**D. Follow up**

**When will the policy be reviewed?**

Five years after the rules start to apply.