



FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE
DE MOTOCYCLISME

FIM Position Paper

Evaluation Roadmap of the 2011 White Paper on Transport

The Fédération Internationale de Motocyclisme (FIM), welcomes the opportunity to express its views on the European Commission [Roadmap](#) published on 7th February. As the global advocate for motorcycling and riders, FIM perceives that the profound changes that have affected the transport sector call for a thorough evaluation of the [2011 Transport White Paper](#).

FIM would like to express its views on a selected number of topics, with the aim of signalling to the European Institutions the strive of our Federation in making transport – and namely, riding – safer, sustainable and more accessible.

Safety

In 2011, the Transport White Paper committed to a future in which, by 2050, European transport would have had zero fatalities. In line with that goal, the EU aimed at halving road casualties by 2020. The Commission acknowledged that setting the framework for safe transport was essential for the European citizen. Additionally, in an extremely positive attitude, the Commission pledged to pay particular attention to Vulnerable Road Users such (VRUs), including in this category motorcyclists alongside with pedestrians and cyclists through safer infrastructure and vehicle technologies.

Notwithstanding this commitment, in 2015, 26.100 people were killed in road accidents throughout the EU. Motorcycle and moped fatalities, together referred to as Powered Two Wheelers (PTW), accounted for 18% of those fatalities (17% in 2006). However, the results could be read as a success story: the number of fatalities counted in road traffic accidents has fallen considerably over the last 20 years, by 40% between 2006 and 2016¹.

Car drivers and passengers represented the largest category of road traffic deaths (46.4%), pedestrians (21.2%) are the second largest category in the EU, slightly ahead of drivers and passengers of motorcycles and mopeds (17 %). Cyclists account for 8 % of EU road deaths, but in individual countries, this proportion can be as high as 19 %.

Interestingly, over the last decade, the largest drop in the number of fatalities in the EU-28 was among buses and coaches (-48.8%), followed by car drivers and their passengers (-46%), and occupants of goods vehicles (-44.6%). Instead, the fall in the number of fatalities among cyclists (-29.3%) and pedestrians (-37.5%), though, was smaller. When it comes to PTWs, the image is more nuanced: the decrease in fatalities involving motorcycles amounted to -27.8%, while the one for moped was -56.7%.

The data shows that many measures taken to improve road safety are paying off. However, they also demonstrate that a more determined action was (and still is) needed in relation to VRUs.

Moreover, FIM believes that the specific characteristics arising from the nature of motorcycling must be recognized and taken into consideration. In this sense, actions aiming at improving road safety for

¹ Data from the [Traffic Safety Basic Fact 2017](#), European Road Safety Observatory, 2017



FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE
DE MOTOCYCLISME

motorcyclists should focus on the following: **(a) improvement of vehicle safety measures, (b) enhancement of the care and design of safe infrastructure, and (c) education, training and behaviour.**

In this perspective, with regards to the first two points, the [Third Mobility Package](#) might represent an enormous leap in motorcyclists' road safety. The revision of the [General & Passenger \(GSR/PSR\) Regulation](#), aiming at transforming EU vehicle safety standards to include the latest safety features, and the [revision of the Road Infrastructure Safety Management \(RISM\)](#) that would improve safety management of road infrastructure are long-awaited positive developments. More specifically, the RISM revision – stating that *“the needs of vulnerable road users [should be] taken into account”* – represents an understanding of the specific needs of VRUs.

Finally, as the Commission acknowledges in its Evaluation Roadmap, technological developments, such as connected and automated mobility and digitalisation of transport, have the potential of transforming road safety. In this sense, FIM calls on the Commission to consider that **clear safety benefits from the deployment of new technologies have to be deployed taking into consideration the interests of VRUs and in particular motorcyclists.** While technology has the potential to partially tackle this issue, reducing human error, traffic incidents and road fatalities, FIM believes that the improvement of the existing active and passive safety systems should be encouraged, and not belittle by an excessive focus on vehicles connectivity.

Pollution & Congestion

In 2011 White Paper on Transport, the Commission pledged to fight against the negative externalities of transport, such as noise, air pollution and congestion. The Commission envisaged a “internalization” of these costs via infrastructure charging, together with a mixed strategy involving land-use planning, pricing schemes, efficient public transport services and infrastructure for non-motorised modes in urban environments was presented a best possible policy mix.

However, FIM believes that PTWs should be regarded as part of the solutions, and not of the problem. As a matter of fact, they bring benefits related to easing congestion in the city, and when it comes to environmental impact, they use less fuel and less energy than public transport and in the end, pollute less too.

With regards to the first point, the inclusion of PTWs in the most recent proposals for urban low emission zones (LEZs)² does not take into account the fact that motorcycles and other PTWs are to be recognised as an alternative for passenger cars.

With regards to the second point, the [position of the European Parliament](#)³ on the [revision of the Eurovignette Directive](#) to levy an infrastructural external-cost charge imposed on any section of the road network to all vehicle categories, including motorcycles is simply unacceptable for the abovementioned reasons.

² Among the other: London, Madrid and Barcelona

³ Cf. Amendment 69 of the European Parliament's position