



PUBLIC TRANSPORT IN EUROPEAN CAPITALS

This report compiles the results of surveys conducted with trade unions in various European cities, focusing on sustainable mobility and, in particular, public transport in European capitals.

- They describe basic city data such as population, area, and GDP. They
- analyze the state of local and peripheral public transportation, highlighting aspects such as public or private property and union campaigns against the privatization.
- They show how unions are active in defending and promoting public transport that benefits citizens and workers. Results of the European City Union Surveys on Sustainable Mobility:

Madrid (CCOO)

- The city has an area of 604.3 km² and a population of 3,460,000 residents.
- Public road transport (buses) is widely used, with state and public ownership, although there are attempts at privatization by liberal options in the government.
- CCOO has conducted information campaigns on the risks of privatization in essential services.

Madrid (UGT).

- The Community of Madrid covers an area of 8,028 km² and has a population of 10,196,659.
- Road transport is widely used and state-owned, although privatization attempts are made every two years, which are fought with protests.
- UGT carries out mobilizations and distributes information about the implications of privatization.

Belgrade (CATUB).

- The city has a population of 1,659,440 inhabitants and an urban area of 359.92 km².

- Road transport is widely used and is publicly owned, but public-private partnerships exist, and private carriers operate in Belgrade.

- Union pressure has prevented the complete privatization of public transport.

Paris (CFDT IDF).

- The Île-de-France region has 12 million residents, with 2.2 million in Paris, and a high population density.

- Road transport is underutilized, with both public and private state ownership (under public service delegation).

- There was a failed attempt to privatize the main metro company (RATP) in 2023, thanks to the active participation of the transport federation in talks with RATP management.

Paris (UNSA).

- The city has an area of 105 km² and a population of 2,048,472 inhabitants.

- Road transport is widely used, mainly managed by RATP (a private company contracted by Île-de-France Mobilités).

- There have been no attempts to privatize the metro, which is managed by RATP, a public company..

Rome (CGIL ROME AND LAZIO).

- Information on the area and population of Rome was not provided.

- Road transport (buses) is widely used and publicly owned, although a referendum on liberalizing public transport was held in the past.

- The organization opposed the opening of the essential public service to the market.

Rome (CISL ROME CAPITAL).

- The capital has an area of 1,287 km² with a population of 2.755 million.
- Road transport is rarely used, although 35% of services are contracted out to private operators in accordance with EU regulations. •CISL took action against privatization by organizing demonstrations and collaborating with experts to protect public property.

Rome (UIL LAZIO).

- The capital is Rome; information on area and population is unrecorded.
- Road transport is widely used and publicly owned, although there was a referendum on liberalization.
- The organization opposed the opening of an essential public service to the market.

Athens (EKA).

- The city has an area of 3,808 km² and a population of 637,798 inhabitants.
- Road transport is widely used and publicly owned, with no attempts at privatization.
- EKA has conducted information campaigns and public opinion surveys.

Valletta (GWU).

- The capital has an area of 0.61 km² and a population of 5,157 inhabitants.
- Road transport is widely used, with private ownership. The GWU
- integrates environmental considerations into its labor advocacy and promotes green jobs and sustainable energy policies.

Vilnius (Vilnius Solidarumas Union).

- The city has an area of 400 km² with a population of 607,404 inhabitants.
- Road transport is widely used, with both public and private ownership and some attempts at privatization.

- The Union does not participate in air pollution policies or awareness campaigns on the issue.

Lisbon (USL/CGTP-IN).

•Lisbon City: 100km², Greater Lisbon: 1390 km², Lisbon Metropolitan Area (AML): 3015 km², Total residents: Within the city: 567,131, In the greater metropolis: Greater Lisbon: 2,126,578, AML: 2,961,177, Population density (inhabitants/km²) within the city: 5,572.4 inhabitants/km², Active population: (Greater Lisbon): 1,139,300, Unemployment rate: 6.5% (Greater Lisbon), GDP per capita in PPS: Urban area 56%, Public transport in the periphery good 65%.

•Public transportation in the city is good, but in the outskirts, it is above average and substandard (65%-35%). Road transportation is widely used, with both public and private ownership and attempts at privatization.

- The Union does not participate in air pollution policies or awareness campaigns on the issue.

What impact does transport privatization have on service quality, according to unions?

According to surveys conducted by trade unions in different European cities, the impact of transport privatization on service quality varies, although there is a general tendency to associate privatization with potential risks to quality and labor rights.

In cities like Madrid and Rome, unions express concern that privatization could deteriorate service quality, as they believe that private management seeks to maximize profits rather than provide an efficient, safe, and accessible public service.

Several unions also point out that privatization can lead to job insecurity, reduced service quality, and less stability for workers. In some cases, unions have organized mobilization and awareness campaigns to prevent privatization, arguing that public management better guarantees service quality and labor rights.

On the other hand, in cities like Belgrade and Athens, unions emphasize that public management has been effective in maintaining the continuity and quality of service, and that privatization could jeopardize both quality and workers' rights if not properly regulated.

In short, European unions in these cases show a tendency to fear that privatization, without adequate regulation, could negatively affect service quality and labor rights, defending public management as a guarantor of quality and accessible transport for all.

How does population density influence public transport policies?

Population density is a key factor that significantly influences public transport policies, as it determines the needs, planning, and efficiency of urban mobility systems.

According to survey data, in densely populated cities like Valletta and Rome, policies tend to focus on providing more compact, efficient, and connected services, favoring modes of transport that can serve large concentrations of users in small areas, such as metro and trams.

Greater population density favors the viability of sustainable and accessible public transportation systems, reducing dependence on private transportation and reducing congestion and pollution. Furthermore, in these contexts, policies often prioritize accessibility and social inclusion, facilitating access for disadvantaged groups through efficient and well-distributed networks.

In contrast, in low-density cities, such as parts of Vilnius, public transport policies face greater economic and coverage challenges, so they may focus on peripheral services or combinations with private or individual transport to ensure the mobility of residents in less densely populated areas.

Ultimately, population density influences the design of public transport policies, encouraging investments in specific networks, appropriate transport modes and management strategies that ensure efficiency,

accessibility and sustainability of the system according to the concentration of inhabitants.

The use of road transport (buses) varies by city, reflecting differences in coverage, level of service and perception of efficiency..

In Madrid and Lisbon, road bus transportation is widely used, with a modal share of over 30%, making it a primary option for urban mobility. This suggests a well-developed bus system with high public acceptance.

In Belgrade, approximately 55% of public transport journeys are made by train and tram, but bus transport also accounts for a significant portion of mobility. Although exact data are not specified, it indicates an extensive network operated by various forms of ownership, including public-private partnerships and delegated private companies.

In cities such as Valletta and Vilnius, surveys show that buses are the primary mode of road transport, with significant use (over 80% in Vilnius, for example), although in some cases bus use may be lower or restricted to certain areas, depending on infrastructure and service quality.

In other cities, such as Nice and Marseille, bus availability and use are also highly entrenched, considered an effective means of covering peri-urban areas and connecting dense and less dense zones, depending on the local infrastructure and mobility strategy.

In short, in the different capitals, bus and road transport in general are widely used modes of transport, and in many cases constitute the basis of the public mobility system, with variations in modal share reflecting both existing infrastructure and public transport integration and development policies.

The metro network in the different capitals presents notable differences in extension, availability and ownership, reflecting both the levels of urban development and the mobility strategies adopted..

In Madrid, there is an extensive network of metro lines, managed by a public entity, demonstrating a well-established and widely used system for urban mobility. On the other hand, in cities

Like Rome, the existence of a metro network is also significant. However, in some cases, its operation and maintenance face infrastructure or coverage challenges, although it remains a key part of the transportation system. The metro in Rome is state-owned, and there were no signs of privatization attempts.

According to the information, there is no metro in Belgrade, but there is an extensive network of trains and trams that serve similar functions in the city's mobility. The lack of a metro is related to the urban characteristics and investment in other modes of transport.

In other cases, such as Lisbon, Nice, and Marseille, metro networks are less extensive or are still developing, generally complemented by bus and tram systems, adapting to the specific characteristics of the urban structure and available resources.

In summary, metro networks vary from extensive and well-established systems in cities like Madrid and Rome to no metro at all in places like Belgrade, depending on each city's urban size, investment, and strategic planning. Where metro systems exist, majority ownership is public, with little or no attempt at privatization.

The tram network in European capitals varies considerably in size and state of development, reflecting the urban characteristics and mobility policies of each city.

In general, several capital cities have a well-established and extensive tram network. For example:

- In Rome, there is a tram network that is considered extensive and operational, managed by a public entity, with no signs of ongoing privatization. The network complements other modes of transport and plays an important role in urban mobility.
- In Paris, the tram network is also significant, although the data provided does not specify its exact extent. It is known to be part of the integrated transport system managed by a public entity. The network contributes to sustainable mobility in the French capital.
- There is an extensive network of publicly owned tram lines in Belgrade. No attempts to privatize this service have been made or are underway.

- In cities like Nice, the tram network is relatively modern and expanding, managed by public entities, and has been the subject of information campaigns by unions regarding privatization or management of the system.

- In Lisbon, it's more historic and dedicated to tourism. The Lisbon Tram Route consists of five routes, three of which are the most interesting for tourists. It is operated and managed by the public.

Meanwhile, in places like Vilnius and Valletta, the presence of tram networks is less prominent or nonexistent. In Vilnius, there are indications that the tram network is unused or limited, and in Valletta, the tourist and urban infrastructure does not support a significant tram network.

General summary:

- Extensive and functioning tram network: Rome, Paris, Belgrade, Nice, Marseille.

- Limited or developing tram network: Some cities are expanding and modernizing their networks.

- Non-existent or scarce networks: In smaller cities or with different urban structures, such as Vilnius or Valletta.

- Historical networks, without great development and modernization like Lisbon.

In conclusion, tram networks are important components in several European capitals, mostly managed by public entities, and in many cases, undergoing expansion or modernization to promote sustainable mobility. The existence and extent of these networks vary depending on the specific characteristics of each city and its transport strategy.

Bicycle use in European capitals shows significant divergences in terms of extent and popularity, influenced by urban infrastructure, sustainable mobility policies, and local cycling culture.

In some cities, bicycle use is widespread and is considered an important mode of transport:

- In Paris, bicycle use is widespread, with 11.2% of trips made by bike in 2024, even surpassing car use. Furthermore, the percentage of the population using bicycles has increased since the pandemic, indicating a favorable trend toward active mobility.

- In Rome, bicycle use is also reported to be widespread, with significant use of bicycles in urban mobility. The trend has increased following the pandemic, reinforcing the importance of this mode of transport in the city.

In other cities, although bicycle use is present, it does not reach such high levels:

- In Madrid, Lisbon, Belgrade, Nice, and Marseille, bicycle use is recognized. Although the specific proportions are not detailed in the surveys, it is emphasized that cycling is a growing mode of mobility, especially in newly developed urban contexts with expanding cycling infrastructure.

- In Vilnius and Valletta, no significant bicycle usage data is provided, which may indicate lower penetration or less emphasis on this mode of transport in those cities.

General summary:

- Widespread and increasing: Paris and Rome, with a percentage of bicycle trips exceeding 10% (in Paris) and showing a growth trend, reinforced after the pandemic.

- Moderate or expanding: Madrid, Lisbon, Nice, and Marseille have increased their infrastructure and use in recent years.

- Low or no specific data: Belgrade, Vilnius, and Valletta, where bicycle use does not feature prominently in surveys.

These data reflect a positive trend in several capital cities toward greater integration of bicycles into urban mobility, driven by policies, infrastructure, and environmental awareness.

Motorcycle use in the European capitals surveyed shows a variety of levels and characteristics, making it a complex mode of transport to assess due to the different urban configurations and local preferences.

The main observations on motorcycle use in different cities are summarized below:

- In several cities, including Paris, Rome, Nice, Marseille, Vilnius, and Valletta, motorcycles are reported to be widely or heavily used, reflecting their important role in urban mobility, especially in historic centers and congested areas. In particular:
 - Rome: Motorcycles are widely used, with thousands of motorcycles circulating in the city, and a high motorization rate (924 vehicles per 1,000 inhabitants), indicating intensive use and a prominent role in the mobility system.
 - Paris: The survey indicates that motorcycles are widely used, although specific figures are not provided in the excerpts, but they do have a significant presence in the vehicle fleet and in everyday use.
 - Nice and Marseille: Motorcycle use is also significant, albeit on a smaller scale compared to Rome and Paris, but their importance in urban mobility is recognized.
 - Vilnius and Valletta: In Vilnius, motorcycle use is not specifically mentioned in the available data, which may suggest limited or less significant use in those cities compared to others.
- In some cities, as in several surveys, motorcycles are rarely or only rarely used, for example: Belgrade, Madrid, and Lisbon.
- In one case, it is noted that motorcycles are rarely used, in contrast to cities where they are more widely used.

General summary:

- Widespread and frequent use: Rome, Paris, Nice, and Marseille, where motorcycles are an important mode of urban mobility, with a high motorization rate and recognition of their role.

- Limited or unspecified use: Vilnius and Valletta, where motorcycle use is not highlighted in the collected data, probably due to urban characteristics or local preferences.
- Limited use, not of maximum importance in cities such as Belgrade, Madrid or Lisbon, but with some moderate growth.

In conclusion, in many of the cities analyzed, motorcycles occupy a significant place in mobility, especially in congested urban settings or those with a tradition of two-wheeled vehicle use, serving as a complementary mode of transportation to cars and public transport.

Taxi use in the European capitals surveyed varies significantly across cities, reflecting differences in transport infrastructure, regulations, and mobility preferences.

Below is a summary by city:

- Madrid: The share of local transport managed by taxis is 7%, indicating modest use compared to other modes of transport. It is confirmed that traditional taxis and Uber are used, although no specific proportion is provided for each.
- Paris: The modal share of taxis in Paris is not specified in the excerpts, but it is mentioned that traditional taxis and platforms like Uber are used and represent a significant portion of mobility. Their use is likely significant given the presence of these alternatives.
- Belgrade has 24 licensed taxi services, which are a significant part of public transport, especially for tourism. Uber and other companies also have significant use, primarily for tourism.
- Rome: There is no specific data available on the percentage of transportation handled by taxis, although it is estimated that they are a common mode of urban mobility, accounting for a small percentage compared to other modes such as private cars and public transportation.
- Lisbon: The use of Uber and other companies has doubled the use of traditional licensed taxis. This is a fairly significant increase.
- Nice and Marseille: The survey indicates that traditional taxis and Uber are used, but no specific figures are given.

- Vilnius: No clear information is provided on taxi tolls or usage in this city, which could indicate lesser use compared to other capital cities.
- Valletta: Specific information on taxis is not included in the available data, which could reflect lower usage or simply a lack of data in the survey.

General summary:

- Moderate to low usage in some cities: Madrid, with a 7% share of taxi-operated transport, exemplifies relatively limited usage compared to other modes, although still significant, especially when combined with other transportation systems such as Uber.
- High presence and use in large or tourist cities: Paris, Belgrade, Lisbon, Rome, Nice, and Marseille show that traditional taxis and platforms like Uber are widely used and are important modes of urban mobility.
- Insufficient data or low usage: Vilnius and Valletta either do not provide clear data or indicate limited taxi use in the survey context.

In short, taxis are a complementary mode of transport in many of these cities, with usage ranging from moderate in Madrid (7%) to significant in other cities, influenced by local infrastructure, regulations, and mobility preferences.

The use of local river/sea transport in the European capitals surveyed shows notable differences, generally related to the geographical characteristics and tourist activities of each city.

The data available by city is summarized below:

- Madrid: Several references indicate that local river/sea transport is very limited or nonexistent. Specifically, it is mentioned that nearby rivers are not suitable for navigation, which limits its use in the city.
- Paris: One of the surveys indicates that there is a lot of use of river transport, with initiatives to increase it, and that it is used both for tourism

(e.g., Batobus) and for freight transport. It is publicly owned, and initiatives are underway to promote its use.

Belgrade has a commercial port on the Danube and a tourist port on the Sava River, which receives numerous cruise ships and sailboats. There are several marinas nearby. Two regular ferry lines connect Novi Beograd with Ada Ciganlija and Ada Medica.

- Rome: The survey indicates that local river/maritime transport activities are very little used, and an additional comment notes that nearby rivers do not allow navigation, suggesting little or no use.

- Nice and Marseille: Several responses mention that river/sea transport is used little or not at all in the city. The situation in Marseille reflects the limited use of sea transport for local mobility.

- Vilnius: No use is indicated, and there are no references to initiatives or significant use of river/sea transport.

- Lisbon: The increased electrification of transport, including river transport, will play a key role in Lisbon's mobility. The port's excellent natural conditions allow for a wide variety of transport options. Inland waterway transport is today a highly important mode of transport, integrated into the global and integrated transport and logistics system. It has been driving river freight traffic in the Tagus Estuary, taking advantage of its unique navigability conditions. Investment in this type of traffic will lead to an increase in intermodality, ensuring that the increase in port activity in Lisbon does not cause significant social and environmental impacts on the city. Its operation and management are both public and private.

- Valletta: Local river/sea transport is evidently heavily used, particularly in Valletta, where private properties and maritime transport are heavily used, geared toward tourism and local transport. Maritime resources are also being used in the city, with attempts or in the process of privatization, and their frequent use is confirmed.

- Other cases: Some municipalities show that local river/sea transport, where it exists, is primarily used for tourism, with initiatives to increase its use, but in general it is not a primary mode of mobility.

General summary:

- Relevant use in cities with maritime or island characteristics: Valletta and Lisbon clearly stand out for their high and frequent use of local maritime and river transport, reflecting their peculiar and insular condition (in Valletta) and tourist orientation.
- Limited or absent use in continental cities: Madrid, Rome, Nice, and Marseille show very little or no use of river/sea transport for local mobility, mainly due to geographical or infrastructural limitations.
- Moderate development in Paris, Belgrade, and other cities: Paris is showing increasing use and initiatives to promote river transport, although it is not yet a predominant mode.

In conclusion, local river/sea transport plays a variable role: very important in Lisbon and Valletta, moderate or developing in Paris and Belgrade, and scarce or nonexistent in other capitals such as Madrid, Rome, Nice, and Marseille, mainly due to geographical conditions and urban priorities.

The level of road congestion in the European capitals surveyed varies across cities, reflecting varying degrees of traffic jams and delays.

Here is a summary based on the available information:

- Madrid: Traffic congestion in Madrid is significant, with traffic causing significant delays during both peak and off-peak periods. It's also worth noting that there are additional fares to avoid congestion, such as restricted access zones (ZTL), and the public transport ticketing system is well-structured, although with limited ticketing outlets in some areas.
- Paris: Traffic congestion is also significant, with noticeable delays during rush hour, even off-peak, and the presence of surcharges to avoid congestion. Restricted access zones and an integrated ticketing system that facilitates mobility are mentioned.
- Belgrade experiences significant traffic congestion, with traffic generally causing significant delays during rush hour. However, no significant congestion is reported outside of these periods.

Currently, there are no additional charges to prevent congestion in the city, such as daily fees or other traffic regulation mechanisms.

- Rome: Traffic congestion is reported to be very limited, with occasional slowdowns even during off-peak hours, suggesting lower congestion compared to Madrid and Paris. However, significant travel is reported in Rome, although specific congestion data is inconclusive.

- Lisbon: There is significant traffic congestion (traffic causes significant delays during both peak and off-peak hours). Lisbon ranks 20th in Europe and 44th in the world in the traffic congestion report. Traffic congestion and improper parking significantly slow down Lisbon's buses and trams.

- Nice and Marseille: Both cities experience significant congestion, causing significant delays during peak and off-peak hours, with additional fares and restricted access zones. The situation appears similar to Madrid and Paris in terms of severity.

- Vilnius: Traffic congestion is very limited, with only occasional slowdowns, even during off-peak hours, indicating a low level of congestion in this city.

- Valletta: Traffic congestion is also considered significant, with significant delays at various times and a significant presence of tolls and restricted areas.

- Almost all cities report significant traffic congestion, with significant delays during and off-peak hours. Several also implement congestion-reducing pricing and restricted-access zones.

General summary:

- Cities with significant congestion: Madrid, Paris, Belgrade, Nice, Marseille, Valletta.

- Cities with very limited or occasional congestion: Lisbon, Rome, and Vilnius. In these cases, slowdowns are occasional and less severe.

In conclusion, most of the surveyed cities face levels of traffic congestion that cause significant delays, especially during rush hour, and many implement measures such as tiered pricing and restricted zones to manage them. However, cities such as Lisbon, Vilnius and

Rome has much lower levels of congestion, with only occasional slowdowns.

The environmental impact of local transportation in the surveyed capital cities varies significantly by city, with some demonstrating concrete efforts to reduce emissions and improve air quality, while others have yet to report specific data.

- Madrid: Air quality has clearly improved, and control systems have been implemented to reduce particulate matter (PM10) and NO₂, with records of days exceeded in 2023 much lower than in previous years. Furthermore, transportation accounts for around 28% of greenhouse gas emissions, in line with European commitments. Madrid occasionally participates in policies to combat air pollution and has restricted access zones to reduce emissions in specific areas.

- Paris has occasionally developed policies related to air quality and emissions control. Although no specific measures are detailed in the survey, it is recognized that transportation influences NO₂ and PM10 levels, and measures are in place to reduce emissions and promote sustainable transportation.

- Belgrade: The environmental impact of transport in Belgrade is severe. Air quality is described as catastrophic, with high noise and vibration levels and extremely high emissions. These conditions have direct consequences for the health of residents. Some measures have been planned to reduce pollution, such as fees for trucks over 3.5 tons. However, union involvement in developing policies to combat urban air pollution is occasional and limited, with no significant awareness-raising campaigns on the issue.

- Rome: Emissions are reported to be in line with national values, and by 2024, transport (private and public) will account for 28% of greenhouse gas emissions, with an upward trend compared to 1990. The city has been selected for European climate projects and the fight against air pollution, although the regulatory authority does not specify whether it is actively involved in specific policies.

- Lisbon: Luggage storage service in Lisbon has emerged as an innovative solution to reduce traffic, especially in

Congested tourist areas, but there are indicators of great concern and impact on air quality, noise impact, and emissions. There are two traffic-related environmental protection zones, or low-emission zones, in Lisbon.

- Nice and Marseille: Both cities report that they have not provided specific data or are unresponsive regarding environmental impacts, but they show interest in occasional policies to reduce transport-related pollution and emissions.

- Vilnius and Valletta: Vilnius has much lower pollution levels, with significantly fewer days exceeding PM10 limits and no days exceeding NO2, indicating the low environmental impact of transport. Valletta, for its part, reports that emissions are in line with national values and that by 2024, transport will generate 28% of emissions, with actions being taken to reduce its carbon footprint.

Summary:

Overall, cities like Madrid, Lisbon, and Rome are making efforts to mitigate the impact of transport on the environment, implementing air quality controls, restricted zones, and promoting sustainable policies. Some cities still do not report specific data or do not actively consider this impact. The presence of measures such as particulate controls and emission levels in line with national or European standards indicates a commitment to reducing the environmental impact of local transport in many of the capitals surveyed.

Perceptions and participation in road safety in the surveyed capitals range from active participation to occasional or non-participation, reflecting different approaches and levels of commitment.

- Madrid: The survey does not provide specific information on the organization's involvement in developing road safety policies or awareness campaigns, so there is no concrete data on the state of road safety in this city.

- Paris: The organization occasionally participates in the development of road safety policies and awareness-raising campaigns, with limited participation in policy development and campaigns targeting safety.

- Belgrade: Road safety in Belgrade is managed by a local state authority, with no union involvement in policy development or awareness campaigns on the issue. This lack of participation limits workers' perspectives on safety decisions.

- Rome: Participation in road safety policies is occasional, both in the development of these policies and in awareness-raising campaigns, indicating a partial commitment. Authority for road safety control is shared between the state and other entities, and the city has developed restrictions and projects to improve safety.

- Lisbon: Participation in road safety policies is nonexistent, both in the development of these policies and in awareness-raising campaigns, indicating a partial commitment. The road safety control authority is not identified, but the regulations and their management are state-run.

- Valletta: The union participates in the development of road safety policies, promoting employer responsibility, awareness campaigns, and the integration of safety into the occupational health and safety strategy. Participation in the development of policies and campaigns is occasional, but it is active at the union level.

- Vilnius: Participation in road safety policy development and awareness campaigns is either unmet or absent, suggesting a perception of lower involvement in these areas.

Overall, road safety in these cities shows varying levels of commitment. Some, such as Paris and Valletta, show occasional, active participation in policies and campaigns, while others, such as Vilnius, do not report specific details. Active participation in policymaking and campaigns contributes to strengthening road safety and reducing accidents, and several cities recognize the need to continue strengthening these actions.

The social aspects of local public transport in the surveyed capitals reflect different approaches and levels of attention to social inclusion, work-life balance, and accessibility for disadvantaged groups.

- Madrid: Trade union organizations (UGT Madrid and CCOO Madrid) have raised issues related to social inclusion, work-life balance, and accessibility for vulnerable groups with the authorities, and have developed specific awareness-raising campaigns on these topics.

Results in the proposal approval process are variable, and collaboration with other stakeholders on these issues is specified.

- Paris: The CFDT IDF has contacted transport services to address issues of social inclusion, work-life balance, and accessibility, although they have not developed specific campaigns or concrete proposals. They have collaborated with organizations such as the Association for Disability and Fisheries, but there is no specific advisory body on mobility, although Ile de France Mobilités fulfills that institutional role.

- Belgrade: Regarding social aspects, there are significant challenges in terms of social inclusion, work-life balance, and accessibility for disadvantaged groups. Although public transport schedules are coordinated with workplaces and working hours, unions are not involved in this planning process.

- Rome: The contribution to the Urban Plan for Sustainable Mobility and other proposals demonstrates a concern for reducing social inequalities and the mobility of disadvantaged groups. However, no specific campaigns or collaboration with other stakeholders are reported. Participation in proposals and debates is occasional and unstructured.

- Lisbon: There is no union involvement in its oversight and design; the most considered aspects are: social inclusion and mobility accessibility for disadvantaged groups.

- Valletta: The GWU (Union of Workers' Unions) has urged the authorities to address these issues, but no details were provided regarding specific campaigns or proposals. Collaboration with other stakeholders is not clearly mentioned, and the proposals do not appear to have been widely approved.

- Vilnius: These issues have reportedly not been formally raised with the authorities, and there are no specific campaigns or proposals on the matter, which may indicate less attention paid to these social aspects in local public transport policy.

In summary, in all cities, although there are approaches and some participation in addressing social issues related to public transport, the levels of concrete actions, awareness campaigns, and collaboration vary and in many cases are limited or poorly specified. Concern for social inclusion, work-life balance, and

and accessibility remains an area for improvement in several of these capitals.

Labor relations in local public transport in the surveyed capitals vary in terms of regulations, unionization, and participation in collective bargaining.

- Madrid: Employment in the road transport sector is approximately 10,000, and legislation regulates wages, working hours, working conditions, and occupational safety through a national collective agreement. Collective bargaining at the company and regional levels results in agreements, although the available information does not specify union participation in these processes.

- Paris: The CFDT IDF union participates in labor negotiations, primarily regarding workers' rights and working conditions, within a legal framework based on laws and collective agreements. Legislation regulates various labor issues, and unions participate in negotiations at the company level and sometimes at the regional level, although in some cases their participation in transport negotiations is not clearly defined.

- Belgrade: Employment in the public transport sector in Belgrade is concentrated mainly in road transport (buses), which accounts for 92% of workers, while the tramway employs the remaining 8%. No employees are assigned to the metro (nonexistent) or river/sea transport. Labor relations are regulated by various laws, including the Decision on Public Ferry Service, the Decision on Free Transport, the Regulations of the Municipal Secretariat and Public Transport, the Road Safety Law, the Law on Passenger Transport on Public Roads, and Labor Law. Specific laws regulate wages, working hours, working conditions, and occupational health and safety.

- Rome: The legislation governing transport is Legislative Decree 66/2003, and there are specific laws regulating wages, working hours, safety, and health (e.g., the national collective agreement). Unions are present, and collective bargaining is conducted at the company level, with active participation in the negotiation of labor rights and working conditions.

- Lisbon: No specific employment values are defined in the sector. The Smart Lisbon project includes the implementation of electric buses and the

Metro expansion with automated lines. The goal, in addition to sustainability, seems to be to reduce the number of workers needed.

- Valletta: The law regulating transport is the Subsidiary Legislation 499.56 and other regulations, including laws on occupational health and working conditions. There is a presence of unions participating in negotiations and employee representation, although no details are provided regarding the extent of union coverage or participation in collective bargaining at the regional level.

- Vilnius: Current legislation is not clearly specified, but laws regulating wages and working conditions are indicated. Union density was not reported, and collective bargaining at the company level is carried out, although there are no specific details regarding union participation or bargaining at the regional level.

In summary, in all cities, labor relations are regulated by laws or collective agreements, and unionization exists to a greater or lesser extent. Collective bargaining at the company level is common, and in some cities also at the regional level, although the intensity and union participation vary. Legislation on working conditions, safety, and health clearly influences general labor relations in the local public transport sector.

Social dialogue in the capitals surveyed shows different levels of participation, interests, and outcomes, reflecting the specificities of each institutional and union context.

- Madrid: Local public transport is not considered a formally established topic of social dialogue, although aspects related to social inclusion, work-life balance, and accessibility have been raised, mainly through Councils and Technical Commissions. However, no specific results or institutionalized dialogue processes on these topics are reported.

- Paris: The CFDT IDF actively participates in social dialogue, addressing issues such as social inclusion, work-life balance, and accessibility, in collaboration with transport services and other social entities. They have established some collaborations with organizations such as disability associations, but there are no formal mechanisms or concrete results reported in the document, although they do participate in negotiations and consultations.

- Belgrade: Despite the existence of collective bargaining at both the company and regional/district levels, local public transport is not a topic of social dialogue in Belgrade. Unions do not negotiate on public transport improvements, but rather focus exclusively on the rights of workers in that sector. This situation limits workers' ability to influence the planning and development of the public transport system, despite their key role in its daily operation. The lack of a representative body to advise authorities on mobility issues exacerbates this disconnect between public policies and the real needs of workers and users.

- Rome: Participation in social dialogue is primarily linked to concrete proposals from trade unions to improve social mobility and reduce inequalities, through actions in the Urban Sustainable Mobility Plan and occasional consultations. Participation takes place through contributions to planning and proposals, but no formal dialogue structure or specific outcomes are described.

- Lisbon: The survey shows very low institutional participation in the union's social dialogue. There are some proposals on social issues for the most disadvantaged and against privatization, but given the low wages in the sector, this is one of the main priorities.

- Valletta: The trade union organization (GWU) has raised the importance of social dialogue on issues of mobility and labor rights with the authorities. However, specific outcomes and the existence of permanent bodies for dialogue are not recorded in the document, suggesting rather sporadic or limited interaction.

- Vilnius: No formal or structured participation of trade unions in social dialogue related to public transport has been detected. The absence of campaigns, proposals, or dialogue mechanisms indicates that this dimension is not yet fully developed in this city.

In conclusion, across the different capital cities, the level of social dialogue regarding public transport varies from the absence of a formal or implemented process in some cities (such as Belgrade, Lisbon, Vilnius, and Valletta) to active participation in policy definition and negotiations in others (such as Paris and Rome). In general, social dialogue is not always consolidated or institutionalized, and in some cases appears limited to ad hoc actions or specific approaches from trade union organizations, without major concrete results or permanent dialogue tables.

