

Urban nodes: Cooperation between cities and stakeholders of their Functional Urban Area (FUA)



Adopted by the EGUM Plenary on 10.12.2025

This document has been prepared by the Expert Group for Urban Mobility set up by Commission Decision C(2022) 5320 of 28.7.2022, register of Commission Expert Groups and Other Similar Entities, code number E03863. It reflects the views only of the authors, and the European Commission is not liable for any consequence stemming from the reuse of this document.

Register of Commission Expert Groups and Other Similar Entities, code number E03863

Table of Contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. Introduction	6
1.1. Goals and objectives of this report.....	6
1.2. Understanding the EU framework on mobility beyond city boundaries	6
1.2.1. Requirements for urban nodes along the TEN-T network.....	7
1.2.2. Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning.....	8
1.2.3. The concept of Functional Urban Area.....	8
2. Perspectives from Member States and their Local/Regional Authorities	9
2.1. Czech Republic	9
2.2. Belgium – Antwerp	9
2.3. Finland	10
2.4. France	10
2.4.1. Île-de-France Mobilités.....	11
2.5. Germany.....	12
2.6. Greece	13
2.7. Malta	14
2.8. Netherlands	14
2.8.1. The Hague, Rotterdam and Zoetermeer.....	14
2.8.2. Groningen–Assen	15
2.9. Poland	15
2.9.1. Katowice Metropolis (GZM).....	15
2.10. Portugal.....	15
2.11. Spain	16
2.11.1 Barcelona Metropolitan Area.....	16
2.12. Slovenia.....	17
2.13. Sweden	17
3. Perspective from Public transport authorities (including Public Transport Operators).....	18
3.1. European Metropolitan Transport Authorities (EMTA).....	18
3.2. International Association of Public Transport (UITP).....	18
4. Perspectives and Cooperation Needs of Associations and Private stakeholders.....	19
4.1. Micro-Mobility for Europe (MMfE)	19
4.2. Move EU.....	20
4.3. Alliance for Logistics Innovation through Collaboration in Europe - ALICE.....	20
4.4. ACEA – European Automobile Manufacturers’ Association	21

4.5. The Motorcycle Industry in Europe – (ACEM).....	21
4.6. The European Transport Workers' Federation.....	22
5. General conclusions.....	22
5.1. Mechanisms of Cooperation and Exchange within FUAs.....	22
5.2. Approaches to implementing FUAs.....	22
5.3. Organisational Arrangements for SUMP's at the FUA Level.....	23
5.4. Understanding FUAs Across Different Territorial Configurations.....	23
6. Annex.....	24
6.1 Participating organisations.....	24

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The EGUM sub-group on cooperation between cities and stakeholders of their Functional Urban Area (FUA) has gathered evidence showing that although urban nodes are vital for both passengers and freight, they rarely align with existing administrative borders. This creates the need for coordination mechanisms, which vary widely across Europe.

Observations and lessons learned

Diversity of approaches: Governance solutions differ according to the national framework. Some countries rely on legal metropolitan and intermunicipal authorities (e.g., Poland, Portugal) while others rely on voluntary partnerships (The Netherlands and Sweden), contractual agreements (Finland), or transport associations (Germany).

Functional Urban Areas are a relevant but complex scale: FUAs provide a meaningful perimeter for mobility planning, yet they do not necessarily coincide with existing jurisdictions. This can raise questions of representation, legitimacy, and implementation capacity.

Implementation challenges: The Eurostat definition is legally binding. The report clearly shows, through the various examples collected, the diversity of implementation of this definition in practice, which varies considerably from one country to another. Therefore, the real challenge is not to redefine FUAs but to manage them effectively in practice, ensuring coherent governance, data collection, and coordination across functional boundaries. FUAs are not static: they evolve as commuting patterns, housing dynamics, and infrastructure decisions change, which creates these challenges. For example, new train lines or motorways can shift functional boundaries, while older political or planning choices may exclude areas that would otherwise belong to an FUA.

Enabling factors matter more than boundaries: The effectiveness of cooperation depends less on formal delineations than on supportive mechanisms such as dedicated funding, national and regional guidance, technical assistance, and strong political leadership. Without these, plans risk remaining aspirational.

The role of data and monitoring: Systematic data collection and monitoring remain challenging, particularly for smaller municipalities. Initiatives such as Spain's big data methodology or Barcelona's mobility survey demonstrate the value of consistent monitoring tools.

Taken together, these experiences illustrate the variety and intricacy of current practices. They confirm that cooperation at the FUA level is both necessary and can be challenging depending on the Member State and local and regional situation. Success depends on combining flexible approaches with supportive frameworks. When urban nodes are situated in proximity to each other, new challenges for cooperation arise.

The subgroup's work therefore provides examples of how different governance traditions, institutional and geographical settings, and resources can influence the implementation of new obligations by TEN-T Urban nodes.

Several types of cooperation exist in the EU today:

A) Formal inter-municipal or metropolitan authorities

In **France**, the 2019 LOM law ensured that all territories are covered by Mobility Organising Authorities (AOMs). These intermunicipal entities coordinate local services and prepare mandatory Mobility Plans. In large regions, mobility contracts are signed between local AOMs and the region to ensure coherence. In **Poland**, the Katowice Metropolis (GZM) is a legally recognised metropolitan association comprising 41 municipalities with over 2 million inhabitants. It has a joint SUMP, but its effectiveness is hindered by fragmented competencies over roads and parking policy. Similarly, in Portugal, Metropolitan Areas and Intermunicipal Communities (NUTS III) have a legal responsibility for public transport and SUMPs, helping to align planning beyond municipal boundaries.

B) Voluntary or contractual agreements

In **Finland**, state-municipal “MAL agreements” (covering Land use, Housing, and Transport) have been in place since 2011, and now cover all seven urban nodes in Finland. These four-year agreements, co-signed by several ministries, are not legally binding but are politically robust. For example, they have supported tramway expansion in Helsinki and Tampere, coordinated with housing development. In **Sweden**, the “West Sweden Agreement” of 2009 pooled state, municipal, and regional funds, supplemented by congestion charges in Gothenburg and its surroundings, to finance major infrastructure and mobility measures. Similarly, in the **Netherlands**, Groningen–Assen has operated since 1996 as a voluntary partnership between two provinces and eight municipalities. This partnership has implemented over 100 projects, including P+R sites, cycling infrastructure, new stations, and high-quality public transport.

C) Transport associations and functional agencies

Germany provides strong examples in this area through its **Verkehrsverbünde**, transport associations that integrate fares, ticketing, and timetables across cities and regions. Kassel, for example, is part of the Northern Hesse Transport Association (NVV), aligning its SUMP with regional strategies. Hanover goes even further, with 1.2 million residents, has adopted a transport development plan (VEP 2035+) to reduce CO₂ emissions by 70% and double the share of public transport.

D) National frameworks for SUMPs

Some countries have introduced national legislation requiring SUMPs. In **Slovenia**, for example, the 2022 Transport Planning Act regulates SUMPs at the local, regional, and national levels and is obligatory for 12 city municipalities. These are supported by quality standards, mandatory indicators, and co-financing. **Greece**'s 2021 law requires SUMPs for all regions and municipalities with over 30,000 inhabitants, but implementation has been hindered by a lack of resources. **Spain** has developed a pioneering national methodology for implementing FUAs, using GIS and big data. The Climate Law requires all municipalities with over 50,000 inhabitants to prepare mobility plans. Yet in practice, overlapping competences, like in Barcelona, where municipal, metropolitan (AMB), and regional (ATM) plans coexist, illustrate the challenges of coordination.

E) Platforms without strong legal powers

In **Belgium (Flanders)**, 15 transport regions were created in 2019. These bring municipalities, the Region, and operators together on a voluntary basis. Antwerp's transport region, which covers 31 municipalities, has adopted a "Roadmap 2030." While initiatives like "Smart Ways to Antwerp" demonstrate success in employer-based mobility management and shared bike systems, the regions lack budgetary autonomy and must rely on consensus.

In short, the EGUM subgroup's work highlights that effective cooperation across FUAs is both a prerequisite and a challenge for urban nodes. While Europe already has a wide variety of practices, the key is to support them with the right incentives, technical guidance, and funding, while ensuring that TEN-T requirements strengthen local and regional governance rather than creating duplication.

1. Introduction

1.1. Goals and objectives of this report

This report provides an expert input paper to support national, regional, and local authorities, as well as the National SUMP Contact Points (NSCP), and to facilitate compliance with the requirements of the TEN-T Regulation^[1] for urban nodes. The report aims to identify existing good practices and approaches across the EU in the field of cooperation between cities and the surrounding region's stakeholders, particularly those in the Functional Urban Area (FUA).

The overarching goal is to strengthen the exchange of experiences and practices between Member States by providing an initial, non-exhaustive overview of how governance, collaborative mechanisms, planning, and the organisation of FUAs and urban nodes currently function in different national contexts.

The report will address the following key questions:

- What mechanisms and governance structures exist across Europe for cooperation within FUAs?
- What approaches are used to implement FUAs beyond city boundaries?
- How are SUMP prepared and implemented with a FUA approach?
- How are FUAs understood in different territorial configurations?

This report does not aim to define a theoretical ideal or to recommend specific measures. Instead, it aims to document how cooperation works in practice, to identify key success factors, and to extract insights from existing examples to inform further policy and implementation efforts. This work intends to deepen the understanding of planning and governance beyond city boundaries by showcasing how coordination functions locally across different European contexts.

It is important to emphasise that this is not a comprehensive survey, but rather an overview based on available information and input from the working group^[2].

1.2. Understanding the EU framework on mobility beyond city boundaries

Over the past decade, the TEN-T Regulation has played a pivotal role in deepening European integration by transforming a patchwork of national transport systems into a coherent, multimodal

network connecting all Member States, regions, and cities. The 2013 revision was a key turning point, formally recognising urban nodes as strategic hubs that enable the smooth flow of people and goods while reinforcing territorial cohesion.

Transport demand is growing, and the sector remains one of the fastest-growing sources of greenhouse gas emissions in Europe. Without coordinated action, the EU's climate neutrality targets and the ambitions of the European Green Deal are at risk. Urban nodes, where over 80% of transport activity occurs, are at the heart of this challenge. A forward-looking TEN-T policy is therefore not only a transport strategy, but also a cornerstone of Europe's climate and resilience agenda.

The COVID-19 pandemic also exposed vulnerabilities in Europe's logistics chains, prompting a shift towards the reindustrialisation and onshoring of key supply systems. This will lead to increased freight volumes and mobility flows, particularly in urban nodes, underlining the need for resilient, future-proof transport infrastructure capable of withstanding disruption while ensuring continuity and strategic autonomy.

In order to meet the goals of the EU Industrial Strategy and decouple economic growth from emissions, the transformation of the transport system must be accelerated. Urban nodes will be at the heart of this shift, acting as centres of innovation and industrial renewal, and as gateways for Europe's SMEs. The resulting employment growth from this transition will put pressure on urban mobility systems. Investment is even more critical. The strategic development of robust urban nodes, within a framework of smart growth and a polycentric spatial planning framework, could promote balanced regional development and significantly advance territorial decentralisation.

In this context, urban nodes must be placed at the core of the EU's transport vision. Providing sustainable, efficient, and crisis-resilient mobility in these areas is essential to achieving Europe's environmental, economic, and social goals and is no longer optional.

The TEN-T Regulation has been revised accordingly. It includes an extended list of urban nodes, and, for the first time, sets out new functional requirements for them.

1.2.1. Requirements for urban nodes along the TEN-T network

The 2023 revision of the TEN-T Regulation is an important milestone in the EU transport landscape. It reinforces the role of 431 urban nodes and requires closer cooperation with local authorities beyond city borders. Key obligations include adopting and monitoring Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP) by the end of 2027, and collecting and reporting Data on sustainability, safety, and accessibility by the end of 2027. Other obligations include developing multimodal passenger hubs to ensure access to active and public transport by 2030, with at least one recharging station, and establishing at least one multimodal freight terminal, where needed, by 2040. By July 2025, Member State were required to implement a national programme to support cities in sustainable urban mobility planning through so-called National SUMP Support Programmes (NSSPs) and to appoint National SUMP Contact Points (NSCP). The European Commission has launched a Coordination of the NSCPs Platform (NSCP Platform) to support Member States in the implementation of their NSSPs and the implementation of urban node requirements.

1.2.2. Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning

Regulation 2024/1679 states that each urban node must adopt a SUMP. This means a document for strategic mobility planning that aims to improve accessibility to and mobility within the functional urban area, including commuting zones in that urban area or in its vicinity, for people, businesses, and goods, with the aim of improving quality of life in particular. Guidelines for the content of a **SUMP are further defined in Annex V of the regulation.**

Unlike traditional planning approaches, SUMP emphasises citizens and stakeholders' involvement, policy coordination between sectors (especially transport, land use, environment, economic development, social policy, health, safety, and energy), and broad cooperation across different levels of government and with private actors. The concept also emphasises the need to integrate all aspects of mobility (for both people and goods), modes and services, and to plan at the relevant administration or cooperation level.

The SUMP definition and concept bring forward specific capacities that the institutional stakeholders in the FUA governance should be able to implement: including stakeholder dialogue, scenario-definition and appraisal, SUMP action plan definition, budgeting and financing SUMP actions, coordinated implementation of the SUMP action plan. Finally the evaluation of the SUMP process and implementation is essential.

1.2.3. The concept of Functional Urban Area

A functional urban area can be defined in four steps: 1) **Identify an urban centre:** a cluster of contiguous high-density grid cells (with at least 1,500 residents per square kilometre) that together have a total population of at least 50,000; 2) **Identify a city:** one or more local units that have at least 50% of their residents inside an urban centre; 3) **Identify a commuting zone:** a set of contiguous local units that have at least 15% of their employed residents working in the city; 4) A functional urban area is the combination of the city with its commuting zone.

Planning at the FUA level is essential to address mobility issues such as congestion, emissions, limited network capacity, and road safety. The FUA scale enables integrated SUMP, coordinated investments, and improved multimodal services across the commuting zone.

The TEN-T Regulation (2024/1679) recognises this approach, highlighting FUAs as critical for strengthening hinterland connections. Planning at this scale improves congestion and access management, supports intermodal connectivity and encourages a shift towards sustainable modes of transport, while ensuring that essential vehicle access is preserved. It also encourages compact development in peripheral towns around public transport nodes, ensuring balanced urban growth that is aligned with local mobility patterns.

2. Perspectives from Member States and their Local/Regional Authorities

2.1. Czech Republic

The Czech Republic has a highly fragmented settlement structure, with most of the population living in suburbs and small municipalities rather than in urban centres. There are ten urban nodes in the country. This fragmentation complicates cooperation across municipal boundaries and makes the active involvement of NUTS III regions essential. These regions already play an important role, for example, in planning for cyclists, but their role still needs to be strengthened in many other areas.

Also, the Integrated Territorial Investments (ITI) mechanism, initially designed to mobilise European funds, has stimulated strong cooperation between urban nodes and surrounding municipalities, particularly in public transport, proving its important role. However, the involvement of political leaders remains a crucial factor.

Regarding FUAs, they have no administrative status. NUTS III regions appear to be the most appropriate level for mobility planning, thanks to reliable and consistent statistical data. By contrast, municipal-level planning is often hampered by gaps and political sensitivities. Traditionally, the Czech approach is based on the gravity zones of cities, defined by commuting flows of workers and students. This is now complemented by analyses using mobile phone data, which make it possible to define metropolitan areas according to the intensity of contacts, the time spent in city centres, and suburbanisation dynamics. Finally, SUMP in the Czech Republic require, at a minimum, the involvement of all municipalities served by urban transport operators.

2.2. Belgium – Antwerp

The city of Antwerp, with a population of 550,000, lies at the heart of a wider transport region encompassing 31 municipalities and 1.2 million residents. Since 2019, Flanders has defined fifteen transport regions, each required to prepare a SUMP. These bodies serve as platforms for coordination between municipalities, the Flemish Region, and transport operators. They have no budget or decision-making power, so their recommendations depend entirely on voluntary cooperation.

In 2024, all municipalities endorsed a regional plan called “Roadmap 2030.” A project group coordinates major infrastructure projects, and a service centre has been set up to assist smaller municipalities lacking technical capacity. The Port of Antwerp retains its own governance over logistics but cooperates with the city on specific projects.

The “Smart Ways to Antwerp” initiative, launched in 2016, illustrates local success stories. It encourages employers to promote sustainable mobility among their staff. Gradually extended to the entire transport region, it now includes a shared bike system, digital tools, and awareness campaigns. This experience has shown that beyond planning, the main obstacles are local capacity gaps and the need to support behavioural change.

2.3. Finland

Finland has under six million inhabitants in total. About 55 % of inhabitants live in urban nodes and in the municipalities around them. In these regions there are altogether sixty-two municipalities of very different sizes, ranging from the Helsinki to small rural communities. This diversity makes it difficult to adopt common sustainable mobility objectives. However, Finland has a long tradition of regional transport system planning, which has made the definition of urban nodes straightforward, largely overlapping with regional public transport administrations.

The key legislative framework is the Act on Transport System Planning and Roads, which covers most of the themes of the TEN-T Regulation. The administrative structure is simple: the state manages national infrastructure, municipalities decide at the local level, and there is no regional authority with executive power in traffic infrastructure. Cooperation therefore, takes place between municipalities and the state, with regional public transport administrations playing an important role. An original mechanism strengthens this cooperation: four-year agreements between the state and municipalities covering land use, transport, and housing, co-signed by several ministries. Although not legally binding, these agreements are politically strong and ensure alignment of investments in mobility and urban development.

The system is robust, with sustainability already well integrated into planning. Successes include the expansion of tram networks in line with residential development. The challenges lie in financing, practical implementation, and political continuity, since each new government tends to leave its mark on priorities. The MAL agreements, possibly to be incorporated soon into law, will become mandatory for all seven urban nodes. While SUMP are not explicitly included in legislation, their principles are fully integrated into national transport planning. Definitions of FUAs do not always match local practices: Finland prefers to work with “greater urban areas,” which are considered more relevant in its national context.

2.4. France

Local Public Transport Authorities (AOM) – The building blocks of French mobility governance

In France, municipalities form the basis of local administration. Since the 1982 transport law, reforms such as MAPTAM (2014), NOTRe (2015), and LOM (2019) have strengthened intermunicipal cooperation. The LOM required that by July 2021, every intermunicipality either assume mobility governance or transfer it to the Region. As a result, the entire French territory is now covered by AOMs: 707 local and 16 regional.

Local AOMs vary by size and may take intermunicipal, syndicate, or specialized forms depending on specific mobility and territorial organization needs (as seen in Paris or Lyon). They hold exclusive authority to organise mobility services (regular, on-demand, school), support active/shared/inclusive mobility, run mobility stakeholder committees, and develop local mobility plans (PMDs). PMDs, equivalent to European SUMP, are mandatory for intermunicipalities above 100,000 inhabitants and can be integrated into broader urban plans (PLUi-D).

(2) Regional AOMs – Coordination across territories

Regions manage interurban mobility and act as local AOMs where intermunicipalities opt out. Within one region, regional and local AOMs may coexist. To coordinate, regions define “mobility basins” that cut across administrative borders, based on social and economic needs. For each basin, regions conclude operational mobility contracts with local actors, identifying diagnostics, key projects, and improvement measures.

(3) National-Level Governance

The State provides strategic direction (e.g., decarbonisation) and supports AOMs via its decentralised services. It reviews local PMDs, co-finances household mobility surveys (using CEREMA-certified methods) and offers technical support through CEREMA. For smaller rural AOMs, the *France Mobilité* initiative pools administrative, technical, and financial support.

(4) Challenges of the French model

The French mobility policy is highly decentralised. Local and regional AOMs design and operate transport systems, while the State plays a supporting and strategic role. This ensures local coherence but requires strong coordination mechanisms.

Approaches to put in practice FUAs or Similar Concepts in France

In France, AOM territorial jurisdictions determine legal authority over mobility, including taxation powers. Other statistical or functional definitions exist, but carry no governance mandate:

- **Urban Attraction Area (aire d’attraction urbaine):** municipalities where $\geq 15\%$ of workers commute to a central pole (close to OECD’s FUA definition).
- **Urban Area (aire urbaine):** urban center with $>10,000$ jobs plus the surrounding area where $\geq 40\%$ of workers commute within it.
- **Living Area (bassin de vie):** smallest unit where residents access essential services.
- **Mobility Basin (bassin de mobilité):** usage-based cooperation area between AOMs, defined regionally under LOM, with no standardized size or legal power.

These definitions are used for analysis but not for governance, which remains in the hands of AOMs. The FUA concept, therefore, has no operational role in France, where the AOM structure is the closest equivalent.

2.4.1. Île-de-France Mobilités

Île-de-France, with 12 million inhabitants, is Europe’s largest employment area. Île-de-France Mobilités (IdFM) is the sole public transport authority but does not have jurisdiction over roads and public space. Its governing board brings together the Region, Departments, the City of Paris, intermunicipalities, chambers of commerce and user associations.

The regional mobility plan (PDUIF), adopted in 2014, was revised to take account of institutional reforms, new legal requirements, technological and environmental challenges, and behavioural changes following the pandemic, particularly teleworking. The preparation of the new plan began in 2022 and relied on extensive consultation: workshops with 63 intermunicipalities, Departments and the State, as well as exchanges with innovation actors, freight operators, user associations and other stakeholders. After a formal consultation process that included public contributions and institutional opinions, a programme of 46 measures organised into 14 themes was drawn up. These address

alternatives to private car use, fairer sharing of road space, sustainable logistics, vehicle transition and behavioural change.

Part of the regional plan must be transposed into local mobility plans at intermunicipal level, with IdFM providing methodological support. This two-level approach ensures coherence between regional objectives and local implementation, while respecting territorial diversity. Formal approval of the new plan is expected soon.

2.5. Germany

Mobility planning is organised according to the principle of subsidiarity, reflecting the federal structure of the country. The **Länder** (federal states) are responsible for overall strategic planning, while **cities** and **Kreise** (districts) organise local services. Additionally, larger cities often, not always, are surrounded by regional associations or special-purpose associations that coordinate in some cases regional transport and infrastructure issues. If such planning authorities exist, they have extensive powers, but only in some areas, such as transport planning or the coordination of local transport, which strengthen regional cooperation between municipalities. Thus, the German system generates a wide diversity of approaches, planning documents, and governance arrangements, ranging from local and regional transport plans for public transport to broader sustainable urban mobility strategies (SUMPs). An increasing number of cities are adopting SUMPs, but their spread remains uneven depending on the region and the size of the municipality.

A distinctive feature of Germany is the importance of the **integrated transport associations (Verkehrsverbünde)**. These bodies often cover large territories comprising several cities and districts. They are central interfaces that enable regional networking in practice and often act as mediators between urban and regional interests. They integrate public transport networks, harmonise fares and timetables, and thereby facilitate daily mobility across administrative boundaries. Originating in the 1970s at the initiative of the Länder to organise regional services, they are today an indispensable tool for functional cooperation. Their size and competences, however, vary between federal states, which can complicate coherence at the national scale. The **City of Kassel**, the **administrative Union of Greater Kassel (ZRK)** and the **Northern Hesse Transport Association (NVV)** provide a telling example. Kassel aligns its local SUMP with regional strategies and cooperates through joint working groups and shared mobility surveys. This collaboration addresses daily mobility needs in a basin of one million inhabitants, well beyond the city's own boundaries.

The **Hanover Region** illustrates another form of **integrated governance**. It is a single authority encompassing around 1.2 million inhabitants. With enhanced competences, it adopted in 2023 a transport development plan (VEP 2035+) with very ambitious objectives: a 70% reduction in CO₂ emissions, a doubling of the share of public transport and cycling, and improvements in social equity and quality of life. A regional SUMP is currently in preparation, in line with the revised TEN-T Regulation requirements. The city of Hanover is considering integrating directly into the regional process rather than preparing its own plan. This approach would help ensure a common strategy and avoid duplication between levels, but the decision is still under discussion and will depend on clearer guidance and requirements from the national and Länder level. Beyond these examples, Germany faces a structural difficulty: the definition of the **Functional Urban Areas (FUAs)** as set out in the

Implementing Regulation does not correspond to real administrative responsibilities. This mismatch complicates joint planning between cities and regions and makes it difficult to establish a single framework for cooperation. In practice, cooperation is organised through Verbünde, administrative unions, or unique regions like Hanover.

Germany also counts a growing number of **SUMP**, supported by initiatives and funding from some of the Länder, the state and EU programmes. However, there is no national legal requirement, as in Slovenia or Spain. Institutional and political diversity therefore remains a challenge: some regions have strong metropolitan cooperation, while others have very limited arrangements.

In summary, the German experience shows that functional cooperation relies above all on the **Verkehrsverbünde**, which ensure effective integration of services, and on certain **regions with extended powers** (such as Hanover). The challenge remains to align these practices with European requirements for SUMP and FUAs, in a context where administrative and statistical boundaries do not coincide.

2.6. Greece

Greece adopted a **framework law in 2021**, making Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans mandatory for all regions, for municipalities with more than 30,000 inhabitants, and for municipalities located within the Athens and Thessaloniki metropolitan areas. A dedicated SUMP unit within the Hellenic Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport (MoIT) supervises their implementation of the elaborated SUMP meeting the requirements of the L.4784/2021.

A national funding programme (Green Fund) launched in 2016 helped cities begin developing their SUMPs, but regions, lacking specific funding, have been much slower to act. Four years after the law was published, no regional SUMP have yet been submitted to the Unit of MoIT. Of the 17 urban nodes identified in the TEN-T Regulation, only three already had SUMP before the European Regulation entered into force. Up to date, in total, five out of the 17 urban nodes have SUMP at municipality level, with two additional nodes having adopted them subsequently to the entry into force of the TEN-T regulation. However, in all five cases, the preparation of the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP) had already begun prior to the adoption of the Regulation. Importantly, these SUMP correspond to the administrative boundaries of the respective municipalities, not to those of the urban nodes, as the latter have not yet been formally defined.

In Athens and Thessaloniki, TEN-T infrastructures extend well beyond municipal borders, which justifies entrusting responsibility for SUMP to the Regions of Attica and Thessaloniki. In other cases, such as Patras, the port and rail station are within the city while the airport lies in another municipality underlying the preparation of a joint plan. The islands pose additional challenges, for example, when a port and airport fall under different municipal jurisdictions, as in the case of Crete, further to this seasonality is an additional parameter that needs to be taken into account in defining FUA.

Greek legislation encourages intermunicipal and regional cooperation: authorities must invite their neighbours to participate when preparing plans and take into account existing SUMP. Greece has also benefited from technical assistance provided by JASPERS, as well as from a national training programme in 2025 to strengthen the capacity of municipalities and regions. A forthcoming reform will formally designate, by ministerial decision, the local government bodies responsible for TEN-T urban nodes.

2.7. Malta

Malta, a small island state of 545,000 inhabitants, faces very high population density and tourism pressures, with around three million visitors per year. The country has one TEN-T urban node (Valletta) and one Mission City (Gozo), but the entire island is classified as one single functional urban area.

Mobility planning remains highly centralised. Existing SUMP s have been prepared by the national government, but efforts are underway to strengthen local ownership and implementation. A specific plan for Gozo is being developed as part of the Climate Neutrality Mission. Priorities include reducing dependence on private cars, promoting active mobility—especially through school programmes—and developing sustainable transport links for tourism.

Malta faces several challenges: limited financial and human resources at the municipal level, gaps between planning and implementation, and a lack of clarity about responsibilities for monitoring indicators. Infrastructure at the ports and airports, crucial for the country's future, requires significant investment. At the same time, pilot projects on mobility data are being conducted, and international partnerships are sought to improve technical skills and professional capacity.

2.8. Netherlands

The Netherlands is characterised by a polycentric system: rather than one dominant city, many interconnected urban areas form a dense urban network. The country has 26 TEN-T urban nodes, many located along key freight and passenger corridors. Planning is strongly integrated between national, provincial, and local levels.

Regional cooperation is well established, particularly in coordinating housing, transport, climate and spatial planning. The Amsterdam functional area, for example, covers two provinces. Likewise, The Hague, Rotterdam, and Zoetermeer operate as a single metropolitan system despite being formally distinct TEN-T nodes.

The application of the FUA approach is feasible but their political and administrative application is sensitive, as they do not always match existing jurisdictions. Dutch authorities, therefore favour a pragmatic approach, avoiding rigid legal obligations. Nevertheless, a strong tradition of cooperation provides a solid basis for regional SUMP s.

2.8.1. The Hague, Rotterdam and Zoetermeer

These three cities, located only 20 to 25 kilometres apart, share the same functional system. Rotterdam is characterised by its port and freight flows, The Hague by its role as the seat of government with heavy commuting flows, and Zoetermeer as a “new town.” All three pursue urban densification strategies supported by regional public transport. The economic significance of the Port of Rotterdam and associated logistics requires deep metropolitan cooperation. A pilot project is currently exploring the feasibility of a joint regional SUMP.

2.8.2. Groningen–Assen

Since 1996, the Groningen–Assen Region has operated as a voluntary partnership bringing together two provinces and eight municipalities. Over the years, around one hundred projects have been implemented, funded by a joint regional fund, particularly in park-and-ride facilities, cycling networks, high-quality public transport and new train stations. Decisions are prepared by a steering committee and then validated by local and regional councils. Each partner retains autonomy, but regional coordination ensures overall consistency and allows national priorities to be addressed collectively.

2.9. Poland

Poland has 30 TEN-T urban nodes, including the Katowice Metropolis (GZM) and the Tricity (Gdańsk–Gdynia–Sopot). The Ministry of Infrastructure coordinates national mobility policy and, in 2019, created a SUMP Steering Committee, a Competence Centre, and a national SUMP plenipotentiary.

Functional urban areas are defined within regional development strategies at NUTS 2 level. Intermunicipal cooperation takes several forms: metropolitan associations, such as GZM, created by law; agreements between municipalities designating a lead authority; or intermunicipal associations pooling certain competences. The ITI mechanism has further strengthened these cooperative arrangements.

The quality of SUMPs is assessed by formal evaluation template adopted by the national Steering Committee. Plans must cover the core city and its functionally connected municipalities, be adopted by a formal resolution, and demonstrate institutional cooperation. A SUMP with a positive evaluation is often a key condition for receiving European funds.

2.9.1. Katowice Metropolis (GZM)

The Katowice metropolitan area brings together 41 municipalities and more than two million inhabitants in a polycentric structure shaped by industrial development. Although it has adopted a SUMP, implementation is hampered by limited legal competencies. Road management is fragmented between many different authorities, and only a few cities have introduced paid parking zones despite the high use of cars. Funding authorities often check individual projects against SUMPs but do not always consider the systemic coherence of investments, which limits effectiveness.

2.10. Portugal

Portugal has a clear administrative structure. Intermunicipal Communities and Metropolitan Areas at NUTS III level bring municipalities together and have legal competencies for managing public services such as road-based public transport. These bodies are used as “greater urban areas” for planning, although they do not always coincide with FUAs.

Intermunicipal cooperation is a well-established practice, especially for projects of supramunicipal relevance. Intermunicipal Communities and Municipal Associations play a key role in preparing and implementing SUMPs, which must take into account daily mobility flows between core cities and their peripheries. Plans may be developed at the municipal level, but in such cases, close consultation with

neighbouring municipalities is required. At regional level, Metropolitan Areas ensure consistency across municipal plans and integration with national and international transport networks.

National guidelines stress the need for constant multi-level cooperation to guarantee consistency between local, regional and national policies, as well as with the main transport networks.

2.11. Spain

In Spain, mobility has traditionally been the responsibility of regional and local authorities, with the central state playing only a limited role. The revision of the TEN-T Regulation, which strengthens the role of urban nodes within long-distance transport networks, therefore marked an important shift. The national Ministry of Transport had to assume a coordinating function and work more proactively with regional and city authorities. To this end, it relied on the support of the European Investment Bank's JASPERS Advisory service and the consultancy TYPESA to develop a national methodology for defining Functional Urban Areas (FUAs).

This methodology, considered pioneering in Europe, is based on a five-step approach. First, urban nodes were defined, consisting of 49 Spanish cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants identified as TEN-T nodes. Second, "urban centres" were delineated using GIS tools and a density filter of 1,000 inhabitants per square kilometre, with a minimum of 50,000 residents. Third, these centres were aggregated with their corresponding TEN-T cities to provide a realistic base for mobility analysis. Fourth, national big data travel matrices were used to map daily mobility flows, applying thresholds of 20 percent of incoming and outgoing trips. Finally, the results were compared with other perimeters such as existing transport authorities' boundaries, FUAs, and one-hour isochrones, in order to refine the functional areas.

The exercise showed that in large metropolitan areas such as Madrid, functional zones extend far beyond municipal borders and align closely with FUAs. For medium-sized cities, the match is also strong. However, in smaller urban areas, the FUA often appeared oversized, reflecting more diffuse rural dynamics. The main challenge is therefore to integrate these mobility-based perimeters into an institutional and administrative framework capable of supporting governance and investment.

At the same time, Spain already has a strong legal framework: the national Climate Law requires all municipalities with more than 50,000 inhabitants to prepare Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (PMUS). These plans must progressively integrate the new requirements of the TEN-T Regulation, but municipalities with plans already completed will not be obliged to revise them immediately. The state's role is therefore to encourage and support local authorities rather than impose direct legal obligations, in line with Spain's constitutional framework.

2.11.1 Barcelona Metropolitan Area

The Metropolitan Area of Barcelona (AMB) illustrates the complexity of Spanish governance. The AMB is a public authority bringing together 36 municipalities, with competence for public transport planning and provision. It prepares a Metropolitan Urban Mobility Plan (PMMU), which coexists with the local plans of individual municipalities. At the same time, the Autoritat del Transport Metropolità (ATM), a separate transport planning body, covers a much wider area of about 300 municipalities and is responsible for regional mobility planning through its Master Mobility Plan (PDM).

As a result, there are three overlapping levels of planning—municipal, metropolitan, and regional—which must be coordinated. Barcelona metropolitan area, as a TEN-T urban node, must also comply with European requirements, but administrative and functional boundaries do not always coincide with those defined by the national methodology. This creates challenges for monitoring indicators and reporting, particularly for smaller municipalities with fewer than 100,000 inhabitants. The ATM nevertheless implements powerful tools, such as the annual Working Day Mobility Survey, which provides valuable data at the metropolitan and provincial levels. However, the data remain too aggregated to fully meet the detailed requirements of the new European regulation.

2.12. Slovenia

Slovenia does not use the concept of Functional Urban Areas for mobility planning. Since 2011, the country has gradually institutionalised SUMP, culminating in the adoption in 2022 of a national Transport Planning Act. This law regulates the preparation of plans at the local, regional, and national levels and is obligatory for 12 city municipalities. These plans are supported by quality standards and mandatory indicators as well as a national co-financing mechanism.

Today, about 180 municipalities have prepared first- or second-generation SUMP, and eleven regional plans are in progress. Slovenia provides financial support for their preparation and has published national guidelines adapted to the local context. Plans are based on administrative jurisdictions rather than on the FUA boundaries, ensuring that the authority responsible has the means to implement the measures.

The two Slovenian urban nodes listed in the TEN-T Regulation do not enjoy any special status. Relevant issues will be addressed either through local or regional SUMP, depending on competence for infrastructure and services.

2.13. Sweden

Sweden has 21 regions and 290 municipalities, with widely varying sizes ranging from Stockholm, with one million residents, to small rural municipalities of just a few thousand. Each level of government has an elected parliament. Three regions have a formal mandate to prepare regional plans, but all have responsibilities for regional development.

In practice, the implementation of FUA concept differs depending on the institution. Some classifications are based on commuting patterns, others on accessibility by car to large urban areas, broadly aligning with Eurostat's definitions but not always matching the designated TEN-T nodes. Cooperation is therefore often based on contractual agreements between the state, regions and cities/municipalities. An example is the 2009 West Sweden Agreement, which financed infrastructure and mobility measures through shared funding and congestion charges in Gothenburg and its surroundings. In Umeå, by contrast, low density and the absence of nearby cities make the application of standard definitions impractical, requiring a more flexible approach. Overall, Sweden advocates European flexibility, allowing Member States to adapt the scope and perimeters to their national realities.

3. Perspective from Public transport authorities (including Public Transport Operators)

3.1. European Metropolitan Transport Authorities (EMTA)

For the European Metropolitan Transport Authorities (EMTA), Public Transport Authorities (PTAs) play a central role in governing urban mobility. Their structures and mandates vary across Europe.

PTAs can take various forms: some operate as departments within larger metropolitan administrations, others are specialised organisations with regional reach, such as in Brussels or Greater London, while some are coalitions of municipalities that pool their transport responsibilities into a single entity. In certain contexts, PTAs are even mandated at the national level. Whether functioning as public authorities with elected boards or as publicly owned companies accountable to regional stakeholders, all EMTA members are metropolitan in nature, extending beyond the urban core to encompass entire city-regions or functional urban areas.

Originally, PTAs were established to coordinate private operators and ensure basic transport services. Their roles have since broadened to include service planning, contracting with operators, tariff integration, multimodal coordination, data management, and, in some cases, the development of cycling, walking, and wider road networks. They are increasingly taking on strategic roles in urban logistics, traffic management, tolling systems, and vehicle access regulation.

In urban nodes, EMTA maintains that PTAs are natural governance bodies because their territorial scope already aligns with, or even exceeds, functional urban areas. They facilitate multilevel governance by involving municipalities, private operators, employers, and civil society, making them particularly well-suited to manage polycentric urban regions with multiple centers. Their growing role in data integration positions them to support harmonised EU reporting, including on Urban Mobility Indicators.

For EMTA, **urban node governance should build on PTAs as existing, functional, and democratically legitimate structures rather than creating parallel institutions or definitions.** However, a challenge remains concerning their independence and authority. In some instances, PTAs are still subordinate to city or regional governments, which can limit their capacity to lead strategic planning. This underscores the need for governance innovation, with the Greater Vienna Transport Authority cited as a promising model that could evolve to include municipalities more directly in its governance.

The association also notes that while large metropolitan areas can sustain autonomous PTAs, smaller urban nodes may lack the capacity or budget to do so. In such cases, support from regional or national authorities is necessary, as demonstrated by the French Mobility Law, which enables regions to take on the role of transport organising authority when local capacities are insufficient.

3.2. International Association of Public Transport (UITP)

The International Association of Public Transport (UITP) echoes this view by emphasizing that mobility must be planned and delivered at the scale where it actually occurs, namely, the functional urban area.

Governance at this level requires both horizontal coordination among municipalities and vertical cooperation with national governments and infrastructure managers. There is no one-size-fits-all approach, but effective cooperation depends on certain prerequisites: a clear mandate at the FUA level, mechanisms such as agreements, contracts, or committees; financing portfolios that combine services, infrastructure, and access policies; and shared data governance with indicator dashboards aligned with European frameworks.

UITP also underscores **the complementary roles of PTAs and Public Transport Operators (PTOs)**. PTAs coordinate across municipalities, translate SUMP into coherent planning, integrate services and ticketing, manage investment portfolios, and act as data hubs. PTOs, meanwhile, implement strategies in daily operations by delivering reliable services, improving the passenger experience, deploying zero-emission fleets, managing hubs and logistics interfaces, and sharing operational data. Together, the PTA–PTO partnership establishes a performance loop that fosters continuous improvement.

Another challenge is financing. Urban nodes rarely have their own tax base and must depend on pooled resources from local, regional, national, and EU levels. According to UITP, the focus should not be on singular projects but on coordinated investment portfolios that maximize efficiency and impact.

4. Perspectives and Cooperation Needs of Associations and Private stakeholders

Across all stakeholders, a common message emerges: the effective implementation of the urban nodes article of the TEN-T Regulation requires governance and cooperation at the scale of functional urban areas. Whether in shared micro-mobility, ride-hailing, freight logistics, vehicle manufacturing or public transport, private actors highlight the need for predictable and inclusive planning frameworks that overcome fragmented municipal rules and embrace regional coordination. Infrastructure deployment must be accelerated and tailored to all modes, from light electric scooters and motorcycles to buses, trucks, and cars, with harmonised access policies to ensure efficiency and scale. Public–private partnerships at the metropolitan and regional level, already demonstrated in cities such as Madrid, Berlin, Zaragoza, and Barcelona, show that industry and authorities can jointly deliver innovative solutions for passengers and freight. At the same time, the resilience of urban mobility depends on social sustainability: addressing structural labour shortages and embedding social dialogue with workers in all planning and contracting processes.

4.1. Micro-Mobility for Europe (MMfE)

Shared micro-mobility services, like e-scooters and e-bikes, can play a key role in boosting connectivity within Functional Urban Areas (FUAs). These services could expand the reach of public transportation by offering flexible first- and last-mile options, helping residents access train or bus stations from suburban or peri-urban zones that lack good service from fixed-route transit.

When integrated into multimodal platforms or Mobility-as-a-Service (MaaS) systems, shared micro-mobility can enhance the functional organisation of travel within FUAs. It can fill service gaps in low-

density areas where traditional public transport is not economically viable, reduce dependence on private cars for short trips and thereby alleviate congestion on radial corridors into cities, and promote equitable access to employment, education, and leisure opportunities across the FUA.

Several European cities already use data from micro-mobility operators to plan multimodal hubs near public transport stations, improving travel reliability and coordination between modes. Shared micro-mobility, therefore, could complement existing FUA mechanisms by enhancing accessibility, connectivity, and environmental performance across the urban-suburban continuum.

4.2. Move EU

Ride-hailing platforms are becoming an integral part of urban mobility ecosystems and can help to manage passenger flows within Functional Urban Areas (FUAs). Their app-based systems efficiently match demand and supply across municipal boundaries, helping residents and commuters to travel seamlessly between city centres and surrounding municipalities. This flexibility is particularly valuable in areas where administrative fragmentation complicates traditional transport planning. Collaboration between local authorities and ride-hailing operators can provide solutions such as Madrid's "Uber Metropolitano" pilot, which offers flat-rate connections to metro and rail stations. This demonstrates how digital, on-demand services can complement public transport, improve access to the first and last miles of a journey, and reduce dependence on private cars. At the FUA scale, ride-hailing data can also support better planning by offering real-time insights into travel demand and congestion patterns.

However, in many Member States, local regulatory fragmentation prevents such cooperation from reaching its full potential. In several cities, operators must obtain separate licences for every municipality they serve, sometimes dozens within the same urban area, making it practically impossible to provide a seamless service across the functional territory. This patchwork of local rules contrasts with the integrated nature of mobility flows within FUAs and jeopardises the implementation of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP). To fully harness these benefits, cooperation frameworks between cities, regions, and digital mobility providers should be embedded in close cooperation with mobility providers during the SUMP preparation phase could contribute to processes, ensuring coherent, sustainable mobility across functional urban areas.

4.3. Alliance for Logistics Innovation through Collaboration in Europe - ALICE

ALICE is a European Technology Platform (ETP) recognised by the European Commission, bringing together over 200 industry, research, and public organisations to advance zero-emission, efficient, and resilient logistics and supply chains. Its Urban Logistics Thematic Group emphasises that urban nodes should strengthen **logistics collaboration** and integrate a **circular logistics** dimension, both within and between nodes, to facilitate goods flows, including those linking major European and global production and consumption areas.

Within **Functional Urban Areas**, collaboration is enabled through planning frameworks that integrate logistics needs (appropriate spaces, access rules, intermodality) and through strong connections to strategic infrastructure (airports, multimodal terminals, TEN-T networks). This ensures better

coordination between logistics, mobility, and urban planning, and seamless connectivity with European logistics chains.

Urban nodes should also rethink goods movement by incorporating circular-economy principles, encouraging repair, reuse, and resource efficiency within the city. This requires multifunctional spaces and cooperation between logistics operators, service providers, and local authorities.

The recommendations are structured around the **3 Cs**:

- **Collaboration**: creating shared logistics ecosystems enabling alignment and pooling of flows and resources.
- **Consolidation**: jointly optimising forward and reverse logistics flows, including repair and refurbishment activities, and strengthening connections with TEN-T networks.
- **Communication**: raising awareness among stakeholders, including citizens, on the impact of delivery choices (e.g., transparent CO₂ calculators, green delivery options).

4.4. ACEA – European Automobile Manufacturers' Association

ACEA represents Europe's 16 largest car, van, truck and bus manufacturers, a sector that employs over 12 million people and invests up to €62 billion annually in R&D. Its message is that a successful urban mobility transition must remain multimodal and user centric. Modern vehicles ranging from zero-emission buses and vans to increasingly clean passenger cars—remain critical to ensuring accessibility, logistics efficiency, and social inclusion. ACEA identifies several enabling conditions for urban nodes. Infrastructure deployment is essential: without sufficient recharging and refuelling points for both private and commercial vehicles, electrification will stall. Local access rules also need alignment across cities to avoid a patchwork of regulations that complicate operations and increase costs. Policymaking should be based on evidence and fair comparisons between modes, using improved data and consistent indicators. Urban nodes should not be seen as zones where cars and trucks are excluded, but as spaces where innovation in cleaner vehicles and logistics systems can support more liveable, efficient cities.

4.5. The Motorcycle Industry in Europe – (ACEM)

L-category vehicles (mopeds, motorcycles, tricycles and quadricycles) provide a range of small, light and specialised mobility and transport solutions, tailored to the urban and peri urban environment. Their inherent characteristics make them vehicles of choice easing congestion, reducing wear and tear of infrastructure and pressure on parking, as well as supporting carbon emissions reduction.

This applies especially within FUAs, in areas where public transport becomes less available due to lower network density or insufficient integration between networks. L-category vehicles allow for socially-inclusive, low/no-carbon passenger mobility towards the urban areas as well as within a multimodal approach, enabling connection with public transport networks. Within the FUAs, L-category vehicles also provide rightsized short-range and last mile delivery options, complementing logistical chains, including for public utility services. L-category vehicles, whether included in SUMP or as part of stakeholders' cooperation within FUAs, are an enabler of sustainable urban and peri urban mobility in the EU, in particular in urban nodes, within and around medium and big cities.

4.6. The European Transport Workers' Federation

Meaningful social dialogue between employers (PTOs), PTAs, and unions must be embedded into all aspects of urban mobility planning in FUAs, irrespective of administrative fragmentation. Cooperation between public authorities and meaningful consultation of workers is particularly important during the tendering and award of PSO contracts, so that issues relating to the public transport workforce can be proactively and constructively addressed.

Fragmentation between different public authorities and PTOs within FUAs can also lead to diverging employment conditions for workers employed in the same transport system. Meaningful social dialogue regarding digitalisation, automation, and the ecological transition is very important, and therefore the need to create adequate worker information and consultation structures that bridge administrative borders within FUAs.

5. General conclusions

5.1. Mechanisms of Cooperation and Exchange within FUAs

The examples gathered show a wide variety of mechanisms. In Poland, metropolitan areas like Katowice have metropolitan associations with a legal foundation, enabling structured coordination, although responsibilities remain limited and scattered among many authorities. In Spain, cooperation has been strengthened through the government's methodological efforts to define FUAs, supported by big-data mobility analysis, but institutional integration remains incomplete. In France, Mobility Organising Authorities (AOMs) offer a governance framework that covers the entire country, while in Germany, this role is often filled by transport associations (Verkehrsverbände), which support operational and fare integration across municipalities. Finland showcases another method with its MAL agreements between the government and municipalities, which, although not legally binding, have proven politically strong and have provided continuity over time. Antwerp and Gothenburg highlight the significance of voluntary regional agreements, which enable progress in fragmented contexts. A common finding is that cooperation functions best when there is a recognized leader whether a metropolitan authority, a transport association, or a region, who acts as a coordinator accepted by all partners.

5.2. Approaches to implementing FUAs

The definition of a FUA, as set out in the implementing regulation that combines city boundaries with commuting flows, is generally used as a starting point, but it does not always align with local realities. In Germany, for example, the classification of FUAs does not correspond to the competences of the Länder or transport associations, making planning difficult. Slovenia has chosen to rely exclusively on administrative jurisdictions, with a hierarchical system of national, regional, and local SUMP. Spain has applied national big-data travel matrices to refine functional delimitations, particularly in large metropolitan areas such as Madrid and Barcelona. Finland uses the concept of "greater urban areas," which is a bit broader area than the FUAs, which facilitates coordination with regional transport system planning. In Malta, the entire island is a single FUA, illustrating the specificity of small states. In Greece,

the definition of FUAs will likely be influenced by seasonality, as the country is a prominent tourist destination, especially the Greek islands defined as urban nodes. These examples confirm that there is no single method that can be applied across the board and that flexibility remains indispensable.

5.3. Organisational Arrangements for SUMP at the FUA Level

The preparation and implementation of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP) also reflect national traditions. In Greece, the 2021 SUMP law requires municipalities to cooperate and introduces the option of preparing joint plans. In France, SUMP (Plans des Mobilités) fall under the competencies of organising mobility authorities and can be embedded in “mobility basin” contracts defined by regions. In Slovenia, the adoption of a comprehensive transport law led to the generalisation of SUMP at the local level and their gradual extension to the regional level. In Poland, SUMP are validated by a national steering committee and assessed against a quality framework, ensuring alignment with EU funding. In Barcelona, a multi-level system involves municipal SUMP, a metropolitan mobility plan, and a regional plan led by ATM, illustrating both the richness and the complexity of such arrangements. These experiences show that a clear legal framework can provide a strong foundation, but voluntary agreements can also prove effective when supported by shared political momentum.

5.4. Understanding FUAs Across Different Territorial Configurations

Territorial configurations strongly influence the way FUAs are implemented. In polycentric regions such as the Netherlands, where Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and The Hague share strong mobility flows, regional cooperation traditions enable network-wide planning. In Katowice, the polycentric structure inherited from industrial development makes it more difficult to design uniform policies. In large metropolitan contexts, such as Athens or Paris, the role of the regions is crucial in order to integrate infrastructures and flows extending beyond city boundaries. In small or island states such as Malta, the FUA corresponds to the entire national territory, which makes the case unique.

Conclusions

The examples demonstrate that functional urban areas are relevant to planning dynamics, but they do not necessarily coincide with existing administrative or institutional boundaries. This tension between functional and administrative perspectives lies at the heart of the implementation challenges. National and local experiences show that the most durable solutions are built on a combination of voluntary cooperation, adapted legal frameworks, and shared political leadership. They also highlight persistent weaknesses: fragmented competencies, gaps between statistical definitions and operational areas, dependence on political cycles, limited capacity in some municipalities, and overlapping of governance. This overview does not seek to prescribe a single model but rather to reflect the reality of the diversity of urban nodes in Europe, where governance mechanisms must be adapted to territorial specificities and national traditions. The report thus offers insights into both progress made and persisting limitations, underlining the richness of practices and the complexity of situations encountered.

^[1] Regulation (EU) 2024/1679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network, amending Regulations (EU) 2021/1153 and (EU) No 913/2010 and repealing Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 (Text with EEA relevance)

^[2] Expert group on Urban Mobility (EGUM), subgroup “urban nodes”, 2025

^[3] [Commission Implementing Regulation \(EU\) 1130/2019](#)

6. Annex

6.1 Participating organisations

Expert group on urban mobility – subgroup 1

Urban nodes - Cooperation between cities and stakeholders of their Functional Urban Area (FUA)

Subgroup leaders

Ile de France Region
Germany

Cities & regions

City of Antwerp
Area Metropolitana de Barcelona (AMB)
City of Groningen
City of Stockholm
City of The Hague
Vitoria-Gasteiz

Member States

Austria
Czechia
Finland
France
Greece
Ireland
Lithuania
Malta
The Netherlands
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Slovenia
Sweden

Organisations

ACEA
ACEM
ALICE
CEMR
LEVA-EU
ECF
EIT Urban Mobility
EPTO
ETF
ETSC
Eurocities
IRU

MaaS Alliance

Micro-Mobility for Europe

Move EU

Polis

UITP

Observers

EIB-Jaspers