

Draft Agenda 3rd Pedestrians' Quality Needs MC 23-24 October – Valencia (Spain)

Venue:

Historic Building of the University of Valencia "La Nau"
Carrer Universitat, 2
Second floor – classrooms A & B
46003-Valencia

1. Welcome

2. Adoption of the agenda, minutes of the 3rd MC meeting

The SMG proposes the MC to accept the **minutes of the 2nd MC meeting¹** and thank Marjolein de Jong (IMOB, Belgium) for drawing them up.

This meetings' minutes will be made by Clemens Kaufman & Gudrun Haindl (FACTUM, Austria).

3. Status of the COST Action

3.1. General status of the Cost Action

New signatures since the 2nd MC meeting: Czech Republic. There are no formal indications regarding countries that plan to sign.

Mutations with respect to participation are:

- Poland: Magdalena Blaszczyk of the Department of Landscape Architecture from the Warsaw Agricultural University (SGGW) indicated to be interested in joining Working Group 2.
- Spain: Maria Anuncia Ocampo Sánchez from the Observatorio Nacional de seguridad Vial will join Working Group 1.
- Estonia: Tiit Metsvahi from the Tallinn University of Technology and also a member of the COST TD, indicated that he wants to join in the activities of the project. Delegation is to be decided first by the Estonian members of the group.

In August 2007 a meeting of the Senior Management Group in Zürich took place. The outcome of that meeting is reported in its **Senior Management Group Minutes**. The mentioned items will all be treated in this meeting.

3.2. News from the COST office

Carmencita Malimban sent us **News from the COST OFFICE**. In that paper it is worded that the implementation of the COST Grant System has been delayed. A financial report is given on pages 4 and 5. It shows clearly that we are on a tight budget and that careful planning is

¹ All yellow marked items are annexed.



essential: the budget for our action till May 2008 leaves only € 14,200. From this budget administration, communication costs and the cost for a preparatory meeting of the SMG have to be paid.

3.3. COST Mid-term evaluation

In mid September a COST Mid-term evaluation meeting took place. All COST Action Chairs had to deliver a progress report:

- the results of the action compared to the stated objectives
- to what extent do results reflect the (international) state-of-the-art
- what are the importance and benefits for the scientific community, stakeholders and the society? What are the 'value added' achieved by having the action organised within the COST framework?
- dissemination of results and conclusions
- involvement of junior (young) scientists
- strengths and weakness faced.

The chairs's **COST Mid-term evaluation report** is included in the MC meeting papers bundle.

The SMG proposes you to agree with the report and to indicate which items you missed, so that they can be included in the next report.

3.4. Working Group participation

Based on the individual participants' indications and his/her expertise and interest participants have been assigned to a Working Group and to specific tasks. Many participants have reacted; most of them agreed with their assignments, but some would like to see some changes. An update on the earlier assignment is made. A simple listing is provided in the **Working Group list-file**.

Working Group leaders have contacted you to ask you to prepare a short conceptual paper on this until our meeting in Valencia (October 23rd and 24th), so that we can discuss and co-ordinate contributions of all colleagues in the Working group in the frame of the group-discussions (first day, 11:15 – 13:30 and 14:45 to 17:45). To set your mind at rest: we do not need any paper beforehand, just think about what your "product" could look like." In this context perhaps it is useful to repeat what is expected of you with respect to the assigned tasks / key research questions:

1. **inventory:** find out what is already known, researched, published, documented with regard to your assignment.
2. **deduct what gaps** need to be filled and give feedback on this to the WG leader
3. make a **short research plan:** context, arguments, what methods will be used to answer the research question that is one's responsibility, when will what be ready, what results can be expected, who will be involved. As help a simple template for this will be offered.
4. **discuss the plan** with the WG leader and adapt it if necessary
5. **implementation:** do the research or arrange for the research work to be done
6. **reporting: present progress** at the WG meetings and **write a paper** / chapter for the WG report on the objective (research question), used methods, results and conclusion/discussion statements
7. if needed, rewrite the **chapter** for the **handbook**.

The idea is that participants are assigned to one WG only. In that Working Group debate can take place and tasks can be divided and allotted to others. So, their function is co-ordination of input and output on a specific issue and debate in more general terms. This does not



mean that one cannot be involved in the subjects of just one Working Group; it only means that one cannot join the discussions in the group, but one can always contribute, review and give feedback on reported results through other participants. In most cases that can be someone from the same country.

Membership of Working Group 4 is different. In the 2nd Management Group Meeting it was agreed, because complexity and workability, that the participation of Working Group 3 and 4 was invitation only. PQN Participants were given the opportunity to express their interest in these special tasks. As Chair and Working Group leader I have not yet decided how we must proceed. Since WG 4 needs input from the other WG's, we gave priority to setting them up first. With regard to WG 4 three things count:

- The participants must be clearly focussed on integration and coherence of *all* relevant factors, including human factors, social context and the transportation system and exceptionally competent and experienced in these matters
- The Working Group leader must have the feeling that the participants in the groups can work together effectively and efficiently. We do have only limited time for the work and it needs to be prevented that time is wasted on foreseeable inter-personal matters.
- Practical and budgetary are also important: money is scarce and additional meetings cost extra money that currently is not available, since we have so many non-MC participants in working groups. This means that I will form the smallest possible unit around the circle of the senior management committee.

WG 4 meetings will not be parallel to the other meetings, but before or after the MC meeting. Thus, contrary to other Working Groups, its members can join other Working Groups and in fact most of them will.

The Senior Management Group proposes you to agree with this structure.

3.5. National Committees of support

In some countries National Committees of support have been established. Can you inform the meeting of developments in your country?

An indicative report from the **Dutch National Committee** is annexed.

4. General Planning

In the reference paper for this project, the Technical Annex of the PQN Memory of Understanding, apart from the Kick-off meeting 2 Workshops (3rd quarter of 2008, 3rd quarter of 2009) and a final conference are planned (3rd quarter 2010)². The Work Plan that was presented at the Kick-off a more detailed insight in activities was given, but a detailed planning of MC meetings and Working Group meetings could not yet be included. In the presentations of the Working Group leaders the following internal workshops were agreed:

² see MoU page 18.

Date:	Place:	Subject:
28-29 March 2007	Wuppertal	Setup of conceptual and organisational structure
23-24 October 2007	Valencia	Discussion on results of data & information accumulation
10-11 April 2008	London	Analysis of available data & information; decision on additional research
13-14 November 2008	Lisbon	
9-10 April 2009?	Lund	
mid June 09	- open -	Reporting on findings
End of October 2010	Amsterdam or The Hague	Dissemination of findings

Intermediary meetings of the MC will be most probably be needed in spring 2008, spring 2009 and spring 2010 to evaluate progress made and to decide on administrative matters. Thus there is need for two MC meetings per year.

Although at the moment no definite statements with regard to the meeting needs of the Working Groups can be made, it can be assumed that at least the same frequency would be desirable. Since most of the Working Groups members will be MC members as well, it will be most efficient and cost effective to hold Working Group meetings directly before or after the MC meetings.

Possibly some addition information of the organisation of the venues in London, Lisbon and Lund can be provided by respectively Jim Walker, Mario Alves and Åse Svensson.

The SMG proposes you to agree with the planning of meetings of the PQN project.

5. Budget Plan October 2007 – December 2008

In the 2nd MC of March 2007 the first Budget Plan for the period 1 May 2007 to 30 April 2008 was agreed on. However, the effectuation of the COST Grant system has been postponed; a new starting date is not fixed. This is not due to problems at the NL ministry side, but at the Brussels side. When asked for the transfer date we were asked to be patient.

In May the COST office asked to send in an updated **Budget for the period May 2007 – December 2008**, so that the 2008 financial year was fully included. The chair made up and sent in this Budget plan, warning the COST office that this plan was not and authorised by the Management agreed by the Management Committee. The updated draft is annexed.

The Senior Management Group proposes you to agree with the (updated) Budget and Activities Plan.

The postponement of the introduction of the COST Grant system has severe implication for the setup of our project. The essential tasks of exchange of information and dissemination are based on adequate website facilities and co-ordination of communications. Under the COST Grant system the Action we can have the needed freedom to allocate budget; we will be responsible for our own administration. As mentioned before (Agenda 2nd MC) a maximum of 15% can be allocated for administrative matters. It was agreed that this money should be spent on managing the PQN (www.walkeurope.org) website, coordination of the project communication and dissemination. The development of the website has been funded by the Dutch Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management. In our Work Plan



€ 16,000 was allocated for website management, coordination of the project communication and dissemination for the period May 2007 – April 2008. The current available budget is lower than that: € 14,200, but € 2,000 has already been paid for website and administrative costs to Walk21.

Particularly for WALK21 the delay forms a serious problem, because the payment of concerned employees depends on the working of the system. Since the Grant system is not effectuated, the old COST system applies, meaning that only € 2,000 was available for website costs, including the postage costs (€ 236) of sending a large package PQN leaflets to Wuppertal. This does not cover their costs. At the moment there is no certainty when the Grant System will be effectuated; The Access Company was forced to let our webmaster Catherine Rawas go. Jim Walker kept things running as good as possible in his own time.

At the COST Mid-term evaluation this issue has been raised. At the meeting the outcome can be reported.

6. Multiple year Budget Plan 2007 – 2010: Brainstorming

The draft Work Plan, as presented during the Kick-off meeting, outlines the activities within the framework of the project. You are invited to evaluate the Work Plan and to indicate which activities and financial consequences should be included in a multiple year Budget Plan and more concretely the 2nd Budget Plan, for the period of May 2008 – April 2009.

Because of uncertainties regarding the budgeting and because the distribution over the WG's and WG Work Plans have not yet been completed, a detailed proposal could not yet be worked out later by the SMG and submitted to the MC at the meeting in London.

WORKING GROUP CONTENT MEETINGS

Country Reports evaluation

Shalom Hakkert and David Zaidel will present the results of the country reports review.

Parallel sessions of the Working Groups

The Working Groups 1, 2 and 3 will have separate sessions; Working Group 4 will not yet meet, since that Working Groups needs input of the other 3 WG's. Because the composition of WG 4 could not be completed before this meeting, co-ordination activities for the time being have been taken up by the Senior Management Group. The WG sessions will be introduced by the Working Group leaders. The distribution over the 4 Working Groups is represented in the Working Groups list file.

You are asked to attend the meeting of the Working Group you either are assigned to or want to change to.

Data availability Questionnaire

Daniel Sauter will report on the results of the data availability survey and the results of discussion on the issue at the WALK21 Conference in Toronto on October 1st 2007.

Web-demonstration

Our website www.walkeurope.org has some very sophisticated features. Jim Walker will show you what they are and how you can use them to your benefit.



Suprise

Of course, a surprise will be kept a surprise. Hector Monterde took great effort to organise niceties and we hope that this will help improving relations.

Second part of the MC meeting**7. Homework**

It is to be expected that the following homework will be needed:

- Search for additional funding
- Search for additional support for the project both on the national level (additional research, students involvement, dissemination options) and the PQN project as a whole (administrative work, dissemination costs, promotion of the project)
- Establishment of national PQN committees or platforms
- To gather additional information for a Country Report
- Ongoing: To collect and compile abstracts from new research on the national level on the pedestrian issue.

8. Miscellaneous**8.1. Reviewers**

At the MC meeting in Wuppertal suggestions were given for possible reviewers of our project results. The idea was that there should be a good geographical, discipline and gender spread. At the meeting progress on this subject will be reported.

8.2. Declaration forms

- At the meeting there will be an Attendance list: please sign.
- please complete the reimbursement declaration form; we need the forms at the closing of the MC meeting, so that we can take care that the reimbursement will take place within some weeks.

8.3. Draft outline of the handbook

A first **draft Outline for the Handbook** is available for discussion; please 'digest' the proposal and think about possible improvements in the structure.

8.4. Additional financing

Aslak Fyhri from TOI-Norway suggested to check the EC 7th Framework program for potential funding opportunities. Ralf Risser can probably tell us more about its potentials.



8.5. Related PhD postings

In the UK Miles Tight informed us on the application for a PhD studentship funded by the UK Economic and Social research Council. The application on 'Why Walk?' was successful (congratulations Miles!) and the work will start in October this year. Probably Miles can give additional information.

8.6. Walk21 conference in Toronto 1-3 October 2007

At the Walk21 conference the PQN project was introduced in two items: Daniel Sauter's pre-conference workshop on Measuring Walking and **Rob Methorst's presentation** of the progress of the project. Furthermore an article on Shared Space by Rob Methorst, Jürgen Gerlach, Dirk Boenke and Jens Leven was sent in to the conference. The article will be posted on our website. The conference proceedings will be posted on the WALK21 website.

8.7. ICTCT Workshop in Valencia 25-26 October 2007

At the meeting a short prelude of the ICTCT workshop will be given.

8.8. Ministry reorganisation in NL: per 1-10-2007 AVV becomes DVS

AVV Transport Research Centre will merge with another ministerial organisation. The new name is DVS Centre for Transport and Navigation. Rob Methorst works in the Safety Section. The offices will be moved to Van den Burghweg 1 – 2228 CS Delft. Rob's e-mail address will not change; the new telephone number is not yet known. His position within the organisation is approximately the same, but the organisation tasks will change. DVS is meant to be the internal consultant for the national road and waterways authority, which deals only with the national networks, and is an agency at some distance of the Ministry. As a secondary task DVS supports policy development by the policy department of the ministry. Pedestrian issues can still be an element in policy advise to the policy department, but within the DVS centre it does not have a priority position.

9. Closing

The meeting will be closed on 24 October 2008, 13:00 latest.

Rotterdam, 10 October 2007 / RM



Decisions list 2nd MC meeting

Nr.	Issue	Votes	Actor
2007-22	Agreement Minutes 2 nd MC meeting		
2007-23	Agreement on Mid-term evaluations report		
2007-24	Agreement on research question co-ordinator task and WG 4 preconditions		
2007-25	Agreement on planning of PQN meetings		
2007-26	Agreement on the Budget and Activities plans May 2007 – December 2008		
2007-27	Agreement on Chairs PQN mid-term evaluation report		
2007-28	Agreement on distribution over working groups and tasks within the WG's		
2007-29			
2007-30			
2007-31			
2007-32			
2007-33			
2007-34			
2007-35			
2007-36			
2007-37			