

Minutes of the 3rd COST Action 358 "Pedestrians' Quality Needs" MC 23-24 October – Valencia (Spain)

23th October 2007

Venue:

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

Participants:

Mario Alves	Michael Meschik
Dago Antov	Rob Methorst
Socrates Basbas	Tiit Metsvahi
Dragana Bazik	Hector Monterde i Bort
Magdalena Blasczyk	Ana Rita Moreira
Enrique Cabello Pardos	Diego Moreno Ribas
Cristina Conde Vilda	Nicole Muhlrاد
Olaf Czogalla	Hans Orru
Marjolein de Jong	Panagiotis Papaioannou
Aslak Fyhri	Chiara Pepe
Anne Katrine Geelmuyden	Manuel Ramos
Thierry Goger	Ralf Risser
Gudrun Haindl	Fermina Sánchez Martín
Philippe Hanocq	Daniel Sauter
Tineke Hof	Karel Schmeidler
Willy Hüsler	Angel Serrano Sanchez de Leon
Christer Hydén	Zuzana Simonova
Galit Jerusalmy	Thérèse Steenberghen
Clemens Kaufman	Jelena Stojanovic
Marketta Kyttä	Alf Støle
Sonia Lavadinho	Miles Tight
Lars Leden	Richard Van der Horst
Jacek Malasek	Milena Vukmirovic
Isaac Martin de Diego	Jim Walker
Lucia Martincigh	David Zaidel

Greetings from Jürgen Gerlach, Shalom Hakkert and Dominique von der Mühl

All presentations held during the meeting will be put on the PQN homepage (www.walkeurope.org)



1. Welcome

Jim Walker and Hector Monterde i Bort welcome everybody; Hector explains the time schedule and the evening program as well as the program for the second day.

Jim summarises the progress of the COST Action so far and mentioned especially the Country reports. He reminds that the aim of the PQN project is to identify gaps in research and write them down.

Jim announces the next meeting which will take place on 10th-11th April 2008 in London (remember: WALK21-Conference).

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

Jim thanks Marjolein for writing the minutes of the Wuppertal meeting. There's no need for an adaptation of the minutes of the Wuppertal meeting.

MC accepts the minutes of the 2nd MC meeting

No adaptation of the Agenda needed.

MC agrees on the Agenda

The travel reimbursement forms will be collected by Rob and 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 (already indicated at the PQN-website):

- Poland: Magdalena Blaszczyk of the Department of Landscape Architecture from the Warsaw Agricultureal University (SGGW) indicated to be interested in joining Working Group 2.
- Spain: Maria Anuncia Ocampo Sánchez form 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.

Any change with regard to the participation of the PQN project should be announced to Jim and Rob in order to be changed on the Homepage

Changes of the participants between the working groups will be done during this meeting.

In August 2007 a meeting of the Senior Management Group in Zürich took place. The outcome of that meeting was 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 has sent news from the COST OFFICE (distributed via e-mail). 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 essential: the budget for our action till May 2008 leaves only € 14,200. From this budget administration, dissemination costs and the cost for a preparatory meeting of the SMG (and a Working group 4 meeting: see under 3.4. and on page 10) have to be paid. As the change of the Grant System is delayed also the distribution of the money will be delayed. The final change to the Grant System will be done in November but no exact date was published.

3.3. COST Mid-term evaluation

Rob reported about the progress of the COST action 358 to the COST office in mid September at the COST Mid-term evaluation meeting. All COST Action chairs had to deliver a progress report there yearly. The report was well received. The following main points were reported:

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

Comment from Willy Hüsler (rapporteur): Progress of the COST action is very positive and the management group is doing a good job. The preconditions have been set; the working process should start right now.

No further comment on the COST Mid-term report; the MC accepts the Chair's 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 (Working Group list-file) was send via to the participants.

Working Group leaders have contacted to ask prepare a short conceptual paper on this until our meeting in Valencia, so that contributions of all colleagues can be discussed and co-ordinated in the frame of the Working groups. In this context of the conceptual paper should tackle the following points:

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 was 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 can only be involved in the subjects of just one Working Group; it only means that one cannot join the actual 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 Rob has not yet decided how to proceed. Since WG 4 needs input from the other WG's, the priority is to set 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 matters 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 Management Committee agrees on the working group members' tasks and structure.

3.5. National Committees of support

In some countries (voluntary) National Committees of support have been established. Rob gives an example about the Dutch national committee.

Intentions were collected from Portugal, Switzerland (more for the actual implementation not for the research), Czech Republic (in the frame of the establishment of a regional master plan for walking) and Spain (national committee, Universities are involved).

Marjolein stated that the national committees should also be possible on a regional level, which was agreed.

Summaries of the progress should be send to Jim and Rob in order to be presented at the next meeting.



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)¹. In 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:

<i>Date:</i>	<i>Place:</i>	<i>Subject:</i>
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	(has to be transferred to other site)
mid June 09	- open -	Reporting on findings
End of October 2010	Amsterdam or The Hague	Dissemination of findings

The mid June 2009 meeting might be postponed due to the fact that a meeting will be held already in April 2009. Karel suggested Brno, Czech Republic for this meeting. Intermediary meetings of the MC will be most probably be needed in spring 2008, spring 2009 and spring 2010 in order to evaluate the progress made and to decide on administrative matters. Thus there is a 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 can be provided by Jim Walker and Mario Alves.

No further comments on the general planning; the MC agrees on the presented planning.

5. Budget Plan October 2007 – December 2008

In the 2nd MC of March 2007 the first Budget Plan for the period May 1st 2007 to April 30th 2008 was agreed upon. However, the implementation 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 asking 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.

No further comments on the (updated) Budget and Activities Plan; the updated plan including separate WG4 meetings is accepted by the MC.

¹ see MoU page 18.

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 remaining money does in no way cover their (WALK21's) 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 keeps things running as good as possible, without the appropriate funding.

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. The participants were 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 by the SMG and submitted to the MC.

At this point, as there was enough time, it was agreed to continue with point 8 of the agenda.

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.

Lucia asked which disciplines had been proposed. More experts for design and architecture issues should be included (Charter of pedestrian) as reviewers and not always traffic engineers.

Rob stated that four names have been collected so far which fulfil the preconditions of four 4 variables (regions, gender, discipline). These persons have to be contacted first.



8.2. Declaration forms

An attendance list was signed by all participants and the reimbursement declaration forms were collected by Rob.

8.3. Draft outline of the handbook

Jim presented a first draft Outline for the Handbook which was circulated via e-mail. This should be a discussion paper and comments are welcomed to Rob (per e-mail).

The main content of the outline for the handbook includes:

- theoretical part
- practical part (results)
- how implementation could be reached

The handbook should address different groups of audience like planners and end users.

No comments so far. Comments should be send via e-mail to Rob.

8.4. Additional financing

Aslak Fyhri from TOI-Norway suggested to check the EC 7th Framework program for potential funding opportunities. Lucia reported that she is preparing a proposal "How to do urban design in a sustainable way" and reminded that "Sustainability" will be important for the next calls.

INTERREG projects could be another possibility in order to allocate additional funding.

8.5. Related PhD postings

Miles Tight informs 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. Miles reports that normally no funds are allocated for such issues. Now a PhD student is financed for a three years and will write about "Barriers of walking".

Socrates reports that in Greece a PhD thesis will be written on pedestrian quality needs because of this COST-action.

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 submitted to the conference. This, the conference proceedings as well as a conclusion will be put on the WALK21 website.

Jim reports about a project in order to develop a "Pedestrian master class". He was invited by the UN to a conference in Copenhagen 2009 on climate change. At the conference eight cities in North America, Asia and European should present their master plans (24 cities in total). Jim is searching for cities which want to co-operate within this project (London, Barcelona and Copenhagen are already an option).

8.7. ICTCT Workshop in Valencia 25-26 October 2007

Ralf and Christer inform the participants about the 20th ICTCT workshop on "Towards future traffic safety research- Tendencies in Traffic Safety Research based on 20 years of experience". A two days workshop will be held on 25/26 October at the Valencia City of



Science and Arts. It is the 20th anniversary of ICTCT workshops and the 30th anniversary of ICTCT as a group of researchers dealing with traffic conflict technique. Gerry Wilde and Truls Vaa will be the key note speakers. The next workshops will be held in Melbourne, Australia, in April 2008 and Riga, Latvia, October 2008.

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

AVV Transport Research Centre will merge with another ministerial organisation and 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 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.

Rob will send an e-mail about any possible changes

Rob: Presentation should please send to Rob and tell me where presented in order to inform the COST Office and other interested parties.

Country Reports

David presents the first results from the analyses of the country report.

The presentation will be put on the website.

WORKING GROUP CONTENT MEETINGS

Parallel sessions of the Working Groups

The Working Groups 1, 2 and 3 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.

Participants meet in small groups according to what WG they wanted to join (meeting to finish 17:45).



24th October 2007

Same venue as 23rd of October.

Jim welcomes everybody and introduces the program of the second day:

- 20 minutes feedback of working groups leaders about the small group work
- Presentation of the homepage by Jim
- Presentation about the first results from the data availability questionnaire by Daniel
- Final points and last minutes issues as well as homework by Jim

Feedback from WG1 (Hector)

Problem/task	Question	Agreement/solution
Convenience of belonging to only one group	is it necessary? in case of yes those of us in more than WG please decide	solved
How to work now	a) organiser model (national team or individually?) b) short conceptual papers prepared by responsible partners	national teams
Function of general meeting	new type of agenda?	No changes
Difference between functional and perceived needs (Jacek)	Discussion to clarify and limiting	Not clear (clarification will be a consequence of gathering information in the future)
Enlargement of perspective how to walk easier or how to make walking more attractive	Should we include the 2 nd topic with same importance?	Has to be an objective
Need of clarify and distinguish among some related specific tasks in the list of research question	Differentiate between C & E and between 3 levels in H & J	No agreement on Chiara's suggestion: task-leader will decide based on these suggestions
Is the index proposed in the outline handbook ok	Discussion and if needed to make a new one	Send proposal to WG 3 leader
On which document we should base our work list of research questions or points in the handbook index	Discussion about advantages and disadvantages: (not all tasks have a responsible person)	List of research question
If list of tasks: What to do with the tasks without people assigned	Look for a practical solution	WG-leader will ask again

Jacek stated that sustainability is important as well as that you have to convince people that walking IS a transport mode. In order to increase the percentage of pedestrians accessibility and usability have to be made easier.

Chiara stated that there is no difference between the questions C & E. To summarise these question into one question would be one possibility.

Hector presents a list of tasks and who is assigned to each of them (will be sent to all participants). Task leader and team will decide about the final distribution of work.



Feedback from WG2 (Ralf)

Questions:

- Response or promises for response for almost all questions
- Many overlapping topics
- Questions could be reformulated so that they fit better with the topic

Marjolein will send out recommendation for reformulations of the questions.

Next steps:

- Collections of inputs and concepts to the questions till December 2007
- Structuring of inputs
- Send out to all members of the working group
- Working group members can compare the inputs to the different topics and see if they are overlapping
- First feedback round: Collecting feedback till February 2007
- Presentation at the next PQN meeting in London April 2008
- Second feedback round: Feedback on the more detailed input to the topics

Input to the Handbook:

Part 2 Sectorial findings Chapter 3 "Perceived needs (WG2)". Subtitles will be amended to our work in workgroup 2

No comments on Ralf's presentation. Next steps will be done according to the discussion within the workgroup

Feedback from WG3 (Daniel)

Building the concepts based on discussion in Wuppertal: Develop a vision "What is the ideal future and the necessary intervention to reach it?". The following questions were raised:

- How do we rate trends and visions?
- What is a "vision"? Should be reachable, one vision or more
- Local vision vs. global vision
- Side effects? → too many people walking?
- Social divide → Poor people are pushed to suburbs without good public transport facilities, therefore they are forced to walk
- Mechanism of trends etc. → what turns trends into a good direction?
- Ageing society → increase of walking "problems" for people with physical limitations (due to the ageing process)
- How creative can people be? → solidarity
- (How) do new development and technology effect walking (computer, etc.)?
- Distribution of chapters

No comments on Daniel's presentation. Next steps will be done according to the discussion within the workgroup. Daniel welcomes comments on this topic per mail.



WG 4

Work for WG4 will be done according what was presented earlier in the meeting.

Rob reports that a meeting in January is planned to prepare the work for London meeting including the summary of the work so far and an update of the research question

The MC agreed on the separate WG4 meetings starting January 2008.

Jim thanks for the hard work and time spending in the working groups

Everybody can send comments and questions to Rob.

Web-demonstration

Jim presents the web-site. Currently he is in charge of the web-site but he hopes to find someone new (replacing Catherine).

Structure:

- News: about conferences
- Publications: summary of the project in different languages (template of the summary could be send for translation goal to have it in all languages)
- Country reports: for every countries (everybody should check if the actual version is on the net)
- Summary of the handbook: Index will be put on it the next days
- Background: Many different documents

A password is needed to get access to the website (First Name_last name and password as sent out by Catherine). Then there are several possibilities like to upload papers, there are links and a discussion forum with various functions for the work group leaders (start new topic, restrict to certain persons) different possibility to send it to people in the work group members, etc. Jim as an administrator has additional functions available for the discussion forum.

Mario proposed to have a possibility of a visual database (movie clips). Jim stated that it might be easier to put only the links to these movies on the web-site.

Every comment about wrong places of documents should be send to Jim(Jim.walker@walk21.com)

Senior management group: new pictures should be added

Country members: Will be updated so everybody should check that the right people are named under this point

Project presentation

David presents a project in Israel regarding benchmarking tools for assessing communities according to how safe they are for children. The project goal is to develop a diagnostic tool to measure the safety level that facilitates local improvements. The local authorities are more interested in infrastructure and how to make the environment suitable for children.

The basic question are: What is a safe town? How to quantify walkability? The following criteria were set: No injuries, quality of infrastructure, activities, safety building mechanism



Four main dimension for a conceptual classification of walkability factors were elaborated:

- Amenities
- Connectivity
- Conflicts
- Comfort

Sampling is important in order to know for whom the results are representant. Methods to be tested in a medium size town:

- Ask people
- Observation
- Evaluate

Data availability Questionnaire

Daniel summarised the first results of the data availability *Questionnaire that deals with the following issues:*

- What should be measured
- How should we measure
- Which ones should be internationally standardised and what should these standards look like
- Focus and setting priorities

The questionnaire has been discussed at WALK 21, the PQN meetings and between the meetings with the help of internet (forum). Consultation with other agencies (ICTCT, WHO, OECD, UN) and participation at related international conferences

Terminology:

- Dimension (safety etc.)
- Method (interviews, counts)
- Tool, instrument (technical equipment)

Quality levels: To reflect different needs and stages of development

Nine countries had filled in the questionnaire. Daniel thanked everybody who filled in the questionnaire.

Transport and travel behaviour:

- most countries have data on nation level, but not on local or municipality level
- different measurements

Minimal standards in order to compare the data:

- For walking we also need data on city level (cheap instrument, pedestrian counts: regularly pedestrian counts are made only in two countries)
- Pedestrian behaviour conflicts are only measured within projects
- Time spend in public space: no data available, some studies, no information how long children play outside



- Road safety: pedestrian accident data, same categories but hardly link to trip purposes
- only in two countries data about single accident (D, NL)
- Security: hardly ever counted, police data highly questionable
- Competencies, health: data on disabilities for all countries, different numbers and names of categories,
- Walking environment: no data on the environment, some project related
- Ecological footprint: CO2 emission, noise level but no linking to walking
- Perception, attitudes: in Fin, NI, data on how people perceive safety and security

Hardly any information about economic aspects or investment; no information about marketing and economic benefits and no information on how much money is spend on research. Data needs to be improved as the fact and argument base in the different countries is really weak.

Information on the questionnaire can be updated anytime

Presentation of the results of the data availability Questionnaire will be on the website

Karel informs about the COST action 355 "Behaviour change to more sustainable transport modes" and that there was a working package on national transport surveys. COST 355 will end spring 2008.

Jim states that implementation costs should be affordable, measurement to measure the benefit of investment on local level of walking cost more than the investment

Daniel states that before-and-after-studies like counting pedestrians after an infrastructure action can be cheap. Willy states that Daniels' work can be very useful on the European level (contact Mr. Ochshausen, COST 355). Contact Kurt Falast in Graz on the topic "low cost measurement on handy, rebuilding the ways of pedestrians".

Jim reports on an evaluation framework of way finding and how lost people are in London"

Manuel reports on a project together with Barcelona in which European students are working as volunteers on way tracking issues.

Thérèse reportes about a 6th framework project: "Walkwell": long distance trips and in which languages information should be given, different information are available in different countries.

Christer reportes that Lund is dealing with accessibility of elderly which become more and more important.

Ralf reported about the CASE project in which a research group will, among many other things, deal with usability, accessibility and functionality of mobility preconditions, in cluding walking, with respect to exigencies of an ageing society. The project is of networking character and will be financed for 10 years.

Marjolein reported that some on-going EU-projects deal with walking and public space

Report from the COST office

Thierry Goger gave a presentation about news from the Cost office.

- Information about new actions: latest open call which was closed in March ended in the selection of two new COST actions



- Collection date for new proposals ended September 27th. Proposals are currently in the first evaluation stage
- Grant system (action groups will manage budget by themselves) cannot be implemented before next year; information will come as soon as possible; recommendation to carry out what was planned
- Budget plan: there is a possibility to spend up to 15% on administrating issues. When the Grant system is implemented, we will have the liberty to spend more than 2.000 Euro for the web-site but we have to stay within the cost rules.

Senior management committee will have a talk with the COST office about the budget

- Information: Willy Hüsler is the Rapporteur for this COST action
- Information on the budget: already 31,000 Euro were spend; The accounting period is from 1 6 2007 to 31.5 2008. In total the COST action has a budget of 91.000 Euro for the meetings in Zurich, Valencia, London. Per participant 800 euro are calculated plus support for the organiser for the meeting Valencia; So the remaining budget is 14.000 Euro; there is a request to spend money for the web-site in January 2008; and there is the senior management committee meeting before the London plan
- Information about the possibility of "Short term scientific mission" (STSM): research exchange financed up to 2.500 Euro; request has to be submitted to the Senior Management Group, where decision is taken.

Lucia states that the budget could not be fixed from the beginning on and that there should be the possibility to propose a STSM. The Management Committee agrees that the Senior Management Group is delegated to decide on requests regarding STSM's. They should be sent in as soon as possible.

7. Homework

- 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, six are planned so far
- To gather additional information for a Country Report
- On-going: To collect and compile abstracts from new research on the national level on the pedestrian issue.
- Reminder about sending Jim proposals for the "Pedestrian master class". Information will be send out by Jim
- Check the website and send all comments per e-mail to Jim
- Make your plans for the London meeting 10th & 11th, on 9th April the annual walking and cycling conference (200-250 participants) will also be held in London.

Lars thanks all who answered his questionnaire which he has distributed at the beginning of the meeting. The Questionnaire will also be put on the website (everybody is invited to fill in).

Jim thanks Hector for the wonderful organisation of the meeting and thanks everybody for the participation.



9. Closing

The meeting ended at 13:00

Valencia, 23/24 October 2007 Clemens Kaufmann/Gudrun Haindl

Decision list

nr	Decision	Actor
2007-22	The Minutes of the 2 nd MC meeting in Wuppertal were accepted	
2007-23	Any change with regard to the participation of the PQN project should be announced to Jim Walker and Rob Methorst in order to be changed on the website	All, Jim Walker, Rob Methorst
2007-24	The chairs' mid-term report of September 2007 is accepted	
2007-25	The MC agrees on working group members tasks and structure	
2007-26	Summaries of progress on National committees of support should be sent to Jim Walker and Rob Methorst in order to be presented at the next meeting	All
2007-27	The general planning of the project is accepted	
2007-28	The updated budget plan, including separate WG4 meetings, is accepted	
2007-29	Comments regarding the outline of the handbook should be sent to Rob Methorst	All
2007-30	Presentations made in the meeting will be posted on the website	Jim Walker
2007-31	The MC agrees on separate WG4 meetings, starting January 2008	Rob Methorst
2007-32	Comments on the website and documents to be posted on the website should be sent to Jim Walker	All
2007-33	The Country reports will be updated continuously; updates will be sent to Rob Methorst at least 4 weeks before the next MC and Working Groups meeting	All
2007-34	Information in the Data Availability Questionare can be updated any time. The results will be posted on the website.	All
2007-35	The Senior Management Group will have a talk with the COST Office about the budget and conditions.	SMG and COST Office
2007-36	The SMG is delegated to decide on STSM requests	SMG
2007-37	Homework is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, six are planned so far • To gather additional information for a Country Report • On-going: collect and compile abstracts from new research on the national level on the pedestrian issue. • Reminder about sending Jim proposals for the "Pedestrian master class". Information will be send out by Jim • Check the website and send all comments per e-mail to Jim • Make your plans for the London meeting 10th & 11th, on 9th April the annual walking and cycling conference (200-250 participants) will also be held in London. 	All

