

# Minutes of the 6<sup>th</sup> Pedestrians' Quality Needs MC April 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 – Belgrade (Serbia)

## Venue:

Faculty of Architecture  
Bulevar Kralja Aleksandra 73/II  
1100 Beograd - Serbia

## Attendants:

Alf Støle	Maartje de Goede
Aslak Fyhri	Marjolein de Jong
Chiara Tonelli	Mário Alves
Clemens Kaufmann	Milena Vukmirovic
Dago Antov	Miles Tight
Daniel Sauter	Iris Mühlenbruch
David Zaidel	Nicole Muhlrاد
Diego Moreno	Olaf Czogalla
Dominique Von Der Muhll	Panagiotis Papaioannou
Dragana Bazik	Pavlina Filemonova Rocakova
Dulce Marques de Almeida	Philippe Hanocq
Fermina Sanchez	Ralf Risser
Galit Yerushalmi	Richard vd Horst
Hector Monterde i Bort	Rob Methorst
Jacek Malasek	Shalom Hakkert
Jim Walker	Socrates Basbas
Juergen Gerlach	Thérèse Steenberghen
Karel Schmeidler	Tineke Hof
Karin Ausserer	Willi Hüsler
Kimmo Lapintie	Sonia Lavadinho
Lars Leden	Tiia Roivas
Lucia Martincigh	
Magdalena Blaszczyk	

**Wednesday 1st of April 2009**

---

**COST Management Committee and Working Groups meeting, Day 1**

## 1. Welcome

Dragana Bazik welcomed all the participants, expressed her thanks to all for being in Belgrade meeting and wishes them all a nice staying in the city. Then, Milena Vukmirovic explained the four (4) ground plans of the building where the meeting took place (ground floor, 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor) and indicated the venue of the WG separate meetings. Jim Walker thanks the Serbian delegation for official invitation and organization in Belgrade.



## 2. Adoption of the agenda, minutes of the 6th MC meeting

The MC unanimously accepts the minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> MC meeting on 13-14 November 2008 in Lisbon and thanks Pavlina Fileroca Rocakova (Czech Republic) for drawing them up. Also accepted are the minutes of the WG4 meetings on 12-13 February 2009 and the SMG meeting on 12-13 February 200, both in Leuven.

This meetings' minutes will be made by Panagiotis Papaioannou and Socrates Basbas (Greece).

The MC unanimously accepts the proposed scheme for making minutes of next meetings:

- MC 7 – Brno – 12-13 November 2009 – Italy
- MC 8 - Tell Aviv – 22-23 April 2010 - Norway
- MC 9 – Final Conference in The Hague – November – Portugal

## 3. Status of the COST Action

### 3.1. General status of the Cost Action

There are no new members to the COST 358 Action. There have been informal contacts with Municipality of Kopenhagen – Denmark with regard to a possible joining of Denmark and involvement in 'Making Walking Count' (see later). According to word from Lotte Bech, the Copenhagen municipality decided not to participate in both projects. The city currently works on a Pedestrian Strategy, which will take up so much energy, that there is no capacity to also invest in work in the PQN project.

### 3.2. News from the COST office

On the 4th of March Thierry Goger contacted Rob as Chair to announce that the COST Grant system will be implemented within the next couple of weeks. The question was whether RWS Centre for Transport and Navigation could receive the Grant, take over the administration and pay out reimbursements and other expenses for the action. Unfortunately the situation has changed much since there was first talk of implementing the COST Grant system. As known within the Dutch ministry of Transport the AVV Transport Research Centre is reorganised to RWS Centre for Transport and Navigation. At the same time the ministry's total (financial and other supportive) administration services have been centralised, so that the Chair's office itself does no longer have administrative capacity and the option to do the banking itself. All payments would have to be done at a distance, which would involve more bureaucracy and would mean that reimbursement of the PQN participants would take much more time than it now does. Because of its high costs, outsourcing is no option either. We investigated the option to delegate the administration of the COST Grant to WALK21. That also proved to be unattractive. On the 6th the Chair replied to the COST office that we have no option but to not transfer to the COST Grant system and keep the reimbursement situation as it is.

The COST office agreed not to migrate our Action to the COST Grant System, so the reimbursement procedures will not change. Another consequence is that there is slightly more room for participants to attend the meetings and Short Term Scientific Missions.



### *3.3. COST Mid-term evaluation – progress report*

On 15 and 16 June 2009 the COST Annual Progress Conference APC takes place. The COST action chairs are requested to attend 2 full days of the meetings. The main objectives of the APC are:

- Allow the Domain Committee (DC) to carry out its statutory mission of quality monitoring of running Actions;
- Make sure all Actions' outstanding research and networking achievements are uncovered;
- Present new/old Actions to old/new DC Members and to the other Actions within the Domain;
- Allow Action Chairs/Representatives to meet and network, so as to make it possible for potential synergies among Actions to emerge;
- Action management experience sharing among Action Chairs and with the COST Office;
- Build a sense of ownership to a common project among Action representatives ("COST pride").

Rob Methorst will prepare the Annual Monitoring Progress Report, a poster in A4 and a powerpoint presentation. Rob Methorst will make the documents after the MC meeting, so that he can include the latest developments.

### *3.4. Working Group participation*

Pavlina Fileroca Rocakova left the CDV in Brno and took up a traineeship at TOI in Norway. She asked permission to continue participating in Working Group 2 as a private person (not representative for Czech Republic). The Senior Management Group gratefully approved this request..

Emil Drapela (Czech Republic) will join WG2.

Liesbeth Uyttersprot left her position at SADL Leuven; her research will be taken over by another PhD student, which in principle will also contribute to the PQN project on children's issues.

Isaac Martin is nominated Substitute MC member for Spain. He will substitute Enrique Cabello when needed (as is the case for the current meeting). The MC unanimously accepted the nomination of Isaac Martin as substitute MC member for Spain.

Maartje de Goede (TNO Soesterberg NL) will be involved in the research for WG1 as Richard van der Horst's colleague. She attends the meeting.

### *3.5. Short Term Scientific Missions*

Galit Yerushalmi will start her STSM in The Hague/Delft per 1st of April. She will work for a month there and then she will prepare her report. The STSM will result in a brochure for a 'self-guided' tour in The Hague on illustrative pedestrian projects. During the Final Conference she will lead such a guided tour herself.

A new application for an STSM has been received from Daniel Malet (he wasn't in Belgrade). His application is included in the MC meeting files as a ZIP file. Mário Alves informed the participants that it is about collaboration with Barcelona and that Daniel Malet worked in pedestrians' observations issues when he was in Lisbon.

The MC discussed Daniel Malet's application (maximum Grant of € 2,500).



The MC approves a STSM grant of maximum € 2,500 to Daniel Malet, on the condition that the report is in English, it is available before the end of the summer holidays and it is connected to the work of Ana Rita Moreira and Rodolfo Soares for Working group 2. Final approval will be made by the COST office.

### *3.6. National Committees of support*

Karel Schmeidler informed the participants about the Conference “Urban Mobility in the Light of Lisbon Strategy” which will take place in the framework of the European Transport Research Innovation Week (under the patronage of Minister of Transport), Brno, Czech Republic, on 11-15 May 2009. He invited the PQN members to participate to this Conference and present a paper (the Conference will cover the expenses).

Shalom Hakkert informed the participants about the International Conference on Pedestrians (Vulnerable Road Users) which will take place on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> of June 2010 in Israel. He proposed to change the dates of the MC 8 meeting in Tell Aviv (April 2010) so that the MC 8 meeting will be in the same dates with the International Conference on Pedestrians.

The MC decided not to change the dates of the MC 8 meeting in Tell Aviv.

### *3.7. Final Conference*

The Dutch Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management and The Hague Municipality accepted the general ideas regarding the PQN Final Conference as a joint PQN-WALK21-ICTCT-OECD conference on walking. Both promised financial support. The ministry allocated budget for 2009, which can be used to involve professional conference organisers. For 2010 both the ministry and The Hague promised finances.

There has been contact with the Dutch Ramblers Association. This organisation considers widening its scope to everyday walking. The director will put the idea of supporting the conference before its board. This will happen sometime in April.

In the Senior Management Group the preparations for the Final Conference were discussed. It was agreed that on the short term a Conference Steering Committee should be established. This is particularly needed to arrive at agreement between the partners on the quite different positions, demands and expectations regarding the conference programming and organisation. The Conference Steering Committee will start its work on May 2009 and the minutes will be sent to the MC members.

Jim Walker stated that there are a lot of organizations which can be linked together so that the Final Conference will be a very successful one.

The MC unanimously approved the establishment of a Conference Steering Committee, where PQN, NL Ministry of Transport, The Hague municipality, WALK21, ICTCT, OECD and possibly the NL Ramblers Association are brought together.

Since the Final Report will be presented at the conference there is an option to finance the publication (partly) within this framework. A discussion issue is what kind and how many hard copies of the Final Report are needed. Printing is much more expensive and difficult to distribute than digital publishing and most of the audience is already used to receiving reports

in digital form. A consideration is that for COST, (some) libraries and the PQN participants hard copies may be needed.

A discussion then followed on what should determine decisions on either digital and/or paper publishing. More specifically:

Karel Schmeidler stated that it is important to disseminate all the products of the PQN COST Action to the practitioners.

Jim Walker stated that we can do that as much as we can afford and organise. The minimum number of the hard copies of the Final Report will be 1000 (this was a decision made by the MC). Assistance will be asked from the COST office for the distribution of the Final Report. All participants have to think of possible ways to assist distribution of the Final Report in their countries.

Lucia Martincigh stated that each person/country may need 5-10 copies of the Final Report to distribute them to Municipalities etc.

Nicole Muhlrád stated that a copy of the Final Report (book) must be sent to all the main libraries. The book will be a landmark for the PQN Action and thus it is worthwhile to send it to the main libraries worldwide.

Karel Schmeidler stated that the COST office allowed sale of the book of the COST 352 Action (price 70 euros). The money from the sale went back to COST.

Jim Walker stated that it would be good that each participant receive 10 copies of the book.

The question of whether there is the possibility for a private publisher is also raised.

Tineke Hof asked to focus on digital publishing.

#### **4. General Planning**

The following Management Committee meetings are planned:

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Nr.</b>	<b>Place:</b>	<b>Subject:</b>
28-29 March 2007	<b>2</b>	Wuppertal	Setup of conceptual and organisational structure
23-24 October 2007	<b>3</b>	Valencia	Discussion on results of data & information accumulation
10-11 April 2008	<b>4</b>	London	Abstracts to coordinate tasks and discuss approaches
13-14 November 2008	<b>5</b>	Lisbon	Current understanding of the subject
2 – 3 April 2009	<b>6</b>	Belgrade	Opportunities
11-13 of November 2009	<b>7</b>	Brno	Results of research
22-23 April 2010	<b>8</b>	Tel Aviv	Conclusions
Mid November 2009	<b>9</b>	The Hague	Dissemination of findings

This planning was already approved in the Lisbon meeting, but it was included in the Belgrade meeting agenda, just to make sure that everyone is aware of it.



## 5. Update Work and budget Plans 2009 - 2010

### 5.1. Budget for website costs

The Access Company / WALK21 hosts and manages our website. In our Budget Plans 2009 an amount of € 16,000 was allocated to this purpose, assuming that the PQN Action would migrate to the COST Grant System. Under the 'old' system rules the maximum amount that can be devoted to website costs is € 2,000. The SMG suggests to approve budgets and payment of € 2,000 per year for managing the PQN website.

The MC unanimously approves budgets and payment of € 2,000 per year for the periods of 1 June 2008 - 31 May 2009 and 1 June 2009 – 31 May 2010 respectively to WALK21 in London for managing the PQN website.

### 5.2. budget for Final Conference

The PQN Final Conference is planned to happen in November 2010. The plans are discussed under item 3.7. of this agenda. The Senior Management Group suggest to approve the allocation of € 10,000 as contribution for the organisation of the PQN Final Conference in The Hague in November 2010 to the conference organisers.

The MC unanimously approved a budget of € 10,000 as contribution to the organisation of the Final Conference in The Hague in November 2010 and payment to the official organisers of the conference (to be specified by the Conference Steering Committee).

### 5.3. budget for printing of Final Report

Under COST rules it is possible to allocate € 3,000 for printing a final report of the action. This will probably cover only a part of the actual costs. The printing costs will be included in the Final Conference budget and will have to be partly financed by other means. For the budgetting it is necessary to know what funding is available for this purpose. The Senior Management Committee suggest to approve the allocation of € 3,000 as contribution for printing expenses of the PQN Final Report.

The MC unanimously approved the SMG suggestion to allocate € 3,000 as contribution for printing expenses to the organisers of the Final Conference (to be specified by the Conference Steering group).

The MC generally agreed that there is need for additional money to cover the cost of printing, storage, handling and distribution of the Final Report. The cost depends on the number of pages and handling costs. We may be able to find a private publisher.

Karel Schmeidler stated that maybe an extra funding will come from the National Resources in the Czech Republic.

All participants are asked to write to Rob Methorst about their proposals concerning extra funding for printing, publishing and distribution of the Final Report.

Rob Methorst stated that it is a complicated issue since we have three (3) parts of the Final Report and he does not know which of the connected organisations can take care of storage and distribution for a number of years. Neither COST, nor the NL ministry of Transport, WALK21 or ICTCT are equipped for such a task. Printing the report is the easiest of the tasks; storage, handling and distribution are much more difficult to organise. He suggested therefore to focus on the digital option in order to save money and trouble.



Aslak Fyhri asked the participants whether it is realistic to publish a 1000 page Final Report. He proposed a book of fewer pages (a selection / summary) and the rest of information on be on the internet.

Nicole Muhlrاد asked the participants if we are going to publish everything.

Jim Walker answered that we will ask the COST office what are the options we have, but our objective is to publish as hard copy as much as possible.

Dulce Marques de Almeida proposed to have publish a summary type Final Report, including a CD-rom in the back side of it.

#### **5.4. The updated Work and Budget plan 2009 – 2010**

An updated Work and Budget plan has been made for period after May 2009 till the end of the project.

The MC unanimously approved the updated Work and Budget Plan for May 2009 till the end of the project.

### *6. Miscellaneous*

#### **6.1. Reviewers**

No new developments.

#### **6.2. Template for PQN articles/Handbook sections**

The SMG prepared a template for PQN articles in the Final Report. This template has been sent to you some weeks ago. For good order it is again included in the meeting files.

#### **6.3. Make Walking Count**

WALK21 in partnership with Mobility21, COST 358 PQN, Urban Mobility Research and Transport for London are working together to develop a common practical measuring tool for collection, analysis and dissemination of quantitative and qualitative information on walking. The MWC partnership hope that the Cities of New York, Copenhagen and Barcelona will work with them to build the tool, and commit these 'most walkable cities' to defining and benchmarking their walkability, compare results and monitor the impact and effectiveness of further investment which aims to encourage more people to walk.

The assumptions for the questionnaire include: 20 questions in the questionnaire & 1000 questionnaires to be collected in each city

It is hoped that the tool and results from 4 cities can be presented at the 10<sup>th</sup> WALK21 International Walking and Liveability Conference in New York during October 2009. Other European cities will be invited to use the measuring tool from 2010 and it is hoped that the partnership will stay together and develop a common set of indicators for walking and publish an international index of the most walkable communities in the world by 2012.

Daniel Sauter and Jim Walker provided additional information on this PQN related initiative.



#### **6.4. National projects – 2 minute presentations**

It appeared that exchange of information on national project is much appreciated. Since we have some 20 countries participating, lengthy presentations would take up a lot of time. Therefore the Senior Management Group came up with the idea to allocate 2 minutes to each country that undertakes interesting pedestrian related projects.

Mário Alves informed the participants that during the Census which takes place in Portugal every 10 years cycling and walking are considered as one issue. Now there is an effort to treat cycling and walking as separate items. In connection to this, Mário informed the participants, 50,000 stickers are distributed through all the newspapers in Lisbon with the message "Respect the Pedestrians".

#### **6.5. Additional financing**

There is no news concerning additional financing.

#### **6.6. Related PhD postings**

Jim Walker asked Miles Tight if he has any news to present on pedestrians and walking related PhD postings in UK. Miles said that he has projects, but no PhD students. There are no other news concerning pedestrians and walking related PhD postings.

#### **6.7. External interests and ties**

In December the second OECD PUSH took place. The minutes of the meeting are included in the meeting files. Since then the co-operation is substantiated by allowing the PUSH participants access rights to the PQN website. On the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> of May the third meeting will take place, to evaluate what progress is made with respect to the agreed chapters. So far there has been a call to the participants to deliver data on walking. A number of countries have delivered. First drafts of chapters are currently written.

The participants had no comments to make concerning OECD PUSH.

#### **6.8. Walk21 conference in New York October 2009 call**

Jim Walker updated the participants on the latest developments regarding the WALK21 Conference in New York.

#### **6.9. ICTCT Workshop in Leeds**

The ICTCT Steering Committee met on the 30th and 31st of March 2009, just before this PQN MC meeting. Ralf Risser updates the participants on the latest developments with regard to the ICTCT workshop in Leeds. The 22nd ICTCT Workshop will take place in Leeds, UK, on 22 – 23 October 2009 and its theme is "Towards and beyond the 2010 road safety targets - identifying the stubborn issues and their solutions". Topics include among other things, pedestrian safety.



### 6.10. Support for Israel International Conference on vulnerable road users

On the 31<sup>st</sup> of May in Israel an International Conference on vulnerable road users will take place. Shalom Hakkert gave inside information and asked for PQN COST Action support (see point 3.6 of the minutes).

The MC unanimously approved the SMG suggestion to announce support the Israel vulnerable road users conference.

### 6.11. External interests

No new developments

*End of first part of the MC meeting*

---  
**10:30 Coffee break**  
 ---

After the coffee break Karel Schmeidler did a power point presentation including maps and pictures of the next venue of the MC meeting (Brno).

Jim Walker expressed his thanks to Pavlina Filemonova Rocakova for taking pictures of the various MC meetings including the Belgrade meeting and posting them on the Internet.

Dominique Von Der Muhll provided information about the country report in Switzerland. She describes five modules (how pedestrian's issues affect politicians and practitioners to take measures).

Then a member of the Serbian delegation expressed his thanks to the participants on behalf of the Faculty of Architecture. A special book was given to the participants as a present ("academic studies by European standards – module catalogue", the University of Belgrade – Faculty of Architecture).

*10:45 Working Group 4 progress*

Rob Methorst informed the participants about his trip to USA and his meetings there. He visited to the University of North Carolina – Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Centre (PBIC) and the VOLPE Institute in Boston. He pointed out that priority in Transport moved from "congestion" to "livability". Most politicians usually only look at raw data for pedestrian accidents (i.e. in The Netherlands some 250 pedestrians were killed in accidents in public space, but official reports mention only a 100 fatalities from traffic accidents). There are also five time as many pedestrians hospitalised after accidents in public space (mainly falls, collisions with stationary objects) than even adjusted traffic accident statistics show. Rob Methorst mentioned that this is not a known fact at policy level. Thus, it should become a major issue in the context of 'livability'. He also informed the participants about the ICTCT Steering Committee meeting in Lund.

Furthermore Rob informed the participants about the progress in WG4. He prepared a Scientific Report of the meeting in Leuven, where the Conceptual Framework, Policy



development Tasks and the Glossary were discussed. This work on the Conceptual Framework will be finished in August 2009; it will form Part 1 of the PQN output.

From the WG4 Leuven meeting minutes participants can see what progress the working group made. Because of advancing insight the tasks content, labels and sequence changed somewhat. Rob Methorst presented the table below to the participants in order for them to see what the current state is. Rob analysed the 10 tasks.

1. Identification of demand <sup>1</sup>	Kimmo Lapintie
2. Identification of requirements	Jürgen Gerlach
3. Picturing the optimal system	Hector Monterde I Bort
4. Assessment of current state of the system	Nicole Muhlrاد & Catia Rennesson
5. Performance, compliance and satisfaction	Rob Methorst
6. Compliance and satisfaction mechanisms	Ralf Risser
7. Promising interventions	Lucia Martingh
8. Evaluation of system output	Thérèse Steenberghen
9. Recommendations for system input	whole group
10. Gaps in knowledge and Good Practises	Shalom Hakkert

Particularly the relation of the first step of the policy process on the assessment of the pedestrians' demand to the assessment of requirements and picturing the optimal situation, needs extra attention.

Mário Alves proposed not to use the term "optimal system" in task 3 but instead to use the term "minimum system".

Kimmo Lapintie stated that he is worried about the changes in terms used in the tasks (i.e., he personally worked in the identification of "needs" (so not "demand"). He said that demand is related to consumer. It is important to secure that we speak about the same thing.

The general planning of the work of WG 4 is:

4<sup>th</sup> meeting – 27/28 August 2009 – Helsinki - **opportunities**

5<sup>th</sup> meeting – January 2010 – Paris/Lyon/Grenoble - **results of the research**

Nicole Muhlrاد is still working on the location of the venue. She will be able to present results in a couple of weeks.

6<sup>th</sup> meeting – September 2010 – Roma – **last preparations of presentation on final conference**

### *11:10 Karin Asserer and Ralf Risser – Research results Campaigning*

Karin Asserer presented the EU project CAST (Campaigns and Awareness-raising Strategies in Traffic Safety) of the Sixth Framework Programme, Directorate-General Energy and Transport. She also distributed leaflets of the project CAST. Jim Walker said that in the

<sup>1</sup> 'Demand' is used here as 'Needs, Abilities and desired opportunities'. Kimmo Lapintie does not agree with this wording. Change of term will be considered.

UK they used to work with health centers (people are paid so to have an incentive to minimize effects on their health).

Panagiotis Papaioannou asked Karin if the reduction in private car use and the increase of walking is a result of the so-called “soft measures” (i.e., campaigns) or “hard measures” also affect the results presented.

### *11:35 Daniel Sauter – Progress regarding Measuring Walking*

Daniel Sauter presented an update on the Measuring Walking project.

Socrates Basbas asked Daniel about the numbers of pedestrians that actually lead the authorities to design their respective infrastructure based only on these numbers. Daniel answered that it is really an important dilemma.

Nicole Muhrad stated that we must link one place to another (so to count at system level). Daniel answered that we have to examine where to count and when (i.e., January is a month with few pedestrian flows, June on the contrary is characterized by high pedestrian flows).

### *12:55 Jim Walker - Conclusion*

Milena Vukmirovic informed the participants that a walking tour with a tourist guide was scheduled for 17:30 (2 hours walking in the centre of Belgrade). Then dinner will be offered at a restaurant (Srpska Kafana) in the city central area.

Jim summarised the Actions to be taken from the morning plenary session :

- Determine the exact dates for the Tell Aviv April 2010 MC meeting
- Decide on the Short Term Scientific Missions in Portugal
- Discuss the future of the PQN website and the on-line information

---

**13:00 Lunch**

---

*Parallel sessions of the Working Groups started after lunch*

*14:00 Parallel sessions of the Working Groups*

*17:30 end of session*



## Thursday 2nd of April 2009

---

### COST Management Committee and Working Groups meeting, Day 2

9:00 *Parallel sessions of the Working Groups - continued*

12:30 *Lunch*

13:30 *Parallel session of the Working Groups – conclusions*

15:00 *Plenary feedback of WG conclusions*

#### **WG1.**

Hector Monterde reported back to the General Assembly, mentioning that all objectives set within WG1 were in practice achieved. Five out of the 8 chapters have been written. There were certain slight changes along with some head titles modifications following group discussions and suggestions. Chapter 3 will be made up of Ch. 3a about mental health benefits etc. and of Ch. 3b about ITS and pedestrians.

#### **WG2.**

Ralf Risser reported back the progress made within WG2. He mentioned that all WG2 member contributions have been delivered. He explained the small group approach adopted in WG2 and described briefly the 4 small groups formed for this reason. He also clarified that small group 4 will not make any contributions to “culture and walking” as initially planned. Kimmo will write in the final report about “Time Budget”. Finally Ralf presented some key findings regarding pedestrians and walking (see WG2 slides).

#### **WG3.**

Daniel Sauter referred to the progress made within WG3 emphasizing the work done on the Final report chapters. He briefly presented the contents of the following presentations:

- The doom scenario
- Public Space as relational space
- Walking and health
- Impact of changing demographics on pedestrian quality system
- Vision for a walking focussed transport system
- Planning for pedestrians – Important aspects to pay attention today and in the future
- Elements of a social and cultural history of walking

Finally he made reference to the following future chapters: On transport, leisure, land-use, city planning, public transport & walking, paradoxical trends and visions.

15:30 *coffee break*



15:45 *Second part of the Management Committee meeting:*

## 7. Agreements regarding Final Report

### 7.1. Draft outline of the handbook & spreadsheet writers names

Rob Methorst prepared and presented an updated spreadsheet including Working Group participation and the outlines of the 3 parts of the Final Report. The three parts are as follows:

- **Part 1** will cover the context and conceptual framework background of the PQN project that will be mainly Rob's responsibility. An advanced draft of this report (version 7) is already available.
- **Part 2** will cover the Country Reports, Working Group results and the Measuring Walking Initiative. Apart from Chapter 1 on the Country Reports, the Chapters and its sections have been assigned.
- **Part 3** will be dedicated to practical guidance on 3 policy making levels. In principle the writing task will be the responsibility of Working Group 4, but help would be greatly appreciated.

The compilation of abundance of chapters shows that the project will result in a huge volume of text. At the next SMG meeting in Helsinki it will be discussed how it is possible to have an integrated report but also what options for subdividing it according to themes or target groups are. We can imagine, as we have done in large research projects before here, to have sub-publications within the overall report.

The SMG suggest:

- that the MC discusses and amend the outline and assignments
- that MC approves the Outline, taking into account that structure and tasks within chapters and titles may change according to the discussion in the Brno meeting latest
- the MC appoints persons responsible for the writing of Part 2 Chapter 1 on the Country Reports and Part 3

According to decision made in Lisbon, Part 2 will consist of 6 chapters. Five of them have been already assigned and drafted. Partial contributions regarding the other chapters have been also made. A person must be appointed for the drafting of chapter 1 (Country Reports summary). Chapter 2 will be co-ordinated by Hector Monterde, Chapter 3 by Ralf Risser, Chapter 4 and 5 by Daniel Sauter and Chapter 6 by Rob Methorst.

Regarding the structure of the report it was decided that this will be flexible – approximately 20 pages including photos per article (sub-chapter or section in a chapter).

Copyrights will be held by individual authors.

It was agreed that the digital form of the report will be available in the Web site. However, it was also stressed that this may not be a sustainable solution since there is risk that the site may be removed after the end of the project.

Discussions also made regarding the need for an agreement on how the referencing will be made in the text of the final report. In the SMG it was agreed that until a new decision is made, references will appear as [Author, Year, Number] rather than [Number] only.



The referee issue was also raised. Kimmo suggested that outside experts could be used as reviewers. Rob reminded the partners that there are already 3 reviewers available to review the report but he will look for an additional one.

Regarding the number of copies of the Final Report, the majority of the PQN members prefers a substantial number of hard copies in addition to a digital form available at the website. Hard copies that are available at libraries are considered a motivation to most of the partners who in any case work without any compensation. Formation of an editorial committee was also proposed. Rob said that WG4 was already assigned this role (see Memorandum of Understanding annex!) therefore is no need to establish another one.

Lucia added that the final report must have an ISBN or ISSN since production of such reports is being taken into account for University evaluation purposes. Rob indicated that this was the intention from the start (see MoU!). Finally she suggested that partners could make a financial contribution for final report production purposes. Rob advises that this is only a partial solution to our bigger publishing problem (storage, handling, distribution).

With respect to this issue Rob explained that all publications even the PDF ones can have ISBN or ISSN and therefore there is no problem.

Regarding production financing Rob said that there is no need to make a decision at this time. Daniel proposed that we hear all relevant suggestions and make a decision at the next meeting. Panos suggest looking for some kind of sponsorship. Karel said that printing could be done in Czech Republic care of CDV where the cost is low.

Discussion also made about the exact number of pages per Part of the final report. Also about page size that may affect drawings. Rob insists that articles in the report should not exceed 20-25 pages.

It was agreed at the end that the discussion will be continued in the Brno meeting where the final version of the Final Report will be presented. It is expected that by June the various chapters will be ready and therefore all relevant information will be available.

Regarding the Country Report the situation is mixed. Some reports have been finished, some are incomplete and some are missing. Country reports are really important and must be obtained urgently. **All missing reports as well as the incomplete ones must be submitted by the end of April** and in case this is not possible by the 5<sup>th</sup> of May 2009.

## 7.2. Update of Glossary

With the kind help of Chiara Tonelli, Ralf Risser, Christer Hydén and Tineke Hof the Glossary was updated. The latest version is included in the meeting files.

In Working Group 4 it was agreed that it would be wise to check at the end of each meeting whether one or more definitions need to be readjusted or added. Rob summarises that there is need to define 'sojourning', 'ITS' and 'demand'. No additional items are suggested.

## 8. 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 update and complete the Country Reports
- Ongoing: To collect and compile abstracts from new research on the national level on the pedestrian issue.
- Deliver complete Working Group 1, 2 and 3 articles for the Working Group reports around 31<sup>st</sup> of May 2009
- Read and react to delivered articles before 30<sup>th</sup> of June on:
  - What is missing?
  - What can be improved (and how)?
  - What should be include in the concerned article from your own article?
  - What should be transferred from the concerned article to your own article?
- Think about the future of the website and the on-line information and do suggestions to Rob Methorst before August 2009.

### *9. Declaration forms*

- Attendance list completed by partners
- Reimbursement declaration forms were given to Rob

### *10. Other matters and 'Afterburners'*

#### *Actions from the previous day morning plenary session :*

- Next meetings:

11 November 2009, Brno, Pre-conference

12-13 November 2009, Brno, PQN Management Committee and WG meetings

21 – 22 April 2010, Tel Aviv, Pre conference

22 – 23 April 2010, PQN Management Committee and WG meetings

-Short term scientific missions (Portugal)

It was agreed that Daniel Malet, Ph.D student of Barcelona University will undertake a short term mission at the University of Lisbon with PQN funding under Manuel João Ramos supervision. Daniel Malet will have to complete his fieldwork which falls in WG2. Conditions that must be satisfied include:

- The work must be done in English
- It must be completed before end of summer
- It must be connected to Anna's and Rodolfo's work on Cultural Aspects of Walking,

On behalf the the whole group Rob gave many thanks to the Meeting Hosts and in particular to Prof. Dragana Bazik and to Milena Vukmirovic. Thanks were also offered to the University technician who took care of all matters during the two days of the Belgrade meeting.

### *11. Closing (16:30)*

Belgrade 1 & 2 April 2009  
P. Papaioannou & S. Basbas



## Decisions list 6<sup>th</sup> COST 358 PQN MC meeting

Nr.	Issue	Votes	Actor
2009-01	Approval minutes of the 5 <sup>th</sup> MC meeting on 13-14 November 2008 in Lisbon	Unanimously	
2009-02	Approval minutes of the WG4 meetings on 12-13 February 2009 in Leuven.	Unanimously	
2009-03	Approval minutes SMG meeting 13 February 2009 in Leuven	Unanimously	
2009-04	The MC approves a STSM grant of maximum € 2,500 to Daniel Malet, on the condition that the report is in English, it is available before the end of the summer holidays and it is connected to the work of Ana Rita Moreira and Rodolfo Soares for Working group 2. Final approval will be made by the COST office.	Unanimously	Mario Alves & Manuel Joao Ramos
2009-05	The MC decided not to change the dates of the MC 8 meeting in Tell Aviv	unanimously	Shalom Hakkert
2009-06	The MC approved the establishment of a Conference Steering Committee, where PQN, NL Ministry of Transport, The Hague municipality, WALK21, ICTCT, OECD and possibly the NL Ramblers Association are brought together.	unanimously	Rob Methorst
2009-07	The MC approves budgets and payment of € 2,000 per year for the periods of 1 June 2008 - 31 May 2009 and 1 June 2009 – 31 May 2010 respectively to WALK21 in London for managing the PQN website.	unanimously	Rob Methorst
2009-08	The MC approved a budget of € 10,000 as contribution to the organisation of the Final Conference in The Hague in November 2010 and payment to the official organisers of the conference (to be specified by the Conference Steering Committee).	unanimously	Rob Methorst
2009-09	The MC approved the SMG suggestion to allocate € 3,000 as contribution for printing expenses to the organisers of the Final Conference (to be specified by the Conference Steering group).	unanimously	Rob Methorst
2009-10	The MC approved the updated Work and Budget Plan for May 2009 till the end of the project.	unanimously	Rob Methorst
2009-11	The MC approved the SMG suggestion to announce support the Israel vulnerable road users conference.	unanimously	Rob Methorst
2009-12	Regarding the structure of the report it was decided that this will be flexible – approximately 20 pages including photos per article (sub-chapter or section in a chapter).	Unanimously	All
2009-13	Copyrights will be held by individual authors.	unanimously	All
2009-14	In the articles, references will appear as [Author, Year, Number] rather than [Number] only.		All
2009-15	All missing Country Reports as well as the incomplete ones must be submitted by the	unanimously	All

	end of April 2009		
2009-16	<p>Homework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Search for additional funding</li> <li>• 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)</li> <li>• Establishment of national PQN committees or platforms</li> <li>• To update and complete the Country Reports</li> <li>• Ongoing: To collect and compile abstracts from new research on the national level on the pedestrian issue.</li> <li>• Deliver complete Working Group 1, 2 and 3 articles for the Working Group reports around 31<sup>st</sup> of May 2009</li> <li>• Read and react to delivered articles before 30<sup>th</sup> of June on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What is missing?</li> <li>○ What can be improved (and how)?</li> <li>○ What should be include in the concerned article from your own article?</li> <li>○ What should be transferred from the concerned article to your own article?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Think about the future of the website and the on-line information and do suggestions to Rob Methorst before August 2009.</li> </ul>	unanimously	All