

**Minutes of the Kick-off meeting of COST 358 Pedestrians' Quality Needs
28 and 29 March 2007 in Wuppertal**

Attendants:

Mario Alves – Portugal
Dago Antov – Estonia
Socrates Basbas – Greece
Enrique Cabello – Spain
Marjolein de Jong – Belgium
Jürgen Gerlach – Germany
Aslak Fyhri – Norway
Anne Katherine Geelmuyden – Norway
Jürgen Gerlach – Germany
Gudrun Haindl – Austria
Alfred Shalom Hakkert – Israel
Philippe Hanocq – Belgium
Tineke Hof – the Netherlands
Willi Husler – Switzerland
Kimmo Lapintie – Finland
Sylvain Lassarre – France
Lars Leden – Finland
Jacek Malasek – Poland
Martin Isaac – Estonia
Carmenciata Malimban – COST-office
Michael Meschik – Austria
Rob Methorst – the Netherlands
Hector Monterde i Bort – Spain
Ana Rita Gaspar Moreira – Portugal
Diego Moreno – Spain
Nicole Muhlrad – France
Alberto Raimondi – Italy
Catherine Rawas – United Kingdom
Catia Rennesson – France
Ralf Risser – Austria
Farida Saad – France
Daniel Sauter – Switzerland
Karel Schmeidler – Czech Republic
Zuzana Simonova – Italy
Thérèse Steenberghen – Belgium
Alf Støle – Norway
Ase Svensson – Sweden
Miles Tight – United Kingdom
Dominique von der Mühl – Switzerland
Milena Vukmirovic – Serbia & Montenegro
Jim Walker – United Kingdom
David Zaidel – Israel

Apology:

Dragana Bazik – Serbia
Olaf Czogalla – Germany



Christer Hydén – Sweden
Herman Katteler – Netherlands
Clemens Kaufmann – Austria
Lucia Martincigh – Italy
Panagiotis Papaioannou – Greece
Miklos Papp – Hungary
Richard van der Horst – Netherlands

1. Welcome

On March 28, at 9.15, everybody is welcomed by Prof. Jürgen Gerlach, the host of the conference. He gives a short introduction of Wuppertal and surroundings.
Jimmy Walker Chairs the meeting.

2. Adoption of the agenda

There are no recommendations, so the agenda is adopted as proposed.

3. Minutes

The minutes drafted by Tineke Hof (thanks Tineke!) are accepted. The Management Committee agrees that from now on minutes of the MC meetings, workshops and conferences will be made in rotation by the delegates of the participating countries on alphabetical order. Minutes for this meeting will be made by Marjolein de Jong.

4. Status of the action and general information

Seven more countries have signed in (Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Israel, Poland and Sweden). At the moment, COST 358 is one of the most active COST projects. There are contacts with 5 countries (Latvia, India, Turkey, Jordan, Australia; Australia, India, Jordan will be corresponding members only). The participation of new countries has impact on the budget, new figures will be showed later on.

There is a possibility to change national delegates if needed. Please contact the COST office if there is a more appropriate person of your country.

With regard to participation mutations the Management Committee agrees unanimously that nominated WG members can be appointed without the formal right to be invited to the meetings.

Because of the size of the project, there is a need for preparatory communication between Management Committee Meetings. There has been a Senior Management Group (SMG) meeting in February 2007 since the kick off meeting. The SMG discusses details as preparation of the Management Committee Meetings like the current one. Comments on the minutes of the SMG meetings can be given.

5. General planning and working procedures

5.1 MC and WG Meetings

- April till October 2007: collection of data
- 23-24 October 2007: meeting in Valencia, Spain, followed by the ICTCT Workshop (25 and 26 October 2007). Ralf Risser and Hector Monterde I Bort can give more information about the meetings.



- September 2008: check if the outcomes will be there. The COST leaflet gives a summary of the outcomes. We have to deliver these products.
- June 2009 : reporting the work of our group
- October 2010 : dissemination

The Management Committee agrees unanimously:

- The Management Committee meets twice a year, combined with a WG meeting. The MC and WG meetings are attached to a Conference (ICTCT or Walk 21) or another event. If possible this should be a country that can take profit of some extra attention to pedestrian policy. Financial support to organising country (institute) of meetings can be obtained from the COST budget. The amount will probably not cover all costs.
- The Senior Management Group will meet in advance of the larger MC/WG meeting.
- In principle Working Groups can meet more often, but there is no money available for these meetings. The website will be the principal platform for exchanging information.

5.2 WG Working Principles

The Management Committee agrees unanimously on the proposed Working Group working principles and structure.

6. Budget plan May 2007-April 2008

The budget for the COST 358 makes it possible to have max. two MC meetings per year and manage the website (max. 3 days a month). The budget for 2007 is approximately 92,000 Euros (depending on the amount of countries participating), of which 30,000 allocated to the Wuppertal meeting. Additional funds are needed, for example to invite more people and experts.

The COST system will be changing in April. The control of the budget will be transferred to AVV Transport Research Centre in the Netherlands. The new rules give more freedom in the project to move budgets. It is possible to allocate savings to other phases of the project. Through constraining rules it is not allowed to spend more than 15% on administration, and 2000 Euros for the website. By using the website as a dissemination tool, the budget for the website can be increased.

In order to use the budget as efficiently as possible the Management Committee agrees to try to limit travel costs by early booking and to plan meetings next to the weekend. If Management Committee Members cannot attend and cannot send someone in their place, the PQN chairman (Rob Methorst) has to be informed at least two weeks after the invitation, earlier if possible, so that funds can be re-allocated.

It is suggested to first invite an additional person per country before considering inviting others (it does not have to be the same person at all meetings). The SMG decides about non-MC persons to be invited, dependent on the context of the meeting. At the moment there are 15 non-MC experts on the Working Group members list.



The invitation of experts, special scientific missions and excursions depend on the savings made. After the Valencia meeting there will be a better insight in the remaining funds. Delegates are asked to hand in proposals for special scientific missions to Rob Methorst. There is no commitment about a contribution, but probably 2 or 3 missions can be accepted. One such mission has been a visit from a student from Portugal to a University professor in Barcelona: a paper will be written and put online.

The budget proposal 2007-2008 will be reviewed after the Valencia meeting.

The administration of the project is done by organisation of Rob Methorst. This saves a lot of money for the project. Funding for home projects may provide some money to the central PQN project. Everybody is asked to examine the possibilities for additional funding and to inform the SMG. Perhaps it is possible to find funding for additional research in your own country. If you have ideas, please contact the SMG.

The MC agrees to ask experts that are specially invited for a workgroup, to write a paper about the subject. Thus the input will be substantiated.

A detailed Budget Plan for 2007-2010 and Deliveries & Dissemination Plan will be presented at the Valencia meeting. The budget will allow for writing the deliveries, but not for designing, translating and publishing it on paper. There are commitments (i.e. the leaflet) to be met, but hardly any finances to meet them!

In order to get translations of material, everybody is asked to look after their own translations. COST can put the translated material into a lay-out and send the pdf back.

- Please send translated documents to Catherine Rawas.

The SMG will meet on the 31 August and 1 September 2007 in Zurich. Discrepancies between what is needed and what we have will be highlighted and addressed in Valencia. First proposals will be sent by e-mail in September. Delegates are asked to give comments before the meeting in Valencia. The full draft budget plan will be discussed in Valencia.

- It is suggested to look for private publishers interested in publishing PQN deliveries. In other projects this worked. In addition to posting on the internet, paper versions have their own value.

The MC agrees unanimously on the proposed invitation procedure, the Budget Plan May 2007 – May 2008 and the need for additional funding.

7. Multiple year Budget Plan 2007 - 2010

The Management Committee meeting after Valencia should be fixed in April 2008 (because of the end of the financial year). In April there will be a walking conference in London, this can be combined with the COST meeting. The Mayor of London wants to support the COST meeting. Jimmy Walker will ask the Mayor formally and will also inform for the date.

Other suggestions are welcome. Perhaps there are countries that need some extra support on walking issues. A COST meeting can help these countries. There is another sug-



gestion from Portugal. Everybody is asked to send good suggestions the SMG. They will make the agreements.

The SMG will make a spreadsheet suggesting priorities and desirability's.

8. State of Affairs

8.1 PQN Leaflet and Website

Delegates are asked to make translations of the PQN Leaflet in their own language. The translations can be sent to Catherine Rawas. She will take care of the lay out. A PDF of the translation will be posted on the website; one can make prints for distribution.

Regarding to the website the following remarks have been made:

- A username and password has been sent, but there seem to be some problems. Catherine Rawas will resend the information on usernames and passwords.
- The country reports are already available in the members' section of the website.
- Photographs of delegates should be all on the website after this meeting. Everybody that did not hand in a photo yet, is asked to send one to Catherine Rawas. A group photograph will also be taken.
- The website has to be populated. If you have interesting information, send it to Catherine Rawas.

8.2 Glossary and Abbreviations

The Glossary is 'work in progress' and should be reviewed continuously. It is now on the website.

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comments, suggestions or additions can be sent to Catherine Rawas. |
|--|

8.3 Country reports

At the moment there are 12 drafts available. The Senior Management Group was aware of difficulties and advised to focus on processes and methodologies to collect data rather than on filing the data themselves. Most important are publications and on-going reference lists description, including short summaries of what the studies are about (a title is not always descriptive enough). Please also mention the languages in which the studies are available.

To make it easier to write the country reports, extra guidance was sent. Especially information about the availability and possible lack of data is important.

The MC agreed that all country reports should be submitted before the end of July 2007. It should be clear who is responsible for the country report and how the work is divided.

With regard to availability of data Daniel Sauter has sent an extensive questionnaire. Process information is needed to assess the comparability of (national) data sets.

8.4 Research questions

At the Kick-off meeting in Brussels, a number of research questions were discussed. Some changes and additional questions have been sent in. The list is not finalised.



8.5 Working groups

From reactions the SMG received it is unclear what the delegates committed themselves to. It is pointed out that application to a working group should result in tangible contributions like papers, contribution to chapters and other deliveries. A COST project depends on the members' initiatives and co-operation. Until the Valencia meeting applications to working group tasks are still open.

Concerning the Working Groups some remarks have been made:

- At the moment it is difficult to know what one is expected to do within a Working Group. To get involved in a working group, one needs to know not only the research questions, but also what methodology and data are needed. Looking at the questions, it is not easy to see with what information and data experts are to work with.
- The Working Group leaders have to make clear in their presentations how they see the process and the role of the participants.
- The integrative WG3 and WG4 shouldn't be too big, so there will be limitation in the amount of participants, the SMG did not need to interfere with this. WG1 and WG2 give room to specialisation, divergence and task division; the size of the group is therefore less important.

8.7 national PQN committees

In the Netherlands, contacts have been taken with institutes across the country (TNO, SWOV, AVV, private companies). This could serve as an example for a PQN group at country level. Are there any plans to set up groups at country level?

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The delegates are asked to inform Rob Methorst about initiatives in other countries. |
|--|

8.8 Review committee

There will be a review committee. This committee is not required by COST, but it is a good practice. The review committee should have a balance in geography, gender and expertise. The main task of the committee will be to look at the results of the project and quality with an external eye. The committee will be asked to review the WG reports and the final report.

The SMG makes a first suggestion, but asks everyone to give other suggestions as well:

- Bert van Wee (NL) – human geography
- Stein Johannessen (No) – transportation planning
- Jana Plichtova – Social Psychologist

The SMG is looking now for a female academic in Health, preferably from the South of Europe.

Regarding the review committee there are some questions:

- Van Wee is also promoter of Methorst's PhD project. Is he the right person to be a member of the review committee? The SMG will consider this.

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Delegates are asked to nominate candidates for the Review Committee. |
|--|

8.9 Communication and Dissemination

In order to promote the project, the following guidance has been given:

- use our logo in all our presentations (and also mention COST support),
- mention the web address.
- the members of the senior management group should represent the project in the various conferences or institutions where it is needed.
- if invited to present our work, we should try and get our costs covered. COST PGN does not have a budget to send someone.

- Anytime we speak about the project at a conference, Rob Methorst should be first informed. He will contact Catherine Rawas.

8.10 Planning of places and dates of the next meetings

- A conference is organized in Brno by the Transport Research Centre in November, and delegates are invited to present their country papers.
- In 2008, it is likely that there will be some sort of conference on pedestrians in Israel and in Barcelona.
- Pedestrian master class, best practice papers (in Copenhagen). Invitations will be sent in June or July 2007.
- INRETS organises a seminar on pedestrians in Lyon in November 2007. Indications to be put on the website.
- The Walk21 Conference is in Toronto in October 2007.
- Velocity will be in Munich in June 2007.
- The PIARC Conference is in Paris in October 2007 and there will be a special session on non-motorised transport.
- ICTCT workshop (20th Anniversary) October 25th and 26th in Valencia (Spain)

- Please give more information to Rob Methorst about interesting upcoming events.

The COST 358 PQN action is linked to COST 353 Winter Service Strategies for Increased European Road Safety. Results will be shared.

9. Closing of the morning session

Jim Walker closes the morning session at 12:05. After the lunch break there was a short excursion to botanical gardens of Wuppertal.

Interactive part of the meeting: presentation of the Working Groups

During the afternoon of the first day, general issues, how to measure walking and the Working Group 1 task have been discussed. Work Group 2, 3 and 4 would be discussed during the morning of the second day.



The presentation 'Elaboration PQN Work program def.ppt' has been sent to the participants of the meeting on 03-04-07 by Rob Methorst. The discussion is summarized in these minutes with reference to the slide number of that PowerPoint presentation.

Slide 5: Establishment subcommittee Country Reports

The aim of the subcommittee is to get a general overview of what is available (fact sheets, no data, etc). The sub-committee can ask for changes or additions in country reports and will report in October in Valencia.

The MC appointed a special sub-committee (Shalom Hakkert, Daniel Sauter and Jim Walker) to review Country Reports and suggest improvements making them comparable.

Slide 7: PQN Key principles

In addition to the slide: proactive means improving the system, looking forward, to the future. Comprehensive has to do with the focus on overview instead of studying matters in depth and going very much into details. A main question is how things interrelate.

Slide 8: Specification of principles

There has been some discussion about issues like 'the meaning of quality', 'what are needs', 'quality for whom'. There is Glossary in which definitions of such terms are provided. Participants are asked to use the glossary.

- If there are comments about the principles or the glossary, please send them to the SMG, so they can be discussed at another moment.

Slide 23: Discussion

- Most of the participants in the COST project do not collect data, but use it. What can their role be? DS: The role of experts is to show what we would like to have.
- There should be standardisation within a European context. Who has ideas? It seems there is a standard for travel information and travel surveys. There might be something similar for data collection.

If you know about some initiative, please send it to Daniel Sauter.

- Is it necessary to collect all information in all countries? DS: It will be difficult to collect the same information in all countries. Therefore it is more productive to have an idea about how you like the data and then confront it with what is available. This will be more effective.
- Not all data we would like to have is available. Therefore it is good to get an overview of what we have. Some countries have good procedures.
- There is a minimal consensus about the quality of data. There are different levels of data. This should be taken into consideration.
- Lack of data can mean it is not considered relevant by policy makers. Therefore it is important to understand who is responsible and who is involved in collecting data.

- Everybody has to send in the questionnaire on data availability before the end of June.
- Daniel Sauter will report back in Valencia.

Slide 24 and 25:

- One area is missing: what does society in general think of pedestrians ?



- The proposed dimensions form a good basis. From some aspects we want to know how to measure them. DS: we first want to have agreement about the dimensions, then we can have discussion about how to measure etc. JW: in the UK there is some experience. We will ask the officer. The questionnaire can be useful for others.
- In some areas, there is already a lot of material available. On some of the other aspects, smaller groups have to do preliminary thinking.
- On what basis are investments made? I.e. it could be found out that most decisions about measures are based on road safety and sometimes crime. Behaviour is often not considered. This would be worth investigating.
- Carbon has now become a currency. Health issues related to calories and to quality of life are also becoming values. How to measure these? Into what extend does walking improve quality of life?

Presentation Work Group 1 - Hector Monterde i Bort

Presentation: slide 27 till 37

Discussion:

- What is a pedestrian, what is a footer? JW: A walker is the term used in the charter of Walk 21 rather than pedestrian, a term linked to traffic. For PQN, the glossary describes what is meant by pedestrian. Let's use those definitions.
- There has been a discussion about the meaning of "pedestrians" and their position in the law. The discussion can be concluded as follows: the norms are defined by traffic laws, but not only. Informal rules also exist. In general, normative needs are easily discovered but some non-normative needs are not.
- It is also important to qualify the type of trip (pleasure, work or other purpose).
- The choice of a classification depends on what we want to do with it. So the point is to look for classifications that may be useful for future work in assessing needs and finding ways to satisfy them. Some needs are difficult to discover so we have to use different ways.
- Why do we work here? Because we want to increase accessibility and improve amenities.
- We can review the literature, but we also have to generate something new. Who are going to be our clients: public agencies? We are not going to lecture them on needs of pedestrians; we will have to provide them with tools. It is not so difficult to get to know what the needs of pedestrians are, but we need a demand for 'walkability'. We could for example develop 'walkability' in road safety audits.
- We have to consider pedestrians like other road users. We have to think as engineers: if we want to define functional needs, we first have to explain how pedestrians function! How they plan their trips, how they choose their routes, how they walk. Then we can find out about needs. Some functional needs are not normative and may be identified only through methods related to perception.
- We need to collect information on the practices in our countries: what we find in the standards and guidelines, how do planners plan, which auditing tools exist, etc.

It is still premature to get practical tasks defined because there is an obvious need for further discussion. Needs become obvious when there is something wrong. How to assess the importance of each issue is crucial.

- What are the needs?
- How to select the issues that will be important?



- How to translate them into requirements?

For example, the quality of the system depends on the number of people that can cope with it, which means working at the extreme of the range (the less mobile pedestrians).

Some participants proposed to continue now:

- List needs as we believe they are.
- Exchange with other groups and collect information on research dealing with these needs. Some of it may already be in country reports.
- Looking at current standards to assess whether they satisfy the needs; this will provide a starting point.
- Evaluate available audit tools.

This proposal is considered not useful as it is not appropriate to define needs on the basis of brainstorming. We do not only need a list of needs, but also a list of criteria to look at them: we need some principles to structure things. The group makes clear that they want to start to work.

The decision is therefore:

- to base the results of WG1 on research literature.
- to authorize Hector to continue preparing the WG 1 tasks
- people who want to be involved in walkability should talk to Hector
- if you want to do something within WG 1: please contact Hector

Presentation Work Group 2 – Ralf Risser

Presentation: slide 38 till 48

The central objective of this Working Group is divided in four parts:

- Individual: what are specific characteristics of pedestrians? They have needs like being safe, they don't want to wait, etc.
- Communication: how is the interaction between pedestrians and other road users (e.g. vehicles are more powerful)
- Society: what is the position of pedestrians in society? Which assumptions are made about what pedestrians need?

Vehicle: we have to consider pedestrians the same way as vehicles, i.e. they have physical characteristics that have to be considered: limited physical power, limited speed, sensitiveness to distances, partly high but very heterogeneous manoeuvrability, etc.

Slide 46: social marketing is important as we have the goal that people who walk are happy. Otherwise, people will not walk voluntarily, or only those will walk who have to walk: They have to take disadvantages without having a choice

WG1 and WG2 are two sides of the same issues.

Discussion:

- Do we only summarize information from other documents, or do we also carry out new research? RR: we will summarize what has been done and structure it for a chapter of the Handbook. So there are two main tasks: collecting information and writing chapter for the Handbook.



- Functional needs are flexible. How do you know potentials of places if you do not ask? What is functional in relation to norms, expert opinions, etc. Here, are we looking through research at the needs of people? The difference between the two approaches is quite clear, we have limited possibilities only to carry out new research, we mainly have to look at past research.

Presentation Work Group 3 – Daniel Sauter

Presentation: slide 49 till 71

WG 3 works on the results of WG 1 and WG 2. WG 3 will focus on the future. How can we improve the situation for pedestrians? What are the likely determinants for durability (horizon: walking in 2030), and how are they (possibly) related to each other ?

The work of WG 3 will be based on:

- Discussion of today
- Framework
- Research questions

Slide 53

The determinants are in trends (economic social), also in unforeseeable events. From the pizza model, five fields can be identified :

- society
- physical and natural environment
- transport system
- the individual pedestrians

Determinants from society: economic trends, health approach, technological trends, etc., perception of those trends by the media, political trends. All this must be integrated.

Determinants from Transport: multi-modal shifts, transport prices, performance trends, technological trends, etc., perception aspects, political trends.

Physical environment: trends in land use planning, urban planning and city development, technological developments, etc., perception and political aspects.

Natural environment: climatic changes, etc., and here perception and political trends are very important.

Determinants linked to pedestrians as individuals: health, etc.

From these determinants, we deduce what walking will be in 2030. There are many uncertainties regarding the institutional framework: what will be the position of politicians with regards to walking, what will be the position of pedestrians themselves, etc.

Discussion:

There are 5 pages at the wall with elements for discussion on it. The question is 'what is important because this will determine the focus'. There has been discussion about these fiches on the wall and the use of scenarios:

- Look more into technological trends.
- Predicting the future as challenging but difficult.



- When forecasting the developments of walking in 2030, we could focus on the amount of walking and the effect on design and concentrate on determinants that will influence these issues. We can build scenarios: walking will remain pretty much the same, walking will increase a lot, walking will decrease a lot. The focus could be on e.g. the amount of pedestrians (more, less, the same) and e.g. the implications for design (more sidewalks, or no physical implications).
- Perception is also important although design is crucial: it sets outer limits to what people can do.
- Forecasting is a major effort for every area. We might be able to use current forecasting models that are available. As perception differs according to countries, scenario may also differ. We could develop different scenarios and ask the countries about how their perception of the developments.
- We have to assess what might be going wrong, and what we can do to correct this.

Slide 60

- The slide shows different elements and the description of determinants looks like a non-system approach. Getting them together implies looking at how they inter-relate and interact. It is very complicated. We cannot measure cultural changes. For example, attitudes towards pedestrians (they depend on design and vice-versa, etc.). In Finland there is experience with expert groups to evaluate new trends.

Slide 63 till 70

- We need approaches to combine these elements. One possible approach is scenarios. This is comparable to existing government reports which neglect pedestrians completely. This approach is not committal in political terms.
- Another approach is to consider opportunities and trend: we could promote walking close to the political agenda. But this is not complete enough.
- A third approach is to consider desirable outcomes and deduce necessary interventions. This is committal and gives arguments to decision-makers. However, it may include too much wishful thinking.
- Should we make country reports or a general report with some diversification? Both solutions have advantages and disadvantages
- We can be quantitative or qualitative. For quantitative analysis, we have seen the insufficiency of data. We have to be careful in qualitative assertions. There are also different ways of thinking about the future in different fields.
- What should we focus on? Scenarios? Links between determinants? Has something already been done in some countries on forecasting pedestrian activity? The Netherlands has for example experience with forecasting. Some work has been presented at WALK21 (in 2000 and in 2004) and at the International Transport Conference this week in Wuppertal. These ideas may be useful, for example for raising questions.
- We could look at what is already there and what the results are of those forecast (in other related fields, like transport). We then can build a composite.
- Till now walking is often not included in forecasting models. Therefore we can only use existing forecasts as background information. We need a fresh approach. With 20 countries represented, this is our big chance. Building on what exists, yes, but we have to do more.
- Starting with the desired outcomes and working back toward the necessary interventions has the advantage that it is very useful for politicians. To get a radical change, we need a vision.



- Some of the alternatives can be combined. For example, one scenario could be a vision.
- There are existing scenarios from which we can get something about walking. Example: denser cities with increased public transport; from this we can infer implications for walking. At the same time, scenarios do not always work.
- The desired outcomes (number 3) can be one of the scenarios. We can introduce one approach in which we set our goals for pedestrians and by working backwards we can design a (difficult) path how to reach these goals. This approach should be complemented by two other scenarios (e.g. equal situation and less walking). These scenarios would be welcome to assess what would be going wrong with these alternatives. Working backward in the preferred solution and working forward in the two other scenarios. We need the different ways of thinking as a contrast.
- The word scenario may be confusing.
- Whatever scenario we choose, we will face the problem of how to measure and how do we know if something works? Perhaps we can suggest a methodology to assess improvements so we can say the result is better, equal or worse.
- There is a growing demand on knowledge as cities are planning master-plans. Maybe we should be more practical.

The conclusion of the discussion is the following:

- We should have several "scenarios", one of them being current developments and one based on the desired approach. We need to collect existing work on the subject, but to work on from that in order to develop more.

Presentation Work Group 4 – Rob Methorst

Presentation: slide 72 till 79

The work of this WG depends on the production of the three others. We need methods to assess coherence and to integrate. To make our work useful to practitioners, we need to get their point of view and their own perspective. To produce guidelines, we have to work on the strategical, tactical and operational levels. We need to take into account the external factors related to the social environment, the physical environment (site, network, land use levels), and the transportation system. To this, we have to add the pedestrian himself.

Discussion:

- How do we define the transportation system? Are the cars not the environment for the pedestrians? What about the shoes and the walkways? Answer: Transportation includes pedestrians. In the glossary there is a definition.
- Why do we exclude joggers and pedestrians who walk for leisure? They are important as target group. RM: yes and no. If you focus on the critical pedestrians' limitations, one can design a system that is good for everybody. We don't want to go in special facilities. A good system for pedestrians should be an improvement for the extremes as well, but we don't want to go into the requirements for special pedestrians (joggers, etc.) This would extend the work too much.
- Without providing for special requirements, we need to think of interactions between joggers, nordic walkers etc.; 'Regular' pedestrians that will share the same space: differential speeds for example. This may influence design (width of walkways) and create needs and requirements.



- A decision-maker would like to know what different groups of pedestrians want: what children need, what the handicapped pedestrians need, etc. How does the Handbook deal with this? The Norwegian road safety handbook gives first facts, then measures fitting each target group.
- If we want to present results, we are highly dependant on the information about the different groups on which data collections are based.
- We should concentrate on walking as a mode of transport. There are different needs for recreational areas then for functional walking. Perhaps we could add a separate chapter for other pedestrian activities.
- It is important to recognise that certain everyday trips have also some leisure elements in them. In the UK, there are six categories of trips
- Walking as a mode of transport is essential but not sufficient: the benefits of walking are also social interaction through direct contact, which is essential for city life. Also we should not confuse leisure and pleasure: some pleasure in walking is a key element in choosing or accepting this mode of transport; it relates to quality of the environment and to needs.
- Walking is also to satisfy other needs such as health.
- Shoes are a vehicle! How many people wish to and are able to walk is something we should consider.
- We should keep in mind who is our audience. The handbook should not be too bulky. We therefore have to concentrate on measures in the guidelines. These are at several levels and differentiated according to various pedestrian groups. The Handbook should be easy to use.
- The analysis should be made for different groups, but we want to design the system for universal use. Therefore we have to start with the weakest user. Measures that are good for them are good for everybody.
- In the flyer there is a list of publications. This can be a guide for us. There are steps to take to come to measures: evidence, a system, tools, solutions. Use the tools and be convinced by the solutions. We have to get round all these things in some way.
- We have scientists to review our results, but we should also have reviewers from our potential audience.

Discussion of commitment:

We need to know at this stage how much time each of us can put into this project, what resources we have, what research we can undertake, so that we can plan future activities and get a chance to achieve our goals.

At this stage, we cannot assess commitment completely as some participants are not attending this meeting. This should be done later through e-mail. Discussing the content and procedures is more important now.

There has been a discussion in four separate groups (see Annex). Based on these discussions the SMG will make a proposal for division of tasks.

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Send your commitment statements to Rob Methorst before 1 July 2007. |
|---|

10. Homework

- Send travel reimbursement form within one week after the meeting to Carmencita Malimban. If there are any unnatural things (e.g. a detour in the trip, more nights, taxi), explain it on the form.
- Translate the flyer in own language. Send the translations to Catherine Rawas, she will take care of the lay-out and the pdf.
- Complete country reports before end of July. Look at 2 or 3 examples to see what is expected. Put the datum of the version in the title of the report (also in other reports)
- The data in the country reports will be reviewed in a small working group (Daniel Sauter, Alfred Shalom Hakkert and Jim Walker).
- Supply names and contact data of good reviewers to Rob Methorst
- Look at the questionnaire for measuring walking. Fill in the questionnaire before end of June and send it to Daniel Sauter.
- Contribute to the working groups by providing information and data regarding the PQN research questions (see Work Plan).
- Participants that want to do research not yet specified in the Work Plan, please contact the working group leaders.
- Search for additional funding (in your own country) and tell Rob Methorst about opportunities.
- Explore the possibilities for a national committee. See the example of The Netherlands.

11. Miscellaneous

Ralf Risser underlines that the main principle of this project is that every country provides data for the Working Groups.

12. Closing

The meeting is closed on 29 March 2007 at 14.00 o'clock.

Diepenbeek, 6 May 2007
Marjolein de Jong



Decision list

nr	Decision	Actor
2007-1	Agreement on minutes of the Kick-off meeting	
2007-2	Minutes of the MC meetings, workshops and conference will be made in rotation by the delegations of the countries in alphabetical order, to be appointed by the SMG.	SMG
2007-3	Agreement that WG members can be appointed without formal right to be invited to WG meetings	SMG
2007-4	There will be 2 connected MC and WG meetings per year (March, October), co-ordinated with ICTCT and WALK21	SMG
2007-5	There will be 2 preparatory SMG meetings per year	SMG
2007-6	In principle Working Groups can meet more often, but there is no money available for these meetings. The website will be the principal platform for exchanging information	WG leaders and participants
2007-7	Working principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Stage 1 – WG's to agree the questions that they need answers for to inform the project model (WG4) – Stage 2 – WG's to agree a methodology for how to collect information to answer these questions – Stage 3 – WG's to collect the information & data at an affordable and appropriate scale – Stage 4 – WG's to check data answers the questions and collect supplementary information & data if possible. – Stage 5 – WG's to collate the evidence and make a summary + identify assumptions + make recommendations for future work. 	SMG
	Future meetings will follow the format :	
	1. Day 1 – AM - Project Management meeting for an update on management decisions, budget, administrative matters etc. PM - WG leaders to report a summary of their current progress to identify the areas agreed by the WG and the areas of concern and seeking further discussion.	
	2. Day 2 – Work Group meetings to discuss/brainstorm the way forwards for the future of each WG.	
	3. Meeting days should be planned near the weekend to make low cost flight travel possible.	
2007-8	Agreement that it will not be possible to be very generous with sending out invitations to MC and WG meetings. The following procedure is agreed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the meetings are planned and budgeted well in advance 2. invite the MC members to a meeting at least 8 weeks in advance 3. ask the MC members to book a journey as soon as possible after the initial invitation and indicate attendance and costs within 14 days after the invitation 4. the Senior Management Group looks at expenditure and calculate how many additional experts can be invited 5. additional experts, mentioned on an MC approved list, 	SMG



Minutes Meeting 28 and 29 March 2007 COST 358 Pedestrians' Quality Needs

- are invited to reply within two weeks regarding their willingness and ability to attend; they can be invited anyway if they arrange to pay for their own expenditure
6. For reasons of justice, additional WG members will be limited to one per country (or a multiple thereof, if lots of funds are available).
 7. Preference will be given to those additional WG members who contribute own/extra research pertinent to the WG
- | | | |
|---------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 2007-9 | Agreement with Budget Plan May 2007 – April 2008 | |
| 2007-10 | Agreement to look for additional funding for website management and dissemination task | All participants |
| 2007-11 | The budget proposal 2007-2008 will be reviewed after the Valencia meeting. | SMG |
| 2007-12 | Agreement to ask experts that are especially invited for a workshop to write a paper about the subject. | SMG |
| 2007-13 | The Mayor of London will be asked to host the 4 th MC meeting in April 2008 | Jim Walker |
| 2007-14 | The Senior Management Group will meet on 31 st August 2007 in Zürich | SMG |
| 2007-15 | The SMG will make a spreadsheet suggesting priorities and desirabilities regarding the multiple year Budget Plan 2007 – 2010. | SMG |
| 2007-16 | Agreement that all Country Reports should be submitted before the end of July 2007. Per country it should be clear who is responsible for the report and how the work is divided. | All participants |
| 2007-17 | Agreement that any participant that presents (some part of) the PQN project will inform the Chair in advance. | All participants |
| 2007-18 | Appointment of a special sub-committee Country Reports for reviewing and making suggestions for improvements. The Committee: Shalom Hakkert, Daniel Sauter and Jim Walker. | sub-committee
Country
Reports |
| 2007-19 | Working Group leaders will base classifications and WG research planning on evidence from scientific studies. | WG leaders |
| 2007-20 | Non-attendants will be asked to send in Commitment statements regarding individual WG tasks to the Chair before 1 July 2007. | Rob Methorst |
| 2007-21 | Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • send travel reimbursement forms to COST office within a week after the meeting • send in translation of the PQN flyer to Catherine Rawas • complete the Country Reports before end of July • supply names and contact data of good reviewers to Rob Methorst • Complete the Data Availability questionnaire before 1 June; send it to Daniel Sauter • Search for additional funding for the project • Explore possibilities for a national PQN committee • Provide data for the working groups regarding the stated research questions (see Work Plan). | All participants |



Minutes Meeting 28 and 29 March 2007 COST 358 Pedestrians' Quality Needs

Annex: results of discussion on commitment

Country	Participant	WG	Time committed	subject
Norway	Anne-Katrine Geelmuyden	WG2 WG3	collection in the Fall; 1 to 2 days/month., maybe students	
Finland	Kimmo Lapintie	WG2 WG3?	Autumn 1 to 2 days/month	
	Lars Leden	WG2	1 to 2 days/month	
Israel	David Zaidel	WG4 WG3	1 to 2 days/ month also selected students	Benchmarking Walkability
Serbia	Milena Vukmirovic (& Dragana Bazik)	WG1	1 to 2 days/month; will try to motivate students	
Czech Republic	Karel Schmeidler	WG2 WG1 WG3	2 to 3 pers/month throughout project	Use of public space
France	Catia Rennesson	WG1 WG4	June and after: 2 days/month, maybe more	Deliverance of studies
Portugal	Ana Rita Gaspar Padua Moreira	WG1 WG2 WG3	2 to 3 days per month	
	Marie-José Enrique Cabello Marjolein de Jong Daniel Sauter Shalom Hakkert			Measuring pedestrian behaviour/ counting
				Scenarios / Vision
Norway Belgium	Alf Stole Marjolein de Jong			Strategic planning & policy for pedestrians
Netherlands	Rob Methorst	WG4 WG3 WG1 WG2	8 days/month	General theory, co-ordination, Country Reports; input from NL
United Kingdom	Miles Tight	WG1 WG3		deliver insight on current knowledge Country Report Forecasting / Vision WG3
Austria	Gudrun Haindl	WG1 WG2		Country Reports National research PQN
Italia	Alberto Raimondi	WG1 WG2		Design process Country Report Produce guidelines congruent design *& construction
Spain	Isaac Martin	WG1		Country Report, computer vision techniques, data collection via questionnaire
Belgium	Thérèse Steenberghen	WG1 WG4		Country Reports, use input from CR; define indicators for PQN; conceptual model

Minutes Meeting 28 and 29 March 2007 COST 358 Pedestrians' Quality Needs

Country	Participant	WG	Time committed	subject
Austria	Michel Meschik	WG1		Aspects Country Report; data analysis from existing studies
France	Nicole Muhlrud	WG4 WG3		Systems approach; finding gaps, conceptual thinking. Forecasting excersises in F.; discussion
Italy	Zusanna Simonova		3 hrs/week	Results of survey/enquiries, give recommendations individualist
Belgium	Philipp Hanoucq		1 hr/week	Best practices; Safety data Belgium; Ideas of legislation reg. pedestrians; Try to get study of before/after safety audit specific project; Teaching practicing
Greece	Socrates Basbas		Team: 1-2 manmonths/yr Self: 2 weeks; 3 undergrads, 1 Phd.	"survey" on physical measures on school trip; Survey on perceived safety level school, Statistics on road safety national + reg. level Schedule pedestrian
Estonia	Imre Antso		4hrs/week	All stats. On transport and travel; Represent traffic safety specialist
Norway	Aslak Fyhri		1 week	Give input from National Travel Survey NTPS Children; People's experience of visual environment
Sweden	Ase Svensson		½ week team 1 week	Projects on elderly and disabled in traffic; Project on hospital data on pedestrian accidents; National travel survey; Exposure measures children
Spain	Hector Monterde		2 – 3 hrs/week (as teamleader) + extra	Statistical - accidents - travel behaviour Traffic Psychology analysis of travel behaviour, Res. Methods + measurements/ statistical method
Germany	Jürgen Gerlach		½ week team: 2 weeks	Facilities as system; Safety + security + experience, Standards for road design, Design for all/ public transport design, Calculate qual. for decision making.
Switzerland	Dominique van der Mühl		4 hrs/week	Analysis on stats. On travel behaviour; Best practices different contests, Factors influening people, existing data, Interactions with stakeholders image of walking, Contact with politicians

