

**ECLIPSE (European Cooperation and Learning to Implement
Transport Solutions to combat Exclusion)**

ECLIPSE Final Conference



Minutes
Brussels, 27th June 2007



This project has received funding from the European Commission within the Community Action Programme to Combat Social Exclusion 2002-2006

The information contained herein is the sole responsibility of the author, and the Commission declines all responsibility for the use that may be made of it

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Purpose and Conference Agenda	3
2. Welcome and Introduction to ECLIPSE project	7
3. Transport and social exclusion: What is at stake?	12
4. The Policy Response	19
5. Transport & Social Inclusion – Local Best Practices	25
6. Toolbox for Transport and Social Inclusion	28
7. Stakeholders' Round Table	31
8. Conclusions	33
Annexes	
A – List of participants	33
B – Presentations	36

1. Purpose and Conference Agenda

The ECLIPSE Final European Conference “The role of transport in addressing Social Exclusion” was organised by Polis, partner of the ECLIPSE consortium. The ECLIPSE consortium is made up of the following partners:

- Transport & Travel Research Ltd (TTR) - Project coordinator
- FIT
- MERSEYTRAVEL
- POLIS
- RATB

The main aim of the conference was to present the findings of ECLIPSE at the end of the project and to open up the discussion on this issue by involving stakeholders from the research field to present their findings as well as, local, regional and national authorities to present their experiences. Some service providers gave presentations on their tools, in relation to transport and social inclusion.

The morning session started with an attempt to define the issue of transport and social inclusion (see agenda on the next page), with a presentation on ECLIPSE and the results of two research projects: a more theoretical one on the social consequences of “hypermobility” and the other on research in mobility and elderly people. The session ended with the policy response to the problem of transport and social exclusion at the EU, national (for the UK) and regional (for Flanders Region) levels.



The afternoon session started with a session on local best practices, including examples of transport and mobility measures to tackle social exclusion in the UK, Romania and Italy. The session continued with a series of presentations dealing with tools to address the issue of transport and social inclusion, including Universal Design of public transport, the Accession GIS software, public transport network management and financial schemes.

All of the presentations are available in Annex B.

The conference ended with a roundtable discussion including stakeholders from different organisations (UITP, Surrey County Council, the UK Department for Transport and TTR), with questions from the audience as well. (See the list of participants in Annex A).

The Agenda

9:30 **Coffee and Registration**

10:00 Morning Session- Chair : Massimo Marciani, FIT Consulting srl

10:00 Welcome and Introduction to the ECLIPSE project

Philip Oxley, Transport & Travel Research Ltd

10:15 Transport and social exclusion: What is at stake?

John Adams, University College London

Heidrun Mollenkopf, University of Heidelberg

11:15 The Policy Response

EU level: Peter Lelie, European Commission, DG for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities

National Level: Tracy Wallace, UK Department for Transport

Regional Level: Frank Van Thillo, Ministry of the Flanders Region, Belgium

Questions and Answers

12:30 **Lunch**

14:00 Afternoon Session- Chair: Philip Oxley, Transport & Travel Research Ltd

14:00 Transport & Social Inclusion – Local Best Practices

Paula Coppel, Merseytravel

Florin Dragomir, Regia Autonomă de Transport București (RATB)

Massimo Marciani, FIT Consulting srl

Questions and Answers

15:00 Toolbox for Transport and Social Inclusion

Universal Design of transport environment, Suzanne Hoadley, Polis

Accession GIS software, Simon Court, Citylabs

Network management and Financial schemes, Ivo Cré, Polis

Questions and Answers

15:45 **Coffee**

16:00 Stakeholders Round Table

Chair: Philip Oxley, Transport & Travel Research Ltd

Jerôme Pourbaix, UITP

William Bryans, Surrey County Council, Chair of Polis Working Group on Social and Economic

Issues related to Local Transport,

Tracy Wallace, UK Department for Transport

Anne Sophie Parent, Age Platform (apologised)

Comments from the audience

17:00 End of the Conference and Cocktail

2. Welcome and Introduction to the ECLIPSE project, Philip Oxley OBE, TTR

Mr Oxley, from the project coordinators TTR, welcomed the attendees to the conference and explained his own involvement in the area of transport and social inclusion. Mr Oxley started



his presentation with providing the **background** to ECLIPSE, which built on the conclusions from the preceding project MATISSE.

ECLIPSE (European Cooperation and Learning to Implement Transport Solutions to Combat Exclusion) is a project funded by the EC's Directorate General for Employment & Social Affairs which runs from September 2005 to August 2007, and involves 5 partners (TTR, Polis, FIT, Merseytravel and RATB).

The project builds on the following findings of the MATISSE project:

- 1) the important impact of transport on increasing social inclusion,
- 2) the limited cooperation of the stakeholders working in transport and social issues,
- 3) the lack of best practice examples on transport and social inclusion, and the lack of dissemination of the few existing ones.

Therefore the **objectives** of the ECLIPSE project are to:

- increase awareness of transport and social inclusion
- disseminate a menu of best practices so that people know what can be done
- promote working strategic partnerships
- promote the inclusion of transport in the National Action Plans (NAPs)
- address the issue at the European level

To reach these objectives, the ECLIPSE Consortium worked at **three levels**:

1) European level:

The challenge is to re-strengthen social objectives into the transport programme by addressing the issue at the European Level (EU institutions, European associations...) through European level briefing meetings, which gather European stakeholders from the transport and social affairs sector.

2) National level:

The challenge is the limited mention of transport in the National Action Plans (NAPs). ECLIPSE liaises with Member States to ensure that transport considerations are taken on board. In addition ECLIPSE aims to create awareness of how important the issue of transport and its impact on social inclusion is, by a series of events (national workshops and European conferences) in order to demonstrate the value of working in this area.

3) Local level:

The challenge is the lack of dialogue between social workers and transport professionals, and ECLIPSE tries to actively engage with transport actors and stakeholders in other sectors to form sustainable working partnerships to formulate policy on transport and social exclusion. Examples of good dialogue exist and in ECLIPSE two cities are involved, and their work is promoted in the project as examples of good practice.

Mr Oxley then explained the importance of the dissemination activities in this project, which included a leaflet in 5 languages, a website (www.eclipse-eu.net), a contacts database,

liaising with Polis cities and a Good Practice Guide to disseminate a menu of best practice measures and to assist transport professionals in combating the issue.

Mr Oxley invited the participants to let the ECLIPSE Consortium know about their own good practices, so that they could be included in the guide, as it should be as comprehensive as possible.

Mr Oxley ended his presentation by mentioning different **events** that ECLIPSE had organised during its two years of existence, i.e.:

- European level briefing meetings in Brussels (June 2006 and June 2007): they included MEPs and EC representatives, as well as representatives from European organisations.
- National workshops in Bucharest (June 2006), Rome (October 2006), Liverpool (December 2006), Budapest (March 2007) and Paris (May 2007).
- International Conferences in Perugia (May 2006) and Brussels (June 2007): these events were open to stakeholders from across Europe, gathering people and high level speakers from the research community, service providers, local authorities, the European Commission, international organisations and networks etc.

Mr Oxley stressed the fact that transport was not an end in itself but a means, and that it was often difficult to convince public authorities that they would only be successful if they worked in cooperation with the operators.

He closed his presentation by inviting people to visit the ECLIPSE website (<http://www.eclipse-eu.net/>) and to submit their examples of local good practice.

3. Transport and social exclusion: What is at stake?

The social consequences of hypermobility, John Adams, University College London

Professor Adams started with the premise that mobility was both liberating and empowering; however he also asked the question as to whether too much mobility was a good thing. With an increasing number of people exercising their freedom –the consequences of this growth on the physical environment, the “environmental externalities” – have been much studied but Professor Adams explained that he had focused on the social consequences of too much mobility.

Professor Adams started by focusing on one of ideas of ECLIPSE; “ECLIPSE and its predecessor MATISSE, have consolidated an increasing realisation across Europe that, in the past, transport policies have contributed to social exclusion. However, transport policies, if properly integrated with mainstream social policy, have the potential to improve social inclusion and cohesion in Europe’s cities and rural regions”.

Professor Adams highlighted two key messages in the sentence above, namely, “An increasing realisation”, which he understands to mean that knowledge about the problems has increased but action is lagging behind. Then “if properly integrated” highlighted the prerequisite to accomplish this action.

Professor Adams continued with some comments on the Mid-term review of the European Commission’s 2001 white paper on transport, which although had rapidly developed since 1992, the general policy objectives had remained stable. He saw that the objective of “high level of mobility” in actual fact meant “*higher* level of mobility”.



He looked some of the priorities of the Mid-term Review of the White Paper, where it mentioned that “the EU must offer the necessary levels of mobility to people and business”. What could be the impact on the environment? Indeed, the second priority related to protection (of the environment, energy, labour standards, passengers and citizens). However, the protection of the environment focused only on the physical environment and not on the social environment. He then concluded that the general aim of EU policy was to have more mobility.

Professor Adams presented a graph (see slide in Annex B) that showed the increase in travel in all modes, and it also indicated the “expected growth” for the future. He asked whether “expected” growth meant “Desired” growth or would this happen, could nothing be reversed?

Professor Adams gave an example of this increased growth of mobility: In the past ten years, in the UK there has been an increase of 6.58 million motor vehicles. In the EU 15, the increase of car ownership in the UK is “typical”. He showed a graph illustrating the related problems and the trends for Britain, and the projected future trends, that were common to all OECD countries, where it is shown that:

- Average mobility levels have increased, and are projected to continue doing so;

- The democratic and environmentally benign modes of travel are in retreat (decline in cycling; buses, 50 percent decline - only increasing in London; increase in train around London for commuters.);
- The elitist and environmentally damaging modes are growing rapidly, and capture the biggest share of resources devoted to transport (car use increased a lot, and the mode that increased most is air travel);
- The increase in distances travelled is a result of faster, longer journeys; travel time budgets have changed very little;
- These trends have profound implications on the way in which we interact with one another.

According to Mr Adams, if we project back into history we encounter the “hypomobile” society, the pedestrian peasant village – socially claustrophobic and vulnerable to disease, crop failure and misunderstandings with neighbours. Professor Adams pointed out that post-war increases in mobility have been widely welcomed as “progress”, however when can the continuing increase still be called “progress”? Mr. Adams believed that at some point there must be too much mobility which would lead to a “hypermobility” society.

He carried out a study for OECD on the social consequences of “hypermobility”. Below is his list of the principal **social consequences of technological success**, which was compiled by identifying current developments that appeared to be related to increasing mobility, and projecting them into the future, assuming that mobility would continue to increase and technology would lead to faster and cheaper transport. The picture of society in these conditions would be:

- more dispersed (more suburban sprawl);
- more polarised (greater disparity between rich and poor);
- more anonymous and less convivial (fewer people will know their neighbours);
- less child-friendly (childrens’ freedoms will be further curtailed by parental fears);
- less culturally distinctive (the McCulture will be further advanced);
- more dangerous for those not in cars (more metal in motion);
- fatter and less fit (less exercise built into daily routines);
- more crime ridden (less social cohesion and more fear of crime);
- subject to a more Orwellian style of policing (more CCTV surveillance);
- less trusting (the rise of the audit/risk-assessment culture);
- less democratic (the majority will have less influence over the decisions that govern their lives).

He illustrated in more detail some of these consequences, for example:

- More dispersed (urban sprawl): Houston, the World’s most car-dependent city, has in its city centre several big parking spaces to accommodate all the cars.
- Less child-friendly (children’s freedoms will be further curtailed by parental fears) and more dangerous: Children’s independence has decreased drastically in the past 30 years (e.g. in the ‘70s children would walk to school alone). There will be more metal (or carbon fibre) in motion. The increase in danger is not well reflected in accident statistics: The fact that there are now about one third as many children killed every year in Britain in road accidents as there were in 1922 when there was hardly any traffic and a nationwide 20mph speed limit, does not mean that the roads are now three times safer for children to play in; they have become so dangerous that children are not allowed out any more. The decline in the number of pedestrians and cyclists of all ages will continue.
- Subject to a more Orwellian style of policing (more CCTV surveillance), and at the same time more anonymity: more policing with cameras than policemen (there is less social control, people are not there to watch and few people know their neighbours). The

strained relations between the “haves” and “have-nots” will generate more crime and fear of crime. As with danger on the roads this phenomenon is not reliably captured by crime statistics. People, especially women, retreat from the areas where they feel threatened, especially the streets and public transport, and growing numbers of motorists travel with their doors locked.

- Mistrust: there is a higher perception of risks and increasing measures for caution, including barriers to separate modes for more defensive transport planning.
- Less democratic (the majority will have less influence over the decisions that govern their lives): Individuals will have less influence over the decisions that govern their lives. As we spread ourselves ever wider and thinner in our social and economic activities the geographical scope of political authority must expand in order to keep up with the growing size of the problems that require governing. Political authority migrates up the hierarchy from Town Hall to Whitehall, to Brussels and ultimately to completely unaccountable institutions like the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation.

Mr Adams wondered if there was any light at the end of the tunnel, and presented three possible questions for an opinion poll:

1. A question that every transport planner could ask: Would you like a car and unlimited air miles? The majority of people would say yes.
2. A question that policy makers would never ask: Would you like to live in the sort of world that would result if everyone’s wish were granted? There would not be votes here.
3. A more positive question on what do we really want: Would you like to live in a cleaner, safer, healthier, more sustainable world in which people knew their neighbours, and it was safe for children to play in the streets? If you can give a convincing choice, a majority of people would say yes.

The last question invites transport policy makers to view the social consequences of transport policies not as “externalities”, to be maximised or minimised as far as possible, but as the primary objectives of policy. Professor Adams hopes that if people could be persuaded of the impossibility of the whole world gaining the vision embodied in question 1, and of the undesirability of the world implied by question 2, and that the world encapsulated by question 3 is achievable – they just might vote for it. According to him only by *cherishing the local*, and defending it against the pressures of economic “efficiency” embodied in conventional cost-benefit analyses, can we hope to achieve it.

The chair of the session, Mr. Massimo Marciani, asked about the link with decoupling traffic and GDP growth. Professor Adams replied that on the transport side, there was indeed scope for more efficiency of free movement. On the economic growth aspect of the equation, his answer was that if the economy continues to grow in the same path as it does now, his great grandchildren would not be able to spend their money.

Social Participation in Later Life: The Role of Out-of-Home Mobility - Findings from the MOBILATE project “Enhancing Mobility in Later Life” (2000-2002), Heidrun Mollenkopf, University of Heidelberg

Ms. Mollenkopf started by saying that the perspective of her presentation was opposite to Professor Adams’, i.e. the focus of the research was the situation of ageing people and the role of mobility for social participation for older people. With age, the maintenance of social participation becomes more difficult due to declining health, increase in the importance of environmental barriers and unfavourable conditions, e.g. rural areas.

The findings of the research are based on the EU project MOBILATE, which studied how older people manage to travel and carry out their daily lives in both rural and urban areas

and the conditions they think that hinder or promote their activities. Trip diaries were used and the research was carried out in five European countries - Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy and the Netherlands.

Ms. Mollenkopf highlighted that the regions involved in the study were very diverse in terms of geography, population density and levels of mechanisation, welfare systems and culture. The people involved in the research themselves were also different, i.e. they had different types of impairments, and were subject to permanent change (health status, economic and social resources, retirement, children leaving home etc), which demanded different actions for them to remain active in society.



Ms. Mollenkopf explained that the aim of MOBILATE was to better understand the complex interplay between older peoples' personal competencies, resources, aspects of their physical and social environments, as well as the role of out-of-home mobility for social participation and quality of life in old age. The main question was: "Are there characteristic travel patterns related to personal and structural variables? Are they dependent on the different environmental conditions?"

From analysing the travel diaries and travel patterns of older adults in urban and rural areas in five European countries and the mean number of journeys made, Ms Mollenkopf explained that the most mobile people were the Finnish, and the least mobile, were Hungarians who lived in rural areas and the Dutch (which was surprising for the researchers). In relation to car use, the main way of travelling was by car as a passenger (except for the car drivers). A graph illustrating the impact of the personal conditions showed also that those individuals with bad health were less active.

Walking was the main mode of transportation amongst the groups of individuals studied in all five countries (except for drivers of cars), both in rural and urban areas. There was however a high proportion of public transport users in urban areas.

Clear differences between men and women and age groups were found, i.e. men aged between 55 and 74 travelled more by car both in urban and rural areas than women of the same age and men aged 75 and over. On the other hand public transport was most important for older people, because many of them did not have a driving licence.

In Hungary, cars were not often available and therefore most people travelled on foot or by bike, which was very different to the situation in Italy where most households have cars.

The level of satisfaction with public transport was in general, higher in urban areas than in rural areas, except for the Netherlands, where satisfaction was a little bit higher in rural areas. This may be explained by the fact that rural areas in The Netherlands are quite different from the rural areas in the other countries (greater density).

According to this research, the least satisfied, with their mobility were women in rural areas in Italy because they depended on someone to drive them.

An analysis to check what has an effect on satisfaction levels with mobility revealed that:

- personal, individual mobility is important;
- the car is important; not only to have (access to) it, but also to be able to drive it, to be independent;
- satisfaction with public transport is very important

The question then is what impacts do differing conditions in different countries have on older peoples' out-of-home activities and satisfaction with their possibilities to participate in activities? Ms. Mollenkopf presented five characteristics of activities that were defined in the project, i.e. social out-of-home, social indoor, physical, home and cultural activities. Taking this range of activities into account we see that Finnish people are the most active and Hungarians and Italians less active, partly due to cultural differences.

If the satisfaction level is compared with leisure possibilities by range of activities, it can be concluded the least satisfied were people that were still active at home but were unable to be active outside, whilst the most satisfied were those people that could carry out different activities.

The main reasons (prevalent in all countries) that prevented people from not carrying out as many activities as they wished were poor health and public transport. However, when we look at the reasons hindering out-of-home participation we see that the most significant were the lack of opportunities available (relatives and friends live far away) the lack of car, bad connections, difficulty using public transport. This indicated how important external conditions are. Ms. Mollenkopf explained that income levels were also predictors, but the most important are conditions related to activity and components of mobility.

Ms. Mollenkopf presented the following conclusions of the research:

- Personal as well as environmental conditions play an important role in maintaining social participation in old age.
- Conditions differ substantially between European regions.
- Activities are more frequent in urban than in rural areas (except for the West German areas).
- Older adults who (can) pursue a broad range of activities are more satisfied than those who can only take part in a limited range.
- Good public transportation and access to a car can, to a certain degree, compensate for declining abilities and help overcome barriers.
- There are two types of environmental obstacles to outdoor mobility: spatial and technological barriers and impediments caused by a lack of mutual consideration, busy and hectic traffic, and feared hazards in public spaces.
- High significance of out-of-home mobility and leisure activities in modern society (besides basic health and economic aspects). Outdoor mobility has high significance for older people. When the question "What does outdoor mobility mean to you?" was asked they answered "it is joy"; To this question, similar answers were given by people in all five countries. For older people, mobility is a way of being free, a human being like everyone else.
- The decline of outdoor mobility in old age is not an entirely voluntary retreat from the world and ensuring them opportunities for participation in their social, built-up, and natural environments despite physical handicaps, financial constraints, social barriers, and technological and spatial barriers would thus greatly contribute to their social participation and, by this, quality of life and well-being.

There is a need, concluded Ms Mollenkopf, of integrating transport policy and urban and social planning, which means:

- providing fully accessible public transport options;
- providing readily accessible easily reachable shops and services;
- reducing traffic volumes, speed and density;

- applying differentiated interventions (stimulation, training, social services, accompanying measures);
- and mutual consideration amongst society.

4. The Policy Response

Mr Marciani introduced the session highlighting that we needed to have a vision of how mobility should be and think about whether basic mobility should be a right.

EU level: Peter Lelie, European Commission, DG for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities

Mr Lelie began by explaining that the focus of his presentation would be on the **social inclusion strategy** and he started with a short **overview of how transport had been considered in the strategy**, as well as the recent changes to the strategy (in 2006), which included two main elements:

- 1) The Lisbon strategy: addressing the three cornerstones of sustainability, the economy the social agenda and the environment, and their interaction.
- 2) The open method of cooperation: a voluntary method of cooperation, by agreeing on common objectives (Nice objectives). Transport is not an objective as such but it is implicit in the participation in society objective. It includes the National Action Plans (NAPs) on social inclusion.

Mr Lelie explained that transport was only mentioned in detail in a few of the NAPs (2001-2006). The mixture of policies in the NAPs aimed at improving access for all with policies specifically targeting the socially excluded. The general weakness was however the multidimensional approach and the failure to mainstream social inclusion into transport policy. Nevertheless, he explained that there were some good practice examples and enough evidence in reports to suggest that limited access to transport can increase social exclusion by:

- limiting access to jobs and training opportunities;
- limiting the possibility of flexible working and balancing work and family life;
- limiting access to key services (health, lifelong learning, culture, sports and recreation);
- limiting the possibility of vulnerable groups to access facilities and maintain social contacts;
- undermining social capital and forcing people on low income to have an increasingly local and restricted lifestyle;
- limiting the possibility of economic and social regeneration of disadvantaged communities

In relation to the NAPs, Mr Lelie concluded that equal access to quality services including transport were identified as a core challenge in the Joint Reports.



Concerning the new EU Social Inclusion Policy Framework 2005/2006 Mr Lelie explained that in 2004-2005 the results of the Lisbon strategy were reviewed and evaluated, and a restructured strategy on jobs and growth and OMC (Open Method Coordination) on Social Protection and Social Inclusion (social inclusion, pensions, health and long term care)

started, including new, streamlined objectives for the OMC (access to health is also relevant for transport policy). He explained that the reporting cycles for economic growth and social issues (National reports on Strategies of Social Protection & Social Inclusion 2006-2008 and 2008-2011) were now synchronised to see a better relationship.

In the new guidelines for the Strategies of Social Protection & Social Inclusion 2006-2008, Member States are now asked to focus on a few of their priorities in greater detail, looking at monitoring, targets in order to ensure more efficient policies and encourage mutual learning.

Mr. Lelie reported that the most selected strategic priorities were child poverty/ well-being and active inclusion. In none of the reports was transport selected as one of the strategic priorities alone and only a few have a separate section on transport. However in almost all the reports transport is mentioned in one way or another (e.g. implicitly mentioned in priorities like access to services).

Mr. Lelie stated that there was interesting material on which the OMC could build in terms of access to education and to the labour market; availability of transport services in rural areas; access to health care and long term care; accessibility of transport for people with disabilities (one of the aspects where Member States were more committed); road safety and arrangements with regard to governance (e.g. working together with partners and target setting with regard to accessibility of services at the local level (UK) or the survey of stakeholders in preparing for a new NAP, to know what is in place before acting).

Mr Lelie concluded that during 2007 the focus would be on the relevance of transport for the themes of child poverty and active inclusion, with the identification of best practice and awareness-raising of the topic will be required. Mr. Lelie invited the ECLIPSE team and participants to inform the Commission about how transport could contribute to tackling child poverty and improve active inclusion. He recommended using instruments available in the context of the OMC, i.e. the European Transnational Exchange project ECLIPSE (contributing to exploit the results of the project to the maximum), new possible mutual learning project and peer reviews on social inclusion.

National Level: Tracy Wallace, UK Department for Transport

Ms. Wallace began by talking about the working context of the Department for Transport (DfT), explaining that Sir Eddington was asked to advise the Government on the long term links between transport & the UK's economic productivity & growth. He concluded, last year, that long-term transport policies should focus on 3 areas – key congested urban areas, inter-urban corridors, and key international gateways. Social policy did not heavily feature in the report, although the report mentions promoting an inclusive society, increasing the accessibility of jobs, and focusing on the needs of users and the whole journey. The report also recommended that the DfT consider the longer term social pressures it may face and to assess the full range of social costs and benefits in appraising its transport policies.

According to Ms. Wallace, in the government's response to the Eddington report (due later this year) a wider social and accessibility role of transport to help tackle social exclusion would need to be included.

Ms. Wallace continued by explaining that there were a number of government priorities to tackle social exclusion and the part that transport could play in would vary. She pointed out

that with the new UK Prime Minister, it would be necessary to see if any different government approach to tackle social exclusion would be adopted. .

Ms. Wallace explained that there had been a recent cross-government re-focus on improving outcomes for the most excluded communities, and the former Social Exclusion Unit was now the Social Exclusion Task Force, located in the heart of the Government – within the Cabinet Office. The former Unit had focused heavily on commissioning research on particular exclusion issues – including a report on the links between social exclusion, transport and the location of services. The new Task Force was trying to ensure that departments deliver on their targets to reduce social exclusion.

Ms Wallace then talked about the government's Social Exclusion Action Plan that was published last year. The Plan had identified particular socially excluded groups whose multiple needs needed to be addressed (employment, education or training and settled accommodation). These groups (young adults leaving care, adults leaving prison, adults leaving secondary mental health services and adults with moderate to severe learning disabilities) were at risk of a lifetime of exclusion. These people were also at key transition points in their lives – but transport would probably not be a key issue for them and, the Action Plan did not cover transport issues. However, the government would like more of the most socially excluded people to gain employment, education or training – according to Ms. Wallace, transport could play a part in this area.

Ms Wallace clarified the specific role of the DfT in tackling social exclusion: the overall aim was for transport that worked for everyone, which means balancing the needs of the economy, the environment and society. Thus the DfT had 4 strategic objectives, one of which is to enhance access to jobs, services and social networks, including the most disadvantaged.

The most disadvantaged areas and people where transport could realistically play a part in improving access were defined within DfT and included peripheral estates, rural areas, seaside towns; low income groups; disabled people; older people with limited mobility; minority ethnic groups. By focusing on these particular groups and areas, policies for dealing with specific accessibility issues at the local level and for particular social groups will be developed.

Ms. Wallace explained that accessibility planning had been introduced in the local transport planning system to help identify and tackle the problems people face in accessing jobs and key services. In this respect key DfT policies to tackle exclusions include:

- A range of regulations to improve the physical accessibility of public transport vehicles for disabled passengers. Improvements to transport infrastructure and stations are also being carried out as well.
- Free bus fares for people over 60 and disabled people in England travelling on local buses at off-peak times. This will be extended next April to these groups for off-peak bus travel anywhere across England.
- The Neighbourhood Road Safety Initiative in 15 deprived areas to try to reduce their high child casualty rates, and roadside training for 5-7 year olds in deprived areas.
- Improvement of local bus services and encouraging and funding of more flexible types of transport. Enhancing the role of Community Transport (CT). Helping to develop a

national database of CT services to improve information between local authorities and CT groups and for the general public.

- Personal security: develop and disseminate good practice in reducing crime and the fear of crime on and around the transport system, including the pedestrian journey.
- Comply with Equality Duties, covering gender, race and disability, which aim to eliminate discrimination against these groups, providing a clear opportunity for the DfT to analyse what the potential and actual impacts of its policies are on these key social groups.
- Social research on the needs of different social groups and research on how CT, buses and taxis can help reduce social exclusion.

Ms. Wallace highlighted the need for cooperation with other government departments since accessibility & travel issues were not only for the DfT to consider. Accessibility planning was trying to address the issue of key government departments and agencies considering the location and delivery of services, as well as access to them. However, Ms. Wallace explained that the quality and availability of the services was also critical.



Ms. Wallace also brought up the issue of the travel horizons among some socially excluded people. For example, some people may have limited travel horizons and not be willing to travel too far to a job that is low paid and where travel takes up lots of their time. Ms. Wallace highlighted that jobseekers should have appropriate skills in order to take up wider job opportunities. Ms. Wallace mentioned some of the fiscal measures undertaken by government agencies to help people on low income meet their transport costs. For example, Education

Maintenance Allowances are given to less well-off 16-19 year old students to attend education or training courses, jobseekers costs to travel to interviews can be covered etc. However, Ms. Wallace pointed out that there had not yet been a cross-government evaluation of all these benefits to see exactly who and how they were helping low income groups access key services.

More generally, she pointed out the need for more cross-government consideration of the potential impact of policies on transport e.g. promoting a 24 hour economy without considering the implications of people being able to access bus services in the late evening/early hours of the morning to get to shift work.

Ms. Wallace explained that the DfT had recently reviewed the range of travel training schemes in England, which aimed to give people the skills and confidence to be able to travel by public transport safely and independently. Most of the schemes were helping people with learning difficulties travel to education and work. The benefits for the individuals (and their carers) were wide-ranging.

Ms. Wallace highlighted the need for travel and transport issues to be considered by other agencies, e.g. care services when assessing the needs of a stroke victim. Currently few such travel assessments were made. Ms. Wallace explained that this is one issue that the DfT would shortly be cooperating with colleagues in other government departments about, with the findings and recommendations to be disseminated later this year.

Ms. Wallace talked about the DfT's future work, highlighting the need to have a better understanding of what peoples' travel needs are and a more formal evaluation of initiatives undertaken to help them, i.e. to know what has really help to improve access to key services. Ms. Wallace also mentioned that the DfT had recently published an evidence base review of social research on the travel needs, choices of and barriers of different social groups and in addition further qualitative research on the travel needs of specific social groups was being carried out. She explained that accessibility planning was also going to be evaluated to understand its impact and what transport initiatives work. She explained that the findings would be fed back to the DfT and local authorities to assist in improving accessibility at the national and local levels.

Ms. Wallace also mentioned that at present the DfT's engagement with anti-poverty organisations was less well established than with disability groups and that the DfT would seek to engage with key stakeholders on poverty issues to improve policy development.

Ms. Wallace also mentioned that the DfT would also try to better mainstream its social objectives into the decision-making process on transport investment and to more fully assess the social impacts of its policies.

Ms Wallace then addressed the future transport challenges starting with the problem of increasing numbers of older people. Some of these older people may have been able-bodied car users most of their adult life but now have a disability and there was a need to see how to help them continue driving safely or to use public transport safely and independently in order to lead a full and active life.

Ms. Wallace also looked at other transport challenges including suitable transport infrastructure for an increased local population and travel information in other languages.

Ms Wallace concluded that travel and transport issues could not just be considered by transport departments alone. She highlighted the need for other departments to 'transport-proof' their policies and effectively liaise with their transport colleagues. In addition, she highlighted the importance of taking into consideration how people can access services, with the location, delivery, quality and availability of key services as a crucial issue. Finally she acknowledged that there were many good transport initiatives to help socially excluded people travel and access services, but that there needed to be further investigation at central and local government levels on exactly who was being helped and how. She acknowledged that this was a very complex task, with many factors would have an impact. However, this could help improve peoples' lives because by identifying where transport could make a real difference to socially excluded people's lives, appropriate initiatives could be targeted more effectively.

Regional Level: Frank Van Thillo, Ministry of the Flanders Region, Belgium

Mr. Van Thillo presented the idea of the "right to mobility" which has been adopted by the transport ministry in the Flanders Region. He began by considering the meaning of "mobility", which he believes to be broader than just transport.

Mr. Van Thillo explained that he represented the Ministry of the Flemish minister Kathleen Van Brempt that deals with different policy aspects, i.e. mobility policy, including the

common city and regional transport; social economy, including service providers in employment for persons with disabilities; the coordination of the equal opportunities policy; gender issues, lesbians, gays and bisexuals and the issue of accessibility.

Mr. Van Thillo outlined the mobility policy priorities of the minister: mobility for all (including basic mobility), road safety, attainability and durability (not only environmental but also liveable cities). In order to achieve these objectives, Mr. Van Thillo argued that it was necessary to envisage public transport as real competitor to the car, instead of a second choice for low income groups. He explained that a public transport system needed to be integrated, available, “welcoming”, safe, frequent, affordable, environmentally friendly, fast and reliable, with good and accessible information.

“Basic mobility” was defined by the social democratic party in Flanders as “the user’s right to the minimum availability of an organised and fixed transportation system”. The right to basic mobility was integrated into legislation. Mr. Van Thillo explained that in practical terms this meant that everyone in Flanders had the right to be live at a maximum distance of 500 meters from a public transport stop in metropolitan areas, 650 meters in urban and suburban areas and 750 meters in rural areas. This stop should be a fixed stop with a scheduled service.



Currently, 90% of the Flanders Region offers its citizens, “basic mobility”. Mr. Van Thillo explained that the 100% coverage had not yet been attained due to the many dispersed rural areas.

According to Mr Van Thillo the pricing strategy is essential as it is a key issue for attaining social inclusion through transport measures. This strategy in Flanders includes keeping public transport prices as low as possible and an integrated ticketing system in the whole region. In addition, transport is free for people over 65. This measure was contested by economists because extra transport might be created. In the Flanders case, the number of trips has almost doubled, mainly among the elderly. Mr. Van Thillo believed that more research was needed on the consequences of elderly people having better access (free ticket and closer stops) to public transport.

Mr. Van Thillo highlighted the importance of accessible transport. In this respect, in Flanders every public transport vehicle has to be accessible to wheelchair users etc with the provision of a quality service, especially to city centres.

Mr Van Thillo also talked about the pendulum-plan (commuter plan) that focuses on home to work place and home to school transport. In this plan there is support to companies to encourage better transport options for their workers and sustainable transport modes are favoured. There is also a Pendulum fund developing best-practices.

MOBIDESK is another initiative in the area that offers a one-stop-shop for advice about the most sustainable transport options available. It is managed at a provincial level, where local

enterprises are taken up in the partnership. The solutions are provided in partnership with De Lijn, the public transport operator in Flanders.

Mr. Van Thillo continued by talking about the issue of social economy policy, with initiatives such as “lijnsporters” (on the job training scheme for unemployed young people who act as stewards on public transport and increase safety), “schoolspotters” (e.g. education at school on how to behave on public transport).

Mr. Van Thillo explained that in Flanders transport/mobility and social issues were dealt with separately but sector protocols included mobility to ensure mainstreaming.

Mr Van Thilo concluded that transport policy was more than about enhancing mobility and that it should not be put in opposition with social policy; i.e. the two are not contradictive. He explained that Flanders had taken this active political choice to contribute to better local communities and that government should take the leading role in including social aspects in transport policies.

5. Transport & Social Inclusion – Local Best Practices

The chair of the session, Mr. Philip Oxley, from TTR, opened the session highlighting the important role of cities, in the effort to work towards inclusion.

Examples of best practices from Merseyside, UK, Paula Coppel, Merseytravel

Ms. Coppel introduced her presentation by providing background information on Merseyside, a sub-region of 1.4 million inhabitants, made up of 5 local authorities including Liverpool city. She explained that Liverpool was a major port, maritime centre and industrial city with pockets of persistent poverty and deprivation. After an economic decline at the end of the 19th century and different socioeconomic crisis in the 20th century, it had begun to recover economically in the late 1990s.



Ms. Coppel explained that Merseytravel was responsible for coordinating public transport in Merseyside. It is a public-sector body made up of 18 elected representatives and funded partly by the five local authorities in Merseyside and partly by the central government. Merseytravel delivers infrastructure projects and ticketing initiatives, but it does not operate buses or trains and has no formal responsibilities for land-use or service planning. According to Ms Coppel partnerships were essential to the work that

Merseytravel carries out.

Ms. Coppel highlighted the key policy priorities for Merseytravel including, economic growth, city renaissance, tourism, population growth and housing market renewal. There was also the recognition of transport as essential to support regeneration, accessibility and social inclusion, which were major priorities. She explained that there were strategic documents to persuade other stakeholders on the importance of these issues, i.e. the Local Transport Plan, the Access Plan and the Bus Strategy.

Ms Coppel presented the vision for the second Local Transport Plan for Merseyside, which has been developed “a fully integrated safe transport network for Merseyside which supports economic and social regeneration and ensures good access for all and which is operated to the highest standards to protect the environment and ensure quality of life”, and in social inclusion terms “to promote social inclusion by overcoming those transport barriers which impact on individuals’ ability to access job opportunities and other essential services that they need”.

The Access Plan, as explained by Ms Coppel, seeks to make transport considerations an integral part of the decision making process to avoid the “plaster sticking” approach, i.e. to avoid creating accessibility problems and the need to travel. It includes Strategic Accessibility Partnerships involving different stakeholders of the social services. These structures of partnerships existed and Merseytravel lobbied to get involved, becoming the first transport authority to be included. In the context of the development of the Access Plan, Action Plans for addressing accessibility barriers were agreed in relation to employment,

education and health, and targets and indicators were defined against which the progress will be measured.

Ms Coppel continued with an overview of the development of the Access Strategy. As evidence had provided a clear focus for the prioritisation of activities, strategic accessibility audits were completed using Accession software and accessibility maps were created. The results were used to inform prioritisation of activities and local accessibility audits were carried out across districts. Finally joint action plans for improving accessibility were drafted.

Ms Coppel explained the key issues in relation to the different policy related to transport on which Merseytravel works. Regarding employment she highlighted the high levels of unemployment and the fact that many people had a low skills base. In addition she explained that there was a lack of public transport to key regeneration areas and that as a consequence people's travel horizons could be limited. Another challenge according to Ms Coppel was that there had been a growing trend towards more shift working and public transport was not available at certain times in the day. Ms. Coppel also highlighted that cost of transport remains relatively high, especially in comparison with low wages and some people spend significant proportion of their wage on transport costs. To face these problems a target was established for improving accessibility to key employment areas: 1% per annum improvement to the number of workless people within 30 minutes of a major employment centre by public transport.

Ms. Coppel talked about the problems in the field of education and transport including the cost of transport for students, the increase in the number of adult learners accessing evening classes, when there was a lack of public transport. The different solutions to these problems have included collaborative arrangements between a number of schools delivering lessons at different sites on issues around the provision of inter school transport. In this policy field, the target for accessing education is 1% per annum improvement to the number of 16 to 18 year olds within 30 minutes of a post 16 education establishment by public transport.

Ms. Coppel also talked about the health sector and transport, explaining that major hospital and health service re-locations had taken place and there has also been a re-organisation of the health services (ambulances, 'Choose and Book' arrangements). She explained that there were new facilities located in inaccessible places and that there was an uneven distribution of healthcare (residents in disadvantaged areas have least provision) and a lack of direct services to hospital sites from socially disadvantaged areas.

Ms. Coppel also explained that Merseytravel was also involved in activities to promote the consumption of fresh food, on the philosophy that this could contribute to improving health and therefore employment opportunities. This was especially important as in many areas where shopping and services were moving to the outskirts of town, making it difficult for people without cars to access food and services. In some parts of Merseyside, there were no shops selling fresh produce so a "veggie van" has been introduced-a mobile van that goes to different areas selling fresh fruit and vegetables.

In order to tackle the different challenges that Merseyside faces in relation to transport a detailed action plan for the first phase of the strategy was developed, which includes different initiatives related to transport and social issues, and is linked to the revised

Merseyside Bus and Rail Strategies. In addition Ms Coppel pointed out that local authorities were finalising their Local Accessibility Action Plans, detailing actions at a local level.

Ms Coppel then presented then the different activities and projects carried out by Merseyside within this strategy. One of the successful solutions was the JobLink Demand Responsive Transport service, which aimed to link people to jobs, and a lot of people have recognised that they would not have been able to find the job without the service.

Ms. Coppel also introduced another initiative – WorkWise that helps unemployed people find a job. It is a joint venture with job centres, Connexions, local authorities and Merseytravel. It addresses cross-boundary ticketing needs (e.g. for people in Merseyside to travel to Northern Wales to access jobs) as well as cultural and linguistic barriers (information has also produced in Polish). WorkWise also offers scooters to help people access jobs as well as travel guides and provides job seekers with free public transport tickets to attend job interviews.

Ms Coppel concluded that social inclusion was a key element of Merseyside's local transport strategy and that Accessibility Planning was a mandatory part of their transport planning process, contributing to a more inclusive system. She explained that Merseytravel and its partners were developing innovative solutions to accessibility and social inclusion problems, and acknowledged that a preventive approach was vital to avoid access problems. She added that good land use planning was essential and that support and commitment was required from other agencies to achieve inclusive and accessible facilities. This approach would ultimately benefit everyone, as the costs of this strategy will improve peoples' lives and the community representing a long-term saving.

Questions

One participant asked about the high costs that some measures implemented could incur. Ms Coppel replied that it was a question of responsibility and that Merseytravel provided viable options so that people could make the best choices.

Mr. Cheung asked why Merseytravel took the lead in all these initiatives related to policy domains outside transport and why they were ahead in this field.

Ms. Coppel replied that Merseytravel had very enthusiastic staff. She also acknowledged that there were also very good examples of integration of transport and social policies in other places, like Greater Manchester for example.

Florin Dragomir, Regia Autonomă de Transport București (RATB)

Mr. Dragomir started his presentation by describing Bucharest city-a very densely populated city (almost 2 million inhabitants in 228 km² urban area). Mr. Dragomir said that the main public transport operator was RATB, which operated the surface network. In addition METROREX, owned by the Romanian ministry of transport, operated the underground network and there were also private companies operating minibuses.

According to Mr. Dragomir the number of cars has increased enormously in Bucharest over the last few years (currently there is more than 1 car per 2 inhabitants).

Mr. Dragomir talked about some of the efforts in relation to tackling social exclusion, in Bucharest. They have decided to concentrate on assisting the most vulnerable categories of people, i.e. disabled people and people low income and RATB has put different measures in place. Technical solutions have included adapting part of the fleet to enable wheelchair access and tram stops for people with reduced mobility with new secured access platforms. Mr. Dragomir explained that there were new technical specifications for modernising the fleet and a smart cards application, as well as improvements being made to the information systems.



Mr. Dragomir also explained that special fares existed for some groups, for example, free passes have been offered to approximately 100,000 people (people on low incomes, older people and people in wheelchairs) and approximately 610,000 have benefited from fare reductions (older people living around Bucharest and students).

Mr. Dragomir explained that RATB had received political support to continue this policy and that they had received support to buy 500 new low floor buses and 100 low floor trolley buses during the ECLIPSE project. In addition, Mr Dragomir explained that politicians had committed to continue supporting these initiatives after ECLIPSE finishes and would support the purchase of another 500 low floor buses and 100 low floor trams.

Mr. Dragomir explained that the big challenge for the future for RATB was bringing about access for all. He said that politicians had understood the added value and importance of access for all, and therefore it was expected to make the whole surface transport accessible in the next few years. He explained that the next challenge was the creation of new interchanges and links between the surface and the underground stations, which were already being modernised (2 metro stations are now accessible for all).

Questions

In relation to the question about the use of all these changes, Mr Dragomir said that there were very dynamic economic changes taking place, and that as a consequence, transport in general was increasing a lot. With the different measures RATB succeeded to conserve the same number of trips even if the number of car trips increased as well.

Someone asked where all the new cars in Bucharest are parked. Mr Dragomir answered that a lot park in the street, which poses a serious hindrance to traffic. However, he explained that there was a project to provide parking spaces around the main ring road (park and ride) with “push” measures as well (enforcement).

In relation to smart cards, another participant asked about their use and whether there were different fares depending on the time of day or season. Mr Dragomir explained that the smart cards were both for the surface and the underground public transport systems, but that the old fare structure was still conserved, because otherwise the introduction of the new smart

card system could have been perceived as a way to introduce new changes (e.g. increase of tariff). He said that the tariffs would be changed at a later date

Examples of ongoing project relevant for ECLIPSE in Italy and two selected best practices: Genoa- Agency for flexible services and Rome-Trambus service, Massimo Marciani, FIT Consulting srl

Mr Marciani started with an introduction to the situation in Italy; where there were many initiatives being undertaken in relation to transport and social inclusion locally but he added that there was no coordination of these initiatives.

Mr. Marciani presented an interesting example of these initiatives, DrinBus in the port city of Genoa. DrinBus provides a transport service (minibuses running on methane) to people living in low density areas, where regular public transport lines had become expensive to operate. The initiative was prepared in a very careful way by AMT/AMI (an agency that deals with flexible transport solutions), providing a service in between the regular collective transport and the private car/taxi.

Mr Marciani explained that DrinBus was a “many to many” service, with trips and timetables fully flexible within fixed stop points in defined areas during the operating hours. He explained that originally the service was designed for people with specific mobility needs, it has also become a service used by all kinds of people, so could be developed as a commercial scheme. Mr. Marciani explained that the service was available from Monday to Saturday, 6am-8pm and the booking could be made by telephone 30 minutes before departure, although users “on the road” without previous booking are accepted, in accordance with the scheduled service. DrinBus uses advanced technologies (GPS-GIS integration for fleet monitoring and GSM for communications between dispatch centre and vehicles).



Mr Marciani presented the results of the service, which included 2857 registered users, with an 8% increase in the number of passengers yearly in the area of Pegli, 5% in Quinto and 13% in Bolzaneto, where the DrinBus had replaced the traditional fixed routes. In addition the environmental costs/benefits analyses have shown a saving of € 34.500 per year, due to the decreased environmental pollution combined with the modal shift obtained (reduction in private car use). About 65% of users use the service every day and 20% more than six times a week.

Mr Marciani continued by talking about the example of Trambus in Rome a public transport operator that has always been very focused on delivering diversified, comfortable and high-quality services to meet the needs of disabled people. These services have been carried out with the support of the Municipality of Rome. Currently the company delivers ordinary and extraordinary services for disabled people on daily basis.

Mr. Marciani then presented the services offered by Trambus in more detail including taking disabled people to school and other on demand services for disabled people.

Mr. Marciani talked about a new service for disabled people, launched in 2007 that took disabled people to the beach. He explained that this had proved to be a very popular service as it picked people up from their door and took them to the beach. Mr. Marciani explained that there were few leisure services available to disabled people and they could often find

leisure time difficult as it was hard to find accessible places. With this service they could also have the chance to socialise. Mr. Marciani highlighted the important part leisure played in quality of life.

Mr. Marciani talked about the vehicle fleet which is equipped with an elevating footboard, wheelchair security devices, lateral entrance, wide spaces and great visibility within the vehicles and proper vehicle cell phone. In addition many electric vehicles have been introduced and are currently being used in the historical centre of the City.

In terms of users, Mr Marciani explained that Trambus strongly supported an improvement in service delivery for disabled people; with a goal to almost double the number of passengers transported every day (from the current 800 to 1500) by 2008. In addition, taking into account the “taxi for disabled people” service, supported by the Municipality of Rome, the city would like transport for 2000 disabled passengers to fulfil its goal of being a caring and respectful City.

Mr Marciani drew some conclusions on the situation in Italy by starting with an explanation of the structure of public authorities and the different competences that each authority has. In that respect he described that the subsidiarity principle was being becoming difficult because there was no integration between the different bodies responsible (federal, regional, provincial and municipalities). He did however clarify that now that integration tables were organised with representatives from different bodies. Mr. Marciani also mentioned that in addition, the Italian legal framework was not homogeneous and made up of fragmented legislative provisions. It was however generally recognised that the issue of mobility and accessibility was complex and that to implement national legislation in a harmonious way was not easy. Nevertheless the local area should ensure a basic mobility. Mr. Marciani concluded that one of the fundamental issues was how to finance mobility, which is of vital importance to independence.

Questions

A participant asked about the fact that people had to call everyday to book a place on DrinBus that this might be an inconvenience. Mr Marciani explained then that people that used the service regularly had a fixed schedule and that they only needed to call if the time needed to be changed.

John Adams agreed with the idea of considering mobility a right and a key to independence, but pointed out that this needed to be specified. He also talked about the Veggie Van in Merseyside (brining fresh food to areas with no local shops) and that this was no substitute to a real shop which would be better.

John Adams also described these types of measures as only “easing the pain” of the situation and not dealing with the route cause (which he believed to be the car). He believed that there was a lack of long term vision and we were in the situation of dealing with emergencies.

Mr. Marciani agreed that often we were dealing with “emergency situations” and that unfortunately there was no vision. He mentioned that power of the automotive industry, which (in Italy) was subsidised by the state.

Ms. Coppel replied to the comment on the Veggie Van. She explained that shops were market led and that in that area – with high unemployment, the only shops that survived were takeaways, chip shops and betting shops. She agreed that a shop would be better but no one was interested in having a shop there so the Veggie Van played an important part in providing fresh food to people.

6. Toolbox for Transport and Social Inclusion

Universal Design of transport environment, Suzanne Hoadley, Polis

Ms. Hoadley presented the EU funded UNIACCESS project, which dealt with Universal Design in public transport (PT), i.e. access for all (not only wheelchair users but all mobility impaired people) in an autonomous (independently) and dignified manner. The goal of the project, which involved manufacturers, user groups and transport authorities as partners, was to promote and support the networking and coordination of research and innovation activities in the field of universal design of accessibility systems for public transport.



UNIACCESS was driven by the fact that the general approach to making the public transport system accessible was piecemeal and often focused on one type of disabled user. Moreover, other barriers include: a lack of accessibility provisions, the design of the accessible devices which were frequently out of order, the attitudes of the general public and public transport staff, and the lack of universal design principles adopted in the transport sector in contrast to the building sector.

Ms. Hoadley highlighted how accessible public transport could benefit all passengers (e.g. the tramway in Strasbourg was the first system that was fully accessible making it quicker for all passengers to get on/off the tram thereby increasing the operational speed), and could offer commercial prospects with new potential users (older people in an ageing population) and financial advantages as it could reduce the need for specialised transport services.

The main activities of the project included gathering state-of-the-art knowledge on accessible systems for public transport, producing a roadmap of future Research & Development (R&D), launching new R&D project proposals and raising awareness of universal design.

Ms. Hoadley explained that these activities were carried out following a methodology to structure them. The state-of-the-art activity was carried out firstly by analysing the infrastructure and rolling stock as well as the legislation and standards in place. The vision for the future was then developed, by developing scenarios on door-to-door journeys. The preparation of the Roadmap for future R&D took place, defining a list of requirements that should be fulfilled to make the scenarios a reality (e.g. the ticket machine area should be accessible to all) as well as of emerging concepts for each requirement (e.g. for the requirement "ticket machine area should be accessible to all", three solutions, or emerging concepts, were defined, i.e. no steps should be around the ticket area; the ticket area should be obstacle-free and the height of ticket machine should be adjustable).

Finally the R&D Roadmap itself was prepared, which encompasses the emerging concepts deemed to have universal or broad application and defined their level of priority (very important, important, less important and, undefined). The roadmap was structured by each step of the journey i.e. before the journey, to the terminal, at the terminal/platform/stop, ticketing, boarding/alighting, during the journey.

ACCESSION: Measuring transport accessibility with GIS, Simon Court, Citylabs

Mr Court gave a presentation on ACCESSION, software for multi-modal transport accessibility analysis developed by Citylabs Ltd and MVA Ltd on behalf of the UK Department for Transport (DfT) in 2003. He explained that since then it had been successful in the UK, in both the public and the private sector.

Mr Court explained that ACCESSION could be used for various purposes, including assessment of public transport services; local transport plans; investigating accessibility to health services; investigating social exclusion e.g. access to employment; analysis of sites (planning applications); business (re)location and catchment analysis.

He explained that the software used UK data import tools (reading a variety of different formats) and read most standard worldwide mapping formats. It had a built-in mapping software component (import/export from/to GIS) and in accessibility calculators, display and reporting tools. The work carried out by ACCESSION was stored in an MS Access database, making it fully accessible to any imported transport data / results files / contours and saving repositories to share between offices.

Local accessibility maps show the level of accessibility to a public transport stop; or to another given services (e.g. hospitals) or specified area. It could also allow the user to “create” their own public transport system by showing the difference between the situation before and after a public transport service is implemented. ACCESSION is a multimodal system that also offers reporting tools, including standard reports and complex reports (e.g. for specific destinations...). Mr. Court gave a short demonstration of the ACCESSION software.

Question

One participant asked where the data came from.

Mr. Court replied that the data came from local authorities, and that it was collected once a year in October.

Public transport network management and financial schemes, Ivo Cré, Polis

In this presentation, Mr. Cré summarised the range of different options the ECLIPSE project had gathered in the field of public transport provision to support social inclusion. He started with the basic assumption that mobility and accessibility were two different issues: Mobility is a function of distance travelled, per time unit and at a certain cost. This cost can either be financial, physical or psychological. Accessibility is a function of all the elements used to define mobility, but introduces another parameter. Accessibility is mobility per destination reached. If we want to increase accessibility, we can “tamper” with distances, speed, financial cost, physical accessibility, psychology (travel horizons) and nature and location of destinations.

The current focus on increasing access in public transport lies on an increased physical accessibility of rolling stock and interchanges. This is reflected in several national obligations in France, UK, Romania and The Netherlands etc and the passenger rights discussion at the



EU level. Demand responsive transport or individual transport is deployed as an alternative in case the increased physical accessibility is not working well enough.

Mr Cré focused on other actions in public transport to improve social inclusion such as fare policy and public transport network management, looking at elements such as speed, psychological cost (effort) and financial cost.

In the field of public transport network management he described actions that minimised the distance to public transport access points, such as better interchange design and legally binding standards for distance to public transport stops. Also a clear public transport network hierarchy could solve problems and could help the user understand what service and frequency to expect on certain lines. Travel data could be used to improve network coherence. In a lot of cases, through smart card data, origin destination matrices could be used to optimise and simplify the network. Mr. Cré highlighted the need for the network to be adapted to the rhythm of the user (e.g. working hours) and that people preferred a simple network.

Mr. Cré explained that within network management, transport authorities were looking for the right balance between demand responsive transport (DRT) and main line public transport. A good example can be taken from Brabant in The Netherlands where the province is responsible for public transport and local authorities are responsible for bus stops and DRT. Over the past years, an unsustainable growth of cost of DRT has been noticed with DRT mainly used on main line trajectories. Instead, local authorities have taken money from the DRT budget to improve accessibility of the public transport line, with a long term perspective and commitment to the mainlines. The end goal is to reach an optimal economic and social balance between DRT and mainline public transport.

Mr.Cré also talked about the other types of solutions that could be found regarding fare policies. Currently, public transport receives overall a subsidy ranging from 0 – 100% throughout Europe. There are also targeted policies ranging from reductions to free public transport for young people, elderly, families and job seekers etc.

Mr.Cré indicated that an interesting option would be to install the third payer principle, whereby public transport could be made free for the end user by looking at third parties to pay for the passengers trips (e.g. the municipality, the employer etc). Another option would be to create more value for the same price (e.g. offering other services or allowing an extra passenger on 1 ticket) or to give full network access instead of fixed trip passes.

To conclude, Mr Cré stated that a physically accessible public transport network was only part of the solution. Public transport operational matters played a role in opening the system for socially disadvantaged people and specific fare policies offered the possibility to financially involve other sectors.

7. Stakeholders Round Table. Chair: Phillip Oxley, TTR. Participants; Jérôme Pourbaix, UITP; William Bryans, Surrey County Council, Chair of Polis Working Group on Social and Economic Issues related to Local Transport; Tracy Wallace, UK Department for Transport.

Mr Oxley introduced the participants and invited them to comment on the themes and ideas raised during the conference.

Mr. Pourbaix started by acknowledging that there was general agreement on the fact that the ability to access jobs, education and other services were key to social inclusion. He highlighted that some barriers could be overcome, e.g. the integration of low floor vehicles DRT, integrated ticketing, concessionary fares for those on low income. However, Mr. Pourbaix highlighted that the real challenge was to get socially excluded people to participate. It was not just about physical accessibility but also about perceived barriers and needs to be addressed, for example someone might feel that jobs the other side of the city were not accessible. He believed that it was not easy to address these perceived barriers and that it required working in partnerships and that the factor of public transport in social inclusion needed to be underlined, for example the Workwise scheme in the UK (providing travel schemes and free tickets to job seekers). According to Mr Pourbaix and the organization he represents, UITP believed strongly in the phrase: "when there is mobility there is social inclusion".

Mr. Pourbaix continued by explaining that UITP realises that social problems differ from country to country. Therefore UITP motivates the different world regions to develop their own actions designed for their specific needs and conditions. In Europe they work at 3 levels- European, national and local. At national levels, National Action Plans are translated into regional programmes. The tools to achieve objectives include on the one hand, exchange of good practices (UITP collects them taking into account different dimensions), which will soon be available on the UITP website, and on the other hand an impact assessment (e.g. 80% of people that found a job with travel advice, say that they would not have got the job without the travel advice).



Mr. Bryans gave then the perspective of a county council, Surrey in the UK. He explained that Surrey is a regional authority in the south of London, which was partly rural and partly urban. He explained that they had been looking at accessibility issues for 10 years, concentrating more on accessibility than on social inclusion. He explained that they had established working partnership with other partners this was especially important as the current UK policy has brought in targets for local authority

regarding accessibility and the local authorities were not always responsible for this. He gave an example; the social inclusion measures include improving the access to education for over 16 year olds. If a school decides to centralise, or decentralise, this can have a big impact on access of the education, but the local authority cannot prevent this from happening. Mr. Bryans explained that the cost of transport was important but according to the market research carried out by Surrey County Council, people thought that a reliable

service, not a cheap service was more important. Surrey County Council was also very keen to look at non-transport solutions, e.g. in rural areas they have encouraged petrol stations to also have a shop where people could have the possibility to buy fresh food and would not need to travel long distances to other larger shops.

Mr. Oxley wondered about information on the outcomes of the projects and the impact assessment of initiatives. It was his impression that there was not always enough available data about measures and he asked if governments were doing something about it.

Ms. Wallace acknowledged that at present, not much impact assessment was being carried out but that they were carrying out more qualitative research which she believed to be just as important as the quantitative research. She mentioned that one of the issues that the DfT had dealt with was crime reduction initiatives and that often the results of measures like this were not always detectable as it was down to peoples' perceptions. She highlighted the need for more money to evaluate initiatives.

Mr. Oxley acknowledged that subjective issues were very important and needed to be addressed. Paula Coppel agreed and stated that older people have a greater perception of insecurity but statistics show that younger people are most vulnerable on public transport.

John Adams asked a question about the petrol stations in Surrey (that sell fresh food) and what the purpose/achievement of this was if people still travelled by car.

Mr. Bryans replied that the aim was to shorten peoples' journeys, even if they travelled by car, it would still represent a shorter distance travelled.

Ms. Pettersson commented that there were a lot of initiatives to encourage social inclusion, but stated that the focus now should be on measuring their impact.

There was then some discussion regarding the local authorities and their local targets and that it could be risky for local authorities to set their targets.

Mr. Bryans answered that in Surrey they had had accessibility targets and that the first target was to increase the number/proportion of the population who lived with certain journey times of key facilities and services. He indicated the problem that during the five years of this target the services/facilities changed. He also indicated the importance of not having too many targets and to be wise when setting the targets, with the conditions to achieve your goal, without barriers from other actors.

Sarah Clifford asked about the next steps and how impact assessments could be carried out.

Mr. Pourbaix replied that they were looking into impact assessment at local level and that it was necessary to map and categorise the different approaches. He highlighted the need to establish common indicators. Over the next year, they would look into how best to carry out the impact assessments.

Mr. Cheung asked about the financing of projects and that a list of good practices should show what local circumstances it could improve and how money could be best spent.

Mr Bryans agreed, stating that it was important to know where the funding came from and how it was run. He said that one of the biggest problems was to have the money to set up a project and then to maintain it. He gave the example in Surrey of the Pegasus School bus, which provides transport for children to school and also serves the community. He stated that it cost 1.5 million € per year to run the service which the council pays for at the moment but he asked where can the money come in the future? He also mentioned that they were

looking at other solutions, funding by private companies but it was very hard work to get funding to provide these kind of services.

Heidrun Mollenkopf came back to the idea of impact assessment, stating that in order to evaluate practices it was necessary to first define the criteria; for example, how many people felt happier, how much money is made/saved, how many people get jobs etc.

A participant believed that public transport operators should see the benefits and the potential increase in revenue if they introduced some social measures.

Ms. Wallace also mentioned that the aim of funding was to supply money for a certain time, with the expectation that ways are found for the initiative to survive after funding.

Ms. Coppel indicated that this was different because if the service was commercially viable, the private sector would have probably done it already.

Ms. Giwa asked about the promotion of Scooters in London Boroughs.

Ms. Wallace replied that there were varying opinions about scooters as they are used on the pavement and may have implications for other users.

Mr. Bryans stated that better land use was needed in order to enhance accessibility to services and facilities.

Mr. Oxley thanked the participants and highlighted the broad spectrum of this topic. Mr Oxley then closed the conference.

8. Conclusions

At the conference the ideas and issues that have been tackled by the ECLIPSE consortium members for two years were presented by experts in the field of transport and social inclusion. The event provided an opportunity not only to present and disseminate different initiatives but to provide the opportunity for experts from the fields of transport and social affairs from across Europe to meet and talk; one of the main objectives of ECLIPSE.

Transport policies can contribute to social exclusion in urban areas if this aspect is not considered at the planning level. On the contrary, transport, as a means to reach a destination (job places, social services, hospitals, leisure and other services), can be an important tool for social actors to reach their goals on local or national social policies. To achieve this, a good dialogue between the transport and social stakeholders is of paramount importance. This also needs to be done at all levels of decision making (EU, national, regional and local), to ensure that the policies at the upper level are coherent with the objectives at the lower levels. At the ECLIPSE Final Conference examples of good policies and practices were presented at all these levels and in different countries, showing that stakeholders and decision makers in Europe are beginning to be aware of the social impacts of transport policies.

Social exclusion is a complex problem. This problem is becoming even more complicated with increasing immigration (within and from outside Europe) and in an ageing society. There is in fact a wide diversity of people with reduced mobility, including disabled people, blind and older people etc. In addition, some people might have difficulty moving around because they travel with children or with buggies, or simply because they do not understand the language in which travel information is provided. However, affordability might be one of the most serious problems, especially in modern European cities designed for the private car.

For these diverse problems, different types of solutions need to be looked at, including pricing and fare systems, and improved physical accessibility to the transport systems. In addition to providing good and affordable access to the transport system itself, we cannot forget that transport is a means and not an end and therefore transport systems should ensure that they provide access to appropriate destinations (job places, services...). At the conference all these aspects were tackled by the speakers and practical examples of these solutions were presented, from Universal Design in public transport to special services for people looking for a job.

It can be concluded that even if there is an increasing awareness of the social aspects of transport and mobility, there is still a long way to go. Even if social aspects are one of the three pillars of Sustainable Development, it is often forgotten and "sustainability" is reduced to "environmental" sustainability. However transport and mobility policies will never be sustainable if they do not integrate and tackle the social aspect.

At the EU level this means that the European Commission Directorates General of Transport and Energy, and Employment and Social Affairs will need to start working more closely together and to consider each others' priorities. Especially avoidance of contradictory policies and harmonisation of transport and social policies is of key importance. At the national level, Member States should start by including transport in their National Action Plans for social inclusion, which so far, only few of them do explicitly (some countries address it indirectly). At the local level social actors and transport decision makers and service providers should cooperate to know each others' needs. As important as involving transport decision makers is to involve land use planners in order to build cities for people, with appropriate density to offer public transport services and mixed areas, and move away from concepts for cities built for cars.

Annex A

List of participants

First Name	Family Name	Organisation
John	ADAMS	UCL
Paul	ARENTS	Vlaamse Vervoermaatschappij De Lijn
Patrick	AUWERX	Mobiel 21
Tina	BLAIN	North West of England Health Office
Cezary	BLASZCZYK	Regional Office of Silesia
Laura	BONACORSI	Merseyside Brussels Office
Mandalina	BREATU	Dambovita County Council
William	BRYANS	Surrey County Council
Anca	BUTNARU	European House of French Local Authorities
Daniela	CARVALHO	TIS PT
Marta	CASTAGNERI	Regione Piemonte
Marie	CASTAIGNE	FUNDP
Francis	CHEUNG	Ministry of Transport
Jorge	CIVERA PEREZ	Fundacion Comunidad Valenciana Region Europea
Sarah	CLIFFORD	TTR
Paula	COPPEL	Merseytravel
Simon	COURT	Citilabs
Ivo	CRÉ	POLIS
Emmanuel	DAWANS	TRANSURB Technirail S.A.
Florin	DRAGOMIR	RATB
Dirk	DUFOUR	Spatial and Transport Planning
Omoniyi	GIWA	Transport for London
Clive	HINCHCLIFFE AIRO	SUSTRACO
Suzanne	HOADLEY	POLIS
Leire	IRIARTE	POLIS
Christopher	IRWIN	European Passengers' Federation
Nathan	KACZMARSKI	JMP Consulting
Alexander	Konstantinov	Southeast Finland and SPb Office
Verena	KRÖSBACHER	Office of the Government of Tyrol
Thierry	LEGRAND	CEN
Peter	LELIE	European Commission, DG for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities
Wim	LOENDERS	Federal Authority of Mobility, rail Transport
Judith	MABELIS	TTR

Massimo	MARCIANI	FIT
Heidrun	MOLLENKOPF	University of Heidelberg
Maria	NYMAN	Eropean Disability Forum
Gema	OCANA NORIEGA	Representation Regional Government of Andalusia
Philip	OXLEY	TTR
Geraldine	PETTERSSON	Stafford Pettersson Neath
Michala	PETZ	Land Salsburg
Jean-Philippe	PEUZIAT	Bretagne/Pays de la Loire/Poitou-Charentes Office
Jerôme	POURBAIX	UITP
Alina	PURICE	RATB
Burdea	REMUS	Maramures County Council, Romania
Sarah	REPO	Salzburg Representation Office
Arne	RICHTERS	Toyota Motor Europe
Marta Assumpcio	ROJO TORRENT	PSA Peugeot Citroën EU Delegation
Sally	SCARLETT	Association for European Transport
Mathieu	SIMON	Représentation de l'Île-de-France à Bxl
Wendy	SLENDERS	Toegankelijkheidsbureau vzw
Zvonimir	SOSTAR M.D.	City of Zagreb
Anna-Maria	SPYRIOUNI	London's European Office
Frank	VAN THILLO	Vlaams Gewest
Ivo	VANEK	National Noise Ovservatory Czech Rep.
Marianna	VARGA	Brussels Representation of the West Pannon Region
Stéphane	VICTOR	Basse-Normandie Region - Brussels Office
Sandra	VINGERHOETS	UITP
Tracy	WALLACE	UK DfT
Helmut Franz	WIEDER	Siemens Transportation Systems

Registered but did not attend the Conference

Anne-Claire	BELLEC	South West UK Brussels Office
Valérie	BENARD	EUROCITIES
Barbara	BERNARDI	EUROCITIES
Alesso	BOTTAN	Regione Piemonte
Nick	BROOKES	Greater Manchester Brussels Office
Kossyvaki	EFFROSYNI	Development Agency of Heraklion - EU Liaison Office
Daniel	FRASNELLI	Autonomous Province of Bozen - South Tyrol
Lars	FRIEDRICHSEN	Hanse Office

Szymon	GEBSKI	Wielkopolska Region Brussels office
Evita	GRZIBOVSKA	Latvian Association of Local and Regional Governments
Carsten	KLENKE	European Office of the Saxon Local Authorities
Barbara	KLINCZYK	Wielkopolska Region Brussels office
Robert	LIBBRECHT	ERTRALCO
Marta	LORENS	Lubelskie Region Euro Office
Agata	MATUSIAK	Wielkopolska Region Office
Nico	MILO	SERV
Anne-Sophie	PARENT	Age Platform
Antonella	PASSARANI	Regione Marche
Eric	PONTHIEU	European Economic and Social Committee
Pablo	SARAZA JIMENA	Delegation of the Regional Government of Andalusia in Brussels
Neil	SCALES	Merseytravel
Rafael	SIMÓN MORAL	Regional Government of Castilla y Leon

Expressed interest in the ECLIPSE findings but were not able to participate in the conference

Petar	TIERZIEV	SOFPROJECT
Jivka	ZUMBULEVA	Sofia Bulgaria
Winifred	FRIAS	SAN JOSE, PHILIPPINES
Hardayani	HAROENO	PALEMBANG CITY

Annex B

Presentations