



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



EUROPEAN COMMISSION – DG EMPLOYMENT, SOCIAL AFFAIRS AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES



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

## **ECLIPSE National Workshop**

### **ECLIPSE Project and Social Inclusion**



**Minutes**  
**2<sup>nd</sup> of October 2006**  
**Rome, Italy**



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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Purpose and Agenda	1
2. Participants	3
3. The Workshop	4
4. Conclusion and recommendations	10
5. Following derived actions	11
Annexes	12
1 - Participants List	
2 - Publication in ASSTRA's in house newsletter - July 2006	

## **1. Purpose and Agenda**

According to its contractual obligations, FIT Consulting organised the Italian National Workshop on October 2<sup>nd</sup> 2006 on the topic: "The ECLIPSE Project and Social Inclusion".

Originally the workshop was planned to be held in early summer 2006 in Parma but opportunities both at the European level (i.e. definition of Cohesion and Structural Funds focus) and at the National level (i.e. definition and discussion of National Budget 2007) resulted in the Consortium moving the venue and date of the workshop to late autumn 2006 in Rome. Federmobilità Association had a meeting on the same morning, which provided an opportunity to attract more attendees to the workshop. There are limited available dedicated funds to provide collective transport to support social inclusion. Therefore, holding the workshop on this date provided an opportunity to support a joint approach between the technical and organisational characteristics of collective transport and economic sustainability.

The goal of the National workshop was to provide a platform for discussion between actors involved in providing collective transportation and social assistance.

After an introductory session presenting the framework and as a result, facilitating a discussion, a review of the National Budget 2007 situation was made by Federmobilità with a specific focus on the role of transport in Social Inclusion, followed by a presentation about the ECLIPSE project. The first session was closed by a review of national experiences and the ECLIPSE project activities in achieving a synergy to create socially inclusive transport.

In the following session a discussion about the barriers and the opportunities for avoiding social exclusion by increasing the role of collective transport took place. ECLIPSE has an important task in identifying ways to integrate the solutions for a better / quality transportation addressed to all into local strategies.

## Agenda

### “Eclipse Project and Social Inclusion”

2<sup>nd</sup> October 2006

*Federmobilità*

*Piazza Cola di Rienzo, 68*

Rome

**15.00**    **Registration**

**15.15**    **Welcome**

Annita Serio, Director, Federmobilità

**15.30**    **National Budget 2007 and social inclusion**

Annita Serio, Federmobilità

**15.50**    **The ECLIPSE project**

Massimo Marciani, Presidente, FIT Consulting srl

**16.00**    **National initiatives and Eclipse: which strategies**

Paola Cossu, General Manger, FIT Consulting srl

**16.20**    **Coffee break**

**16.30**    **Opportunities and Barriers to progress** - Moderator: Massimo Marciani, FIT Consulting srl

Discussion session regarding Italian situation on the social exclusion issue, stressing the importance of mobility.

Participants: representatives from Municipalities

**18.00**    **End of the Workshop**

## **2. Participants**

Being a National workshop, Federmobilità and FIT Consulting aimed to provide the opportunity for discussion not only between local actors involved in developing strategies or specialised organisations, but also between representatives of the local authorities from the different areas of Italy.

41 persons attended this workshop which was organised in the headquarters of Federmobilità (see Annex 1 for the list of participants). No translation service was necessary.

### **3. The workshop**

The workshop was officially opened by dott.ssa Annita Serio, Director of Federmobilità, who welcomed attendees to the workshop. Annita Serio stressed the importance of ECLIPSE in finding synergies across Europe in order to reinforce the Italian Government's commitment to the delivery of funds to collective transport as a means to tackle social exclusion in society. She expressed her hope that the outcomes of the workshop would not only be solutions for improving citizen life by developing integrated local strategies but also a follow up of initiatives aimed at maintaining a high profile for this issue.

Ms Serio presented the outline of the National Budget 2007 with a specific focus on the available funds dedicated to collective transport as well as the ones in the social services. The preliminary agreed statement was that the 2007 funds would not be sufficient to provide additional services nor to keep the level of existing ones. It was agreed the National Government needs to be encouraged to allocate more resources. It was agreed that €60 million was insufficient to deliver a proper service – even without specific attention being given to the needs of people with different levels of mobility. It was agreed that instead as a possible target should be an outlined budget of €300 million.

Massimo Marciani provided an overview of the background and context of the ECLIPSE project, stressing that the aim of the ECLIPSE project is to actively engage transport professionals and other actors in creating working strategic partnerships in order to increase awareness of the influence of transport on social inclusion at the local, regional and European level. He explained that the project hopes to outline the way the social exclusion problem is tackled by transport planners or by governments as well as to outline the importance given by governments to this kind of the problem and how future governments could develop their policies in this field by having a different range of priorities on their agenda. In the same context Mr Marciani expressed the necessity of identifying, monitoring and evaluating the policies and measures needed to tackle “transport poverty”.

Paola Cossu presented ongoing national initiatives in developing strategic accessibility partnerships with key actors. She reported the outcomes of several contacts made with Guido del Mese, ASSTRA General Manager and Arcangelo Merella, ANCI Mobility Committee Coordinator.

ASSTRA (Collective Transport Operator Association) (the host of the ECLIPSE European conference in Perugia, Italy in May 2006), reaffirmed its commitment to the project, recognising the issue of transport and social inclusion in the core of their discussions amongst associates as shown by the publication of a specific article in their in house newsletter in July 2006 (see Annex 2). ASSTRA requested the circulation of a specific questionnaire in order to collect information on the latest projects that aim to reduce social exclusion through the provision of an effective collective transport service accessible to all.

ANCI (Association of Italian Municipalities) asked Massimo Marciani to present the ECLIPSE project at the next Mobility Committee in order to focus the attention of Local Authorities on this issue as well as reporting the outcomes of this workshop. ANCI is interested in investigating economic sustainability of transport accessibility for all in the context of the 'Stability Pact' between Local Authorities and Central Government whose target is to reduce of 2% overall expenses.

Paola Cossu confirmed the willingness of the ECLIPSE Consortium and FIT Consulting to undertake specific activities at the National level in order to raise awareness among key actors of the goals to be achieved in supporting the right to mobility for all.

In the last part of the afternoon, a discussion which identified barriers and opportunities for increasing the role of transportation in social inclusion took place. The participants were invited to talk about the most common barriers / opportunities identified and which they thought were the best solutions to avoid / further develop them.

### ***Discussion on the opportunities and Barriers to progress:***

De Angelis (Naples) started the discussion and considered urban mobility as a basic right that affords access to employment, services and the city's various resources, and that to be deprived of or restricted in the ability to get around, is something these persons regard as a handicap, an obstacle to joining or re-joining the labour market and to social integration. He reported that practices connected with mobility have evolved in recent years, and that this has affected the shape of towns and cities and that the conurbations of EU countries have, to varying degrees, undergone major changes both in their morphology and in their social make-up. He explained that housing and activities of various kinds have relocated, and most cities have grown at the edges, over a more and more extensive area.

A process of urban sprawl or 'peri-urbanisation' is thought to have taken place, leading to a considerable increase in travel. De Angelis explained that to be mobile is nowadays considered a necessary feature of urban life; and while a sustainable city must make provision for protecting the environment, it will also in future have to tackle these growing needs for transport and travel. He believes that there is no equality amongst people or households when it comes to getting around and feels that the mobility required in today's urban societies has produced winners and losers: town and city services are not accessible to everyone on the same terms and some people's mobility has been left out of the reckoning which raises questions and issues of social equity and cohesion in our modern cities. He pointed out that some underprivileged or vulnerable groups – the aged, the young, the unemployed, people with poor qualifications, low-income households, poor people, families or individuals living in 'bad' neighbourhoods – are all penalised by transport capacity cuts or limited transport services and that these inequalities in mobility need to be diminished or put right; and that is one of the first challenges that town and city authorities must face.

Cicatiello (Rome) reported that social justice is generally understood to be a social construct and as such it is a highly contested concept. He explained that one model is philosophically liberal and politically conservative and at the other end of the political/philosophical spectrum is social justice defined in redistributive terms, supportive of a structural approach to alleviating social marginalisation and deprivation. Within the context of the redistributive model of social justice, Cicatiello believes that the State should be involved in ensuring that social support is set at levels sufficient to prevent all individuals from living in disadvantaged circumstances. He also reported that between these two definitions of social justice, numerous others exist, that blend market and public service provision responses to social problems. The Third Way emphasises freedom of consumer choice and, thus, it was stated that it tends more towards the neoliberal, or right, end of the political/philosophical spectrum.

Cicatiello stated that its responses to social problems call for assisting individuals to alleviate their difficulties, rather than allocating State resources to address the structural problems that contribute to their difficulties and that its responses also call for market-driven solutions

to social problems or achieving social equity. In general, it (is) refers to “just” or “fair” access to social (or public) services. He added that it denotes fairness and equal treatment with social resources and opportunities.

Paduano (Perugia) directed his attention on Transport, Mobility and Accessibility and reported that Transportation equity is about fairness in mobility and accessibility levels across race, class, gender, disability and other personal attributes and equal access to all social and economic activities. He reported that the ultimate objective of transportation equity is to provide equal access to social and economic resources and opportunities by providing equitable levels of access to all places at which those resources and opportunities are located. Mobility was said to refer to the capacity to physically move from one place to another and Paduano reported that in the contemporary world, mobility is critical to human welfare. He believes that the ability (or the lack thereof) to physically move about has important implications for access to employment, to such basic social services as healthcare and education, to amenities like groceries, clothing and other types of shopping, and to entertainment and other cultural activities.

In summary, Paduano described mobility as a critical enabler of social participation and that it is widely recognised as a fundamental human right. Accessibility was said to refer to the ease of reaching valued destinations (e.g., resources and opportunities) and to the ability of people to physically access those destinations they must reach in order to attain their social needs which is different from the ease of travelling along transportation networks themselves. He reported that it is important to underline that high levels of mobility may, but do not necessarily lead to high levels of accessibility and, high levels of accessibility can occur despite low levels of mobility. Generally, it was felt that accessibility requires some level of mobility and in this scenario transportation is a means by which accessibility and mobility may be achieved.

Coverta (Brindisi) explained that the term ‘economically sustainable mobility’ may be preferred to the term ‘mobility’, since it also takes into account the system of access resources and constraints which hinder their use. Furthermore, Coverta stated that speaking of mobility enables an analysis of the dynamic relationships and not always direct relationships, which exist between mobility and accessibility, since the latter is not only associated with the mere increase in the number of travel events. In other words, he explained that not only the absence but also excess mobility can preclude the possibility of accessing the opportunities (the places where the various activities are organised), since access is not associated so much with the possibility of reaching more opportunities but rather with the capacity of accessing the more significant opportunities in the social networks to which the players belong.

Gargaro (Bari) stated that in all of our cities, levels of accessibility have improved continuously since the early 1990s. He feels that mobility and transport have advanced; this has taken the form of a rise in the number of journeys; and this process has helped strengthen the urban areas’ economic efficiency and enhance the freedom of their inhabitants. He stated that on average, mobility has increased by 4% a year for the last two decades, which is much faster than the rate of economic growth. It is thought that this progress had been made possible by a more effective range of public transport services, a rise in households’ car ownership and a road network which provides better access to the cities’ various districts.

Against this background of general improvement in the conditions of transport and mobility, Gargaro reported that, nevertheless, there remain groups of people for whom travel is a

problem and that in the various towns and cities, the ability to get around is unequally distributed among individuals and among households, and that some are left out altogether. He reports that although progress has been undeniable for the higher and middle income groups, there are layers of society which are underprivileged or in “vulnerable circumstances” – the old, the young, the unemployed, people without good qualifications or skills, low-income households, the poor, families or individuals living in deprived neighbourhoods – who pay the penalty in a lower or restricted ability to get around. He feels that this also applies to the disabled and those of ‘reduced mobility’. He stated that there are, for instance, certain neighbourhoods with low rates of car ownership which are poorly served by public transport: pockets of poverty, where most households belong to the worse-off groups and that the priority for urban social policy was to guarantee a majority of citizens their entitlement to housing; inequality was measured or evaluated as a function of opportunity to access decent housing. Nowadays he feels that the right to get around seems at least as important as the right to housing. Gargaro finished by stating that in our modern, mobile societies, transport and mobility are an essential and necessary precondition of participation and that it is becoming more and more apparent that the inadequacy of transport in certain zones and for certain social groups is making social inequalities worse.

Gambuli (Modena) considered the rise in property values in most if not all central areas is a common feature of all the cities and that this rise has accelerated over the last ten years. He stated that the property market in these same areas is often tight for would-be buyers as well as tenants, and the supply of housing is often poorly matched to the demand and that this situation leads a considerable number of households leaving the central areas of towns and cities. At the same time Gambuli believes that we find that many of the average-income households have been leaving the underprivileged neighbourhoods, whatever their location within the city and that this trend is still going on today. He stated that these two phenomena have produced (and continue to feed) a high demand for property to buy or rent in the peripheral areas, often in the “second ring” where access to housing is easier for households of modest means. In the last fifteen years, Gambuli feels that we have witnessed a significant “push” component in demographic increases in these second ring areas resulting from the two types of flow mentioned above. Although he knows that this phenomenon cannot be measured and figures cannot be calculated, he feels that this residential dispersion is observable. This relocation of households with modest means in the peripheral areas is stated to be generating new inequalities in mobility with these households spending a high proportion of their budget on travel, some 20% to 25% of disposable income on average. He concluded by saying that it can generally be said that the smaller a household’s budget the bigger the proportion spent on transport.

Baffetti (Bologna) reported that there is a general agreement that the ‘right to mobility’ or ‘right to transport’ is a legitimate one, and must be made effective. He believes that such a right is also implicitly recognised in the other urban areas, though as a conditional right, a right to access basic services, work and other urban amenities. He stated that In Bologna, the representative of one Old Age Pensioners (OAP) charity described it as an “inalienable right” ... “transport and the mobility system are part of the welfare system”. He went on to say that the right to mobility appears as a component of social policy: “there are discussions about how mobility is to be secured where [personal] resources are inadequate” and that this formulation very clearly illustrates the necessity of mobility for social integration. On this subject, some suggestions mentioned the idea of establishing a “universal public mobility service” like other “basic” public services that are necessary for social life, and provide a safety net against poverty and exclusion. In this guise the right to mobility would play a role as an essential plank in the structure designed to ensure equality of opportunity among individuals and families.

Zucchetti (Milan) responded to these comments by stating that that mobility assistance can take a variety of forms and can concern various modes of transport believing that the fight against inequalities in getting around must not deal only with public transport solutions, but also cover solutions that include the car. He reported that it is a natural tendency – or has become a mental habit – to associate equality in transport or mobility with the use of collective means of transport; but in fact the social problems connected with mobility call for answers that are not limited by a narrowness of vision to public transport. Zucchetti said he believes that we can fight inequality by making it easier to use the car in different ways, and even encouraging its use but acknowledges that in present circumstances public transport has a limited capacity to reduce mobility inequalities. Furthermore, he stated that the present layout of our travel-to-work areas or metropolitan regions makes it improbable or even impossible that public transport will come up with relevant solutions for certain types of mobility and for certain journeys or routes.

De Robertis (Trieste) underlined that another aspect regarding the issue of reducing inequality in mobility concerns enforcing the responsibilities of those that generate the need for it: the companies, the shopping centres and even the public services which make it necessary for workers, customers, and users to travel. It was felt that this extra traffic is a major proportion of daily travel in these urban areas. De Robertis stated that sometimes these travel generators have chosen peripheral locations, some of which are inaccessible by public transport which also applies to public institutions such as hospitals which choose to build on Greenfield sites in the “first ring” or on the edge of town where they can arrange for plenty of parking. Among these travel generators, he feels that businesses in particular need to think about how they can make sure their workforce has access, above all those who do not have cars. Indeed, he acknowledges that businesses are being invited to design travel plans that take account of the various travel capabilities of their workforce. He finished by suggesting that social equity criteria could be built into the various systems of incentive and subsidy for worker mobility: one idea would be a “mobility voucher” for an amount calculated on the basis of the worker’s salary level and residential location.

Binaghi (Cagliari) pointed his attention to the jobseekers who generally receive concessionary fares on public transport - a form of mobility assistance. However, against a background of urban sprawl as shown in the places studied here, he stated that the jobs available are more and more sited on the edge of town, in areas which are inaccessible by public transport or accessible only with great difficulty. He believes that inadequacy of transport can be a major obstacle in the way of access to employment. Accordingly he reported that many people say that lack of transport is indeed an obstacle. Binaghi explained that there are specific transport-related factors that act as a factor of exclusion from the labour market and as far as it is known there are so far very few schemes in European cities to help people buy second-hand cars, or lend cars to jobseekers. He went on to say that there are cases where it appears that help in buying a used car, or the loan of a vehicle, may be the most effective solution for getting someone back into work and that these practices should be encouraged as they show that in the modern urban layout help in using a private car (hiring, buying, ‘travel vouchers’ to mitigate the impact of higher fuel costs on household budgets) can make it possible to reduce inequalities in mobility, and to work towards improved social equity.

#### **4. Conclusions and recommendations**

Urban sprawl has many consequences for the urban environment. It generates costs by occupying public space, it lengthens the mean distance travelled by all modes of transport and it makes congestion worse on certain routes and in particular neighbourhoods. The process of urban sprawl likewise produces adverse and undesirable effects so far as concerns equity in getting around and accessing services. This tendency is evident in Italian cities.

These two considerations give rise to a number of conclusions.

First of all, mobility is now something exercised on a metropolitan or even a regional scale, for that is the scale of the territory within which individuals live their lives in today's society.

Secondly, there are people who are left out when it comes to getting around: underprivileged or vulnerable groups (the old, the young, the unemployed, the poor, low-income households, unskilled people with low educational qualifications, families or individuals living in deprived neighbourhoods); these groups are penalised by their relatively poor mobility.

Also, the growth in private car use and the wider spread of access to automobiles has helped reduce some inequalities in mobility, especially for households living on the edge of town where public transport networks offer no services; but against that, these same households have seen a considerable rise in the proportion of their spending that goes on travel.

Furthermore, in the urban areas studied there is a correlation between income level and efficiency in getting around: the 'better-off' households exploit their mobility effectively for the purposes of their jobs and their private activities, whereas people and households with low incomes have limited room for manoeuvre when it comes to access to transport and mobility.

In the cities in Italy, the organisations canvassed recognise the legitimacy of a right to mobility or transport. This entitlement is recognised as a right that gives access to basic services, to work and to the other amenities of urban life.

Finally, assistance in getting around can take many different forms, from special fares provided by transport operators for vulnerable groups, to new schemes providing car hire at low rates, or the chance to use taxis, car sharing or transport on demand. It should be borne in mind that any charging system has to be guided by a strong concern for social equity.

## **5. Following derived actions**

According to the requirements from the audience, FIT Consulting agreed to continue to raise and maintain the level of awareness on this issue with a number of actions after the workshop as outlined below:

- Presentation of the ECLIPSE project at ASSTRA (December 1<sup>st</sup> 2006)
- Presentation of the ECLIPSE project at ANCI (11<sup>th</sup> December 2006)
- Circulation of a specific questionnaire in order to review new initiatives at the National level (December 2006 – January 2007).

## Annex 1

### Rome National Workshop - Participants List

<b>Surname</b>	<b>First name</b>	<b>Area represented</b>
BAFFETTI	Costanzo	40138 BOLOGNA
ADAMI	Franco	37020 VERONA
ARBA	Renato	09030 CAGLIARI
ARONI	Alfredo	07100 SASSARI
ASCIUTTI	Massimo	05100 TERNI
BAUMGARTNER	Dott. Thomas	39100 BOLZANO
BEATRICE	Adriano	39100 BOLZANO
BELLINO	Paolo	00186 ROMA
BINAGHI	Dott. Enrico	09125 CAGLIARI
CARLINI	Dott.ssa Cristina	00186 ROMA
CARRIERE	Dott. Roberto	27100 PAVIA
CICATIELLO	Massimo	00186 ROMA
CLO'	Alberto	40132 BOLOGNA
CORRIERE	Ing. Ferdinando	90141 PALERMO
COVERTA	Dott. Aldo	72100 BRINDISI
CROCCO	Dott. Antonio	90141 PALERMO
DALLEDONNE	dott. Andrea	40124 BOLOGNA
DE ROBERTIS	Aldo	34144 TRIESTE
DEL FANTE	Dott. Augusto	16122 GENOVA
DI MATTEO	Dott. Andrea	06100 PERUGIA
GALLI	Dott. Alessandro	50123 FIRENZE
GAMBULI	Dott. Paolo	41100 MODENA
GARGARO	Dott. Giuseppe	70126 BARI
GIRALDI	Dott. Luigi	16128 GENOVA
GUASCO	Dott. Bruno	28100 NOVARA
MARELLA	Gianpaolo	30121 VENEZIA
MURATORE	Renato	80125 NAPOLI
NANNETTI	Dott. Giorgio	16152 GENOVA
PADUANO	Paolo	06100 PERUGIA
PENNACCHIONI	Roberto	60121 ANCONA
PIGLIACELLI	Augusto	03100 FROSINONE
SCARAMUZZA	Ing. Elio	27100 PAVIA
SCHIFFER	Giorgio	25124 BRESCIA
SERRA	Dott. Antonio	16122 GENOVA
SPADACCINI	Dott. Antonino	95127 CATANIA
TOSI	Ezio	90141 PALERMO
VILLASANTA	Dott. Carlo	09125 CAGLIARI
VINCI	Alfio Franco	95127 CATANIA
VISCIANO	Ing. Giuseppe	00187 ROMA
ZICHE	Valentino	36100 VICENZA
ZUCCHETTI	Roberto	20136 MILANO

## Annex 2

Publication in ASSTRA's in house newsletter - July 2006

L'IMPEGNO DELLA COMMISSIONE EUROPEA

# Se è collettivo deve essere per tutti

Il trasporto e la mobilità dei cittadini sono direttamente connessi ai fenomeni di esclusione sociale. Oggigiorno la maggior parte della popolazione europea vive in aree urbane, più o meno estese, dove si concentrano la maggior parte delle attività sociali e culturali e dove si svolgono le attività economiche. Il problema è come garantire che l'offerta di trasporto collettivo e sostenibile sia in grado di raggiungere il territorio esteso, comprese le periferie e le aree rurali in modo da assicurare le stesse possibilità e la medesima accessibilità anche agli individui con mobilità ridotta.

Spesso quando si parla di mobilità ridotta si pensa a quella categoria di persone con gravi disabilità, in realtà ognuno di noi nella vita sperimenta periodi di mobilità ridotta: una mamma con passeggino è una persona a mobilità ridotta, una persona anziana è una persona a mobilità ridotta, un giovane con una stampella per un infortunio temporaneo è una persona a mobilità ridotta, un bambino è una persona a mobilità ridotta.

Offrire un servizio a queste categorie di persone significa offrire un servizio di elevata qualità e non un servizio "speciale" per qualcuno.

È partita da Perugia, con un convegno di lancio organizzato da FIT Consulting e supportato dalla Provincia di Perugia e da APM, la campagna europea del progetto Eclipse, co-finanziato dalla Direzione Generale Occupazione ed Uguali Op-

portunità della Commissione Europea, che ha come obiettivo la diffusione di strategie innovative ed efficaci per combattere i fenomeni relativi all'esclusione sociale. Il progetto, che si concluderà nel giugno 2007 con una conferenza internazionale a Parigi, ha come obiettivo l'esame, l'analisi e la successiva valutazione dei principali progetti in atto nel settore di trasporto locale in oltre 70 città e regioni dell'Unione Europea. Particolare attenzione verrà posta sulle esperienze già avviate su reti di trasporto in grado di mettere in comunicazione tutte le aree attive delle città, diffondendo il servizio di trasporto pubblico locale omogeneamente sul territorio e consentendo in questo modo l'accesso alla città come luogo di incontro e di fruizione dei servizi socio-culturali. Determinanti in questo ambito sono le scelte che vengono operate localmente in termini di tariffe ed in termini di abbattimento delle barriere architettoniche per favorire la mobilità delle persone diversamente abili.

Contemporaneamente alle attività di promozione delle buone prassi del settore, il progetto prevede una intensa attività di lobby sul Parlamento Europeo per garantire che le problematiche dell'esclusione sociale legate al trasporto vengano prese in considerazione a livello legislativo comunitario ed in sinergia con i Piani di Azione Nazionale previsti dall'Agenda di Lisbona.

Maggiori informazioni su: [www.eclipse-eu.net/Index.htm](http://www.eclipse-eu.net/Index.htm)