



For a **European Accessibility** for Public Transport for people with Disabilities

6th framework programme
"Integrating and strengthening the European research Area"
Scientific Support to Policies SSP - 5A

Final workshop

Proceedings

Confidentiality level: public



For a European Accessibility for Public Transport for people with Disabilities

6th framework programme
"Integrating and strengthening the European research Area"
Scientific Support to Policies SSP - 5A

Work package 5:
- ERT: Mathilde Bruyère

Rev.	Issuing date	Pages	Written by	Visa	Approved by	Visa
0	09.02.10	20	Bruyère Mathilde	V	Claude Marin-Lamellet, INRETS	V
Modifications: creation of the document						
1	09.04.10	18	Bruyère Mathilde	V		<input type="checkbox"/>
Modifications: Inclusions corrections partners						

Contract for: SPECIFIC SUPPORT ACTION
Project acronym: EURO ACCESS
Project full title: For a European Accessibility of public transport for people with disabilities
Proposal/Contract no.: 044448
Start date of contract: (to be completed by Commission)

Address for correspondence:
INRETS case 24, 25 avenue François Mitterrand F69675 Bron cedex

Further information about Accessibility of public transport for people with disabilities is available at: <http://www.euro-access.org>

Table of contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Minutes	4
2.1	Introduction by Véronique Bernard – Project officer (European Commission, <i>DG Research, Unit F2: Public Health</i>)	4
2.2	Context of the proposal by Claude Marin Lamellet, scientific coordinator of the project – INRETS (France)	6
2.3	Work Package 1: Policies, by Merethe Dotterud Leiren –Toi (Norway)7	
2.4	Work Package 2: User needs and expectations, by Anders Wretstrand- Lund University (Sweden)	8
2.5	Work package 3: Best practices, by Ann Frye- Ann Frye Ltd (United Kingdom)	9
2.6	Discussion on work packages 1 to 3 presentations	11
2.7	Work Package 4: recommendations for EU policies, by Carlos Marques – Tis.pt (Portugal)	13
2.8	Questions on Work Package 4 presentation.....	14
3.	Closure of the Workshop	15
4.	Appendixes.....	17
4.1	Appendix 1: list of participants	17
4.2	Appendix 2: agenda.....	18
4.3	Appendix 3: presentations	19

1. Introduction

The Euro Access project is a Specific Support Action funded under the Sixth Research Framework Programme as a Scientific Support to Policies (SSP).

The aim of Euro Access is to make an inventory of legal issues, frameworks and guidelines in the 27 Member States and in Norway and Iceland. It also aims to explore user needs and expectations of people with disabilities and to highlight best practices on policies, technologies and service provision. Finally the objective is to make recommendations, also for further research in the field.

Euro Access held its final workshop, entitled "Towards an Accessible European Transport Network", on the 3rd of December 2008 in Brussels. The event gathered 29 key actors in that field, such as public transport authorities, policy makers and persons with disabilities.

The partners presented their work and the conclusions of the project and developed recommendations to improve the accessibility of public transports in Europe for people with disabilities.

2. Minutes

2.1 Introduction by Véronique Bernard – Project officer (European Commission, DG Research, Unit F2: Public Health)

I am really very pleased to introduce this EURO-ACCESS Workshop as EU Project Officer in charge of the project, and I want to mention that you are all very much welcome. Public Transport Accessibility, the topic of today's activities is an ambitious one but it is also an **extremely** important one for the whole European Society and its foreseen trends and evolution. [So welcome to all.]

To start with, I would like to put EURO-ACCESS into its **context** at European level, and explain briefly how it was funded, why it was funded and what the expectations are.

EURO-ACCESS is a European **research** project, funded under the 6th Framework Programme of the European Community for Research, Technological development and Demonstration activities, commonly also named the FP6.

The activity area under which EURO-ACCESS has been supported is in **itself** self-speaking, as it is **Research for Policy Support, also called SCIENTIFIC SUPPORT TO POLICIES**. One of the research priorities of this 'Research for Policy Support' has been dedicated to the "**Quality of life** issues relating to handicapped/disabled people (**including equal access facilities**)". And, this is where EURO-ACCESS found its place.

This place is not a hazard. The status of Public Transport Accessibility in the different Member States has been identified by DG Employment and Social Affairs – which, as you know, is the leading policy DG with regard to disability issues – as a priority area deserving more study and evidence.

EURO-ACCESS is fully in line with the "European Action Plan on Equal opportunities for people with disabilities".

It is able to support:

- removing barriers and promoting anti-discrimination,
- creating an environment truly and proactively inclusive, giving thus equal opportunities to all, as well as
- independent living at individual level,

And there is no need to recall how this is important in the currently ageing European Society.

And I would like to quote one of the 2008 'European Day of People with Disabilities' speaker: "Society must create the conditions for people with disabilities to be included. Everyone matters."

Expectations thus are high and you are here today to help meet some of them:

- How to transfer to users, how to feed into political debate and action the results and outcome of the project ?
- Which guidelines or which recommendations could be put forward to authorities and which are the relevant authorities to reach ?
- What is the further role of stakeholders ?

These questions will be addressed today during the discussions.

But today's final workshop is certainly not an end: it has to be seen as a base and a starting point for further activities in the area of accessibility to all and in particular in PT accessibility.

The recently started 7th [Research] Framework Programme offers several opportunities and entry point for research opportunities, even if there is no more an activity directly identified as "Disability-related issues".

Among these entry points for further research projects, one can list:

- the Socio-economic research theme [Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities],
- the Transport research theme and
- the Information and Communication Technologies theme.

Indeed, some disability and accessibility related projects are already funded through these themes.

Finally the Health Theme, in which I am currently working, addresses Health Care systems, which is a topic very relevant to the ageing population.

To conclude, I am pleased to recall this audience that today's workshop, organised at the end of the EURO-ACCESS project lifetime, will present the achievements and allow discussions about 2 years of collaborative studies that involved 7 different partners, coming from 4 different Member States and 1 associated country (Norway).

We will come back on the history of disability research in the different Framework Programs and see what is at stake in this scientific policy support research and what information is available on websites:

- FP5 disability related issues were under the "quality of life" item, so there was a strong link to life sciences activities with a dedicated action line. Thirty projects were funded under the health directorate, that is to say a "medical model" of disability.

- FP6 dedicated research themes have been health, security and opportunity to people of Europe with a specific line on disability research. FP6 scientific support to policy research was targeted on the needs and you could cover technical approach, for example transport. It had to be quickly responsive to policy requirements. (Asian flu was dealt with there, for example)
- FP7 enables several themes to offer possibilities, such as socio economic, IST, transport or health themes.

The role of the stakeholders is very important during and after the project, especially for implementation issues.

In total 8 projects were funded for about 8 billions €:

- 2 of them deal with accessibility vs. environment,
- 2 of them deal with support employment for disabled people,
- 2 of them deal with analysis capacities,
- 1 of them deals with free movement of disabled people.

All these projects have their website; there is also a lot of information on Cordis.

2.2 Context of the proposal by Claude Marin Lamellet, scientific coordinator of the project – INRETS (France)

The context in which the proposal of Euro Access was made is the change of European framework of disability issues. During and after the Council of Lisbon, different initiatives have been taken by the EU on the subject. There is also a common view of a switch of approach of disabled issues from a medical model to a social based model, a more human rate based approach of disability - mainly as a consequence of the adoption of the UN Convention for people with disabilities since 2007.

Euro Access concerns Public Transport accessibility and is a 24-months project.

Its partnership brings together different countries in Europe:

- France : INRETS/ ERT/ CERTU,
- Portugal : TIS PT,
- The United Kingdom: Ann Frye Consulting,
- Northern Europe: Lund University in Sweden and TOI in Norway,
- Two subcontractors: from Italy and Austria.

To achieve this goal, the project includes three main steps:

1. review of legal frameworks - also from the user perspective - to see what policy maker do and how disabled people view their policy,
2. overview of best practices,
3. recommendations for new policies and transferability issue to new EU members.

The project takes into account relevant stakeholders like disabled people associations or authorities and policy makers.

One difficulty encountered has been the language because some countries do not translate their official documents, so there was a language accessibility problem.

Also it has sometimes been difficult to identify relevant actors at the policy level as

public transport accessibility is sometimes considered as a social issue, sometimes as a transport issue.

Today's objective is to present the main outcomes of the project and to discuss the results. It is also to consider future perspectives in terms of policies and research.

Agenda of the day:

- Review of current policies and regulations
- User needs and expectations
- Some examples of best practices
- Recommendation framework to improve accessibility

2.3 Work Package 1: Policies, by Merethe Dotterud Leiren –Toi (Norway)

Since 2000, numerous legal texts have been implemented at EU level and an EU disability action plan 2003-2010 has been launched. There has also been a UN Convention for people with disabilities in 2007.

Within Work Package 1, an extensive survey was sent to transport Ministries in 29 countries, in order to get an overview of legal framework, action plans, standards, guidelines on accessibility of public transport and national provision on employment and education relating to the topic. The other goal was to provide an inventory with access to the documents in the different countries.

The respondents were asked to give their opinion on the state of the art. Documents were cross checked; documents of the PT Access project as well as European Conference of Ministries of Transport were checked.

Patterns were looked for but there were no typical differences between e.g. Western and Eastern European countries. This would have required a deeper study of the contents of the policies and legal texts.

Policies, strategies and action plans demonstrate a country's will to change. The survey shows that most of the countries have policies specifically aimed at accessibility of public transport systems. All the main policy documents were adopted after 2003.

- National level is the most important implementation level. Few mentioned the local or regional level. Accessibility of public transport is important in urban area and rural areas.

- Most countries have general texts and specific texts on building, spatial and planning which include the needs of people with disabilities. Fifty percent of the countries have a transport act which takes accessibility into account. Most of them have implemented the 2001 bus directive.

- Guidelines for accessible vehicles are common. Guidelines for design of bus stops etc are on their way. Only few countries mentioned that they take into account the fact that transport is not a barrier for employment, education or independent living. However, most countries include this approach in policies and legal frameworks with general objectives and particular schemes and projects.

- Concessionary fares to reduce individual economic barriers are on their way to be adopted in a large majority of countries. Special services are viewed as being a very important element. More than 50% do have economic incentives to improve accessibility of the public transport system.
- A minority of countries have requirements for operators to make a strategic plan.
- Few countries (e.g. the Nordic countries) are developing indicators.

The EU and user groups have a high influence on legal framework. The politicians are not mentioned as having as high influence and this is an interesting point. Also, the public administrations are mentioned as having moderate influence.

Eleven countries think that they have come a long way in developing policies and legal documents; five find themselves in a state of rapid improvements; and 10 assess that they are improving slowly. Accessible PT is on the agenda of all countries but none view the job as fully accomplished.

The output of WP1 is a report called "Accessible public transport - a view of Europe today: policies, laws and guidelines. It is to be found on Euro Access' homepage (www.euroaccess.org) and TOI's homepage (www.toi.no). It is an inventory of 157 pages which refers to 300 policy and legal documents with many links. There is also an article on the Nordic Roads' webpage (www.nordicroads.com).

2.4 Work Package 2: User needs and expectations, by Anders Wretstrand- Lund University (Sweden)

The objectives were to review the existing literature on the needs of disabled people in transport, how users' needs are met in reality and to develop a framework for mobility planning.

Survey and literature review were found via the European Disability Forum and the Age platform.

It is crucial to understand concepts like disability, mobility, etc to organise transport accessibility.

What comes out is a holistic perspective such as a travel chain unbreakable, with accurate information, universal design, high operational intermediate standards, appropriate vehicle, high level of comfort, safety and trained personal.

Different users have different needs. But they share a need of high accessibility. Physical design is important for mobility impaired vehicle, stops, terminals and people should be oriented. People with diminished mental ability, visual, hearing or cognitive problems have very often the same requirements with mobility impaired which is an important point, with a focus on information and orientation with the help of trained staff.

Environmental sensitivity and allergies concern another group: vehicle services, in and out door climate are important elements there.

Intermediate transport is necessary between special services and public transport, especially as far as employment and commuting is concerned.

The questionnaire surveys carried out showed that disabled and seniors are aware about existing policies and legislation. They perceive it as containing clear directions for everybody (more than directions to a specific group).

They think that the legal framework neglects the soft barriers in public transport. They perceive average accessibility as quite low and fares as too high.

What is the planning perspective then? The planners materialise legislation, norms and regulation while the user faces built infrastructures and information that might be supportive.

Accessibility is a crucial question for whom? Barrier free environments, like no steps on the way, are good for wheel-chairs but for visually impaired, other things are more important. So you need to list the needs of the various groups to take the correct decision.

To create mobility, planners or transit authorities have to perform subjective evaluation to create real integration and to have keys to choose the right mode. And if they find out that the system is adapted to the norms but not to the needs, then they have to go back to the norms and redefine it.

Implementation is often slow and difficult and it often involves a high degree of cooperation between users, builders and authorities. It is difficult to assess the mobility effect of all the measures taken.

To see if there has really been an effect, more evaluation is needed.

2.5 Work package 3: Best practices, by Ann Frye- Ann Frye Ltd (United Kingdom)

This Work Package considers how to improve the mobility of disabled people and provide a better understanding of what makes best practice successful and how to transfer it.

All Public Transport modes are considered, including door to door services, urban and rural, IT systems, training, communication, high technology and high cost as well as low technology and simple approaches.

Very few best practices came out of the questionnaire asking people to identify best practices.

A literature review and web search have been done. We also used the knowledge of partners in the field.

The result is not a listing of best practices found in Europe, but a set of 20 generic examples of best practices. They are not exhaustive but illustrative.

The first thing which needs to be highlighted is that it is not possible to give a clear definition of best practice because of the differences in economic, political and cultural background of the country. Needs and expectations of disabled people are also very different according to their disability. And different disabilities perceive

accessibility differently: a ramp to board a bus will help wheelchair users but not people with impaired hearing or vision. So best practice rarely meets everyone's needs and in the worst case, one person's best practice can create real problems for another. Badly installed or incorrectly sited tactile paving is one such example.

The partnership between stakeholders is a key driver. We found that best practice has to be a joint approach. It also needs to be strategic and cannot work in isolation.

Integrated or inclusive solutions enable disabled people to travel with other people. Door to door services are sometimes perceived as a bad solution and sometimes as a very high cost transport. In reality, although they are not an ultimate goal, they can be valuable intermediate or complementary services.

To define best practice, the key question is to what extent a practice has improved the life of disabled people. The most relevant examples we found in European cities are the following:

- Berlin is regarded by many disabled people as being the most accessible city in Europe and it is interesting to understand why: there has been a lot of reconstruction lately with the reunification of Germany.
- Barcelona is also mentioned as being very accessible, as well as Grenoble in France, a city that can be considered as one of the first to have taken the question of public transport accessibility into consideration with a fully integrated approach.
- Specialist schemes have been looked at in Sweden with sophisticated vehicle dispatch systems to improve efficiency, in rural Ireland where they serve a wide range of isolated communities and in Lisbon, a city with very difficult topographical issues and where drivers also help the people with daily living, for example by helping to put on their coats etc.
- There is a web based information system in London which enables people with different disabilities to plan journeys that meet their access needs.
- In technology, we gave the example of Prague with an information and navigation system for blind people and the accessible ticket machine in the Barcelona Metro. This latter example illustrates the concept of universal design because the machine was designed by disabled people to be intuitive to use. As a result everyone finds it easier including people who are not disabled. There is also an economic benefit because people use the machines faster and require less support from staff.

We found very little evidence of cost benefit analysis of schemes or services to improve accessibility. This means that it was often not possible to demonstrate that there had been an improvement in levels of independent mobility although anecdotally it was clear that this had been the case...

The key elements we found which should produce good practice are the following:

- Universal design is a key goal of this exercise: it should be possible to approach any kind of vehicle or machine the same way and to find it intuitive to use. The transport system should be available to everybody and involve low physical effort; there should be enough space for the people to feel comfortable. Best practices do not necessarily have a high cost. They can

benefit to the whole travelling public and therefore bring economies of scale. For example, low floors are also useful for parents with young children or people travelling with luggage or shopping. Even door to door transport can be made economically available and become an alternative to public transport and sometimes both of them are complementary.

- There is a strong need for further research to reduce costs and increase profitability. According to our results, it is that disabled people should be involved at the very beginning of the process, from the earlier concept. Otherwise, it is often too late and the solutions offered are often inappropriate.
- It is also essential that best practice is sustainable; it needs to have a source of funding that will take it beyond pilot stage;
- Affordability is also a key element: the provider needs to be able to afford to deliver the vehicle, the service or the information and the user needs to afford to travel.

To conclude, it is important to recognise the broad spectrum of disability rather than to focus on one type of disability group. It is necessary to get everybody's perspective. The successful scheme should always be part of a mainstream strategy; it is not to be seen separately. Also a scheme should not be judged solely on economic criteria - or if so, it should include costs such as the cost to society of supporting people that cannot live independently because of a lack of mobility. These costs include welfare, health and social budgets.

2.6 Discussion on work packages 1 to 3 presentations

Question 1: Nigel Dotchin, UK Department for transport

Was there much information about the role of transport on employment and education? Is there a problem to identify the proper Ministry or Department to get the information? Can you explain the link between Euro Access and the PT access project?

Answers to question 1:

- Claude Marin Lamellet – INRETS (France):

About the PT access project: there are no common partners in the 2 projects. PT access partners have adopted a different approach, using experts in different countries. Otherwise they also use surveys, etc. We will cross check our results and theirs (as PT access project is under the same call than Euro Access) but we will do that only in a meeting next year as they are less advanced than we are (they started later).

- Merethe Dotterud Leiren – TOI (Norway):

TOI is not part of the PT access project but we received their work on legal documents analysis and we extended it.

We did not receive much information on the relationship between public transport and employment from the Ministries of transport. It is true that different departments are responsible for employment, education and transport. This might explain that few countries answer that they have an education and employment approach, although most countries include it in general documents, special transport service provisions

or particular projects. We mainly received answers about transport to school. Ideally, the information should have been cross-checked with other Ministries.

- Anders Wretstrand – University of Lund (Sweden)

It is difficult to find research studies on this point and there is little evidence on it. It is still too early to find information, even in Sweden where it is coming now.

- Ann Frye – Ann Frye Ltd. (UK)

We have included two small scale successful schemes but we found little evidence otherwise of schemes to tackle employment.

Question 2: Peter Wagstaff - CEREMH (France), working for British French cooperation –dealing with mobility issues associated with vehicles and accessibility): Is there a correlation between the financial support offered in a country where you have best practice and other countries where it is more difficult to get financed and therefore to put up best practices?

Answer to question 2:

- Ann Frye – Ann Frye Ltd. (UK):

There is some evidence of such a correlation but it is important to note that high investment does not guarantee a successful outcome.

What is most important is the political will and, of course, mainstream sustainable funding. The main failure we've seen was when there was a pilot action for 3 years and then the funding was dropped. Some schemes like door to door schemes will never be profitable, so it is where you have a political will backed up by the money that you have the greatest chance to find best practice.

Question 3: Katrin Dziekan - Ins. of Land and Sea transport. - UT. Berlin (Germany) Concerning the methodology part, what is the return rate of the questionnaire? Do you have an idea of how to finance this and incorporate your findings into future research proposals?

Answers to question 3:

- Anders Wretstrand – University of Lund (Sweden):

It was difficult, both regarding data collection on the legal framework and regarding the user perspective to obtain answers.

The response rate reaches about 30-40% and this is low. Some answers should be interpreted with care because we have not covered all the countries and we have not covered enough of each users group. So we do have analysis but it should be taken with care.

Regarding evaluation: If you provide funding for accessibility measurement you should demand that implementation is evaluated.

We did not send it to individuals but to organisations and they were supposed to assess how their members regard the question.

- Merethe Dotterud Leiren – TOI (Norway):

Of 29 Ministries7 countries did not respond the questionnaire on policies and legal documents. For 2 of them (Italy and Germany) other entities filled out the questionnaire.

- Ann Frye – Ann Frye Ltd. (UK) :

I have some comments on the responses to Anders Wretstrand's work on user groups: we worked very closely with the EDF and in turn the Forum worked with its members, so it was a cascade of reactions.

On evaluation, we have a strong message to decision makers: if you are financing a scheme then build in the cost of monitoring and evaluation so you can see how well it is working and, most importantly, whether you made a difference on the daily lives of disabled people.

2.7 Work Package 4: recommendations for EU policies, by Carlos Marques – Tis.pt (Portugal)

At the policy level, there were a lot of existing initiatives. The challenge in Work Package 4 was to interpret the results and propose new initiatives, because we had to find our way among hundreds of documents.

The lack of evaluation framework as a finding of WP3 was a major issue: what could be considered as best practice?

We should at least be able to make a judgement on best practise looking out the effectiveness, efficiency and this will give us an idea of the cost effectiveness of the measures and finally the consistency and cross impacts of the measures taken.

We have tried to identify clear targets for intervention. From the perspective of users you see: integration, seamless travel chain but from the transport point of view, things are not exactly the same. There is a clash there and we need to put the two things together. It is difficult for example in railways, to the infrastructure manager that his client is not the passenger. And this happens in several other areas.

Some issues have to do about planning and operation and there is the need for integration: this area policy has to be reinforced as integration is not occurring naturally.

For transport planning and operation, the major issue is logical information about integration, web base information... but there might be a gap between what you know and what you can do.

Other major issues are physical integration, vehicle accessibility, on board safety and security, staff assistance...

For infrastructure planning and management, important points are access to railway stations, tram and bus stops and their safety. On walking side, what matters is the assistance to users. Major point here is information on board of vehicles, estimated time of arrival of the next bus, signalling, and statistic information.

However it is difficult to know what a best practice is: a best practice will be the one that fits the needs of the users. There is a long list of best practices, such as integrated planning and specialist and universal design.

Concerning transferability, it is not possible to predict it precisely but packaging as well as decision making and the role of ITS are important. Until 2010, there will be some improvements in this field (especially as far as integration is concerned).

In conclusion, the key points to mention for recommendations are:

- Seamless transportation, user expectations, improved cooperation between stakeholders and stakeholder involvement.
- Packaging and commercial opportunities (ageing society)
- Institutional cooperation
- Common organisation and funding structures
- Improvement of the links between social partners, consumers associations, EC, manufacturers
- Achievement of policy convergence through a momentum
- Cross cutting economies and policies, environment consumer and health are also to be taken into consideration. Also the employers should be involved into the accessibility question.
- Finally the dissemination is a main step as well as the setting up of a range of indicators in order to support decision on funding.

2.8 Questions on Work Package 4 presentation

Question 1: Peter Wagstaff, CEREMH (France)

Four of the speakers have spoken about a universal design. Do you have a definition of a universal designer? What is his background?

Answer to question 1:

- Ann Frye – Ann Frye Ltd. (UK):

Universal design is a state of mind, what architects and engineers need to understand is that design is about people. All you need is someone to understand what it is to be mobility impaired; it is a flexibility of mind. All the schools of engineering and so on should teach universal design because a lot of people graduate and they never have heard about it.

Question 2: Hans Chr Kirketerp-Møller – Danish States Railways (Denemark)

Best practice has to be good examples for what we have to do. We have to accept good solutions for the users. Not a solution for engineers but for users.

Answers to question 2:

- General comment – Véronique Bernard, Project Officer (European Commission):

The list of recommendations is very long: what are the incentives to people to take on board these recommendations? And about cost-benefits analysis: how to ensure that there is fairness when taking on board the recommendations?

- Carlos Marques - Tis.pt (Portugal)

Indeed, recommendations should include who have the incentives for doing what. In our final report, we can make an effort to have this point clearer and illustrate the report on the point of incentives. The cost benefits analysis is part of this of course. But answers will be difficult to answer. It will lie on what is of public interest: access to work force for disabled is a positive contribution for companies and for the society, so it could be translated into figures.

Question 3: Nigel Dotchin, UK Department for Transport speaker:

You make the relationship between operators and infra manager quite clear that they should have a good relation. It is a challenge; a lot of stakeholders need to be brought together. What would be your recommendation about a structure for this cooperation?

Answers to question 3:

- Maryvonne Dejeammes - CERTU (France):

In France there has been a planning process (urban mobility plan) and after this, a law in favour of disabled transport was adopted with a scheme for accessible public transport and one to access buildings. Now the law requires that these mobility plans integrate the 2 schemes for disabled people. So we are in the process of contacting all these stakeholders, taking on board the issue of impaired people.

But of course, it is a difficult negotiation between all these stakeholders.

- Carlos Marques - Tis.pt (Portugal) :

We did insist on the role of transport authority in playing the role of integrator and in explaining what it means to have an accessible public transport.

Awareness and dissemination of advantages of accessibility for all is also a key issue.

3. Closure of the Workshop

The concluding elements were given by Claude Marin Lamellet – INRETS (France), because the speaker from the DG Employment who was planned to make the final speech was not able to come.

What is important is the holistic approach of public transport accessibility. The possibility given to mobility impaired people to be able to go to work, to university, etc. The importance of the transport chain has to be underlined: a disabled person should be able to come in and out of the transport system, during all the way.

We have found a lot of interesting legal framework but there is a gap to fill between frameworks and implementation, so that the accessibility criterion is used also in the final implementation part and not only in the law.

The approach of the cost for society has to be thought again, taking into consideration the benefits for other parts of the population as a whole. We could take the examples of road safety, where they are trying not only to count saved life but also the benefits for the whole system.

Integration of the public transport system, the environmental issue and also the urban planning is important and we have to put into it a lot of mobility access questions. Environment will help us change our views on transport issues. We need to take this opportunity.

There is a need for further research support to integrate urban and transport policies, especially as far as the ageing society question is concerned (reduction in car use,

Alzheimer, Parkinson diseases: there will be a greater need for public transport). Gender issue also has a role to play in the accessibility area.

Please visit our website as much as you like, it will be updated next year with our latest results.

I would like to thank the participants for their attention and participation, the EUROACCESS partners, and extend these thanks to Soizick Chambard and Farida Idir for their contribution to the organisation of this workshop.

Finally, I would like also to address a special thanks to Mathilde Bruyère who was in charge of coordinating the project with me: she has done an excellent job in this difficult task.

4. Appendixes

4.1 Appendix 1: list of participants

NAMES	INSTITUTES	COUNTRIES
Mathilde BRUYERE	ERT - Euro Access	France
Farida IDIR	ERT - Euro Access	France
Claude MARIN LAMELLET	INRETS - Euro Access	France
Soizick CHAMBARD	INRETS- Euro Access	France
Ann FRYE	Ann Frye Ltd - Euro Access	United Kingdom
Maryvonne DEJEAMMES	CERTU - Euro Access	France
Merethe DOTTERUD LEIREN	TOI - Euro Access	Norway
Anders WRETSTRAND	University of Lund - Euro Access	Sweden
Alexandra RODRIGUEZ	Tis.pt - Euro Access	Portugal
Carlos MARQUES	Tis.pt - Euro Access	Portugal
Luca LUCIETTI	FIT Consulting	Italy
Véronique BERNARD	Project Officer - Euro Access (DG RTD, Unit Health)	European Commission
Alexa VANZETTA	Repr. Autonomous Region of Bozen at EU	Italy
Caroline BRITT	Dep. Transport - Disability Unit	United Kingdom
David MARTIN RUIZ	Burson-Marsteller	Belgium
Guy HERMANS	KPVV	The Netherlands
Ian CATLOW	London's European Office	United Kingdom
Jayesh PATEL	Lancashire County Council	United Kingdom
Jean THIRIFAYS	Ass. Sces Transp. Adapté pers. mobilité réduite	Belgium
Katrin DZIEKAN	Ins. of Land and Sea transport. - UT. Berlin	Germany
Kusuto NAITO	AGE platform	Belgium
Nigel DOTCHIN	Dep. Transport - Accessibility & Equalities Unit	United Kingdom
Peter WAGSTAFF	CEREMH	France
Pierre MOISE	TRANSDEV	France
Hans Chr Kirketerp-Møller	Danish States Railways	Danemark
Rafaëlle DELEPAUT	Représentation de l'Ile-de-France à Bruxelles	France
Jonathan MILLINS	Greater Manchester Brussels Office	United Kingdom
Bodron OANAN	Délégation Nord Pas de Calais	France
Sarah MURRAY	East of England	United Kingdom

4.2 Appendix 2: agenda

Euro Access Final Workshop: Towards an Accessible European Transport Network

Brussels, 03/12/08

9h00 Welcome Breakfast

9h30 – Workshop introduction

Véronique Bernard, Euro Access Project Officer DG Research, Unit F2: Public Health

9h40 - Introduction to the Euro Access project

Claude Marin Lamellet, INRETS(France)

9h50 - Presentation of Euro Access results:

Review of current policies and regulation: *Merethe Dotterud, TOI (Norway)*

Users needs and expectation: *Anders Wretstrand, University of Lund (Sweden)*

Identifying best practices: *Ann Frye, Ann Frye Ltd (United Kingdom) and Maryvonne Dejeammes, CERTU (France)*

10h35 - Discussions

10h55 Coffee break

11h15 - Recommendations to improve the accessibility of public transports in Europe for people with disabilities

Carlos Marques and Alexandra Rodriguez, Tis.pt (Portugal)

11h35 - Discussions

11h50 – Closure of the workshop

Invited speaker, to be determined

Claude Marin Lamellet, INRETS(France)

12h00 End of the meeting

The venue

Address:

Hotel Best Western Carrefour de l'Europe

Rue Marché aux Herbes 110

1000 Brussels – Belgium

Contact details

Email: soizick.chambard@inrets.fr

Phone: +33 (0)4 72 14 24 56

Fax: +33 (0)4 72 14 24 58

4.3 Appendix 3: presentations

Enclosed zip file