

INCEPTION REPORT

Contract N° 1999-RD.11129

MOST

MOBILITY MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR THE NEXT DECADES

PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR:

FGM-AMOR – Forschungsgesellschaft Mobilität, Austrian Mobility Research

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE:

CH2MHILL (E), ILS (D), Langzaam Verkeer (B), NEA (NL), RWTH-ISB Aachen (D),
University of Westminster (UK)

REPORTING PERIOD: from 1/2000 to 4/2000

PROJECT START DATE: 01.01.2000

DURATION: 36 months

DATE OF THE ISSUE OF THIS REPORT: 15th of November 2000



Project funded by the European Community
under the 'Competitive and Sustainable
Growth' Programme (1998-2002)



1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION TO THE INCEPTION REPORT (IR)..... 2

- 1.1 PROGRESS.....2
- 1.2 INTRODUCTION TO THE INCEPTION REPORT (IR)2
- 1.3 WORKING DEFINITION OF MOBILITY MANAGEMENT3
- 1.4 OPTIMISING THE PROCESS BY MANAGEMENT MEASURES3
 - 1.4.1 Managing diverse partners..... 3*
 - 1.4.2 Ensuring Quality 4*
 - 1.4.3 Building a bridge between academic expert knowledge and practitioners' demands..... 5*
 - 1.4.4 Preliminary results of the Initialising Phase so far..... 6*

1 Executive Summary and Introduction to the Inception Report (IR)

This IR was first submitted in May 2000 and has been finalised after some revisions by the EC in November 2000.

1.1 Progress

The MOST project officially started on 1st January 2000, following an extensive negotiation and redesign period of more than half a year. As planned, work started with the Kick-off-procedure, culminating in the Kick-off-meeting on the 18th of February. From then on all partners became involved, especially through the process of gathering information and materials for the Inception Report (IR). Work Packages (WP) 1 and 3 developed and processed a common questionnaire and are well on the way to providing the necessary materials before the first MOST-Seminar, which will take place in June 2000. WP 4 has delivered the Dissemination plan and the web site (<http://mo.st>) should be online by now.

1.2 Introduction to the Inception Report (IR)

The Inception Report was needed for the following reasons:

There was only space for a two page description of each WP and thematic Cluster in the Work Description (Technical Annex). This meant there were often only a few lines for the description of the work plan of each partner. Neither all the partners nor the evaluators and the Commission had the opportunity to receive more detailed information. This information came in various different formats including verbally, and was sometimes in languages other than English. To define the role of each partner, it was necessary to have a standardised and broader format for the description of the work of each partner. It is important that each partner and site add value to the project. So the inception report explains and justifies the inclusion of each element of the study.

The request for the IR was made during the negotiation phase and this is, therefore, the first deliverable for the MOST project.

It is a valuable tool for involving each partner at the beginning of the project and making standardised, comparable information available for everyone interested in the initialising phase of MOST.

It is the first opportunity for the horizontal WPs to undertake a quick analysis of the participating projects.

In order to achieve this, each Cluster Partner completed a standardised 2-page questionnaire (answers are summarised in Annex 1). All other project partners (including the WPs and Cluster Leaders) used this information and, based on the Work Description, worked together on the IR in order to answer the crucial questions necessary to obtain an overview and to evaluate MOST.

1.3 Working Definition of Mobility Management

The following working definition of Mobility Management (MM) serves as a basis for the whole MOST project and for the understanding of the concept among all partners:

Mobility Management is primarily a demand orientated approach to passenger and freight transport that involves new partnerships and a set of tools to support and encourage change of attitude and behaviour towards sustainable modes of transport. These tools are usually based on information, communication, organisation, co-ordination and require promotion.

The **objectives** of Mobility Management can include:

- encouraging greater use of sustainable transport modes
- improving sustainable accessibility for all people and organisations
- increasing the efficiency of use of transport and land use infrastructure
- reducing traffic (growth) by limiting the number, length and need of motorised vehicle trips

This definition was communicated to all partners in the Initialising Phase, and the understanding was further clarified during the initialising phase.

1.4 Optimising the Process by Management Measures

1.4.1 Managing diverse partners

The **competence** in, and previous **experience** of, Mobility Management differs from site to site. This becomes obvious also in different levels of experience in the evaluation of MM measures and their success. But this was anticipated, and it is exactly one of the objectives of MOST, to find out how to bridge the gap in knowledge and reduce such differences (*note especially the difference in Work-Plan-elaboration of partners in Annex 1*).

Given this diversity of schemes in MOST and the differences in competence in **monitoring and evaluation** between the sites, WP 3 will elaborate a common set of topics or indicators that all sites will monitor and report upon. It will include a more

extensive set for all demonstrators, whilst case studies and information providers (if applicable) have a reduced core set. The inventory of existing monitoring and evaluation methods (part of WP3) will include the outcome of MAESTRO. The MAESTRO methods and guidelines that are useful for MOST, will be applied, taking into consideration also institutional, operational, managerial and financial matters as well as basis transport and/or usage statistics.

The diversity of partners also requires a common understanding among all sites of what is exactly within the **scope of the project** and what is exactly expected from them. Several instruments help to provide for this:

- The structured Inception Report itself
- The first seminar
- The Internal "newsletter" Most of the Month
- The web site
- The management structure - cluster leaders are responsible for ensuring consistency within their cluster and the six monthly management committee meetings provide the opportunity to ensure consistency across clusters.
- A timetable for the project as a whole - showing partners when they will be expected to provide information and what they will be expected to provide (not included in Inception Report, but will be ready by November 2000).

To be sure partners will be able to cope with **language** problems, all partners have signed a consortium agreement committing them to work in English. However, Cluster Leaders are the contact persons for their partners; their responsibility is to announce all kinds of problems to the project management, hence also those concerning the language. The established communication flow between project partners will serve as a system for identifying and dealing with any language difficulties and to ensure that the project management team were aware of such problems. In case such problems arise, project management will appoint a national liaison point to deal with them (so far this has not been necessary).

Despite, or even because of the diversity of partners, each partner (including the subcontractors) adds value to the project. Their local plans and objectives fit in with and support the purpose of the MOST project as a whole. In this way each partner contributes to the added value the EU expects from MOST. *(see especially Chapter 3 "Contributions to MOST by the Clusters" – subchapters on the meaning of the Cluster for MOST - and Annex 1 – Description of Cluster Partners)*

1.4.2 Ensuring Quality

In order to achieve maximum quality of all outcomes of MOST, the whole project is structured like an iterative process:

- Part of this is a back-and-forth procedure and exchange between partners, WP 2 and WP 3, so the M&E-methodologies can be optimised stepwise. This way, a feedback

of the practitioners and an adaptation to their needs can be achieved and the approach will not be too academic.

- D 3 will already contain results of a first questionnaire (this questionnaire is included in the Annex II to IR)
- In D 4 (midterm review) monitoring activities are reviewed extensively and adapted as far as necessary.
- Each Management Report and Management Committee meeting will have the monitoring and evaluation process as a theme.
- All this becomes the basis of D 5 - finally elaborated into D 7.

1.4.3 Building a bridge between academic expert knowledge and practitioners' demands

In addition, Quality Control checks on the overall intellectual quality of the work proposed in each Work Package and Cluster. It ensures that the agreed work has been carried out comprehensively and to a high standard. Additionally, it checks the content and English of each deliverable.

In order to have an optimum balance between a high demand for high quality and academically based know-how on the one hand and applicability of results for practitioners on the other, a lot of effort has been invested into the initialising phase: It was one of the main goals of the first seminar and the kick-off procedure to find out the requirements of the Cluster Partners. The potential conflict between this high demand and applicability became obvious in the seminar:

The criticism of many partners at the seminar was the academic orientation. The Management Committee reacted immediately by changing the seminar structure: more weight was given to the practitioners, to the exchange of the partners about the situation at the sites and circumstances for implementing MM.

On the next management meeting measures to avoid the too academic orientation will be a prime topic. Under discussion are at the moment:

- Info from the partners in WP4: Brief overview of the national situation in their country e.g. target audience, issues that need to be addressed, key information requirements
- Info from Cluster Leaders: to provide similar evidence specific to their cluster topic.

As several partners represent cities or regions, their needs (and contributions) will be regarded in MOST as well. Especially when implementing MM in cities or regions, the partners represent policy makers. In order to extract reasonable and applicable results for politicians, the task of WP2 is to further elaborate on (legal and) political frame works, hindering or promoting MM.

1.4.4 Preliminary results of the Initialising Phase so far

All projects are now in a process of being aligned according to the definitions of Mobility Management as laid down by the EPOMM. Comparability and evaluation at the policy and data level are in the process of being established and defined by the WP 1 and WP 3 (*see Chapter 6 “ Contributions to MOST by the Work Packages” and Annex 2 – Questionnaires of WP 1&3*).

The boundaries and links between WP 1, 2 and 3 have been clarified during the kick-off meeting and in the communication process during the production of the IR (*see Chapter 4*)

Roles (within WPs, within Clusters, and within the Management Committee), communication rules, and contributions from Cluster Leaders and Cluster Partners to the WPs have been defined (*see Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 - subchapters on links to WPs*).