INCLUSIVE MOBILITY: AN INTERNATIONAL SURVEY

Inventory, best practices and lessons learned

2014 Survey – Summary

What initiatives and projects have been successfully implemented in other countries? From these experiences, what lessons can we learn in France?

INCLUSIVE MOBILITY

MOBILITY FOR ALL

The full version of this survey (in French) is available on the website of the Laboratory of Inclusive Mobility: www.mobiliteinclusive.com (website in French language only).

This international survey on mobility among seniors and populations in precarious situations is designed to shed light on the French situation through comparisons with the challenges and initiatives developed in other countries.

What is the conception of inclusive mobility, or mobility accessible to all, behind the policies deployed abroad? What players are addressing the issue? Are their actions coordinated with and supported by civil society, transportation authorities, enterprise and government? What initiatives have been implemented and which projects are proving effective? And finally, what should we learn from these experiences in France?

This survey focuses on the different approaches favored in five geographic countries or regions (Canada, Denmark, Japan, the United Kingdom and the European Union), and on seventeen projects identified around the world. The countries studied all face similar challenges: making the resources and infrastructures of the territory accessible to large groups of disadvantaged residents, preventing the isolation of the growing population of seniors by assisting them in their daily activities.

Although it cannot be presumed that good practices observed elsewhere are perfectly transposable to France, these innovative and promising projects offer valuable lessons for France. The players of inclusive mobility – whether public, private or non-profit – can use such experiences as a basis for their analysis. By referring to these pertinent and documented initiatives, stakeholders can contribute to greater awareness of the issue and its critical implications.

This international survey had three major aims:

1

To establish an international inventory of barriers to inclusive mobility and the types of solutions deployed by local players.

2

To identify, describe and analyze a series of good practices and evaluate their "replicability" – in other words, their potential applicability to the French context.

3

To create ties with French studies conducted by the Laboratory of Inclusive Mobility on mobility among seniors and populations in precarious situations, and propose recommendations.

WHAT IS BEING DONE ABROAD FOR AN INCLUSIVE MOBILITY?

A close-up look on the United Kingdom, Denmark, Canada, Japan and the European Union

Methodology

The survey focuses on Canada, Denmark, Japan and the United Kingdom, four countries chosen for their level of socio-economic development comparable to that of France, and for their diverse approaches to inclusive mobility/accessible mobility for all.

The study also looks at the European Union on the specific scale of the community institutions that are tasked with issues of social exclusion and the mobility of seniors, primarily via multipartners research projects.

Key findings

Although the barriers to inclusive mobility and the solutions found to deal with them are extremely varied across the different regions, some fundamental trends are common to the different countries studied.

A country's geographic organization and demographics strongly influence the barriers to inclusive mobility and the solutions invented to overcome them. For example, the extremely high population density of Japan requires optimized design and fluidity of public transportation, whereas the urban sprawl and remote outposts of Canada call for inventing new transport-on-demand concepts. Yet regardless of the country studied and its specific context, the periurban and rural areas are facing similar issues: the isolation of older inhabitants, mobility-related constraints on access to jobs, and lack of cost-effectiveness of public transportation routes, to name the major ones.

In France, a "primary system" (public policy on inclusion and access to employment) and a "secondary system" (mainly non-profits) are tasked with addressing the challenges of inclusive mobility[1]. The solutions they propose can be divided into two main categories: financial/material aid (such as subsidies for Driver's Education, social fares) and educational solutions (information and counseling)[2]. However, managing these two levels of solutions is complex and asks for better coordination. What is the situation in the other countries and regions studied?

1 This refers to job-seekers and people in work-integration programs, according to the scope defined for the study, "Mobilité, insertion, accès à l'emploi", Laboratory of Inclusive Mobility, 2013.

2 "Mobilité, insertion, accès à l'emploi", Laboratory of Inclusive Mobility, 2013.

WHAT IS
BEING DONE ABROAD
FOR AN INCLUSIVE
MOBILITY?

A bias towards "infrastructure" and "physical accessibility"

Regardless of the country, public actors suffer from two main biases in their approach to inclusive mobility. One lies in an overly "infrastructure-centric" approach that focuses on transportation infrastructure but tends to neglect services, cycling, walking and remote access to the resources available in the territory. The other stems from a conception of inclusive mobility centered on physical accessibility but often overlooking economic, social, cultural and cognitive impediments to mobility.

While the issue of mobility for seniors is clearly featured on the policy agenda – particularly in the form of accessibility compliance of public transportation – mobility for populations in precarious situations rarely receives an institutional response.

For this reason, this study is focusing on projects that try to overcome such biases and to address the mobility issues of low-income populations too.

Some countries (Denmark and Japan) have opted for a "comprehensive" and centralized approach to inclusive mobility, giving pride of place to solutions based on universal design[3], while others (Canada and the UK) tend to choose approaches that are more segmented according to the target population category.

Significant differences between local and national policies

The concept of inclusive mobility is rarely discussed by name. Expressions like "accessible transportation", "cities for all", "universal design", "fair transport", etc. are more common. Yet a myriad of stakeholders in the countries surveyed – as well as at the EU level! – have already grasped the role that mobility can play in an inclusive society.

In the UK and Canada, local governments or local transportation authorities, along with non-profits and communities[4], are the source of innovative policies, but such local initiatives are necessarily dependent on both political will and available funding. Accordingly, projects on the theme of inclusive mobility are relatively "fragile".

In Japan and Denmark, the implications of inclusive mobility stem from an inclusive social vision and are considered from the standpoint of the nation as a whole. Japan makes extensive use of legislative and regulatory mechanisms, whereas Denmark promotes a shared vision and cultural mindset of "society for all" to achieve policy gains in the area of mobility.

Innovative projects based on education and help from the community

The real-world solutions initially put in place look fairly conventional: special services (i.e., transport on demand, shuttles), social fares, development/planning projects. However, other more creative solutions are emerging. They shift the focus on education (concerning cycling, for example) and on seeking help from the community, especially in countries of Anglo-Saxon tradition. This recourse to the community to make up for the inadequacies of public service takes different forms. It may be strongly encouraged by the state – perhaps somewhat forcibly – in a context of budget restrictions (UK), or it may occur as a spontaneous initiative of civil society (e.g., Canada, Denmark).

3 Universal design refers to the design of environments, infrastructure or technologies suitable for use by all without requiring special adaptations.

4 The term "community" is used here to mean a local entity that pursues a common goal on a volunteer basis (e.g., a seniors' association or neighborhood group).

WHAT ARE THE BEST PRACTICES TO ACHIEVE INCLUSIVE MOBILITY ABROAD?

Methodology

The international survey on inclusive mobility aims to enlighten the debate on inclusive mobility in France by viewing it through the lens of projects developed in other countries. Benchmarking is an ideal tool then: it highlights a sampling of innovative projects-backed by a review of the literature coupled with in-depth interviews.

This survey of "best practices" does not aim to propose turnkey solutions, but rather to give stakeholders elements to consider and guide their decision-making process. For example, benchmarking will point to emerging trends and the key factors in the success or failure of a project.

Key findings

Following an initial phase devoted to analyzing the barriers to inclusive mobility in various countries, the second phase of our survey focused on seventeen actual projects. These "best practice" initiatives identified abroad are considered representative of the many possible responses in this area.

Although the practices examined are quite different from one another, we sought to ensure a balance in terms of target populations (seniors and populations in precarious situations), the types of territory (rural, periurban and urban) and the players involved (public, private and non-profit entities). The next section features summary descriptions of each of these seventeen "best practices".

Transport Solutions (Merseyside, UK)

Since 2006, Transport Solutions has been providing a package of mobility measures to facilitate a return to employment. The organization assists job-seekers, young people and occasional workers in various ways: personalized travel plans, reduced fares, loans (microcredit) to purchase scooters, loans of bicycles, etc.

Merseytravel (the combined transport authority for the Liverpool City Region) has processed over 15,000 varied requests varied over a three-year period.

Good practices:

- A Public Transport Authority is in charge of inclusive mobility within its territory
- The public transport operator trains employees of Job Centre Plus (employment service) to handle job-seeker questions concerning mobility
- Familiarity with the territory and its demographics (nomenclatures):
  - › Mapping of districts liable to benefit from inclusive mobility initiatives (low income/ high unemployment)
  - › An original quantitative indicator, "Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET)"
- Merseytravel's mission is to: "Promote a culture of mobility, and allow people to be economically, socially and physically active".

www.letstravelwise.org

Independent Transportation Network (ITN) America, United States

This national network of volunteer drivers serves seniors and visually-impaired adults, based on a system of ride credits:

- 25 local affiliates with about 1,650 volunteer drivers
- 4,093 active members (drivers and passengers)
- 660,586 trips completed in the past twenty years
- A 94% rate of customer satisfaction
- Average cost of a round trip: $11
- Average age of beneficiaries: 80
- Average age of drivers: 60

Good practices:

- A demonstration of the "willingness to pay" for a quality service, especially when public transportation services are inadequate or non-existent
- Yesterday's drivers can become tomorrow's passengers (converting credits earned by driving others into ride credits for the future)
- Governance entails around 20 affiliates which ITN America supports by supplying the business model, marketing, and software deployment.

www.itnamerica.org

AENEAS

"Attaining Energy-Efficient Mobility in an Ageing Society" is a European project aimed at improving mobility management for elderly citizens.

Good practices:

- An innovative approach: one-to-one marketing of sustainable modes to seniors,
- Awareness-building among everyone involved in mobility, such as transport service operators and bus drivers
- The magnitude of the system: 100,000 people in five European cities have been targeted by workshops, one-to-one marketing, communication campaigns and promotional events
- One of the main objectives of the project is dissemination to all cities in Europe: its website offers reports, guides and best practice surveys for download in seven different languages.

www.aeneas-project.eu

TUS (Copenhague, Denmark)

A multipartner project to make transport-related information accessible to all in the Copenhagen area.

The project calls for the harmonization of signage and way-finding information across the various multimodal operators, in accordance with universal design principles.

Good practices:

- "Universal" pictograms are used to eliminate language barriers
- Passenger experience takes precedence over brand promotion
- Employees of the various mobility operators receive training and thus are able to inform users about all available modes of transportation
- Multipartner cooperation involving seven operators but requiring the creation of a single job only
- The TUS Charter (concerted development of mobility information) is deployed in nine transport hubs and made available to other local authorities free of charge.

www.tusdesign.dk

TEKI (Pays-Basque, Spain)

A telemedicine solution that provides remote elderly patients with monitoring and advice.

Good practices:

- Avoids unnecessary trips
- Encourages and supports new uses of technical innovation
- Developed jointly with users.

www.accenture.com/fr-fr/Pages/success-basque-country-managing-increased-chronicity.aspx

Other projects:

- **Navette Or** (Canada), a shuttle service open to all users but specially adapted to seniors, to fight isolation
- **Conduce tu futuro** (Spain), an innovative partnership between municipalities and a private foundation to fund driver's education and promote work integration
- **Wheels2Work** (UK), a nation-wide network of scooter-lending outlets in remote and rural areas
- **Postbus** (UK), a project that takes advantage of postal vehicles to alleviate the isolation of rural districts
- Integration by cycling (Canada, Denmark and Austria), a series of workshops for women, young people and immigrants to improve their integration into urban life
- **JARC** (USA), a federal funding program for mobility services that facilitate access to jobs
- **SIMON** and **Mobility, Mood and Place**: two multipartner research projects, one focusing on the role of mood and cognition in the elderly's desire for mobility, and the other involving the deployment of mobility access services via a mobile platform
- **Age-Friendly Cities**, a worldwide program to adapt urban environments to seniors; an initiative of the World Health Organization
- **Free off-peak concessionary bus travel**: a nationwide program in England that allows seniors to ride the buses for free in off-peak hours.

Each of these seventeen projects is analyzed in detail in the full report of this survey, available at www.mobiliteinclusive.com (in French).

Accessible mobility, a vital resource for contemporary living

The target population categories, strategies employed, types of territory and players involved differ widely across these various initiatives. Nonetheless, our survey has highlighted some important lessons.

The contemporary individual can be defined as a mobile person[5]. Taking this as the basic premise, projects designed to remove barriers to mobility offer solutions to a variety of problems: isolation (Navette Or); access to jobs (JARC, Wheets2Work, Merseytravel, etc.); or cognitive discomfort in urban environments that are unfamiliar or perceived as hostile (e.g., bicycle workshops; Mobility, Mood and Place).

The most effective projects generally identify and understand their specific target population(s) at the earliest stages of their processes. Examples include the long-term unemployed with no driver's license (Conduce tu futuro); immigrant women who do not own a car (bicycle workshops); young people in rural areas deprived of mobility services (Wheels2Work); seniors who are no longer able to drive (ITNAmerica).

Initiatives designed to encourage individual competence and empowerment

Most of the projects we studied give precedence to individualized support designed with a long-term outlook, rather than generic "stop-gap" solutions. This approach often calls for carrying out a preliminary personalized assessment (Conduce tu futuro, Transport Solutions). It seems critical to provide target beneficiaries with

5 George Amar, "Homo mobilis", p.47

an attractive concept rather than with a "better than nothing" solution, by taking advantage of individualized travel marketing techniques (AENEAS) and giving the opportunity to choose between various options (such as the multimodal "packs" available from Transport Solutions), or by devising customized offerings suited to the needs of specific populations (Navette Or).

The empowerment of program beneficiaries requires a change of perspective on the part of the supply side: the target groups become individuals who need to be persuaded and won over, rather than a captive audience requiring assistance. Empowerment also demands that an explicit "social contract" be established to define the conditions for support: beneficiaries are actively engaged in the process and must give something in exchange for being eligible to use the service. This might be symbolic (e.g., time devoted to building one's bicycle with Charlie's Free Wheels), or financial (contribution to the cost of the service, with Wheels2Work and ITNAmerica).

In search of a deployment model

The projects that work best often stem from a successful initial trial at a local scale, before being more widely developed. A recurring model is that of local outlets affiliated to a nationwide network, with examples like ITNAmerica and Wheels2Work. However, the deployment and upscaling phases continue to pose huge challenges for projects that are initially sponsored by small non-profits with minimal or even non-existent public support. The private sector is often called in for the deployment phase, as seen for example in the involvement of the Altadis foundation (for Conduce tu futuro) or the Motorcycle Industry Association (for Wheels2Work).

Once launched and at cruising speed, some services (TEKI Kinect, ITNAmerica) plan to expand their beneficiary base. Replicability will be easier to achieve if it was made a core goal at the inception of the project: this was the case for TUS Design, SIMON and TEKI Kinect.

The division of roles and responsibilities: an outstanding issue

Our study of these various initiatives has revealed two recurring challenges. One concerns the allocation of roles between public entities and private/non-profits. In some cases, mostly in the UK and the USA, the trend is toward a delegation of the public service to non-profits or communities. In such cases, a clear framework defining the respective roles and contributions of each party appears imperative.

The second challenge is cost-effectiveness of individualized solutions. Several projects are confronted with the dilemma of providing far-reaching, quality support but only on a selective basis to limit costs. For such projects, increasing the number of beneficiaries may jeopardize the quality of assistance provided and raise the issue of the financial resources needed to expand the service. A related issue is how to share the costs of service provision between the beneficiaries, the private sector and non-profit players and government.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FRANCE

The first two phases of our international survey focused on challenges and best practices relating to inclusive mobility. This enabled us to identify methodologies, governance models, financing models and intervention strategies that hold interest for France. The following recommendations aim to capitalize on these lessons.

The recommendations formulated herein also draw on the conclusions of two additional studies carried out by the consulting firm Auxilia on behalf of the Laboratory of Inclusive Mobility: Mobilité, insertion et accès à l'emploi (Mobility, Integration and Access to Employment), published in 2013, and Mobilité des seniors en France (Mobility for Seniors in France), published in 2014.

The level of French investment in inclusive mobility has been comparable to that of the other OECD countries of interest in terms of studies, policies and projects. That is encouraging! Even so, we still have much to learn from the policies and good practices implemented elsewhere.

Three strategies translating into ten recommendations

1

Reorganize the governance of inclusive mobility projects: cooperation, professionalization and assessment

At the local level, cooperation among public, private and non-profit players must be made systematic. The Transport Organizing Authorities (TOA) must be assigned a special role, with inclusive mobility being one of their prerogatives. In this model, TOAs would be tasked with coordinating initiatives led by non-profit associations and enlisting the major local employers in projects targeting vulnerable categories of the population.

This type of multilateral partnership demands a professionalization effort directed at players involved in mobility/social integration, in order to bring them "up to par": improved professional credentials of non-profit staff and official recognition of the job of mobility counselor; appointment of a coordinator of inclusive mobility reporting to the senior management of the Transport Organizing Authorities; training of professionals such as bus drivers and network operators who are in daily contact with population categories in precarious situations.

Defining harmonized indicators is also indispensable as a decision-support tool in this area, specifically for:
- Identifying and quantifying the people who need inclusive mobility solutions
- Analyzing their needs
- Evaluating projects designed to address their situation
- Facilitating the replicability of these projects.

Finally, new population typologies must be developed to better address their diversity and specificities. One example is the Liverpool City Regional Transport Organizing Authority, which targets young people "not in employment, education or training (NEET)".

RECOMMENDATION 1

Systematize multipartner cooperation when developing projects at a local level

- Reinforce the scope of national collaboration as embodied by the Laboratory of Inclusive Mobility to allow centralized management, but above all by creating regional bodies that bring together local authorities, transport authorities and operators, the main local employers, mobility platforms and non-profit stakeholders;
- Reward and encourage the role of private foundations and enterprises in their efforts to promote inclusive mobility by:

1. lobbying public authorities, setting an example,
2. driving public-sector and non-profit initiatives,
3. setting up public-private partnerships,
4. providing aid for the upscaling of initial small-scale success stories.

RECOMMENDATION 2

Systematize the evaluation of inclusive mobility programs and the follow-up of program beneficiaries

- Evaluate inclusive mobility projects quantitatively and qualitatively before, during and after their implementation
- Incorporate all Social Returns on Investment – at both the individual (micro) and overall policy (macro) levels – into the evaluation processes
- Define new typologies to identify target population categories for inclusive mobility programs
- Arrange for funds set aside on each project to be used to cover the costs of these evaluations.

RECOMMENDATION 3

Take part in European and international networks and foster the sharing of best practices

- Formalize the sharing of best practices at the European and international scales by creating platforms, fact-finding visits and dialogue. This action can be supported by existing tools (i.e., POLIS, URBACT III, EPOMM and CIVITAS in Europe)
- Pool the international contacts of the various members of multilateral platforms.
- Encourage local authorities, Transport Organizing Authorities , transport operators and businesses to get involved in inclusive mobility projects in Europe
- Facilitate the conditions of access to European projects.

2

Look differently at target populations and rethink the relations with beneficiaries

In France, measures to promote sustainable mobility have generally benefited active members of the workforce (i.e., those with a stable job), as opposed to categories facing barriers to mobility. The first group is the preferred target of marketing campaigns, receives financial compensation for cycling to work, or enjoys flexible systems to adapt their work schedules, while the second group mainly receives financial aid to help them acquire a car; rarely are they offered mechanisms with gratification and reward designed to encourage new mobility behaviors.

We must amend our vision of populations in precarious situations, starting with seniors and socially vulnerable groups. This shift can be achieved by drawing on individualized travel marketing initiatives (such as the AENEAS project); multimodal packages (such as the Transport Solutions project) and solutions for "remote day-to-day services" (such as the TEKI project), which should be made more easily accessible to these vulnerable categories.

RECOMMENDATION 4

Develop "co-design processes" for inclusive mobility offerings and services

- Engage with target population categories at every stage, from design and construction to deployment and evaluation of inclusive mobility projects, through focus groups, surveys and other means
- Make the principle of concurrent design part of the mandatory stages of deployment of inclusive mobility policies and projects.

RECOMMENDATION 5

Develop one-to-one marketing and adapt to the needs of each category

- Give employers and mobility operators dedicated training to enable them to answer questions from people facing barriers to mobility
- Consider seniors and disadvantaged population categories as customers to be won over and held on to by means of personalized assessments, regular follow-up and tailored offerings
- Propose a variety of solutions containing multiple options, such as multimodal "mobility solutions packs"
- Adapt mobility services to actual customer needs, such as for off-peak travelers (expanded transportation offerings for elderly people who travel during off-peak hours) and for occasional workers who often work irregular or non-standard hours
- Extend the availability of "new mobility solutions" (shared mobility, digital mobility information) to disadvantaged population categories rather than confining them to wealthier urban residents.

RECOMMENDATION 6

Involve and empower people through incentive contracts that formalize objectives and reward efforts

- Formalize a "social contract" written between beneficiaries and suppliers, not based on coercive clauses but on symbolic incentives and rewards (certificates of aptitude, discounts from mobility service

providers). Such contracts should also require some financial (contribution to costs, loans to purchase) or non-financial (objectives, training obligations, etc.) counterparties
• Plan regular "status briefings" with beneficiaries as well as a clearly identified standing contact in order to assess progress, needs and points for improvement
• Develop lending mechanisms to support purchases of "clean" means of transportation such as bicycles and electric power-assist bicycles in partnership with local suppliers, on the premise that the prospect of ownership leads to greater commitment and empowerment on the part of service beneficiaries
• Organize and supervise bicycle workshops for vulnerable population categories.

RECOMMENDATION 7

Support mobility education

• Use education to nurture a culture of "sustainable mobility" (active and shared mobilities, public transport) among the youngest citizens (awareness-building in schools through experiments and games)
• Plan special programs for population groups without access to such training such as immigrant and senior populations
• Consider mobility as a key factor in the integration of immigrant populations through access to the resources of the territory and as a means of independence and empowerment (bicycle workshops), by providing mobility counseling services in connection with formalities for moving into housing, for example
• Accompany seniors in their transition to retirement to help them plan ahead for their future mobility limitations; provide targeted mobility advisory services at the same time as aid for moving house and equipping their new home.

3

Revise approaches to inclusive mobility: services for day-to-day living and health

The analysis of inclusive mobility has everything to gain from being multidisciplinary and considering aspects like services (day care, babysitting drop-off centers, administrative services, etc.), shops and housing – all of which affect people's day-to-day travel routes and organization. Thus, acting on the trip purposes and on planning considerations, especially in sparsely populated areas, helps broaden our vision. Instead of confining it to travel between home and work, the entire chain of mobility must be taken into account.

RECOMMENDATION 8

Give precedence to comprehensive approaches covering home/work/services and mobility

• Build inclusive mobility objectives into planning documents (such as SCOT and PDU in France)
• Establish a systematic link between the area of residence/area of work/access to transportation, for seniors as well as for populations in precarious situations
• Take the entire "chain of limitations" faced by populations in precarious situations into account regarding access to employment – particularly access to services such as day-care and drop-off babysitting centers, to define offers that improve their access to jobs and alleviate their geographical disadvantage
• Develop indicators of distance between home and work as well as between home and services that facilitate access to work, coupled with the resulting energy precariousness of disadvantaged populations.

RECOMMENDATION 9

Encourage places and services that meet the criteria for universal design, including information and communication technologies

• Redefine the concept of accessibility not as a problem that is specific to some users but as an issue of universal significance
• Ensure the physical, economic and cognitive accessibility of mobility infrastructure and mobility information (maps, real-time schedule information, etc.)
• Apply the principles of universal design to mobility information systems that involve proficiency in information and communication technologies (such as smartphone applications).

RECOMMENDATION 10

Integrate health considerations into inclusive mobility approaches

• Demonstrate the link between active modes of mobility and improved well-being at work and slower aging
• Increase the practice of assessing impacts (positive and negative) of mobility infrastructure and services on the health of population in precarious situations (such as the Transportation Health Impact Assessment)
• Give "specifiers" and "prescribers" (social services, mobility agencies, healthcare personnel) opportunities to facilitate access to active modes of transportation (particularly cycling) for sedentary individuals
• Assess the impact of these policies in terms of avoidance of healthcare expenditures.

Chronos

Director of the survey: Léa Marzloff
Conduct of the survey: Laurent Barelier with Caroline de Francqueville Hansen, Elisa Mendoza-Hauchecorne, Karyn Poupée, Kathryn Teissier du Cros, Claire Huberson and Marc Fontanès (Auxilia).

We wish to thank the following individuals for their invaluable help in conducting this study:

Mireille Appel-Muller (City On The Move), Francesc Aragall (Design for All Foundation), Raffaelle Barbato (URBACT), Jean-Paul Birchen and Virginie Lasserre (CEREMA), Diane Bouchenot (Auxilia), Benjamin de la Pena (Knight Foundation), Sophie Fegueux (French Ministry of Interior), Véronique Feypell (OECD), Marlene Freudendal-Pedersen (Roskilde University), Madeleine Kelly and Daniela Rosca (European Commission), Eric Lebreton (University of Rennes), Jean-Pierre Orfeuil (Institut d'Urbanisme de Paris – Paris City Planning Institute), Karen Lucas (Institute for Transport Studies, Oxford University), Paula Negron-Poblete (Institute of Urban Planning of the University of Montreal), Karyn Poupée (AFP correspondent in Japan), Albert Rey (Urbaccess), Katherine Freund (ITN America), Jacinthe Clossey (Société des Transports de Montréal), Katherine Mc Ilveen-Brown (Charlie's Free Wheels), Eliza Brunmayr (Radlobby), Cecilie Herlow (Danish Red Cross), Inés Cassin (Altadis Foundation), Carol Johnson and Sara Kearney (Merseytravel), Nicky Basset-Powell (Rowan Public Affairs), Angelika Gasteiner (Transports de Salzbourg), Matthias Fiedler (City of Munich), Eva Maria Muñoz Navarro (SETRA), Anu Siren (Social Research Institute, Denmark), Tetsuo Akiyama (Chuo- University), Pilar Quintana Susilla (City of Santander), Jens Willars (DSB), Angel José Faría Rodriguez (Osakidetza), Jose Rambla Lop (Accenture Spain), Mary A. Leary and Gilbert F. Williams (Federal Transit Administration, United States), Dr. Katherine Brookfield (University of Edinburgh), Carole Cano (Wimoov).

This survey was carried out by the research and foresight consultancy Chronos on behalf of the Laboratory of Inclusive Mobility, founded by Wimoov and Total.

We wish to thank all the members of the Laboratory of Inclusive Mobility who enabled us to define, conduct and follow up this study. We would also like to thank everyone in the field for their input and availability to contribute to this survey.

Design, production, illustration:
M&C Saatchi Little Stories