BACK TO THE FUTURE:
10 YEARS OF MOBILITY MANAGEMENT
((INCLUDING ECOMM 2002 OUTCOMES AND SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS)

Category: Plenary session

In case of a workshop:

Name: Jos Zuallaert; Peter Jones

Organisation: Langzaam Verkeer vzw; University of Westminster

Country: Belgium, U.K.

E-mail address: jos.zuallaert@langzaamverkeer.be;
                    jonesp2@westminster.ac.uk

ECOMM GENT 2002
BACK TO THE FUTURE:

10 YEARS OF MOBILITY MANAGEMENT
(INCLUDING ECOMM 2002 OUTCOMES AND SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS)

1.   The past

1.1   Early Developments

The USA provides the unlikely historical context from which the growing and successful European Mobility Management family can trace much of its ancestry. Some States in a country renowned for its reliance on the motorcar were among the first to encourage companies to reduce the numbers of solo car driver trips to work, primarily through a series of car-pooling and van pooling initiatives.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) gained in popularity in parts of the USA during the nineteen eighties, as a means of meeting strict local air pollution limits. The approach was given added weight by the Clean Air Act Amendments (1990), which required employers of 100 or more employees in States with ozone non-attainment areas to increase car occupancy rates by 25% above the area average. While key sections of this Act were later repealed, many authorities still actively encourage TDM measures, strengthened by recent changes in tax laws that permitted employers to offer tax-free incentives to use alternative modes. Note, however, that TDM was not viewed primarily as a congestion reduction measure, nor was it seen as a means to counter the growth in CO_2 emissions.

The first substantive take-up of the TDM philosophy in Europe was in the Netherlands. By the early nineteen nineties, all Dutch ministries were required to develop commuter plans for their employees, thereby providing Good Practice examples for the private sector. In adapting TDM to European conditions, changes were evident both in terms of key objectives (which did include congestion reduction and more sustainable travel patterns), and in the range of instruments used. In contrast to the USA, much greater emphasis was placed on switching to walking, cycling and public transport services – and much less on car pooling and car sharing. However, in common with the USA, the emphasis was primarily on workplace sites.

During the nineties a growing number of local authorities in England, led by cities and counties such as Nottingham and Nottinghamshire, also began to encourage their own departments and local private sector companies to develop 'travel plans' or 'green commuter plans'. As in the Netherlands, there was interest in using TDM to achieve a wider range of policy objectives than in the USA, and the successful schemes tended also to be associated with a shortage of on-site car parking spaces for employees. By 1998, the UK Transport White Paper formally encouraged the take-up of travel plans, which are now viewed as an appropriate policy response in **any** situation where there is a need to reduce levels of car use to a major trip attractor – including sports venues and airports.

Belgium, Germany (pioneer Nord-Rhein-Westfalia), Austria, and Switzerland rapidly took up this new approach and developed a number of experimental schemes. They gradually started integrating the new demand oriented methodology into their transport policies.

The inclusion of a 'soft' transport demand strategy in a research task of the European Commission's Fourth Framework RTD Programme triggered Europe's awakening to this new approach. This task also coined the European name '**Mobility Management'** to describe the approach. At the start of 1996, two three-year projects were funded: MOMENTUM and MOSAIC, involving a total of nineteen organisations and local authorities.

Having established this solid platform for European research and the demonstration of Mobility Management (MM), it then became possible to more systematically disseminate experiences in MM at a European level: the ECOMM series (European Conference on Mobility Management) was borne!

1.2 The ECOMM Conferences

The first ECOMM Conference was held in Amsterdam in 1997. This brought together local experience from several European countries and the USA. It helped to establish the role that Mobility Management could play in reducing car use for the journey to work, and put MM on the political map for the first time in several countries. It also provided a major networking opportunity for professionals across Europe who hitherto had worked largely in isolation from one another.

The second ECOMM Conference took place in Nottingham in 1998, and drew heavily on the emerging findings from MOMENTUM and MOSAIC. As well as presenting a further range of Good Practice examples, it also laid down some basic ground rules for the future development of Mobility Management in Europe.

In particular, it provided a working definition of Mobility Management that has since become widely used throughout Europe:

> 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.

It goes on to identify the range of objectives that can be met through the application of Mobility Management, including:

- 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

In addition to outlining the objectives and tools available to implement Mobility Management, the definition also highlights the importance of forming new kinds of **partnerships**. By its nature, Mobility Management does not fall under the provenance of any one authority, unlike earlier kinds of transport measure (e.g. road building, or public transport improvements) that had their identifiable 'homes' within established organisations. Instead, it involves the coming together of a range of organisations, that traditionally may have had little experience of working together:

- Various public agencies responsible for constructing and maintaining different types of transport infrastructure (roads, parking, cycle ways, etc.);
- Organisations (both public and private sector) responsible for running public transport services (buses, trams, trains, taxis);
- Companies and other – usually private sector – organisations that manage sites where Mobility Management measures are to be applied (e.g. offices);
- Organisations involved in marketing and publicity initiatives, or in offering certain Mobility Management services (e.g. developing travel plans).

In such situations, there is the further problem of deciding who should 'take the lead', both organisationally and financially.

Since Nottingham, there have been a further three ECOMM conferences before Gent took on the mantle for 2002. Each has had its own themes and has contributed to a growing richness of understanding of Mobility Management and the ways in which it can be successfully applied in different European contexts.

- The Third ECOMM Conference, in Munster in 1999, explored new targets, tools and services for mobility management;
- The Fourth ECOMM Conference, in Bregenz in 2000 emphasised crossing borders and widening the scope for Mobility Management;
- The Fifth ECOMM Conference, in Rome in 2001, introduced Southern European countries to Mobility Management, at a time when Italy had introduced legislation requiring larger companies to introduce workplace travel plans.

Gent thus has a firm foundation on which to build, and a high standard to achieve.

1.3   Looking Back: What Has Been Achieved?

European Mobility Management has 'come of age' in the last decade, from being a very young infant of mixed parentage, to becoming a well recognised and respected tool in the armoury of the urban policy analyst.

In the process, we can track a whole series of changes, relating to:

(i)   A broadening of the types of **context** in which Mobility Management measures are applied:
- Starting with workplace-site-based schemes, with a focus on the journey from home to work;
- A rapid and logical extension, in several European countries, to cover home to school travel;
- The introduction of Mobility Centres in several urban areas, providing a range of MM services in a 'one-stop shop';
- Broadening the target sites, to include health sites (hospitals, surgeries, etc.), leisure and tourist facilities, and housing developments (e.g. 'car-free' housing); and,
- Looking beyond urban areas, to some rural sites and addressing cross-border situations.

(ii)   Changing **policy frameworks** and **financial incentives**:
- The formal requirement to introduce Mobility Management measures at large employment sites, or when major new land use developments are planned';
- Official encouragement to open Mobility Management Centres and to employ Mobility Consultants, to spread Good Practice and assist with plan design and implementation;
- Tax incentives, in several countries, to provide alternatives to travel by private car, particularly for the journey to work.

(iii)   Growing recognition of Mobility Management as a **philosophical approach** to tackling car-related problems as much as a set of specific tools. This:
- Places increasing emphasis on travel awareness and publicity as an important part of any implementation strategy. This leads to important links between MM and events such as 'car-free' days.
- Recognises that Mobility Management has a role to play both in relation to all aspects of travel behaviour and in relation to wider lifestyles decisions that affect car use (e.g. car ownership decisions, choice of home, work or school location).

Maintaining and developing a European perspective has been assisted through two important developments: the establishment of the EPOMM network and the efforts of the 'MOST' project, funded under the Fifth Framework Programme and managed by DGTREN.

EPOMM, the European Platform on Mobility Management, aims to provide a source of information about developments in MM and to encourage a range of bodies throughout Europe to become involved – from local authorities to consultants & planners, private companies and transport service providers. It is sponsored by the Commission and seven Member States and regions, and also has an important on-going networking function that complements the annual ECOMM Conferences. See: http://www.epomm.org

The MOST project (Mobility Management Strategies for the Next Decades) represents an ambitious attempt to extend the application of MM to new policy areas, while taking a longer-term look at impacts and benefits in some more established areas of development. It is built around six 'clusters' covering: education, tourism, health, site development, temporary events, and mobility centres. See: http://www.mo.st.

2.   The present: ECOMM Gent - 2002

Sixth ECOMM, Gent 2002: 'Building responsible, active and effective partnerships'

During the ECOMM 2000 Conference (held in Bregenz, Austria), the International Programme Committee assigned the organisation of ECOMM 2002 to Flanders. In April 2001 the Flanders Region decided to adopt the phrase: 'Responsible mobility – active partnerships' as its theme for the conference.

Why this core theme?

2.1.   The Flemish mobility covenant based on partnerships

From the point of view of the congress initiator, the Flemish Government and Flemish administration, ECOMM 2002 fits in well with the deployment of its 'mobility covenant' policy. In 1996 Flanders introduced its mobility covenant as a new organisational instrument to assist it in embarking on a sustainable transport policy process. The covenant, basically, structured a partnership between the Flemish administration, the municipalities and the public transport authority (De LIJN), and more recently, the five Flemish provinces. This new instrument was a strategic answer to the problem posed by the highly fragmented and instrumental decision and planning environment in which the traditional transport policies of the past had been developed and implemented. Signing the covenant committed all the partners to acting on the basis of achieving an integrated mobility plan.

It also provides a blueprint for the future when concluding new partnerships with the semi public and private sectors. Consequently, ECOMM 2002 was seen as an important opportunity to elaborate on the nature of responsible and active partnerships, and to explore best European strategies and practices in the field of mobility management.

2.2   The changing face of mobility governance: sharing responsibilities in an interactive and decentralised mobility policy context

From the point of view of the European mobility management community, it is clear that mobility management would gain a lot from strong and responsible partnerships that are actively engaged in promoting and implementing local, regional and national sustainable transport policies. As sustainable transport policy is moving towards multi - modal and inter-modal applications, its processes inevitably become multi – sectoral and multi – actor in nature. The techno-centric approaches of the past are being overruled by a changing context of interactive and decentralised decision-making in mobility policy. Co-production of policies and the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders - even conflict resolution - become the norm.

As the practice of mobility policy formulation and implementation is becoming more interactive and open to new partners, the question arises as to which particular partners have the 'credibility' and 'authority' to engage in the process and, also, how strong the organisational and institutional framework should be to ensure the effective involvement of new partners?

2.3   ECOMM's identification of partnership networks in mobility management

In early 2001, Flanders and the International Programme Committee (IPC) sent out its call for papers under the 'responsible mobility – active partnerships' conference theme. As a result, 140 abstracts were submitted and assessed. In November 2001, the IPC selected 52 presentations.

Six application areas and associated 'partnership networks' (box A) – some of them well known, others fairly new - were identified as the backbone for the conference structure. Each of these domains has a specific potential for national, regional or local partnerships in sustainable transport.

Box A: Identification of Application Areas and Partnership Networks in MM
-      The educational community (8 papers) -   The leisure, tourist and shopping sector (6) -   The economic community (9) -   The freight and logistics sector (3) -   The citizen at large and specific population target groups (6) and -   The mobility manager & mobility centre as a 'facilitator' (6) Also: The local and regional mobility policy of cities and towns (14)

All presentations can be included in these six broad application areas.

Some of them identified additional issues and types of partners, as set out in Box B.

Box B: New issues and partner groups represented in ECOMM 2002 presentations
-      Public health: medical sector -   Land use and urban renewal: housing companies, residential builders, land and urban developers, retail traders -   Energy (saving) -   Employment: temporary work sector -   Quality of living and noise reduction

2.4 ECOMM's identification of promising and best practice partnership strategies and practices

All speakers and chairs, invited by the International Programme Committee, were asked to elaborate on the conditions for effective partnerships:
- Their identification or profile (Who?)
- Their vision, needs, interests? (What?)
- The effectiveness of the partnership (How?)
- The efficiency of the partnership (Effects, results, improvements)
- Their integration within the sustainable transport policy process (Process)

As a result of this, a number of valuable lessons have been identified:

✳ Learn to know your (new) partners!

Every sector has a specific potential for forming national, regional or local partnerships in sustainable transport. However, because mobility management agents are in general unable to impose projects on partners and have to rely on voluntary agreements, they have to become adept at understanding the stakeholders' concerns and needs for becoming involved. Partnerships should lead to win – win situations, in economic, psychological and even emotional terms. Cost, conveniences and status issues do play their role. This can only be dealt with if each stakeholder' interests and needs are understood from the start and are brought in balance within a sustainable transport context.

Any stakeholder may hold some of the keys to progress towards sustainable solutions in his/her own hands. However, identification of stakeholder' concerns is a valuable first step; otherwise it takes more effort to turn a stakeholder into an active and responsible partner.

ECOMM 2002 provides examples of basic concerns of potential partners:

- Cities and towns: ongoing need to legitimise its own transport policy, competition between cities and towns, concerns about accessibility, safety, equity, liveability and environment.
- Educational community: competition, accessibility, safe routes to school, health concerns, status, convenience.
- Economic community: accessibility, competition ,costs, recruitment, status…
- Leisure and shopping sector: competition, marketing
- Freight and goods sector: logistics chain constrains, competition, congestion, Just in time delivery
- Public: different user needs to be specified according to type of target group (gender, age, location, status, origin – destination pattern etc.)

✳ It's all about commitment, *stupid!*

Commitment to addressing mobility issues is generally rooted in the recognition of local or regional traffic and transportation problems and issues of convenience, economics, quality of life and even status. Commitment may be driven by concerns or perceptions that congestion, accessibility, accidents, liveability issues, recruitment of personnel or visitors and air quality and energy consumption, can only get worse if no actions are taken.

What kinds of triggers encourage potential stakeholders to act (or to hold back?) and to turn their concerns into a real commitment that includes contributing to a 'responsible partnership'? All ECOMM presentations are, in some way or other, an investigation of the various levers that move us toward behavioural change. Some presentations explicitly elaborate on models of behavioural change or are, implicitly, adherents of a specific model.

ECOMM 2002 examples:

- In order to legitimise their mobility policy, cities and towns rely on a mix of collaborative planning and public governance models, and of communicative and marketing models, as exerting leverage toward behaviour change.
- To seek justification for their commitment to MM activities, the MM agents in the educational community rely on models such as the trans-theoretical model of behaviour change, cooperative decision – making concepts, empowerment schemes, personal construct psychology model, etc.
- The economic community tend to legitimate their MM commitment both in terms of rational and economic considerations, based on targets, indicators and performance, and on status measurement.
- Leisure and shopping sector: commercial considerations, accessibility improvements, customer values, status , delivery facilities, location constraints
- Freight and goods sector: commitment to MM will be based on economic grounds and performance standards

What, then, are the levers to turn commitment into a responsible and active partnership?

- Lever #1: The institutional framework for mobility governance should be partnership – driven by nature
- Lever #2: Develop 'Quality Partner Forums'
- Lever #3: Cooperate effectively, perform efficiently
- Lever #4: Provide Incentives for a true cooperative approach

✳ Lever #1: The institutional framework for mobility governance should be partnership – driven by nature

Traditional transport policy has always been characterised as being highly instrumental in nature. New governance procedures in transport policy, such as the covenant or other consensus building strategies, tend to combine a 'goal – action – effect' orientation coupled with an emphasis on forming effective multiple partnerships.

This new governance approach opens doors to new partners on the basis of a new but simple principle: "If you take up your responsibility for sustainability as a partner, we're in business!" Every single partner is invited to commit him/herself to take appropriate responsibility within a local, regional or national sustainable transport policy. Signing a commitment (e.g. charter, covenant) implies that a partner will take actions in compliance with the local, regional or national sustainable transport policy and plan. This assures him/her the accessibility to procedures, rights or incentives as specified in the commitment. Partners also commit themselves to cooperation in monitoring the effects of their actions.

ECOMM 2002 examples:
- Covenants between public authorities and (semi) public agencies and private partners
- Charters
- Cooperative planning
- Social contract for a new culture of urban mobility
- Thematic or sectoral networks
- Different levels of involvement, ranging from informal contacts to formal contracts and procedures on project base or on a structural programme base

✸ Lever #2: 'Quality Partnerships'

'Quality partnerships' are informal or formal arrangements in which partners operate on the basis of their commitment towards a specific local, regional or national mobility strategy and programme. Members of such forums will seek legitimisation for their commitment. 'Quality' stands for the ambition of the partnership and its members to create a solid and effective partner platform for concertation, consensus building, sharing of ideas and monitoring of the progress made by the partnership on the basis of agreed objectives, planning and outcomes.

Any partnership seeks its appropriate organisational structure. Examples are:
- Forums
- Partnership networks
- 'Mobiliteitscentrales'
- 'Mobiliteitswinkels'
- In the USA: Transportation Management Districts (TMDs) and Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) in informal, semi independent and independent forms
- 'Vervoerscoördinatiecentra'
- Round tables

What are then the building blocks for effective platforms for quality partnerships?

ECOMM 2002 identifies the following issues for effective quality partnerships:
- Clear delineation of area of coverage
- Goals and target setting: multi modal and inter modal
- Partnership based on public and private inputs
- No single solution orientation, nor single focus lobbyist groups or transportation providers
- Well structured organisation, however flexible
- Importance of leadership and role models ('champions')
- Excellent communication (internal, external)
- Presence of a core group
- Collaborative problem solving approach and culture
- Orientation towards collective service delivery
- Transparency in budgeting and resources
- Various levels of involvement
- Monitoring progress

Establishing a 'quality' label for MM partnership networks

Most of the ECOMM 2002 presentations expressed explicitly or implicitly their search for (excellent) partnership formation. Whenever a partnership formula gets established, partnership networks develop a certain routine in their activities.

In this perspective, the German Quality label for mobility centres (see paper by Guido Müller) as an inspiring initiative. The label is a sort of audit or quality control of the mobility centre's strategy, practice and impact. It audits the initial objectives of a mobility centre - the mobility centre as a multi - modal and inter - modal customer tailored information and service centre – and indicates further ways of improvement.

❋ Lever #3: Cooperate effectively, perform efficiently

Partners are generally represented by busy people, who are not interested in wasting their time attending unproductive 'talking shops'. In order for partnerships to perform efficiently, members must have confidence in the process and in each other, and be able to cooperate effectively.

ECOMM 2002 provides the following guidance:
- Clear communication about goals and targets
- The decisive role of the coordinator
- Basic knowledge as a starting point for every partner
- Periodic meetings to share information
- Sharing experiences on implementation
- Assistance with programs and projects
- Visible results and progress
- Public relation skills
- Consolidation about strategy
- Basis acceptance and support among various interest groups
- Clear position of various involved partners
- Clarity on roles
- Recognition of needs, interests, wishes
- Decisions made through dialogue
- Different levels of involvement: informal contacts, bilateral contacts, questionnaires, formal meetings

❋ Lever #4: Incentives for a true cooperative approach

It is more likely that partners will 'pull in the same direction' and achieve a cooperative effort, if there is a system of incentives in place (particularly 'positive' but also regulatory, in some instances).

ECOMM 2002 suggests the following means of achieving effective partnerships:
- Public sector commitment to the supply of infrastructure and services
- Public transport agency commitment to the supply of services
- Private sector commitment to action within own competence
- Partnership funding
- Special MM project funding
- Private sector contributions resulting from land use developments directly spent on MM actions
- Land use planning conditions
- Land use planning obligations
- Certifications, awards
- Games, prizes, rewards
- Create a 'Something special' culture for the customer: new shuttle service, being part of a walking bus or cycle-pool, guaranteed home ride, leased vanpool, etc
- Financial profits for participants

- Fiscal benefits

2.5 Mobility management as an ongoing mobility campaign in cities and towns

Some cities (e.g. Hasselt, Zürich, Geel) deploy a package of mobility management measures for various target groups. They involve different partners and various target groups such as schools, companies, administrations, retail, tourism, leisure, special events, the social sector, etc. In doing so, they create a citywide, real-life laboratory of mobility management initiatives with different partners. Consequently, they produce an on-going stream of information on projects and new products appealing to and involving different segments of the sustainable transport and traffic market/audience. Some projects may be successful, others may fail…but the basic message gets into people's minds and subsequently their behaviour. A most promising way of building long-term effectiveness into a car free day!

Inspiring ECOMM 2002 examples include:
- Zürich – Switzerland: mobility consulting services as a transport sub-policy (A. Spoerr)i
- Flanders – Hasselt, the SAM campaign: a city wide and life scale laboratory of small mobility management initiatives (D. Lambrechts, G. Zuallaert)
- Flanders – Geel : The town of Geel in a cycle of partnerships (N. Raets).

2.6 Competence building by providing training in MM jobs for the future: the MM facilitator, the MM manager, the MM marketer

Whenever MM is well established as a policy and strategy, there is a desperate need for specially trained staff to carry out a wide range of policy and communication functions. In particular, the following tasks can be discerned:
- process facilitator
- mobility manager
- mobility consultant
- mobility market analyst
- mobility marketer
- communication officer

More high quality training programmes need to be developed to meet this need, and to help educate policy makers about the benefit of MM initiatives. It might even be possible to establish a European 'gold standard' for recognised high quality training schemes in this area.

3. Suggested recommendations for the future

3.1. The central role of MM within the 'decoupling economic growth and transport growth' discourse

The OECD Environmentally Sustainable Transport Programme (EST) boosts the debate on the decoupling of economic growth and transport growth. It basically says that the aggregated transport needs and the aggregeated transport mode choices should be realised in different ways. The scenarios are built on both supply and demand stategies. A substantial part of these scenario's depend on a culture shift in concepts of governance on the demand side. Fair pricing on the one hand, coupled with 'responsible mobility by partnership networks with impact on the demand side ' on the other hand. This is where the next generation of MM initiatives can play a key role. Promising and best strategies and practices, as identified at ECOMM , might become common strategy and practice within the EST programme.

Suggested recommendation 1:	Carry out a detailed investigation of the potential relationship between EST and MM

3.2. The changing face of mobility governance: sharing responsibilities in an interactive and decentralised mobility policy context

As noted in section 2: 'it is clear that mobility management would gain a lot from strong and responsible partnerships that are actively engaged in promoting and implementing local, regional and national sustainable transport policies. As sustainable transport policy is moving towards multi - modal and inter-modal targets, its processes inevitably become multi – sectoral and multi – actor in nature'.

Recognising this key shift and expansion in the nature of Mobility Management and the importance in this of wide ranging partnerships, provides a key to the wider application of MM in European cities and regions.

Suggested recommendation 2:	Form comprehensive and sensitive partnerships, in recognition of the broadening role of MM and the changing face of mobility governance

3.3 Cross the borders between policy fields

The need for wide-ranging partnerships arises not only in relation to the effective delivery of sustainable transport policies, but also in relation to potential synergies between different policy fields. For example, some of the objectives of the transport policy analysts are shared by policy makers in the health or education sectors.

As a consequence, there is beginning to be an interest in developing wider local and regional sustainable policy processes, that include integrating MM into every policy sector (land use, economic development, transport, education, environment, health, etc.). Key groups to engage include:
- Educational community
- The leisure, tourist and shopping sector
- The economic community
- The freight and logistics sector
- The health sector

Suggested recommendation 3:	MM should be much more closely linked with initiatives in non-transport policy fields

3.4. Develop new niches for MM within transport/land use planning

Within the traditional domain of the transport planner, there are several opportunities to extend the MM philosophy. ECOMM 2002 has identified four key new targets:

- Target 1: trip chaining mobility
- Target 2 : Freight and service movement
- Target 3: Land use, housing and site development
- Target 4: Temporary works

Suggested recommendation 4:	MM should be extended to other areas within the traditional competence of the transportation planner

3.5. MM networks built on Quality Partnerships

In section 2 of this paper we identified several partnership domains in mobility management and listed conditions for effective partnerships.

This identified a number of areas requiring further attention, including:

- Defining quality standards
- Identifying leadership qualities and champions
- Devising operational platforms
- The role of the facilitator or manager
- Strategic and operational plan

- Indicators
- Project management
- Budgeting
- Monitoring effects
- Progress report
- Benchmarking

Suggested recommendation 5:	Further investigation is needed of how to inject quality into MM partnership networks;

3.6. European Platform on Mobility Management (EPOMM)

EPOMM 1999 – 2002 has been established as a European forum with regional members to promote, develop and implement MM in the EU member states. Its basic tasks are to develop a EU MM network and to exchange information (See: www.epomm.org and the EPOMM newsletters and seminars).

EPOMM in the future.

Possible update of its mission:
1. Strategic alliances with (new) partnership networks;
2. Operational alliances with (new) partnership networks;
3. Organisational improvement, benchmarking and monitoring of MM progress;
4. Dissemination of best strategies and practices.
5. Possible update of its deployment strategy:
6. Active role of EPOMM in national and regional forums / focal points
7. Role of ECOMM as the annual or bi-annual EU platform on the MM discourse and as the EU informative platform on MM

Suggested recommendation 6:	EPOMM 2002: update of mission and deployment strategy.

3.7. Is there a need to update the definition of mobility management?

As noted in section one, most professionals now subscribe to the common EU definition of mobility management, as coined in the Momentum and Mosaic projects in 1999:
> *"MM is primarily a demand oriented 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, coordination and require promotion.*

"The objectives of Mobility Management should 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."

Based on the experiences reported in ECOMM 2002, we suggest that it is now appropriate to update this common EU definition of MM, in the following way:

Suggested recommendation 7:	Redefine the definition of Mobility Management, based on ECOMM 2002 (1)

> *"MM is primarily a demand oriented approach to influencing passenger and freight movement, **that involves active partnerships to support and encourage** a change of attitude and behaviour towards sustainable modes of transport. MM tools are wide ranging and usually require the active cooperation and **coordination of partners**, based on information, communication, and organisational initiatives, and require promotion."*

Is there a reason to go even further?

During recent debate on MM in Flanders, there has been a drive to push the MM definition beyond its current terms of reference. MM is becoming a reference for bridging the demand

and the supply sides, keeping both sides connected within a sustainable development context. This is true of many of the interesting cases presented during this conference, which seem to take for granted the concept of MM as a 'bridge'(e.g. Flanders' mobility covenant practice, Zürich , Ettlingen, Dresden's intermobil project)

MM is beginning to take up an intermediary role, to facilitate an interactive cooperation between the demand side ('partnership domains' as identified by the conference) and the supply side (land use and infrastructure) within a changing planning context.

Does this make any difference for the definition of MM? Let's debate this in the closing session of the conference!

| Suggested recommendation 8: | Update the definition of Mobility Management, beyond its actual terms of reference (2) |

One possibility might be to say:
"MM facilitates the interaction between the demand side ('partnership domains' as identified by the conference) and the supply side, in a cooperative sustainable policy and planning process. MM facilitates effective coordination of partners and makes use of appropriate managerial, communicative and promotional tools."