



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MOBILITY AND TRANSPORT
Directorate C - Innovative and sustainable mobility
C.3 - Intelligent transport systems (ITS)

EXPERT GROUP

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORT SYSTEMS FOR URBAN AREAS

Fourth Meeting
“TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND URBAN LOGISTICS” session
07 November 2011
Brussels

- Minutes of the Meeting -

Date: 09/12/2011
Version: 1.0
Authors: Dorota Szeligowska / Christian Egeler



1. WELCOME

Pawel Stelmaszczyk– European Commission, Head of Unit C.3 DG Mobility and Transport

Pawel Stelmaszczyk welcomes the participants to the 4th Meeting of the Urban ITS Expert Group and explains the recent reorganization of DG MOVE, as of 1 July 2011, and the creation of a unit exclusively devoted to ITS, C.3. He also mentions the evolution of the team: Guido Mueller has left the Commission in September 2011. Dorota Szeligowska is now replacing him as secretary of the Expert Group, and is supported by Gzim Ocakoglu.

P. Stelmaszczyk thanks the members of the Group, the external experts and the external support for their presence and the work that has been done until now. Then he introduces the agenda of the meeting:

1. Focus on Traffic Management and Urban Logistics
2. Discussion on the progress of work on the Guidelines and the collection of Best Practices.
3. Presentation on the standardization needs.

Because the leader and one of the two other members of the sub-group on Smart Ticketing are absent (excused) it is proposed to focus the work on the two other sub-groups. Nevertheless, as two external experts of Smart Ticketing are present, the external support will shortly discuss with them and with the other member of the smart ticketing sub-group about the next steps to be taken concerning the work on Guidelines.

P. Stelmaszczyk reminds the Group members that the supporting documents for the reimbursement of travel costs have to be provided within one month. The attendance list has to be signed and the official contact for administrative matters is Mrs Theresia Gruendl.

Christian Egeler of Rapp Trans is introduced. Rapp Trans got the new support contract and will assist the Expert Group in their work.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM 3^RD MEETING

Pawel Stelmaszczyk– European Commission, Head of Unit C.3 DG Mobility and Transport

The minutes of the third meeting have been distributed to the experts for review prior to the meeting.

No comments were provided. The minutes of the third meeting are approved.

3. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND URBAN LOGISTICS FOR URBAN AREAS – PRESENTATIONS FROM GROUP MEMBERS

Three members of the Expert group presented examples of traffic management and urban logistics in their city / region.

The announced presentation of Susanne Planath had to be cancelled due to her absence.

All presentations are accompanied by PowerPoint presentations that will be made available after the meeting on CIRCAB.

3.1. Traffic Supply and Demand Management

Dietrich Leihs – KapschTrafficom AG

Dietrich Leihs explains that there are mainly two types of traffic management (they both have to respond to challenges coming from goals of environmental and transport policies):

- Supply Management can lead people to shift their mobility behaviour accordingly to the available traffic infrastructure (reinforcing public transport, providing accurate traffic information).
- Demand Management that occurs pre-traffic and aims at fulfilling the aforementioned goals even if people do not choose transportation alternatives (Reduce traffic before it starts: Road user charges, low emission zones, Limited access Regulation).

3.2. Ideas for managing Traffic in Large Urban Areas – The London Experience

Steve Kearns – Transport for London

Steve Kearns gives a presentation on traffic management highlights in London, on pilot projects of ITS and on foreseen traffic measures for the up-coming Olympics.

Key success since 2000: modal shift: the usage of private cars has fallen by 7%, and bus usage has increased by 40%. Cycling increased 100% (but it remains low in absolute terms), and general traffic in central London decreased by 20%.

Transport for London owns 5% of the roads (the remaining 95% are owned by local councils) and these roads carry 53% of all traffic. The aim now is to promote walking, but people have to know how and where to go: know the geography of the city.

Transport expenditure per year is £9.0bn.

The **London Congestion Charging Zone** was introduced using ANPR cameras in East part of Central London in 2003, in 2007 it was extended to the West part, but this part has been excluded from the scheme again in 2009 after the election of the new Mayor. Taxis and motorcycles are excluded from this scheme.

Since 2010 automatic accounts with special fares are available. The introduction of a 24h post-payment resulted in a considerable reduction in penalty charges.

The scheme showed a 25% reduction in traffic of private cars, none for vans and lorries, and a rise in bus and bicycle usage. Space gained is reallocated to bus/pedestrian/cycling priority.

Interestingly, moving from £5 to £8 charge per day, in 2005, made almost no difference to volumes of vehicles. Those people who were prepared to pay £5 paid £8. Since 2010, a 10£ charge (9£ for automatic registering) applies. The economic impact was broadly neutral, environmental benefits have been achieved.

The support for the scheme grew significantly after its introduction. The entire net revenue must be spent on transport improvement (infrastructure, fleets, safety, etc.). The operation

costs have been reduced by the automatic registration and post-payment scheme. Currently congestion returned to Central London, it reflects the reduction in effective capacity of the road network because of urban realm improvement schemes, and especially increased road works because of the replacement of water pipes in the entire city.

The **Low Emission Zone (LEZ)** was introduced in 2008 and showed clear improvements to air quality. In 2012 new categories of vehicles will be concerned by this scheme.

Then S. Kearns presented some **ITS trials**.

Many streets are equipped with traffic cameras (4000-5000), the question is which ones to use to improve traffic management. A trial was implemented at the Hyde Park corner, using **IRID** (Image Recognition and Incident Detection) system that analyses flow patterns (volume, speed) and detects automatically possible changes in the operating pattern on the streets.

The delivery situation is problematic, and companies complain about frequent fines. Therefore within the **CVIS** (Co-operative Vehicle - Infrastructure Systems) project, the Urban Loading Zone Application is in a trial phase. This project gives the operators the possibility to pre-book a parking place on the street or re-book it in case of unexpected travel delay. Unauthorized vehicles are removed from the reserved parking slots by parking attendees. Some lessons learned are that the size of the hardware and its reliability is important, the power consumption of the onboard equipment (via cigarette lighter) is too high, an engineering screen for fault finding is needed and the scalability needs to be given a very close look.

In Bishopsgate a trial to measure **pedestrian movements** using cell phones has taken place during one week: 30.06-06.07.2010. The number of people, their nationalities, their dwell times and average passing time have been metered. The technology showed to be interesting because of its potential to improve the management of pedestrian crossing and an integration of such counters in traffic signals (taking into account the number of people waiting) are in discussion.

The successful **Oyster system for ticketing** (faster boarding, fraud hammered) will be enhanced to accept contactless credit & debit cards on all modes, as they are the main medium of payment.

To bring **Cycling** forward a network of Cycle Hire stations has been introduced and cycle superhighways are planned.

For the London **Olympics**, the sports arenas will only be accessible by public transport. There will be special 'Javelin' train from St. Pancras station to Stratford, the journey will take 7 minutes. VIPs shall be brought to the stadium in less than 21 minutes (the time you need when all traffic lights are green). The green wave for VIPs was tested during a short test period.

The discussion after the presentation concerned the technology used in London Congestion Charging Zone. It was said that DSRC would be a technically better solution but it would require considerable new investment. Another question concerned the use of GPS positioning, but for the moment it does not provide a high enough quality of positioning, but it could improve with the use of Galileo.

3.3. ITS in Vienna Region 2010

Rainer Haselberger – City of Vienna

The experience of the introduction of AnachB.at (from “A” to “B” in German) showed that while data comes from different sources, a common data platform was needed to manage it. The need of traffic situation control is reinforced by the imbalance between demand and supply of transport services.

Therefore a transport data warehouse and the Netgraph GIP (graph integration platform) were developed. The transport data warehouse is fed by a huge number of sources (traffic signals, FCD, measured data, messages, notifications, regulations etc). Traffic situation image has different layers and it is composed of different levels of data (static → dynamic → active).

The system calculates every 7 minutes a forecast of the traffic situation in Vienna Region including static and real-time data.

Vienna has introduced an integrated traffic administration using this data platform. The data flows are based on the RITA model.

The conclusion is that transport system should be seen as a whole and Intelligent Transport Systems require an integrated comprehensive Transport System Information Management based on a joint graph for all transport tasks (MMI, regional and urban planning, e-Government processes, guidance, urban logistics etc.)

During the discussion following the presentation further questions concerning data were touched upon. Concerning the check of the quality of data, it was explained that local authority set up a minimum requirement for the data entering the data warehouse and if it is possible the data is checked and corrected. The aim of the warehouse is to have as much data as possible from different sources. Ideally, it would be perfect to have good data sources, but they can be expensive. When it comes to the operation cost of such a warehouse, they are difficult to estimate, but the core system in Vienna cost 6-7m € (investment) excluding the roadside installations.

3.4. Discussion

The general discussion following all presentations focused on several issues:

- The legal situation when using data from tracking smart phones: in the UK so long as anonymised data is used there are no legal issues. Such applications are not allowed in Germany for privacy reasons, they are also forbidden in Poland. It is not a privacy issue in the Netherlands, because the user accepts a contract. With this technology, buses could be recognised by speed patterns recognition (e.g. 30 mobile phones travelling together at the same time).
- Arrangements with mobile phone operators: during the British trial all the operators had been informed about it and were interested by this experience, but no specific permission was needed.
- Cycling: in some countries (DE, UK) the number of bicycle accidents increased, but in some other countries this number was reduced (NL led awareness raising campaigns). At first, the introduction of bicycles in the traffic may provoke the increase of the number of accidents involving them. But after a certain time, new behaviours both from cars and cyclers bring this number to a lower level.

4. WORKING GROUPS

Dorota Szeligowska – European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport

Ms Dorota Szeligowska thanked for the contributions received and for the work done especially by the sub-group leaders in drafting the guidelines. Nevertheless she reminds the Expert Group that the Guidelines shall be short and focused on what ITS solutions will provide as additional value, as well as provide with recommendations as to what can be done in short term and what in mid/long term. She reminded that the corollary work on the collection of best practices could be of help for the work on Guidelines. She also suggested that the working groups reflect on the work they need to do in order to keep the original deadline of end 2011 to have the draft of Guidelines ready, and decide on work share for specific sub-groups members.

As most of the members of the Smart Ticketing group were not able to participate (two out of three), it was planned to have only two working groups. But because two external experts were present it was decided to have a small exchange also on Smart Ticketing in the beginning.

The **composition of the subgroups** looked as follows (*external experts in italics*):

	Travel information	Traffic Management & Urban Logistics	Smart Ticketing
Rapporteur	J.Coldefy	S.Kearns	Ch.Egeler (due to the absence of Alexandre Blaquièrè)
	T.Brown H.Fiby P.Izdebski O.Lefebvre	H.Albrecht S.Beasley R.Haselberger H.Jensen	<i>J.Verity</i> <i>K.Philipp</i>

	M.Meeuwissen S.Tofting <i>B.Radermacher</i> <i>D.Szeligowska</i> <i>J.Verity (part II)</i> <i>K.Philipp (part II)</i>	D.Leihs M.Tomassini J. Hedin D.Van den Abeele Ch. Egeler (part II)	
--	--	--	--

First, the sub-groups gathered in order to discuss the progress of the work on Guidelines. Later on, the leaders of the sub-groups presented this question to the entire Group. The summary below provides with the syntheses of the group discussions and presentations to the whole group.

4.1. Travel Information

Chair and Reporter: Jean Coldefy – Greater Lyon Region

The sub-group discussion started by reaffirming the decision-makers as main addressees of the future document, and not the laymen. Then some issues identified in the previous meeting were discussed: with the aim to feed the 'Recommendations' section of the draft Guideline.

The question of open data vs. open information service was among the most prominent ones. The experts are of the opinion that a decision on data is a political decision and it should be specified what types of data should be provided, by whom and at what possible cost. Not all data is necessarily needed for proper traffic information at the same time. In the first step one could envisage providing static data, and expanding towards dynamic data in the second step. A provisional conclusion was that open data is not an aim in itself; it can cost much, and it is not needed for all services. Some levels of data sharing could be suggested by the Guidelines (which type of data is available for free, e.g. timetables; which other type of data could be free of charge but with restricted usage; or yet another type would be charged with an appropriate fee). A corollary question is of how to check the quality of data and who would bear the liability for services based on this data.

Possibly more distinction could be introduced between definitions of data, information and service. It would make it easier to prepare recommendations.

It has been stated that, in general, people overestimate the time of travel by public transport and underestimate the time of travel by individual car. There is a need to promote the knowledge about realistic travel times, in order to provoke the modal shift, because the market will not do it by itself. It is especially true for car users, because, on the whole, cyclists and public transport users tend to have more realistic travel time estimates. Good and reliable information is a prerequisite for people to consider changing their travel habits. People need to be aware of different options and their costs, yet one has to have in mind, that people are rarely willing to listen to advice about their travel choices, coming from public authorities, and change their preferred travel option. The question is also how to make a successful 'marketing' of such solutions for modal shift: make it about cost/environment/alternative choices?

The question of why travel information is needed was split into three sets of reasons:

- support for public policy
- support for user needs and estimation about travel time
- allow for more complex travel solutions

Public authorities can foster public services, but also can support private service. They should have access to all sources of real-time information. The question of how to obtain this data and of good quality (possible solution: contracts) and how to store it and share it was also discussed. A question of how to merge different types of data was also brought up. It could be a basis for formulation of a specific recommendation, e.g. about a possible meta-data in order to make the combination easier. Cities should have a model of data exchange to ensure the minimal level of interoperability, even though all the existing systems (SIRI, DATEX, IFOPT) have some flaws.

After the discussion within the sub-group, Jean Coldefy presented the work of the sub-group to the entire Expert Group. He set the timeline for next actions. A 'draft draft' (draft version of the final draft) shall be ready by the end of November. Then, until Christmas, all members of the sub-group would have time to comment on this document. Then the draft will be passed on to the contractor, who will perform the proofreading. Later on comments from other members of the Expert Group could be gathered.

4.2. Traffic Management & Urban Logistics

Chair and Reporter: Steve Kearns – Transport for London

The group started with a fundamental discussion about the target audience of the Guidelines. It was decided that the target audience is NOT the political level but the organisations in charge of decision making and deployment of ITS on local/regional level (i.e. some technical knowledge existing).

General remark: The current draft document is too long, but it was written with an overall perspective on Traffic Management & Urban Logistics. The sub-group has to focus on the situations "where ITS make a difference".

A harmonisation of the models of cooperation in Europe would be advantageous for a broader implementation of ITS, particularly the benefits and added value that can derive from open standards, but the need to respect subsidiarity should also be accommodated.

The interaction between traffic management on local roads in a given urban area and traffic management on strategic / regional / national roads in the same urban area needs to be taken into account. There needs to be an acknowledgment that multi-agency partnership working is a requirement for successful deployment of ITS traffic management projects in urban areas. A stronger link between relevant organisations (urban, sub-regional, regional, and possibly, national level) would be beneficial in this respect.

There is also a strong link between traffic management requirements in an urban area and the surrounding suburban area. The administrative implications of this relationship need to be fully acknowledged and identified in any potential ITS based traffic management solutions that are proposed.

Urban Logistics is an often neglected area of traffic management. The requirements of freight operators to gain adequate access to the scarce resource of kerbside space should form the basis of ITS solutions to aid this group of road users.

The "Best Practice/Lessons learnt" collection will be a critical source of information for those seeking to implement ITS based traffic management projects.

4.3. Smart Ticketing

Chair and Reporter: Christian Egeler – Rapp Trans, external support

The short session on smart ticketing was longer than originally planned and very fruitful. Currently the work done is too broad. The main focus shall not be on ticketing itself but on the benefit of Smart Ticketing, and on added values and additional benefits from a European-wide Smart Ticketing. Nevertheless Smart Ticketing shall be explained in the main part of the Guidelines document, but the focus will be on the chapter “key points” and “benefits and impacts”. The text shall not be a smart card technology discussion.

The guideline shall promote and show the benefits using new technologies / ITS along the individual travellers mobility chain.

A new section on a common portal to plan journeys and to buy tickets shall be included

On the occasion of Alexandre Blaquièrè’s presence in Brussels on 30 November/1 December, an informal meeting can be organised to further discuss the Guidelines drafting process (*Note: it took place on 30/11/2011*).

4.4. General discussion

After the presentation of the current status of the drafts, there was a short general discussion about the Guidelines.

- All three groups should use the common structure. The three documents look very different at present. However, for the moment more focus shall be put on the content of Guidelines and once is ready all will be put in the same harmonized form.
- The Guidelines shall show how the use of ITS helps to achieve the intended goals (the goal before the means).
- The Guidelines do not need to give detailed answers, but are foreseen as the first explanatory step: “If one has a problem, there are possible solutions and these are the key factors to be followed.” They should be compatible with other documents and toolkits.
- Paying is part of smart ticketing but the payment itself is not the permission to travel. One ticket is not the ultimate aim, but rather, the aim is to have a “basket” to store all the tickets inside. A common European portal for travel planning and payment could be very important.
- ITS solutions should make the life easier when travelling. It is important to give the user the chance to buy all tickets for his journey in advance. The transport system needs to be more efficient if today’s travel behaviour is subject to change.
- A short discussion was held on what is the exact definition of “urban”. A definition shall be included in the introduction parts of the Guidelines. In general an urban solution is not focussing on (inter-)national links of the transport network, but does also take in to account the rest of the local network. The Guidelines shall also indicate where the EC can try to push away any obstacles.

5. STANDARDISATION

Johan Hedin – Hybris Konsult

Mr Johan Hedin gave a short overview of the different standardisation bodies. Within the Urban ITS Expert Group, he is the link between ITS standardisation bodies and the Expert Group.

He mentioned that ITS standards enable interoperability and open new markets. Standards have the advantage of clearly defining the ownership, but require voluntary work from stakeholders and often a long process to obtain consensus is necessary.

J. Hedin explains that in “D7 Report on standardisation needs” concrete ideas shall be specified and the need for new standards explained, if any. Only to mention general topics is no help to the standardisation bodies. It is important to check these ideas versus the current scope (CEN/ISO/ETSI).

The dormant “WG5 Traffic Management” of CEN/TC 278 could be reactivated as the POSSI initiative has showed the need for Urban (now also Universal) Traffic Management and Control (UMTC).

Models to describe problems exist but there is doubt if these description standards shall be used. The Commission suggests that for the Guidelines these models do not necessarily have to be used (as far as they are probably too technical), but they could be listed in the Glossary.

Experts want to know if standards are to be mandatory. In general it seems that it will be difficult to reach a consensual position on this point. Smart applications develop really fast and development of standards takes a lot of time and maintenance effort. This is a difficult question in a fast moving field and should not be underestimated.

In a short discussion on compliance testing it was mentioned that one should not forget that trust is crucial for all business models and is a major obstacle with relations over the national frontiers.

6. BEST PRACTICE COLLECTION

Christian Egeler – Rapp Trans, external support

Mr Christian Egeler gives a short overview on the current status of the Best Practice Collection. In part I of the support contract, 14 cases have been collected, and in the meantime further 19 examples have been collected (in total 33). The challenge is that the density of information is different from case to case.

Ch. Egeler mentions that such a collection makes more sense if many cases are described. The aim of the external support is to have an example of each key application from all the Member States.

The external support has issued a list of possible Best Practices/Lessons learned and has **assigned responsible experts** to review these practices (especially the ones coming from the EMTA list). The idea is that the responsible person:

- assesses whether this project **is or is not of value** for the collection, or
- **fills in** the template, or
- **suggests** someone who could fill in the template.

Ch. Egeler will send an updated list (collected and to be collected by whom) in the next days.

He will probably also approach some experts in order to ask for help in improving the quality of the already collected examples.

Ch. Egeler reminds the experts that the list is not exhaustive and other projects are very welcome. Especially also projects that did NOT succeed are also of particular importance. The lessons learned of these less successful projects are of special value to spread knowledge to other stakeholders and decision-makers.

Therefore the name “Best Practice” could be changed to “**Lessons learned**”.

7. AOB - NEXT MEETING

Dorota Szeligowska - European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport

- Next Urban ITS Expert Group meeting: **7 OR 8 February 2012 in Brussels.**

D. Szeligowska will inform the Group about the date of the next meeting.

APPENDIX

**U R B A N I T S E X P E R T G R O U P
F I N A L A G E N D A O F T H E F O U R T H M E E T I N G**

9.00-9.30	<i>Registration and Coffee</i>		
9.30	Welcome		
9.35	Adoption of Minutes from 3 rd Meeting		
	Traffic Management and Urban Logistics		
9.45	3 Presentations from Group Members, max. 15 min (and Handouts)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dietrich Leihs "Traffic supply and demand management" • Steve Kearns "Traffic management in London" • Rainer Haselberger "Data-requirements" for co-modal traffic management, urban logistics and multimodal transport information" 		
11.00	Discussion		
11.30	Briefing for the Working Groups Gzim Ocakoglu/Dorota Szeligowska		
11.45	Coffee Break		
12.00	Working Groups		
	<i>Travel Information</i>	<i>Traffic Management (+ Urban Logistics)</i>	<i>Smart Ticketing</i>
	Discussion of draft Guidelines	Discussion of draft Guidelines	Discussion of draft Guidelines
	Jean Coldefy	Steve Kearns	Alexandre Blaquièrè
13.00	Lunch Break		
14.00	Working Groups – Presentation of draft Guidelines		
14.05	Travel Information – Presentation of draft Guidelines by Rapporteur		
14.20	Traffic Management and Urban Logistics – Presentation of draft Guidelines by Rapporteur		
14.35	Smart Ticketing – Presentation of draft Guidelines by Rapporteur		
15.00	Coffee Break		
15.15	Feedback from the Groups on the draft Guidelines Incorporation of the feedback		
15.45	Johan Hedin "ITS standardisation needs" – short presentation and discussion on the Deliverable on Standardisation needs , due in April 2012		
16.00	Best Practice Collection		
16.30	Next Meetings, Any other business		
17.00	Closing of the Meeting		

ATTENDEES

URBAN EXPERT GROUP – MEMBERS

Present

Name	First name	Organisation	Stakeholder group	
ALBRECHT	Hanfried	Albrecht Consult GmbH / OCA	Consultancy / Nat ITS Association	DE
BEASLEY	Simon	Reading Borough Council / UDG	Local Authorities / Nat ITS Association	UK
BROWN	Tony	Hampshire County Council	Local Authorities	UK
COLDEFY	Jean	Greater Lyon Region	Local Authorities	FR
FIBY	Hans	Transport Association East Austria	Public Transport Authority	AT
HASELBERGER	Rainer	City of Vienna	Local Authorities	AT
HEDIN	Johan	Hybris Konsult	Standardisation bodies	SE
IZDEBSKI	Piotr	ZTM Warsaw	Public Transport Authority	PL
JENSEN	Helge	City of Oslo	Local Authorities	NO
KEARNS	Steve	Transport for London	Local Authorities	UK
LEFEBVRE	Olivier	STIF Ile-de-France	Public Transport Authority	FR
LEIHS	Dietrich	Kapsch TrafficCom	ITS Industry	AT
MEEUWISSEN	Marcel	City of Enschede	Local Authorities	NL
TØFTING	Svend	North Denmark Region	Local Authorities	DK
TOMASSINI	Maurizio	ISIS - Rome	Consultancy	IT
VAN DEN ABEELE	Didier	Alstom Transport	ITS Industry	FR

Excused

DIEGO BERNARDO	Enrique	EMT - Madrid Public Transport Authority	Public Transport Authority	SP
BLAQUIERE	Alexandre	Tisseo - Toulouse Public Transport Authority	Public Transport Authority	FR
ELIASSEN	Jarl	Trafikanten AS	Travel Information Provider	NO
FRANCO	Gino	Mizar / Swarco	ITS Industry	IT
PLANATH	Susanne	Swedish Transport Administration	National Authority	SE
SPELL	Sabine	Volkswagen AG	Automotive Industry	DE
TYRINOPOULOS	Yannis	Hellenic Institute of Transport (HIT)	Research	GR
VLEMMINGS	Tiffany	National Data Warehouse for Traffic information	National Authorities	NL
WINNING	Ian	City of Cork	Local Authorities	IE

EXTERNAL EXPERTS

Name	First name	Organisation	Function
RADERMACHER	Berthold	VDV – German Association of Public Transport Undertakings	Head of Division – Standards and Research Coordination
PHILIPP	Klaus	T.C.L. GmbH	CEO
VERITY	John	ITSO	Chief Advisor

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Name	First name	Organisation	Function
STELMASZCZYK	Pawel	European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport	Head of Unit <i>Chair of Expert Group</i>
OCAKOGLU	Gzim	European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport	Head of Section
SZELIGOWSKA	Dorota	European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport	Project assistant <i>Secretary of Expert Group</i>
ARBEIT CHANDELAR	Odile	European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport	
GRUENDL	Theresia	European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport	