

# EPOMM Task Force Mobility Management Policy and Research, April 2008

## 1. Introduction

The European Platform on Mobility Management (EPOMM<sup>1</sup>) has convened a Task Force in order to define policy and research needs in the field of mobility management (MM) in Europe for the coming years.

Mobility management is a popular work field in many cities and in many European Projects. It is all about a greener mobility and more pleasant and accessible cities to live and work in. Yet, after all these years we still see that some fundamental issues are not tackled and that mobility management is susceptible to dissolving itself in more urgent issues: cleaner vehicles, better public transport and more climate related regulation on mobility. The Task Force claims a clear and strong position for mobility management for the years to come. Experiences have shown that the complex issues at stake cannot be solved by isolated projects. Neither by more supply or infrastructure related measures. The MAX<sup>2</sup> project offers a strong case for an integrated, demand oriented approach that needs specific interest in the years to come (beside all the other approaches!). This paper focuses on the main research and policy issues of mobility management for the future.

### Why a Task Force? To whom is this paper addressed?

Mobility management experts cooperating in EPOMM feel that some urgent research questions on mobility management haven't been answered. Answers are needed to attain a faster dissemination of mobility management. This is required to meet EU targets as written down in the Green Paper on Urban Mobility. The EPOMM Task Force focuses on six interrelated topics that need utmost attention.

The Task Force has no formal link to the EU or the programs on sustainable urban transport that are carried out in relation to the Green Paper. It feels itself free to address issues on all levels, relevant for all cities, regions, nations and the EU as a governing body. The main target groups for this paper are the national governments and the European Commission, particularly DG TREN and DG Research. EPOMM is funded by its member states (see footnote), but generally promotes mobility management. Therefore the Task Force feels itself representing all European states in which mobility management is an active issue.

The EU recently has issued the Green Paper on urban mobility and is working on a range of programs with cities and other partners. Mobility management is part of that. Discussions about sustainable mobility often focus on clean vehicles and alternative fuels. Mobility management provides a second group of measures: The cleanest car kilometre is no car kilometre. A shift from car traffic to

---

<sup>1</sup> EPOMM is a network of governments in European countries that are engaged in Mobility Management (MM). They are represented by the Ministries that are responsible for MM in their countries. EPOMM is organised as an international non profit organisation with seat in Brussels. The main aims of EPOMM are:

- To promote and further develop Mobility Management in Europe
- To support active information exchange and learning on Mobility Management between European countries

The member states of EPOMM are Austria, France, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. For more info see [www.epomm.org](http://www.epomm.org)

<sup>2</sup> MAX – Successful Travel Awareness Campaigns & Mobility Management Strategies – is the EU's latest framework research project on Mobility Management – see the chapter on the next page and for more info the website: [www.max-success.eu](http://www.max-success.eu)



alternative modes of transport and teleworking has a positive impact. The Task Force Mobility Management focuses on this type of measures.

### Definition of mobility management

Mobility Management (MM) is a concept to promote sustainable transport and manage the demand for car use by changing travellers' attitudes and behaviour. At the core of Mobility Management are "soft" measures like information and communication, organising services and coordinating activities of different partners. "Soft" measures most often enhance the effectiveness of "hard" measures within urban transport (e.g., new tram lines, new roads and new bike lanes). Mobility Management measures (in comparison to "hard" measures) do not necessarily require large financial investments and may have a high benefit-cost ratio.

To give an impression what this means in practice: in a city where MM is implemented:

- you would notice campaigns and promotions for walking, cycling and public transport;
- you could be offered personalised travel assistance to help you see where and how you might be able to reduce your car use;
- your employer might pay your public transport tickets to encourage you not to drive to work;
- at home, you might have a carsharing service available on the street outside your house,
- at your children's school, there could be a mobility plan organising safe walking for the children's trip to school,
- for leisure trips by public transport you would have the option of using the consulting services of the local mobility centre;
- building permits might be connected to certain requirements to minimise the mobility impact of the new development, for example the development of a mobility plan for employees, visitors, and goods transport around the building site or limiting the number of parking spaces provided.

Typically, MM measures are rarely isolated, instead they often come as a bundle of measures, i.e. information campaigns combined with infrastructure, pricing policy or regulations. For more detail on measures see [www.epomm.org](http://www.epomm.org).

The Task Force has the following addition to this definition:

Mobility Management (as the term indicates) indicates more than any other field in transport planning active *management*. It requires a good manager to link all related issues both in policy and in the market, and to get results from issues that are not common to most people. Mobility *management* is more than simple means towards an end, it is crucial in the way the Task Force looks at the subject.

### MAX and other EU-projects on mobility management

This document frequently refers to research carried out by previous European projects on mobility management, and the current FP6 project, MAX (2006-2009), and in some cases indicates that research needs can be met by work currently being undertaken in MAX. However, these projects are by their nature limited in scope; for example, MAX is research-focused and could be criticised for not paying enough attention to how the research findings and policy tools that it will develop can be implemented in a wider policy context. As most members of the Task Force are also partners in MAX, it will take the objectives of this paper into account and realign the project (as far as possible) to obtain maximum coordination and impact.

## 2. The six topics

The Task Force selected the following six topics:

1. Better incorporation of MM into transport policies
2. Usefulness and effectiveness of MM
3. MM in tourism and leisure
4. Impact of MM measures in combination with conventional traffic measures
5. Marketing MM within/ to non-transport organisations
6. New target groups for MM

### **Topic 1: How MM can be more widely incorporated into transport policy to increase its use – including the role within this of training and incentives.**

#### State of the art

This topic relates to a large extent to the idea of “campaigning the campaign” – that is, selling the idea of a new “product” (in this case, mobility management) to decision makers, both politicians and influential senior technical/professional officers within transport organisations. The MAX WP A State of the Art report could not uncover any previous research on this topic, at least as it relates to mobility management.

Incentives to install MM exist on various levels: e.g. on a national level where governments provide subsidies for municipalities or companies, but also on municipal level where municipalities provide subsidies for making mobility plans – for example in schools and companies. Examples for such programmes are the Swedish national climate investment program, klima:aktiv:mobil in Austria, EnergieSchweiz in Switzerland as well as national and municipal programmes in the UK and the USA.

Some public transport operators are changing towards mobility providers – also engaging in MM. However, most of them largely remain in their old role.

#### Main gaps

On the basis of the above, it can be concluded that there is unlikely to be any specific research to date on the way in which MM can be “sold” to decision makers and taken up more widely by them within transport policy. However, there may be research or experience from other areas of transport or other policy areas completely, where the way in which novel ideas have been adopted have been explored.

There also appears to be a lack of information on how the take-up/adoption of MM in transport policy varies with culture.

A further gap is the lack in observation data on the change in attitudes of car users and car buyers (e.g. a growing trend in some countries to buy less polluting cars), and ensuing there is no knowledge how to react on these trends.

It is not known how public transport operators can be motivated to change towards full service mobility providers.

#### Research questions

The key research questions are as follows:

1. Where MM has been more institutionalised into wider transport planning practice, how far has this occurred and why it has occurred, and is there a cultural aspect to explaining this take-up?

Countries to be investigated might include the UK, Spain, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland.

2. In general, how can novel concepts in policy be “sold” to decision makers (that are often unaware about functioning alternatives to conventional policies); what is the process of adoption, and how can the process be speeded up? How can cost-benefit arguments be used in this context? What are the unique selling points of MM?
3. To what extent does training assist with the process of adoption of new ideas such as MM and on what should training be focussed?
4. To what extent can incentives be used to encourage the adoption of new measures such as MM, and what happens if these incentives are only temporary?
5. Experience from the Netherlands and Sweden indicates that where MM has really had an impact this has often been because the authorities in charge of that initiative were committed to it and to obtaining results from it (“where there’s a will, there’s a way”). It would be interesting to find out why these authorities had that level of commitment.
6. The role of context: What are the best MM measures in a given context – in the sense of effectiveness and saleability to decision makers? Is the existence of a problem (e.g. parking space, congestion) essential for the success of MM? How can temporary events (e.g. major road overhaul, sports events) help to establish MM? How can a change in attitudes of the general public be taken into account in MM?

#### Methods to approach research questions

1. Interviews with key practitioners/academics in the countries listed; analysis of the role of cultural, organisational and institutional background (Note that MAX WP A will deliver research results on cultural aspects in MM).
2. Literature review with possible case studies of the adoption of novel policy concepts from other sectors, if these can be identified. An example could be the growth in acceptance of public health campaigns, or the growth in acceptance of limiting smoking in public places.
3. Interviews with key practitioners/academics in the countries listed; interviews and surveys of those who have undergone training in projects such as COMPETENCE and ELTIS: what was the influence on their daily work and to what degree have they succeeded in implementing MM?
4. Review of previous and existing incentive schemes on national, regional and municipal level to install and support MM.
5. Usage of data from a possible future European Observatory on Urban Transport

#### **Topic 2: (Measuring the) Usefulness and effectiveness of MM.**

##### State of the art

This topic links to the previous one in that the availability of data that show convincingly that MM is effective will help to increase its credibility and therefore incorporation into “mainstream” transport policy.

Previous EU projects on the topic of MM, such as MOSAIC, MOMENTUM and MOST, have attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of the pilot demonstrations carried out within these projects, like the Malaga business park and the Potsdam TV studios that were demonstration sites in MOST. However, the quality of the evaluation data was critically dependent on the local partners involved and it was not always gathered comprehensively or systematically, in spite of the availability of evaluation guidance such as MOST-MET.



In the USA various urban regions have been implementing MM measures – especially region-wide carpool databases, vanpool schemes and the encouragement of workplace-based mobility plans – for many years, and there is a considerable pool of evaluation data, especially for the workplace mobility plans. The largest such pool is in Washington State, as it has had a law making workplace mobility plans mandatory since 1996. However, other such datasets do exist and show that there are particular combinations of measures within workplace mobility plans that tend to increase their effectiveness, and other measures which, if implemented alone, will have very little influence on how people travel to the site. A much smaller pool of similar data, covering about 30 sites, is available in the UK.

Much MM work in the Netherlands in the late 1990s and early 2000s was justified on the basis of a report entitled “*Using what we have as well as building anew* [Benutten naast bouwen]” that concluded that MM was far more cost effective than investment in new transport infrastructure and services. A more recent piece of work for the UK Department for Transport called *Smarter Choices* also came to the same conclusion and has informed a change in transport policy in England, increasing the importance of MM. A recent report for the UK Department for Transport on 22 personalised travel planning initiatives concluded that these schemes achieved on average an 11% reduction in car use amongst the targeted population (DfT, 2007: Making Personal Travel Planning Work: Research Report – downloadable from <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/travelplans/ptp/>).

An attempt to gather evaluation data systematically is now being made in Sweden with the SUMO monitoring framework and SARA database in which to store the results of many different kinds of MM projects, whilst the TRICS database in the UK has been modified to provide a common means of evaluating travel plans (site mobility plans) and storing the results in a common database so that they can be compared.

### Main gaps

The most significant gap remains the lack of consistent comparable data on the impacts of MM measures, in spite of the creation of a number of evaluation framework and guides. In addition, the statistical reliability of the data that are available has been questioned by Bamberg (2007) (reference in footnote needed: Tom?) due to what he argues is a lack of rigour in data collection techniques, related in part to the absence of control groups in most evaluation approaches.

In addition the relative effectiveness of smaller targeted measures compared with, for example, more broadly-based campaigns remains little understood. On top of this, there appears to have been little work in translating those evaluation results that do exist into system-wide impacts (e.g. congestion and pollution reduction).

Further building on experience from the Netherlands in particular, it would be useful to consider the effectiveness of the MM implementation process, as initial findings indicate that this is critical in the overall impact of MM measures: specifically, the degree to which managers are committed to the concept of MM was found to be very important in affecting its success.

Finally there is a need for including framework conditions, e.g. level and diffusion of mobility services, mobility culture or site accessibility for the different modes to measure success and effectiveness of MM measures in an isolated way.

### Research questions

Main research questions that stem from the above discussion include, therefore:

1. Can more, and more consistent, data be gathered on the impacts of MM? How can those who are implementing it be encouraged to evaluate what they are doing?
2. Can some form of control group be used in the evaluation of all MM measures and, if not, is there any suitable alternative?

3. What are the most effective and practicable methodologies for assessing the system-wide impacts of MM? How can change in attitudes towards mobility, mobility buying habits and mobility behaviour be monitored city based but on a European scale?
4. Is targeting measures towards certain groups more effective than a “one size fits all” approach?
5. How should the MM process be managed; how should the interests and ideas of the several parties that typically have an interest in an MM measure, and integrate and direct these towards an outcome?

#### Methods to approach research questions

1. The MAX project WP B Task Force on evaluation (TF4) is already developing an assessment framework that should permit the gathering of more consistent data from MM projects across Europe. MAX and EPOMM aim to deliver suitable motivational support tools to substantially increase the proportion of MM projects in which evaluation is actually carried out. More research might be needed, e.g. by considering the literature on evaluation in fields other than transport to understand how these fields have dealt with this problem.
2. MAX WP B TF3 and TF4 aims to deliver answers to this research issue.
3. Standardises monitoring of mobility behaviour and attitudes could happen within the framework of a European Observatory on Urban Transport.  
A first step in answering the question of impacts of MM disentangled from other measures could be to review the results of EU transport projects covering other fields such as the development of sustainable urban transport plans and policies and “selling” them to decision makers (e.g. PROSPECTS – see <http://www.ivv.tuwien.ac.at/forschung/projekte/international-projects/prospects-2000.html>), in order to understand how these projects suggest that system-wide impacts of measures can be evaluated, and disentangled from the impacts of other measures. However, this disentanglement is an extremely complicated research question for which this Task Force is not prepared to formulate a straight solution.
4. MAX WP B TF3 aims to deliver answers to this research issue.
5. The development of a process management toolkit could be a useful and practical way to approach this question, to demonstrate how the joint working required for MM can best be pursued.

### Topic 3: MM in tourism and leisure

#### State of the art

In tourism there is the trip to and from the destination as well as the tourist mobility at the destination – the need for action is in most cases most urgent for the trip to and from the destination. Leisure travel (that includes tourism) has the highest share and the fastest rise in trips and it includes mobility caused by sports events, fairs, outings etc.

Touristic institutions (information centres, hotels, etc.) are often unaware of existence and the possibilities of MM, and if they are aware, they are sceptical that tourists would like it.

The knowledge about current trends in tourism (such as ecotourism) and what it means for MM and about some special tools like integrated packages is not very high and not well spread.

One of the clusters in the MOST project dealt with this relatively new area of MM but did not get in depth results. The conclusions of the project were that tourists’ needs should be researched before MM measures are implemented to manage their mobility; that actual transport alternatives need to be in place before MM will work; that information provision is very important; that car-restrictive measures are often needed in tourist areas to protect the environment and to boost the use of the MM

measures; and that measures must be very carefully designed to improve the environment and mobility whilst not deterring tourists from visiting.

With regard to relatively local travel to major events, amusement parks, nature reserves and so on, very little work has been done in previous projects, although this is a specific topic in the FP7 Transport call due on 7<sup>th</sup> May 2008, and is also likely to be the topic of at least one Interreg IVC proposal in the next call.

In some countries (e.g. the Netherlands) the permit to organise an event is sometimes only given if MM measures are in place.

It is probable that leisure and tourism is the most promising field for introducing MM in the new member states.

### Main gaps

The MOST approach was based on a small number of demonstration sites. Therefore a key gap is the lack of wider knowledge on the degree to which towns and cities across Europe are already implementing MM in tourism areas, why they have done so and, in other areas, why they have not done so and what barriers they perceive.

### Research questions

Research questions stemming from the gaps above include the following:

1. Where/to what extent is MM already incorporated into tourism and travel to major leisure destinations, and what are the lessons that can be learnt from these areas?
2. What barriers are there to the wider use of MM in tourism and leisure, and how can these be reduced?
3. How can the various stakeholders in tourism and leisure be encouraged to work together to manage transport problems in tourist areas by using MM?
4. Which MM measures actually work in managing tourism-related and major leisure attractions' transport problems?
5. What is the role of legal frameworks (e.g. spatial planning) in stimulating MM in the leisure and tourism contexts?

### Methods to approach research questions

These research questions can be approached by means of questionnaires or with round tables involving stakeholders from cities, regions, national governments, transport and tourism organisations, etc. coupled with interviews with those who have already tried and use MM. Further demonstration projects may also be required.

## **Topic 4: The impact of MM measures when combined with conventional traffic measures (such as infrastructure, regulations, pricing)**

### State of the art

This topic is also one of those that is dealt with in WP A of the MAX project and in particular in a small demonstration project in Almada, Portugal, where MM measures (an awareness/promotional/advertising campaign) are being introduced at the same time as a new tram network. The use of a control group in the evaluation should show whether the MM measures add value to any travel behaviour change brought about by the tram, but it will not be possible to ascertain in the same area whether MM measures alone have more effect than the tram on its own or the tram together with MM measures. An earlier study on the MobilZentral mobility centre in Graz, Austria, has also dealt with this issue.

MM in this context can be seen as a form of ‘logical marketing’ by the public transport operator/ authority or the road authority (introduction tickets, information campaigns, ...). This kind of marketing is still not common but should be given more attention (Munich is a good example of a city that acts this way). By seeing it from this perspective the task is clearer: make sure that you (‘the owner’) provide the good infrastructure and also: make sure that people use it. The marketer can select the best MM measures before building and after completion.

As the solution of traffic problems in the New Member States is often sought in building new infrastructure, the connection of this with MM is considered to be a promising activity field to introduce MM in the New Member States.

### Main gaps

The biggest gap here is that, as the topic title suggests, it is very difficult to know whether MM measures increase the impact of conventional measures such as new cycle or public transport infrastructure, new public transport services or congestion charging when implemented at the same time.

### Research questions

1. Central issue: does the use of MM in tandem with conventional measures such as new infrastructure and services enhance the effect of those measures on travel behaviour change?
2. What role does MM have when infrastructure and services are disrupted temporarily by, for example, long term roadworks?
3. How can we take into account future regulation developments, such as a carbon tax?
4. How can MM be included in SUTP:s as a tool for better effect of conventional measures?
5. How can decision making on conventional traffic measures also take into account the effect on combined MM measures?

### Methods to approach research questions

These research questions can really only be addressed by means of case studies and demonstration projects, evaluated carefully using the methodology being developed by the MAX project.

In addition a thorough review of previous evaluations of transport projects could be helpful, starting perhaps with the CIVITAS projects to date, notably CIVITAS-GUARD. Other research available is from the Netherlands, the US and LundaMats in Sweden.

## Topic 5: Marketing MM within/to non transport organisations

### State of the art

There are three subgroups of such organisations. Each subgroup has different interests and should be treated differently:

1. Developers of property and owners of property with issues such as: limiting parking, links to public transport, MM connected to building permits, etc.
2. Employers responsible for a specific site (e.g. facility management): mobility plans, parking solutions, area wide approaches (e.g. in relation to road works).
3. Employers and employees associations such as chambers of commerce of trade unions: working hours and travel allowances, ITS, communication / Public Relation.

There is evidence in Sweden, the Netherlands (for example the Rabo-Bank) and in Switzerland (for example MM in the framework of quality management) that taking up MM can benefit companies economically – mainly through cost savings but also through a better image causing better sales.



There is a link between this topic and topic 1, on incentives for the implementation of MM.

As WPD from MAX is on land use planning and MM, the research of WPD will touch upon the interests of developers.

### Main gaps

There is not much knowledge about the awareness, concerns and the ways to motivate non transport organisations to take up MM.

### Research questions

1. What level of awareness do non transport organisations have about MM?
2. What are the key concerns of non transport organisations about managing transport?
3. How can MM best link to these key concerns?
4. If and where it does link to these concerns, what will be the impacts?
5. Developers: what sort of MM remains in place after the development is finished?
6. What are the key selling points to non transport organisations to convince them about the usefulness of MM? What are the economic arguments for MM?
7. How can MM be a natural and important part of a company's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) work?

### Methods to approach research questions

An approach based on interviews with a representative sample of non transport organisations and interviews with stakeholders that have taken up MM could be best to answer these research questions.

## **Topic 6: MM for groups at whom it has not traditionally been targeted,**

### State of the art

Very little work has dealt with this issue in the past. There is some bicycle training for immigrants in Sweden and the Netherlands. In the Netherlands studies were done on the reasons behind the lesser use of the bike by these immigrant groups. For the elderly, mobility behaviour, attitudes, and needs have been researched quite comprehensively within the last years (e.g. EU-Projects: MOBILATE, SIZE, German projects: AEMEİS, ANBINDUNG, FRAME). Thus, a quite solid basis exists for the deduction of suitable MM for this group.

Still, European research here would have to start from a low level. WP A of MAX is looking at the importance of cultural issues in travel awareness campaigns. This has not drawn any conclusions to date – but conclusions will be available at the end of 2008. WP B of MAX is attempting to assess the effectiveness of targeting and adapting the content of MM measures, depending on how receptive people are to travel behaviour change, which also has relevance to this topic.

### Main gaps

The mentioned target groups have not been defined: at least the elderly and immigrants belong to them. For most new target groups the mobility behaviour needs to be studied as a basis.

For the elderly, the lack mainly consists in the implementation of recommendations resulting from research and also in the evaluation of already existing MM.

### Research questions

1. What new target groups are there? What is their relevance and potential for mobility behaviour change?

2. What are the differences in mobility behaviour, attitudes, needs, and requirements between the considered target groups and the average inhabitant?
3. What can be concluded from the target groups' attitudes, motivations and barriers regarding certain transport modes? What kind of MM supplies the needs of the target groups?
4. How should suitable MM be adopted and promoted to the target groups?
5. How can recommended and implemented MM for the target groups be evaluated in terms of feasibility and acceptance?
6. What is the interaction between culture and acceptance of MM; as culture changes through generations, does acceptance and take-up of MM change?

### Methods to approach research questions

There are two key methods by which these questions can be addressed:

1. A review of literature from other fields e.g. public health to see whether the issue of different responses by different groups to behaviour change messages has received attention in those fields, and what has been learnt.
2. Primary research with people in these groups to determine their mobility behaviour and to understand their attitudes and motivations and possible pathways through which they would respond more to MM messages and measures.

### 3. Conclusions

The EPOMM Task Force has discussed the research agenda for mobility management in the European Union. From this overview three main conclusions can be drawn:

1. **Critical success factors for a good start.** Several isolated cities and regions in Europe successfully have developed and implemented mobility management. These successes did not cause a snowball effect towards the surrounding cities. Many cases have been described, but effective do's and don'ts about implementation lack. It's not known why some cities start with mobility management, why they succeed and in what circumstances this happens. Research should be done to discover in which circumstances decision makers are open for mobility management. This should lead to a faster spread out of mobility management in a growing number of cities and regions. Mobility management should not be based on the conviction that it is "so nice" to stimulate biking or public transport. A professional start sets the tone for the following process.
2. **Critical success factors for cooperation.** Mobility management requires cooperation with a myriad of partners like property developers, employers, facility managers and the tourism sector. These stakeholders have their own interest. Mobility managers have to know how to involve them, trigger them with the right arguments about the feasibility of certain measures and how to make them part of the problem and the solution. Such knowledge doesn't exist yet.
3. **Critical success factors for good results.** Besides arguments for triggering politicians and other stakeholders, comparable data about the effects of mobility management measures lacks. A research project should lead to such data and to a practical shortlist of effective measures. The SUMO method applied in Sweden provides a practical framework and should become the EU standard for monitoring mobility management projects. An important assumption is that soft measures strengthen the effects of hard measures like road pricing and new public transport routes, but this evidence has to be proved with further research.

The European Union is doing a good work in mobility management. However, some projects focus on the same issues, some key research questions stay unanswered and dissemination still is a problem. A coordination body is required in order to:

- address these and future research questions
- communicate research results to countries, cities and regions throughout the EU
- pick up issues
- answer practical questions.

#### Need for a coordinating body

The research specified by this EPOMM Task Force can be carried out, but still there is a need for a body that can communicate the results and recommendations to the bodies that could implement them. This body can also solve practical questions and can act as a intelligence centre for the EU to pick up new issues in cities, regions or countries. In the Netherlands, there is an organisation like this, the Knowledge Platform on Traffic and Transport (KpVV); the UK has the Travelwise organisation (although a membership fee is required). EPOMM has the potential to play this role in Europe, but needs to be larger and better funded if it is to be able to do so. As well as communicating the results of research, carrying out training and marketing, it could forge links between MM and other related fields, such as ITS, energy saving, and public health.



#### 4. Members of the EPOMM Task Force on Mobility Management Policy and Research

Each EPOMM member state nominated a Task Force member, the experts from Switzerland and Germany were included to reflect the views from these two countries where MM is quite well developed. The expert from Slovenia was included to reflect experience from a new EU member state. Most Task Force members are partners in the MAX research project – this was deemed useful as MAX is currently the main research project in MM in Europe.

Austria	Karl-Heinz Posch (chairman)
France	Bruno Faivre d'Arcier
Germany	Herbert Kemming
Slovenia	Marjan Lep
Spain	Pedro Puig Pey
Sweden	Christer Ljungberg
Switzerland	Roberto De Tommasi
The Netherlands	Wim Van Tilburg
United Kingdom	Tom Rye