

European Co-operation
in the Field of Scientific and

Technical Research

COST 340/38

COST
Secretariat

26 May 2002

Gijs Mom



Management Committee

COST 340

Towards a European Intermodal Transport Network, Lessons from History

Subject: Minutes of the 4th WG3 meeting, Lisbon, May 23, 2002

COST 340/38

1. MINUTES OF THE 4TH WG3 MEETING, LISBON, MAY 23, 2002

2. ATTENDEES

Erik Buyst (B), Ioan Cuncev (Ru), Alberto Carreras (Sp.), Marc Dierikx (NL), Ruud Filarski (NL; chair), Reiner Fremdling (NL), Olle Kranz (Se), Peter Lyth (UK), Mrs. Maria Eugenia Mata (Por), Mrs. Michèle Merger (F), Gijs Mom (NL, secr.), Claudio

UK: draft is ready and already on the website. Mr. Lyth wants to discuss some items about methodology and standardization, especially related to the chronological ordering. He and Mr. Divall opted for a different, thematic, structure of their bibliography.

Greece: no information available.

Spain: draft version ready, not restricted to transnational and unimodal literature. Mr. Carreras says that if he follows the German standard the list will contain at least 200 to 300 titles. His list is not yet fully annotated. For that we need discussion. Also the periodization causes some problems.

Austria: no information available.

Slovenia: list is ready, not the annotations. Ready at the end of September.

Czech Republic: not known.

Ireland: not known

Rumania: ready.

Mr. Barzman on maritime transport and roads: not yet ready.

Dienel on air transport: not yet ready

Laurent Tissot on rail transport: ready in September/October.

Eastern countries organisation: ready.

For the Neuchâtel conference in December we must have at least draft versions of every country. That means that every member should send his or her final version to the secretary by 1 October and that we will have a discussion on publication on the basis of this in Neuchâtel. There we will have to nominate an editorial commission. Possible publisher could be AHICF, as a special issue. Also Mr. Lyth (Journal of Transport History) offers to be involved. Mr. Fremdling prefers a journal instead of a book.

Discussion on the conceptual points raised by mr. Lyth and Carreras will take place either at the end of this meeting, or during the Management Committee meeting, or in Neuchâtel.

5. FINAL REPORT

We need a final report on the workgroup's activities on the basis of the papers and other documents. The chair asks how we should proceed: Should we write a final report, on the development of unimodal transport systems, or do we write it as a comment on the White Paper of the EU (September 2001)? And, second question, who will write this report and when should it be finished?

Mrs. Merger suggests that every WG writes a final report, on the basis of which she can write a synthesis. She suggests a book with all the final group reports. The COST action will be finished in July 2004. Final conference is Paris in June 2004, so the final reports have to be ready at the end of 2003.

Mr. Fremdling: we have to make a comment on current European policy. That should be in the report.

As no one comes forward spontaneously, Mr. Filarski concludes that we need an editorial committee. Apart from the chair and the secretary, Mr. Carreras, Mr. Lyth and Mrs. Merger offer to join this committee.

Mr. Mom suggests to have an email conference of the editorial committee and that a progress report on the basis of this will be discussed in Neuchâtel. We will have to discuss the subjects that are missing, such as city transport and short sea transport. One idea is to organize a workshop after Neuchâtel dedicated to short sea transport.

Another question is raised how far we have to go back. Mr. Filarski suggests not to go further back than the beginning of the 19th century, when competition between 'modern' transport modes started. Mr. Carreras remarks that the periphery of Europe is still lacking. He suggests to make a short questionnaire to determine the major issues that are important and then invite an expert.

Mr. Mom proposes to have a workshop on road network building and use in Neuchâtel. He explains the aims and activities of the Tensions of Europe programme, especially the Mobility History theme. It is decided to organize a workshop on road networks in Neuchâtel, to be organized by Mr. Tissot and Mom.

It is decided:

- that the final report will be ready at the end of 2003;
- that we will have an editing committee of five people, which convenes in Neuchâtel;
- that the editing committee will have an email conference to discuss important topics;
- that we will have a road network workshop in Neuchâtel;
- that we will organize a special session on short sea transport during our next gathering after Neuchâtel, probably in connection with a new Management Committee meeting in 2003. One of the ideas is to have this next meeting in Milano.

6. PLANNING OF ACTIVITIES

As the final report and the bibliography have already been discussed, the question remains what we do with the more than 20 papers. Mr. Filarski proposes to publish them. There are two possible trajectories: publish them individually or make a book. Mr.

Dierikx asks why we do not put our bibliographies on the internet. Provided they are well indexed, they can function as an excellent research tool.

Mr. Spoustra explains that DG Research has changed its publication policy: it is now possible to have them printed in a paper form. This has to be between 200 and 300 pages, the rest can be put on a CD.

Mr. Lyth asks why we don't publish only the abstracts, while the full-length papers can be offered to scholarly journals.

Mrs. Merger stresses that we have to publish the conference proceedings.

Mr. Carreras proposes to have a different type of book, with shorter contributions of 5 to 6 pages.

It is decided to discuss this further in the Dissemination WG.

Dates and places of the next meeting.

All members of the Management Committee should be in Neuchâtel. Also, WG3 will have its next meeting there, to discuss the bibliography and the final report.

7. MISCELLANEOUS

No further points raised.

8. CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The chair proposes to continue the discussion on the points raised by Mr. Lyth and Mr. Carreras about the conceptualization of the bibliography. Mr. Lyth explains that the Journal of Transport History is at a turning point. In the past it has been heavily geared towards railway studies and the supply side of transport history, and to maritime history, and it has been weak about the 20th century. Also: how to define road transport? According to Mr. Lyth there is a methodological split in 1914 concerning the way people want to travel. We need to know more on use, more on gender.

Mr. Carreras introduces another set of questions: building of networks; infrastructural approach; intermodality is to be found in the network nodes. Local literature is very vast. Do we integrate this?

Mr. Mom explains the difference in infrastructure use between motor car transport and train transport.

Mr. Dierikx suggest an electronic format for the bibliography.

Mr. Filarski wants to keep the bibliographies as they are now: use the Diemel standard.

Mrs. Merger suggests a first approach through the Diemel standard, followed by a comment made on the basis of a list of national and intermodality issues.

Mr. Tissot agrees with Mr. Lyth.

Mr. Mom suggests the introduction of a set of keywords, especially to enhance the research tool character of the bibliographies when placed on the internet or on CD. This will be discussed in the Management Committee.

We decide that we keep to the Berlin approach, but that we will have a short list of points for the final comments.

Mrs. Merger and Mr. Mom suggest to have a special conference on ideas about transport.

It is decided that this discussion will be continued during the subsequent MC meeting and that there decisions will be taken (see the minutes of the MC meeting).

9. CLOSING

The meeting is closed at 12.55 h.

Gijs Mom, Secretary,

Lisbon, 26 May 2002