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Speaker 1: Secondly, I can say that the interviews will be transcribed and you will receive a full text copy of this transcript and we will still ask you for your final permission. Then I think we are basically set to go if there are not any starting questions from your side.

Interviewee: No, I can hear an echo now. Now it is okay. Thank you. I very much like the idea of this whole project. I think it is quite timely. I also like the process and your efforts to make it- within the possible collective undertaking, so both things I like.

Speaker 1: Thanks for the feedback. Maybe advanced information, what is interesting is that the commission was very keen on having, for example, an equal geographical split over Europe, gender balance etc. It is becoming a very interesting working group, particularly, also with Southern European, Eastern European researchers. Obviously from our DRIFT networks we realise quickly we have a bit of a North Western bias but we manage pretty well so far because the overall working group recruitment runs until end of February and then we have the 30 set. It looks pretty good and I am happy to get ideally all the voices from all European regions.

 I think we will roughly need 45 minutes, that should be it just to give you a quick idea of the timing.

 I would start asking you to quickly, again, introduce yourself just for the record, so to say, and maybe already with a particular emphasis on your previous work on transport and mobility. Maybe a final comment, what our focus will always be is to say a social sciences and humanities lens on transport and mobility.

Interviewee: I’m (anonymized). I’m a professor of urban planning at the University of (anonymized). I must say that since my PhD, my focus has been on the interface between urban planning, transportation planning between mobility and urban development in different ways but always try to be at interface. I think that is what best defines me. On one hand is understanding how these two things are interrelated but they are also such strong policy which is not surprisingly more and more focused on the challenges of a transition for urban mobility.

 What I might add is that - we will discuss it also later - sustainability defined in a broad sense. Of course environmental issues but I would say at least as important social issues. So quality of life in cities and things like that. So that is the broad- I must say I’m quite familiar with your work and DRIFT because in the years I also engage more and more also with the broader field of transitions. I think that’s why there could be a very fruitful connection.

Speaker 1: Thanks a lot. Maybe last question, what is your original background? What are you trained in?

Interviewee: That is a good question. I’ve been trained as an architect. In (anonymized) it is quite a broad education. I would say the closest you could get at least, I don’t know, [ \_\_\_ 00:04:41] to have a really traditional education with elements of technology, humanities, social sciences. Of course with a strong design and where you put the things together. As a student later I became especially fascinated by the city as an object of- that’s why also [ I shifted] more and more towards the urban planning and the social sciences because of this fact with the [ \_\_\_ 00:05:21] by which architects deal with cities. Every city has a physical object. In the end architects work through design and build and that I felt as an invitation.

 I still, especially, the role of the physical but also the role of design, so not just being critical but also construct, these are the things that I try to take with me.

Speaker 1: Thanks for sharing. It is interesting because I am also in another project ‘Smart Urban Green’ it’s a JPI project, the colleagues from (anonymized) actually, from [ \_\_\_ 00:06:01]. (anonymized) is the professor there is also an architect. I have the feeling that, as you said, it’s a very broad interdisciplinary perspective. Yes, at the same time with, so to say, always a design lens and still a priority for the physical artefacts. I really enjoyed the discussions in that project with them. It is interesting.

 Thanks for the introduction part. What we will now look at is how social science and humanities research on transport and mobility evolved or emerged over the last you could say decades. How do you feel about that? What would you say were the main topics? How did social science and humanities research on transport and mobility evolve?

Interviewee: I will define what I think is the key question and then you can see whether this works and if you want a different kind of narrative but I can do that. Let’s first try how- I think it is also important to understand how I look at it and the way I would this is quite fair by fellow researchers is that mobility [ \_\_\_ 00:07:34] handled itself, even though it can be a valid \_\_\_ but still mobility is there \_\_\_ relevant resources, the places, the activities, people, so that is deeply interlined with lifestyle, business models. It is part of it.

 At the same time, and we don’t need to have a long discussion about that, current mobility practices are not sustainable. [ \_\_\_ 00:08:13] but in order to [spread that] there are many dimensions of the lack of sustainability. Of course there are climate change issues, there are energy related issues. There is also safety, there is sound, there is air pollution, there is lack of physical movement. There is occupation on public space. There is fragmentation of human and natural communities. So it is a multi-dimensional issue that is quite crucial I think and this awareness has been growing and not only research but also policy.

The two situations together are quite key because this results in what I often call it as a dilemma. On one hand we hear with people, me and you, others, but also households, cities, depends on all this for our [ \_\_\_ 00:09:18]. On the other hand mobility is not sustainable so you cannot just choose one of the two sides because they are integrated.

 The way that I would say things \_\_\_ again there is some parallel development in policy and research. What is by now sometimes also called the sustainable mobility paradigm. There is an article, by the way I did not find, but I could also have maybe Bannister 2008 with this title. If I summarised what idea there is, but mobility has good and bad sides and we have to balance. We have to find ways to- and there are successes, certainly local, certainly uncertain dimensions but still we really cannot speak of a breakthrough, not even on the perspective of achieving that breakthrough.

 I would think more and more in the last few years, me but also others are starting to think that we have to look beyond this sustainable mobility paradigm and enter an area where the kind of shift that might be needed is deeper. It is about culture, it is about institutions and that is right at the beginning. Here I am even critical in my own work which a lot have been framed in sustainability paradigm, which started to move. Maybe [ \_\_\_ 00:11:01] about my own work and people like me at this interface of urban planning and \_\_\_ is that they started to frame it already for some time as a challenge not of achieving sustainable mobility but sustainable accessibility.

 The issue what it boils down to is resources but it is quite important because then it stresses that access to resources can be achieved of course by mobility but also by what, for some call proximity. It is still moving but it is not going far or moving by motorised means. This also has the possibility that you are doing now to access resources without moving. It does open a whole range of solutions that are quite interesting but that will be my focus and [ \_\_\_ 00:12:03] even there I don’t see that solves the issues of deeper culture.

Speaker 1: Excellent point. I’m sorry, I’m just closing my office door.

Interviewee: Okay.

Speaker 1: Very interesting points. Maybe to dig a bit deeper there, what we saw also in other interviews, and I heard from you a bit as well, would you say that social science research on transport and mobility with this integrated lengths across the disciplines that it is more reactive to societal changes and developments or do you see also in the past more proactive agenda setting by social science and humanities research?

Interviewee: I think that is an interesting question. You might have a point there, in a way it is [ \_\_\_ 00:13:10] it is also about coincidence. It is not a coincidence. I know research has been done in collaboration with societal stakeholders often looking at government but also others really- there have been some instances of really critical assessment of growing people with the article of John Berry and the system of mobility does go deeper. Even there if you look at the solution part it is really also problematic.

 It is as if maybe people appreciate the conclusion he has, the system but then don’t dare to challenge it. Then I think that is when me but also others all [ \_\_\_ 00:14:10] to actually challenge this system on all sorts of levels. It maybe that is where the humanities become interesting because maybe more of a tradition of online on a deeper structure.

Speaker 1: Narrative or cultures or habits.

Interviewee: Yes, training and I think it’s not that nobody ever did it and one of the articles suggests which is distinguish three ways of branding urban mobility issues and where the other they say even sustainability mobility means mainstream but they preferred report is one much more rooted in justice. I mean you see various movements and there are others but I would say that in a way I’m confirming what you say. I would say I wouldn’t entirely follow it and of course even there are huge differences between practices in different cities. So by comparing you can still be very- you can come up with some very challenging ideas in different [ \_\_\_\_ 00:15:40]. Here in the Netherlands that is really revolutionary.

Still, even cycling in the Netherlands is it really challenges, is it not still about efficiency, speed and other things that might be the critical things to challenge here.

Speaker 1: Also a good point. I’m still once more returning to the evolution of the field, so to say. You mentioned already some seminal works from Bannister or John Berry’s work. What would you say is the major time span of social science research on transport and mobility? Is there a certain evolution or are there certain phases or from when would you say did this field really come into play?

Interviewee: I guess the field I know better is that of how mobility and urban development, transportation planning influence each other. There is this [ \_\_\_ 00:17:04] with transport, there is this feedback cycle, it was being quite \_\_\_. I would say that the idea that the two are interacting with each other it started in the ‘50s with this paper by [Hausman], how accessibility shape \_\_\_ 00:17:25] and use the figures by \_\_\_ about how they interact with each other and others, like, \_\_\_ ‘50s, ‘60s, these are already there.

 By the way, already there are [ \_\_\_ 00:17:45] of research emerged because of the lack of acknowledgement of these interactional institutional structures. Even now these are very different views, different disciplines, so even that has not been addressed yet.

There is research that I have also been involved that emerged and in a way is still there is that addressing what is called the implementation gap. We know these things are interconnected by organisationally, disciplinarily and professionally we are not connected.

 Then also stemming from this awareness, I would say, the devolution again, I would say, in the ‘70s it is also famous paper by [ \_\_\_ 00:18:49] how are people in \_\_\_ really again putting the people in. If you have travel time bag, space bag or something. Anyway we should start there. It has been traffic of two directions. One is assessing how the built environment affects travel behaviour and the other, which is you would say one half of the feedback cycle and the other on the other half is how [ \_\_\_ 00:19:33] shape views, urban development. With some research perhaps more in the modern kind of world, people like \_\_\_ and others involving the whole set of interactions.

The two fields that I mentioned they are both I would say quite in parallel. At the beginning quite simple, cause effect relationships, but then saying okay but there are other factors, like, personal characteristics in the case of built environment travel and the [contribution 00:20:15] of the local economy in the case of accessibility land use.

 That will be the evolution, so the physical barriers is one and more others. In some cases others are more important and more recently moving I would say [ \_\_\_ 00:20:30]. I think in the ‘’90s there was a lot about that and later also getting deeper in personal characteristics, psychology coming on board, or the other side, more business models.

 I think over the last 20 years you see these ideas that it is not only more factors but also relationships going both ways, you can do a self-selection, how are these [causalities 00:21:18] going, maybe people have \_\_\_ and then they don’t look at environments that fit that, not the other way around. It’s a huge debate about this. In the end still saying okay but still you can have impacts of the built environment on [people 00:21:44] or on accessibility, on fuel, on pricing.

If I have to give- again maybe my personal assessment, my impression is that no, it is not as quite [solid 00:21:58]. Of course you can still have also discussion, make even better models. Again, is this going to help achieve this great \_\_\_? I think the big problem to me and we are now in the present and I mean in the future, it’s not that that has already happened. I think that the next step [ \_\_\_ 00:22:27] should be to challenge assumptions behind all this model and system thinking.

 Again, \_\_\_ such as the people are utility maximiser and that sort of assumption or that maybe behind all these regularities things are much more varied, even in mobility, again, it seems to be crucial but I’m really speculating about in the future that research moves from it’s [ \_\_\_ 00:23:09] to identifying possibility of a radical change in status quo. Then all this kind of research I don’t think is very useful because it is mainly explaining the whole service remains of course, how things are now. When we have understood that we need to change things more in a marginal way. We probably have to approach the problem in a totally different way.

Again, it will be exceptional behaviour or outliers. That is why of course I become interested in transitional studies and [ \_\_\_ 00:23:58] experiments, that might be more important depending how people- how those \_\_\_ could be broken.

 That I think needs a really different approach. In fact it’s emerging not everybody would agree with me. Also I don’t know exactly how and also try- yes.

Speaker 1: Thanks for that. I mean we could discuss for hours about this, very interesting insights and I share your impression of the emergence, particularly, in terms of this general pattern of having for a long time and there are good reasons to do so, sort of say, problem focused research on analysing how systems work, first of all, mobility systems with all the differences and the fragmentation, but that we now are at least seeing the necessity to close this implementation gap. I mean to really bridge the question of how do we translate our findings into future design or policies or regulations that really contribute to substantial structural changes in the mobility systems. Which then brings all the politicised value loaded debates into our so far clean, nice models.

 I think there is a very interesting link to make because on the one hand I also worked with agent based modelling with (anonymized), for example, at ETH Zurich. Then we often saw this gap, how do we discuss now the model results with policymakers and what are they really taking out of it and that is really a challenge.

Interviewee: I think it is very important and I like that you not just apply what we know but there are [ \_\_\_ 00:26:05] of these political discussions about, discussion about \_\_\_ which have been quite absent from the field. It has been remarkably, now we could say post-political field, but with the idea that we don’t need that discussion or that is not a relevant discussion. Again, you will see there are sites that are genuinely some people you and I agree, but that is again risk.

Speaker 1: You mentioned already, for example, this implementation gap but also this contestation of the causalities in previous models, what other key, I would call it, tipping points or contestations, debates, conflicts would you see in the past of social science research on transport and mobility or also today?

Interviewee: Well, again, what I [scratch 00:27:27] is not on everybody, it’s not an linear trajectory that many people that think that that is not fruitful to challenge the heart of the system or to [throw that level] value that science that \_\_\_. So many people in the field- there is a nice article by probably maybe even talking to [anonymized 00:28:00] but he wrote an article with others a few years ago which was a review of the kind of science involved with climate change \_\_\_ transport, I think is how he frames it. I mean it is \_\_\_ economist and psychologist and only very recently sociology. So the value, the political is very- and for many it is really an area where they don’t want to go, that is not science.

 I mean the mainstreamist view, if you just go through any transportation researcher you would see that the way I’m talking to you is absolutely not mainstream at all. [ \_\_\_00:28:56] and whatever discussion but I don’t know whether this you consider a political or policy discussion is the one of- but it is related on technology, of course, because one idea of narrative of how to get out of this dilemma is that technology will solve it. Of course the last few years there is a kind of [economy 00:29:34] on the supply side. It is the kind of things Silicon Valley kind of thing and many are impressed or I think that they show sign of science is understanding how can we make our societies think with technology. For me, they are \_\_\_ if you look at- it is really this is coming, it’s just a matter of time so we have to understand how societies should develop too.

 On the other side, it really emerged a few years ago where to say, to have any doubt about the fact that self-driving cars [ \_\_\_ 00:30:29] was seen as a lewdest and backwards. That is changing and people say it is maybe the other way around. Maybe we should challenge the cultures to feed societies. More at the level of policy goals, social, environmental, it’s been a \_\_\_. More recently and again, here, I think there is an interesting link with \_\_\_ is to say technologies should serve humans not the other way around, I mean technology as machines.

So here I really think an interesting opening with [ \_\_\_ 00:31:18] what does it mean being human and also what does it mean being human not just as an individual and of course humans are social beings also interact with others. The idea that if we don’t understand that we will be used by technology and if we do understand, it’s not just reject technology but have a framework a way that distinguishes through the pattern or human analysis and human [constrains 00:32:04] in technology and not only selecting but also in developing technologies that help us be human and not help technology develop and capitalist and so.

 This is again an area where I think that for many people [ \_\_\_ 00:32:35], it is even difficult to just think of something like that. Maybe for others that might be interesting to look into maybe, especially, the humanities. Very critical social scientists people might be freer to really question things.

Speaker 1: It is a very good point. I mean what we see also in our own projects but also with some other interesting institute is that, for example, when addressing transport and mobility issues in cities that there is an interesting shift in how you do stakeholders based research that you don’t in the beginning start addressing transport infrastructure or electric vehicles, like, the technologies but you rather ask in what type of city do you want to live, what qualities do you want to have? If you have this vision then you can start breaking it down, what does that mean for your transport infrastructure and technologies? That is really a paradigm shift in terms of approaching transport systems. That is a very good point.

What you mentioned, it refers to our next question here, you mentioned also the humanities and critical social sciences, do you think there are disciplines marginalised or overlooked so far? Would you like to see other humanities or social science disciplines coming in or working more on the issue?

INTERVIEWEE I think there are, I’m just putting myself engagement, I mean you have some obviously in your field, one very interesting discipline is history and why? Because history helps understand that what we are reading is a construction, it can always be a different [course 00:34:36]. I’m doing some work now with colleagues on \_\_\_ and street work. Traffic was not the main \_\_\_ and they were not- it was a very self-organising kind of environment.

 So these are the things I don’t even consider but for the history. The history will help you realise but it’s not just a linear progress. We might also lose stuff along the way. Also history was in judicial studies, I mean work of anonymized but also [ \_\_\_ 00:35:24]. History helps you understand why these system changes might- so historians are one with some precedents. Another one is that we are talking about what it means to be human and its philosophy, I would say. It is not humanity but I think that some connection to also like evolutionary biology, really understand what is being human.

 For instance, all these assumptions on humans, you are dealing with [maximised 00:36:17] individuals are really very limited which means the interpretation of what it means, you need to have a long term for the historical perspective, even for archaeology, being human and evolution biology, I mean humans have come to be what they are, so dominating in the world because they are social beings, because they are better at collaborating than other beings.

 Again, these notions are crucial when challenging the individually maximise the [ \_\_\_ 00:37:01]. So going beyond humanities but of course philosophers \_\_\_ can engage with this sort of discussion \_\_\_ and also ethics issues also involved here. Maybe it is also \_\_\_, how the power of images, how images emerge, what are strong narratives. Again, I’m not a specialist, but that area, on the one hand personal characteristics are becoming more and more important in the mainstream. Again there tends to be an assumption that attitude preferences are not looked upon. That is one you can doubt but again, we can’t accept that from the point of view of the challenges.

 So we have to understand even if you doubt it, it is very special which when [ \_\_\_ 00:38:24]. Some psychology might get there, even need to go beyond psychology in philosophy, history or evolutionary biology. What also by the way I feel has been excluded is alternative economics. Economy is really the new classical mainstream, so we ask feminists, economists or [ economics 00:39:03] people are thinking of that \_\_\_ and all those ideas. I mean the economics used to be that dominate [draft] researches is now very mainstream.

 There are also other economics even though they are a minority marginalised so that will also be an interest.

Speaker 1: Thanks a lot for your input. I’m getting to the last part of that section. I asked about marginalised perspective and disciplines, how about geographies, what do you consider as geographies that were also so far overlooked, be it within a country, be it in Europe or even globally?

Interviewee: So here you mean not so much geography as a discipline but particular spaces?

Speaker 1: Exactly, sort of say spatial areas, social spatial context.

Interviewee: A lot of the research has been at the urban but [ \_\_\_ 00:40:25] from the \_\_\_ June much less, at least in the field of personal mobility, the international scale, business travel, holidays, I mean there has been but I would say there is quite a disconnection which lets you adopt situation that by now are becoming evident between people cycling everyday but also flying every month which- and even being commended. So that kind of way we are thinking is still not there. It is not just at the global scale but connecting the local and the global.

 If you come in [ \_\_\_ 00:41:20] not define geographies, it depends on the actual lifestyle of people or to [doubt oneself] to change of groups which might be very complex geographies mixed with the local and the global.

 That kind of approach is business kind of an assumption and of course in many ways it is very \_\_\_ developed region. A second area I think is that literature is overwhelmingly focused on folks of big cities and big cities in developed countries and especially countries where English is the language or researchers that speak English well, like, in the Netherlands. It is changing but if you look where interested things are happening. Policy wise there is absolutely no reports. South American cities are incredibly interesting but there is hardly any literature or very few.

 Again, I think that once we look at this whole thing in a more fundamental way so-called developing countries or [global 00:42:47] countries by \_\_\_ more of the future, again, it’s not that simple but maybe, for instance, regarding the street is still self-organised, kind of, system where traffic is just one many uses which is in many ways what we are trying to reconnect now in our cities.

 There are other areas and there are places that people are already hoping much mobility [ \_\_\_ 00:43:23]. Of course sometimes, often, unfortunately, it means also much lower quality but maybe not always. Maybe it can help us understand how can you live well moving less. So there is also this dimensions.

 Then in developed countries, again, smaller cities, suburbs, maybe the transition challenge there is much bigger. We see developed cities becoming car free, not without resistances but still the country is car dependent, [ \_\_\_ 00:44:06] not much research is focused on the suburbs.

Speaker 1: I fully agree that’s a very, very relevant point because due to the lower densities, I mean we know about the shortcomings, for example, also of all business models of public transport and that is really an issue. We really need alternatives there about non-car driven mobility in less denser populated areas. It’s really an issue.

Interviewee: Absolutely.

Speaker 1: The question is actually out there already for decades but no one jumped on it. Maybe funding is also playing a role there. I mean there is a lot of funding on really urban issues.

Interviewee: Yes, there is a hype of- yes, we need to say why but of course now the idea is cities are working harder but cities, they are full of [ \_\_\_ 00:45:09] in the role mobility and \_\_\_ mobility and economic growth and also assumption that we need to grow. There are a few people, and again at least as a question \_\_\_ mobility and say [handling 00:45:36] \_\_\_ with a colleague now to put it down on paper and sketch the problem in that \_\_\_. There is something happening.

Speaker 1: There’s a printer in the back, I’m sorry.

Interviewee: I think there is a relevant issue detail, the questions in relation to not only mobility in economic growth but when even questioning the deal of economic growth at least in developed countries. We might need to put that also on the agenda at least as a research question. Again, it’s not a matter of- even asking that question [ \_\_\_ 00:46:25] but really because of all these assumptions, research that finally focuses on area of [growth] those are cities right now. And the way you see things happening and opportunities and other areas don’t have that. They are seeing maybe daily, I don’t know.

Speaker 1: That is a fantastic point, I mean particularly to frame it as the elephant in the room. The question is to me then also how to still break it down because this whole question of the necessity of growth or even de-growth thinking, it is very marginalised in my perception but still the nexus between growth assumptions and mobility is really an interesting one.

 We see it also in all the inner city parking debates. I mean you still have the trade associations in the inner cities, saying, “No, people cannot access by car then our revenues will go down.” And we now see a lot of studies with facts that this is actually really not the case.

Interviewee: Yes.

Speaker 1: I’m getting to the last point and that is with a particular focus again on social science and humanities or on transport and mobility. The question of how policy and research so far, so to say, collaborate and interact. We could keep this a bit shorter with the question of do you have a success area where a research policy collaboration worked? We would also be interested in maybe an example of what are the barriers or what is really difficult?

Interviewee: I can say my own research has always been interacting with stakeholders, even in time when this was not considered- I remember when I started it was considered the research, like, now it is different and also the programmes demand that. In one way I could say it has always been a success but what I learned because stakeholders did give us access to data in a broad sense which we will never have without them. What we can give [ \_\_\_ 00:49:07] the real point is involving them in all of the process first because you need insights or facts all along the project but also because this whole idea that research affects policy by communicating the results and policymakers applying it. That does not work.

 It is really disrespectful of their own knowledge with a different knowledge or at least as rich and specific knowledge. I think we can offer that by working as a researcher, it is room for reflection which [ \_\_\_ 00:49:49] at the end of the day looking at things in a different way because of different concepts, because of confronting [that with experience] in other context and that is- I cannot say, oh they applied this or that. I mean I have examples of that in the ‘90s I developed a model, hard to understand \_\_\_ between \_\_\_ stage where developed \_\_\_ place model being applied in [any situation 00:50:16].

 More in general I think by creating room for reflection you have to reanalyse- I’m talking more about my own conclusion, not just general research itself [ \_\_\_ 00:50:39] my own research has been for one where this collaboration was completely especially in the form workshops, very interactive workshop, different place of the research where one we are trying to get now where it is more- many others, I, of course is really making actual experiments out there in the city. Even though, because that is right now also fashionable, what really there is a limitation now is that this experiment that prove those policymakers they have become a bit too much in itself and so all the energy goes in making this [ \_\_\_ 00:51:26] successful as triggers of system change you can adapt. I think that too much experiments don’t challenge the system.

 Again, if you want to experiment with the challenge, you will see that it is very difficult, also very difficult for policymakers. Even the person who like that to make that an acceptable, one of the question was whether [ \_\_\_ 00:51:56] to do that but then we also look for very different kind of stakeholders outside of the system. I don’t know, maybe reframe the whole idea, what is an experiment.

 Personally, I do think we need to go out there and experiment in one way or the other, but I don’t think beyond the workshop which has been very productive but I feel that we need the next step.

Speaker 1: It is a very interesting point. I’m currently writing a paper with a colleague from Copernicus Institute in Utrecht and we called the Grammar of Urban Experimentation. What we saw in a lot of previous projects and we were really also self-critical because we started, so to say, with experimenting with experimentation out there and then we also saw, for example, I mean there is really an issue with this project focus. You have two or three years, you do some experiments, you write up the stuff. A few people learned something but then you leave again and that’s it. So the continuity is really an issue.

 What you mention is really one of the key points in our paper and that is to say a continuum or a dilemma between being able to implement incremental smaller step experiments versus having the wish to be very radical while then being confronted with a lot of resistance or so or not even being able to actually conduct them. It is very interesting how to move on this continuum, so to say, between the polls. Ideally we would be able to implement and test the radical ones but then often the question is how do you get there?

Interviewee: Absolutely that is so-

Speaker 1: I’m very happy to share it with you.

Interviewee: Absolutely, I would be very happy.

Speaker 1: Luca, many, many thanks. We’re almost at the end and closing it. I have one last question but you basically answered it already that is to say why you have picked these literatures? I mean you mentioned John [00:54:09], you mentioned others. If you want to add something why you think these five pieces are really key pieces then you can do it then and then we really close the interview.

Interviewee: I said it again, I have to think about that. I had a longer list and I’m not saying these are the most important. Again, if I had to think in a historical way, already we did that a little bit now. The last 50 years, one for every decade, the amount of people, the papers there are a bit representative for me of the state of the art. Again, not necessarily the best but they might be, again I’m not representing because one, it is very- I think the possibility to have- I have been looking or we have been looking again the next step is not there yet. So that is what we have and now we have to go for it.

 Again, especially focus all my owns interests for the interface between urban plus transition planning, it’s just mobility and social science and humanities more broadly. That is also the field paper.

Speaker 1: Perfect. Thanks a lot for this final input. Just some closing information. I informed you already in the beginning that we are happy to name you in the acknowledgements of the report to the commission and obviously that we will get back to you with the paper probably end of this year.

 Final point would be if you have any further ideas, it doesn’t need to be a large list, maybe one or two names of people that you think would really make good members of this working group on transport and mobility, particularly in Eastern Europe or Southern Europe, we would be very happy. You could just drop an email to me just with the name and affiliation that would be fantastic.

 I mean as you mentioned [anonymized 00:56:17] is already member of the working group. So you will get back to him later this year than in the webinar.

Interviewee: I mean I have a colleague but again it’s a very close colleague so it’s not really Eastern part of Europe that is Marco [ \_\_\_ 00:56:35] but now he’s really doing more recently to language. He is working also with a correspondent, with a journalist, about to publish a book \_\_\_. It is really about especially language, so it is very fundamental thing but it is very close, probably more close to a lot of things. I understand you would rather have Eastern or Southern.

Speaker 1: We have rather a bias still towards North Western Europe.

Interviewee: I understand because-

Speaker 1: So whenever in the next weeks you have any idea, you can also easily write an email. We don’t have to do it now, that is fantastic.

 Is there anything else you want to add that we may have missed to ask?

Interviewee: No. It seems to me to think during several interviews I’m hopeful that you will get out some very interesting-

Speaker 1: Yes and obviously we are very happy to share the insights. So the follow up procedure is that in roughly three weeks at latest four weeks, two to four weeks, so I guess end of February you will receive an email from my colleague, Marianne in Norway. She is the head of this working group on transport and mobility and then you will have this link on the first [DELFI 00:58:09] round just collecting the research questions. Then from there we walk you through the rest of the process. As I said, there is a second round and there is webinar and that is really it. Then you will also receive the transcript of our interview today and can have another look at it.

Interviewee: Okay.

Speaker 1: (Anonymized), fantastic inputs. Thanks a lot for your time. I look forward to keeping in touch and if I finish this Grammar of Urban Experimentation I am very happy to share with you.

Interviewee: Very, very curious about it.

Speaker 1: Thanks a lot. Have a good day. Bye bye.

Interviewee: Bye.