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Introduction

Population growth, economic development and continued urbanization lead to strongly increasing demand for urban transport. In addition, growing urban transport will challenge the transport system and consequently increase congestion and emissions. In the Baltic Sea Region, many cities are developing and introducing green urban mobility solutions. Unfortunately, senior citizens often remain reluctant towards these alternatives. It is important to remember that even the best environmentally friendly transport solutions cannot unfold their full potential if public authorities and transport operators are unaware of the specific needs of senior citizens. Therefore, improving the senior citizens’ participation in green urban mobility planning is very important.

This “Atlas on participative approaches to age-friendly green mobility” report’s aim is to provide information on the specific needs of senior citizens in green mobility affairs for municipal stakeholders, decision-makers, planners and parties involved in transport planning. The Atlas contains identification and analysis of relevant factors for senior participation in green urban mobility. It will also increase the knowledge about local socio-cultural, legal and political conditions for good and improved participation processes. The Atlas gives the framework for GreenSAM project activities including the Toolbox, which guides planners and decision-makers in the practical implementation of participatory process.

The Atlas is also a visualized infographic, which can be found in the project’s website (greensam.eu). The purpose of the infographic is to act as a map, which helps the reader to navigate through the prerequisites of participatory process for developing age-friendly green mobility solutions.

The Atlas is produced as a part of EU funded GreenSAM project, during which participatory solutions for age-friendly green urban mobility were piloted in six different cities in the Baltic Sea Region (see more about the project and pilots on greensam.eu).
1. Key aspects in ageing and age-friendliness

1.1 Ageing world and Europe

According to the latest data, one in six people in the world will be over age 65 (16%) in 2050, up from one in 11 in 2019 (9%). By 2050, one in four persons living in Europe and Northern America could be aged 65 or over. In 2018, for the first time in history, persons aged 65 or above outnumbered children under five years of age globally. The number of people aged 80 years or over is projected to triple, from 143 million in 2019 to 426 million in 2050.

In Europe, people aged 50+ already represent 37 per cent of the population, i.e. 190 million citizens. The number of people aged 60+ will increase by about two million persons each year in the coming decades, while the working age population will start to shrink. The number on very old persons, 80 years and older, who are most likely in need of care, will also increase. More human beings than before also live alone and have lived alone their whole life. Especially this phenomenon is to be seen in the big cities. Across 143 countries or areas with available data, the proportion of persons aged 60 or over who live “independently” – alone or with a spouse only – varied widely, ranging from a low of 2.3 per cent in Afghanistan to a high of 93.4 per cent in the Netherlands.

As the average age of populations continues to rise, governments should implement policies to address the needs and interests of older persons, including those related to housing, employment, health care, social protection, and other forms of intergenerational solidarity. By anticipating this demographic shift, countries can proactively enact policies to adapt to an ageing population, which will be essential to fulfil the pledge of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development that “no one will be left behind”. Because more ageing human beings live alone, it sets special demands also to the usability of the public transportation.
The city of Hamburg does not differ from other cities especially in West Germany. In East Germany, the population also in the cities (except Berlin) is older. The share of the aged population is stable over the past five years. Aarhus is generally younger than the national population. The share of the population above 65 years of age on a national level is 19 per cent. Between 55 and 66 it is 12 per cent on the national level. In Riga there are no differences nationwide (among the cities/regions). However, the society ages rapidly due to the high emigration rate of young people and extremely low birth rates. Tartu is a university city and the population is younger than in the other cities in Estonia. The percentage of senior citizens (65+) in Turku is 20.6 per cent; this matches the nation-wide percentage of senior citizens that is 21.4 per cent. Turku, as the whole of Finland, has an aging population and the share of senior citizens is growing rapidly. According to population projections, the amount of 65+ year-olds in Finland will grow to 25.6 per cent by 2030. The share of senior citizens can be expected to grow at a similar rate in Turku. Polish society, similarly, to contemporary European societies, is characterized by dynamic changes in the demographic structure of the population. Gdansk is in the same situation. Eurostat data show that in 2020 people over 60 years of age will constitute nearly 25 per cent of the population of the Polish society. According to demographic estimates and projections, the share of the aged population in Poland will be growing quite rapidly: Now 65+ constitute 14 per cent; in 2020, 18 per cent; in 2035, 23 per cent.
1.2 Ageing process

Age and the ageing process can be examined from many points of view. Ageing can be examined by chronological, biological and psychological aspects.

- **Chronological age**
  
  Chronological age is based solely on the passage of time. It is a person’s age in years. Chronological age has limited significance in terms of health. Nonetheless, the likelihood of developing a health problem increases as people age, and it is health problems, rather than normal ageing, that are the primary cause of functional loss during old age. Because chronological age helps predict many health problems, it has some legal and financial uses.

- **Biological age**
  
  Biological age refers to changes in the body that commonly occur as people age. Because these changes affect some people sooner than others, some people are biologically old at 65, and others not until a decade or more later. However, most noticeable differences in the apparent age among people of similar chronologic age are caused by lifestyle, habit, and subtle effects of disease rather than by differences in actual aging.

- **Psychological age**
  
  Psychological age is based on how people act and feel. For example, an 80-year-old who works, plans, looks forward to future events, and participates in many activities is considered psychologically young.

Ageing is a gradual, continuous process of natural change that begins in early adulthood. During the early middle age, many bodily functions begin to gradually decline. People do not become old or elderly at any specific age. Traditionally, age 65 has been designated as the beginning of old age. But the reason is based in history, not biology. The age 65 has been chosen as the age for retirement in many countries and it continues to be the retirement age for most people in developed societies, although this tradition is probably changing. Majority of the changes caused by ageing can be characterized as normal. They are the slight degree of weakening of the ability to function physically an increase in the psychologic vulnerability, the adopting of external influences becoming more difficult, an emphasis on the individual traits and the weakening of the short-term memory and recalling. The sense functions weaken which for its part affects the managing of the old person. Normal ageing does not hamper the ability to function, except in stress situations.
Functional decline that is part of ageing sometimes seems like functional decline that is part of a disorder. For example, with advanced age, a mild decline in mental function is nearly universal and is considered normal ageing. This decline includes increased difficulty in learning new languages, decreased attention span, and increased forgetfulness. In contrast, the decline that occurs in dementia is much more severe. For example, people who are ageing normally may misplace things or forget details, but people who have dementia forget entire events. People with dementia also have difficulty doing normal daily tasks (such as driving, cooking, and handling finances) and understanding the environment, including knowing what year it is and where they are. Thus, dementia is considered a disorder, even though it is common in late life. Certain kinds of dementia, such as Alzheimer disease, differ from normal ageing in other ways as well.

With ageing, the human being meets changes to which he/she adapts him/herself using all those resources which have accumulated to him/her during his/her life. The ageing of an individual is a comprehensive process, in which the physical changes will usually first and gradually take place. The social environment of the individual reacts to the changes. The experience of the process will consist of the ageing, when the individuals simultaneously realize the changes themselves and what are their own and environments attitude towards their own ageing and usually for ageing. Ageing can be examined as processes which affect each other: physical, mental, cognitive, cultural or social but, however, it must be remembered that each of them will be only one point of view to the manifold wholeness of the ageing. The individual differences of ageing are considerable.

The human being who has aged is thinking, wanting and he/she makes initiatives, and operates in his/her own cultural environment. The experience of ageing is created in relation with the world in which the individual lives. Every environment also produces an individual ageing process. The life of the human being can be examined from the point of view of the life expectancy in which case attention is paid for example on which decade the person’s life periods have taken place. Ageing is above all an individual process and the aged are a very heterogeneous group of people.

The level of physical activity is one of the strongest predictors of healthy ageing, in particular for older age groups. Physical activity can improve respiratory and muscular fitness, and bone and functional health, and reduce the risk of depression and cognitive decline. For older people, physical activity includes recreational or leisure-time physical activity, transportation (e.g. walking and cycling), occupational physical activity (if still engaged in work), household chores, play, games, sports or exercise planned in the context of daily, family, and community activities.
1.3 Age-friendly and memory-friendly environments

According to WHO, age-friendly environments foster health and well-being and the participation of people as they age. They are accessible, equitable, inclusive, safe and secure, and supportive. They promote health and prevent or delay the onset of disease and functional decline. They provide people-centred services and support to enable recovery or to compensate for the loss of function so that people can continue to do the things that are important to them.

The purpose of age-friendly environments is health and well-being for all, regardless of age, sex or gender, cultural or ethnic background, wealth or health status. Older people may experience negative attitudes and discrimination based on their age. Creating age-friendly environments acknowledges diversity, fights ageism and ensures that everyone has an opportunity to fully participate.

Creating barrier-free and affordable housing, accessible public spaces, and transportation enable people to stay independent and participate in community life. An age-friendly environment reduces the risk of falls and prevents the neglect and abuse of vulnerable older people by increasing the safety of the natural and built environments and the security and protection of older people in the community. Older people play a crucial role in their communities – they engage in paid or volunteering work, transmit experience and knowledge, and help their families with caring responsibilities. These contributions can only be ensured if societies foster their health and participation.

In the localized analysis made in the Green SAM partner cities, one success factor was that in all the cities considered, a culture of giving seats to the elderly was recognized. In addition, priority seats were available for the elderly in public transportation in 67% of the responses. In every partner city there are discount tickets in public transportation for elderly people.

In practical terms, age-friendly environments are free from physical and social barriers and supported by policies, systems, services, products and technologies that:

- promote health,
- build and maintain physical and mental capacity across the life course; and
- enable people, even when experiencing capacity loss, to continue to do the things they value.
Age-friendly practices help build older people’s abilities to meet their basic needs, learn, grow and make decisions, be mobile, build and maintain relationships and contribute. In doing so, age-friendly practices recognize the wide range of capacities and resources among older people, anticipate and respond flexibly to ageing-related needs and preferences, respect older people’s decisions and lifestyle choices, reduce inequities, protect those who are most vulnerable and promote older people’s inclusion in and contribute to all areas of community life.

For many older adults, the ability to participate in the social environment is dependent on the physical environment and the extent to which it enables mobility. For example, a city could invest time and energy designing and constructing a park specifically for older adults, with appropriate seating and other amenities and programming. But, if older adults cannot physically access the park, they are unintentionally excluded from this space. In many ways, transportation is the tissue that connects people to their physical and social environments.

One example of good practices that the City of Turku has developed its digital services actively by building a service map. The task of the service map is to guide the people in need of services to them. The service map includes information about the services, offices of the town and their accessibility. Furthermore, there are own profiles in the service map for different user groups such as visually disabled people, hearing impaired people and wheelchair users, who get the information how to manage their business in every service.

![Service map in Turku](https://servicemap.turku.fi)
Petri Lampinen (Alzheimer Europe’s member of the memory sick people’s team) write in Finnish Memory magazine about a cognitive liberty. He emphasizes the significance of good and clear guides. Especially contrasts of colors to facilitate perceiving. Also, the noise of the environment can cause the problems of the concentrating.

Clusters for the domains of an Age-friendly city

The WHO’s Age-friendly City Project was launched at the 18th IAGG World Congress of Gerontology and Geriatrics in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in June 2005. Between September 2006 and April 2007, 33 cities from all continents participated in a WHO research project to explore the elements that make up an age-friendly city, with each city conducting focus groups with older people, their careers and service providers. From the extensive information obtained from the research, the WHO produced the Global Age-friendly Cities: A Guide and the Checklist of Essential Features of Age-friendly Cities to assist cities and communities to self-assess against a range of criteria across eight key domains.

Picture 3. Clusters for the domains of an Age-friendly city.
- **Outdoor spaces and buildings**
  The outside environment significantly impacts on the mobility, independence and quality of life of older people and affects their ability to age in place.

- **Transportation**
  Accessible and affordable transportation enables older people to move around a city and influences social and civic participation and access to community and health services.

- **Housing**
  Appropriate and affordable housing influences the independence and quality of life of older people and enables them to age safely within the community.

- **Social Participation**
  Having opportunities to participate in leisure, social, cultural and spiritual activities in the community, and within the family, allows older people to exercise their competence, enjoy respect and esteem and to build and maintain relationships.

- **Respect and Social Inclusion**
  Creating environments where older people are respected, recognized and included in the community and the family.

- **Civic Participation and Employment**
  Ensuring older people have the opportunities to continue to contribute to their communities through paid work or volunteering and to be engaged in the political process.

- **Communication and Information**
  Supporting older people to stay connected with events and people and have ready access to relevant information in a variety of forms.

- **Community Support and Health Services**
  Having access to health and support services that are affordable, of good quality and appropriate is vital for older people to maintain health and independence in the community.

---

**Some examples of age-friendly solutions from pilot cities**

**Turku** is in the WHO’s Global Network for Age-friendly cities. Membership to the Network is not an accreditation for age-friendliness. Rather, it reflects cities’ commitment to listen to the needs of their ageing population, assess and monitor their age-friendliness and work collaboratively with older people and across sectors to create age-friendly physical and social environments. Membership is also a commitment to share experience, achievements and lessons learnt with other cities and communities.
Dokkx is funded by the City Council of Aarhus Municipality. X stands for the unknown. X stands for experiment. But X is also a letter that, with a little imagination, looks like an active human being. At DokkX, citizens can get advice and guidance so that they can acquire the right technologies and tools that support an independent and active life. DokkX is also a space for innovation, in which education and research institutions, business and industry, the Municipality and the citizens of Aarhus can collaborate in the development of technological solutions for the future. https://dokkx.aarhus.dk/english/welcome-to-dokkx/ Den Gamle By (The old town museum) The old town museum has built up an memory apartment where people with cognitive decline can visit an apartment as it looked like in their youth. https://www.dengamleby.dk/en/den-gamle-by/about/

In Riga the Mobility Lab concept in close collaboration with the target group (seniors), introduced an innovative approach to address the core mobility needs of this target group in the cities (municipalities), ensuring that mobility in physical, technological, or virtual environments become available, acceptable, affordable, more efficient, healthier, smarter and thus – more sustainable. Co-creation with the municipal board led to the experimental pilot in Čaka and Bruninieku street where universal senior friendly street design was implemented in more than 4 km long distance. The renovated street presents a totally new living street concept with separated bike lines, public transportation stops, one level pedestrian pavements and crossings, new senior friendly amenities and signs for visually impaired people. (Source: https://eng.lsm.lv/article/economy/transport/bicycle-lane-experiment-in-riga-center-launched.a381599/) This experiment downgraded traffic intensity more than 25% and improved air quality and safety on the street. One of the Mobility Lab participants - the local senior association “RIGA ACTIVE SENIORS ALLIANCE” (RASA) is a good example of age friendly environment where the seniors through life-long learning can improve their physical skills, build capacities, improve their digital and social skills. The society RASA was set up in late 2010 with the aim of promoting socialization and integration of Riga senior age citizen. Currently, the society has more than 700 members (individuals).

In Hamburg there are several examples from age-friendliness. Accessibility and universal design are important aspects in the binding regulations for street planning in Hamburg (see https://www.hamburg.de/bvm/restra/) Most stops of the metro in Hamburg have been equipped with elevators so that they are barrier-free and handicap-accessible. Until 2024 all metro statins shall be barrier-free (https://www.hochbahn.de/hochbahn/hamburg/de/Home/Naechster_Halt/Ausbau_und_Projekte/Barrierefreier_Ausbau) The regional traffic association (Hamburger Verkehrsverbund HVV) has edited several guidelines, e.g. for planning accessible bus-stops https://www.kreis-pinneberg.de/pinneberg_media/Dokumente/Stabsstelle+015/Barrierefreier+%C3%A4PNV/20190216+Leitfaden+BfrA+Bushaltstellen+final.pdf. The traffic association HVV also offers trainings for seniors, supported by experienced seniors (see https://www.hvv.de/senioren) The competence center for living barrier-free provides knowledge and gives advice concerning barrier-free planning and communication https://www.barrierefrei-leben.de/. The GreenSAM pilot in Hamburg mainly addressed the aspects of accessibility and acceptability.
2. Factors related to green age-friendly urban mobility

It is a well-established fact that being able to move is an instrumental daily activity to any age group. Being mobile can be regarded as an integral part of sense of self and feeling whole. Therefore, it is understandable that even a small decline in such a core ability may have considerable negative impacts on the quality of life. In fact, losing either the opportunity for autonomous, independent living or the ability to participate in various activities may lead to adverse effects such as passiveness, general loss of abilities, decreased mental, social and physical health as well as social exclusion and isolation among the elderly. The end-result may be a vicious circle: diminished out-of-home mobility may increase exclusion and isolation and lead to even more immobility, which in turn may cause various unfavourable health impacts.

The aim of any urban mobility system should be, therefore, to provide people of all ages with the opportunity to travel conveniently and safely. In addition, by linking age-friendliness and sustainable travel modes, such as public transport, walking and cycling, we can create urban mobility systems, which tackle two of the major challenges of our time: ageing populations and climate change. **There is a need for developing green travelling alternatives in order to enable older people to be mobile and to be less dependent on individual cars.** Besides mobility, green mobility alternatives facilitate participation in different activities. Furthermore, cycling and walking increase health benefits.

Increasing the age-friendliness of green urban mobility systems benefits all age groups: even those with no challenges in their ability to move may find it more comfortable and easier to travel in a city which considers the most vulnerable groups.
2.1 Needs and characteristics of age-friendly mobility

One key issue is that green urban mobility planning should ideally consider the different needs for age-friendly mobility that are:

- **Primary**, i.e. the need to get from place A to place B. These trips include necessary or utilitarian travel, e.g. travelling to doctor appointments.

- **Secondary**, i.e. social and psychosocial needs, such as, independence, control and need to be normal. These trips include travelling to meet friends, family or people in general.

- **Tertiary** transport needs. These are leisure, spontaneous or aesthetic needs, such as, travel for its own sake. Examples of these types of trips are travelling to a countryside cottage, to hobbies or Sunday rides that are made just for the sake of travelling.

Planning systems that aim to fulfil all the three types of needs may increase the acceptance of public transport among older people. Different trips may realize multiple needs, e.g. travelling to a doctors’ appointment may also fulfil social and aesthetic needs. Usually, necessary travel needs are better covered in mobility planning than discretionary trips such as social travel or leisure.

**Mobility patterns of older people**

Mobility patterns of older people are not stable, but susceptible to changes caused by various factors, such as changes in one’s physical and mental health, economy, or major life events. Major life events include, for example, retirement, death of a spouse or a partner, divorce, birth of grandchildren, loss of a driving license or moving to a care home. The changes in mobility patterns may connect with a decreased ability to overcome challenges related to the use of mobility services.
In the mobility patterns, individual, social and material resources, personal goals as well as people’s knowledge and competences in order to understand and use the transport systems need to be considered, too.

It has been noted that although it is important to understand old people as a heterogeneous group, there are some tendencies in older people’s mobility, including:

- The elderly are more active and healthier than previous generations of equivalent age, thus green transport modes may play a crucial role in maintaining their active life
- Older people seek more flexibility for their trips that is provided for by fixed-route services
- Older people tend to travel shorter distances during a more constrained time frame than other adults, for instance, not that much at peak hours or at night
- In general, the elderly make fewer trips than other adults
- The use of car decreases: changes in physics and cognition often force people to give up driving. Still, the car is the most used mode of travel among the older population in the Western world; often due to the lack of valid alternatives for car use. Older people are often more familiar with car use than with using green mobility alternatives: the change in attitudes towards sustainable urban mobility is an important aspect.

**Journey chain**

Understanding the entire journey chain is essential; all of its parts should work and provide an equally positive experience to the end-user. Each transport mode, from walking, cycling, bus, train, tram or metro to flexible transport solutions, is one part of the chain. All the transport modes should be integrated to each other in order for the entire journey chain to be successful.

The journey chain:

- Starts from the starting point which often is a person’s home
- Continues from home to a stop or to a station
- Goes on from the stop to the vehicle, for instance to a bus
- The next part of the chain is the journey itself in the vehicle
- When the desired arrival stop is reached, one needs to get from the vehicle to the stop
- The final part of the chain is to reach the destination from the stop
Older people’s travel purposes are simpler compared to younger people’s; however, their journey chains are as complex as anyone else’s.

Furthermore, people who live outside urban areas should be considered. For instance: service lines, demand-responsive transport or voluntary transport services should be available when public transportation is limited or does not exist. For instance, demand-responsive transport can take a person to a stop from where urban transportation is reached.

2.2 Mobility services of good quality

Older people depend strongly on the mobility services provided by cities; however, the mere existence of a mobility service does not yet guarantee that older people will utilize it. There are many reasons why older people may not use green transport modes, such as public transport. Any negative occurrence during a journey affects the general experience; sometimes one bad or discouraging experience is enough.

Policy making processes should take ageing people into account. Integrated planning and cross-sectoral dialogue are needed to make green transport modes more age-friendly. It should be remembered that older people are not a homogenous group and different approaches should be used for different groups. Older people are experts of their own environment; it is important to listen and involve the people.

Age-friendly mobility systems have some core attributes, which need to be somehow addressed for older people to utilize various mobility services. If an urban mobility system does not fulfil these requirements at least partly, it may be difficult to get older people, or other users, on-board. Taking the characteristics of age-friendly urban mobility into account help urban planners to find tools that can encourage older people’s utilization of public transport services, as well as increase the quality of life among seniors. The main characteristics of age-friendly mobility systems include availability, acceptability, accessibility and affordability.

Availability

**Availability:** The mobility system should be available to older people. For example, if the routes of local bus lines do not cover important service hubs (e.g. hospitals, grocery shops), older people rather use other modes of transport, even if the local public transport system was otherwise appropriate.

Transportation should also aim to fulfil secondary and tertiary transport needs, such as travel to leisure, not only people’s basic needs to get from A to B. Older people can manage their travel needs to a large degree even without the ability to drive a car if they have:

- A high-quality transport system available
- Activities that are accessible and properly localized and organized in time and space
- Sufficient experience with alternative transport modes
Besides walking, cycling, buses, trains, metro and taxis, there are new, more flexible mobility services. **Flexible transport solutions (FTS)** can be characterized being between a regular bus and a custom service, such as taxis. FTS include demand responsive buses, shared cars and taxis, community transport or dedicated services for disabled people. Furthermore, new intelligent technologies, such as self-driving autonomous vehicles, may help to increase availability and flexibility. Information on all the mobility alternatives should be transparently and clearly delivered to older people in order to avoid negative and presumptive attitudes. Examples of good availability of services are:

- **Strategic planning; comprehensive and appropriate networks:** bus stops and shelters are available close to home and destinations.

- **Service lines** are particularly suitable for the elderly and people with reduced mobility. For instance, in the GreenSAM partner city of **Turku**, buses on the service lines can stop outside actual bus stop areas and all the buses on these lines are low-floor buses with wide doors and spacious interiors. The drivers are trained to be service-friendly, buses include wheelchair ramps and the routes are planned based on needs of the elderly. Most of the service users are elderly and the service has received positive feedback. In Turku, out of all the bus card holders, the percentage of seniors is 12%. However, there are lots of seniors who travel with more expensive single tickets.

- In the municipalities surrounding the city of **Turku**, **demand responsive transport**, where bus routes are based on the needs of customers, is in use.

- GreenSAM partner city **Riga**’s pilot aims to improve green mobility services and solutions for seniors and raise their awareness and ability to use contemporary green urban mobility technologies. Availability of public transport stops and senior friendly public space nearby public transportation was fostered in Riga.

- GreenSAM partner city of **Hamburg** works intensely on a sustainable traffic turn. Therefore, cycling and pedestrian traffic, public transportation (PT) and sharing offers shall be further extended. Sharing offers are provided at PT stations (by hvv switch). An app (by Anewly) is available with which one can book tickets for PT and shuttle on demand. Car-sharing offers will also be included in the app. Sharing offers are mainly available in the inner parts of the city but shall be extended to suburban areas in the years to come. This has also been a wish of the seniors who were involved in the GreenSAM pilot in Hamburg. There will also be a further metro line (U5): the building will start in 2021. Furthermore, the bus-line-network will be extended.
In the north-eastern part of Hamburg-Eimsbüttel, an electric minibus driven by volunteers serves as a shuttle to the next sub-centre twice a week. It started in March 2020 and is still running, even though the rules due to the pandemic have been very strict in winter and spring (only members of one household were allowed). The so-called citizen bus is also a good example of strengthening neighbourhoods as people get to know others who live nearby.

GreenSAM follower city Gothenburg has introduced “Flexlinjen” that is a form of age-friendly public transport consisting of accessible minibuses that operate on 29 different flex lines and cover all districts in Gothenburg. “Flexlinjen” also functions as a meeting point for seniors. The bus drivers are educated in giving good service and meeting the needs for the main target group.

Barriers related to the availability of services may be

- Unsuitable timetables, for instance during off-peak times
- Inadequate route coverage or connectivity with other transport modes
- Unreliability or inaccuracy of services

Acceptability

Acceptability: A mobility system should be something that older people are willing to use; for example: safe, comfortable and user-friendly. Acceptability includes the attitudes or biases older people may have towards various transport modes. For example, an older person might be reluctant to use buses, because of a bad experience 20 years ago.

Encouraging older people to use green transport modes is crucial: gaining positive experiences even when a person is still driving a car, for instance, increases the acceptability of the modes and the probability of later life utilization. Supporting older people in striving for meaningful goals in their lives is an important aspect as well: it contributes to more mobility, leaving home more often, better health and the quality of life.

Green mobility should be comfortable and safe. Friendly attitude and the awareness of other pedestrians, cyclists, co-travellers and public transport or car drivers related to special needs of older people and the disabilities they may have, should be increased in order to avoid unpleasant situations. Training should be given to the drivers as well as to older people themselves regarding how to use public transportation comfortably and safely.
Older people’s awareness of different public transportation alternatives, practices, and health benefits of walking and cycling should be increased. Safety can be enhanced via allocated planning, fall hazard assessments and enhancing the collection of data, for instance.

The AENEAS project’s (Attaining Energy-Efficient Mobility in an Ageing Society) main objective was enabling and encouraging older people to use energy-efficient mobility in five European cities through concrete measures in the areas of mobility management, training, awareness raising and communication. The project organized for example:

- **Passenger, bus driver and staff trainings**: older people were encouraged to use buses and drivers were trained to be aware of older people’s specific needs and understand them as pedestrians. It was noticed that the image of a public transport provider can be improved significantly by improving services to senior citizens (Salzburg).

- The evaluation of the above mentioned passenger and staff training showed that **safe mobility can be relearned** – even, or especially in higher age. Older people can gain back routine in stressful situations by empowering personal resources and expanding skills and abilities. The training helped to reduce fears and behave safely. Also, a safety brochure was made that contains all the topics of the training and defines safe behavior in public transport.

- **Trainings for young people**: The idea was to raise children’s awareness of the requirements and needs of older people in the context of seniors’ mobility in public transportation, and promote appropriate behaviours towards older people in public transportation (Krakow).

- **Project partner Valonia** piloted senior peer-mentoring in GreenSAM partner city of **Turku** in 2019: seniors that are experienced bus users mentored seniors that are unfamiliar with public transportation. The pilot was successful. In the next part of the pilot, adolescents will mentor seniors in using public transport applications and the city’s bicycle sharing system.

- **The pilot in GreenSAM partner city of Aarhus** encourages seniors to change attitudes to more positive towards public transport, ride sharing and renting e-bikes.

- **Riga**, as a partner of the GreenSAM project, improved the overall acceptability of the silver age green mobility and digitalization in a post-Covid era. Riga organized a training and six Mobility Lab sessions for senior citizens to improve their digital skills and knowledges about sustainable mobility.

- In 2018, a Shuttle on Demand Service (ioki Hamburg) was established in some parts of Hamburg as part of the public transportation (PT) system. The vehicles are accessible for people in a wheelchair and mostly electric. Together with an adult education center, trainings were offered for seniors on how to use the shuttle (via using a smartphone app). Also, **coordination of the surroundings of PT stations** regularly checks the quality of the environment of PT stops in close contact with the user group and suggests improvements to different stakeholders (municipality, mobility providers etc.). These stakeholders have been important experts and multipliers in the GreenSAM pilot in Hamburg. The pilot not
only addressed how to diminish physical barriers in public space but also social aspects; the subjective feeling of security and the quality of stay at change-over points is also in focus.

- GreenSAM follower city, Gdynia, has organized workshops for seniors on safe cycling in cooperation with stakeholders in 2018.

Barriers related to acceptability are often psycho-social factors:

- Attitudes towards public transportation or deep-rooted habits related to car use
- These barriers may relate to lack of safety, general discomfort, poor service quality and not feeling welcome
- Negative attitudes of other cyclists, pedestrians, passengers and public transport drivers towards older people have an effect

**Walking and cycling** are good ways to travel especially in urban areas: they bring health benefits and are environmentally friendly and often the fastest and the easiest ways to get from one place to another. With allocated planning and recognizing the barriers, walking and cycling can be made easier and safer for older people. There are barriers for the elderly related especially to health, safety and the built environment.

- **Health-related** barriers can be sensory (e.g. reduced perception and hearing), cognitive (problems in spatial navigation and orientation) or physical (e.g. reduced mobility, loss of agility and flexibility)
- **Safety** barriers may relate to the feeling of safety or negative attitudes of other cyclists or walkers. Also, social barriers, such as decreased ability to process information, have an effect.
- **Built environment and infrastructure** related barriers are, for instance, poor quality of walking and cycling routes and dispersed services and activities throughout the city, beyond a reasonable walking or cycling distance. Also, difficulties in crossing the streets in time due to reduced walking speed may be a problem. Fear of falling is connected to all these barriers: falling certainly is a significant risk for older people.

- The GreenSAM partner city of Gdansk will pilot what barriers keep seniors from cycling and how to overcome these barriers. The participative pilot activities include professional field exploration and testing and training sessions with e-tricycles, for instance.

- In the project partner Turku, physiotherapists were involved in the pilot where silver age people tested city bikes. The physiotherapists compiled hints for city bike use based on their observation and discussions with participants. Electrically assisted bikes are easier and more optimal for the silver age people; they can cycle longer with the assistance which also has significant
role in maintaining health and condition.

- Project partner, Riga has piloted new bike lines and universal age friendly design in the Čaka and Bruņinieku streets to overcome cycling and walking barriers. Safe and separated bike lines (separate from other the traffic) have been implemented.

- In Hamburg, the relevant regional and local authorities decided on the “Alliance for Cycling” together with several stakeholders, based on three columns of infrastructure, communication and service in 2016. Since then, the cycling infrastructure has been massively expanded as more resources were provided. This alliance is extending and will also include pedestrian traffic. As the first alliance was criticized by NGOs and citizens for not taking into account the needs of elderly or children and youngsters, these aspects are now incorporated. Also, the aspect of participation and communication is strengthened. Many districts of Hamburg have elaborated concepts for pedestrian traffic, e.g. for Eidelstedt, a suburban area within the borough of Eimsbuettel. For this concept, an online participation and a joint walk with citizens were realized (this were the only tools that were possible due to Covid-19). Hamburg is working intensely on strengthening cycling and pedestrian traffic as important parts of a climate-friendly traffic transition. The Ministry of transport has been transformed into the Ministry of transport and traffic transition.
Accessibility

**Accessibility:** The system should exist in a way that enables older people to fulfil their needs, e.g. the mobility system should be accessible to older people. The characteristics covers both physical and digital accessibility. Various physical or digital barriers may greatly decrease the willingness of a person to use a particular transport mode.

**Physical accessibility** can be enhanced via introduction of more accessible infrastructure: public transportation stops, stations, vehicles and routes. Stops and stations should be well designed and include good and well-lit shelters and enough benches. More accessible footpaths, kerbs and ramps as well as removal of obstacles in walking paths and increasing benches and toilets also along the way is important. Low-floor buses and ramp-assisted technologies help the elderly. On-board facilities, like standing and moving spaces, should be appropriate. Related to cycling, bike lanes should be safe to use which means they should be separated from other traffic.

Timetables and other relevant information should be clearly visible and understandable – the information should be provided all along the journey. Older people need clear travel information more than other people due to declined physical and mental conditions as, for example, many older people cannot stand for long, are sensitive to weather conditions, cannot do things quickly, and cannot walk long distances. Older people may require additional information, such as the location of lifts at multi-floored stations, availability of low-floor buses or payment options. **Digital accessibility** means the capacity of finding information online and using ICT tools.

- **Online courses:** In the AENeAS in Munich, over 300 older passengers were trained to use the internet to get information about sustainable transport services, to buy tickets, make train reservations and use car sharing.

- **In the GreenSAM partner city of Hamburg,** surrounding infrastructure and public spaces of public transport stations are improved to more age friendly. The project pilot in Hamburg provided a guideline for senior-friendly change-over. The guideline includes many aspects of barrier-free planning and provides an overview as well as possible solutions. The guideline will be available in German and in English. At the pilot site, several improvements to enhance the age-friendliness (and user friendliness in general) of a congested point were implemented. In other pilot site, the situation of pedestrians was considered.

- The project partner city of Tartu, pilots innovative participative ICT tool that can be applied to city’s bicycle sharing system and increasing the system’s age-friendliness.

- GreenSAM follower city of Gdynia has introduced low-floor trolley buses equipped with information systems for passengers and ramps for prams and wheelchairs. Another follower city, Gothenburg, had a seating campaign aimed at seniors that included replacing, renovating and introducing new accessible seating in green areas, public spaces and streets. In the follower city of Växjö, the city has information campaigns, together with pensioners’ organizations, to the older
population regarding the possibility for cycling and public transport, updated maps of the cycling infrastructure, and a new sign system for cycling lanes with distances to relevant destinations.

Accessibility barriers may be physical or digital:

**Physical barriers**
- Accessibility during the entire journey chain; for instance, inaccessible bus stops or buses, difficulties in standing in a moving bus or long waiting times
- Health related barriers

**Digital barriers**
- Problems in finding information online for instance on ticketing options, timetables, maps and directions both at stops and on-board
- Difficulties in using mobile apps
- Lack of awareness related to different transport options

**Affordability**

**Affordability:** Use of the system should be possible within the financial means of older people, e.g. if the use of a transport mode is too expensive, an older person will naturally not utilize such a mode.

Many older people have less income in retirement, and thus the use of transport system should be possible within the financial means of older people. This can be done via concessionary schemes; free or lower fares should be available through the whole journey chain. For instance, in **Luxembourg**, public transportation is free for all. Examples from different cities are:
“Patenticket” in Cologne. Innovative word-of-mouth advertising and buddy scheme: owners of the “Aktiv60 ticket” have been asked to convince friends and relatives to a three-month free trial of the senior’s ticket.

Free public transport for all citizens in Estonia and in GreenSAM partner city of Tartu

Senior discount tickets in public transportation are available in all Green SAM partner cities. In GreenSAM partner city of Riga, there is free public transportation for seniors. In Turku, those with rollator/walker can travel with the public transport bus for free daily between 9 AM - 1 PM.

The city of Riga developed an innovative concept for blockchain-based mobility and public transportation payment system which will enable the silver age residents to use affordable shared mobility services and thus improve their green mobility patterns.

There are cheaper tickets for seniors in the project partner city of Hamburg (aged 63+). Until 2019 the monthly tickets for seniors were only valid outside the rush hour. Since the end of 2019, they are valid during the whole day. In general, the pricing system of the regional public transportation is very complicated and not so cheap, an aspect that seniors named several times as a problem in the first phase of the GreenSAM pilot.

GreenSAM follower city Gothenburg has introduced a senior card that gives free access to public transportation during weekends, and weekdays except for rush hours. In the city, car use has decreased 24–35% among people over 65.

Barriers related to the affordability of services are:

- Expensive tickets or lack of age-related incentives. For instance, the use of taxi is often seen as a too expensive option for regular transportation. Older people tend to spend more money on health or food and less to transportation, for instance.

The GreenSAM partner cities estimated in localized analysis how well they take 4 A:s into account. Evaluation was based on the scale: 1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=neither agree or disagree 4=agree 5=strongly agree. Affordability and acceptability, in terms of comprehensiveness of transport system, were rated the highest (both 4,6/5). On the other hand, accessibility; especially digital accessibility (2,8/5) and making the whole journey chain comprehensive (3/5), are the things that need the most development in the future.
Picture 4: 4A:s in the GreenSAM partner cities.
3 Participatory approach

Participation can be defined as possibility to participate in decision-making, concerning both individuals’ everyday life but also the wider society and political system. Public participation is traditionally reasoned by its value to administration. This instrumental approach contains perceptions according to which citizen participation strengthens public support and acceptance for policy initiatives, identifies previously unforeseen concerns, and reveals potential conflicts. In addition, citizen participation is expected to provide information that will improve the quality and effectiveness of planning and decision-making. Instrumental value is generally assessed through its costs and usefulness to administration. Generally, participation is regarded expensive and time-consuming.

Public participation is justified also by the democratic rights of citizens. In some cases, the participation itself has been regarded more important by participants than the actual outcome. It can provide personal satisfaction and recognition. Participation also has a strong equality dimension. It can promote and provide participation channels for hard to reach groups, marginalized citizens and other people that do not have ways to influence decision-making. In addition, participation has a social learning and knowledge transfer dimension while people are monitoring others’ opinions. In general, participation can enhance social cohesion, the legitimacy, accountability and transparency of policy and citizens’ trust to administration and governing institutions.

Why citizen participation?

Value to administration (instrumental approach)
- strengthens legitimacy, public support and acceptance of policy initiatives
- enhances transparency and promotes trust in governing institutions
- identifies previously unforeseen concerns
- reveals potential conflicts
- provides information that will improve the quality and effectiveness of planning and decision-making
- enhances social cohesion

Value to citizen
- democratic dimension
- equality dimension: channels for hard to reach groups, marginalized citizens
- provides personal satisfaction and recognition
- promotes social learning and knowledge transfer, creates social capital

Weaknesses:
- expensive and time-consuming
Co-creation

More recently, the trend to view citizens as partners has strengthened. It has been underlined that citizens should be involved in co-production of public values irrespectively of their legitimating function. Participation has been accompanied with the conception of co-creation. As participation, co-creation is often assumed to produce better quality, customer-oriented and less costly public services. The core of co-creation is to engage into incorporation a wider range of perspectives. The aim is to create partnership between local authorities and citizens especially concerning public services. It involves end-users of services in designing, managing, delivering and evaluating the public services. The essence of co-creation is the formation of new relationships and reconfiguration of roles. While engaging all relevant stakeholders, including decision-makers, co-creation is expected to consider also the constraint of reality and thus avoiding the unrealistic expectations usually challenging the traditional participation.

Senior participation

Co-creation changes the roles of participants, while citizens are regarded as resources to city development. Especially the attitude towards elderly people seems to be in change. The respect of tacit knowledge and expert by experience are new dimensions in working life. For example, in Germany, after retirement, elderly people are trained to operate as mentors in the field which can utilize their knowledge. Discussions about Third Age similarly point out the wide group of pensioners, who are out of working life but still very healthy and active in society.

Tacit knowledge: The component of knowledge that is widely held by individuals but not able to be readily expressed. It is expertise, skill, and ‘know how’, as opposed to codified knowledge.

Expert by experience: An expert by experience is a person who has lived experience on some issue. Experience-based knowledge is needed for developing services, changing attitudes and creating an understanding of challenges which people meet during their lifespan. An experience cannot be only studied; it must be lived first.

The Third Age is now considered by many to be the “golden years” of adulthood. It is generally defined as the span of time between retirement and the beginning of age-imposed physical, emotional, and cognitive limitations, and today would roughly fall between the ages of 65 and 80+.
Elderly people’s contribution

Elderly people can give a considerable contribution for developers as:

- elderly people are active

It is indicated that political activity is notable among elderly people. In Finland, age has turned to be one of the most relevant indicators in explaining societal or political participation, even more relevant than for example gender, language or education.

- elderly people are experienced

It is common that they have lived long in the same municipality and they have long experience of using public services.

- elderly people are motivated

In addition, elderly people are usually devoted to their living environment. Surveys in Finland have evidenced that elderly people are more committed to municipals than other age groups. Further, elderly people identify themselves more with their environment, city district and neighbourhood than other age groups.

Restrictions of senior participation

Still, many European research and development projects indicate that older people are not involved in or affecting transport planning and design. Even though the right to participate is age-neutral and has a legislative basis in many European countries, several dimensions make aged people’s actual participation less effective than that of other age groups:

- physical, economic and social restrictions
- aged groups are less represented in policy level and decision-making organs
- civil servants and city planners represent the working life age groups
Try to avoid common weaknesses in understanding participation.

The participatory approach frequently confronts the contradiction: in general, it is widely supported, but the implementation of participation is not at the same level. This creates a gap between the aspiration to age-friendly environments and their realization. The problem arises from the lack of awareness of age-related issues as well as the unknown consequences of decisions to everyday life of the elderly population. Problems may be:

- **to confuse the aims of participation to the tools of participation.**
  Participation is not an event. It is a long-lasting co-creation process, which starts from the needs of people and continues to the empowering of the people. This process contains co-operation, co-designing and decision-making as well as evaluation of the implementation of decisions. Without this aspect, participation easily meets the criticism of being formulaic in nature and lacking the influence on the decision-making.

- **to improve participation procedures is not sufficient**
  Simultaneously with improving participatory procedures, processes of administration should be reconsidered, especially the procedures by which administration is managing public participation. The way administrators are managing participation is a rarely addressed issue, even though legislation only gives the general legal requirements leaving the practical arrangements to administrators. Public sector entities are usually large and complex and prefer to implement policies through standard administrative channels.

- **narrow interpretation of participation**
  The administrative culture and attitudes might hold a relatively narrow interpretation of participation. Administrators further determine the extent of participation, choose participants, shape the ways that the participation takes place and assess the value and usefulness of the process. Administrators might perceive their task more as balancing competing needs than implementing will of the public.

- **elderly people are regarded as a homogeneous group**
  Participation procedures for older people are often designs for a homogenous group. Still, there is constant tension between older people as frail and needy and older people as resourceful, proactive and engaged. When planning participation or implementing old-age policy, a clear specification between self-acting senior citizens and old people who need support and nursing should be made.

- **narrow insight to individual role as a consumer/service user**
  In the common approach to individual travel and activity participation, it is assumed that individuals make choices on the basis of the range of opportunities available to them, but it does not take into account the active participation of individuals in the possible extension of their range of opportunities. Opportunities for mobility are not a fixed structure but something that is managed, shaped and directed by individuals.
3.1 Key aspects of participatory approach

Legislative basis

Some research findings suggest that if participation is not formalized, it may well not occur. Legislation often demands administrators to facilitate participation, but rarely have details how to achieve participation. Yet, legislation has an important function in participation as giving the ground for participatory activities, providing citizens a tool for demanding participation and pronouncing the societal expression of intent. Frequently participation is inherent in national urban planning legislation. Some countries have specific legislation for the elderly, young people or end-users in public services.

To achieve permanent changes or changes in operational or administrative procedures, decisions in policy level are demanded. To ensure the sustainability of changes often requires integration to wider programmes or plans of the city with legitimation and validity to city officials. A legislative basis ensures the equality and validity of the participation.
**Denmark:** The Planning Act involves the public in the planning process at the municipal, regional and national levels. Before a municipal plan, a regional spatial development plan, a national planning directive or a national planning report may be adopted, a proposal and a report on the premises of the proposal must be published. Property owners, neighbors, nongovernmental organizations, public authorities and others then have at least 8 weeks to submit their objections, comments, proposals or protests. The Planning Act stipulates minimum rules on public participation.

**Finland:** The Act on Supporting the Functional Capacity of the Older Population and on Social and Health Care Services for Older Persons entered into force in July 2013. According to the Act, the older population has the right to participate in the preparation of decisions influencing their living conditions and in planning services they need in the municipality. Participation is involved in the Local Government Act, Land Use and Building Act and several other laws and acts. In 2015, the Local Government Act was revised and an obligation to city councils to not just ensure possibilities but also methods of participation was added.

**Germany:** In Federal Building Code, Public Participation is fixed as follows: The public is to be informed at the earliest possible stage about the general aims and purposes of planning, about significantly different solutions which are being considered for the redesign or development of an area, and of the probable impact of the scheme; the public is to be given suitable opportunity for comment and discussion. (…) The resulting drafts of land use plans have to be on public display for some time. The possibility of lodging suggestions is clearly regulated in the code, too. The “public” is not specified any further except for children and young people who are named explicitly.

**Estonia:** Estonia does not have legislation about citizens participation. It is only obligatory to ask during the planning process of building or land use and ensure that people who are living there or neighboring know about future developments.

**Latvia:** National urban planning legislation. Riga city does not have any specific activities for the participation of elderly people.

**Poland:** The public policy framework for older people in Poland were determined by the document of Council of Ministers in 2013 titled Long-Term Senior Policy in Poland for years 2014-2020. Verified and updated document was adopted in 2018 titled Social Policy for Older People 2030. Security. Solidarity. Participation - a document defining directions of social policy in regard to older people. In 2015, the Act on elderly people was adopted. The act has obliged public administration bodies, state organisational units and other organisations involved in determining situation of elderly people to monitor their situation in Poland, which results in the Information on the Situation of Elderly People in Poland, prepared every year.

*Picture 5. Legislation for participation in the countries of partner and follower cities.*
Action plans and programmes

Besides legislation, action plans and programmes are important mechanisms to promote participation and age-friendliness. Elderly people are highly affected by the features of the urban neighbourhood and thus it is imperative to create exact and strategic plans in order to evaluate age-friendliness and ensure the quality of life for aging people. WHO strategies on aging are important, city level planning often uses them as a basis. For example, **Strategy and action plan for healthy ageing in Europe, 2012–2020.**

**EU Action Plan on Urban Mobility** does not have much on ageing population, but EU has its own **AGE Platform Europe Strategy 2018–2021** that focuses on older people and on their participation. EU also has for instance **Creating age-friendly environments in Europe – a tool for local policymakers and planners,** which concentrates on the ageing population and their participation.

Older people’s participation and mobility is deeper considered in the local level (for instance plans of Tampere, London, Manchester and Madrid) In Manchester and Madrid, local age-friendly approach is based on WHO eight domains of age-friendly.

Plans of other cities and additional information of sustainable, mobility and ageing programmes and reports are in the **Literature** section.

Among the GreenSAM project partners and follower cities, four of seven cities have an action plan for age-friendly or similar activity: Gdansk, Gothenburg, Gdynia, Hamburg, Turku, Tampere and Växjö. In Gdansk the “cloud” concept of the Gdańsk Development Strategy 2030 plus brings together a variety of issues that have an impact on the lives of all of the people of Gdańsk, through 9 operational programmes: education, public health and sports, social integration and community participation, culture and free time, innovation and enterprise, investment attractiveness, infrastructure, mobility and transport, public space. Each of the nine operational programmes addresses the needs and expectations of all, including people with disabilities and older people living in Gdansk. Two documents (survey 2012 “Old Age in Gdansk”, 2014 “Recommendations”) are the basis for Gdansk’s social policy addressing older people. For this purpose the following additional programs were adopted: Economic security and indebted people support program; Gdańsk Social Housing Program; Offices of free legal aid, civic counselling and mediation - appointed on the basis of the Act of 5 August 2015 ; Long-term Program of Cooperation with NGOs; Mental Health Care Program. In Gdynia, important initiatives have been:

1. The whole policy of intergenerational Integration and activation of Gdynia senior citizens
2. Gdynia Senior Activity Centre and Third Year University for seniors over 60: around 10 000 citizens take part every year in the complex university, activation and sport activities
3. Research walks and sentimental maps: building dialogue and engaging citizens into participation and decision-making processes in Gdynia
Finland
Turku: An age policy strategy was made in 2014 but it focuses more on social and health care.
Tampere: A senior programme has been working on participation and quality of life for the elderly for many years. The programme has concentrated on age-friendliness for the last two years. This work has mostly consisted of coordination and cooperation between different city sectors and projects.

Sweden
Växjö: The city has information campaigns including presentations, together with pensioners' organizations, to the older population regarding health and safety issues. This includes information about the possibility for cycling and public transport, updated maps of the cycling infrastructure, and a new sign system for cycling lanes with distances to relevant destinations.
Gothenburg: 11 seniors have participated in creating the Action plan for Age-friendly Gothenburg, co-producing with public officials what interventions need to be implemented in order to become more age-friendly regarding mobility and transport. Good seating options are vital for seniors to prolong their outdoor visits. Recently, the city had a Seating Campaign, consisting of replacing, renovating and allocating new accessible seating in green areas, public spaces and streets.

Poland
Government Programme for Social Participation of Senior Citizens for 2014–2020 and the Multi-Annual Programme Senior+ for 2015–2020. In addition, the Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy has been implementing the “Secure and Active Senior” informational campaign, whose objective is to raise public awareness of issues related to security and active life of older people.
Gdynia: Diverse initiatives create substantial effects for Gdynia municipality and, what is the most important, build up the real dialogue with Gdynia citizens.

Germany
Hamburg: In a first step, the report “Getting Older in Hamburg” will address the diverse living conditions and lifestyles of older people as well as formulate goals, design options and measures to take into account their interests and needs. Concrete measures are being developed with which the city’s plans are geared more towards a longer life and an aging population.
In the report it is named that the Seniors advisory Boards should be involved in the housing programmes of the boroughs, especially regarding aspects of barrier-free planning and renovation.

Picture 6: Action plans and programmes in partner countries and follower cities.
Valid system for participation

A valid system for participation ensures the real influence in official decision-making. It promotes careful preparation of issues and involvement of all relevant stakeholders. The most common system for the representation of elderly people is elderly councils.

Elderly councils or boards are established in several countries in Europe, e.g. Sweden, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway and Poland. They have been established since the 1970s, (in Scandinavia already in the 1960s) and become especially popular in the last decade. In many countries they are statutory, namely in Denmark, Norway, Finland and Poland.

The role of the elderly council is usually to operate as an advisory and consultative body in issues concerning older people’s interests in local government policies. They are also important mediators between NGOs and other associations. Often, they are comprised of representatives of associations of the elderly. Usually they are appointed by the city council, which in some countries is also obligated by law to establish elderly councils (Finland, Poland). However, in Denmark, the elderly council is chosen by popular vote. All citizens over 60 years old are electorates and eligible to be candidates. Despite the fact that elderly councils do not usually have decision-making power, they are important local entities supporting elderly people’s initiatives. They are also valuable stakeholders in programmes and projects.
Finland/Turku: Each local authority in Finland has a local council of the elderly that the local authorities are obliged to consult in the planning, preparation and monitoring of any activities that concern elderly residents. The local council of the elderly is therefore an important link between the elderly population and communal planning and decision-making, which enables participation of the aged population. Turku developed an operational model for the participation of people in 2012. Based on this, the city has developed a model with a focus especially on seniors to increase their participation in decision-making, planning and operation. The elderly council consists of elderly associations and organizations and it works as a channel to influence decisions and services regarding seniors.

Denmark/Aarhus: In 1995, it was decided by law that senior councils should be elected in all Danish municipalities. The Act entered into force on 1 January 1997. The Elderly / Senior Councils constitute a new forum in Danish political and administrative practice. The intention is that the municipal, political and administrative level must involve the elderly / senior council in and exercise influence on decisions and actions in municipalities in all areas that concern the elderly population. The knowledge about the living conditions of the elderly and about the impact of the public services that the councils of the elderly help to gather needs to be summarized and passed on to decision-makers in parliament, government, regions and municipalities.

Latvia/Riga: Elderly associations and NGOs representing elderly people’s interests. During the Green SAM project activities under the local senior association “RASA” have been established senior council to give support for senior friendly city planning and to protect senior interests.

Estonia/Tartu: Elderly committees or boards. Elderly representatives in official teams. Panels.

Poland/Gdansk: The city delivers its policy addressed to the older population through its City Hall Departments and agencies. The Department for Social Development and Municipal Family Support Services Centre are the lead organizations for the city’s relevant social policy. The Mayor of Gdansk established the Gdansk Seniors Council in 2007, a consultation and advisory group on senior citizens’ issues. To ensure a comprehensive and collaborative approach to seniors’ issues, the Mayor appointed a Senior Citizens Officer on 30 September 2011. In April 2015, the Mayor appointed an Advisor for Social Policy. In 2018, The City Council established the Seniors Council in Gdansk, as a representation of the elderly in Gdansk (the council consists of 31 senior representatives). In addition, in Gdansk, official teams have elderly representatives and there are 34 District Councils.

Germany/Hamburg: In Hamburg, there is a “Seniorenmitwirkungsgesetz” (Senior Participation Code). The aim of the Code is to strengthen the active participation of seniors in social, societal, cultural and political life. According to this Code in every borough a commission of 100 senior delegates has to be elected for four years. It has to be ensured that this commission represents the heterogeneity among seniors including men and women as well as seniors with other cultural backgrounds. This commission elects the members of the Senior Advisory Board. This Board has to be involved in all issues and planning that are relevant for seniors. The members of the Board have the right to speak in the political commissions of the borough. There is also a Senior Advisory Board on the city-wide level (“Landes-Seniorenbeirat) with representatives from all Senior Advisory Boards from the boroughs and further members to be nominated.

Picture 7. Valid system of participation in partner countries participating in the GreenSAM project.
Cross-sectoral cooperation

Designing services for elderly people requires knowledge of elderly people’s living conditions from many perspectives. In improving mobility services, a multidisciplinary approach is needed in order to balance different aims, such as safety, effectivity, community and environmental goals. Participation demands knowledge transfer from the social sector to technical sector about the boundaries of aged people. Further, age-friendly participation demands change of attitudes, facilitators and skills to use participatory methods, which can be shared between different sectors. However, transport is traditionally a protected, subsidized and not very customer-oriented field. It has nearly a monopoly, which enables its quite self-sufficient role. It might not have traditions of cooperation with other city departments.

For example, in Manchester, it was recognized that elderly people’s healthcare appointments were in contradiction with the times allowing elderly people to travel in public buses without fee.

Cross-sectoral cooperation has many benefits while coordinating activities and building consensus on chosen solutions. Elderly people’s participation in different sectors can bring forth different kinds of aspects determining elderly people’s everyday life and make reasons that otherwise could remain blurred more understandable.

Challenges of cross-sectoral cooperation

In the GreenSAM partner cities, the experiences of crosscutting cooperation vary. In Hamburg, Tartu and Turku there is a tradition of cross-sectoral cooperation. In Riga and Gdansk cooperation is not so clear. In Aarhus there is no cooperative tradition.

The most general challenges for cross-sectoral cooperation among the GreenSAM partner cities are related to the lack of managerial support, negative or contrary attitudes towards cross-sectoral cooperation and lack of facilitators. Other mentioned reasons are lack of knowledge of methods. In addition, Gdansk mentioned lack of platforms for cooperation. Riga mentioned logistics (different city structures are placed in different buildings all across the city). Turku described the challenge of not knowing the right people and the culture of only taking an approach when there’s a big issue.

All partner cities yet have good practices for cross-sectoral cooperation. Gdansk, Riga, Tartu and Turku are devoted to cooperation with NGOs. Aarhus, Gdansk, Tartu and Turku use problem-based approaches. Aarhus, Gdansk and Riga use cross-sectoral teams. In addition, Aarhus and Hamburg mentioned strategic support, while Riga and Tartu mentioned political support as a good promoter of co-operation.
In **Turku** pilot, cross-sectoral cooperation was key in the success of mentoring. The outcome of the pilot, establishment of Public Transport (PT) volunteer peer support network, would not have been possible without cooperation between PT authority and local elderly NGOs. NGOs know the user group, they have active networks and run continuous activities with the silver age people.

During the project, **Riga** city has developed cross-sectoral collaboration platform for co-design and testing of innovative planning and technological solutions in urban mobility and public transport aimed to improve the green mobility offer for seniors, ensuring that seniors are not “left behind” with technological progress.

**Hamburg** pilot worked intensely together with seniors and experts to elaborate guideline and the planning for the demonstration site. Many further stakeholders (including e.g. the competence centre for barrier-free planning, but also the police who is responsible for traffic security and rules in public space) checked and commented the guideline and the planning. At the moment Hamburg tries to start a project for an artistic design of several buildings at our demonstration site an try to initiate a co-operation of private investor, artist, school, mobility provider and municipality, supported by the “Haltestellenumfeld-Koordination”. The “Alliance for cycling and pedestrian traffic” is an example on the Hamburg-wide scale for cross-sectoral co-operation (regional ministry, all seven boroughs of Hamburg, NGOs etc.).

**Co-creation**

More recently, the trend to view citizens as partners has strengthened. It has been underlined that citizens should be involved in the co-production of public values irrespectively of their legitimating function. Participation has been accompanied by the conception of co-creation. As a participation, co-creation is often assumed to produce better quality, customer-oriented and less costly public services. The core of co-creation is to engage in the incorporation wider range of perspectives. The aim is to create partnership between local authorities and citizens especially concerning public services. It involves end-users of services in designing, managing, delivering and evaluating public services. The essence of co-creation is the formation of new relationships and the reconfiguration of roles. While engaging all relevant stakeholders, including decision-makers, co-creation is expected to consider also the constraint of reality and thus avoiding unrealistic expectations usually challenging traditional participation.

In **Turku**, the final version of the on-going Public Transport (PT) peer support scheme was designed together with the user group, PT authority and a local NGO. The design of mentor network called “Föli friends” was co-created based on experiences and lessons learnt in the mentoring pilot. The plan is to continue the model annually and it could spread to all six Föli municipalities eventually. Cross-sectional cooperation is very important in this work also.

In **Riga** the Mobility Lab that unites public authorities, seniors and experts, facilitated 6 public co-design sessions. In the first run the Mobility Lab worked on solutions how to adapt urban public space to better facilitate different modes of green mobility, meeting the needs of senior population. Further, it focused on fostering use of green mobility services among seniors in the
city. Ultimately, the potential of blockchain technology application in PT has been analysed. The process led to a cross-institutional roadmap for technological innovation in green urban mobility and PT.

- On the Hamburg-wide level we have the “Stadtwerkstatt” which has developed an online participation platform (DIPAS) that can be used by all municipal and regional stakeholders. We started to use that tool very often for our plannings in the field of cycling and pedestrian traffic. GreenSAM and our online-participation has diminished the barriers to use this tool. -In Eimsbuettel there is another intense participation process running at the moment dealing with the question of a climate-friendly development of the borough (including online-participation platform, competition, online-workshops and Street Talk with our GreenSAM-cargo-bike.

**Stakeholder engagement**

Age-friendly participation is not happening solely among the target group. Facilitators are found both from the city organization and politicians and from the family and peer groups of the elderly. NGOs are experts and play an important role both in elderly people’s mobility, and in elderly people participation. Designing services also benefit from the intergenerational approach.

The challenges with top-down policy making have led to the birth of stakeholder participation in policy making for inclusive and sustainable development. The idea is that consultation with stakeholders would enhance the quality of the decision taken both substantively and procedurally.

In Manchester, focus group discussions have noted that other people are very important to the transport system for older people. According to the city’s report, sometimes connection with others enables the system to work properly. Manchester’s programme gives also an example of another important stakeholder group: actors in the community providing resources and support. Businesses’, cafes’ and other buildings’ role can be beneficial in prompting elderly people’s mobility by opening their doors for rest or using the toilet.

To ensure that all relevant stakeholders are included, the tools for stakeholder mapping have become popular. Very often stakeholders are mapped based on the structure of organizations, lists of relevant stakeholders or service providers. However, in research literature it is reminded, that in developing mobility systems, the behavioural factor might be forgotten. While concentrating on the system, the confrontation and adaptation of the elderly should be recognized. In this light it is important that
the closest persons in an individual’s life, meaning family members and friends, are included in stakeholder mapping. Further, empirical research has indicated that having family and friends correlates to the activity of mobility, suggesting that the social network potentially provides help for transport, if needed. In addition, Eurostat statistics indicate that families and friends are the most important contacts for elderly people.

In the GreenSAM project, stakeholder mapping was done by placing the elderly people in the middle of the picture and starting to think what kind of actions elderly people have in their everyday life and with who or what kind of actors he/she will be in contact. From this perspective the most relevant actors are family and friends, often lacking in stakeholder mapping. Secondly, it was thought who or what kind of actors are lacking from the picture. The third task was to study what kind of links there are between different stakeholders and if all actors are connected to others comprehensively.

Results of stakeholder mappings indicated that elderly people have generally numerous activities and places, in which they meet several stakeholders. All of these should be considered to effect on the attitudes and behavior of elderly people. Along with friends and families, there are neighbors, hobby mates, peer mates and other relatives. Extended families can include children and all the relations coming from kindergarten and nursery schools.
Different kinds of stakeholder groups, activities and activity places
(defined in GreenSAM stakeholder mapping):

- **Health services**: doctor, specialist, dentist, physiotherapist, hospital and health care system personnel, pharmacy and private health care services
- **Municipality services (in addition to health care)**: social care with social workers, volunteers, personnel in city government and city hall/other city departments, transport services
- **Everyday services**: shopping, banks, transport, special stores, hair dresser, car repair, beauty center
- **Leisure activities**: senior or community center, cafeteria, pub, hobbies and free time activities (choir, sport center, bingo, culture facilities including theatre and library), education related activities (e.g. Age University, courses), informal groups, peers and hobby mates.
- **Involvement and social participation**: citizen budget projects, chamber of disabilities, voting, honor posts, NGOs, associations,
- **Other institutions**: Police, church
- **Work life**: employer, colleagues
- **Virtual persons (e.g. TV stars)**: TV company, Radio, other media companies, internet platforms

3.2 Roles of participants and levels of participation

End-users may participate in various forms in the designing and management of services. Four different user roles are defined in co-production of services:

1. consumer: the use of services generates the value that motivates the actual provider;
2. co-performer: the user performs some tasks essential for the service;
3. co-creator: user exchanges opinions and ideas, gives advice or guidance and consultation;
4. co-designer: there is a constructive discussion between customers and provider.

An extreme approach may be for users to co-produce the services that they use.

The process of co-creation has been classified according to three types of involvement:

- citizens as co-implementer of public policy,
- citizens as co-designer and
- citizens as co-initiator
In public service development, citizens are traditionally seen as the target group of services. In the last decades, the principles of customer-oriented approach have generalized, with the belief that it is more effective to develop public services according to customers’ needs. Recent literature consists of several conceptions beginning with “co” (co-design, co-produce, co-create etc.), which describe the joint role of citizens and developers. However, what usually is still lacking is the link between developing public services and policy responses. Even in many sophisticated participatory or co-creation practices, the result of the process might be a bunch of jointly created solutions, while it remains unclear, to what extent these solutions are implemented and sustained as valid procedures.

This aspect is apparent in the Ladder of Citizen Participation, the model for assessing the quality of participation. It was formulated by Sherry Arnstein, already in 1969. According to her, real participation is not implemented until the decision-making is involved. All other levels of participation are tokenism. Even though Arnstein’s model is simplification and made in a provocative manner, it is still relevant and gives good perspective to participation planning. Arnstein’s ladders have been a significant initiator in the public participation field and several participation models ground on these original principles. However, more recently the concepts have changed. Arnstein’s partnership level is corresponding with co-creation approaches. The citizen control level is replaced with the principles of empowerment. Recently launched modes of participatory budgeting could meet the criteria of the citizen control level.

Some partner and follower cities have already experiences of participatory budgeting:

- **Tartu** was the first city in Estonia that opened its budget designing process to citizens and began experimenting with participative budgeting in 2013. Citizens of Tartu can decide how their city should spend 200,000 EUR, which is about 1% of the subsequent year’s investment budget.

- Civic budget in **Gdansk** allocates 18.5 million zloty to citizens’ projects in 2020.

- **Tampere** has a 450 000 EUR reservation in the budget 2020 towards promoting the wellbeing of children and young people by participatory budgeting. Local residents submit their ideas related to the given theme, develop these ideas at workshops, and then select the ones to be implemented through voting. All persons who at least 12 years old can vote.

- **Turku** City Council has accepted the model of participatory budgeting, which will be implemented during the spring 2020. The Budget is 1 million euros.
Arnstein sees eight levels in participation, regarding the extent that citizen has possibilities to influence issues. Two levels from below are pure tokenism. Manipulation (First level) means a situation where “In the name of citizen participation, people are placed on rubberstamp advisory committees or advisory boards for the express purpose of “educating” them or engineering their support”. Therapy (Second level) means the level in which peoples’ inability or poverty are associated with mental health issues. Information (Third level) means a one-way flow of information without possibilities to feedback or negotiations. This can also be the case, when information is delivered in such a late stage of planning that people have no possibility to influence the decision. Arnstein points out importantly that also meetings, which allow discussions, can turn out to this level while providing superficial information, discouraging questions or giving irrelevant answers. According to Arnstein, the consultation level (Fourth level) is still “sham” if it is the only used mode of participation. It does not ensure that citizens’ ideas and concerns are taken into account. The usual methods (attitude surveys, neighbourhood meetings, public hearings) can remain just a “window-dressing ritual”, which is assessed by the number of participants but gives evidence to power holders that they have “gone through the required motions of involving “those people”. Placation (Fifth level) means that citizens are placed to local agencies or public bodies and boards. Citizens are allowed to advice and plan, but the power holders keep the right to judge the feasibility of citizens’ contribution. Representing the minority of the board, citizens are also easily “outvoted or outfoxed”. Partnership (Sixth level) is the first level, which allows some degrees of citizen power. The power structure and decision-making responsibilities are agreed and redistributed between citizens and power holders with joint committees and a solving mechanism for contradictions. An effective partnership requires that citizens have proper resources for preparing issues and there is a mechanism regulating the representatives’ accountability to community. Delegated power (Seventh level) means that citizens have achieved dominant decision-making authority over some plan or programme. It can be manifested as citizens having the majority of seats in boards, provision for citizen veto or subcontracts to citizen groups to plan or operate particular issues. The difference between lower levels is that power holders are forced to negotiate with citizens, if they want changes. The highest level of ladders is citizen control (Eighth level). In practice, the pressure for this level has become in the mode of community or neighbourhood control over local programmes or institutions, e.g. schools. Citizens want full charge of policy and governance of the target issue. Arnstein mentions neighbourhood corporations as most advocated model of this level. In this model, there are no intermediaries between the corporation and the source of funds. The implementation of this level demands that not even the city council restrains the final approval power, even though it is argued to represent the community.
To assess the level of participation in GreenSAM, we have applied the model of International Organization for Public Participation. In origin, the model consists of five levels, including in the middle a level of “involve”. We interpret that involvement is inherent to nearly all levels and to make the model more practical, we combined two middle levels. Thus, our approach includes four levels: Inform, Consult, Collaborate, and Empower (Figure 2).

**Informing** is one-way communication from the provider’s side to inform target groups about those issues the provider considers important. The Inform level of public participation does not actually provide the opportunity for public participation, but rather provides the public with the information they need to understand the decision-making process. However, the Inform level is quite useful in many situations (e.g. letting people know about changes to legislation).

**Consulting** involves obtaining feedback about plans, ideas, options or issues, but little interaction with the public. It is still one-way communication. The Consult level is a relatively low level of community engagement, representing the basic minimum opportunity for public input to decision-making. In many European countries, consulting is statutory in formal city planning. Questionnaires, interviews and the feedback method are widely used tools for consulting. In addition, advisory boards, hearing of experts and citizen panels might stay in consult level, regarding the role they are allowed.

**Collaborating** means working together. At the Collaborate level, citizens are engaged in decision-making, but the public organization is still the ultimate decision-maker. This level often includes the explicit attempt to find consensus solutions. To what extent consensus is sought and how much decision authority is willing to share the power, must be made explicit. Finally, the public organization will take all of the input received and make independently the decision. Negotiation and partnership are inherent approaches in collaborate level.

**At the Empower level**, public organizations provide the public with the opportunity to implement and manage a certain project or programme independently and to make relevant decisions for themselves. Public organizations rarely conduct public participation at the Empower level, even though subcontracts to third-sector organizations in the social and health sector are close to this. Currently, participatory budgeting represents empower level operation at the clearest. In general, public organizations are not permitted to delegate their decision authority to the public. Creating a fair, legitimate, and inclusive process for empowerment beyond basic voting is a complex and challenging effort.
4 Methods

Developing an accessible transport system should concern all age groups. It is no use to wait that individuals get old to use particular elderly-friend mechanisms. The transport system should be multi-generational and universal. This can be understood as what is good for the elderly is good for all other age groups. Over a decade, city planners have utilized conception Design for All (DfA), which implies designing products, environment and services, which affect equally to all population groups. In addition, it is not possible to plan mobility options to elderly people in the vacuum. Decisions concerning e.g. benches are affecting those who might cycle in the same place. The concern of the development is, if the city planners are aware of the circumstances, which determine elderly people’s mobility and if their voice is heard as well as others’. When planning methods for elderly people’s participation, ageing as a process should be considered. Getting older has three dimensions, which might also have different implications for an individual’s capability to participate: social ageing, historical context and generational membership.

Any participatory tool or method does not ensure that the process is participatory. It always depends of the use of the tool. However, by using several tools, it is possible to increase the level of participation. It is important to understand the basic principles of the different methods. All methods are beneficial when used in the right situation and circumstances.

Informing audience/target group

The informing methods are connected to the first level of participation. The aim of the tools is to inform citizens about something. Communication is one-sided and it comes from the provider’s side without inherent possibility to give feed-back. This concerns also events, for example panels, which have clear distinction of conversationalists and audience. Even though information is regarded as very low level of participation (if at all), it does not mean that information level tools have no benefits. They are necessary tools in awareness raising, for example.

Examples: information events, websites without interaction, newsletters and other published material, campaigns, panel discussions.

Gathering information/collecting feedback

Information gathering is also a one-sided way of communication. Its aim is to either get target groups’ opinion over some matter or more general insight of target groups’ lives. The tools can be very comprehensive, including workshops and discussions. Still, the aim is only to gather information without the intention to negotiate about these matters or involve participants further. These tools are frequently used for preparation purposes and getting a basic understanding of the wider audience.

Examples: Interview, observation, conversation, personal narratives, questionnaires, case studies

In Manchester, a priority method was used. “In order to explore the key transport issues for older people in Greater Manchester, a series of workshops were set up in six different locations. Workshops
included older people from the local areas. Each workshop lasted around one and a half hours. In each workshop, participants prioritized key issues that they have with transport in different domains outlined in an age friendly transport model. Each group concentrated on different areas of transport, but each of them included pedestrian issues, as almost all journeys begin and end with walking. Each workshop finished with prioritizing solutions.” Read more

Action research project in Belgium: “The operational objectives of the research project were to gain insights into the current mobility patterns of elderly people in Belgium and their determinants; to assess the impact of this mobility behaviour of the elderly in terms of sustainability now and in the future, to gain insight into older people’s perceptions regarding the problems of sustainable mobility, their own responsibility and opportunities for action and to test and evaluate new methods to enhance elderly participation into the local mobility policy.” Read more

**Knowledge transfer**

In knowledge transfer tools the basic idea is that all participants are aware of other participants’ opinions or perspectives. They can consider all dimensions and add their own opinions in order to form a comprehensive picture of the matter. Participants do not have to agree on issues. Only in deliberative discussion the assumption is that in the end of the process, there will be some consensus on the matter.

**Examples:** Deliberative discussions, learning café, conceptual mapping

**Co-creation, co-designing, co-production**

The basic principles of the co-creation method are to gather a wider range of perspectives, consider needs of end-users, but also understand the constraints of reality. In addition, co-creation methods reveal the complexity and interconnections of factors and raise awareness and understanding between different interest groups. The result of the co-creation process ought to be agreed and lead to actual decision-making. In order to achieve these goals, also politicians and other decision-makers should be involved. Co-designing methods can consist of the same features, but they address less the empowering dimension.

**Deliverable methods**

A common feature of deliverable tools is the aim to provide citizens with accurate information, possibility to consider evidence and discuss with others before forming own opinion about the matter. They are based on the ideal of deliberative democracy aiming at jointly formed opinions and best evidenced solutions. Inherent to these tools is the presumption that the results are affecting the policy level and decision-making.

In Scottish Government Social Research Group websites, examples of these methods are introduced. Read more
Mentoring

The presumption of mentoring methods is that people can learn through socialisation by asking, looking and discussing with others, who are more experienced. In addition, mentoring has features of safety and confidence building while getting familiar with new things together with someone.

Examples: Coaching, peer coaching, over-generational coaching

Passenger support, mentoring services and travel ambassadors are methods used in several cities in order to help people to enter and exit vehicles, ensuring they have seats, and accompanying them on a practice journey (The Netherlands, Krakow, Manchester & London).

The Mediate (Methodology for Describing the Accessibility of Transport in Europe) project’s main objective was to contribute to the development of inclusive urban transport systems with better access for all citizens. One of the project’s outputs was Good Practice Guide, which covers a wide spectrum of examples of different types of initiatives.

Travel ambassadors (The Netherlands): Public transport “ambassadors” were brought onto the buses of the specific route to explain how they work and to help when necessary. These ambassadors also visited the target group in retirement homes, where public transportation and door-to-door services were explained.

Living Labs

Living lab method means testing and/or developing a service in a real-life situation.

Service prototyping is a tool for testing the service by observing the interaction of the user with a prototype put in the place, situation and condition where the service will actually exist. The purpose of this method is to analyse the interaction between end-users/citizens and the new service, policy or strategy that is to be implemented and the impact on the user perception and experience. Service prototyping can be used in all stages of the co-design process, but it is especially valuable in the ideation phase.

3H: Head, Heart, Hands-on is an open living lab methodology that has been specifically developed for the European CIP iCity project. It uses the human body to describe a step-by-step user driven innovation process: 1. Head: identifying and mapping the actors of the community innovation system to provide protocols and tools to collect and understand the needs and barriers. 2. Heart: consolidating all the relationships necessary to establish trust and commitment between all the stakeholders. 3. Hands-on: engaging the participants in the co-creation and development activity in itself. This final part includes an evaluation activity based on a client-driven set of indicators.

Documenting

Photovoice is a qualitative research technique in which participants record and reflect their community through photography. It has been proved an effective tool for eliciting older citizens’ perceptions of their communities, giving voice to their concerns and identifying strategies for change. Nevertheless, there are several challenges to overcome including training in photography.

Examples: photo voice, personal narratives
Visualization

Examples: Site visit/field trip, walking groups, community mapping, photo voice

Audit local areas: Older people would very much welcome the opportunity to audit their own local area. An example of a local neighbourhood audit tool is the Older People’s Residential Assessment Tool (OPERAT) Read more

Research Walks & Sentimental walks and maps (Gdynia) & guided neighbourhood journeys (Riga)

ICT methods (e-participation)

The core idea is to enhance human communication with digital tools – making participation easier by de-attaching it from physical places or schedules of traditional workshops or meetings or aiming at creating added value on ideation and communication in physical workshops.

Examples:

- Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter)
- Digital surveys (Harava, Maptionnaire, Place Standard)
- Applications (Future Dialog, Mentimeter, Pocket City)
- GIS & other map-based services (ArcGis, Citizens Foundation, Place Standard, SoftGis)
- Online social platforms (Crowdsourcing is the involvement of citizens in online social platforms where they can provide feedback about the level of the services, any problems encountered or suggestions for further improvement. Used platforms: ImproveMyCity, OpenIDEO, Crowdynews & Everyblock.
- Community information and participation portal (Munich)

GreenSAM partners declared similarly that traditional participative methods were used in their cities. All cities have used public events, nearly all mentioned web-based feedback. Aarhus, Riga and Tartu mentioned hearings and Hamburg, Tartu and Turku mentioned web-based platforms. In addition, Riga mentioned urban planning workshops. Other methods for getting users’ insight are questionnaires, interviews, social media channels (Gdansk, Tartu, Turku) and co-creation of transport and mobility solutions (Riga, Tartu). In addition, Gdansk mentioned Mayor’s meetings with citizens.

In GreenSAM project, the objective is to pilot at least one participatory tool in every partner city for developing age-friendly green mobility. The main outcome of this project will be a Toolbox for city planners, which includes detailed descriptions of tools, quality catalog and implementation guide.
**Toolbox**

In the GreenSAM web page you can find a Toolbox, which is a collection of various tools, ranging from simple participation approaches to more complex digital tools, that can be used to engage people in the silver age. As all tools have different aims, filters can be applied to find the tool best suitable for the user’s purposes. These filters are the development phase in which the user wants to use them (when they are developing age-friendly and green mobility solution), the aim of the user’s citizen engagement, the number of people involved at one time and the time available to implement the tool. After the user has found the most suitable tools for them, they can read more about these tools (incl. instructions for implementation) from the Concept Papers.

In the Toolbox, there are also links to the “**implementation guidance**”, which offers a comprehensive overview of how to design and implement participatory processes, and the “**evaluation framework**”, that helps evaluate these processes.
5 Checklists

After reading the text from the Atlas, one can check from the checklists if all the most important aspects are taken into account in the planning work. The checklists also show the text structure of the Atlas on age-friendliness, green urban mobility and participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG\E-FRIENDLINESS: HAS THE FACTORS BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT</th>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
<th>VERY WELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive functioning overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understanding a written text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and language factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor performance and mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need of wheelchair, rollator or other aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senses: hearing, vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards aged people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-friendly service culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching for elderly people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN URBAN MOBILITY: HAS THE FACTOR BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT</td>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>VERY WELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The core attributes of age-friendly mobility systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The whole journey chain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the starting point (e.g. home) to the stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the stop to the vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The journey in the vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the vehicle to the stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the stop to the destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>VERY WELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes and plans of the city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid system for participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-sectoral co-operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles for aged people</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-performer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-creator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-designer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levels of participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing audience/ target group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering information/collecting feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Labs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting discussion among target group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Recommendations

Throughout the project, feedback was collected from partners about ongoing issues, lessons learnt and recommendations to others who want to develop public transport and engage people in silver age. Project activities have been assessed in an evaluation report that can be found in different language versions from the project’s website. Below are some of the most important lessons learnt and recommendations described in the evaluation report:

- **Senior participation should be considered in all stages of the process (planning, implementation, and evaluation)**
  1. Consider that seniors want to see improvements in real life, not just to talk about it.
  2. Participation can be enhanced via different tools – Prepare using different involvement tools carefully, step by step, with a clear aim of each stage of implementation.
  3. Use as many tools as needed to involve people with different backgrounds and activity levels. Consider that while the 60+ target group is heterogenic, they also have various things in common such as decreased physical abilities, etc.
  4. While designing or implementing anything, think of all target groups and test any solution with a variety of users before installing or implementing them.
  5. Offer mentoring and trials to user groups – this will encourage them to use PT (public transport), including city bikes.
Meet the senior citizens

6. Go meet with the senior citizens at places they normally visit, e.g., day centers, public transport, streets, medical centres. People need personal contact. Meeting seniors where they are and speaking about the item (public space and mobility) on the spot is very helpful to get profound insights in barriers and needs.

7. Practical trainings and personal instruction (both peer-to-peer and from (young) experts) are important for silver age people. Do not rely only on creating instruction materials and disseminating them.

8. Quite often the needed changes may be very small – it is important to listen and observe user groups, introduce the available opportunities to them, increase empathy, helpfulness and caring of drivers and other passengers.

Support people participating in events and using ICT and online tools.

9. Create a comfortable environment at different events and during implementing different activities so that participants feel free to discuss and give feedback. Have social warm-up before the event.

10. Do not underestimate the digital skills of people in silver age. However, be ready to support them, carry out trainings, compile info materials, etc. if needed.

Cooperate with different organisations and stakeholders cross-sectorally

11. Ensure your communication is high-quality and relevant: reach out through local networks and organizations and ensure a good balance of passive and personal communication.

12. Remind decision-makers and politicians about documents compiled to ensure that the input of the target group is considered, and they are ready to share their experiences and ideas in the future as well.

13. Working together with multipliers, e.g., networks or community leaders, in the field of age-friendliness and mobility is essential.

14. Find so-called locomotives to reach other people in your target group while carrying out different actions.

15. Use representatives of user and target groups and already existing frameworks to reach target and user groups. They may help you in involving the desired group and disseminate materials.

16. Be prepared to receive ideas for developments that you cannot implement on your own.

17. Projects are good motivators to support setting priorities in cases where administration is overloaded with work.

18. Be flexible in your activities to maximize the effect of these kinds of projects.
More recommendations can be read from here:

- **Atlas** – covers different aspects that are good to know while thinking about age-friendliness and participatory approach

- **Implementation guidance** – gives several recommendations to design the participatory process when developing and improving green mobility and public transport solutions. Available in all partners’ languages (Estonian, Finnish, Latvian, German, Polish, Danish)

- **Evaluation framework** – provides a practical framework and overview of what, why and how to consider while evaluating your activities. Available in all partners’ languages.

- **Toolbox** – consists of 26 different tools with detailed concept papers that support you in engaging user groups (and other target groups as well). The focus of concept papers is on what to avoid and how to maximize the effect of using a tool. (List of tools with short description and filtering options are available in all partners’ languages, detailed concept papers are in English)

- **Pilots’s section and pilot one-pagers on the homepage** – describes all pilots shortly, includes chronology of the project with links to more detailed articles, blog posts, reports, etc.
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Web links

AENEAS project:  
http://www.aeneas-project.eu/?page=about

AENEAS Salzburg:  
http://www.aeneas-project.eu/?page=salzburgmeasure2

AENEAS Krakow:  
http://www.aeneas-project.eu/?page=krakow

Ageing programmes and strategies:

Age-Friendly Tampere – Action Plan, WHO GNAFCC  
https://www.tampere.fi/tiedostot/w/Adr9bFrzp/2018_chart_Tampere_Action_Plan_WHO_  
GNAFCC_English.pdf

Age Friendly London Action Plan 2017 – 2020  

Manchester Ageing Strategy  
https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/media/1166/gm_ageing_strategy.pdf

Age-friendly Madrid Action Plan 2017-2019  
https://extranet.who.int/agefriendlyworld/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Madrid-Age-  

Age Friendly Leeds - Strategy and action plan 2019 – 2022  
- https://extranet.who.int/agefriendlyworld/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/AgeFriend-  

- WHO: The Global strategy and action plan on ageing and health  
- https://www.who.int/ageing/global-strategy/en/

Cologne “Patenticket”:  
https://www.polisnetwork.eu/wpcontent/uploads/2019/06/pt_goodfathers_for_se-  
niors_in_cologne_-_2007.pdf

Demand responsive transport in Turku:  
https://www.foli.fi/en/have-you-tried-f%C3%B6li%E2%80%99s-demand-responsive-trans-  
port

EU programmes

Strategy and action plan for healthy ageing in Europe, 2012–2020  
http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/Life-stages/healthy-ageing/publications/2012/  
strategy-and-action-plan-for-healthy-ageing-in-europe,-20122020
EU Action Plan on Urban Mobility
https://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/urban_mobility/action_plan_en

AGE Platform Europe Strategy 2018–2021

Creating age-friendly environments in Europe
http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0018/333702/AFEE-tool.pdf?ua=1

European Green Deal

Aging Europe 2019 report

Active aging EU
https://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1062

European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing
https://ec.europa.eu/eip/ageing/

EU Policy on the Urban Environment
https://ec.europa.eu/environment/urban/index_en.htm

GreenSAM pilot in Riga:
http://greensam.eu/portfolio/city-of-riga-mobility-lab/

GreenSAM pilot in Turku (Valonia):

GreenSAM pilot in Aarhus:

GreenSAM pilot in Gdansk:

GreenSAM pilot in Hamburg:
http://greensam.eu/portfolio/city-of-hamburg-improved-participation

GreenSAM pilot in Tartu:

Turku service lines: