

# OUTPUT T2.3

## National Consultations

Output	T2.3
<b>Work package:</b>	T2 Best practice analysis
<b>Based on Activity:</b>	AT2.3 Stakeholder consultation
<b>Authors per project partner (if more than one per PP, provide them together):</b>	Klaus Machata, Marlene Mellauner, Maria Fleischer, Marielis Fischer (KFV), with contributions from all project partners
<b>Status (F – final, D – draft, RD – revised draft):</b>	F
<b>Version:</b>	1.0
<b>File name:</b>	20211111_SABRINA output.T2.3
<b>Issue date:</b>	11. 11. 2021

## Table of Contents

<b>Abbreviation List .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THIS OUTPUT REPORT.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. NATIONAL CONSULTATIONS IN THE SABRINA PARTNER COUNTRIES.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.1. The currently biggest problems in provision and assessment of safe cycling infrastructure in the Danube Area .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1.1. General observations .....	5
2.1.2. Data for safety assessment .....	5
2.1.3. Funds .....	6
2.1.4. Knowledge – guidelines & capacity.....	7
2.1.5. Awareness.....	8
2.1.6. Attitude / Culture.....	9
2.1.7. Legal issues .....	10
2.1.8. Responsibilities.....	11
2.1.9. Key issues – aspects to providing and assessing safe cycling infrastructure .....	12
<b>2.2. Solutions and good practices for provision and assessment of safe cycling infrastructure in the Danube Area .....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.2.1. General observations .....	13
2.2.2. Local projects & engineering solutions.....	13
2.2.3. Planning approaches.....	14
2.2.4. Strategic approaches.....	15
2.2.5. Safety ratings .....	16
2.2.6. Other concrete examples for good practices.....	16
2.2.7. Experiences to avoid at all costs.....	17
<b>3. CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER STEPS.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>4. ANNEX .....</b>	<b>18</b>

## Abbreviation List

Abbreviation	Full name
AÖFK	Centre for Development of Active and Ecotourism
AF	Application Form
CNAIR	Romanian National Company for roads and highways
DTP	Danube Transnational Programme
FRB	Romanian Cyclists Federation
FSV	Österreichische Forschungsgesellschaft Straße - Schiene - Verkehr   Austrian Research Association for Roads, Railways and Transport
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
GIP	Graphenintegrationsplattform   Graph Integration Platform
KRESZ	KPM-BM Joint Decree on Road Traffic Rules
KTI	Institute for Transport Sciences
MAKETUSZ	Hungarian Bicycle Tourism Association
MAÚT	Hungarian Road and Rail Society
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
PP	Project Partner
SUMP	Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan
WP	Work Package

## 1. Introduction and purpose of this Output report

The project SABRINA aims at providing safer bicycle routes in the Danube area. The objective of SABRINA’s Work Package T2 (WPT2) is to collect and collate best practices relevant to cycling infrastructure and safety improvement measures. In addition to the analysis of collected data and desk research, stakeholder consultations took place on local, national, EU and international level. These consultations were carried out by individual SABRINA partners in all contributing countries and are considered an important tool for gathering additional insight and for raising awareness about the importance of safe cycling infrastructure.

This Output report T2.3 draws together the results of consultations with over 250 stakeholders which took place in spring 2021 in all nine participating countries. Based on a joint questionnaire the stakeholders were contacted by the respective project partners by phone or email at the beginning of March 2021 and invited to join the consultations in the following weeks. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic most consultations were implemented as approx. one-hour single or longer group online-interviews / workshops or participants were asked to provide written answers to the stakeholder questionnaire. Some consultations took place in person. The questionnaire was provided in advance so that stakeholders had the chance to familiarise with the topics.

The consultations were held in order to increase awareness and knowledge about the importance of cycling infrastructure safety but also to collect important best practices in each participating country with regard to provision, maintenance and safety assessment of cycling infrastructure. The Output covers both core problems (chapter 2.1) and good-practice solutions (chapter 2.2).

Table 1 provides an overview of the relevant stakeholder target groups to be reached by his Output – and the whole SABRINA project – according to the Application Form (AF). Consequently, an appropriate – and sufficiently diversified – audience was chosen for every country. A list of participating institutions is provided in the annex which indicates the number of documented learning interactions in all participating countries under SABRINA’s Work Package T2 (Activity AT2.3).

4

Table 1 Overview Target group/-s according to AF

Target group/-s	Target group specification
Local public authority	Local government bodies and municipalities
National public authority	Ministries in charge of transport, tourism, internal affairs and national road authorities
Interest groups including NGOs	Road Safety, sustainable mobility, health, environment and climate change NGOs. Automotive and cycling clubs
Higher education and research	Universities, scientific institutes
Regional public authority	Regional road authorities, regional governing bodies, regional tourist offices
Sectoral agency	Road Safety Agencies, Tourist Agencies
International organisation under national law	International Road Assessment Programme (iRAP), European Cycling Federation (ECF), Conference of European Directors of Roads (CEDR), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), World Bank (WB)
International organisation under international law	World Health Organisation (WHO), United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)
Infrastructure and (public) service provider	Road authorities and public transport companies
Other	EUSDR and Professional organisations, chambers of chartered engineers, strategic documents working bodies, political parties and IFIs (international financing institutions such as EBRD, EIB etc.)

## 2. National consultations in the SABRINA partner countries

All SABRINA partner countries are currently in one of several transition phases in relation to cycling: while in some jurisdictions in the Danube Area, cycling has not yet become a relevant player in (road) transport, many others face a transition of cycling towards a popular leisure activity, and some even witness the first steps of cycling becoming a full – and fully accepted – mode of transport. Likewise, the problems and solutions for cycling infrastructure are varied, and so are the expectations of stakeholders from the project and its final products. The following sub-chapters provide an overview on the results of the SABRINA stakeholder consultation, both among experts from all contributing countries and with representatives of international institutions.

### 2.1. The currently biggest problems in provision and assessment of safe cycling infrastructure in the Danube Area

#### 2.1.1. General observations

There is common agreement among all stakeholders of SABRINA countries that a variety of deficiencies need to be eradicated before cycling can be considered a travel mode fully accepted by all levels of society. It comes as a bit of a surprise that the main issues seem fairly similar across the countries, even if they are all in different stages of the cultural development process to make cycling a self-evident and safe part of mobility. Among these are:

- Cycling is still predominantly seen as a **leisure** activity and not as an everyday transport mode – by many decision-makers and practitioners as well as a substantial part of the public, especially car users.
- The mindset of decision-makers is still **car-oriented**; therefore, the interests of motorised transport still prevail over those of cyclists.
- The planning and implementation of cycling networks lacks **strategic** approaches.
- **Funding** mechanisms for investment as well as maintenance and safety assessment are partly lacking.
- The distribution of **responsibilities** between national, regional and local levels is often inadequate – with mostly the municipalities – and sometimes regions – having to carry the full burden for investments and maintenance.
- Administrations and building authorities often lack expertise and **capacity**.
- Expertise and legal requirements to carry out **safety assessments** are virtually absent in most countries.
- Experts and institutions outside administrations have poor access to **data** for safety and planning related activities.
- The difference between objective safety and **subjective sense of safety** is disregarded – while the latter is key to raising the share of cycling.
- While towns declare that they aim at “sustainable mobility”, they do not consider cycling as one of its full-bodied components.

#### 2.1.2. Data for safety assessment

Both the accessibility and quality of cycling-related data are ranked poor by most stakeholders; this is true both for crash (let alone: conflict or *near miss*) data and traffic flows. However, a lack of the latter, exposure data, makes it impossible to correctly evaluate risks and effects of safety interventions. Likewise, the scarcely available data on cycling infrastructure are hardly comparable between different jurisdictions. No detailed data are available for safety assessments of infrastructure. Some more concrete examples are listed hereunder (countries in alphabetic order):

- **Austria:** official records of cycling crashes are claimed to be substantially underreported as most single vehicle cycling accidents go unnoticed by the police. In addition, there is no distinction between pedelecs and e-scooters. Traffic data on cyclists are rather the exception than the norm, as there are hardly any permanent census points or bicycle traffic models.
- **Bulgaria:** an inherent lack of information on cyclist crashes was communicated; only aggregated information is available to stakeholders.
- **Croatia:** neither safety nor traffic-related data on cycling is currently reported to be utilised fully in planning or evaluation processes.
- **Czech Republic:** there are several websites with local data on cycling accidents available, and the cities of Prague and Brno publish regular data on the monitoring of high-risk sites. However, it is reported that infrastructure safety and quality data are hardly used in implementation processes, such as of SUMP.
- **Hungary:** the Hungarian Public Roads Zrt. is reported to provide access to detailed crash data *if necessary*. Although the database includes both minor and major injury accidents, the majority of minor incidents go unrecorded due to administrative burdens. However, traffic data on motor traffic are reported to be well accessible, whereas information on bicycle traffic is less available. At the same time, the conditions improved in the recent years: there is a manual traffic counting programme, and there are also fixed traffic counters installed at 53 locations.
- **Moldova:** only general (i.e., aggregated) police statistics are available on cycling crashes, no information on causation is available, and high-risk sites are not identified. Likewise, no cycling flow data are available – and infrastructure assessment methodologies are missing.
- **Romania:** every five years, a traffic census – including cycle traffic (digital & manual counting) – is organised, the last one in 2015. Crash data are reported to be available on request by the police, however on limited scale or detail for stakeholders outside the administrative system.
- **Slovenia:** a high underreporting rate is noted for cycling crash data, as well as a lack of proper assignment of geo-coordinates to crash locations. Cycling flow data are largely lacking, as cycle counters are available only on a very small number of sections, mainly along touristic routes.
- **Slovakia:** only aggregated crash data is available from the police, with little added value for local analysis. A traffic census is organised every 5 years – the last one in 2015. Although it contains data on non-motorised traffic, it is reported that the information is not used in planning or day-by-day management. In general, reliable modal share data are missing at all, only partial surveys are available. The traffic model of Slovakia is not usable for modelling of cycling transportation.

### 2.1.3. Funds

There are various funding structures for cycling infrastructure in the Danube Area countries, but there is a lack of systematic integration in other projects (road/rail/tram), making retrofit at later stages substantially more expensive. What is common to practically all schemes is that they are mostly focused on investment, whereas maintenance – and especially safety assessment of infrastructure – are hardly ever covered. Specific observations of stakeholders are listed hereunder:

- **Austria:** National funds for investments in cycling infrastructure have recently been established, however they do not cover maintenance or evaluation. Usually, application processes and funding requirements are complex, hence especially for smaller municipalities it can be challenging to obtain resources from these funds.
- **Bulgaria:** municipalities, who carry the bulk of the financial burden for cycling infrastructure, obtain financial resources through funding with EU instruments, or less often by state funds provided through district administrations, mostly as part of bigger infrastructure projects. Maintenance, however, is reported to put a huge burden on their budgets and is therefore usually carried out only at superficial level.

- **Croatia:** Unlike most other SABRINA countries, implementation, maintenance and assessment of bicycle infrastructure are the responsibilities of individual and independent state institutions. A lack of funding was however reported for areas where cycling infrastructure does not yet exist.
- **Czech Republic:** good knowledge of how to request funding from regional, national and EU funds was reported, however these funds seem only applicable for specific types of infrastructure. Stakeholders regret that little interest was observed for the carrying out of safety audits for new projects, even if funded, allegedly because audits are believed to delay projects.
- **Hungary:** stakeholders report that (national) funding has improved a great deal over the last 10 years and that this includes also maintenance of facilities operated by the Hungarian Public Roads company. It is however reported that in some cases facilities operated by the local municipalities feature poor condition due to lack of local human and/or financial resources.
- **Moldova:** Funding mechanisms and annual budget lines dedicated to the development of cycling infrastructure are reported to be non-existent. The capital Chisinau however has recently opened a separate budget line for the development of cycling infrastructure.
- **Romania:** it is reported that state resources do not suffice to properly maintain roads and cycle routes, and that projects – including those linked to SUMP – do usually only foresee resources for investment – and not for maintenance. European funds are believed to hold opportunities for additional resources in this field.
- **Slovenia:** stakeholders indicate that the (former predominantly touristic) cycling infrastructure was financed mainly through European funds (with a co-financing share by the state), but that for maintenance a separate fund will need to be established.
- **Slovakia:** The bulk of the funds for investments are reported to be obtained from the EU fund ERDF – and only a small share through state budgets. The disadvantages of the dependence on EU support are listed as follows: grants are unpredictable (making both short- and long-term planning tedious), not necessarily the best proposals (in terms of evidence) are awarded, the funding terms might be in contradiction with the development requirements of the networks, uncoordinated funding of different projects might end up in non-convergent networks, and maintenance is insufficiently covered. Paperwork and bureaucracy are reported to be a barrier to funding, as well as unclear or unknown land ownership and public procurement processes.

#### 2.1.4. Knowledge – guidelines & capacity

The competences for safe cycling infrastructures of acting persons in administrations and consulting companies as well as the availability of adequate technical guidelines varies across the Danube Area countries. What is common to all is an inherent lack in the uptake of prevailing rules and regulations, and a certain tendency, in the end, to make political instead of evidence-based decisions. EU institutions often depend on NGO work, as there is no in-depth inter-governmental co-operation in the area of cycling infrastructure. The situation in the individual countries, as communicated by stakeholders, can be summarised as follows:

- **Austria:** the capacity (i.e., competence) in public bodies on how to design, maintain and assess cycling infrastructure is believed to grow with the size of the city/municipality – and high-level support would be desired for the very many small settlements. The availability of technical guidelines is considered fairly sufficient, however there is little information included about maintenance and assessment of cycling infrastructure.
- **Bulgaria:** stakeholders believe that the level of knowledge and competence of public authorities is comparatively low and that, although some designers have a good understanding of the needs of cycling, the final decisions about the type, location and parameters of the cycling infrastructure differ dramatically from the requirements and good European practice. Technical guidelines are reported to be available, however participative processes and evidence-based decision-making would need to be strengthened.

- **Czech Republic:** it is reported that the conceptions of how safe cycling facilities should look like can vary substantially between urban planners, transport planners and local authorities. Therefore, and because the interpretation of relevant rules and regulations differs, there is not yet a common approach to cycling infrastructure in Czech municipalities. Stakeholders note that additional communication and training would be required to enforce the implementation of available technical guidelines.
- **Hungary:** stakeholders report about a divide between the authority levels with regard to competence: whereas at the national level professionally competent entities are active, the capacity of local governments and county-level organisations can vary substantially. The available technical regulations are described as adequate for the purpose; however no domestic technical guidelines have so far been set up, only respective documents (e.g., from neighbouring countries like Austria) were translated, but not adapted to local requirements.
- **Moldova:** only very limited capacity at both local and national levels in the field of design, construction and maintenance of cycling infrastructure are reported. The relevant norms for cycling infrastructure are assessed as very vague and focused on motorised traffic, and little political will in relation to cycling and to establishing a “Safe System” is noted. Therefore, decisions tend to be made on an ad-hoc basis or within projects financed by external donors, without a strategic approach.
- **Romania:** the common assessment is that there is currently very limited knowledge and capacity at decision-making levels available. Technical guidelines are reported to be outdated – with an updated version having been blocked in the regulatory pipeline for a long time. In the absence of national documents, practitioners tend to consult good practices from other European countries – or from the internet.
- **Slovenia:** stakeholders indicate that a state-of-the-art rulebook on cycling infrastructure has recently been made available, and that technical guidelines had been set up, however it was the common impression that these were not followed on a large scale. A potential reason for this was assumed in an inherent lack of competent project leaders and contractors. In addition, a lack of both transparency and the opportunity of public participation in decision-making processes was criticised.
- **Slovakia:** stakeholders believe that public bodies have generally low competence and therefore often hire external experts – who are also reported to partially lack the necessary competences. In the absence of available training courses, the learning-by-doing principle was noted among interested officers in authorities. The strong – and often conservative – position of the police in technical approval processes was criticised, and the fact that appointed police representatives often appear to entirely lack topical training. Relevant guidelines are provided by way of several technical standards which are reported, however, to be either not detailed enough or not harmonised with other legislation or not to be fully followed, partly resulting in safety issues for cyclists. Cycling (either transportation or tourism) is missing in important acts.

### 2.1.5. Awareness

Although the knowledge on health and environmental benefits of cycling seems to be ubiquitous, only in a limited number of cases concrete activity can be identified based on this knowledge. A large part of the societies in the Danube Area countries seem to be divided on the topic of cycling, consequently the agenda of motorised transport often prevails. There are, however, also some positive developments noted, e.g., among younger generations of decision-makers and administrative personnel who have personally experienced less dependency on cars – and tend to act accordingly. Individual country-wise observations of stakeholders are summarised hereunder:

- **Austria:** There is common agreement about a rising awareness on the benefits and safety issues of cycling, however with a lot of catching up yet to do. The recent participation of the Green party in the national government has provided a boost for active mobility, and a generation change is also noted in administrations and authorities. Likewise, rising awareness



is noted among the public, and the media follow suit, even if some – especially the tabloid press – still tend to focus on conflicts between cyclists and other road users and continue to frame cycling as a leisure-time activity.

- **Bulgaria:** Although benefits of cycling are obvious, societal interest is reported to be still predominantly on e.g., *what rules cyclists must follow and whether they follow them, and whether they wear helmets and reflective vests*. Also, at the level of decision-makers little activity has been noted to build on the obvious societal and environmental benefits. Especially the role of safe cycling infrastructure in avoiding crashes seems largely neglected so far.
- **Croatia:** Stakeholders communicated that quite some achievements have been made in recent years towards raising awareness on the positive effects and safety issues related to cycling, stating that awareness is high on all levels (political, administration, public, media).
- **Czech Republic:** it was noted that, despite well-developed awareness at political level, still other issues often prevail over cycling. At authority level, insufficient personal attachment of officers with cycling was observed, while a large part of the public still considers cycling as a sports and leisure-time activity. Likewise, the media seem divided over the topic.
- **Hungary:** all levels of society seem to show a growing interest and concern with cycling: at political level, the post of a government commissioner for ‘active Hungary’ has been established, however at regional and local level commitment of political and authority level can vary. An issue was noted with the police which has a reputation to act in an *unfavourable* way in relation to cyclists in some cases. At public level, even if there is an ever-growing demand for cycling, the level of awareness still varies substantially. The media are reported to mostly convey positive messages on cycling.
- **Moldova:** stakeholders report relatively poor awareness – and hardly any promotion – at all levels of society. There are, however, some notable developments like roundtables and workshops at political and administration levels. Cycling seems poorly promoted on the media; however online platforms on social media are reported to support the development of cycling infrastructure.
- **Romania:** there seems to be common agreement about the environmental impacts of cycling (air quality!) and the obvious health benefits are recognised as well, however this knowledge is not translated into action on a large basis. What was observed was the *chicken-and-egg* question in relation to cycling: even if polls identify the lack of safe infrastructure as the key impediment to cycling, there is little political will to step up investment in such infrastructure.
- **Slovenia:** most stakeholders agreed that the public as well as the media are relatively well aware of the positive effects of cycling and that people would cycle more if there was more well-implemented cycling infrastructure.
- **Slovakia:** the awareness at political and public administration level is considered poor, however a small minority of high-level politicians show some understanding, even if this does not yet translate into practical decisions. Some cities and regions take the health (but not the traffic or safety) argument as motivation to invest in adequate infrastructure. Public awareness is on the rise as well and cycling has become a popular recreational activity – even if it still has a bad safety reputation. The media are reported neither to have interest nor awareness about the positive impacts of cycling.

9

### 2.1.6. Attitude / Culture

Even if cycling is not yet accepted as a full-fledged mode of everyday transport, notable positive developments were reported from all SABRINA countries:

- **Austria:** stakeholders reported about substantial differences between the approaches of political parties, however the new Transport Minister claims she cycles to work daily. Culture in administrations varies between regions, with the state of *Vorarlberg* commonly perceived as forerunner. Within the larger cities it is noted that cycling is on the verge of becoming a full-fledged mode of transport, whereas in smaller rural settlements cyclists can still often be seen

as *losers* or *leftists*. It was recognised how big a difference it often makes for the municipal cycling culture whether political or administrative staff use the bicycle themselves for their daily trips.

- **Bulgaria:** cycling is reported to be practiced by less than 1% of the population, and substantial shares of the population believe it *is only for children and should be practiced in gardens and parks, or as a sport*. It seems current practice to implement cycling infrastructure only where it does not interfere with motor traffic. Despite several indications that there is growing public desire to use the bicycle on a daily basis, no change of attitude was so far noted at political or authority level. The media are depicted as being mainly interested in emphasising negatively perceived aspects of cycling.
- **Croatia:** positive and supportive attitude towards cycling is communicated about national authorities, however lack of funds for cycling infrastructure is perceived a major barrier for the bicycle to become a full-fledged mode of transport.
- **Hungary:** the topic of cycling is reported to be on a break-through, and a growing number of positive examples can be observed at all levels of society, e.g., with road construction projects which are obliged to foresee parallel cycling facilities. However, there is still room for further improvement – across administration and media – before cycling can be considered a full-fledged mode of transport. One of the most important steps would be entering the modification of the Joint Decree on Road Traffic Rules into force (including e.g. 1.5 m overtaking distance).
- **Moldova:** even if cycling is generally not considered a full-fledged mode of transport, some improvement in attitude on the political level has been noticed in the last years. As an example, a Bike2Work campaign was carried out for the first time in 2020 in the capital Chisinau, with some city councillors actively participating and spreading the message on social media.
- **Romania:** it was reported that, not least because of communication campaigns by NGOs, in some bigger cities cycling started to be perceived as cool and trendy. Some enterprises have launched Bike2Work campaigns. However, in smaller cities and rural areas, cycling is still viewed as a sign of poverty. The change of media attitude was illustrated by a bike lane project in Bucharest launched 21 years ago, which then sparked public (and media) uproar – and today is celebrated as best practice. Nevertheless, the bike is still seen more as a leisure than a transport vehicle.
- **Slovenia:** cycling is reported to be perceived mainly as a recreational activity – which is also reflected by the comparatively well-developed touristic network of cycling routes and supported by media coverage. Some cities, notably the capital Ljubljana, made substantial investments in everyday cycling infrastructure. The need of education towards sustainable mobility from early ages on was emphasised by stakeholders.
- **Slovakia:** cycling was depicted as very popular, yet recreational, activity among large parts of the population, albeit a growing number use the bicycle for the daily commute, especially in a small number of cities. The attitude towards cycling on political and public administration level is considered poor, with only minor exceptions. Cycling is largely not yet perceived as a part of the urban/suburban transportation system, and sustainable mobility plans are reported to be set up in larger cities and in regions predominantly because of requirements for EU funding.

### 2.1.7. Legal issues

A large part of the traffic rules and regulations in Danube Area countries have been set up decades ago, with motor traffic as key focus. There seems common understanding among most countries' stakeholders that the individual legal apparatus does not live up to the requirements of cycling as a full-fledged transport mode. In addition, currently liability regulations may be detrimental for infrastructure development, as in some jurisdictions authorities can be held responsible for crashes on cycling facilities. Two of several other problematic issues include land acquisition and environmental permits – outside urban areas it is sometimes more difficult to construct a cycle track

than a motorway, as the legal tools for linear investments do not apply to cycle tracks. The following was reported from the individual countries:

- **Austria:** according to stakeholders, cycling has not yet arrived on equal terms with motor traffic in the Highway Code, even after countless amendments. In addition, the Code is perceived as too complex for many users, including for smaller municipalities' administrations. Currently an amendment is in consultation which is believed to bring about several decisive modifications in favour of cycling.
- **Bulgaria:** although recently there has been progress with updating certain requirements for planning and design of cycling infrastructure, a lack of normative requirements for its safety was noted by stakeholders. The transport law is believed to require substantial update, a process which is currently ongoing.
- **Croatia:** Although updated rules and regulations in the realm of cycling infrastructure have been issued in 2016, it is believed by stakeholders that further improvement is required.
- **Hungary:** stakeholders argue that several regulations currently in force are in contradiction with each other – or fail to regulate cycling properly; therefore, a recast of the relevant legal apparatus is deemed necessary (partly on the way but substantially delayed).
- **Moldova:** the assessment of stakeholders is that cycling is poorly reflected in the relevant laws and at the level of technical guidelines. Suggestions for updates include obligations to consider cycle infrastructure in road construction projects (urban & rural), and a functional classification of the road network.
- **Romania:** stakeholders criticise that current legislation contains less obligations than *recommendations* in relation to safe cycling and related infrastructure. The launching of a *bicycle law initiative* is therefore recommended with the goal of arriving at a set of clear and easy-to-understand rules. It was uttered that local authorities are somewhat reluctant to assume their responsibilities in relation to cycling infrastructure, as officers may be personally held liable in case of crashes.
- **Slovenia:** an infrastructure rulebook was published in 2018 and is reported to be adequate for practitioners, however a general gap between rules and guidelines and actual implementations was noted. Both for laws and technical guidelines, further development towards better applicability is therefore suggested by stakeholders.
- **Slovakia:** cycling as a mode of transport is assessed as *basically considered*, however several additional requirements were identified, like yet missing traffic signs, definition of a minimum passing distance, and the option to carry out temporary experiments for novice pieces of infrastructure. However, legislation about construction is considered insufficient, laws, standards and guidelines poorly harmonised, and public procurement and acquisition of land assessed as legally demanding.

### 2.1.8. Responsibilities

Complex and diverse roles and responsibilities exist in the Danube Area countries in the realm of cycling infrastructure. The common impression is that many jurisdictions could benefit from improved communication and coordination between the many actors. Individual observations are summarised hereunder:

- **Austria:** general responsibilities for the planning and maintenance of cycle networks are with the municipalities, i.e., the issue is dispersed between more than 2,000 entities – and cross-community projects like cycle highways can be difficult to realise. Stakeholders therefore argue that a somewhat more centralised approach would be desirable.
- **Bulgaria:** it is reported that no state institution has powers regarding bicycle traffic at the national level, and that the same applies to district administrations, hence an inherent lack of coordination is evident; practically all responsibilities for planning, design, investment, and maintenance are reported to be imposed on municipalities, whose expert capacity and financial possibilities are very limited in terms of cycling. On the other hand, a complex system

of responsibilities between institutions at national, regional, and local level is reported for cycle *tourism* routes.

- **Croatia:** roads and cycling routes in Croatia are reported to be classified in several categories and different state institutions take care of planning, implementation and maintaining of those routes. No problems in this respect were reported by stakeholders.
- **Czech Republic:** stakeholders suggest the integration of the national and regional roads directorates in planning, building and maintenance processes, so that a future cycle network can be operated in a similar way to roads, with different functional classes.
- **Hungary:** a complex set of responsibilities for the development of the cycle network was identified by stakeholders, from national to regional and local entities. For maintenance, the responsibilities are shared between the municipalities (inside settlements) and the Public Roads company (outside settlements). No suggestions for improvement were received from stakeholders.
- **Moldova:** it is reported that, outside the capital Chisinau, cycling is not a core topic yet, hence a share of responsibilities between actors at national, regional, and local level is still hypothetical.
- **Romania:** there is a complex structure for the planning and maintenance of roads between institutions at national, regional, and local level. Questions arise when a cycle route is located along several road classes, or when a piece of infrastructure is built by another institution than a road authority.
- **Slovenia:** stakeholders note that road operators are responsible for cycling infrastructure; the national Infrastructure Agency is responsible for state cycling connections, while municipalities are responsible for cycling infrastructure within settlements. It is reported that recently municipalities increasingly take care also of the interurban cycle networks. The lack of regional coordination was criticised by stakeholders.
- **Slovakia:** it is argued that all cycling infrastructure is planned and constructed by public administrations – at regional or municipal level. The national level usually takes care of funding. Several issues delaying regular planning, projecting and approval processes were identified by stakeholders, and the related decisions are not always based on evidence.

### 2.1.9. Key issues – aspects to providing and assessing safe cycling infrastructure

A wealth of ingredients of a well-working system of providing and assessing safe cycling infrastructure was shared by each individual stakeholder in the hundreds of interviews and workshops across the Danube Area. Hereunder a list of the most commonly quoted aspects is given:

1. A clear and long-term **strategic vision** of a basic cycling network which follows the five principles: cohesion, directness, safety, comfort and attractiveness.
2. Up-to-date **guidelines, rules, and regulations** (including straightforward public procurement and land acquisition processes as well as adjustment of the liability principles so that vulnerable road users obtain special protection)
3. **Education & training** of professionals and decision-makers
4. Supportive **political environment** and **committed actors**
5. Professional **communication and cooperation** channels between all institutions & the public
6. Thorough **analysis** of the **current situation**: needs and requirements of all involved parties (participative process), crash and traffic data (flows, speeds, HGV share, ...) or local data collection when data are not available (see point 10).
7. Consideration of different evidence-based **interventions** (shared or separated infrastructure)
8. **Step-by-step implementation plan**
9. **Funds** for construction and maintenance – covering also costs of administrative staff.

10. **Data collection:** crash and injury data, conflict surveys, traffic flows, network-wide GIS
11. Independent **monitoring & evaluation** before & after; use of the results for **public relations**.
12. Regular **data collection & analysis for infrastructure safety assessment**, according to a national plan: database with access to all stakeholders

## 2.2. Solutions and good practices for provision and assessment of safe cycling infrastructure in the Danube Area

A wealth of indications for good practices was received by stakeholders during interviews and through questionnaires, including many links to websites and illustrations. In this Output report, these specific links are not replicated but references are given in a more general manner.

### 2.2.1. General observations

For some of the SABRINA partner countries, stakeholders conveyed that the provision of cycling facilities is still in its early steps, with little strategic backing, and mostly limited to separate cycle paths or local cycling planning initiatives within single projects (BG, RO). Even where cycling is still marginal, notable activities have recently been launched at city level, including experimental solutions, (Chisinau, MD). Other countries report that, except for larger towns, activities directed at cycling infrastructure are still mainly focused on touristic routes (SI). The transition to incentivise cycling as an everyday mode of transport can be supported by awareness activities, such as the successful *Bike to Work* campaign & competition (SK), or by programmes to teach safe cycling to children (HR, SI). Collections of good practices and statistics of cycle networks are already available for some countries, e.g., through the *CityChangers* initiative (CZ). While financial resources are crucial for any activity to improve cycling infrastructure, it seems advisable to link funding to the existence of adopted cycle network plans (HU).

13

### 2.2.2. Local projects & engineering solutions

The local solutions presented by SABRINA partners were as varied as the status of cycling in the Danube Area countries; some outstanding examples are listed hereunder (countries in alphabetic order):

- **Austria:** good experiences are reported with advanced stop lines (“bike boxes”) and “pre-green” at traffic lights for cyclists. A variety of solutions are presented from different regions, both for recreational and everyday cycle routes. They include traffic calming and shared space-like solutions, narrowing of roads and separation of cycling facilities, routes on former railway lines, advances in intermodality between trains and bikes as well as bridges and underpasses that closed connections between sub-networks. Specific reference is made to Austria’s westernmost region *Vorarlberg* which in many respects was reported as most advanced by stakeholders.
- **Croatia:** the city of Pula was praised for its cycling infrastructure management, including monthly maintenance, and the town of Karlovac for its project to separate bicycle and pedestrian flows from motorised traffic along a state road section.
- **Czech Republic:** illustrated examples were given for successful implementation of cycling facilities in several Czech towns, including bicycle contraflow in one-ways, (separate lane or marked by sharrows), narrowing of roads to curb speeds, bicycle racks, advisory lanes (experiment currently not covered by regulations), and underpasses/overpasses.

- **Hungary:** touristic routes between Budapest and Lake Balaton as well as the Lake Balaton Round Trip cycle route were presented as good practice – including their ongoing developments.
- **Moldova:** local projects were presented, mainly in the capital Chisinau, e.g., a (temporary) dedicated lane for public transport and cyclists, and “*the first cycling lane that does not pass through a park*”
- **Romania:** the cities of Arad and Timisoara are listed as successful in implementing cycling infrastructure; in the city of Brasov, public buses feature bike racks; and a law was passed in late 2020 – obliging all authorities to mount bike stands at all locations of public institutions.
- **Slovenia:** the cities of Koper, Maribor and Novo mesto are mentioned for their successful separation of cycling infrastructure from motorised traffic; the capital Ljubljana, is likewise praised for cyclist separation as well as for traffic lights, good connectivity, and bike rental services. Several recreational routes are mentioned (e.g., Izola-Koper – part of *Parenzana*, which is part of EuroVelo 8; Kranjska Gora cycling trail – both partly on abandoned railway routes) as well as connections to boats, trains or buses that are adapted for bicycles. In general, it is claimed that road transport strategies in some municipalities have made a good contribution to the review and planning of cycling infrastructure.
- **Slovakia:** the Banská Bystrica – Podlavice cycling route is mentioned as a good example of collaboration of local administration and local cycling advocacy group, to overcome lack of capacity in the authority. Reference is made to several successful local projects in the cities of Bratislava (including first use of *shark teeth* in Slovakia), Žilina (where the oldest segregated cycling lane in the town showed that the principle “*build it for them and they will come*” works), Trnava (intensive use of automatic counters of cyclists to obtain hard data), and Trenčín (reconstruction of old railway bridge for cycling and pedestrian use)

### 2.2.3. Planning approaches

14

Even if the integrative planning of cycling networks is a fairly recent concept in the Danube Area, all SABRINA countries’ stakeholders did present several remarkable examples for good practices, the majority of them at local or regional level:

- **Austria:** stakeholders emphasised that participative processes are key to success in sustainable planning for cycle networks, as well as the involvement of decision-makers and representatives of authorities who cycle themselves. The Austrian *Graph Integration Platform* GIP, i.e., a nationwide, geographic database for all traffic routes, is becoming a common basis and tool for all planning activities. Several examples for successful planning, participation and implementation processes were given, for different types and use classes of cycling facilities in various regions.
- **Bulgaria:** good practice planning approaches for the development of cycling networks were presented for the cities of Ruse, Burgas, Sofia, and Kazanlak.
- **Croatia:** the cities of Osijek, Čakovec, Varaždin, Karlovac and Koprivnica were mentioned as exemplary when it comes to planning and implementing cycling networks as well as commitment to awareness-raising work towards everyday use of cycling.
- **Czech Republic:** the region of UnicoVsko was depicted as “the Czech Netherlands” by stakeholders for its rapid development of a cycling network and wide-scale cycle use of the population. The *Elbe Cycle Route* in the Usti Region was praised for the ambition of local municipalities to provide an entirely safe facility by the end of 2021.
- **Hungary:** the capital Budapest boasts several noteworthy developments; the Cycling Network Plan (CNP) of District XI was the first to be processed entirely in a GIS database. A national cycling path planning programme was reported to be launched in 2021 to improve regional accessibility with a budget of HUF 4 billion, involving all county municipalities (all submitted network and design plans to be reviewed by a professional committee with the involvement of

NGOs). CNPs have recently become a requirement to apply for EU funds. First CNPs are reported to be launched also for the regional level, e.g., for 60 settlements in the Somló-Marcalmamente-Bakonyalja area.

- **Moldova:** a first participative planning process between designers and the cycling community is reported for the implementation of a *green corridor* in the capital Chisinau.
- **Romania:** the city of Cluj Napoca is reported to be developing a project with the World Bank (currently in public consultation phase). Integrative planning and public consultation processes are also reported from the city of Sibiu, while noteworthy SUMP are available from the cities Dej and Oradea.
- **Slovenia:** the capital Ljubljana and the town of Velenje are quoted for their integrative planning processes; the latter boasts large-scale enabling of contraflow cycling in one-ways and good communication with all relevant stakeholders. Experts have been appointed to coordinate cycling infrastructure planning initiatives between the municipalities Gorenjska and Savinjska.
- **Slovakia:** the towns of Trnava and Trenčín are reported to consider cycling as a full-fledged transport mode and local transportation plans have been elaborated accordingly. In addition, the cycling network and master plans of Banská Bystrica, Bratislava and the Bratislava region are quoted as exemplary in terms of participative design and connectivity.

#### 2.2.4. Strategic approaches

In the Danube Area countries, cycling as a mode of transport is regularly included in national road safety strategies, however individual cycling strategies are reported to be found mainly on regional and local level:

- **Austria:** two national working groups for touristic and every-day cycling (including regional and national cycling coordinators) meet on a regular basis to coordinate their activities. It was stressed that personal continuity of a “champion”, i.e., a committed person at political or administrative level, has often been identified as key to success. Several strategic initiatives at the level of cities and regions as well as a nationwide campaign and competition to promote everyday cycling were presented by stakeholders.
- **Croatia:** cycling is reported to be included in the national public health strategy, in addition to current cycling related upgrades of the Highway Code and the road safety programme.
- **Czech Republic:** several well-elaborated strategic documents are reported to be available, from municipal (with specific mention of the town of Otrokovice) to national level, however it is seen as difficult for practitioners and decision-makers to adequately keep track of those documents.
- **Hungary:** the setting-up of a National Cycling Strategy is reported to be in progress. Reference is made to the INTERREG project *Danube Cycle Plans* which, amongst other objectives, aims at promoting national and international cycling policies on the basis of national cycling strategies, developed under a common (macro-regional and yet to be developed) Danube Cycling Strategy.
- **Moldova:** a local cycling strategy for the capital Chisinau is reported to be in the consultation phase.
- **Slovenia:** apart from inclusion in national road safety strategies as well as in local road transport strategies, safe cycling is included in the promotional strategy of the Slovenian Tourism Agency.
- **Slovakia:** stakeholders highlighted the regional strategies of Prešov, Košice and Banská Bystrica which have been prepared with a view to allowing local authorities to follow suit with their processes in a coordinated way (zoning plans, land acquisition, procurement, funds)

### 2.2.5. Safety ratings

Safety assessment of cycling facilities is no common practice whatsoever in the Danube Area countries so far. Whereas the principles of road safety audits and inspections are well-known concepts to many (at least for the high-level road network), and the EuroRAP methodology is familiar to some, those principles are not yet widely applied to cycling routes. A noteworthy exception is the European Certification Standard which has already been applied on 21,000 km of EuroVelo routes – across 26 countries. Individual observations from SABRINA countries are listed hereunder:

- **Austria:** infrastructure assessment has predominantly been carried out on EuroVelo routes (ADFC methodology) and in the course of research projects, e.g., to assess surface conditions or cycling comfort by way of (fusion of) new-generation sensor technology. In addition, several initiatives have been set for cyclist's feedback on deficiencies or dangers on the network. Tools or projects from other countries were also mentioned by stakeholders, such as the *Propensity to Cycle Tool* (PCT) for England and Wales, and the *Welsh active travel audit tool*.
- **Hungary:** a technical document "*Designing Public Roads Suitable for Cycling*" was mentioned, which proposes a rating system with indicators to measure the comfort level of cyclists (similar to the four-level traffic stress concept used by the U.S. Mineta Transportation Institute).
- **Slovenia:** safety assessment for cycle routes is reported to be limited to the EuroVelo network
- **Slovakia:** road safety audits are reported to be mandatory for all (new & reconstruction) road projects, including for cycling facilities, however uptake of proposed remedial measures seem poor. A private association (EuroRAP member) plans to assess cycling facilities in 2021. Principles and methods of safety ratings are not generally known by design engineers and cycle routes investors, thus neither requested nor implemented.

### 2.2.6. Other concrete examples for good practices

16

A variety of further examples for good practices were presented by stakeholders from SABRINA countries. They include learning, promotion and awareness-raising activities, funding options, and touristic initiatives to popularise cycling:

- **Bulgaria:** a wealth of – mainly recreational – cycling routes as well as the construction of 200 bicycle parking spaces in Sofia near the metro and to the main lines of public transport were reported by stakeholders.
- **Croatia:** several cities are reported to have recently set up children cyclists' education and training tracks/parks, e.g., Zagreb, Vinkovci, Varaždin, Kutina and Split.
- **Hungary:** since May 2015, an annual National Day of Traffic Culture is organised by the Hungarian Transport Ministry together with a wide range of partner organisations, with awareness-raising events throughout the country including the promotion of cycling safety.
- **Moldova:** Travel surveys were conducted among the cycling communities on social media to determine the main routes in the capital Chisinau.
- **Romania:** a voucher campaign for the acquisition of bicycles and the first and biggest bike-sharing project in Romania were reported from the capital Bucharest.
- **Slovenia:** the provision of investment funds for cycling infrastructure in municipalities as well as cycling training initiatives in primary schools were reported.
- **Slovakia:** the annual Bike to work campaign & competition was reported to have nation-wide impact. A new initiative makes cargo bikes available to municipalities for testing a potential use for community services. The cooperation of villages and small towns in the Bratislava region in cycling network development as well as the activities of the Slovak Cycle Club (signposting recreational routes) were also depicted as good practices by stakeholders. The European Mobility Week is quite well received.



### 2.2.7. Experiences to avoid at all costs

Without exception, participants of the SABRINA stakeholder consultation have witnessed mishaps and setbacks in relation to providing and maintaining safe cycling infrastructure. The following issues should, according to stakeholders, be avoided wherever possible in the future:

- Lay out a **strategy** - avoid isolated measures just because there is some colour/cement left over. Local and regional authorities are often focused on individual pieces of infrastructure, neglecting the wider context and harmonisation with other modes (e.g., public transit).
- Do not solely produce **glossy strategic brochures**, only to learn that real decisions are then made – in isolation – elsewhere, in regions and municipalities; **involve as many stakeholders** and as much **public consultation** as possible, at all levels.
- Do not start **planning cycling** infrastructure without connectivity of facilities to the network as a main objective: a cycle track in the middle of nowhere, often as make-shift, will not be used. Avoid road/rail investments that do not integrate necessary elements of cycling infrastructure.
- Do not make too many **compromises** – they will not be useful for cyclists. Do not plan under standard level, these constructions work in theory but not in practice.
- Do not forget to organise sound structures of **responsibilities and coordination**, including well-thought **communication** and **decision structures**; otherwise, the many involved parties will not cooperate – and the wheel will be invented over and over again.
- Do not omit the **value for money aspect**: allocate funds only based on data, quality and efficiency – and avoid the shotgun approach.
- Do not forget to provide **attractive alternatives for car users**: it is necessary to consider the values of individuals and their feelings & sentiments in sustainable city planning.
- Do not plan any large piece of **road infrastructure** without a **parallel cycling facility**.
- Avoid pushing **cyclists together with pedestrians** on the same facility and force them to go at walking speed; it will cause conflict and will not be used in a sustainable way.
- Avoid organising each **junction** differently, **standardised solutions** add safety and comfort to cycling.
- Do not forget to **properly maintain** your cycling networks: every cycling facility is a living – and ageing – organism.
- Do not forget that an overall **reduction of speed levels of motorised traffic** can turn a road into a perfect cycling facility.
- Do not fail to give cyclists a proper status in rules and regulations: e.g., a minimum **safety distance** between cyclists and overtaking motor vehicles should be established.
- Do not take **Amsterdam** or **Copenhagen** as your role model; choose *relatable* and successful cities with similar size and structure to your own.

17

## 3. Conclusions and further steps

The stakeholder consultation provided mutual exchange between project partners & stakeholders, both within and between participating Danube countries, which has the potential to speeding up the provision of safe cycling infrastructure across the region. In addition, the findings will directly feed into developing the basic architecture and functions of SABRINA's Safer Cycling Routes Toolkit (SCRT) as well as the trainings and pilot actions which will demonstrate the effective use of the SCRT across the Danube region. The SCRT is designed to prevail and be available to all stakeholders beyond the lifetime of the SABRINA project.

## 4. Annex

Name of Organisation	Target Group	Country
Österreichischer Städtebund	Local public authority	Austria
City of Salzburg	Local public authority	Austria
Mobilitätsagentur Wien	Regional public authority	Austria
Amt der Niederösterreichischen Landesregierung, Land Niederösterreich, Austria	Regional public authority	Austria
Amt der Vorarlberger Landesregierung, Land Vorarlberg, Austria	Regional public authority	Austria
Amt der Burgenländischen Landesregierung, Land Burgenland, Austria	Regional public authority	Austria
Amt der Salzburger Landesregierung, Land Salzburg, Austria	Regional public authority	Austria
Federal Ministry for Climate Action, Environment, Energy, Mobility, Innovation and Technology (BMK)	National public authority	Austria
Vienna University of Technology	Higher educ. & research	Austria
University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna	Higher educ. & research	Austria
Radlobby Österreich	Interest groups+NGOs	Austria
Österreichische Forschungsgesellschaft Straße - Schiene - Verkehr (FSV) – Austrian Research Association for Roads, Railways and Transport	Interest groups+NGOs	Austria
ÖAMTC	Interest groups+NGOs	Austria
Umweltbundesamt (UBA) - Environment Agency Austria	Sectoral agency	Austria
Kärnten Werbung	Sectoral agency	Austria
ecoplus. Niederösterreichs Wirtschaftsagentur GmbH	Sectoral agency	Austria
via donau - Österreichische Wasserstraßen-Gesellschaft mbH	Infrast.+service provider	Austria
European Cyclists' Federation (ECF)	Int.org, national law	Belgium
iRAP	Int.org, national law	Great Britain
International Transport Forum (ITF) / Organization for Economic	Int.org, international law	France

Cooperation and Development (OECD)		
Allgemeine Unfallversicherungsanstalt (AUVA)	Other	Austria
Verracon GmbH	Other	Austria
Arbeiterkammer Wien	Other	Austria
European Integrated Projects (EIP)	Other	Austria
Tourist agency of Pula	Sectoral agency	Croatia
Croatian Autoclub (HAK)	National public authority	Croatia
Croatian roads Ltd.	National public authority	Croatia
Ministry of Internal Affairs	National public authority	Bulgaria
BCCI Vidin (Bulgarian Chamber of Commerce and Industry)	Sectoral agency	Bulgaria
Technical University Ruse	Higher educ. & research	Bulgaria
Regional Administration Silistra	Regional public authority	Bulgaria
Association Bulgarian Politics School	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Vratsa Municipality	Local public authority	Bulgaria
Ruse Municipality	Local public authority	Bulgaria
Regional Administration Vratsa	Regional public authority	Bulgaria
Ministry of Transport	National public authority	Bulgaria
Institute for Tourism	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Technical University Ruse	Higher educ. & research	Bulgaria
Varna Free University	Higher educ. & research	Bulgaria
Varna University of Management	Higher educ. & research	Bulgaria
Association of Black Sea Municipalities	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
NGO Sitovo	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Varna University of Management	Higher educ. & research	Bulgaria
Avangard Personal Consulting Ltd.	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Road Auditor	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Regional Administration Vidin	Regional public authority	Bulgaria
Byala Municipality	Local public authority	Bulgaria
Dunav Municipalities Association	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria

Association for Tourism enhancement, Vidin	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
ARDBC Vidin	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
BCCI Vidin (Bulgarian Chamber of Commerce and Industry)	Sectoral agency	Bulgaria
Velo Club Vidin	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Vratsa Velosociety	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Velo Club Dobrich	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Velo evolution	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Technical University Gabrovo, Vice Rector	Higher educ. & research	Bulgaria
Velo Mechanic, Gabrovo	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Alliance for regional and civil initiatives	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
ROAD SAFETY BULGARIAN BRANCH ASSOCIATION	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Transport Infrastructure and Construction Institute	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Dunav Ultra	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Dve Mogili Municipality	Local public authority	Bulgaria
Nikopol Municipality	Local public authority	Bulgaria
Dolna Mitropolia Municipality	Local public authority	Bulgaria
BCCI Silistra (Bulgarian Chamber of Commerce and Industry)	Sectoral agency	Bulgaria
BCCI Pleven (Bulgarian Chamber of Commerce and Industry)	Sectoral agency	Bulgaria
NTS – Pleven (Professional training centre)	Interest groups+NGOs	Bulgaria
Bulgarian State Agency for Road Safety	Sectoral agency	Bulgaria
Lom Municipality	Local public authority	Bulgaria
BCCI Ruse (Bulgarian Chamber of Commerce and Industry)	Sectoral agency	Bulgaria
Tutrakan Municipality	Local public authority	Bulgaria
360 Magazine	Other	Bulgaria
CykloBudějovice	Interest groups+NGOs	Czech Republic
Nadace Partnerství	Interest groups+NGOs	Czech Republic
Atelis, s.r.o.	Interest groups+NGOs	Czech Republic
EDIP s.r.o.	Interest groups+NGOs	Czech Republic
FD ČVUT v Praze	Interest groups+NGOs	Czech Republic

Haskoning DHV CR s.r.o.	Interest groups+NGOs	Czech Republic
CDV	Interest groups+NGOs	Czech Republic
HBH projekt s.r.o.	Interest groups+NGOs	Czech Republic
Atelier MOK	Interest groups+NGOs	Czech Republic
MAKETUSZ, Hungarian Bicycle Tourism Association	Interest groups+NGOs	Hungary
ITM, Ministry for Innovation and Technology	National public authority	Hungary
KTI, Institute for Transport Sciences	Higher educ. & research	Hungary
Hungarian Public Roads Zrt.	National public authority	Hungary
AÖFK, Centre for Development of Active and Ecotourism	Interest groups+NGOs	Hungary
MAÚT Hungarian Road and Rail Society / Ertekterv Ltd.	Other	Hungary
Chisinau City Hall	Local public authority	Moldova
Road Infrastructure Safety Observatory	Higher educ. & research	Moldova
Technical University of the Republic of Moldova	Higher educ. & research	Moldova
Ministry of Infrastructure of the Republic of Moldova	National public authority	Moldova
State Road Administration	Infrastr.+service provider	Moldova
Chisinau City Hall	Local public authority	Moldova
Working Group for Alternative Transport	Interest groups+NGOs	Moldova
EcoVisio, NGO	Interest groups+NGOs	Moldova
National Inspectorate for Public Security	National public authority	Moldova
Platforma Urbana	Interest groups+NGOs	Moldova
Technical University of the Republic of Moldova	Higher educ. & research	Moldova
FRB	Interest groups+NGOs	Romania
Nomad	Interest groups+NGOs	Romania
Politehnica University Bucharest	Higher educ. & research	Romania
CNAIR	National public authority	Romania
Traffic police brigade	National public authority	Romania
Civic cycling initiative Banská Bystrica	Interest groups+NGOs	Slovakia
Slovak cycling club	Interest groups+NGOs	Slovakia
Ministry of Transportation, National cycling coordinator	National public authority	Slovakia

Cyklokoalícia	Interest groups+NGOs	Slovakia
Dopravoprojekt	Other	Slovakia
University of Žilina	Higher educ. & research	Slovakia
Bratislava Selfgoverning region	Regional public authority	Slovakia
Municipality of Ilirska Bistrica	Local public authority	Slovenia
TIC Ilirska Bistrica	Regional public authority	Slovenia
Zavod za kulturo, turizem in šport Murska Sobota	Regional public authority	Slovenia
RDA Green Karst	Regional public authority	Slovenia
ORA Krasa in Brkinov	Regional public authority	Slovenia
RDC Koper	Regional public authority	Slovenia
Research and education center, mansion Rakičan	Regional public authority	Slovenia
Focus, Association for Sustainable Development	Interest groups+NGOs	Slovenia
IPoP - Institute for Spatial Policies	Interest groups+NGOs	Slovenia
Slovenian cycling network	Interest groups+NGOs	Slovenia
University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Civil and Geodetic Engineering	Higher educ. & research	Slovenia
Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency	National public authority	Slovenia
Ministry of Infrastructure, Sustainable Mobility and Transport Policy Directorate	National public authority	Slovenia