# INCLUSION Project

## Deliverable D3.2

## Case study methodology

Version: 2.1

Author: Ralf Brand



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

# Document Control Page

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Case study methodology |
| **Editor** | Ralf Brand |
| **Contributors** | Michele Masnata, Stefano Persi, Caitlin Doyle Cottrill |
| **Nature** | R |
| **Dissemination Level** | CO |
| **Version number** | 2.1 |
| **Planned Delivery Date** | 28 February 2018 |
| **Version date** | Apr. 11 2018 |
| **Abstract** | This document articulates the epistemological and conceptual framework of the INCLUSION case study methodology and elaborates the specific methodical devices to be used by all consortium partners who contribute to the case study activities. It also includes a written rationale on the case selection process, the data analysis procedure and a separate section on the ethical conduct of all related activities. |

| Version | Date | Modified by | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0.1 | Jan. 10 2018 | Ralf Brand | Outline |
| 1.0 | Jan. 30 2018 | Ralf Brand | First share-worthy draft |
| 1.5 | Feb. 10 2018 | Ralf Brand | Version with comments from consortium partners incorporated |
| 1.8 | Mar. 10 2018 | Ralf Brand | Version ready for sharing with Stakeholder Forum members and other potential interviewees |
| 1.9 | Mar. 27 2018 | Ralf Brand | Version with comments from Stakeholder Forum members and from other potential interviewees incorporated |
| 2.0 | Mar. 29 2018 | Michele Masnata | Conversion into official INCLUSION CI layout |
| 2.1 | Apr. 11 2018 | Ralf Brand | Final |

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

# Contents



# List of tables

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

# 1 Signposting

This document describes and explains the methodology to be used for the case study research within the INCLUSION project. Its initial **chapter 2** sets the overall scene by providing the general context and purpose of the research to be undertaken within INCLUSION's work package 3.

One of this document's main purposes is it to make the rationale underlying our methodological and methodical decisions transparent and therefore open to scrutiny and thus to strengthen our findings' reliability and credibility. As with any research methodology, it should always be a function of some underlying assumptions and principles, typically referred to as epistemological framework. Related considerations are expressed in **chapter 3.**

Another purpose of this document is to communicate the research approach clearly to all participating consortium members, in particular to those who execute some case studies themselves (in addition to the WP leader, Rupprecht Consult). **Chapter 4** therefore articulates the concrete, practical approaches and rules for the actual data gathering elements of all case studies.

To give a flavour of what aspects of the fifty (50) case studies are of interest to the INCLUSION team, **chapter 5** contains an indicative questions bank. This set of possible – and non-exhaustive – questions will have to be tailored to each specific case study. **Chapter 6** explains what happens to the information that will gathered about all 50 INCLUSION case studies. In other words, it elaborates the analysis procedure as an integral part of the overall research process.

Logistical and operational details (responsibilities, timing, risks, expenses) of all activities within the overall case study research process are made explicit in **chapter 7**, before the final **chapter 8** presents INCLUSION's strategies to ensure compliance of its research activities with highest ethical standards, including a template for an Informed Consent Agreement.

# 2 Case study research with INCLUSION

INCLUSION has a separate work package dedicated exclusively to research about cases, initiatives, projects etc. with the intention to tackle exclusion from mobility (a.k.a. transport poverty). This is to get an overview of the range of existing approaches – ideally innovative ones – and to learn related good (and bad) practice lessons. From this, INCLUSION aims to derive generalisable lessons, which should serve as inspiration to others, who pursue a similar mission. Another target audience are those who shape wider regulatory and other frameworks (e.g. policy makers, insurers etc.) and could therefore help to improve the context conditions for successful initiatives tackling transport poverty to emerge and to thrive.

To get a reasonably representative view across the various initiatives out there, INCLUSION will investigate 50 cases overall. Forty (40) of them will be studied at a more superficial level, primarily through desk research, in order to capture the *breadth* of initiatives; each study will eventually result in a case fiche of 2-3 pages. Ten (10) other cases will be studied at much greater *depth* and with appropriate methods such as semi-structured interviews, focus group meetings, face-to-face conversations with beneficiaries etc. At least five such cases will be visited physically through field trips of ca. 3-5 days each. As explained in chapter 8, all interviewees will be offered a signed Informed Consent Agreement, which articulates the project's promise to protect everyone's anonymity (if so desired).

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

In order to get a sense of the general scope and reach of each initiative, INCLUSION will gather some quantitative information about them all. While the purpose of such data is mainly to *describe* every initiative and to provide some benchmarking across them, the core of our intention is to *understand* them. The majority of 'data' to be gathered about each case will therefore be of a qualitative nature in the form of textual information, transcripts – possibly also audio recordings – from telephone and face-to-face interviews, focus group notes, photographs and potentially even drawings, while assuring the compliance of the GDPR, as described in the yet to be developed Data Management Plan (part of Deliverable 9.1).

Even the most rigorous case study research methodology could still turn out impractical if the people whose collaboration is required in the sense of sharing their views, experience and insights (esp. those of a sensitive nature) perceive it as inappropriate, threatening or otherwise problematic. Among the potential obstacles could be inappropriateness of the chosen methods to a cases' cultural conventions, gender issues, language capabilities, literacy, affinity for technology, access to the internet, etc. For this reason, INCLUSION's case study approach will be shared with at least two representatives of at least five cases and/or of INCLUSION's Stakeholder Forum in order to hear their feedback and thus to improve the methodology before it is applied in actual data gathering "missions".

With reference to INCLUSION's DoA (Description of Action), this document is the key output of Task 3.2, which is embedded within other elements of WP3 as follows:

Task 3.1: Case study identification and selection (Months 3-6 / Dec 2017 – Mar 2018)

- 50 case studies across Europe (potentially beyond)
- based on prioritised areas & social groups addressed (WP1), and innovative measures
- Output: D3.1 Database of case study nominees (Month 6)

Task 3.2: Developing the case study methodology (Months 4-5 / Jan – Feb 2018)

- Defined with input from research subjects (2 representatives from 5 cases)
- Output: D3.2 conceptual and epistemological framework & set of complementary methods (Month 5)

Task 3.3: Conducting the case studies (Months 6-18 / Mar 2018 – Mar 2019)

- 10 in-depth, 40 shorter overview case studies
- Output: D3.3 50 case study profiles (Month 18)

Task 3.4: Data Analysis, identification of patterns and transferability (Months 12-25/ Sep 2018 – Oct 2019)

- Analysis of qualitative and quantitative data
- Output: D3.4 Typology and description of underlying principles and generalizable lessons

# 3 Conceptual framework

The INCLUSION consortium is convinced that the specific context within which sustainable mobility practitioners operate is of utmost importance. This certainly includes financial, regulatory and other 'objective' opportunities and constraints. The case study methodology pursued by the INCLUSION team therefore contains elements to capture such parameters as accurately as possible, for example through a

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

thorough documentation of the detailed funding structure of every initiative studied. Likewise, we endeavour to understand the legal framework of every case and its impact on the specific approach, shape, structure, success of every initiative we study.

In addition to such 'hard' context factors it is always the individual perception of all factors that matter in practice. Therefore, our methodological approach has been chosen to enable us to capture these aspects as well. Accordingly, we need to deploy methods that allow us to understand the perception of the human beings working for the various cases we are going to study. Also, the kinds of questions we are going to ask (see chapter 5) will correspond to this assumption and the forms of interactions we are going to deploy, i.e. interviews, focus group meeting, drawing exercises etc. The nature of 'data' gathered through such methods will, in most cases, be of a qualitative nature in the form of words and visuals. This has an impact on the kinds of data analysis approach we envisage as most suitable – see chapter 6.

What also determines the overall framework of INCLUSION's case study methodology are the following quality criteria which will inform every aspect of our research, in particular as guiding principles in situations that might require compromises:

- Credibility: The raw data, interim findings and final conclusions should be publicly available (but confidentiality trumps this factor).
- Transparency: The method description should be publicly available; hence this document.
- Confidentiality: Respondents should be offered complete anonymity in writing; this requirement will be fulfilled through an Informed Consent Sheet (see chapter 8).
- Data security: All names of respondents, interview notes, recordings and any other "data" will be encrypted.
- Proportionality: The data collection and analysis efforts should be proportionate to the intended purpose; hence the possibility for representatives of potential cases and members of the Stakeholder Forum to provide input into the INCLUSION methodology.
- Manageability: Only such types and amounts of data should be collected that will actually be used in further analysis steps.
- Traceability: Anyone questioning a certain statement should have the opportunity to trace it back to the origin (as long as it does not violate confidentiality); this possibility exists by contacting the leader of the INCLUSION case study research activities, Rupprecht Consult at info@rupprecht-consult.eu.
- Validity: Care should be taken that questions appropriately capture the actual issue at stake; pilot tests of interview schedules, surveys etc. will be conducted to ensure this.
- Reliability: The data captured should be representative of the standard situation; not of a special outlier situation.
- Freedom of bias:
    - Respondent bias: Every respondent will be offered written anonymity and complete freedom from any repercussions to facilitate frank answers without self-congratulatory tendencies.
    - Researcher bias: If case study researcher(s) become aware of their own positionality that might affect their judgment, they will disclose this to the WP leader or (in the case of the WP leader itself) to the project coordinator.
- Ethics: The research process, data gathering process, use of data, dissemination of findings should adhere to highest ethical standards (see chapter 8).
- Evidence based: Wherever possible, factual and verifiable information should be used. Nevertheless, subjective opinions should enter the "dataset" but must be declared as such.
- Triangulation: A range of sources (interviews, written material, observations, …) should inform the

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

final conclusions, especially where incongruent signals are received.

- Independence: The design and execution of the research process must not be affected by any vested interests of parties involved in the research consortium or third parties.

Please note: Some of the above criteria stand in theoretical conflict to each other (e.g. confidentiality and traceability). In case such theoretical discrepancies materialise in a concrete way, the case study researchers will seek advice from the project coordinator and/or the entire consortium.

# 4 Case study methods

## 4.1 Selection of cases

INCLUSION will investigate fifty cases overall. In order to capture the breadth of existing initiatives, forty of them will be studied at a more superficial level, primarily through desk research, eventually resulting in a case fiche of 2-3 pages each. Ten other cases will be studied at much greater depth through interviews, focus group meetings, face-to-face conversations etc. An average of around 10 pages is foreseen for the final documentation of each in-depth case study.

As very first step, this requires the compilation of possibly many *candidate* cases from which a strategic sample can then be selected. For this purpose, INCLUSION has set up a dedicated database where all case nominations are being collected. It has been and will continue to be fed directly by consortium members who know of certain cases and through a public questionnaire (https://qeurope.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6g7KslRsaTnURz7), which was sent to all members of the Stakeholder Forum and beyond. Consortium members also circulated a call for nominations through their individual channels.

The final selection of cases to be actually studied and the allocation to the "overview" versus "in-depth" category will be made with the intention to ensure a balance across parameters like beneficiaries (e.g. disabled people, low-income, migrants, …), area types (e.g. urban, rural, hilly etc.) and other contextual factors. Special attention will be given to particularly innovative initiatives, also ensuring that a good number of cases is included that make use of novel IT applications and novel operational arrangements (incl. co-creation). Another selection criterion is the relevance for activities planned in the INCLUSION Pilot Labs.

Given the broad coverage of various languages among all consortium partners we anticipate that language barriers will not be relevant as exclusion criteria. Case studies with particularly unique context conditions – and therefore difficult transferability – are not likely to be included unless there is a plausible indication that they represent situations that might become more common in the future. If it turns out that contact to certain cases cannot be established or that case representatives are unwilling to participate a second round of case selection will be necessary – if necessary with slightly relaxed complementarity criteria.

The WP leader will propose an initial selection, which will then be discussed with all other consortium members with resources in WP3. A final selection is expected to be made by the end of May 2018. We anticipate this selection to be made public on the INCLUSION website.

The timing and responsibility for related activities within Task 3.1 (Case study identification and selection; months 3-6 / Dec 2017 – Mar 2018) is articulated in the WP3 work plan and has been agreed among the consortium partners as follows:

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

***Table 1 – WP3 Work Plan – Task 3.1***

| (Sub-) Task | Task name | Duration | Responsible Partner, Supporting partners | Assigned actions to contributors |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Task 3.1 | Case study identification and selection | 01.12.'17 - 31.03.'18 | **RUPPRECHT**, MEM, UNIABDN, EMTA, POLIS | **RUPPRECHT:** task leader<br><br>**MEM, UNIABDN, EMTA, POLIS:** contribute to case study identification and selection; provide links to service providers, operators, city authorities and other stakeholders |
| 3.1.1 | D3.1 'Database of case study nominees' – Case study identification | 1.12.'17 - 15.03.'18 | **RUPPRECHT**, MEM, UNIABDN, EMTA, POLIS | Identify 30 potential cases each and add details to database (5 partners x 30 cases = 150 to choose from) |
| | | 16.02. - 20.02.'18 | **RUPPRECHT**, EMTA, POLIS, SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN | Launch and promote call for nominations through Stakeholder Forum and consortium's member organisations (deadline for responses: 15 March) |
| 3.1.2 | D3.1 'Database of case study nominees' – Preliminary case study selection and report | 15.03. - 31.03.'18 | **RUPPRECHT,** MEM, UNIABDN, EMTA, POLIS | Provisional selection and allocation to in-depth or overview category |
| | | 01.04. - 31.05.'18 | **RUPPRECHT,** MEM, UNIABDN, EMTA, POLIS | MS3 Final selection of 10 + 40 case studies |
| | | 15.03. - 19.03.'18 | RUPPRECHT | Draft D3.1 developed and sent to WP3 partners for review |
| | | 19.03. - 21.03.'18 | MEM, UNIABDN, EMTA, POLIS | Send feedback on D3.1 to RUPPRECHT |
| | | 22.03. - 27.03.'18 | RUPPRECHT | Incorporate comments from partners on D3.1 and send to SOFT for final review |
| | | 27.03. - 29.03.'18 | SOFT | Send feedback on 'final' version of D3.1 to RUPPRECHT |
| | | 29.03. - 30.03.'18 | RUPPRECHT | Finalise and submit final version D3.1 |

## 4.2 Data sources

The data sources for each selected case will be selected simply by availability in a first instance. Such written and visual data sources will be utilised both for the 40 overview case studies and for the 10 in-depth case studies. It is anticipated that this will mainly be online resources, project websites, reports etc.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

In addition, we will actively search for additional sources, especially those that might add alternative interpretations to the dominant narrative from a project's own publications. All sources will be recorded in a Zotero[1] library for quick future retrieval and transparency. All consortium members already have or can get access to this library.

## 4.3 Selection of respondents

In addition to the desk-research based study of written data sources (see above), some cases – in particular the 10 in-depth case studies – will require a correspondence and/or conversations with representatives of the cases under study; possibly also with other researchers, key stakeholders and with end-users / beneficiaries. The selection of such respondents will start with a similar "opportunity sampling" as the data sources. Deliberate "snowball sampling" will be used to widen the spectrum of suitable respondent. Here again, particular care will be taken to ensure a balance across promoters, beneficiaries and critics of each case in the sense of a strategic triangulation of data sources. INCLUSION will also document, analyse and reflect upon the representativeness of its respondents in terms of gender, actor type, age etc. and – where any imbalances are detected – adjust its recruitment strategy accordingly.

## 4.4 Data gathering techniques for the in-depth case studies

Basic background information about the 40 overall case studies will start with desk research in the same way as for the 10 in-depth case studies. In addition, the in-depth investigations will also make use of a number of other data gathering techniques such as the following:

### *Semi-structured interviews*

Interviews, i.e. live conversations with knowledgeable individuals make it possible to gain deeper insights into the context conditions, success factors of a project, its (historical) background, supporters, opponents and also to learn about difficulties encountered and how (or to what degree) they were overcome. Some such conversations of a more exploratory nature will take place over the telephone or VoIP (e.g. Skype). In cases of non-face-to-face conversations, the persons conducting the interviews will offer their interviewees to share their screen during the conversation so that the informant can see live the notes the interviewee is taking and thus to ensure the correct representation of the respondents' views.

It is foreseen to also undertake at least five field trips to at least five cases in order to gain first-hand experience with these cases; ideally bundling two or more cases in one trip. This fieldwork period is scheduled for mid-2018 until early 2019. Interviews conducted during field trips are expected to last between 30 and 120 minutes; on average about one hour. A tentative interview schedule ("questions bank") is included in this document as section 5.

Full audio recordings of such interviews (and concomitant verbatim transcriptions) will only be done in rare cases – and only with the interviewee's explicit written consent (see section 8 for the Informed Consent Form). Typically, the interviewer will take written notes during the conversation on a digital device. These notes will be shared with the interviewee shortly after the interview so that the informants can check the congruence of the notes with what they intended to convey ("member check").

[1] *https://www.zotero.org/groups/2036951/inclusion*

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

All interviewees will always be offered a signed Informed Consent Agreement, which articulates the project's promise to protect everyone's anonymity (if so desired).

### *Interactive drawing exercises*

Interactive drawing exercises can complement the interviews, because they can stimulate the articulation of tacit knowledge and experiences that would otherwise evade the attempt to express them verbally. Various techniques will be employed, depending on the situation. Examples are:

- Respondents will be encouraged to "think out loud" while they draw a map of all actors (Venn diagram) and their relationships as they subjectively perceived it, using different colours for different power grades.
- Respondents will be invited to articulate their thoughts while they draw a retrospective Gantt chart of the initiative's evolution over time.

### *Focus groups*

Focus groups can play a valuable role for the in-depth case study process and will be held depending on needs and possibilities. Given the probably short physical fieldtrips to some selected in-depth cases, it will be important to schedule such group meetings well in advance in order to ensure a balanced representation of various actors and, very importantly, also beneficiaries of the respective initiative / project. Depending on the specific context, the case history, the actor constellation etc. various moderation techniques can be used to elicit the participants' views and to utilise the specific social dynamic of a synchronous conversation among multiple participants with their specific views ("live triangulation").

Focus groups should be comprised of various actors with various perspectives and interests, including – but not limited to – commercial service providers, transport operators, technicians, key promoters, citizen groups (i.e. users / beneficiaries), representatives of the city administration, local policy makers etc. While the actual composition of a focus group will always be subject to a certain degree of "opportunity sampling", deliberate efforts will be made to recruit a fair balance of stakeholders. If specific "stakes" are apparently absent, we will try to fill such gaps through personal interviews with individuals who hold such stakes.

Focus group meetings will be held under the Chatham House Rule, which was developed and established by the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, also known as „Chatham House". This rule stipulates:

> *"When a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the Chatham House Rule, participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed."*

This rule has often shown to facilitate the expression of frank and uninhibited statements from the participants. In addition, focus group participants will also be offered a signed Informed Consent Agreement, which articulates the project's promise to protect everyone's anonymity (if so desired).

It is not foreseen to audio-record such conversations but to take detailed written notes; these will – again – be circulated among all participants shortly after the event with a request to check whether important views are correctly reflected in the meeting minutes.

### *Online survey*

As a technique to gather the views of several actors (and to add breadth to the depth of the intensive conversational techniques mentioned above) online surveys might also be used for the in-depth case studies. Such surveys make the data entry / information submission procedure very convenient, especially

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

if certain answer boxes are pre-defined (where sensible). Where the nature of the question/answer is suitable to the expression of *degrees* of dis/agreement, Likert scales will be used. This will also ensure a high level of comparability across the cases. The WP leader will set-up online questionnaires with the specific tool Qualtrics[2].

The timing and responsibility for related activities within Task 3.3 (Conducting the case studies; months 6-18 / Mar 2018 – Mar 2019) is articulated in the WP3 work plan and has been agreed among the consortium partners as follows:

***Table 2 – WP3 Work Plan – Task 3.3***

| (Sub-) Task | Task name | Duration | Responsible Partner, Supporting partners | Assigned actions to contributors |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Task 3.3 | Conducting the case studies | 01.03.'18 - 31.03.'19 | **RUPPRECHT**, SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN, EMTA, POLIS | **RUPPRECHT:** conduct and coordinate research and drafting of case studies, esp. in-depth<br>**SOFT:** support data gathering, esp. DRT, flexible services and infomobility<br>**UNIABDN, MEM, MOSAIC:** conduct some case studies, esp. where specific language skills are required<br>**EMTA & POLIS:** establish contacts, links and sharing of knowledge with external initiatives and stakeholders |
| 3.3.1 | MS3 'Final selection and assignment of 40 + 10 cases' | 1.03. - 30.04.'18 | **RUPPRECHT,** SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN, EMTA, POLIS | Conduct further research to fill in the data gaps in the case study database in order to make a more informed final selection of 40 + 10 cases |
| | | 1.05. - 15.05.'18 | RUPPRECHT | Analyse data in the case study database and suggest final selection and assignment of 40 + 10 cases |
| | | 15.05. - 25.05.'18 | SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN, EMTA, POLIS | Comments/endorsement of final selection and assignment of 40 + 10 cases |
| | | 25.05. - 31.05.'18 | RUPPRECHT | MS3 final selection and assignment of 40 + 10 cases sent to consortium partners, ticked on PP |
| 3.3.2 | D3.3 'Compilation of 50 case study profiles; overviews and in-depth investigations' | 15.05. - 31.05.'18 | RUPPRECHT | D3.3 template sent to Task 3.3 partners |
| | | 1.06. - 31.07.'18 | **RUPPRECHT,** SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN, EMTA, POLIS | Conduct further desk research as needed for the overview and in-depth case studies |
| | | 1.06. - 31.08.'18 | RUPPRECHT, SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN | D3.3 First drafts of overview case studies ready for review by assigned peer review partner |
| | | 1.09. - 30.09.'18 | RUPPRECHT, SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN | Review overview case studies and send back to your assigned partner |

[2] *https://www.qualtrics.com/*

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.10. - 31.10.'18 | RUPPRECHT, SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN | Final draft of overview case studies – send to RUPPRECHT to incorporate into D3.3. |
| | | 1.06. - 30.11.'18 | **RUPPRECHT,** SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN | MS4 completion of five field trips - month 14 |
| | | 1.06.'18 - 15.01.'19 | RUPPRECHT, SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN | D3.3 First drafts of in-depth case studies ready for review by assigned peer review partner |
| | | 16.01. - 15.02.'19 | RUPPRECHT, SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN | Review in-depth case studies and send back to your assigned partner |
| | | 16.02. - 15.03.'19 | RUPPRECHT, SOFT, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN | Final draft of in-depth case studies – send to RUPPRECHT to incorporate into D3.3. |
| | | 16.03.'18 - 31.03.'19 | RUPPRECHT, SOFT | Final review and compilation of case studies into D3.3 'Compilation of 50 case study profiles; overviews and in-depth investigations' submitted |

# 5 Questions bank

The following is a list of questions that might be asked to interviewees of the 10 in-depth case studies (although these issues will also guide our "search light" for the overview case studies). This list is by far not exhaustive, and in many ways probably overambitious, but it still gives an indication about the type of questions that are likely to be asked. The actual selection of questions has to be tailored to the types of case, interviewee etc. by each interviewer.

### *Case context*

- What is the specific context of your case and how important are the various factors?
- Geographic
- Cultural
- Political (e.g. council majority)
- Historical
- Regulatory, legal
- Financial
- Technological
- Institutional
- Organisational
- Have any of these changed between the early stages and now? Are they likely to change?
- What are external context conditions at the meso- and macro-level (regional government; national laws; public sensitivities; …)

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

### *Case history*

- What did happen when? Possibly co-develop retrospective Gantt chart
- Which stakeholder did what in what time sequence and why?

### *Intention and ambition*

- What did the initiators want to achieve initially?
- What is planned in the future? (technical activities but also communication, information, participation)
- What problems did you envisage / anticipate?
- What do you expect to happen from here on?

### *Approach*

- Were new services developed and offered?
- How much does your approach rely on "compatible" / disciplined behaviour of users?
- Could the same (or even better) effects have been achieved with completely different measures?
- Are there any competing alternative products, services, technologies available?
- Which precedents / sources of inspiration were used?

### *Beneficiaries*

- Which were the original beneficiaries of your initiative?
- Are there any unintended, but acceptable, beneficiaries?
- Are there any unintended and unacceptable beneficiaries?

### *Technology / materiality*

- Which novel technical / technological solutions were deployed?
- What are the roles and benefits of ICT in the sense of an enabling technology?
- Which artefacts, objects, materials played a role in the development of your initiative?
- How important is (big) data for your approach?

### *Space*

- Are there any specific issues that have to do with space, its distribution, usage patterns, proximity etc.?
- What about real estate aspects?
- Anything important to understand with regards to topography (valley, hill, island, …)
- Are any routing issues (start of transport line, end of line, routing) important to understand?

### *Time*

- Is anything important with regards to time?
- months, seasons, day of the week, time of day, …
- functional times e.g. rush hour
- Qualitative perception of time
- What about waiting / idle times?

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

### *Organisation*

- What kind of organisational innovations were made?
- Which operational arrangements were set-up?
- Are responsibilities clearly articulated, assigned and accepted?
- Are liability issues handled well?

### *Regulations / permissions …*

- Did any activity require certain certificates, permissions, approvals, …?
- Have you run into any insurance / liability issues?
- What about contractual issues, e.g. with suppliers, with support partners, with citizens, …?

### *Finances*

- What are the initiative's main sources of income? (differentiate at least btw. private and public)
- What is the budget used for?
- Could the same effects have been achieved with fewer efforts, fewer resources, less time?
- Had you had more financial resources what would you have done differently?

### *Long-term prospects*

- How is the initiative maintained in the long term in terms of personnel, finances, permissions etc.?
- Is the initiative built around a specific business model?
- Are currently modifications to your work programme foreseen?
- Do you expect the achievements to be sustained for the next 5, 10, 20 years?
- How resilient do you consider the initiatives to external changes (e.g. rise of fuel prices)

### *Sustainability*

- Describe the balance between economic, social, environmental (+ aesthetic) impacts of the initiative
- Is this initiative in line with specific sustainability goals (e.g. Paris agreement, Millennium goals, …)

### *Knowledge, expertise, know-how*

- What factual knowledge, know-how was vital for the initiative?
- What data/information would have been useful to have (before, during, after)?
- Is this type of information formal or tacit?
- Who held / holds such important information?

### *Reception*

- Was / is there awareness of the problems the initiative is trying to address?
- How was the original idea received among authorities, citizens etc.?
- What were the key ingredients that helped it to get accepted?
- How is the initiative received by those actively involved (workers, drivers, maintenance personnel, office workers, software handlers, … re: comfort, health, safety, working hours, toilet breaks)
- What do stakeholders, passengers, non-users say? (evidence based, i.e. surveys etc.)
- What aesthetic impacts (visual, acoustic, olfactory) are you aware of?

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

### *Stakeholders*

- Optionally: Ask interviewee to develop a Venn Diagram of key actors
- What are your key stakeholders and what interests do they have?
- Is there a difference between self-perceived and de facto stakeholders?
- What other stakeholders should have been involved and why? Which ones should not have been involved?
- Is it important to differentiate stakeholder roles by phase? (problem analysis, planning, implementation, …)
- What would key players say should have been done differently and what are their future plans?
- How has the cooperation worked so far…
- intra-institutional (e.g. across department, …) and
- inter-institutional (utilities, housing associations, …)

### *Communication*

- What information has been provided to which stakeholders and the general public at which stage?
- What are your key approaches to internal communication? Why these?
- What are your key approaches to external communication? Why these?
- What is the role of the media (local newspaper, radio, online journalism, …)

### *Supporting factors*

- What (in a very wide sense) fostered the process? (expected and unexpected). How and to what degree?
- Who were / are promoters and supporters of your initiative?
- How would you rate public support or opposition to your initiative?
- What support was crucial? What support would have been good?

### *Barriers*

- What were / are the main obstacles? Were they anticipated or not?
- Did you anticipate certain problems, which turned out much less serious?
- Were specific individuals and/or groups particularly hostile to the initiative?
- What non-human barriers (legal, regulatory, technical difficulties, …) did you encounter?

### *Evaluation / Reflection*

- Are there any ongoing or periodic evaluation activities taking place? If so, could we get access to some results?
- Does the "journey" and the results so far meet your expectations; the expectations of other stakeholders?
- What are the impacts on the pre-identified problems? Were the original objectives achieved?
- (How) do the actual results deviate from the expected results? If applicable: What might explain this?
- Would you say that all key elements of cause-effect chains are well understood; or only assumed; or unknown?
- What should have been done differently and why? What should not have been done at all?

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

- Are some of the "impactees" possibly "voiceless" members of society?
- What did take more / less time than expected?
- Are there any positive / negative side-effects?
- Do the results comply with and/or complement other local policy goals?
- Have you detected or do you expect to have triggered any knock-on effects? (e.g. spin-off projects)
- Could similar effects have been achieved with less money, staff, time? With completely different measures?

### *Recommendations*

- What should someone else with similar aims pay attention to and why?
- What recommendations can we give to …
- Private sector, industry, start-ups, …
- Regulators, policy makers (EU, national, local)
- Media, …
- Local activists?

# 6 Data analysis

### *Quantitative data*

Quantitative data about all cases will be stored in standard data processing software (e.g. MS Excel). Since INCLUSION does not operate with specific hypotheses that lend themselves to quantitative testing, we do not anticipate the need for sophisticated multi-variate analysis processes such as cluster or factor analysis; signals that indicate a potential added value of such procedures will, however, be pursued. Tests will be run routinely for any possible correlations between certain shared parameters across a possibly high number of cases (e.g. population density, average GDP / person) wherever such data can be obtained.

In any case, all quantitative data will routinely be checked for plausibility and completeness and basic correlations between certain parameters will be computed where some significant connection can be assumed. Results will be visualised in diagrams, charts, infographics, etc.

### *Qualitative data*

The majority of raw "data" for the case study research, however, is anticipated to be of a qualitative nature and requires an analysis step with the purpose …

- to detect patterns and discrepancies in the data,
- to sort and to group similar types of information according to certain parameters,
- to identify similarities across cases,
- to detect causal links within cases,
- to check for plausibility.

Such analyses and their results are most effective and credible when they are undertaken in a structured and transparent way so that the resulting conclusions are "solidly 'grounded' in the data collected" (DG

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

BUDGET, 2004, p. 89). It is therefore necessary, to operate with an explicit analysis strategy, which is guided by the following key principles:

- "Coding and abstraction. The identification of categories of concepts that are used to label data (coding), the grouping of linked categories of data and the conceptualisation of the latter at a higher level of abstraction to produce conclusions.
- Data matrices. The identification of key themes or dimensions and the sorting of data in respect to them, hence making patterns across data easier to draw out.
- Frequency counts. The identification of key themes and assertions and counting the number of times that they occur in the data.
- Time-series qualitative data analysis. The chronological ordering of data to provide an account of activities and events in such a way as to identify causal relationships." (DG BUDGET, 2004, p. 89)

### *Pre-existing and emerging hypothesis testing through coding*

The Qualitative Data Analysis Software NVivo will be used for this purpose. It will facilitate a systematic testing for pre-existing and emerging ("grounded") hypotheses. This procedure revolves around the identification of suitable codes (like "tags") for specific units of information; sometimes as short as half a sentence. A code is meant to capture the essence of or proxy for such a unit of information.

For example: An interviewee might report about the importance of state-funding during the early phases of a project when the conceptual cornerstones are being defined. The sentences that contain this information would then be coded with "subsidy" and "planning". Another interviewee from another case might report about the importance of subsidies for proper evaluation; this would trigger the application of codes like "subsidy" and "evaluation". At some point, the analysis could thus systematically retrieve all bits of information that deal with subsidies. Or with both subsidies in rural areas (provided the analysts have allocated the code "rural" to certain units of information).

Some codes will be pre-defined, corresponding to pre-existing hypotheses and specific research interests such as the search for approaches that are likely or unlikely to be transferable to other context conditions. Examples include:

- Sharing approaches have the biggest potential to alleviate the risk of transport poverty for people below the age of 40.
- Trust is a key ingredient of successful initiatives that aim at tackling the risk of transport poverty for older people and for women of any age.
- State subsidies are not a necessary condition for successful initiatives that aim at tackling transport poverty in countries below the EU average per capital GDP.

All INCLUSION partners – in particular those who conduct some case studies – are encouraged to formulate such hypotheses and to suggest related "codes". They can do this at any time before, during and after they engage in the actual research process. Unlike much of positivistic research, which stipulates that hypotheses have always to be formulated before data is being gathered, the approach adopted by INCLUSION explicitly allows to "learn as we walk". In other words, some sensible hypotheses will surely emerge only when the data starts to "speak for itself", i.e. as soon as a general understanding – initially tacit – grows among the researchers who are executing the data gathering and the analysis. This means that we do admit assumptions and speculations about potential mechanisms and patterns into the analysis process even if they were spawned and nurtured "late" through the direct encounter with a concrete project or initiative. To ensure a coordinated evolution of such codes, the WP3 team will maintain a central repository of all codes and will add a related item on all routine WP3 tele-conferences.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

At the end of the coding process, the final set of codes represents the extract, distillate or essence of the large amount of relatively unstructured data that was gathered during the actual research phase. These codes can then be investigated for any relationships, simultaneous or exclusive occurrence, frequencies etc. The results can be visualised in word trees, word clouds, mind maps, concept maps, sociograms, etc.

Multiple iterations of this direct engagement with the data should enable the research team to ultimately develop a draft typology of underlying principles and generalisable lessons. Multiple versions of these conclusions will be shared and discussed within the entire INCLUSION consortium until eventually, the essential lessons learned can be formulated as a unified position of the INCLUSION team. This core output of the entire WP3 will be articulated in a format suitable for the intended target audience in terms of writing style, layout, format etc. The content focus will correspond to the overarching goal of INCLUSION's WP3 in general, that is, the detection of patterns, the identification of underlying principles and the extraction of transferable lessons.

The responsibility for specific analysis-related tasks has been agreed among the INCLUSION consortium partners as follows:

***Table 3 – WP3 Work Plan – Task 3.3***

| Task id | Task name | Duration | Responsible Partner, Supporting partners | Assigned actions to contributors |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| T3.4 | Data analysis, identification of patterns and transferability | 01.09.'18 | **RUPPRECHT**, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN, EMTA | **RUPPRECHT:** task leader<br>**MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN, EMTA:** Serve as "sounding board", provide critical/ constructive comments on draft versions of D3.4 |
| 3.4.1 | Analysis of data gathered in Task 3.3 | 1.09. - 30.09.'18 | RUPPRECHT | Develop template for D3.4 |
| | | 1.10. - 15.10.'18 | UNIABDN | Quantitative data checked for plausibility and completeness and for any significant correlations – determine whether statistical procedures like cluster or factor analyses are possible |
| | | 16.10. - 31.10.'18 | T.b.d. | Develop visualisations for quantitative data analysis (diagrams, charts, infographics, etc.) |
| | | 1.11. - 15.11.'18 | MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN, EMTA | Provide feedback on quantitative data analysis and visualisations |
| | | 01.09.'18 - 31.01.'19 | RUPPRECHT | Circulate list of hypothesis-driven (ex-ante) qualitative data codes (tags). Discuss in WP3 TelCo. List to be updated with data-driven codes every two weeks |
| | | 16.11. - 15.12.'18 | RUPPRECHT | Qualitative data assessed to determine patterns and discrepancies within and across cases |
| | | 16.12.'18 - 15.01.'19 | RUPPRECHT | Develop visualisations for qualitative data analysis (word trees, word clouds, mind maps, concept maps, sociograms, etc.) |
| | | 16.01. - 31.01.'19 | MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN, EMTA | Provide feedback on qualitative data analysis and visualisations |
| 3.4.2 | D3.4 'Typology and description of underlying | 1.04. - 30.04.'19 | RUPPRECHT | Develop draft typology of underlying principles of generalisable lessons based on outcomes of analysis in task 3.4.1 |

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | principles and generalisable lessons' | 1.05. - 31.05.'19 | RUPPRECHT | Draft description explaining the typology (methodology used to develop it, what it conveys, how it can be used) |
| | | 1.06. - 15.06.'19 | **RUPPRECHT**, MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN, EMTA | Presentation of typology and explanation at WP3 telco; feedback from WP3 partners incorporated |
| | | 16.06. - 30.06.'19 | RUPPRECHT | Draft section on transferability |
| | | 1.07. - 15.08.'19 | RUPPRECHT | Draft D3.4 developed and sent to WP3 partners for review |
| | | 16.08. - 30.09.'19 | MEM, MOSAIC, UNIABDN, EMTA | Send feedback on D3.4 to RUPPRECHT |
| | | 1.10. - 31.10.'19 | RUPPRECHT | Finalise and submit final version D3.4 |

# 7 Practicalities

## 7.1 Data recording and storage:

For overview case studies the majority of data will come from publicly available sources. In cases where non-public material is entrusted to us we will store this on password protected servers only. In-depth case studies in particular will rely on significant amount of information, which local respondents will disclose – be this in the form of documents or, primarily, through phone or face-to-face conversations, i.e. interviews. Full audio recordings of such interviews (and concomitant verbatim transcriptions) will only be done in rare cases – and only with the interviewee's explicit written consent; see section 8.2 for the informed consent form. Typically, the interviewer will take notes during the conversation on a digital device. These notes will be shared with the interviewee shortly after the interview so that the informants can check the congruence of the notes with what they intended to convey ("member check").

Any non-public material (reporting sheets, interview recordings and transcripts) will be encrypted in order to protect the informants' identity. In all further analysis steps, interim and final outputs, pseudonyms will be used. The key between pseudonyms and real names will be password protected and only accessible to people involved in the actual research process. Care will be taken not to disclose the respondents' identity through reference to their location, position etc. All related data will be stored at computers with an at least weekly routine back-up system until 5 years after the end of the INCLUSION project. These and other details can be amended in light of the yet to be developed Data Management Plan (part of Deliverable 9.1) – but only towards more strict standards, not towards more relaxed standards.

## 7.2 Responsibilities

The detailed responsibilities for specific research and analysis steps are indicated in the tables in the previous chapters. The following constitutes an overview of key responsibilities. Cells marked as green signal task leadership and major responsibilities.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

***Table 4 - Overview of key responsibilities***

| | SOFT 2PM | MEM 5PM | RUPPRECHT 17PM | MOSAIC 4PM | UNIABDN 6PM | EMTA 3PM | POLIS 2PM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Task 3.1: Case study identification and selection (M3-6)<br>Outcome: D3.1 DB of case study nominees (M6) | Contribute to case study identification and selection and promote call for nominations through own network | Contribute to case study identification and selection and promote call for nominations through own network | Lead case study identification and selection | Contribute to case study identification and selection and promote call for nominations through own network | Contribute to case study identification and selection and promote call for nominations through own network | Contribute to case study identification and selection and promote call for nominations through own network | Contribute to case study identification and selection and promote call for nominations through own network |
| Task 3.2: Developing the case study methodology (M4-5)<br>Outcome: D3.2 Case study methodology (M5) | Review final D3.2 | | Develop D3.2 | Review final D3.2 | Review draft D3.2 | | |
| Task 3.3: Conducting the case studies (M6-18)<br>Outcome: D3.3 50 case study profiles (M18) | Conduct 3 overview case studies. Contribute to data gathering activities, esp. service types | Conduct 7 overview case studies and 1 in-depth case study, esp. where local language needed | Conduct 9 overview case studies and 7 in-depth case studies; Develop D3.3 | Conduct 6 overview case studies, esp. where local language needed | Conduct 8 overview case studies and 2 in-depth case studies, esp. where local language needed | Conduct 4 overview case studies. Establish contacts and share knowledge with external initiatives & stakeholders | Conduct 3 overview case studies. Establish contacts and share knowledge with external initiatives & stakeholders |
| Task 3.4: Data Analysis, identification of patterns and transferability (M12-25)<br>Outcome: D3.4 Typology of underlying principles and lessons learned (M25) | | Provide critical/ constructive comments on draft versions of D3.4 | Analyse qualitative & quantitative data; develop D3.4 | Provide critical/ constructive comments on draft versions of D3.4 | Contribute to qualitative code list for analysis in NVivo Provide critical/ constructive comments on draft versions of D3.4 | Provide critical/ constructive comments on draft versions of D3.4 | |

## 7.3 Risks

No unsurmountable risks are anticipated during the data gathering and analysis process. However, we do not want to pretend an entirely risk-free undertaking. Foreseeable are the following challenges:

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

***Table 5 – Risk management***

| Risk | Mitigation measure |
|---|---|
| Language barriers (especially during field trips) | We will search within the consortium for a partner who speaks the local language and who could travel to the city for the field trip. |
| Gap in case studies for specific prioritised areas and user groups – what if no innovative cases are found? | We will make every effort to cover as many of the prioritised areas and vulnerable user groups identified in WP1 as possible. If we are missing some due to lack of cases, we will try to find cases that match as many of the characteristics as possible to still ensure the richness of our research. |
| Main stakeholders not willing to be transparent enough about the outcomes and experienced issues | |

## 7.4 Major cost items

INCLUSION's case study research activities will incur mainly two types of foreseeable cost items:

- Five field trips to gain first-hand experience with selected in-depth cases. 5 * € 1,000 = € 5,000
- Licence for qualitative data analysis software NVivo[3] Ca. € 1,200

# 8 Ethical conduct

## 8.1 Ethical principles

No INCLUSION related activity must ever violate basic ethics principles. It therefore seems sensible to articulate them – even at the risk of stating the all too obvious:

- Everyone who is involved in case study research must adhere to the following overarching ethics principles
  - Honesty
  - Rigour
  - Transparency
  - Open communication
  - Accountability
  - Traceability
- Everyone involved in case study research should be aware of the following risks and dangers
  - Stigmatisation. Be careful about every single word in any survey or interview question.
  - Data leakage. Make sure all data is stored safely and properly encrypted.

[3] *https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo/home*

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

- Interception. Never send files that contain personal data via email or as email attachment.
- Data protection. Promise all respondents not to release any information that can be linked to the individual respondent; and do stick to this promise. Use pseudonyms if you want to publish quotes etc.
- Socially desired answers. Be aware of the danger to guide responses through the way you formulate a question

- Certain populations
  - Everyone involved in case study research has to be particularly careful when they wish to collect data from vulnerable people such as:
    - Children
    - Disabled people
    - Older people
  - It is always difficult to gather data (through a survey, interview etc.) from people, who cannot give informed consent – either because they are too young, not capable for mental health problems, etc.
- Minimum requirement
  - Before any INCLUSION member interacts with a respondent (through whatever data gathering means) they always have to inform them first about the overall purpose, the duration of the data gathering, what will be used with this data, how their anonymity will be protected, where they can complain etc. and then to as them explicitly for their consent; ideally in written format with their personal signature. In the case of surveys, a specifically dedicated tick-box will be used to collect the participants' explicit consent to participate.

These and other details can be amended in light of the Data Management Plan (part of Deliverable 9.1) which is under finalization at the time of writing this methodology– but only towards more strict standards, not towards more relaxed standards.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

## 8.2 INFORMED CONSENT SHEET

As someone who is actively involved in an initiative that tries to tackle transport poverty you are invited to share some of your experience with members of the INCLUSION project. This project tries to identify and disseminate general principles of effective ways to reduce transport poverty. Take your time to read the following information and please ask if anything is unclear.

**Who will conduct the research?** The organisation in charge of the case study research is Rupprecht Consult. The responsible persons are Ralf Brand and Kristin Tovaas. You can reach the team on +49 221 60605512 or at r.brand@rupprecht-consult.eu. Other members of the INCLUSION consortium will also conduct some case study research. Feel free to contact Rupprecht Consult to enquire about their legitimacy.

**What is the aim of the research?** INCLUSION will study 50 cases that managed to reduce transport poverty through some innovative approach. 40 cases will be studied at a more superficial level whereas 10 cases will be studied at much greater depth, that is, with interviews, focus group meetings, site visits etc. It is not the purpose of this research to "dig around" for problems and INCLUSION will not share any such details with any actual or possible funder. We simply want to understand the history, the key actors, essential elements and effects of the initiative you were / are involved in so that – when we look across all 50 case studies – we are able to identify some general patterns and principles that can inspire and help others to achieve something similar.

**Why have I been chosen?** You have been chosen because of your active role in an initiative that tries to tackle transport poverty. It is foreseen to collect the views of around 50 persons in total across all 50 case studies.

**What, concretely, does my participation entail?** You will be asked to …

- either engage in an interview-style conversation, either face-to-face, over the phone or via tele-conference. With your permission we would like to audio-record such conversations – or parts thereof.
- or participate in a focus group meeting with some other people to discuss certain issues.
- or answer some questions in a survey, most likely online.
- or put down some of your thoughts visually, e.g. by drawing a network of actors, by sketching the timeline of your initiative etc.

**What happens to the information collected?** Information may be typed as notes or transcribed[4] and will be analysed for patterns across all cases. The information will be securely stored for a maximum of 5 years after the end of INCLUSION. Upon your written request by you we will destroy any records we have of the conversation with you.

**How is confidentiality ensured?** The raw information gathered through surveys, interviews and focus groups will not be released to the public! Only anonymised versions (i.e. without references to real names) will be accessible to selected individuals of the INCLUSION team. If you have concerns about this please do get in touch with Ralf or Kristin (contact details above) so we can find a pragmatic solution. Reports, scientific papers, posters, lectures etc. for the public will not include any real names, only pseudonyms (unless interviewees wish to be named). Care will also be taken not to disclose identities by references to professional roles or organisations. The key between real names and pseudonyms will be encrypted and will only be accessible to the INCLUSION team.

[4] *Transcription means that an audio recording will be typed (sometimes even word for word) onto a computer.*

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

**How often and how long will I be asked to contribute?** In almost all cases participant will only be asked for one interview or focus group meeting. An average interview might last about one hour, a focus group session between one and two hours. It should be possible to fill in a survey in 10-20 minutes. In rare cases, we might ask you to kindly participate in two such activities.

**How is the research funded?** The entire INCLUSION project is paid for by the European Commission through the research framework programme "Horizon 2020". The grant agreement number is 770115.

**What if I require further information, or have any concerns?** Please contact Ralf Brand in the first instance (details above). However, if there are any issues or concerns regarding the conduct of the case study research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the case study research team, please contact the INCLUSION project coordinator:


| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Marco Boero | Head of Division | Softeco Sismat S.r.l. | Head Office |
| Via De Marini 1 - WTC Tower | 16149 Genoa - Italy | marco.boero@softeco.it | ph. +39 010 60261 |


# CASE STUDY CONSENT FORM

If you agree, after having read the above Information Sheet, to participate in the INCLUSION case study research process, please complete this form by placing your initials in the boxes provided. **Please note** that some points are optional. At the end please sign the form at the bottom.

Please Initial

1) I confirm that I have had time to read the information sheet provided, and have had an opportunity to ask questions and have these answered to my satisfaction. ☐

2) I agree that any anonymised information collected may be passed to other members of the INCLUSION team and only to them.

3a) I agree to the use of *anonymous* quotations from these interviews or focus groups in reports and publications. ☐

3b) Alternatively: I agree to the use of my *real* name in any future reports or publications *(optional).* ☐

3c) Alternatively: I would like to be informed at my below email address if the Process Evaluation team is planning to use my real name in any report or publication. If I do not object within 10 days of such an email I imply my consent to the use of my real name. *(optional).* ☐

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

5) OPTIONAL: I agree that interviews and focus groups might be audio-recorded and transcribed as long as these recordings are stored securely on an encrypted computer. ☐

Email Address: _____ *(optional)*

*and/or* Telephone Number: _____ *(optional)*

I agree to take part in the INCLUSION case study research process under the above specified conditions

| Name of participant | Date | Signature |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

| Name of Researcher | Date | Signature |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

# 9 Bibliography


- Chatham House (2018) Chatham House Rule https://www.chathamhouse.org/about/chatham-house-rule
- CIVITAS GUARD (2006), Framework for Evaluation.
- CIVITAS POINTER (2009), Framework for Evaluation in POINTER.
- DG BUDGET – Evaluation unit. (2004). Evaluating EU activities: a practical guide for the commission service. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Retrieved on 22. Sept. 2015 from http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_activities_en.pdf
- Dziekan, K. et al. (Eds.). (2013). Evaluation matters: a practitioners' guide to sound evaluation for urban mobility measures. Münster: Waxmann.
- Piao, J. and J. Preston (2010), CBA Recommendations for CIVITAS Evaluation, TRG University of Southampton.
- van Rooijen, T., Nesterova, N., & Guikink, D. (2013). Applied framework for evaluation in CIVITAS PLUS II. Retrieved on 22. Sept. 2015 from http://www.civitas.eu/sites/default/files/Results%20and%20Publications/civitas_wiki_d4_10_evaluation_framework.pdf

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115

# INCLUSION consortium

For further information

www.h2020-inclusion.eu

@H2020_INCLUSION
#H2020INCLUSION

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770115