

Active2Public Transport Pilot Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Schemes

KTI Hungarian Institute for
Transport Sciences and Logistics (KTI)

Author: Tuan Viet Trinh
Version: 1.0

https://interreg-danube.eu/projects/active2public-transport

Active2Public Transport | Better combining cycling, walking and public transport in the Danube region

https://interreg-danube.eu/projects/active2public-transport

Contact

Coordinator:
Österreichische Energieagentur – Austrian Energy Agency
Irene Bittner
Email Address: irene.bittner@energyagency.at
Web: www.energyagency.at

Authors: Tuan Viet Trinh

Email: trinh.viet@kti.hu
Web: www.kti.hu

More information about Active2Public Transport
and the project activities & results are available on:
https://interreg-danube.eu/projects/active2public-transport

Table of contents

Executive Summary 4

1 Introduction 6

2 Common Monitoring and Evaluation Plan 7

2.1 Development of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan 8

2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Methodology 8

2.3 Reporting Process 11

3 Analysis of Joint Pilot Evaluations 12

3.1 Overview of the Joint Pilot Evaluations 12

3.2 A2PT Testing Schemes 14

3.3 Street Transformations 15

3.4 Testing Bike Boxes Combined with Attractive Ticketing/Pricing 17

3.5 Mobility Lab for Testing Bike Carriage Solutions for Regional Buses 18

3.6 Demonstrating the Effectiveness of New Hike + Bike + Rail Services 20

3.7 Testing New Integrated Tickets for A2PT 21

3.8 Integration of Improved A2PT Information into Existing Apps and Tools 22

4 Synthesis of Pilot Evaluation Results and Recommendations 24

4.1 Main Findings from the Pilot Evaluations 24

4.2 Key Factors for Successful Implementation 25

4.3 Recommendations for Future Pilot Implementation and Transferability 27

5 Conclusions 28

Appendices 29

Appendix 1. Pilot Evaluation Template 29

Appendix 2. Joint Pilot Evaluation Template 38

Executive Summary

The Active2Public Transport (A2PT) project aims to improve the integration of active mobility and public transport across the Danube Region by promoting multimodal transport solutions that encourage walking and cycling as integral parts of public transport journeys. Within the project, pilot actions were implemented to test different approaches to active mobility and public transport integration under real-life conditions. Activity 3.3 focused on monitoring and evaluating these pilot actions and on identifying lessons learned, good practices and opportunities for transferability.

This deliverable, Pilot Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Schemes, documents the common monitoring and evaluation framework developed for the A2PT pilot actions and synthesises the results of the monitoring and evaluation activities carried out by project partners. The framework established a common structure for assessing implementation and outcomes while allowing indicators and evaluation methods to be adapted to the specific objectives and characteristics of each pilot. Individual pilot evaluations were subsequently consolidated into seven thematic Joint Pilot Evaluation Templates, which form the main analytical basis of this deliverable.

The evaluated pilot actions covered a broad range of measures supporting active mobility and public transport integration. These included testing schemes encouraging alternatives to private car use, temporary street transformations, secure bicycle parking, bicycle carriage on regional buses, hike + bike + rail services, integrated ticketing solutions, and improved A2PT information in existing digital platforms. The different approaches provided evidence from a range of urban, regional and cross-border contexts and allowed both the effectiveness of individual measures and the practical conditions for their implementation to be assessed.

The pilot evaluations indicate that A2PT measures can support more sustainable and multimodal travel, but their effectiveness depends strongly on the conditions in which they are implemented. Practical infrastructure and service quality, clear information, user engagement and appropriate incentives can reinforce each other and make multimodal travel more attractive. At the same time, the evaluations showed that individual measures cannot always be transferred directly between locations, as local infrastructure, mobility patterns, institutional arrangements and operational conditions influence their effectiveness.

Several common implementation factors emerged across the pilots. Early stakeholder involvement, clear responsibilities and sufficient preparation time were particularly important where interventions required procurement, infrastructure works, technical arrangements or cooperation between several organisations. Communication and user engagement supported awareness and uptake, while direct user feedback helped identify practical barriers and opportunities for improvement. The evaluations also demonstrated that monitoring and data collection need to be considered as part of pilot design from the outset, as differences in data availability, participation and monitoring methods affected the strength and comparability of some results.

The pilots also demonstrated the value of testing measures in real-life conditions before wider implementation. Even where planned results were only partially achieved, or implementation could not be completed, the pilot process generated useful information on feasibility, user needs, institutional requirements and potential improvements. In several cases, the tested measures or elements of them were continued, expanded or incorporated into longer-term solutions.

Overall, the monitoring and evaluation activities provided a practical evidence base for further development of A2PT approaches. The findings suggest that future actions should build on tested solutions while adapting them to local conditions, involve relevant stakeholders at an early stage, integrate monitoring into pilot preparation and combine practical measures with appropriate communication and user engagement. The experience gathered through the pilots can therefore support the further development and transfer of A2PT approaches within the Danube Region.

1 Introduction

The Active2Public Transport (A2PT) project, funded under the Interreg Danube Region Programme, aims to improve the integration of active mobility and public transport across the Danube region by promoting multimodal transport solutions that encourage walking and cycling as integral parts of public transport journeys. Through strategic planning, knowledge exchange, pilot actions and the development of practical tools, the project seeks to support a modal shift towards more sustainable, accessible and climate-friendly mobility systems.

Within the project, pilot actions play a central role by testing innovative Active2Public Transport (A2PT) solutions under real-life conditions in different regional contexts. These pilot actions address various aspects of active mobility and public transport integration, including infrastructure improvements, mobility services, ticketing solutions, information systems and behavioural measures. Their implementation provides practical experience and evidence that supports the development of recommendations and facilitates the transfer of successful solutions to other regions.

Activity 3.3, led by KTI, focuses on the monitoring and evaluation of pilot action outcomes. To ensure a consistent and comparable assessment across the diverse pilot actions, KTI developed a common monitoring and evaluation framework that was applied by all pilot partners while allowing sufficient flexibility to reflect the specific objectives and characteristics of each pilot. The framework enabled partners to systematically monitor implementation, evaluate the effectiveness of the pilot actions and identify lessons learned, good practices and opportunities for transferability.

Deliverable D.3.3.1 *Pilot Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Schemes* documents the common monitoring and evaluation framework developed within Activity 3.3 and presents the synthesis of the pilot monitoring and evaluation activities carried out by the project partners. While the common methodology established the overall principles, indicators and reporting structure for all pilot actions, each partner adapted the framework to the specific objectives and implementation context of its respective pilot. The completed individual pilot evaluations were subsequently consolidated into thematic Joint Pilot Evaluation Templates, which constitute the main analytical basis of this deliverable.

The report first describes the common monitoring and evaluation framework developed for the project and the process through which individual pilot evaluations

were implemented and synthesised. It then analyses the available Joint Pilot Evaluation Templates, highlighting the main findings, common experiences and key observations emerging across the pilot actions. Finally, the report summarises the principal conclusions and identifies recommendations that support the further development, transferability and long-term uptake of Active2Public Transport solutions within and beyond the Danube region.

2 Common Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

To ensure a consistent and comparable assessment of the diverse pilot actions implemented within the A2PT project, a common monitoring and evaluation framework was developed under Activity 3.3. Although the pilot actions addressed different challenges, target groups and implementation contexts, they all shared the common objective of improving the integration of active mobility and public transport. Consequently, a harmonised methodological approach was required to enable partners to systematically monitor implementation, evaluate the effectiveness of the pilot actions and identify transferable experiences across the project.

The framework established common principles for monitoring and evaluation while allowing sufficient flexibility to accommodate the specific objectives and characteristics of each pilot action. Rather than prescribing identical indicators or methods for all pilots, it provided a structured approach through which each partner could define pilot-specific monitoring and evaluation schemes within a common reporting framework. This approach ensured both the comparability of results and the relevance of the collected evidence to the individual pilot contexts.

The common framework covered the complete lifecycle of the pilot actions, including the planning of monitoring activities before implementation, the systematic collection of information during implementation, and the evaluation of outcomes after completion. The following sections describe the development of the framework, its methodological principles, and the reporting process that formed the basis for the synthesis presented in this deliverable.

2.1 DEVELOPMENT OF THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

The common monitoring and evaluation plan was developed to support the implementation of pilot actions across a wide range of intervention types, including infrastructure improvements, mobility services, ticketing solutions and digital information tools. Given this diversity, the framework needed to provide a common methodological basis while remaining sufficiently flexible to accommodate pilot-specific objectives and monitoring needs.

To support this process, KTI developed the Pilot Evaluation Template (see in Appendix 1), which served both as a reporting tool and as a practical guide for planning, implementing and evaluating the pilot actions. The template followed the chronological lifecycle of each pilot: partners completed the planning sections before implementation, documented implementation progress throughout the pilot, and finalised the evaluation after completion. This approach ensured that monitoring activities, indicators and evaluation criteria were established from the outset rather than reconstructed retrospectively.

Following the completion of the individual pilot evaluations, KTI also developed a Joint Pilot Evaluation Template (see Appendix 2) to facilitate the synthesis of pilot actions addressing similar thematic areas. Action Lead Partners used this template to consolidate individual pilot experiences into thematic evaluations, providing the analytical basis for this deliverable and supporting the identification of transferable practices across the project.

2.2 MONITORING AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The monitoring and evaluation methodology was designed to accompany the entire lifecycle of each pilot action. Rather than treating evaluation as a final reporting exercise, the plan integrated monitoring and evaluation into the planning, implementation and assessment of the pilots. This approach ensured that the collected evidence reflected not only the achieved results, but also the implementation process,

the challenges encountered and the factors influencing the effectiveness of each intervention.

The methodology combined quantitative and qualitative assessment methods in order to capture both the measurable effects of the pilot actions and the practical experiences gained during their implementation. While quantitative indicators enabled partners to assess the achievement of predefined objectives, qualitative information – including stakeholder feedback, implementation challenges and expert reflections – provided the context necessary to interpret the observed results. This mixed-method approach was particularly important considering the diversity of pilot actions and implementation environments within the project.

The common monitoring and evaluation methodology followed the chronological implementation of the pilot actions. This ensured that monitoring and evaluation activities were embedded throughout the pilot lifecycle, from the initial planning stage to the final assessment of outcomes. While the specific indicators and methods varied depending on the characteristics of each pilot, all partners followed the same general methodological sequence, as summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 Overview of the common monitoring and evaluation methodology

Pilot phase	Monitoring focus	Evaluation focus
Before implementation	Definition of pilot objectives, planned activities, expected outcomes, monitoring indicators (KPIs) and data collection methods	Establishment of the evaluation approach, assessment criteria and expected results
During implementation	Monitoring implementation progress, key milestones, implementation changes and unforeseen challenges	Documentation of factors influencing implementation and achievement of objectives
After implementation	Collection and analysis of monitoring data, assessment of outputs and outcomes	Evaluation of effectiveness, stakeholder satisfaction, lessons learned, sustainability and transferability

The monitoring process began before the implementation of the pilot actions. During this phase, partners defined the objectives of their pilot actions, identified the expected

outputs and outcomes, established key performance indicators, and selected the most appropriate monitoring and evaluation methods, including planned monitoring activities and data collection approaches. By defining indicators, expected outcomes and evaluation methods in advance, partners ensured that evidence collection remained aligned with the intended objectives throughout the implementation period, rather than relying solely on retrospective assessment after the pilot had been completed.

Monitoring continued throughout the implementation of the pilot actions. During this phase, partners documented implementation progress, recorded key milestones, and identified any unforeseen challenges or modifications required during execution. As pilot actions inherently involve testing innovative solutions under real-life conditions, adaptations to local circumstances were often necessary. Documenting these changes formed an integral part of the evaluation process, providing essential context for interpreting the achieved results while generating valuable implementation knowledge that can support the design and implementation of similar pilot actions in the future.

Following the completion of the pilot actions, partners carried out the evaluation of the implemented measures using the methodology defined during the planning phase. The evaluation considered both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the pilot actions, including the achievement of the planned objectives, the observed outcomes, stakeholder and user feedback, and the overall effectiveness of the implemented measures. In addition, partners reflected on implementation experiences, identified lessons learned and assessed the potential for further application and transfer of the tested solutions to other regions and contexts.

Beyond assessing whether the planned objectives had been achieved, the evaluation also considered the wider applicability of the tested solutions. Consequently, partners were requested to reflect on sustainability, transferability and future implementation opportunities. This forward-looking perspective supports one of the principal objectives of Activity 3.3: providing evidence that can inform the further development of the A2PT Toolbox and facilitate the uptake of successful approaches in other regions of the Danube area.

Although the specific monitoring indicators and evaluation methods differed according to the nature of the individual pilot actions, all partners followed the same methodological sequence and reporting structure. This common approach ensured that pilot-specific evidence could subsequently be analysed jointly, allowing common

experiences, implementation challenges and transferable practices to be identified across the project. The thematic Joint Pilot Evaluation Templates therefore represent a synthesis of harmonised pilot evaluations rather than a collection of independent pilot reports.

2.3 REPORTING PROCESS

To ensure consistent documentation of the monitoring and evaluation activities, KTI established a common reporting process that accompanied the implementation of the pilot actions. The process was designed to support partners throughout the entire evaluation cycle while ensuring that the collected information could subsequently be compared and synthesised at project level.

The reporting process was organised in two stages. In the first stage, each project partner completed an individual **Pilot Evaluation Template**, documenting the objectives, monitoring approach, implementation process and evaluation results of its respective pilot action. Serving both as the primary reporting document and a practical reference for implementing the common monitoring and evaluation framework, the template guided partners through the entire evaluation process, from the definition of planning assumptions to the final assessment of outcomes. This ensured the traceability of each pilot evaluation, facilitated quality assurance and improved the consistency of reporting across the partnership.

In the second stage, the completed individual pilot evaluations were consolidated into thematic **Joint Pilot Evaluation Templates** developed by KTI. Prepared by the responsible Action Lead Partners, these joint evaluations brought together pilot actions addressing similar intervention areas, enabling partners to jointly assess implementation experiences, monitoring approaches, outcomes, lessons learned and transferability. Rather than replacing the individual evaluations, the thematic synthesis complemented them by identifying common patterns, shared challenges and transferable practices that would have been difficult to recognise from the pilot reports alone.

This two-stage reporting approach ensured that pilot-specific information was retained while enabling the identification of common findings across different pilot actions. The completed Joint Pilot Evaluation Templates constitute the primary source of

information for the analytical chapters of this deliverable, where the experiences and outcomes of the pilot actions are examined from a cross-project perspective.

3 Analysis of Joint Pilot Evaluations

3.1 OVERVIEW OF THE JOINT PILOT EVALUATIONS

Following the implementation of the pilot actions and the completion of the individual Pilot Evaluation Templates by the responsible project partners, the results were consolidated into seven thematic Joint Pilot Evaluation Templates by the responsible action lead partners. Each joint evaluation brings together pilot actions addressing a common intervention area, enabling a thematic assessment of their implementation, monitoring and evaluation outcomes while preserving the specific characteristics of the individual pilots.

The Joint Pilot Evaluation Templates represent the primary source of information for this chapter. Rather than reproducing the individual pilot evaluations, the following sections present the main findings emerging from each thematic group, with particular attention to the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation framework, the achieved outcomes, implementation experiences and the potential for wider application of the tested solutions. The analysis follows the thematic grouping established during the project and reflects the collaborative evaluation carried out by the partners responsible for the respective pilot actions.

Table 2 provides an overview of the seven thematic pilot groups analysed in this chapter.

Table 2 Overview of the seven thematic pilot actions

Section	Pilot theme	Action lead partner
3.2	A2PT Testing Schemes	BGL (Wirtschaftsagentur

		Burgenland GmbH, Austria)
3.3	Street Transformations	MOP (Ministry of the Environment, Climate and Energy, Slovenia)
3.4	Testing Bike Boxes Combined with Attractive Ticketing/Pricing	MOP (Ministry of the Environment, Climate and Energy, Slovenia)
3.5	Mobility Lab for Testing Bike Carriage Solutions for Regional Buses	BGL (Wirtschaftsagentur Burgenland GmbH, Austria)
3.6	Demonstrating the Effectiveness of New Hike + Bike + Rail Services	GYSEV Zrt., Hungary
3.7	Testing New Integrated Tickets for A2PT	BID (Bratislavská integrovaná doprava, Slovakia)
3.8	Integration of Improved A2PT Information into Existing Apps and Tools	DCC (Danube Competence Center, Serbia)

3.2 A2PT TESTING SCHEMES

Pilot Overview

The A2PT Testing Schemes pilot tested whether temporary access to bicycles and public transport, combined with a four-week restriction on private car use, could encourage more sustainable everyday mobility behaviour. The pilot was implemented across five partner regions in Austria, Romania, Slovakia, Serbia and the Czech Republic between April and December 2025, with more than 50 participants taking part. Participants were regular car users with different mobility profiles and were provided with bicycles, including e-bikes, folding bikes and cargo bikes, as well as public transport tickets. The pilot aimed to demonstrate the feasibility of replacing selected car trips with walking, cycling and public transport, while also identifying the conditions required for longer-term behavioural change.

Implementation and Main Results

The testing schemes were implemented through three rounds of four-week testing, with participant recruitment, baseline questionnaires, bicycle handover and technical guidance preceding each testing period. During implementation, participants were supported through regular communication, bicycle maintenance and technical assistance. Monitoring included questionnaires before and after the testing period, with follow-up surveys, interviews, participant feedback and documentation of individual experiences.

The pilot generated positive results in terms of behavioural change and user acceptance. More than 50 participants across the five regions reported satisfaction levels of approximately 70–80%, while around 75% reported changes in their lifestyle within three months. Participants generally increased their use of cycling, walking and public transport, and several continued to use sustainable modes more frequently after the testing period. Reported benefits included lower mobility costs, improved physical and mental well-being, reduced travel-related stress and greater confidence in using sustainable transport.

The pilot also highlighted barriers to wider uptake. These included insufficient cycling infrastructure and bicycle parking, weaker public transport connections in rural areas, weather conditions, longer travel times and difficulties transporting groceries or other larger items. Nevertheless, the results indicate that hands-on testing can reduce

psychological and practical barriers to sustainable mobility and can provide a useful basis for longer-term changes in travel behaviour.

Lessons Learned and Transferability

A key lesson was that temporary, real-life access to suitable bicycles can help participants overcome uncertainty and psychological barriers associated with changing established car-based travel habits. The availability of different bicycle types was particularly important for accommodating different everyday mobility needs. The pilot also demonstrated the importance of participant management and consistent monitoring, as incomplete responses and differences between local approaches can reduce comparability across regions.

The experience further showed that communication and local ambassadors can strengthen participation, visibility and acceptance. At the same time, behavioural measures alone have limited potential where basic infrastructure and public transport connections are insufficient. Future replication should therefore combine testing schemes with practical route information, secure bicycle parking, safe cycling infrastructure and reliable public transport connections. The approach is considered transferable across the Danube Region, but should be adapted to local mobility patterns, infrastructure conditions and governance structures rather than replicated identically.

3.3 STREET TRANSFORMATIONS

Pilot Overview

The Street Transformations joint pilot tested temporary, low-cost interventions as a way to improve conditions for walking and cycling and to support better connections with public transport. Two regional pilots were implemented in Ljubljana, Slovenia, and Burgenland, Austria. While both pilots focused on reallocating or visually redefining street space, their approaches reflected different local contexts: Ljubljana combined strategic planning with a physical transformation of Miklošičeva Street, while Burgenland tested visual and physical crossing improvements in Neufeld an der Leitha and subsequently in Deutschkreutz.

Implementation and Main Results

In Ljubljana, the pilot included a multidisciplinary baseline analysis, development of a long-term transformation concept and detailed implementation planning, followed by a physical intervention using greenery, movable furniture, street painting, revised traffic regulation and the closure of the Tavčarjeva-Dalmatinova section to through motor traffic. However, formal cooperation with the Municipality was finalised later than planned, and the intervention was only completed at the end of June 2026. As a result, the planned before-during-after traffic counts and post-pilot surveys could not be completed within the project period. A pre-pilot survey of 210 respondents nevertheless showed strong support for change, with 82% supporting some form of motor-traffic restriction.

In Burgenland, temporary coloured road markings, planters and removable bollards were used to improve pedestrian safety and driver awareness at selected crossings. The strongest results were recorded at Dr Karl Renner Straße in Neufeld, where 75% of respondents considered the intervention an improvement, 62.5% felt safer and 43.8% perceived slower driving. Results were weaker at other locations. At Linke Bahngasse, 52.8% reported feeling safer, but the colourful markings were also perceived by some children as a play area. At the Deutschkreutz crossing, 83.3% identified speeding as a problem and 76.9% observed no change in vehicle speed, indicating that visual measures alone had limited effectiveness in a severe speeding context.

Lessons Learned and Transferability

The pilots demonstrated that temporary street transformations can generate visible improvements and provide useful evidence before committing to permanent changes. However, their effectiveness depends strongly on local conditions, the scale of the intervention and how clearly the design communicates its intended function. Early agreement with municipalities and road authorities, sufficient time for approvals and procurement, and adequate time for monitoring are essential. The Burgenland experience also showed that visual treatments may need to be combined with stronger physical traffic-calming measures where speeding is a major issue.

The approach has good potential for transfer across the Danube Region, but the pilots suggest that the process is more transferable than any specific physical design. A

staged approach—assessing local conditions, securing institutional agreement, co-designing a temporary intervention, monitoring its effects and using the evidence to inform permanent investment—can be adapted to different urban and regional contexts. The experience in Burgenland, where the Neufeld pilot directly supported a subsequent intervention in Deutschkreutz, also demonstrates how pilot experience can facilitate replication between municipalities.

3.4 TESTING BIKE BOXES COMBINED WITH ATTRACTIVE TICKETING/PRICING

Pilot Overview

The Bike Boxes joint pilot tested secure bicycle parking as a measure to support the integration of cycling and public transport, particularly for first- and last-mile journeys. Three partner regions followed different implementation approaches: Slovenia refurbished and digitalised existing bicycle boxes at Grosuplje railway station and tested their use together with e-bikes; Serbia introduced locally designed and produced boxes at public transport and tourism destinations; and Croatia prepared locations and technical specifications for new boxes, but the planned procurement was not successfully completed. The pilot aimed to assess how secure, accessible and convenient bicycle storage can encourage the use of cycling as part of wider public transport journeys.

Implementation and Main Results

In Slovenia, eight existing bicycle boxes at Grosuplje railway station were upgraded and equipped with KALUU app-based access, while three e-bikes were made available for one-month user trials. Eleven people registered and nine completed the trial, generating ten interviews. Feedback indicated strong acceptance of the security and usability of the boxes, with most participants reporting increased cycling and reduced car use for shorter trips, although the effect on public transport use was more limited.

In Serbia, 15 locally produced bicycle boxes were installed at five locations, including public transport and tourism destinations. The original focus on commuters was broadened to include cycling tourists after key railway stakeholders withdrew. Initial use was estimated at around 2–3 users per business day and approximately 300–400

uses/users during the first month, although the absence of digital tracking means that these figures remain approximate.

In Croatia, the planned 14 box installation at Zagreb Central, Zaprešić and Bjelovar railway stations was not implemented because the procurement process was unsuccessful. However, the completed traffic study, site definitions and technical specifications provide a basis for potential future implementation.

Lessons Learned and Transferability

The pilot showed that secure bicycle parking can be a useful component of bike–public transport integration, but its effectiveness depends on more than the physical infrastructure itself. Location, proximity to public transport, reliable access arrangements, operational support and user-friendly technology are important conditions for successful uptake. In Slovenia, digital access was generally well accepted, but the experience also highlighted the value of technical assistance and a non-digital access option for users who may have difficulties with smartphone-based systems.

A key joint lesson concerns implementation readiness. Early procurement planning, reliable suppliers, committed site owners and clear stakeholder responsibilities are essential, while monitoring arrangements need to be designed together with the access system from the beginning. The different experiences of Slovenia, Serbia and Croatia demonstrate that the concept is transferable, but the implementation model should be adapted to local institutional, technical and operational conditions. For wider Danube Region transfer, a staged approach—assessing demand and site ownership, securing approvals and procurement, selecting an appropriate access and monitoring system, testing with users and allowing sufficient time for evaluation—would provide a practical basis for replication.

3.5 MOBILITY LAB FOR TESTING BIKE CARRIAGE SOLUTIONS FOR REGIONAL BUSES

Pilot Overview

The Mobility Lab for Testing Bike Carriage Solutions for Regional Buses pilot action comprised two implemented pilots in Austria and Slovakia, while a planned pilot in Croatia could not be realised due to the absence of a regional bus operator willing to

participate. The implemented pilots tested different bicycle carriage solutions on regional and cross-border bus services to improve the integration of cycling with public transport. Their common objective was to evaluate the technical and operational feasibility of bicycle transport on buses, enhance multimodal travel opportunities and provide practical recommendations for wider deployment across the Danube Region.

Implementation and Main Results

The pilots were implemented on regional bus services in Burgenland and on the cross-border bus line 901 between Bratislava, Slovakia and Hainburg, Austria. Monitoring focused on the technical performance of bicycle racks, operational procedures, passenger feedback and user demand. Although quantitative uptake remained below expectations, the pilots generated valuable operational experience and confirmed strong stakeholder interest in expanding bicycle carriage on bus services. In Burgenland, the bus operator committed to purchasing additional bicycle racks following the pilot, while the seasonal bicycle carriage service on line 901 will continue beyond the project period.

The evaluation identified several common implementation challenges, including limited communication with drivers and passengers, technical certification requirements, and difficulties in collecting user feedback. Nevertheless, both pilots confirmed the technical feasibility of the tested solutions and highlighted a clear interest among users in combining cycling with regional bus services, providing an important evidence base for future implementation.

Lessons Learned and Transferability

The pilot action demonstrated that successful implementation of bicycle carriage on regional buses depends not only on suitable technical solutions but also on effective stakeholder cooperation, clear operational procedures and targeted communication. Early involvement of transport operators, drivers and tourism stakeholders proved essential, while continuous promotion was identified as a prerequisite for increasing service uptake. The operational experience gained through the pilots, together with the commitment to continue and expand the tested solutions, provides a transferable model for other regions seeking to strengthen multimodal mobility through better integration of cycling and public transport.

3.6 DEMONSTRATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF NEW HIKE + BIKE + RAIL SERVICES

Pilot Overview

The Demonstrating the Effectiveness of New Hike + Bike + Rail Services pilot action combined three complementary pilot activities implemented in Austria and in Hungary to strengthen the integration of public transport with hiking and cycling. The pilots promoted sustainable recreational mobility through improved access to hiking trails and cycling routes, free bicycle transport on trains, improved information infrastructure, communication activities and user engagement. Together, they aimed to make rail-based travel more attractive for outdoor recreation and encourage a shift from private car use to multimodal travel.

Implementation and Main Results

The pilot action was successfully implemented across several regions in Hungary and achieved most of its planned objectives. Key measures included the installation of National Blue Trail information panels at three railway stations and stamping boxes at two stations, updates to the official National Blue Trail website and mobile application, the wrapping of two rail vehicles promoting rail-based access to the National Blue Trail hiking trail, free bicycle transport incentives, guided cycling tours and a nationwide communication campaign. Monitoring combined user surveys, participation data and operational indicators to assess the implementation and effects of the measures.

The evaluation demonstrated strong public interest in the promoted services. Communication activities reached almost 200,000 people, exceeding the initial target, while 771 cyclists used the free bicycle transport scheme and participation in guided cycling tours surpassed expectations. User surveys confirmed a high level of satisfaction and highlighted the benefits of combining rail services with hiking and cycling. Although some planned indicators, such as launch event participation and survey response rates, fell below target due mainly to weather conditions and limited response rates, supplementary focus group interviews provided additional qualitative evidence supporting the effectiveness of the pilot action.

Lessons Learned and Transferability

The pilot action demonstrated that relatively simple measures—including integrated communication, targeted mobility incentives and improved information infrastructure—can significantly encourage the combined use of public transport with hiking and cycling. Close cooperation between transport operators, tourism organisations and regional stakeholders proved to be a key success factor throughout implementation. The experience also highlighted the importance of adequate bicycle transport capacity, clear passenger information and continuous stakeholder engagement. Given the positive evaluation results and the potential to expand several measures beyond the pilot locations, the approach provides a transferable model for other regions seeking to strengthen sustainable recreational mobility and Active2Public Transport connections.

3.7 TESTING NEW INTEGRATED TICKETS FOR A2PT

Pilot Overview

The Testing New Integrated Tickets for A2PT joint pilot combined two complementary approaches to integrating cycling and public transport. The pilot in Slovakia tested a new integrated ticket on cross-border bus line 901 between the Bratislava Region and Lower Austria, enabling passengers to purchase a single digital ticket covering the journey and bicycle transport. In parallel, in Hungarythe Tekergő-ticket, a seasonal express train line ticket was evaluated, previously offered between 2020 and 2023, which combined rail transport and bicycle rental on four predefined routes to tourist destinations in Western Hungary and, in one case, Austria. Together, the activities aimed to explore practical approaches to making multimodal travel easier and more attractive for cyclists and tourists.

Implementation and Main Results

The Slovakian pilot was implemented between June 2025 and June 2026 on cross-border bus line 901. Monitoring focused on ticket sales through the mobile application, operational observations and passenger feedback. During the implementation period, 1,668 integrated tickets were sold, demonstrating demand for a simplified multimodal ticketing solution. The pilot confirmed the technical feasibility of integrating bicycle transport into digital ticketing, although tickets purchased directly from the driver could not be recorded separately.

The Hungarian pilot's evaluation focused on analysing the concept and previous experience of the Tekergő-ticket. The evaluation, completed in December 2025, found a very positive market response and high customer satisfaction. The ticket combined rail travel and bicycle rental on four predefined routes, including one cross-border route between Hungary and Austria. Its use was strongly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, while the introduction of national and regional integrated public transport tickets subsequently reduced the rationale for maintaining a dedicated product.

Lessons Learned and Transferability

The joint pilot demonstrated that integrated ticketing can support multimodal travel but also showed that different approaches may be appropriate depending on the existing fare and transport system. The BID experience demonstrated the feasibility and continued value of a digital integrated ticket for cross-border bicycle and bus travel, while the permanent incorporation of the solution into the tariff system and mobile application supports its continuation beyond the pilot. The Hungarian evaluation of the Tekergő-ticket showed that dedicated cycling products can generate strong customer interest, but their long-term relevance depends on wider developments in the public transport fare system.

A key lesson is therefore that integrated ticketing should be developed in coordination with broader fare integration processes and with the needs of cyclists clearly reflected in ticketing products. Clear communication, comprehensive data collection and cooperation between transport operators and authorities are important for successful implementation and evaluation. The experiences provide useful examples for other regions seeking to simplify multimodal travel, while demonstrating that solutions should be adapted to existing ticketing structures rather than developed as standalone products.

3.8 INTEGRATION OF IMPROVED A2PT INFORMATION INTO EXISTING APPS AND TOOLS

Pilot Overview

This pilot action brought together four partner initiatives that aimed to improve access to A2PT information by integrating new content into existing digital platforms rather than developing new applications. The pilots enhanced well-established tools serving

cyclists, hikers and transport planners, including danube.travel in Serbia, the eVelo platform in Slovakia, the National Blue Trail application in Hungary and the Cyklovize2030 portal in the Czech Republic. Despite their different target groups, all four pilots shared the objective of making multimodal travel information more accessible, improving user awareness and encouraging the combined use of active mobility and public transport.

Implementation and Main Results

The pilots were implemented successfully and largely achieved or exceeded their planned objectives. Together they expanded digital information available to cyclists, hikers and planners through upgraded online platforms, interactive maps, mobile applications and planning tools. Quantitative results included the publication of more than 75 new content pages on danube.travel, an interactive multimodal map with more than ten thematic layers on the eVelo platform, updated information on railway stations and public transport connections within the official National Blue Trail website and mobile application, and the validation of approximately 6,000 km of cycling network data through the Cyklovize2030 portal. The updated information was provided to the Hungarian Hiking Association for integration into the official website of the trail and application and subsequently cross-checked, with no corrections required. User feedback and monitoring results indicated improved accessibility of A2PT information and confirmed the value of integrating mobility information into platforms that users already regularly access.

Although implementation was generally successful, partners encountered similar challenges related to the availability, quality and harmonisation of data from multiple sources. These issues were addressed through close cooperation with transport operators, regional authorities and other stakeholders, together with iterative improvements to the underlying data models and digital platforms throughout implementation.

Lessons Learned and Transferability

A common conclusion across all four pilots was that improving existing digital platforms represents an effective and sustainable approach to promoting Active2Public Transport. Rather than creating standalone applications, integrating reliable multimodal information into established tools increased the visibility and long-term usability of the developed solutions. The pilots also highlighted the importance of stakeholder cooperation, high-quality standardised data and flexible implementation

processes when developing digital mobility services. As all solutions remain operational beyond the project lifetime and can be further expanded, the experiences provide a transferable model for other regions seeking to improve digital support for multimodal travel.

4 Synthesis of Pilot Evaluation Results and Recommendations

4.1 MAIN FINDINGS FROM THE PILOT EVALUATIONS

The joint evaluation of the A2PT pilot actions shows that the different interventions tested across the Danube Region provided useful evidence on how active mobility can be better integrated with public transport. Although the pilots differed substantially in scope, target groups and implementation context, several common findings emerged from their monitoring and evaluation.

1. The pilot results highlight the importance of **addressing practical barriers to multimodal travel rather than relying on awareness-raising alone.** The testing schemes showed that providing access to bicycles and public transport can support changes in travel behaviour, while the bike box, bicycle carriage and hike + bike + rail pilots demonstrated the importance of appropriate infrastructure, service availability and practical incentives. Similarly, the integrated ticketing pilots showed that simplifying the use of combined transport modes can support multimodal travel when the solution is well integrated into existing transport systems.

2. **The effectiveness of individual measures depends strongly on the local implementation context**. The Street Transformations pilots demonstrated that similar temporary interventions can produce different results depending on traffic conditions, location and the scale and design of the intervention. The Bike Boxes and regional bus pilots similarly showed that infrastructure or technical solutions alone do not guarantee uptake. Local infrastructure, public transport connections,

operational conditions and user needs therefore need to be considered when designing A2PT measures.

3. **Stakeholder cooperation emerged as a recurring condition for successful implementation**. The pilots involved transport operators, municipalities, tourism and cycling organisations, infrastructure owners and other regional stakeholders. Their involvement was particularly important where interventions required physical infrastructure, changes to public transport services, access to existing platforms or coordination across institutional boundaries. The evaluations also showed that insufficient stakeholder commitment can limit or prevent implementation, as illustrated by the unsuccessful procurement of the Croatian bike boxes and the cancellation of the planned Croatian regional bus pilot.

4. **The pilots confirmed the value of testing measures under real-life conditions before wider implementation**. Temporary street transformations, bicycle carriage solutions and user testing schemes generated practical evidence that could be used to refine measures, identify barriers and inform decisions on continuation or expansion. In several cases, pilot experience directly supported continuation beyond the project, including the expansion of bicycle carriage services, continued use of digital information solutions and further consideration of infrastructure measures.

5. **The quality and availability of monitoring data influenced the strength of the evaluation**. Most pilots combined quantitative indicators with surveys, interviews, observations or other qualitative evidence. However, limitations included low survey response rates, lack of automated usage data and difficulties in recording certain types of use. The pilot evaluations therefore underline the importance of defining realistic indicators, data sources and responsibilities before implementation, while allowing sufficient flexibility to adapt the monitoring approach to the specific pilot context.

4.2 KEY FACTORS FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION

The pilot evaluations indicate that successful implementation of A2PT measures depends on a combination of institutional, operational and user-related conditions.

Although the specific requirements differed between pilot types, several factors were consistently important across the evaluated actions.

Early stakeholder involvement and clear responsibilities were among the most important conditions. Many of the pilot actions required cooperation between transport operators, municipalities, infrastructure owners, tourism and cycling organisations and other regional stakeholders. Early agreement on roles, responsibilities and implementation arrangements helped facilitate delivery, while a lack of committed partners or suitable operators could delay or prevent implementation. This was particularly evident for infrastructure and public transport-related measures, where procurement, approvals and operational arrangements had to be secured before implementation could proceed.

Adequate preparation and sufficient implementation time were also essential. The experience of the Street Transformations and Bike Boxes pilots showed that permitting, procurement, site preparation and technical arrangements can require more time than initially anticipated. Pilot designs therefore need to allow sufficient time not only for implementation, but also for monitoring and evaluation. Where implementation was delayed, this could directly reduce the time available to collect evidence on the effects of the intervention.

Communication and user engagement influenced the visibility and uptake of the tested measures. The pilot experiences indicate that users need clear information about how new services or facilities work and what benefits they provide. This was particularly relevant for bicycle carriage on buses, integrated ticketing and the hike + bike + rail measures. User testing, surveys, interviews and direct engagement also provided valuable information for adapting measures to actual user needs.

Finally, monitoring and data collection need to be considered as part of pilot design rather than as a separate reporting activity. The evaluations showed that the availability of reliable usage data, realistic indicators and sufficient survey participation directly affected the extent to which outcomes could be assessed. In several cases, additional qualitative methods such as interviews or focus groups were useful for complementing incomplete quantitative data. Clear responsibilities for data collection and realistic monitoring arrangements should therefore be established before implementation and adapted where necessary during the pilot.

4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PILOT IMPLEMENTATION AND TRANSFERABILITY

The pilot evaluations suggest that future actions should be designed with early stakeholder involvement, realistic implementation and monitoring timelines, and clearly defined responsibilities for data collection and evaluation. Practical measures should be supported by appropriate communication and user engagement, while monitoring arrangements should be integrated into pilot design from the outset.

For transfer to other regions, the pilot experience indicates that tested solutions should be adapted to local infrastructure, mobility patterns and institutional conditions rather than replicated unchanged. Where appropriate, small-scale testing can be used to assess local feasibility before wider implementation. The continuation and expansion of several pilot measures also indicate that well-designed pilot actions can provide a practical basis for longer-term measures.

5 Conclusions

The monitoring and evaluation activities carried out under Activity 3.3 provided a structured basis for assessing the implementation and results of the A2PT pilot actions across the Danube Region. The common monitoring and evaluation framework enabled the different pilot actions to be assessed according to a consistent overall approach, while allowing indicators and methods to be adapted to their specific objectives and implementation contexts. The completed evaluations provided both quantitative and qualitative evidence on the effectiveness, challenges and practical implementation of the tested measures.

The pilot evaluations showed that the tested A2PT measures can support the integration of active mobility and public transport, while their effectiveness depends strongly on local conditions and implementation arrangements. Across the different pilot themes, the evaluations highlighted the importance of suitable infrastructure and services, stakeholder cooperation, clear communication and user engagement. They also demonstrated the value of testing measures under real-life conditions, as pilots provided opportunities to identify practical barriers, refine approaches and assess their potential for continuation or wider application.

The evaluation process also highlighted the importance of integrating monitoring and data collection into pilot planning from the outset. While the pilots generated valuable evidence, differences in data availability, participation and monitoring methods limited the comparability of some results. These experiences provide useful guidance for future pilot design, particularly regarding the definition of realistic indicators, responsibilities for data collection and the timing of monitoring activities.

Overall, the pilot evaluations provide a practical evidence base for further development of Active2Public Transport approaches within the project and for their potential transfer to other regions. The findings and recommendations presented in this deliverable should support future pilot implementation by highlighting the conditions that contribute to successful delivery, while recognising that individual solutions need to be adapted to local infrastructure, mobility patterns and institutional contexts.

Appendices

APPENDIX 1. PILOT EVALUATION TEMPLATE

Contact information of the Project Partner

Name and Surname of the contact person:	
Organisation name:	
Country:	
E-mail address:	

To Do's

Step 1:	Fill out the 2. Planned Activities and Expected Outcomes section of the template **before the pilot starts**. Submit the partly completed template to KTI for approval of the monitoring process.
Step 2:	Fill out the 3. Pilot Implementation and Key Events section of the template **during the pilot**.
Step 3:	Complete the 1. Executive Summary, 4. Activities and Outcomes, and 5. Follow-up Actions sections of the template **after the pilot**. Submit the completed template to KTI for integration into the Toolbox.

List of pilots and PPs responsibility for the evaluation template

	Pilots	Lead Partner:
1.	**A2PT Testing schemes**	**BGL**
1. BGL 2. DOU 3. VNC 4. BID 5.PUM		
2.	**Temporary street transformation**	**MOP**
1.MOP 2.BGL		

3.	**Testing bike boxes combined with attractive ticketing/pricing**	**MOP**
1.MOP 2.VNC 3.MMP 4.DCC		
4.	**Mobility lab for testing bike carriage solutions for regional buses**	**BGL**
1.BGL 2.MMP 3. BID		
5.	**Demonstrate effectiveness of new hike + bike + rail services**	**GYS**
1.GYS 2.KTI 3.BGL		
6.	**Testing new integrated tickets for A2PT**	**BID**
1.BID 2.GYS		
7.	**Integration of improved information on A2PT in existing apps/tools**	**DCC**
1.DCC 2.GYS 3.PUM 4.VNC 5.BID		

1. Executive Summary

General data	
Title / Name of the pilot	
Location country / region / city	
Short Summary (max. 350 characters)	
Detailed description (1500 characters)	
1.1 Purpose and Scope: Briefly describe the purpose of the pilot and the specific objectives. (max. 500 characters)	
1.2 Key Outcomes: Provide a high-level overview of major achievements and results. (max. 500 characters)	

2. Planned Activities and Expected Outcomes

Before the pilot	
2.1 Summary of the pilot action: General description of the pilot plan. Give an overview of the pilot's intended purpose, goals, and target audience. Outline the specific objectives that the pilot intends to achieve. (max. 2500 characters)	
2.2 Report on monitoring: Outline the planned key actions and measures to be monitored during the implementation. Describe the expected timeline, including key phases and milestones. (max. 2500 characters)	
2.3 Outcomes: Define the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the pilot. Identify key measurable indicators (KPIs) to track progress. Outline anticipated changes, benefits, and feedback from participants, and describe how these outcomes align with	

the pilot's initial objectives. (max. 2500 characters)	
2.4 Evaluation of Satisfaction: (Self-)evaluation of the results. Define the planned approach for evaluating the results, including methods for assessing satisfaction with outcomes. Identify key criteria for determining whether expectations are met or exceeded. Outline potential challenges and strategies for addressing them. Specify if evaluation will include interviews, expert reviews, or other assessment methods. (max. 1500 characters)	
2.5 Budget Summary: Detailed budget table. Prepare a detailed budget table, outlining estimated costs for each spending category. Define key areas of expenditure. (max. 1500 characters)	

3. Pilot Implementation and Key Events

During the pilot	
3.1 Unexpected challenges: Were there any unexpected challenges or issues? If so, how were they addressed? (max. 1000 characters)	
3.2 Modifications or adjustments: Were there any modifications or adjustments made during the pilot? (max. 1000 characters)	
3.3 Picture Please provide at least one high-quality photo that align with the klimaaktiv website's strict guidelines. (optional)	

4. Activities and Outcomes

After the pilot	
4.1 Summary of the pilot action: General description of the pilot. Provide an overview of the finished pilot's main achievements, succeeded goals, and reached target audience. Compare	

the intended objectives with the actual implementation. Summarize the specific objectives the pilot aimed to achieve and assess to what extent they were met. Include reference to the programme and project objectives. (max. 2500 characters)	
4.2 Report on monitoring: Summarize the key actions, measures, and changes that occurred during the implementation. Provide an overview of the actual timeline, highlighting key phases and milestones. (max. 2500 characters)	
4.3 Outcomes: Present the quantitative and qualitative results of the pilot based on collected data. Highlight key measurable indicators (KPIs) and assess their achievement. Summarize observed changes, benefits, and participant feedback, and	

evaluate how well the outcomes align with the initial objectives. (max. 2500 characters)	
4.4 Evaluation of Satisfaction: (Self-)evaluation of the results. Assess the satisfaction with outcomes, highlighting areas where expectations were met or exceeded. List any challenges encountered and describe how they were solved. Summarize findings from interviews, expert evaluations, or other assessment methods, and provide insights into the overall success of the pilot. (max. 1500 characters)	
4.5 Budget Summary: Detailed budget table. Provide a detailed breakdown of actual costs versus budgeted amounts. Highlight and explain any significant deviations from the initial budget. Assess whether financial resources were used efficiently and identify any lessons learned for future budgeting.	

(max. 1500 characters)	

5. Follow-up Actions

After the pilot	
5.1 Future Planning: Discuss the potential for extending the pilot at the transnational level. In your reflection, consider the identification of challenges and key success factors that could influence implementation at the transnational level. (max. 1500 characters)	
5.2 Lessons Learned: Summarize the major takeaways from the pilot. (max. 1500 characters)	

6. Pictures

After the pilot	
6.1 Picture 1 Please provide high-quality photos that align with the klimaaktiv website's strict guidelines.	
6.2 Picture 2 Please provide high-	

quality photos that align with the klimaaktiv website's strict guidelines.	
6.3 Picture 3 Please provide high-quality photos that align with the klimaaktiv website's strict guidelines.	
6.4 Picture 4 Please provide high-quality photos that align with the klimaaktiv website's strict guidelines.	
6.5 Picture 5 Please provide high-quality photos that align with the klimaaktiv website's strict guidelines.	

APPENDIX 2. JOINT PILOT EVALUATION TEMPLATE

Contact information of the Project Partner

Name and Surname of the contact person:	
Organisation name:	
Country:	
E-mail address:	

To Do's

Step 1:	Make a video call with all the involved partners and fill out the 2. Planned Activities and Expected Outcomes section of the template **before the pilot starts**. Submit the partly completed template to KTI for approval of the monitoring process.
Step 2:	Make a video call with all the involved partners and complete the 1. Executive Summary, 3. Activities and Outcomes, and 4. Follow-up Actions sections of the template **after the pilot**. Submit the completed template to KTI for integration into the Toolbox.

List of pilots and PPs responsibility for the evaluation template

	Pilots	**Lead Partner:**
1.	**A2PT Testing schemes**	**BGL**
1. BGL 2. DOU 3. VNC 4. BID 5.PUM		
2.	**Temporary street transformation**	**MOP**
1.MOP 2.BGL		
3.	**Testing bike boxes combined with attractive ticketing/pricing**	**MOP**
1.MOP 2.VNC 3.MMP 4.DCC		

4.	**Mobility lab for testing bike carriage solutions for regional buses**	**BGL**
1.BGL 2.MMP 3. BID		
5.	**Demonstrate effectiveness of new hike + bike + rail services**	**GYS**
1.GYS 2.KTI 3.BGL		
6.	**Testing new integrated tickets for A2PT**	**BID**
1.BID 2.GYS		
7.	**Integration of improved information on A2PT in existing apps/tools**	**DCC**
1.DCC 2.GYS 3.PUM 4.VNC 5. BID		

1. Executive Summary

General data	
Title / Name of the pilot	
Locations country / region / city	
Short Summary (max. 350 characters)	
Detailed description (1500 characters)	
1.1 Purpose and Scope: Briefly describe the purpose of the pilots and the specific objectives. (max. 500 characters)	
1.2 Key Outcomes: Provide a high-level overview of major achievements and results. (max. 500 characters)	
1.3 Lessons Learned: Summarize the major takeaways	

from the pilots. (max. 1500 characters)	

2. Planned Activities and Expected Outcomes

Before the pilots	
2.1 Summary of the pilot action: General description of the pilot plan. Give an overview of the pilot's intended purpose, goals, and target audience. (max. 2500 characters)	
2.2 Report on monitoring: Outline the planned key actions and measures to be monitored during the implementation. (max. 2500 characters)	
2.3 Outcomes: Define the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the pilot. Identify key measurable indicators (KPIs) to track progress. (max. 2500 characters)	
2.4 Evaluation of Satisfaction: (Self-)evaluation of the results. Define the planned approach for evaluating the results, including methods for assessing satisfaction with	

outcomes. (max. 1500 characters)	

3. Activities and Outcomes

After the pilot	
3.1 Summary of the pilot action: General description of the pilot. Provide an overview of the finished pilot's main achievements, succeeded goals, and reached target audience. Compare the intended objectives with the actual implementation. Include reference to the programme and project objectives. (max. 2500 characters)	
3.2 Report on monitoring: Summarize the key actions, measures, and changes that occurred during the implementation. (max. 2500 characters)	
3.3 Outcomes: Present the quantitative and qualitative results of the pilot based on collected data. Highlight key measurable indicators (KPIs) and	

assess their achievement. (max. 2500 characters)	
3.4 Evaluation of Satisfaction: (Self-)evaluation of the results. Assess the satisfaction with outcomes, highlighting areas where expectations were met or exceeded. List any common challenges and describe how they were solved. (max. 1500 characters)	

4. Follow-up Actions

After the pilot	
4.1 Future Planning/sustainability: How can the sustainability of the output be ensured and where and to whom is it going to be transferred? (max. 1500 characters) Discuss the potential for extending the pilot at the transnational level. In your reflection, consider the identification of common challenges and key success	

factors that could influence implementation at the transnational level. (max. 1500 characters)	
4.2 Target groups: How can the output be used and by whom (target group), what is the benefit and the impact for these target groups and the target area / Danube Region? (max. 1500 characters)	