



Investing In your future  
Cross border Co-operation  
Programme 2007-2013  
Part financed by the  
European Union (European  
Regional Development Fund)

## **SEMINAR FOR FULL ACCESSIBILITY Muziekcentrum Bijloke Gent – March 29th 2011**

### **Presentation of the question**

For us, as organisers of the workshop, it is interesting to know how you, as participants, have experienced this day. We therefore would like to ask you to make some time to formulate an answer to the four following questions.

**Are you, after today, of opinion that there should be a more frequent co-operation with officials from different cities and communities as regards accessibility? Why/why not?**

### **The collected answers:**

- The exchange of information/experiences between different communities and cities can indeed be very interesting. After all, we all want to achieve one goal: we do not only want to create an accessible city/community, but in theory even an accessible society.
- Yes, because of the transfer of knowledge.
- Intervisitation can be extremely interesting. For partners from a smaller community this mainly concerns one-way communication: flow of information from a larger to a smaller community.
- Yes, we can learn from each other. We do not need to invent hot water on our own.
- In order to exchange experiences. To pursue a uniform systematic application of accessibility in new designs. In term, this will allow us to avoid screening and adaptations.
- Yes: in order to learn from each other.
- Yes: some communities and cities already have quite some experience. And they will certainly be prepared to share their expertise and good practices.
- Yes: knowledge grows everywhere. Co-operation can be strengthening and knowledge can be shared.
- We can learn from each others' good and less good practices.
- Yes: the exchange of knowledge and good practices, learning moments.
- Yes: the exchange of information and ideas is very useful and will in the long term appear to be time-saving.
- Co-operation between both officials and policymakers.
- To learn from each other and to start joint initiatives in the long term.
- Yes: this way, not everybody has to do the same research. We can learn a lot from each other.



## **Presentation of the question.**

### **In which form do you see such a co-operation?**

#### **The collected answers:**

- Workshop with intervision moment.
- Exchange day.
- For example a four-yearly meeting. With each time a different central topic and different points on the agenda. Through the establishment of an umbrella organisation with responsibilities in each province. Development of a website on which information is gathered, with links to supporting authorities, texts of experts' offices ... Provincial co-operation groups.
- A platform. The list of participants is also very useful to make some valuable contacts.
- A forum during which we regularly meet (a good communication is essential).
- Development of tools with respect to accessibility.
- Annual workshops
- To exchange good practices and proposals works inspiring. To invite a number of experts to provide necessary information. Common forms for each province? Can be useful for smaller communities.
- To organise on a regular basis a workshop in a different guest city in Flanders.
- Provincial or Flemish deliberation (depending on the number of interested cities). The provincial deliberation by analogy with the provincial integration deliberation. The province can guide the process. Preferably 2 to 3 times a year deliberation and exchange moment. This also gives us the opportunity to work on an intercommunity/municipal basis. There is a much larger support.
- Meetings with small active workshops. Once or twice a year.
- To participate in the co-operation between officials and policymakers. To develop and exchange good examples in close deliberation with the Flemish Association of Cities and Communities. I gladly put my thesis 'Accessibility and the role of local governments' at the disposal.
- An annual workshop, organised by different cities/communities. With different sub-aspects (in accordance with the policy and on a technical and in-depth basis). Discussion panels and the systematic exchange of good practices.
- The group is already large. More individual contact would certainly be better. Through the division in sub-groups during the afternoon session this was certainly easier. Globally speaking it was a very interesting way of working. Workshops are certainly necessary during the next meetings: to put theory into practice, such as the application of the anysurfer label, how to make communication accessible, ...

### **We wish to thank all the participants in this enquiry.**