

Bodenmann Balz Reto

Von: Saskia van der Loo <Saskia.vanderLoo@kuleuven.be>
Gesendet: Donnerstag, 21. Februar 2013 13:37
An: antoniou@central.ntua.gr; Efthymiou Dimitrios (dimitrios.efthymiou@epfl.ch)
Cc: 'Isabelle Thomas'; 'Sylvie Gayda'; Zöllig Christof; "Kiarash MOTAMEDI"; Stef Proost; 'Ines Cabrita'; ignacio.inoa@u-cergy.fr; Schirmer Patrick; Nathalie Picard; andre.depalma@ens-cachan.fr; Bodenmann Balz Reto; 'Thomas Nicolai'; 'Kai Nagel'; Jonathan Jones; Camille Cotteels; Axhausen Kay W.
Betreff: summary of indicator module leuven meeting

Dear Costas, Dimitrios and others,

This is a summary of the fruitful discussion we had on Tuesday in Leuven about the indicator module. First of all, it would be useful if you take contact with the case study teams about the module because there was some discussion whether the module should be an external module or incorporated within the urbansim module. As I understood it, you are currently developing an external module. Could you elaborate on this and explain in more detail what you are doing?

It was also suggested that it would be useful to develop the module for one case study (brussels as Dimitrios has access to the urbansim model of brussels) and then send this module to the other two case studies so that they already can have a look. Could you do this as soon as possible, even if the module for brussels is not completely finished? In this way you could already get feedback from the teams and the teams could better assist you in developing the module.

Then there were other issues concerning the social welfare function as it is defined now. Maybe you could comment whether our suggestions are feasible for you or not.

1. The utilities used in the module should be the utilities from the location choice model from urbansim instead of computing them ex post as is now the case. This will simplify computations and the amount of required data will be reduced significantly.
2. Concerning the first term of the social welfare function: there was a discussion whether we should sum over the residents living at time $t=0$ or over the residents living at time t (so including new residents at each year t). We decided that for computational reasons it will be simpler to take the sum of the residents at time t .
3. The weights of the utilities: these weights depend on the relative utility or income. These can be put to one as first simplification although different weights for different income classes would be better.
4. The third term of the social welfare function where we have the utility of the rest of the world can be interpreted as the environmental damage caused to the "rest of the world". We will circulate the marginal external costs that can be used. These can then be multiplied by the total amount of vehkm.
5. Utilities of commuters: if the case studies lack information on those, we can assume that commuters and residents have the same utility.

I hope I have covered everything. If not, feel free to complete the list.

Kind regards,
Saskia