

Item 8 (a) of the provisional agenda
**Managing THE PEP: Monitoring progress
on the implementation of THE PEP goals**

Proposal for monitoring progress toward the Paris Goals

Note by the secretariat

I. Background and mandate

1. At its eighth session, the Steering Committee agreed on an annual questionnaire to monitor country activities towards the implementation of the Amsterdam Goals and related activities. The questionnaire was applied in 2011, 2012 and 2013 and the replies received were used for reporting back to the Steering Committee at its annual sessions as well as for a regional assessment of progress made for the Fourth High-level Meeting in Paris in 2014.

2. In 2014 at the Fourth High-level Meeting on Transport, Health and Environment held in Paris, the ministers in the UNECE-WHO/Europe region adopted the Paris Declaration in which they agreed to strengthen their commitment to the four priority goals of the Amsterdam Declaration adopted at the Third High-level Meeting adopted in 2009 and added a new goal 5.¹

3. The Paris Declaration reconfirmed the terms of reference of THE PEP Steering Committee, adopted at the Second High-level Meeting in 2002 and agreed to monitor, through the Steering Committee at its annual sessions, progress in the implementation of THE PEP workplan 2014–2019.²

4. It moreover called on Governments to convene a Fifth High-level meeting no later than 2020, to review and report on progress achieved in the implementation of THE PEP workplan, to renew or modify THE PEP priority goals and to plan future activities (ECE/AC.21/2014/3–EUDCE1408105/1.6/4HLM/3, paras. 17, 18 and 21).

5. At its 24th meeting, following the Fourth High-level Meeting, the extended Bureau of THE PEP discussed the development of performance indicators as an important tool for monitoring the implementation of the five goals. Several delegations encouraged the agreement on specific performance indicators for each of the five Paris goals, mindful of existing work done by the European Environment Agency (EEA), such as the Transport and Environment Reporting Mechanism (TERM). It was stressed that indicators should be developed at national level so that member States are able to use them to assess whether they have adequately implemented the goals in their countries (Secretariat note 04, 25th meeting of THE PEP Extended Bureau, 16 April 2014, para 7–9).

¹ The Amsterdam Declaration includes: Priority Goal 1: to contribute to sustainable economic development and stimulate job creation through investment in environment- and health-friendly transport; Priority Goal 2: to manage sustainable mobility and promote a more efficient transport system; Priority Goal 3: to reduce emissions of transport-related greenhouse gases, air pollution and noise; Priority Goal 4: to promote policies and actions conducive to healthy and safe modes of transport. The Paris Declaration added new priority goal 5: to integrate transport, health and environmental objectives into urban and spatial planning policies.

² THE PEP workplan cited here and submitted to the Extended Bureau of THE PEP following the Fourth High level Meeting covered 2014–2020. However, following the offer of the Government of Austria to host the Fifth High-Level Meeting in 2019, this should be changed to 2014–2019.

6. This followed a prior discussion of the Steering Committee in considering the replies to the annual THE PEP questionnaire on the implementation of the Amsterdam Goals. The questionnaire (secretariat note no. 15) was developed following the adoption of the Amsterdam Declaration as a vehicle for member States to report on progress made at national level on pursuing an integrated policy approach to sustainable and healthy urban mobility and transport and on achieving the Amsterdam Goals. In this connection, Mr. Carlos Dora (WHO) presented health indicators linked to ongoing discussions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the need to develop an evidence base.

7. Some examples of indicators that could be developed included: the proportion of urban travel done by healthy transport, such as public transport and active mobility; the proportion of the urban population exposed to air pollution emissions above WHO air quality guidelines; mortality attributable to urban air pollution; the reduction in traffic injury deaths among cyclists and pedestrians per 1,000 kilometres of non-motorized travel; and the proportion of daily physical activity obtained through active mobility. The Committee welcomed work on indicators and encouraged member States to make use of them in ongoing discussions on health-related SDGs. (ECE/AC.21/SC/2013/6–EUDCE1206040/1.9/SC11/6, para. 54).

II. Monitoring progress of THE PEP process in the region using a results-based management approach

8. The current questionnaire used for monitoring implementation is a valuable tool for reporting, with a reasonable qualitative assessment potential, on the achievement of the goals agreed by member States. However, to be able to monitor and evaluate progress at the pan-European level and in order to garner support from member States for THE PEP process, countries may wish to consider putting in place a system that focuses more on higher level outcomes, rather than activities and outputs, to achieve an agreed vision. Outcomes can be defined as “the intended or achieved short term and medium term effects of an intervention’s outputs, usually requiring the collective effort of partners. Outcomes represent changes in development conditions which occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impacts.” (UNDG Results-Based Management Handbook, 2010)

9. Member States, in adopting the Paris Declaration, have agreed a common vision and five priority goals toward achieving this vision. As such, it would be important to develop a system for measuring results achieved between 2014 and 2019 and thereafter, to be assessed at the High-level meetings held every 4-5 years. Monitoring and evaluating THE PEP process as activities are carried out through the implementation mechanisms could be done using performance indicators.

10. Performance indicators are a qualitative or quantitative means of measuring an output or outcome, with the intention of assessing the performance of a programme. In the case of THE PEP, a pan-European process, “process indicators” could be used to measure the effectiveness of the Paris Declaration, for example. Qualitative indicators might also serve to measure how stakeholders participate, or how much they participate, in THE PEP process and their satisfaction with the outcomes resulting from THE PEP activities.

11. The indicators chosen should give an observable signal of a measurable change with regard to the objectives of THE PEP, in order to verify results. The identification of indicators is an important participatory process because it requires prior agreement on the changes sought. In addition, the identification process can help THE PEP stakeholders clarify the specific outcomes they seek (in the short, medium and long term) through the

application of the implementation mechanisms. This would also avoid overly ambitious or broad outcomes being pursued, or that the monitoring and evaluation process becomes too onerous for THE PEP.

12. The selection of indicators for activities that are considered of a “soft” nature, such as policy advice, dialogue and advocacy is not easy in practice. The indicator should focus on the concrete outcomes resulting from the soft interventions; for example, the formal adoption of a policy or the issuance of a decree does not always indicate a real change or improvement in the lives of people. This means that what is of interest in the assessment of progress are the actions that followed the adoption of a policy or a decision to carry out certain measures.

13. Member States participating in THE PEP may also wish to consider the usefulness of identifying and agreeing on outputs, outcomes and performance indicators for THE PEP workplan 2014–2019 in order to focus on results and measure progress in the achievement of THE PEP goals.

14. At the request of member States, the United Nations system has been working with a results based management (RBM) approach for over a decade. Using such a system for THE PEP could help stakeholders and donors to better appreciate the impact of a given programme, or implementation mechanism, is having in the region. It is reasonable to expect increased participation and support for THE PEP by member States if positive impacts can be verified and assessed in a credible manner.

15. The Secretariat could prepare a proposal for a monitoring tool on progress for THE PEP, including the identification of performance/process indicators for the agreement of the member States participating in THE PEP process. The aim would be to put in place an enhanced approach for monitoring progress in the achievement of the goals of the Paris Declaration in the run up to the Fifth High-level meeting in 2019 and beyond.

16. At the 25th Meeting of THE PEP Steering Committee Bureau, the members considered the above ideas for enhancing the current process of monitoring implementation of THE PEP. The recommendations of the Bureau were for the Secretariat to propose a “light” process so as not to place an additional burden on the countries and to avoid duplication with other processes.

17. Taking into account the recommendation of the Bureau, the Steering Committee may wish to recommend that, in the short term (current reporting period), THE PEP member States continue to use the current format for reporting using the annual questionnaire. The Steering Committee may also wish to consider inviting the ECE’s Committee on Environmental Policy to continue to include in the Terms of Reference for the ECE Environmental Performance Reviews, an assessment of the implementation of THE PEP Goals in the reviewed country. In the medium-long term (next and forthcoming reporting periods), and with views of further enhancing the quality of reporting on THE PEP, the Steering Committee also may wish to consider the following two options:

(a) Improve the quality of the present reporting mechanism, by requiring respondents to the annual monitoring questionnaire also to provide evidence of the information reported, for example through the provision of links to relevant supportive documentation (e.g. publications, reports of events, national policies/legislation, as applicable). Compared to the present reporting system, the additional costs to be incurred are estimated in terms of approximately 3–4 additional days for the member States to collect the supportive documentation and of approximately 1 month for the secretariat to perform the analysis of replies and validate them against the evidence provided.

(b) Explore the development of an indicator-based assessment of progress in the achievement of THE PEP goals at the national or pan European level, in collaboration with relevant institutions such as the EEA, and with due consideration of the reporting burden of the member States. This would result in a proposal that would work to the extent feasible with existing indicators and tools that could be applied for monitoring progress in the integration of transport, health and environment policies. The costs associated with the establishment and maintenance of such a reporting framework would depend on the number of indicators, their availability, and the sources from which they would be collected. Should the Steering Committee be interested in further exploring this option, it could request the Secretariat to develop a proposal for such a monitoring framework, including estimated costs, for consideration by the 13th meeting of the Steering Committee.
