

Conference Room Paper No.2

31 December 2007

ENGLISH ONLY

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE
WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION**

Regional Office for Europe

**HIGH-LEVEL MEETING ON TRANSPORT,
HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT**

Steering Committee on the Transport, Health and
Environment Pan-European Programme¹

(Sixth session, Geneva, 28–29 April 2008)

Item 5 of the provisional agenda

THE PEP SELF-EVALUATION

¹ THE PEP.

UNECE Transport Division

UNECE Environment, Housing and Land Management Division

Self-evaluation

**Transport, Health and Environment Pan-European Programme
(THE PEP)**

31 December 2007

**UNECE Transport Division
UNECE Environment, Housing and Land Management Division**

**Self-evaluation of the
Transport, Health and Environment Pan-European Programme
(THE PEP)**

I. INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

A. Purpose and scope of evaluation

1. The purpose of the present self-evaluation covering the 2006-2007 biennium is to analyse the effectiveness of the Pan-European Programme on Transport, Health and Environment (THE PEP) in improving cooperation, communication and collaboration among the three sectors and its impact on the development of inter-sectoral policies and strategies in the Member States. The evaluation also aims to identify gaps in the programme and develop mechanisms for improved integration of environmental and health concerns into transport policy. In addition it assesses the institutional set-up of THE PEP and its secretariat and makes recommendations for improvement.

B. Background and mandate of THE PEP

2. THE PEP was established in 2002 consolidating the Programme of Joint Action (POJA) of the UNECE Regional Conference on Transport and Environment (Vienna, 1997) and the London process of the WHO/Europe Conference on Environment and Health (London, 1999). The present evaluation conducted by the secretariat mainly covers the period of 2006-7 but also takes into consideration the entire programme since its inception in 2002.

3. THE PEP addresses key challenges to achieve sustainable transport patterns and a closer integration of environment and health concerns into transport policy. The three key priority areas of THE PEP are: integration of transport, environment and health, urban transport and demand management.² THE PEP is overseen by a tripartite Steering Committee and a Bureau that promotes, monitors, coordinates and facilitates the implementation of the programme carried out in collaboration with the World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe (WHO/Europe). To ensure effective

² The main priority areas agreed by Ministers at the inception of THE PEP and reiterated by the Bureau at its second High-level Meeting are: the integration of environmental and health aspects into transport policy; sustainable urban transport and demand management/modal shift. In addition, two cross-cutting themes were agreed: specific needs of EECCA/SEE and protection of ecologically-sensitive areas. This evaluation primarily addresses the three main priority areas, as work on sensitive areas has been less evident in recent years and the specific needs of EECCA/SEE have been largely addressed under priority 1 (sustainable urban transport).

implementation, UNECE and WHO/Europe member countries are committed to providing adequate resources and financial means, also to ensure participation of representatives of EECCA and SEE countries.

C. Issues to be addressed and questions to be answered through the evaluation

4. The evaluation aims to determine whether THE PEP achieves its objectives in promoting integration between the transport, environment and health sectors in UNECE and WHO/Europe member countries and in particular in EECCA and SEE countries. The evaluation examines, moreover, THE PEP outputs and activities according to its three main priorities, considering the following indicators of achievement, and makes concrete recommendations for future action.

a. Indicators of achievement at national level include:

- The development of sustainable transport strategies and action plans; and
- The development of institutional mechanisms for policy integration and cross-sectoral cooperation.

b. Indicators of achievement at international level include:

- Participation in meetings of THE PEP and its activities by representatives from all three sectors and from all sub-regions; and
- Targeted actions in the Programme of Work, such as the development of sub-regional workshops on sustainable urban transport or the tools and methods used at international level (e.g. THE PEP Clearinghouse internet platform and database, a cost-benefit analysis tool on walking and cycling and THE PEP toolbox of best practices in sustainable urban transport).

c. Other issues: THE PEP's programmatic and institutional approach, including funding

- Other issues to be addressed include the operation and effectiveness of THE PEP Steering Committee and its Bureau to oversee and guide the activities of the programme;
- The functioning of inter-agency cooperation within THE PEP secretariat between the transport and environment divisions of UNECE and between UNECE and WHO/Europe; and
- Particular features of THE PEPs institutional mechanism, including funding.

D. Methodology for data collection

5. Given the difficulty in determining the real impact of THE PEP outputs and activities on actual achievements at national level, a questionnaire was developed by THE PEP secretariat in 2007 and circulated to Member States in advance of the annual meeting of THE PEP Steering Committee. The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain information from Member States on the degree of integration among the three sectors in policy development at national level. The questionnaire aimed moreover to elicit detailed responses from Member States about national and local level strategies, policies and programmes and their implementation, as well as obstacles to policy integration.

6. Replies were received from 12 countries and a first synthesis was presented to the Steering Committee in April 2007 with a subsequent request to Member States to reply to the questionnaire. Three additional replies were received as of September 2007, for a total of 15 responses out of 56 Member States. Due to the limited response by countries, this evaluation is made only partially on the basis of the replies to the questionnaire and also draws on feedback from THE PEP Steering Committee and its Bureau. As background information for the planned 3rd High-level Meeting on Transport, Health and Environment (3HLM) the secretariat drafted an assessment report which examines the effectiveness of the institutional set-up of THE PEP and its secretariat using existing data on participation and substantive contributions from Member States. Some of the information below has been excerpted from the assessment report (ECE/AC.21/SC/2008/3).

E. Use of the findings

7. The findings of the evaluation will be used to: 1) improve cooperation between the three sectors within the Member States; 2) facilitate the tasks of the secretariat in developing future work plan elements for THE PEP and 3) contribute to the finalization of the assessment report to be able to present concrete recommendations to the 3HLM.

II. EVALUATION OF THE PEP

8. The following section evaluates the success of THE PEP in terms of outputs and work accomplished in its three main priorities in accordance with the above-mentioned criteria. It also addresses the particularities of THE PEP's programmatic approach and its institutional mechanism, including the issue of funding. A detailed explanation of the work achieved in each of the priority areas is in the annex.

A. THE PEP Priority 1: Integration of environment and health into transport policies

9. The notion of policy integration underpins all THE PEP activities. Specific programme outputs include THE PEP Clearing House, guidance on the implementation of institutional arrangements and a brochure on supportive institutional conditions.

10. Concrete indicators of achievement in policy integration however are not well-established and, as noted above, it is difficult to determine the actual impact of THE PEP on the policy response in the countries. The above-mentioned questionnaire, specifically, asked countries to describe the most significant national level (and/or local-level/urban) progress achieved in the integration of environmental and health aspects into transport policy. This included the development, implementation and monitoring of sustainable transport strategies/action plans and the development of institutional mechanisms for policy integration and cross-sectoral cooperation.

11. While the results cannot be considered comprehensive or representative of the UNECE/WHO region as a whole, some of the replies shed light on the possible impact of THE PEP over the long-term and the potential usefulness of its outputs and activities. Some countries reported they had national transport plans with specific objectives for environment and health and laws requiring cross-sectoral cooperation among ministries when elaborating strategic documents.

Recommendations for future action

12. To further the activities undertaken within the framework of THE PEP towards integration of environment and health into transport policies, attention should be given to the following:

(a) *Organization and sustained integration strategies and mechanisms.* Competent authorities and stakeholders should find effective ways to better coordinate the three sectors and report back to THE PEP Steering Committee on actions taken and results obtained; and

(b) *Capacity building, communication and awareness.* Exchange of good practices (e.g. through workshops) on the different political, legal and administrative environments of countries in the region could overcome barriers and promote dialogue between sectoral stakeholders.

B. THE PEP Priority 2: Demand management / modal shift

13. Transport demand management can be achieved by a set of policies, strategies and action plans at the international, national and local levels, directed at improving the use of motor vehicles, supporting more sustainable travel and improving the efficiency of transport infrastructure, taking into account social, economic and environmental effects of transport. Specific programme outputs related to demand

management and modal shift include THE PEP Toolbox (2008), guidance on economic valuation of transport-related health effects and reports on energy-efficient driving methods (2004-5).

14. Though it remains an important policy objective in most of the countries in the region, in reality, Governments have met with limited success in achieving a sustainable balance between transport modes. The development of investment strategies that could influence the modal split towards sustainable transport in freight and passenger transport as foreseen by THE PEP has not been achieved. Other actions that were targeted by THE PEP did not come to fruition, including: a commitment to refocus domestic investments and bilateral aid to influence the modal split; to enhance collaboration with International Finance Institutions (IFIs), particularly in EECCA and SEE countries; and the establishment of a special fund to support pilot projects towards such a reorientation in EECCA and SEE countries (ECE/AC.21/2002/9, annex 1).

15. Several Member States have indicated they have policies in place to promote modal shift – away from road transport, toward rail, inland waterways and inner-city (light) rail. Some noted, policymakers coped with congestion through: intermodality for passengers and freight; revitalization of the rail sector, promotion of sea and inland waterway transport and development of metropolitan railways in big cities. Others said they had adopted national and regional transport plans that aimed to ensure sustainable mobility policies were compatible with the environment. Many countries have taken steps toward wide-scale introduction of eco-driving. Some countries indicated that policies had been enacted that require the preparation of sustainable transport plans by large private and public enterprises for passenger and freight transport.

16. Moreover, a number of policy, economic and epidemiological studies have been undertaken in the region to develop strategies and methods to improve estimates of the external costs of transport activities and to promote their internalization. Experiences from countries in northern Europe have shown that, even if the full knowledge of external costs is not available, relatively simple price signals and environmental differentiation of existing charges may trigger considerable adjustments among the actors in the transport sector (ECE/AC.21/2002/9, annex 1).

Recommendations for future action

17. Activities undertaken within the framework of THE PEP in the area of demand management and modal split may need to be further focused on areas where THE PEP as a pan-European mechanism for the exchange of information on good practices can make a difference. This is not the case in areas such as the elaboration of investment strategies and other measures directly influencing the modal split towards transport that is not sustainable from a health and environmental perspective. In addition, the elaboration of sustainable transport plans by large private and public enterprises for passenger and freight transport may continue to be difficult for THE PEP as an inter-governmental forum not having

direct contact with private manufacturing and service industries that would need to be targeted for such measures.

18. However, further work by THE PEP could focus on the promotion of instruments and mechanisms achieving behavioural changes of motorists, such as eco-driving techniques, where the prestige of an international institution and a pan-European mechanism could be used and could have an impact.

19. Similarly, work within THE PEP could be strengthened using tools for the cost-benefit analysis of environment and health effects, including by further fine-tuning the mechanisms and models in line with the different institutional and geographical environments of countries in the pan-European region, particularly in EECCA and SEE.

C. THE PEP Priority 3: Sustainable urban transport

20. This activity promotes policy integration, capacity-building and awareness raising and generates policy-relevant recommendations for SEE and EECCA countries. Programme outputs related to the promotion of sustainable urban transport include recommendations stemming from three international capacity-building workshops and work underway for a fourth, as well as the outcome of a survey on citizen's urban travel patterns.

21. Progress was made by Member States on specific aspects of sustainable urban transport, such as energy savings programmes and the use of alternative fuels in EECCA countries. For example, in some countries, taxis and public transport vehicles had switched from petrol to compressed natural gas to reduce total emissions from transport. In others, there were national programmes on energy saving and on the use of alternative fuels, as well as a program on the regeneration of public transport vehicles, the use of excise taxes for imported old vehicles to encourage imports of newer vehicles and research on traffic management and mobility and transport.

22. The promotion of clean and efficient public transport continues to be seen as a way to deal with many of the urban transport problems in THE PEP member states. Unfortunately, not all cities are able to deliver dependable and cost-effective public transport services to their citizens. Member States provided insight into their policies and strategies to tackle accessibility and quality of public transport systems, such as the establishment of automated systems for traffic management and control, introduction and improvement of traffic management and information systems (e.g. traffic operations centres, central computer systems, vehicle detector stations, changeable message signs, ramp metering stations, communications sub-systems) and the development of infrastructure and route networks of new destinations to remote residential areas.

Recommendations for future action

23. The series of sub-regional workshops on sustainable urban transport under THE PEP have apparently yielded positive results both in attracting participation across the three sectors and in developing concrete and practical recommendations. For example, the Tbilisi workshop offered a set of recommendations encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of transport and at reducing private motor vehicle use by 20-30 % in order to reduce congestion, urban air pollution, noise and road traffic accidents, as follows:

(a) Design and implementation of a comprehensive urban transport strategy/policy framework outlining measures to be taken at local level;

(b) An increase in the attractiveness of public transport, in particular trolleys and tramways, and in parallel, a better regulation of privately-operated services (minibuses). This requires improvement in the vehicle fleet, infrastructure and services of the public transport system by prioritizing public transport in road traffic planning and in investment strategies, development of integrated ticketing systems and training for more environmentally-friendly and safer driving.

(c) Market and pricing reforms to manage private car use and to reduce environmental and health externalities of transport involving: road and congestion pricing; removing parking subsidies; introducing parking charges; realignment of excise taxes to assure that fuel prices reflect the true environmental impact; a system of fiscal incentives for zero or ultra-low emission vehicles.

24. In addition, further work is needed to encourage policies that promote walking and cycling as environmentally and healthy modes of transport. The inclusion of health benefits and other effects e.g. on road safety would not only lead to a more complete assessment but also provide much stronger arguments for walking and cycling as policy options. Further guidance and tools should be developed to facilitate integration of transport-related health effects into economic assessments of transport interventions.

D. Programmatic approach of THE PEP

25. While THE PEP Steering Committee and its Bureau have in general expressed satisfaction with the progress made under the existing priority areas, problems have been cited regarding the programmatic approach. The underlying work plan of THE PEP includes only a limited number of activities to be carried out within the above-mentioned priority areas through the allocation of adequate resources (ECE/AC.21/2002/9). This limited focus, within which a limited number of projects were to be undertaken at the international level, was a reflection of the large and diverse number of activities included in the Vienna Programme of Joint Action (POJA) that did not provide for a clear identity or visibility of this Programme. Due to the limited funding, POJA was not able to deliver concrete results.

26. While most of THE PEP priority areas have been addressed during the reporting period, not all actions listed in the work plan have been implemented in substance and with concrete results. For example, no activities have been undertaken since 2002 on ecologically sensitive areas. Apart from the workshops on sustainable urban transport and the Clearing House, where particular efforts have been made to provide access to information and data for EECCA countries and in Russian, none of these activities has focused on specific EECCA problems³. In addition, cooperation with other international organizations, with the exception of the former ECMT (now the International Transport Forum) has not been successful.

27. The concentration of work on a few areas and activities facilitated work of the Steering Committee and at the same time this streamlined approach has increased the impact, visibility and identity of THE PEP among experts and policy makers. Apart from limited WHO and UN regular budget resources and staff to support the operational activities of THE PEP, particularly its Clearing House, the limited and unpredictable availability of extra-budgetary resources from a few donor countries and organizations has also played a role (see section “E” below).

Recommendations for future action

28. In the case where available resources for THE PEP activities at the pan-European level do not change substantially, it might be appropriate to keep the present narrow focus of THE PEP as recommended by the Steering Committee in 2006. However, it might be worth considering fine-tuning the priorities, in particular concerning “demand side management and modal shift”, in order to bring the objectives of THE PEP more in line with its realistic potential and to abandon overly-ambitious goals, such as investment strategies and other measures influencing the modal split that have not been realized.

29. Activities could be enhanced in other fields, such as guidance on environment and health impact assessments, case studies of sustainable urban transport solutions and good practices (e.g. THE PEP Tool-box, etc.) or on behavioural changes, such as promotion of eco-driving or use of public transport. In these “soft” policy areas, the prestige of international organizations (UN) and an international mechanism (THE PEP) might assist Governments in gaining acceptance of integration policies within public administrations and by the public at large, particularly in EECCA and SEE countries.

³ It should be noted, however, that preparations are underway for a fourth workshop on sustainable urban transport in June 2008 specifically intended to highlight urban transport problems and solutions in EECCA countries, including a side event on urban air pollution and its health and environmental effects.

E. THE PEP's institutional approach

30. As noted above, the 2nd High-level Meeting in 2002 established THE PEP Steering Committee and its Bureau, as tripartite bodies, replacing the former Joint Meeting on Transport and the Environment (JMTE) of UNECE and the London Charter Steering Group of WHO/Europe. The Steering Committee was tasked with giving guidance and strategic direction to THE PEP, intending to promote, monitor, coordinate and facilitate the implementation of the programme according to an agreed timetable and with clear objectives and a mechanism for implementation (ECE/AC.21/2002/8, para. 7).

31. Since 2003, the Steering Committee has been convened annually. Similarly, the Bureau has met at least annually to prepare the sessions of the Committee. However, participation rates are clearly declining: in 2007 the annual session of the Steering Committee was attended by THE PEP Focal Points and other designated experts of 22 countries (2007). This compares to 23 countries in 2006, 27 countries in 2005 and 29 countries in 2004 and 2003.

32. As the majority of participants were from the European Union, participation rates of EECCA and SEE countries have been especially limited. In 2007 only 5 EECCA and 2 SEE countries attended (mission costs for which were covered by THE PEP trust funds). In 2006 (2005) only 5 (4) EECCA and 3 (4) SEE countries participated at the sessions of the Steering Committee.

33. While it is understandable that participation at international meetings is costly, particularly for EECCA and SEE countries, the participation of experts from these countries is a crucial prerequisite to maintain the credibility of THE PEP. Appropriate expert participation from EECCA and SEE (i.e. participation by the relevant experts from all three sectors) is particularly critical if THE PEP wants to claim to be a pan-European mechanism addressing the needs of all of its member countries.

34. International organizations and finance institutions, such as the European Commission and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) have only sporadically attended sessions of the Steering Committee. This may be due to THE PEP's focus on a few specific activities not necessarily of primordial interest to these organizations. It may however also be due to the limited possibilities for these organizations to present themselves and to provide input to agenda items under consideration.

35. Another factor contributing to the lack of visibility and effectiveness of THE PEP lies in its tripartite nature and its "independence" from the UNECE and WHO/Europe institutional mechanisms. While the secretariat and conference resources for THE PEP are provided by UN organs, the Steering Committee reports to the WHO Regional Committee for Europe, to the UNECE Committee on Environmental Policy and to the UNECE Committee on Inland Transport and it is mandated by and accountable only to the High-level Meetings.

36. Thus, as may be the case at national levels, THE PEP mechanism and its area of work are not in the mainstream of the activities and concerns for which these WHO/Europe and UNECE organs and their secretariats are responsible and accountable. This lack of clear ownership applies to many horizontal and cross-sectoral activities and processes and can only be overcome by a strong commitment to valuable work at a high political level on the part of the Member States and focal points.

Recommendations for future action

37. Given these developments, renewed efforts must be made to make the sessions of THE PEP Steering Committee more attractive to its constituencies. One approach could be to discuss and review at its annual sessions selected policy themes, through, for example, in-depth discussions on salient topics and activities particularly useful or relevant in the integration of transport, environment and health policy. Routine and administrative issues could be discussed in and prepared by THE PEP Bureau for approval by the Committee only.

38. Moreover, wider participation of EECCA and SEE countries will most probably require continued assistance through international resources and donors. In line with similar procedures, it might be considered to use a certain percentage (e.g. 10%) of all extra-budgetary assistance provided for THE PEP activities to cover such expenses.

39. Finally, further efforts need to be made to increase the number of national focal points able to act as national coordinators and represent all three sectors, as well as to engage relevant members of the transport, environment and health NGO community.

F. THE PEP Funding

40. The 2nd High-level Meeting committed to ensure the effective implementation of THE PEP through the allocation of adequate resources and financial means for carrying out the activities under the rationalized priorities, as outlined in THE PEP work plan and to ensure adequate participation of representatives from EECCA (formerly NIS) and SEE (formerly South Eastern Europe) (ECE/AC.21/2002/8, para. 7).

41. While resources have periodically been made available by a number of donor countries, particularly for the development of THE PEP Clearing House, they have not been sufficient to implement all activities of THE PEP work plan (ECE/AC.21/2002/9, annex 1)⁴. This is due not only to

⁴ Major donors thus far include: Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America, UNECE, WHO.

the insufficient level of funding, but also to the unpredictable nature of such funds that made effective implementation of the planned activities challenging. In particular, it was impossible to obtain regular funds for the sustained operation of the Clearing House in line with projected requirements. In addition, the planned mechanism for subscriptions of “shares” that could be subscribed to, to be earmarked for specific or general support of THE PEP work programme did not produce tangible results -- even though a similar system had worked reasonably well in the framework of the Aarhus Convention.

Recommendations for future action

42. While the lack of a legal basis for THE PEP (such as a multilateral agreement or convention) makes it difficult to ensure sustainable funding by its member countries, further efforts are required for more effective fund raising, including preparation of attractive project proposals, if THE PEP is to increase its visibility and impact in the region.

* * *

Annex

Description of principal outputs under THE PEP (2002-2007), by priority area

Excerpted from the Assessment Report, prepared for the Third High-level Meeting on Transport, Health and Environment (ECE/AC.21/SC/2008/3)

Priority 1: Integration of environment and health into transport policies

(a) *THE PEP Clearing House* (<http://www.thepep.org/CHWebSite>) is a state-of-the-art internet platform and database that has been designed to facilitate the exchange of information and knowledge across the transport, environment and health sectors in the pan-European region. It has been operated since December 2005 by the UNECE in English and Russian and in automatic mode due to a lack of resources for the sustained services of a content/database manager.⁵ The Clearing House content covers 110 topics relevant to the transport, health and environment sectors, including as priorities the health and environmental effects of transport, policy integration, urban transport and demand management. It is accessed on average by 350 visitors per month; one-fifth of visitors are from EECCA and SEE countries.

(b) A workshop on 'Institutional Conditions for Integrated Transport, Environment and Health Policies' was hosted by the German Federal Government in Berlin (23-24 January 2006) <http://www.thepep.org/en/workplan/ia4pi/ia4pi_docs.htm>. The workshop was organized by THE PEP secretariat, in co-operation with the European Academy of the Urban Environment, the German Federal Environmental Agency and Delft University of Technology. Participants included experts from eight states of the EU-15 region, six states from the EU-10 region and eight non-EU states (including Albania, Georgia and Russia). Results of the workshop have been incorporated into the policy-oriented guide described below.

(c) *Practical guidance on institutional arrangements for integrated policy and decision-making* (<[ECE/AC.21/2006/7](http://www.thepep.org/en/workplan/ia4pi/ia4pi_docs.htm)>) was prepared for the consideration of the Steering Committee at its 4th session in April 2006. The guidance document presented state-of-the-art knowledge on supportive institutional conditions for the integration of transport, environment and health issues in policy-making. In addition to the conclusions of the workshop mentioned above, the report incorporates results of an online survey on supportive institutional conditions prepared by the secretariat <<http://www.thepep.org/en/survey.htm>>. The document also provides practical guidance on adapting the institutional structures and practices identified to EECCA and SEE countries.

⁵ The framework of the Clearing House, a description of topic areas and some searchable materials are also available in French.

(d) THE PEP brochure on ‘Supportive Institutional Conditions for Policy Integration of Transport, Environment and Health’ was developed by the German Federal Environment Agency on the basis of the above report. It provides practical guidelines for decision-makers aiming to improve vertical as well as horizontal policy integration and will be presented to the 3rd High-level Meeting in 2008.

Priority 2: Demand management and modal shift

(a) *Guidance on transport-related health impacts, costs and benefits, with a focus on children – development of a “Toolbox” for Action on Transport, Health and Environment ((THE PEP Toolbox).* The Toolbox has been designed to help policy makers and practitioners in reducing the negative impacts of transport on health and environments and in promoting modal shifts toward more environmentally-friendly and healthy transport. The tools elaborated to date aim to build capacity in assessing transport-related environment and health effects, provide checklists and reporting forms for case studies,⁶ as well as policy briefs on selected topics as well as easy access to knowledge and information available from other relevant projects, sources and databases. These tools, particularly check-lists for health and environmental impact assessments, have been developed in Western Europe but applicability in EECCA and SEE countries has been a main focus of the project. However, such transferability needs to be tested further. THE PEP Toolbox will be officially launched at the 3rd High-level Meeting on Transport, Health and Environment in 2008.

(b) In 2003 a project on “*Transport-related Health Effects with a Particular Focus on Children*” was launched among five Member States (France, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and Malta). The aim was to progress toward an integrated assessment of major transport-related health effects. After reviewing the evidence and addressing different aspects of transport-related effects on environment and health, key messages were summarized in a synthesis report (<http://www.euro.who.int/Document/trt/PEPSynthesis.pdf>) and an executive summary (<http://www.euro.who.int/Document/trt/PEPSynthesis.pdf>) which were launched at the 4th Ministerial Conference on Environment and Health in June 2004 in Budapest. One topic addressed was economic valuation of transport-related health effects (<http://www.euro.who.int/Document/trt/PEPEconVal.pdf>), recommending further research and work. In 2007, a follow-up project on “Review methods and development of guidance for the economic valuation of transport-related health effects, with a particular focus on children” was started. The project carried out a review of existing economic valuations of transport-related health

⁶ Examples of THE PEP Toolbox case studies include: ‘Health impact of air pollution in France’, ‘Speed limit reduction on highways in the Netherlands’, ‘External transport costs in Switzerland’, ‘Inter-ministerial cooperation in Lithuania’, ‘Economic benefits of cycling and walking in Austria’, ‘Health in transport appraisal’ in the United Kingdom.

effects, including air pollution, noise, traffic crashes and lack of cycling and walking and summarized the relevant epidemiological literature with regard to identification of health-endpoints to be included into economic valuations. Based on the literature reviews, guidance towards a more harmonized methodology to economic valuation of transport-related health effects was developed together with an advisory group of international experts. The final report was presented to the sixth session of the Steering Committee.

(c) *THE PEP reports on “eco-driving” behaviour* were submitted to the Steering Committee during its 2nd session (March 2004) and 3rd session (April 2005) respectively.

(http://www.thepep.org/en/commitee/documents/ECE.AC.21.2004.10e_000.pdf);

(<http://www.thepep.org/en/commitee/documents/ECE-AC.21-2002-9E.DOC>). The first of these reports presents the objectives, execution and outcomes of a Dutch project on improving driver behavior that took place in Riga (Latvia) with the involvement of representatives from Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania and Estonia. The project achieved tangible results, including the practical instruction of 7 trainers in eco-driving and raising the awareness of the potential contribution of transport industry to the reduction of CO₂ emissions. The second report presents a similar Dutch project, introducing eco-driving in professional driver training in Poland. In April 2005, the Steering Committee was invited to review the project’s implementation at its 3rd session and consider the usefulness of expanding the activity to EECCA and SEE countries. [Since then THE PEP has not been involved in eco-driving and the activity has been recently taken up by the OECD].

Priority 3: Sustainable urban transport

(a) *THE PEP Workshop on ‘Sustainable and healthy urban transport and planning’* took place in Nicosia on 16-18 November 2003 (ECE/AC.21/2004/4). The workshop highlighted the challenges in EECCA/SEE countries, including urban air pollution and its health and environmental effects, congestion and road traffic accidents. The workshop brought together around forty experts on transport, environment, health and land use planning representing local and central governments as well as the academic community and private sector from twelve EU countries (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia), Norway and three EECCA countries (Moldova, Russian Federation and Uzbekistan). The participating organizations and city networks included the former European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT),⁷ European Commission, International Association of Public Transport (UITP), Regional Environmental

⁷ The former European Conference of Ministers of Transport has been superseded by the International Transport Forum (ITF) (<http://www.internationaltransportforum.org>).

Centre for Central and Eastern Europe (REC) and Access - Eurocities for a New Mobility Culture and Healthy Cities Network.

(b) *THE PEP Workshop on 'Implementing sustainable urban travel policies in the Russian Federation and other CIS Countries'*, organized jointly with the former ECMT, took place in Moscow on 29 September-1 October 2004 (ECE/AC.21/2005/4). In addition to addressing the implementation of sustainable policies, the workshop provided an overview of environmental and health effects of urban transport in EECCA. Around 170 experts participated, including approximately 60 from EECCA and SEE countries (Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine). It brought together participants from central and local governments, representing mainly the transport sector but also the health and environment sectors and urban and land-use planners, including ten national focal points of THE PEP. City networks, relevant intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations, international financial institutions (the World Bank and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, EBRD), as well as the academic community, were also represented.

(c) *THE PEP Workshop on 'Sustainable urban transport and land-use planning'* took place in Tbilisi on 18-20 October 2006 (ECE/AC.21/2006/4) http://www.thepep.org/en/workplan/urban/urban_docs.htm#Tbilisi. The workshop brought together 70 representatives of the transport, environment and health sectors and land-use planners from the national and municipal governments of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan as well as from other UNECE and WHO/Europe member countries. Also represented were ECMT, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the Regional Environmental Centre for the Caucasus and a number of local NGOs.

(d) *Walk 21 Satellite symposium on Transport-related Physical Activity and Health (Magglingen, Switzerland 18 - 20 September 2005)* The symposium was organized by the Swiss Federal Office for Sports (BASPO) and co-sponsored by WHO Europe. Leading experts discussed: health effects of transport-related physical activity; Understanding the determinants of transport-related physical activity; measurement of transport-related physical activity and evaluation of interventions; effectiveness of interventions; policies and strategies. The symposium included a session on the economic valuation of transport-related physical activity.

(e) *Case-studies on collaboration between Physical Activity Promotion and the Transport Sector: Examples from European Countries*. This collection of 48 practical examples from 11 countries⁸ is aimed at supporting Member States in the intersectoral promotion of physical activity

⁸ http://www.euro.who.int/hepa/projects/20050615_2

through cycling and walking. Until the end of 2007, the first 500 printed copies of the report with CD had been distributed at different events and meetings. The main report and the case studies are available through a dedicated web page as well as through the Clearing House and the “International inventory on documents on physical activity promotion”.

(f) *International inventory of documents on physical activity promotion* This inventory is being developed as part of the work programme of HEPA Europe to provide Member States with easily accessible information on promoting physical activity and to disseminate existing experiences to support policy developments. It contains policy documents from different administrative levels (national, subnational and local) and different sectors involved in the promotion of physical activity, such as health promotion, sport, transport, environment and education. It also includes knowledge and information documents, activities and projects. Information can be viewed and searched on a country basis, a regional overview by categories or in summary tables. In November 2007, the inventory included about 400 documents from about 30 countries, of which about 100 related to transport-related physical activity. The relevant documents are also made available through the Clearing House of THE PEP.

(g) *Methodological guidance on the economic appraisal of health effects related to walking and cycling*. At its fourth session, the Steering Committee emphasized the need to further clarify the costs and benefits of promoting non-motorized transport and agreed on the proposed next steps outlined in the background document (ECE/AC.21/2006/6 – EUR/06/THEPEPST/6). This project aims at facilitating the harmonization of methodological approaches by providing guidance for practitioners⁹. It focuses in particular on approaches to the economic valuation of potential health effects. Its products are meant primarily to be integrated into comprehensive cost-benefit analyses of transport interventions or infrastructure projects, complementing existing tools for economic valuations of transport interventions on, for example, emissions or congestion. They can also be used for an assessment of the current situation or of investments made in the past. In November 2007, methodological guidance to quantify the health effects of cycling and walking and an illustrative tool (Health Economic Assessment Tool for Cycling - HEAT for cycling) with a user guide were presented at the British Heart Foundation’s Annual Conference on “Evaluation in a nutshell”. Thanks to the close involvement of practitioners into the development of the products, 2 transport administrations have already shown interest into the products for their national adaptation.

⁹ http://www.euro.who.int/eprise/main/WHO/Progs/TRT/policy/20070503_1