

THE PEP Steering Committee, 9<sup>th</sup> session  
Agenda item 8(a)

## MANAGING THE PEP

### MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION

#### **Implementing the Amsterdam Declaration of the Third High-level Meeting of the Transport, Health and Environment Pan-European Programme (THE PEP): Regional overview of self-assessed reporting by Member States**

Note by the secretariat

#### **A. Introduction**

1. Following the Third High-level Meeting on Transport, Health and Environment in January 2009 in Amsterdam, the Steering Committee and its Bureau underlined the importance of monitoring the implementation of THE PEP programme and of progress made by Member States at national level toward the attainment of the four Amsterdam Goals. These reports will facilitate the assessment of progress made and provide valuable information about the achievements and obstacles encountered by Member States and other stakeholders in attaining the Amsterdam Goals and in implementing THE PEP. In turn, this feedback will provide elements to adjust THE PEP work programme to better meet the needs of Member States.

2. In fall 2011, THE PEP secretariat conducted a questionnaire-based survey among all Member States of the UNECE-WHO/Europe region that have at least one THE PEP Focal Point (n=47) to gather self-assessed qualitative information on the state of national implementation of THE PEP and the Goals of the Amsterdam Declaration, the main developments, challenges and enabling factors as well recommendations for further strengthening the process. A total of 13 Member States<sup>1</sup> responded to the questionnaire.

Graph 1. Respondent countries to THE PEP 2011 questionnaire on the implementation of the Amsterdam Declaration of the Third High-level Meeting



---

<sup>1</sup> Respondent Member States: Austria, Azerbaijan, France, Georgia, Germany, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

3. While replies have been received from across the region, the low number of replies limits the possibility to draw conclusions on trends in geographical terms. Detailed replies from can be found at the website of THE PEP at <http://www.unece.org/transport-health-environment-pep/about-us/monitoring-implementation.html>

#### **B. Sectors involved in preparation of questionnaire**

4. Out of the 13 respondent countries, 8 reported that all three sectors (transport, health and environment) have contributed to the completion of the questionnaire. Two reported that no other sector than the lead reporting sector had contributed to the questionnaire, indicating a lack of coordination between the three sectors. The lead reporting sector was either health (n=5) or environment (n=5) and only rarely transport (n=3). Other stakeholders, such as relevant NGOs, local administrations or academia were involved in the reporting in 4 countries.

#### **C. Implementation of the Amsterdam Goals**

Priority Goal 1: to contribute to sustainable economic development and stimulate job creation through investment in environment- and health-friendly transport.

5. Three quarters of the 12 respondent focal points reported addressing Goal 1 through investments in environmentally sustainable infrastructure for transport, such as public and active transport (walking and cycling). Eight reported on clean and efficient intermodal connections, while all reported to be taking measures to improve road safety. Only 6 focal points reported specific activities for improving infrastructure for active and environmentally friendly transport. Eco-Tourism is also being addressed in 6 countries across the region.

Priority Goal 2: to manage sustainable mobility and promote a more efficient transport system

6. Of the respondent focal points, 11 reported projects aiming at improving the attractiveness of cycling and walking (n=6) and/or public transport (n=10) with the aim to create a modal shift towards healthier and more sustainable modes of transport. The majority of reported programmes take place at the national level and target communities and/or the public but several local projects were reported as well. Specific projects on mobility management were reported in one country.

7. All focal points reported that the government raises awareness of mobility choices and is promoting the use of information technology to increase the efficiency of the transport system.

8. A majority of the focal points (12 out of 13) indicated that mechanisms exist in their country to improve the coordination between land use and transport planning.

9. More than three quarters of the respondent member states reported that their country takes measures to promote high-quality integrated public transport and reducing the need for, and the volume of, car traffic. The 3 countries which reported

no measures are spread across the region, with one even reporting that current measures actually favor increases in car traffic.

Priority Goal 3: to reduce emissions of transport-related greenhouse gases, air pollutants and noise

10. All countries reported strategies, policies or measures to support a shift in the vehicle fleet towards zero- or low-emission vehicles and fuels based on renewable energy, clean transport modes and fostering electric mobility as well as eco-driving.

11. Eight focal points reported specific measures to support a reduction in noise emissions from transport activities. Among the respondent countries, the issue of noise emissions was more likely to be addressed in western European countries than south-eastern and central Asian countries.

Priority Goal 4: to promote policies and actions conducive to healthy and safe modes of transport

12. All countries reported strategies, policies and measures for the promotion of healthy and safe modes of transport. However, most of them focused on improving either road safety or air quality. Infrastructure and safety measures specifically targeted at walking and cycling and policies to support walking and cycling were less reported. Improving the accessibility of public transport was only reported in 1/3 of the respondent countries.

13. Most countries (n=11) reported that transport policies and actions focus on vulnerable groups such as children and persons with reduced mobility. However, the issue of inequalities in transport seems to be less addressed in Eastern Europe and central Asia.

## **D. Implementation of THE PEP**

THE PEP Implementation mechanisms

14. Overall, 4 out of 13 Member States have either adopted or implemented a national transport, health and environment action plan. Out of the 4 countries with NTHEAPs, 2 assessed THE PEP as having been useful in the development. Five out of the 9 without a NTHEAP have reported to be developing or planning to develop one.

15. Most existing or planned/in preparation NTHEAPs are national, with half of them including sub-national components. None of the existing and planned NTHEAPs is standalone but rather integrated in either NEHAPs or national transport action plans.

16. 75% of the respondent focal points indicated that their country contributed to past relay race workshops. Nine of these 10 countries have provided technical (in kind) and 5 direct financial support (all Western Europe).

17. Ten countries have supported THE PEP Partnership. All of them providing technical (in kind) support, leading to a broad general basis for the Partnership. However, only 4 of them invested in THE PEP Partnership directly financially so far, making it dependent on a few donor countries. In half of the countries formal networks of professionals (apart from the Focal Points) are in existence for the implementation of THE PEP. Five of them are supported by the government; most financially and politically while few only politically.

#### Policy, regulatory and operational frameworks that support the promotion of THE PEP

18. More than half of the focal points (n=7) indicated the existence of a coordinating body in the government for the implementation of THE PEP at the national level. Of these, six included at least representations from the three sectors transport, health and environment, while 4 also included urban planning and/or NGOs. One country covered all relevant sectors and one also included the ministry of interior. The sectors finance, academia, education and agriculture were not included in 12 out of the 13 respondent countries.

19. Ten of 13 countries reported that integrated policy making for the three THE PEP sectors was also reflected in other national policy documents. These range from policies on climate change and transport strategies to legislation on noise management, action plans on cycling, environment and health and sustainable development as well as specific state budgets and spatial planning. 60% of these countries also reported that public awareness on THE integration is included, with 5 reporting the availability of specific public budgets to foster integrated policy making between transport, health and environment.

#### Future of THE PEP

20. Most countries (n=11) reported specific major achievements towards the goals of THE PEP which are linked to THE PEP. For further details on the various reported projects, programmes and policy developments please see THE PEP website.

21. As the main challenges of THE PEP for stimulating national action, the respondents listed the following (in order of frequency):

- a. THE PEP is not a legally binding instrument.
- b. Any participation and support of THE PEP is on an entirely voluntary basis.
- c. Support to move from the international level to national and local implementation is not strong enough in THE PEP.
- d. THE PEP does not provide direct financial support
- e. Clearly defined and communicated indicators for monitoring and reporting on implementing THE PEP are missing.

22. In response to the above mentioned challenges, the focal points' main recommendations for the improvement of THE PEP to increase its impact in Member States were:

- a. Strengthen the implementation mechanisms and existing tools of THE PEP, in particular the development of national action plans (NTHEAPs)
- b. Support Member States in raising funds for relevant projects
- c. Stimulate more awareness by requesting (re-)appointment of focal points
- d. Increase exchange of good practices, including translation of relevant documents and tools to national languages
- e. Define indicators across the three sectors for better monitoring
- f. Increase visibility at international events
- g. Target activities more towards specific (groups of) countries

## **E. Concluding considerations**

23. The electronic questionnaire piloted in this monitoring exercise provided a good basis for regular monitoring of THE PEP implementation. Comments are welcome from THE PEP Steering Committee regarding its further improvements. The questionnaire could be considered for reporting back on implementation of THE PEP in view of the Fourth High-level Meeting on Transport, Environment and Health, to be convened not later than 2014.

24. Replies received to the questionnaire reflect to a large extent the views and experiences of those countries, which have been more actively engaged in THE PEP implementation, particularly through THE PEP workshops/relay race, and its partnerships, as well as development of NTHEAPs. This seems to indicate that direct engagement and involvement in THE PEP does provide value added to Member States. It also encourages to further invest in the elements of THE PEP that respondents have identified as providing the greatest value, as a means to increase engagement and support national actions.

25. There is a need to develop a better understanding of the experiences of non-respondent countries. On the one side this calls for (re)-establishing national focal points in the relevant ministries, and on the other side it calls for investigating the challenges, limitations and obstacles that non-engaged countries see in the process, in order to identify and possibly address these aspects through THE PEP work programme.

---