



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/AC.21/2006/7
EUR/06/THEPEPST/7
4 April 2006

ENGLISH ONLY

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE
WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION**
Regional Office for Europe

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING ON TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH
THE PEP Steering Committee
Fourth session
Geneva, 10–11 April 2006
Agenda item 4.A. (d)

**PRACTICAL GUIDANCE ON INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR
INTEGRATED POLICY AND DECISION-MAKING**

The project report presented in this document was prepared with the assistance of consultants to the secretariat for consideration by THE PEP Steering Committee at its fourth session.

The report presents the state-of-the-art knowledge on supportive institutional conditions for the integration of transport, environment and health issues in policy-making, established on the basis of a synthesis of academic and policy literature, information from national and local administrations in UNECE and WHO-Europe member countries (collected by means of an online survey), and additional information from a stakeholder workshop held in Berlin on 23-24 January 2006.¹ The document also provides practical guidance regarding the implementation and “transferability” of the institutional structures and practises identified. Finally, it offers suggestions for further work.

¹ The stakeholder workshop was hosted by the German Federal Environmental Agency and co-organized with European Academy of the Urban Environment (EA.UE). The programme and report of the workshop can be found in Annexes I and II respectively. Documents and presentations from the Berlin workshop can be downloaded from <http://www.thepep.org> and from <http://www.eaue.de/Programme/THEPEP.htm>

The Steering Committee is invited to provide its views on the outcomes of the project and to give guidance on its further development.

On the basis of the feedback provided by the Steering Committee as well as through further work on specific case studies, the project report will be finalized. It is suggested to publish the final report in English, Russian and French for presentation at the third High-level Meeting of 2007.

SUPPORTIVE INSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS FOR THE INTEGRATION OF TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH ISSUES IN POLICY-MAKING

Dominic Stead² and Martin de Jong³, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

I. Background

1. This paper sums up the state-of-the art knowledge on the subject of integrating transport, health and environmental policies and gives practical guidance concerning methods and approaches for promoting policy integration. The material presented in this document is based on a synthesis of academic and policy literature concerning policy integration, information from national and local administrations in UNECE and WHO-Europe member countries (collected by means of an online survey), and additional information from a stakeholder workshop held in Berlin on 23-24 January 2006⁴. The synthesis of these different materials makes this document an original resource. Other innovative aspects of this report include its specific focus on policy integration in relation to transport, health and environment, and the consideration of the transferability of practice, particularly in relation to EECCA countries and South-Eastern Europe.

2. The paper originates from a project supported under the joint UNECE and WHO/Europe framework of Transport Health and Environment Pan European Programme, THE PEP, and was specifically set up to investigate supportive institutional conditions for the integration of transport, environment and health issues in policy-making⁵. The main focus of the project is on UNECE and WHO-Europe member countries, particularly those in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA)⁶ and South-Eastern Europe⁷. The need for this document was identified during the workshop on “Sustainable and Healthy Urban Transport and Planning”, organized under the framework of THE PEP and held in Nicosia, Cyprus, on 16-18 November 2003⁸.

² OTB Research Institute for Housing, Urban and Mobility Studies, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands.

³ Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands.

⁴ The stakeholder workshop was hosted by the German Federal Agency and co-organized with European Academy of the Urban Environment (EA.UE). The programme and report of the workshop can be found in Annexes I and II respectively. Documents and presentations from the Berlin workshop can be downloaded from <http://www.thepep.org> and from <http://www.eaue.de/Programme/THEPEP.htm>

⁵ ECE/AC.21/2004/11 – EUR/04/5045236/11, Project proposal by the UNECE and WHO-Europe secretariats: “Institutional arrangements and mechanisms for integrated policy and decision making”.

⁶ The ‘EECCA’ countries include Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

⁷ “South Eastern Europe” includes Albania, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro.

⁸ Various documents from the Cyprus workshop on Sustainable and Healthy Urban Transport and Planning can be downloaded from <http://www.thepep.org>.

II. What is policy integration?

3. Policy integration concerns the management of cross-cutting issues in policy-making that transcend the boundaries of established policy fields, and which do not correspond to the institutional responsibilities of individual departments. It also refers to the management of policy responsibility within a single organization or sector. Integrated policy-making refers to both horizontal integration between policy sectors (different departments and/or professions in public authorities) and vertical inter-governmental integration in policy-making (between different tiers of government), or combinations of both. Integration implies going beyond mere coordination of policies and encompasses joint work among sectors, creating synergies between policies, sharing goals for their formulation and responsibility for their implementation. Various degrees of policy integration can be distinguished, ranging from information exchange and consultation to joint government goals and strategies (Annex III). Policy integration has a number of potential benefits. It can for example:

- promote synergies (win-win solutions) between sectors
- reduce duplication in the policy-making process, both horizontally and vertically
- promote consistency between policies in different sectors (horizontal) and at different levels of decision-making (vertical)
- improve the achievement of cross-cutting goals or objectives
- give more focus to the achievement of a government's overall goals rather than the achievement of narrower sector-oriented goals
- help to promote innovation in policy development and implementation
- encourage greater understanding of the effects of policies on other sectors

4. The way that governments function, and particularly the historical tradition of 'compartmentalization' is a key factor inhibiting policy integration. The 1999 report of one of the working groups of the EU Joint Expert Group on Transport and the Environment, for example, noted "administrative organisations responsible for transport and for the environment have traditionally had very different cultural characteristics... [which] is linked to their different historical development, as well as to the different professions that are dominantly represented in these organisations". Other important barriers to policy integration include the divergence of political and departmental goals, the structures and processes of policy coordination and the increasing number of actors in the policy-making process (barriers to policy integration and ways to overcome them are considered in more detail later on in the document). Perfect policy integration is not possible but it

can nevertheless be improved. Institutional conditions are one means of promoting policy integration and this is the main focus of the paper.

5. The focus on institutional conditions to promote policy integration is particularly relevant for many UNECE and WHO-Europe member countries, particularly in EECCA countries and South Eastern Europe, since many institutional structures are in a process of evolution and this evolution offers the potential to introduce new organizational structures and procedures that promote greater policy integration.

III. The importance of policy integration

6. The importance of policy integration is becoming more widely recognized at many political levels. The Brundtland report of 1987 noted the tendency for institutions to be ‘independent, fragmented, and working to relatively narrow mandates with closed decision processes’ (WCED, 1987). Agenda 21, adopted at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, identified transport as one of the key sectors where action towards sustainable development should be undertaken both at the national and international levels. In 1997, ministers agreed to “work towards a close integration of environment, health and transport policies at the local, national and international level” at the UNECE regional conference on transport and the environment⁹. In 1999, ministers agreed and adopted the WHO charter on transport, environment and health at the Third Ministerial Conference on Environment and Health. The charter emphasized the need to address policy integration and highlighted the “urgent need to take the next step in adding value to efforts to achieve sustainable development in transport, by fully integrating health requirements and involving environment and health authorities in decision-making on transport, land use and infrastructure policies at transnational, national, subnational and local levels”¹⁰. The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation of the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development specifically highlighted policy integration in the transport sector, urging governments to develop “an integrated approach to policy-making at the national, regional and local levels for transport services and systems to promote sustainable development, including policies and planning for land use, infrastructure, public transport systems and goods delivery networks” (United Nations, 2002: para 21).

7. Within the European Union, the integration of environmental issues in other policy areas has been on the agenda since the early 1980s and has gained importance with the successive

⁹ Vienna Declaration and the Programme of Joint Action (POJA).

¹⁰ London Charter on Transport, Environment and Health and the Charter Plan of Action.

amendments made to the EC Treaty, notably with the Amsterdam Treaty signed in 1997¹¹. One year later, at the 1998 European Council in Cardiff, heads of governments called for specific strategies for the integration of environmental concerns into different areas of policy (the so-called ‘Cardiff Process’), starting with the transport, energy and agriculture sectors. The European Transport White Paper of 2001 emphasises the need for transport to contribute to sustainable development in light of the Cardiff Process (Commission of the European Communities, 2001). The ECMT’s key messages for governments concerning sustainable urban travel policies, produced as a result of an ECMT project on Implementing Sustainable Urban Travel Policies, include calls for the co-ordination of urban land-use, travel, health and environment policies (ECMT, 2002).

8. In short, policy integration is becoming more important, particularly in relation to transport, health and the environment, but progress towards integration has generally been slow. Some of this is a consequence of the structure and ways of working of public administrations but perhaps the most important reasons for slow progress are the facts that policy integration is difficult to achieve, not well understood and has low priority in many administrations.

IV. Institutional conditions for promoting policy integration

9. There are many institutional conditions that can help to promote policy integration but no single solution alone can guarantee policy integration. The 1996 OECD report on policy coherence (a concept which is very similar to policy integration) is one of the most detailed publications on policy integration to date. The publication identifies eight basic ‘tools of policy coherence’ such as political leadership, strategic framework/priorities, information management and analysis, policy coordination structures, policy coordination processes, policy-budget coordination, policy implementation and administrative culture (Box 1).

10. The 2000 UK Cabinet Office report on the management of cross-cutting policies and services identified a range of different ways of promoting cross-cutting policies or joint working activities (UK Cabinet Office, 2000). These range from new or merged organizational structures and budgets, at one extreme, to simple sharing of information or appropriate mechanisms for consultation between departments at the other. The report identifies the following forms of cross-cutting interventions and joint working arrangements:

- organizational change

¹¹ Article 6 of the Amsterdam Treaty stipulates that integration of environmental concerns into the policies of other sectors is one of the main means of achieving sustainable development.

- merged structures and budgets
- joint teams (virtual or real)
- shared budgets
- joint management arrangements
- shared objectives and performance indicators
- consultation to enhance synergies and manage trade-offs
- sharing information to increase mutual awareness

11. Somewhat related to the above report, Ling (2002) analysed the activities taking place under the banner of joined-up government in Britain and identified four distinct ways of achieving more integrated policy in practice:

- new types of organization (e.g. culture and values, information and training)
- new accountabilities and incentives (e.g. shared outcome targets and performance measures)
- new ways of delivering services (e.g. joint consultation and involvement)
- new ways of working across organizations (e.g. shared leadership, pooled budgets, merged structures and joint teams)

12. A recent publication from the EEA presents an overview of administrative culture and practices concerning environmental policy integration and investigates some of the main management styles used (EEA, 2005a). It reviews institutional structures and practices in the EU25, the candidate and applicant countries, the countries of the European Free Trade Area (EFTA) and the EECCA countries. The focus of the report is on administrative culture and practices at the national level. The report contends that administrations have an important function in relation to policy integration because of their role in policy formulation (shaping decisions subsequently taken by parliaments) and because of their responsibility for implementing and executing policy decisions. The report recognises that whilst the administrative/organizational aspects are crucial, policy integration cannot be achieved by administrative/organizational changes alone (some of the other necessary preconditions for policy integration are identified in an accompanying EEA report¹²). The EEA report also highlights the various differences between national and regional administrative cultures and management styles, which it recognises need to be considered carefully when assessing

¹² EEA, 2005b.

current practice and the transferability of lessons. The report contends that public management styles in Europe can be broadly grouped as southern European, German-speaking, Anglo-Saxon and Nordic (see **Annex IV**).

Box 1: OECD tools of policy coherence

The experience of OECD countries, distilled into a handful of practical lessons, has led to the identification of the following basic tools of coherence. These are organizational concepts which, translated into appropriate structures, processes and methods of work, have proved conducive to higher degrees of policy coherence in governments from different political and administrative traditions. Some may seem, at first glance, deceptively obvious. However, experience shows that successfully putting them into practice requires painstaking experimentation and careful adaptation to the legal, administrative and political requirements of each national system.

- Commitment by the political leadership is a necessary precondition to coherence, and a tool to enhance it
- Establishing a strategic policy framework helps ensure that individual policies are consistent with the government's goals and priorities
- Decision makers need advice based on a clear definition and good analysis of issues, with explicit indications of possible inconsistencies
- The existence of a central overview and co-ordination capacity is essential to ensure horizontal consistency among policies
- Mechanisms to anticipate, detect and resolve policy conflicts early in the process help identify inconsistencies and reduce incoherence
- The decision-making process must be organized to achieve an effective reconciliation between policy priorities and budgetary imperatives
- Implementation procedures and monitoring mechanisms must be designed to ensure that policies can be adjusted in the light of progress, new information, and changing circumstances
- An administrative culture that promotes cross-sector co-operation and a systematic dialogue between different policy communities contributes to the strengthening of policy coherence

Source: OECD (1996)

**V. Integrating transport, environment and health issues into policy-making:
current institutional practices**

13. A variety of different examples of institutional practices can be found that support the integration of transport, environment and health issues into policy-making. Some key examples from

practice are outlined below. These have been primarily identified by means of an online survey of national and regional governments in UNECE and WHO-Europe member states (the questionnaire and the list of respondents can be found in Annexes V and VI respectively)¹³ and by group discussions in the Berlin workshop in January 2006.

VI. Promoting joint organizational arrangements and accountability

14. In terms of *mechanisms to promote horizontal and vertical cooperation*, several institutional mechanisms can be conducive to joint policy-making. One way to achieve this is through setting up organizational arrangements such as interdepartmental committees, commissions, working groups and steering groups which can help to bring members of different ministries together and promote horizontal cooperation between departments and/or sectors. Examples include Bulgaria's interdepartmental commission for sustainable development, Finland's commissions on sustainable development and on sustainable consumption and production, Lithuania's intersectoral expert group of the national sustainable development strategy, Malta's interdepartmental local transport, health and environment committee and the UK's inter-departmental steering committee for environment and health. Also, a central steering role can help to coordinate policies from different departments (e.g. the Prime Minister's office in Finland). So too can intersectoral programmes involving cooperation between departments, both in terms of development and implementation (e.g. Lithuania's intersectoral programme for its National Health Action Plan). There are however few examples to date that relate explicitly to transport, environment *and* health. Exceptions here are intersectoral coordination groups or working groups to implement THE PEP (e.g. Lithuania and the Netherlands).

15. The extent to which these arrangements can be effective in terms of policy integration depends heavily on a certain number of conditions. One of them is an earmarked budget specifically reserved for joint policy-making (see below). Joint accountability reinforces the importance of joint enterprises. Further reinforcement can be expected if there are financial incentives/rewards for all partners to get policy integration off the ground. A second condition is working with a common set of analytical indicators and parameters. Either merging or synthesizing the sets of performance

¹³ The survey was structured around six main themes, derived partly from Metcalfe's spectrum of policy integration, the OECD's tools for policy coherence, the UK Cabinet Office report on the management of cross-cutting policies and services, and the analysis of joined-up government in the UK by Ling (see the previous section of the report):

- Promoting joint accountability/responsibility and policy coordination
- Building intersectoral capacity and strengthening intersectoral relations
- Promoting integrated policy development
- Promoting integrated policy delivery (implementation)
- Promoting integrated policy assessment
- Examples of policy documents that demonstrate the integration of the transport, health and environmental policies

indicators induces sectors to develop a more complete picture of the policy issues and consequences. The role of citizens and NGOs through public debate is also important since citizens and NGOs often perceive and experience policies in a more holistic manner and are more critical of exclusively sectoral policies. In many cases, they can therefore be considered supporters for integrated policies.

VII. Strengthening intersectoral relations and awareness

16. *Human resource policies* such as job rotation can be used to promote vertical or horizontal working relationships although there is little evidence that this is currently being used to a great extent. In the Netherlands, there is an internal mobility programme and joint trainee programme for government employees which both promote job rotation. In some countries, multidisciplinary professionals are highly valued, whereas in other countries specialization and sectoralization of professions is considered as much more desirable. The specialization and sectoralization can provide stability of personnel within administrations, but it can sometimes also stifle strategic thinking, creativity or innovation in policy development as a result of the fragmentation of tasks and policies. In addition, it may also create resistance to change, that may be perceived as undermining roles, power and identity. *Workshops* and other similar *training activities* are typically used as ways of building intersectoral capacity.

17. In terms of monitoring the consistency of sectoral policies with sustainability objectives, some countries have *management structures* in place where units within ministries are responsible for the monitoring and assessment of cross-cutting issues such as environmental issues or sustainable development. Examples can be found in Belgium, where each Federal Ministry has a unit responsible for sustainable development to ensure that all national sectoral policies comply with the national sustainable development plan, and in Ireland, where the Department of Transport has a sustainability unit. These units often contain multidisciplinary teams. At the more local level, Local Agenda 21 teams in some countries (e.g. Germany) are also often quite multidisciplinary in composition.

18. Current examples of *mechanisms for benchmarking or exchanging good practice* in the area of transport, health and environment are mainly confined to the exchange of good practice at the national level with the exception of some European transport and environment initiatives (e.g. the European Civitas Initiative¹⁴, the European Local Transport Information Service – ELTIS,¹⁵ the

¹⁴ <http://www.civitas-initiative.org>

¹⁵ <http://www.eltis.org>

OECD's Environmentally Sustainable Transport Programme¹⁶ and the OECD's Environmentally Sustainable Transport in Central and Eastern Europe Programme¹⁷). There are few mechanisms for benchmarking or exchanging good practice that are explicitly orientated towards transport and health issues and there is therefore a mandate for the role of the Clearing House of THE PEP. Activities under the Local Agenda 21 initiative provide a mechanism for benchmarking or exchanging good practice within some countries at the national level (e.g. Germany). The Lithuanian Ministry of Environment has collected examples of good practice by means of a competition. City networks can also promote benchmarking or the exchange of good practice. These include the WHO Healthy Cities Network and the German Social Cities Network. Research projects (often European-funded) are also a useful way of benchmarking or exchanging good practice, although there are sometimes problems of data comparability or access to information (access to information often becomes more difficult after the completion of projects). The European Environment Agency's transport and environment reporting mechanism (TERM), based on a set of indicators, provides another example of a useful mechanism for benchmarking performance concerning transport and the environment although its coverage is mainly limited to the member states of the European Union.

19. Finally, various channels can be used to promote *dialogue and exchange of information between sectors*. Environmental monitoring and reporting (e.g. state of the environment reports and sustainable development monitoring reports) is an important way of promoting dialogue and exchange of information between sectors by some respondents, especially where the reporting includes assessment of individual sectors.

VIII. Linking integrated policy development to integrated policy implementation

20. Few *integrated national strategies* dealing exclusively with transport, health and environment can be found. However, national sustainable development plans or strategies in some countries do include these (and other) sectors (e.g. Albania, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Serbia and Montenegro, United Kingdom). A number of examples of strategies can be found that focus mainly on transport and environment (e.g. Finland's energy and climate change strategy and Ireland's climate change strategy). There are also examples of integrated strategies that focus more on environment and health but less on transport, such as national health and environment plans (e.g. Albania, Belgium, Finland, the Netherlands and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia). Some of the above documents contain specific *quantitative objectives for transport, health and environment* (e.g. the sustainable development strategies for Germany, Lithuania, and

¹⁶ <http://www.oecd.org>

¹⁷ <http://est east.unep.ch>

Serbia and Montenegro). Other specific targets can be found in national policy documents such as Albania's national environment and health action plan, Finland's environmental guidelines for the transport sector up to 2010 and Malta's draft national transport strategy.

21. It is much more common to see the use of *mechanisms to anticipate, detect and/or resolve conflicts between policies* in different sectors or at different levels of decision-making. These include internal consultation (see below), strategic environmental assessment for policies and programmes (e.g. Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, the United Kingdom) and health impact assessments in a more limited number of cases (e.g. Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Serbia and Montenegro). Joint interministerial conferences are additional mechanisms to anticipate, detect and/or resolve conflicts between policies. In Belgium, for example, joint interministerial conferences are held on environment and health and on environment and mobility. Various joint inter-ministerial conferences and coordination committees (e.g. environment and health, environment and transport, environment and energy) have been established in Serbia and Montenegro to resolve conflicts between sectors.

22. What proves difficult in most cases, however, is ensuring that intersectoral plans are effectively implemented. Drawing up, approving and enacting policies do not guarantee successful implementation. It is of key importance to translate policies into actions. Furthermore, in order to be successfully implemented, appropriate resources and incentives must accompany these policies and actions.

IX. Promoting integrated policy implementation

23. *Financial allocation systems* can help to promote the integration of policies. However, there are very few examples where they already exist. In the Netherlands there is a joint budget for research and policy activities in connection with the national action programme on environment and health (from the ministries of environment and health). In Sweden, the government sets objectives that cut across ministerial and budget boundaries and the budget system, at least initially, allocates money according to policy areas, rather than to departments¹⁸.

24. *Interdepartmental or inter-agency teams* responsible for policy implementation can also promote policy integration but, again, there are very few examples. Currently, the financial allocation of resources is frequently sectoral and the implementation of policy is sectoral rather than

¹⁸ Information concerning Sweden comes from the report of the UK's Cabinet Office (2000).

intersectoral. Local Agenda 21 initiatives sometimes involve intersectoral teams responsible for policy implementation. However, examples of larger-scale intersectoral policy implementation are scarce.

25. At the root of the problems to implement integrated transport, health and environmental policies is the hesitancy of both politicians and heads of bureaucratic departments to seriously commit themselves to changes reaching further than the interests of the offices they are directly responsible for. *Political and departmental commitment* to ideals and values is key to many well-known success stories. Sometimes legislation and/or funds can drive decision makers in this direction, but a certain amount of idealism and political risk-taking is also often required. The introduction of road-pricing in London and the overnight car ‘clean-up’ of Bogota are two examples where some idealism and political risk-taking was involved. In both cities, public and private actors and citizens alike found it hard to believe such dramatic changes were possible and initial resistance seemed insurmountable. However, the measures were not shelved: they were implemented and have since become generally accepted. For integrated and sustainable policies to succeed, institutional arrangements need to be supported by dynamic public officials and politicians. Acknowledging and valuing idealism and personal commitment as key elements for change does not imply ignoring political prerogatives by executives and administrators. It does however imply that constructive and value-driven attitudes can support administrations and executive powers to steer change in the direction set by political decisions.

X. Promoting integrated policy assessment

26. *Mechanisms for the cross-sectoral monitoring and assessment of policies and programmes* include ex-ante techniques, such as strategic environmental assessment and health impact assessment (see ‘Promoting integrated policy development’ above for examples). An environmental risk assessment forms part of the strategic environmental assessment process in Germany and in Serbia and Montenegro. Regulatory impact assessment used in the UK is identified as another mechanism for ex-ante cross-sectoral monitoring and assessment of policies and programmes. Regulatory impact assessment is a policy tool to assess the costs, benefits and risks of any proposed regulation and is carried out for all policy changes that may affect the public or private sectors, charities, the voluntary sector or small businesses. The assessment incorporates aspects of sustainable development appraisal and health impact assessment. Indicators of sustainable development are also a means of assessing progress towards certain transport, health and environmental indicators, although sustainable development assessments are rarely policy-specific, which means that it is not usually possible to evaluate the effect of specific policies from sustainable development assessments. However, when it comes to health, a frequent limitation of these

assessments is that they often adopt a limited view of health issues. For example, they often fail to include aspects such as effects on vulnerable groups of the population, impacts of a psychosocial nature or effects related to the exposure to noise or to reduced opportunities for physical activity. The fact that health impact assessments and the involvement of health experts are left to voluntary decisions in most countries represents another limitation to the extent to which health considerations can be better integrated in decision making.

27. The effectiveness of such instruments and their impact on the countering of exclusively economically or commercially instigated policies can often be enhanced by *giving the public and NGOs a substantial say in the evaluation process and the drafting of evaluation criteria relevant to them*. This is more common in some countries than in others. Some have a more active civil society in which they are used to expressing their views and to some extent have them translated into public policies, whereas in others citizens and interest groups are weaker and/or more passive and feel unable to criticise plans or government interventions.

28. Ex-post cross-sectoral monitoring and assessment mechanisms can also promote policy integration but fewer examples exist in practice. One example is the Belgian national environment and health action plan, which was subject to ex-post evaluation. Other examples include strategies or plans relating to climate change and/or sustainable development that are subject to ex-post assessment in a number of countries (e.g. Belgium, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Lithuania, UK).

XI. Effective ways of demonstrating policy integration

29. *Sustainable development strategies or plans* illustrate a move towards the integration of the transport, health and environmental policies in a number of countries (e.g. Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Serbia and Montenegro, UK). Various documents specific to two sectors, such as various national health and environment plans (e.g. Belgium, Czech Republic, Serbia and Montenegro, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), sustainable transport action plans (e.g. Albania) and national action plans for health and environment (e.g. Bulgaria) also illustrate a move towards policy integration.

30. Also interesting is the way in which some cities have seen the benefits of sustainability for their self-image. In this vein, some local governments are able to present themselves at the international forums as attractive, sustainable cities. A common denominator of many of these cities

is their means of communication: they have developed a marketing approach rather than an analytical approach to ‘sell’ their policies to politicians, the public and the ‘outside world’.

XII. Transferring examples of policies and practices

31. Having identified various examples of institutional structures and practices that can help to promote the integration of transport, health and environment policies, the opportunities for transferring some of these examples of policies and practices (and the lessons associated with these examples) are now considered. The various examples of institutional structures and practices that can help to promote the integration of transport, health and environment policies are summarized in Table 1, together with an indication of important issues that need to be taken into account when considering their potential ‘transferability’ or applicability between different administrations.

32. When considering transferability of examples, it is important to recognise that a variety of policies, practices and lessons can be transferred, including lessons from practice, general ideas, philosophies or ideologies, analytical models or policy frameworks, policy goals and instruments, programmes or projects, administrative structures or legislative frameworks. In general, the transfer of lessons, general ideas, philosophies and/or ideologies is the least demanding type of transfer whilst the transfer of administrative structures and legislative frameworks is the most demanding.

Table 1: Institutional structures and practices that can help to promote the integration of transport, health and environment policies and key issues for transferability.

	Examples	Key issues for transferability
Promoting joint accountability/ responsibility and policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • interdepartmental committees, commissions, working groups and steering groups • central steering function within government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • many of these examples are dependent on division of responsibilities within

coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intersectoral programmes involving cooperation between departments 	government (horizontally) and between levels (vertically)
Strengthening intersectoral relations and awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • human resource policies such as job rotation • workshops and other similar training activities • units within ministries responsible for the monitoring and assessment of cross-cutting issues • benchmarking and best practice initiatives • environmental monitoring and reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inter-professional exchange can be culturally dependent • the effectiveness of cross-sectoral units is dependent on the division of responsibilities within government (horizontally)
Linking integrated policy development to integrated policy implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • integrated strategies and quantitative objectives for transport, health and environment • strategic environmental assessment • health impact assessments • joint interministerial conferences • joint committees, commissions, working groups and steering groups • internal and external consultation processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • large cultural differences in the use of quantitative measures and indicators for policy • differences in the role and scope of impact assessment techniques across different countries • the process of consultation is influenced by the extent to which citizens are accustomed to being involved
Promoting integrated policy delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • joint budgets for policy activities • objectives that cut across ministerial and budget boundaries • financial allocation according to policy areas, rather than to departments • intersectoral teams responsible for policy implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • joint budgets and common objectives must be linked to the process of implementation • intersectoral and interprofessional working is culturally dependent
Promoting integrated policy assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strategic environmental assessment • health impact assessment • sustainable development indicators • ex-post evaluation according to cross-sectoral criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • differences in the role and scope of impact assessment techniques across different countries • evaluation must be connected to the policy-making process
Effective ways of demonstrating policy integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sustainable development strategies or plans • 'marketing' of policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sustainable development strategies must be linked to sectoral policies • marketing must correspond at least partially with reality or an achievable future

33. The work of Rose (1993) helps to understand the transferability of examples. He identifies seven 'contingent' influences on lesson-drawing – preconditions affecting whether a policy initiative can be transferred from one place to another. In general, the fewer conditions that are fulfilled, the more difficult it is to learn from policies from elsewhere and to transfer them. These conditions for policy transfer comprise:

- *Uniqueness* of the initiative being transferred,
- *Resources*: the availability of sufficient finances, public personnel, legal instruments,
- *Institutions*: the similarity of institutions in the 'model' (donor) and recipient locations,

- *Complexity* of the initiative being transferred,
- *Scale of change* that the initiative will cause,
- *Interdependency*: the extent to which the initiatives in the model and recipient locations are related to each other,
- *Values*: the similarity between the values of policy makers in the donor and recipient locations,

Box 2: Basic rules for policy transfer

- Make realistic comparisons with peers.
- Take institutional differences between the ‘model’ country and ‘recipient’ country into account, including subtle ones. Minor institutional differences can have major impact when policies are actually implemented.
- Activate domestic champions that can use their networks, but do not push.
- Draw inspiration from various sources, both for learning purposes and to create room for manoeuvre in bargaining processes.
- Be sensitive and tolerant to uncertainty and ambiguity: outcomes in such processes are always unclear in the beginning.
- Draw inspiration from general ideas or action programmes rather than legislation; they allow for more creative and flexible adjustments.
- Show agility in creating a sense of urgency.
- Anticipate why and how certain actors may react to new policies.
- Operate regularly in trans-national ‘communities of practice’ and absorb ideas through multilateral learning: this increases your appreciation of the relative value of your own institutional system as compared to other and the range of options you see for improvement.
- Communicate using examples of successful countries, regions or cities that have achieved visible and concrete results rather than trying to promote abstract ideas such as ‘policy integration’.

34. The success in transferring examples of policies and practices can be increased by following a number of basic rules: ten of which are identified in Box 2 below. These should be taken into account before beginning to transfer examples of policies and practices. Although it may be tempting to consider countries where relatively more work has been done in the area of policy integration as the best model to follow, this may not necessarily be appropriate strategy. The similarity of public and political concerns is a key factor affecting the successful transfer of policies and practices.

35. Apart from the basic rules that have been identified above, it is important to acknowledge that the transfer of policy or practice has much more chance of success if there is strong public and political demand for change. In some EECCA countries, the demand for policy integration is not yet very widely felt, so achieving policy integration, and adopting examples from elsewhere, is particularly challenging. Highlighting the benefits of policy integration and convincing politicians and the public is an important first step in these countries. Creating the conditions for change requires politicians and officials who are willing to challenge current trends and take innovative action.

XIII. Overcoming barriers to policy integration

36. Many of the institutional barriers to policy integration are not country-specific but are common to most countries.¹⁹ The solutions however may be different. Various general types of barriers can be identified concerning issues such as resources, support, power relations, working practices, information, knowledge, education, training and communication. Some of the important ways of overcoming these barriers are considered below.

37. Support (political, professional and public support) and resources are two necessary preconditions for the promotion of policy integration and the introduction of the various arrangements and mechanisms outlined above. Allocating resources according to overall goals, rather than government departments will facilitate their successful implementation. Making joint funds available for intersectoral cooperation and joint projects is also important for policy integration. In addition, policy integration needs to be supported by means of incentives or awards to promote intersectoral working and increase the motivation of professionals to think and work intersectorally and overcome the rigidity of existing working practices. Training, education and information management can also play an important role here (see also below). Closer assessment of the environmental and health impacts as a compulsory requirement of national and international financial support for large projects (e.g. transport infrastructure) may help to increase integration between the three sectors.

38. The legal basis for intersectoral working is crucial for policy integration: organizational structures and administrative responsibilities must not only permit but also encourage intersectoral working. Overall government objectives (including long-term objectives as well as short and

¹⁹ Many of these barriers were identified discussed during the workshop on Institutional Conditions for Integrated Transport, Environment and Health Policies, which took place in Berlin on 23-24 January 2006.

medium-term objectives) should be defined that cut across ministerial or departmental boundaries. This is of course dependent on policy integration becoming recognized as a priority area. In order for it to be recognized as a priority, the costs and benefits of policy integration need to be closely examined and explained to politicians, professionals and the public alike in simple, specific terms (e.g. cost savings, lives affected). Formal requirements for project and policy assessment (e.g. strategic environmental assessment and health impact assessment) and evaluation (e.g. ex-post evaluation) can help to increase integration between the transport, health and environment sectors. Formal agreements and policy commitments made at international forums (e.g. charters, directives and regulations) can increase attention on policy integration at the national, regional and local levels. Attention to the implementation of integrated policy is at least as important as the process of policy-making. Integrated policy-making, after all, is not an end in itself but a process for delivering win-win situations: improvements in health, environment and accessibility in this case.

39. The availability of reliable, up-to-date cross-sectoral indicators and data and the use of effective information and knowledge management systems are important for policy integration. Benchmarking and other forms of national and international information exchange can also help to support policy integration. Capacity-building, training and education are equally important factors. Brokering information, especially in relation to good practice databases, case studies and guidelines, can play a role in policy integration. So too can international events (e.g. seminars and workshops), which bring sectors together and promote dialogue between professions. Clarity of the policy-making and implementation process, including clear explanations of options, choices, impacts and decisions and open access to information, is also important.

XIV. Conclusions and suggestions for future work

40. Policy integration has a number of potential benefits such as promoting synergies (win-win solutions) between sectors, promoting consistency between policies in different sectors and reducing duplication in the policy-making process. The need for policy integration, especially in relation to transport, health and environment issues, is becoming increasingly recognized. However, achieving policy integration is no easy task, particularly since the number of actors and the amount of information involved in the policy-making process is generally increasing. Perfect policy integration is not possible but it can nevertheless be improved. Institutional conditions are one means of promoting greater policy integration. Policy integration should not be seen as an end in itself but it should be recognized as a way of achieving practical outcomes that simultaneously fulfil the goals of more than one sector. What is vital is that plans and policies result in practical action on the ground. Promoting wider interest in policy integration amongst politicians and the public alike has to be driven by a sense of need and openness to change and requires information, education and training.

It requires practical examples to illustrate the concept. The role of citizens and NGOs through public debate is also important since citizens and NGOs often perceive and experience policies in a more holistic manner and are more critical of exclusively sectoral policies.

41. There are various institutional conditions and practices that can help to promote policy integration. A number of different examples of institutional practices can be found across UNECE and WHO-Europe member states that support the integration of transport, environment and health issues into policy-making. These include intersectoral working groups and committees, formalized assessment and auditing procedures (e.g. SEA, HIA), central steering or monitoring arrangements, mechanisms for exchanging information and experience (e.g. city networks and benchmarking), staff recruitment and career progression policies, and education and training programmes. Various examples of policy documents can be found that attempt to bring various sectors together: one of the main examples being sustainable development strategies and plans. In a number of cases, cross-sectoral indicators and targets form part of these policy documents. Binding obligations (e.g. impact assessments) can often stimulate policy integration. So too can overarching governmental strategies, such as sustainable development plans, especially where they are strongly linked to the work of individual departments and their policies.

42. Whilst a range of institutional conditions and practices can help to promote policy integration, there is no single solution. The various institutional conditions and practices for policy integration identified in this paper should be used as a checklist when considering the introduction of changes to government structures and practices. Political will, and the allocation of resources, is often just as important to policy integration as the mechanisms, institutional conditions or practices themselves. This political will and commitment can be strengthened and facilitated by favourable institutional conditions and can also be complemented by proactive public officials and politicians. Effective communication with illustrative examples as well as analytical facts and data are both needed for winning over potential supporters for changes in policy and action. The role of softer factors such as key individuals or organizations (policy pioneers or policy entrepreneurs) also needs to be recognized. Initiatives such as THE PEP provide a useful stepping-stone for these individuals or organizations in this regard. The fact that there are few mechanisms for benchmarking or exchanging good practice that are explicitly orientated towards transport health issues is also a mandate for the Clearing House role of THE PEP.

43. Lesson drawing from elsewhere provides new ideas for policy development, implementation and assessment and is being increasingly used in different forms (e.g. benchmarking, development aid initiatives). The key to its success is the process of transfer and adaptation: it involves more than just copying or transplantation of policies or practices. The similarity of public and political

concerns is a key factor affecting the successful transfer of policies and practices. A variety of institutional barriers to policy integration exist. Most of these are not country-specific but common to most countries across UNECE and WHO-Europe member states. Most of the barriers are fortunately surmountable. Supportive institutional conditions and practices can help to overcome many of these barriers. The overall goals and priorities of government will ensure that sectoral policies are consistent. A central overview and coordination function will improve the horizontal consistency of sectoral policies. In addition, clear assessment procedures and explicit statements of options, choices, impacts and possible inconsistencies will make the process of decision-making more transparent and help to bring conflicts and synergies between sectors out into the open.

44. In terms of future work, there are various ways in which this work on institutional arrangements for policy integration could be further exploited and developed. Three options are briefly outlined here. First, detailed insights and specific recommendations concerning the transfer of policies and practices that promote policy integration could be identified by means of a detailed examination of case studies where transfer of policies or practices has already taken place. For example, a new transport authority in Wroclaw has recently been established, which was inspired by western European examples and financially supported by the German government. This could provide a useful case study to explore the decisive factors of successful transfer and to examine how this success could be replicated elsewhere. Second, the issue of vertical policy integration could be further studied in the future: very little information about vertical policy integration emerged from either the questionnaire or the workshop, indicating a general lack of information here. The scarcity of academic and policy literature on the subject also confirms this point. Third, specifically tailored advice, training and capacity-building activities concerning organizational aspects of policy integration could be developed and tested, particularly in countries where institutional reform is taking place and where there is political and public demand for genuine change. The main aim of such an exercise would be to help create greater awareness and introduce new institutional conditions that nurture and support policy integration in the future.

REFERENCES

- Agranoff, R. (1986). *Intergovernmental Management. Human Services Problem-Solving in Six Metropolitan Areas*. State University of New York Press, New York.
- Cabinet Office (2000). *Wiring it up. Whitehall's Management of Cross-cutting Policies and Services*. The Stationery Office, London.
- Capano, G. (2003). Administrative traditions and policy change: When policy paradigms matter. The case of the Italian administrative reform during the 1990s. *Public Administration* 81(4) 781-801.
- Challis, L., Fuller, S., Henwood, M., Klein, R., Plowden, W., Webb, A., Whittingham, P., Wistow, G. (1988). *Joint approaches to social policy: rationality and practice*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Christensen, T. (2000). The development and current features of the Norwegian civil service system. In: Bekke, H.A.G.M. and van der Meer, F.M. (eds.). *Civil Service Systems in Western Europe*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- ECMT (2002). *Implementing Sustainable Urban Travel Policies. Final Report*. OECD, Paris.
- European Environment Agency (2005a). *Environmental policy integration in Europe. Administrative culture and practices* EEA Technical Report No 5/2005. EEA, Copenhagen.
- European Environment Agency (2005b). *Environmental policy integration in Europe – state of play and an evaluation framework*. EEA Technical Report No 2/2005. EEA, Copenhagen.
- Guyomarch, A. (1999). “Public service”, “public management” and the modernisation of French public administration. *Public Administration* 77 (1) 171-193.
- Hammerschmid, G. and Meyer, R. (2003). *Current initiatives and central actors in the Austrian administrative reform process*. Paper presented at the EGPA Annual Conference, Oeiras, 3-6 September 2003.
- Huxham, C. (ed.) (1996). *Creating Collaborative Advantage*. Sage, London.
- Knill, C. (1998). European Policies: the impact of national administrative traditions. *Journal of Public Policy* 18(1) 1-28.
- Knill, C. (1999). Explaining Cross-National Variance in Administrative Reform: Autonomous versus Instrumental Bureaucracies. *Journal of Public Policy* 19(2) 113-139.
- Kickert, W.J.M., Klijn, E-H. and Koppenjan, J.F.M. (1997). *Managing complex networks: strategies for the public sector*. Sage, London.

Liefferink, D. and Andersen, M.S. (1998). Strategies of the “green” member states in EU environmental policy-making. *Journal of European Public Policy* 5(2) 254-270.

Ling T. (2002). Delivering joined-up government in the UK: Dimensions, issues and problems. *Public Administration* 80(4) pp.615-642.

Metcalf, L. (1994). International policy coordination and public management reform *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 60 pp.271-290.

Mulford, C.L. and Rogers D.L. (1982). Definitions and Models. In: Rogers, D.L. and Whetten, D.A. (eds.) *Interorganizational coordination: theory, research, and implementation*. Iowa State University Press, Ames.

OECD (1996). *Building Policy Coherence: Tools and Tensions*. OECD Public Management Occasional Paper No 12. OECD, Paris.

Peters, B.G. (2000). *Politics of Bureaucracy*. Routledge. Florence.

Rogers, D.L. and Whetten, D.A. (1982). *Interorganizational coordination: theory, research, and implementation*. Iowa State University Press, Ames.

Rose, R. (1993). *Lesson-Drawing in Public Policy: A Guide to Learning Across Time and Space*. Chatham House, Chatham (NJ).

Torres, L. (2004). Trajectories in public administration reforms in European Continental countries. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 63(3) 99-112).

United Nations (2002). *Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development*. United Nations, New York.

Warren, R.L., Rose, S.M. and Bergunder, A.F. (1974). *The structure of Urban Reform*. Lexington Books, Lexington.

Wilkinson, D. and Appelbee, E. (1999). *Implementing holistic government: joined-up action on the ground*. Policy Press, Bristol.

World Commission on Environment and Development (1987), *Our Common Future*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

ANNEX I
PROGRAMME OF THE STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL
ARRANGEMENTS FOR POLICY INTEGRATION, BERLIN, 23-24 JANUARY 2006

Monday, 23 January 2006	
09:00	Registration
09:30	Welcome and introduction <i>Thomas Holzmann, deputy president, Federal Environmental Agency, Germany</i> Transport, Health and Environment Pan-European Programme (THE PEP) - outline of the project and introduction to the workshop <i>Tea Aulavuo, UNECE; Francesca Racioppi, WHO Europe</i>
Session 1: Institutional arrangements promoting policy integration <i>chair: Nigel Dotchin, Department for Transport, UK, Chairman of THE PEP Steering Committee</i>	
10:00	Administrative culture and practice in the pan-European region: how far does this support environmental policy integration? <i>Jock Martin, European Environment Agency EEA</i>
10:20	Policy integration tools and institutional arrangements across three sectors and levels of government: current situation in UNECE and WHO-Europe member states <i>Dominic Stead, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands</i>
10:40	Questions
10:50	Coffee
11:15	4 examples from practice <i>Albania (M. Mima), Georgia (N. Tkhilava), Denmark (N. Jensen), Russia (Y. Kunin)</i>
12:00	Questions
12:15	Lunch
13:15	Small group discussions: introduction to method and topics
13:25	Small group discussions, addressing in particular questions such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is necessary for horizontal policy integration? • What is necessary for vertical integration? • How important are framework conditions in the different countries in implementing more integrative approaches? What are these conditions? • What lessons can be learnt from present experience? • What arrangements have the greatest effects? The discussions will focus on national strategies, goals and action plans, on administrative culture and practice, on financial allocation, training and capacity building, on monitoring and assessment.
15:15	Report back from small group discussions
Session 2: Barriers and bottlenecks to policy integration <i>chair: Rainer Fehr, (North Rhine-Westphalia) Institute of Public Health, Germany</i>	
16:00	Barriers and bottlenecks to implementing policy integration <i>Axel Friedrich, Federal Environmental Agency, Germany</i>
16:20	Questions
16:30	Small group discussions, addressing in particular questions such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barriers to vertical integration • Barriers to horizontal integration • Country specific barriers (if any)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses to policy integration <p>The discussion will focus on administrative and political culture and structures, on financing/budget conditions, on monitoring and reporting</p>
18:00	Session ends
19:30	Informal reception
Tuesday, 24 January 2006	
Session 3: Learning from each other: Supportive institutional arrangements for policy integration	
<i>chair: Axel Friedrich, Federal Environmental Agency, Germany</i>	
09:00	Report back from small group discussions
09:40	To what extent can policies and institutional arrangements be transferred? <i>Martin de Jong, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands</i>
10:00	Transferring policies - lessons from European research <i>Carlo Sessa, ISIS, Italy</i>
10:20	Questions
10:30	4 examples from practice <i>Denmark (M. Fischer), Germany (Bremen: M. Glotz-Richter), Czech Republic (Prague: J. Mach; Brno: I. Draholova)</i>
11:30	Questions
11:45	Small group discussions, addressing in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenges for / bottlenecks to transfer • Advantages of international cooperation /exchange of experience • Conditions for successful exchange and transfer • Examples of transfer
13:15	Lunch
14:30	Report back from small group discussions
Session 4: The way forward - dissemination, information and training	
<i>chair: Carlos Dora, WHO</i>	
15:15	What do decision-makers need? <i>Carlos Dora, WHO</i>
15:35	What next?: Plenary discussion on the needs of decision makers, conclusions and recommendations
16:30	Workshop closes

ANNEX II

Transport - Health – Environment Institutional Arrangements for Policy Integration

Results of a THE PEP workshop held in Berlin, 23 - 24 January 2006

Dr. Hanns-Uve Schwedler, European Academy of the Urban Environment, Berlin

This report summarizes the results of a workshop, which was carried out in the context of the Transport, Health and Environment Pan-European Programme (THE PEP). The (German) Federal Environmental Agency awarded a service contract to the European Academy of the Urban Environment to prepare and arrange the event. The workshop was organized jointly by

- European Academy of the Urban Environment (EA.UE)
- Federal Environmental Agency, Germany
- Delft University of Technology
- United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)
- World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe (WHO) representing the Secretariat to the Transport, Health and Environment Pan-European Programme (THE PEP)

BACKGROUND, AIMS, TARGET GROUPS AND METHODOLOGY

THE PEP provides a framework for cooperation to representatives from the three sectors health, environment and transport in 55 European countries with the aim of promoting sustainable transport goals across the pan-European region. The workshop was organized as part of a THE PEP project on "Supportive institutional mechanisms for integrated policy and decision making on transport, environment and health".

The workshop aimed to contribute to understanding about policy-making processes that integrate transport, environment and health issues with a focus on institutional arrangements. It served to discuss, to deepen and amplify the information on current institutional practices that was gained within the project through relevant studies and publications and through a questionnaire survey which was carried out at the end of 2005.

The workshop aimed to gain additional information on the situation in different European countries and on the experience of participants as well as to discuss actual approaches and constraints on these approaches. A mixture of plenary sessions (with presentations and short discussions) and incorporated workgroups (small group discussions) was chosen to reach these aims. The workshop was divided into four thematic sessions:

- Institutional arrangements promoting policy integration
- Barriers and bottlenecks to policy integration
- Learning from each other: supportive institutional arrangements for policy integration
- The way forward - dissemination, information and training

The main presentations under these topics gave an overview on the situation in Europe. In addition to this, eight case studies were presented on current practice in Albania, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Georgia, Germany and Russia.

The workshops (3 workshop sessions with 3 parallel working groups (two for each topic)) dealt with the following topics:

- Institutional arrangements promoting policy integration
 - Experiences and driving forces
 - Instruments and tools
 - Strengthening intersectoral cooperation and public participation
- Barriers and bottlenecks to policy integration
 - Barriers to organizational changes
 - Barriers to instruments and tools
 - Barriers to intersectoral cooperation
- Supportive arrangements
 - Convincing politicians
 - Transferring policies and practices
 - Experiences to date

The workshop principally aimed to reach (actual and potential) stakeholders in policy integration in the three sectors. 63 representatives from governmental bodies at different administrative levels but also from government-related (research) institutions and from the private sector (commercial and non-commercial) took part. They originated from 22 European countries. The following table summarizes origins and background:

Table 1: Origin and background of participants

	<i>participants (no.)</i>	<i>countries (no.)</i>
total participants / countries	63	22
“old” EU member states	26	8
“new” EU member states	22	6
non-EU states	15	8
supra-national institutions	6	
Ministries	15	
governmental agencies / institutes	12	
Cities	13	
Research	5	
NGOs	7	
private companies	5	

WORKSHOP RESULTS

The following sections will summarize the content and results of the plenary presentations and the workshops. In doing so, the main focus is on the group discussions as the presentations are available on the Internet (www.eaue.de and www.thepep.org) as an information source in themselves. Due to overlaps between topics and discussion issues and due to the comprehensive experience of the participants, it was not always possible during the group discussions to distinguish

properly between the given questions and sub-topics. The results of these discussions are therefore presented as a synopsis under the main topics of the working group sessions.²⁰

After an introduction to the workshop and the topic given by the Deputy President of the Federal Environmental Agency, Thomas Holzmann, and an overview on THE PEP, its content, aims and steps, the first session dealt with the central issue of the programme, with institutional arrangements promoting policy integration.

SESSION 1: INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS PROMOTING POLICY INTEGRATION

Jock Martin (European Environment Agency): “Administrative culture and practice in the pan-European region: how far does this support environmental policy integration?”

The speaker presented the main findings of the latest EEA report on “The European Environment” (2005). He concluded that the transport sector is the key area to fulfil European environmental policies and goals. One prerequisite to reach these goals is, however, the design of long-term, coherent policies that shift market signals towards sustainable production and consumption, to develop integrated market instruments that combine sustainability objectives, to reinforce public and private sector expenditure on research and development in the environment, and to improve institutional set-ups to design and implement integrated approaches. Such set-ups can be as important as policies themselves. Finally, he presented a framework for integration of environment into sector policies that has been developed by EEA.²¹

Dominic Stead (Delft University of Technology): “Policy integration tools and institutional arrangements across three sectors and levels of government: current situation in UNECE and WHO Europe member states”

The speaker gave an introduction to main concerns of policy integration, reviewed key (international, policy) documents dealing with integration, and gave an overview on the findings of THE PEP questionnaire survey.²² One main finding is that integration - if present - often refers only to two sectors.

Martin Fischer (City of Aalborg): “Practicing the Aalborg Commitments - Integrating planning, transport and environment in politics”

The speaker gave an overview of the Aalborg Charter (1994) and the Aalborg Commitments, and presented the Danish planning law which ensures to a certain extent (vertical) integration of environmental issues into other planning sectors. The main instrument is exchange of information and guidelines at national, regional and local level. On the local level

²⁰ based on such overlaps between various discussions, to a certain extent it is possible to state a hierarchy of individual discussion contributions (e.g. concerning the most important stakeholder(s), instruments, barriers etc.). One may assume that remarks and insights which appear in different contexts are perceived by participants to be the most significant ones. Comparing working groups which took place concurrently but on the same topic also permits conclusions to be drawn on the priority ranking of individual comments.

²¹ EEA: Environmental Policy Integration in Europe, 2005.

²² background paper distributed before the conference.

(Aalborg), (horizontal) integration of environmental goals and policies is mainly enabled through the Action Plan for Traffic and Environment, the Public Transport Plan and the Infrastructure Plan and through accompanying measures. The main lesson to be learnt is to keep politicians involved and to cooperate (and learn) internationally.

Niels Jensen (City of Copenhagen): “Cycling in integrated policy making”

Cycling policy and measures form a strong and very successful instrument within sectoral transport policy. It is also well integrated into physical planning through structural and institutional measures. Though health issues were even more important than environmental ones for implementing the cycling policy (and also for public information campaigns), cooperation with the health sector is practically absent, while cooperation (and integration through some joint actions) with the environmental department and other stakeholders occurs comparatively frequently.

Nino Tkhilava (Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources, Georgia): “Transport-related Air Pollution in Georgia”

Traffic is the main source of air pollution and other environmental problems. Transport and traffic planning is dominated by economic goals; environmental and health issues are hardly considered at the national level. On the local level (in Tbilisi), there are initial steps to reflect environmental issues in transport-related actions, although cooperation is practically and integration completely absent. Integration is also impeded through lack of communication between ministries and departments, due to an absence of reliable basic data, poor control and measurement systems, and because of limited awareness amongst the public and decision makers.

Yuliy Kunin (State Scientific and Research Institute of Motor Transport, Russian Federation): “Development of an integrated road transport policy in the Russian Federation”

Physical and spatial planning issues - and to some extent environmental aspects - are considered by the Transport Strategy up to 2020, while on the other hand transport issues are included in the Environmental Doctrine. Health topics are limited to road safety questions. Though these policy documents exist, implementation of closer cooperation or even integration of sectors is not present. On the local level (Moscow), environmental issues are considered (and implemented) to a greater extent in traffic planning, some formal and informal cooperation takes place. The health department, however, is not involved. Main (cooperational and institutional) links exist between spatial and traffic planning departments. A main barrier to integration is unclear distribution of responsibilities (vertical and, to a lesser extent, horizontal), lack of legislative and administrative mechanisms to support cooperation and exchange, competition for funds between sectors/ministries/departments, and limited awareness of environmental problems among (political) decision makers and the public.

Discussion of the main presentations and the case studies dealt to a large extent with cultural differences, with often weak implementation of integration and with forces against this (and thus anticipated in part the outcomes of Session 2).

Cultural differences: Opinions on job rotation as an instrument for more integrated thinking and better integration of sectoral approaches, for instance (and as a personal tool to climb the career

ladder) are very diverse in different countries. The practice of the EU accession process did focus largely on sectoral policies, and thus in some cases even enlarged the gap between “old” and “new” member states with regard to sectoral integration.²³ The role of the public and the culture of participation differ to a large extent all over Europe; consequently considering these differences is crucial for the transfer of experience.

Weak implementation and hindrances: Lack of coherent national policies can be observed. National but also regional and local policy is very much influenced by commercial and economic interests thus dominating other (non-economic) sectors and policy fields (particularly transport planning). This is especially true in countries undergoing structural change during the last 15 years, and was underpinned by the EU accession process and aims. (Political) commitment towards sustainability and awareness of the necessity for integrated policies are normally low; highlighting the costs of doing nothing could be an element to enable these barriers to be overcome.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

In the majority of question complexes, two working groups were meeting concurrently. The results of the group work have been summarized below and represent the opinions of the respective participants. Statements or remarks which were evidenced in both parallel groups are listed in order of priority.

Experience and driving forces – current practice:

- Often there is hardly any commitment to integration (except in some policy documents and plans).
- In some countries’ practice, there is hardly any (personal) commitment and passion for integration; professional and sectoral aims dominate, hindering cooperation and integration.
- In some countries, integration is an unknown and new task which has no (political) priority.
- In several countries, integration is on the political agenda, but is poorly implemented and/or not evaluated/measured.
- Cooperation between the health and environmental sectors is more pronounced than cooperation with the transport sector. (This statement contradicts the results of other working groups and some presentations.)
- Formal integration of sectors occurs more at national than at the local level, through national documents.
- Transport is the dominant (“most aggressive”) sector, suppressing other fields of action.

Experience and driving forces - driving forces and effects

Pros:

- Discussion of integration arises from EU legislation that (in particular recently) demands not only more integration but also participation.
- Political will and commitment can support integration (at all levels).
- Coherent national laws (and initiatives) can support integration also at a lower level.

²³ for instance: EA.UE: Twelve Candidate Countries' Overview Report, see above

- Public awareness and pressure support integration.
- Coherent policies (i.e. time frame) can support integrated policies.
- Integration (once started) is gaining momentum through overcoming professional barriers and interests and supporting mutual understanding and capacity building.
- Integrated “steering units” can support integration.

Cons:

- Privatization makes integration more difficult.
- Commercial and economic interests are often a counterproductive driver.
- National laws and distribution of responsibilities make integration difficult.
- The call for integration normally comes from the environmental sector (which often is held in low esteem) but seldom from the health sector - the environmental sector is essential for success.
- Sustainable development is too complex a subject for day-to-day work; requirements are therefore often very formal or too difficult to fulfil.
- If measurement and evaluation tools exist - and if they are used - they are often very technical and sectoral.
- Some programmes and projects have failed, causing frustration and reduced commitment.
- Competition exists between sectors and professions.

Instruments and tools - effectiveness and experience:

- Coherent and clear formulation of aims, action plans with clear targets (on all levels)
- Tools for targeted information, knowledge management, brokering information
- Evaluation process, benchmarking, tools and allocation of resources for this
- Transparency of funding mechanisms and for evaluation
- Involvement of the public
- Intersectoral working groups focusing on a specific issue/topic
- Mechanisms which are jointly owned by different departments with targets which have been negotiated
- Political will more important than mechanisms, mechanisms can be informal and on an ad-hoc basis (“Mechanisms are not an aim in themselves”)
- Cost benefit analysis of integrated actions can influence the will of decision makers to support integration and to set frameworks for this
- Legislation is more important than (weak) formal tools and mechanisms

Instruments and tools - supporting conditions

- International cooperation stimulates intersectoral dialogue
- Education and training and “learning the language” of the other
- Financial incentives attached to tools
- Legally binding conditions for auditing and accountability
- Involvement of the private sector
- Transparency of the system and the introduction of control and monitoring
- Positive outcome and results of integration process and accountability

Strengthening intersectoral cooperation and public participation – education / training / awareness raising / information exchange

- Knowledge of present situation and interests is essential to develop tools and mechanisms in this field.
- Tailored and specific strategies have to be developed (the spectrum ranges from basic lack of understanding of sustainable development (and thus of one of its requirements: integration and accompanying training measures) to the frequent use of training in the process of integrating policies).
- Tailored strategies need to be developed for specific core groups which have to be identified (decision makers and civil society are most important; here awareness has to be enhanced).
- Professional (university) education has to incorporate elements of integration and other (but related) subjects.
- Need to improve tools for public information and participation; media and their interests are important.
- Dissemination of (good) practice is essential.
- Information exchange is not a technical problem (databases, Internet, e-mails etc.), but a question of how to get the right information to the right place/person and a question of information overflow.
- Job rotation can support integrated thinking and experience, but has to be handled carefully to ensure professional decisions.
- “Top-down” information exchange needs to be ensured (it occurs more frequently “bottom-up”, hierarchical information flows need to be avoided).

Strengthening inter-sectoral cooperation and public participation - public participation

- Public participation is essential.²⁴
- The role of public participation is not obvious in itself (for many decision makers).
- Public participation might be counter-productive. (It is possible that a political decision making process (as a short term exercise) is steered towards a sectoral direction, to solve a sectoral problem which is currently and directly important for the public.)
- Public participation is in place in many countries (mainly in “old” EU member states, where it has a tradition in the planning process).

²⁴ comment by the writer: why? Several case studies and research projects prove that it produced better results, but there is scarcely any hard evidence to support integration itself; results are important for the public, not the way to reach them.

Excursus: steps toward policy integration within the European Union

As several relevant policy documents were presented during this session and referred to in a background paper distributed to participants in advance, it might be useful and of some benefit to THE PEP if an overview of relevant EU approaches (affecting 25 European countries to a large extent) is provided, which - in the view of the writer - should be considered more closely by the programme.

The Sustainable Cities Report

Based on its first sustainable cities report (1994) and on the results of several expert working groups (among other things: on policy integration, on mobility and on holistic urban management), the European Commission Expert Group on the Urban Environment published the European Sustainable Cities Report in 1996.²⁵ Policy integration and adequate arrangements to achieve this are seen by the Expert Group as one of the key issues in good governance and sustainable urban development. The following principles are suggested and can be summarized as follows:

- Integration: vertical and horizontal integration of organizations, policies, plans and programmes; integration of the external environment with the internal policy-making process; integration of time and space dimensions; integration of values and behavior; integration of personal need and institutional capacity; creating organizational frameworks which manage complex dependency and promote agreement; matching rights with responsibilities and powers with resources; building new relationships between different levels of government and between local authorities and the community;
- Cooperation: recognizing mutual dependence between all agents in the system; equal access to power and resources; a proactive approach to consensus building; mobilizing action through empowerment; networking;
- Homeostasis: management of dynamic change within a flexible but broadly stable system. This implies: developing an organizational culture which accommodates change; recognizing the incremental nature of policy processes; feedback systems to regulate change; addressing issues of values, motivations and ownership;
- Subsidiarity: making decisions and implementing action at the lowest level consistent with the achievement of the desired goals;
- Synergy: 'create a whole that is either greater than or qualitatively different from the sum of the parts'. This implies providing strategic direction for incremental actions; outlining a vision of the possible; adopting cyclic rather than linear planning.

In addition, pitfalls in implementing these principles are identified, and several tools and mechanisms for sustainable urban management - including institutional arrangements for policy integration - are suggested; several case studies are presented in order to underpin the use of these instruments.

The Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment

Following the Sustainable Cities Report, the European Commission launched several programmes and projects to support more sustainable urban development in Europe. These include, for instance, the Sustainable Cities campaign, the design of good practice databases and development of several guidelines and indicator systems, not only to measure the environmental performance of urban areas, but also governance and management within cities (these include indicators for integration).

As - for the time being - a final step towards sustainable urban development and better urban governance, the Commission adopted the Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment in January 2006.²⁶ Based on an extensive consultation process and on the results of several expert working groups (on urban management and on urban mobility, for instance), the Strategy advocates implementation of Environmental Management Plans and Management Systems as well as implementation of Sustainable Urban Transport Plans. Both tools have a powerful impetus towards policy integration as an essential prerequisite for sustainable urban development: "A high quality and healthy urban environment is unlikely to emerge spontaneously... A clear vision and an overall strategy and action plan to achieve agreed objectives and targets are necessary to provide a framework to guide and steer daily management decisions... so that the traditional barriers both between neighboring municipalities and between administrative units within local authorities are broken down to achieve more integrated decision making."²⁷

²⁵ http://www.eu.int/comm/environment/urban/policy_initiatives.htm

²⁶ http://www.eu.int/comm/environment/urban/thematic_strategy.htm

²⁷ European Commission: Interim Communication on the Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment, 2004

As one of the core objectives of the Strategy is "to encourage local authorities to adopt a more integrated approach to urban management", the Commission pronounces in its recent Communication on the topic that technical guidance on integrated management and on integrated transport plans will be provided in 2006. In common with the Communication itself, these will be based on the reports of several expert working groups²⁸.

SESSION 2: BARRIERS AND BOTTLENECKS TO POLICY INTEGRATION

Axel Friedrich (Federal Environmental Agency, Germany): "Barriers and bottlenecks to policy integration". A number of EU directives, approaches and programmes were analyzed with respect to their ability to support integration. Even though some of the directives and approaches have potential to foster policy integration, they are surpassed and thwarted by other policies (like TEN, Structural Funds etc.), which are dominated by economic interests (i.e. 'the motor car industry') and goals. The TEN guidelines, for instance, only consider environmental concerns; health aspects are not included at all; road transport will be further strengthened.²⁹ The - recent - Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment is a positive step in the direction of integration. Its requirements, however, only need to be fulfilled on a voluntary basis. Thus, far-reaching positive results are in doubt.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

This working group session dealt with barriers to organizational change, to instruments and tools and to intersectoral cooperation. It was, however, hardly possible for groups to distinguish between these three spheres, and the results overlap to a great extent. They are therefore summarized in a synoptic way under the topics of "barriers", "geographical differences" and "overcoming barriers". The same principle of prioritizing the results has been used as described above.

Barriers:

- Lack of common goals, sectoral targets are too specific; "traditional" organizational structure(s) in institutions (focused on a sectoral target, not problem oriented)
- Economic interests dominate decisions
- Lack of (political) commitment

²⁸ In the course of preparation of the Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment, the Commission set up several expert groups and awarded contracts for studies on different issues. Of these, the following might be useful for THE PEP project as they deal to a quite large extent with questions of policy integration in urban management:

- Working Group on Sustainable Urban Management: Final Report, 2004
(http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/environment/urban/pdf/0401_finalreport.pdf)
- Working Group on Urban Environmental Management Plans and Systems: Final Report, 2005
(http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/environment/urban/pdf/fin_rep_urban_emps.pdf)
- Working Group on Future Research and Training Needs: Final Report, 2005
(http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/urban/experts_working_groups.htm)
- European Academy of the Urban Environment: Twelve Candidate Countries' Overview Report on Sustainable Urban Management, Sustainable Urban Transport, Sustainable Urban Design and Sustainable Construction, 2003
(<http://www.eaue.de/Publikation/CountryReport-Inhalt.htm>)
- European Academy of the Urban Environment: Analysis Report - Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment; 2004
(<http://www.eaue.de/Publikation/AnalysisReport-Inhalt.htm>)

²⁹ The High Level Group involved in TEN development consisted only of transport and financial experts.

- Personnel and financial resources are limited (in particular at the beginning of institutional change, cooperation is often a voluntary task and therefore neglected)
- Lack of coordinating bodies and of financial allocation systems
- Lack of awareness and knowledge (political and administrative decision makers)
- Inertia and resistance in institutions (and human beings) to change
- Overall responsibility, political will and commitment are often absent
- Lack of cross-sectoral communication and communication strategies
- Information and knowledge is seen as an 'instrument of power' and therefore retained within one institution
- Lack of instruments to measure success, only insufficient (and only sectoral) data
- Lack of (also personal) incentives for change
- Lack of public awareness (raising)
- Sector-oriented professional education, capacity building is needed
- Weakness of environmental action plans, lack of accompanying national programmes

Geographical differences

- Differences in barriers are in the majority of fields more of a quantitative than a qualitative nature (in some cases, however, the sheer size of a problem/a barrier and the dynamics of its development present such a huge hindrance that this represents a barrier in itself); however, tools and steps to overcome them have to be tailored and adapted to the situation .
- Economic goals dominate decisions, in particular in countries in transition.
- Political, economic and social transition makes integration more difficult as it produces the need (to some extent only felt) for short-term action, the feeling of having no time for other things, and thus increases inertia in institutions.
- For large countries with many regions (and national groups) and decision-making bodies, integration and the transfer of experience is more difficult to implement as this process is even more complex than in other countries.
- Differences in administrative cultures in EU15, EU10 and in other EECCA and SEE states (e.g. rigid and established organizational structures / responsibilities - more flexible structures; insufficient and unreliable data collection system – well-established system; “top-down” versus more equal or “bottom-up” decision making).
- Capital cities often have more funds available and more decision-making freedom.
- Conflicts of interests between cities and regions depend also on (national) planning and decision making system(s).
- Differences in environmental and health awareness and geographical differences in lifestyles
- In some countries there is mistrust of public bodies and no 'tradition of participation', a weak 'NGO culture.

Overcoming barriers

- Introduction of shared responsibilities (vertical and horizontal) and cross-cutting programmes
- Cross-sectoral training and professional education (universities); capacity building at all levels
- Earmarking in budgets for integrated actions / integration process

- Give time: restructuring needs this in order to preserve consistency, needs to be a 'fair' process towards all groups / institutions involved; set reachable goals
- Cost-benefit analysis
- Clear target setting and transparency of decisions
- (External) coordination units
- Legislation and rules on implementation procedures
- International exchange (and financial support) can stimulate integration
- Overarching strategies, goals and targets set in a 'top-down' approach (parliament, ministries)
- Changes in internal administrative procedures (e.g. evaluation procedures for senior management; awarding innovative personnel, creating incentives for cooperation)
- Communication strategies to achieve common understanding on all levels
- Dissemination of experience and tools

SESSION 3: BARRIERS AND BOTTLENECKS TO POLICY INTEGRATION

Martin de Jong (Delft University of Technology): “To what extent can policies and institutional arrangements be transferred?”

Although the European Union firmly advocates exchange of experience, good practice and transfer of policies, instruments and institutional arrangements, the possibilities to realize this successfully are limited. A one-to-one transplantation is not possible in any case. A series of constraints and pitfalls exist. Many of them relate to diverse cultures, values and political and administrative practice in different countries. Lessons on crucial success factors for transfer can be drawn from the analysis of common European practice. These factors were expounded at the end of the presentation.

Carlo Sessa (Institute of Studies for the Integration of Systems) “Transferring policies - lessons from European research”

The speaker identified lessons on success factors from research on integrated land use and transport projects. Sustainable development needs broad strategic concepts, innovative forms of interdisciplinary cooperation and integration, and is a multi-sectoral and multi-level task which in many cases requires reorganization of institutions, changes in relationships and territorial competencies, and has to be accompanied by public participation measures. If good practice of this kind is transferred to other situations, it might well require transferring legal and institutional aspects, too. Transferability is, however, not a matter of transferring specific technical and operational features and instruments, but more a matter of ideas and approaches and their adaptation to other situations. Here - again - understanding of end-user needs and participation is crucial.

Marieta Mima (Environmental Center for Administration and Technology, Tirana): “Sustainable traffic development in Tirana”

The speaker gave an overview of the traffic situation in the Albanian capital and of an international project that aims to improve the transport conditions. She focused mainly on air pollution and steps to measure and to reduce this. Though the municipality and several national ministries are involved in this project (environment, health, transport), formal steps towards

integration seem not to be present. However, the ministries declared that closer cooperation is intended in the future.

Jaroslav Mach (City of Prague, transport department): “Transport and environment policies integration”

The agglomeration of Prague is comprised of several boroughs and districts. Formal and legal arrangements exist to ensure shared responsibilities for social development. This includes also transport and health issues. The Strategic Plan for the City of Prague (2000) has been prepared by means of an inter-sectoral (horizontal and vertical) cooperation process which includes not only transport, but also environmental and health issues. It calls for the integration of several policies. Implementation, however, is difficult due to only sectoral knowledge and professional interests of specialized administrators and planners, and lack of arrangements and support for closer inter-sectoral cooperation (which only happens on an ad-hoc basis). International cooperation projects and public pressure can help to overcome these barriers.

Ivana Draholova (City of Brno): “Intersectoral approach in the framework of the Brno Healthy City project”

The project aims to improve the health situation and sustainable development and follows two main principles: intersectoral cooperation and public participation. The Brno Healthy City Office guides the process under the supervision of a steering committee which consists of representatives from the political sector, several city departments and civil society. A policy document has been approved by the City Assembly. It covers a wide range of different sectors. Community campaigns have been organized jointly by different departments and stakeholder groups, and a Health Development Plan has been adopted dealing with transport and environment, health care, social and economic issues, public administration and lifestyle.

Michael Glotz-Richter (City of Bremen, department of building, housing and traffic): “Bremen case study”

The presentation dealt mainly with practical steps to improve the traffic situation in Bremen. These steps made involvement of various departments (mainly spatial planning and environmental planning) and private companies necessary. Environmental issues are well integrated into traffic planning and are underpinned by policy papers on transport. A main impetus of the presentation was on lifestyle issues and how to change emotional attachments to the motor car. Public bodies should learn from approaches used by private companies (that are successfully advocating private car ownership and use) and try to involve the media with respect to concerns within sustainable development.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Convincing politicians

- Public opinion and the media are crucial for political decision making.
- Present good and bad examples and demonstrate concrete benefits.

- Meet the needs of the media, deliver compelling stories and train staff for public relations work and exchange with journalists.
- Organize meetings, conferences targeted to the specific needs of politicians (reliable, precise, short, simplified - but not simple - information, cost-benefit analysis, eliminate misinterpretation of public opinion / view of media), try to create a sense of competition among the different policy-makers in being innovative. (Showing international experience and practice might help to achieve this aim.)
- Support by people from outside the specific profession / sector is essential: organize lobbying and networking with NGOs and other stakeholders, but also with (young) politicians. (Try to raise their passion for sustainability / integrated thinking.)
- Be careful that institutional integration does not cause a feeling of being lost between responsibilities, otherwise public opinion will turn against integration; the public is not interested in integration but in a positive reply / reaction to their problems.
- Organize projects and steps towards integration in such a way that short-term benefits and results are also possible; remember that integration is not an aim in itself but an instrument to achieve goals, and politicians have to “sell” these goals.

Transferring policies and practice - importance of experience and practice from elsewhere

- Can provide ideas for your own situation / tasks / practice
- Raising interest in innovative practice (in particular if financial support or reduction of expenditures is attached)
- The need to learn from other experience is obvious in many cases, but the public has to be convinced that change is an attractive alternative
- Helps avoid mistakes

Transferring policies and practice - copying and adaptation

- Mainly experience from major projects is transferred, EU legislation is a driving force
- Experience from international projects / networks is transferred more frequently than from single / individual projects
- Projects / programmes that are advocated by national / international networks and in particular by donor / funding agencies are transferred more often
- Benchmarking / indicator approaches for measuring developments are transferred more often than concrete projects

Transferring policies and practice - success

- It is important to adapt practice and ideas, not to copy
- Structures / networks that support sharing of experience make success more likely
- “Marketing” the benefits supports a successful implementation process, highlight the pros and cons of changing the current situation

Experience to date – policy documents

- They fail to achieve their aims if no concrete development is visible, but this needs time
- International policy strategies start initiatives at national (political) level, but implementation on a lower level often faces problems

- The local level is too often left alone, but has to implement aims of national policy (documents)
- Transposition and implementation of EU legislation is very often in the responsibility of only one ministry, although it requires integrated approaches

Experience to date - implementation of policy

- Strategic documents often exist, but implementation is absent or is at least weak (partly due to lack of experience)
- Capacity building, training, coordination and taking ownership is needed
- Guidance and support through international organizations is helpful
- In many cases sufficient data are needed and tools have to be developed to acquire the data
- Financial benefits support successful implementation
- Comparison of international approaches / experiences can support realization

Experience to date - monitoring and assessment of policy

- Evaluation is too often absent, it should start as soon as possible and continue at short intervals
- Monetary gains or losses (through integration or non-integration) should be evaluated

SESSION 4: THE WAY FORWARD - DISSEMINATION, INFORMATION AND TRAINING

Carlos Dora (WHO): "Passion and politics - integrating Transport Environment and Health decisions"

The speaker summarized the workshop discussions and drew some lessons from some non-European programmes and projects. Institutional change and commitment by civil servants are necessary to ensure sound economic decisions and policy-making that draws on existing knowledge and best practices, to protect vulnerable groups and to promote social and health equity. This type of commitment and action can only be driven by passion and has to be accompanied by:

- Understanding the political (decision-making) process
- Supporting strategic decisions, goals and targets/ support politicians
- Identification (and experiment with) tools and arguments that influence decision making
- Development of institutional links that facilitate policy integration
- Networking with other stakeholders
- Giving a voice to ordinary citizens' priorities

The final plenary discussion focused mainly on cultural / geographical differences and on "soft" elements of integration (culture, mentality), on the question of having passion for and taking ownership of a process, and how to avoid resistance to change from the very beginning - thus underpinning the results of the small group discussions.

FINAL REMARKS

Without going into details, in the view of the writer some major conclusions can be drawn from the workshop:

- Though the state of implementing organizational integration differs widely from country to country (and from city to city), differences in barriers to more integrated developments are in the majority of fields more quantitative than qualitative; however, tools and steps to overcome them might well be different or at least have to be tailored and adapted to the situation.
- Transferability is not a matter of copying certain projects, programmes and measures, it is more one of transferring ideas and approaches to a different situation, a situation which has to be understood.
- Understanding the barriers and constraints to integration is probably more important than the perception of success stories.
- Awareness raising, training and capacity building need to be enhanced at all levels and at all stages of education and have to be tackled in a targeted fashion.
- Without the taking of ownership and responsibility, institutional integration is very difficult to fulfil (or is fulfilled in a formal way only).
- Legal frameworks are important and can help, but more important are the political will and the passion of all stakeholders.
- Once the process has started, monitoring the process and the results is essential.
- Public involvement can be supportive; in any case the needs of the public have to be fulfilled.
- Integration is not an aim in itself; the results (in the three and other sectors) are important, and integration must create win-win situations.
- Integration takes time, and the process must be given time.

ANNEX III
THE POLICY INTEGRATION SPECTRUM³⁰

1	<i>Independent decision making by ministries.</i> Each ministry retains autonomy within its own policy domain.
2	<i>Communication to other ministries (information exchange).</i> Ministries keep each other up to date about what issues are arising and how they propose to act in their own areas. Reliable and accepted channels of regular communication must exist.
3	<i>Consultation with other ministries.</i> A two-way process. As well as informing other ministries of what they are doing, individual ministries consult other ministries in the process of formulating their own policies, or position.
4	<i>Avoiding divergences among ministries.</i> Ensuring that ministries do not take divergent negotiating positions and that government speaks with one voice.
5	<i>Interministerial search for agreement (seeking consensus).</i> Beyond negative co-ordination to hide differences, ministries work together, through, for example, joint committees and project teams, because they recognise their interdependence and their mutual interest in resolving policy differences.
6	<i>Arbitration of inter-organizational differences.</i> Where inter-organizational difference of view cannot be resolved by the horizontal coordination processes defined in levels 2 to 5, central machinery for arbitration is needed.
7	<i>Setting parameters for organizations.</i> A central organization of inter-organizational decision-making body may play a more active role by setting parameters on the discretion of individual organizations. These parameters define what organizations must not do, rather than prescribing what they should do.
8	<i>Establishing government priorities.</i> The centre of government may play a more positive role by laying down main lines of policy and establishing priorities.
9	<i>Overall governmental strategy.</i> Overall government strategy is used to determine departmental goals, targets, policies and funding allocation. ³¹

³⁰ Based on the work of Metcalfe (1994).

³¹ According to Metcalfe (1996), this last category is unlikely to be attainable in practice, although a few examples can be found which indicate that some governments are trying to develop overall governmental strategies (e.g. sustainable development strategies) and funding allocation systems according to overall goals rather than to departments.

ANNEX IV CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLIC MANAGEMENT STYLES IN EUROPE³²

The so-called *southern European countries*, including France, Italy, Portugal, Spain and Belgium, are influenced by structures inherited from the French legal model built around administrative law and the ideals of “due process” and “equality of treatment”. This system is also referred to as “Napoleonic” (Guyomarch, 1999). In this model, the institutionalization of administrative law has resulted in a clear separation of political decision-making from administrative implementation and an emphasis on formal rules and organizational structure (Capano, 2003). The Napoleonic model is relatively legalistic and hierarchical. A key feature distinguishing it from the German-speaking model is the reliance on technical expertise within administrations, something which can work against policy integration if it is used to prevent interference or ‘meddling’ from other interests.

Administrative practice in the *German-speaking countries* (Austria, Germany and Switzerland) is marked by a more dominant, overriding legal philosophy with constitutional protection for tiers of government and civil servants, and giving judicial bodies an important role in circumscribing administrative practice (Hammerschmid and Meyer, 2003). Public administrations apply the law rather than make policy, with comparatively little flexibility and discretion when implementing legal provisions (Knill, 1998).

Within the *Anglo-Saxon tradition* (notably the United Kingdom), the role and position of the civil service is more subordinate than in the German-speaking countries. This does not mean that the civil service is unimportant in government policy-making, but it is not assigned a constitutional role, and tends to be subject to structural changes produced by the government of the day. The limited constitutional, legal and structural entrenchment reflects the conception of the administration as a flexible system which is subordinate and instrumental to political requirements and priorities (Knill, 1999). The British civil service is to a large extent based on a business-like management approach and is often staffed by generalists, who have the ability to move across the system, which increases opportunities for policy learning and cross-fertilization, and for furthering policy coordination.

The *Nordic countries* (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden) and the Netherlands belong to a public administration model which can be described as consensual, considering the tradition of negotiation and consultation (Torres, 2004). The civil services are characterized by relative homogeneity and equality, which has created a strong administrative culture based on close attention to political decisions and to professional considerations. A growing administrative specialization has contributed to fragmentation in terms of tasks and values, but there have been relatively few conflicts in the system, mainly as a result of shared cultural norms and values (Christensen, 2000). A potential disadvantage for policy integration is the tendency towards stability and the lack of innovation this might entail. Another potential disadvantage is the lack of movement within administrations.

Attempts by the countries of *Central and Eastern Europe* to adapt to more democratic forms of management, following the break-up of the Soviet Union, have resulted in the emergence of

³² based on EEA (2005a).

another style of administration. Rather than relying on individual initiative, bureaucratic hierarchies and/or laws, administrations rely more heavily on external controls (Peters, 2000). Political and strategic decisions are taken within the party structure, not within the administrative structure. While reforms are under way, there is still a lack of cohesiveness and horizontal coordination within governments. This problem is also caused by a lack of vertical delegation (i.e. a lack of defined roles and mandates for officials within a ministry, which is partly a matter of mistrust). Within Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) countries, the transition to more democratic forms of management is less advanced than in the new EU member states, where the process of accession speeded up administrative changes. In many countries in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), several vertical structures inherited from the Soviet system are still largely in place. Without administrative changes, options for improving policy integration in EECCA countries are perhaps limited. On the other hand, however, administrative change in these countries offers great potential for more integrated policy-making.

Within all these groupings, the Nordic, German-speaking and Anglo-Saxon countries are frequently grouped among Europe's environmental leaders (Liefnerink and Andersen, 1998). Even among countries where the environment has a relatively high political priority and which share similar management styles, the approach to policy integration can differ significantly. Nevertheless, the most effective solutions are likely to be those that reflect national specificities. For example, in the more pragmatic Anglo-Saxon culture, where organizational coordination is not the central problem, explicit but "soft" guidance and high-level political leadership may be the key to progress; in heavily rule-based countries, top-down legal provisions may be preferable to softer bottom-up or consensual approaches that may take a long time to penetrate departments, because of the hierarchical nature of the systems and the dominance of legalistic cultures.

ANNEX V
**ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE ON SUPPORTIVE INSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS
FOR INTEGRATED TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH POLICIES**

Respondents are kindly asked to provide information for his or her country, using examples either at the national, regional or local level, in the boxes below. The number of boxes that each respondent completes is not of importance – the intention is not to be comprehensive but rather to identify a range of interesting examples of institutional practices that promote greater integration of transport, health and environmental policies in their country. All questions require only short responses containing a brief description together with details about where more information can be found (e.g. the name and contact details of a person or organization, the name of relevant document(s) or a website address).

1. Promoting joint accountability/responsibility and policy coordination

- Mechanisms to promote horizontal cooperation (inter-sectoral) or vertical cooperation (between levels of government) on transport, health or environmental policy (e.g. inter-sectoral committees, joint working groups).

- Arrangements for the horizontal coordination of policy-making and implementation (e.g. a central policy unit with responsibility for strategic policy coordination).

- Additional remarks or comments.

2. Building inter-sectoral capacity and strengthening inter-sectoral relations

- Training courses and/or human resources policies that promote inter-sectoral awareness (e.g. inter-professional training courses, staff secondment schemes, job rotation).

- Management structures that promote inter-sectoral working relationships (e.g. project teams with staff from different sectors).

- Mechanisms to promote regular inter-sectoral dialogue and exchange of information within the organization and between responsible agencies (e.g. inter-sectoral newsletters/briefings).

- Additional remarks or comments.

3. Promoting integrated policy development

- The existence of an integrated national strategy on transport, health and environment.

- The existence of specific, measurable objectives for transport, health and environment at the national, regional or local level.

- Mechanisms to anticipate, detect and/or resolve conflicts between policies in different sectors or at different levels of decision-making (e.g. consistency analysis of policies, impact assessment procedures).

- Mechanisms to involve representatives from the health, environment and transport sectors and also the general public in the policy-making process (e.g. internal consultation on draft policies involving different sectors, public participation in policy-making, Local Agenda 21).

- Mechanisms for exchanging good practice and/or benchmarking on the issues of transport, health and environment (e.g. good practice guides, benchmarking reports).

- Additional remarks or comments.

4. Promoting integrated policy delivery (implementation)

- The existence of a financial allocation system that promotes the integration of transport, health and environmental policies (e.g. a specific cross-departmental or inter-agency budget for delivering joint policies or programmes).

- Inter-sectoral and/or inter-agency team(s) responsible for policy delivery (implementation).

- Additional remarks or comments.

5. Promoting integrated policy assessment

- Mechanisms for cross-sectoral monitoring and assessment of policies and programmes, either *ex ante* (e.g. strategic environmental impact assessment, health impact assessment) or *ex post*.

- The existence of auditing or monitoring systems that promote the integration of transport, health and environmental policies (e.g. the use of cross-sectoral indicators for policy assessment).

- Additional remarks or comments.

6. Examples of policy documents that demonstrate the integration of the transport, health and environmental policies

- Details of any legislation, regulations, policy documents or guidelines produced which demonstrate the integration of the transport, health and environmental sectors.

--

7. Contact details of the survey respondent

First name

Last name

Organization

Type of organization:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> National government | <input type="checkbox"/> NGO |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional government | <input type="checkbox"/> Government agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local government | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) <input type="text"/> |

Function

Address

Country

Telephone

Fax

Email

Finally, as mentioned above, a short summary of the survey responses will be produced by December 2005 and this will be the focus of discussion in a workshop organized by the Government of Germany in January 2006. Please indicate whether you are interested in receiving details about this workshop.

- Yes No

ANNEX VI RESPONDENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Responses to the questionnaire concerning institutional conditions for the integration of transport, environment and health issues in policy-making were received from the following countries:

- Albania (from national government)
- Belgium (from national government)
- Bulgaria (from an NGO)
- Cyprus (from national government)
- Czech Republic (two from national government and two from local government)
- Finland (from national government and a government agency)
- Germany (from national government, state government and two consultants)
- Hungary (from national government)
- Ireland (from national government)
- Italy (from local government)
- Latvia (from a government agency)
- Lithuania (two from national government)
- Malta (from national government)
- Netherlands (from national government)
- Russia (from national scientific institute)
- Serbia and Montenegro (from national government)
- The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (from national government)
- Turkey (from national government)
- United Kingdom (from national government)