

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

Contents

1.	Background, aims, target groups and methodology	2
2.	Workshop results	3
2.1	Session 1: Institutional arrangements promoting policy integration	4
2.1.1	Plenary session	4
2.1.2	Small group discussions	6
	Excursus: steps toward policy integration within the European Union	9
2.2	Session 2: Barriers and bottlenecks to policy integration	11
2.2.1	Plenary session	11
2.2.2	Small group discussions	11
2.3	Session 3: Barriers and bottlenecks to policy integration	13
2.3.1	Plenary session	13
2.3.2	Small group discussions	15
2.4	Session 4: The way forward - dissemination, information and training	16
3.	Final remarks	17

Annex:

- workshop programme
- small group discussions - guiding questions
- workshop questionnaire results

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

Technical University of Delft

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)

1. 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	

2. 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.¹

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.

2.1 Session 1: Institutional arrangements promoting policy integration

2.1.1 Plenary session

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.²

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.³ One main finding is that integration - if present - often refers only to two sectors.

Practical examples

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

¹ 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.

² EEA: Environmental Policy Integration in Europe, 2005

³ cp. background paper distributed before the conference.

instrument is exchange of information and guidelines at national, regional and local level. On the local level (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

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 to a major extent on sectoral policies, and thus - in some cases - even enlarged the 'gap' between 'old' and 'new' member states concerning sectoral integration.⁴ 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.

2.1.2 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 hardly any commitment to integration (except in some policy documents and plans)
- in some countries' practice, hardly any (personal) commitment and passion for integration - professional and sectoral aims dominate and hinder 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 either poorly implemented and/or not evaluated/measured
- cooperation between the health and the environmental sector is more pronounced than cooperation with the transport sector (this statement is in contradiction to the results of other working groups and some presentations)
- formal integration of sectors more on national than on local level through national documents
- transport is the dominating ('most aggressive') sector suppressing other action fields

⁴ cp. for instance: EA.UE: Twelve Candidate Countries' Overview Report, see footnote 9

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 (on all levels)
- coherent national laws (and initiatives) can support integration also on a 'lower' level
- public awareness and pressure supports 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 counter-productive driver
- national laws and distribution of responsibilities make integration difficult
- the call for integration normally comes from the environmental sector (which often is low in 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 failed, causing frustration and reduced commitment
- competition 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 intersectoral cooperation and public participation - public participation

- public participation is essential⁵
- 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)

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 1996.⁶ Policy integration and adequate arrangements to achieve this is 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;

⁵ 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

⁶ http://www.eu.int/comm/environment/urban/policy_initiatives.htm

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 2006.⁷ 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."⁸

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 groups⁹.

⁷ http://www.eu.int/comm/environment/urban/thematic_strategy.htm

⁸ European Commission: Interim Communication on the Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment, 2004

⁹ 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

2.2 Session 2: Barriers and bottlenecks to policy integration

2.2.1 Plenary session

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.¹⁰ 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.

2.2.2 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 (focussed towards sectoral target, not problem oriented)
- economic interests dominate decisions
- lack of (political) commitment

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>)

¹⁰ 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 of 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 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

2.3 Session 3: Barriers and bottlenecks to policy integration

2.3.1 Plenary session

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 requires in many cases 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.

Practical examples

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 focussed 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 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.

2.3.2 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 'racy 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 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, 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

2.4 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

Discussion

The final plenary discussion focussed 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.

3. 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 of a quantitative than a qualitative nature; 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 that 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 on all levels and at all stages of education and have to be tackled in a targeted fashion

without taking 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 is 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, integration must create win-win situations

integration takes time, and time has to be given to the process

**Transport - Health - Environment
Institutional Arrangements for Policy Integration**

Workshop, Berlin 23 - 24 January 2006

at: European Academy of the Urban Environment - Bismarckallee 46/48 - 14193 Berlin-Grunewald

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? <p>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.</p>
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	<p>Small group discussions, addressing in particular questions such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Barriers to vertical integration ○ Barriers to horizontal integration ○ Country specific barriers (if any) ○ 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	
<p>Session 3: Learning from each other: Supportive institutional arrangements for policy integration <i>chair: Axel Friedrich, Federal Environmental Agency, Germany</i></p>	
09:00	Report back from small group discussions
09:40	<p>To what extent can policies and institutional arrangements be transferred? <i>Martin de Jong, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands</i></p>
10:00	<p>Transferring policies - lessons from European research <i>Carlo Sessa, ISIS, Italy</i></p>
10:20	Questions
10:30	<p>4 examples from practice <i>Denmark (M. Fischer), Germany (Bremen: M. Glotz-Richter), Czech Republic (Prague: J. Mach; Brno: I. Draholova)</i></p>
11:30	Questions
11:45	<p>Small group discussions, addressing in particular:</p> <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
<p>Session 4: The way forward - dissemination, information and training <i>chair: Carlos Dora, WHO</i></p>	
15:15	<p>What do decision-makers need? <i>Carlos Dora, WHO</i></p>
15:35	<p>What next?: Plenary discussion on the needs of decision makers, conclusions and recommendations</p>
16:30	Workshop closes

Small group discussion

Guiding questions

Session 1: Institutional arrangements promoting policy integration (Monday, 13:25 - 15:15)

Table 1: Experiences and driving forces

(a: CONFERENCE ROOM / b: TELEVISION LOUNGE)

Current Practice. To what extent is policy integration currently considered important? How does this differ from say 5 years ago? At what level(s) (national, regional, local) is policy integration being implemented? Which sectors/ policies does it involve? What arguments are used to promote policy integration? (*round a: 13:25 - 13:50*)

Driving forces. Are some sectors taking more of a lead in promoting policy integration (environment, transport, health, other)? To what extent are ‘policy innovators’ or ‘policy entrepreneurs’ (key individuals/organizations/ policy processes – UNCSO, THE PEP, ECMT, WHO, ECMT,) responsible for promoting policy integration? What is the role of the legal obligations (international: UNFCCC, EIA, SEA; regional: EU legislation) in advancing policy integration? (*round b: 13:55 - 14:20*)

Effects. What are the possible consequences of increasing attention to policy integration? Changes in policy instruments? Changes in policy documents or in legislation? Organizational changes? New ways of working? (*round c: 14:25 - 14:50; round d (summing up) 15 - 20 minutes*)

Table 2: Instruments and tools

(a: BREAKFAST ROOM / b: SMALL SEMINAR ROOM)

Effectiveness. What mechanisms / tools / instruments could be introduced to improve policy integration, either horizontally or vertically (e.g. organizational, evaluation/assessment techniques)? Which mechanisms / tools / instruments will probably have the greatest effect? To what extent is there agreement among participants about the potential effectiveness of different options? (*round a: 13:25 - 13:50*)

Experience. What mechanisms / tools / instruments have already been introduced? What kind of effects have they had? Changes in policy instruments? Changes in policy documents/legislation? Organizational changes? New ways of working? (*round b: 13:55 - 14:20*)

Supporting conditions. What supporting factors (e.g. resources, management structure, information) would help to increase the effectiveness of the various mechanisms / tools / instruments discussed above? (*round c: 14:25 - 14:50; round d (summing up) 15 - 20 minutes*)

Table 3: Strengthening intersectoral cooperation and public participation

(a: LIBRARY / b: FOYER 1st FLOOR)

Education / training / awareness raising. How important is education / training / awareness raising in helping to promote policy integration? How can the current situation be improved? (*round a: 13:25 - 13:50*)

Information exchange. How important is the exchange of information between sectors or between levels of government in helping to promote policy integration? How can the current situation be improved? (*round b: 13:55 - 14:20*)

Public participation. Is there an important role for public involvement and participation in promoting vertical or horizontal policy integration? If so, what role can it play and how can it be used effectively? (*round c: 14:25 - 14:50; round d (summing up) 15 - 20 minutes*)

Session 2: Barriers and bottlenecks to policy integration
(Monday, 16:30 - 18:00)

Table 1: Barriers to organizational changes
(a: CONFERENCE ROOM / b: TELEVISION LOUNGE)

Barriers to organizational change. What are the main barriers to organizational changes, such as introducing inter-sectoral groups (e.g. joint inter-ministerial committees, commissions or working groups)? Why do these barriers arise? How strong are the barriers? (*round a: 16:30 - 16:50*)

Geographical differences. To what extent are these barriers specific to one country (or a group of countries)? Or are the barriers similar for most countries? (*round b: 16:55 - 17:15*)

Overcoming barriers. How can the barriers identified above be avoided or overcome? To what extent are 'solutions' country-specific? Or are the 'solutions' similar for most countries? (*round c: 17:20 - 17:40; round d (summing up) 15 minutes*)

Table 2: Barriers to instruments and tools
(a: BREAKFAST ROOM / b: SMALL SEMINAR ROOM)

Barriers to the introduction of new instruments and tools. What are the main barriers to introducing new instruments or tools for policy integration, such as monitoring and evaluation techniques involving cross-sectoral indicators / assessment techniques? Why do these barriers arise? How strong are the barriers? (*round a: 16:30 - 16:50*)

Geographical differences. To what extent are these barriers specific to one country (or a group of countries)? Or are the barriers similar for most countries? (*round b: 16:55 - 17:15*)

Overcoming barriers. How can the barriers identified above be avoided or overcome? To what extent are 'solutions' country-specific? Or are the 'solutions' similar for most countries? (*round c: 17:20 - 17:40; round d (summing up) 15 minutes*)

Table 3: Barriers to intersectoral cooperation
(a: LIBRARY / b: FOYER 1st FLOOR)

Barriers to the introduction of intersectoral cooperation. Are there barriers to introducing inter-sectoral cooperation such as training or education programmes? If so, why do these barriers arise? How strong are the barriers? (*round a: 16:30 - 16:50*)

Geographical differences. To what extent are these barriers specific to one country (or a group of countries)? Or are the barriers similar for most countries? (*round b: 16:55 - 17:15*)

Overcoming barriers. How can the barriers identified above be avoided or overcome? To what extent are 'solutions' country-specific? Or are the 'solutions' similar for most countries? (*round c: 17:20 - 17:40; round d (summing up) 15 minutes*)

Session 3: Learning from each other: supportive arrangements
(Tuesday, 11:45 - 13:15)

Table 1: Convincing politicians

(a: CONFERENCE ROOM / b: TELEVISION LOUNGE)

The role of politicians in policy integration. To what extent is convincing politicians essential to achieving policy integration in practice? To what extent are answers specific to one country (or a group of countries)? (*round a: 11:45 - 12:05*)

Accepting the claims of policy integration. To what extent do politicians accept the arguments for policy integration? Are there counter-claims or counter-arguments against policy integration? (*round b: 12:10 - 12:30*)

Convincing justifications. In cases where politicians have stated the need for policy integration, what justifications have they used? What sort of arguments might be most effective in convincing politicians about the importance of policy integration? (*round c: 12:35 - 11:55*); (*round d (summing up) 15 minutes*)

Table 2: Transferring policies and practices

(a: BREAKFAST ROOM / b: SMALL SEMINAR ROOM)

Importance of experiences or practices from elsewhere. To what extent are the experiences or practices from elsewhere taken into account when new mechanisms / tools / instruments / policies / organizational structures are being developed? How are these experiences or practices taken into account in developing new mechanisms / tools / instruments / policies / organizational structures? (*round a: 11:45 - 12:05*)

Copying and adaptation. To what extent are experiences or practices copied or adapted from elsewhere? Are experiences or practices often copied or adapted from one particular donor country? To what extent can benchmarking promote policy integration? (*round b: 12:10 - 12:30*)

Success. To what extent have experiences or practices from elsewhere been copied or adapted successfully? Are there also examples of copying or adapting experiences or practices from elsewhere that have not worked as intended or anticipated? (*round c: 12:35 - 11:55*); (*round d (summing up) 15 minutes*)

Table 3: Experiences to date

(a: LIBRARY / b: FOYER 1st FLOOR)

Policy documents. To what extent are current policy documents really promoting policy integration and changing policy-making and to what extent are they simply fulfilling a requirement or a legal or political obligation? (*round a: 11:45 - 12:05*)

Implementation of policy. Do integrated strategies or policies always lead to integrated implementation? How can we ensure more integrated outcomes / implementation practices? (*round b: 12:10 - 12:30*)

Monitoring and assessment of policy. Is the monitoring and assessment of policy (both ex-ante and ex-post) sufficiently cross-cutting or cross-sectoral? What lessons can be drawn from recent experiences? (*round c: 12:35 - 11:55*); (*round d (summing up) 15 minutes*)

Seminar questionnaire

Participants were asked to give their views and impressions of the workshop. The questionnaire dealt with organizational matters, with the content of the workshop itself and with participants' opportunities to participate in the event and to learn from it. Four possible answers to questions range from very good (1) to unsatisfactory (4).

29 out of 39 participants who were present at the very end returned the questionnaire.

The following table gives an overview of the results:

Table 2: Results of the seminar questionnaire

Issue	average result (cp. text)
organization	
overall organization	1.3
programme	1.8
conference atmosphere	1.6
conference direction / supervision	1.4
content and expectations	
content	1.9
speakers	1.7
leadership /chairs	1.7
(mixture) of participants	1.8
knowledge and participation	
increase of knowledge	1.8
increase of skills / learning	1.9
opportunities for input / participation	1.5