

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE  
WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION**

Regional Office for Europe

**Investigation of supportive institutional conditions for the integration of transport,  
environment and health issues in policy-making**

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

Background paper prepared by Dr Dominic Stead<sup>1</sup> for the workshop on institutional conditions for policy integration, Berlin, 23-24 January 2006

- What is policy integration?

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 organisation or sector. Integrated policy-making refers to both horizontal sectoral integration (between 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. Policy integration offers a number of benefits (Box 1).

**Box 1: Benefits associated with policy integration**

- Reducing duplication
- Promoting synergies between policies
- Reducing inconsistencies between sectoral policies
- Conveying the ‘big picture’ for strategic issues
- Maximising the effectiveness of policy and/or service delivery
- Exploiting economies of scale
- Improving customer/client focus and thus the quality and user friendliness of services
- Providing a framework for resolving potential conflicts and making trade-offs
- Improving service delivery

Based partly on: UK Cabinet Office (2000)

---

<sup>1</sup> OTB Research Institute for Housing, Urban and Mobility Studies, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands, tel +31 15 2782540, fax +31 15 2783450, email [d.stead@tudelft.nl](mailto:d.stead@tudelft.nl)

The way governments function, and particularly the historical tradition of ‘compartmentalisation’, has long been identified as a key factor inhibiting policy integration. The lack of policy integration has a number of causes including the divergence of political interests at different levels, shortcomings in policy formulation, assignment of leadership and in the structure and process of policy coordination, the increasing number of actors, the amount of information involved in the process and the costs associated with the integrated decision making process itself. Perfect policy integration is not possible but it can nevertheless be improved. Institutional conditions are one means of promoting policy integration and it is this aspect that is the focus of the paper.

In 1987, the Brundtland Report noted the tendency for institutions to be ‘*independent, fragmented, and working to relatively narrow mandates with closed decision processes*’ (WCED, 1987). In 2002, the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation of the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development urged governments to ‘*promote 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). The ECMT’s key messages for governments concerning sustainable urban travel policies refer to policy integration as an important aspect of sustainable transport policy-making (ECMT, 2002). The ECMT document specifically calls for the co-ordination of urban land-use, travel, health and environment policies. In short, there have been numerous calls for more policy integration over a period of some time but progress towards integration has been slow. Some of this is a consequence of the structure and ways of working of public administrations. Perhaps most important reasons for slow progress, however, are the facts that policy integration is difficult to achieve and is not a priority in most administrations.

Whilst the term ‘integrated policy-making’ is less common in policy and academic literature, a number of similar concepts can be found, including *coherent policy making* (OECD, 1996), *cross-cutting policy-making* (Cabinet Office, 2000), *policy co-ordination* (Challis et al, 1988), *concerted decision-making* (Warren et al, 1974) and *holistic government*, also known as *joined-up policy* (Wilkinson and Appelbee, 1999) or *joined-up government* (Ling, 2002). Other related concepts in the organisational literature that have potential relevance include *inter-organisational co-ordination* (Rogers and Whetten, 1982), *inter-organisational collaboration* (Huxham, 1996), *inter-governmental management* (Agranoff, 1986) and *network management* (Kickert et al, 1997). Although all these concepts have similarities, they are not exactly the same. There is not always agreement about how these concepts differ from each other. Some for example regard co-ordination as more or less the same as integrated policy-making (e.g. Mulford and Rogers, 1982), whilst others see differences (e.g. OECD, 1996).

#### - Institutional conditions for promoting policy integration

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), which draws from its member countries’

experience in the field of policy coherence (both horizontal and vertical aspects), is one of the most detailed publications on policy integration to date. The publication identifies various tools for 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. It identifies eight basic ‘tools of policy coherence’ (Box 2).

**Box 2: 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 organisational 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 organised 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-sectoral co-operation and a systematic dialogue between different policy communities contributes to the strengthening of policy coherence

Source: OECD (1996)

In 2002, Ling (2002) analysed activities taking place under the banner of joined-up government in Britain and identified four ways of achieving more integrated policy in practice:

1. new types of organisation (e.g. culture and values, information and training)
2. new accountabilities and incentives (e.g. shared outcome targets and performance measures)
3. new ways of delivering services (e.g. joint consultation and involvement)
4. new ways of working across organisations (e.g. shared leadership, pooled budgets, merged structures and joint teams)

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, 2005). 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 countries of eastern Europe, Caucasus and central Asia (EECCA). The focus of the report is on administrative culture and practices at the national level (the report does not cover the interrelations between the different levels of government). 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/organisational aspects are crucial, policy integration cannot be achieved by administrative/organisational changes alone (the other necessary preconditions for policy integration are not identified). The 2005 EEA report also highlights the various differences between national and regional administrative cultures and management styles. These differences need to be considered carefully when assessing current practice and the transferability of lessons. The report argues that public management styles in Europe can be broadly grouped as southern European, German-speaking, Anglo-Saxon and Nordic. The nature of these groups is summarised below. The extent of vertical policy integration can differ substantially across each of these groups due to the different levels of autonomy given to the sub-national, and local levels of government.

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 institutionalisation of administrative law has resulted in a clear separation of political decision-making from administrative implementation and an emphasis on formal rules and organisational 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 UK), 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-fertilisation, and increasing possibilities for furthering policy coordination.

The *Nordic countries* (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden) plus 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 characterised 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 specialisation 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 commonly-held 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 former Soviet Union, have resulted in the emergence of 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 by the Soviet system are still largely in place. Without administrative changes, some 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 (Lieverink 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 organisational 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.

- Survey of supportive institutional conditions for the integration of transport, environment and health issues in policy-making

The Second High-level Meeting on Transport, Environment and Health (held in July 2002) considered that integrating environment and health concerns in the decision making on transport, both at the national and local levels remains one of the main challenges for achieving sustainable and healthy transport, and should constitute a priority area where further action should be pursued jointly by the UNECE and WHO/Europe under the framework of THE PEP. Urban transport and specific needs of the transition countries of the Region were defined as other priorities for action under the Programme.

In line with the priorities adopted at the High-level Meeting, a research project was commissioned to identify and to provide guidance on supportive conditions for the integration of transport, environment and health issues into policy-making with special emphasis on UNECE and WHO/Europe member countries in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) as well as in South-Eastern Europe. The research project will lead to the publication of a final report mainly targeted at central and local government officials with responsibility for transport, environment and/or health issues. The final report of the project will provide an overview of the state of the art of current institutional practise at the UNECE and WHO/Europe region and identify supportive conditions, bottlenecks and common lessons. It will also analyse the opportunities and difficulties in learning from the lessons learned by the others and issue recommendations. The project report will be published in English and in Russian and presented to the Ministers and representatives of the transport, health and environment sectors at the High-level Meeting scheduled for 2007. Capacity-building activities such as training courses and workshops for professionals may be organized as a possible follow-up to the project.

As part of this research project, an online survey was developed to gather information about current practice concerning institutional arrangements and mechanisms for policy integration (Annex 1). The survey was structured around six main themes, derived partly from the OECD's tools for policy coherence and the analysis of joined-up government in the UK by Ling (see above):

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

By the end of December 2005, 17 questionnaire responses had been received from the following countries:<sup>2</sup>

Belgium (from national government)  
 Bulgaria (from an NGO)  
 Czech Republic (from local government)  
 Finland (from national government and a government agency)  
 Germany (from national government, state government and two consultants)  
 Ireland (from national government)  
 Italy (from local government)  
 Lithuania (from national government)  
 The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (from national government)  
 Malta (from national government)  
 Turkey (from national government)  
 United Kingdom (from national government)

Because most respondents were from national government, the focus of the responses was mainly the national level of policy-making. Below is a summary of the main points emerging from these responses presented according to the six main themes of the survey.

- 1. Promoting joint accountability/responsibility and policy coordination

In this part of the survey, respondents were asked about mechanisms to promote horizontal cooperation (intersectoral) or vertical cooperation (between levels of government) and arrangements for the horizontal coordination of policy-making and implementation. In terms of *mechanisms to promote horizontal and vertical cooperation*, a number of respondents referred to interdepartmental committees, commissions, working groups and steering groups, which often 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-

---

<sup>2</sup> Additional responses have since been received from Albania, Hungary, the Netherlands and Russia but these were not received in time for the preparation of this paper. These responses will be analysed over the next few weeks of the project.

departmental steering committee for environment and health. In terms of *arrangements for the horizontal coordination of policy-making and implementation*, respondents to the survey mentioned the importance of the central steering role of the Prime Minister's office (e.g. Finland) and the role of intersectoral programmes that involve cooperation between departments, both in terms of development and implementation (e.g. Lithuania's intersectoral programme for its National Health Action Plan). Some of the examples of mechanisms to promote joint accountability/responsibility and policy coordination illustrate the integration of transport and environmental issues, others relate to environment and health. Few examples, however, relate explicitly to transport, environment *and* health. An exception here is Lithuania's intersectoral coordination group that was established for the implementation of the WHO Charter on Transport, Environment and Health (and now serves for the implementation of THE PEP). Some responses tend to suggest that the link between transport and health in policy is often neglected, with the exception of issues such as air quality.

**Questions to for workshop delegates to consider:**

Are there other existing examples of mechanisms to promote horizontal cooperation (intersectoral)?

Have any of the examples identified above been tried elsewhere?

If so, what were the main driving forces and what kind of effects have they had?

Did they pay lip service to policy integration or consider it seriously? Did they lead to new policies or the re-packaging of old policies?

How attractive or feasible are the various examples identified above for the delegate's own country? What are the most and least attractive examples and why? What are the key factors affecting whether they could be transferred to the delegate's own country?

Is the connection between transport and health often neglected whilst the connections between transport and environment and between environment and health relatively well covered?

- 2. Building intersectoral capacity and strengthening intersectoral relations

In the second part of the survey, respondents were asked about training arrangements and human resources policies that promote intersectoral awareness, management structures that promote vertical or horizontal working relationships and mechanisms to promote intersectoral dialogue and information exchange. There is little evidence from the survey responses to suggest that *human resource policies* such as job rotation are being used to promote vertical or horizontal working relationships. In fact, most evidence points to the fact that there is specialisation and sectoralisation of professions within government (which fits with the description of public management styles across Europe – see above) and that this has contributed to the fragmentation of tasks and policy. On one hand this specialisation and sectoralisation can provide stability of personnel within administrations but can also sometimes stifle strategic thinking, creativity or innovation in policy development. In addition, it may also create resistance to changes, that may be perceived as undermining roles, power

and identity. Workshops and other similar training activities are mentioned as more typical ways of building intersectoral capacity. Training is often provided by one ministry or sector for the benefit of another, which means that communication can sometimes be more of a one-way process rather than an interactive two-way process. In terms of *management structures* that promote vertical or horizontal working relationships, examples include units within ministries responsible for the monitoring and assessment of cross-cutting issues such as environmental issues or sustainable development. Examples can be found in the 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. Local Agenda 21 is also identified by a number of respondents as one of the main channels of promoting regular dialogue and exchange of information between sectors. Aside from Local Agenda 21 initiatives, few examples of intersectoral newsletters or briefings were identified via the survey. Perhaps surprisingly, nothing emerged from the survey about the potential role of academic or professional training for developing better cross-sectoral understanding about different disciplines.

**Questions to for workshop delegates to consider:**

Are there other existing examples of mechanisms to build intersectoral capacity and strengthen intersectoral relations?

Have any of the examples identified above been tried elsewhere?

If so, what were the main driving forces and what kind of effects have they had?

Did they pay lip service to policy integration or consider it seriously? Did they lead to new policies or the re-packaging of old policies?

How attractive or feasible are the various examples identified above for the delegate's own country? What are the most and least attractive examples and why? What are the key factors affecting whether they could be transferred to the delegate's own country?

To what extent can 'cross-cutting units' within ministries promote policy integration?

Are there any training programs (e.g. post-graduate education/professional training) that encourage the development of practitioners with a more cross-sectoral view?

- 3. Promoting integrated policy development

Respondents were asked in the survey about the existence of an integrated national strategy on transport, health and environment, the existence of objectives for transport, health and environment, available mechanisms to anticipate, detect and/or resolve conflicts between policies, mechanisms to involve stakeholders (professionals as well as the general public) in the policy-making

process and mechanisms for exchanging good practice and/or benchmarking on the issues of transport, health and environment. Various *integrated national strategies* concerning transport, health and environment were reported, although few deal exclusively with these three sectors. Some examples cover the three sectors as part of the national sustainable development plan or strategy (e.g. Finland, Germany, Lithuania) whilst other examples focus mainly on transport and environment, as in the case of Finland's energy and climate change strategy and Ireland's climate change strategy. There are also examples of integrated strategies that focus more environment and health but less on transport, as in the case of Belgium's national health and environment action programme, Finland's environmental health programme and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia's environmental health action programme. The state of North Rhine Westphalia in Germany has an Action Programme on Environment and Health which focuses on transport as one of the main areas of activity. A number of the above documents contain specific *quantitative objectives for transport, health and environment* (e.g. Germany's sustainable development strategy and Lithuania's sustainable development strategy). Other specific targets can be found in national policy documents such as Finland's environmental guidelines for the transport sector up to 2010 (prepared by the Ministry of Transport and Communications), the traffic safety plan, transport-related greenhouse gas reduction targets for urban areas in Finland and Malta's draft national transport strategy.

Reported *mechanisms to anticipate, detect and/or resolve conflicts between policies* in different sectors or at different levels of decision-making are mainly limited to strategic environmental assessment for policies and programmes (e.g. Finland, Germany, Lithuania, Malta, UK) and health impact assessments in a more limited number of cases (e.g. Lithuania and Malta). Joint interministerial conferences are also identified as possible 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.

Reported *mechanisms to involve other sectors in the policy-making process* mainly include committees, commissions, working groups and steering groups, which often bring members of different ministries together (see 'Promoting joint accountability/responsibility and policy coordination' above for examples). There are also various examples of policy consultation processes, both internal (involving other government departments) and external (often involving the general public), which also involve other sectors and/or the general public in the policy-making process.

Only a limited number of examples of *mechanisms for benchmarking or exchanging good practice* in the area of transport, health and environment were identified by the survey, which is a clear mandate for the role of the Clearing House of the UNECE and WHO-Europe's Transport Health and Environment Pan European Programme. Activities under the Local Agenda 21 initiative provide a mechanism for benchmarking or exchanging good practice within some countries (e.g. Germany), although these are often limited to the national level. A number of city networks were mentioned that 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) were mentioned as 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.

**Questions to for workshop delegates to consider:**

Are there other existing examples of mechanisms to promote integrated policy development?

Have any of the examples identified above been tried elsewhere?

If so, what were the main driving forces and what kind of effects have they had?

How attractive or feasible are the various examples identified above for the delegate's own country? What are the most and least attractive examples and why? What are the key factors affecting whether they could be transferred to the delegate's own country?

To what extent can benchmarking promote policy integration?

What are the likely explanations for the discrepancy between the existence of some mechanisms for integration and the lack of financial means/mechanisms that allow for such integration to take place?

- 4. Promoting integrated policy delivery (implementation)

The fourth part of the survey, focusing on policy implementation, asked respondents about financial allocation systems that promote the integration of policies and about interdepartmental or inter-agency teams responsible for policy implementation. Unfortunately, the survey responses do not help to identify any detailed examples of *financial allocation systems that promote the integration of policies*. Neither do the responses help to identify good examples of *interdepartmental or inter-agency teams responsible for policy implementation*. One possible conclusion that can be drawn from this is that few examples exist, that the financial allocation of resources is almost always sectoral and that the implementation of policy is almost always done sectorally rather than intersectorally. Although a few projects under the Local Agenda 21 initiative sometimes involve intersectoral teams responsible for policy implementation, examples of larger-scale intersectoral policy implementation remain elusive.

**Questions to for workshop delegates to consider:**

Are there any examples of financial allocation systems that promote the integration of policies or interdepartmental or inter-agency teams responsible for policy implementation?

If so, what kind of effects have they had? Did they lead to very different policies or very different results?

What are the key factors affecting whether interdepartmental or inter-agency teams responsible for policy implementation could be feasible in the delegate's own country?

- 5. Promoting integrated policy assessment

Respondents were asked about mechanisms for the cross-sectoral monitoring and assessment of policies and programmes (ex-ante or ex-post) and about auditing or monitoring systems that promote the integration of transport, health and environmental policies. Responses concerning *mechanisms for the cross-sectoral monitoring and assessment of policies and programmes* focus mainly ex-ante techniques, such as strategic environmental assessment and health impact assessment (see 'Promoting integrated policy development' above for examples). In Germany, an environmental risk assessment also forms part of the strategic environmental assessment process, which has been used in the development of the 2003 National Transport Infrastructure Plan. 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 mentioned as means of assessing progress towards certain transport, health and environmental indicators, although sustainable development assessments are rarely policy-specific, so it is not usually possible to evaluate the effect of specific policies from sustainable development assessments. There are fewer examples of ex-post cross-sectoral monitoring and assessment mechanisms. 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 which are subject to ex-post assessment in a number of countries (e.g. Belgium, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Lithuania, UK). In addition, the Finnish Road Administration is in the process of developing ex-post assessment procedures for its own plans, programmes or projects. The proposed assessment process consists of three stages: (i) a preliminary evaluation carried out immediately after completion of the plan, programme or project (mainly a technical and economic evaluation); (ii) an evaluation carried out 2-3 years after the completion of the project, plan or programme covering issues such as transport volumes, traffic safety, economic and social effects; and (iii) an evaluation carried out 5 years after the completion of the project, plan or programme analysing broader social impacts, including environmental and health impacts.

**Questions to for workshop delegates to consider:**

Are there other existing examples of mechanisms to promote integrated policy assessment?

Have any of the examples identified above been tried elsewhere?

If so, what were the main driving forces and what kind of effects have they had?

How attractive or feasible are the various examples identified above for the delegate's own country? What are the most and least attractive examples and why? What are the key factors affecting whether they could be transferred to the delegate's own country?

To what extent are sustainable development strategies or plans really promoting policy integration and changing policy-making and to what extent are they simply fulfilling a requirement or a legal or political obligation?

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

The sixth part of the survey asked respondents to identify specific policy documents that demonstrate integration of transport, health and environmental policies. The responses identified a number of different examples. Sustainable development strategies or plans were identified by a number of respondents (e.g. Finland, Germany, Lithuania, UK). Also mentioned here were documents more specific to one or two sectors, such as health strategies or programmes (e.g. Lithuania's National Health Programme, the UK's Health White Paper), Bulgaria's National Action Plan for Health and Environment and Finland's environmental guidelines for the transport sector.

**Questions to for workshop delegates to consider:**

Are there other policy documents that demonstrate the integration of the transport, health and environmental policies?

If so, what were the main driving forces and what kind of effects have they had?

Did they pay lip service to policy integration or consider it seriously? Did they lead to new policies or the re-packaging of old policies?

To what extent have policy innovators or policy entrepreneurs (e.g. key politicians, civil servants, NGOs, pressure groups) played a role in introducing new policy documents?

To what extent are the 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?

- 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 (2005). *Environmental policy integration in Europe. Administrative culture and practices* EEA Technical report No 5/2005. 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.

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.

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 1: 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 organisation, 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).

Other 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 organisation and between responsible agencies (e.g. intersectoral newsletters/briefings).

Other 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).

Other 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).

Other 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).

Other 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

Forename

Surname

Organisation

Type of organisation:

National government

NGO

Regional government

Government agency

Local government

Other, namely

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 organised by the German Government in January 2006. Please indicate whether you would be interested in receiving details about this workshop.

Yes

No