



**Economic and Social
Council**

Dist.
GENERAL

ECE/AC.21/SC/2009/2
EUR/09/5088363/2
30 April 2009

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

**WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION
REGIONAL OFFICE FOR EUROPE**

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING ON TRANSPORT,
HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT

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

Seventh session
Geneva, 22–23 October 2009
Item 5(b) of the provisional agenda

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE'S WORKPLAN

Workshop on sustainable and healthy transport

Report by the secretariat

Summary

A sub-regional workshop on sustainable and healthy urban transport was held in the framework of the Pan-European Programme on Transport, Health and Environment (THE PEP) on 29-30 October 2008 in Chisinau, Republic of Moldova. The objectives of the Chisinau workshop were: to build capacity, raise awareness and share good practice among the three sectors and to generate policy recommendations to Ministers for the 3rd High-Level Meeting on Transport, Health and Environment (22-23 January 2009, Amsterdam) with a particular focus on the needs of countries in Eastern Europe, Central Asia and Caucasus (EECCA) and South East Europe (SEE). The programme covered a range of issues affecting urban sustainability, including urban air pollution from transport, mobility management and integrated policy approaches. The workshop was organized in cooperation with the Ministries of Health, Environment and Transport, Republic of Moldova, the Moldovan National Scientific and Applied Centre for Preventative Medicine (NSACPM) and the Ministries of Transport and Environment of Switzerland. <http://www.thepep.org/en/workplan/urban/sut.htm>

INTRODUCTION

1. At its sixth session (Geneva, 28–29 April 2008), the Steering Committee on the Transport, Environment and Health Pan-European Programme (THE PEP) discussed ongoing activities in the field of urban transport. The representative of the Republic of Moldova offered to host a workshop on the topic of sustainable and healthy urban transport as a follow-up to earlier workshops under THE PEP.¹ The Steering Committee welcomed the proposal, as indicated in its work programme (ECE/AC.21/SC/2008/6 - EUR/08/5068055/6, para. 16).
2. A workshop was held on 29 and 30 October 2008 in Chisinau. It was organized in the framework of the THE PEP in cooperation with the Ministries of Health, Environment and Transport of the Republic of Moldova and the Moldovan National Scientific and Applied Centre for Preventive Medicine, with funds from the Governments of Austria, Switzerland and the United Kingdom through THE PEP trust fund. THE PEP secretariat developed the programme in cooperation with the hosts, and supported the practical arrangements for the workshop.
3. The workshop's objective was to build capacity, raise awareness and share good practice among the three sectors. It also generated policy recommendations for ministers for the Third High-level Meeting on Transport, Health and Environment (Amsterdam, 22–23 January 2009) with a particular focus on the needs of countries in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) and South-Eastern Europe (SEE).
4. This report has been prepared by the secretariat in consultation with the delegation of Moldova and the Chairman of THE PEP Steering Committee. It summarizes the key issues discussed at the workshop as well as the main conclusions and recommendations made that arose from these discussions. Based on the workshop outcomes and on recommendations made by the Bureau, this document also presents proposals for further activities to be undertaken by THE PEP in the field of sustainable urban transport, in particular as follow-up to the Third High-level Meeting.
5. The Steering Committee is invited to consider the workshop's findings and recommendations. It is also invited to decide on further activities for promoting sustainable urban travel it may wish to undertake and support (financially and/or in kind) in EECCA and SEE.

I. PARTICIPATION, PROGRAMME AND MAIN OUTCOMES OF THE WORKSHOP

6. The workshop brought together 42 representatives of the transport, environment and health sectors and land-use planners from the national and municipal governments of the

¹ Previous workshops were held in Cyprus (2003), Moscow (2004), Tbilisi (2006) and Telč, Czech Republic (2007). Information on the programmes and presentations made during previous workshops can be accessed on THE PEP website (<http://www.thepep.org/en/workplan/urban/sut.htm>).

Republic of Moldova and of 11 other UNECE² and WHO/Europe³ Member States. Several non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other stakeholders were also represented. The workshop was chaired by Mr. Vadim Donchenko (Director-General, State Scientific and Research Institute of Road Transport, Russian Federation, and Chairman of THE PEP Steering Committee, and was co-chaired by Mr. Oleg Benes, Director, National Centre of Scientific and Applied Preventative Medicine, Republic of Moldova. Participants were welcomed by Dr. Mircea Buga, Deputy Minister of Health, Ms Violeta Ivanov, Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources, and Dr. Pavel Ursu, Head of the WHO Country Office.

7. The meeting: (a) discussed critical issues in sustainable and healthy urban transport in EECCA and SEE; (b) reviewed available tools and methods to promote and evaluate sustainable and healthy urban transport; (c) focused on health and environmental effects of abatement strategies for urban air pollution; and (d) discussed examples of strategies for urban transport planning and mobility management from different countries. It reached consensus on actions that could be recommended to ministers in view of the Third High-level Meeting.

8. The participants welcomed the unique opportunity to meet representatives from other sectors, countries and international organizations and to exchange expertise and experience. The workshop provided a valuable impetus to networking and collaboration between the various stakeholders and provided useful inputs to preparations for the Third High-level Meeting.

9. For the list of speakers and links to their presentations, please consult THE PEP website (<http://www.thepep.org/en/workplan/urban/sut.htm>). The topics covered by the workshop are as follows:

- (a) Session I. Challenges in sustainable and healthy urban transport in EECCA and SEE: What are the critical issues?
 - (i) Sustainable urban transport in the Republic of Moldova;
 - (ii) Sustainable transport in Tbilisi: current challenges and the way forward;
 - (iii) Road traffic and its health impacts on modern society;
 - (iv) Sustainable urban transport: challenges and good practice in the Russian Federation.

- (b) Session II. Tools and methods to promote and evaluate sustainable and healthy urban transport:
 - (i) THE PEP products: the Clearing House on transport, health and environment, and integration of THE PEP Toolbox;

² United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

³ World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe.

- (ii) Guidance on economic valuation of transport-related health effects;
 - (iii) Evaluating good practice in sustainable urban transport: THE PEP Assessment Report.
- (c) Session III. Urban air pollution from transport: health and environmental effects and abatement strategies:
- (i) Health effects from urban air pollution;
 - (ii) Particulate matter abatement in cities;
 - (iii) Air quality monitoring in the Republic of Moldova and action taken to improve legislation.
- (d) Session IV. Strategies for urban transport planning and mobility management:
- (i) Improving public transport efficiency: infrastructure and operations;
 - (ii) Sustainable urban transport planning in Yerevan;
 - (iii) Sustainable development of public transport in Chisinau.
- (e) Session V. Improving policy integration in transport, health and environment:
- (i) Getting transport actors involved: a programme to promote mobility management in Austria;
 - (ii) Guidance on supportive institutional conditions for coordinated policy and decision-making.
- (f) Session VI. Recommendations to ministers at the Third High-level Meeting on Transport, Health and Environment:
- (i) Making THE Link: aims, scope, planning and programme for the Third High-level Meeting;
 - (ii) Inputs to the final draft outcome document and recommendations to policymakers.

II. CONCLUSIONS BY THE CHAIRMEN

10. The Chairmen underlined several points in concluding the respective sessions. The workshop agreed a list of challenges and proposed solutions (see the annex to this document). Some particular points highlighted were:

- (a) The importance of having comprehensive and reliable data to facilitate the monitoring of the transport, health and environment situation;

(b) The importance of pursuing systematic approaches to policy integration, and improved cooperation between the main actors in the three sectors;

(c) The importance of exchanging practical information and technical experience at the municipal level (e.g. the Swiss examples of local air pollution control measures and public transport policy);

(d) The usefulness of targeted interventions (e.g. the construction of noise barriers and cycling paths) to create opportunities for the public to make safe and healthy transport choices and for authorities to learn how to better manage existing infrastructure.

11. The workshop also contributed to the finalization of the Third High-level Meeting's outcome document, the Amsterdam Declaration: "Making THE Link – Transport choices for our environment, health and prosperity" and its four priority goals of sustainable economic development, mobility management, reduced emissions, and healthy and safe transport⁴.

12. Further capacity-building activities are envisaged following the Third High-level Meeting: (a) to re-launch THE PEP; (b) to disseminate best practice in integrated policy approaches across the UNECE and WHO/Europe region through targeted mechanisms, including THE PEP Partnership; and (c) THE PEP *staffeta* (relay), designed to advocate sustainable and healthy urban environments and make available the lessons learned under THE PEP.

⁴ http://www.thepep.org/en/hlm/hl3_info.htm

Annex

**SPECIFIC CHALLENGES AND PROPOSED SOLUTIONS IDENTIFIED
BY THE WORKSHOP**

Challenges identified	Possible solutions
<p>A multitude of policy frameworks across three sectors reflects wishful thinking, but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated policymaking does not happen automatically • There is often a mismatch between intentions and reality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved legislation can drive change and create the institutional basis for intersectoral work. Governments may wish to adopt new legislation (i.e. update laws or regulations), particularly in EECCA and SEE, which is conducive to sustainable urban transport. • Governments may wish to consider the development of a new international instrument (e.g. a framework convention on the principles of transport policies) to promote intersectoral work and to share common principles. • However, there may not be consensus in countries to find common ground to develop this; less binding mechanisms could be more appropriate and realistic. • Other important drivers can also be: existing legal commitments (e.g. air-quality directives, and emission reduction targets under the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which can provide a systematic framework for action. • At the same time, political commitment is a prerequisite for developing and adjusting legislation and for its enforcement.
<p>Intersectoral work can result in lack of ownership, duplication and competition, leaving some areas uncovered, e.g. responsibility for monitoring.</p>	<p>Governments may wish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To establish intersectoral mechanisms for collaboration and agree on a clear allocation of responsibilities between the three sectors, as best fits national needs; • To develop and implement action plans, although these do not replace the need for legislative action; • To stress, in particular, the need for the transport sector to be more involved in finding solutions and to take account of the effects of their policies;

Challenges identified	Possible solutions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To employ a bottom-up approach (e.g. with pilot projects/field laboratories) to build bridges between the sectors and help pave the way to new legislation.
<p>Policymakers are apt to act on visible problems such as congestion and road safety. However, there are less visible problems, for example air pollution and lack of physical activity, which are equally important (e.g. in the Republic of Moldova, the estimated number of deaths attributable to transport-related emissions is of the same order as for road traffic injuries).</p>	<p>Governments may wish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide information on the effects of transport on environment and health, based on reliable monitoring data; • To promote both better technology and demand management; • To improve communication with the media; • To make use of economic tools to quantify the health effects of transport, as this can provide the basis for the internalization of external costs and the calculation of taxes whose revenues could be invested in better public transport and non-motorized transport (e.g. pedestrians and cyclists); • To support the involvement of local authorities in the use of economic instruments; • To assign budgets to support non-motorized transport.
<p>Financing of public and sustainable transport is perceived by politicians as very expensive, and there is a lack of awareness and knowledge on the part of policymakers of what can be done and what is available.</p>	<p>Governments may wish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To implement financing mechanisms that earmark taxes for special funds to support sustainable public transport; • To use case studies that demonstrate the long term return of investment in public transport (e.g. in Zurich, the “14-lane highway” and public-private partnerships for the leasing of public transport); • To provide more evidence of the cost-effectiveness of different options, to ensure that money is spent effectively and efficiently; • To demonstrate the possible role of private companies in public transport in EECCA and the Commonwealth of Independent States, as well as the need for cleaner fuels and vehicles.

Challenges identified	Possible solutions
<p>Several effective measures (e.g. restriction of parking places) can encounter strong political opposition.</p>	<p>Governments may wish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To encourage top-down approaches (e.g. Klima Aktiv); • To lead by example (e.g. for top officials and politicians to regularly use public transport); • To provide attractive alternatives to the public and to policymakers (e.g. on public transport, walking and cycling) as a preparation for possible opposition; • To identify the benefits of proposed measures and specify who will benefit from them; • To use locally-driven approaches and empower local communities regarding items of direct relevance to them (e.g. parking places); • To encourage long-term investment in clean and efficient public transport; • To clarify that some fiscal instrument can help increase the budgets of local authorities; • To use remaining windows of opportunity for stronger financing of public transport (e.g. the Republic of Moldova can demonstrate that it values its historically strong public transportation system by improving its attractiveness and convenience); • To pursue incremental approaches to achieve consensus (e.g. in Zurich, changes started small and expanded gradually); • To use effective communication strategies to modify cultural attitudes and perceptions (e.g. regarding public transport, walking and cycling).
<p>“If there is no information, there is no way to measure problems and no way to see if we are making progress” (from a presentation by Georgia).</p>	<p>Governments may wish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To invest in reliable information and monitoring systems (e.g. on air pollution, traffic modes/mobility noise, road traffic injuries) and in the assessment of impacts on health; • To invest in good information about available alternatives (this can win support from stakeholders); • To use information to document problems and raise the awareness of policymakers (including on the impact of no action).

Challenges identified	Possible solutions
<p>There are innovative approaches from a policy, technical and action point of view that are being tested across Europe, but there is a lack of effective mechanisms for their broader dissemination and adaptation.</p>	<p>Governments may wish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To invest in bilateral and multilateral collaboration and technical assistance for sustainable urban transport; • To make better use of existing opportunities (e.g. the United Nations Environment Programme project on sustainable urban transport in EECCA and SEE); • To make use of THE PEP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To support dissemination of good practices and technical assistance to countries; • To assist in the development and implementation of pilot projects and in disseminating information on policy instruments and case studies that illustrate how these work; • To build capacity for the sectors involved, for national and local authorities, and for NGOs.
<p>It is very difficult to maintain good public transport with the present financial restrictions (e.g. on local authorities).</p>	<p>Governments may wish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be aware that the perceived advantages and reputation of public transport can be lost in a very short period of time if no attractive alternatives to individual transport are provided; • To create a positive image for public transport to have a chance of competing with private transport; • To support public transport by making available good infrastructure and rolling stock, as well as making it accessible and fashionable; • To make use of capacity planning to help create a positive image and make public transport attractive (e.g. through bus lanes, green lights for public transport, attractive stations, good parking facilities); • To take note of the Swiss example (the reputation of public transport in Switzerland, based on 50 years of development, has been instrumental) as well as other examples of the co-existence of modes of transport where public transport is part of the culture.
