I. INTRODUCTION

1. In line with the decisions taken by THE PEP Steering Committee at its first session, the first meeting of its Bureau was convened to review progress made in the implementation of THE PEP Work Programme for 2003-2005, to take stock of the resources available, to prepare the second session of THE PEP Steering Committee and to discuss the input of THE PEP to the 4th Ministerial Conference on Environment and Health (Budapest 23-25 June 2004).

2. The meeting took place in Rome, on 31 October 2003. It was chaired by Mr. Zaal Lomtadze (Georgia), Chairperson of THE PEP Steering Committee, and attended by the following Bureau Members: Mr. Francois Andre (Belgium), Mr. Xavier Delache (France), Mr. Vadim Donchenko (Russian Federation), Mr. Nigel Dotchin (United Kingdom), Mr. Bertjan Griffioen (Netherlands), Mr. David Hohman (United States of America), Mr. Risto Saari (Finland), Ms. Ursula Ulrich (Switzerland), Mr. Jaroslav Volf (Czech Republic). Mr.

1 See document ECE/AC.21/2003/6 - EUR/03/5040828/6.
Robert Thaler (Austria) participated via phone-conference. The meeting was also attended by Mr. Jorg Thiemann-Linden and Mr. Harry Rutter, consultants to the secretariat for the design and development of THE PEP Clearing House.

3. Ms. Tea Aulavuo (UNECE), Mr. Martin Magold (UNECE), Ms. Francesca Racioppi (WHO) and Ms. Nicoletta di Tanno (WHO) participated on behalf of THE PEP secretariat.

II. PROGRESS MADE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PEP WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2003-2005

(a) THE PEP Clearing House

4. The Bureau acknowledged that significant progress has been made in the design of THE PEP Clearing House and web site and congratulated the secretariat and its consultants on achievements to date.

5. Following an introductory presentation reporting on progress and proposed directions of work, discussions focused on the following aspects:

(i) Language

The Bureau acknowledged that the availability of key documents in Russian is essential for Russian-speaking policy makers both at the national and local level. It also recognized the relevance of translating relevant documents available in Russian and/or French into English. Availability of Clearing House contents in French is also desirable. However, it should be understood that this is of a somewhat lower priority compared to the need of providing information in Russian. As no software of adequate quality exists allowing for automatic translations from/into Russian, the only possibility remains that of using translation services. Different options and their respective costs will need to be identified in view of preparing specific proposals for THE PEP Steering Committee (e.g. translation of executive summaries as opposed to complete documents; translation services carried out in Russian-speaking countries; translations made available by the originators of information; establishment of priority lists of documents that should be considered for translation). In addition, as some local authorities may not speak any of the languages used by the Clearing House, the provision of contact details of national focal points could help non Russian/English speakers to be informed of the most relevant developments.
(ii) Selection of topics for a demo of the Clearing House

The Bureau endorsed the proposal of developing a demo to test the proposed design of the Clearing House and to serve as a dissemination and promotion tool. The Bureau highlighted the importance that the topic(s) selected for the demo should be relevant to all member States, and be linked to major forthcoming regional events, such as the 2004 World Health Day on Road Traffic Injury Prevention, the Fourth UNECE Road Safety Week (5-11 April 2004) and the themes addressed by the 4th Ministerial Conference on Environment and Health (the Budapest Conference), to increase the relevance and interest of the demo. It was agreed that the demo will have as overarching theme “Urban Areas”, with a more specific focus on (a) cycling and walking and (b) safety aspects, with emphasis on children’s issues and (c) congestion, thereby addressing the interests of different target users across the Region.

(iii) Development of a brochure on THE PEP Clearing House

The Bureau recommended the development of a brochure as an effective means to present and promote THE PEP Clearing House in different fora. The Brochure should be ready for the Budapest Conference, where progress in the implementation of THE PEP will be presented and discussed.

(iv) Value-added services

The Bureau recommended that a step-wise and cautious approach be followed in the provision of value-added services, as these are highly demanding in terms of resources. Executive summaries for policy makers and maps relating different aspects of transport with health, environment, social and economic dimensions were mentioned as being particularly useful. Another useful function for the Clearing House would be that of providing consultancy, and answering users’ questions on technical and policy matters.

(v) Architecture of the Clearing House

The Bureau stressed the importance of a flexible architecture to better serve diverse users (policy makers, scientists, general public, etc.). It should allow the user to move from general to more specific topics, with provision of multiple entry options to search the Clearing House (e.g. by topic, by theme). It also highlighted the importance of selecting a search engine that allows optimizing the trade-off between completeness and specificity of searches.
(vi) Survey of potential nodes with THE PEP Focal Points

The Bureau recommended that the secretariat provide member States with guidelines on what kind of material should be made available to the Clearing House, in terms of contents, scope and quality. It also recommended carrying out a survey to identify the main nodes at the national level to which the Clearing House should establish links, with a brief description of their main contents and characteristics.

(vii) Running costs of the Clearing House

While resources made available by donor countries have allowed for a swift start of the Clearing House design, the question of support to its running costs and long-term sustainability remains to be addressed. As there is only a limited possibility that, during the 2004-2005 biennium, adequate resources from the UNECE and WHO Regular Budgets could become available, alternative strategies to secure continuity of adequate funding need to be explored. To that extent, the Bureau recommended that the secretariat develop estimates for running costs under different implementation stages and options of complexity/completeness of the Clearing House (e.g. with/without the provision of value-added services), for consideration by the Steering Committee at its second session.

(b) Workshop on “Sustainable And Healthy Urban Transport And Planning” (Nicosia, Cyprus 16-18 November, 2003)

6. The Bureau recognized the importance of the topic at the pan-European level and congratulated the secretariat on progress in the preparation of the Cyprus Workshop. It focused the discussion on possible follow-up activities.

7. The Bureau highlighted the importance of disseminating the outcome of the Workshop, and in particular the case-studies that will be presented and discussed on that occasion, through the Clearing House. The possibility of organizing a follow-up workshop specifically addressing the needs of EECCA countries (Eastern-Europe, Central-Asia and Caucasus) was also considered. In that respect, the Bureau encouraged the secretariat to identify areas of collaboration and partnership with the ECMT, which is planning to organize a workshop on Sustainable Urban Transport in Moscow next autumn. The possibilities for joint work with the ECMT are also to be explored with respect to the future Guide on good practices requested by the ECMT Lisbon Ministerial Council. Further opportunities for collaboration could also include joint research activities. The Bureau recommended re-assessing the situation on the basis of the outcome of the Cyprus Workshop, as well as of the
value added that could be brought by collaborating with the ECMT (e.g. by addressing health aspects more explicitly).

8. Among options for follow-up activities, the possibility of establishing “twinning programmes” between countries/local authorities that have been experimenting with urban transport planning and those who are willing to develop initiatives in this context received some interest, together with the possible development of a guidebook with examples of how to develop national cycling plans.

9. The secretariat was requested to prepare options for possible follow-up actions to the Cyprus workshop, including their cost estimates, for the consideration of the Steering Committee at its second session.

(c) Transport Related Health Impacts and their Costs and Benefits (with a Particular Focus on Children)

10. The Bureau took note of the presentation of progress achieved so far in the implementation of the work, as made by Mr. Thaler on behalf of the countries participating in this initiative, and acknowledged the high relevance of the work and its important implications for the Region. It welcomed the invitation made by Mr. Thaler for participation of the Bureau in the development of policy recommendations resulting from the project and recommended that the Bureau and Steering Committee closely follow-up the further development of the process and provide input and comments to the policy recommendations to be discussed in Malta in early February 2004. These will be developed on the basis of an input paper that will be sent to the Bureau and to the Malta meeting participants in January 2004. The Bureau also agreed that the brochure summarizing the key findings of the series of workshops and national case studies should be translated into Russian, and stressed the importance of facilitating the active participation of EECCA countries in the Malta workshop.

11. The Bureau also provided preliminary comments on some of the draft policy recommendations resulting from the workshop which took place in Den Haag on 16-17 October 2003, highlighting the need to assess children’s exposures in different countries as their time-activity patterns are significantly different depending on where they live, the need to maintain a balance in the formulation of policy priorities to take into account also the needs of other vulnerable groups, such as the elderly, and the need to improve comparability and completeness of information regarding exposure to noise.

12. It was agreed that the countries responsible for this activity would submit a progress report to the Steering Committee for its consideration and feedback.
(d) Establishment of a Set of Indicators to Monitor the Integration of Environmental and Health Aspects into Transport Policies, and their Impacts on Health and the Environment

13. The Bureau endorsed the secretariat proposal to re-prioritize this project to 2004-2005, and to follow a phased approach in its implementation, building to the extent possible on ongoing relevant activities and on the synergies that these would allow. It recommended that an interim report on progress achieved and resources needed for a phased implementation be developed for consideration by the Steering Committee. The Bureau welcomed the development of a background paper discussing relevant work currently undertaken at the international level, critically reviewing existing sets of indicators and reporting on systems that would allow the identification of transport, environment and health links and the monitoring of progress in achieving integration among environment, health and transport policies, with a view to identifying possible synergies and gaps. The background paper would be used as a means to start a discussion with relevant international players and to develop a stronger implementation and fund-raising strategy.

14. The Bureau highlighted the need to maintain focus on indicators of integration among transport, health and environmental aspects, to give consideration to qualitative indicators of policy implementation, to the distinction between national and sub-national aspects and the implications for the definition of appropriate indicators and to issues of comparability and consistency of statistics collected by different administrations within the same country.

15. The Bureau took note of the interest expressed by Belgium to appoint in 2004 an expert to participate in the ad hoc task force to be convened by the secretariat in accordance with decisions taken at the first session of THE PEP Steering Committee\(^2\).

(e) Other Projects and Initiatives

16. The Bureau took note of the update provided by Mr. Griffioen on progress in the implementation of a project promoting energy efficient driving behaviour as a contribution to the implementation of THE PEP priority area on “Demand side management”. Mr. Griffioen reported that a “Training the trainer” programme is currently under way in Latvia, and that Ukraine and Poland have been invited to consider the relevance of this initiative for their respective countries, e.g. with a special focus on truck drivers. Mr. Griffioen informed that the results of the studies carried out in the Netherlands and Latvia will be made available to the

\(^2\) See the Summary Report of the first session of the Steering Committee for THE PEP (10 - 11 April 2003), ECE/AC.21/2003/6-EUR/03/5040828/6 (21 May 2003).
Clearing House and a report will be made to the Steering Committee. He also informed that the Netherlands could consider starting a pilot project on eco-driving.

17. The Bureau also took note of information provided by Mr. Saari that Sweden, in collaboration with other Nordic countries, will develop cost benefit analyses of cycling investments, building on the findings and methodology used in a recent Norwegian study. Results of these studies are expected to be available by end 2004.

III. OVERVIEW OF RESOURCES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORK PROGRAMME

18. The Bureau noted that, while available in-kind and financial resources made available for THE PEP implementation have allowed for a swift start of work on most of the projects approved under the Work Programme for 2003-2005, there is a need for resources (including possible in-kind contributions) to support short, medium and long term implementation of THE PEP Work Programme, and for clarifying if and to which extent these resources can be provided through allocations of funds from the WHO and UNECE Regular Budgets. The Bureau recommended that the secretariat develop estimates of resources needed for each activity for consideration by the Steering Committee, taking into account the need of fully implementing and maintaining the Clearing House, as well as the outcomes of the Cyprus workshop and progress on the other activities being implemented under THE PEP. Such estimates should be developed taking into account different options for implementation.

19. The Bureau took note and welcomed the intention expressed by France to support the development of the Clearing House by providing an in-kind contribution in the form of three-months’ consultancy, and the information provided by Finland that the Nordic Countries at their next meeting will consider opportunities of supporting the implementation of THE PEP Work Programme.

IV. PREPARATION OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE PEP STEERING COMMITTEE

20. The Bureau discussed the main items for the proposed agenda of the 2nd Meeting of THE PEP Steering Committee, which will take place on 29 - 30 March 2004 in Geneva at WHO headquarters. The agenda will be finalized in consultation with THE PEP Chairperson and circulated for comments to the Bureau. On a preliminary basis, the proposed agenda will cover the following items:
(a) Progress report on the implementation of the activities within THE PEP Work Programme for 2003-2005, including resource requirements;
(b) Update on “other activities” carried out as part of THE PEP implementation;
(c) Updates on the preparation of the Budapest Conference;
(d) Strategic discussion on pan-European effects for health and the environment of current major political processes in the region (e.g. globalization, pan-European trends in transport and related health and environmental aspects, enlargement process of the EU and development of Trans European Networks (TENs)). Such discussions, addressing also possible consequences for THE PEP and other international organizations and arrangements in these fields could be introduced by key-note presentations of developments in the area of transport, health and the environment;
(e) Update on activities related to the World Health Day 2004 on Road Safety and the Road Safety Week.

21. The Bureau decided that, in principle, it would not meet before the second session of the Steering Committee, unless the need to do so emerges in the coming months. It also concluded that there seems to be no need for informal consultations with the EECCA member States before the second session of the Steering Committee.

22. The Bureau considered the chairmanship for the period 2004-2005, and proposed Mr. Jaroslav Volf (Czech Republic), representing the health sector, as Chairman of the second session of the Steering Committee.

V. PREPARATION OF THE BUDAPEST CONFERENCE

23. The Bureau took note of progress in the preparation of the Budapest Conference and considered the latest draft of the Children’s Environment and Health Action Plan (CEHAPE), to be used as a basis for negotiations taking place at the third inter-governmental meeting in Evora (Portugal) on 27-28 November 2003. It also considered and approved without modifications the proposed paragraphs relevant to THE PEP in the draft Ministerial Declaration.

24. The Bureau decided that a progress report on THE PEP implementation be prepared as part of the background policy documents for the Budapest Conference. As timing for the finalization of the progress report would not allow for its discussion at the second session of THE PEP Steering Committee, it was agreed that the progress report will be drafted by the secretariat and circulated to the Bureau for its comments.
25. The Bureau recommended that steps be taken to ensure a high visibility of THE PEP in the Budapest Conference and requested the secretariat to assess with the conference organizers opportunities for setting up promotion and dissemination activities related to THE PEP implementation. These could include: availability of computers with the demonstration of THE PEP Clearing House; dissemination of THE PEP Clearing House brochure, and of summary reports of activities implemented under THE PEP; organization of satellite events, e.g. for the presentation of the main results of the workshops on the development of methods for the economic valuation of transport-related health effects.