

## GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>PETUS description of tool in use</b>						
<b>Name of the case</b>	Dogme 2000: A municipal network on sustainable urban development					
<b>Name of the tool</b>	Dogme 2000					
<b>Country</b>	Denmark					
<b>City / region</b>	Country					
Total area (km <sup>2</sup> )	43.560,76 km <sup>2</sup>					
Population	5.397.640 persons					
Density (people/km <sup>2</sup> )	123,91 people / km <sup>2</sup>					
<b>Tool user's profile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Organisation name (municipality, NGO, national or regional department, company, etc.)</li> <li>b. Field of activity</li> <li>c. Detailed contact/feedback (project website, e-mail, address, tel., fax)</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The municipalities of Albertslund, Copenhagen, Ballerup, Herning and Fredericia.</li> <li>b. Building &amp; Land Use</li> <li>c. <a href="http://www.dogme2000.dk/">http://www.dogme2000.dk/</a></li> </ul>						
<b>Reviewer, date:</b> Jesper Ole Jensen, d. 30.11.2004 / revised February 2005						
<b>Short description of the case</b>						
<p>The Dogme 2000-network is a concept of municipal cooperation on sustainable urban development, based on measurable goals, indicators, external annual auditing of the progress, political commitment, and on local embedding of environmental initiatives (amongst residents and enterprises). The network has at the moment five members: The municipalities of Albertslund, Copenhagen, Ballerup, Herning and Fredericia. Dogme has proved to a very fruitful way of making environmental progress, especially by involving other actors in the initiatives, and the awareness of embedding the concept and goals of Dogme locally.</p>						
<p>The case was chosen as it deals with key issues of PETUS: defining measurable environmental goals and using them for regular assessments. The case illustrates how this concept influences decision-making processes on different scales of the municipality. Dogme 2000 covers in principle all sectors in the municipality (energy, waste, water/sewage, green/blue, transport, buildings and planning), and is related to key problems in different sectors. Dogme can be seen as an umbrella for the environmental policies in the sectors.</p>						
<b>Sector</b>	Waste	Energy	Water	Transport	Green/blue	Building & Land Use
						X
<b>Scale of project</b>	Component	Building	Neighbourhood	City	Region	
				<b>X</b>		
<b>Status of project</b>	Starting up	Ongoing	Finished	Start date	End date (exp.)	
		<b>x</b>		1.1.2000		
<b>Key words</b>						
<i>each reader (author, expert, non-expert) may add his/her own suggestions</i>						
<b>Project</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Object (building, city park, wind farm, etc.)</li> <li>b. Type of activity (regeneration, renovation, new development, etc.)</li> <li>c. Type of product (plan, scheme, design project, etc.)</li> </ul>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. City</li> <li>b. Environmental management</li> <li>c. Goals, monitoring, network, learning</li> </ul>					
<b>Tool</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Character (according to WP3final0704.doc)</li> <li>b. Benchmarks (qualitative or quantitative)</li> <li>c. Availability (paid/ free)</li> </ul>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Network</li> <li>b. Quantitative</li> <li>c. Participation in Dogme requires payment</li> </ul>					
<b>Decision-making process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Stage of the tool implementation (preliminary, midterm, etc.)</li> <li>b. Level (political, technical, etc.)</li> <li>c. Public participation</li> </ul>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. all phases</li> <li>b. Political and technical</li> <li>c. Yes</li> </ul>					
<b>Other (optional, if needed)</b>						

## DETAILED INFORMATION

<b>A. Detailed description of project and tool</b>													
<p><b>1. Description of context</b> (existing strategies, laws, policy, action plans, etc.): EU, national, regional, municipal</p>	<p>Dogme 2000 has not been directly influenced or initiated by national or international regulation. Dogme 2000 is based on former local (municipal) policies and initiatives on sustainability, which have often been based on individual projects; the aim of Dogme is to make sustainability an ongoing policy. The participating municipalities have very different contexts (political, cultural, environmental, economic), which requires an openness in the Dogme concept.</p>												
<p><b>2. Description of project</b></p> <p>a. Background (What caused the initiation of the project?; What was the problem? Who initiated the project?);</p> <p>b. Objectives/aims (sustainability statement – what issues of sustainability were attacked);</p> <p>c. Time interval and stages of project realization;</p> <p>d. Financing – amount, sources, institutions involved, partnerships, levels.</p> <p>e. Other sectors involved in the particular project/problem (conflicts and/or links)</p>	<p>a. Dogme 2000 is a Danish network on sustainable urban development, established in 2000, having at the moment five members: The municipalities of Albertslund, Copenhagen, Ballerup, Herning and Fredericia. Dogme 2000 emerged from the municipality of Albertslund, who has in the last decades gained a reputation as a leading green municipality in Denmark, through a number of organizational innovations and environmental initiatives. The municipality conceptualised and initiated the Dogme-2000. The other members were included through existing political networks and contacts. In choosing potential members, municipalities with a green profile had a highest priority, but also it was aimed to broaden the network, in terms of the municipalities location (geography), size and political colour.</p> <p>b. The objectives of Dogme is formulated in 3 Dogmas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All human impacts on the environment must be measured</li> <li>2. A plan for environmental improvements has to be prepared</li> <li>3. The Dogme 2000 must be embedded locally</li> </ol> <p>This only concerns the environmental aspects of sustainability. As an urban sustainable policy, Dogme in principle covers all sectors.</p> <p>c. Dogme was initiated in 2000, and is ongoing</p> <p>d. The participating municipalities are financing Dogme themselves (payment depends on size the municipality)</p> <p>e. In principle, all sectors are involved (energy, waste, water/sewage, green/blue, building and planning)</p>												
<p><b>3. Description of tool</b></p>	<p>The network is based on political commitment to the common goals defined, on setting up measurable goals, and on annual audits on the municipality's success. This is formulated in 3 Dogmes:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All human impacts on the environment must be measured</li> <li>2. A plan for environmental improvements has to be prepared</li> <li>3. The Dogme 2000 must be embedded locally</li> </ol> </div> <p>If the annual audit reveals that the municipality is not improving its environmental standard, exclusion from the network is possible. For each Dogme there are 3 sub-goals defined, and different ways to measure them (see table 1).</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Dogmas</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Sub-goals</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Indicators</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">1. All human impacts on the environment have to be measured</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">1a Green accounts for buildings 1b Sector-measures 1c Total contribution to pollution</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green accounts for municipal and private buildings</li> <li>• Waste, district heating, electricity, gas, oil, traffic, groundwater and pesticides</li> <li>• emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub></li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">2. A plan for environmental improvements has to be prepared</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">2a Agenda 21-plan 2b Environmental goals 2c Specific public goals</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal Agenda 21-plan</li> <li>• Goals for resource-consumption and environmental impacts</li> <li>• Organic food, sustainable construction, sustainable planning, green purchase policy</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">3. Dogme 2000 must be anchored locally</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">3a Residential areas 3b Industries 3c Municipal departments</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• formation of local Agenda 21's</li> <li>• formalised way of SUD (e.g. networks)</li> <li>• environmental certification (e.g. EMAS)</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Dogmas	Sub-goals	Indicators	1. All human impacts on the environment have to be measured	1a Green accounts for buildings 1b Sector-measures 1c Total contribution to pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green accounts for municipal and private buildings</li> <li>• Waste, district heating, electricity, gas, oil, traffic, groundwater and pesticides</li> <li>• emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub></li> </ul>	2. A plan for environmental improvements has to be prepared	2a Agenda 21-plan 2b Environmental goals 2c Specific public goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal Agenda 21-plan</li> <li>• Goals for resource-consumption and environmental impacts</li> <li>• Organic food, sustainable construction, sustainable planning, green purchase policy</li> </ul>	3. Dogme 2000 must be anchored locally	3a Residential areas 3b Industries 3c Municipal departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• formation of local Agenda 21's</li> <li>• formalised way of SUD (e.g. networks)</li> <li>• environmental certification (e.g. EMAS)</li> </ul>
Dogmas	Sub-goals	Indicators											
1. All human impacts on the environment have to be measured	1a Green accounts for buildings 1b Sector-measures 1c Total contribution to pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green accounts for municipal and private buildings</li> <li>• Waste, district heating, electricity, gas, oil, traffic, groundwater and pesticides</li> <li>• emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub></li> </ul>											
2. A plan for environmental improvements has to be prepared	2a Agenda 21-plan 2b Environmental goals 2c Specific public goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal Agenda 21-plan</li> <li>• Goals for resource-consumption and environmental impacts</li> <li>• Organic food, sustainable construction, sustainable planning, green purchase policy</li> </ul>											
3. Dogme 2000 must be anchored locally	3a Residential areas 3b Industries 3c Municipal departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• formation of local Agenda 21's</li> <li>• formalised way of SUD (e.g. networks)</li> <li>• environmental certification (e.g. EMAS)</li> </ul>											
<p><b>Table 1.</b> The three Dogmes, the sub-goals, and suggested indicators to</p>													

measure the goals (see also Annex 1). Dogme is a dynamic concept, meaning that measures of goals and sub-goals can be changed along the way, so can the sub-goals themselves, if agreed by the partners.

The main characteristic of Dogme 2000 is the political commitment, where the city council signs the Dogme document. The participants commit themselves to have these Dogme's audited each year by a certified accountant. If they do not show progress compared to last years audit, the municipality can be excluded from the network. The main idea is that the three Dogme's include the entire municipality's activities and environmental impacts; therefore it is the municipality's entire progress according to the Dogme 2000s that has to be evaluated. This concept has several advantages: The political commitment motivates for a serious effort to improve on the three Dogme's. It also legitimises the environmental departments' demands to other departments. This gives the Dogme 2000 a potentially strong role internally, integrating sustainable issues in the municipality's different policies. This is also strongly supported by the annual audit, where the auditors<sup>1</sup> interviews 20-60 persons in the municipal administration (including the involved politicians) about their contribution to Dogme and the initiatives included in Dogme. From this, the municipality can compare this audit with last years audit, and with other municipalities' audits.

	Human impacts on the environment must be measured	A plan for environmental improvements (Agenda-21 plan) has to be prepared	SUD must be anchored locally	
Fully implemented	1a			
Widespread implementation	1b			
Progressing	1c	2a		3c
Foundation established		2b	2c	3a 3b
Start phase				

**Figure 1.** Example on a summary of an external Dogme-audit in a municipality. The annual audit includes an assessment that in a simple way summarises the municipality's progress on the 3 Dogme's and the subgoals, categorising the policy on a step from "start phase" to "fully implemented".

In some of the participating municipalities, Dogme is used as a coordinating and collecting tool for the various sustainable policies in the municipality. Amongst the participating municipalities, Dogme functions as a forum for exchanging experiences, knowledge, innovations etc. between the participants. Also, it has the potential of making common environmental actions within the Dogme network more visible and known to other stakeholders in the municipality, and thereby enforcing Dogme as an environmental policy. Dogme 2000 is gradually becoming nationally and internationally recognised, and has been internationally awarded twice (Latest in 2003 from "Les Eco Maires", in the category "European Cities")



- a. Character (according to WP3final0704.doc) - calculation tools, process tools, assessment methods, generic tools, simulation tools, guidelines, framework tools, schemes, indicators and monitoring, checklists, case-specific tools;
- b. Availability of the tool (web-based / paper, paid / free, etc.)

a. Indicators and monitoring in a committing network

- b. available for free, but participation in the network is paid. The charge for participating in Dogme 2000 depends on the size of the municipality:
  - 25.000 Dkr. for municipalities with less than 15.000 inhabitants
  - 50.000 Dkr. for municipalities with 15.000 to 100.000 inhabitants
  - 100.000 Dkr. for municipalities with more than 100.000 inhabitants.

In reality, expenses for participating in the network can be larger.

<sup>1</sup> Norske Veritas A/S

<p>c. Based on existing tool or newly elaborated;  d. Adaptation of the tool to the local context (are there local experts involved in tool's development?)  e. Other tools implemented to support the project development</p>	<p>Copenhagen has a budget for 5 mill. DKr. for participating in the network. That covers 400.000 Dkr. for establishing a coordinating Dogme-secretariat, 500.000 DKr. for the annual audit of the environmental effort, 2 mill. DKr to ensure that Dogme-goals that 75% of the food served in the municipal institutions is organic, and 2 mill DKr for environmental certification of the institutions in the municipality.</p> <p>c. Dogme 2000 is newly elaborated  d. Dogme sets up goals to be reached in the municipalities (for instance that 75% on the food served in the municipality's institutions has to be organic), but it is up to the local actors how to implement initiatives to reach the goal.  e. Dogme can be used in combination with many other tools. For instance, environmental certification methods are required in Dogme, which can include EMAS-certification of the municipality and its institutions.</p>
<b>B. Tool implementation</b>	
<p><b>1. Argumentation for choosing the tool</b></p> <p>a. What were the reasons for the implementation of the tool? (voluntary or requested by what local, national, etc regulation)  b. Who took the initiative for choosing /elaboration the tool?  c. What were the criteria for choosing the tool?  d. Was there knowledge of other tools and were they considered?</p>	<p>Amongst the Dogme participants there were different motivations for joining the network, as well as the network has different functions in the municipality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For Albertslund, Dogme is the "foreign-policy" of the municipality's environmental policy. They already have policies on the different Dogme's, but see the Dogme-network as a way of strengthening environmental policies in general, and a way to collaborate with other municipalities (interview with officer, Albertslund)</li> <li>- For Copenhagen and Ballerup, Dogme functions as an umbrella for the different environmental initiatives and policies in the municipality. For Copenhagen, the political commitment was also a way of making the environmental policy more efficient (officer, Copenhagen)</li> <li>- For Herning and Fredericia, Dogme is an environmental initiative, parallel to others in the municipality. For Herning it was also a chance to participate in a network with larger municipalities, in contrast to the other networks, where they were always the largest municipality (interview with officer, Herning). Also for the other municipalities, Albertslund and Copenhagen were seen as attractive partners in a network on sustainable development.</li> </ul> <p>For all the municipalities, Dogme is seen as a way to maintain and emphasise an image as a green municipality.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>a. Voluntary (the municipalities had different reasons to participate)  b. The initiative came from Albertslund and Copenhagen municipalities  c. no explicit criteria  d. Yes. The municipalities are members of other networks on sustainability, and know other potential networks. The main difference between Dogme and other networks is the political commitment in Dogme. Other networks on sustainable urban development (for instance ICLEI) are based on intentions, but with no actual commitment, no consequences if the intentions are not followed, and no ways to actually measure or document progress. As an officer explains: <i>"The difference is that Dogme 2000 commits – in the other networks you meet once a year, have a good time, and go home. It is nice that you can exchange experiences with other municipalities, but.....?"</i> In contrast to other networks, Dogme 2000 is a politically based network; it was conceived politically, established by means of political networks, and of personal contacts between the mayors of the municipalities.</p>
<p><b>2. Barriers for the tool implementation</b>  What were the main problems in the tool implementation? (Regulation, information available,</p>	<p>A main problem is that the number of members in Dogme is small; therefore, recruiting new members is a major challenge (interview with Mayor, Copenhagen). The political commitment, which gives</p>

<p>public awareness, lack of clear SD definitions and benchmarks, communication etc.)</p>	<p>much power to the initiatives in Dogme, also might keep some municipalities away from joining the network. As an officer points out: <i>"It takes political courage to be able to say open in public, "we can do better", and to admit that things are not going well on all points"</i>.</p> <p>Another barrier is the Danish "structure-reform". It will reduce the number of municipalities, and transfer tasks from the counties to the municipalities. Due to this reform, which will take place from 2007, the municipalities are reluctant to commit themselves to new initiatives, such as Dogme 2000.</p>
---	---

**C. Influence of the tool on the decision-making process**

<p><b>1. Description of the decision-making process/ procedures</b></p>	<p>Officers involved in Dogme all underline the commitment and embedding as an extremely important element of Dogme. In Dogme, the commitment is formalised as the city council signs the Dogme document, and the annual external audit will point out if the commitment is followed by action. The annual external audit shows how the municipality has performed on the nine points in Dogme 2000 (see figure 1), and on which points there are strengths and weaknesses. According to the officers in the municipalities, it would be very problematic if the audit showed a lack of progress, as the municipality regard themselves as green, and the mayor reads the audit and feels a personal responsibility for the network.</p> <p>The degree of commitment and engagement from the municipality is to a large extent due to the internal embedding of the environmental policy in the municipality. Traditionally, the municipality' sustainability initiatives are based in one department (for instance, the Department of Environment and Supply, or an Agenda 21-department). The department has to ask the other departments to support these initiatives, which requires extra services from them, and inevitably, extra work. Often, other departments are less willing to do so, as the initiative is seen as "owned" by the Department of Environment and Supply. In Dogme, the responsibility is instead put on the political level, which to a large extent solves this conflict; as long as the Dogme is a politically defined goal, it is legal to spent time and resources to achieve it. This is particularly important in a large municipality as Copenhagen, with 8 different departments, and was also a main reason for Copenhagen to join the network.</p> <p>Interviews with officers involved in Dogme also demonstrated other mechanisms in Dogme that makes the concept to be embedded internally in the municipalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementing Dogme 3c, <b>environmental certification of the institutions in the municipality</b>. Starting up with an environmental auditing makes Dogme very concrete for the parties involved. The environmental mapping and screening makes the different departments and institutions aware about their own consumption, and put them in a position to formulate their own goals (for instanced to reduce their water consumption). The feeling of ownership is one of the most important elements of Dogme; if the departments and institutions feel that they are just fulfilling goals that the municipality has formulated, their motivation is limited, but if they feel that they are pursuing goals they have formulated themselves, they are much more committed. This also goes for the certifications in general. As an example, one department in Copenhagen have been EMAS-certified, and completely defining it as their own achievement, without mentioning the Department of Environment (who have introduced Dogme), which demonstrates their feeling of ownership.</li> <li>- The <b>external audit</b>, where many different persons in the municipal administrations are interviewed about how they contribute to Dogme 2000 and the different sub-goals</li> </ul>
---	---

<p>a. Stages b. Levels (political, technical, etc.)  c. Sources of information used during the dmp;  d. Who are the decision-makers? e. Who made the final decision for the project implementation? Was it political or technical decision?</p> <p><b>2. Tool in decision-making process</b></p>	<p>makes Dogme known. The persons interviewed include mayors, directors, managers, and general staff in different departments and administrations in the municipality. In the smaller municipalities this includes 20-30 persons, and in Copenhagen more than 50 persons, each interview taking ½-1 hour. Having participated in the interview gives the persons a good knowledge about Dogme, and an awareness about the goals and commitments in Dogme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In each municipality there are officers from different departments, having <b>regular meetings</b> on the different initiatives on Dogme, the strategies etc., which strengthens the SUD-collaboration internally in the municipality.</li> <li>- The <b>annual Dogme-conference</b> makes Dogme visible, particularly in the municipality arranging the conference.</li> </ul> <p>These embedding mechanisms are especially important in a time where many Danish municipalities have reduced their environmental staff and efforts, due to as well economic reductions as modifications of environmental policy under the present government. The officers in the municipalities are aware that the environmental initiatives under Dogme are absolutely voluntary, and the lack of legal obligations (national as international) makes it vulnerable to future cut-downs.</p> <p>Another big challenge for the municipalities is the <b>embedding outside the municipality</b>, which is formulated in the Dogme 3a (embedding in neighbourhoods) and 3b (embedding in enterprises). The embedding in the neighbourhoods has been the most difficult element, where the municipalities have had problems in making progress. Even in Albertslund, where many neighbourhoods have made local Agenda 21-plans, and green accounts on neighbourhood-level have been published for many years, the audit pointed at a limited local embedding. According to the municipality, this is a real problem – but it is also a problem how to measure “embedding” (interview with officer, Albertslund). Dogme measures the embedding in local neighbourhoods by the number of local Agenda 21-plans. The embedding of the sustainable initiatives in private enterprises is measured by the participation in formalised collaborations, for instance networks<sup>2</sup>. However, more officers admit that counting the number of local Agenda 21-plans might give a wrong picture of the embedding; for instance if the plan was made 3 years ago, and haven't been revised since, and more importantly, if it is not used locally. So the challenge is to find a good “measure stick”, without using too many resources on collecting data for it. As a new goal for embedding in neighbourhoods, the Green Diploma<sup>3</sup> is considered. This is because the idea of the diploma is simple, and based on mappings, goals and annual audits, similar to the Dogme-concept (interview with Mayor, Copenhagen). Instead of making the number of local Agenda-21 plans a measure stick for the local embedding, the number of buildings with a Green Diploma might be used.</p> <p>.....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Dogme is used in all stages of decisions on sustainable initiatives</li> <li>b. The commitment of the political level is very important in Dogme, but it is practically implemented on the technical level</li> <li>c. There are many sources of information to implement and embed Dogme, including information on goals, external audits, interviews, “story-telling”</li> <li>d. the main decision-makers are the local politicians</li> <li>e. participation in Dogme is decided by local politicians</li> </ul>
--	--

<sup>2</sup> In Copenhagen, participating in Dogme has led to the formation of a network (“The Environmental Network of Copenhagen”) between the municipality and the local private enterprises

<sup>3</sup> The Green Diploma has been reviewed in the PETUS-project, both as a tool (WP2), and in a case study (WP3)

<p>a. At what stage was the tool implemented? By whom? (experts, politicians, etc.)</p> <p>b. How did the tool output influence the process (added or skipped levels/stages in the existing decision-making process, etc.)?</p> <p>c. Quantitative goals or benchmarks defined? (If YES, which – and what were they compared to?)</p> <p>d. Was the tool used to support argumentations?</p>	<p>a. Dogme is implemented in all stages of decision-making; the initial stages, monitoring the progress, and evaluating the initiatives. This includes politicians as well as technical staff in the municipality.</p> <p>b. There are several outputs from Dogme. One output is the goals formulated in Dogme, that the municipality has to pursue. For instance, the goal on publishing green accounts has motivated some municipalities to publish green accounts. Also, the goal of environmental certification (of the municipality and the municipality's institutions) motivates for initiatives to start a certification of departments and institutions in the municipality. Another output is the annual evaluation, based on external audits (see figure 2). This motivates the politicians to pursue the goals formulated, as the audit very explicitly shows the areas where there is a lack of progress.</p> <p>c. Yes. The whole concept of Dogme is based on defining quantitative environmental goals and benchmarks.</p> <p>d. Yes. The commitment on Dogme has motivated the municipalities to pursue the formulated goals, and a number of environmental initiatives.</p>
<p><b>3. Transparency of decision-making process</b></p> <p>a. How was the information of the dmp disseminated? - directly (decision makers – public) or indirectly (decision makers - NGO, PR company, etc. - public); sources of dissemination used (mass media, internet, brochure, etc.)</p> <p>b. How was the public involved?</p> <p>c. Was there a public discussion over the project and at what stage of the project development?</p>	<p>a. Information and dissemination of the goals in Dogme is a main challenge. A number of different methods are used, for instance: Directly information to the departments and the institutions in the municipality about Dogme and the goals (for instance EMAS-certification, or goals on organic food), interviewing the departments about their contribution to Dogme, establishing green networks with the local enterprises, and different initiatives to involve local residents and actors in neighbourhoods. The use of “story-telling” is seen as a way to achieve this. Therefore, a consultant has been hired to outline a communication strategy for the network, to maximise the communication of the good stories and message in Dogme. It is crucial for Dogme to become well known in the municipal administration, as a way to embed the concept as a general policy on the municipality. The politicians' needs success-stories to justify that the municipality is spending money and resources at Dogme, and local stakeholders need to be aware of Dogme as a policy in the municipality.</p> <p>b. The public will be involved according to the strategies mentioned above. Different initiatives are being made to involve the public on a local scale. In Albertslund, the municipality have publishing green accounts for each neighbourhood, encourage them to make local Agenda-21 plans, make EMAS-certification of some of the neighbourhood and establishing a local Agenda 21-center as a way to encourage the residents in the neighbourhoods to take environmental action. In Copenhagen, a number of Agenda 21-centers have been established in different neighbourhoods, as a way to start local initiatives. In the other municipalities, similar initiatives have been made.</p> <p>c. There has been limited public involvement in the municipalities on the decision on whether to join Dogme or not, and on the goals formulated in Dogme. However, public participation and local embedding of environmental initiatives is a central goal in Dogme.</p>
<b>D. Expert assessment/analysis/comment of the tool effectiveness</b>	
<p><b>1. Assessment by tool users</b></p> <p>a. Were there measurable improvements as a result of the tool implementation? If YES, what? If no: why not?</p> <p>b. Were there any spun-off's or unintended consequences?</p>	<p>a. Yes. The annual audits reveal the improvements being made in the municipality.</p> <p>b. There are several examples on spin-off's in the Dogme-network. For instance, in one department in the municipality of Copenhagen,</p>

<p>c. General view on the tool? Lessons learned?</p> <p>d. Potentials for further use of the tool?</p> <p>e. Will the actors recommend it or use it in other cases - why / why not?</p>	<p>going through the EMAS-certification, they discovered that screening and mapping of flows (energy, water, waste etc.), as the initial step of the EMAS-procedure, was a much more efficient way to get an overview of their department, that existing management tools they were using (interview with Mayor, Copenhagen). The actual flows – and the economy related to them – are little known or visible in the departments and institutions. Another example is the goals of 75% organic food in the municipality’s institutions. This demands that the staff maps the ingredients (vegetables, meat, oil, flour etc.) used for the meals, which again might give an opportunity to improve the quality of the food. For instance, the mapping has showed a general tendency of using too little fat in the children’s food (a consequence of adults converting their own food habits to children’s meals).</p> <p>On a more general level, the thread of social decline in the neighbourhoods of Albertslund was a strong motivation for the municipality to enter the environmental initiatives. This strategy has been successful, and the environmental initiatives and the network-management have had an “empowerment-effect” in the neighbourhoods (Andersen &amp; Godt-Hansen, 1997).</p> <p>c. All actors involved in Dogme seem very satisfied with the way Dogme is working. A main reason and a main difference to other types of networks is that Dogme (As mentioned before) is based on a commitment, which is supported by the use of indicators and external audits. The necessity of local commitment is another main lesson from Dogme: People who have do fulfil environmental goals also have to define the goals themselves; it is not enough that the municipality defines the goals, and asks local actors to fulfil them. If local actors define their own local goals (although they might not be very ambitious), it will make them feel an “ownership” to them, and might later motivate them to take up actions on other fields.</p> <p>d. There is a large potential for using the tool. At the moment there are other municipalities participating as “observers” (3-4 municipalities), with the intention of joining the network at later stages. However, the potential should over time be larger. The barriers are, as mentioned before, that it requires ambitions and openness in the political system. For international transferability this is also the case. Mayors in other European cities have been rather scared by the openness in the external audit of Dogme, which might reveal a lack of progress. Also, there are organisational and legal differences, for instance related to EMAS-certification of cities: In many cities in other European countries (especially in the UK), the local authorities typically do not own schools, institutions, infrastructure services etc., which instead have been outsourced or privatised. This makes the certification quite different (and easier) compared to municipalities who are directly responsible for such services.</p> <p>e. Yes – all actors interviewed have good experiences of Dogme.</p>
<p><b>2. Reviewer’s assessment</b> of the tool (usefulness, sustainability relevance, who are the actors excluded? etc.) Suggestions and needs for further development of the tool</p>	<p>Dogme 2000 is a very useful and innovative tool. The concept of setting up concrete measures, committing politicians, involving other institutions and local actors gives it a lot of advantages, which have already been demonstrated.</p> <p>There is a risk if other municipalities see it as an “environmental elitist club”, giving the impression that it requires extraordinary initiatives or finances to participate. Therefore it is important to inform other municipalities about the concept, the success-stories and the spin-offs related to Dogme.</p>
<p><b>E. Additional information on the case study available</b></p>	
<p>Websites</p>	
<p>References concerning the case but also the key</p>	<p>Homepage on Dogme (only in Danish)</p>

<i>words or problem</i> (papers, articles, reports, laws, etc.)	<a href="http://www.dogme2000.dk/">http://www.dogme2000.dk/</a> Jensen & Tollin (2004):
Other sources (Interviews, conferences, discussions, etc.)	Interviews: Mrs. Elise Stilling (officer, municipality of Herning) d. 3.3.04 Mrs. Trine Baarstrøm (officer, municipality of Ballerup) d. 4.3.04 Mrs. Karin Langendorf (officer, municipality of Ballerup) d. 9.3.04 Mrs. Anne Stougaard (officer, municipality of Albertslund) d. 4.3.04 Mrs. Susanne Kremmer (officer, municipality of Albertslund) d. 12.3.04 Mr. Lasse Kenborg (officer, municipality of Copenhagen) d. 8.3.04 Mrs. Anette Bæk (officer, municipality of Fredericia) d. 12.3.04 Mrs. Winnie Berndtson (Mayor of Environment, Copenhagen) d. 30.4.04
Contact details for further information	Mr. Lasse Kenborg, municipality of Copenhagen

## **Annex 1. The three Dogmes**

**Dogme 1:** the municipality's, the neighbourhoods and the industries environmental impacts must be measured and annually reported in the green accounts. This includes three sub-goals:

- A. Green accounts are made every year. The borders of the municipality are regarded as borders of a local community, which in total is committed to the goals. Green accounts as a minimum includes the municipality's own buildings, all residential areas and industries.
- B. Green accounts states the developments in reuse of waste and as a minimum includes use of district heating, electricity, gas, oil, traffic, groundwater and pesticides.
- C. Based on the consumption rates, the Green accounts must inform the areas total contribution to pollution (for instance NOx) and climate change (for instance CO2))

**Dogme 2:** Goals for resource-consumption and environmental impacts have to be made, and included in a local Agenda 21 plan. The municipality must be leading in the environmental efforts. This includes three sub-goals:

- A. Agenda 21 includes the total local community, as well as the green accounts
- B. Agenda 21 must include goals for resource-consumption and environmental impacts, based on the principle of environmental space
- C. In acknowledging that the public sector must take the leading role in the transformation to sustainable development, the following demands should be respected:
  - At least 75 % of the public food consumption has to be organic
  - herbicides must not be used
  - the municipality should respect environmental sustainable guidelines with the construction sector
  - all planning has sustainability as the overall goal
  - an environmentally sustainable purchase policy must be formulated

**Dogme 3:** The environmental work has to be embedded in residential areas, in industries, and in the municipality. This includes three sub-goals:

- A. The residential areas must be involved in the formation of local Agenda 21's.
- B. The industry must be involved in a formalised way in developing a better environment. For instance, agricultural land must be aimed at organic farming.
- C. The municipality's own departments and institutions must over time become environmentally certificated, and the environmental work included in the business-plans, staff policy etc.