

GENERAL INFORMATION

PETUS description of tool in use						
Name of the case		Procedure for Environmental Assessment of local regulation in Copenhagen.				
Name of the tool		Procedure for Environmental Assessment of local regulation in Copenhagen.				
Country		Copenhagen, Denmark				
City / region		Copenhagen				
Total area (km ²)		89 km ²				
Population		502.000				
Density (people/km ²)		5640 people/km ²				
Tool user's profile		<p>a. Organisation name (municipality, NGO, national or regional department, company, etc.)</p> <p>b. Field of activity</p> <p>c. Detailed contact/feedback (project website, e-mail, address, tel., fax)</p>				
		<p>a. Municipality of Copenhagen</p> <p>b. Environmental Protection Agency of Copenhagen</p> <p>c. Address: Miljøkontrollen, Kalvebod Brygge 45, Postboks 259, DK-1502 København V. Tlf. 33 66 58 00.</p> <p>Mail: miljoe@mff.kk.dk. Website: http://www.miljoe.kk.dk/?frames=no</p> <p>English presentation of the Copenhagen EPA (leaflet): http://www.miljoe.kk.dk/840D7BF9-97D5-485E-810E-C6AD80AF4B8C</p>				
Reviewer, date: Jesper Ole Jensen, 18.11.04						
Short description of the case						
<i>abstract up to 300 words</i>						
<p>Since 2001 the municipality of Copenhagen has worked to implement a decision on assessing all proposals (laws, policies, plans etc.) from the departments in the municipality, so that the environmental implications are taken into considerations when the proposals are assessed by the relevant committees and the politicians in the city council. A first version of the procedure was developed and tested for a year, from 2001. In 2002 it was evaluated by external consultants, focusing on the different departments' experiences with the procedure. From this evaluation, the procedure has been revised, and is now in the process of political approval and implementation. When the new version of the procedure has been used for about a year, it will be evaluated, this time focusing on the politicians' views on the output of the procedure.</p>						
<p>Why was the case chosen? To which PETUS key-problem is this case study related?</p> <p>The aim of the procedure is to make decision-makers (politicians) more aware of environmental implications of political decisions, which makes it a relevant study for PETUS. It includes 13 environmental themes (Water/sewage, energy, waste, soil, noise, air pollution, transport, Agenda 21, embedment of environmental policy, operation of Municipal institutions, enterprises, buildings, and infrastructure provision), and therefore relates to key-problems from all sectors</p>						
Sector	Waste	Energy	Water	Transport	Green/blue	Building & Land Use
	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	X
Scale of project	Component	Building	Neighbourhood	City	Region	
				X		
Status of project	Starting up	Ongoing	Finished	Start date	End date (exp.)	
		X		2001		
Key words						
<i>each reader (author, expert, non-expert) may add his/her own suggestions</i>						
Project		<p>a. Object (building, city park, wind farm, etc.)</p> <p>b. Type of activity (regeneration, renovation, new development, etc.)</p> <p>c. Type of product (plan, scheme, design project, etc.)</p>				
		<p>a. Procedure for implementing Environmental Assessment</p> <p>b. All kinds of activities</p> <p>c. Scheme</p>				
Tool		<p>a. Character (according to WP3final0704.doc)</p> <p>b. Benchmarks (qualitative or quantitative)</p> <p>c. Availability (paid/ free)</p>				
		<p>a. Impact assessment</p> <p>b. Yes (qualitative and quantitative)</p> <p>c. Free</p>				

Decision-making process a. Stage of the tool implementation (preliminary, midterm, etc.) b. Level (political, technical, etc.) c. Public participation	a. preliminary b. political c. no
Other (optional, if needed)	

DETAILED INFORMATION

A. Detailed description of project and tool	
1. Description of context (existing strategies, laws, policy, action plans, etc.): EU, national, regional, municipal	The case describes the implementation of a procedure for Environmental Assessment of local regulation in the municipality of Copenhagen, and the hitherto experiences from using the procedure. The aim of the procedure is to make decision-makers (politicians) more aware of environmental implications of political decisions, which makes it a relevant study for PETUS.
2. Description of project a. Background (What caused the initiation of the project?; What was the problem? Who initiated the project?); b. Objectives/aims (sustainability statement – what issues of sustainability were attacked); c. Time interval and stages of project realisation; d. Financing – amount, sources, institutions involved, partnerships, levels. e. Other sectors involved in the particular	<p>The city council in Copenhagen (Borgerrepræsentationen) has some years ago decided that all proposals from the departments to the politicians in the city council should be assessed for its environmental impacts. The types of proposals or recommendations typically include plans or strategies, projects, new or changed operation conditions, new collaboration agreements, and financial grants.</p> <p>The Copenhagen EPA has had the responsibility of implementing this procedure. A first version of the procedure was developed by the Forum for Environmental Assessment in the municipality, which includes representatives from each of the Departments in Copenhagen municipality (Economy, Education and Youth, Health, Family- and Labor, Culture and Leisure, Building and Technique, Environment and Supply).</p> <p>This procedure was used from 2001 to 2002. In 2002 it was evaluated by external consultants, focusing on the different departments' experiences with the procedure. From this evaluation, the procedure has been revised, and is now in the process of politically approval and implementation. In 2006 it will be evaluated again, this time focusing on the politicians' views on the procedure.</p> <p>b. The general purpose of the assessment procedure is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to ensure that an environmental impact assessment is made for all relevant proposals to the City Council 2. that the politicians will be aware about the environmental impacts of the proposals, and how it relates to the environmental goals that they have defined earlier 3. that this will make politicians raise questions to the departments that forwards the projects and proposals, so that the environmental performance will become better <p>The checklist to support the assessment operates with 13 environmental themes: Water/sewage, energy, waste, soil, noise, air pollution, transport, Agenda 21, embedment of environmental policy, operation of Municipal institutions, enterprises, buildings, and infrastructure provision. For each theme, the environmental goals defined in previously accepted plans and policies are summarised, with references to the documents where the goals are defined.</p> <p>c. The process started in 2001, and is expected to become permanently integrated in the municipal administration d. There is no extra financing involved. e. The main actors involved are:</p>

<p>project/problem (conflicts and/or links)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Copenhagen EPA - The Departments in the Municipality - Politicians in the City Council (Borgerrepræsentationen) <p>As a preparation for the process, all environmental goals in the Municipality (app. 160 goals) were collected, and outlined for each sector. These goals are included in the assessment that the departments prepare for the politicians. They should remind the politicians about the goals they have decided, and make them aware how their decisions will influence these goals.</p>
<p>3. Description of tool</p> <p>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;</p> <p>b. Availability of the tool (web-based / paper, paid / free, etc.)</p> <p>c. Based on existing tool or newly elaborated;</p> <p>d. Adaptation of the tool to the local context (are there local experts involved in tool's development?)</p> <p>e. Other tools implemented to support the project development</p>	<p>A set of guidelines has been developed by the Municipality's Forum for Environmental Assessment, to enable the department who puts forward the proposal or recommendation to make an assessment of the environmental impacts. The assessment includes three steps: 1. On the basis of a "positive list" (defining the type of proposals for which an assessed should be made) it is evaluated if the proposal should be environmentally assessed, 2. (if yes), it is assessed if there are any important environmental impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposal, 3. The actual environmental assessment is carried out, including an assessment of whether the proposal will have a positive, negative or neutral influence on the goals for the sector.</p> <p>a. Process guide (Checklists and guidelines)</p> <p>b. Free (paper-based)</p> <p>c. Newly elaborated.</p> <p>d. There has been no external experts involved in the elaboration of the procedure, except from the evaluation of the procedure</p> <p>e. no</p>
B. Tool implementation	
<p>1. Argumentation for choosing the tool</p> <p>a. What were the reasons for the implementation of the tool? (voluntary or requested by what local, national, etc regulation)</p> <p>b. Who took the initiative for choosing /elaboration the tool?</p> <p>c. What were the criteria for choosing the tool?</p> <p>d. Was there knowledge of other tools and were they considered?</p>	<p>a. The process is voluntary, decided by the Copenhagen City Council. Due to this political decision, it is obligatory for the departments to participate in the process. The process is somehow parallel to an SEA-procedure (but includes more features than an SEA).</p> <p>b the municipality of Copenhagen</p> <p>c. see a.</p> <p>d. No. Experiences on SEA were collected from other municipalities at the beginning of the process (including the municipality of Hillerød and Local Government Denmark (LGDK) .However, the general impression was that these municipalities were not so long in their process, that their experiences could be useful.</p>
<p>2. Barriers for the tool implementation</p> <p>What were the main problems in the tool implementation? (Regulation, information available, public awareness, lack of clear SD definitions and benchmarks, communication etc.)</p>	<p>The main problems identified (from the first evaluation) were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The aim and the target group for the assessments were unclear • Unclear ambition level of the assessment in the

	<p>guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ambiguous concept of environment in the guidelines and tools • Lack of attention on environmental assessment • Long process <p>This revealed a need to simplify the assessments, and make them more oriented for the politicians, as the primary target group.</p> <p>A main and general barrier is the departments' motivation towards sustainability, which is a precondition to use the assessment procedure actively. However, there seems to be a positive development in this.</p>
C. Influence of the tool on the decision-making process	
<p>1. Description of the decision-making process/ procedures</p> <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>a. The tool is implemented in the initial stages (assessment of law proposals and plans). b. The assessment is made by technicians, to support political decisions. c. information letters, brochures, meetings d. politicians in the City council e. it was a political decision, made by the politicians in the City council</p>
<p>2. Tool in decision-making process</p> <p>a. At what stage was the tool implemented? By whom? (experts, politicians, etc.) 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?) d. Was the tool used to support argumentations?</p>	<p>a. The procedure is implemented in the initial stages (assessment of law proposals and plans). The assessment is made by technicians, to support political decisions.</p> <p>b. It is too early to say, how much the EA-procedure will influence the decision-making processes. In the 4.th quarter of 2002, 228 assessments were carried out, corresponding to 62% of the 366 proposals put forward (Copenhagen Municipality's Green Accounts 2002).</p> <p>Example One example of a positive influence is the renovation of Brønshøj Torv (square). This served as test-case for the new environmental policy for the Department of Roads and Parks, and included use of the MEMPD (see tools review), the municipality's guidelines for environmental friendly renovation as well as the EA-procedure was used as an inspiration for the environmental efforts made, which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reusing the existing granite-stones from the "old" square on the new square • Recycling concrete at the site (crushing it and using it for filling behind stairs) • The cut trees will be reused at the playground • Rainwater from the square will be lead to the local village pond (substituting drinking water) <p>Another positive example is that the assessment of school-buildings has caused the Mayor for Schools in Copenhagen to ask the Department for Building and Technique why the schools did not include any elements of environmentally good or best practice. This is the type of reactions from politicians that the Copenhagen EPA is hoping for, as this will encourage officers in the department to include more environmental goals in projects and plans.</p> <p>c. Yes. The present environmental goals in the Municipality (app. 160 goals) are used as benchmarks for assessing the environmental impacts d. This is too early to say (see 2b)</p>

<p>3. Transparency of decision-making process</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 letters, brochures, meetings</p> <p>b. There is no intention to involve</p> <p>c. No</p>
D. Expert assessment/analysis/comment of the tool effectiveness	
<p>1. Assessment by tool users</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>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>a. too early to say.</p> <p>b. too early to say.</p> <p>c. see C1 (evaluation of the first procedure).</p> <p>d. It is expected that the procedure will mainly be used in the Department of Building and Technique and the Department of Environment and Supply, where the assessments are most relevant</p> <p>e. This will depend on the second evaluation</p>
<p>2. Reviewer's assessment of the tool (usefulness, sustainability relevance, who are the actors excluded? etc.) Suggestions and needs for further development of the tool</p>	<p>The procedure is a positive step in the local environmental policy. For each major decision, it provides politicians with an overview of the environmental goals related to this subject, and how the goals will be affected by the present project / plan.</p> <p>There is still a need to develop the methodology on some points, however, in a form that allows integration in the existing procedures.</p>
E. Additional information on the case study available	
Websites	
References concerning the case but also the key words or problem (papers, articles, reports, laws, etc.)	<p>Arce and Gullón (2000). <i>The application of Strategic Environmental Assessment to sustainability assessment of infrastructure development</i>. Environmental Impact Assessment Review, Vol.20 Issue.3, 393-402.</p> <p>Copenhagen EPA (2001). <i>Guidelines for environmental assessment of proposals presented for permanent committees in the Municipality of Copenhagen</i>.</p> <p>Copenhagen EPA (2003). <i>Evaluation of the work with environmental assessment of proposals and plans for the further work</i>. Recommendation from the Copenhagen EPA, Department of Environment and Supply.</p> <p>Sheate, W.R.; Dagg, S.; Richardson, J.; Aschemann, R.; Palerm, J.; Steen (2003): Integrating the environment into strategic decision-making. European Environment, Vol. 13</p>
Other sources (Interviews, conferences, discussions, etc.)	Interview with Mrs. Susanne Boisen Pedersen, the Copenhagen EPA, d. 25.02.04
Contact details for further information	Mrs. Susanne Boisen Pedersen, Copenhagen EPA