



Grant agreement no: 265114  
Seventh Framework Programme

Project acronym: URGENCHE

**Project full title: Urban Reduction of GHG Emissions in  
China and Europe**

Deliverable: D1.3

**Title: Report on Optimised-2020 Assessment Workshop**

Author name(s)/Affiliations: Clive Sabel, Nicky Cocksedge UExeter

February 2014

Start date of project: 1 September 2011

Duration: 36 months

## **URGENCE / WP1 (Coordination) D 1.3**

**Optimised-2020 Assessment Workshop, Kuopio, Finland, 18-20th February 2014**

### Contents

- |                          |        |
|--------------------------|--------|
| 1. Project wiki: OPASNET | Page 3 |
| 2. Meeting Agenda        | Page 4 |
| 3. Meeting Minutes       | Page 6 |

## 1. Project wiki: OPASNET

All project management, and many scientific activities appear on the project wiki, OPASNET wiki: <http://heande.opasnet.org/wiki/Urgenche> [Password protected]. Upon request to the project manager, Nicky Cocksedge, we can provide usernames and passwords.

Presentations from the Kuopio workshop appear on the wiki, as follows:

- [Introduction - Nino Kuenzli](#)
- [Welcome to Kuopio - Mayor Petteri Paronen](#)
- [What have we achieved, and what is left to do? - Clive Sabel](#)
  
- [Lessons learned from the EU v Chinese case studies - Traffic - Menno Keuken](#)
- [Lessons learned from the EU v Chinese case studies - Energy - Ganlin Huang](#)
- [Lessons learned from the EU v Chinese case studies - Buildings - Jouni Tuomisto](#)
- [Lessons learned from the EU v Chinese case studies - Health & wellbeing - Marco Martuzzi](#)
  
- [Wellbeing Impact Assessment - Mattias Braubach](#)
- [Wellbeing - Conceptualisation for URGENCHE - Rosemary Hiscock](#)
  
- [Policy Briefing: Project Overview - Clive Sabel](#)
- [Policy Briefing: What have we learnt from the Traffic case studies? - Menno Keuken](#)
- [Policy Briefing: What have we learnt from the Energy case studies? - Sandra Torras](#)
- [Policy Briefing: What have we learnt from the Building case studies? - Jouni Tuomisto](#)
  
- [Seeing is Believing - Visualising scientific data for non-experts using information graphics - Will Stahl-Timmins](#)

## 2. Meeting Agenda

# Urban Reduction of Greenhouse gas Emissions in China and Europe (URGENCE)

Optimised-2020 Assessment Workshop, 18<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> February 2014

Hotel Rauhalampi, Katiskaniementie 8, 70700 Kuopio, Finland

### Programme

Time	Item	Presenter/ chair
<b>Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> February</b>		
08.45	REGISTRATION	
09.00	Welcome from City of Kuopio Mayor Petteri Paronen	City Mayor
09.15	Welcome, programme of meeting	CS/NC
09.30	Urgence – where are we, and where are we going? - Includes update on the amendment & interim payment from our EC Project Officer -	CS/SP
10.00	Round table discussion on communicating with policy makers	Internal only
10.30	BREAK	
11.00	Discussion: What have we learnt from the EU v Chinese case-studies? - 30 min presentation - 60 min discussion	MK/JT/ST/ MM
12.30	LUNCH	
13.30	Discussion on wellbeing	Led by WHO & Exeter
14:30	BREAK	
15.00	Policy Briefing: Project overview – Clive Sabel 10 mins Policy Briefing: What have we learnt from the Traffic case-studies? Policy Briefing: What have we learnt from the Energy case-studies? Policy Briefing: What have we learnt from the Building case-studies? - 20 min for each presentation - 50 min discussion	Open event for policy-makers, authorities, and experts in Kuopio.
17.00	Closing discussion on open event policy briefing	Internal only
17.30	CLOSE	

<b>Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> February</b>		
09.00	Visualising Science for non-experts using Information Graphics	Will Stahl-Timmins
10.00	BREAK	
10.30	Generic problems and solutions arising from the case-studies	Led by meth WPs
12.00	LUNCH	
13.00	Planning and preparation for the Brussels final policy meeting	
14.15	BREAK	
14.45	Project Management Team Meeting ( 1 person per partner)	
16.15	CLOSE	
16.30	2 hour bus tour around Kuopio, leading to Puijo	
19.00	Dinner at Puijo Tower	

<b>Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> February</b>		
08.30	Bus leaves from outside Hotel Rauhalahhti	
09.00	Site visit to Haapaniemi power plant	
10:30	Skiing & skating on Lake Kallavesi ice	
13.30	A bus to the airport for the 14:35 flight	

### 3. Meeting Minutes

## **Optimised-2020 Assessment Workshop, Kuopio** **18-20<sup>th</sup> February 2014**

Please note: all presentations referenced below can be found on the Kuopio workshop page of the wiki, accessible from the main page, or via the following link: <http://heande.opasnet.org/wiki/Urgenche: Optimised-2020 Assessment Workshop>

As a lot of information is contained within these presentations, the notes below detail only the discussions and questions relating to them.

### **Day 1 – Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> February**

#### **Presentation: Where are we, and where are we going? – Clive Sabel/Serena Pontoglio**

Denis Sarigiannis: Noise data for Thessaloniki has also been provided to Menno's team in the traffic work package.

Menno Keuken: It would be great for the URGENCHE cities to be included on the TRANSPHORM website ([www.transphorm.eu](http://www.transphorm.eu)), which looks at transport related air pollution and health impacts.

**Action:** *Menno to approach city partners to discuss which cities would like inclusion on TRANSPHORM website.*

Mike Depledge: As a policy maker, the question I would have after this overview would be which policies have delivered health and well-being benefits, and which haven't?

Serena Pontoglio: That would be useful to know, and I can help you with disseminating your results to policy makers to maximise the impact of your project. To update all, the interim payment was delayed as the finance office needed verification on certain things, but it is now being processed, and should be with Exeter either this week or next.

With regards to the amendment, we are in dialogue with the legal department about issues surrounding Clive's move to Bristol. Exeter has to remain the Project Coordinator as an entity, but Clive cannot be the Project Coordinator without an Exeter contract, although he will remain the Scientific Coordinator. Negotiations are being held with Exeter as to who will take on this responsibility, hopefully someone from the Research Knowledge Transfer EU Team, and this should be resolved soon.

Denis Sarigiannis: I agree that having a member of the Exeter EU Team as the Project Coordinator is the most sensible solution<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note subsequent to the meeting, Exeter has agreed Head of Geography, Prof John Wylie, will act as Project Coordinator, not Exeter EU team. In practise, we hope partners will not see any difference from before.

## **Discussion: Communicating with policy makers**

Jack Spengler: I was interested in what the Mayor of Kuopio had to say, and I would like to ask him what the elements are that make a difference in one city versus another?

Jouni Tuomisto: Our mayor is a scientist himself (Health Sciences), which has an impact on how he thinks things should be run. For 30 years Kuopio has been a major centre of environmental health.

Clive Sabel: In Bristol, the new elected mayor is an architect, and is having an impact on urban design and well-being.

Mike Depledge: Policy makers are very diverse, so there may not be one way of communicating with them. It strikes me that some of the UK cities are behind some of the EU cities in terms of thinking about health and well-being. It's good to ask policy makers how they see the world and how they frame it. We have to be very clear about what a policy is, what it's designed to do, and be very specific about what it's done e.g. quantify improvements in health, air quality etc.

Clive Sabel: We need to de-jargonise what we say.

Mattias Braubach: We are having a co-benefit discussion and so we should try to reflect what the intervention does in terms of energy etc., allowing us to look at it in different ways.

Mike Depledge: I'm surprised not to have heard more about money and economy, as people want to know how much will it cost or save.

Clive Sabel: We do not have health economists in our project, and so this is something we will mention at our meeting in Brussels. It would be useful to discuss who we should invite to Brussels. There may be over 100 people there, especially if we communicate jointly with PURGE, so would it be best to have small group dissemination, or in a large theatre?

Serena Pontoglio: The audience is not just the EC, it's good to have local authorities and umbrella organisations that represent municipalities – I can help you identify people.

Menno Keuken: The traffic results for Europe and China are totally different, and how much should we focus on China if it's a mainly EU audience?

Clive Sabel: The project call from the EU was to work and compare China to Europe, so we need to unpack the motivation for working with China on this. The pace of change in China and the amount of money available is really high, often in response to public pressure due to smog, so it's a challenging area to work in.

Denis Sarigiannis: For traffic, it depends on the evolution of urban processes we are addressing. Clean technology is a driver, but it depends a lot on the situation on the ground e.g. the metro, so we cannot take a one model fits all approach.

Mike Depledge: The technology is generic and global – electric cars are the same in Suzhou and Stuttgart, but the amount of resources to implement these are different, and there are also cultural differences.

Marco Martuzzi: We're focussing on how to convey the message and to whom, but I struggle with what the message is. We have a lot of material, much of it raw, and it can be shaped in many different ways, so what bullet points would we use to say what the project has achieved? The results are important in themselves, and the methods & networks derived from the project are useful, but we need to know what message to convey.

Rainer Friedrich: The result of this project is not to propose certain policies, but to present our new and better methodology to assess policies. Nearly all of the plans cities have made have not included health impacts, so this is a major advantage.

Clive Sabel: The main thrust is not to create new methodology, but to use existing methodology to do this, based largely on previous EU projects (INTARESE, HEIMTSA etc). Our uniqueness is in looking at city policies, asking what they are, and assessing them.

Denis Sarigiannis: The main message of Urgenche is to say be aware and take into account co-benefits. It is very important not just for local officials, but for the Commission to know local values systems are important to people on the ground.

Marco Martuzzi: One of the outcomes is to develop new methodology, but this is not particularly newsworthy for policy makers, so as a practical way to proceed, why don't we write a press release that's catchy and can convey some of the key results?  
**Action:** *Clive to draft an Urgenche press release once results are finalised.*

**Presentations: What have we learnt from the EU vs Chinese case-studies? – Ganlin Huang/Menno Keuken/Jouni Tuomisto/Marco Martuzzi**

Clive Sabel: There are political motivations in China, where the official air pollution figures released are often just below the pollution targets. Different estimates can be observed in published papers on Chinese cities.

Nino Kuenzli: European collaborations and sensitivities within the cities are important too, as there is a difference between communication with the EU and locally. The problem in Basel was whether Urgenche would use historical data that does not match the data the city uses in their reports.

Denis Sarigiannis: I don't think we have developed a model in the traffic work package as it could not apply fully in Basel, and wasn't fitting for Thessaloniki either so we did our own.

Jack Spengler: Are the Chinese case study cities in the winter heating zone?

Jouni Tuomisto: Suzhou is South and warm, but Xi'an is inland and has cold winters.

Denis Sarigiannis: In a city with no centralised heating, why would a mayor be interested if he cannot do this kind of assessment?

Jouni Tuomisto: This comes back to the policy question – what policies can be implemented if there is no district heating system? There are other things like emission standards, although these are not usually decided at city level.

Denis Sarigiannis: Decisions are usually made at national or federal, not local or city level, so it's hard to implement with all this variance with the decision making.

Jouni Tuomisto: Decisions at a local level can be important. For example, when we visited Xi'an we saw a major contributor to air pollution there was local burning of coal in small industry, and making policies to change this would help.

Rosemary Hiscock: There is very little data available, so how confident can we be that the models are showing results in the right direction?

Menno Keuken: There is a large amount of uncertainty.

Marco Martuzzi: We decided to do more qualitative work [referring to wellbeing work], and it would be an unstructured exercise, but something can be done.

Clive Sabel: Although not a focus of Katie Morton's work, it touches on some of these issues such as areas of uncertainty. It's more nuanced than saying 'Europe good, China bad', as China does many things better, but China simply doesn't record health episodes to enable analyses in the way that we do e.g. no data on hospital admissions or GP visits. They don't have our GP or family practitioner system and thus less continuity of care.

Mike Depledge: When presenting to policy makers, we only need to mention the difficulty getting data once, try not to reiterate this. We can say that for EU cities we DO have good data, and with it we have achieved X...

Clive Sabel: We've learnt a lot from working with China, and I will find a way of reporting this to the Commission, as it is important to be positive.

Serena Pontoglio: It's important for us to know the lessons learned, both positive and negative.

Pierpaolo Mudu: We've put together a lot of interesting data from China, but we also know how to work with a lack of official data.

### **Presentations: Wellbeing Discussion – Mattias Braubach/Rosemary Hiscock**

Jack Spengler: I noticed you used 4-6 significant figures despite the levels of uncertainty – perhaps you could round more?

Nino Kuenzli: It's still not clear to me where has it been shown what the association is between noise and mental wellbeing? This is not coming from an investigation of the association.

Mattias Braubach: No, we do not have a study that gives us a risk estimate, so we are using the data we have. The only link we have is from people in the quality of life survey.

Nino Kuenzli: I think this makes huge assumptions and it's dangerous to use data under these circumstances.

Clive Sabel: We're sensitive to the lack of literature in this emerging area, and are pushing the boundaries – we hope to get this published and start creating this literature. Conceptualising wellbeing is difficult so we're doing it with something fairly well established i.e. noise. Noise is already used in a very quantitative way in health impact assessments in a physical health sense.

Laura Perez: There is literature on noise annoyance that we can use.

Denis Sarigiannis: It's a valiant effort, but I agree with Nino – your approach to take one number for each city is unsatisfactory. I think this gives us an opportunity as it's very easy to do an annoyance map at a high spatial resolution, and then see if we can combine the two approaches to make a kind of hybrid wellbeing index. Going more in depth into 1 or 2 case studies could make it more robust.

Rainer Friedrich: We could add an alternative annoyance category. The people heavily annoyed may not be the ones most heavily affected by noise, so we would have to adjust findings, but we can calculate how many people then change categories.

Mattias Braubach: We need this data in one dataset, and annoyance was not in that survey so we cannot adjust.

Denis Sarigiannis: This can be done by fusing them and seeing how they coincide with annoyance levels.

Mattias Braubach: We cannot do this in WHO, but possibly can with the help of the team in Thessaloniki.

Katie Morton: This is about perceived wellbeing. Noise can be measured in a subjective way, but it's about people's perception to it, so we could maybe use some of the qualitative approaches.

Mike Depledge: There are massive amounts of literature on wellbeing but often in the domain of psychologists, so may be worth discussing with an environmental psychologist. I'd avoid the term wellbeing and look more at components of wellbeing. Wellbeing also has a temporal component, for example a woman with a new born baby may have low wellbeing but high happiness, so what are we measuring?

Nino Kuenzli: Wellbeing is such a complex story, and without adjusting for things like age, SES etc., how can we show the association?

Clive Sabel: In Suzhou we're trying to get data by doing a wellbeing survey of 2000 people and have built psychological questions into the survey.

**Action:** *Clive to chase Nanjing for the Suzhou wellbeing survey.*

### **Presentation: Policy Briefing (Traffic) – Menno Keuken**

Erkki Parjala: How would you classify biofuels used in transport?

Answer: We looked at the emission factors as there has been research on these for different types of fuels. There is not much difference for additional biofuels in terms of air quality, although in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> it's better to use biofuels rather than fossil fuels.

Local Guest: For the last 15-20 years Kuopio has had a special concept in urban design (finger plan with zones), to promote active travel and maintain public transport. Our experience is this is one of the most effective tools.

Menno Keuken: I'd prefer this type of strategy to converting all fossil fuel cars to electric cars, as it's more integrated.

Jack Spengler: A translational piece would be useful as a sustainable return on our investment, although I know this would be outside of this project.

Serena Pontoglio: There are local policies such as these in Kuopio that can have a lot of impact, and there are lots of examples beyond zoning of the public areas.

Menno Keuken: This is a BAU approach changing small bits at a time, which requires a total rethink of the city centres. Most have a few cycle lanes, and it's very limited what you can achieve with that due to the sheer volume of traffic, so you'd need to change something in a big way.

### **Presentation: Policy Briefing (Energy) – Sandra Torras**

Denis Sarigiannis: You assume that the [wood] pellets come from nearby?

Answer: Yes, but this is changing, as Stuttgart is starting to import them from elsewhere in Europe.

Matti Jantunen: Burning wood does not reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, it increases them. I think we should come up with a more accurate way of showing this, as it can lead to misunderstandings.

Sandra Torras: Pellet boilers contribute to reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions when compared to other technologies, as they're being used to replace fossil fuel energy sources.

Erkki Parjala: We did calculations on increased use of wood burning in domestic houses, and small scale wood combustion wasn't making a big difference.

Matti Jantunen: Wood burning improves the carbon balance as it includes the regrowth of forest, so it's a complicated situation. I suggest in terms of wood combustion we discuss either fossil fuel emissions or carbon balance.

### **Presentation: Policy Briefing (Buildings) – Jouni Tuomisto**

Serena Pontoglio: Kuopio has their climate change target to reduce emissions by 40% by 2020, and I was curious as to how this number was decided? Was there a scientific input to that decision, and were health and wellbeing impacts taken into account?

Answer: I understand that the planning paper for the policy had a 20% reduction, and when it went to the city council they decided they should be more ambitious and raised it to 40%. Everyone agreed this was a good idea, but now they're asking how we can do this. The single combined heat and power plant dominates, so it is impossible to achieve 40% without looking at the powerplant.

Clive Sabel: Is there therefore no external power supply to Kuopio?

Answer: Yes, most comes from the national grid, and we give back to the grid. We also have local plants that generate extra heat as a reserve when temperatures drop below a certain figure.

Jouni Tuomisto: Detached houses have to have some kind of wood heater so the house doesn't freeze if the power goes down, particularly for those far from cities.

Local Guest: There are two power plants [within the combined heat and power plant], one of which was renewed last year. One of the positive results of city planning is that about 90% of buildings are connected to district heating from the power plant, which makes it quite efficient. This is rare in old cities.

Matti Jantunen: There are two ways of running these plants. In Finland they are run for heat demand, so heat and power drops when the heat demand drops. In other countries they are run for power demand and excess heat is dumped.

### **Discussion: Post policy briefing feedback with local guests**

Local Guest: One of the most interesting questions in Kuopio is providing energy to buildings outside of the heating network. I hope and believe that these tools will be very useful to us.

Local Guest: I was amazed I understood something as I'm a psychologist so thank you, as I think I can use this information.

Matti Jantunen: A lot of jobs will be generated renovating buildings in coming years to reach targets, and renovation requires better planners & builders than new builds to get it right. Lots of highly skilled renovation workers and designers are needed – we don't have them and haven't started training them.

Local Guest [ex-city Architect]: You have interesting results, but are also facing the problem of how to compare and recognise different types of cities. It's extremely important to have a new way of thinking and analysing cities. It's not only a question of different zones in cities, its comprehensive fabrics, and a question of who is doing what. I'm very interested in the work of Peter Newman in Perth.

Menno Keuken: Now that we've seen the presentations from the methodological work packages, what is the overall message for cities?

Clive Sabel: Good question, but the project hasn't finished yet, and we are also waiting for the health impact assessments. I think we have a sense, and each of the 3 methodological work packages could probably have a stab at the most effective policies they've evaluated.

Jouni Tuomisto: I would be worried about the difference between the two CO<sub>2</sub> indicators. Going for wood would seem to be a good choice for Kuopio, but it would seem that it is not the best choice to mitigate climate change.

Clive Sabel: It's a convention to state that burning wood does not produce CO<sub>2</sub>, but this is something many policy makers don't understand, as you're releasing it from a carbon reservoir.

Jouni Tuomisto: If we burn the wood instead of building with it we increase CO<sub>2</sub>, if we let it grow it becomes a carbon sink, so we always have to compare.

Rainer Friedrich: All wood in the forest is destroyed at some point and converted back to CO<sub>2</sub>, so whether you let it rot or burn it in a stove, you still have the same CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

Local Guest: Burning wood is better than burning peat, which is what we've always done, and is also better than burning oil or coal. There are also options like ground source heat pumps, and it's hard to compare these alternatives.

Jouni Tuomisto: There is a tiny amount of geothermal heating in Kuopio, but it's more popular in Sweden.

### **Discussion: Post policy briefing feedback internal only**

Mike Depledge: If you wanted to demonstrate to policy makers that scientists can't agree on anything, talk for a long time, and use some graphics that are excellent, but some not, then you did it. You cannot hold people's attention for that long – it has to be clear, punchy, positive and engaging. That was not the session to argue and debate points in front of policy makers.

Will Stahl-Timmins: Will we seek feedback from them privately, as a lot of them were quiet, and may not have wanted to speak up in front of all?

Mike Depledge: 10 minutes per presentation would probably be plenty, rather than 20, as all three were too long. Jouni's graphics were great and told a story with the

pictures. Will Stahl-Timmins also has some ideas which will help, as when telling a story the graphics must at least be pleasant and engaging.

Jack Spengler: It's good to spend a lot of time with the user group before a workshop to find out what issues they are facing at their level, where they are stuck etc. It is important to put in as much time before the workshop as during it, and is a good tool to work more effectively at a community level.

Mike Depledge: Working with local policy makers is very different than interacting with EU policy makers, and it's important that what we say doesn't conflict with what Brussels are saying.

Serena Pontoglio: It's a difficult exercise to try to shape your work into messages useful to policy makers. I agree that it's important to know the issues and specific problems policy makers are facing in their daily work, so you can shape your messages. For the session we have just had, I expected to have the city colleagues sat at the front to stimulate their reactions and interact with them more.

Mattias Braubach: 3x 20 minutes is too much for policy makers even if it is short for us. People won't come to the Brussels conference if it is too short, so probably need to do both, and include longer scientific sessions too.

Clive Sabel: We will start planning, and possibly bring in PURGE, but I think that it should be part internal, part external.

Mike Depledge: I thought this would bring the great and good of Brussels to a 1.5 hour evening reception with a panel.

Clive Sabel: I intend that to be a part of the meeting.

Jouni Tuomisto: I think we need to integrate, as for policy makers it's not about the methodological work packages but about city policies, so we need to find some kind of synthesis. We should also do more online, as not everyone will want to come in person.

Denis Sarigiannis: I would have preferred a more integrated presentation that brought in Kuopio more as we were talking to local policy makers. A lot depends on who we are addressing in Brussels, and we need to be able to adjust our message.

Clive Sabel: We are going to Brussels partly because we are funded from there, and we want to show what we have done. If we want to influence policy, this is part of the group we can talk too.

## Day 2 – Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> February

### **Presentation: Visualising science for non-experts using information graphics – Will Stahl-Timmins**

Mike Depledge: When I stand in front of these infographics, I can point to the parts I'm demonstrating and it's a simple statement that people can take away. You can move around the graphics to make your points when presenting.

Katie Morton: What format would we use for Brussels – online or printed material?

Clive Sabel: This is something we will discuss further but possibly a mix – I would like to see a printed pamphlet of some sort.

Serena Pontoglio: For inspiration, The European Climate Foundation have done some good work with the IPCC.

Rainer Friedrich: We would need the Sankey diagram in a graphic/report, and we would also need something for presentations, which would need less information in it. Is it possible to produce a Sankey diagram to go on a powerpoint slide, perhaps where you can zoom into parts?

Laura Perez: These examples show the final message, but as we haven't decided on our final message yet, I'm worried this could make things difficult for you.

Clive Sabel: We know the policies so can start diagrams that summarise the policies now, but the health impact assessments are not ready yet.

Laura Perez: This is targeted at Brussels, but it's also important to direct something at our city partners, as we are doing this with them, and we would like to impress them.

Mattias Braubach: For the health work package there are three different levels – within the city, where the biggest impact is on those exposed, also comparing the cities, looking at magnitudes, trends and statistics of city groups, then finally an overarching message. We probably need to choose priorities, and at this stage it's hard to decide what those should be.

Rosemary Hiscock: I'm wondering what packages you use, and whether they are expensive?

Will Stahl-Timmins: I use Adobe Creative Suite software which is fairly expensive. For interactive graphics and things that are data heavy, I programme in a piece of software calling 'Processing' which outputs to Java.

Mike Depledge: The kind of graphics shown depends on whether you want it for a report, a poster etc.

Marco Martuzzi: WHO have quite an interest in this, but traditionally have fairly conservative audiences. What concerns me is potential infographics fatigue – if you do it well and it has a good impact, will we have to do something different next time?

Will Stahl-Timmins: There are lots of different standard tools you can use. I like to start by hand so it is a new presentation that is engaging, but you're right that it has less impact with repeated use.

Clive Sabel: The only strength isn't that it's effective because it's new, but that it helps audiences to read the information more clearly, and gives a better way of doing this – I wouldn't dismiss infographics just because people are used to them.

Mike Depledge: We've all heard the expression 'death by powerpoint' so it's a valid point about people becoming fatigued, but you can still see fantastic powerpoint presentations that really engage you. I think we should be trying to think of any way we can communicate to catch people's attention.

Denis Sarigiannis: As a policy maker, the Pharma-transport poster would make me think 'what is the gist of it?', as there is a lot to take in. It's beautiful, and as a scientist it would be great to communicate to students, but for policy makers I would go for a simpler, more distilled down message. What is it we really want to say?

Will Stahl-Timmins: I would like to get a range of different things for different audiences, some complex, some simple.

Nino Kuenzli: It's extremely important to be aware of the relevance of your audience, which is the city partners, not us. We don't want them to think that this project has nothing to do with them.

Katie Morton: Can you work in layers so that it can be quite an interactive tool? It could allow you to highlight one city, or one energy source, so you still have the complexity there.

Rosemary Hiscock: It's important that we don't lose sight of the scientific information behind it.

### **Discussion: Planning & preparation for the Brussels final policy meeting**

Clive Sabel: Our final meeting will be in Brussels to engage with our funders & Brussels-based policy makers. It's not appropriate to hold this in August as many would be unavailable, and Scandinavia is on holiday in July. However, we're unlikely to be ready to speak to policy makers in June.

We assumed that the final meeting would be with policy makers, but we could separate them. We would also like to have a joint meeting with PURGE. There is the possibility of a no-cost extension to the project due to the amendment delays, which may mean we could hold a project meeting in June, with a separate policy briefing in July or the first week of September.

**Action:** *Nicky to circulate a Doodle poll with suitable dates in June, July & September.*

Mike Depledge: At policy briefings I've been to they've had four ten-minute talks followed by a panel discussion that can last up to two hours. Afterwards people meet informally, so the whole event lasts around 3 hours. To make it worthwhile, you could have the meeting in the afternoon with a more workshop type of approach before the evening policy event.

Denis Sarigiannis: I like the idea of a joint hybrid event and a more detailed one later. There are a number of networks of cities in Europe who should be invited as well as mayors etc. If they get the message and find it useful, it would make an impact.

Clive Sabel: We need another meeting before the briefing, and we haven't been to Rotterdam so perhaps we could hold the final project meeting there in June. We wouldn't expect all members to attend the policy briefing although they would be welcome. We should be aiming to potentially change laws, so could invite elected MEPs, perhaps focussing on green MEPs.

Serena Pontoglio: It would be good to focus your messages on the Committee of the Regions.

Mike Depledge: You're right to try and engage MEPs, and there are many organisations in Brussels that sell their services getting MEPs to events like this, so we could engage with those. It's a good idea to get DG Regions involved, and members here could also write to their own MEP to try to get them involved. The Belgian Academy of Science might be a good venue.

Denis Sarigiannis: The EU Committee on the Environment (ENVI) will not be able to commit right now as they may change after the elections.

Serena Pontoglio: The Commission are the policy makers, not the MEPs, so you should speak to both. You need to decide what the message is and why we want to engage with them. These people are very busy, so to engage with them we need to set the date very soon.

Denis Sarigiannis: There are NGO's who act as go-betweens with MEPs - they are very well connected and we have access to these people. Other DG's such as DG REGIO and DG RELEX, the external relations section may be useful due to our links with China.

Marco Martuzzi: We have networks collectively and can come up with a good variety of contacts. If we want to have a high profile attractive event, the findings of one project are small, so we should perhaps team up with others to reach a critical mass, although it would be more demanding to prepare and organise.

Serena Pontoglio: Another dissemination opportunity would be the UNFCCC 40<sup>th</sup> session of the subsidiary bodies, which will take place in Bonn from 4-15 June. There will be a lot of side events, and the audience is not only scientists and NGOs but also policy makers in the field of climate change. There is a submission process via their website.

Clive Sabel: Bonn and Rotterdam are very close, so we could move between the two. This would not replace the policy meeting.

Rosemary Hiscock: Is it also possible to disseminate locally to all the local governments? It would be good if we had a set of slides that could be shown in different countries and translated into different languages, and this will also sell the EU funding.

Laura Perez: Locally we have to organise a formal event, and it would be nice if we can record it and people from other cities can see it online. Each city could organise their own, but it would be nice to have something in common, perhaps having information on them all on a website.

Nino Kuenzli: A three minute video clip from each city online where they can summarise their message.

Clive Sabel: We did investigate recording & either the relevant people were unavailable, or were charging too much.

Jack Spengler: Many universities are doing MOOC's and this is material that can be used.

Nino Kuenzli: Given the time and resources we have, I think a MOOC is not possible.

Jouni Tuomisto: We should produce something that can be easily used again for some other purpose.

Clive Sabel: I can approach the people that did the University of Exeter MOOC and see if they can do a few very short films for us.

**Action:** *Clive to discuss filming with University of Exeter contacts*

Nino Kuenzli: If we do not produce a clear message for the cities then we have failed. How do we package our message?

Clive Sabel: It is difficult to maintain the interest of some of our cities. At some point some of them are deciding that this is not relevant to them.

**Action:** *Clive to refine and tighten the key message to the cities.*

Rainer Friedrich: The exciting part is to add the health impact assessments into the assessments – this is new and will be interesting to the cities.

Mike Depledge: When talking about reaching lots of people, 'Science for Environment Policy' are an EU-funded group with a website, newsletter etc. which goes out to policy makers across the EU, and it would be good to get something into this system. They are based at the University of the West of England (UWE).

## **Discussion: Generic problems and solutions arising from the case-studies**

Clive Sabel: [Speaking on behalf of Nino, who had to leave] Our case study assessments are likely to show that implementing expensive measures would only save fractions of a person's life across the whole city, which is not headline making. Nino proposed that we need to stretch both boundaries of the scenarios as BAU is not strong enough. He suggested going back to 2008, without BAU. Our current measures are very sensible, so are not testing an extreme scenario.

Stephan Trueb: There are doubts that BAU will be implemented.

Clive Sabel: Nino suggested we maybe test a future scenario around 0.1 elemental carbon, which would yield very high health benefits, although hard to achieve.

Mattias Braubach: Basel has a very strong BAU. If a city has been strong on climate change already and is a leading city, you'd expect them to have a high performance level, and therefore it is hard to get much progress with interventions. The interventions are not public health interventions, they're for climate change, so saving only 0.5 of a life should not matter. We would wish for a bigger health and wellbeing impact, but it's not the main goal.

Clive Sabel: Our analyses so far show that health impact is largely irrelevant in Europe, as it's such a small order of magnitude. It wouldn't require much more analysis to run an extra, more radical scenario.

Rainer Friedrich: It's not a matter of absolute performance of a measure, but whether the outcome is positive or negative. We should say 'what is the health outcome per tonne of CO<sub>2</sub>?' It also depends on how you define your measure.

Katie Morton: We could have some kind of interactive slider to show what the policies would mean in terms of cost or pollution.

Denis Sarigiannis: We don't have the expertise in the project, although we have done similar things in Thessaloniki and it is easy to do. This is an easy message for policy makers, but people will then be focussing on the value of a life, which is a problem, and I'm not sure it's a good idea given the focus of the project. Also, a slider means we either have a really simplified model, which we don't, or we run more complicated models enough times to have a table of impacts/outputs, and the slider then runs through the table.

Sander Jonkers: I think it's better to compare the BAU, and if we do a radical scenario, we do it as well as, not instead of.

Clive Sabel: Nino's point is you have to do this if you want to show a health benefit.

Denis Sarigiannis: Only having marginal health benefits is not a negative thing.

Jouni Tuomisto: If you want to hit headlines, you should look at scenarios thought to be beneficial that are actually not, such as wood burning. Showing that going in the

direction that has been suggested is a bad idea would be a good thing, and would generate headlines.

Erkki Parjala: This is one of the scenarios, but not one of our official ones.

Clive Sabel: Yes it's not a policy but could be one for the future, and there is no harm in doing it as you can show the health impact quickly.

Marco Martuzzi: It would be useful to do as much as possible, but we agreed a long time ago that we cannot keep up comparability. It would be nice to make some statements to compare cities, but it will necessarily be very broad and qualitative. It would be nice to take a close look at summary written reports from cities and see if we can draw an overall picture of the health impact assessments, hopefully pulling them together with the wellbeing assessments.

Clive Sabel: It makes a lot of sense for work package 6 to have a function to do this prior to publication.

Jouni Tuomisto: We're now at the point where we should be sharing the results of our scenarios. If you see the data it is easier to have further ideas, and we should agree on how to make this happen.

Clive Sabel: Methodological work package leads should exchange what they have for each city, and may want to use the wiki as a tool to collect it – all city based assessments would pass to the wiki for storage. We can start populating this now, as some of it is finished.

Jouni Tuomisto: Everyone has a model and produces an output table, so it would be useful to have all data in one place. This is a way to learn and understand what is going on, and I would like to see any data in whatever format, whether it is aggregated or not.

**Action:** *Work package leads to forward their data to Jouni Tuomisto.*

Marco Martuzzi: I agree to all having access to what has been produced, but getting to the bottom line message is a gradual, iterative process, and it's everyone's responsibility to address the 'so what' question, not just dumping everything on the wiki. It would be good for each health impact assessment to come with their own discussion and conclusions.

Denis Sarigiannis: I don't see the use of sharing data without knowing methods. Let's have a meeting between those that did the calculations and explore the methods, and see how to bring these things together. Then we can exchange, rather than sharing data blindly.

Clive Sabel: We agreed early on that we couldn't have a common methodology.

Denis Sarigiannis: I'm worried about methodological differences that skew the results we see – I have nothing against sharing data, but don't think it is useful.

Jouni Tuomisto: If you email me your results files, I will do the work and figure out what you did.

Clive Sabel: We have a deliverable for the leads to produce a paper on over-arching methodology and it looks like this feeds into that.

Denis Sarigiannis: We need a practical session (not a technical one) to discuss methodology and results, attended by those that ran the models.

**Action:** *Jouni to organise a separate session to discuss methodology, perhaps by Skype.*

Mattias Braubach: We need common labelling of the scenarios, as I find it confusing, and people in Brussels will too.

Clive Sabel: Rainer produced a short guidance document on this after the Thessaloniki meeting. We will recirculate this, and all should adopt this convention in the future.

**Action:** *Nicky to recirculate Rainer's guidance notes on the definition of scenarios*

### **Project Management Team Meeting**

The notes and actions from this meeting will be circulated separately to the relevant people.

#### **Summary of actions:**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsible</b>
To approach city partners to discuss which cities would like inclusion on TRANSPORM website	Menno Keuken
To develop a press release conveying some of the key results of the project – towards end of project.	Clive Sabel
To chase Nanjing for the Suzhou wellbeing survey	Clive Sabel
To circulate a Doodle poll of Jun/July/Sep dates for final project meeting & policy briefing.	Nicky Cocksedge
To discuss filming with University of Exeter contacts.	Clive Sabel
To refine and tighten the key message to the cities.	Clive Sabel
To forward data/results to Jouni as appropriate.	Work Package Leads
To organise a meeting to discuss methodology, perhaps by Skype.	Jouni Tuomisto
To recirculate Rainer's guidance notes on the definition of scenarios.	Nicky Cocksedge