PLUREL Module 3

NOTES ON POLICY ASSESSMENT

JR 19-06-08

How to assess policy which is complex, multi-level & multi-agency?

Policy research questions

CONTENT ISSUES

- What are the objectives (i.e. what is the problem we are trying to solve)
- Is there direct data, indicators or benchmarks (on conditions / trends / pressures / spatial distribution)
- What are the strategies, policies & plans?
- What are the programmes & projects?
- Which are the most significant underlying and context factors?
- How much are the costs / benefits and distribution / equity effects, in economic or other terms?
- Where are the externalities and un-intended side –effects?
- What are the direct outputs (if any)?

- What are the long term or final outcome (if information available)?
- Which are the most relevant sustainability criteria and does the PPP succeed?
- Which are the most topical discourses or debates?

PROCESS ISSUES

- Is the policy for local or wider objectives?
- Does the policy encourage innovators and entrepreneurs?
- Does the policy enable integration & multi-level governance?
- Are there ways to improve?

Policy analysis table

	objectives	direct data	strategies / policies	programmes / projects	indirect & contextual factors	costs / benefits & distribution effects	externalities & un-intended effects	direct outputs	final outcomes	sustainability / success criteria	underlying norms, values, discourses
policy analysis & appraisal											
e.g. housing in peri-urban areas	to ensure a good supply of housing for lower income groups	housing shortage %: housing price / income	rural housing policy: adaptation for green belt areas	rural 'exceptions' planning rules: rural social housing subsidy:	housing tax system: social benefit system: law on landlords etc	Green Belt areas create housing shortage & price rises: housing subsidy problems, i.e.displacement & additionality	restrictions on sale of housing can be very tight and damaging to local economy	300 houses per year on 'exceptions' sites.	mixed communities in peri-urban villages are encouraged. But, good planning & design is stretched, and the integrity of the planning system is questioned.	reduction in travel & CO2 emissions: increase in local community equity	'Englishman's home is his castle" "NIMBY"
etc etc……											
transport											
tourism											
agriculture											
biodiversity											
water											

Policy criteria / goals

Example - UK sustainable communities goals, Components and Sub-Components

All provision and/or activity to be high quality, well-designed and maintained, safe, accessible, adaptable, environmentally and cost-effectively provided

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL – Vibrant, harmonious and inclusive communities

- A sense of community identity and belonging
- Tolerance, respect and engagement with people from different cultures, background and beliefs
- Friendly, co-operative and helpful behaviour in neighbourhoods
- Opportunities for cultural, leisure, community, sport and other activities
- Low levels of crime and anti-social behaviour with visible, effective and community-friendly policing
- All people are socially included and have similar life opportunities

GOVERNANCE & EQUITY – Effective and inclusive participation, representation and leadership

- Strategic, visionary, representative, accountable governance systems that enable inclusive, active and effective participation by individuals and organisations
- Strong, informed and effective leadership and partnerships that lead by example (eg government, business, community)
- Strong, inclusive, community and voluntary sector (eg resident's associations, neighbourhood watch)
- A sense of civic values, responsibility and pride
- Continuous improvement through effective delivery, monitoring and feedback at all levels

ENVIRONMENTAL – Providing places for people to live in an environmentally friendly way

- Efficient use of resources now and in the future in the built environment and service provision (eg energy efficiency, land, water resources, flood defence, waste minimisation etc)
- Living in a way that minimises the negative environmental impact and enhances the positive impact (eg recycling, walking, cycling)
- Protecting and improving natural resources and biodiversity (eg air quality, noise, water quality)
- Having due regard for the needs of future generations in current decisions and actions

HOUSING AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT – A quality built and natural environment

- Creating a sense of place (eg a place with a positive 'feeling' for people, and local distinctiveness)
- Well-maintained, local, user-friendly public and green spaces with facilities for everyone including children and older people
- Sufficient range, diversity and affordability of housing within a balanced housing market
- A high quality, well-designed built environment of appropriate size, scale, density, design and layout that complements the distinctive local character of the community
- High quality, mixed-use, durable, flexible and adaptable buildings

ECONOMY – A flourishing and diverse local economy

- A wide range of jobs and training opportunities
- Sufficient land and buildings to support economic prosperity and change
- Dynamic job and business creation
- A strong business community with links into the wider economy

SERVICES (Inc. transport and connectivity) – A full range of appropriate, accessible public, private, community and voluntary services

- Well-educated people from well-performing local schools, further and higher education and training for lifelong learning
- High quality, local health care and social services
- Provision of range of accessible, affordable public, community, voluntary and private services (eg retail, food, commercial, utilities)
- Service providers who think and act long term and beyond their own immediate geographical and interest boundaries
- Good transport services and communication linking people to jobs, schools, health and other services
- Transport facilities, including public transport, that help people travel within and between communities
- Facilities to encourage safe local walking and cycling
- Accessible and appropriate local parking facilities
- Widely available and effective telecommunications and Internet access

Adapted from Egan (2004: 20-21)

Indicators & policy agendas

Notes on a framework based on case study experience

Joe Ravetz
28-10-08

As above, the Plurel project needs ***simple*** indicators to communicate and report on ***complex*** systems and models.

But there is a more fundamental point – that to provide good indicators needs some understanding of the system which they represent.

Comments on proposed indicators framework

The current indicators framework, which was presented in Warsaw & Haagland, seems to take a technical approach, with long lists of possible indicators in economic, social, environmental and land-use categories. But collecting such long lists would need much time and money. Who is to say which are the most relevant or significant, in each sector or each region?

There is a strong case for starting with known and agreed indicators lists, for instance the EU Sustainable Development Indicators: for these there is ready time series data at NUTS 1, with a 3 level hierarchy scheme:
(http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page?_pageid=1998,66119021,1998_66292168&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL

Then the question is how to adapt and focus these on the Plurel agenda:

The 'policy agenda' approach

We propose that one practical way to start is to identify the key 'policy agendas' – i.e. the urban-regional actions / responses, to problems / opportunities, for policy makers, entrepreneurs and citizens. These are the main focus of M3, which is a central 'crossroads' of the project.

The concept of the 'policy agendas' can then be used to explore for each: the main driving forces, system concepts, dynamics, pressures, impacts, winners / losers, and policy responses, etc.

The 'policy agenda' approach should be able to pick up the results and implications from each of the other Modules:

- M1 – top-down model outputs: data categories for spatial allocation rules
- M2 - typology of spatial forms: governance: response functions
- M3 – comparative analysis based on 'policy agendas' in the case studies
- M4 – parameters for modeling and value / response functions
- M5 – reporting to external users: Siat-Rur parameters: resource library data structure

Key policy agendas at the peri-urban level

Here are very simple summaries of some common policy agendas (each of the M3 case studies focuses on 3-4 of these agendas).

- ***Housing pressure / demand growth*** < demographic & household change > rate of new build / rate of urban regeneration > gross density > loss of agricultural land > decline in local quality

- ***Transport congestion*** < demand growth < modal split < occupancy etc: > journey to work distance & time > climate emissions

- ***Tourism pressures*** < rate of inward tourism flows: > travel mode > tourism development > socio-economic change > tourism impacts.

- ***Agriculture pressures*** < industrialization < global markets > intensive farming > landscape change > environmental pressures

- ***Landscape / biodiversity change*** < business development < general economic development > rural economic change > agriculture change > land use change > landscape pressure > soil & water impacts

- ***Water pressures*** < climate : economic development: resource pressure: soil & drainage problems

'Core framework' indicators (a)

The tables below then provide a mapping of the 'policy agendas' on to the 'concept systems'.

They show a first estimate of which indicators / data is the most significant, in each policy agenda.

Each city-region has a small number of most significant policy agendas: this table should be a guide as to which indicators are the most relevant to those agendas. If all the city-regions can agree on a common scheme for indicators, then there will be a good basis for comparative analysis and benchmarking.

CONCEPT SYSTEMS / POLICY AGENDAS 1	Social / demographic	Technology / infrastruct	Economy / business	Environment / ecology	Politics / institutions	Urban development: general factors	PERI-URBAN LAND USE ISSUES
urbanization	demographic pressure: household options:	transport modes infrastructure:	economic structure & development: job location: occupational types:	high / low value environments:	spatial policy & zoning: market / state control	sprawl / perforation: counter-urbanization: re-urbanization:	landuse markets: landuse policy:
housing	demographic pressure: household options: community formation:	access to jobs/services: transport options	housing market: household incomes:	housing efficiency: domestic biodiversity:	health / education services: social housing policy:	housing densities: urban form & clustering:	house / garden ratios: net/gross ratio:
transport	travel / time behaviour: public transport aversion:	modal split: car traffic: public trans: freight trans: air travel: hot spots	travel costs / time costs: infrastructure investment:	modal efficiency: local impacts: congestion:	transport policy: public investment:	peri-urban transport modes:	transport direct land-use: transport – landuse interaction:

CONCEPT SYSTEMS / POLICY AGENDAS 2	Social / demographic	Technology / infrastruct	Economy / business	Environment / ecology	Politics / institutions	Urban development general	PERI-URBAN LAND USE ISSUES
tourism / leisure	tourist numbers & activities: social change in tourist areas	transport infrastructure:	tourist & leisure direct spend: indirect impacts:	tourism direct impacts: indirect impacts:	socio-political factors in tourism / leisure:	accommo-dation development:	direct land use claims: indirect land use impacts:
landscape / biodiversity	social / behavior issues in landscape:	landscape / biodiversity infrastructure	shadow value of landscape / biodiversity quality:	landscape quality / ecological health indicators:	biodiversity / landscape protection policies / zones:	landscape pressure / degradation:	biodiversity sites lost to development: derelict land use:
agriculture / forestry	community scale farming / woodlands: social access & rights of way:	farming / forestry accessibility:	agricultural / forestry markets: food demand factors:	agro-environment impacts: forest management:	farm support, CAP etc: forestry support:	urban & peri-urban farming / woodlands: green spaces / parks:	peri-urban farming / forestry pressures: partnership schemes:
water / soil etc	water demand:	water supply infrastructure:	water resource investment & return:	landscape water / flood retention: soil quality & erosion:	privatization of water supply / resources	demand growth from urban development: soil quality impacts:	landuse change impact on water: landuse change impact on soil:

‘Core framework’ indicators (b)

The next table shows an example mapping of such indicators on to the multiple knowledge types in the meta-framework, i.e. technical, systems, policies and discourses.

Some of these types will have simple direct quantitative indicators. In contrast the ‘discourses’ are generally not suitable for simple direct indicators, and may be better expressed through indirect and qualitative indicators.

	technical model data	key system components	policies / strategies	underlying discourses
policy agendas	***module 1 & 2***	***module 2, 3, 4,***	***module 2, 3***	***module 3, 4, 5,***
housing	• household growth % per year • new housing started: % of stock.	• housing tax & finance system • social security benefits system • law on landlords etc	• urban housing policy • rural housing policy • urban fringe policy • Green Belt policy	• “Not In My Back Yard” • “Not in my term of office” • “Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Anyone”
transport	• private transport growth % per year • commercial road traffic % per year • air travel % per year	• Price & tax structure of transport modes. • Integrated transport challenges.	• regional & local transport strategy • public transport finance	• “Freedom to drive” • “buses are for losers”
tourism & leisure	• countryside visitor trends:	• Personal mobility & leisure trends • Overloading of ‘honeypots’ • Competition with overseas travel	• regional tourism strategies • Countryside & access policy • Peri-urban partnership	• Whose land is this land? • The Tourism curse
agriculture	• agriculture regional productivity trend:	• Industrialization of food supply chains & quality standards • Cheap food imports • ‘Horsiculture’ and land abandonment	• Sustainable food & farming strategy • CAP reform & Stewardship schemes	• ‘Eat the view’ • Farmers – stewards or producers? • “our kids are fat”
biodiversity	• biodiversity quality index: • site protection trends:	• Ecological connectivity • Inter-species co-existence & multi-functional landuse.	• biodiversity strategy • Special Landscape Areas	• Suburban gardens as eco-habitats
water manage ment	• flood vulnerability:	• Finance & asset structure of utilities. • Institutional gaps in drainage & flood management.	• Integrated catchment management • Water stewardship programs. • Sustainable Urban Drainage policy	• ‘Dilute and disperse’ approach to pollution control. • ‘P-ing into the wind’

Application to M3 methodology

These proposed Module 3 indicators are particularly relevant to different parts of the M3 work.

a) Analysis of urban dynamics and governance strategies – the indicators should be used to identify and compare these between regions. For instance,

- Context indicators e.g. actual population growth and rate of urbanization
- Policy indicators which focus on responses – e.g. protected areas, or rate of housebuilding.
- 'qualitative' indicators for the associated discourses (e.g. NIMBy or BANANA)

b) assessment of regional strategies – the indicators can be used for outcomes and processes. The relevant priority items can be selected from the matrix above.

(this raises the possibility of a third type of matrix on 'policy' , discussed in 2007 but not shown here. This is a more conventional analysis of inputs, outputs and outcomes. The problem is it only works fully, if the policies are assumed to have specific and tangible chains of cause and effect, (input / output / outcomes), which is often not the case).

- sustainability outcomes where these can be identified
- policy process factors where these can be identified.

c) case study scenarios – selected indicators should be used to characterize the scenarios as far as possible. A separate paper contains guidance on the adaptation of the M1 scenarios to the case studies.

- where possible the selected indicators should link to the modelling work in M1, M2 and M4.
- While the indicators will be different in each region, we should aim at a simple common indicators to enable comparison. (This was suggested in the original JAF, but needs to be updated).
- The 'discourse' indicators will be useful for the qualitative fuzzy issues, which are very important in scenario work.

Next steps

Further research is needed to finalize the core indicators lists, and to test them in relation to each of the Modules.

- Module 1 - collect all the key model variables
- Module 2 - collect the key spatial parameters and policy categories
- Module 3 – review the policy agendas suggested above from the case studies
- Module 4 – review the agent types and parameters, response & cost-benefit parameters.

References:

Ravetz J, (2000): *'City-Region 2020: integrated planning for a sustainable environment' (*with a foreword by the UK Secretary of State for the Environment), London, Earthscan.

Ravetz J, Roberts P, George C, (2009) *'Environment and the City: critical perspectives on the urban environment around the world'*: Routledge / Taylor & Francis) (in press).