

European Perspectives on Territorial Impact Assessment

*A Background paper for the
ESPON EATIA Project*

Cliff Hague
April 2010

Executive Summary

This paper was prepared to aid the development of the ESPON Targeted Analysis study of Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA), which is called EATIA. The paper also aims to contribute more generally to the development of the concept and practice of TIA in European spatial planning by sharing knowledge of views from different countries.

The paper is based on two pieces of research. In 2008 a short study was done for the UK's Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) that explored awareness of TIA amongst UK spatial planning practitioners. Then in 2010 a similar short study was done of experts in some other EU countries.

The findings are:

- 1: The term TIA is not in common use.
- 2: There are some TIA-style procedures in some countries
- 3: EU Directives and Policy do have territorial impacts
- 4: Environmental assessments are the main form of impact assessment, but have limits
- 5: TIA needs to be easy to understand and manageable in terms of resources and data
- 6: There is value in ESPON's TIA work, but it is too sophisticated to be transferred to practice
- 7: TIA would be most useful if done ex-ante
- 8: Plans are key to the TIA process

The implications for the EATIA ESPON Priority 2 project are:

- Look for simple procedures that draw strongly on qualitative judgement and use existing plans and strategies as the departure point against which to assess impacts.
- Communication really matters, not least the ability to communicate the complexity of ESPON's work and findings to a practitioner

audience, and to enable policy makers to understand the policy choices open to them.

- Several countries use their own planning procedures to undertake ex-ante assessments of the impacts of projects and policies. These are worth looking at.
- SEA and EIA are established as the way to do impact assessment. In general, they have been valuable in raising the quality of environmental analysis, but they do not amount to integrative or truly territorial tools.

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

Preamble

This paper summarises the main findings from two short studies undertaken for the Department for Communities and Local Government. The first study (Hague, Crawford and Gracie, 2008) reviewed some of the background to the TIA idea. It then drew on telephone interviews with nine experts – all but one of them practitioners – from across the four national planning administrations within the UK (England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland).

The second study was done in 2010. It attempted to gain insights into understanding of the concept of TIA in a number of Member States and amongst ESPON Contact Points, other researchers who are expert in European policy and spatial planning and also practising planners. In all 10 telephone interviews were conducted between February and April: four with ECPs, three with other researchers, and three with practitioners. Between them these people have in depth experience of the following countries: Belgium, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia and Sweden, and familiarity with some others. One interviewee has held a leadership position in the European Council of Spatial Planners (ECTP). Thus, although the number of interviews is small, the interviewees between them have extensive and in-depth experience which they shared willingly in the course of the interviews.

Method

In both studies semi-structured interviews with experts were chosen as the most appropriate method for this study. TIA is a complex area. The research on TIA in 2008 with UK practitioners had demonstrated that few of those interviewed really used the concept. Within the time and resources available, therefore, there was no real prospect of getting useful views from a wide range of European practitioners. Similarly, the research was seeking to probe understanding and interpretation, not to gather statistics.

Thus a series of open questions was developed. The questions were then pre-circulated to the interviewees a couple of days before the interview. This gave them time to prepare answers, and further

reduced the barriers that might have been posed by doing the language in English (though all interviewees are excellent English speakers).

Interviews were then conducted over the phone. Typically an interview took 45-60 minutes and began with an explanation of the purpose of the research – in particular in relation to the prospect of the ESPON Priority 2 project, EATIA. Notes were taken of the interview while it was being conducted, and these were then tidied up and sent to the interviewees for correction or further comments.

This report draws extensively on quotes from those interviews. Some of the quotes are put in boxes as they seem to capture the flavour of more general responses.

The ESPON EATIA project

The Department of Communities and Local Government, along with its counterparts in Slovenia and Portugal, are stakeholders in an ESPON Priority 2 “targeted analysis” project, EATIA. This project is to be tendered in May 2010 and will look at ways which ESPON findings and methods on TIA can be used at national / regional scale in these three countries. Part of the EATIA project is about testing whether practising planners can understand and make use of this ESPON work.

ESPON undertook a series of research studies of the territorial impacts of EU policies during its 2006 programme. In addition, the Spatial Scenarios project from ESPON 2006 developed a methodology to undertake TIA as a form of multi-criteria analysis. This method, called TEQUILA, also involves the use of an econometric model. It has been further developed in the ESPON 2013 project called TIPTAP.

The paper now describes the main findings from the 2008 UK study and then reviews the situation in Portugal and Slovenia, since with the UK they are the stakeholders in the EATIA project. The findings from the wider 2010 survey of other EU countries are then summarised.

Chapter 2: APPROACHES TO ASSESSMENT IN THE UK, PORTUGAL AND SLOVENIA

TIA in the UK

In many ways the findings from the UK in 2008 anticipated similar responses from other countries in the 2010 survey. TIA is not a term that UK practitioners are familiar with, even though the spatial planners interviewed were very aware that sectoral policies have territorial impacts. Furthermore, the fact that so many other forms of impact assessment already exist, especially Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) makes practitioners uneasy about any requirement for TIA to become a standard practice.

"Here in Wales we increasingly use our own Spatial Plan as the yardstick against which to assess impacts on different areas. Thus we are asking policy makers at different levels if their policies are fit for purpose in the context of the Plan. For example, we have Structural Funds Strategic Frameworks for different regions – how do these relate to the Spatial Plan? Local Development Plans are expected to be consistent with the Spatial Plan."

In England there is a form of territorial assessment called "rural proofing". It seeks to ensure that policies do not have perverse impacts in rural areas. It involves subjecting policy-making to a consideration of its likely impacts on rural areas. However, the assessment is on rural areas in general rather than precisely defined spatial impacts at a more local level. Thus rural proofing is essentially a tick-box exercise to scope how a particular policy or proposal would affect the social and economic profile of rural communities. It forms part of the more thorough process of Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA), a procedure that largely checks for impacts on business.

As well as RIA, SEA and EIA, other forms of impacts assessment used in the UK are Equalities Impact Assessment and Health Impact Assessment. There is also a requirement under the Habitats Directive to undertake Appropriate Assessment. This covers any plan or project having a "significant effect" on any "European site" where the plan or project is not directly concerned with nature conservation.

As part of its continuing interest on the territorial impact of EU Directives within the UK, the Department of Communities and Local Government commissioned research in 2009-10 on tools to assess the impacts of EU Directives. This includes consideration of TIA methodology. The commissioned research will be completed before the EATIA project begins.

The situation in Portugal

As elsewhere, SEA and EIA are the main approaches in Portugal. However there are procedures linked to the National Spatial Development Policy Programme. All the central government sector ministries are involved in the procedure for preparation of this Programme. The final agreed Programme, after this widespread consultation with other ministries, was adopted by the Parliament. So all the plans and sector policies then have to conform with that document. Regional and local level public authorities refine what is in this national Programme to fit to local specificities.

In recent years a special procedure has been introduced that means some projects are classed as a "Project with Special National Interest". These then go to a commission that tries to short cut the problem and resolve it. All ministries are sitting on that Commission, so consultation is done in the meeting and agreement reached there and a decision is taken.

Notwithstanding this procedure, the situation remains that the main forms of impact assessment are SEA and EIA, and consequently environmental considerations receive more attention than territorial impacts.

The situation in Slovenia

A new regulatory impact procedure is being prepared in Slovenia. The new rules will mean that government measures have to be assessed in terms of their environmental, economic and social impacts. It will be similar to the Impact Assessment approach of the Commission. It is likely that some guidance about the territorial dimension will be included as part of the impacts on environment. The guidance on how to apply the new procedure is still being worked on. It is anticipated that a series of questions will be asked on each dimension about the

impacts, and indications will be given on what might be the implications of the regulatory proposals.

In addition, SEA is required for all programmes and plans. Then additionally, there are some assessments of territorial impacts within the procedures on spatial development. These apply especially for the plans of infrastructure ministries. For such plans and projects a form of TIA has to be done on how the proposed development will impact not just on the environment, but also on some lower level spatial structures such as settlements. Thus SEA covers the environmental part of the assessment. Then as well as the technical or feasibility assessment for a big infrastructure project, there will be an economic assessment, but also a spatial assessment. The final process of evaluation and integration of the different assessments is done by inter-departmental negotiation.

All the sectoral ministries were consulted during the preparation of the Spatial Development Strategy of Slovenia, and their various plans and programmes were built into the Strategy. The Strategy was adopted in the Parliament. There are no regional councils in Slovenia.

Chapter 3: Approaches and attitudes to TIA in other EU countries

Analysis of the interviews revealed substantial agreement on a number of points that are summarised here as findings.

Finding 1 - The term TIA is not in common use

There was a lot of common ground on key points. The TIA concept was always understood as being about assessing the territorial dimension of economic, social, environmental (and in some cases, cultural) impacts of projects or policies, particularly sector policies such as transport. One researcher close to ESPON explained it as follows:

To me, TIA is broader than what ESPON does at the moment, where it tries through macro economic modelling to get NUTS 3 data on impacts. I see TIA much more in a discursive vein, a way of influencing other policies – something that makes policy-makers aware of all the indirect effects of policy - I would include there too.

There was wide recognition that existing impact assessment regimes are heavily biased towards environmental impacts. Though such assessments may include some spatial elements, they do not seek trade-offs between environmental and other impacts, nor work towards policy integration. Indeed, the fundamental aim of such approaches is often to protect environment absolutely, rather than balance it against jobs, for example. As one interviewee put it, *"at the present, the environmental aspect has been weighted more than the social, economic or cultural aspects when considering development."*

"The term TIA is not in planning culture of my country (Italy) or in my region"

The TIA concept is seen as strongly related to the EU level of policy making, though there is recognition that in principle such assessments would also be appropriate at national, regional and local level. However, in most countries there is no such terminology as "TIA" at those levels. As one interviewee put it:

I use the term TIA mainly at EU level. It should also be relevant at national level especially, but also more like a broad Environmental Impact Assessment at regional and local level. The analysis would be

more vague or general at the higher level, but more concrete at local level.

Finding 2 - There are some TIA-style procedures in some countries

This does not mean that there are no attempts to address problems of territorial impacts at these levels, and within national procedures and institutions. Most notably, in Germany there is a system known as “*Raumordnungsverfahren*”, which is part of the legislation for spatial planning. A leading researcher explained:

However, it means something different from the way that “TIA” is currently being used. Now when TIA is discussed the stress is on quantitative measurements of the impacts on space or territory of sector policies. In contrast, the German procedure means comparing the impacts of new projects for conformity with existing plans, though of course this does not necessarily mean that the project has to be dropped if it does not conform. I have always thought that TIA in this sense would be very useful approach, as it would immediately highlight conflicts between spatial and sectoral plans. This meaning of TIA got lost. Even in the German discussions about TIA this difference got lost.

A different researcher explained further:

It began almost 20 years ago now. Every major project and regional plan must undergo a kind of TIA before it can be approved by the regional parliament. It is an older instrument than EIA. The most relevant examples are the application of this procedure to proposals for major infrastructure or large retail developments. It includes cross-border impacts within the Federal state, e.g. on retailing. The main focus is on projects, but every regional plan has some elements of TIA, though it is not called TIA. The assessment is carried out by the Lander, or in the large Lander it is done by the next regional scale below that. Overall though it was a Federal requirement that each Lander then enacted and the Lander is in charge of the action.

A similar system operates in Austria. Other countries have also sought ways to tackle similar problems through spatial planning procedures. In Ireland, for example:

There are important moves to make compliance with Ireland's National Spatial Strategy (NSS) a strong requirement in the preparation of spatial plans at regional and local level. In effect the use of the NSS in this way has a measure of TIA built in. Previously all that was required was to "have regard to" the NSS, which in practice meant token reference was all that was essential.

In Poland:

There has been ex-post evaluation that focused on results and impacts. They were using some basic indicators – a transport TIA included things like time savings, access to main regional nodes and also differences on scale of improvement and also impact on environment and on labour markets and also gender impacts. These were done as before / after comparison for particular municipalities for big infrastructure investment like road improvements. Outcomes were maps that would show the relative e and absolute impacts. It was done by a university team as public procurement.

In Wallonia the focus is at the local level:

Assessments are done at local level because a municipality is responsible for issuing development permits. For example, if there is a proposal for a huge retail development, then there would need to be some assessment of the likely impacts, particularly in terms of mobility and traffic. Sometimes a university team - or a private consultant - may study impacts but that is not mandatory.

Finding 3 – EU Directives and Policy do have territorial impacts

Interviewees were asked to identify three EU policies that have significant territorial impacts in their country. Two things were notable from the replies. Firstly, nobody had any difficulty identifying three policies. While this is not surprising, it does confirm that EU policies (and Directives, which were often cited) do indeed have territorial impacts. As one interviewee commented, "*EU policies often have a huge effect on agendas for regional and national policy debates.*" The second finding perhaps was more interesting. It is that quite a wide range of policies and Directives were identified. Please see Table 1.

Table 1: Main EU Policies and Directives with territorial impacts

Policy / Directive	Country where it is seen as significant
Agriculture	Luxembourg, Ireland, Netherlands, Poland, Belgium
ERDF / INTERREG	Luxembourg, Sweden, Ireland, Poland, Belgium (particularly Wallonia)
Competition	Sweden, Norway, Luxembourg
Transport	Ireland, Poland, Belgium
Environment	Italy, Netherlands, Belgium
Energy	Ireland
Maritime	Ireland

Table 1 should be treated with caution. It does not mean that the policies are only significant in the countries identified, nor was any attempt made to rank relative importance. In particular, one difficulty is that the territorial impacts for some policies / Directives are easier to anticipate than others. For example, the impacts of territorial transport policy are easier to identify than for a move such as the development of the Eurozone. While agriculture / rural development policy and ERDF are of general importance there are some interesting differences in emphasis. Observations from the interviewees reveal some important national nuances on impacts.

Concern with the impacts of Clean Air Directive are sharp within the Netherlands, where it has been used by environmentalists to challenge major development proposals. However, this seems to be the exception rather than the rule and to be a consequence of the way the Directive was translated into national legislation. However, there are also debates about air quality in urban areas in Sweden and Belgium.

"In Sweden there are concerns that following the environmental policy will create a loss of jobs. Areas with lot of environmental problems are also regions with low income people, so strict environmental controls are not popular. In cities the problems that are discussed are traffic congestion and air quality. So the impacts of EU initiatives here are differentiated on both rural – urban and North - South dimensions."

In Sweden, agriculture had been de-regulated, but once Sweden joined the EU and came under the Common Agricultural Policy a new phase of regulation and subsidy began. In terms of regional policy, though, the approach changed in line with the Lisbon Strategy and its emphasis on competitiveness. This is leading to very fundamental questions being asked about the traditional pattern of dispersed and

decentralised higher education provision: the case for concentration and global competitiveness is now being argued.

Competition policy challenges some traditional regional approaches in Scandinavia. High taxes on petrol disadvantage people and firms in peripheral, sparsely populated regions, but regional variations in the tax rate would be in contradiction to competition policy. Similarly, Norway had to change a system which allowed regionalised variations in the company tax system. Luxembourg's tradition of a low rate of Value Added Tax is also brought into question. A surge of new interest in issues and measures linked to urban competitiveness was also reported from Ireland.

"Much of the EU investment in transport is going into improving west-east routes. The effect is to change the relative position of places not on those routes. We are seeing the 'peripheralisation' of the peripheral parts of northern Europe."

Finding 4 - Environmental assessments are the main form of impact assessment, but have limits

The importance of Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment was widely recognised. The advent of these assessment regimes has had some benefits. It has brought sectoral agencies such as those concerned with forestry, for example, into a better co-ordination with spatial planning policies. Similarly it has extended the leverage open to interested people to participate in the planning process. In Italy, for example:

Some colleagues have traditionally only looked at the plan and had a narrow outlook on the issues behind the plan. However, the new Strategic Environmental Assessment regime shows that planning is a comprehensive activity and you have to take account of wide effects. Although the emphasis is on the environment, it can have a kind of domino effect, so this is the added value.

However, several interviewees had some reservations about the way these environmental assessments operate. In Luxembourg, for example:

SEAs are not very transparent. SEA done at national level is top-down. Ministries in charge were obliged to add on this procedure – it was incoherent. The results will only be presented to the public after the

procedure is complete. Thus the SEA procedure is not well integrated with existing sectoral or spatial planning procedures. Rather SEA has been put on top of them. Doing a SEA has been perceived as an EU obligation, rather than as a more positive tool. It is seen as a kind of audit.

"EIA only comes into the process at a late stage. At times you feel the EIA process is rather like providing an alibi."

Not surprisingly, given the background of those interviewed, they saw benefits in having as more holistic form of impact assessment. However, this was far from an unqualified endorsement of the TIA idea. There was concern about the top down imposition of more obligations. Indeed the idea of TIA has struggled to command a consensus. As one expert noted, *"The idea of TIA was mooted in discussions leading up to the Territorial Agenda, but some Member States were very resistant to the idea."*

"An assessment culture is developing that is onerous and demanding on time and other resources, checking things which are ridiculous."

Finding 5 – TIA needs to be easy to understand and manageable in terms of resources and data

Thus there was a general feeling that if TIA is to develop and strengthen the practice of spatial planning, then it needs to be easy to understand and communicate. One interviewee saw the need for *"a way of doing TIA that would involve asking just a few very pertinent questions that would open the eyes of people not used to working territorially. If TIA managed that it would be a very good exercise even if it lacked any mapping and detail."*

This pragmatic stance was widely echoed, though the value of an EU-wide methodology was also recognised, *"with some margin to flexibly adapt this standard approach to the particular national context."* The caveat made was that for this to become a reality there needs to be comparable and reliable data. Similarly, there is a tension between the desire for a "user-friendly" method that is transparent and easy to understand for policy-makers, and the recognition that spatial relations are complex.

One solution proposed was that *"we need to combine the econometric and quantitative work with use of case studies and interviews with key respondents in locations and sectors. TIA should not be exclusively a quantitative data driven process."*

Those interviewed were keen to avoid TIA becoming a bureaucratic routine. Similarly, there was recognition that *"The form of a TIA depends on the scale – a hierarchy of TIAs are needed."* Nevertheless, several interviewees stressed the need to integrate procedures into planning legislation and practice.

We come back to the need to do it through the lens of plans and planners. We should take away the idea that TIA needs to look at everything. Let's instead focus on the plan, though this does not mean that the plan is all-powerful and to be implemented at all costs.

"Complicated methods will not be taken up in practice – if you go out to practitioners with a TIA methodology, you have to realise that they are not technicians. They want results. In small counties there will be very few practitioners able to use a complicated methodology. If they can take results on board easily, then that is positive. There is not much interest in methods – results and preconditions are what matter."

Finding 6 – There is value in ESPON's TIA work, but it is too sophisticated to be transferred to practice

The interviews included a question and discussion about the TIA work done in ESPON, particularly the use of the TEQUILA and TEQUILA II multi-criteria evaluation models developed by Roberto Camagni in the ESPON 2006 Spatial Scenarios project and the ESPON 2013 project known as TIPTAP.

"What's being done on TIA in ESPON is useful – but we need to get beyond GDP as the main measure and look at economic performance in a deeper way, encompassing things like productivity and agglomeration benefits. This links into polycentricity. Flows are also important – but too often we can't measure anything other than physical links between places. We need data on functional interactions such as economic interaction. This is on TIPTAP's radar. We need to see impacts in relation to networks within and between urban clusters."

It was noted by some that the range of TIAs done in the ESPON 2006 programme did not follow a common methodology, and sometimes produced policy recommendations that contradicted those of other ESPON TIA studies. Overall, there was general respect for what had been achieved, which as one interviewee put it has made ESPON “a strong partner driving the debate about TIA”. Another commented that “*Roberto Camagni has turned it into a very comprehensive instrument – he has done a lot of good conceptual work*”. However, there were deep reservations about the gap between this work and the world of practice. Notably the only practitioner interviewed was not familiar with the ESPON work on TIA.

More fundamentally there was concern that no matter how sophisticated the analysis, the basic problem remains that choosing and weighting indicators fundamentally shapes outcomes which carry the aura of objective science. As one interviewee put it:

Assessment based on a selected list of indicators should just be one element of the discussion. It is very interesting to be able to combine several complex elements and compare the likely impacts. But the way it was done – with some factors seen as positive and some others as negative – well, you can ask about that. It misses the ideology behind the choices, for example GDP growth – a positive indicator - includes nevertheless things like reparation after accidents: therefore the more accidents, the more positive the indicator. An indicator can be positive in the short term, but negative in the long term. This is not taken into account. It is not just science: there is also a political and ideological dimension, which should be expressed more clearly.

Similarly, another expert commented “*Avoid the black box feeling that people have when presented with the output from a very sophisticated and complex piece of statistical analysis. Advanced models can be well done but people feel powerless when presented with the results of such work.*”

Finding 7 – TIA would be most useful if done ex-ante

The interviews also probed when TIA should be done – ex-ante, ex-post or on-going. While all were seen as valuable in different ways and would fit into different stages of the planning process, there was a clear consensus that the greatest value to policy makers would come from ex-ante TIAs. Not surprisingly, this is the stage where similar exercises are conducted in the planning systems of most of the countries covered in this short review.

"Ex-ante is about predicting future development and ex-post is done to monitor the outcome of a plan. I am not so sure about TIA as means of continuous monitoring – it depends on the TIA methodology. The same methodology to do TIA as an on-going analysis may not mix with that needed to use it as ex-ante. When done ex-post TIA would be a method to lead into the next revision of the plan."

Finding 8 – Plans are key to the TIA process

The idea of co-ordination is at the heart of TIA. The problem was put simply by one expert interviewed: *"Sectors remain detached from one another. Planning is what brings them together at the territory."* If a robust but basic TIA, combining qualitative and quantitative analysis could be undertaken, the view is that it could be a valuable tool. Equally important though is the need to have a set of spatial policies which provide the yardstick against which to assess territorial impacts. As one expert said: *"Plans, whether formal or informal (such as strategies) are a filter through which to look at spatial reality. They define what you need to look at in development that is to be promoted or controlled. Plans shed light on the significant issues in respect of the proposal. Of course this process can lead to a decision that the plan itself needs to be revised."*

However, we are some way from this ideal. As another interviewee observed: *"It would be better to integrate TIA into existing planning procedures rather than build up a parallel procedure. However, to do this would require major revision of planning procedures in many countries."*

There are also concerns about whether the skills in spatial analysis exist, as the following quote from one of the interviews shows:

Using existing spatial plans as the basis to anticipate potential impacts of EU measures on the territory should work quite well at Local/Regional level. However, for it to work it would depend on people being able to translate what are usually "fuzzy" EU directives into what they mean for concrete action. Often it needs a lot of translation to see what they will mean in the end. For example, a new directive on pollution would take a lot of working out, and until then it is hard to talk of a TIA on it. So "yes" spatial plans could be used, but it demands people with the skill to translate the directive.

Given the lack of EU legal competence for spatial planning, does this invalidate pan-European TIAs such as those done by ESPON? The answer is "no": *"TIA done at EU level should force national policy makers to check out their national situation and refine it; and also to contribute to the refining of the EU work by provision of national insights."*

Chapter 4: CONCLUSIONS

"The sector planning is now very strong. For example, before 1995 environmental concerns were included within the general field of spatial planning. However, since then we have seen the rise of a separate agenda of environmental concerns. Now all other sectors have become very strong also. Partly this is because EU legislation is itself sectoral."

There can be no doubt that sectoral policies, whether EU or national, can have territorial impacts. In some cases those impacts are reasonably simple to anticipate, at least in broad qualitative term. This is particularly the case when the policies or programmes themselves are focused on physical and territorially specific matters such as constructing a new major highway or protecting an area that is of high environmental value or avoiding development on land that has been badly polluted. However, it is harder to anticipate the territorial impacts of less spatially specific policies. EU Directives like those on competition or policies on Research and Development are examples.

Implications for the EATIA project

The EATIA project will explore how ESPON work on TIA might be used at national level in the UK, Portugal and Slovenia. This short study has shown that there are likely to be barriers to transfer of the methodology from ESPON. The priorities of practitioners are different from those of research teams. In addition there is evidence of distaste for more top-down imposition to new procedures. However, there is also recognition that the underlying logic behind the TIA idea is very robust – sector policies and EU Directives do have significant, often unanticipated territorial impacts, some of which are easier to anticipate than others.

The main messages for the EATIA project are:

- Look for simple procedures that draw strongly on qualitative judgement and use existing plans and strategies as the departure point against which to assess impacts.
- Communication really matters, not least the ability to communicate the complexity of ESPON's work and findings to a

practitioner audience, and to enable policy makers to understand the policy choices open to them.

- Several countries use their own planning procedures to undertake ex-ante assessments of the impacts of projects and policies. These are worth looking at.
- SEA and EIA are established as the way to do impact assessment. In general, they have been valuable in raising the quality of environmental analysis, but they do not amount to integrative or truly territorial tools.

References

C.Hague, J.Crawford and K.Gracie (2008) 'UK experience of using Territorial Impact Assessment', unpublished paper produced for the Department of Communities and Local Government by the UK ESPON Contact Point.