



Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru
The National Assembly for Wales

Developing Health impact assessment in Wales

Better Health
Better **Wales**

Contents

Foreword	3
Executive summary	5
1. Introduction	7
2. What is health impact assessment?	9
3. History and development of health impact assessment	12
4. The practice of health impact assessment	15
5. Risk assessment	24
6. Progress in Wales	29
References	32

Foreword

The drive towards improving the health of people in Wales is gaining considerable momentum. The importance of tackling inequalities in health is also recognised with the aim of bringing the health of people with the worst levels of health in Wales up to that of those with the best health. It is a major challenge but one to which the Assembly is fully committed. Success will require a combined, and sustained, effort from us all - in organisations in the public, private and voluntary sectors, and as individuals and members of local communities. We can all contribute to achieving better health and we can all benefit as a result.

Our strategy for health improvement recognises the need to tackle the underlying factors which lead to poor health; for example, poor housing, poor education, and unemployment. It also recognises the potential contribution of these sectors to efforts to improve health, well-being and prosperity among the population and to reduce inequalities in health. Better health is one of the priorities of our Better Wales consultation document, along with better job opportunities, better education, better quality of life and best value. Better Wales sets out our proposals to develop a confident, outward-looking Wales, where everyone can realise their potential. To achieve our aims, policies and programmes must add value to each other and in this context, the concept of health impact assessment is important.

There is no doubt that we need to develop better tools to help us to assess the effect(s) on health of policies, programmes and other developments in sectors outside the health service. Health impact assessment will, as a minimum, help to ensure that the health consequences and effects of future decisions are not overlooked. Using it will increase further our awareness of health and help to ensure that decisions on policies and developments are informed by an understanding of their impact on health. However, the development and use of health impact assessment in Wales will, given that health is an issue which cuts across policy areas, also help to identify further opportunities to make a positive difference to health of people in Wales.

This document is another step forward in the development. It brings together from around the world a wealth of information on the use of health impact assessment. In that sense, it is a rich source of information. It will help to raise awareness and understanding of health impact assessment as an approach which can be adopted by organisations at all levels as an aid to decision making and as part of joint efforts to promote better health.


The purpose of this document is to provide a base of information and a platform for further action to explore and develop the use of health impact assessment in Wales. However, a

single document cannot achieve all we want to achieve and therefore it will not stand alone. We are committed to following up this publication with action. Our broad plans for action, which will include testing out the health impact assessment approach within the National Assembly itself, are described in Chapter 6.


Join us in exploring and developing the use of health impact assessment in Wales as one more step towards improving health and well-being of people in Wales.




First Secretary



Health & Social Services Secretary



Business Secretary




Agriculture & Rural Development
Secretary




Finance Secretary



Local Government &
Environment Secretary



Economic Development Secretary



Pre 16 Education, Schools & Early
Learning Secretary



Post 16 Education & Training Secretary

Executive summary

The purpose of this document is twofold. First, to raise awareness of health impact assessment. Second, to provide a base resource of information on the subject as a platform and aid to further action, including the development of tools and techniques. It aims to increase awareness and understanding of health impact assessment so that national and local organisations adopt it as part of their decision making processes.

The Government is committed to improving the health of the population by tackling the underlying causes of ill health.

Better health is recognised by the Assembly as an issue which cuts across policy areas. It features as one of the five priorities of Better Wales, a consultation paper produced as part of the process of developing a strategic plan for the Assembly and for Wales.

The Better Health Better Wales Strategic Framework sets out the Assembly's plans and priorities for action to improve the health of people in Wales. It makes a clear commitment to develop the use of health impact assessment in Wales.

The target audience for this document is policy and decision makers, professionals and practitioners at national and local levels - in health services, local government, and in other organisations in the public, private, community and voluntary sectors. Publication will be followed by further action to increase understanding of health impact assessment, to explore and test its use, and to share experience and learning.

The aim must be to develop the health impact assessment approach in a way that is neither academic nor bureaucratic but 'fit for purpose'. The outcomes of health impact assessment are particularly important for people and communities and therefore, their participation in the process is vital. Developing and testing health impact assessment will help to identify ways in which they can be involved.

A key reason for developing the use of health impact assessment is to add value to the policy and decision making processes thus resulting in better decisions in terms of their potential contribution to improving health. It will also help to identify further opportunities to address cross-cutting issues such as health and to contribute to reducing inequalities in health.

While health is by no means the only consideration for decisions on policies and developments, it is essential that health is taken into account within the wider agenda of improving the health and well-being of people in Wales.

There is no doubt that better tools are needed to enable the health consequences of decisions and developments to be assessed. Health impact assessment has largely been developed from environmental impact assessment. The immediate need is to explore and develop health impact assessment in Wales. This will enable its usefulness to be assessed. It may also help to identify whether the concept of impact assessment, its processes and/or tools will be of relevance to other cross-cutting issues.

Health impact assessment can be defined as a combination of procedures or methods which enable a judgement to be made on the effect(s) - positive or negative - of policies, programmes or other developments on the health of a population or on parts of the population where inequalities in health are concerned.

Health impact assessment can be used for large and complex issues such as major policies or for relatively small issues such as local planning or licensing applications. It can be applied by organisations at local, regional, national and international levels - across public, private and voluntary sectors, and in communities by self-help groups and as part of wider initiatives.

This document is one of a series of Better Health Better Wales documents designed to take forward action to achieve improvements in the health of the people in Wales.

There is a need to develop appropriate health impact assessment methods for use in Wales. Methods are likely to vary with the setting in which the health impact assessment is being undertaken and the issue(s) to which it is applied. As a general point, it can be helpful to try and quantify the size of predicted outcomes wherever possible but policy and decision makers should not be deterred from undertaking health impact assessment by the difficulty of making fully quantified predictions. They should make the best assessment they can using the information and skills available to them and by accepting that some degree of uncertainty may be unavoidable.

The five main stages of health impact assessment are: screening; scoping; risk assessment; decision making and implementation/monitoring.

A series of tools and checklists for the screening and scoping stages of health impact assessment are described in this document. Issues relevant to the application of health impact assessment methods are also discussed.

The involvement of stakeholders - policy and decision makers, people and communities - in health impact assessment is important. The involvement of the public is particularly important as many judgments within health impact assessment are value judgments rather than scientific judgments. The best ways of involving the public requires careful consideration but this will be important as part of the participatory approach to policy making which has been adopted by the National Assembly for Wales.

The Assembly is committed to exploring and developing further the use of health impact assessment in Wales. This publication provides a solid foundation for additional action including pilot projects, dissemination and feedback activity, support and guidance, and training and development events.

1. Introduction

1.1 It is widely recognised that the health of people and communities is determined far more by matters such as housing, employment, income and social cohesion than by health services¹². Better Health Better Wales³ demonstrated the Government's commitment to improving the health of the population. In setting out its intention to tackle the underlying causes of ill health through a new approach which addresses the factors which impact on health, it recognised the importance for health of policy areas such as housing, transport, education, economic development, and law and order. Better Health Better Wales suggested that health impact assessment should be considered as a means of assessing how different policies would affect health and to help ensure that the health effects of policies were not overlooked.

1.2 The importance of better health is further reinforced by Better Wales⁴, a consultation paper published as part of the process of developing a widely owned strategic plan for the Assembly. Better health is one of the document's five priority themes along with better job opportunities, better education, better quality of life and best value. In stating the intention to ensure policies and programmes add value to each other, it recognises the importance of identifying opportunities to address cross-cutting issues such as health.

1.3 There is no doubt that better tools are needed to enable us to predict the health consequences of policies in numerous areas. Health impact assessment has been described as 'an idea whose time has come'⁵ and its use as a tool to aid policy and decision making must be tested.

1.4 There is evidence of widespread inequalities in health in Wales⁶. They largely reflect the distribution of factors which determine health. The Assembly is committed to reducing health inequalities by 'bringing the level of those with the poorest health up to the level of those with best health'⁷. In order to achieve this, policies, programmes and projects should be assessed not only for their overall effect on health but also to show that they will contribute to reducing inequalities or at very least not increasing them.

1.5 The need for health and well-being to be sustainable was emphasised in Better Health Better Wales. This can only be achieved in the context of sustainable development and care for the environment. Local Agenda 21 strategies have been adopted by local authorities in Wales to focus on sustainable development⁸. The degree to which policies, programmes and projects that impact on health produce sustainable health also needs to be assessed.

1.6 Health is of course not the only consideration for decisions on policies and other developments. Decisions will be influenced by other imperatives. However, the aim must be to ensure that opportunities for health gain are not lost because they were not considered. When health has to be balanced against other policy objectives, it should be done in full knowledge of the consequences, whether positive or negative. Health impact assessment does not mean that health considerations will always take primacy over all others. However, it does mean that the potential impact on health will always be considered. It also offers the possibility that additional opportunities to address cross-cutting issues will be identified.

1.7 The Better Health Better Wales Strategic Framework⁹ sets out the Assembly's plans and priorities for action to improve the health of people in Wales. It makes a clear commitment to develop the use of health impact assessment in Wales. There is already considerable experience of the approach in Wales albeit limited to a relatively small number of sectors. However, there is a solid foundation on which to develop further the use of health impact assessment in Wales in order to harness the potential contributions to improving the health of the population.

1.8 The target audience for this document, one of the series of Better Health Better Wales documents, is policy and decision makers, professionals and practitioners at national and local levels in health services, local government, and in other organisations in the public, private, community and voluntary sectors. The aims of the document are:

- to raise awareness of health impact assessment;
- to increase understanding of the approach so that with further guidance and support, organisations at national and local levels may adopt it as part of their decision making processes;
- to outline the approaches and tools available to assist the process of health impact assessment.

1.9 This document is based on an extensive review of published literature on health impact assessment. It describes health impact assessment and how it has been developed in Wales, the UK and in other countries. It also outlines action which will be needed to explore and develop further its use in Wales.

1.10 Comments on any part of this document and suggestions for the further development and use of health impact assessment in Wales would be welcome. Comments should be forwarded to: Mr Ceri Breeze, Health Promotion Division, The National Assembly for Wales, Cathays Park, Cardiff, CF1 3NQ, Tel: 029 20 752222, Fax: 029 20 756000, Email: Ceri.Breeze@wales.gsi.gov.uk

2. What is health impact assessment?

2.1 Health impact assessment has been defined in a number of ways. One such definition is:

‘Any combination of procedures or methods by which a proposed policy or program may be judged as to the effects it may have on the health of a population’ ¹⁰.

2.2 A more detailed definition is:

‘A methodology which enables the identification, prediction and evaluation of the likely changes in health risk, both positive and negative, (single or collective), of a policy programme, plan or development action on a defined population. These changes may be direct and immediate or indirect and delayed.’ ¹¹

2.3 The overall aim of health impact assessment is to provide a means of ensuring that the potential impact on health is taken into account as part of the decision making process for policies, programmes and other developments. Health impact assessment may be applied to a policy, a programme or a single project. It may be applied to an issue as large and complex as welfare policy or transport policy, or an issue as small as a local planning or licensing application.

2.4 Health impact assessment may be applied at a variety of levels; for example, at international level by bodies such as the European Commission or the World Health Organization; at national level by national governments or national organisations and at local level by local authorities, health authorities and by non-government organisations.

2.5 There are three types of health impact assessment; each depends on when the assessment is undertaken:

- prospective
- retrospective
- concurrent

2.6 Prospective health impact assessment looks at some policy, programme or project not yet implemented and attempts to predict the consequences. These predictions are based on theory and on experience of similar decisions in the past. If sufficient knowledge has been gained of the size of health effects associated with different levels of health determinants, it may be possible to make quantified predictions. Prospective health impact assessment can be partially validated by seeing if predictions of consequences in the near future turn out to be correct.

2.7 Retrospective health impact assessment looks at the consequences of some policy, programme or project already implemented or of some unplanned event that has occurred. It asks what have been the consequences. Understanding of the nature and magnitude of effects on health for use in prospective health impact assessment may be derived from such studies.

2.8 In concurrent health impact assessment, the consequences of the policy, programme or project are monitored as they are implemented. It may allow activity to mitigate any negative effects to be undertaken promptly. Its main use is where consequences are expected but where their nature is uncertain.

2.9 Frequently, single proposals may be too small to generate significant effects on their own but the total effect of many such small proposals may create a major impact. In

response to this within the field of environmental impact assessment, there has been a call for assessments to be applied to whole sectors - a process termed 'strategic environmental assessment'. The same issue may arise for health impacts and therefore, there may be a need for a corresponding strategic approach.

2.10 Prior to the development of health impact assessment, policy making did not take place in an intellectual vacuum. Therefore, if health impact assessment is to be worthwhile, it must add value to the existing policy making process and result in better decisions than would otherwise have been made. For example, health impact assessment must do more than point out that the construction of a new road may create noise and air pollution or that closure of a factory may cause unemployment and distress. Decision makers do not need a new discipline of impact assessors to tell them such obvious facts.

2.11 Health impact assessment needs to be developed as an approach which can be adopted and used by individuals who are involved in decision making processes at a variety of levels. All those involved will need to develop their knowledge and skills. One of the early contributions it can make is to change the culture among policy and decision makers so that they become more aware of health as an issue which is relevant across policy areas. Other ways in which it could assist decision making include:

- Identifying factors - harmful or beneficial - that would not otherwise have been identified;
- Quantifying the magnitude of harmful and beneficial impacts more precisely than could otherwise have been done;
- Clarifying the elements of trade-offs in policy making by better identification and description of the elements involved, and their interrelationships;
- Allowing better mitigation of harmful impacts or enhancement of beneficial impacts;
- Making the decision making process more transparent and helping to inform it - particularly in policy areas where the relevance of health is not immediately apparent - leading to increased participation by stakeholders.

2.12 It is important that the health impact assessment procedures should be commensurate to the issue to which they relate. Thus, where appropriate, the health impact assessment process should be reasonably quick and simple so it does not add greatly to the time and cost of making the decision.¹² It is sometimes suggested that health impact assessment would only be routinely applied by decision-makers and public authorities if it were to be mandatory. However, a premature attempt to do this could lead to an unthinking, 'tick-box', approach, rather than encourage in-depth consideration of the possible health consequences of decisions. The immediate need is to develop further our understanding of health impact assessment and to explore and test its use. As discussed later in this document, the aim is to integrate health impact assessment as part of decision making processes. Therefore, the contribution of decision makers and other stakeholders to its development is essential.

Outcomes

2.13 The World Health Organization defines health as 'a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease and infirmity'¹³. This definition may be considered utopian but it does indicate the multi-faceted nature of health and the need to take a broad view of outcomes within health impact assessment. Better Health Better Wales suggested a more practical goal when it defined sustainable health as being achieved 'when people and communities can take control of their lives and are able to live their lives to the full'.¹⁴

2.14 The outcomes considered in health impact assessments will depend on how the term health is understood. There is a danger that the outcomes considered will be limited to number of deaths, perhaps years of life lost, or possibly hospital admissions because the

information with which to predict other outcomes is lacking. However, a full health impact assessment would cover not only death and serious illness but also less serious illness, self reported illness and even feelings about life. Indications of these could be derived from usage rates for primary care services and surveys of self reported symptoms (e.g. the Welsh Health Survey) using standardised approaches developed to measure quality of life such as the Nottingham Health Index¹⁵, SF36¹⁶ and EuroQol¹⁷ or measures of positive health¹⁸. The importance of outcomes to people and communities must be recognised and, therefore, their participation in the health impact assessment process is essential. This is discussed later in this document.

2.15 When comparing the consequences of different options it may be inconvenient to have the outcomes expressed on a several different scales (for example numbers of deaths, numbers disabled, and numbers feeling unwell). In order to overcome this problem, attempts have been made to combine different outcomes into a single measure which reflects the many dimensions of health. Quality Adjusted Life Years (QALY)¹⁹ and Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALY)²⁰ are examples of measures which combine several dimensions. However, some dispute the validity of these and similar approaches.

2.16 One approach suggested was that health impacts could be valued monetarily²¹ but in many cases, the level of knowledge is insufficient to allow this to be done and different stakeholders may disagree with the values used in the process.

3. History and development of health impact assessment

3.1 Formal aids to decision making are not new. In the mid sixties, cost benefit analysis was introduced as a tool to aid large infrastructure decisions, and has been used in the planning of developments in Wales as elsewhere. The World Bank has made use of cost benefit analysis in deciding whether to proceed with investments in developing countries.

3.2 It was rapidly realised that simply looking at projects in terms of financial costs and benefits was inadequate and failed to take account of the consequences for bio-diversity and the environment. In projects in developing countries these were often substantial. This gave rise to environmental assessment alongside consideration of the financial costs and benefits. In 1969, the United States introduced the Environment Protection Act²² which requires an environmental impact assessment of all projects in the United States of America and all projects funded by United States aid. This requirement was rapidly followed by other countries. In 1985, the European Commission introduced its first directive requiring all large development projects to be subject to environmental impact assessment and this was implemented in the UK in 1988. Since then there have been several revisions tightening and extending the original European Commission Directive. In many ways, the development of health impact assessment has been linked to or modeled on environmental impact assessment.

3.3 With the widespread introduction of environmental impact assessment it was increasingly realised that the issues to be addressed required far more than the skills and knowledge of any single person or discipline and an environmental impact assessment team is now likely to involve the skills of specialists from several different disciplines. Projects in developing countries were often associated with massive disruption of human communities which could be displaced and have their culture and lifestyle radically changed. Despite this often less attention was paid to the human species than to flora and other fauna. This gave rise to the practice of including anthropologists and sociologists in the environmental impact assessment team²³ and the development of social impact assessment.²⁴

3.4 The need to consider health issues in environmental impact assessment was also realised at an early stage²⁵. Health impact assessment is closely allied to social impact assessment. The difference is one of emphasis and disciplinary mix rather than one of substance. Both are concerned with impacts on human health and well being. Effects on social structures and functions, on culture and on how humans interact with their environment are powerful determinants of health. As Hirschfield et al ²⁶ remark 'it is difficult to envisage what a social impact would be that did not have an impact on health or what territory could be covered by a social impact assessment that was not enveloped within a health impact assessment.'

3.5 While understanding and skills were being developed for the assessment of environmental and health impacts of major construction projects and developments, awareness was also growing of the importance of assessing public policy. Recognition of the wide range of factors that determine health and the importance to health of 'non health' policy areas lead to calls for 'healthy public policy'²⁷ and by implication, health assessment of policies. As Milio²⁸ wrote in her influential book in 1986, 'health interests will be better served if the impact of policies affecting health important aspects of environments and patterns of living were assessed'.

3.6 Considerable experience of health impact assessment has already been developed in other parts of the world. The following paragraphs summarise this.

3.7 The early development of environmental impact assessment and health impact assessment was largely concerned with projects in developing countries which, because of the low level of economic development and absent infrastructure, tended to have massive impacts on biodiversity and the environment. The high prevalence of infectious disease and inadequate health services meant that health impacts also tended to be considerable. For example, dam projects could result in increased frequency of water borne disease, displacement of population, changed habitats resulting in increased frequency of vector borne disease, and disturbed culture and lifestyle, resulting in diseases of malnutrition, alcohol related disease, sexually transmitted disease, social disruption and mental health problems.²⁹ These difficulties have led most major funding agencies to require environmental impact assessments for all large developments. Increasingly, the tendency has been to move beyond assessment to environmental management plans which prevent or mitigate environmental and health problems.³⁰

3.8 In developed countries, the basic level of population health is higher, communicable disease less prevalent and health services much more widely available. As a result, the health impacts of projects in developed countries tend to be less dramatic but the lessons learnt with environmental impact assessment and health impact assessment in developing countries can be adapted to the circumstances of the developed world.

3.9 In New Zealand, the Resource Management Act 1991, requires consent authorities (regional, district or city councils) to make an 'assessment of any actual or potential effects on the environment' which includes 'any effect on those in the neighbourhood or wider community including any socio-economic and cultural effects'. The public health authority is expected to contribute resources and expertise to help the consent authority. An useful Guide to Health Impact Assessment has been published.³¹

3.10 In Australia, responsibility for most development planning and resource issues lies with individual States hence most environmental and health impact assessments are carried out under State legislation. The National Better Health Programme commissioned a report³² on environmental and health impact assessment and this serves as a guide for its implementation in States.

3.11 In 1993, the Government of British Columbia (Canada) required that in submissions to the Cabinet the health impacts of all options should be considered and that any significant impacts should be discussed. The guidance reads:

'The likely positive or negative impact of each option on the health of individuals, groups and communities, or on the health care system should be analysed. The analysis should recognise the social, economic and physical factors affecting health, such as economic security, employment and working conditions, social support, safety, equity, education and sense of control. The opportunity for inclusion of individuals, communities and other sectors in the decision making on issues that affect their health should be considered. Attention should be paid to short and long term effects. The consistency of each option with the Government's objectives for improved health should be evaluated.'

3.12 The Ministry of Health for British Columbia published a tool kit³³ consisting of eleven prompt questions to help Government departments to identify the health implications of each policy. Reflecting the guidance on cabinet submissions, the approach used is very broad and covers possible social, cultural and economic factors that could influence health.

3.13 In Europe, when health impact assessment is undertaken it is often as part of an environmental impact assessment. Considerable experience of health impact assessment in association with environmental impact assessment has been gained in Germany³⁴ and in the Netherlands³⁵. Much work was done in assessing the health impact of developments at Amsterdam's Schipol airport. Procedures for health impact assessment of policies have been investigated in the Netherlands³⁶, Finland³⁷ and Sweden.³⁸ The World Health Organization European region, in association with the European Commission, has supported a study of health effects of transport in four countries.

3.14 The development of health impact assessment in the United Kingdom has been pioneered by public health specialists in Merseyside. The first health impact assessment in which they were involved related to the proposed new runway at Manchester Airport³⁹. Since then, they have produced several further reports. Scott-Samuel of the Liverpool Public Health Observatory was one of the first to advocate health impact assessment in the UK⁴⁰ while the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine has extensive experience of health impact assessment of projects in developing countries⁴¹. The Merseyside group have published guides to health impact assessment⁴² and literature reviews⁴³. They advocate extensive use of key informants and stress the importance of process in health impact assessment.

3.15 The Health Impact Assessment team at the Department of Health is collaborating with practitioners and with academic researchers in England and internationally in the development of a methodology that will help central and local Government to add value to their work by improving the quality of their decision-making. A literature review on policy appraisal and health from the University of Northumbria, ⁴⁴ was one of the first fruits of this programme. In Scotland, the Social and Public Health Sciences Unit in Glasgow and participants in the Scottish Needs Assessment Programme are developing health impact assessment methods.

3.16 Several health impact assessments have already been undertaken in Wales and some of these are highlighted in Chapter 6. Thus some experience and expertise already exists in Wales and this will provide an useful foundation for further development of the approach.

4. The practice of health impact assessment

4.1 Descriptions of health impact assessment have identified a number of steps but five major steps can be identified in all.

- Screening
- Scoping
- Risk assessment
- Decision making
- Implementation and monitoring

4.2 Screening consists of a preliminary assessment to see if the project is likely to pose any significant health questions and is therefore worth subjecting to health impact assessment. Where a policy is clearly beneficial to health it may well be decided that no further health impact assessment is needed though it may be considered worth undertaking one in order to quantify the benefits.

4.3 Scoping is the process of broadly outlining the possible hazards and benefits and identifying the questions that must be addressed in the assessment process. This is referred to as setting the terms of reference.

4.4 Risk assessment involves characterising the nature and magnitude of the harmful and beneficial factors, how many and which people will be affected by them and how they will be affected. A risk management plan flows from the risk assessment with suggestions how the effect of harmful factors can be negated or minimised and how the effect of beneficial factors can be maximised.

4.5 Decision making involves considering the report of the risk assessment and the risk management plan and making a choice of options (including the no action option). Once the main option has been determined, there will be sub-options, possible modifications and ways of mitigating possible disadvantages to consider.

4.6 Implementation and monitoring involves action to implement the decision(s) and to observe the consequences. Monitoring is particularly important where adverse consequences are predicted but where their nature, size and timing are uncertain. Early detection of adverse consequences may allow their effect to be minimised by modification of the way in which the decision is implemented or at least mitigated with appropriate measures.

4.7 In practice, the process is not necessarily sequential but iterative i.e. some steps may need to be repeated. For example, preliminary risk assessment may identify further issues requiring a revision of the terms of reference agreed in the scoping process. Decision making after the first risk assessment may identify further questions which in turn require further assessment. Modification of the initial proposals may generate a need for further assessment. Developments during implementation and monitoring may lead to decisions being revisited with the need for further assessment and so on.

4.8 It can be seen that impact assessment and decision making are not distinct activities but all part of the same process. However, the two may be undertaken by different people. It is clear that those who undertake the assessment and those who take the decisions need to work together very closely and need to understand each others' perspectives and goals. This brief description of the health impact assessment sequence makes it clear that, if it is to


be useful, assessment must be closely integrated with the decision making process. There is a case to be made for expecting decision makers to routinely undertake the screening stage of health impact assessment for themselves rather than involve separate assessors. This avoids unnecessary delay and allows specialised health impact assessment expertise to be concentrated on the difficult cases where it will be most useful and cost-effective.

4.9 It is important to realise that health impact assessment does not avoid the need to make decisions. Health impact assessment is not a method by which decisions are made by algorithm or some sophisticated system of calculations. Health impact assessment cannot therefore absolve decision-makers of their responsibilities. It can improve decision-making by making explicit the underlying assumptions and reducing the risk that a development will bring about unforeseen and unwanted consequences. In this respect, it is very similar to cost benefit analysis.

4.10 Health impact assessment must not be allowed to delay unduly decision making or it will become another hurdle to be overcome rather than an aid to decision making. It will be necessary to compromise between the speed with which the assessment is made and the completeness of the data on which it is based.

4.11 Various ways of organising health impact assessment within the framework of the five stages have been recommended. The procedure recommended by the Merseyside group⁴⁵ is shown in Figure 1. A steering group of stakeholders is established to agree the terms of reference and oversee the remainder of the health impact assessment process. The main sources of evidence for the assessment stage are stakeholders and key informants though documentary and other evidence is also used to support this.

Figure 1: Stages in the health impact assessment process (Taken from Merseyside Health Impact Guidelines)



Source: Merseyside Health Impact Assessment Steering Group

4.12 A rather different approach is recommended in the 10 step model from Bielefeld⁴⁶. This is shown in Figure 2. Steps 1-7 describe the sequence for making the risk assessment using evidence both from measurement and information from technical literature. Qualitative assessment is given little prominence in this model.

Figure 2: A 10 Step Risk Assessment Model (Developed by The University of Bielefeld and State Institute of Public Health, North Rhine Westphalia)

0. Scoping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defining the scope of relevant topic
1. Project analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coverage of construction phase, normal operation, accidental releases and decommissioning phase Expected emissions, odours, noise vibration Hazard characterisation/ classification (toxicity etc.)
2. Regional analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physio-geography, meteorology, natural features Anthropogenic changes, land use (housing, gardens, schools, nurseries, hospitals, agriculture, industry) Definition of area of interest for further investigation
3. Population analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population size, distribution by age, sex etc. Health status, based on health reports, disease registries Behavioural patterns, activities, food, hobbies
4. Background situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental monitoring e.g. air, groundwater, soil, food Analysis of existing pollution concerning chemicals, odours, noise, vibrations, radiation Identification of additional data needs (parameters, places, environmental media)
5. Prognosis of additional pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on data from similar plants/ facilities which are already in existence (same technology different location) Coverage of air, water (surface, ground) soil, flora, fauna Modeling of dispersion from (non-) point sources, transfer between environmental media, terrestrial, limnic food chain
6. Prognosis of health impact	<p>6.1 Qualitative assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes concerning neighborhood features, quality of life Citizen concerns (incl. non-government organisations, local newspapers) <p>6.2 Comparison with media-specific limit values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparison of predicted emissions and ambient concentrations of chemicals in air, water, soil, food with limit values Comparison of predicted intensity of noise, vibrations, odours, radiation with limit values Total burden rather than single agents. <p>6.3 Quantitative risk assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For non-threshold effects especially carcinogenicity: Quantitative risk assessment including all relevant pathways and carcinogens leading to probability statement on additional cancer risk and on population cancer burden For threshold effects: Estimation of hazard quotient/ hazard index summarising over chemicals which affect the same target organ system
7. Summarising assessment of impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary and assessment of predicted impacts For threshold agents the assessment is implied in the comparison of predicted and threshold limit values For non-threshold agents there needs to be agreement about 'acceptable risk'.

Continued overleaf

8. Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recommendations on planning alternatives ● Recommendations on additional steps e.g. emission control monitoring, public information, post-project analysis
9. Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Communication of results to all parties involved including planners, decision makers, public at large ● Risk comparison, visualisation of results⁹. Communication ● Communication of results to all parties involved including planners, decision makers, public at large ● Risk comparison, visualisation of results
10. Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If project is put into practice comparison of predicted impact to actual situation: systematic evaluation of prognosis providing basis for improvement of subsequent tests, methods and/or procedures ● Evaluation of communication and decision making

Checklists for health impact assessment screening and scoping

4.13 The following pages illustrate a selection of checklists sourced from the various guides on health impact assessment. These checklists are primarily suitable as screening tools or as a starting point for scoping.

4.14 Figure 3 shows an example of a very simple checklist from Sweden⁴⁷. This gives very little guidance to its users on what aspects of the proposal they should be checking and so is probably best suited to those who have a considerable understanding of health impacts.

Figure 3: Simple health impact assessment checklist

<p>The Health Question</p> <p>This simple option can be adopted prior to consideration of an individual policy proposal. It can be used before collective decisions are made at meetings of local boards/committees.</p>	
A.	<p>Will the proposal promote health development for various groups/the population in relation to the social environment (e.g. opportunity to exert influence, mutual work and support)?</p> <p>YES [] NO []</p>
B.	<p>Will the proposal promote health development for various groups/the population with regard to certain risk factors (e.g. the physical environment or living habits)?</p> <p>YES [] NO []</p>
C.	<p>Is the proposal consistent with overall municipality / county health targets and objectives?</p> <p>YES [] NO []</p>
<p>Comments/justification</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	
<p>Alternative proposal</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	
<p>Our assessment is that</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	

Source: Landstings Förbundet and Svenska Kommunförbundet

4.15 The same source contains a more searching checklist under the title Health Impact Analysis (Figure 4). As with the checklist in Figure 3, it is again best suited to those who are already very familiar with health impact assessment.

Figure 4: Health Impact Analysis Checklist

<p>Health Impact Analysis</p> <p>Health Impact Analysis is guided by a number of key questions. They may for example, be appropriate to raise prior to analyses of strategic policy decisions.</p> <p>General questions</p> <p>1.a What does the local Public Health Report show regarding the health conditions of different groups within the municipality/county? Are there groups which are particularly vulnerable or already exposed to numerous health risks, or are there groups with evident health-trend problems?</p> <p>1.b Are there defined health policy targets?</p> <p>Questions which may be linked to the matter at hand</p> <p>2. Are there particular health risks which can be expected to decrease or increase as a result of the proposal? Will impacts become apparent in the short term (within 5 years) or in the long term.</p> <p>3. For the distribution of ill-health within a population, it is of decisive importance which groups are subjected to decreased / increase health risks, and whether any decision will affect these groups capacity either to deal with difficulties or by contrast increase their vulnerability.</p> <p>4. In what way will the social environment in the local community be affected by the proposal?</p> <p>5. Is there a risk that a proposal may have a 'double' impact on certain groups i.e. that both their health risks increase and their social environment deteriorates? Are there alternative policies which might result in better health for exposed groups and the population as a whole?</p>

Source: Landstings Förbundet and Svenska Kommunförbundet

4.16 The checklist produced by the British Columbia Ministry of Health Population Health Resource Branch⁴⁸ is summarised in Figure 5. This provides the decision maker with more guidance on the determinants of health which should be considered. It is notable for the broad view of health and its recognition of the importance of socio-economic factors in determining health.

Figure 5: British Columbia Health Impact Assessment Checklist from British Columbia toolkit

WILL GIVEN OPTION HAVE AN IMPACT ON	Possible impact	Information required
1. The creation of income and/or wealth? Will specific income groups or communities be impacted positively or negatively?		
2. The distribution of income and/or wealth? Will specific income groups or communities be impacted positively or negatively?		
3. Employment opportunities for individuals and/or communities? What is the impact on the nature and distribution of jobs and/or working conditions?		
4. Learning opportunities, particularly for young people and/or unemployed? Will the training/education support tomorrow's jobs.		

WILL GIVEN OPTION HAVE AN IMPACT ON	Possible impact	Information required
5. Healthier beginnings for children? This includes meeting their basic physical needs, building self-esteem and developing a sense of connectedness with others.		
6. The number and quality of healthy personal connections, such as those with friends, families, colleagues and community groups (as distinct from professional support services)? Will it segregate or isolate individuals or groups?		
7. Physical safety and security among individuals and communities?		
8. People's sense of control over their own lives in the decision making affecting their income, working and living conditions, support systems local government programs, services and/or resources?		
9. Physical and/or mental health? Which individuals are most affected?		
10. The provision of fair, equitable and respectful access to government programs, services and/or resources?		
11. The environment Will the environmental changes affect health?		

Source: Ministry of Health, Vancouver, British Columbia

4.17 Figure 6 shows a matrix taken from the Department of Health book *Policy Appraisal and Health*.⁴⁹ The determinants of health which may be influenced by a proposal are listed vertically down the table while the possible health consequences are listed horizontally. The matrix is then completed to show which determinants might produce which consequences. A comprehensive list of determinants and consequences would produce an unmanageably large matrix so it is necessary to select those that are most relevant.

Figure 6: Matrix suggested in *Policy Appraisal and Health*

	Health impacts		
	Accidents	Ill Health	Catastrophe
Diet - Choice and availability			
Psycho social environment (e.g. exposure to stress, crime risk)			
Housing & living conditions (e.g. cold, damp, noise, sanitation, food storage and preparation, lighting space, domestic waste, indoor air quality, capacity for self-care)			
Pollution			
Lifestyle (e.g. exercise, reproductive and sexual behaviour)			
Accidental injury (e.g. in the home, at work, on the roads, or from faulty products)			
Tobacco and alcohol consumption			
Occupation (e.g. exposure to industrial processes)			
Geophysical factors (e.g. exposure to ultra-violet light, radon)			

Source: Department of Health, London

4.18 Two general streams - categorised as 'broad perspective' and 'tight perspective' - can be recognised within health impact assessment (Table 1). Broad perspective health impact assessment takes an holistic view of health, has disciplinary roots in sociology, rarely attempts to quantify risk and attaches great weight to popular and lay concerns. In contrast, the roots of tight perspective health impact assessment are in epidemiology and toxicology. It emphasises aspects of health which are measurable or at least observable and seeks to derive quantified estimates of risk. Of course, there is a continuous spectrum and most practice of health impact assessment falls between these two extremes. Health impact assessment tools published from British Columbia⁵⁰ Sweden⁵¹ and Merseyside (UK)⁵² are towards the broad perspective end of the spectrum while those from New Zealand⁵³ and Bielefeld (Germany)⁵⁴ are towards the tight perspective end.

Table 1: *Comparison of Broad Perspective and Tight Perspective health impact assessments*

	Broad perspective	Tight perspective
View of health	Holistic	Emphasis on defined and observable aspects Epidemiology,
Disciplinary roots	Sociology	Toxicology
Ethos	Democratic	Technocratic
Quantification	In general terms	Towards measurement
Types of evidence	Key informants, popular concern	Measurement
Precision	Low	High

Integration with environmental impact assessment

4.19 Many discussions^{55, 56, 57, 58} of health impact assessment assume that it will form part of an environmental impact assessment but there is debate over the merits of this arrangement. In theory, integrating environmental impact assessment and health impact assessment could save effort and money although this is another issue which needs to be tested.

4.20 If health impact assessment and environmental impact assessment are combined there is a risk that assessment of one element may be over-emphasised at the expense of the other. Undertaking health impact assessment separately from any other impact assessment ensures that health remains the prime focus of the impact assessment. While environmental impact assessment directs attention to ecosystems and biodiversity, it may fail to adequately address impacts on human communities and culture^{59,82,83}. In the context of an environmental impact assessment, there is a tendency for health impact assessment to concentrate on physicochemical hazards and adopt a tight perspective approach.

4.21 In the UK, the conduct of some environmental impact assessment in development projects is defined by law. For planning applications, the terms of reference for the environmental impact assessment are set by the regulatory authorities and the proposers are required to bear the cost.

4.22 The case for combining health impact assessment with environmental impact assessment is strongest in the context of development projects and weakest in the context of policy decisions in areas such as fiscal, education and law and order which have many more implications for health than for the environment.

Involving stakeholders - people and communities

4.23 Most guides on impact assessment stress the importance of involving stakeholders including those who are concerned with, or will be affected by, the proposal i.e. people and communities. Their participation in the health impact assessment process is vital. People can be involved in various ways; for example, meetings with community representatives and service providers, holding community meetings, organising focus groups or citizens juries. It is desirable that this should take place as early as possible in the process and stakeholders should be involved in setting the terms of reference for any health impact assessment.

4.24 Involving stakeholders requires careful consideration. Health impact assessment itself is a relatively new approach and is still evolving as a subject. The approach and methods, along with the information necessary to undertake it, will therefore be new to some stakeholders. As with most subjects, effective presentation of information and data is essential to good communication and there is evidence to back this up. For example, risk is likely to be better understood as a subject if it is shown on visual scales, rather than expressed in numbers, or if comparisons with familiar events are made⁶⁰. Above all the discussion of risk should be open^{61, 62}. It is very important that health impact assessment should address issues which raise public concern. The fact that people are worried about the health effects of a development makes it a health issue even if technical experts do not share their perception of the risk.

4.25 The participation of people and communities in the process is all the more vital because health impact assessment involves many judgments which are value based rather than science based. The choice of which outcomes to consider and how the importance of different outcomes will be weighted relative to each other are value judgments. The relative importance attached to health and non-health outcomes and the preference given to present benefits over future benefits (discounting) are value judgments. The degree to which a health detriment to one group is acceptable, if there are much larger health benefits for another group, is a value judgment as is the question of what constitutes an acceptable level of risk. These issues all point to the importance of involving policy and decision makers, professionals and practitioners, and people and communities in the process.

Quality assurance of health impact assessment

4.26 Some methods^{63, 64} include an audit step at the end of the health impact assessment in which the quality of the procedure can be considered. This is desirable but raises questions on the quality criteria which could be used to evaluate a health impact assessment. The first requirement of a health impact assessment is that it shall be useful and add value to decision making. The potential benefits of health impact assessment, listed in paragraph 2.11, could provide the basis for a quality checklist. If it cannot be said to have done any of those things, its quality is low.

4.27 Another quality criterion might be the accuracy of predictions. Subsequent monitoring will demonstrate whether the predictions made by the health impact assessment are correct. In the event of the predictions not being fulfilled it is then necessary to consider whether the assumptions on which the health impact assessment was based have changed (for example the proposal was not implemented as designed) or the health impact assessment was at fault. The practicality of assessing the accuracy of predictions is limited to the relatively near future. Where health consequences are not expected until many years or decades have passed, the accuracy of predictions is more difficult to assess.

4.28 A third set of quality criteria can be drawn from study of the process⁶⁵:

- Were stakeholders involved in an appropriate and timely way?
- Has the evidence in the literature on consequences of similar proposals or events been properly searched?

- Have alternative options been adequately explored. Have the issues identified in the scoping exercise been addressed?
- Have efforts to mitigate any negative effects been concentrated on the largest impacts?

4.29 Health inequalities are a major concern of policy and the Acheson report ⁶⁶ recommended that 'as part of health impact assessment all policies likely to have a direct or indirect effect on health should be evaluated in terms of their impact on health inequalities'. In developments which have both positive and negative health effects, positive effects may well be experienced by one group within the population while the negative effects fall upon another group. Health impact assessment needs to consider not only the overall impact but also the distribution of health impacts within the population. This allows decision makers to assess the impact across the groups and thus the effect on inequalities in health.

5. Risk assessment

The need to estimate effect size

5.1 Very few proposals bring unmixed benefit. Even after the proposal has been optimised, some less desirable consequences may remain and the decision has to be made whether the positive consequences justify the negative consequences. The decision is made more difficult by the fact that often the people who will experience the positive consequences are not the same as the people who will experience the negative consequences. It is easier to make decisions about these trade-offs if the extent of the positive and negative consequences can be estimated.

5.2 Even a proposal which seems to bring only good consequences will use resources which could be used for other purposes. Every proposal therefore raises the question of whether resources used in one way could, if used in another way, produced even more health benefit?⁶⁷ Once again, it is easier to answer such questions if the extent of the benefits which are produced by the different options can be estimated.


5.3 There is a tendency to talk of qualitative (described in words) and quantitative (measured using numbers) impacts but this is misleading. Any impact may be described in quantitative or non- quantitative terms. The difference lies not in the nature of the impact but in the ability of assessors to quantify it.

5.4 The following paragraphs explore how far it is possible in a health impact assessment to predict the size of the health consequences.

Epidemiological models for health impact assessment

5.5 Procedures for assessing risk due to physico-chemical hazards (such as exposure to air pollutant gases or radiation) are well established. For each particular hazard, an estimate is made of the number of people exposed to particular levels and the likelihood of an individual experiencing harm when exposed to those levels. It is then a matter to calculate the numbers of individuals who would be expected to experience particular harms.

Figure 7: United States National Research Council Risk Assessment Model



5.6 While straightforward in theory, there are many practical difficulties in applying this method. It can be difficult to estimate the number of people exposed to different levels of hazard. Very sophisticated models have been built to predict the distribution of pollutants released from chimney stacks or into water courses which take account of factors such as stack height, prevailing winds, geographical features, currents and tides but the predictions made are far from perfect.


5.7 Even if the exposure level is accurately known understanding of how humans will be affected by that exposure is often incomplete. The chart showing the likelihood of suffering harm when exposed to different levels (doses) of hazard is called a dose-response curve. Sometimes there is very little evidence on which to base a dose response curve and as a result, it is constructed by extrapolating from very few observations on people who have been accidentally exposed to very high doses. Sometimes there is no data at all on humans and dose response curves can only be estimated by extrapolation from observations made on animals.

5.8 Estimating the response can be further complicated because individuals are often exposed to several hazards at the same time and there is a possibility that the response to several hazards combined may differ from the response to each one individually (the cocktail effect).

5.9 A further difficulty is that individuals vary in their susceptibility to different agents. Young children and elderly people may be harmed by exposure levels that do no harm to young adults. People with asthma may experience severe symptoms at pollution levels which do not affect those who do not have asthma. When assessing how exposure will affect a population, it is therefore necessary to consider how the groups with different susceptibilities will be affected. Frequently, however, the information available is insufficient to allow this to be done, with any degree of certainty.


5.10 In theory, the same approach can be applied to all the determinants of health. Figure 8 illustrates a few of the numerous mechanisms through which a proposal might affect population health. The proposal will affect a range of intermediate factors which will in turn have good and bad effects on health of the population which is exposed to them. The level of unemployment, psychosocial disturbance (stress, social isolation or fear of crime), physicochemical challenge (pollution, noise), loss of amenity (contentment with environment) and other intermediate factors to which individuals are exposed can be estimated. The effect of different levels of exposure to these factors on the individuals health can also be estimated. These in turn can be used to make an estimate of the overall impact on the health of the population. The path marked 'unknown' on the chart is included as a reminder that some consequences are likely to be the result of mechanisms of which we have no knowledge and whose effect therefore cannot be predicted.

Figure 8: Health Impact model



5.11. Lifestyle is one of the intermediate factors in the model. Lifestyle refers to those aspects of living which are to a large extent chosen by the individual such as smoking, drinking alcohol, eating patterns and physical activity. Some proposals such as taxation of tobacco, regulation of advertising, licensing of alcohol and health education will directly influence lifestyle. It may also be indirectly influenced through factors such as income, unemployment, social isolation and stress. Good dose response curves can be drawn to describe the quantitative relations between certain aspects of lifestyle such as smoking and drinking and selected health outcomes (see for example Figure 9 taken from a Study on British doctors⁶⁸).

Figure 9: Example of Dose response curve - Smoking and lung cancer



Source: Data from Doll et al ⁶⁸

5.12. Some progress has been made in understanding these complex relationships and mathematical models can be built to show how the different factors could interact. For example the PREVENT model⁶⁹ allows a prediction to be made of how various lifestyle changes influence the future frequency of particular diseases and the MIASMA model⁷⁰ allows prediction of how climatic changes affect the frequency of vector-borne and other diseases.

5.13. A series of studies usually described as 'burden of disease' studies⁷¹ have analysed the present causes of illness and death in populations together with risk factors. This information has then been used to predict future trends. The same sort of methodology could be used to predict the health impact of policies which influence the risk factors.

5.14 One goal must be to develop health impact assessment to a level where knowledge and understanding are sufficient to make quantitative predictions of the consequences of proposals. Although data will always have limitations in terms of its precision, this can be taken into account when assessing the predicted effects. In the meantime, developing the health impact assessment approach will help to highlight where gaps exist in our knowledge and to make clear the assumptions which underlie decision making.

5.15 The danger in this quantitative approach is that particular hazards which have been omitted from calculations because of insufficient information are believed, erroneously, to be unimportant.

Uncertainty

5.16 Prediction is difficult because there is a great deal that is not known about the determinants of health. Sometimes, it is possible to be more precise about the level of uncertainty around risks. For example, in one study⁷² it was stated that for a female aged 40-49 who smokes more than 25 cigarettes per day, the best estimate of risk of suffering a heart attack in the next six years was 7.0 times that of a non smoker of the same age. However, the risk could be between 4.8 and 10.5 times greater (these are the 95% confidence limits attached to the estimate). Other types of uncertainty can only be acknowledged together with a rough indication of its size. For example, there is considerable evidence that alcohol causes a small increase in risk of breast cancer but it is just possible that this evidence might have some other explanation. The Merseyside guide to health impact assessment⁷³ suggests that postulated health impacts should be graded according to their certainty as definite, probable and possible.

5.17 Some idea of the level of confidence that can be attached to predictions may be obtained by sensitivity analysis. This involves varying the assumptions that are made in calculating the impacts and effects. If changing a particular assumption has little effect on the prediction, then the prediction will be robust. If, on the other hand, small changes in an assumption make large differences to the predicted outcome, then it means that the prediction relies more heavily on that assumption. Therefore, confidence in the accuracy of the prediction can be no greater than confidence held in the underlying assumption.

Baseline assessment

5.18 The usual effect of a proposal is to change one of the determinants of health rather than to introduce a factor that was previously totally absent. For example, a new road may increase the levels of noise and exhaust fumes in its vicinity but these may have been present at lower levels before the road was built. In order to assess the impact of the proposal, it is necessary to assess the baseline level of these factors and the effect of the increase or reduction in these levels. The impact of a raised hazard level may be very different in situations where the level of that hazard was previously low from situations where it was already high. Equally, when a proposal is being considered, it is unlikely that population health is perfect. Because one is concerned with the change in health after the proposal, it will be important to ascertain the health status of the population which would be affected by the proposal. Most health impact assessment methods therefore include a baseline assessment stage.

Discounting

5.19 A further problem in calculating impacts is that they tend to occur at different points in time. A death in twenty years time might at this moment be regarded as less bad than a death next week. Technically, this problem is dealt with by a process known as discounting. Discounting means that benefits and harm which are likely to occur at some future date are given less weight than benefits and harm which would occur more immediately. The selection of discount factor can affect considerably the estimated size of a health impact and is a contentious issue.

5.20 Even more difficult is the question of how one allows for impacts affecting future generations as may well be the case for long lasting hazards. One study⁷⁴ proposed that the impact of deaths in all future generation could be estimated by multiplying years of life lost in the present generation by a factor of 1.3. The assumptions underlying this type of calculation are again contentious.

Climate change

5.21 Considerable attention has been paid to the health impacts caused through climatic change^{75 76}. Human activity has reached such a scale that it is affecting global systems in a number of ways e.g. thinning of the ozone layer, global warming, rising sea levels, shifting distribution of rainfall and changing weather patterns. These in turn may impact in many ways such as increased skin cancer (due to increased penetration of ultraviolet radiation), wider distribution of diseases carried by insects and nutrition affected by reduced agricultural productivity. These dramatic changes are produced by the combined effect of thousands of activities most of which are negligible individually. It is difficult to include these sorts of considerations in health impact assessment but they are part of the larger picture. The importance of this was highlighted in paragraph 2.9.

Choosing the most appropriate method(s)

5.22 The previous chapters summarised how health impact assessment is being applied in different places. Exploring and testing its use will inform its future use in Wales. Methods which are appropriate to the scale of proposals and the setting in which they are to be implemented will need to be selected. For example, the health impact assessment procedures appropriate for a transport policy or a multi-million pound industrial development are likely to be different from those which may be used for smaller, perhaps local, developments. The precise health impact assessment procedures appropriate for use by the National Assembly may differ from those appropriate for a local authority, which in turn may differ from those appropriate for a Local Health Alliance or a voluntary organisation.

5.23 The choice of health impact assessment method must be guided by the need to make it add value to the decision making process. It follows that methods which give information on the size as well as the nature of the impact are to be preferred. This, however, must not result in impacts being ignored because there is not enough information to allow their size to be predicted accurately. Nor should it discourage groups who are unable to access the information or the skills for more quantitative predictions from making the best predictions that they can. The best results are likely to come from a judicious mix of broad perspective and tight perspective methods.

5.24 Where environmental impact assessments are being undertaken, it should be ensured that health issues are adequately covered. In situations where no environmental impact assessment is required, it may be appropriate to undertake a health impact assessment on its own.

5.25 As stated in Chapter 4, the general principle of involving stakeholders - including people and communities - in health impact assessment must be supported strongly. The precise way in which this should be done will vary with the circumstances. At local levels, it may be possible to include representatives of communities affected by decisions in any steering group which is established to consider a health impact assessment. For larger, perhaps more complex, organisations, other ways of ensuring participation of stakeholders in the health impact assessment process need to be found. Some of these may build on existing consultation mechanisms. With the above in mind, it is important that health impact assessment is not seen as academic or bureaucratic but as a participatory process which recognises the importance of outcomes for people and communities.

5.26 Discussion of what might be achieved in future years with improved techniques and specialised skills in health impact assessment must not delay the introduction of simpler methods. The aim must be to develop, on the basis of testing and experience, an incremental approach to its use. The immediate priority is to increase awareness of health consequences amongst decision makers, professionals and practitioners at all levels and to identify ways in which people and communities can be engaged in the process.

6. Progress in Wales

Previous experience

6.1 While this document focuses on the future development of health impact assessment, it recognises that a base of relevant experience and expertise already exists in Wales. For example, expertise on environmental impact assessment exists within local authorities, Environment Agency Wales, the Assembly itself and groups in several Welsh universities. Experience of health impact assessment also exists albeit to a lesser extent. Some examples are provided in the following paragraphs. Future developments will draw on existing knowledge and experience.

6.2 International expertise on the public health management of chemical accidents has been built up. The World Health Organization Collaborating Centre for an International Clearing House for Major Chemical Incidents in Cardiff is a major source of public health information and expertise on this topic. The National Focus for Work on Response to Chemical Incidents and Surveillance of Health Effects of Environmental Chemicals provides advice to the National Assembly and Government Departments in the UK while the Chemical Incident Management Support Unit in Cardiff provides advice to health authorities and local authorities in Wales.

6.3 Researchers in Wales working for the Protocol Enhancement Project have produced a series of Health Evidence Bulletins which assess the evidence that specified measures produce health benefits. The bulletins on Healthy Environments⁷⁷ and Injury Prevention⁷⁸ identify some of the causal pathways through which policies, programmes and projects could influence health. These and similar studies contribute to the knowledge base needed for health impact assessment.

6.4 A decision was taken to invest in the refurbishment of Oakdale village and this was made the subject of a concurrent health impact assessment by Caerphilly Borough Council and Gwent Health Authority. This work not only demonstrated the health consequences of a policy decision but also built up experience of how this could be monitored.

6.5 An investment project in housing in the Riverside district of Cardiff is the subject of a concurrent health impact assessment. A portfolio of questionnaires, symptom diaries and other instruments is being used to show the consequences for respiratory health, mental health and injuries.

6.6 A retrospective health impact assessment⁷⁹ was made on the effects of the grounding of the oil tanker Sea Empress in Milford Haven in 1996. This provided information on the nature and frequency of symptoms which might be expected to follow such an event.

6.7 A concurrent health impact assessment is being undertaken on the by-pass constructed at Connah's Quay in North Wales. This will provide information on how people are affected by such construction that can be used to inform future decisions.

6.8 Waste disposal is an important and sensitive issue. Retrospective health impact assessments have been undertaken on the land-fill sites at Nant y Gwyddon and Trecatti by the Welsh Combined Centres for Public Health.

6.9 The proposal to modify and extend the power station at Pembroke to enable the burning of emulsified hydrocarbon fuels (Orimulsion) was the subject of an environmental impact assessment of which health issues were a prominent feature⁸⁰. Dyfed Powys Health Authority played a major part in assessing the possible health consequences.

6.10 Bro Taf Health Authority has made health inequalities a particular priority. Following a public declaration to tackle health inequalities in the area, the Authority have introduced a Health Inequality Impact Assessment. This uses an equity checklist which is completed for each new project⁸¹.

6.11 Researchers from the University of Wales at Bangor are contributing to the UK climate change impacts programme. The programme looks at how Wales might be affected by climatic change in the next century.

Future plans

6.12 We are committed to exploring the use of health impact assessment as part of its approach to improving the health of people in Wales. The publication of this document demonstrates that commitment by providing a solid foundation for future action to develop and test the approach.

6.13 In considering the way forward, a number of broad needs can be identified. The immediate needs are:

- To raise further the awareness of health impact assessment and its potential to contribute to the achievement of better health.
- To increase understanding of the approach among policy and decision makers, professionals and practitioners in different sectors, and the community and voluntary sectors.
- To help people to become more familiar with the approach, the processes and the tools available for the purpose.
- To explore and test the approach as a means of assessing the impact on health of proposed policies and other developments and its potential as a means of identifying further opportunities to address cross-cutting issues.

6.14 This document starts the process but will need to be supplemented by additional action. For example:

- pilot projects
- dissemination and feedback
- support and guidance
- training and development events

6.15 Some pilot projects are in the process of being established by local authorities, health authorities and others. Further pilots are being considered. Work is in hand within the Assembly itself to pilot the use of health impact assessment in its own policy and decision making processes. The piloting of the approach in different sectors is important and action is in hand to do this.

6.16 As the use of health impact assessment in Wales is explored and developed, and as experience is gained and the value and benefits of the approach are assessed, it will be important to disseminate and exchange information and experience as the basis for learning and further development. Effective arrangements for information dissemination and exchange will need to be developed. Information and feedback will be used to inform the development of further action. It may also help to identify whether the concept of impact assessment, its processes and/or tools will be of relevance to other cross-cutting issues.

6.17 In order to encourage organisations to explore the approach and its use as part of decision making processes, consideration must be given to the provision of support and guidance. The nature of support and guidance required will need to be identified but it is anticipated that training and development events - initially to increase awareness and understanding - will feature as part of future action.

6.18 Partnership between organisations and sectors, and the participation of people and communities, is as important to the testing of the health impact assessment approach as it is to wider action to improve the health and well-being of people in Wales. Among a number of developments which will stimulate and facilitate partnerships in Wales are:

- Local Health Alliances
- Health Improvement Plans
- The National Network for Health
- The Wales Centre for Health
- Voluntary Sector Compact

6.19 While dissemination within Wales is important, it is clear that the health impact approach is being taken up and developed in the rest of the UK, in the Member States of the European Union, and in other countries of the world. It will therefore be important to build on existing links with other countries not only to share experience and learn from others but to tell others of the progress being made in Wales.

6.20 The opportunity exists for Wales to demonstrate further its commitment to improve health by exploring and developing the use of health impact assessment. This document is intended as a base on which to build and develop future action. The following outlines some of the action which will be taken in the year following publication of this document:

- i) Assessment of support and guidance needed to test and progress the use of health impact assessment in Wales;
- ii) Development of information exchange mechanisms, harnessing where appropriate, the benefits of information technology e.g. e-mail network/forum;
- iii) Series of workshops or 'teach-ins' held in different parts of Wales as a means of increasing awareness of health impact assessment;
- iv) Assessment of broad training and other needs relevant to developing further the use of health impact assessment;
- v) Continued action to test the health impact assessment approach by way of pilot projects undertaken in partnership by different organisations.

6.21 Detailed plans and action will emerge over time but health impact assessment will feature as a key theme for the Wales Centre for Health and The National Network for Health in Wales.

References

- 1 Benzeval M, Judge K, Whitehead M. (1995) Tackling inequalities in health An agenda for action. London: Kings Fund
- 2 Acheson D. (1998) Independent inquiry into inequalities in health. London: The Stationery Office
- 3 Welsh Office (1998) Better Health, Better Wales. Cardiff: Welsh Office
- 4 The National Assembly for Wales (1999) Better Wales. Cardiff: The National Assembly for Wales
- 5 Scott-Samuel A. (1996) Health Impact Assessment: An idea whose time has come. *British Medical Journal* 313, 183-184
- 6 Monaghan S. (1998) An atlas of health inequalities between Welsh Local Authorities. Cardiff: Welsh Local Government Association
- 7 Welsh Office (1998) Better Health, Better Wales. Cardiff: Welsh Office
- 8 Welsh Office (1998) Sustainable Communities in Wales for the 21st Century - Why and how to prepare an effective Local Agenda 21 Strategy. Cardiff: Welsh Office
- 9 Welsh Office (1998) Better Health, Better Wales Strategic Framework. Cardiff: Welsh Office
- 10 Ratner PA, Green LW, Frankish CJ, Chomik T, Larsen C. (1997) Setting the stage for health impact assessment. *Journal of Public Health Policy* 18, 67-79.
- 11 BMA Board of Science and Education (1998) Health and Environmental Impact Assessment. London: Earthscan
- 12 Hubel M. (1998) Evaluating the Health Impact of Policies: A challenge. *Eurohealth* 4(3), 27-29
- 13 World Health Organization (1946) Constitution. Geneva: World Health Organization
- 14 Welsh Office (1998) Better Health, Better Wales. Cardiff: Welsh Office
- 15 Hunt SM, McEwan J, McKenna SP. (1986) Measuring health. London: Croom Helm
- 16 Ware JE, Sherbourne CD. (1992) The MOS 36 items short form health survey (SF36) Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical Care* 30, 473-480
- 17 EuroQol group (1990) EuroQol: a new facility for the measurement of health related quality of life. *Health Policy* 16, 199-208
- 18 Kemm JR. (1993) Towards an epidemiology of positive health. *Health Promotion International* 8, 129-134
- 19 Williams A, Kind P. (1992) The present state of play about QALYs. In Hopkins A (editor) Measures of quality of life and the uses to which such measures may be put. London: Royal College of Physicians
- 20 Murray CJL. (1994) Quantifying the burden of disease: the technical basis for disability adjusted life years. *Bulletin of World Health Organization* 72, 429-445
- 21 Department of Health (1995) The Health of the Nation; Policy Appraisal and Health: a guide from the Department of Health. London: Department of Health
- 22 US National Environmental Protection Act (1970)
- 23 Goodland R, Mercier JR. (1999) The evolution of environmental assessment in the World Bank: from 'Approval' to results. Environment Department Papers No 67 New York World Bank
- 24 Burdge RJ, Vanclay F. (1995) Social Impact Assessment Chapter 2 in Vanclay F Brinstein DA (Editors) Environmental and Social Impact Assessment. Chichester: John Wiley
- 25 World Bank (1979) Environmental health and human ecologic considerations in economic development projects. New York: World Bank
- 26 Hendley J, Barnes R, Hirschfield A, Scott-Samuel A. (1999) What is HIA and how can it be applied to regeneration programmes? Working paper series No1. Health Impact Assessment Research and Development Project Liverpool, University of Liverpool
- 27 World Health Organization (1985) The Ottawa Charter for health promotion. *Health Promotion* 1 (4) iii-v

- 28 Milio N. (1986) Promoting health through public policy. Ottawa: Canadian Public Health Association
- 29 Birley MH. (1995) The health impact assessment of development projects. London: HMSO
- 30 Goodland R, Mercier JR. (1999) The evolution of environmental assessment in the World Bank: from 'Approval' to results Environment Department Papers No 67 New York: World Bank
- 31 Public Health Commission (1995) A guide to health impact assessment. Wellington, New Zealand: Public Health Commission
- 32 Ewan C, Young A, Bryant E, Calvert D. (1994) Framework for Environmental and Health Impact Assessment. Canberra National Health and Medical Research Council Australian Government Publishing Service
- 33 Population Health Resource Branch Ministry of Health (1994) Health Impact Assessment toolkit. A resource for government analysts. Victoria, British Columbia: Ministry of Health
- 34 Fehr R (1999) Environmental health impact assessment - evaluation of a 10 step model. *Epidemiology* 10, 618-625
- 35 Lebrete E, Staatsen B. (1999) www.rivm.nl/env/lbv/main/htm
- 36 Putters K. (1997) Health Impact Screening. Rijswijk: Ministry of Health Welfare and Sport
- 37 Koivusalo M, Santalahti P, Ollila E. (1998) Healthy public policies in Finland. *Eurohealth* 4(3), 32-34
- 38 Berensson K. (1998) Focusing on health in the political arena. *Eurohealth* 4(3) 34-36
- 39 Will S, Ardern K, Spencely M, Watkins S. (1994) Proof of Evidence of Stockport Health Commission to Town and Country Planning Act Inquiry on Application by Manchester Airport PLC for the development of a second main runway (part) and associated facilities
- 40 Scott-Samuel A. (1996) Health Impact Assessment: An idea whose time has come. *British Medical Journal* 313, 183-184
- 41 Birley MH. (1995) The health impact assessment of development projects. London: HMSO
- 42 Scott-Samuel A, Birley M, Ardern K. (1998) The Merseyside guidelines for health impact assessment. Liverpool: Merseyside Health Impact Assessment Steering Group, University of Liverpool
- 43 Winters L. (1997) Health Impact Assessment: A literature review Observatory report series No 36. Liverpool: Liverpool Public Health Observatory, University of Liverpool
- 44 Milner S, Marples G. (1997) Policy appraisal and health project Phase 1 - a literature review. Newcastle: University of Northumbria
- 45 Scott-Samuel A, Birley M, Ardern K. (1998) The Merseyside Guidelines for Health Impact Assessment. Liverpool: Merseyside Health Impact Assessment Steering Group
- 46 Pastides H, Corvalan C. (1998) Methods for health impact assessment in environmental and occupational health. Geneva: World Health Organization WHO/EHG/98.4
- 47 Landstings Forbundet and Svenska Kommunforbundet (1998) Focusing on Health. Stockholm: Landstings Forbundet (www.lf.se/hkb)
- 48 Population Health Resource Branch (1994) Health Impact Assessment toolkit. Vancouver, British Columbia: Ministry of Health
- 49 Department of Health (1995) The Health of the Nation; Policy Appraisal and Health: a guide from the Department of Health. London: Department of Health
- 50 Population Health Resource Branch (1994) Health Impact Assessment toolkit. Vancouver, British Columbia; Ministry of Health
- 51 Landstings Forbundet and Svenska Kommunforbundet (1998) Focusing on Health. Stockholm, Landstings Forbundet (www.lf.se/hkb)
- 52 Scott-Samuel A, Birley M, Ardern K. (1998) The Merseyside Guidelines for Health Impact Assessment. Liverpool: Merseyside Health Impact Assessment Steering Group
- 53 Public Health Commission (1995) A guide to health impact assessment. Wellington, New Zealand: Public Health Commission
- 54 Pastides H, Carvalan C. (1998) Methods for health impact assessment in environmental and occupational health. Geneva :World Health Organization
- 55 Ewan C, Young A, Bryant E, Calvert D. (1994) Framework for Environmental and Health Impact Assessment. Canberra National Health and Medical Research Council Australian Government Publishing Service

- 56 Public Health Commission (1995) A guide to health impact assessment. Wellington, New Zealand: Public Health Commission
- 57 Turnbull RGH. (1992) Environmental and Health Impact Assessment of Development Projects: A handbook for practitioners. Barking Elsevier Applied Science
- 58 BMA Board of Science and Education (1998) Health and Environmental Impact Assessment. London: Earthscan
- 59 Arquiaga MC, Canter LW, Nelson DI. (1994) Integration of health impact considerations in environmental impact studies. *Impact Assessment* 12, 175-197.
- 60 Calman KC, Royston GHD. (1997) Risk language and dialects *British Medical Journal* 315, 939-942
- 61 Department of Health (1997) Communicating about risks to public health: pointers to good practice. London: Department of Health
- 62 World Health Organization (1999) Access to information, public participation and access to justice in environment and health matters EUR/ICP/EHCO 02 02 05/12
- 63 Public Health Commission (1995) A guide to health impact assessment. Wellington, New Zealand: Public Health Commission
- 64 Scott-Samuel A, Birley M, Ardern K. (1998) The Merseyside Guidelines for Health Impact Assessment. Liverpool: Merseyside Health Impact Assessment Steering Group
- 65 Scott-Samuel A, Birley M, Ardern K. (1998) The Merseyside Guidelines for Health Impact Assessment. Liverpool: Merseyside Health Impact Assessment Steering Group
- 66 Acheson D. (1998) Independent inquiry into inequalities in health: Report. London: The Stationery Office
- 67 Drummond M, Stoddart G. (1995) Assessment of health producing measures across different sectors. *Health Policy* 33, 219-231
- 68 Doll R, Peto R, Wheatley K, Gray R, Sutherland I. (1994) Mortality in relation to smoking: 40 years observations on male British doctors. *British Medical Journal* 309, 901-911
- 69 Gunning-Schepers LJ. (1989) The health benefits of prevention a simulation approach. *Health Policy* 12, 1-256
- 70 Martens WJM. (1998) Health and climate change: modelling the impacts of global warming and ozone depletion. London: Earthscan, Kogan Page
- 71 Murray CJL, Lopez AD. (1997) Mortality by cause for eight regions of the world: Global Burden of Disease study. *Lancet* 349, 1269-1276.
- 72 Willett WC et al. (1987) Relative and absolute risk of coronary heart disease among women who smoke cigarettes. *New England Journal of Medicine* 317, 1303-1309
- 73 Scott-Samuel A, Birley M, Ardern K. (1998) The Merseyside Guidelines for Health Impact Assessment. Liverpool: Merseyside Health Impact Assessment Steering Group
- 74 Cohen JT, Beck BD, Rudel R. (1997) Life years lost at hazardous waste sites: remediation worker fatalities vs. Cancer deaths to nearby residents. *Risk analysis* 17, 419-425
- 75 McMichael AJ. (1993) Planetary overload. Global environmental change and the health of the human species. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- 76 United Nations Environment Programme (1999) Global environment outlook 2000. London: Earthscan, Kogan Page
- 77 Welsh Office (1999) Health Evidence Bulletins - Wales: Healthy Environments. Cardiff: Welsh Office
- 78 Welsh Office (1998) Health Evidence Bulletins - Wales: Injury Prevention. Cardiff: Welsh Office
- 79 Lyons RA, Temple JMF, Evans D, Fone DL, Palmer SR. (1999) Acute effects of the Sea Empress oil spill. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 53, 306-310
- 80 Agenda papers for Extraordinary Meeting of Pembrokeshire County Council Monday 8th September 1997
- 81 Lester C, Hayes S, Griffiths S, Lowe G, Hopkins S. (1999) Implementing a strategy to address health inequalities: a Health Authority approach. *Public Health*
- 82 Sutcliffe J. (1995) Environmental impact assessment: a healthy outcome? *Project appraisal* 10, 113-124
- 83 Joffe M, Sutcliffe J. (1997) Developing policies for a healthy environment. *Health Promotion International* 12, 169-173