

# **LEAD-Europe Course Report**

## **Cohorts 6 and 7**

**Bonn, Germany 19 February - 2 March, 1999**

### **Summary:**

A joint course was held for the Associates from cohort 6 and 7 to facilitate their networking. It was the third European course for cohort 6 and prepared them for graduation at the LEAD International session in April. For cohort 7, it was the second European course. The course comprised tutorials, group work, site visits and assignment presentations. The design of the course integrated specific requests from the Associates with curriculum items not yet addressed in previous courses. Following explorative and intensive work on the issues and potential solutions to transport (sustainable aviation), various economics approaches were studied in detail: consumption, markets, innovation, accounting and taxes. To contextualise these in a different manner, “Sustainable Germany”, a proposal for a concerted shift to sustainable development on a national level, was used as an extended case study where complex political, social and cultural questions had to be treated. The second half of the course could then focus more on the assessment of current issues, starting from an update of the Conference of Parties (UNFCCC-COP), international institutions (UN and Bretton Woods), waste management and coastal zone management.

The analysis (Annex 2) of the evaluation questionnaire (Annex 3) shows that about one quarter of the tutorials got higher ranks than the group work, three quarters get lower marks. In other words, on average the group work is seen as more effective than the tutorials. The Sustainable Germany exercise provided more insight than the sustainable aviation work. The tax tutorials were more appreciated than other economic instruments. The tutorials on institutional practice were ranked in between. The detailed analysis of the benefit to the Associates should therefore be used to eliminate some items or change the format of their presentation. Overall, the appreciation of the Associates confirms that the combination of basic instruments and methods with aggregate policy proposals is well received.

## Tutorials:

### **Economic instruments**

Following two days of policy analysis on sustainable aviation, consumption was a suitable start to look at the state-of-the-art in more detail. Despite the evidence for a decoupling of growth and use of materials, there are several alternative approaches to **consumption change** with only vague specificity. Recommendations discussed were the importance of stakeholders, experimentation, infrastructure related factors and the monitoring of indicators. Particularly regarding transport, the only advice to give at the moment is to maintain a systems approach, something cohort 6 had already struggled with.

The second tutorial looked at powerful and central concepts, supply and demand curves. Different types of **market failure** were presented with these simple tools and the price-taking was presented as the key condition for markets to work toward equilibrium. Five working groups assessed different policy instruments to correct market failures: Command and Control systems, Liability for Pollution Damages and Eco-labelling, Improving public information and auditing, Charges and Taxes, and Subsidies and permits.

In the afternoon, Hugh Cameron from PREST at the University of Manchester presented an overview on **approaches to research and development**. It was generally accepted that science and technology are not separable any longer and government, industry and universities are all feeding into a semi-private research market. The Associates reinforced the limitations of the linear model of R&D and followed the changes in economic theory to describe the current interest in evolutionary economics. An innovation policy tutorial should also comprise an overview of current research in this school in economics, but most questions posed were directed at the importance of R&D and the effectiveness of R&D policy in general.

Ernst-Ulrich von Weizsäcker presented the history of **environmental taxation**. Since the mid-Eighties, energy, SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> taxes were considered to improve the economic viability of renewable energy sources. Nonetheless, it has been impossible to introduce such legislation on the EU level, and only national legislation has been introduced, first in Sweden, and Denmark, then in the Netherlands and at present in Germany. Changing behaviour of consumers through taxation requires unfeasible high levels of taxes and the approach of choice is to introduce marginal increases over a period of 20 years.

Jürgen Blazejczak of the Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung provided a detailed picture of **the macro-economic consequences of environmental taxes**. Households would pay higher prices for energy-intensive goods and a 25% CO<sub>2</sub> reduction by 2005 is estimated to reduce household income by 6%. This will be borne out because the substitution of factors of production is not complete and is linked to a considerable time lag. Obviously, the determinants of innovation play a mayor role in the substitution. A second complex of effects to be considered are trade related. Production can be relocated rather quickly through the purchasing of intermediate materials. The first remedy considered were border adjustments for environmental taxes, but these are open to be challenged on trade rules (WTO) and require complex accounting procedures. Altogether environmental taxes should be introduced in a concerted form with increased support for R&D and support for structural changes through retraining and other help for labourers in affected industries.

In order to experiment the arguments, the Associates organised a **tax debate** in the form of a public deliberation. The public (constituted by the Associates) commented on a panel's

(other Associates) arguments and the debate was directed by Igor Mitroczyk, whose experience in the Polish Ministry of the Economy provided a strong sense of realism to the event. After two hours of debate, the majority in favour of environmental taxes had clearly shifted to an equal number of supporters and opponents, with a considerable group of undecided Associates. Especially the North/South implications of a tax reform had undermined the support. The conclusion shared by most in the end was that the decision of environmental taxes depend strongly on the specific context, while there was no question about the fact that environmental taxes are a least cost policy instrument and especially for imperfect markets such as energy

The conclusion from the economic instruments tutorials was therefore that taxes are the instrument of choice, but that this instrument depends crucially on fine-tuning it to economic sectors.

### **Waste Management**

Mike Chadwick presented waste management in relation to mining operations in different countries around the world. The comparison of the reclamation efforts in different countries such as Germany, the UK, Columbia and Australia, introduced the issues the Associates could observe first hand during the site visit the following day.

### **The U.N. system and Bretton Woods**

Preparing the graduation session of cohort 6, one day was spent to discuss the current reform proposals for the U.N. institutions and the Bretton Woods twins, the IBRD and the IMF. Four tutors were invited to provide different perspectives. Alexander Graf York (former ambassador to the UN) presented in particular the shift in the U.N. context after the Cold War and explained the institutional learning in the U.N. from the Korean War to the conflict in former Yugoslavia. He showed the historic challenge to move towards a *Weltinnenpolitik* and commented on the more recent initiatives such as the U.N.-CSD, explaining that their contribution to the U.N. was too young to evaluate. Jürgen Maier from the “Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung”, a German NGO working on North-South issues, provided the outside critique, pointing to the weaknesses of the present structures and the difficulties of the U.N. to adapt to globalisation and especially to the increasing power of multi-national corporations.

Dennis Mahar introduced the Associates to the IBRD’s Economic Development Institute (EDI). The changes in the EDI are indicative of the organisational reforms of the IBRD. The EDI’s role is prominent by establishing long term relations targeted at increasing the institutional capacities to respond to development needs. The parallels to the LEAD programme were evident as well as the importance of the intersectoral representation within each LEAD cohort. Reviewing the record of the IBRD’s funding in Eastern Europe, it became evident that EDI’s capacity to be a vehicle for the changes in the IBRD is limited.

The following tutorial by Percy Mistry reviewed the record of the IBRD and the IMF in dealing with financial crisis since 1973. Regarding the Asian crisis there is evidence that their actions has increased the spread of the currency contagion instead of combating it. Percy Mistry concluded that “The danger of course is that decades of incrementalism may have left the IMF and the IBRD too far behind to play a significant, meaningful role in keeping up, or copying, with developments in the global economy and in the international financial system. They may no longer have the resources, influence, credibility, clout, knowledge-base, staff skills,

management capability, or overall institutional capacity for financial leadership, to handle the tasks that need to be handled in the rapidly globalising world of the present and the future.” The Associates from the EBRD had specific questions relating to their tasks and Percy Mistry outlined his prediction that the currencies would eventually convert into a dollar zone in the Americas, an Euro zone in Europe and Africa, and some hybrid form of Yen in Asia because other architectures such as currency boards could not operate in a globalised economy. He provided arguments to reject the criticism that the International Finance Corporation or the EBRD would crowd out private banks and explained his view on financial support for local government in economic transition periods.

The U.N. and Bretton Woods tutorials led to the conclusion that no institutionalisation has occurred recently that would be able to address the dynamic of current economic and social integration on the global scale.

### **Coastal Zone Management**

Following specific requests from cohort 7, the last day of the course consisted of three tutorials on coastal zone management. The first presentation established an overview on coastal zone management efforts around the world. Different institutional arrangements from most countries concerned were reviewed. Stakeholder participation and volunteer participation have been pursued in most cases. The development banks have made much progress in targeting specific problem areas such as mangroves. The second presentation concerned the Baltic region in particular. The international collaboration in this region has started with the first Helsinki convention 1974. Currently an Agenda 21 is being elaborated for the Baltic Sea region in order to go beyond the “Hot-spot” type efforts. Questions concerned the enforcement of regulation in particular regarding the discharges from commercial vessels and the recovery in the populations of endangered species. Finally Ljubomir Jetic presented the efforts by various intergovernmental bodies in the Mediterranean. Principal lessons learned concern the importance of evaluation methodologies and the dissemination of the results, the involvement of all users of coastal zones and the political commitment to make difficult choices. Especially the Associates from Greece and from Croatia provided insights from their own experience.

There is a general need for more applied research for monitoring of pollution in order to improve compliance with existing legislation. Management tools such as GIS need to be further refined in order to improve the effectiveness of the increasing budgets dedicated to coastal zones.

### **Group Work: Cohort 6 preparation of Sustainable Aviation Presentation**

The Associates from cohort 6 will graduate as LEAD Fellows during an international LEAD session in parallel to the annual meeting of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD). The central topic for the UNCSD is sustainable tourism. As air transport plays a major role, cohort 6 will present an assessment of policies to shift current growth to sustainable aviation.

The first day was composed of five resource persons. Starting with the airline efforts and the example of KLM, the Associates were introduced to the collaboration between the Dutch government, and the major companies, KLM and Schiphol airport. Prof. Callum Thomas provided the larger conceptual frame to integrate the speed of technological changes and the

important linkages between transport and economic growth. The North - South equity dimension was analysed and the range of evidence about the employment multiplier effects of air travel were reviewed. Jeffrey Gazzard from an airport nuisance NGO identified the major actors in the aviation industry, which he sees as a Wild West industrial sector where geopolitical factors play the overriding role. The competition between airports is as intensive as the competition between airlines. The major factor for this competition is the demand elasticity for air travel. Aviation is a market in urgent need of guidance, but the global nature of the market does not allow institutions such as IATA or ICAO to provide this guidance. Colin Beesley, environmental team leader in Rolls Royce Turbines provided the key technological factors. Over the next 50 % he foresees and annual growth rate of 5% in air traffic, and technological improvements will only be able to reduce the pollution at a rate of 2% per year. Beatrice Schell from the European Transport NGO resumed the current policy coordination efforts. In comparison to other transport sectors, air travel is largely unregulated and there is no fair competition with other modes of transport. Therefore it is urgent provide an accounting framework for bunker fuels and define the role of aviation in sustainable aviation via the general fossil fuel consumption limits. During the following week cohort 6 used a variety of techniques to organise their analysis of the complex input they received.

They concluded that it is not possible to pursue regional policy initiatives. The European air travel industry cannot be isolated especially from the US industry. Three working groups were formed, economics, environment and social aspects. Towards the end of the week, their conclusions were combined into a powerpoint presentation, followed by a video illustration of the relations between these aspects to be shown at the UNCSD in April in New York. Because of the complex multiplier effects between transport and growth, transport cannot be directly reduced. Production and consumption structures must shift and transport policies have to be fully integrated with economic and environmental policy.

### **Sustainable Germany**

All Associates had received a copy of (1998), "Greening the North", London:ZED, the English version of the Sustainable Germany study. Joachim Spangenberg, Program Director "Sustainable Societies" at the Wuppertal Institute presented the study. The combination of different NGOs participating was able to provide a considerable push to public opinion in Germany, with unprecedented reactions from the whole political spectrum. The viability of this combination rests on a suitable approach to sustainable development, enabling these different NGOs to work together. The key principles of the study are an equal right of all humans to benefit from the eco-sphere and the complete embeddedness of the economy in the eco-sphere. Connecting the two is the analysis of the material flows of all economic activities. By using private households as the central unit for the study links all economic activity to individual resource use and provide decision criteria how individual resource use should be modified. The Prism of sustainability is the overarching organising principle.

Before splitting up in working groups to assess the study, Joachim Spangenberg also introduced to most important criticisms of the study, insufficient attention to North/South relations, to gender issues and to employment concerns. Indeed, given the current gender relations in Germany, the study would lead to a strengthening of the female roles in the household. But this mainly reflects that the study was meant to be an "advertisement" for sustainability, leaving the formulation of strategic options for actions to others. Correctly so,

since these options must be the product of a much larger social dialogue than only between the three different NGOs involved. The working group on the analytical approach underlined the specificity of social groups in the economy with a staged TV programme to the plenary looking especially on the trade implications. The economics group saw many favourable possibilities for governmental action to change the rules in the economy, from the way architects are paid to information policy and many regulatory improvements. Finally the social aspects group stressed the effectiveness of the study to attract public attention and was at the same time concerned that the Associates' favourable reception of the study was not a sufficient indicator for the social viability of what is finally one vision for a possible future.

### **Site Visits:**

Thursday morning was used for a visit to the **UN secretariat of the Framework Convention for Climate Change**. Richard Kinley presented the work of the secretariat and the history of the climate negotiations, from Berlin, to Kyoto and to Buenos Aires. In the mechanic of these negotiations the role of the United States has been crucial. Richard Kinley stressed the importance of the clause for implementing the Kyoto Protocol, it comes into force when 55 countries ratify it AND when 55 % of world emissions are represented. Unprecedented media attention helped to achieve progress following 31 months of standstill. The negotiations between the United States, the EU and Japan dominated the multilateral negotiations. The inside view provided let the Associates reflect in a different light on their respective countries' results in Kyoto. This showed to what extent it is the particular dynamic of these negotiations which is not only new to the Associates but represents a qualitatively new type of international negotiations, which in itself are more important than the actual results obtained. Anja Köhne, LEAD-Europe Fellow from cohort 5, showed that EU members states are currently not approaching their agreed greenhouse gas emission targets as planned. Ultimately, a better climate policy depends on adequate integration into other policy areas, especially in transport, agriculture and the internal market.

After an introduction to the waste management and land use problems in the industrial region of the Ruhr by Mike Chadwick, Cohorts 6 & 7 visited the Ruhrgebiet. At the headquarters of the **Kommunalverband, the Ruhr Planning**. The encouragement of a network of green corridors in the region was illustrated and the recent development of the whole Ruhr area as a recreational and cultural centre was discussed. Two site visits were made: one was to an area where millions of tonnes of colliery spoil had been dumped, landscaped and revegetated to improve the environment for the local population and to provide an area of public open space; the second was a site from which gravel had previously been extracted and then work carried out to create a recreation and wildlife park. Associates had ample opportunity to question and discuss the aims, objectives, implementation, costs and underlying scientific and social bases of the work of the Kommunalverband.

## Assignments:

All Associates from cohort 6 and two from cohort 5 presented their assignments to their new colleagues. This was an effective way to make the new Associates aware of their professional experience and of their intentions to pursue their careers. Several Associates elaborated in particular on the specific benefit they are seeking from their participation in LEAD-Europe. About half of the assignments reflected Associates looking for new issues or skills where they could expand their professional practice, the other half concerned their learning progress in long-standing interests.

Examples for the latter type were Turid Tronbol's efforts to understand **the role of patent rights** in sustainability and esp. the relation between the publication of knowledge enriching the available knowledge combined with a monopoly exploitation. This relation is changing in a **knowledge society** but at the same time this relation is affected by the increased accessibility of patent information. Another example for a such an assignment was Marin Ignatov's research on **safety culture in nuclear power plants**. Other Associates questioned him regarding the variation of tacit rules within one society and within one organisation. Delia Dimitriu will evaluate different industry initiatives to improve **environmental management in aviation**, including flight management around airports, accounting for bunker fuel and the possibility to market "Green tickets" with a higher price for a customer assuring him/her on a minimum environmental impact. Magdalena Matei submitted an assessment of the climate policy of the Romanian utility company, comparing different initiatives in Demand-side Management in different countries. Imre Biczo has compared different technologies for **site-remediation** applied to former military sites in Hungary. Other Associates were interest to understand why Hungary chose to adapt the Dutch legislation during the intermediate period before they could provide an adequate framework taking into account the Hungarian soil conditions. Boris Strecansky presented the group assignment produced by seven Associates from cohort 5, the environmental implication on the EU enlargement. His own Slovakian NGO later received funding from the EU to expand this analysis and then publish it on the Internet.

Assignments leading to new approaches were, for example, Andrea Deri's work on the use of **scenarios for environmental education**. Her assignment will comprise the enlargement of an existing scenario produced in the United States to the global scale. Igor Mitroczyk presented his efforts to create a **forum for stakeholder consultation in Poland**. Together with Dorota Chmielowiec, LEAD-Europe fellow cohort 5, he has succeeded in bringing together large industrial corporations, ministries and many NGOs and to consider to institutionalize the forum.. His assignment will consist of a workplan to establish such a forum. He will notably look for advice from the Canadian National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (host institution of LEAD Canada). Other innovative assignments concerned **software for domestic consumption** such as water, adapted to different age groups, the **role of the arts** in sustainable development, and the comparison of **indicators for sustainability initiatives** by different cities and towns in Europe.

# ANNEX 2

## COURSE EVALUATION

The questionnaire presented in Annex 3 was distributed at the beginning of the course and the Associates returned it before leaving at the end. The questionnaire uses one closed question for each tutors, case study and site visit. The Associates are asked to rank each event from 1 to 6, and the ranks are defined primarily towards the novelty of the matter treated. The highest rank corresponds therefore to: New perspective formerly unknown to me. The ranking for the case study is similar only that instead of knowledge, the Associates are asked to decide whether their skills were improved. Using one ranking dimension forces the Associates to summarise their judgement. Therefore there is an open question afterwards and the Associates use this open question often to indicate other aspects of their judgement.

Table 1 on the following page shows the ranks given by cohort 6 and cohort 7. Where a case is empty, the Associates did not rank it. The values in each case are not even numbers (1 to 6) because the table is normalized by using the sum of all ranks given by an Associates and weighting the ranks in proportion to the average of the rankings from all Associates. Thereby the influence of the general degree of receptivity by an Associates is reduced. The weighted rank is higher than the actual one when the sum of all rankings by an Associate is lower than the average from all Associates, and vice versa, the weighted rank is lower when the sum of all rankings by an Associate is higher than the average from all. Finally, the last row shows the average appreciation of a tutor (in bold numbers), first for cohort 6 and lower for cohort 7.

The average of the subjective appreciation of the Associates is therefore highest at 5.3 from cohort 6 for the resource person from the policy NGO. For cohort 7, the highest is equally 5.3 but for the first tutorial on taxes. These averages give an indication of the benefit of a tutorial to the Associates. But it should be stressed that this is a rather crude measure. The benefit varies in all cases widely primarily because of the differences in the Associates' backgrounds and professional experiences. These average can therefore only be interpreted with certainty by someone who has participated in the actual course and who can take into account especially the types of questions asked by the Associates during each tutorial, case study and site visit.

# ANNEX 3

## Evaluation Questionnaire

### Associates cohort 7

**Bonn 21 February - 2 March. 1999**

Dear Associate:

To improve our understanding of your preferences and in the interest of the next Associates, please fill in this questionnaire and respond to the open questions.

1.) Tutorials:

- 1 - the basic orientation of the tutorial was not clear
- 2 - the level of competence was inadequate, I did not gain insight
- 3 - I was able to complete my knowledge in this field
- 4 - the tutorial substantially added to my understanding of that field
- 5 - I was made aware of major aspects formerly unknown to me
- 6 - the tutorial opened a new perspective formerly unknown to me

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Consumption / Michaelis	0	0	0	0	0	0
Market Failure / Russell	0	0	0	0	0	0
Innovation Policy / Cameron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Green Accounting / Common	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tax Reform von Weizsäcker	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blazejczak	0	0	0	0	0	0
COP update Kinley	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Vision of the UN / Graf York	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maier	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bretton Woods / Mahar	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mistry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coastal Zone Management / Ormond	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ehlin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jeftic	0	0	0	0	0	0

Which aspect would you want to see pursued in more detail ?

2.) Case study work:

- 1 - the skill level was inadequate
- 2 - would have preferred a more theoretical approach
- 3 - allowed me to regain skills I had not been able to sustain
- 4 - substantially improved my skills
- 5 - I was made aware of major aspects formerly unknown to me
- 6 - the training allowed me to grasp a formerly unknown professional field

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Sustainable aviation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sustainable Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0
Waste Management District	0	0	0	0	0	0

Resource persons:

- 1- could not provide pertinent information to
- 6 - enabled the group to come to a conclusion

Smeets	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gazzard	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schell	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bessley	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spangenberg	0	0	0	0	0	0

What would have made the case study work a stronger learning experience ?

# ANNEX 4

## **Residential Course Bonn 19 February - 2 March 1999 Tutors' Coordinates**

*Colin Beesley*

Environmental Technology  
Rolls Royce Turbines Ltd.  
Derby DE24 8BJ  
UK  
Phone: +44-1332-247680  
Fax: +44-1332-247129

*Jürgen Blacejczak*

Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung  
Abt. Strukturforschung  
Königin-Luise-St. 5  
D-14195 Berlin  
Germany  
Phone: +49 30 897 89 359  
Fax: +49 30 897 89 200

*Hugh Cameron*

PREST  
University of Manchester  
Manchester M13 9PL  
UK  
Phone: +44-161-2755921  
Fax: +44-161-2731123  
Email: [Hugh.Cameron@man.ac.uk](mailto:Hugh.Cameron@man.ac.uk)

*Mick Common*

Graduate School of Environmental Studies  
University of Strathclyde  
Wolfson Building  
106 Rotten Row East  
Glasgow G4 ONVV  
UK  
Phone: +44-141-5524400  
Fax: +44-141-5525498

*Uwe Ehlin*  
Stockholm International Water Institute  
S-106 36 Stockholm  
Sweden  
Phone: +46-8-7362015  
Fax: +46-8-7362022  
Email: uwe.ehlin@siwi.org

*Jeffrey Gazzard*  
27 Galmar Road  
Knutsford  
Cheshire WA1 6 8BG  
UK  
Phone: +44-1565-653561

*L. Jeftic*  
Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea  
11 Dartmouth Street  
London SW1 H 9NB  
UK  
Phone: +44-171-7993033  
Fax: +44-171-7992933  
Email: acopsorg@netcomuk.co.uk

*Richard Kinley*  
Climate Secretariat  
Haus Carstanjen  
PO Box 260 124  
D-53153 Bonn  
Germany  
Phone: +49-228-8151108  
Fax: +49-228-8151999

*Anja Koehne*  
Deutscher Naturschutzring  
EU-Co-ordination  
Am Michaelshof 8-10  
D-53177 Bonn  
Germany  
Phone: +49-228-351549  
Fax: +49-228-359096  
Email: eu-koehne@dnr.de

*Reinhard Loske*  
Bundestag  
Bonn  
Germany  
Phone: +49-228-1681645

*Dennis J. Mahar*

Manager Environment & Natural Resources Division  
Economic Development Institute  
The World Bank  
1818 H Street  
Washington DC 20433  
USA  
Phone: +1-202-458.79.70  
Fax: + 1 -202-676.09.77

*Juergen Maier*

Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung  
Am Michaelshof 8-10  
D-53177 Bonn  
Germany  
Tel.: +49-228 - 35 97 04  
Fax: +49228 - 35 90 96  
Email: forumue@csi.com

*Laurie Michaelis*

Oxford Centre for Environment, Ethics & Society  
Mansfield College  
Oxford OX1 3TF  
UK  
Phone:+44-1865-282903  
Fax: +44-1865-270889

*Percy Mistry*

Oxford International Associates  
The Dell  
Bruern Road  
Milton under Wychwood  
Oxon. OX7 6LL  
UK  
Phone: +44-1993-83.15.67  
Fax.. +44-1993-83.18.19  
Email: oxford\_int\_uk@compuserve.com

*Rupert Ormond*

Tropical Marine Research Unit  
University of York  
Heslington  
York YO1 5DD  
UK  
Phone: +44-1904-432930  
Fax: +44-1904-432860  
Email: rfg01@york.ac.uk

*Noel Russell*

School of Economic Studies  
University of Manchester  
Manchester M 1 3 9PL  
Phone: +44-161-4797  
Fax: +44-161-4812

*Beatrice Schell*

European Federation for Transport and the Environment  
34 blvd de Waterloo  
B-1000 Brussels  
Belgium  
Phone: +32-2-5029909  
Fax: +32-2-5029908  
Email: b.schell@arcadis.be

*Hans Smeets*

Senior Manager Public Affairs  
KLM Royal Dutch Airlines  
Public Affairs Bureau (AMS/DG)  
Amsterdamseweg 55  
NL-1 182 GP Amsteiveen  
The Netherlands  
Phone: +31 20 649 39 32  
Fax: +31 20 648 82 92  
Email: hans.smeets@klm.nl

*Joachim Spangenberg*

Wuppertal Institute  
Postfach 100480  
D-42004 Wuppertal  
Germany  
Phone: +49-202-2492128  
Fax: +49-202-2492108  
Email: joachim.spangenberg@wupperinst.org

*Callum Thomas*

Dept. of Environmental and Geographical Science  
Manchester Metropolitan University  
John Dalton Building  
Chester Street  
Manchester M1 5GD  
UK  
Phone: +44-161-247-3664  
Email: c.s.thomas@mmu.ac.uk

*Emst-Ulrich* von Weizsäcker  
Wuppertal Institute  
Postfach 100480  
D-42004 Wuppertal  
Germany  
Phone: +49-202-2492-0  
Fax: +49-202-2492108

*Reinhardt de Witt*  
Kommunalverband Ruhrgebiet (KVR)  
Pf. 10 32 64  
D-45032 Essen  
Germany  
Phone: + 49-20-649.39.32

*Alexander* Graf York  
Heinrich-Blömer Weg 1  
D-53127 Bonn  
Germany  
Phone: +49-228-28.42.45