

Review of HIA Report

HIA Report	Gesundheitsfolgenabschätzung zum verpflichtenden Kindergartenjahr
Reviewer	Fiona Haigh
Date of Review	4 October 2012
Grades	<p>Overall Grade: A-</p> <p>Justification: This is an excellent report which uses appropriate methods and procedures and draws on a wide range of relevant evidence. It is well written and presented in a clear and logical way leading to evidence based conclusions and recommendations. The limitations of the study are clearly stated and understood and within this context, very good use is made of the material available. A key strength of the report is the clear descriptions of how decisions were made during the HIA process and reasoning for these decisions. In general where there are weaknesses in the report these can be accounted for by the pilot nature of the assessment and the level of HIA (rapid).</p>
Review Method	<p>The review score is based upon <i>A review package for Health Impact Assessment reports of development projects</i>¹. It was developed for use on projects so some adjustment was needed to look at this policy HIA. When assigning grades the reviewer took into account the level of HIA (Rapid). The reviewer (FH) read the HIA report and then in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. used the grades achieved in the sub-categories to determine a grade for the categories. b. used the grades achieved in the categories to determine a grade for the review areas. c. used the grades achieved in the review areas to determine an overall grade for the HIA report. <p>Grading Scale</p> <p>A Relevant tasks well performed, no important tasks left incomplete, only minor omissions and inadequacies.</p> <p>B Can be considered satisfactory despite omissions and/or inadequacies.</p> <p>C Parts are well attempted but must, as a whole, be considered just unsatisfactory because of omissions or inadequacies.</p> <p>D Not satisfactory, significant omissions or inadequacies, some important tasks(s) poorly done or not attempted.</p> <p>NA Not applicable.</p> <p>There are some situations (for a particular type of project for example) where a criterion will not apply, however the reviewer is advised to avoid N/A unless there is no alternative.</p>

¹ M. W. Fredsgaard, B. Cave, and A. Bond. A review package for Health Impact Assessment reports of development projects. Ben Cave Associates Ltd. 2009. www.hiagateway.org.uk

Review Area 1: Context

1 Context²	Grade
1.1 Site description and policy framework	A
1.1.1 The report should describe the physical characteristics ³ of the project ⁴ site and the surrounding area.	A
1.1.2 The report should describe the way in which the project site and the surrounding area are currently used. ⁵	A
1.1.3 The report should describe the policy context and state whether the project accords with significant policies ⁶ that protect and promote wellbeing and public health and reduce health inequalities.	A
1.2 Description of project	A
1.2.1 The aims and objectives of the project should be stated and the final operational characteristics of the project should be described. ⁷	A
1.2.2 The estimated duration of the construction phase, operational phase and, where appropriate, decommissioning phase should be given.	N/A
1.2.3 The relationship of the project with other proposals should be stated.	A
1.3 Public health profile	B
1.3.1 The public health profile should establish an information base from which requirements for health protection, health improvement and health services can be assessed.	B
1.3.2 The profile should identify vulnerable population groups. The profile should describe, where possible, inequalities in health between population groups and should include the wider determinants of health ⁸ .	B
1.3.3 The information in the profile should be specific about the timescale, the geographic location and the population group being described and links should be made with the proposed project. ⁹	A
Summary Context Grade	A

² If the HIA is prepared in conjunction with an Environmental Impact Assessment, or other studies, elements of this description may be shared with those other studies.

³ The physical characteristics may include the location, design, size and an outline of the area of land take during the construction and operation phase. Presentation or reference to diagrams, plans or maps will be beneficial for this purpose. Graphical material should be easy to understand without having any knowledge about planning and design.

⁴ The review package uses the term project to mean the execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes; or other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources (30;46).

⁵ Does the site description indicate whether the site and the surrounding area are used, either formally or informally, and if so who by?

⁶ The policies may be local, regional, national or international policies or they may be sector-specific.

⁷ Has a do-nothing option and other alternatives to the project been described? Does the report also describe the primary advantages and disadvantages to health of the proposal and alternatives? It should be noted if no alternatives are being assessed.

⁸ People's health is influenced by the conditions in which they live. Health determinants are the personal, social, cultural, economic and environmental factors that influence the health status of individuals or populations. These include, but are not limited to, factors such as income, employment, education, social support and housing.

⁹ Does the profile include consideration of the future profile of the population?

Review Area 2: Management

2 Management	
2.1 Identification and prediction of health impacts	A
2.1.1 The report should describe the screening and scoping stages of the HIA and the methods used in these stages. ¹⁰	A
2.1.2 A description of how the quantitative evidence was gathered and analysed (where appropriate) should be given and its relevance to the HIA justified. ¹¹	A
2.1.3 A description of how the qualitative evidence was gathered and analysed (where appropriate) should be given and its relevance to the HIA justified. ¹⁰	A
2.2 Governance	A
2.2.1 The governance process for the HIA should be described. ¹²	A
2.2.2 The terms of reference for the HIA should be available to the reader and the geographical, temporal and population scope of the HIA should be made explicit.	B
2.2.3 Any constraints in preparing the HIA should be explained. ¹³	A
2.3 Engagement	A
2.3.1 The report should identify relevant stakeholder groups, including organisations responsible for protecting and promoting health and wellbeing that should be involved in the HIA.	A
2.3.2 The report should identify vulnerable population groups which should be involved in the HIA. ¹⁴	B
2.3.3 The report should describe the engagement strategy for the HIA. ¹⁵	A
Summary Management Grade	A

¹⁰ Tools or checklists are methods mostly used to screen for potential health impacts. The scoping stage often includes consultation, workshop, matrices, specific checklists, literature review, expert advisory panels, etc. Sometimes the scope of the HIA is predetermined by the commissioner of the HIA. Do the authors justify the use of particular methods?

¹¹ Is the use of any statistical techniques adequately justified?

¹² Was the HIA guided and scrutinised by a steering group? What was the membership of the steering group? Which organisation has final ownership of/accountability for the report and its findings? Was the commissioner's relationship to the HIA process including the development of findings and reporting of the HIA made explicit?

¹³ This might include limitations of method or availability of evidence, for example time, resources, accessibility of data, non-availability/involvement of key informants and stakeholders. It might also describe any limitations in the scope of the HIA.

¹⁴ Does the report describe how stakeholders were identified and whether key informants have been selected as representatives?

¹⁵ Does the report describe how the stakeholder groups, key informants, other stakeholders and citizens who were involved were involved? There may be reasons for not engaging or consulting members of the public. If so, are these provided and adequately explained? Does the report explain the engagement methods, and their timing, e.g., were leaflets, meetings, interviews, etc. used and at what stage and for which stakeholder groups?

Review Area 3: Assessment

3 Assessment		
3.1 Description of health effects		A
3.1.1	The potential health effects of the project, both beneficial and adverse, should be identified and presented in a systematic way. ¹⁶	A
3.1.2	The identification of potential health impacts should consider the wider determinants of health such as socio-economic, physical, and mental health factors.	A
3.1.3	The causal pathway leading to health effects should be outlined along with an explanation of the underpinning evidence. ¹⁷	B
3.2 Risk assessment		B
3.2.1	The nature of the potential health effects should be detailed. ¹⁸	A
3.2.2	The findings of the assessment should be accompanied by a statement of the level of certainty or uncertainty attached to the predictions of health effects.	B
3.2.3	The report should identify and justify the use of any standards and thresholds used to assess the significance of health impacts.	B
3.3 Analysis of distribution of effects		B
3.3.1	The affected populations should be explicitly identified.	B
3.3.2	Inequalities in the distribution of predicted health impacts should be investigated and the effects of these inequalities should be stated. ¹⁹	A
3.3.3	Effects on health should be examined based on the population profile. ²⁰	B/C
Summary Assessment Grade		B

¹⁶ Does the identification of impacts consider short-term, long-term (and are these timescales defined?), direct and indirect impacts on health and well-being? Does the identification of health impacts distinguish between the construction phase, the operational phase and where relevant the decommissioning phase?

¹⁷ The potential health effects may be presented in diagrams, which show the causal pathways and changes in intermediate factors by which the project may affect population health, or may be descriptive.

¹⁸ Does the assessment consider the severity of impact/exposure (intensity, reversibility and impact on vulnerable population groups), the impact magnitude (number of people affected and duration of impact/exposure) and the importance (political and ethical)? Have the health impacts of each alternative been assessed? Sometimes the health impacts are ranked and prioritized before making recommendations, if so; have the criteria for prioritizing and ranking health impacts been given?

¹⁹ How does the report define inequalities? Inequalities are found between social groups and can be measured in different ways e.g. by geography, social class or social position, population (ethnicity, gender, sexuality etc).

²⁰ It should be possible to determine whether effects are more prevalent in certain demographic or vulnerable groups.

Review Area 4: Reporting

4	Reporting	
4.1	Discussion of results	A
4.1.1	The report should describe how the engagement undertaken has influenced the HIA, in terms of results, conclusions or approach taken.	A
4.1.2	The report should state the effect on the health and wellbeing of the population of the option and any alternatives which have been considered.	A
4.1.3	The report should justify any conclusions reached, particularly where some evidence has been afforded greater weight than others.	A
4.2	Recommendations	C
4.2.1	There should be a list of recommendations to facilitate the management of health effects and the enhancement of beneficial health effects. ²¹	B
4.2.2	The level of commitment of the project proponent to the recommendations and mitigation methods should be stated.	C
4.2.3	There should be a plan for monitoring future health effects by relevant indicators and a suggested process for evaluation.	C
4.3	Communication and layout	B
4.3.1	Information should be logically arranged in sections or chapters and the whereabouts of important data should be signalled in a table of contents or index.	A
4.3.2	There should be a lay summary of the main findings and conclusions of the study. Technical terms, lists of data and detailed explanations of scientific reasoning should be avoided in this summary. ²²	B
4.3.3	All evidence and data sources should be clearly referenced.	B
Summary Reporting Grade		B

²¹ Do the recommendations cover the construction, operational and, where appropriate, decommissioning phases in the short, medium and long term (and are these timescales defined?). Some HIAs include recommendations as a management plan and list the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders and provide a timetable for action. Do the recommendations link with the findings of other relevant studies for example, Environmental Impact Assessment?

²² Does the summary cover all main issues discussed in the HIA report and contain at least a brief description of the project and the potentially affected population, a description of the most important positive and negative health effects and the project's impact on equality, an account of the main recommendations and mitigation measures to be undertaken by the developer and the main outline of the action plan recommended to manage, and monitor the health effects and evaluate the HIA. Is a brief explanation of the methods by which data were obtained, and an indication of the certainty which can be placed in them included?