

# Health economic assessment tools (HEAT) for walking and for cycling



Methodology and user guide

ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT OF  
TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE  
AND POLICIES




This publication arises from the project "PHAN", which has received funding from the European Union in the framework of the Health Programme.

The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union.



lebensministerium.at



# Health economic assessment tools (HEAT) for walking and for cycling

## Methodology and user guide

# ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT OF TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND POLICIES

Sonja Kahlmeier, University of Zurich, Switzerland  
Nick Cavill, Cavill Associates, United Kingdom  
Hywell Dinsdale, National Obesity Observatory England, United Kingdom  
Harry Rutter, National Obesity Observatory England, United Kingdom  
Thomas Götschi, University of Zurich, Switzerland  
Charlie Foster, University of Oxford, United Kingdom  
Paul Kelly, University of Oxford, United Kingdom  
Dushy Clarke, University of Oxford, United Kingdom  
Pekka Oja, UKK Institute for Health Promotion Research, Finland  
Richard Fordham, University of East Anglia, United Kingdom  
Dave Stone, Natural England, United Kingdom  
Francesca Racioppi, WHO Regional Office for Europe

## Keywords

ISBN: 978-92-890-0251-6

BICYCLING  
WALKING  
TRANSPORTATION METHODS – ECONOMICS  
HEALTH ECONOMICS  
COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS – METHODS  
DATA COLLECTION – METHODS  
GUIDELINES  
EUROPE

### © World Health Organization 2011

All rights reserved. The Regional Office for Europe of the World Health Organization welcomes requests for permission to reproduce or translate its publications, in part or in full.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the World Health Organization concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Dotted lines on maps represent approximate border lines for which there may not yet be full agreement.

The mention of specific companies or of certain manufacturers' products does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by the World Health Organization in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. Errors and omissions excepted, the names of proprietary products are distinguished by initial capital letters.

All reasonable precautions have been taken by the World Health Organization to verify the information contained in this publication. However, the published material is being distributed without warranty of any kind, either express or implied. The responsibility for the interpretation and use of the material lies with the reader. In no event shall the World Health Organization be liable for damages arising from its use. The views expressed by authors, editors, or expert groups do not necessarily represent the decisions or the stated policy of the World Health Organization.

### Address requests about publications of the WHO Regional Office for Europe to:

Publications  
WHO Regional Office for Europe  
Scherfigsvej 8  
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark

Alternatively, complete an online request form for documentation, health information, or for permission to quote or translate, on the WHO/Europe web site at <http://www.euro.who.int/pubrequest>.

# Contents

Contributors and acknowledgements . . . . .	1
<b>1. Introduction. . . . .</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Methodological guidance on economic appraisal of health effects related to walking and cycling . . . . .</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1. Walking and cycling data . . . . .	8
2.2. Time needed to reach full level of walking or cycling . . . . .	8
2.3. Interactions between transport-related physical activity, air pollution and road traffic injuries . . . . .	8
2.4. Mortality or morbidity? . . . . .	9
2.5. The nature of the relationship between physical activity and health . . . . .	9
2.6. Age groups. . . . .	11
2.7. Sex . . . . .	11
2.8. Time needed for health benefits to build up. . . . .	11
2.9. Activity substitution . . . . .	11
2.10. Static vs life tables approach. . . . .	12
2.11. Costs applied . . . . .	12
2.12. Discounting . . . . .	13
2.13. Sensitivity analysis . . . . .	13
<b>3. Reviews of the literature: summary . . . . .</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1. Economic literature . . . . .	14
3.2. Epidemiological literature . . . . .	15
<b>4. The HEAT for walking and for cycling: introduction . . . . .</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1. General principles of the tool . . . . .	18
4.2. Who is the tool for?. . . . .	18
4.3. What can the tool be used for? . . . . .	19
4.4. What should the tool not be used for? . . . . .	19
4.5. Basic functioning of the tool . . . . .	20
4.6. What input data are needed? . . . . .	23
4.7. Data sources . . . . .	23
4.8. What data will the tool produce? . . . . .	25
<b>5. HEAT for walking: instructions for users. . . . .</b>	<b>26</b>
5.1. How to access the tool . . . . .	26
5.2. How to use the tool: five simple steps . . . . .	26
5.3. Assumptions. . . . .	31



<b>6. HEAT for cycling: instructions for users</b> . . . . .	<b>32</b>
6.1. How to access the tool . . . . .	32
6.2. How to use the tool: five simple steps . . . . .	32
6.3. Assumptions . . . . .	36
References . . . . .	37

# Contributors and acknowledgements

## International advisory group for HEAT for cycling

- Lars Bo Andersen,\* School of Sports Science, Norway
- Finn Berggren, Gerlev Physical Education and Sports Academy, Denmark
- Hana Bruhova-Foltynova, Charles University Environment Centre, Czech Republic
- Fiona Bull, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
- Andy Cope,\* Sustrans, United Kingdom
- Maria Hagströmer/Michael Sjöström, Karolinska Institute, Sweden
- Eva Gleissenberger/Robert Thaler, Lebensministerium, Austria
- Brian Martin, Federal Office of Sport, Switzerland
- Irina Mincheva Kovacheva, Ministry of Health, Bulgaria
- Hanns Moshhammer, International Society of Doctors for the Environment
- Bhash Naidoo, National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE), United Kingdom
- Åse Nossu/Knut Veisten, Institute for Transport Economics, Norway
- Kjartan Sælensminde, Norwegian Directorate for Health and Social Affairs, Norway
- Peter Schantz,\* Research Unit for Movement, Health and Environment, Åstrand Laboratory, GIH – The Swedish School of Sport and Health Sciences, Sweden
- Thomas Schmid, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, USA
- Heini Sommer,\* Ecoplan, Switzerland
- Jan Sørensen,\* Centre for Applied Health Services Research and Technology Assessment, University of Southern Denmark
- Sylvia Titze, University of Graz, Austria
- Ardine de Wit/Wanda Wendel Vos, National Institute for Health and Environment (RIVM), Netherlands
- Mulugeta Yilma, Road Administration, Sweden

## Acknowledgements

The development of HEAT for cycling was supported by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Division V/5 – Transport, Mobility, Human Settlement and Noise and by the Swedish Expertise Fund, and facilitated by the Karolinska Institute, Sweden. The project benefited greatly from systematic reviews being undertaken for the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) in the United Kingdom. The consensus workshop on cycling (Graz, Austria, 15–16 May 2007) was facilitated by the University of Graz.

\* Members of the extended core group



### **International advisory group for HEAT for walking**

- Lars Bo Andersen, School of Sports Science, Norway
- Andy Cope, Sustrans, United Kingdom
- Mark Fenton, Tufts University, USA
- Mark Hamer, University College London, United Kingdom
- Max Herry, Herry Consult, Austria
- I-Min Lee, Harvard School of Public Health, USA
- Brian Martin, University of Zurich, Switzerland
- Markus Maybach/Christoph Schreyer, Infrac, Switzerland
- Marie Murphy, University of Ulster, United Kingdom
- Gabe Rousseau, Federal Highway Administration, USA
- Candace Rutt/Tom Schmid, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, USA
- Elin Sandberg/Mulugeta Yilma, Road Administration, Sweden
- Daniel Sauter, Urban Mobility Research, Switzerland
- Peter Schantz, Mid Sweden University and GIH – The Swedish School of Sport and Health Sciences
- Peter Schnohr, The Copenhagen City Heart Study, Denmark
- Christian Schweizer, WHO Regional Office for Europe
- Heini Sommer, Ecoplan, Switzerland
- Jan Sørensen, Centre for Applied Health

Services Research and Technology Assessment, University of Southern Denmark

- Gregor Starc, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
- Wanda Wendel Vos, National Institute for Health and Environment (RIVM), Netherlands
- Paul Wilkinson, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom

### **Acknowledgements**

The development of HEAT for walking was supported by a consortium of donors from the United Kingdom under the leadership of Natural England. The consortium included the Department of Health England, Environment Agency, the Countryside Council for Wales, Public Health Wales, the Physical Activity & Nutrition Networks for Wales, the Forestry Commission and the Scottish Government, Public Health Directorate. It was also supported by the Swiss Federal Office of Public Health and by the WHO Regional Office of Europe. It was financially supported by the European Union in the framework of the Health Programme 2008–2013 (Grant agreement 2009 52 02). The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union.

The development of HEAT for walking was carried out in close collaboration with HEPA Europe (the European network for the promotion of health-enhancing physical activity) and the Transport, Health and Environment Pan-European Programme (THE PEP). The consensus workshop on walking (Oxford, United Kingdom, 1–2 July 2010) was facilitated by the University of Oxford.





### **Pilot testing**

- Hana Bruhova-Foltynova, Charles University Environment Centre, Czech Republic
- Sean Co, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Oakland, California, USA
- Werner Hagens, Liesbeth Mathijssen, Yonne Mulder, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Netherlands
- Ruth Hunter, Centre for Public Health, Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom
- Sam Margolis, LBTH and NHS Tower Hamlets, United Kingdom
- Angela Wilson, Research and Monitoring Unit, Sustrans, United Kingdom

### **Peer review**

- Paul Curtis, London European Partnership for Transport, United Kingdom
- Adrian Lord, Arup, United Kingdom
- Nanette Mutrie, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, United Kingdom
- Web programming and design of [www.heatwalkingcycling.org](http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org): Duy Dao, Switzerland
- Editing: Frank Theakston, Denmark
- Layout: Lars Møller, Denmark
- Printing: Colombo, Italy
- Pictures: WHO/Nicoletta di Tanno (p 6, 7, 10, 17, 29), Fotolia (p 1, 3, 4, 8, 14, 18, 20, 26), Istock: (p 32)





# 1

## Introduction

Physical inactivity is a significant public health problem in most regions of the world, which is unlikely to be solved by classical health promotion approaches alone. The promotion of active transport (cycling and walking) for everyday physical activity is a win-win approach; it not only promotes health but can also lead to positive environmental effects, especially if cycling and walking replace short car trips. Cycling and walking can also be more readily integrated into people's busy schedules than, for example, leisure-time exercise. There is a large potential for active travel in European urban transport, as many trips are short and would be amenable to being undertaken on foot or by bicycle. This, however, requires effective partnerships with the transport and urban planning sectors, whose policies are key driving forces in providing appropriate conditions for such behavioural changes to take place. This has been recognized by a number of international policy frameworks, such as the Action Plan for implementation of the European Strategy for the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases 2012–2016, adopted by the WHO Regional Committee for Europe (1). The strategy identifies the promotion of active mobility as

one of the supporting interventions endorsed by WHO Member States to address this high-priority topic in the European Region, as do other international policy frameworks such as the Toronto Charter for Physical Activity launched in May 2010 as a global call for action (2).

Transport is an essential component of life and a basis for providing access to goods and services. Different modes of transport are associated with specific effects on society, including health, environment and social effects. Fully appraising these effects is an important basis for evidence-based policy-making. Economic appraisal is an established practice in transport planning. However, techniques for assessing the economic value of the benefits to health of cycling and walking have historically been applied less systematically than the approaches used for assessing the other costs and benefits of new infrastructure.

Valuing health effects is a complex undertaking, and transport planners are often not well equipped to fully address the methodological complexities involved. A few countries in Europe, such as those working through the Nordic



Council (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), have carried out pioneering work in trying to assess the overall costs and benefits of transport infrastructures taking health effects into account, and guidance for carrying out such assessments has been developed. Nevertheless, important questions remain.

Coordinated by WHO, two projects were carried out aimed at developing guidance and practical tools for economic assessments of the health effects (a) from cycling and (b) from walking. First published in 2007 and officially launched in 2009, a methodological guidance report (3) and a health economic assessment tool (HEAT) for cycling (4) were presented. In 2011, an updated online version of the HEAT for cycling and a HEAT for walking (5) were published.

Implementation of the projects was steered by a core project group, which worked in close collaboration with advisory groups of international experts (see the list of contributors above). These experts were specifically selected to represent an interdisciplinary range of professional backgrounds and expertise, including health and epidemiology, health economics, transport economics, a practice and/or advocacy perspective, and policy development and implementation. Close coordination also took place with HEPA Europe (the European network for the promotion of health-enhancing physical activity) and the Transport, Health and Environment Pan-European Programme (THE PEP).

The key project steps were as follows.

- The project core group commissioned systematic reviews (a) of published economic valuations of transport projects, including a physical activity element (6) and (b) of

epidemiological literature with regard to health effects from cycling and walking, particularly by regular commuting.

- The results of these reviews were considered by the core group and used to propose options for and guidance towards a more harmonized methodology.
- Draft methodological guidance and practical tools for cycling and for walking were developed and tested, and piloted by members of the advisory group.
- International consensus meetings with the advisory groups on walking and on cycling, respectively, were held to facilitate discussion and the achievement of scientific consensus on the options proposed in the draft methodological guidance and tools.
- Based on the meeting recommendations, further bilateral discussions with different members of the advisory group and extensive pilot testing by additional experts, the products of the project were approved for publication: a guidance document (3), a systematic review of the economic literature (6), an online tool for walking and for cycling (5) (based on a previous, Excel-based version for cycling only (4)), a publication on HEAT for cycling applications (7) and this booklet.

This publication represents a summary of these products. Chapter 2 presents the main conclusions on the methodology for economic assessment of transport infrastructure and policies regarding inclusion of the health effects of walking and cycling. Chapter 3 contains the main results of systematic reviews of economic and health literature.



The principles outlined in the guidance have been applied in two web-based, practical calculation tools, showing how the methodology can be used to assess health effects related to walking or to cycling, respectively. The main principles are outlined in Chapter 4. The tools are available online (5). If you are mainly looking for guidance on applying the HEAT tools, please go directly to Chapter 4 and then read Chapter 5 and/or Chapter 6, which contain detailed user guides with instructions for walking and cycling, respectively, and outline potential limitations of the approach.

Knowledge of the health effects of cycling and walking is evolving rapidly. These projects represent first steps towards an agreed harmonized methodology. In developing these tools, on several occasions the advisory group made expert judgements based on the best available information and evidence. Therefore, the accuracy of results of the HEAT calculations should be understood as estimates of the order of magnitude, much like many other economic assessments of health effects. Further improvements will be made as new knowledge becomes available. Feedback to further improve the tools and maximize their user-friendliness is welcome at: [info@heatwalkingcycling.org](mailto:info@heatwalkingcycling.org).







## Methodological guidance on economic appraisal of health effects related to walking and cycling

This chapter summarizes the key methodological issues concerning the economic appraisal of health effects related to walking and cycling. A more extensive discussion of these issues, including options for and guidance towards a more harmonized methodology for the economic appraisal of the health effects of walking and cycling, has been published previously (3). This earlier report was reviewed and its conclusions updated in 2010 in view of new evidence (see also Chapter 3).

### 2.1. Walking and cycling data

The quality of economic appraisals is highly dependent on the accuracy of the walking and cycling data used. In many countries, systematic long-term surveys of cycling and walking are not yet available or they do not provide local-level data, which are often needed for the appraisal of a local transport intervention or infrastructure.

When using data from local surveys, it must be ensured that they accurately represent the studied population. The studies should have been carried out over a sufficient period of time and across sufficient locations to adjust for temporal and spatial variations in cycling or walking.

### 2.2. Time needed to reach full level of walking or cycling

Transport interventions can take various lengths of time to influence a particular type of behaviour. For example, a certain new cycle path might result in immediate uptake, while it might take a year or more to see levels of use increase on another. Transport appraisals should allow for different assumptions about the speed or level of uptake of cycling or walking after such interventions.

### 2.3. Interactions between transport-related physical activity, air pollution and road traffic injuries

Transport-related health effects include possible negative effects from exposure to ambient air pollution or road traffic injuries. Possible interactions between the positive effects of exercise through active transport and such negative effects need to be considered. To date, no comprehensive review of active transport and physical activity is available that takes the possible negative effects of ambient air pollution into account.



Regarding road traffic injuries, evidence suggests that, if promotion of active travel is accompanied by suitable transport planning and safety measures, active commuters are likely to benefit from a “safety in numbers” effect (8): with increasing levels of active travel, walking and cycling become safer. Such measures could, at the same time, lead to less exposure to air pollution if more cycling occurs away from main roads.

Two recent scenario analyses showed that the positive health effects of cycling are likely to greatly outweigh negative effects of air pollution and road traffic accidents suffered by cyclists (9,10). Also, the use of all-cause mortality estimates (see also below) rather than cause-specific ones has the advantage of incorporating the possible detrimental effects associated with walking or cycling.

#### 2.4. Mortality or morbidity?

Physical activity has beneficial effects on many aspects of morbidity such as coronary heart disease, stroke, diabetes, some types of cancer, musculoskeletal health, energy balance and aspects of mental health (including anxiety and depression) and improving functional health in elderly people (11). From a public health point of view, these benefits materialize more rapidly than reductions in mortality. They can also be important in motivating individuals to walk and/or cycle, as people may be more likely to increase their physical activity to improve their immediate health and well-being than to prolong their life. Nevertheless, the current evidence on morbidity, both for walking and for cycling, is more limited than that on mortality. Thus including the impact of morbidity in an economic appraisal leads to greater uncertainty. The consensus meetings therefore recommended, for the time being, focusing only on all-cause mortality for HEAT for walking and for cycling. It should be noted that this method is likely to produce conservative

estimates, since it does not account for disease-related benefits.

Nevertheless, addressing morbidity was identified as the single most important item for later refinement to broaden the tool’s appeal (see also section 3.2).

#### 2.5. The nature of the relationship between physical activity and health

Epidemiological studies report relationships between different categories or levels of exposure and health outcomes. For example, a comparison of sedentary people with people who are active beyond a specific threshold (such as 150 minutes of activity per week) may show that active people are healthier. However, there is a strong consensus that physical activity has a continuous dose–response relationship with most health outcomes, i.e. each increase in physical activity is associated with additional health benefits (11,12). This has also been shown by studies looking specifically at walking or cycling (13,14). For many health outcomes, the exact shape of the curve is still uncertain (11).

To develop a methodology to quantify the health effects of active transport, a dose–response relationship needs to be incorporated. Based on the best available evidence for overall mortality as an outcome, and for walking and cycling as sources of physical activity, it is assumed in HEAT that any increase in walking or cycling would be associated with a reduction in risk, irrespective of whether a specific threshold is reached.

There is some limited evidence of a stronger association between the perceived intensity (pace) of walking and health effects than for volume of walking (14,15). However, these studies did not correct for the fitness of the participants or the true distance covered





and it remains difficult to assess their relative importance. In general, taking account of walking or cycling pace might lead to a more accurate assessment of the health effects, for example by differentiating between the different paces in leisure and transport walking or cycling, but it will also lead to more complicated models and additional uncertainties. HEAT does not take into account the pace (or intensity) of walking or cycling, or the possibility that less well-trained individuals may benefit more and better-trained individuals may benefit less from the same amount of walking or cycling.

## 2.6. Age groups

Ideally, economic analysis would be able to take account of the differential effects of physical activity on children and adults, and on adults of different ages. However, the vast majority of epidemiological studies have been conducted on adults, mainly because the most commonly studied disease end-points such as coronary heart disease or death are rare in children, and studies on adults are easier to carry out. Thus the evidence base for the health effects of physical activity on young people is not as large as that for adults. The advisory group concluded that the evidence for children and adolescents was insufficient, and that economic appraisals should focus on adults only in the first instance.

Age is also of relevance regarding the mortality rates used. Mortality rates vary substantially by age, and thus the choice of age range for the rate used in an economic appraisal can have a significant impact on the calculated benefits.

Therefore, the age groups to which the results may be applied and for which mortality rates were used should be made explicit. If any model is subsequently applied to children or older adults, any related assumptions should also be made explicit.

## 2.7. Sex

The review of the epidemiological evidence did not find significant differences between the sexes in the effects on all-cause mortality (see section 3.2) that would warrant different relative risk estimates for men and women.

Active transport behaviour can differ between men and women; for example, women often walk and cycle more than men. Ideally, economic analyses should take account of such gender differences.

## 2.8. Time needed for health benefits to build up

The epidemiological evidence on the effects on health of physical activity (11,12) implies that economic analysis should be carried out for habitual walking and cycling behaviour.

It is important to recognize that there will be a delay between increases in physical activity and measurable benefits to health. Based on the best available evidence, it was concluded that five years was a reasonable assumption to use for such “newly induced physical activity” to reach full effect, with an increment of 20% in benefits each year.

## 2.9. Activity substitution

This guidance is concerned with the effect on health of transport infrastructure and other types of transport interventions that are expected to result from walking or cycling. However, most of the literature on risk of disease relates to total physical activity, usually a composite index expressing overall energy expenditure (often measured as kilocalories (kcal) per week) or time spent active, including a wide range of non-transport activity such as leisure-time and occupational activity. The approach therefore

needs to address the issue of a potential substitution of one form of activity for another, which could occur in two ways.

1. Does an observed increase in rates of walking and cycling necessarily mean there has been an increase in total physical activity? For example, people may have stopped jogging when they started cycling or walking to work. While this is theoretically possible, none of the involved experts was aware of any evidence that would support such a pattern. Nevertheless, intervention studies should consider, for example, that a new cycle path may lead to a user's new journey actually being shorter than before.
2. The results of studies on walking or cycling could be confounded by other forms of physical activity, such as leisure-time activities. This could lead to an overestimation of the health effects of walking or cycling if those people who cycle or walk were actually more active through other forms of physical activity. It is recommended that activity substitution is accounted for in economic analyses as far as possible. This means not assuming that any increase in cycling or walking automatically leads to a similar increase in total physical activity, and using studies that correct for non-transport-related forms of physical activity.

## 2.10. Static vs life tables approach

Since economic appraisals evaluate benefits over a period of time, several parameters may not stay constant over the time of the analysis. For example, the mortality rate in the population may change, owing to an increase in walking or cycling or other factors. The evaluated

populations also represent a broad age range and health effects may vary by age. Life table calculations constitute a methodology to address these issues.

Nevertheless, the advisory group conclude that, currently, neither the available data nor the epidemiological evidence is sufficient to apply this approach to the evaluation of health benefits from walking, cycling or physical activity as a whole. In a refined version of an assessment tool, this could be an option for scenario analysis that allows for separate assumptions every year. For now, however, the potential improvement in accuracy from life table calculations appears to be small compared to the remaining uncertainties in various other parameters of such appraisals.

## 2.11. Costs applied

To conduct an economic appraisal of walking and cycling, it is necessary to agree on a method of valuing health (or life). There are a number of ways in which this can be done.

- A standard "value of a statistical life" (VSL) can be agreed. This is often used in transport appraisals. It is most commonly derived using a methodology called "willingness to pay" to avoid death in relation to the years this person can expect to live according to the statistical life expectancy. The willingness to pay shows how much a representative sample of the population (who, in this instance, are potential victims) would be willing to pay (in monetary terms) to avoid a specific risk such as the risk of a road accident. A common example is the value of €1.5 million agreed by the UNITE study (16).
- A "cost of illness" approach can be taken. This applies costs (for example costs to the national health service or loss of earnings) to each specific disease.



- A “years of life lost (or gained)” approach can be taken. This allows a more comprehensive assessment of health effects, as it takes the life expectancy of the participants into account.
- A “quality-adjusted life years” (QALYs) or “disability-adjusted life years” (DALYs) approach can be taken. These are derived from years of life spent in ill health, multiplied by a weight measuring the relative undesirability of the illness state.

Different economic end-points are preferred by different audiences – transportation planners prefer VSL while health experts prefer years of life lost or health care costs. As this project was aimed primarily at transport appraisals, the VSL approach was used, as this is more common in transport appraisals. Other methods, such as an approach based on QALYs, could be adopted if data were available to permit a more comprehensive assessment. However, this would be challenging given the difficulties of assessing the effects of walking and cycling on morbidity (see also section 2.4).

Internationally, substantial differences exist between VSL (17–19); it is therefore recommended to use a recent local VSL wherever possible.

## 2.12. Discounting

Since benefits occurring in the future are generally considered less valuable than those occurring in the present, economists apply a so called “discount rate” to future benefits. In many cases, the economic appraisal of health effects related to walking and cycling will be included as one component into a more comprehensive cost–benefit analysis of transport interventions or infrastructure projects. The final result of the comprehensive assessment would then be discounted to allow a calculation of the net present value.

When the health effects are to be considered alone, it is important that the methodology allows for discounting to be applied to this result as well.

## 2.13. Sensitivity analysis

Carrying out economic appraisals of the health effects of transport behaviour is a complex undertaking and will invariably involve a number of assumptions and expert judgements, as outlined above.

It is recommended that the uncertainties around an assessment are made explicit, and that the calculations are carried out with high and low estimates of the main variables in order to gain a better understanding of the possible range of the final results.



# 3

## Reviews of the literature: summary

### 3.1. Economic literature

To inform the development of the first version of HEAT for cycling, a systematic review of economic analyses of cycling and walking projects was carried out in 2007, in collaboration with the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) in the United Kingdom (6,20). The review aimed:

- to identify relevant publications through expert consultation and tailored searches of the literature;
- to review the approaches taken to including health effects in economic analyses of transport interventions and projects; and
- to propose recommendations for the further development of a harmonized methodology, based on the approaches developed to date.

To be included in this review, a study was required to:

- present the findings of an economic valuation of an aspect of transport infrastructure or policy;

- include data on walking and/or cycling in the valuation;
- include health effects related to physical activity in the economic valuation; and
- be in the public domain.

A total of 16 papers were included from an original list of 4267 titles. These covered a range of approaches to economic analysis, the majority being cost–benefit analyses of cycling projects or programmes. Quality was variable: using the quality scale adopted by NICE, only three of the studies were classified as “high quality” with a high probability that the observed relationship is causal (2++), six as “well conducted” with a moderate probability that the relationship is causal (2+) and seven “low quality” (2–).

Generally, the economic analyses showed positive benefit–cost ratios, the median being 5:1 with a range from –0.4 to 32.5. However, owing to the different methods applied in the studies, this value has to be viewed with caution. Some studies estimated the value attributed to



each new walker or cyclist; these ranged from about €120 to €1300.

The review found wide variation in the approaches taken to including health effects of physical activity in economic analyses of transport projects. This was not helped by a lack of transparency in the methods used in many of the studies reviewed. The studies used various sources of data as the basis for their calculations, there appeared to be no consensus on the diseases to be included in mortality calculations, and few studies included a measure of morbidity.

One of the most significant challenges identified was the relationship between observed cycling or walking and total physical activity. Studies had to: use modelling to make assumptions about how cycling or walking might influence total physical activity; assume that all observed cyclists or walkers could be classed as sufficiently active (and therefore had a reduced risk and/or reduced medical costs); or make some sort of estimate of the scale of benefit somewhere between these two extremes. One study used an approach based on the relative risk of all-cause mortality among cyclists compared to non-cyclists. It appeared to have the greatest potential for further development towards a more uniform approach. This methodology was proposed as the basis for the development of the first version of HEAT for cycling (4).

As part of the work on developing HEAT for walking and updating HEAT for cycling in 2010, an update was carried out of this systematic review designed to find papers published on the same topic since 2006 (21). The same protocol was used for this search. Of over 1800 hits, 8 publications met the inclusion criteria.

The studies included in this review indicated that there did not appear to have been a significant

methodological advance in valuing the health benefits of active travel. Methods remained variable, with limited transparency and reliance on numerous assumptions. As noted in the previous review, in most cases the health benefits of cycling and walking were based on the literature on physical activity in general, requiring assumptions on the health effects of cycling and walking being equivalent to other forms of physical activity as well as regarding the absence of “activity substitution”.

Although excluded from the review on technical grounds for not including an economic assessment, the approach by Woodcock et al. (22) appeared to be the most systematic and methodologically robust. The core group was also made aware of studies in progress that are using approaches involving QALYs or DALYs. While these approaches have many inherent advantages, the primary target audience for the HEAT for walking is transport planners (see also section 4.2) and they are familiar with calculations based on VSL. Studies based on metrics used predominantly in the health sector, such as DALYs, are not directly applicable to this target audience.

It was concluded that the literature review supported developing a HEAT for walking using a similar approach as for the HEAT for cycling: estimating the value of reduced risk among walkers based on VSL.

## 3.2. Epidemiological literature

### 3.2.1. Cycling

The strongest evidence at the time of the first project on the health effects of cycling was the relative risk data from two combined Copenhagen cohort studies (23). This study included 6954 20–60-year-old participants, followed up for an

average of 14½ years. It found a relative risk of all-cause mortality among regular commuter cyclists of 0.72 (95% confidence interval (CI): 0.57–0.91) compared to non-cycling commuters, for 3 hours of commuter cycling per week. The study did not report sex-specific risk estimates but noted that the tendencies were similar. It controlled for the usual socioeconomic variables (age, sex, smoking, etc.) as well as for leisure-time physical activity. As recommended (3,6), it also adjusted for the possibility that observed associations between commuter cycling and mortality might have been caused (or inflated) by higher levels in leisure-time activity among cyclists.

In 2010, the evidence with regard to cycling was reassessed and, again, it was not possible to carry out a meta-analysis of several studies as there were insufficient relevant studies on cycling. A recent systematic review by Oja et al. (13) found only three prospective population studies on cycling and all-cause mortality (23–25). The study by Matthews et al. (24) largely confirmed the results of Andersen et al. (23) in regular female cyclists in Shanghai, China, with a statistically significant trend for reduced all-cause mortality and borderline statistically significant relative risks. It also controlled for the most important covariates and leisure-time physical activity. The study by Besson et al. (25) did not find a statistically significant association in data from the United Kingdom. However, it was noted that the narrow range of weekly cycling found in this study may explain the non-significant result (13). In addition, the authors themselves pointed out that cycling as a mode of transportation was much less prevalent in their study population than in Copenhagen or Shanghai, which might also have contributed to the different findings (25).

HEAT for cycling currently uses the relative risk from the Copenhagen studies (23). Future work on further improving HEAT cycling will revisit this estimate and consider new data on regular cycling and mortality as they become available, aiming to derive a relative risk based on a larger number of studies.

### 3.2.2. Walking

We conducted a systematic review to identify suitable studies to derive a risk estimate that could be used for HEAT for walking (21). The studies used were derived from the report of the United States Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee (11), with additional searches conducted for more recent publications.


The review covered studies that specified walking as a separate behaviour and reported a risk for mortality. Fifteen studies were identified that reported an association between walking and a reduction in all-cause mortality.

Nine studies on mortality among comparable populations identified in the review had controlled in the analysis for other types of physical activity, particularly during leisure time (26–34). These studies were combined in a meta-analysis to calculate an aggregated risk, weighted by sample size. The resulting relative risk estimate was 0.78 (95% CI: 0.64–0.98) for a walking exposure of 29 minutes, 7 days a week, which was similar to the result of another recent meta-analysis on walking that also included studies that did not adjust for other forms of physical activity (14). The meta-analysis did not find a statistically significant difference in health effects between the sexes that would warrant the use of separate estimates.

An issue raised throughout the project was the inclusion of effects of walking on various

morbidities, something that the HEAT for cycling did not capture as it only includes savings from reduced mortality. For a number of practical and methodological reasons (see also section 2.4), the core group decided first to create an initial version of HEAT for walking based on mortality only, and to address morbidity at a later stage as part of refinements to HEAT for cycling and/or for walking. It was recognized that a more in-depth review of the literature would be necessary for assessing the effects of walking on morbidity. In addition, separation of the effects of different diseases would pose a challenge.

The consensus meeting on HEAT for walking recommended using the relative risk estimate of 0.78 from the meta-analysis for the HEAT for walking tool (see also Chapter 5).





# 4

## The HEAT for walking and for cycling: introduction

The principles and guidance set out in Chapter 2 have been developed into a practical tool for walking and for cycling, known as HEAT (5). The tool estimates the maximum and the mean annual benefit in terms of reduced mortality as a result of walking or cycling. It can be applied in a number of situations, as further described in section 4.4, such as:

- when planning a new piece of cycling or walking infrastructure, or helping to make the case;
- to value the reduced mortality from past and/or current levels of cycling or walking; or
- to provide input into more comprehensive economic appraisal exercises or prospective health impact assessments.

It will help to answer the following question:

**If x people cycle or walk for y minutes on most days, what is the economic value of the health benefits that occur as a result of the reduction in mortality due to their physical activity?**

### 4.1. General principles of the tool

The following core principles for the HEAT tool were agreed upon by the advisory groups. The tool shall be:

- robust and based on the best available evidence;
- fully transparent regarding assumptions;
- based in general on a conservative approach (low-end estimates and default values); and
- as user-friendly as possible.

### 4.2. Who is the tool for?

The tool is based on the best available evidence and transparent assumptions. It is intended to be simple to use by a wide variety of professionals at both national and local levels. These include primarily:

- transport planners;
- traffic engineers; and
- special interest groups working on transport, walking, cycling or the environment.

The tool is also of interest to health economists, physical activity experts or health promotion



experts. However, due to the use of transport-specific methods such as VSL, the results of HEAT in its current form might need to be accompanied with additional information and explanations for such audiences.

### 4.3. What can the tool be used for?

The tool can be used in a number of different situations.

- It can be used when planning a new piece of cycling or walking infrastructure. HEAT attaches a value to the estimated level of cycling or walking when the new infrastructure is in place. This can be compared to the costs of implementing different interventions to produce a cost–benefit ratio (and help to identify the most cost-effective investment).
- It can be used to evaluate the reduced mortality from past and/or current levels of cycling or walking, such as to a specific workplace, across a city or in a country. It can also be used to illustrate the economic consequences of a potential future change in levels of cycling or walking.
- It can be used to provide input to more comprehensive economic appraisal exercises, or prospective health impact assessments, such as to estimate the mortality benefits from achieving targets to increase cycling or walking or from the results of an intervention project.

The tool provides an estimate of the economic benefits accruing from walking or cycling as a result of lower death rates. Ideally, for a comprehensive assessment, it would be supplemented with data on other potential health outcomes from walking or cycling (morbidity) and combined with other transport-related

outcomes such as less congestion, reduced journey times or fewer road traffic injuries. These and other enhancements will be considered for inclusion in future versions of the tool.

### 4.4. What should the tool not be used for?

Before using HEAT, the following should be considered carefully to make sure HEAT is applicable.

1. HEAT is to be used for assessing habitual behaviour at population level, i.e. in groups of people, not in individuals.

The tool is designed for regular walking or cycling behaviour, such as for commuting or regular leisure-time activities.

In particular, it should not be used for the evaluation of one-day events or competitions (such as walking days), since these are unlikely to reflect long-term average activity behaviour.

In addition, HEAT for walking is meant to be applied for walking of at least moderate pace, i.e. about 3 miles/hour (4.8 km/hour), which is the walking speed of the studies in the meta-analysis, where available. This is also consistent with the minimum walking pace necessary to require a level of energy expenditure considered to bring health benefits (11); for cycling, this level is usually achieved even at low speed. If the walking pace in the study population is unknown, this should be borne in mind as an underlying assumption.

2. HEAT is designed for adult populations. For HEAT for cycling, the recommended applicable age range is approximately 20–64

years and for HEAT for walking, approximately 20–74 years (see also section 4.5). HEAT should not be applied to populations of children, very young adults or older people since the available evidence was not sufficient to derive a relative risk for these age groups (see also section 2.6).

**3. HEAT should not be used in populations with high average levels of physical activity.**

Studies on the benefits of physical activity for decreasing premature mortality have typically been conducted in the general population, where very high average levels of physical activity are uncommon. Thus, the exact shape of the dose–response curve is uncertain above physical activity levels that are the equivalent of perhaps 2–3 hours of brisk walking or 1.5 hours of cycling per day. Therefore, the tool is not suitable for populations with high average levels of walking or cycling (such as professional athletes, postal delivery workers or bicycle couriers) that go beyond activity levels common in an average adult population.

**4. As mentioned above, the tool does not produce comprehensive assessments of all the benefits of walking or cycling, so it should not be used in place of a full cost–benefit analysis. Nevertheless, its outcomes can be used as part of the input data (benefits) of a more comprehensive analysis.**

#### **4.5. Basic functioning of the tool**

Assessments can be carried out with two main types of data: (a) data from a single point in time; and (b) before and after data.

The former option is used when assessing the status quo, such as evaluating current levels of walking and cycling in a city. The latter is



used when assessing the impact of an actual intervention or hypothetical scenarios; before and after data are required and the tool evaluates the difference in levels of walking and cycling between the two.

The tool is based on relative risk data from published studies (see section 3.2). As recommended (3,6), the included studies controlled for leisure-time physical activity as well as the usual socioeconomic variables (age, sex, smoking, etc.). This means that the relative risks reported for walking or cycling and mortality were not confounded by other forms of physical activity.

The tool uses these relative risks and applies them to the amount of walking or cycling entered by the user, assuming a log-linear relationship between walking/cycling and mortality. To illustrate this, the relative risk from the reference study used for HEAT for cycling is 0.72 for regular commuter cycling for 3 hours per week for 36 weeks of the year (equivalent to 108 hours of cycling per year) (see also section 3.2). Thus, in any given year, regular cyclists receive a protective benefit of 28% (1.00 minus 0.72) – i.e. they are 28% less likely to die from any cause than non-cyclists. If the user enters a cycling volume equivalent to 36 hours per year (i.e. three times less), the protective benefit of this amount of cycling will be roughly 10%. The resulting protective benefit is slightly higher than one third of that experienced by the reference population due to the log-linear relationship, as shown in Fig 1. If the user enters 216 hours (i.e. double the time cycled in the reference population), the resulting protective benefit is 48%. This is slightly less than double the protective benefit of the reference population.

To avoid inflated values at the upper end of the range, the risk reduction available from the HEAT is capped. In currently available studies, the highest observed reductions in mortality

from regular physical activity were usually around 50% (11,24,35). Thus HEAT will not apply more than a 50% reduction in the risk of mortality.


The HEAT then uses population-level mortality data to estimate the number of adults who would normally be expected to die in any given year in the target population. Next, it calculates the reduction in expected deaths in this population that cycle or walk at the level specified by the user, using the adjusted relative risk. Finally, the tool produces an estimate of economic savings from this calculated reduction in deaths, as well as discounted and average savings.

The basic functioning of the tool is shown in Fig. 1.

#### **4.5.1. Applicable age range**

For HEAT for cycling, the relative risk used of (0.72) was derived from a study carried out with 20–60-year-old people (see also section 3.2). It is suggested that HEAT be used for regular behaviour such as commuting, and the pensionable age is about 65 years in most countries. After retirement, physical activity behaviour (especially that related to commuting) can change. In addition, many mortality databases give mortality rates for up to 64-year-olds. The advisory group agreed that the risk estimate from the study was also applicable to individuals aged a few years above 60, and thus the recommended applicable age range for HEAT for cycling is approximately 20–64 years. For HEAT for walking, the relative risk estimate of 0.78 from the meta-analysis is used, and the advisory group recommended that this relative risk shall be applicable for an age range of approximately 20–74 years, as walking behaviour seems to be more sustained than cycling.

**Fig. 1. Basic functioning of HEAT**



If the age distribution in the assessed population is significantly different (much younger, much older), HEAT may underestimate or overestimate the resulting benefits. In such cases, it is important to adjust the mortality rate used, which depends strongly on the age of the assessed population. However, HEAT should not be applied to populations of children, very young adults or older people, since the available evidence was not sufficient to derive a relative risk for these age groups (see also sections 2.6 and 3.2).

#### 4.6. What input data are needed?

To use HEAT, the following data are needed:

- an estimate of how many people are walking or cycling, which might come from route user surveys, population surveys or roadside counts, or could be estimates from scenario analyses (for more information on the use of surveys see section 4.7); and
- an estimate of the average time spent walking or cycling in the study population, which can again come from surveys or estimates and can be entered in a number of ways:
  - duration (average time walked or cycled per person, e.g. 30 minutes walked on average per day), which is the most direct data entry route;
  - distance (average distance walked or cycled per person, e.g. 10 km cycled on average per day);
  - trips (average per person or total observed across a population, e.g. 250 bicycle trips per year); or
  - steps (average number of steps taken per person, e.g. 9000 steps per day).

A number of default values are provided in HEAT;

these have been derived from the literature and agreed on as part of the expert consensus process. They should be used unless more relevant data are available that more accurately reflect the situation under study, for the following variables:

- mortality rate (a European average can be used or a national rate from the WHO European Detailed Mortality Database (DMDB) (36), or the local mortality rate can be entered);
- VSL (a value commonly used across Europe is provided in the model but users may adapt this value by, for example, adopting agreed values for their own country; for more information see section 2.11);
- the period of time over which average benefits are to be calculated; and
- a discount rate, if so wished (see also section 2.12); the default value supplied can be used or an alternative rate can be entered.

In addition, details of the cost of promoting cycling or walking can be entered, if it is wished to calculate a benefit–cost ratio with HEAT.

Along the way, some assumptions may need to be taken where no data are available, such as on the supposed impact of an intervention on newly induced levels of walking and cycling. Input is provided for such assumptions, wherever possible with default values (and their sources). Explanations and further information on the different steps of the tool are provided on the web site as well (see also Chapters 5 and 6).

#### 4.7. Data sources

Input data for the model may come from a number of sources, including:

- route user surveys

- population-level travel behaviour surveys
- destination-based behaviour travel surveys (e.g. commuter behaviour)
- traffic counts.

Alternatively, informed estimates may serve as surrogates for empirical data, such as in scenario calculations. In all cases, it is important to use the most reliable data possible and to validate these with secondary sources where available.

Ultimately, the quality of economic appraisals will depend entirely on the accuracy of the walking and cycling data used. A few considerations will help to make the best use of the available data and avoid mistakes.

#### **4.7.1. Use of short-term counts and surveys**

The main concern with short-term counts is that they do not accurately capture variations in walking or cycling over time (i.e. time of the day, day of the week, season or weather). If counts are done on a sunny day, larger numbers may be seen than on a rainy day. Since HEAT assumes that the entered data reflect long-term average levels of walking or cycling, data from short-term counts may distort the results.

This issue will affect single-site evaluations (such as a footpath or a bridge) where counts are conducted at the site itself, or community-wide evaluations that are based on surveys conducted only during a certain time of the year.

Short-term counts may also be adjusted for temporal variation to better reflect long-term levels of walking or cycling. An example for how this can be done is provided by the national bicycle and pedestrian documentation project in the United States (37).

Not affected by this issue are assessments based on large surveys conducted on a rolling basis, such as national travel surveys, or automated continuous counts.

#### **4.7.2. Use of data from a few locations**

Spatial variation, particularly in walking, may affect evaluations that are based on counts at a single or a few locations. The choice of location may strongly influence the count numbers, which may not be representative of the wider level of walking (or cycling). Results need to be interpreted carefully, and should in general not be extrapolated beyond the locations where actual data were collected.

Not affected by this issue are evaluations based on surveys that sample subjects randomly from a defined area (such as large household surveys) and, to a lesser extent, count-based evaluations on linear facilities such as trails.

#### **4.7.3. Use of trip or count data**

In HEAT, trip or count data need to be combined with an estimate of average trip length in order to calculate the volume of walking or cycling. An example is provided by counts conducted on a bridge, where it remains unknown how far people walk or cycle beyond the bridge. Average trip distance estimates may be derived from user surveys on a specific facility or from travel surveys.

There are several methods of estimating cycling and walking distances.

- Cyclists or pedestrians can be asked to draw their route on a map and to measure the distance (38,39).
- Cyclists and pedestrians can be asked to provide their starting and finishing points and to multiply the straight-line distance

between the two points with a correction factor. One study has suggested a factor of 1.26 (39).

- Another method is based on subjective estimates of distance travelled, although this has been shown to lead to distances being overestimated and not to be always reliable (39). Thus, if subjective measures are used, it is recommended that a correction be made for overestimation; a correction factor of 0.88 has been suggested (39).
- Making use of global positioning systems (GPS) has been shown to overestimate the distance; a correction factor of 0.95 has therefore been suggested (39).
- Making use of shortest- or fastest-route algorithms in geographical information systems has been shown to overestimate distance by between 12% and 21%, depending on the algorithm used (39). This corresponds to correction factors of 0.83 and 0.89, respectively.

#### 4.8. What data will the tool produce?

The tool will produce an estimate of the following outputs:

- maximum annual benefit
- mean annual benefit
- net present value of mean annual benefit.

The maximum annual benefit is the total value of reduced mortality due to the level of walking or cycling entered by the user. This is a maximum value, as it assumes that the maximum possible benefits to health will have occurred as a result

of the entered level of walking or cycling. In reality, the health benefits are likely to accrue over time.

The mean annual benefit is therefore the key output of the model. It adjusts the maximum annual benefit (total value of lives saved due to the level of walking or cycling entered by the user) by three main factors:

- an estimate of the time frame over which the benefits occur;<sup>1</sup>
- a build-up period for uptake of walking or cycling, which allows the user to vary the projections in uptake if valuing a specific intervention such as for a new cycle path, and varies for full usage occurring between 1 and 50 years; and
- the net present value of mean annual benefit, which adjusts the above outputs to take the diminishing value of current savings over time into account (the model suggests a discount rate of 5% but this can be varied).

---

<sup>1</sup> The default value used in HEAT is five years, based on expert consensus achieved with the international advisory group. As this period is based on the physiological mechanism of physical activity behaviour with an impact on health, it cannot be changed by the user.



# 5

## HEAT for walking: instructions for users

### 5.1. How to access the tool

The tool is available on the WHO Regional Office for Europe web site at [www.euro.who.int/HEAT](http://www.euro.who.int/HEAT) (5) or directly from the HEAT site [www.heatwalkingcycling.org](http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org)

### 5.2. How to use the tool: five simple steps

#### 5.2.1. General features of the HEAT web site

HEAT is composed of 16 questions in total; depending on the route taken, some questions will be skipped. On the left-hand side of the screen, the flow chart of questions helps users to orientate where they are in the assessment process.

Click on “next question” or “back” to move between questions; do not use the back-button of your internet browser. You can also go back to a previous question by clicking on it in the flow chart of questions on the left-hand side of the screen. If you make changes, click on “save changes” before you continue.

On all HEAT screens, by hovering with the mouse over an entry option, the relevant “hints and tips”

box or boxes will be highlighted on the right-hand side of your screen.

#### Step 1: entering walking data

First of all, the scope of the use of HEAT needs to be considered to make sure that it is applicable for an assessment (see also section 4.1).

If HEAT is right for the study in question, a decision needs to be taken as to which of the two possible data types is going to be used for the assessment.

- Data from a single point in time are used when assessing the status quo, such as valuing current levels of walking in a city, or if data on the results of an intervention only are available (no “before” data).
- Before and after data are used when assessing the impact of an actual intervention or hypothetical scenarios. Before and after data are required, and the tool evaluates the difference in levels of walking between the two.

All assessments require two main parameters to be entered:



1. the amount of walking done in the study area as duration (the most direct entry route), distance, trips or steps (more information on data sources is given in section 4.7); and
2. the number of people benefiting from this amount of walking.

**Amount of walking: select the desired option for input data**

The amount of walking can be entered per day, week, month or year as follows.

*Duration*

Enter the average time spent walking per person.

*Distance*

Enter the average distance walked per person.

*Trips*

If data are entered as trips, the average number of trips per person can be entered or the total number of trips observed in the study area (e.g. from a count of pedestrians passing a sample point). If the total number of trips includes trips by modes of transport other than walking, the mode share option can be used to take account of this by specifying the proportion of these trips that are walking trips.

Then, either the total number of people taking these walking trips or the proportion of these trips that are return journeys needs to be entered. For example, if 1000 trips a day are observed at a sample point, this could correspond to 1000 individuals each counted once or 500 individuals each counted twice (as they make a return journey), or some combination of the two. If the total number of people taking these trips is unknown, the tool will use the proportion of return journeys to estimate the number of individuals taking the trips. As the HEAT web

site assumes that the trip data you have entered relates to a regular (i.e. daily or near-daily) pattern of walking, the number of individual walkers is calculated from the proportion of return journeys, using the daily average number of trips. On the HEAT for walking web site, input is given to derive the best proportion of return journeys for different types of count data.

Finally, the duration or distance of the walking trips has to be entered.

*Steps*

The average number of steps walked per person per day, week, month or year and the average step length can be entered. Otherwise, the default value of 71.5 cm (28.15 inches) can be used, which is the average of values often used for men and for women.

If data from a single point in time are assessed, the user can then enter the general parameters. Otherwise, users will be asked to enter the after-intervention data. They can choose to use a different metric for the after data (e.g. duration for the before data and distance for the after data).

**Number of people benefiting**

The tool requires information on the number of individuals doing the amount of walking entered in the previous questions.

In many cases, this figure will be the number of walkers in the study area, city or country, or the number of people who stand to benefit from the reported levels of walking entered if the data were entered as walking trips (see above).

In some cases, walking data may have been derived from a survey based on a representative sample of a larger population, where the findings apply to the whole population. For example,

in the case of a national travel survey that is representative of the whole population, the total population should be used rather than the sample size of the travel survey.

It is important to ensure that the correct population figure is entered, as this can substantially affect the resulting calculations.

### **Step 2: checking the walking summary**

HEAT will now show a summary of the entries, allowing you to make corrections or to change entries. HEAT will also show the likely reduction in the risk of mortality in the study population, based on the entries (see also section 4.5).

Warning messages will appear here in two cases: (a) if levels of walking have been entered that are above the suggested scope of HEAT of 2–3 hours of brisk walking; and (b) if levels of walking have been entered that would theoretically lead to very high reductions in the mortality rate.

Specifically, if an equivalent of 180 minutes or more of walking per day is entered, users are requested to consider whether their entered volume of walking truly represents long-term behaviour in an average adult population, as this is what HEAT is designed for (see also section 4.4). To avoid inflated values, the risk reduction available from the HEAT is capped at 50% (see also section 4.5).

### **Step 3: impact of an intervention or all current walking?**

In this step, users can decide whether they want to quantify the benefits of a current situation (or a scenario analysis) in a country, in a community or on a specific infrastructure. This means that HEAT will provide an estimate of the value of all the walking data entered.

If “impact of an intervention” is selected, the tool will ask for an estimate of the proportion of the

walking that can be attributed to the intervention. When assessing the impact of an intervention, it is prudent to assume that not all the walking or increase in walking observed is newly induced.

Data to estimate the proportion of newly induced walking are rarely available. Therefore, the proportion of walking to be attributed to the intervention (i.e. to be evaluated) needs to be estimated to the best of the user's knowledge. For guidance on this estimation, see the “hints and tips” box on this page.

It is strongly advised to calculate various scenarios with higher and lower percentages, as this number significantly affects the results.

Note that if users wish to assess the value of an increase in walking over time without a particular intervention, 100% should be entered.

### ***Time needed to reach full level of walking***

This allows adjustment for the estimated time it will take to reach the full level of walking entered. This can be particularly useful when assessing interventions. For example, if a new footpath is built and it is estimated it will take 5 years for usage to reach a steady state, this figure should be changed to 5. The default value has been set at 1 year.

### **Step 4: checking the parameters**

The parameters in Step 4 have been set by the expert advisory group according to the best information currently available. They should be changed only if reliable local data are available, as changes to these parameters can have a significant impact on the final values. Nevertheless, local values for the following two parameters should be used where available.

- For the *value of a statistical life* (in local currency), the standard value of a statistical life used in the country of study should





be entered; the preferred currency can be chosen. This will form the basis of the cost savings in the model. If the value is not known, the default value of €1.574 million can be used. This is based on a standard value of €1.500 million (in market prices) for 1998 used across Europe (16). This was corrected for an EU average rate of indirect taxation of 18.6% in 1998 (40) and adjusted to the price level for 2010 (plus 24.47%, based on a gross domestic product deflator (41)). Guidance on how to derive a nationally adjusted value is provided online (5).

- The *mean proportion of the working-age population that die each year* can be derived from published mortality data for people of working age for the study country. The default value is set at 727.12 deaths per 100 000 persons per year, which is the latest available average for the WHO European Region according to the DMDB (36). HEAT also provides national values as available in the DMDB in June 2011 (36); it is suggested that the most recently available local rate be used wherever possible.

Users can also enter their own value. In this case, it is suggested to use the local crude annual death rate, as it reflects the age- and sex-specific mortality rates and the age and sex distribution of the population. Enter the number of deaths per year among people aged 20–74 years, divided by the total number of people in that age group. This allows the tool to focus on the age groups most likely to walk and reflects the relative risk of all-cause mortality in that age group (see also sections 3.2 and 4.5). If the age distribution in the assessed population is significantly different (much younger or much older), HEAT may overestimate or underestimate the resulting benefits. In such cases, it is important to adjust the age range of the mortality rate used. It must be

noted, however, that HEAT is not appropriate for populations consisting mainly of children, very young adults or older people, as the underlying relative risk would not be appropriate.

The *time frame for calculating mean annual benefit* is the period over which the discounted mean annual benefit will be calculated. This is usually standardized within each country; the default value has been set at 10 years.

If it is known how much it costs to promote walking in a particular case (such as a specific promotion project or new infrastructure), and the user would like the tool to calculate a benefit–cost ratio for the local data, costs can be entered here. It needs to be made sure that the costs include all relevant investments. For example, to assess the benefit–cost ratio of a promotion campaign for walking, costs for the walking infrastructure used by the target audience, which may be borne by the local administration, will also need to be included.

For the *discount rate*, the rate to be used for calculating future benefits can be entered. Savings that occur in future years will be discounted by this percentage per year, and will be shown in the “present value” section of Step 5. A rate of 5% has been set as the default value. Common discount rates are usually available from government agencies; one option is to use interest rates on long-term government bonds.

### **Step 5: reading the economic savings resulting from reduced mortality**

Results are presented in three different ways.

The *mean annual benefit* is the total value per year of lives saved (mortality only), assuming that a “steady state” of health benefits has been achieved and that all walkers will have realized the benefits of reduced mortality due to their

walking (see also section 5.3). It averages the benefit over the time frame given for the calculation of mean annual benefit. This output is highly dependent on the number of years entered.

In addition, the accumulated annual benefit over the time period entered for averaging the result is given. This should always be quoted as a maximum rather than an average value.

The *net present value of mean annual benefit* is the second main output of the model, using the discount rate from Step 4 to calculate the net present value, taking into account the reduced value of costs and outcomes over time.

The *accumulated current value of average annual benefit* over the time period entered is also shown.

If costs are entered, HEAT also provides a benefit-cost ratio.

### 5.3. Assumptions

The results of the assessment depend on a number of assumptions, which were agreed at the consensus meeting.

The *build-up of benefits* is the estimated time it will take for walkers in the model to realize the benefits in terms of mortality of the walking entered at Step 1. The default value is 5 years, based on expert consensus (see also section 2.8). If a steady-state situation is assessed, no build-up period is applied.

The *average walking speed* is set at of 4.8 km/h (or 3 miles/hour). This is in line with the walking speed of the studies in the meta-analysis (where available) and equivalent to the minimum walking pace necessary to require an energy

expenditure that is considered to be necessary for health benefits (11).

The relative risk data from the meta-analysis, which includes studies from China, Europe and the United States (see also section 3.2), can be applied to walkers in other settings.

There is a log-linear relationship between risk of death and walking duration (assuming a constant average speed), in other words, each dose of walking leads to the same percentage in risk reduction.

No thresholds have to be reached to achieve health benefits.

Men and women have approximately the same level of relative risk reduction.

It is important to remember that many of the variables used within this HEAT calculation are estimates and therefore liable to some degree of error.

You are reminded that the HEAT tools provide you with an approximation of the level of health benefits. To get a better sense for the possible range of the results, you are advised to rerun the model, entering slightly different values for variables where you have provided a “best guess”, such as entering high and low estimates for such variables.



# 6

## HEAT for cycling: instructions for users

### 6.1. How to access the tool

The tool is available on the WHO Regional Office for Europe web site at [www.euro.who.int/HEAT](http://www.euro.who.int/HEAT) (5) or directly from the HEAT site [www.heatwalkingcycling.org](http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org)

### 6.2. How to use the tool: five simple steps

#### 6.2.1. General features of the HEAT web site

HEAT is composed of 16 questions in total; depending on the route you take, some questions will be skipped. On the left-hand side of the screen you will see the flow chart of questions to help you orientate where you are in the assessment process.

Click on “next question” or “back” to move between questions; do not use the back-button of your internet browser. You can also go back to a previous question by clicking on it in the flow chart of questions on the left-hand side of the screen. If you make changes, click on “save changes” before you continue.

On all HEAT screens, by hovering with the mouse over an entry option, the relevant “hints and tips”

box or boxes will be highlighted on the right-hand side of your screen.

#### Step 1: entering cycling data

First of all, the scope for the use of HEAT needs to be considered to make sure that is applicable for an assessment (see also section 4.4).

If HEAT is right for the study in question, a decision needs to be taken as to which of the two possible data types is going to be used for the assessment.

- Data from a single point in time are used when assessing the status quo, such as valuing current levels of cycling in a city, or if data on the results of an intervention only are available (no “before” data).
- Before and after data are used when assessing the impact of an actual intervention or hypothetical scenarios. Before and after data are required, and the tool evaluates the difference in levels of cycling between the two.

All assessments require two main parameters to be entered:

1. the amount of cycling done in the study area as duration (the most direct entry route), distance or trips per day (more information on data sources is given in section 4.7); and
2. the number of people benefiting from this amount of cycling.

**Amount of cycling: select the desired option for input data**

*Duration*

Enter the average time spent cycling per person per day.

*Distance*

Enter the average time spent cycling per person per day.

*Trips*

If data are entered as trips, the average number of trips per person per day can be entered or the total number of trips observed in the study area (e.g. from a count of cyclists passing a sample point). If the total number of trips includes trips by modes of transport other than cycling, the mode share option can be used to take account of this by specifying the proportion of these trips that are cycling trips.

Then, either the total number of people taking these cycling trips or the proportion of these trips that are return journeys needs to be entered. For example, if 1000 trips a day are observed at a sample point, this could correspond to 1000 individuals each counted once or 500 individuals each counted twice (as they make a return journey), or some combination of the two. If the total number of people taking these trips is unknown, the tool will use the proportion of return journeys to estimate the number of individuals taking the trips. As the HEAT web site assumes that the trip data you have entered

relates to a regular (i.e. daily or near-daily) pattern of cycling, the number of individual cyclists is calculated from the proportion of return journeys, using the daily average number of trips. On the HEAT for cycling web site, input is given to derive the best proportion of return journeys for different types of count data.

Finally, the duration or distance of the cycling trips has to be entered.

For all entry options, the user also has to enter how many days per year this amount of cycling is done. If this amount is done every day (or represents an average value per year, e.g. from a travel survey), 365 should be entered. However, most individuals do not cycle every day. If no long-term data are used and users are unsure how many days they cycled in a year, 124 is recommended as a default, which is the observed number of days in Stockholm (42). This is a conservative value, which should be changed only if reliable local data are available, as it will influence the final calculation.

If data from a single point in time are assessed, the user can then enter the general parameters. Otherwise, users will be asked to enter the after-intervention data. They can choose to use a different metric for the after data (e.g. duration for the before data and distance for the after data).

**Number of people benefiting**

The tool requires information on the number of individuals doing the amount of cycling entered in the previous questions.

In many cases, this figure will be the number of cyclists in the study area, city or country, or the number of people who stand to benefit from the reported levels of cycling entered if the data were entered as cycling trips (see above).

In some cases, cycling data may have been derived from a survey based on a representative sample of a larger population, where the findings apply to the whole population. For example, in the case of a national travel survey that is representative of the whole population, the total population should be used here rather than the sample size of the travel survey.

It is important to ensure that the correct population figure is entered, as this can substantially affect the resulting calculations.

### **Step 2: checking the cycling summary**

HEAT will now show a summary of the entries, allowing you to make corrections or to change entries. HEAT will also show the likely reduction in the risk of mortality in the study population, based on the entries (see also section 4.5).

Warning messages will appear here in two cases: (a) if levels of cycling have been entered that are above the suggested scope of HEAT for cycling of about 1.5 hours of cycling per day (see also section 4.4); and (b) if levels of cycling have been entered that would theoretically lead to very high reductions in the mortality rate.

Specifically, if an equivalent of 90 minutes or more of cycling per day is entered, users are requested to consider whether their entered volume of cycling truly represents long-term behaviour in an average adult population, as this is what HEAT is designed for. To avoid inflated values, the risk reduction available from the HEAT is capped at 50% (see also section 4.5).

### **Step 3: Impact of an intervention on all current cycling?**

In this step, users can decide whether they want to quantify the benefits of a current situation (or a scenario analysis) in a country, in a community or on a specific infrastructure. This means that

HEAT will provide an estimate of the value of all the cycling data entered.

If “impact of an intervention” is selected, the tool will ask for an estimate of the proportion of the cycling that can be attributed to the intervention. When assessing the impact of an intervention, it is prudent to assume that not all the cycling or increase in cycling observed is newly induced.

Data to estimate the proportion of newly induced cycling are rarely available. Therefore, the proportion of cycling to be attributed to the intervention (i.e. to be evaluated) needs to be estimated to the best of the user’s knowledge. For guidance on this estimation, see the “hints and tips” box on this page.

It is strongly advised to calculate various scenarios with higher and lower percentages, as this number significantly affects your results.

Note that if users wish to assess the value of an increase of cycling over time without a particular intervention, 100% should be entered.

### **Time needed to reach full level of cycling**

This allows adjustment for the estimated time it will take to reach the full level of cycling entered. This can be particularly useful when assessing interventions. For example, if a new cycle path is built and it is estimated it will take 5 years for usage to reach a steady state, this figure should be changed to 5. The default value has been set at 1 year.

### **Step 4: checking the parameters**

The parameters in Step 4 have been set by the expert advisory group according to the best information currently available. They should be changed only if reliable local data are available, as changes to these parameters can have a significant impact on the final values.





Nevertheless, local values for the following two parameters should be used where available.

- For the *value of a statistical life* (in local currency), the standard value of a statistical life used in the country of study should be entered; the preferred currency can be chosen. This will form the basis of the cost savings in the model. If not known, the default value of €1.574 million can be used. This is based on a standard value of €1.500 million (in market prices) for 1998 used across Europe (16). This was corrected for an EU average rate of indirect taxation of 18.6% in 1998 (40) and adjusted to the price level for 2010 (plus 24.47%, based on a gross domestic product deflator (41)). Guidance on how to derive a nationally adjusted value is provided online (5).
- The *mean proportion of the working-age population that die each year* can be derived from published mortality data for people of working age for the study country. The default value is set at 727.12 deaths per 100 000 persons per year, which is the latest available average for the WHO European Region according to the DMDB (36). HEAT also provides national values as available in the DMDB in June 2011 (36); it is suggested that the most recently available local rate be used wherever possible.

Users can also their own value. In this case, it is suggested to use the local crude annual death rate, as it reflects the age- and sex-specific mortality rates and the age and sex distribution of the population. Enter the number of deaths per year among people aged 20–64 years, divided by the total number of people in that age group. This allows the tool to focus on the age groups most likely to cycle and reflects the relative risk of all-cause mortality in that age group (see also sections 3.2 and 4.5). If the age distribution in the assessed population is significantly different

(much younger or much older), HEAT may overestimate or underestimate the resulting benefits. In such cases, it is important to adjust the age range of the mortality rate used. However, it must be noted that HEAT is not appropriate for populations consisting mainly of children, very young adults or older people, as the underlying relative risk would not be appropriate.

The *time frame for calculating mean annual benefit* is the period over which the discounted mean annual benefit will be calculated. This is usually standardized within each country; the default value has been set at 10 years.

If it is known how much it cost to promote cycling in a particular case (such as a specific promotion project or new infrastructure), and the user would like the tool to calculate a benefit–cost ratio for the local data, *costs* can be entered here. The costs must include all relevant investments. For example, to assess the benefit–cost ratio of a promotion campaign for cycling, costs for the cycling infrastructure used by the target audience, which may be borne by the local administration, will also need to be included.

For the *discount rate*, the rate to be used for calculating future benefits can be entered. Savings that occur in future years will be discounted by this percentage per year, and will be shown in the “present value” section of Step 5. A rate of 5% has been set as the default value. Common discount rates are usually available from government agencies; one option is to use interest rates on long-term government bonds.

### **Step 5. reading the economic savings resulting from reduced mortality**

Results are presented in three different ways.

The *mean annual benefit* is the total value per year of lives saved (mortality only), assuming

that a “steady state” of health benefits has been achieved and that all cyclists will have realized the benefits of reduced mortality due to their cycling (see also section 5.3). It averages the benefit over the time frame given for the calculation of mean annual benefit. This output is highly dependent on the number of years entered.

In addition, the accumulated annual benefit over the time period entered for averaging the result is given. This should always be quoted as a maximum rather than an average value.

The *net present value of mean annual benefit* is the second main output of the model, using the discount rate from Step 4 to calculate the net present value, taking into account the reduced value of costs and outcomes over time.

The *accumulated current value of average annual benefit* over the time period entered is also shown.

If costs are entered, HEAT also provides a benefit–cost ratio.

### 6.3. Assumptions

The results of the assessment depend on a number of assumptions, which were agreed at the consensus meeting.

The *build-up of benefits* is the estimated time it will take for cyclists in the model to realize the benefits in terms of mortality of the cycling entered at Step 1. The default value is 5 years, based on expert consensus (see also section 2.8). If a steady-state situation is assessed, no build-up period is applied.

The *average cycling speed* is set at 14 km/h. This value is based on commuting time per week

from the Copenhagen study (23), combined with data from the Stockholm commuting studies on the number of trips per week over the year, distance and duration (42,43). Based on an estimated average of 4 km per trip, the observed distance–speed relationship produces an estimated average speed of 14 km/h (44).

The relative risk data from the Copenhagen Centre for Prospective Population Studies (23) can be applied to cyclists in other settings, as suggested by Matthews et al. (24).

There is a log-linear relationship between risk of death and cycling duration (assuming a constant average speed), in other words, each dose of cycling leads to the same percentage in risk reduction.

No thresholds have to be reached to achieve health benefits.

Men and women have approximately the same level of relative risk reduction.

It is important to remember that many of the variables used within this HEAT calculation are estimates and therefore liable to some degree of error.

You are reminded that the HEAT tools provide you with an approximation of the level of health benefits. To get a better sense for the possible range of the results, you are advised to rerun the model, entering slightly different values for variables where you have provided a “best guess”, such as entering high and low estimates for such variables.



## References

1. *Action plan for implementation of the European Strategy for the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases 2012–2016*. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2011 (document EUR/RC61/12) ([http://www.euro.who.int/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/147729/RC61\\_edoc12.pdf](http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/147729/RC61_edoc12.pdf), accessed 8 September 2011).
2. *The Toronto Charter for Physical Activity: a global call to action*. Champaign. Global Advocacy Council for Physical Activity, International Society for Physical Activity and Health, 2010 (<http://www.globalpa.org.uk/charter/>, accessed 8 September 2011).
3. Cavill N et al. *Economic assessment of transport infrastructure and policies. Methodological guidance on the economic appraisal of health effects related to walking and cycling*. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2007 ([http://www.euro.who.int/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/87479/E90944.pdf](http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/87479/E90944.pdf), accessed 8 September 2011).
4. Rutter H et al. *Health economic assessment tool for cycling (HEAT for cycling)*. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2008. Revised edition published online, 2011 (<http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org/index.php?pg=archive&PHPSESSID=8762nh08r8662r2fkj6jrnf4b4>, accessed 22 September 2011).
5. *Health economic assessment tool (HEAT) for cycling and walking*. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2011 (<http://www.euro.who.int/HEAT>, accessed 8 September 2011).
6. Cavill N et al. Economic analyses of transport infrastructure and policies including health effects related to cycling and walking: a systematic review. *Transport Policy*, 2008, 15:291–304 (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0967070X08000450>, accessed 8 September 2011).
7. Kahlmeier S et al. “Health in All Policies” in practice: guidance and tools to quantifying the health effects of cycling and walking. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 2010, 7(Suppl. 1):S120–S125 ([http://www.euro.who.int/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0009/97344/E93592.pdf](http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/97344/E93592.pdf), accessed 8 September 2011).
8. Jacobsen PL. Safety in numbers: more walkers and bicyclists, safer walking and bicycling. *Injury Prevention*, 2003, 9:205–209.
9. de Hartog JJ et al. Do the health benefits of cycling outweigh the risks? *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 2010, 118:1109–1116.
10. Rojas-Rueda D et al. The health risks and benefits of cycling in urban environments compared with car use: health impact assessment study. *British Medical Journal*, 2011, 343:d4521 doi: 10.1136/bmj.d4521.
11. Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee. *Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee Report 2008*. Washington, DC, US Department of Health and Human Services, 2008.
12. *Global Recommendations on Physical Activity for Health*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2010 ([http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/factsheet\\_recommendations/en/index.html](http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/factsheet_recommendations/en/index.html), accessed 8 September 2011).
13. Oja P et al. Health benefits of cycling: a systematic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 2011, 21:496–509.
14. Hamer M, Chida Y. Walking and primary prevention: a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2008, 42:238–243.
15. Schnohr P, Scharling H, Jensen J. Intensity versus duration of walking, impact on mortality: the Copenhagen City Heart Study. *European Journal of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation*, 2007, 14:72–78.
16. Nellthorp J et al. *UNification of accounts and marginal costs for Transport Efficiency (UNITE): Valuation Conventions for UNITE*. Leeds, University of Leeds, 2007 ([http://www.its.leeds.ac.uk/projects/unite/downloads/D5\\_Annex3.pdf](http://www.its.leeds.ac.uk/projects/unite/downloads/D5_Annex3.pdf), accessed 8 September 2011).
17. Boesch H-J et al. *Economic valuation of transport-related health effects: review of methods and development of practical approaches, with a special focus on children*. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2008 ([http://www.euro.who.int/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/53864/E92127.pdf](http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/53864/E92127.pdf), accessed 8 September 2011).
18. Bellavance F, Dionne G, Lebeau M. *The value of a statistical life: a meta-analysis with a mixed effects regression model*. Montreal, École des Hautes Études Commerciales, 2007 (Canada Research Chair in Risk Management: Working paper 06-12).
19. Braathen NA, Lindhjemb H, Navrud S. *Valuing lives saved from environmental, transport and health policies: a meta-analysis of stated preference studies*. Paris, OECD Environment Directorate, 2009.

20. Beale S et al. *A rapid review of economic literature related to environmental interventions that increase physical activity levels in the general population*. London, National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE), 2007 (<http://www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/live/11679/34735/34735.pdf>, accessed 8 September 2011).
21. *Development of guidance and a practical tool for economic assessment of health effects from walking*. Consensus workshop, 1–2 July 2010, Oxford, United Kingdom. Background document: summary of literature reviews and issues for discussion. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2010.
22. Woodcock J et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions: urban land transport. *Lancet*, 2009, 374:1930–1943.
23. Andersen LB et al. All-cause mortality associated with physical activity during leisure time, work, sports and cycling to work. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 2000, 160:1621–1628.
24. Matthews CE et al. Influence of exercise, walking, cycling, and overall nonexercise physical activity on mortality in Chinese women. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 2007, 165:1343–1350.
25. Besson H et al. Relationship between subdomains of total physical activity and mortality. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 2008, 40:1909–1915.
26. Gregg et al. Relationship of changes in physical activity and mortality among older women. *JAMA*, 2003, 289:2379–2386.
27. Hakim et al. Effects of walking on mortality among nonsmoking retired men. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 1998, 338:94–99.
28. Landi F et al.; Walking one hour or more per day prevented mortality among older persons: results from iSIRENTE study. *Preventive Medicine*, 2008, 47:422–426.
29. Lee IM, Paffenbarger RS Jr. Associations of light, moderate, and vigorous intensity physical activity with longevity: The Harvard Alumni Health Study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 2000, 151:293–299.
30. Smith TC et al. Walking decreased risk of cardiovascular disease mortality in older adults with diabetes. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 2007, 60:309–317.
31. Stessman J et al. The effects of physical activity on mortality in the Jerusalem 70-year-olds longitudinal study. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 2000, 48:499–504.
32. Sun Q et al. Physical activity at midlife in relation to successful survival in women at age 70 years or older. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 2010, 170:194–201.
33. Stamatakis E, Hamer M, Lawlor DA. Physical activity, mortality, and cardiovascular disease: is domestic physical activity beneficial? *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 2009, 169:1191–1200.
34. Wannamethee SG, Shaper AG, Walker M. Changes in physical activity, mortality, and incidence of coronary heart disease in older men. *Lancet*, 1998, 351:1603–1608.
35. Manson J et al. Walking compared with vigorous exercise for the prevention of cardiovascular events in women. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2002, 347:716–725.
36. European Detailed Mortality Database (DMDB) [online database]. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2011 (<http://data.euro.who.int/dmdb/>, accessed 8 September 2011).
37. National bicycle and pedestrian documentation project [web site]. Portland. Alta Planning & Design and Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Pedestrian and Bicycle Council, 2011 (<http://bikepeddocumentation.org>, accessed 8 September 2011).
38. Schantz P, Stigell E. A criterion method for measuring route distance in physically active commuting. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 2009, 41:472–478.
39. Stigell E, Schantz P. Methods for determining route distances in active commuting – their validity and reproducibility. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 2011, 19:563–574.
40. Hunt A. *General issues in costing analysis: units of account, base years and currency conversion*. Annex B to HEATCO Deliverable 5: Developing harmonised European approaches for transport costing and project assessment (HEATCO): proposal for harmonised guidelines. Stuttgart, IER, 2006 (<http://heatco.ier.uni-stuttgart.de>, accessed 8 September 2011).
41. World Economic Outlook Database [online database]. By Country Groups (aggregated data) and commodity prices, Euro area, Gross domestic product, deflator. Update: June 17, 2011. Washington, International Monetary Fund, 2011 (<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2011/01/weodata/index.aspx>, accessed 8 September 2011).



42. Schantz P, Stigell E. Physically active commuting between home and work/study place in Greater Stockholm. In: *Proceedings of Transport Research Arena Europe. Greener, safer and smarter road transport for Europe. Conference of European Directors of Roads, European Commission and European Road Transport Research Advisory Council, Gothenburg, Sweden, 12–15 June 2006* ([http://www.gih.se/Global/3\\_forskning/prev\\_halsovetenskap/RHM\\_peterschantzgrupp/Schantz\\_Stigell\\_Transport\\_Research\\_Arena\\_Europe\\_2006.pdf](http://www.gih.se/Global/3_forskning/prev_halsovetenskap/RHM_peterschantzgrupp/Schantz_Stigell_Transport_Research_Arena_Europe_2006.pdf), accessed 8 September 2011).
43. Schantz P, Stigell E. Distance, time and velocity as input data in cost–benefit analyses of physically active transportation. In: *Proceedings from the 2nd International Congress on Physical Activity and Public Health, Amsterdam, 13–16 April, 2008* ([http://www.gih.se/Global/3\\_forskning/prev\\_halsovetenskap/RHM\\_peterschantzgrupp/ICPAPH08\\_abstract2.pdf](http://www.gih.se/Global/3_forskning/prev_halsovetenskap/RHM_peterschantzgrupp/ICPAPH08_abstract2.pdf), accessed 8 September 2011).
44. Schantz P, Stigell E. Frequency of bicycle tours per week and bicycling days per year as input data in cost–benefit analyses. In: *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Congress of the European College of Sport Sciences, Estoril, 9–12 July 2008* ([http://www.gih.se/upload/Forskning/Rorelse\\_halsa\\_miljo/ICPAPH08%20abstrakt%202.pdf](http://www.gih.se/upload/Forskning/Rorelse_halsa_miljo/ICPAPH08%20abstrakt%202.pdf), accessed 6 December 2007).



## The WHO Regional Office for Europe

The World Health Organization (WHO) is a specialized agency of the United Nations created in 1948 with the primary responsibility for international health matters and public health. The WHO Regional Office for Europe is one of six regional offices throughout the world, each with its own programme geared to the particular health conditions of the countries it serves.

### Member States

Albania  
Andorra  
Armenia  
Austria  
Azerbaijan  
Belarus  
Belgium  
Bosnia and Herzegovina  
Bulgaria  
Croatia  
Cyprus  
Czech Republic  
Denmark  
Estonia  
Finland  
France  
Georgia  
Germany  
Greece  
Hungary  
Iceland  
Ireland  
Israel  
Italy  
Kazakhstan  
Kyrgyzstan  
Latvia  
Lithuania  
Luxembourg  
Malta  
Monaco  
Montenegro  
Netherlands  
Norway  
Poland  
Portugal  
Republic of Moldova  
Romania  
Russian Federation  
San Marino  
Serbia  
Slovakia  
Slovenia  
Spain  
Sweden  
Switzerland  
Tajikistan  
The former Yugoslav Republic  
of Macedonia  
Turkey  
Turkmenistan  
Ukraine  
United Kingdom  
Uzbekistan

World Health Organization  
Regional Office for Europe  
Scherfigsvej 8, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark  
Tel.: +45 39 17 17 17. Fax: +45 39 17 18 18  
E-mail: [contact@euro.who.int](mailto:contact@euro.who.int)  
Web site: [www.euro.who.int](http://www.euro.who.int)

