

Figures, tables and boxes

FIGURES

4.1	Flow chart of the DMP of a general urban plan in Spain	44
5.1	ANSEA approach: overview	56
5.2	The decision framework flowchart: example from a real DMP – from the case study on urban transport planning in Germany	67
5.3	The links between SIDA country strategies and other PPPs (SIDA case study)	70
5.4	Example of a functional description flowchart – the country strategy process in Sweden	86
6.1	Using PC and DWs to assess the DMP	113
8.1	Vertical integration of planning levels in Germany	128
8.2	The FTIP process	136
8.3	Valuation of projects	138
8.4	Functional description of the FTIP	140
9.1	Hierarchy of urban planning instruments	158
9.2	Legal and institutional framework of the GUP of Puerto de la Cruz	160
9.3	Decision-making process	167
9.4	Environmental assessment's role and urban planning DMP	169

TABLES

2.1	Changing perspectives in approaching EA	24
3.1	Theoretical perspectives to decision making and relations to EA	37
3.2	Description of specific procedural criteria of the Swedish case study in the DW 'specifying the issue'	40
4.1	Description of a decision window in the German Federal Transport Infrastructure Planning case study	47
5.1	Assessment modes	59
5.2	Example of organogramme – from the case study on urban planning in Puerto de la Cruz, Spain	73
5.3	Example – identification of environmental issues	77
5.4	Examples of specific procedural criteria for integrated or <i>ex post</i> assessment	82

5.5	Definition of decision windows in the FTIP	90
5.6	Example – description of decision windows in the Swedish country programmes	94
5.7	Matrix for the assessment of DWs against PC: Step 1	96
5.8	Example – matrix for the assessment of DWs against PC: Step 2. From the case study on country strategies in Swedish bilateral development co-operation	98
6.1	Potential benefits of the ANSEA approach in implementing the SEA directive (2001/42/EC)	108
7.1	Case studies and SEA reviews undertaken for the ANSEA project	118
8.1	Target system of the FTIP 1992 – structural and performance goals	129
8.2	Questions related to the procedural criteria	132
8.3	Specific procedural criteria of the FTIP	134
8.4	Decision windows in the FTIP	142
8.5	Description of decision windows	146
8.6	Matrix for the assessment of DWs versus procedural criteria	148
8.7	Recommendations for the FTIP	152
9.1	Institutional participation in the GUP of Puerto de la Cruz	163
9.2	General urban planning stages and tasks classification	168
9.3	Urban planning and environmental implications in Puerto de la Cruz	172
9.4	Matrix of procedural criteria/urban dynamics	174
9.5	Identification of decision windows	178

BOXES

3.1	Assumptions of Rational Choice Theory	30
4.1	Broad categories of procedural criteria	49
5.1	Screening in the EU Directive 2001/42/EC	63
5.2	List of prompt questions for describing the legal and institutional context	68
5.3	List of prompt questions for stakeholder analysis	71
5.4	List of prompt questions for identifying environmental dimensions	76
5.5	Different interpretations of the public for participation	78
5.6	Identifying decision windows	89
5.7	Proposed contents of an ANSEA report	102
7.1	Case studies and SEA reviews developed within the ANSEA project	119