PHYSICAL ACTIVITY POLICIES AT MUNICIPAL LEVEL IN EUROPE

ANALYSIS OF THE PASSPORT SURVEY
ABOUT THE PACTE PROJECT

The Promoting Active Cities Throughout Europe (PACTE) project is a 3-year initiative led by the Sport and Citizenship Think Tank and funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union. It is supported by 7 European partners. Cities and municipalities are both important settings of physical activity and crucial mediators of public health messaging. Unfortunately, physical activity at local level has been largely under-researched although they represents a level of administration which is closer to citizens that the national one. Cities are gradually recognising the importance of physical activity for their attractiveness and competitiveness, and for providing well-being to their citizens. The PACTE project intends to provide local administration with resources and tools to kickstart physical activity action plans and help them find the path to become Active Cities.
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THE PASSPORT SURVEY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The relationship between physical activity and well-being is established beyond doubt, and the health costs and consequences of inactivity are now so severe that it is widely recognised as a major public health concern. The World Health Organisation estimates that physical inactivity is the fourth leading risk factor for global mortality, with recent analysis suggesting that the impact of physical inactivity on mortality could be up to about 5.3 million deaths a year, rivalling tobacco use as a cause of death.

So, at the heart of the PACTE project was a Europe-wide representative survey of cities’ and municipalities’ physical activity policies and practices (PASSPORT) in order to identify status of their physical activity policies across Europe, and to investigate gaps in policy and practice. The PASSPORT questionnaire was developed as a standardized tool to provide a systematic approach to capturing details of relevant physical activity policies in European cities and municipalities.

Its aim was to understand the situation of those cities and municipalities regarding the physical activity of their citizens as a basis to help improve them. The development of this measurement instrument was informed by the limited number of pre-existing audit tools, then trialled in a heterogeneous group of European cities. The final version was translated into seven languages. Analysis of results was based on 663 completed surveys.

The PASSPORT survey was developed within this context. It was designed to provide an accurate account of physical activity policies in European cities and municipalities. Building on previous collaborative projects, including the PASS project (Physical Activity Serving Society) that were concerned with activity promotion at local government level, PACTE sought to take a further step towards more active cities across the continent. The focus on cities and municipalities was deliberate, and followed an extended study of physical activity policies and guidance, concluding that there is a clear need for information about physical activity policy and practice at the municipal level.
Key findings

1 Cities and municipalities are both important settings of physical activity and crucial mediators of public health messaging. Physical activity was widely recognised as an important area of responsibility, although there was some inconsistency regarding the ‘ownership’ of this responsibility. It was apparent that physical activity connected with many areas of responsibility for municipalities, including sport, health, education, community development, and city planning, and the delivery of physical activity policies often requires the involvement of these and other branches of local government.

2 Local governments fulfil a vital role in ensuring that all citizens have access to a variety of physical activity opportunities, although the extent to which this happens in practice varies considerably by geography and setting. In some cases, there appears to be a general acceptance of the importance of physical activity promotion at the level of municipalities. Examples of this acceptance include the support of families and younger children. Elsewhere, engagement is more mixed, such as in workplaces and high schools.

Lack of involvement with work environments and schools by cities and municipalities is a cause for concern, as these are the settings in which the greatest number of people can be reached with public health communication. The reasons for such disparity are unclear, and would require further investigation. Limited finances might be one factor; another might be inconsistent communication between different levels of government.

3 Most of the municipalities surveyed reported:

- Having a physical activity policy: 70%
- Having local recommendations: 63%
- Target for the population to be physically active: 58%
- Reported that their physical activity policy was a part of a national programme: 34%
Policy documentation was indicated in a wider range of settings. The most positive response at the municipal level was with sport and leisure, urban design, environment, tourism, kindergarten, and primary school. Strongly positive responses of municipalities working with other levels of government included high schools, primary health care, transport, and tourism. Respondents also identified population groups that were targeted by specific actions or activities. Findings reinforce the account of wide variation in the role of Government intervention in physical activity promotion. The workforce receives relatively low support both at the level of municipalities and other forms of government. People with disabilities also receives relatively low levels of targeting. Overall, children, families, girls, boys, older adults, and low socioeconomic status groups were the groups most strongly identified as populations within the remit of cities and municipalities.

When it came to monitoring and evaluation of the policy implementation, on average more than 50% of respondents reported that their cities and municipalities do not have it in place. Municipalities were also asked about the types of physical activity strategies they had in place. With the exception of ‘Walking Bus’ schemes (an organised group of children who walk to school together, accompanied by volunteers), all of the physical activity promoting strategies suggested - cycle lanes and cycle paths, cycle parking spots, designated walking tracks, active parks, skate parks, open-access sports pitches - were reported to be in place by the sample overall.

It was reported that 74% of municipalities worked with a political leader/designated department for physical activity, with the figure varying from 95% in Belgium, to 48% in Italy. In almost every case, fewer municipalities had local level communication or mass media strategy aimed at raising awareness and promoting the benefits of physical activity.

Two questions about employees and businesses where answered with similar responses, with 60% of the sample stating that they both work with private businesses or companies in the delivery of physical activity opportunities, and make physical activity available to employees.
Judgements about the importance of increasing the levels of physical activity compared with other areas of work in their municipality or city resulted in an overall score (on a scale of 1 to 100) of 70, suggesting a moderately strong response. The relatively low score from France and Switzerland is difficult to explain without further qualitative evidence.

The promotion of physical activity in cities and municipalities requires both a breadth of information about its state and status, and in-depth information about the personal and contextual settings in which physical activity policy making takes place. The findings of the PASSPORT survey provide a unique insight into the former. The latter requires further consideration, whether by subsequent surveys which go beyond scratching the surface of the current situation, or qualitative data gathering.
ABOUT PACTE PROJECT

Promoting Active Cities Throughout Europe is a three-year project, supported by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union, which focuses on physical activity rates across Europe from a municipal perspective and on the creation of Active Cities schemes. Previous projects and recent research have highlighted some alarming facts as concerns physical activity across Europe.

210 million Europeans are physically inactive

This amounts to a minimal annual cost of EUR 80 billion across the EU28

66% of local European decision-makers are unaware of this situation

These findings have therefore unveiled physical activity policies at the municipal level as an area deserving much closer consideration for further work since it remains a sphere overlooked by physical activity researchers, and because local administration delivers more impactful physical activity policies than national ones do.
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INTRODUCTION

Acting as a direct follow-up to the PASS project (Physical Activity Serving Society), PACTE sought to take a further step towards increasing active cities across the continent. The PASS findings and further research brought to light the far-reaching effects and burdensome costs of physical inactivity on Europeans, but it also defined the ever-growing importance of cities and municipalities. An early finding has been that over three quarters of local decision-makers are unaware of the levels and consequences of inactivity, which becomes an increasing issue as over 70% of the European population lives in urban areas today. To top it off, local policies have a more direct impact on the daily lives of citizens than national or European ones do.

A core aspect of the PACTE project was a Europe-wide representative survey of municipalities' physical activity policies and practices (PASSPORT) in order to identify the status of municipalities physical activity policies across Europe, and to investigate gaps in policy and practice.

The PASSPORT questionnaire was developed as a standardized tool to provide a systematic approach to capturing details of relevant physical activity policies in European cities and municipalities. It was iterated to understand the situation of those cities and municipalities regarding the physical activity of their citizens as a basis to help improve them.

PASSPORT was comprised of 27 questions, organised into the following topics:

- Background information;
- Content and development of local policy;
- Implementation of the physical activity policy/action plan;
- Importance of the elements of physical activity policy.

Most questions were quantitative, requiring numerical information, although three questions included a qualitatively aspect. This report provides an overview of the findings from the first full PASSPORT survey. Data were collected from April 2018 to the beginning of August 2018.

PASSPORT was translated into seven languages: Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish, and was administered by local partners. All versions of PASSPORT were made available to all respondents, so respondents could choose the language version they preferred.

In total, 663 complete responses were received in these languages, with the most responses in Italian, followed by French and English. Responses were then re-analysed to identify the nationality of respondents, since there is no necessary relationship between the language of the surveys completed and their nationality. This is particularly the case with English, which was completed by people from many different countries. Other languages are spoken in more than one country, such as German (Germany, Austria, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg), and French (France, Belgium, Luxembourg). Figure 1 shows the responses by language. Consequently, the re-analysis was judged necessary, with a small number of exceptions, data presented are based on country, rather than language.
As can be seen, the number of responses in the Italian language was considerably greater than that of the others. This seems to be attributable to the large and strong existing network of municipalities coordinated by the Italian partner. Relatively low responses in other languages reflect the absence of such networks, and partners often distributed PASSPORT on an ad hoc basis. This is an important finding of the project, suggesting the most effective approach works through networks that are already established, and regularly participate in the reciprocal sharing of information.

PASSPORT was organised in terms of languages, rather than countries, because it was not practical to administer a survey in the 24 official languages of the European Union. However, once the data were gathered, they were re-analysed to allow the PACTE team to understand responses from the 28 countries of the EU. In fact, the countries represented by these surveys results go far beyond the EU, as can be seen by Figure 2, below.

1 All values in this report are expressed as percentages, if not stated otherwise.
The most plausible explanation for this anomalous finding is that some PACTE member organisations extend outside the EU, resulting in a small number of erroneous responses. They were not included in the analysis and representation of data.

Figure 3 summarises on the responses from those countries represented in PACTE. As was the case with languages, there was a clear dominance of a relatively small number of variables. It was agreed that 10 responses would act as a threshold for separate analysis, with countries with fewer than 10 responses being excluded from separate analysis.
# TABLE 1: The Included in Country-specific Analysis & Overall Analysis and EU Countries Included in ‘Overall’ Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACTE SIMPLE</th>
<th>EU Countries Included in 'Overall' Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Included in country specific &amp; Overall Analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Included in 'Overall' Analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELGIUM</td>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>BELGIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>CZECH REPUBLIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTUGAL</td>
<td>DENMARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>ESTONIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
<td>FINLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE NETHERLANDS</td>
<td>FRANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GREECE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRELAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITALY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LATVIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITHUANIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NORWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PORTUGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLOVAKIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE NETHERLANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As expected, Italian municipalities contributed by far the greatest number of responses, followed by the Netherlands, France and Portugal. Few responses from Scandinavian and Eastern European countries it is, perhaps, not surprising as these were not represented in the project partnership. However, very low responses from Germany and the UK (including Scotland) are disappointing since they were part of the PACTE partnership. (Responses were also provided from the USA, Turkey, Philippines, Nigeria, Mexico, Japan and Canada, which are especially interesting as they are not in Europe! The most plausible explanation for these data is that some partners work as a part of networks extending outside of Europe).

Analysis of background data also gave insight into an extent to which respondents chose a language version of PASSPORT that was a main official language of their country. The responses were received from the total of 31 countries, mostly from the European Union (n=21). In this analysis, 100% of the Spanish-language surveys were completed by Spanish municipalities, and 99% of the Italian survey responses in Italy respectively. Meanwhile, 25% of the German language PASSPORT was completed by German municipalities, and only 11% of the English-language surveys were from British municipalities.

The large number of responses from Italy presented a challenge for analysis, as there was a danger that Italian data would swamp every other language’s. This issue was overcome by calculating proportions within each language, rather than absolute numbers. This large sample can at the same time be regarded as an opportunity for further, more extensive national analysis.
This section focused on the general information about the municipalities or cities, and their approaches to physical activity. It opened with some general questions about physical activity policies (see Figure 4).

**FIGURE 4: Does your municipality or city have a physical activity policy?**

There was a strong tendency for the municipalities to have a physical activity policy. **Overall, 78% stated that the city or municipality had a policy**, with Portuguese and Belgium responses leading, with over 94% and 91%, respectively. However, with the exception of Switzerland (67%), all of the countries considered reported strongly positively to having a physical activity policy, plus the overall average of positive responses was 78%.
FIGURE 5: Does your municipality or city have local recommendations or action plan on physical activity levels?

About 60% of responses indicated that municipalities and cities had local recommendations or action plans on physical activity levels. However, results varied considerably. Responses from Belgium, Spain and the Netherlands indicated that over 80% of cities or municipalities have their own, local recommendations or action plans. Other countries gave more cautious answers, with survey responses from Italy, Portugal, France, and Switzerland suggesting that those countries have developed more slowly in this regard. Anecdotal evidence from Germany and other countries not discussed separately indicates that they have been similarly hesitant in developing recommendations or an action plan.
FIGURE 6: Does your municipality or city have targets for the population to be physically active?

Overall, 58% of cities and municipalities reported to have targets for the population to be physically active. Since this figure is significantly lower than the number of cities and municipalities that reported to have physical activity policy put in place (see Figure 4), it seems reasonable to assume that many policies do not have defined targets for physical activity. Spain, Belgium, and The Netherlands reported the highest proportions of targets.

FIGURE 7: Is this physical activity policy part of a national programme?
Overall, 54 percent of all cities and municipalities reported that their physical activity policy does not make a part of a national programme. This number is the highest in Spain, followed by French and Swiss cities and municipalities that reported the highest levels of alignment of national and local physical activity policies.

The final part of the ‘Background’ section focused on the concept of the ‘active city’, and related terms.

**FIGURE 8: Are you aware of the idea of ‘active city’, ‘active community’ or similar concepts?**
Overall, around 60% of respondents were familiar with the concepts of ‘active city’ and ‘active community’. The concepts were the most-known to the respondents in Portugal and Spain. Belgium, France and Switzerland were least acquainted with the concepts, although more claimed to be members of an active city or a similar network. This is an interesting finding, as it seems to suggest that there are many European cities and municipalities that are engaging with the active city/community concepts was considerably higher than the number that knew what they meant!

Overall, 58 percent of all cities and municipalities were not members in such network. When asked if they would be supportive of the idea of joining such network, overall most respondents were positive.
The next section sought to get a more detailed understanding of European cities’ and municipalities’ physical activity policies.
This question can be understood partly in terms of the distribution of responsibilities for physical activity policy, and the findings have been somewhat surprising. While international organisations like the World Health Organisation have downplayed the role of sport as a source of health-related physical activity, it seems that cities and municipalities’ provision indicates a much stronger role. Equally interesting is the minimal role played by other agencies (including national bodies) in the delivery of sport and leisure opportunities. Other domains reportedly largely within the remit of cities and municipalities were urban design and planning, environmental planning, and provision for senior citizens, kindergarten, and Primary Schools.

Physical activity within High Schools was predominantly associated with other levels of government, rather than cities and municipalities. It is difficult to hypothesise why this would be, and further investigation is needed. Settings where cities and municipalities played either subsidiary or minimal roles in the support of physical activity policy included domains typically associated with national administration, such as tourism and transport.

Although it was identified as an area of responsibility by only a minority of cities and municipalities in this survey, answers indicated that primary health care (essential health care) was mainly within their remit. However, clinical health care settings (involving the direct treatment of patients) were predominantly aligned to no level of government. This reflects evidence of a growing role for primary health in preventative medicine through strategies such as the prescription of exercise or gym membership, but a slower embrace of the role of physical activity in healthcare within clinical contexts.

Two other findings deserve mentioning. Reports that neither workplaces nor universities figure within the remits of cities and municipalities and other levels of governments indicate two settings for which a considerable body of evidence have been gathered as potentially supportive of physical activity promotion. Indeed, workplaces and universities/colleges are likely to account for the majority of young adults between the ages of 18 and 25, and age phase in which life transitions often lead to significant drops in levels of physical activity. The absence of central responsibility for an area of clear public health concern suggests further enquiry.

Further investigation will be required to fully understand the distribution of responsibilities with regard to physical activity policies, which will form a part of the next stage of the PACTE project.

FIGURE 12: Which population groups are targeted by specific actions or activities stated in the policy/action plans? (overall)

- Children and Young People (16 years and under): 78%
  - Municipality or city: 16%
  - Other level of government: 7%
- Families: 67%
  - Municipality or city: 20%
  - Other level of government: 13%
- Girls/Women: 69%
  - Municipality or city: 19%
  - Other level of government: 11%
- Boys/Men: 67%
  - Municipality or city: 23%
  - Other level of government: 11%
- Older adults: 77%
  - Municipality or city: 14%
  - Other level of government: 9%
- People from low socio-economic groups: 65%
  - Municipality or city: 21%
  - Other level of government: 14%
- Workforce/Employees: 43%
  - Municipality or city: 34%
  - Other level of government: 23%
- People with disabilities: 54%
  - Municipality or city: 23%
  - Other level of government: 23%
- Senior/older adult services: 67%
  - Municipality or city: 14%
  - Other level of government: 20%
- Clinical populations/Chronic disease patients: 46%
  - Municipality or city: 15%
  - Other level of government: 39%
- Sedentary/the most inactive: 44%
  - Municipality or city: 33%
  - Other level of government: 38%
- Migrants/refugees: 45%
  - Municipality or city: 33%
  - Other level of government: 21%
Figure 12 summarises findings related to populations targeted by different levels of government. As can be seen, they reinforce the story of wide variation in the role of Government intervention in physical activity promotion that is evident in the earlier graphics. For example, the workforce receives relatively low support both at the level of municipalities and other forms of government. This is consistent with earlier presented data. It is more surprising that people with disabilities received relatively low levels of targeting, especially as they have been identified as a vulnerable population for noncommunicable diseases and most/all countries also signed the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Other identified vulnerable populations are more explicitly targeted at the municipal level, although there remain considerable variation in areas of emphasis, respondents from Netherlands reporting much more support for the physical activity of children and young people than, for example, respondents from Italy. Overall, Children, Families, Girls, Boys, Older adults, and Low SES groups were all identified as populations within the remit of cities and municipalities.

**FIGURE 13: Does your municipality or city have a specific plan for the monitoring and evaluation of the policy implementation?**

When it comes to monitoring and evaluation of the policy implementation, on average more than 50 percent of respondents reported that their cities and municipalities do not have it in place. The level of policy monitoring and evaluation was noticeably low in Italy, Spain, France, and Switzerland, and most in the Netherlands and Portugal.

---

FIGURE 14: Does your city / municipality currently have any of the following (overall)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPEN-ACCESS SPORTS Pitches</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Parks</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access to Outdoor Equipment/Active Parks</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Walking Tracks</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Bus Schemes</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Parking Spots</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cydelanes and Cyde Paths</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of ‘Walking Bus’ schemes (an organised group of children who walk to school together, accompanied by volunteers), all of the physical activity promoting strategies were reported to be in place by the sample overall. The implementation of the Walking Bus concept seems to spread least across Europe, with just 17.1% of municipalities stating it happens there.
Implementation of the physical activity policy/action plan

This section aims to capture the process of implementing physical activity policies and actions in order to better understand the impact of policies in terms of physical activity promotion in European municipalities or cities. The first set of questions sought to understand something more about political and administrative approach of the cities and municipalities, including policy leadership, communications, and outreach to the private sector.

FIGURE 15: Is there a political leader/designated department, nongovernment group or individual with overall responsibility for physical activity in your municipality or city?

FIGURE 16: Does your municipality has a local level communication or mass media strategy aimed at raising awareness and promoting the benefits of physical activity?
FIGURE 17: Do you work with any private businesses or companies in the delivery of physical activity opportunities?

FIGURE 18: Are physical activity made available to employees of your municipality or city?
The leadership of physical activity promotion has emerged as an important theme in recent years, and the consensus in this area is that strong leadership, supported by a clear vision and set of values, is necessary for a successful and sustainable policy. The PASSPORT survey revealed that the majority of responses indicated that such leadership was in place. No information was available about the nature of this leadership, nor its political location, so it would not be possible to draw inferences about the importance attributed to physical activity within the local government priorities. Italian municipalities were much less likely to identify a political leader/designated department, nongovernment group or individual with overall responsibility for physical activity than the other recorded countries. Again, further research will be needed to understand why this was the case.

Conversely, the number of cities or municipalities with established communication or mass media strategies aimed at raising awareness and promoting the benefits of physical activity was relatively small, with only the Portuguese sample indicating a majority having such practices. Overall, 41% of respondents answered positively that their local government employed communications strategies to promote physical activity. The advent of media- and policy-led initiatives such as Designed to Move have highlighted the role of messaging within effective public health promotion, and it would be fascinating to learn more about the decision-making processes behind the adoption or otherwise of local-level communication strategies in support of physical activity.

Two questions about employees and businesses where answered with similar responses, with 60% of the sample stating that they both work with private businesses or companies in the delivery of physical activity opportunities, and make physical activity available to employees.


6 http://www.designedtommove.org
Finally, respondents were asked to offer their interpretation of the importance of increasing the levels of physical activity in their municipality or city, compared with other areas of work. This is, of course, a subjective judgement, but it can be a useful marker for employees' sense of policy priorities. The overall score given (on a scale of 1 to 100) was 70, suggesting a moderately strong response. The relatively low score from France, Switzerland, and the German-speaking respondents is difficult to explain without further qualitative evidence.
The PACTE project was set out to conduct a Europe-wide representative survey of municipalities’ physical activity policies and practices (PASSPORT) in order to identify the status of municipalities’ physical activity policies across Europe, and to investigate gaps in policy and practice.

The survey has revealed a wide range of information necessary to inform an evidence-based intervention in cities and municipalities. There is no doubt that participation in physical activity is strongly influenced by the built, natural and social environments in which people live. Cities and municipalities have a crucial role to play in creating environments that support activity and consequently health. The evidence from the PASSPORT survey suggests that physical activity is widely recognised as an important area of responsibility, but there is some inconsistency with regards to whose responsibility it is. In addition, it needs to be acknowledged that physical activity as an area of policy, is competing against many other priorities.

The findings broadly support the importance of cities and municipalities. There is little doubt that local governments fulfil a vital role in ensuring that all citizens have access to a variety of physical activity opportunities, although the extent to which this happens in practice varies considerably by geography and setting. In some cases, there appears to be a general acceptance of the importance of physical activity promotion at the level of municipalities. Examples of this acceptance include the support of families and younger children. Elsewhere, engagement is more mixed, such as in workplaces and high schools. Lack of involvement with work environments and schools by cities and municipalities is a cause for concern, as these are the settings in which the greatest number of people can be reached with public health communication. The reasons for such disparity are unclear, and would require further investigation. Limited finances might be one factor; another might be inconsistent communication between different levels of government. Highlighting these concerns has been an important finding of the PACTE project.

So, the promotion of physical activity in cities and municipalities requires both a breadth of information about its state and status, and in-depth information about the personal and contextual settings in which physical activity policy making takes place. The findings of the PASSPORT survey provide the unique insight into the former. The latter requires further consideration, whether by subsequent surveys which go beyond scratching the surface of the current situation, or qualitative data gathering.

Some of the areas that would benefit most from this follow-on research include:
- the distribution of responsibilities with regard to physical activity policies,
- the nature of the leadership and its political location in local governments,
- the decision-making processes behind the adoption of local-level communication strategies in support of physical activity.

The present study has several limitations. First, the large participation rate of the cities and municipalities from Italy compared to the rest of the languages impeded the more serious statistical analysis that could have possibly provided some more precise insights.

Nevertheless, the findings of this survey provide a valuable evidence base about of largely under-researched, but very important aspect of physical activity policy and practice. The PASSPORT survey findings provide, for the first time, a base for evidence-based policy development, and also focused advocacy, communication, and supporting materials.
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