

**P-252****USING EVIDENCE IN POLICY MAKING: A CASE STUDY****Authors:**

**Sabina De Rosis**, Institute of Clinical Physiology of National Research Council, Italy

**Liliana Cori**, Institute of Clinical Physiology of National Research Council, Italy, [liliana.cori@ifc.cnr.it](mailto:liliana.cori@ifc.cnr.it)

**Gaetano Licitra**, IRegional Agency of Environmental Protection of Tuscany, ARPAT, Italy

**Fabrizio Bianchi**, Institute of Clinical Physiology of National Research Council, Italy

**Mariangela Vigotti**, Institute of Clinical Physiology of National Research Council, Italy

**Background:** Science based decision making is a high priority of European Union Commission and WHO. Among several factors, which shape knowledge translation, the most influential have been detected analysing the case of the management of environmental noise in Pisa Municipality (Tuscany, Italy), where the first noise map of road traffic in Italy was drafted in 2007 and a policy to address environmental noise was implemented.

**Objectives:** To analyse the use of scientific knowledge and the creation of new research opportunities.

**Methods:** Relevant literature and documents produced by Pisa administration, the Regional Environmental Agency, the National Research Council were examined; narrative interviews with main actors involved completed the case-study.

**Results:** Noise policy included the production of a set of research tools: 1) strategic acoustic map of the city; 2) socio-acoustic survey, to assessing the community perception; 3) an epidemiology study to assess the health effects of noise pollution, focused on cardiovascular and myocardial infarction.

**Main drivers:** implementation of national and EU legislation; growing knowledge amount about health effects; support actions by policy makers; scientific results presented in national and international conferences; communication including web information.

**Further factors:** perception of noise risk by citizen relatively low and referred to personal exposure; media attention low; noise legislation compulsory but not applied; noise issue not considered priority.

**Conclusions:** Policy makers used available evidence to promote a policy, which needed further knowledge production, for intervention, remediation and prevention, involving international collaborations.

Policy makers used the available evidence to promote a policy, which created the need of new knowledge production.

**Keywords:** decision making, evidence, noise, policy, interview