Review form

Sustainable Development Goal for Sustainable Transport and Associated Results Framework[1]

INCLUDES COMMENTS FROM:

Heather Allen (TRL)	Michael Fahy (WBCSD)	Jonathan Nguyen (UNIFE),
Saul Billingsley (Fia Foundation)	Priyanthi Fernando (Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka, member of IFRTD Board, and formerly the Executive Secretary of the IFRTD network)	Robert Petts (AFCAP Steering Group)
Marcial Bustinduy, Matthew Jordan-Tank (EBRD)	Liz Jones, Lily Ryan-Collins (DFID)	Alan Ross (DEE Limited)
John Dulac (IEA)	Etienne Krug, Margie Peden, Tami Toroyan (WHO)	Frederic Rudolph (Wuppertal Institute)
Derk de Haan (Agentschap NL)	Todd Litman (VPTI)	Dieter Schwela (Stockholm Environment Institute at the University of York)
Rob de Jong (UNEP)	Mathias Merforth (GIZ)	Philip Turner, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)
Bernhard Ensink (ECF)	Rob McInerney (iRAP),	Bronwen Thornton (Walk 21)

[1] This report was prepared by Phil Sayeg, Paul Starkey and Cornie Huizenga

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
General Comments:			
Priyanthi Fernando, Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka, member of IFRTD Board, and formerly the Executive Secretary of the IFRTD network			
	Congratulations on a good first attempt. But lots of issues to be ironed out.		*Agree*
	Main issue is that the targets and indicators are still in danger of not being able to meet the first of the five transformative shifts proposed by the HLP report i.e. *leave no one behind* and to address the issues facing the most vulnerable. Also ignores some aspects of transport infrastructure development (in particular) that are inimical to putting sustainable *development at the core.*	Target those who are 'left behind' by the current transport system Broaden the focus of climate and environmental issues beyond air pollution and emissions.	*Agree – i.e. is why we focus on lowest 20% income group* *Not possible to broaden in this draft – risk of overreach*
	Most of the discussion is significantly gender insensitive.		*Agree*
Bronwen Thornton, Walk 21			
Throughout the document	Terminology: in the Issues Paper (p6) the term active travel is used instead of non-motorised transport. We support broader use of this terminology. It is a more positive description of walking and cycling and avoids the presentation of motorised transport as the norm and these modes as the negative 'other', instead of valuable and positive in its own right. Active travel also encapsulates walking more accurately, as many don't see it as 'transport' as it doesn't have a machine; it's just what we do.	Review use of the term 'non-motorised transport' and replace it with either 'active travel' or specifically: walking and cycling or pedestrian and cycling infrastructure (as appropriate and as already done so in the document) Include a definition of active travel if necessary.	*We will consider this but there are some issues involved e.g. captive walking.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	This terminology also links to physical activity opportunities and benefits that can be realised through the transport system. We appreciate NMT is widely used, but Active Travel is gaining a lot of traction and helps create the mind shift needed to truly value and thus provide for these modes.		
Todd Littman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute			
	General Tone and Scope Could be more positive, particularly regarding the many co-benefits provided by a more diverse and efficient transport system.	Highlight the many benefits that can result from a more diverse and efficient transportation system.	*Agree*
		Should emphasize the need to favour affordable/efficient modes such as walking, cycling and public transport, particularly in urban areas.	*Agree*
	The current draft reflect, to a large degree, the conventional perspective that sustainability reflects a relatively limited set of impacts which can be addressed by specific technical changes that increase vehicle safety and fuel economy. I see little about social equity and affordability objectives etc.	"Although a good starting point, I think we can do much better by emphasizing the many additional economic and social benefits that can result from a more diverse and efficient transport system which offers users encourages uses to choose the most efficient mode for each trip. To build political support I think we must explain how these strategies help achieve economic development (increased productivity, employment and investment), social (improved	*We agree – some of this message was in earlier drafts but got lost in the editing. We do note that we may need to ensure the appropriate wording does not overemphasise the perspective of middle and high income urban areas at the expense of matters relevant to poor regions and rural communities.* *We also see that the appropriate form of wording would assist to answer World Bank's Andreas Kopp's comments –that thought emphasis should be more on emphasising transport's contribution to*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		affordability and basic access for disadvantaged populations) and conventional transport planning objectives (traffic and parking congestion reductions, infrastructure cost savings, safety). We might add a paragraph explaining how these strategies reflect basic market principles (responding to consumer demands, favoring higher value trips and more efficient modes over lower value trips and less efficient modes.	*sustainable economic development. Refer Annex E of progress report 1.* *Todd also mentioned above that there was not much on demand management –there is material under GHG. <u>Original wording said:</u>* • Phase out all motor vehicle fossil fuel subsidies by 2020 and institute motor vehicle fuel taxes in 90% of countries by 2030 (still in current draft RF). • Price transport so that travellers perceive the full social costs of their travel (on average) and in cities with a population of 1M or more, by location and time of day (time/location part replaced with a statement about TDM schemes).
		"I think there should be a summary section, which will then become the executive summary. I added a table from one of my previous reports, which summarizes the relationships between general goals, transport planning objectives and specific performance indicators. I think that something like that will be helpful to illustrate these relationships."	*We have no problems with the table but there is no room in the document which is already too long – desirable max/ length of 6 pages. This can be possibly used in supporting documentation for final version of RF.*
		Todd's said in an email to Derk de Haan on 19 Dec 13, we usually categorizes indicators as "inputs"	*We adopted analogous terminology but used words which we think may be more*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		(such as the supply and pricing of infrastructure and fuel), "outputs" (such as mode share, per capita vehicle travel, and vehicle travel speeds), and "outcomes" (such as per capita time spent in travel, traffic accidents, fuel consumption, pollution emissions, and transportation cost burdens to consumers). We are ultimately interested in the outcomes, but input and output indicators are often easier to measure and useful for planning purposes. Similarly, how should logistics be handled recognising it is multi-modal (land, sea, air) and multi-sector involving industry etc.?	*meaningful:* Targets – same as a sub-goal or sub-impact using metrics that are as communicative as possible measurable with a time dimension –e.g. fatalities, etc. They may be measured at intermediate time periods. Process indicators: these measure progress towards achievement of outcomes due to components say of a GHG reduction program e.g. on vehicle fuel economy that contributes to the GHG target. They are measurable and have a time dimension and can be used to measure intermediate results. Implementation measures: here we have focused on the actions/ implementation measures that can be quantified that are needed for implementation – typically the measures needed to implement the components of a program. Distinction with enabling measures (if there is greyness) is they are quantifiable and would have a time dimension. Enabling measures: are 'inputs" i.e. the policies, standards, skills, institutional arrangements needed to deliver the above. Able to be measured qualitatively. During editing and with many diverse contributions we may have mixed these terms sometimes. We will endeavour to get them consistent.

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
			(Note: road safety process measures are regional differentiated targets and differ a little from what was intended but we propose no change at this time.
			We specifically addressed rural farm to market requirements. *We did not directly address logistics since should logistics is multi-modal (land, sea, air) and multi-sector involving industry etc. further, in contrast say to urban public transport where in most cities, the services are procured and regulated by government even if operated by private firms, logistics provider services are not procured by government.* Government's role is seen to be to remove regulatory impediments to efficient truck transport while maintaining safety etc., *We therefore felt we could not propose a separate target for logistics but we could recognise that the freight land transport component of logistics would usually benefit from (i) improved pax access; (ii) from improved infrastructure – hierarchical roads; and (iii) facilitate efficient truck transport – e.g. discourage use of old polluting, fuel inefficient trucks by preventing rebuilds; remove impediments to cross-border logistics operations that may reduce empty backloads etc.* *Guidance please! If a new target is required it will have to be developed after January.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Mathias Merforth, GIZ			
	The OWG might have a strong focus on cross-sectoral themes: topics of special relevance for achieving a number of different targets and goals.	Thus we might stress the positive impact of achieving sustainable transport targets on urban environments, equity, equal job opportunities, direct and indirect health benefits, improved access to health, improved access to education, economic development etc. even more self-confident!	*Agree – see response to Todd Litman's comments*
	There is large consensus among OWG (or among Co-chairs) on poverty reduction as overarching goal PLUS the SDGs shall lead also to the final fulfilment of current MDGs	Thus we might elaborate the relevance of transport more (all benefits of improved access + reduced poverty through less road accidents PLUS where are major lacks in the fulfilment of the former MDGs and how transport will contribute to achieving these?)	*Agree*
	The SDGs shall be universally applicable but also reflect national realities	The goals shall become a widely accepted vision, national realities shall reflect in differentiated (sub)-targets and indicators. Possibly we might at the end present an entire catalogue of indicators, from which countries can choose according to their priorities and current policies (but of course sticking to some key requirements in monitoring achievements towards the goal – chosen lead indicators) I would also understand it the way,	*Agree* *On differentiated targets - we have them for safety and do not wish to pre-judge them for GHG but we are in no position at present to derive baseline values and targets by country/ region/ income for other targets. That is the implication of what we currently summarise on data quality.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		that we mustn't do the entire work on indicators as quick as possible – more important in for the January OWG meeting might be a sound and convincing vision + targets + some lead indicators	*Don't think this is scope of our work – we need to settle on preferred indicators at this stage we believe*
	Dependencies with other targets shall be carefully considered		*agree*
	I'd be interested to hear your opinions / your state of knowledge regarding the requirements of the OWG or generally how to increase the chances for an own transport SDG. It might be not bad to discuss this point within the SC, as it might have impact both on our further strategy and on possible differentiated sub-targets		*This will be topic of discussion in the consultation meetings on 8 and 15 January meetings as well as the SC meeting in week of January 20th.*
	The debate on rural access shall not be limited to improved roads and transport services only. Without likewise improving rural structures, uncontrolled urbanisation processes might speed up, rural areas depopulate (faster). Next to increased stress on urban areas, this might impact national food security (developments as observed in China).	An approach that integrates both improving the linkages between urban and rural areas while in the same time strengthening rural structures would prove out-of-the-box thinking and interlink with further SDG-targets.	*Agree that one of the ways to meet the targets is to improve rural development and proximity to markets, jobs and services – we said this in an early draft*
	The current version of the RF doesn't take position to national/international transport, freight and logistics part of the transport sector. Some aspects are covered by indicators and targets on emission reductions, vehicle/fuel standards. But the inclusion of these parts of the transport sector to a comprehensive vision on sustainable transport is missing (mainly due the focus of the goal on		*Scope of RF is clearly on national transport. It would be confusing to include international transport for some of the elements.* *Rural freight is a human and development issue/* *Refer discussion on logistics above – need*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	universal access for people). A clear vision would help to cover especially the whole challenge of reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from the transport sector.		*guidance from SC but please note constraints.*
	Current transport policy (not only in developing countries) often focusses on the pure expansion of road, rail, harbour and airport infrastructures (covered by indicators such as length of road networks). Key actors of local and national administrations of many African countries (lately attending a German-African Infrastructure Forum in which I participated) emphasized the expansion of national road and rail transport corridors, investments in harbours and airports repeatedly as key driver for development. Unfortunately negative impacts of increased transport activities are perceived as necessary to accept or perceived as not (primarily) important. This leaves large room for up-scaling negative transport impacts in the near future in many world regions.		*Noted*
	These foreseeable developments may be addressed by sound policies (some measures and indicators were already mentioned, some additional ideas can be found in the attached document)		*Noted*
	Implementing the principle “transport finances transport” allows for both: necessary investments in national, urban and rural transport infrastructures and limiting the pressure on public budgets (allowing also for other development needs). In the same time incentives for “over-consumption” of all kinds of transport can be abandoned (or at least reduced).		*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	Phasing out fossil fuel subsidies PLUS introducing/increasing taxes would in this context be an important enabling measure. I'd even see a need for the stronger internalisation of external and infrastructure costs then it is applied today through pricing policies in developed countries. We might discuss this point later when talking on the level of differentiated country sub-targets.		*See above on pricing – under responses to Todd Litman's comments*
	Better data on travel patterns, including full modal split data might slowly change and impact investment priorities for more ST. Shares of SUT modes (especially when compared between different years) can serve as a proxy for several targets - increased livelihood, air quality and access. Not to forget about the fact that higher shares of cyclists in cities generally increase road safety.		*Noted*
	Therefore conducting comprehensive household and transport surveys is extremely important, not only regarding SDG-monitoring activities. These surveys could as well deliver necessary data for land use and transport planning purposes. A tremendous challenge when thinking about current transport institutions in most of the world – but one necessary to face when aiming for sustainable development.		*Agree note contrary view of DFID. Refer our response to DFID's comments. We understand the different viewpoints: MM's is desirable and DFID wish to be practical. We believe a hybrid approach may be needed.*
	Synergies with further SDGs exist as well – thinking of SE4All approach on measuring access to electricity and clean cooking fuels (reaching out to rural population as well). Probably there will be further targets whose measurement builds on comprehensive household surveys		*Agree there may be synergies with SE4ALL & eventual incorporation in national Censuses (usually 10 year intervals), national h/hold expenditure surveys (5 year intervals) etc.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Rob de Jong, UNEP			
	The paper at several places separates urban and rural. While I agree that the results framework should address both urban and rural issues, I think splitting them gives a wrong impression that these are separate issues – when they are not.	In para 1 and 3 in specific I would not differentiate between urban and rural.	*Disagree. It is like gender etc. one has to disaggregate to understand and ensure equality*
	We should emphasize esp. in the early parts of the paper, more the societal issues and benefits. The need for a paradigm shift and potential benefits of this, that the current developments are unsustainable and how a paradigm shift will have social, environmental and economic benefits. However, making this more general point should not keep us from translating this in clear and as concrete as possible proposed targets for inclusion in the SDGs.		*Agree. See responses to Todd Littman's similar comments*
	Social equity issues, vulnerable groups (children, disabled) and gender issues are lacking from the paper. These are important issues that need to be integrated, not only as generic principles, but also as a key drivers for success (esp. in the access proposals, like for BRT and other mass transit systems).		*Agree*
	On the results framework – I think this needs a bit more work.	A set of max three clear indicators for each target and followed by some suggested implementation measures will make the framework shorter, more focused and sufficiently detailed for inclusion in the SDGs	*Agree if possible*
	Process indicators **-** are actually not process indicators but more outcome or results indicators.		*Yes – see definition/ explanation above*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	And I think there are too many of these indicators. This dilutes the strength of the messages and the likely hood these will be included in the SDG framework. The indicators do not need to be comprehensive – that is why they are indicators. I suggest that each target has a maximum of three indicators.		
	Implementation measures – these are often not really implementation measures but more outcomes. In any case, these lists are not comprehensive/ exhaustive and I suggest to indicate this.		*Yes we may have got muddled occasionally*
	Enabling measures – not sure these are always enabling measures and again, there are many more measures that may contribute to achieving the target. I suggest to either mention this, but probably better is to remove these sections completely.		*Ditto*
Alan Ross, DEE Limited			
	Excellent effort in the time available and congratulations to all involved. My comments given below		*Ok*
Dieter Schwela, Stockholm Environment institute at the University of York			
	Very good draft	Some slight improvements are suggested below.	
Jonathan Nguyen, UNIFE			
	On a general note, the Results Framework could/should be promoting more actively shifting		*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	strategies as a transversal aspect of the 3 key areas. The best way to reduce road casualties or to improve environmental performances remains to shift to safer and cleaner modes of transport! There should be an implementation measure directly or indirectly contributing for each key area.		
	UNIFE is not listed as a SLoCaT Member	The Member list should be updated	*For SLOCAT action*
Rob McInerney, iRAP			
Title	Suggest title is "Provide Safe and Sustainable Transport" or equivalent so that it is in a form as per the MDGs	http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml	*Agreed, having a verb would strengthen Goal. If we want to link TRANSPORT DELIVERS campaign, use deliver☺*
John Dulac, IEA			
Overall	Why are we looking only at 2030 SDG targets?	It could be useful to have 2030 and 2050 targets	*Lifetime of SDGs is to 2030*
Footnotes	There is a need for checking footnotes, and properly quoting sources for data		
Liz Jones & Lily Ryan-Collins-DFID			
	Overall reads well. Great opportunity. Let's not miss it by making targets too complex.	Please ensure thorough referencing throughout. All statements containing facts or figures need to be referenced.	OK, will do
Heather Allen, TRL			
Title	I find the title weird and not attractive – what are associated results?	Rewrite	*Understood – results are achievements at 2030 for targets etc. Eventually (not now) intermediate results may be able to be*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
			specified. I.e. Achievement of the target etc. at an intermediate year
	No introduction or preamble makes it difficult to put into context		*Brief introduction – pre-amble will be inserted in later versions.*
Bernhard Ensink, ECF			
	Good doc!		
	Avoid the negative term "non-motorised transport" = confirmation that the motorised is the norm/standard <u>Mode shift</u> to active travel (walking and cycling) could have more emphasized Idem: safe infra for active travel Idem: positive health impact of active mobility = fighting lack of physical activity of many people in many countries	To replace everywhere by "active transport (walking and cycling)"	*We will consider this, also in the light of comments by ECF and Walk 21*
Marcial Bustinduy & Matthew Jordan-Tank, EBRD			
	Lack of references to freight, logistics and non-land transport. If we want to meet the problem of climate change, etc. we cannot just look at 40% of the carbon footprint and ignore shipping, aviation, road freight transport, etc.	We should add some specific indicators and measures about those sectors (probably under the environment focus). T If not, at least we should open up numerous references which are now narrowed to the urban environment (e.g. in para 34 refers to cities and may refer to clients)	*Agree. Refer elsewhere. We have some limitations by being constrained to 'land transport. We will emphasise the benefits of access to persons and firms.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	Most references refer to rural access and urbanization at low income countries. What about developed and developing countries? They're also part of the problem	This might bring the risk of focusing all resources in very low income countries and exclude most of our CoO or other developing countries	*Noted*
Philip			
	UITP greatly appreciates the efforts that have been made to produce such a comprehensive document.		
1. Cost of Action (1-3)			
Priyanthi Fernando, Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka, member of IFRTD Board, and formerly the Executive Secretary of the IFRTD network			
1.	*"When designed to be inclusive, transport is a strong driver of economic growth and poverty reduction."* Without being inclusive, transport could be a strong driver of economic growth. but not of poverty reduction (and new framework is not about reduction, but about eradication)	Reformulate sentence: When designed to be inclusive, transport can be a strong driver to eradicate poverty.	*Agree*
1.	*"greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global warming."* There are other environmental costs that have not been mentioned.	Infrastructure Development can also have impacts on the natural environment, bio diversity and ecosystem services. This needs to be acknowledged.	*Noted*
		Also, displacement due to large scale infrastructure projects can lead to impoverishment	*Noted*
		Development of corridor transport infrastructure and new trucking	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		routes can lead to new disease patterns to areas that have been opened up e.g. HIV AIDs	
Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute			
		More positive tone.	*See above*
	Offers little information on the economic development benefits.	Provide more information on the economic development benefits (e.g., reduced traffic congestion and development costs) of more efficient and multi-modal transport.	*See above*
		Provide information on user benefits, including affordability and health benefits.	*See above*
Rob de Jong, UNEP			
2.	"*50 million people….* "Are these premature deaths due to urban air pollution? or due to small PM pollution?	Can you please add a reference	*SLoCaT to provide reference*
2.	"*The transport sector will be the largest contributing sector to climate change*" I am not sure if this is true. What I always use is that transport contributes one quarter to all energy related climate emissions (so this does not including agriculture etc.). That this is increasing to one third by 2050. And that transport emissions are growing more rapidly than any other sector. (This is all CO2 – in addition transport plays a key role in reducing black carbon).		*SLoCaT to provide reference*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Alan Ross, DEE Limited			
Para 2 , line 3	Suggest adding a few words end of that sentence	…injured or disabled perpetuating and, in some cases increasing, poverty of victim's families in many LMICs	*Noted*
Dieter Schwela, Stockholm Environment institute at the University of York			
1.	Noise missing as an adverse impact	Also mention noise.	*Agree*
3.	Lack of proper access a bit unspecific	More precise: comfortable, safe, affordable access	*Noted*
Frederic Rudolph, Wuppertal Institute			
2	I would not begin the bullet point list with traffic accidents and traffic casualties	change the order: first money, then climate change	*Disagree the money incorporates the previous bullets*
Jonathan Nguyen, UNIFE			
2.	"50 trillion dollars": 50 or 60 (cf. Transport Delivers note)?	Verify indicated data	*SLoCaT to document*
Rob McInerney, iRAP			
2.	15 million is low Injuries vs serious injuries needs definition.	EITHER At least 24 million people will die and 240 million will be seriously injured. OR At least 24 million people will die and 750 million will be injured.	*It is up to UN Safety collaboration to tell us – assume latest view of UN Safety collaboration, including that of IRAP, sets their latest proposal out*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
3.	Help build case for the impact on all development	The urban and rural poor will be characterised by their lack of equitable access to opportunities facilitated by transport. This lack of safe and sustainable access to services will impact all other SDG objectives and hinder the eradication of poverty worldwide.	*Agree*
John Dulac, IEA			
2.	Need to identify sources of information		*Appears to refer to introductory section – SLoCaT to provide. We will address references elsewhere also*
Liz Jones & Lily Ryan-Collins-DFID			
1.2	Need to reference where the figures come from on deaths and econ costs in 1.2 (road traffic and air pollution – is latter really completely attributable to transport pollution?)	The rural poor will remain inaccessible with current estimates of 1 billion living further than 2km from an all-weather road. This should be included.	*OK, will do – SLoCaT*
	Need to acknowledge that more roads will be built and likely that as infrastructure improves vehicular speed will increase. This will impact on road safety and targets.		*Noted.*
Heather Allen, TRL			
2	Without sources and references the figures are quite meaningless Would also suggest referencing the projected number of motorised vehicles and that this is	Add credible sources such as WHO etc.	*See above*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	unsustainable...		
3	What is the current paradigm? Hundreds of millions of people sounds an exaggerated claim – it may be true but there is no source This paragraph is written in such a way as to suggest that present transport does not serve anybody well The last sentence is not written in a direct and punchy style – yet it is the most important message		*Current paradigm – car dependent development of transport infrastructure.* *Clarify hundred's of millions (both urban and rural).* *We will have more emphasis on editing in later stages.*
Mathias Merforth, GIZ			
1.	Leaving out the freight and logistics aspect.	emphasize the meaning of infrastructures and sound traffic management for national logistics + supply of urban areas	*Refer elsewhere*
1.	Leaving out aspects, such as resource use, land grab, noise, urban land use etc.	Either this is acceptable or we deliver a comprehensive picture of negative (and positive) transport impacts	*Noted*
2.	To what extent air pollution and climate change can be related to the 5% of GDP loss? Only transport pollution/ghg emissions, or general?	Clearly state what can be related to transport.	*Slocat to consider*
3.	Current transport paradigm – not understandable for everyone.	Needs to be defined	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
3.	The relation between current paradigm and lack of access needs some clarification.	Clarify or change formulation (first define what we understand under current transport paradigm)	*Noted and to be done*
Marcial Bustinduy & Matthew Jordan-Tank, EBRD			
6	Shouldn't we come back to the definition agreed at Rio +20?	"Transport that is accessible, affordable, financially sustainable, efficient, environmentally friendly and safe". If we don't use this, at least we should include a reference to efficiency!	*Noted*
Philip Turner, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)			
3.		It might be worth mentioning the additional benefits of sustainable transport – for example at regional or national level, encouraging the use of sustainable mobility options can therefore have a major impact on public health bills	*Noted and to be done*
2. Advocating the goal for transport to secure The Future We Want (p. 4-7)			
Priyanthi Fernando, Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka, member of IFRTD Board, and formerly the Executive Secretary of the IFRTD network			
***6.*.**	Should you not also include the International Forum for Rural Transport and Development (IFRTD) as a partner bringing in the poverty focus and the rural transport focus – Paul Starkey, one of the authors of this results framework, is a key member of the	Reword: The Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport (SLoCaT) and colleagues in the International Forum for Rural Transport and Development	*Disagree. The document is statement on behalf of SLoCaT partnership. If we include IFRTD this would open up the possibility/need to include whole range of other organizations.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	IFRTD.		
Michael Fahy, WBCSD			
6.	"Universal Access to Clean, Safe, Healthy and Affordable Transport for All."	Should maybe be "Universal access to goods, services and markets through Clean, Safe, Healthy, Affordable and Reliable Transport" thus we focus on the goal rather than on the means.	*Disagree, this would require including indicators etc. for reliability, which we do not have at the moment.*
Rob de Jong, UNEP			
5.		I would not put the financing argument first for a dedicated SDG. I would start with the latter part of para 5; the substantive reasons.	*Noted*
7.	while I agree that having one transport SDG would be best, I find the arguments you present weak – I do not see why integration of five separate targets into other SDGs is per definition less effective than put together in one SDG – at least you do not give arguments for this. One could actually argue having transport in poverty, health, climate etc. integrated may actually be more effective than isolated together.	I would remove this para.	*Agree, we will come up with revised language that responds to your concerns, which were also expressed by some others.* .
Alan Ross, DEE Limited			
Para 5 line 1	Suggest rewording to avoid repetition of "sustainable"	5. Inclusion of a dedicated transport related Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) would….	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Frederic Rudolph, Wuppertal Institute			
5.	Often, finance for infrastructure is mis-perceived with finance for car-friendly infrastructure. You always talk about finance (as was for instance the case at transport day) but you neglect that sustainable transport is less expensive that car-friendly infrastructure and you do not mention that many policies and measures are cost-effective.	A dedicated sustainable transport Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) would accelerate the introduction of more sustainable transport infrastructure and services in rural and urban areas. Often, sustainable transport policies and measures are cost-efficient, but must be high priority of decision makers.	*Noted*
Robert Petts, AFCAP STEERING GROUP			
7.	As well as adopting transport targets, a UN or other organisation needs to be assigned the responsibility for promoting and monitoring their achievement.	Add text to this effect	*Already noted for rural transport*
Rob McInerney, iRAP			
2.	TITLE	The Need for Safe and Sustainable Transport in the Future We Want	
John Dulac, IEA			
6	There is no such thing as “Healthy Transport”	Keep with “Universal Access to Clean, Safe, and Affordable Transport for All” as these also link well with the three key areas of Para. 8.	*We will consider this. Health impacts will be derived from combination of clean and safe. Health impacts could be described in associated narrative.*
Liz Jones & Lily Ryan-Collins-DFID			
	Good focus on sustainable transport’s impact on		*OK*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	economic growth		
	We recognise SLoCaT's aim is an SDG however it would still be useful to include reference to where transport noted as…..	….important in other OWGs (e.g. Growth and the language used in summary co-chair minutes).	*Noted.*
7		Remove suggestion that targets under other goals is unlikely to be effective.	*Disagree, this is an important part of the argument that*
Heather Allen, TRL			
4 and 7	4 - I find this and odd proposition as we are talking about the SDGs – should we not refer to the fact that as Transport was NOT mentioned governments have not done much within the context of SD compared to other sectors such as water or energy and we should not risk this again	The order should be reworked and the messages better aligned	*Revised logic set out above in response to Rob De Jong's comments*
5	It is not just to marshal finance but also political interest and will for change		*Agree*
Derk de Haan, Agentschap NL			
6.	***"Universal Access to Clean, Safe, Healthy and Affordable Transport for All."*** Adequate: e.g. fast enough, frequent enough	Insert the word "Adequate" between Clean and Safe	*Suggest no action – getting cluttered*
6.	Healthy would also seem to imply safe?		*No – see comments elsewhere – need to address link to physical & community well-being in some way that is - rather than only minimising negative aspects*
Mathias Merforth, GIZ			

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
4.	The SDGs shall also take-up and continue the achievement of the (not yet fulfilled) MDGs	Line out lacks in the fulfilment of MDGs and how transport addresses especially these points.	*Noted*
7.	Very important point! The OWG might pay special attention to enablers (such as transport, energy and education) for the fulfilment of several other goals such.	Stress this point even more/more prominent. Why not make explicit links between transport and other SDGs here?	*Noted*
Philip Turner, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)			
5.		It might be worth mentioning something from paras from 132 and 133 from the Rio+20 outcome document at the start of the para.	*Noted and to be done*
7.		It might be worth citing an example of some of the co-benefits (e.g. health) that would be generated if there is specific focus on transport.	*Noted*
3. Five Targets to Encourage Action on Sustainable Transport (p. 8-9)			
Priyanthi Fernando, Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka, member of IFRTD Board, and formerly the Executive Secretary of the IFRTD network			
8.	*"The SLoCaT partnership is proposing five main targets, divided over three key areas (access, safety and environment) that the global community should focus on in the realization of the sustainable transport SDG."* Think there should be an additional target that actions the reduction in environmental and public	Increase the targets to six.	*Think it is covered already.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	health costs of large scale transport infrastructure development.		
	Like the access indicators because they could also encompass the relocation of services that will facilitate people accessing these services by walking and by bicycle and other non-motorised transport – but this needs to be spelled out in the detail.	Include the decentralisation of services in the implementation measures (see below)	*Noted.*
Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute			
8.A	Add "Affordable" before Access	The sub-heading would read A. Affordable Access	Noted.
8.A	The urban and rural access targets are identical at this point so they can consolidated, with difference performance indicators as discussed below.		Disagree. Note See comments on need to keep rural and urban separate
8.A	I suggest adding affordability and efficient freight transport	• *Efficient freight and commercial transport access. Reduce congestion and other delays to freight and other commercial transport by improving information resources, pricing and management that favours higher value trips.* • *Affordable and equitable access:* Ensure that the portion of household incomes that must be devoted to basic (essential) transport does not increase, and that the quality of access for people with low incomes and disabilities improves at least as	Agree – see earlier responses

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		much as more affluent and physically able.	
8.B	*"Economic impact of road crashes: By 2030, reduce the economic impact of road crashes from the current 3% of GDP per year to less than 1% of GDP per year."* This seems to be simply a different way of expressing the change in death rates.	Delete this sentence	Disagree – this wording is provided by UN road safety collaboration new members
8.C.	"Air Pollution and Human Health" This could also include physical fitness and health.		Agree – see guiding questions
9	"These five targets" These targets are not clearly numbered		Noted
Rob de Jong, UNEP			
8.	Trying to categorize the five targets over three areas is confusing, unnecessary and may back fire. For example, if we do not get a transport SDG, road safety will most probably fit under health – but in your proposal it is not part of health. Greenhouse gas emissions will most probably fall under a climate/ energy SDG, but you propose it to be part of environment - for which there may not be an SDG at all. The categories also do not include a link between transport and energy – while energy may be a major SDG.	I suggest you remove the three categories and just present the five targets – that will either be the five targets that together form a separate transport SDG or the five targets that need to be part of the other SDGs in case there will not be a transport SDG. Trying to group the targets is not necessary and can easily back fire	Noted but difficult. Also the clustering has some advantages of linking the targets to the three dimensions of sustainable development. Ordering the targets in three areas does not preclude the possibility that individual targets are picked up later by other SDGs.
8.A	I think it would be much better if it would be possible to have one access target that includes both urban and rural dimension. Cutting it up in urban and rural gives the impression that these are quite different – which is not the case – actually the urban		Disagree; having an urban and rural target is important because of the differences in nature of problems and solutions.

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	–rural link is crucially important in transport. Thus try to develop one access target for both urban and rural. If need be you can develop different indicators for each urban and rural to make sure both are fully covered.		
8B.	Road safety is confusing – it seems to be one target, which I agree with, but cut up in two? It does not follow the same format as the other targets.		Noted but developed by Road Safety Collaboration – no change proposed
9.	The targets should not cover only land transport. During the preparation of the UN transport issues briefs many UN agencies commented that maritime and air transport need to be part of this. I suggest you don't explicitly exclude these two – in which case they would be automatically included - if you set targets or indicators on PM emissions, you automatically get BC reductions from maritime included. And if you set targets/ indicators in GG emissions you can include aviation and maritime.		Disagree – including air and maritime opens up a whole new can of worms.
Alan Ross, DEE Limited			
Para B line 2	We need to be more ambitious. If we just move the goalposts to 50% reduction by 2030 , we immediately reduce the momentum to have 50% reduction by 2020 in current UN Decade .Target for 2030 should be higher to build on 2020 otherwise everyone will just relax and stop since current urgency and focus will be lost . Unless lower target used this will have a negative effect on current push and momentum to reduce global fatalities by 2020	…fatalities by 75% from …….	*Noted – think issue resolved*
Para 3B line 5	Need to reduce target numbers for 2030 to reflect the actual reductions which will have occurred by 2020 even if full 2020 targets are not achieved by	…. less than 250,000 per year and serious injuries to less than 2,500,000 per year	*Noted – think issue resolved*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	then, it will be lower than 2010 start point.		
Dieter Schwela, Stockholm Environment institute at the University of York			
8	Economic impact of traffic congestion missing	Reduce impact of traffic congestion by 50% by 2030	*Noted*
9	Six targets if impacts on traffic congestion are included	See row above p.8	*Noted but no action proposed*
Robert Petts, AFCAP STEERING GROUP			
8. Rural Access	What about markets? It will be essential that the rural poor have access to income generating possibilities!	Add the word 'markets' after 'health'	*Agree with sentiment*
John Dulac, IEA			
8A.	I would suggest that the two Access targets are but one. The means to achieve them could be different in Rural and Urban Areas.	Suggest merging two targets into "By 2030, increase the proportion of populations that have appropriate access to employment, education, health and community services using safe, convenient and affordable sustainable transport (target: 80%)."	No*. sees above discussion.*
9.	Modify first sentence in reference to above comment on one single access targets	"These four targets represent…"	*Not applicable if we keep urban and rural distinction.*
Liz Jones & Lily Ryan-Collins-DFID			
Good division of three targets: Access, Safety and emissions. Latter	Access: both urban and rural targets are too broad and not transport specific. Too much overlap with other sectors, risk of immeasurability and don't sound sharp or high impact. Don't need to say	By 2030, increase the proportion of rural populations that live within 2km of an all-weather road (target:	*We note that we should change to all-season roads or 'year round access' to make this affordable to governments.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
most contentious.	sustainable transport here as you cover this in C. Targets need simplifying.	X%) By 2030, increase the proportion of urban population that have access to safe, affordable transport (target: X%, affordable meaning <20% income)	*We see problems with an infrastructure-only target for rural people. Both urban and rural populations need more than infrastructure. What about 'increase the proportion of rural populations that live within 2 km of roads with year round transport'. This will be RAI plus transport.*
Are you not suggesting wording for the SDG?	Safety: due to data paucity suggest use of fatalities as opposed to serious injuries. Again risk of immeasurability. Environment + human health: air pollution mortality and morbidity will again risk immeasurability, causation of death / illness will be difficult to prove.		*Safety is measurable and has been be developed by UN road safety collaboration core members (WHO /IRAP/ FIA Foundation)* *Agree there is come further investigation on measurability – but see commentary elsewhere – it appears possible with some effort under a global initiative – WHO says the process indicator for air quality is measurable*.
Heather Allen, TRL			
A - access to employment	How do you define access here Without know where we are it makes little sense to say 80% - why not 50 or 90%? If they only have access to education does that count? People could already say that X % has access – i.e. they are able to go to school the fact that it is 3 hours walk away is that OK for us?		*There is considerable documentation of thinking on access and degrees of access – some in progress report 1. More will appear in progress report* 2
C	achieving at least 1.6 to 2.5 $GtCO_2e$ reduction by 2030 refers directly to the UNEP emissions gap report –		*Will do*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	we should reference it		
Derk de Haan, Agentschap NL			
A. Urban Access		Insert "appropriate" before access so that the new sentence reads "By 2030, increase proportion of urban populations that have appropriate access to employment, education…"	*Noted*
A. Rural Access	Should not also urban access be appropriate? Nb it would seem to be the appropriateness that matters ; there's access now, but it' not good enough / improvements are required		*Noted*
A. Rural Access	Regarding "80% in the rural access" of all urban inhabitants (?)		*Noted*
B. Road Safety **bullet point**	*"50%, from the 2010 figure of 1.24 million:"* This suggest < 0,62 million fatalities per year ; seeming inconsistency and doubling with the below		*New suggested language by Road Safety actors addressed this.*
B. Road Safety **bullet point #1**	*"500,000 per year, and serious injuries to less than 5 million per year".* Fatalities -/- 50% but seriously injured reduced by 75 -90 % (going by the above figures of 300 -750 millions/15 years); would that be realistic?		*This has been deemed feasible by UN Road Safety collaboration*
B. Road Safety **bullet point #2**	*"3% of GDP "* Above 5% is quoted; would the percentage increase if no action is taken?		*To be determined by UN Road Safety collaboration*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
C.		At the end of GHG Emissions bullet, you need to add "… compared to…"	*Noted and overtaken by information/ comments of J de Luc of IEA*
Mathias Merforth, GIZ			
8.	We're talking about 5 targets, just there are six. The formulations of the urban and rural targets are almost identical.	Subject to change	*Noted*
8.	Target levels shall be subject to national differentiation. Why not aim for 100 % overall (?). What is understood under proper access might additionally defer from country to country and region to region.	**Define** differentiated country target-levels once the base line is established	*To be done during implementation of SDGs*
8. - C. GHG	Reduction of 1.6 to 2.5 GtCO2e compared to which baseline? How it relates to the overall contribution of transport in achieving the 2° aim?		*Noted and adjusted / clarified*
Philip Turner, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)			
8a.	Access alone is not enough as quality of mobility services is just as important if we are to help improve the livelihoods of the urban poor. What this target should focus on is 'affordable mobility' as this will encourage compact, mixed, multi-modal development and support the development and maintenance of the mobility needs of the poor, who mostly use public transport, walk or cycle. This would also ring true for rural access.	***Insert words "quality" after convenient and "systems"*** after transport so the sentence reads; By 2030, increase proportion of urban populations that have access to employment, education, health and community services using safe, convenient, quality and affordable sustainable transport systems (target: 80%)	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
8c.	It is not clear what we mean when we say 'Realise least-cost transportation GHG mitigation potential' – it would be worth making the link to the avoid-shift-improve message.		*Noted. Wording changed*
4. Result Framework (p.10)			
Rob de Jong, UNEP			
	For me these indicators are not process indicators, they are indicators of expected outcomes or accomplishments. To reduce traffic deaths by x number in year Y is not a process indicator.		*Noted – see above*
Dieter Schwela, Stockholm Environment institute at the University of York			
	Six targets if impacts on traffic congestion are included	See row above p.8	*Noted but no action proposed*
Liz Jones & Lily Ryan-Collins-DFID			
	No comment. Reads well		*OK*
Heather Allen, TRL			
10	Why are we only going for process indicators? Performance indicators reflect the effort made		*See definitions above – in fact process = outcomes*
Mathias Merforth, GIZ			
10	"Often one type…" doesn't really fit here, why talking suddenly about measures?	Create on paragraph explaining linkages between the targets (and rethink the position). Do this for both positive and negative interrelations. E.g. improving	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		rural roads and transport services will also increase emissions and the probability for higher road accident figures.	
Philip Turner, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)			
	This is a very good structure and we congratulate you on your efforts.		
4.1 Urban and Rural Access (p. 11-13)			
Priyanthi Fernando, Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka, member of IFRTD Board, and formerly the Executive Secretary of the IFRTD network			
12.	Do we have evidence to prove that 'benefits will come from large cities.....'? Or is this just a faith statement. What is the evidence that urbanisation and the creation of large cities are better for '*putting sustainability at the core'* than for example, improving rural economies? Why are we talking about 'in emerging cities it still **may** be possible to prevent car dependent mobility patterns'? Surely we know how to prevent car dependency, so why should we not target the implementation of such policies?	Need to rethink and reword this whole paragraph.	*Agreed - this sentence was not written but produced by too rapid editing.*
Table 1. Urban access	Have a problem with the target 80% (across the board) because it could very easily exclude the 20% who are the most vulnerable	Reformulate the targets so that we have: By 2030, ensure that the poorest 20% of urban populations have access to employment, education, health and community services using	*Noted. A complex topic and we are already facing questions on measurability*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		safe, convenient and affordable sustainable transport	
Table 1. Urban access Process indicators	Need the indicators to reflect the bottom 20% (i.e. the poorest) if we are to leave no one behind Can keep this indicator unchanged • Double public transport ridership and non-motorised travel from 2015 levels.	So reformulate to read: • Percentage of family income spent by the poorest 20% of urban families..... to less than 20% of household income • All individuals in the lowest quintile spend not more than 90 minutes.... • Ensure that the poorest 20% has access within 500 metres to **good quality and *safe* walking and cycling** facilities (assuming this is not just for leisure and exercise)	*Noted. Paul Starkey to suggest revised wording*
Table 2. Rural Access	Target in danger of leaving the most remote/isolated i.e. the 20% most difficult behind. So need some re-formulation Also, I learned recently that it should be an all season road, rather than an all weather road.	Let's qualify the 80% By 2030, ensure that **80% of the most isolated populations** have appropriate access to employment, education, health and community services using safe, convenient and affordable sustainable transport	*Noted*
	Process indicators need to consider other transport modes. Some communities are only accessible by water for instance, and railways could present a better mode of access than from an environmental perspective.		*Agree - to include a sentence in the preamble to expand the potential scope to other modes.*
	Proxy indicators for rural transport need to be	Proposed proxy indicators	*Noted no action proposed.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	targeted at the poorest, most isolated. This does not mean only improving the transport system. It could also be achieved by bringing the services closer to those communities, so that they can cycle/walk to these services. This could be a more environmentally sound solution. Focusing on the isolated (i.e. those marginalised by the existing transport system) could incentivise investments that promote inclusivity.	• Travel time to access significant health services [for emergency treatment if possible] is less than 60 minutes (*or maybe need to change this as appropriate for each context*) for the most isolated villages • Travel time to access significant local markets/major shopping facilities is less than 60 minutes *or maybe need to change this as appropriate for each context*) for the most remote villages	
Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute			
Table 1	I don't understand why you use the term "Table" when they are not in table format, they are sections.		*??? They look like tables*
Table 1 Implementation Measures		**Add equity targets**, "The quality of accessibility for poor residents and people with disabilities should increase at least as much as for affluent and physically able residents"	*Noted. Will do what we can within length constraints*
Table 1 Implementation Measures		**Add** "Transportation policies and planning practices should prioritize road space and money to favour more affordable and space efficient modes over more expensive and space intensive modes, with high quality sidewalks and crosswalks and efficiently-managed bus lanes on all major roadways."	*Noted. Will do what we can within length constraints*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Table 1 Implementation Measures		**Add,** "All cities and towns efficiently manage vehicle parking that favours higher value uses (delivery vehicles and short errands), limits the amount of urban land devoted to vehicle parking, and supports transportation demand management objectives."	*Noted. Will do what we can within length constraints but also how the wording translates across the globe*
Table 1 Implementation Measures		Delete "over 1M" and "over 0.3 M to"	*Noted*
Process Indicators	*Regarding the Process Indicators, two bullets on travel time* These do not seem realistic to me. Do we have any research justifying these targets?		*Noted. Part of discussion on measurability*
Rob de Jong, UNEP			
12	Large cities are not per definition good – they can be large sprawled cities (e.g. Houston). So maybe say compact large cities.		*Noted*
13	While para 12 describes *how* urban transport systems can improve urban access, para 13 does not do so for rural access. In calling for more rural roads, one needs to qualify this. I agree that more rural access is essential but it must be done in a sustainable way – if not it could actually affect our own targets on road safety and environment. We see often around us how not to do this (being based in Africa myself...).	So I would suggest there is need for some qualification here, to avoid a call for unrestricted road building that does not consider the impact that this has on the communities, with increased road fatalities, spread of HIV Aids; on ecosystems, cutting these up and resulting in increased deforestation; and on poverty, ignoring for example non-motorized transport facilities. With these	*Disagree. Nothing suggests unrestricted road building!*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		qualifications is it obviously clear how improving rural access can contribute to poverty reduction and development. In any case the urban and rural divide is very artificial - there is a strong linkage between the two.	
Table 1	Table 1- the implementation measures are vague – "*all cities over 1 million have well functioning, integrated, affordable transport systems…*" and "*all cities over 0.3 m have designated cycle lanes*…". What is well functioning? and if a city has build one cycle lane they already qualify…... I suggest to give some more thought to the framework. For example we have a Share The Road programme, which has a target that countries and cities adopt a policy that any new urban road or any urban road that is being upgraded will systematically always include a dedicated walking and cycling lane. I find this more specific than your implementation measures.		*Noted.*
Table 2	See earlier comment on qualifying a call for more rural road building.		*Disagree*
Alan Ross, DEE Limited			
Para 11 line 5	Need to bring in equity issue	…of life, increase equity and assist……	*Agree*
Para 12, line 3	Add 2 words to reinforce health argument and benefits to disadvantaged	… Urban access and pedestrian /cyclist mobility…….	*Noted*
Table 1 implementation	add one word	….to have designated pedestrian	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
measures , line 4		/cycle routes and …..	
Dieter Schwela, Stockholm Environment institute at the University of York			
11	Creation of jobs, services, livelihoods in rural areas not possible? Who will do the work of rural farmers if all rural people are urbanised?	Thinking about the development in rural areas.	*Noted*
13	Maybe the idea in p.11 above is incorporated in p.13?	If so it should be made clearer. If not, ideas for rural development (jobs, services, markets) should be developed.	*Noted*
Frederic Rudolph, Wuppertal Institute			
	Infrastructure is important. But again, more streets lead to more cars	all cities are dense and compact with mixed land use	*Noted*
Jonathan Nguyen, UNIFE			
Table 1. Process indicators	"Double public transport ridership…" should be on top of the list	Place the indicator as the first or second point	*Noted*
Robert Petts, AFCAP STEERING GROUP			
Table 2: Draft Results Framework - Rural Access	Target: add access to 'markets'	Add 'markets'	*Noted*
Process Indicators (2030 compared to 2010 baseline):	Need to include delta and island communities that rely on waterborne transport. Need to specify that the time parameter is for walking.	Change text to: Increase the proximity of rural population to all-weather routes (the benchmark is to be within two kilometres (or 30 minutes walking distance) of all-weather road or navigable	*Noted – see above*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		waterways. Higher standards will be set for well-connected areas and achievable targets will be developed for people living in very remote areas):	
Implementation measures 1	In some regions only about 15% or roads are 'all-weather' at the moment (World Bank). Therefore there is an enormous amount of work and resources required to improve this situation after over 100 years of the motor vehicle era! Furthermore an 'all-weather' road does not have to be (problematic in terms of periodic maintenance liabilities) gravel, or paved. Maintained earth roads are cheap and adequate on many soils and locations for low traffic flows. Also we have a catalogue of local resource based low cost durable paving (AFCAP Guideline).	Insert footnote to this effect. Refer to Cook, Petts, Rolt, 2013, "Low Volume Rural Road Surfacing and Pavements, A Guide to Good Practice"	*OK But we must change from all-weather to year-round access or all season*
Implementation measures 1	0.2% of GDP to be spent on road maintenance is at the extreme minimum. Better to quote a range to be refined according to local conditions.	Quote for example World Bank, 1981, The Road Maintenance Problem and International Assistance: "If the road maintenance burden is measured as a proportion of gross domestic product (GDP), the difference is a median of 0.7 percent (range 0.3 percent to 1.4 percent) for the African countries, while the proportion is only 0.22 percent (range: 0.1 percent to 0.5 percent for the others. "	*Noted*
Implementation measures 2 Construct	Much of the road networks need to be rehabilitated and brought to all- weather standard	Change text to: Construct, rehabilitate or upgrade to maintainable all-weather standard infrastructure (roads, trails, bridges) to reach isolated communities. Investment of at least 0.3 to 0.5%*	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		of GNP per annum in rural roads.	
Enabling measures	There are two key weaknesses in the rural transport sector that must be addressed, namely; technical and managerial competence, and access to knowledge and good practice	An additional enabling measure is to invest in the education and professional training of sector practitioners to empower them to apply sustainable, environmentally sound and local resource based solutions, wherever possible. We also need to ensure that rural transport good practice knowledge is widely and freely available.	*Strongly agree – depends on space*
John Dulac, IEA			
12.	Change "car dependent mobility patterns"	To "personal vehicle dependent mobility patterns" or private motorisation. Could be useful to distinguish for possible car sharing type programmes, and also to include 2/3W.	*Done*
13.	Change "roads that are passable all the year "	to "transport infrastructure that can be used all throughout the year "	*Note we will ensure there is an appropriate definitions of the term we intend – which appears to be same as implied in the comment*
Table 2	GDP/GNP	Is there a reason GDP is used in point 1 and GNP in point 2?	*Noted*
Liz Jones & Lily Ryan-Collins-DFID			
Table 1	Comment as above in section 3 on wording of urban target. The process indicators are too complex, overly ambitious and difficult to measure (household surveys are going to be used to measure many	Implementation and enabling measures are better worded and sharper in focus but overly ambitious / unrealistic.	*Will try to simplify and focus the process indicators.* *Most stakeholders contacted agreed that indicator data for urban access can be quite*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	different targets, we should have proxy process indicators rather than assuming all our transport questions can be included in HH surveys).		*easily and inexpensively be collected by stratified sample surveys. Urban and suburban inhabitants (disaggregated for economic class, gender, type of user e.g. school-children and disadvantage) can provide the required information on their modes of transport, fares and travel time. Annual surveys can be arranged by the urban authorities with information collated by national transport authorities. We will be recommending a transport 'champion' organisation to promote and assist this.* *We are open to specific suggestions on proxy process indicators but the default seems likely to be the surveys.*
Table 2	Comment as in section 3 on wording of rural target. Process targets should say how these will be measured	(<2km from all-weather road could utilise updated RAI in conjunction with satellite imagery/ mobile telephony / GIS. Delete proxy indicators for transport services as again overlap with other sectors (dependant on health /	*We will review wording of targets.* *We have based the target on an updated RAI with the availability of appropriate services Yes, the RAI needs better estimations and the development of such is envisaged, together with a transport 'champion' organisation to promote and assist this. GIS and satellite estimations are possible, but not yet ready: Government of India/World Bank has been trying GIS but the difficulty is assessing existing road quality with GIS or satellite.* *We agree that proxy indicators are dependant on other sectors and not ideal in the long term. We had originally stated that prior to the adoption of specific rural transport indicators that will be developed we would use those proxy indicators. So*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		market extension).	*short-term use was envisaged.* *If we delete these proxy indicators, is it reasonable to suggest the envisaged transport indicators that will be further developed? Otherwise this becomes an infrastructure-only indicator which is does not really fit into the overall ethos and the goal of safe and affordable transport for all.*
11		Reference the fact that an estimated 70 per cent of the world's very poor people are currently rural (IFAD (2011) Rural Poverty Report)	*OK noted.*
12		Could be clearer. Unsure what is meant by 'Benefits will come from large cities'? Second and third tier cities are growing far more rapidly and improved transport is also important here.	*Agreed, this wording came from multiple editing and needs to be clarified.*
13		Please reference this statement: "Transport services in rural areas are often infrequent and expensive, with a downward spiral of deterioration. Rural access is neglected."	*OK noted. We will insert suitable references.*
Heather Allen, TRL			
11	*"Improved access to jobs, education and health care would improve people's quality of life and assist to lift them out of poverty"* This phrase implies that their urban counterparts do not suffer in the same way – urban poor and those		*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	displaced to live in the peri-urban area are just as marginalised as the rural poor – you just need to clarify this a bit		
12	Do you just mean public transit or mass transit – the first includes minibuses the second not? Why will the Benefits ONLY come from large cities? AND (blood boiling :)) this phrase needs dealing with *Hence maintain the informal transport systems that provide employment to large numbers of people.* The informal transport sector only offers a large number of employment opportunities because there are many more of them BUT the majority are precarious and no tax or health care is paid. On the other hand mass transport usually provides training, pays taxes, covers some health care, provides an employment contract etc. – both need some reform but just to promote informal because anyone can one day get a job and next day loose it not a sustainable future.		*We mean any public transport system likely with a strong bus component whether there is rail or Bus rapid transit or not. The issue of formal (i.e. regulated) or informal is less important as long as services are safe and meeting market needs* *We can tone down the phrase but these systems are the reality in many places just as motorcycles and motorcycle taxis are a reality in many places. We can't assume they disappear. We can assume they should be made safer etc.*
13	Why are national and international champions are needed to promote and monitor better means of sustainable access for one third of humanity only needed for rural populations - This is unjust.		*Not sure what unjust means here*
Table 1	• Double public transport ridership and non-motorised travel from 2015 levels. Do you mean as UITP does double formal public transport?		*Yes* *Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	• All cities and towns have well developed functional hierarchical road networks to facilitate convenient travel by public transport, goods vehicles, and private modes while catering for non-motorised transport safely and conveniently This point should probably be number one rather than the last – it also duplicates the walking and cycling facilities of point 2 **Transport pricing –** does this include FF subsidies?		*Pricing and subsidies are related but we measures for both*
Bernhard Ensink, ECF			
Term "non-motorised transport"	Avoid this negative term = confirmation that the motorised is the norm/standard	To replace everywhere by "active transport (walking and cycling)"	*See earlier response*
Derk de Haan, Agentschap NL			
12.	*"….development of car dependent mobility patterns, and hence maintain the informal transport systems that provide employment to large numbers of people."* What's meant here? It sounds as if "it was better in the past" – which should be maintained		*Noted*
13.		***Add the terms "Adequate / Appropriate"*** in the beginning of the third sentence, so it reads "Adequate / Appropriate rural…"	*Noted – for this and below – a lot of relevant responses have been made in response to DFID above*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Table 1-Target		***Add "appropriate" and "adequate"*** to the target sentence so it reads: By 2030, increase proportion of urban populations that have **appropriate** access to employment, education, health and community services using **adequate**, safe, convenient and affordable sustainable transport* (target: 80%).	*Noted*
Table 1 Target		***Add the following text after the *i.e. public transport..:*** There's access already now, but often it' not adequate, not safe, not affordable etc. It would seem that the SDG concerned in fact would be about increasing / improving each of these attributes by a certain margin / to a certain level. Process indicators might subsequently relate to each attribute: one for safety, one for convenience etc.	*Noted*
Process Indicators	***1st bullet point,*** Is the figure of 20% underpinned, or more precisely, is there a suggested division of an entire HH budget? Raising the issue as e.g. for energy there's a 10% benchmark, implying that 70% should suffice for housing, clothing, food, education and everything else		*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Process Indicators	The indicators used in this part are independent of baseline E.g.: "not more than 90 minutes", "80% of population has access within 500 meters"		*Noted*
Process Indicators	*"Double public transport…."* Why 2015 levels are the baseline is 2013?		*To be changed to 2010*
Process Indicators		***Add another indicator:*** (adequacy) … indicator on frequency (the 90 minute mark for health should e.g. be possible 24/7 and should include waiting time	*Will be considered*
Process Indicators	What about adding indicators on safety and convenience?		*Will be considered*
Process Indicators		**Suggest to add** (affordability) after the first indicator, and (adequacy) after the second and third indicators	*Will be considered*
Implementation measures	the below measures seem to be formulated as targets rather than measures		*Noted. May be right. Note terminology discussion above*
Implementation measures	In addition to "cycle routes", what about and walkways / footpaths?		*Noted*
Enabling measures	***"90 countries"*** Including developed countries? (if so it would seem the 2020 target is quite easy - at least to the layman's eye)		*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Enabling measures	***"Build sound institutions, appropriately staffed and resourced."*** Might be formulated more precisely (what is sound, appropriate?)		*Agree*
Table 2	**"Process Indicators (2030 compared to 2010 baseline):"** Compare urban access: process indicators for safety convenience & affordability are missing (while the said transport should be safe, affordable etc. Like for urban, most indicators presently are baseline independent		*Noted*
Table 2 **Target**		**Add the term "adequate"** before "safe" in the target	*Noted*
Table 2 Implementation Measures		**Add "improved"** next to maintained in the first implementation measure	*Noted*
Table 2 Implementation Measures		**Replace** "GNP per annum" with GDP	*Noted*
Enabling measures	***"In the first bullet point on capacity building:"*** Any relation with the 1st enabling measure for urban? Also: 40 > 100 in just 5 years; is that realistic?		*Will consider*
Mathias Merforth, GIZ			

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
12.	"possible to prevent car dependence" … "and hence maintain the informal transport systems…" The causal dependence is simply wrong. In some regions we might need to at least maintain these systems - but they are usually not an alternative for choice-riders. In most cities the task should be to transform urban transport systems to higher quality, integrated services.	**Include** the need to improve or transform informal transport in terms of system integration, comfort, safety in order to limit car-dependence and offer quality alternatives.	
	"Rural access is neglected."	**Remove**	*Noted*
Table 1 process indicators	"limited daily travel time budget to 90 minutes". Very good! Needs to be measured by household surveys.		*Noted and agree*
Table 1 process indicators	"Double put/walking/cycling" in absolute or relative figures? Absolute transport figures (relevant especially for the emissions targets) are going to be measured by different indicators.	We might better aim at improving the (full) modal split" – increasing the share of put/walking/cycling, reducing the share of private car use.	*Noted – relative*
Table 1 process indicators	"Note" is it realistic to have a 2013 base line? If no/no full data is available – use 2015/16/17 baseline in accordance with the definite and inevitable need to improve data collection in most countries and cities?		*All 2010*
Table 1 implementation measures	"Provision of public transport systems" - Only 716 million people live in cities with more than 1 million inhabitants (wiki pedia) – large potential is lost. The question where the cut the border is hard, but it should be lower.	Probably not to mention a certain figure for the number of inhabitants is adequate. Unit points 1 and 2: "All mid-sized and large towns and cities have quality public transport systems and	*Noted. Refer instead to sustainable transport*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		cycling facilities ” or similar formulation Additionally: “All cities, towns and transit/major roads in villages have designated walking facilities.” (interlinkage with road safety)	
Table 1 Enabling measures	“National transport programs” - Guess you mean additional 30/90 countries? To achieve progress in REALITY this point must come much earlier.	Change to: 100 % of countries placed appropriate strategies in 2020.	*Noted*
Table 1 Enabling measures	“land use plans integrated with transport facilities”	Change to: “integrated land use and mobility plans” … “that encourage efficient land utilisation AND minimise the need for motorised transport modes through smart planning” “land use and transport plans must cover walking, cycling, put, car transport”	*Noted*
Table 2 – Process indicators	Doesn’t universal access mean 100%?	Change to 100%, but consider existing realities within differentiated country targets.	*Yes*
Table 2 – implementation measures	To increase the access to health, markets and social services it is also partially appropriate to improve local structures. Our overall goal is improving living conditions for everyone. Solely improving roads and transport services might also lead to speeding up urbanisation processes and	We should carefully stress the need for integrated approaches. We need both the improvement of rural structures (in terms of facilities for education, health, administration/political	*Agreed*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	depopulation of rural areas. We are in danger to put higher pressure on urban areas both through increasing and uncontrolled urbanisation processes and through reduced food security (rural areas are important for supplying urbanities in many terms)	participation, supply, job opportunities etc.) and of roads and transport services. **Emphasize** the interlinkage of other SDGs that aim at improving rural structures. Take up points where improving roads and transport services could have negative impacts. (Out-of-the-box-thinking!)	
Table 2 – implementation measures	"appropriate transport services"	**Needs to be defined**… possible during the later process.	*Agreed*
Table 2 – enabling measures	"what are impediments that need to be removed?"	**Needs to be defined...** **Possibly change to**: "Reduce administrational barriers and create clear-cut-responsibilities for the organisation of rural transport services".	*Done*
Philip Turner, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)			
13		In additional to national and international champions, we also need local level champions both in rural and urban areas.	*Noted*
Process indicators	We need to be more ambitious as urban population growth will mean that we will realise the target by simply doing nothing – by focusing on market share it would bring about significant sustainable development benefits for cities. We can provide a link to the analysis that has been done to	Double public transport ridership share and non-motorised travel from 2015 levels	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	demonstrate this if that would be useful.		
Target definition of sustainable transport	In addition to the comments made on 8a about the need to focus on sustainable mobility, it would be useful to understand where the 20% figure came about.		*Noted*
Urban access - Implementation measures		All town/cities over 0.3 M to have designated cycle routes and facilities and quality public transport systems.	*To be considered*
Rural access		If road construction or rehabilitation does not generate transport provision, then the investment will not lead to the provision of services for the local population and will have been largely wasted. We would suggest that something be included as part of the process indicators to complement the enabling measures.	*Noted*
4.2 Road Safety (p.14 – 15)			
Priyanthi Fernando, Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka, member of IFRTD Board, and formerly the Executive Secretary of the IFRTD network			
14.	Makes no mention of the cost to the care economy, i.e. to women of accidents, in terms of looking after the injured/loss of income. So while there is promotion of support for the 'victims' less support for the carers.		*Noted.*
Table 3. Road Safety Target	I would like to see the reduction of 50% of road fatalities in the countries where road accidents are highest (so that the overall 50% does not come from higher reductions in countries where fatalities are		*Noted but no change proposed* *Transport safety – security – all important.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	more under control) I am also wondering why we are focused on ROAD SAFETY. Why not Transport safety? This will mean reduction in injuries on train and water transport as well. (are they not significant?)		
Table 3. Road Safety Process Indicators	This process indicator suggests an actuarial rather than a developmental/humanitarian position – i.e. that life is worth more in high income countries than in low income countries.	Revise indicators to ensure that the poorest countries, populations get a better deal.	*Noted but no change proposed*
	From what I know about the statistics, the majority of fatalities from road accidents are pedestrians and cyclists. The implementation measures (ensuring helmet and seatbelt legislation) while important will not prevent this. It's both a driver behaviour issue, but also an infrastructure issue and these need to be incorporated into the implementation measures.	Reflect safety measures for pedestrians, cyclists, and other vulnerable road users in the implementation measures.	*Noted – will attempt to adjust*
Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute			
Table 3. Implementation Measures	These measures all reflect the old traffic safety paradigm which focuses on "safer driving" and ignores the safety benefits of transportation demand management and smart growth strategies which reduce total motor vehicle travel.	***Add the following implementation measure:*** "Develop modeling tools that can predict the long-term emission impacts of specific transport policy and planning decisions.	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*
Table 3. Implementation Measures		***Add the following implementation measure:*** Apply "least cost" planning practices so demand management and smart growth strategies are considered as pollution reduction and health	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		improvement strategies.	
Table 3. Implementation Measures		***Add the following implementation measure:*** Implement traffic speed reduction and complete streets planning which increases traffic safety particularly for vulnerable road users (pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists). Implement transportation demand management and smart growth policies that increase traffic safety.	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*
Table3: Enabling Measures		***Add:*** Apply comprehensive analysis of the impacts that transport policies and planning decisions will have on per capita traffic casualty rates, particularly risks to vulnerable road users.	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*
Rob de Jong, UNEP			
	We need one target for road safety. I would not split it up. Road safety will need to find a niche in the SDGs. Splitting it up in two may make this more difficult – and there is no need for it. The decade of action target is very clear and useful. I see no use splitting the target in health and economic impacts. You can do this in the indicators		*Noted but no action proposed as the proposed language comes from groups closely associated with the Global Decade of Action.*
Alan Ross, DEE Limited			
Para 14 line 2	Modify wording to bring out fact that millions are permanently disabled annually	….people suffers serious or permanently disabling injury ….	*Language can be adjusted to explain concept of serious injury*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Ref 4	Need to say which document it is that is already cited?		ok
Table 3 , line 1	Adjust target to reflect progress and reductions that will have been achieved by 2020	.....fatalities by 75% from the 2010 figure……..	*Noted but wording up to RSC.*
Table 3 line 4	As above	.. less than 250,000 per year and serious injuries to less than 2,500,000 per year	*Noted but wording up to RSC.*
Table 3 Process indicators , line 2	Clarify which fatality rate is to be used to prevent misuse of fatality rates as often happens with deaths /10,000vehicles which comes down anyway due to rapid rises in vehicles but which some cynically use to imply road safety is improving	…Fatality rates per 100,000 population by…….	*Noted but wording up to RSC.*
Table 3 , implementation measures , after line 2	Add an indicator re multilateral development banks current	All Multilateral bank funded road projects to have a minimum IRAP rating of 3*	*Noted but wording up to RSC.*
Table 3 , Implementation measures , line7	Add asterisk (*) to seat belt wearing* with footnote as suggested	Add footnote *front and rear on all roads	*Noted but wording up to RSC. Number of footnotes to be limited In summary documents.*
Table 3. Implementation Measures , line 8	Add 2 asterisks (**) to helmet wearing** with footnote as suggested	Add footnote **riders and passengers on all roads	*Noted but wording up to RSC.*
Table 3 , Enabling measures , line 1	Modify wording slightly to ensure sustainability and increased likelihood of effectiveness	….. capacity and mechanisms to support and finance the establishment of …… strategies and effective implementation of casualty targeted action plans.	*Noted but wording up to RSC.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Table 3 Enabling measures, line 4	Clarify use of funds for safety to avoid misuse and to encourage identification and improvement of the most dangerous locations	….improvements to the most hazardous locations on the road network	*Noted but wording up to RSC.*
Table 3 Enabling measures , line 5	Legislation is useless without effective enforcement so bring in that into statement	…..and provide sufficient resources for its effective enforcement	*Noted but wording up to RSC.*
Task 3 Enabling measures , line 6	Monitoring and evaluation cannot be done without good crash data systems and analyses both a rarity in LMICS so we need to include into indicators to encourage establishment of such capacity	….effective crash data systems , analyses ,monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to inform policy	*Noted but wording up to RSC.*
Dieter Schwela, Stockholm Environment institute at the University of York			
14.	1.24 million deaths in 2012 vs. 8B. same number in 2010.	Harmonize numbers/years.	*Will check but wording up to RSC.*
15.	Good idea to reduce the number of deaths differently in countries of different incomes! Are numbers such as "< 3" meant as "< 3 per 100,000 people"?	Make statements more transparent.	*Noted*
Liz Jones & Lily Ryan-Collins-DFID			
As in section 3 above on language for target.	Process indicators are sharp and clear. Need to explain how measured and ensure they are realistic given increased vehicle speed with better infrastructure.		*Un Road safety collaboration developed these and we believe they are ok*
Heather Allen, TRL			
	I do not see the proposition of an agreed global definition of what is a road fatality – is someone who dies after I day 5 days? Three months?		*Noted – but believe it is 30 days as in mentioned in Road Safety Status report (2013)*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	Helmets – an agreed standard should also be mentioned – a 'Chinese' substandard plastic helmet is next to useless		*Noted*
Derk de Haan, Agentschap NL			
14.	AIDS, TB facts malaria	**Please check**; WHO gives 1,7 million for aids related causes; 1,3 million for TB and 0,7 for malaria, totalling 3,7 million or 3 times more than road crash fatalities;	*Will check with Road Safety Group*
Table 3 Target A&B	Same inconsistency as doubling in Table 1 &2		Will check
Target B.		Delete "per year" after GDP	*Noted*
Target B	When saying 3% of GDP, do you mean "global" GDP?		Will specify
Process Indicators	***1st bullet point*** 3 / 6 / 9 per (100.000)? Why aim lower for low income countries if present fatality rate is better than that of middle income countries?		*Decided by UN RSC*
Process Indicators	***2nd bullet point***	**Delete "per year"** after GDP in all three	*Noted*
Implementation Measures		**Add a new** bullet point? • increase global child restraints usage to …. (?)	*Noted*
Mathias Merforth, GIZ			

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Table 3 – process indicators	Figures given per 100.000 inhabitants? Unit is missing		*Noted*
	No indicator for injuries?		*Adjusted*
	Can we proof the reduction of economic costs through targeted road infrastructure investment? This would allow for a convincing argumentation…	Research results available?	*IRAP/ UN RSC provide backup*
Philip Turner, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)			
Process indicators		Per passenger-mile, the traffic fatality rate for public transport is approximately one tenth that of automobile travel. Encouraging a more balanced mobility mix could therefore generate a significant reduction in urban traffic fatalities. This should be usefully highlighted in the process indicators section.	*Noted*
Process indicators	It is not clear what the units are so this needs to be explained.	For developed countries, we need to be more ambitious - the long term vision should always be "Zero mortalities". In addition, accidents with injuries which result in disabilities are constant and not declining, especially considering impact. So Targets should always include serious injuries.	*UN RSC provides backup*
4.3 Environment and Human Health (p. 16 – 20)			

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Priyanthi Fernando, Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka, member of IFRTD Board, and formerly the Executive Secretary of the IFRTD network			
	Interesting that there are only two very narrow targets for this. Transport impact on health is not limited to air pollution alone – the transport sector has acknowledged (and has measures to address) the spread of HIV AIDS through the increase in corridor transport. Also, the impact on the environment is not limited to emissions alone. The building of roads for instance can result in the loss of biodiversity and other negative environmental impacts. There are also the costs of displacement, and the impoverishment of communities that it sometimes engenders.	Expand the target to include a target on reducing the negative impacts on the environment and human health and well being of large scale road building in particular.	*Think we have it covered*
Michael Fahy, WBCSD			
18.	"Transport contributes 23% of global GHG emission" is not correct statement. If the share of Transport CO2 emission to global GHG emission is correctly described, it would be around 13% such as in follows: http://www.springerimages.com/Images/Geography/1-10.1007_978-3-642-19674-4_4-6 If 23% would be correct here, then the denominator would be global energy related CO2 emission.	This sentence should be revised to align the correct pairing. Either way is OK.	*Will check*
Bronwen Thornton, Walk 21			

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	While the priority of this group is on sustainable, low carbon transport, the Issues paper does note the physical activity impacts of transport and cascade of health benefits that can be realised. This document doesn't capture that human health dimension of transport.	Consider if it needs a specific reference - not to change the overall goals or details, but perhaps a note in the explanatory paragraphs about the cascade of benefits	*Noted but see guiding questions*
Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute			
16.		***Add the following as the first sentence of the Paragraph:*** "Motor vehicles emit a variety of harmful pollutants."	*Noted*
Table 4 Implementing Measures		***Add the following implementation measure:*** Develop modeling tools that can predict the long-term emission impacts of specific transport policy and planning decisions.	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*
Table 4 Implementing Measures		***Add the following implementation measure:*** Apply "least cost" planning practices so demand management and smart growth strategies are considered as pollution reduction and health improvement strategies.	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*
Table 4 Implementing Measures		***Add the following implementation measure:*** Redesign roads to favour active (non-motorized) modes over motorized modes, and lower-polluting travel (e.g., bus and trains) over more polluting travel (e.g.,	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		private automobiles).	
Table 4 Enabling Measures		***Add the following enabling measure:*** Develop modeling tools that can predict the long-term energy and emission impacts of specific transport policy and planning decisions.	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*
Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute			
Table 5 Implementing Measures		***Add the following implementation measure:*** Develop modeling tools that can predict the long-term emission impacts of specific transport policy and planning decisions.	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*
Table 5 Implementing Measures		***Add the following implementation measure:*** Apply "least cost" planning practices so demand management and smart growth strategies are considered as pollution reduction and health improvement strategies.	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*
Table 5 Implementing Measures		***Add the following implementation measure:*** Redesign roads to favour active (non-motorized) modes over motorized modes, and lower-polluting travel (e.g., bus and trains) over more polluting travel (e.g., private automobiles).	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*
Rob de Jong, UNEP			

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	As mentioned earlier, I strongly suggest not to use the three categories but just present five targets and their indicators. We should present the greenhouse gas emissions target as an environment and health target.		*Noted – see above*
Table 4	I think we can improve on the indicators. Some are to far off from reality – like all major cities having air quality meeting WEHO standrads will never happen (against a background of exceeding tjem 5 times tofay and fleet tripling in the same time…). Or are unmeasurable (as most cities don't measure PM2.5 pollution levels).	So develop indicators that are achievable, for example focus on a criteria pollutant (PM) and its sources (vehicles emissions).	*WHO says they will soon to be able to make consistent estimates of PM2.5*
	In your targets and indicators, in general, link to ongoing major global programs and initiatives. Like the PCFV is the leading global programme to reduce PM emissions from vehicles. They have a global target of moving all countries to low sulphur fuels of max 50 ppm. CCAC has as a target to move to 50ppm, with ultimately 10 ppm. Do not introduce a new target now (15 ppm) that differs from what is already ongoing.		*Agree.*
Table 5	Pleased to see that here the GFEI target (also include in HLP report) has been adopted. First bullet under implementation measures; change "standards" into "policies" – countries may improve the fuel economy of their fleet through standards and/or financial policies (feebates for example).		*Agree*
Dieter Schwela, Stockholm Environment institute at the University of York			
16-20	Lacks quantitative numbers for the contribution of transport to air pollution (except for GHGs). In developing countries other sources such as open	It is a bit arbitrary to request reduction of mortality and morbidity from transport-related air pollution	*Agree need to be careful – see response to comments to DFID on air pollution. Wording changed in regards GHG contribution from*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	fires may play a big role.	if the contribution from transport to air pollution is unknown. Need for more research on the contribution of transport to air pollution should be admitted.	*transport.*
17, **Table 4**	**Second bullet point:** There are no "WHO standards", only guidelines, the difference being that standards are promulgated and can be enforced while WHO guidelines cannot.	Replace "WHO standards" by WHO guidelines.	*Noted.*
Jonathan Nguyen, UNIFE			
16.	Air pollution needs to be more closely linked to the transport sector	Provide relevant figures worldwide, especially on road transport in cities	*Noted.*
Implementation measures for air pollution	Natural environment and public spaces implementation measure is not related to transport	Link accessibility to natural environment and public spaces with public transport infrastructure development since both dimensions increasingly go hand in hand	*Noted.*
20	Rephrase "mode shift through improvements in public transport and non-motorised transport"	"mod**al** shift through improvements in public transport and non-motorised transport, **and appropriate government policies**"	*Noted.*
Table 5. Process indicators for GhG emissions	Black carbon emissions indicator should be on the top of the list	Place the indicator as the first point	*Noted.*
Table 5. Implementation measures for GhG	Rephrase "Adopt fuel economy standards in all countries by 2020"	"Adopt fuel economy and energy efficiency standards and targets, with performance criteria over the	*Noted.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
emissions		whole investment cycle"	
Implementation measures for GhG emissions	Rephrase "Price transport so that travellers perceive the full social costs of their travel"	"Market-based mechanisms need to incentivise low-carbon transport, for instance through road-pricing and CO2 pricing in transport"	*Noted.*
Robert Petts, AFCAP STEERING GROUP			
General comment	Road infrastructure construction and maintenance are over-reliant on high carbon footprint cement and bitumen material inputs	Preliminary research indicates potential for sustainable bio alternative sealers and binders. This needs to be further investigated: See below*	*Noted.*
John Dulac, IEA			
17	The source for footnote 10 is for Latin America and the Caribbean Region	Mention whether this can be extrapolated globally; what about work by Clean Air Asia or others as another example??	*Noted. developing more extensive background note*
18, footnote 12	No source for 23% transport allocation of CO2 emissions	Add reference to footnote 12 – could come from ETP 2012 or IEA statistics.	*Will check*
19	There is no mention of switching to lower carbon fuels as a means to achieve CO2 reductions	Add reference to fuel switching as an option	*Will add – is in longer background note*
18, footnote 13 and 14	IEA 2012	This transport book is from 2009. ETP 2012 could be used for more recent update.	*Noted*
Table 5	No mention of avoid	Perhaps something should be said about avoid potential through	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		integrated land use planning	
Table 5	No mention of baselines	What reference year/levels are being used for these targets? Are we halving over 2000 levels? Halving relative to projections for BAU (ETP 6DS)?	*Based on email exchanges we believe the following is correct:* **Target**: Realise least-cost transportation GHG mitigation potential consistent with a 2-degree warming scenario, achieving at least 1.6 to 2.5 GtCO2e reduction by 2030 (compared to a BAU of 6-degree warming scenario).
Table 5, indicators 1st bullet	No fleet specified	Specify if this is just for PLDVs (target may not apply to other vehicle types). Also, careful with targets: ETP analysis looks at stabilizing total transport sector emissions over 2000 levels. New fleets certainly have significant cuts, but it's not clear if talking about fleet emissions (CO2/vehicle) or if halving transport sector emissions….	*Based on email exchanges we believe the following is correct:* • Halve GHG emissions from the global vehicle fleet, in 2030 for all new vehicles (compared to 2010) and by 2050 for the complete global fleet (compared to 2010).
Table 5, indicators last bullet	This item is not related to GHG mitigation but instead adaptation.	Suggest move this indicator to access section (tables 1&2)	*Noted*
Table 5, Implementation 4th bullet	Empty miles reduction is more concrete and easier to measure	Suggest to move this first, with facilitate freight as supporting point.	*noted*
Table 5, measures	No mention of fuel subsidies reform (although mentioned in the text)	Add bullet on fuel subsidies reform	*It is there*
Liz Jones & Lily Ryan-Collins-DFID			

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
As previously stated a focus on access and safety may be a more successful route to SDG framework incorporating transport.	As in section 3 concern on identifying causality of deaths and illnesses from transport related air pollution. Table 4 is weak. Table 5 better but given contentious issue will need to be stronger on measurability.		*See above discussion*
Heather Allen, TRL			
Table 4	What is the X% to Y%?		*Numbers yet to be determined – we will attempt to find an appropriate wording*
Implementation Measures	Presume all is by 2030 not just Africa Is the world now lead free – know that there are not that many countries but there are still some – this should be mentioned to be out Why are we only looking at PM 2.5 when PM 10 is worse and this should be mentioned		*Thought PM2.5 is becoming the new benchmark in AQM*
Greenhouse gas section	IEA now quotes 27% not Transport contributes 23% of global GHG emissions • Reduce black carbon emissions from transport by 90%. If we don't know where we start this is tough Suggest that you add something Same for PT ridership		*Need to check figure – also referred to be IEA above* *BC figure also needs thought*
Bernhard Ensink, ECF			

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Process Indicators (2030 compared to 2010): **•Reduce urban population exposed to air quality that exceeds WHO guidelines for PM 2.5 from X% to Y%.**	To fill in x and Y … but I am not an expert on this		*Noted – see above comment*
4.3.2. – section 20	Underline the potential of mode shift to cycling –add a footnote	Footnote to section 20: "if levels of cycling in the EU-27 were equivalent to those found in Denmark, bicycle use would help achieve 12 to 26% of the 2050 target reduction set for the transport sector, depending on which transport mode the bicycle replaces." http://www.ecf.com/wp-content/uploads/ECF_CO2_WEB.pdf	*Noted*
Derk de Haan, Agentschap NL			
16.	So as to distinguish from kerosene lighting and cooking related indoor air pollution (approximately 1,5 million fatalities / year)	***Add "outdoor"*** before the words air pollution	*Ok- we can mention it once…it is mentioned in text and transport-related air pollution is outdoor*
Process Indicators	Is there an underpinning that these process indicators indeed lead to the -50% target? (Or is that where the X and Y still need to be defined?)		*They lead to target or should*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Process Indicators		***Add "outdoor"*** before the words "air quality" in all three bullets	*Ok*
Process Indicators	*2nd bullet point referring to WHO standards by 2030* What is the figure for 2010?		*Don't have – to be determined by WHO*
Implementation measures		***Add "or equivalent"*** after Euro 5 in the second bullet point	*Ok*
Enabling measures		***Add "capacity"*** after building institutional	*Noted*
Enabling measures		***Add "in"*** after building capacity in the second bullet	*Noted*
18.		**Add "motorised"** after "one billion"	*Noted*
Table 5 Process Indicators	"Halve GHG emissions" Per kilometre or absolute? Nb: the 2030 objective (for all new vehicles) suggests a per kilometre reduction, however the 2050 objective can be seen as that the entire global fleet (that by then is a lot bigger than in 2010) should emit only half the GHG gasses as the entire 2010 fleet		*The proposed modification is defined above after discussion with John De Luc of IEA*
Table 5 Process Indicators	*"Double public transport… from 2015 levels"* Why not 2010 as reference?		*Yes, 2010*
Table 5 Process Indicators	*"Ensure that all newly created, as well as most at risk currently existing, transport infrastructure and services are climate resilient"* At first sight this indicator does not seem to relate to		*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	GHG emissions?		
Implementation Measures	*"Facilitate freight and low carbon logistics by appropriate….. compared to 2015"* Also: 2010?		*Yes, 2010*
Mathias Merforth, GIZ			
16.	The role/share of transport for pollution is missing. In most countries transport is number 1 source for urban pollution, while in other countries where industry pollution has a higher share than transport, transport still significantly contributes to pollution in absolute figures.	Include further sources	*Covered in background paper*
Table 4 – process indicators	As transport cannot achieve this alone, the population exposure indicator might be a combined indicator of an over-arching air-quality target (do we know anything on that? Possible within the health targets?), where transport, household, industry and other emissions play a role.	Subject to discussion, we might need indicators that clearly relate to transport emissions. Modal Split figures and fleet composition might be good proxy indicators. Data from vehicle registration data bases could be used. Why not go for differentiated country-sub targets that relate to the fleet composition? More complex transport models might be necessary to simulate the explicit reduction of transport emissions (especially where there are significant industry/household emissions)	*Noted – but burden of disease studies do the attribution by risk factor already*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Table 4 - Implementation measures	EURO5/6 requirements only for new/imported 2nd-hand vehicles or for all?	Sharpen the requirements for new/imported 2nd –hand vehicles by latest 2020, for changes to take effect until 2030. In the same time adapt policies (e.g. vehicle taxes, environmental costs) that increase the costs for operating older vehicles or prohibit there use in (urban) areas.	*Noted*
Table 4 - Implementation measures	EURO 5/6 standards	Clarify that this is valid for both vehicles and fuels.	*Yes*
Table 4 – Implementation measures	Regarding the 90% target on ultra-low-sulphur fuels: The technology is available, is it unrealistic to aim for 100% by 2030?	Change to 100%	*It seems so*
18.	23% GHG or only CO2?		*Yes, from use of fuels*
19.	"cars"	Change to "vehicles" (include trucks)	*Done*
19.	Fuel economy standards only make sense, if the gains in energy efficiency are not eaten up by heavier carriages and or additional energy consumers.	Include the need to down-size vehicle sizes for energy-efficiency increases to take effect in real term fuel consumption reductions.	*Agree*
Table 5 – process indicators	"Halve GHG emissions from the global vehicle fleet" – it sounds like in absolute terms, but guess you mean per vehicle fuel consumption. If only the emissions of new vehicles by 2030 are halved we will not achieve the overall reduction target. Even if we halve today	Absolute process/further indicators could rather be: - Reduce the total amount of fossil fuels consumed by the transport sector by x%. - reduce vehicle kilometres of	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	s energy consumption of all vehicles, the growth in numbers of vehicles by 2030 would eat up these gains. Thus making it difficult achieve absolute reductions of transport-ghg.	private car/freight traffic by x% - This will partially facilitated by increasing the share of renewable (non-food-conflict) transport fuels (switch to electricity, partially to gas/biogas, and partially to modern biofuels) – thus also necessary to Increase the share of renewables in total energy production (interlinkage with energy/se4all targets) Emphasize that running towards the urban access target (increasing the share of put/walking/cycling) reduces the need for individual motorised transport and thus contributes to the ghg reduction target. --> proxy-indicator modal split Emphasize that transport must be well integrated into national energy strategies. (Where wind, sun and water energy is largely available, switch public transport to electric propulsion and increase renewables share in total energy mix) --> proxy-indicator: share of renewables in transport fuels	

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Table 5 – process indicators	A very easy to communicate lead indicator to cover all transport ghg emissions, (including national transport and logistics) is: *transport sector fossil fuel consumption/unit GDP.* SE4All uses MegaJoules per $ GDP (PPP) as lead indicator for energy efficiency.	Lead indicator: Fossil fuel consumption (transport sector) / unit GDP	*Included in process indicators*
Table 5 – process indicators	"Double public transport ridership…"	Change to "Double/increase the share of put/walking/cycling compared to private car)"	*Noted*
Table 5 – implementation measures	Regarding fuel economy standards, does it mean a real term reduction of fuel consumption per vehicle km of 50% between 2020/2030?		means • GHG emissions from the global vehicle fleet, in 2030 for all new vehicles compared to 2010 and by 2050 for the complete global fleet compared to 2010 (desired achievement both sub-indicators: 50%)
Table 5 – implementation measures	Phase out fossil fuel subsidies stands for a minimum requirement of stopping wrong incentives. Increasing fossil fuel taxes are an important step towards internalisation of external costs and towards the principle of "transport finances transport"	Stress this as a key enabler for achieving climate change targets and reflected energy consumption in the transport sector. We'd suggest even to set some minimum requirements for taxation: such as a fuel tax of at least 10ct per litre Diesel/Gasoline for all countries, plus higher requirements for mid/high-income countries (what would allow countries to maintain rural roads.)	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Table 5 – implementation measures	Social costs of travel	Needs to be defined – clear only to specialists.	*Noted*
Table 5 – implementation measures	The vision on low carbon logistics and low carbon supply chains shall be elaborated yet. Alternative of reducing empty miles by 50% - would that realistically be measurable?		*Yes*
Table 5 – implementation measures	"well-functioning, integrated and affordable public transport system"	Needs to be defined	*Term to be adjusted*
Table 5 – Enabling measures	All cities and countries comprehensively monitor travel activity. Very important!	Add freight movement.	*Noted*
Philip Turner, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)			
GHG emissions – implementation measures – bullet 5		All cities of over 1M people have well-functioning, integrated and affordable public transport systems, all with walkable access and extensive networks of non-motorised transport trails and paths.	*Noted*
Enabling measures – bullet 2		Develop national and local transport programs for sustainable transport systems, build related institutional capacity, and foster sound transport pricing and demand management coordinated with land use are adopted by 30 countries by 2020 and by 90 countries by 2030.	*Noted*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
5.1 Target Differentiation (p. 21)			
Priyanthi Fernando, Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka, member of IFRTD Board, and formerly the Executive Secretary of the IFRTD network			
	Disaggregation is a clear element of the HLP recommendations. One important reason for proposing disaggregation is so that statistics can reflect the equity objectives. This needs to be reflected here too.		*Note comments on differentiation above. Suggest to add language that differentiation can be in principle both geographically and by income status. However not easy to implement in all cases.*
Heather Allen, TRL			
Differentiation of the global targets	Should add that the SDGs should apply to ALL but the targets can be differentiated		*Agree – but see response to M Merforth*
Philip Turner, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)			
		We agree on the need to differentiate the targets.	*tks*
5.2 Measurement and Verification (p.22 – 27)			
Priyanthi Fernando, Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka, member of IFRTD Board, and formerly the Executive Secretary of the IFRTD network			
	From what is presented here, and from my knowledge of the transport sector, I would say that the methods of verification and measurement are available for all the proposed changes I have made – it will only be harder to do. And stretch the will of the transport bureaucrats and policy makers.		*Agree*
Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute			

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
23.		***Add affordability after urban and rural access in the first sentence, so it reads*** "Urban and rural access and affordability"	*Noted*
23.		***After "Similar surveys are carried out in studies of rural transport. Improved, standardised and more regular surveys funded by proposed national transport funding programs should "add the following phrase,*** "collect information on transportation affordability (the costs to households of basic access, and the portion of household budgets devoted to transport)"	*Noted but refer above comments/ responses on measurement*
24-25.		***Add the following text as a new paragraph,*** New modeling tools are needed to better predict how specific policies and planning decisions will affect overall accident and health risk (per capita traffic casualties, particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists), and the portion of residents that achieve physical activity targets (22 daily minutes of moderate physical activity).	*Noted. Depends on length constraints*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
Rob de Jong, UNEP			
26.	PCFV is keeping detailed stock of fuel and vehicles standards and policies as a proxy for reduced emissions and urban air quality.		*Noted.*
27.	GFEI is the only global initiative that measures the global fuel economy trend on an annual basis.		*Noted.*
Dieter Schwela, Stockholm Environment institute at the University of York			
22-27	Traffic congestion not considered, see above	Reduction of costs of traffic congestion needed	*Noted, but inherent in our approach to transport sector*
Rob McInerney, iRAP			
Data on crashes and road infrastructure safety and vehicle safety	IRTAD, iRAP and Global NCAP currently provide international standard benchmarks for the measurement and reporting of crash data, road infrastructure safety and vehicle safety respectively.		*Noted*
John Dulac, IEA			
Reference to IEA WEO is misleading	Data should be refereed to IEA World Energy Statistics, and projections to 2050 to Energy Technology Perspectives. World Energy *Outlook* (WEO) is the publication with projections to 2035 with specific in-depth foci.		*Ok.*
Liz Jones & Lily Ryan-Collins-DFID			
23.	***as previously stated need to think laterally about how access can be measured (e.g. use GIS, satellite imagery, mobile phone locations).***		*Note –see responses above on this subject. We understand the difference between desirable and practical but feel there is*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	Not realistic to suggest incorporation of many questions in already overloaded HH surveys. Look at how difficult it has been to even get RAI measured.		*scope to go somewhere towards desirable*
24.	Road safety – use of WHO data is good.		
Heather Allen, TRL			
		Would add generally something on data collection and standardised ways of doing this – it does not seem to be mentioned anywhere	*Agree*
Marcial Bustinduy & Matthew Jordan-Tank, EBRD			
	Further detail would be useful, including a clear calculation of the baseline figures nowadays. Otherwise it doesn't seem credible that the measurement methodologies are readily available.	In general, when providing indicators (e.g. p travel time no more than 90 minutes) we should be able to point the 2013 situation.	*Not possible at this stage*
6. Mobilising resources for implementation (P.28 – 37)			
Priyanthi Fernando, Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka, member of IFRTD Board, and formerly the Executive Secretary of the IFRTD network			
	Can't get my head round this at the moment so just a brief suggestion.	What we need is not that much more resources, but **rethinking** how transport is delivered, and to whom. Transport investments in middle and low-income countries (MIC and LIC) tend to be around 1.5% to 2.5% in MICs and about 2.8% in LICs (OECD countries average about 1%). A majority of this investment is on road infrastructure, though some	*Both are needed and that is what is explained in text.*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		countries are beginning also to invest in railways....so comparatively significant, the question is to examine who benefits from these investments and what is their environmental impact – and rethink how d to ensure that sustainability is at the core of the transport investment and that the investment goes towards ensuring that no one is left behind.	
Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute			
		As a Summary add a new Section 7, with a summary and table of goals, performance targets and data needs	*Disagree, see earlier response to proposed summary table*
Rob de Jong, UNEP			
	I think this section needs rethinking. I have the following comments on it: It may give the impression that we need more funds and that more funds will resolve the issues. More funds for the old way of business will only make matters worse. First and foremost we need to shift the current funding for transport into another direction – through better urban design and from individual car use to NMT facilities and mass transit. So that when we build road infrastructure we systematically add walking and cycling facilities, so that we use the USD 400 billion that are spend on fuel subsidies for, for example, BRT systems, so that we introduce budget neutral policies that increase		*As indicated to Priyanthi both new money and redirect existing funding is required – will go through text to check on balance between the two arguments*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
	taxes on dirty inefficient vehicles and give a rebate for cleaner and more efficient vehicles, etc.		
	First and foremost, funding needs to be made available for organisations that are supporting cities and countries implement the 5 targets proposed. International organisations like ITDP and local bicycle promotion NGOs in East Africa… that is more important than SLOCAT or UNEP. So that programs that are currently working well in addressing the five targets are supported to do this. Embarq on BRT, GFEI on fuel economy, etc.		*Noted.*
	100 million seems to be random, number. 100 million is way too little to achieve the implementation of the targets, and it is way too much for a project preparation facility.		*The Project Preparatory Facility number was discussed with MDB who would be important user of the facility. Note this is for 3 years only.*
Alan Ross, DEE Limited			
Para 30 , line 4	It might be worth mentioning as a foot note that the Multilateral development banks also now meet twice a year to develop and coordinate a joint approach to road safety in LMICS and to mobilize resources both within their own respective organizations and externally to address global road safety	…….banks (MDBs) *. According to Secretary …… **Possible Footnote *** 8 MDBs are meeting regularly to develop and coordinate a joint approach to road safety in LMICs and to mobilize recourses internally and externally to help LMICs address this growing problem	*Too much detail.*
Rob McInerney, iRAP			
Before 28.	Scene setting	Safe and Sustainable Transport will provide significant long-term	*Can be considered*

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
		benefits and savings to every nation worldwide. The recognition of this potential and the appropriate allocation of resources at a central government and aid/development level will unlock the full potential of sustainable development.	
Between 34/35	Social Impact Bonds	The use of innovative finance mechanisms such as Social Impact Bonds and Pay for Success models should be fully investigated for all goals and targets. For high-return capital intensive programs that deliver long term benefits like road and transport infrastructure the Social Impact Bond and Pay for Success framework is well suited to delivery safety (e.g. minimum 4-star safety) and environmental outcomes (e.g. reduced urban congestion)[1].	*Agreed*
37	Extra bit on safety	Agency study…..and an estimated US$10,000 billion plus saving in road crash costs between 2010 and 2030.	*Noted – but need a reference*
John Dulac, IEA			
37.	No source for cost savings of $50 trillion by 2050	Quote IEA Global Land Transport Infrastructure Requirements information paper (Dulac, 2013)	*Agreed*
Mathias Merforth, GIZ			

Paragraphs	Comments	Suggestions	Response
35.	Capacity-Building is crucial! Why not integrate it as enabling measure to the access targets?	Integrated Capacity-Building as enabling measure to the access targets.	
Marcial Bustinduy & Matthew Jordan-Tank, EBRD			
32.	A project preparation facility (100 mln$) is suggested. Who is supposed to fund this?		*Slocat to consider*
34.	"co-financing for cities"	"co-financing for clients"	*ditto*
35.	The proposal to training 1 million people seems overly ambitious and therefore perhaps not credible. The type of training should be specified. Should this be the responsibility of the MDBs as seems to be implied? We're concerned that we will be unable to reach so many people Furthermore, we are unable to make part of our lending resources for policy dialogue. Instead, we try to raise funds from donors for this purpose	Write something like "scale up capacity building related activities up to a total of XXX"	*ditto*
Philip Turner, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)Turner, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)			
28		While it is clear that large-scale sustainable transport projects are costly, the cost of improving urban mobility is actually significantly lower than the direct cost of congestion. So it becomes clear that investing in sustainable transport represents good value for money when you look at the cost of inaction – the point could usefully be made.	*Noted*

APPENDIX I:

Name of Reviewer: Saul Billingsley / Etienne Krug / Rob McInerney / Margie Peden / Tami Toroyan / Alan Ross

Organization: FIA Foundation / WHO / iRAP / Alan Ross

The following wording for Section 3 and 4 is recommended based on consultation and agreement of the reviewers listed above.

{SECTION 3 RECOMMENDED TEXTS}

GOAL X: Provide Safe and Sustainable Transport

Target: By 2030, halve the burden of global road traffic crashes from the 2010 baseline:

- **Fatalities: By 2030, reduce the number of people killed on the world's roads to less than 620,000 per year from the 2010 baseline of 1.24 million per year**[2]
- **Serious Injuries: By 2030, reduce the number of people seriously injured on the world's roads to less than 6,200,000 per year from the 2010 baseline of 12.4 million per year**[3]
- **Economic Impact: By 2030, reduce the global economic impact of road crashes to less than 1.5% of GDP per year from the current 3% of GDP per year**[3]

{SECTION 4 RECOMMENDED TEXTS}

4.2 Road Safety

14. Globally, the World Health Organisation (WHO) estimates that 1.24 million people died on roads in 2010[2]. Up to 50 million people are injured each year, with permanent disability a frequent outcome. Road traffic crashes are estimated to be the ninth leading cause of death globally and are forecast to rise to become the seventh leading cause of death by 2030[4]. Road traffic crashes inflict a similar burden of mortality to other communicable diseases, such as

tuberculosis[5]. Road traffic crashes are also a leading cause of non-fatal injury and disability and premature death predominately impacting the young[2]. In some countries, 75% of hospital capacity for treating head trauma is taken up by road crash victims[6].

15. Road crashes are estimated to cost more than US$1,800 billion or 3% of GDP globally with the economic losses in low- and middle-income countries equivalent to 5% of GDP or US$1,000 billion per year[3]. Road crash costs in these countries often exceed the total development aid received, whilst also diverting valuable health and social support resources from other development priorities. In low- and middle-income countries in particular, the death or serious injury of a family member can lead to direct financial hardship for the family and exclusion from economic, social and education opportunities that counter poverty reduction efforts.

16. The UN Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon, highlighted the need for global action on an unprecedented scale when recommending the need to "reduce the burden of …road accidents" in his post 2015 UN General Assembly report[7] "A life of dignity for all". The United Nation's launched the Decade of Action for Road Safety (2011-2020) supported by the Global Plan[8] promoting proven cost effective solutions for making roads safer through: (i) road safety management; (ii) safer roads and mobility; (iii) safer vehicles; (iv) safer road users; and (v) improved post-crash response and hospital care.

17. Successful achievement of the SDG target for road safety will save an estimated 100,000,000 fatalities and serious injuries and more than US$10,000 billion in economic costs between 2010 and 2030[3]. Secure funding at the required scale is needed to implement the proven road safety actions on a sustained basis to 2030. Building on the 'Decade of Action for Road Safety' a results framework for road safety is provided in Table 3.

[1] This report was prepared by Phil Sayeg, Paul Starkey and Cornie Huizenga

[2] WHO (2013) "Global Status Report on Road Safety 2013 – Supporting a Decade of Action," page 4.

[3] iRAP (2013) "The business case for investment in road safety" London, UK

[4] http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/projections/en/index.html & http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/en/ accessed 19/12/2013

[5] Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (2013), "The Global Burden of Disease: generating evidence, guiding policy." Seattle, WA, USA, page 12.

[6] RAC Foundation (2011) "Saving Lives, Saving Money: The costs and benefits of achieving safe roads" London, UK

[7] United Nations (2013) "A life of dignity for all: accelerating progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and advancing the United Nations development agenda beyond 2015" A/68/202

[8] WHO (2011) "Global Plan for the Decade of Action of Road Safety" Geneva, Switzerland

Table 3: Draft Results Framework – Road Safety

Target: By 2030, halve the burden of global road traffic crashes from the 2010 baseline:

- **Fatalities: By 2030, reduce the number of people killed on the world's roads to less than 620,000 per year from the 2010 baseline of 1.24 million per year[2]**
- **Serious Injuries: By 2030, reduce the number of people seriously injured on the world's roads to less than 6,200,000 per year from the 2010 baseline of 12.4 million per year[3]**
- **Economic Impact: By 2030, reduce the global economic impact of road crashes to less than 1.5% of GDP per year from the current 3% of GDP per year[3]**

Process Indicators (2030 compared to baseline):

- Reduce road traffic fatality rates by 2030 to:
  - < 4 per 100,000 population in high-income countries (baseline of 8.7 in 2010)
  - < 7 per 100,000 population in middle-income countries (baseline of 20.1 in 2010)
  - < 12 per 100,000 population in low-income countries (baseline of 18.3 in 2010)
- Reduce road traffic serious injury rates by 2030 to:
  - < 40 per 100,000 population in high-income countries (baseline of 87 in 2010)
  - < 70 per 100,000 population in middle-income countries (baseline of 201 in 2010)
  - < 120 per 100,000 population in low-income countries (baseline of 183 in 2010)
- Reduce the economic cost of crashes by 2030 to:
  - < 1% of GDP per year in high-income countries (baseline of 2% in 2010)
  - < 2.5% of GDP per year in middle-income countries (baseline of 5% in 2010)
  - < 2.5% of GDP per year in low-income countries (baseline of 5% in 2010)

Implementation measures:

- Increase the safety of road infrastructure around the world by eliminating 1 and 2 star rated roads* by 2030 for all road users
- Multi-lateral development bank funded projects to be built to minimum 3-star safety levels for all road users, with highway authorities worldwide encouraged to adopt the same minimum safety standards
- Increase the proportion of vehicles manufactured each year that meet the standards set by the United Nations to 100% from the current figure of approximately two-thirds
- Increase the proportion of countries with comprehensive legislation on 5 key risk factors (speed, drink-driving, the use of motorcycle helmets, seat-belts and child restraints) to 80% by 2030
- Increase global front and rear seat-belt wearing rates to over 80% in all countries by 2030 (baseline of 65%)

- Increase global motorcycle rider and passenger helmet wearing rates to over 80% in all countries by 2030 (baseline of 57%)

(*) International Road Assessment Programme rating of unsafe roads

Enabling measures:

- Develop institutional capacity and mechanisms to support and finance the establishment of lead agencies and national road safety strategies including the implementation of the associated action plans
- Benchmark the safety of infrastructure and invest >0.1% of GDP per year in targeted road infrastructure improvements that maximise the return on investment through deaths and serious injuries saved
- Create the consumer and industry demand for safer vehicles through the promotion and dissemination of national and/or regional New Car Assessment Programme (NCAP) star ratings for vehicles or equivalent
- Set best practice road safety legislation and provide sufficient resources for effective enforcement
- Increase responsiveness to post-crash emergencies and improve the ability of health and other systems to provide appropriate emergency treatment and longer term rehabilitation for victims
- Establish effective crash data systems and analyses along with monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to inform policy and measure progress.

APPENDIX II: Additional Text & Comments from Rob McInerney

2. Advocating the goal for transport to secure The Future We Want (4-7)

Safe and Sustainable Transport has been grossly neglected as a sustainable development issue because the solutions are in one area and the sectors that benefit are in another. While the costs and benefits are in the health and community sector for example, the solutions are in the provision of safe, sustainable and affordable transport options.

Transport facilitates sustainable development through the provision of access to markets, services, health, education and economic opportunities. This is equally the case for the provision of basic safe access for remote villages and communities and the transport disadvantaged areas in the world's fast growing urban areas.

Reduced road fatalities and serious injuries that lift the burden from health systems, social support services, rehabilitation programs, emergency response and legal systems will free up those resources for other health based priorities.

The impact of air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions casts a large shadow over the ability of the world to ensure sustainable development. The forward projections for increased people and freight movement require a transport revolution to shape the future we want.

In summary:

- The poverty reduction impacts of poor access have safe and sustainable transport solutions.

- The education outcomes facilitated through safe access to schools have safe and sustainable transport solutions.
- The health and financial impacts of road traffic crashes have safe and sustainable transport solutions.
- Transport infrastructure projects generate large scale, nation-wide job opportunities.
- Access to food, water and energy needs is often facilitated through transport corridors.
- Addressing the environment impacts of the movement of people and freight has safe and sustainable transport solutions.

A Safe and Sustainable Transport Goal will ensure that the SDG focus will be enabled in the sectors that have the solutions and therefore the knowledge and resources to scale up appropriately. The other sectors will benefit from the burden of unsafe and unsustainable transport being removed as one of their implementation challenges.