

Item 6 of the provisional agenda

**Preparation of the Fourth High Level Meeting (4HLM)**

**Preparation of the Fourth High level Meeting (4HLM)**

**Proposals and comments on the draft Paris Declaration**

1. As part of the preparatory work toward the Fourth High-level Meeting on Transport, Health and Environment (14-16 April 2014, Paris), the secretariat requested inputs from Member States as a basis for discussion on the Outcome Document (draft Paris Declaration) on its eleventh session (ECE/AC.21/SC/2013/3-EUDCE1206040/1.9/SC11/3).
2. Two Governments (The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Azerbaijan) indicated they had no comments on the draft Paris Declaration.
3. **Germany, France and the United States of America** submitted comments as below.
4. Delegations may wish to take the floor during the meeting under agenda item 6 to indicate these and any additional proposed modifications to the draft Paris Declaration.
5. Based on the interventions and discussion, a revised version of the draft Paris Declaration will be submitted to THE PEP Extended Bureau at its twenty-second meeting, scheduled to take place from 30-31 January 2014 in Zürich (Switzerland).
6. The Steering Committee is invited to entrust THE PEP Extended Bureau with the finalization of the draft Paris Declaration, to be adopted by the High-level Meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

**COMMENTS FROM FRANCE**

7. The draft declaration seems to take into account all items discussed during the past meeting. It contains all essential idea concerning the full process THE PEP. However, it seems by far too long in this state, which may be due repetitions. In any case, from our point of view, this document is not "political" enough in its current form to encourage our ministers to sign.

**Length and organization of the Declaration:**

8. Regarding the size of the draft Paris Declaration, relative to the Amsterdam Declaration of 2009: the Amsterdam Declaration is 5 pages, whereas the draft Paris Declaration is 10 pages. For information, the Parma Declaration is only 2 pages, with an appendix "Commitments to act" of 6 pages.
9. Note that the Annex of the draft Paris Declaration details the priority goals. Therefore it does not seem necessary to set out in full in the statement. An annex "commitments to act," integrating the 5 priority goals, could be a solution.

10. Furthermore, the 16 paragraphs (in the Preamble) are too long and some contain implicitly the actions on which the Ministers can commit. They should probably be rewritten and more lightweight, translated in actions. The section, "Taking stock" should be put into an appendix (we do not record a statement here), a general paragraph of a few lines in the statement should be sufficient.

Content of the declaration:

11. So the Declaration really begins in Part III ("Defining THE PEP Vision"), but the terms used are not pro-active enough: (i.e., "Agree to continue....", "Confirm the priority goals... ", etc.). It would be stronger to use verbs like: we "decide"...we "commit", "we encourage..."

12. Concerning the priority goals: A solution could be to highlight only new priority goal 5 (with details on priority goals 1 to 4 given in appendix).

Propositions:

13. In general, France proposes to rewrite the declaration by taking synthetically the principle of each objective we would like to include in it, in order for ministers to sign a very general and short commitment. For example:

"We are committed to act on the key transport, health and environment challenges of our time in developing more healthy and sustainable transport:

- By taking into account the health and environmental risks from the design of transport infrastructure ...
- By promoting the development of urban designs encouraging active mobility..."
- By supporting research for non-polluting transport ...
- By coordinating our efforts...

14. To conclude, we think that it is not a good idea to retain the same form as the Amsterdam declaration. As we have more text, we need to find an innovative format. We are in favor of working in a small working group on this new format for the Declaration, one that is lighter and proactive. This should be done as quickly as possible, supported by the current draft, translating and readapting some parts in the annex.

**COMMENTS FROM GERMANY**

15. The footnote 3 on page 2 is important. The whole declaration should be checked, if (in each case) transport or mobility or both is meant.

16. On page 3, para. 12 and page 5, priority goal 3 Electric mobility (as an example of technical development) is mentioned at the same time and equal valued than eco driving. But eco-driving is not as impressive and important as electric mobility (and some other technical developments). This may be due to the THE PEP eco-driving initiative (page 4, para. 19, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet). If so, it should be made clearer in the messages.

17. Generally, it must be pointed out in a prominent place that all recommendations etc. are on a voluntary basis, that is, that there are no commitments entered into by the Member States (MS).

18. Section I, para 2(a) and (b) are quoted from the UN document. This is unnecessary and unusual, and is not made in the other references.

19. Section I. para 14: Why do we not also mention the national level?

20. Section III, para 24: Here is not obvious why the objectives are repeated. If it refers to new aspects, which will be implemented from 2014 to 2019, this point would have to be voluntary and adapted to the situation in the MS.
21. Section III, para 25: The square brackets with respect to extreme weather events should be deleted because there are many influences here.
22. Section IV: In the section "Fulfilling The Vision PEP", the addressee is missing, i.e. it is not clear who is addressed e.g. WHO, other international organizations, MS, civil society.
23. Section IV, para 27: The introduction of "new implementation mechanisms" must not be connected with the collection of new data, monitoring or reporting requirements. Again, the question arises as to who is responsible for the introduction.
24. Section IV, para 28: The mention of "youth organizations" makes no sense, since this is part of the civil society organizations and other very relevant organizations would then also be listed.
25. Section VI, Resources: Here there is needed a clarification of who is responsible for funding. No new or additional obligations for the MS should be implied. Furthermore, the meaning of the square brackets is unclear.
26. Section III, para 24: As priority Goals 1-4 are from the previous (Amsterdam Declaration), it is advisable that only the bold subject headings remain and not the full text of each goal, as the text is long and the title of the goals are self-explanatory.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

27. The United States looks forward to the Fourth High-Level Meeting (4HLM) on Transport, Health and the Environment and to discussions related to the theme of "City in Motion – People First!" In our capacity as a member of THE PEP Bureau (representing the environment sector), the United States has contributed over the years ideas, guidance and data to inform the implementation and strategic direction of THE PEP. The United States supports those elements of the proposed Paris Declaration for adoption at the 4HLM that underscore the organization's mandate as a forum for regional and national experts and policymakers on the intersection among transport and mobility, health and the environment – e.g., paragraph 17's reaffirmation of THE PEP as a "unique tripartite platform and model for intersectoral policy coordination and international cooperation and exchange of good practice assisting Governments and other stakeholders to develop and implement sustainable transport policies with a focus on environment and health effects."

28. In addition, the United States continues to support the existing three implementation mechanisms of THE PEP – NTHEAPS, THE PEP relay race, and THE PEP partnerships. The proposed two new implementation mechanisms – THE PEP knowledge network and THE PEP policy outreach – merit further exploration and discussion at the upcoming Extended Bureau meetings in Geneva and Zurich. We would like to better understand how the PEP policy outreach tool might "link" THE PEP activities with those of other United Nations activities. Moreover, given the continued constrained budget environments for many UNECE member states, we are interested in learning about anticipated funding sources for these two additional streams of work.

29. We do not, however, support exploration of a "Framework Convention on Transport, Health and Environment" as mentioned in paragraphs 16 and 32 of the draft Declaration. As THE PEP Secretariat indicated at the November 2012 meeting of the Bureau, instruments other than a "Framework Convention" are available to THE PEP such as seeking to include THE PEP principles in the work of existing multilateral environmental agreements. The United States supported this perspective at that meeting and continues to prefer a holistic approach.

30. In this time of resource constraints and elaboration of major multilateral forums and initiatives geared to the establishment of a post-2015 development agenda, it would be unproductive and duplicative to open yet another pathway for discussion of sustainable development. It is preferable for THE PEP to wait and see what emerges from the Post-2015 process and then determine how to proceed.

---