

My name is Ramon Cruz from the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy and also representing the Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport. I would like to take the floor to commend the Bureau on the job done so far. We are pleased with the inclusion of Mobility and Transport in the zero draft. Many member states and stakeholders have mentioned the importance to promote and include public transportation. However, as we enter new drafts, it is important that the New Urban Agenda place **STRONG** emphasis on three paradigm shifts that go beyond the “promotion” of sustainable transport:

**First Paradigm shift** is that development of transport systems should go hand in hand with land use planning and be based on **Equitable Transit Oriented Development**. This will result in livable, compact, safe cities with neighborhoods that are designed at a human scale prioritizing walking and cycling AND through expanded mass transit that create access to a mix of jobs and services FOR people of all ages and incomes - including people with special needs

**Second shift** is that **Accessibility** should be our main objective in planning and investment decisions around mobility. Urban development should prioritize accessibility for people rather than creating more space for cars. If currently, on average, walking, cycling, or public transport accounts for 70% of urban trips, WHY 70% of funds go towards car infrastructure that favors the privileged minority???

In this regard, the guiding question on how to **measure performance** is very important. At the Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport, we have many materials on the topic, but one proven approach is to measure the percentage of population or jobs near transit by income segment, as presented in SDG Target 11.2. Rio de Janeiro, for example, recently set an ambitious target of 90% by 2030.

**A third paradigm shift has to do with funding and financing.** Full cost recovery has been mentioned for infrastructure. This is not really viable in most instances, but instead adequate financing mechanisms must exist at the international and national levels to facilitate investment into those types of projects. While we recognize the need to “adequately fund services through contributions from users and beneficiaries” and we support getting rid of subsidies that favor fossil fuels, it is important to make the distinction between income levels. We should ensure that the services that are subsidized ensure access for the most vulnerable and improve health. It is often a lack of access to services and opportunities that causes economic and social inequality.

The **role of national governments** is also important, especially to guide investments in this area. National governments can provide guidelines, regulatory framework, technology standards and support capacity building at the local level. It can facilitate financial mechanisms and promote international and private sector investment to ensure that all cities move together and no one is left behind. Local

governments are best placed to lead implementation efforts while addressing local needs.

When it comes to urban services, we know many of the solutions, we have the knowledge and the experience, we EVEN have the technology, BUT many countries are in the WRONG policy path. We see Habitat III and the New Urban Agenda as the chance to change this policy direction. Thank You.