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The mandate

- **11th Session of the Bureau:** monitoring is an important role of SC
- **Request by Member States for a slim reporting mechanism:**
  - quick and easy-to-understand overview of activities
  - easy sharing and comparison of information
  - regional overview
  - sustainable and repeated once per year (i.e. consistent)
  - access the owners of information to learn more, if desired
  - towards a full reporting to the 4HLM in 2014
- **SC8 approved questionnaire with minor changes**
- **Survey of all Member States with focal points in fall 2011**
- **SC9 adopted report and future use of questionnaire**
- **2nd round of reporting in September 2012**
The questionnaire: format/output

- Sent to all THE PEP focal points to complete in collaboration (= 1 reply per country)
- Standardized replies
- Electronic format, distribution and collection
- Semi-automated processing of replies (maps, graphs, tables)
- Same questionnaire once per year up to 4HLM

The results

- 14 respondent countries (out of 46)
The results

- General info on the process of reporting
- Implementation of Amsterdam Goals
  - Main developments in THE by goal
  - Main challenges
- THE PEP implementation mechanisms
- Policy, regulatory and operational frameworks that support THE PEP
- Future of THE PEP
  - Key recommendations

Results

- Amsterdam Goal 1
- Amsterdam Goal 2
- Amsterdam Goal 3
- Amsterdam Goal 4
- THE PEP Implementation mechanisms
  - NTHEAP
  - Relay race
  - Partnership
Challenges of THE PEP

- not legally binding
- entirely voluntary basis
- No direct financial support
- Too little pressure on Member States to establish coordinating bodies at national level
- Lack of indicators for monitoring and reporting
- Support to move from the international level to national and local implementation is not strong enough in THE PEP.
- Few synergies with the transport sector

Recommendations for THE PEP

- Strengthen the implementation mechanisms and existing tools of THE PEP, in particular NTHEAPs
- Support Member States in raising funds
- Stimulate more awareness by requesting (re-)appointment of focal points and creation of national coordinating bodies
- Exchange of good practices, including translations
- Define indicators across the three sectors for better monitoring
- Increase visibility at international events
- Target activities more towards specific (groups of) countries
Encountered challenges in completing the questionnaire

- Harmonization of format of replies
  - More standardization of replies
- Aggregation/summary of information in replies
  - See above
- (joint) replies from all focal points
  - New requests to Member States for appointment of focal points
- Verification
  - Request and verify references for all replies
- Low response rate

And for you?

10th session of the Steering Committee of THE PEP

Conclusions

- Provided a good basis for regular monitoring of THE PEP implementation
- Replies reflect mainly the views and experiences of countries, which have been more actively engaged in THE PEP implementation
- Need to develop a better understanding of the experiences of non-respondent countries
  - (re)-establishing national focal points
  - investigating the challenges, limitations and obstacles

10th session of the Steering Committee of THE PEP
Proposed next steps

- Re-establishing focal points
- Annual sending of standardized questionnaire
- Annual updates of web reports and web map in summer 2013, leading up to full report for 4HLM in 2014