

The interventions of the previous speakers have exposed the need for a binding principle at local level that can bring logic between vision, goals, objectives and measures across policy fields such as transport, health and environment. The EU has strongly promoted such a principle: the sustainable urban mobility planning approach, or SUMP.

The SUMP provides a tool to allocate tasks and resources to implement urban mobility policies in a coherent way, looking at horizontal integration (across policy sectors), modal shift (as in planning for people). The SUMP process is increasingly improving its implementation detail and accountability (through the use of indicators, such as the WBCSD Mobility 2.0 indicators that will be rolled out across Europe and practices of performance based planning).

SUMP has been a success in those cities who have lived up to its principles. Even smaller cities and towns take fact based measures embedded in a mobility vision that contribute to better air quality, road safety, and further walking and cycling.

SUMPs benefit from the involvement of governance levels above the city: the region, the country and international dialogue on this issue. The EU is currently running two urban partnerships in the framework of the Urban Agenda deployment that relate to this topic: the Partnership on Urban Mobility and the AQ partnership. National authorities are crucial for providing guidelines and funding, and for their competence for specific transport networks (rail, road etc.).

There is a lot to say about the role of technology in urban mobility. The achievements of technology are ever more amazing, specifically in the support of individual travelers with hyper-personal travel information. But local authorities are interested in reconciling the personal and individual travel needs with the optimization of the urban mobility system, as a multi-modal, space- and resource restrained complex.

It is therefore very important that cities strategically engage in new technologies, in the sense that they decided in a pro-active way what to do and what not to do. The city of Barcelona has established a 'simple' scheme to involve local politicians in the discussion whether to support or not smart city technologies. Three areas need to be covered: legacy (does the technology fit our current technological systems, can it build further on what we have), policy (does the technology help us to achieve our policy goals) and business model (are the financial resources requested from the city proportional to what the city gets in return in view of the delivery of policy goals).

An important factor in the technological discussion is that we need to bring active travel modes within the digital environment. We have to pull them into 'the matrix' to be sure they are taken into account as problem-solver. EU projects such as TRACE and FLOW are working on this issue.

Cities function as living labs for new technologies. These living labs should not only function as hardware-application sites, but also creative environments where new policy ideas can root. An interesting example is the bike-solutions bikathons in Amsterdam, where urban problems are brought forward in discussions, and the solutions are anyway related to bicycles!

With regards to barriers, we think that one of the bigger problems will be to capture locally the added value that cities and local solutions bring to T-H-E problems. A good example of this problem is health care, where in most European countries local actions are of benefit to health insurers that work at national or international level.

As a final statement, I would like to highlight tools and solutions that could be of inspiration for the THE PEP for future activities:

- First, there is SUMP, in all its variety, and with all its tools attached.
- Multi-level-governance on T-H-E issues, and the issue of how we continue to finance solutions across governance levels.
- Digital tools for active travel modes (modeling, personal travel apps)