

Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Consultation Roadmap

Take the survey

Department of Climate Change, Energy, Environment and Water

Response received at:

August 6, 2024 at 9:06 PM GMT+10

Response ID:

sbm2fbd76f5fc4892ab1acfb

1 Confirm that you have read and understand this privacy notice.

Yes

2 Please indicate how and if you want your submission published.

Public

3 Published name

Parents for Climate

4 Confirm that you have read and understand this declaration.

Yes

5 First name

David

6 Last name

McEwen

7 Email

[REDACTED]

8 Phone

[REDACTED]

9 Who are you answering on behalf of?

Organisation

10 Organisation name

Parents for Climate

11 What best describes you or your organisation?

Not for profit

12 What sector do you represent?

Light road vehicles (cars, utes etc.)

Rail

Active transport

All transport

Public transport

Climate change/net zero

Energy

Infrastructure

Other: "NOTE: "What state or territory" needs to give ability to select "Australia" - we are a national organisation with representation in all states and territories. Similarly, we have representation in urban and regional areas."

13 What state or territory do you live in?

Australian Capital Territory

14 Postcode

3000

15 What area best describes where you live?

City

16 1. Do you support the proposed guiding principles?

Yes

17 1.1 Please add details to your response.

Please refer to our attached submission.

18 2. Do you support the use of the avoid-shift-improve framework as a tool to identify opportunities for abatement?

Yes

19 2.1 Please add details to your response.

Please refer to our attached submission.

20 3. Do you agree the development of a national policy framework for active and public transport will support emissions reduction?

Yes

21 3.1 Please add details to your response.

Please refer to our attached submission.

22 4. What should be included in a national policy framework for active and public transport and how should it be developed?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

23 5. What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to ensure the movement of people contributes to transport emissions reduction?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

24 6.1 What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to ensure that the movement of goods contributes to transport emissions reduction?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 25 6.2. How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities for emissions reduction in the movement of goods?
Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.
- 26 7. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for light road vehicles?
No
- 27 7.1 Please add details to your response.
Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.
- 28 8. The Australian Government is currently developing an Australian New Vehicle Efficiency Standard and has already begun to implement actions in the National Electric Vehicle Strategy.8.1 What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce light vehicle emissions?
Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.
- 29 8.2 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce light vehicle emissions?
Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.
- 30 9. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for heavy road vehicles?
Not answered
- 31 9.1 Please add details to your response
Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.
- 32 10. The proposed pathway for heavy road vehicles relies on a mix of battery electric, hydrogen fuel-cell and low carbon liquid fuels.Rank from 1 to 3, the order in which these should be prioritised for emissions

reduction.

1: Battery electric

10: Hydrogen fuel cell

11: Low carbon liquid fuels

33 10.1 Please add details to your response. Why did you rank them in that order?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

34 11. What role should low carbon liquid fuels play in the heavy vehicle decarbonisation?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

35 12. What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce heavy vehicle emissions?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

36 13. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for rail?

Not answered

37 13.1 Please add details to your response.

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

38 14. The proposed pathway for rail relies on a mix of battery electric, hydrogen fuel-cell and low carbon liquid fuels. Rank from 1 to 3, the order in which these should be prioritised for emissions reduction.

1: Battery electric

2: Hydrogen fuel cell

3: Low carbon liquid fuels

39 14.1 Please add details to your response. Why did you rank them in that order?

Electrification (with or without batteries) is typically the easiest path to rail

decarbonisation. Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

40 15. What role should low carbon liquid fuels play in rail decarbonisation?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

41 16. What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce rail emissions?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

42 16.1 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce rail emissions?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

43 17. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for maritime?

Not answered

44 17.1 Please add details to your response.

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

45 18. The Australian Government is engaging in consultation as part of the development of the Maritime Emissions Reduction National Action Plan and those consultations will also inform the final Roadmap and Action Plan. 18.1 What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce maritime emissions?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

46 18.2 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce maritime emissions?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 47 19. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for aviation?
Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission. We prefer a reduction in the need for aviation due to better/faster intercity rail connections.
- 48 19.1 Please add details to your response.
Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.
- 49 20. The Australian Government has already engaged in consultation on aviation decarbonisation through the development of the Aviation White Paper and those consultations will also inform final Roadmap and Action Plan.
Not answered
- 50 20.1 What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce aviation emissions?
Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.
- 51 21. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for transport infrastructure?
Not answered
- 52 21.1 Please add details to your response.
Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission. We believe more emphasis should be put on prioritising active and public transport infrastructure.
- 53 22. What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce transport infrastructure emissions and ensure that transport infrastructure is ready for and enables low-emission transport modes?
Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.
- 54 22.1 How would these actions address the identified challenges and

opportunities to reduce transport infrastructure emissions?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 55 23. What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to ensure the energy mix is ready to support transport emissions reduction?

We strongly support an "electrification first" approach to transport energy use. This is the most energy efficient and low emissions pathway. Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 56 24. How should the use of low carbon liquid fuels (LCLFs) be prioritised across different transport modes over time to achieve maximum abatement?

We believe the strategy has too much emphasis on LCLFs and that electrification should be prioritised.

- 57 25. What are the best ways for the Australian Government to work collaboratively with industry, business, governments and communities to implement the proposed pathways?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 58 25.1 What are good domestic or international examples of partnership and collaboration on transport and transport infrastructure emissions reduction that could inform the final Roadmap and Action Plan?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 59 25.2 What opportunities can Government leverage to show leadership in Australia and internationally?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 60 26. What measures and metrics should be used to evaluate the final Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Roadmap and Action Plan?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 61 26.1 What other data and evidence could governments use and how could this offer further insights on the pace, scale and location of transport emissions reduction pathways?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 62 27. Do you have any feedback on the proposed review process?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 63 28. Do you have any further feedback on the Consultation Roadmap and proposed pathways?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 64 28.1 Is there anything missing? Are the sections appropriately integrated? Is the Roadmap appropriately ambitious?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 65 29. Is there any further information or documentation that you wish to be considered with your submission?

Please refer to specific recommendations in our attached submission.

- 66 Would you like to upload a document?

Yes

- 67 Have you removed any identifying information from your submission?

Yes

- 68 Upload a submission

Parents for Climate - Transport Roadmap Submission Aug 24.pdf

- 69 Upload a submission

Not answered

70 Upload supporting file
Not answered

71 Upload supporting file
Not answered



**PARENTS FOR
CLIMATE**

Parents for Climate

**Submission to the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and the Arts
Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Consultation Roadmap**

6 August 2024

Parents for Climate

% Financial Fanatics

Suite 1010 - 189 Queen Street

Melbourne, VIC 3000

Email: info@ap4ca.org

Parents for Climate represents over 22,000 parents, grandparents and carers from across Australia. We are Australia's leading organisation for parents advocating for a safe climate. Our supporters are from across the political spectrum, across all Australian electorates, and from varied socio-economic positions. We seek non-partisan responses to climate change and its impacts.

We advocate for Australian governments and businesses to take urgent action to cut Australia's carbon emissions to net zero as quickly as possible. We encourage Australia to take a leadership role on the world stage, leading by example and calling for other nations to take the necessary action to protect our children's futures.

A [Lowy Institute poll](#) in 2023 found "there is a significant gap between how younger and older Australians respond to [the question of what Australia and other countries should do about climate change.] Those aged under 30 are far more likely to see global warming as a serious and pressing problem requiring immediate action (72%), compared to a bare majority (53%) of those aged 30 and older who say the same." Overall, 56% of Australians surveyed shared this view. Parents for Climate is here to amplify our children's valid and factually grounded concerns.

For more information, visit www.parentsforclimate.org

This submission was prepared by parent volunteer Dr Simon Campbell and has been approved by Nic Seton, Chief Executive Officer of Parents for Climate.

Introduction

We welcome the opportunity to comment on the government's Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Consultation Roadmap.

As parents who want a safe climate for our kids, we are increasingly concerned by the toll that worsening global heating is taking on our families. We have a duty of care to protect our children, and so are highly motivated to help find solutions that will keep them safe.

We are pleased to see the overarching **Avoid-Shift-Improve** approach taken in this Roadmap. **The order of those three guiding principles is very important to us**, because:

- A. **Avoiding** emissions is the quickest and highest-priority route to emissions reductions;
- B. **Shifting** transport modes is the second most important since it can also be very fast, plus it has many co-benefits, and;
- C. Although **Improving** technology is essential, it should not be the main/initial focus, since it has the potential to:
 - a. lead to delays when technology isn't developed in time, and
 - b. distract from working on more immediate and beneficial emissions reductions that can be gained from (1) and (2).

As a parent group, we want the best future for our kids. Given the nature and urgency of the climate crisis, this is best served by a rapid transition away from fossil fuels (see Recommendation 1 below). And the transition can also enable many significant benefits from systems changes in transport, for example reducing pollution, noise, road deaths and congestion.

There are also substantial opportunities to improve quality of life, for example increasing the amount of active transport and evolving our local streets to be people-friendly rather than car-friendly. In addition, in the current cost of living crisis, car ownership is a significant financial burden for families, which could be substantially reduced if we invest heavily in alternative transport options – active and mass transit. In terms of mass transit we need to make it convenient (short walks/rides to stations/stops), frequent, and accessible (infrastructure leading to the stops/stations).

In our submission below, via our 11 Recommendations, we focus on three guiding principles: (i) transition as *quickly* as possible, (ii) as *equitably* as possible, and (iii) *with as many co-benefits as possible*. To do this we must think outside the traditional box and focus investments to enable the transition we would like to have, which will make a healthy and bright future for our kids and the planet.

Submission

PART I: General Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Increase ambition in line with the science – Net zero by 2035

Although outside the scope of the discussion in this document, the government's Net Zero target necessarily guides any quantitative aims of the Roadmap. Since 2021, Parents for Climate has consistently called for the following emissions targets:

- **2030 emissions target of 75% below 2005 levels**, and;
- **Net zero by 2035.**

Based on the methodology established by the former Climate Change Authority, in Chapter 8 of its [Targets and Progress Review Final Report](#) issued February 2014, subsequently updated for a 1.5 degree target by the [Climate Targets Panel](#) in 2021, these targets were judged consistent with Australia's fair share contribution to the Paris Agreement's 1.5°C objective, given the notions of equity laid out in the Paris Agreement.

Only by having this science-aligned emissions-target basis can any of the Roadmaps be aligned properly with the Paris Agreement. This should be our aim, given that the **the cost of moving slowly is extremely high**, because of the compounding risks, for example:

- Increased frequency and severity of natural disasters
- Increased threats to national/global security
- Potential breakdown of economy

Moving quickly also means that **families will benefit sooner**, for example by providing:

- **Safe air for our kids:** Apart from GHG emissions, ICE vehicles including hybrids create vast amounts of dangerous pollution. The death toll alone from car pollution is greater than the road toll, causing tens of thousands of hospitalisations and asthma cases.¹
- **Cheaper vehicle running costs:** Given high inflation, increasing mortgage interest rates, and high fuel costs, families are really feeling the pinch financially. The much lower running costs² of BEVs will be available to families once the cost of EVs drops, which will come about sooner through the upcoming NVES, although we recommend the NVES should be strengthened (see Recommendation 8).
- **Partially alleviate climate anxiety:** Climate anxiety amongst parents and children is increasing³, and firm action by the government can help alleviate this.

Recommendation 2: Focus more on avoidance & mode shift

We are pleased to see the overarching approach of **Avoid-Shift-Improve** taken by the government in this Roadmap. However we believe that the **order** of those three guiding principles is very important, and in correct order as listed, because:

- A. **Avoiding** emissions is the quickest and highest-priority route to emissions reductions;
- B. **Shifting** transport modes is the second most important since it can also be very fast, plus it has many co-benefits, and;
- C. Although **Improving** technology is essential, it should not be the main/initial focus, since it has the potential to:
 - i. lead to delays when technology isn't developed in time, and
 - ii. distract from working on more immediate and beneficial emissions reductions that can be gained from (1) and (2).

In our view the current version of the Roadmap over-emphasises the *improving technology* facet. We want to see **more emphasis on the Avoiding and Shifting approaches**, and for policy to be guided first and foremost by these.

As mentioned above, avoiding trips is the most rapid way to zero out some emissions. It also reduces the need for building and maintaining vehicles and infrastructure.

Mode shifting is the next most efficient way of reducing emissions. Given that around 80% of transport emissions are road-based, a large opportunity exists in shifting from cars and trucks to mass transport (eg. bus, rail) or active transport (eg. walking, cycling). The co-benefits of mode shifts for personal trips are well known – increased health, reduced pollution, reduced road deaths, reduced noise, reduced congestion, etc. Many of these benefits also apply to shifting road transport of goods to rail (preferably electric rail). For families, which we represent, the benefits of mode shifting are of very high value, increasing livability into the future. For this reason **we strongly suggest that the Transport Roadmap prioritises building infrastructure to allow mode shift to dominate over simply replacing current road transport with electric vehicles**, which carry many of the same disadvantages as ICE vehicles. **We would love to see very large investments in cycling, walking, and public transport solutions.** Active transport can virtually

¹<https://www.unimelb.edu.au/newsroom/news/2023/february/vehicle-emissions-may-cause-over-11,000-deaths-a-year-research-shows>

²<https://www.racv.com.au/royalauto/transport/electric-vehicles/are-evs-cheaper-to-run.html>

³[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/article/PIIS2542-5196\(21\)00278-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/article/PIIS2542-5196(21)00278-3/fulltext)

be considered under avoidance, since the emissions go practically to zero. Mass transit allows the changing/conversion of only a few vehicles to electricity to have an outsized effect.

In summary, improving technology is of course necessary for the emissions reductions task, but it should be secondary to avoidance and modal shift.

Recommendation 3: Build social licence

A focus on building social licence is missing from the Roadmap. This focus is important since it lays the foundation and acceptance for the fast action/change that is needed. Social licence is built through increasing public awareness of the climate situation and its solutions, so for example we would like to see:

1. National public information campaigns (with a particular focus on **solutions**)
2. Consultation with communities/stakeholders
3. School education: Particularly teachers
4. Media education: Journalists (eg. [efforts in the US](#))
5. Leader education: Politicians and other leaders

As the general population becomes more informed, and understands the task and solutions, faster action can be taken. This is critical in a democracy such as Australia's.

Recommendation 4: Use current zero-emissions tech as much as possible, rather than focusing on LCLFs

The Roadmap has a strong focus on relying on low-carbon liquid fuels (LCLFs). While we understand that these fuels may be necessary at some level, we are concerned that the current emphasis on LCLFs may undermine emissions reductions. There are four key reasons/risks for this:

1. LCLFs could lock-out/de-incentivise other, better/faster, decarbonisation technologies
2. LCLFs do not scale well, due to the raw materials required
3. LCLFs involve carbon, so have the potential to *increase* emissions – if not very well regulated
4. LCLFs are very expensive compared to other solutions.

Given these clear risks we therefore recommend that the focus on LCLFs be narrowed in the Roadmap. The implementation of **LCLFs should be reserved for very-hard-to-abate and critical situations**. Instead, we recommend that the focus (for improving technologies) be primarily on currently proven solutions – primarily electrification. Again, the broader focus should be on avoidance/reduction and mode shifting (see Recommendation 2).

Recommendation 5: Set strong, explicit targets

In each section of the Roadmap it is suggested that explicit targets might be applied to each transition (be it mode shift, passenger transport, freight transport). In order to keep Australia on track, we strongly support explicit, ambitious targets. We have seen this implemented in the NVES, and targets should be part of each 'sub-transition' in the Transport Roadmap.

Recommendation 6: Accelerate electrification

Whilst electrification is already underway, it needs to be accelerated (see Recommendation 1). Government can, and should, lead this – through regulation and incentives.

An example where electrification could be enhanced is with electric vehicles. Currently in Australia, [hybrid cars are outselling BEVs by 100%](#). That is, twice as many hybrids are now being sold than BEVs. This is a problem because (i) **hybrids are known to pollute at the rate of two thirds of full ICE vehicles**, and (ii) these new hybrid vehicles will be around for 15-20 years, ie. into the 2040s - when we should be at or near

net zero. As stressed in our FES and NVES [submissions](#), hybrids were meant to be an intermediate technology as BEVs were developed – they were a solution 20 years ago. **We should now be totally focused on BEVs – to the exclusion of hybrids** – because they take (tailpipe) emissions directly to zero – rather than just reducing them by ⅓ over the next 20 years as happens with hybrids.

Another example where electrification could, and should, be accelerated – with the assistance of the government – is in domestic appliances. Government should be supporting a fast transition away from, for example, gas hot water heaters, gas heating, gas stoves. The technology already exists, and some states are already leading this transition.

Recommendation 7: Redirect fossil fuel subsidies to the Transition

Of course a major consideration in using the various levers available to government to accelerate the Transition away from fossil fuel energy, is the cost of the various actions.

Here we stress the fact that the fossil fuel industry is currently being subsidised by the Australian taxpayer, to the tune of [billions of dollars per annum](#). We recommend that these fossil fuel subsidies be used as powerful economic levers.

First, by **phasing out fossil fuel subsidies**, fossil fuels will become more expensive – and begin to better represent their true cost: ie. environmental breakdown on a global scale, with obvious consequences for our societies whose economies rely on a functioning environment. This would send a price signal to the market. Having a planned phase-out would mean that the fossil fuel industry could plan to wind down, and diversify/change their business focus.

The ex-fossil-fuel subsidy funds could then be used to fund the transition itself. This level of investment (up to 10s of billions of dollars per annum) would allow the acceleration of the transition (desperately needed, see Recommendation 1). As set out in Recommendations 2, 4, and 6, there are many ways in which these funds could be used for this acceleration.

PART II: Transport modes, energy and infrastructure recommendations

Recommendation 8: Road - light vehicles

Parents for Climate made detailed FES and NVES [submissions](#) in 2023 and 2024. We were supportive of the final option chosen (Option B), although we did recommend some improvements, which we reiterate here:

A. We recommend an explicit zero by 2030 (or 2035) target

The NVES should be updated to include an enforced target of 100% ZEVs by 2030, or 2035 at the latest.

- a. Using a simple model⁴ we find that it is impossible for the light vehicle sector to meet the government's legislated target of 43% emissions reduction by 2030 (assuming this were applied pro-rata to the transport sector). This is true even if 100% of vehicle sales were ZEVs from 2025 onwards.
- b. However, a strong NVES can reduce emissions to zero by 2050. To do this would require a target of reducing the emissions intensity limit to zero as soon as possible.
- c. A 2035 zero-emissions intensity target is in line with the EU.
- d. A 2040 target is unlikely to result in reaching zero light vehicle emissions by 2050.

⁴https://assets.nationbuilder.com/ap4ca/pages/442/attachments/original/1685514840/Australian_Parents_for_Climate_Action-Fuel_Efficiency_Standards_May_2023.pdf?1685514840

- e. Since targets are not always met, and given the time-critical nature of the global climate emergency, we think it prudent to aim high, so we recommend a 2030 target.

B. Zero Emissions Vehicles should be the focus (Hybrids⁵ are old technology)

- a. **Hybrids and efficient ICE engines are intermediate technology solutions:** These vehicle types still have significant emissions since they still run on fossil fuels at some level. Typical hybrids in Australia only produce about 30% less emissions of comparable ICE vehicles⁶, leaving 70% of emissions to be released to the atmosphere. Any increased sales of these intermediate-technology vehicles would slow the transition to zero emissions. Further, they will create a legacy fleet that is still polluting, and will do so for their lifetimes of 15-20 years.
- b. **Since the NVES was finalised, hybrid sales have increased very quickly - they now out-sell BEVs by 2-to-1:** Compare this to 2023, where EVs overtook hybrids (first 4 months⁷). Through the NVES, or other means, **the government needs to stem this tide of old, polluting technology.** Hybrids were a solution – but 20 years ago (eg. Toyota Prius).
- c. **BEVs are the fastest way to zero emissions:** Since ZEVs/BEVs have zero emissions intensity, they give a step-change to zero emissions. It takes roughly 3 hybrids (or efficient ICE vehicles) to have the same effect on emissions as a single BEV.
- d. **BEVs are already available, and increasing exponentially:** Being zero emissions, BEVs offer the fastest way to zero fleet emissions. As mentioned, even if 100% of new light vehicles were EVs, we can not achieve the federal government's legislated target of 43% reduction by 2030.

Recommendation 9: Road - heavy vehicles

The Roadmap currently puts LCLFs front-and-centre for heavy vehicles. As detailed in Recommendation 4 above, this comes with substantial risks. We recommend to move the focus to be more strong on:

- i. Mode shift to rail
- ii. Investing in battery electric heavy vehicles, which are starting to come on line already.

Recommendation 10: Aviation

Aviation is renowned for being one of the hardest forms of transport to decarbonise, and therefore is the most likely to be converted to LCLFs. However, as detailed in Recommendation 4, this comes with substantial risks. Because of this risk, we recommend that **the Roadmap focus more on reduction of air travel**, through:

- i. Public awareness campaigns of the environmental impact of flying
- ii. Reducing subsidies to the airline industry (and associated fossil fuel industry subsidies), to increase the cost of flying to be (more) in line with its environmental cost, sending a price signal to reduce flying
- iii. **And, critically – Massive investments in fast rail between major cities, to reduce demand on air travel.**

LCLFs (here SAFs) should be only used as a last resort – for essential services only – due to the limitations and risks SAFs carry. Including the fact that they are not yet fully developed.

Recommendation 11: Transport infrastructure

Following our Recommendation 2, where we stress that avoidance and mode shift should be prioritised, we believe the Roadmap should focus more heavily on **massive investments in transport infrastructure that**

⁵ We note that PHEVs represent a tiny fraction of EV sales in Aus.

⁶<https://www.drive.com.au/reviews/2020-toyota-rav4-cruiser-hybrid-awd-review/>

⁷<https://www.drive.com.au/news/vfacts-april-2023-electric-cars-now-outsell-hybrids-in-australia/>

support active and mass transit, for example:

- i. Massive investment in fast rail between cities
- ii. Increased investment in rail, bus, tram networks – and hugely increased convenience & frequency of services of these
- iii. Large investments in converting many of our roads to be active-transport friendly, for example adopting the world-leading (and far safer) 30 km/h speed limit for local streets
- iv. Large investments in extending cycling and walking networks

With regards to passenger transport in cities, our investments (and urban design) **should be focused on moving people, not cars**. This will have many co-benefits apart from the emissions reductions. An important co-benefit for families in the cost of living crisis is that active and mass transit are much cheaper than car ownership.

Critically, if we follow the traditional path of building more and more roads, there is the real danger that cars will continue to displace mass- and active-transport, to the detriment of our health and the livability of our cities. **In short, the focus should move away from road/car expansion and be very much on active and mass transit.**