

Consultation on options for revision of the EU Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution and related policies

Section 1/6: Introductory Questions

A. Are you responding to this consultation as an individual or on behalf of an organisation? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	On behalf of an organisation
A1. What type of organisation do you represent? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	business: industrial interest group, business association, sectoral association
A1a. Please specify the sector of your activity (e.g. health, environment, transport, energy, multi-sector): -open reply-(optional)	Representing the interest of European companies of American parentage in Europe. Multi-sector; focusing on all issues, including environment, energy, transport.
A2. Does your organisation work mainly on an EU-wide basis or in a single country? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	EU-wide
A3. Please indicate the country where your organisation is located: -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Belgium
A4. Please indicate the name of your organisation: -open reply-(compulsory)	American Chamber of Commerce to the European Union (AmCham EU)
A5. Please indicate your name and title: -open reply-(compulsory)	Julie Linde Kjeldsen, AmCham EU Policy Officer
B. Do you now work on air pollution issues, or have you done so in the past? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Yes, air pollution has been one issue in my professional work

D. Please feel free to provide any further details regarding your answers to the introductory questions: -open reply-(**optional**)

AmCham EU speaks for American companies committed to Europe on trade, investment and competitiveness issues. It aims to ensure a growth-orientated business and investment climate in Europe. AmCham EU facilitates the resolution of transatlantic issues that impact business and plays a role in creating better understanding of EU and US positions on business matters. Aggregate U.S. investment in Europe totaled €1.7 trillion in 2010 and directly supports more than 4.2 million jobs in Europe.

Unless you specify otherwise, your contribution will be published on the Commission's website. Please indicate here if you wish your contribution to be anonymous.(For full information please refer to the Specific Privacy Statement point 3) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	You can publish this contribution as it is.
--	---

Section 2/6: Ensuring compliance with EU air quality requirements and coherence with international commitments in the short term

1. How should the EU modify or supplement its approach to ensure compliance with current air	Additional non-legislative options: for example by establishing partnership agreements with MS that focus Member State efforts
--	--

quality legislation? (Please choose one or more responses) -multiple choices reply-(compulsory)	to address non-compliance with air quality objectives
1a. Which options should be considered as additional non-legislative measures? (Please choose one or more responses) -multiple choices reply-(compulsory)	Partnership implementation agreements negotiated between the Commission and Member States in infringement, where further legal action would be suspended subject to proper implementation of agreed transparent and binding programmes to address air pollution - Other (please describe below in question 2)

2. Please feel free to provide written comments on the course of action to ensure compliance with the current air quality legislation: -open reply-(optional)

•For an international level playing field EU measures should not be more stringent than those established by the Gothenburg Protocol. •The EC should run impact assessments on why the objectives of the first AAQD were not met;especially relevant in cases when Member States had adopted measures,that were insufficient. •Market surveillance is a gap.It is too easy for a third country to introduce a new brand with new components that are not compliant with current EU legislation,and commercialise them for months before any decision is made.Also,it is too easy for a third party to import genuine and safe products,but manufactured for a different part of the world and not meeting EU requirements. •e.g.much could be achieved for non-road mobile machinery by catching up with international limit values in areas where we still see gaps.Both EU and US are aiming for a similar levels of ambition with respect to reduction commitments,and a harmonisation of the trantransatlantic technical regulations would enable more stringent emission source controls in the EU.The EU should avoid breaking up harmonisation and overshooting international standards by developing its own unique requirements.

Section 3/6: Further reducing exposure to damaging air pollution in the medium to long term

Sub-section 3.1: Ensuring coherence between air pollution and climate change policies

3. How should future EU air pollution policy interact with a new climate and energy framework for 2030? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	It should maximise the synergies between the policies, but with no new air pollutant emissions reductions except those delivered by the climate and energy policy
4. Should specific complementary action in the EU be pursued to curb emission of short-lived climate pollutants (SLCP) and their precursors, to improve both air quality impacts on health but also to boost climate mitigation in the short term? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Don't know

5. Please feel free to provide comments on the interaction between air pollution and climate change policies: -open reply-(optional)

•Inasmuch as possible, there should be efforts to avoid overlap and contradictions between air quality and legislation aimed at reducing CO2 and other emissions (e.g. existing CO2 limits for cars and vans, the European standards for motor vehicles). •We also ask that the Commission keep in mind that in some cases, there may be a trade off between CO2 efficiency and that of particulate matter emissions. We ask that the EU allows for flexibility in this field and not be too prescriptive in setting preferences for either. This is the case for example in the case of Euro 6 vehicles. Investment needed to meet the objectives in both fields requires a certain amount of regulatory stability. •There is an evident link between the energy source used and the air quality. For example, authorities should promote clean renewable energies development and facilitate urban and peri-urban use of electrical vehicles

Sub-section 3.2a: Strategic approach and target year of future air pollution policy

6. Which target year should be the main focus of the revised Thematic Strategy? (Please choose	2030
--	------

one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	
6a. If the target year is 2030, should the EU set an interim target for Member States to achieve for 2025 to strengthen the achievement of the 2030 objective? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Yes, interim targets should be set on an indicative (i.e. voluntary) basis

Sub-section 3.2b: Strategic approach and target year of future air pollution policy

7. How much additional progress should EU air pollution policy pursue in the revised Thematic Strategy? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	The level delivered by the forthcoming climate and energy framework for 2030, without additional air pollutant emission reductions
---	--

8. Please feel free to provide comments on the level of ambition: -open reply-(optional)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Setting interim targets would help to evaluate the trends that we have in between these dates. Many things can happen for such a long time frame, both from a technology perspective and from a global competitiveness perspective. Periodic evaluation and discussions with the legislator is therefore the best option. •AmCham EU members do not recommend targeting the maximum technically feasible reduction, as this does not take into account cost. We support measures to reduce emissions that are proportionate and cost effective to society. •The level of ambition should also be set after a thorough impact assessment on what the current implementation short comings have been with the first NEC directive. 	

Sub-section 3.3: Setting Priorities

9. How should EU air pollution policy give priority to addressing either human health or the environment? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Equal weight to both
--	----------------------

10. Please feel free to provide comments on setting priorities: -open reply-(optional)	

Sub-section 3.4: Choice of policy instruments

Negotiate new emission reduction commitments for 2030 under the Gothenburg Protocol which are aligned with the ambition level determined for the revised strategy. To be effective, this option would require action to ensure that EU neighbouring countries join and ratify the 2020 emission reduction targets. -single choice reply-(optional)	2
In the National Emissions Ceiling Directive, establish emission ceilings for the 2025-2030 period which are aligned with the ambition level determined for the revised strategy. -single choice reply-(optional)	
In the Ambient Air Quality Directive, adapt the AQ limit values for the 2025-2030 period to more stringent levels corresponding to the ambition level determined for the revised strategy. -single choice reply-(optional)	
In EU legislation on emission sources, set more	

stringent emission requirements for industrial activities, motor vehicles and other air pollution sources, where cost-effective. -single choice reply-(optional)	
Use non-legislative methods, such as existing EU funding schemes, urban air quality programmes, research and innovation actions or awareness raising (please specify in following question). -single choice reply-(optional)	1
Other instruments (please provide comments in question 12). -single choice reply-(optional)	

12. Which other instruments should be used? -open reply-(optional)

•UNECE (Gothenburg protocol) should be the basis for harmonisation of international legislation. International norms should be ahead of national propositions and increasingly become the norm to follow in close collaboration with EU efforts. •A mixture of national targets, which allows for flexibility in meeting objectives, and cost effective measures to target emissions at their source is appropriate. However, we stress that any new measure should be consistent with other EU and national regulations, particularly those related to CO2 emissions.

Section 4/6: Revising the Ambient Air Quality Directive

Sub-section 4.1a: Aligning with latest scientific and technical knowledge

13. Should the indicative limit value for PM _{2.5} of 20 µg/m ³ for 2020 be made mandatory? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Don't know
14. Should the PM _{2.5} or other limit values in the AAQD be made more stringent to bring them closer to WHO guidance values? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Don't know

Sub-section 4.1b: Aligning with latest scientific and technical knowledge (black carbon)

15. Should monitoring and regulation be introduced for black carbon/elemental carbon? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Yes, introduce monitoring requirement
16. Should any other components of particulate matter be addressed in the AAQD? -open reply-(optional)	

Sub-section 4.1c: Aligning with latest scientific and technical knowledge (ozone)

17. Which binding limit values (if any) should the AAQD set for ozone? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Don't know
---	------------

Sub-section 4.2a: Management framework

18. Should any limit values be removed from the AAQD? If so, which? -open reply-(optional)

Sub-section 4.2b: Management framework

19. Should any *other* monitoring and reporting obligations be reduced in the AAQD? If so, which? -open reply-(optional)

Sub-section 4.2c: Management framework

20. Should zone-specific plans be consolidated into coordinated national plans? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)

Yes

21. Should cooperation among Member States be reinforced to better address transboundary pollution flows that affect local air quality problems? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)

Yes, cooperation should be reinforced, but in other ways (pls specify in following question).

22. Please feel free to provide comments on the options for the revision of the AAQ Directive: -open reply-(optional)

•International requirements are the best option. Zone specific requirements should only be contemplated where they have been carefully assessed, are proportionate and cost effective for society. •In no way should zone specific requirements be used as de facto non tariff trade barriers to favour local suppliers. If zone specific requirements are deemed necessary, they should still fit under a harmonised umbrella with mandatory coordination. Such zones should set similar requirements to avoid a costly duplication of measures.

Section 5/6: Revising the National Emission Ceilings Directive (NECD)

Sub-section 5.1: Aligning with latest scientific and technical knowledge

23. Should national emission ceilings be adopted for black carbon/elemental carbon? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(optional)

Don't know

24. Should national emissions ceilings be introduced for other new pollutants? (Please provide written comments if you would like to propose ceilings for other pollutants) -open reply-(optional)

Sub-section 5.2a: Management framework

25. Which mechanisms for flexibility should be introduced into the NEC Directive management framework? (Please choose one or more responses) -multiple choices reply-(optional)

Allowing limited adjustments of Member State emission inventories for compliance check, under specific circumstances and after approval by the Commission

Sub-section 5.2b: Management framework

26. Should coordination be required between the national and local levels in respect of emissions reduction measures and local air quality management? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)

Yes

27. Please feel free to provide comments on the options for the revision of the NEC Directive:

-open reply-(optional)

Section 6/6: Addressing major air pollution sources

Sub-section 6.1: Road transport

Introduce with minimum delay the new test procedure to ensure that real world emissions of Euro 6 light duty diesel vehicles are as close as possible to the type approval limit values

-single choice reply-(optional)

Strengthen EU-wide requirements for in-service compliance with emissions standards, to ensure that light-duty vehicles on European roads continue to produce low emissions over their lifetime -single choice reply-(optional)

1

Develop a new, more stringent standard to be mandatory for motor vehicles after 2020

-single choice reply-(optional)

Develop a supplementary more stringent standard, not mandatory, to be used by national and local governments in a harmonised way wherever air quality exceeds EU standards (e.g. to establish low emission zones), or to establish incentives at MS level to increase penetration of cleaner vehicles

-single choice reply-(optional)

Introduce standards to retrofit existing heavy duty vehicles (e.g. trucks, buses) to reduce their air pollution emissions -single choice reply-(optional)

Introduce a mandatory road charging scheme for heavy duty vehicles that incorporates air pollutant emissions ("eurovignette directive")

-single choice reply-(optional)

Develop additional test-cycle components specific to the driving patterns of special purpose urban vehicles (e.g. buses and refuse collection vehicles), to ensure that pollution control technologies operate effectively under real urban driving conditions

-single choice reply-(optional)

Other (please provide comments in question 29)

2

-single choice reply-(optional)

No additional measures should be introduced

-single choice reply-(optional)

Don't know

-single choice reply-(optional)

29. Please feel free to comment on your answers regarding regulation of road transport emissions: -open reply-(optional)

Emission levels from passenger and commercial vehicles have already decreased substantially over the past decade. The new Euro 6 levels proposed by industry will reduce NOx and particulate matter emissions by 95 and 98% respectively, compared to Euro 1. The new test cycle is expected to result in more stringent targets. Rather than setting yet new standards, the EU and Member States should focus on incentives to support the deployment of Euro VI/6 vehicles on the market, which will help to comply with current national emission ceilings. Furthermore an accelerated support from the Commission for the uptake of alternative fuels, low carbon technologies, light weighting can be an effective instrument in reducing air quality emissions. To be technically and economically viable, an integrated approach regarding pollutant and CO2 emissions is necessary and worldwide harmonisation of technical standards is essential to stay competitive.

Sub-section 6.2: Off-road transport and non-road machinery

Extend the scope of application of current Stage IV NRMM standards to additional power classes and applications, including stationary applications

-single choice reply-(optional)

Introduce as soon as possible a more stringent Stage V standard for non-road machinery, aligned with the limit values of the most stringent Euro VI regulation for heavy duty road vehicles, which would further reduce especially PM emissions.

-single choice reply-(optional)

Ensure that approval emission tests reflect the machinery's emissions in real world circumstances -single choice reply-(optional)

Ensure that there are incentives for retrofitting and/or replacing older inland waterway vessels' engines by newer and cleaner ones -single choice reply-(optional)

Other (please provide comments in question 31)

5

-single choice reply-(optional)

No additional measures should be introduced

-single choice reply-(optional)

Don't know -single choice reply-(optional)

31. Please feel free to comment on your answers regarding regulation of emissions from off-road transport and non-road machinery: -open reply-(optional)

The European Commission is addressing additional measures for off-road transport and non-road machinery through a separate consultation on Directive 97/68/EC. Sectoral European trade associations, including AmCham EU members, have submitted detailed positions at the stakeholder hearing on 14 February 2013.

Sub-section 6.3: Agricultural sector

Set tighter emission ceilings for ammonia for 2020 and 2030 in the NEC Directive, leaving flexibility to Member States on how these ceilings can best be reached

3

-single choice reply-(optional)

Where cost effective, introduce new or revise existing EU legislation to establish EU-wide

4

specific rules for e.g. improved manure storage, management and spreading techniques -single choice reply-(optional)	
Promote good practices in manure management and manure spreading in Member States through support from the Rural Development Fund -single choice reply-(optional)	1
Introduce measures to ban or restrict the burning of agricultural waste -single choice reply-(optional)	2
Other (please provide comments in question 33) -single choice reply-(optional)	
No additional measures should be introduced -single choice reply-(optional)	
Don't know -single choice reply-(optional)	

33. Please feel free to comment on your answers regarding regulation of emissions from the agricultural sector: -open reply-(optional)

Sub-section 6.4: Small/medium combustion sector

34. Which additional measures should be taken to address air emissions from small and medium combustion installations (below 50 MW)? (Please choose one or more responses) -multiple choices reply-(optional)	Other (please elaborate below)
---	--------------------------------

35. Please feel free to comment on your answers regarding regulation of emissions from the small/medium combustion sector: -open reply-(optional)

•Retrofitting of small boilers would most likely not be a cost effective measure. •No permitting type measures, the administrative burden is too large for small installations.

Sub-section 6.5: Shipping sector

36. Which additional measures should be taken to address air emissions from the shipping sector? (Please choose one or more responses) -multiple choices reply-(optional)	
---	--

37. Please feel free to comment on your answers regarding regulation of emissions from the shipping sector: -open reply-(optional)

Final comments

38. Please feel free to provide any further comments related to the revision of the Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution: -open reply-(optional)

1. Ensure proper implementation of existing tools Many sectoral policies already tackle emissions into the air. These policies should remain the priority focus for these sectors: - The Industrial Emissions Directive define 'best available technologies' and should remain the reference instrument to deal with industrial emissions -EURO 6VI norms are the best instruments for passenger and commercial vehicles

2. Thinking holistically We strongly encourage the EU institutions to ensure there is consistency between EU environmental laws, and that a coherent approach — based on scientific evidence while taking into consideration socio-economic impact — is followed to avoid duplication of efforts and regulatory overlap. 3. Be consistent with actions at international level and ensure a level playing field: EU legislation should be aligned with the internationally agreed Gothenburg Protocol 4. Support innovation for new technologies The Commission's continued and accelerated support for alternative fuels, renewables and new technologies can be an effective instrument in reducing air quality emissions 5. Before proposing new legal obligations, options and impacts should be assessed The Commission should ensure that any new regulation it proposes is proportionate to the desired outcome and provides cost-effective solutions On PM specifically: Develop monitoring requirements with regard to PM2.5 in order to fill the various knowledge gaps and uncertainties concerning these emissions. This would contribute to build a more comprehensive picture about sources, measurements, modelling and the relative impact of PM 2.5 on ambient air quality. Distinguishing between anthropogenic and natural sources is especially relevant for PM2.5, and would help with the implementation of any new emission reduction measure.