

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)	The Austrian Federal Economic Chamber (WKO - in German language: Wirtschaftskammer Österreich) represents 400.000 Austrian companies in the sectors industry, trade, small manufacturing etc.
A2. Does your organisation work mainly on an EU-wide basis or in a single country? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Focus on a single country
A3. Please indicate the country where your organisation is located: -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Austria
A4. Please indicate the name of your organisation: -open reply-(compulsory)	Austrian Federal Economic Chamber (WKO - in German language: Wirtschaftskammer Österreich) Interest Representation Register No 10405322962-08
A5. Please indicate your name and title: -open reply-(compulsory)	Axel Steinsberg, Mag., MSc, Advisor for EU Environmental Policy, WKO, Environment & Energy Policy Department
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)	

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 quality legislation? (Please choose one or more responses) -multiple choices reply-(compulsory)	Additional non-legislative options: for example by establishing partnership agreements with MS that focus Member State efforts to address non-compliance with air quality objectives - Relaxing the obligations under Ambient Air Quality Directive
---	---

<p>1a. Which options should be considered as additional non-legislative measures? (Please choose one or more responses) -multiple choices reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>Governance support, for example through competence building programmes and guidance on increased and more effective use of existing EU funding sources - 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</p>
<p>1b. Which options should be considered to relax obligations under the AAQD? (Please choose one response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>Weaken those air quality limit values for which there is currently widespread non-compliance (in particular PM and NO₂)</p>
<p>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)</p>	
<p>Referring to 1c: Instead of more stringent obligations cover missing sectors such as agriculture, households as well as individual transport. Referring to 1d: Austrian interests were not sufficiently taken into account at the Gothenburg Protocol negotiations in Geneva in May 2012 - therefore NEC directives has to foresee more flexible approaches (especially concerning NO_x emission ceilings) The NEC-directive should not go beyond the 2020 Gothenburg ceilings, further the targets of the NEC-directive should only be binding for member states that ratified the 2020 Gothenburg protocol.</p>	
<h2>Section 3/6: Further reducing exposure to damaging air pollution in the medium to long term</h2>	
<h3>Sub-section 3.1: Ensuring coherence between air pollution and climate change policies</h3>	
<p>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)</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>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)</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>5. Please feel free to provide comments on the interaction between air pollution and climate change policies: -open reply-(optional)</p>	
<p>Ad 3: Concerning "black carbon" the composition of substances in PM₁₀ should be examined in depth on their health relevance; Cross-effects between air protection measures and climate protection are to be considered to take into account adverse effects. For example biomass combustion is GHG efficient but increases the exposure of NO_x and PM. New air pollution policies or the strengthening of existing ones which interact with climate change policies should be coordinated closely with the establishment of an international climate protection agreement. We further recommend to consider, that technical reduction of air pollution in industry is very often accompanied by an increase of energy demand. Adverse effects of measures should be considered. For example biomass combustion is GHG efficient, but increases the exposure of NO_x and PM.</p>	
<h3>Sub-section 3.2a: Strategic approach and target year of future air pollution policy</h3>	
<p>6. Which target year should be the main focus of</p>	<p>2030</p>

the revised Thematic Strategy? (Please choose 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)	No, interim targets should not be set
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)	No change: only the level of protection delivered by current legislation
8. Please feel free to provide comments on the level of ambition: -open reply-(optional)	
We generally oppose the tightening of existing limit values as long as those cannot be fulfilled and as long the EU legislation does not offer effective measurements to achieve them.	
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)	4
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)	5
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)	6
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)	2
Other instruments (please provide comments in question 12). -single choice reply-(optional)	1

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

Incentives (such as tax releases or subsidies) for emission reduction measures such as thermal insulation of buildings Cooperation of Member States concerning transboundary emissions (cross-border effects) should be intensified. In general, voluntary instruments and programmes should be preferred to binding legislation.

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)	No
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)	No change

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)	No
--	----

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)	No change
---	-----------

Sub-section 4.2a: Management framework

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

Yes, the value for the daily average of PM10 should be removed from the AAQD. Member States have immense problems to fulfil this value as it is much too strict compared to the annual average value. It should be noted that the relation between the daily and annual

averages for PM10 is not correct. From a medical point of view, the limit value based on the annual average is much more relevant. Hence, it would be justifiable from a health perspective, and absolutely necessary from an economic perspective, to eliminate the limit value for PM10,. At least it should be increased considerably in order to balance the relation to the annual average. Short term limit values of NO2 should be deleted in order to minimise monitoring costs.

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)

Monitoring and reporting should only refer to representative measuring points. Measuring points which are close to high traffic, should be out of scope.

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, the Member States concerned should be legally obliged to prepare joint air quality plans in cases of significant transboundary pollution

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

We think it is important to differentiate between outlying areas and central agglomerations. Furthermore, it should be taken into account that - especially as far as PM is concerned - Member States, situated in Central Europe, are discriminated against Member States on the edge of Europe due to significant transboundary transport of air pollutants.

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)

No

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)

No ceilings for new pollutants.

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 Member State compliance for the Directive's ceilings to be measured on the basis of a multi-year average - Allowing limited adjustments of Member State emission ceilings, under specific circumstances and after approval by the Commission - Allowing limited adjustments of Member State emission inventories for compliance check, under specific circumstances and after approval by the Commission - Other (please specify below)

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)	
Ad 25: WKO suggests optional pooling of Member States to balance NEC between MS.	
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)	2
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)	4
Develop a new, more stringent standard to be mandatory for motor vehicles after 2020 -single choice reply-(optional)	5
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)	8
Introduce standards to retrofit existing heavy duty vehicles (e.g. trucks, buses) to reduce their air pollution emissions -single choice reply-(optional)	7
Introduce a mandatory road charging scheme for heavy duty vehicles that incorporates air pollutant emissions ("eurovignette directive") -single choice reply-(optional)	6
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)	3
Other (please provide comments in question 29)	

-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)

It should be considered that the extension of maximum tonnage limits for heavy loads in the EU would help to decrease the number of journeys in road transport. This would cut CO2 emissions, too. The positioning of measuring points close to high traffic areas leads to serious problems for the economic development near highways. As limit values are already exceeded, permissions for industrial installations are not given, so they are forced to move into inhabited areas. These negative effects should be taken into consideration; therefore the rule of Annex III C of the CAFE directive requiring that traffic-oriented sampling probes should be at least 25 m from the edge of major junctions and no more than 10 m from the kerbside, should be thoroughly revised. This regulation is not necessary for the protection of human health as there is no fixed habitation inside 10m from the kerbside of highways.

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)	4
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)	5
Ensure that approval emission tests reflect the machinery's emissions in real world circumstances -single choice reply-(optional)	3
Ensure that there are incentives for retrofitting and/or replacing older inland waterway vessels' engines by newer and cleaner ones -single choice reply-(optional)	2
Other (please provide comments in question 31) -single choice reply-(optional)	1
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)

Incentives should not be limited to waterway vessels' engines only but should also include other non-road machinery.

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 -single choice reply-(optional)	5
---	---

Where cost effective, introduce new or revise existing EU legislation to establish EU-wide specific rules for e.g. improved manure storage, management and spreading techniques -single choice reply-(optional)	3
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)	
We require a good balance between the contributions asked from different polluters. For instance, we do not accept a disproportionate burden for the industrial and commercial sector, only because of failures in the agricultural sector.	
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)	No additional measures should be introduced
35. Please feel free to comment on your answers regarding regulation of emissions from the small/medium combustion sector: -open reply-(optional)	
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)	Promote the extension of the Sulphur Emission Control Areas to additional EU sea areas such as the Irish Sea, the Gulf of Biscay, the Mediterranean and/or the Black Sea provided that such a measure is cost-effective. - Promote the designation of NOx Emission Control Areas in EU regional seas where cost-effective (those listed above and/or the Baltic and the North Sea including the English Channel) provided that such a measure is cost-effective. - Introduce requirements for PM emission controls in EU regional seas where cost-effective - Require continuous

monitoring of the emissions of sulphur dioxide, NOx, particulate matter (fine dust) as it is practised on many industrial installations on land.

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)

To keep industries in Europe we need a balanced approach between economic and environmental interests and therefore we strictly oppose another tightening of limit values, especially for PM and NO₂. More time extensions to achieve the limit values are necessary and should in case of NO_x and PM be timed according to the actual effects of the EU legislation for emission reduction measures for vehicles. In this context it has to be noted, that – according to a new study of the TU Graz of 2010 - the reduction of NO_x emissions due to the improvements by EURO IV and EURO V are not nearly as good as expected (Study of the Institute For Internal Combustion Engines And Thermodynamics of Graz University of Technology: „Fuel Consumption and Emissions of Modern Passenger Cars, from 29.11.2010). This fact has to be taken into account when Member States are denied to exceed (or extend the compliance of) the strict limit values of NO_x and PM₁₀. The limit value for PM₁₀ has to be scrutinised, especially the value for the daily average, which is - compared to the annual average – far too strict. The role of PM₁₀ as indicator for health risks should be re-considered. As PM_{2,5} correlates better with effects on human health, the provisions for PM₁₀ could be substituted by those for PM_{2,5}.