



Urban Agenda - Air Quality

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Objective of the Public Feedback

In order to realise the full potential of the European Union and deliver on its strategic objectives, the Urban Agenda for the EU strives to involve Urban Authorities in achieving Better Regulation, Better Funding and Better Knowledge.

Established with the 'Pact of Amsterdam' of May 2016, the Urban Agenda for the EU is a new working method to ensure maximum utilisation of the growth potential of cities and to successfully tackle social challenges. It aims to promote cooperation between Member States, Cities, the European Commission and other stakeholders, in order to stimulate growth, liveability and innovation in the cities of Europe.

As stated in the Pact of Amsterdam, Thematic Partnerships are the key delivery vehicle towards realising the goals of the Urban Agenda for the EU. The Pact of Amsterdam lists 12 Priority Themes for the Urban Agenda for the EU. On each Theme a Partnership has been formed.

Four Partnerships were set up in the first half of 2016 and have now developed draft Action Plans. These are: Air Quality (coordinated by The Netherlands); Inclusion of Migrants and refugees (coordinated by the City of Amsterdam and DG HOME); Housing (coordinated by Slovakia and the city of Vienna); and Urban Poverty (coordinated by France and Belgium).

The goal of the **Partnership on Air Quality** is to improve air quality in cities and to bring the 'healthy city' higher on the local, regional, national, and EU agendas as part of the Urban Agenda. This will be done by improving regulation, funding mechanisms and knowledge at all levels, as well as the coordination between them.

The Partnership has identified the following topics that need to be addressed in order to achieve its goal: Modelling city-specific situations, Mapping of regulatory instruments and funding, Recommendations on air quality good practices, and Guidelines for cities' air quality action plans.

This Public Feedback is part of a two-stage process to gather stakeholders' views.

This is the first stage and focuses on the relevance of the findings of the Partnership on Air Quality, upon which the Partners are working to formulate an Action Plan.

The second stage will be in September, again on Futurium, with another survey to gather stakeholders' inputs on actions and recommendations.

The work of the Partnership would greatly benefit from the insights of relevant stakeholders, who have the opportunity to contribute to the identification of priority issues in the area of air quality, as well as to the formulation of future actions and recommendations.

The results of this online Public Feedback will be taken into consideration by the Partnership on Air Quality for the preparation of an Action Plan, which will be presented on 26 October 2017 to the DG meeting on Urban Matters (Directorate-Generals responsible for urban matters in their Member States, the European Commission, the Committee of the Regions, CEMR and EUROCITIES).

The individual contributions to this Public Feedback will not be published on the Internet.

At the beginning of the questionnaire, you will be able to choose between providing your personal details or submitting your contribution anonymously.

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR COLLABORATION!

Target group(s)

Contributions are sought from individuals and national authorities, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations, social partners and civil society, academic institutions, financial institutions, international organisations, EU Institutions and Agencies, based in EU Member States or third countries.

Period of the online Public Feedback

From 17/07/2017 to 25/08/2017

How to submit your feedback

You can contribute to this Public Feedback by filling out the online questionnaire, available hereafter.

You may find it useful to **refer to the background documents** which are published alongside this consultation.

Individual contributions to this Public Feedback will not be published on the Internet. Answers to the online questionnaire will be taken into account by the Partnership as input to a revised version of the Action Plan, which will be published on Futurium before the end of 2017.

Replies may preferably be submitted in English.

Reference documents and websites

Background Paper to the Public Feedback to the Partnership on Air Quality Pact of Amsterdam Futurium – section dedicated to the Partnership on Air Quality

Disclaimer

The information and views contained in the online Public Feedback are those of the Partnership and do not reflect the official opinion of the European Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the information contained therein. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the content and the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Contact details

Secretariat of the Urban Agenda, Communication team

E-mail: UA.communication@ecorys.com

* 1. Are you responding as an individual:

- Yes
- No

* 1.a. Which country are you from?

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovak Republic
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- United Kingdom
- Other

Please specify

* 2. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation:

- Yes
- No

* 2.a. Are you a public, private or non-governmental organisation?

- Public
- Private
- NGO
- Other

Please specify the level of your public organisation

- Local
- Regional
- National
- EU
- International

* Please specify

* 2.b. In which country is your organisation based?

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovak Republic
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- United Kingdom
- Other

Please specify


3. Name, surname and position of the respondent (this information will be kept strictly confidential)

4. Name of the institution (if applicable - this information will be kept strictly confidential)

5. Email (this information will be kept strictly confidential)

THEME 1 : Better Regulation

The findings generally point at actions to improve regulation. However, most findings could also point at actions aimed at improving the implementation of regulations at European, national and city level. The following chart shows that any action on local, national or European level should be complemented by measures on other levels. It shows the relative improvement of health due to measures on different levels (FUA=functional urban area). It also shows the differences between cities due to their size and geographical location.



Establishment and implementation of air quality legislation

1. It was assessed that there should be a **much stronger and systematic dialogue between Cities and National/Regional authorities**; frameworks for some useful/effective measures could be established or strengthened, as well as coordination mechanisms with neighbouring regions to reduce sources outside the city or region. These could be regulatory measures or introduced as good practices.
2. The way in which the **monitoring and assessment requirements** of the Ambient Air Quality Directive, 2008/50/EC, are interpreted can make a significant difference to the size of the air quality problem to be addressed. This in turn plays into local decisions on priorities and public funding. However, this issue has not been extensively researched and so it is not clear to which extent different interpretations of the Directive would impose different requirements on urban authorities across the Union.
3. There is a **lack of regulations to enforce and support the adoptions of cities Air Quality Action Plans in the view of 'citizens' health' protection**, considering cities as 'hot spot' areas for exposure and the percentage of the urban population exposed to air pollutant concentrations above EU and WHO reference thresholds.
4. There is a **lack of tools for checking of content and quality of Air Quality Action Plans submitted within e-reporting**, which are drafted in national language. There is also a lack of quality assurance (impact) of local air quality plans by national governments.
5. Action on air quality at local level requires **local leadership, knowledge, capacity and resources to invest**. However, such action can also be incentivised, undermined, or blocked, by policy and legislative structures set up at local, national or regional level. For example, the introduction of urban low emission zones in Germany is subject to local level decision making. However, all German low emission zones follow a common structure and format, a structure set up by the Federal Government. It could be suggested that the lack of such a framework in, for example, the UK has restricted the uptake of low emission zones and those that do exist tend to follow very different patterns.
6. An important finding is that **integrated approaches combining different policy areas** can be more effective in creating healthier cities than focussing on air quality in isolation. While extending these as legal requirements may not be considered appropriate, it may be useful to explore ways to incentivise the development of national/regional integrated policy frameworks (e.g. align climate policy, mobility policy and public transport policy and air quality policy) to enable more coordinated action.

Control of the components of air pollution:

7. Urban areas can exercise measure of control on particulate matter primary sources, such as on industry, domestic heating (only in the cases where cities have powers over these sectors) and mainly transport. Cities also emit the precursors of secondary PM and contribute to the background emissions. Many authorities have been active in promoting clean vehicles and retro-fitting Diesel Particulate Filters to older diesel buses, and such measures have been successful in controlling primary emissions from transport. However, **it is not clear to what extent these efforts are influencing the total mass of particulate matter** (and specifically PM5).
8. The measures identified as being taken by cities **mostly focus on road traffic**. Eastern European cities focus more on **emissions reduction from energy** (mostly heating).
9. There are **gaps in the regulations/policies tackling emissions from sectors like shipping, farming /agriculture, Heavy Goods Vehicles refrigeration units, heating and power (specifically biomass)**. Cities do not always have (or use) the jurisdiction and competency to develop measures to tackle agriculture/shipping emissions. But this strongly depends on the legal framework and on the ambition of the national, regional and local authorities involved. For example, using power from the shore while being in the harbour is something cities can facilitate. Furthermore, shipping measures require coordination mechanism with other harbours and even EU standards.
10. It was also assessed that there is a **lack of legal measures to tackle emissions at sources level** (i.e. emissions standard limit values).
11. **Emissions from small diesel engines used to power refrigeration units on lorries** are unregulated and represent a reason of increasing concern. Emissions from these engines are disproportionately polluting, especially within urban areas where such engines are left running even when the main engine is switched off.

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the weakest and 5 the strongest), to what extent you find this issue crucial and why?

	1 - Weakest	2 - Weak	3 - Regular	4 - Strong	5 - Strongest	N /A
* A	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* B	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* C	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* D	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* E	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* F	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* G	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* H	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* I	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* J	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* K	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 1.a. Please briefly justify your score

1000 character(s) maximum

* 2. Is there any other issue not included in the list above that should be considered as priority?

- Yes
- I do not know
- No

*2.a. If yes, please explain what is/are the issue/-s that should be considered as priority.

1000 character(s) maximum

3. According to your experience, what actions would you support to address the issues above?

1000 character(s) maximum

3.a. If you answered to question 3, please briefly indicate which actors should be involved in the implementation of the actions that you suggested.

1000 character(s) maximum

4. Are you aware of any initiatives or documentation developed at EU, national or local level that could be relevant for addressing the issues above?

- Yes
- I do not know
- No

4a. If yes, please provide relevant details

1000 character(s) maximum

THEME 2 : Better Funding

Funding is one of the fundamental issues in adopting and implementing measures timely and effectively.

There are many projects and actions relevant for the better funding and financing for air quality measures since this goal, i.e. air quality and related policies, is usually a component of the sustainable urban development funding and financing effort, or it is meant as a side positive effect entailed by broader urban policies. Projects in this sector are substantially heterogeneous and aiming at impacting on several components of the productive, political and social assets of countries. The following issues regarding 'funding' were identified:

1. It was assessed that there is a **lack of availability of specific funding for Air Quality for City Administrations**, and air quality improvement could be more easily achieved as a target if it is the 'title' of funding items and not only a by-product of mobility, energy and other sectors. Although it was also stated that funding options for cities are already complex and fragmented and adding an extra fund will only contribute to this. Also, integrated funding helps with promoting integrated thinking (so e.g. assessing infrastructure projects with regard to their impact on air quality, promoting nature-based solutions, etc.).
2. There is a **lack of funding dedicated to areas where costs of local abatement measures for Limit Values compliance achievement are remarkable** (stronger measures and wider range of action to be taken). Lack of financial support from national governments for effective (but costly) measures, or to allow local funding of air quality projects with local pollution weighted congestion charges. This can mean that the responsible regions and national authorities have not considered it a priority in Operational Programmes or Rural Development Programmes.
3. There is a **limited accessibility to information on funding resources and procedures**, which is essential to acquire funding for clean air projects from European funds. However, information regarding operational programmes funded by the European Structural Investment Funds are available on the website of responsible authorities of Member States and Regions. Furthermore, the Commission created a tool that gives access to data on financing and achievements under the ESI Funds 2014-2020 [1]. The platform visualises, for over 530 programmes, the latest data available (end-2015 for achievements, end-2016 for finances implemented, daily for EU payments).
4. There are **internal market restrictions for taxes/subsidies to promote the use of cleaner energy**.
5. A key component of good policy making is **ex ante assessment of the impacts of a policy on air quality and ex post evaluation to see if those impacts materialised**. It is not clear to what extent funding mechanisms have been subject to such assessment in terms of air quality benefits and, in particular, in terms of the long-term impacts on air quality. Such information would be extremely helpful to direct local and regional authorities towards the most effective funding schemes and to modify and implement such schemes. It is not within the scope of the Partnership to undertake such an evaluation but it may be possible to gather information on what has been undertaken to date and recommend further action in this area. Evaluation mechanisms though are already in use in relations to EU funds. For example, The Common Agricultural Policy schemes are regularly submitted to a periodic mandatory ex-post evaluation carried out by independent contractors, providing not only the assessment of the different functioning scheme, but also conclusions and recommendations for the European Institutions and the national Administrations. These reports are published on the website of the European Commission. The Articles in the recent National Emission Ceilings Directive 20196/2284 related to the use of EU funding and the reporting will already address a lot of these findings.

[1] <https://cohesiondata.ec.europa.eu/>

5. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the weakest and 5 the strongest), to what extent you find this issue crucial and why?

	1 - Weakest	2 - Weak	3 - Regular	4 - Strong	5 - Strongest	N /A
* A	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* B	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* C	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* D	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* E	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 5.a. Please briefly justify your score

1000 character(s) maximum

* 6. Is there any other issue not included in the list above that should be considered as priority?

- Yes
- I do not know
- No

* 6.a. If yes, please explain what is/are the issue/-s that should be considered as priority.

1000 character(s) maximum

7. According to your experience, what actions would you support to address the issues above?

1000 character(s) maximum

7.a. If you answered to question 3, please briefly indicate which actors should be involved in the implementation of the actions that you suggested.

1000 character(s) maximum

8. Are you aware of any initiatives or documentation developed at EU, national or local level that could be relevant for addressing the issues above?

- Yes
- I do not know
- No

8.a. If yes, please provide relevant details

1000 character(s) maximum

THEME 3 : Better Knowledge

1. Knowledge on the impact/effectiveness of air quality measures (not only regarding contributions to emission reduction, but especially on health effects improvement and related external cost gain), future developments and methods to forecast scenarios are the basis for developing effective air quality policies and select effective measures. The selection of the measures to obtain Limit Values compliance depends on the effectiveness of each individual measure; but this parameter depends the duration of the measure or time necessary for achieving compliance for the selected pollutant, thus the **assessment of the relative effectiveness of measures to be evaluated/implemented** is of crucial importance. Estimation of how much each measure reduces the concentrations at the exceedance location(s) is therefore very challenging as it requires detailed air quality and emission data available, modelling capability, software tools and huge computational time to assess the whole city territory with a good detail.
2. It was mentioned there is a **lack of knowledge on how to promote public awareness and participation**. How to make people more aware of health risks related to air pollution? How to organise participatory processes around air quality, to tap into community knowledge and build ownership (e.g. Citizens' panels in Gdansk, PL)? How to tap into the public mobilisation inspired by environmental organisations and support them in their activities?

3. It was assessed that there currently is a **lack of access to modelling approaches to assess the impact of measures, and difficulties in implementing and use them** is observed by several cities. It was noted that there are difficulties to access to instruments/methods/tools to verify the effectiveness of the planned and adopted measures in terms of concentration/health effects and external costs.
4. It is **difficult to estimate how emission factors will change in the future**. Because conformity factors are larger than 1 there is a uncertainty about the impact of new Euro emission limit values as regards NO_x and NO₂ for diesel cars and their real emissions. It is expected that with the introduction of Real Driving Emissions tests NO_x emissions will decline. But the current uncertainty has impacts for the accuracy of the calculations regarding expectations about economic growth in the future and growth of mobility, and expectations about socio-economic growth of the city (i.e. numbers of workers and citizens). These issues makes it difficult for cities to select and implement measures that would reduce NO₂ concentrations in traffic environment.
5. **Lack of knowledge in citizens about the fundamental role of local policies on traffic regulation measures and potential role in reduction of citizen exposure with health benefits on specific local and toxic pollutants regulated (NO₂, benzene) and not regulated (PAH, BC, PN)**. This knowledge/awareness in citizens would help to achieve wider support of private traffic limitation measures. It is important to choose the correct pollutant/indicator in assessing the effectiveness of such measures in relation to improving health.
6. **Need for measures tailored to the specific area where a city is located** (orographic and meteorological characteristic, economic situation, type of industry).
7. **Source apportionment** is an important tool for identification of sectors contributing to health impact and concentrations of specific pollutants in air - a baseline for drafting Air Quality Action Plans. It was mentioned that it is important to have/use upgraded and complete local emission inventories.
8. In most Members States responsibility for drafting and implementing Air Quality Action Plans from Art. 23 of Directive 2008/50/EC is given to local or regional authorities, while measures defined by the Air Quality Action Plans should address different sectors, also of competence of authorities operating at different governance levels. In the majority of Members States there is a **lack of a national coordination body or competent authority and/or mechanism on national level to support drafting and implementation of local Air Quality Action Plans, to harmonize Air Quality Action Plans of different zone and agglomeration** (g. more or less developed).
9. There is a **need for increased scrutiny of, and exchange of information about, national and local air quality plans from different cities/countries**: Member States' national Air Quality Plans contain important information about actions being taken to address air quality at national, regional and local levels. However, it is not clear how accessible this information is, even to other Member States or local authorities within Member States.

9. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the weakest and 5 the strongest), to what extent you find this issue crucial and why?

	1 - Weakest	2 - Weak	3 - Regular	4 - Strong	5 - Strongest	N /A
* Issue 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Issue 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Issue 3	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Issue 4	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Issue 5	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Issue 6	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Issue 7	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Issue 8	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Issue 9	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*9.a. Please briefly justify your score

1000 character(s) maximum

*10. Is there any other issue not included in the list above that should be considered as priority?

- Yes
- I do not know
- No

*10.a. If yes, please explain what is/are the issue/-s that should be considered as priority.

1000 character(s) maximum

11. According to your experience, what actions would you support to address the issues above?

1000 character(s) maximum

11.a. If you answered to question 3, please briefly indicate which actors should be involved in the implementation of the actions that you suggested.

1000 character(s) maximum

12. Are you aware of any initiatives or documentation developed at EU, national or local level that could be relevant for addressing the issues above?

- Yes
- I do not know
- No

12.a. If yes, please provide relevant details

1000 character(s) maximum