

URBAN AGENDA FOR THE EU

Partnership for Air Quality

Final Draft Action Plan

(v.5.3 from 28.09.2017)

Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
1 BETTER REGULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION	4
1.1 RECOMMENDATION N°1 – IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS IN REGULATIONS ON AIR POLLUTANT EMISSION SOURCES	4
1.2 ACTION N°1 – BETTER AIR QUALITY PLANNING (GOVERNANCE)	8
2 BETTER FUNDING	11
2.1 ACTION N°2 – BETTER TARGETED FUNDING FOR AIR QUALITY	11
3 BETTER KNOWLEDGE	14
3.1 ACTION N°3 – BETTER FOCUS ON PROTECTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CITIZENS' HEALTH	14
3.2 ACTION N°4 – AWARENESS RAISING AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING	17
3.3 ACTION N°5 – OUTREACH	20

INTRODUCTION

The Urban Agenda for the EU – consolidated with the Pact of Amsterdam, agreed on 30 May 2016 by the EU Ministers responsible for Urban Matters¹ - has introduced a new working method of thematic Partnerships being elaborated by partners representing various governance authorities aiming to tackle social challenges by focussing on cities. 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. The Partnership on Air Quality is one of the 12 priority themes of the “Urban Agenda for the EU”.

The main objective of the Partnership on Air Quality is to improve air quality in cities and to bring the ‘healthy city’ higher on the local, national and EU agendas as part of the Urban Agenda. This will be done through improving the development and/or implementation of regulation, funding mechanisms and knowledge at all levels, as well as the coordination between them.

Following the scoping exercise of existing regulation, committed resources and knowledge, advice can be given on improving the EU policy and funding landscape. The Partnership works on proposals for better regulation (and implementation), funding and knowledge in this area.

The first step consisted of the identification of the relevant issues regarding urban air quality focusing on regulation and implementation of regulations, funding and knowledge (see also annex 1). The findings of the Partnership have then been thoroughly discussed among the partners and shared with public stakeholders through an international workshop and a public consultation to gather feedback that has been used to complement the Partnership’s work². Drawing on the evidence gathered to find concrete solutions to the issues identified, the Partnership has developed a series of actions and recommendations. This paper presents the proposal for these.

The Partnership’s actions and recommendations also aim to contribute to the goals of the New Urban Agenda and to the targets set in the Sustainable Development Goals³.

¹ See: <https://ec.europa.eu/futurium/en/content/pact-amsterdam>.

² URBAN AGENDA FOR THE EU, Main findings and issues, Partnership for Air Quality, 17.07.2017

³ New Urban Agenda, adopted at the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III) in Quito, Ecuador, on 20 October 2016. <https://habitat3.org/the-new-urban-agenda>, and <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals>.

1 BETTER REGULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

1.1 RECOMMENDATION N°1 – IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS IN REGULATIONS ON AIR POLLUTANT EMISSION SOURCES

What is the specific problem?

Air quality is a complex issue requiring pollutants and sources control at EU level and effective implementation at national and local level. It requires coordinated efforts at national, regional and local level.

The overall air policy strategy of the EU is directed towards meeting the Air Quality Guideline Values of the WHO in the coming decades (EAP7). At the EU level six instruments dominate:

- i. The Ambient Air Quality Directive(s): Maximum concentrations to be attained across the EU (SO₂, NO₂, PM₁₀, benzene, lead, CO, O₃, arsenic, cadmium, nickel, PM_{2.5} and BaP), , including an obligation to further reduce the average exposure of the urban population to PM_{2.5} + Directive EU/2015/1480;
- ii. The National Emission Ceilings Directive (NECD): i.e. National emission inventories and caps to limit transboundary pollution (SO_x, NO_x, NMVOC, and NH₃);
- iii. Source-specific performance standards: Euro and fuel standards, energy efficiency standards, Industrial Emissions Directive, Ecodesign directive, Directives aimed at vehicles and non-road machinery, Directive relating to a reduction in the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels etc. that define emission limit values for NO_x, PM_{2.5}/PM₁₀ and precursors of PM_{2.5} and ozone for new and existing installations, vehicles, products, etc.. Directive on deployment of alternative fuels infrastructure that requires MS to make publicly available electric charging points, hydrogen, LNG and CNG refuelling stations, in order to speed-up deployment of less polluting vehicles.
- iv. Monitoring and reporting requirements and requirements to inform the public on emissions and (actual and expected) air quality.

And additionally two other (non-regulatory) instruments can be mentioned:

- v. Funding mechanisms e.g. for innovative “green” or “smart” projects.
- vi. Knowledge transfer, e.g. data, models and other tools for air quality planning, which can be used at the national, regional and local levels.).

The main Member States’ main policy instruments are:

- i. Air Quality Plans & Programmes (AAQD)
- ii. National Emission Inventories, Projections, and Measures (NECD).

The Partnership’s analysis pointed out that EU and national regulatory instruments, and/or the way they are implemented, may not always ensure an adequate and timely

reduction of the following sources of air pollution, which have a proven negative impact on the health of exposed populations, especially in urban environments:

- PM:
 - No regulation exists on black carbon and nanoparticles, which are far smaller than the regulated PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} particle classes, and are believed to have several more aggressive health implications than those classes of larger particulates.
- NO₂:
 - There is wide uncertainty about the new Euro emissions limit values as regards to NO_x and NO₂ for diesel cars and their real emissions (failure of Euro Standards to control NO_x emissions, e.g. specifically from Light Duty Vehicles (LDVs), and increased primary NO₂ emissions from Euro6 vehicles, tampering (i.e. of particulate filters).
- Non-exhaust traffic-related particles:
 - Notably road, brake, clutch and tyre wear can contribute to relevant portion of total non-exhaust traffic-related PM₁₀ emissions and of total traffic-related PM₁₀ emissions in urban environments.
- Shipping⁴:
 - Air pollution from international shipping accounts approximately for 50,000 premature deaths per year in Europe, at an annual cost to society of more than €58 billion according to recent scientific studies⁵. Air pollution from ships continues to increase as the sector grows. Land-based emissions – SO_x and NO_x – on the other hand, particularly from fixed installations, have been reduced dramatically. However, NO_x from shipping is set to exceed NO_x from all EU land-based sources in the coming decade.
 - The Commission's 2011 White Paper on transport suggests that the EU's CO₂ emissions from maritime transport should be cut by at least 40% from 2005 levels by 2050, and if feasible by 50%. However, international shipping is not covered by the EU's emissions reduction targets.
 - Inland shipping and the inland emissions from shipping and harbour activities is contributing to land-based emissions and exposure.
- Ammonia (NH₃) volatilization from manure application and from smaller cattle, pig and poultry farms:
 - It contributes to the formation of secondary particulate aerosols, an important air pollutant due to its adverse impacts on human health⁶.
- Mobile refrigeration units:
 - Although refrigerated vehicles make up a small proportion of the vehicles on the road, they are unregulated, use out-dated fossil fuelled technology and are disproportionately polluting due to poor maintenance, cycle beating at certification, aftermarket defeat devices that eliminate or bypass pollution reduction equipment. What's worse, that pollution is

⁴ Sulphur content of fuel is well regulated in the Baltic Sea and the North Sea but not in the Mediterranean. Legislation for NO_x emissions on the North Sea and the Baltic Sea will come into force soon.

⁵ <https://www.transportenvironment.org/members>.

⁶ See also <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/indicators/eea-32-ammonia-nh3-emissions/eea-32-ammonia-nh3-emissions>.

concentrated on city streets where it does the most damage to our health.

- Space heating and power:
 - Specifically referring to problems due to biomass use promotion as renewable fuel in climate protection legislation, but also coal, oil and gas heating.

What ideas for actions are recommended?

The Partnership identified some ideas for actions to tackle the problem described above, which are presented here below in two parts. The first set of ideas for actions include those focusing on better implementation; the second set focuses on aspects related to better regulation.

Better Implementation

- Encourage MS and local/regional administrations to adopt a continuous improvement approach to sources of PM and NO_x (as these are the two pollutants that many MS struggle to legally comply with), taking action wherever possible.
- Further investigate the possibility to improve coherence of cities' implementation approaches of Low Emission Zones (LEZs), either via access restrictions based on pollution levels of vehicle or based on EURO standards, or via road pricing, speed limits or reducing on-road parking facilities.
- Based on the Partnership's findings, provide input to EU level policy discussions; for example during the Fitness Check of the EU Ambient Air Quality Directives, and to promote additional actions for national governments to remove/retrofit old installations, and for local government to improve transport infrastructure (possibly liaising with the Urban Partnership for Mobility).

Better Regulation

- Set up a multilevel governance working group to tackle unregulated issues. Drawing on the findings of previous Partnership's work on WP1 and WP2, this working group should focus on the gaps in existing regulations on sources of pollution and air quality levels of pollutants, and propose ways for the EU/national legislation to stay relevant in the face of changing scientific evidence. The working group's method should be based on the principle of subsidiarity. First, when looking for solutions to mitigate the negatives impacts of pollution, it should begin from the local level. If that is not possible, the search for solutions should be escalated at regional level, then at national level, and so on up to the European level, until a suitable solution is found.
- The working group could additionally reflect on how to ensure that the further reduction of the conformity factor for RDE tests of NO_x emissions, as provided for by Regulation (EU) 2016/646, and already agreed, can be enforced faster.

Which partners are necessary to promote the recommendation?

<i>Partner</i>	<i>Role</i>
Greater London Authority	Coordination
Europe (COM):	Expert input on better regulation
Europe (Eurocities, HEAL):	Expert input on better implementation and on better regulation
National/Regional (Partners and other MS/Regions):	Expert input on better implementation and on better regulation
Local (Partners and other cities):	Expert input on better implementation and on better regulation

1.2 ACTION N°1 – BETTER AIR QUALITY PLANNING (GOVERNANCE)

What is the specific problem?

Almost three quarters of Europeans live in cities, which remain the most immediate level of intervention in dealing with the threats to human health coming from pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter, and ozone.

However, “Air quality planning” in the EU is not always under the responsibility of cities, as the majority of Member States set the responsibility for drafting and adopting Air Quality Action Plans (AQAP) from Art. 23 of Directive 2008/50/EC⁷ at regional or even at national level. In the meantime, the measures defined by the AQAP should address different sectors, whose enforcement and implementation are of competence of urban, regional or national authorities, as appropriate.

These elements raise two needs:

- i. to improve the coordination between different levels of governance (national regional, local) involved, respecting specific situations and the subsidiarity principle; and
- ii. to improve the coordination within cities between air, health, energy, transport and urban planning, taking into account the contributions that could come from the involvement of citizens in urban policy development.

Furthermore, the work of the Partnership has allowed to identify issues of concern for many cities relating to the development and implementation of Cities Air Quality Action Plans. Notably, it has been found:

- That access to knowledge and experiences (e.g. on process optimization, pitfalls, stakeholder interactions, governance, monitoring, etc.) from front-runners cities having already designed and implemented AQAPs is often crucial to avoid inefficiencies, and that such knowledge should be improved.
- Likewise, that knowledge of best practices in the selection, design, funding, and implementation of air quality measures is essential to facilitate the choice of the relatively most effective measures for the AQAPs, and that such knowledge should be improved.

⁷ Article 23 - Air quality plans: 1. Where, in given zones or agglomerations, the levels of pollutants in ambient air exceed any limit value or target value, plus any relevant margin of tolerance in each case, Member States shall ensure that air quality plans are established for those zones and agglomerations in order to achieve the related limit value or target value specified in Annexes XI and XIV. In the event of exceedances of those limit values for which the attainment deadline is already expired, the air quality plans shall set out appropriate measures, so that the exceedance period can be kept as short as possible. The air quality plans may additionally include specific measures aiming at the protection of sensitive population groups, including children. Those air quality plans shall incorporate at least the information listed in Section A of Annex XV and may include measures pursuant to Article 24. Those plans shall be communicated to the Commission without delay, but no later than two years after the end of the year the first exceedance was observed. Where air quality plans must be prepared or implemented in respect of several pollutants, Member States shall, where appropriate, prepare and implement integrated air quality plans covering all pollutants concerned. 2. Member States shall, to the extent feasible, ensure consistency with other plans required under Directive 2001/80/EC, Directive 2001/81/EC or Directive 2002/49/EC in order to achieve the relevant environmental objectives.

Which action is needed?

The Partnership identified the following action to tackle the problem described above:

- Development of Code of Good Practice for Cities Air Quality Action Plans to ensure a consistent interpretation of the AQAP content listed under Art. 23 of Directive 2008/50/EU (Annex XV, Section A).
- Assemble and keep updated a register of examples of best practice in urban air quality planning, in order to encourage the dissemination of knowledge on relevant air quality measures and facilitate comparative analysis on their relative effectiveness.

How to implement the action?

1. Development and dissemination of a Code of Good Practices for Cities Air Quality Action Plans⁸ in cooperation with experienced cities. Expert input and reviewing can be provided by all partners.
2. Promote the dissemination of best practices in urban air quality planning between different governance levels (European/National/Regional/Urban), and between cities fostering the use of state-of-the-art methodologies, tools and data for air quality planning. This work could be carried out in cooperation with the Forum for Air Quality Modelling (FAIRMODE⁹).

Which partners are necessary to carry out the action?

<i>Partner</i>	<i>Role</i>
Milan	Action Leader
Europe (JRC):	Coordination of sharing register of air quality regional-local measures
Europe (EUROCITIES, HEAL):	Expert input/review of Code of Good Practices
Europe (URBACT):	Expert input/review, based on the experience of URBACT Action Planning and Implementation Networks
Europe/National (e.g. Polish National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management):	Promotion of the use of Code of Good Practice of Cities Air Quality Plans and dissemination of best practices and facilitation of comparative analysis on their relative effectiveness between cities and different governance levels
National (Croatia):	Expert input/review of Code of Good Practices and Cooperation for air quality planning within FAIRMODE

⁸ Note that in an exceedance situation air quality plans are mandatory (and not voluntary) – see Directive 2008/50/EC

⁹ <http://fairmode.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

Local (Utrecht):	Expert input/review of Code of Good Practices
Local (HSY/Helsinki):	Expert input/review of Code of Good Practices, incl. write a chapter about stakeholder and public consultation. Provide input on best practices to the register of air quality regional-local measures shared by JRC
Local (Milan, HSY/Helsinki):	Cooperation for air quality planning within FAIRMODE

2 BETTER FUNDING

2.1 ACTION N°2 – BETTER TARGETED FUNDING FOR AIR QUALITY

What is the specific problem?

The Partnership observed that the dynamics of measure implementation are to a high degree influenced by the business plans of each individual competent authority, primarily their organisational capacities and the availability of necessary financial resources.

Various EU and national funds are available to prepare and implement national, regional and local air pollution policies¹⁰. However, the Partnership found that there is an overall lack of specific programmes dedicated to funding of projects aimed at air pollution reduction, as funding of air pollution projects usually has to compete with other societal challenges. In addition, knowledge of the right procedures and conditions is required and stakeholders consider procedures to acquire funding for clean air projects from EU funds difficult. It also appears that in some Member States the legal support for local experiments could be improved.

Last but not least, the Partnership found that air quality policy is often treated as a stand-alone effort, where developments in economic activities, transport, agriculture and energy use are seen as given. Air quality policies becomes more effective when integrated to other policies, for examples decisions about implementation of common agricultural policy, the European transport network, or the EU-climate and energy policy. This increases the possibilities for synergies between policy areas or to include potential negative side effects for air pollution in an early stage of the policy development process. In this respect, the Partnership observed that cities are in demand for more possibilities to integrate existing EU/MS/regional funds for implementing air quality measures.

The elements above combined notably determine a need for an increase in the relevant funding options for urban projects/plans to carry out air quality management solutions. This issue is particularly sensitive for those urban areas where the costs of local abatement measures for limit values compliance are remarkable (stronger measures and wider range of action to be taken).

¹⁰ E.g. within the European Structural and Investment Funds €1.57 billion is allocated in the period 2014-2020 to air quality measures. Air quality measures can also be funded from the sustainable transport programme of the Cohesion Fund and measures to abate ammonia (a precursor of particulate matter) can be funded from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development. Management authorities in each member state decide about specific operational allocation of the available funds. Moreover co-funding for innovative projects can be obtained from the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) programme, LIFE-programme, the European Fund for Strategic Investments (the so-called Juncker Investment Plan), Horizon 2020 (e.g. the European Green Vehicles Initiative), and the Urban Innovative Actions in sustainable development programme (€371 million for 2015-2020).

Which action is needed?

The Partnership identified the following action to tackle the problem described above:

- Assessing funding needs for the sustainable design/implementation of Cities Air Quality Action Plans and develop an appropriate business model to fund air quality measures, considering also the possibilities offered by the integration of different funding instruments (e.g. blending facilities).
- Making recommendations for :
 - Improving the targeting of existing funding instruments on air quality, as well as for providing technical assistance for cities to access such funding instruments. As a positive example, the Croatian Environmental Protection and Energy Efficiency Fund (EPEEF) provides co-financing to cities for developing air quality plans and air quality projects, as well as for measures implementation. Likewise, in Poland, the National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management funds air quality projects, using resources coming, among other things, from penalties raised on pollutants.
 - Having funding bodies play a more active role in making funding opportunities easier to access for cities, as well as in facilitating the dissemination and the uptake of air quality–related project results in EU and national policy making.

How to implement the action?

1. Defining funding needs for the sustainable design/implementation of Cities Air Quality Action Plans, and assessing sources of funding, and options for their integration.
2. Developing a pilot business model based on the City Air Quality Action Plans designed on the basis of the Code of Good Practices developed under Action N°1 above.
3. Presenting results on pilot business model at event and disseminating them online (web, social media).
4. Drafting recommendations for improving the targeting of existing funding instruments on air quality, as well as their integration, based on the results of the pilot.
5. Drafting recommendations for having funding bodies play a more active role in making funding opportunities easier to access for cities, as well as in facilitating the dissemination and the uptake of air quality–related project results in EU and national policy making.
6. Sharing draft recommendations with stakeholders through internet-based public consultation and/or Partnership event and finalization of recommendations.

Which partners are necessary to carry out the action?

<i>Partner</i>	<i>Role</i>
Milan	Action Leader
Europe (COM):	Expert input/review
Europe (URBACT):	Invite URBACT cities to comment on the proposed business model
National/Regional:	Expert input/review
National (Croatia, Poland):	Expert input/review, especially with consideration on existing/future financing solutions
Local (HSY/Helsinki, and other cities):	Expert input/review

3 BETTER KNOWLEDGE

3.1 ACTION N°3 – BETTER FOCUS ON PROTECTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CITIZENS' HEALTH

What is the specific problem?

The findings of the Partnership clearly highlight that air quality planning in cities would benefit from complementing the 'focus on exceedances of limit values', with an additional emphasis on citizens' health.

In particular, an important finding of the Partnership is that, although limit values (based on existing indicators) are not questioned, there is a need to go beyond them, as there are health impacts even at concentrations below current EU air quality standards. For instance, it was pointed out that in some hot spot areas, such as urban traffic stations, there are often exceedances of limit values (NO₂, PM₁₀, even in some locations PM_{2.5}). In these areas a number of people are exposed to the concentrations exceeding limit values, although the majority of urban population is not. Urban background concentrations are in most cities well below limit values. These concentrations better reflect large scale health impacts in these cities¹¹.

The Partnership also observed the need to better consider how air quality outcomes can be better integrated into existing funding mechanisms. To this end, it would be useful to include considerations regarding the impact on air quality as early as possible in the planning formulation process as a possible criterion for funding infrastructural or industrial development projects. This would be an ideal way to communicate with stakeholders, financiers and government layers and to contribute to make it harder to fund projects that would contribute negatively to air quality.

The development of an additional indicator/-s for measuring air quality health impacts could be a way to move in that direction¹². Such a health assessment instrument would be no replacement of existing indicators, nor would it question the related limit values, but it would be a concrete way to go beyond them, as relevant for safeguarding citizens' health.

There is already a lot of technical knowledge about air quality, both regarding the effects and the causes of air pollution, as well as useful indicators¹³. However, the Partnership

¹¹ This was presented in the JRC modelling reported in the Partnership's findings on Work Package (WP)1. Notably urban populations, more than people residing in other areas, suffer the effects on health of traffic-related pollutants, mainly 'primary pollutants' such as NO/NO₂ and finest particles (Ultrafine Particles or Nanoparticles) characterized by the presence of toxic and carcinogenic compounds such as PAHs (Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons), Black Carbon, benzene and heavy metals.

¹² Indicator does not necessarily mean a single number. It may also refer to a set of numbers or an instrument/approach. Moreover, the term "indicator" can refer to many types of data.

¹³ Several tools, or indicators, are available, such as GES in the Netherlands, the use of DALYs, and health impact assessments. See for example the WHO report on Air Pollution Health Risk Assessments (AP-HRA) http://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/298482/Health-risk-assessment-air-pollution-General-principles-en.pdf?ua=1.

found that health impact assessments obtained by means of larger scale models are not able to capture the additional effect on health of traffic proximity exposure¹⁴, which can only be assessed with detailed models, which are more expensive - both financially and in term of computational time, although generally useful for determining the effects of local measures.

The Partnership believes that the development of this additional indicator/-s for measuring air quality health impacts can be a valuable opportunity to foster synergies in urban planning between different policies (i.e. air quality, energy, mobility, housing, etc.) and health.

As a further step, instruments able to assess external costs of different health impacts could be developed with the help of experts (i.e. WHO). This health assessment instrument could be used to obtain the relative value in term of external cost and become a basis for cost-benefit analysis of measures to improve air quality.

Last but not least, the introduction of an additional indicator/-s for measuring air quality health impacts would also contribute to boost the effectiveness of communication to the general public. Instead of talking about the co-funding of technical operations, budgets lines spent, rules modified, the institutional messages would focus more on measurable benefits generated in terms of well-being, quality of life improved, and cleaner air, which are issues that probably resonate more for most of European citizens.

Which action is needed?

The Partnership identified the following action to tackle the problem described above:

In the current situation (spatial) planning is based upon approaches that do not fully reflect adverse health effects of pollution. Therefore additional instruments are needed to take these effects into account, and protect and improve citizen's health. This could be useful for:

- Stimulating more focus on improvement of citizens' health and encouraging cities to give more emphasis to air quality-related impacts on health in the planning of their interventions.
- Requesting to indicate the impact of air quality on health and apply a new instrument for measuring benefits generated in terms of citizen's health and living environments.

How to implement the action?

1. Mapping and assessing existing (health) impact tools, or monetisation tools (e.g. Cost benefit analyses), specifically regarding their applicability for air pollution and/or for environmental stressors,¹⁵ taking also into account context (explanatory) factors (e.g. institutional and cultural factors)
2. Conducting empirical case studies

¹⁴ See also APHEKOM Project results http://aphekom.org/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=4846eb19-df8a-486e-9393-1b7c7ac78ce3&groupId=10347 and also <http://decumanus-fp7.eu/home/>.

¹⁵ See for instance https://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/sustainable/studies/sustainable_en.

3. Developing an instrument, including indicators and use the instrument in a pilot project or in a test run call (e.g. with funding from relevant EU programme/initiative)
4. Evaluating and disseminating results through event, web and social media.

Which partners are necessary to carry out the action?

<i>Partner</i>	<i>Role</i>
Utrecht	Action Leader
Europe (COM):	Expert input/review
Europe (URBACT):	Support the dissemination of the additional indicator/-s for measuring air quality health impacts
National/Regional (Croatia):	Expert input/review
Local (HSY/Helsinki, and other Partners)	Conduct empirical case studies, Expert input and review
Local (Utrecht):	Development, pilot and monitoring/evaluation
International (WHO ¹⁶):	Expert input and review

¹⁶ See for instance https://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/sustainable/studies/sustainable_en.



3.2 ACTION N°4 – AWARENESS RAISING AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING

What is the specific problem?

In spite of the work carried out by the EU institutions, by the Member States and by grass-root movements in Europe, the general public has still been slowly engaging in air quality policy initiatives and knowledge of the effects of poor air quality on health is not widely available. Likewise, the general public has in some instances a low appreciation and acceptance of the measures adopted to improve air quality (e.g. traffic bans). The general public is often not aware of the impact of personal choices on air pollution and on their own health.

The Partnership has found that differences in the level of awareness of the general public across cities about the negative impacts of pollution on health represent a barrier to the effectiveness of air quality policy measures. Such differences, however, could be alleviated by sharing examples of successful measures to trigger participation and to coproduce solutions. Increased public awareness about health impacts is therefore essential for improving social acceptance of and support for air quality management measures, and the Partnership agrees that providing cities with improved communication strategies and tools and with relevant examples of best practice could contribute to deliver that result.

Which action is needed?

The Partnership identified the following action to tackle the problem described above:

- Improving cities' communication strategies by focusing on the benefits brought by clean air for health and well-being, environment and economy, as well as potential of positive side-effects (e.g. less noise, less congestion, greener cities).
- Developing a Communication Toolbox for awareness-raising strategies on air quality issues and solutions, organisation of events etc., focusing on an integrated multi-stakeholder approach (European, national, regional, local).
- Bringing together educational and information models of awareness-raising campaigns for different stakeholder groups to emphasise shared responsibility for air quality, propose concrete actions, and provide support for bottom-up awareness-raising/knowledge sharing initiatives (e.g. by schools, local businesses, civil society organisations, etc.)

Examples of possible activities:

- Educational campaigns --> e.g. inform children; involve all stakeholders; concentrate on health authorities; sectoral campaigns, bottom-up initiatives. For instance, Croatia: CZ collaboration; Chimney sweepers campaign in Finland [Chimney sweepers are distributing a leaflet "burn right" for households about wood burning in woodstoves and pharmacies are distributing a leaflet about street dust (e.g. how to reduce your exposure)].
- Promote citizen science and better solutions to complement regulatory and mandatory approaches to measure and manage air quality (e.g. like

- in the <https://hackacity.eu/> project) or consultations around various measures.
 - Promote examples of participatory design and implementation of air quality policies, e.g. like recent citizen panels in Gdansk or ideas developed as part of <http://www.claircity.eu/> project or Smogathons (<https://www.smogathon.com/about>) to emphasise that air quality management is not only an expert issue; citizens may be part of a problem, but can also hold valuable solutions.
 - Scale up activities such as <https://www.cleanairday.org.uk/> to the European level.
- Inviting the European Commission, MS and cities to dedicate resources for the development and implementation of communication campaigns¹⁷.

How to implement the action?

1. Selection of examples of best practice in the area of educational and information models of awareness-raising campaigns for different stakeholder groups to emphasise shared responsibility for air quality, propose concrete actions, and provide support for bottom-up awareness-raising/knowledge sharing initiatives.
2. Development of Communication Toolbox for awareness-raising strategies on air quality issues.
3. Fine-tuning of Communication Toolbox through feedback from stakeholders at EU, national, regional and local level.
4. Publication of Communication Toolbox with illustrative examples of best practices (web, social media) and presentation at showcasing event/-s.

HEAL as a partner can assist in developing Air Quality communication strategies, including a toolbox for designing, delivering and evaluating awareness raising campaigns. The Air Quality Communication strategies and the Toolbox will be based on examples of best practices. Educational/information campaigns on "clean" driving styles, traffic control for lower emissions and information on tampering of particle filters on vehicles can be included here.

The work under this action will take into account results from EUROCIITIES' relevant working group/-s, EEA, noise abatement societies and their equivalents on air pollution. Likewise, synergies will be sought with ongoing relevant EU projects in order to capitalise on their results.

Which partners are necessary to carry out the action?

<i>Partner</i>	<i>Role</i>
HEAL	Action Leader
Europe (HEAL, EUROCIITIES):	Development of a communication strategy and toolbox
Europe (URBACT):	Support the development of Communication Toolbox, based on

¹⁷ In compliance with public procurement applicable regulations.



	existing good practice and URBACT experience with stakeholder engagement
National/Regional:	Expert input/review communication strategy and toolbox
National (Croatia, Poland):	Expert input/review communication strategy and toolbox. Notably Croatia will share with the Partnership the experience achieved as a pilot country in FAIRMODE WP 5 – Management practices
Local (HSY/Helsinki, other Partners, and other cities):	Expert input/review, implementation



3.3 ACTION N°5 – OUTREACH

What is the specific problem?

The Partnership has an EU-wide representation from cities, Member States, NGOs and the European Commission. Through an international workshop and other communication channels, such as the FUTURIUM web platform, the Partnership has already gathered valuable inputs from stakeholders and started to spread its results.

However, more work is needed to further disseminate the outcomes of the Partnership's work and to complement them with the views of an even larger number of stakeholders across Europe.

Indeed, one of the objectives of the Partnership was also to try and involve other Member States and cities in the development and implementation of pilots where models and best practices could be tested. For instance, some stakeholders indicated that they are interested in test-running the Code of Good Practices for Air Quality Plans, as developed by the Partnership in Action 1 above.

Which action is needed?

The Partnership identified the following action to tackle the problem described above:

- Organising local/national/European Air Quality events to exchange experiences and be updated about scientific developments under EU-projects (e.g. FAIRMODE), UNEP, WHO, the UNECE Air Convention, etc.

How to implement the action?

In order to foster exchange with and engagement of other stakeholders, the Partnership will organise a series of events (i.e. workshops, round-tables, or webinars) in different Member States. These events will be either national-/regional-oriented or have an international character.

Through these events the Partnership will seek to collect:

- Inputs on the new Action Plan (Findings, Actions and Recommendations)
- Suggestions for additional Actions and/or Recommendations
- Involvement of other stakeholders in the Actions (such as Partners already involved in the Partnership on Urban Mobility, and networks like the Covenant of Mayors and CIVITAS).

Partners will additionally seek opportunities to participate in relevant international workshops organised by third parties to further improve the outreach of the Partnership's communication activities on its results. As an example: The Partnership organised mid 2017 an international workshop in London to obtain input for the current Action Plan. The Netherlands will organise an international conference in spring 2018 on Ports and Shipping and clean air.

Which partners are necessary to carry out the action?

<i>Partner</i>	<i>Role</i>
The Netherlands (tbc)	Action Leader
Europe (HEAL):	Organisation of webinars
Europe (COM):	Participate in and promote selected events
Europe (URBACT):	Support the dissemination of stakeholder events and consider opening some of the URBACT events, especially on the national scale, to Partnership representatives
National (Poland):	Organize events/webinars with involvement of Polish advisors network and the signatories of Covenant of Mayors initiative, in coordination with the Polish Ministry of Development
National (Croatia):	Organize national workshop or Partnership meeting in cooperation with Croatian UDG representative (tbc)
Local (HSY/Helsinki):	Organize an event with relevant Finnish ministries
Partners:	Organise events Participate to events/webinars organised under this action, as relevant Promote the Partnership's results in third-party events