

VCÖ-Empfehlungen zur Konsultation der EU-Kommission zum Thema Luftqualität “long questionnaire”

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) * (compulsory) (at least 1 answers)

- No adjustment of the approach described above is needed.
- 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
- Strengthening emissions controls: for example more stringent emissions ceilings or source controls that support the attainment of air quality limit values
- Don't know

1c. Which options should be considered to set more stringent obligations on air pollution emissions? (Please choose one response) * (compulsory)

- Set more stringent emission ceilings for 2020 in a revised EU National Emissions Ceilings (NEC) Directive. This option would set the priority on air pollution measures taken by national authorities to meet the ceilings.
- Set more stringent emission source controls at an EU level (e.g. on combustion plants, motor vehicles and other sources), focusing on the sectors where measures to reduce emissions will be most cost-effective in terms of improving air quality
- Combine, in a matched approach, more stringent national ceilings under the NEC Directive with more stringent source controls at EU level
- Other (Please describe below in question 2)
- Don't know

1d. What further level of ambition (if any) should the revised NEC Directive aim for in 2020? (Please choose one response) (optional)

- The NEC Directive should only match the recently-agreed 2020 ceilings in the so called Gothenburg Protocol under the UNECE Convention on Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution
- The NEC Directive ceilings for 2020 should go beyond the 2020 Gothenburg ceilings in order to achieve the objectives in the Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution
- The NEC Directive ceilings for 2020 should go beyond the 2020 Gothenburg ceilings and the Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution in order to support further objectives for air pollution reduction, including supporting the attainment of air quality limit values
- Other (Please describe below in question 2)
- Don't know

2. Please feel free to provide written comments on the course of action to ensure compliance with the current air quality legislation: (optional)(maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

Most of the limits set by Directive 2008/50/EC were agreed by EU Member States more than 10 years ago. Some are not even adequate to protect human health, while significant benefits can be expected from tighter limits – around €31.5 billion annually if the WHO PM2.5 recommendation were adopted and respected. Against this background, the most appropriate method of ensuring compliance with current limits is to speed up infringement action against non compliant MS, while at the same time continue to improve air quality legislation in the long run, with more ambitious health based limits to be met in the coming years and decades. In addition, the European Commission should propose new and/or revised legislation to control emissions from the most polluting sectors including transport. EU policy action in these areas would speed up compliance, reduce the number of infringement cases and help ensure implementation of measures which would reduce overall abatement costs. An ambitious revised NEC Directive is necessary to complement the source-sector approach and ensure the achievement of the EU's health and environmental objectives.

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) * (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
- It should maximise the synergies between the policies, and set out additional measures to reduce air pollutant emissions and improvements to air quality
- Other (please describe below in question 5)
- Don't know

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? * (compulsory)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

4a. Should specific complementary action be pursued to curb black carbon emissions? (Please choose one response) (optional)

- Yes (please describe below in question 5)
- No
- Don't know

 4b. Should specific action to address ozone precursors that are short-lived climate pollutants, such as methane, be reinforced? (Please choose one response) (optional)

- Yes (please describe below in question 5)
- No

Don't know

5. Please feel free to provide comments on the interaction between air pollution and climate change policies: (optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

The EU must establish and implement faster and more far-reaching domestic GHG emission reductions. It should adopt mandatory renewable and energy efficiency targets through EU policy. Such ambitious climate policy is necessary for countering climate change but would also bring benefits for people's health and the environment.

In addition, air pollution policy must be strengthened. Several air pollution measures can contribute to climate change mitigation, such as measures to reduce emissions and/or concentrations of pollutants that are both "traditional" air pollutants and act as greenhouse gases, i.e. methane, tropospheric ozone (and its precursors) and black carbon.

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 one response) * (compulsory)

- 2025
- 2030
- Other (please comment below in question 8)
- Don't know

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) * (compulsory)

- No change: only the level of protection delivered by current legislation
- The level delivered by the forthcoming climate and energy framework for 2030, without additional air pollutant emission reductions
- Substantial progress beyond the climate and energy framework, towards the maximum achievable pollution reduction
- The maximum achievable pollution reduction (MTR)

Don't know

8. Please feel free to provide comments on the level of ambition: (optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

In order to achieve the EU's long-term objectives of "a high level of quality of life and social well-being for citizens by providing an environment where the level of pollution does not give rise to harmful effects on human health and the environment" the levels of air pollutants must come down so that the WHO's guidelines and the critical loads and levels are no longer exceeded. This requires emission reductions beyond what is estimated to be achieved by the limited set of technical abatement measures included in the MTR. Therefore the full application of MTR needs to be combined with structural changes, such as energy efficiency and savings, fuel switch (from fossil to renewables), and behavioral change (e.g. changed transport patterns, less meat consumption). Such structural changes are necessary to achieve the policy objectives for both air pollution and climate change.

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) * (compulsory)

Equal weight to both

Give priority to addressing human health impacts

Give priority to addressing environmental impacts

Other (Please describe below)

Don't know

10. Please feel free to provide comments on setting priorities: (optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

Sub-section 3.4: Choice of policy instruments

11. Which of the following policy instruments should be given priority to achieve the environmental and health objectives in the period up to 2030? (Please rank as many of the following options as you wish in order of preference from 1 (most preferred) to 6 (least preferred))

	1	2	3	4	5	6
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	<input type="checkbox"/>					

emission reduction targets.						
(optional)						
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
(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.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
(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.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
(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). (optional)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Other instruments (please provide comments in question 12).	<input type="checkbox"/>					
(optional)						

12. Which other instruments should be used? (optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

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/m³ for 2020 be made mandatory? * (compulsory)

Yes

No

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) * (compulsory)

No change

Yes, review the limit values and bring them closer to WHO guidance values

Bring AAQD limit values closer to WHO guidance values only in the future, once the EU has made further emissions reductions

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) * (compulsory)

Yes, introduce monitoring requirement

Yes, introduce non-binding target value (along with a monitoring requirement)

Yes, introduce binding limit value (along with a monitoring requirement)

No

Don't know

16. Should any other components of particulate matter be addressed in the AAQD? (optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

There is growing concern about the health impact of smallest particles in ambient air, i.e. ultrafine particles (UF) and engineered nanoparticles. While these pollutants have attracted significant scientific

and medical attention over the last decade, they remain unregulated under EU law. The EU should set a framework to monitor concentrations of such particles into the air and investigate the possibility of setting an EU wide particle number limit value for the protection of human health.

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) * (compulsory)

- Replace the current ozone target values with binding limit values set at the same levels
- Replace the current ozone target values with binding limit values set at more stringent levels
- No change
- Don't know

Sub-section 4.2a: Management framework

18. Should any limit values be removed from the AAQD? If so, which? (optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

No.

Sub-section 4.2b: Management framework

19. Should any *other* monitoring and reporting obligations be reduced in the AAQD? If so, which? (optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

No.

Sub-section 4.2c: Management framework

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

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

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

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

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

No

Don't know

22. Please feel free to provide comments on the options for the revision of the AAQ Directive: (optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

Compared to WHO recommendations, existing EU standards are not sufficient to protect human health against the adverse impacts caused by the exposure to SO₂, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀ and O₃. There are currently no specific standards for ultra-fine particles, despite evidence of harmful effects due to their small size. For PM_{2.5}, the annual limit value which will enter into force in 2015 is 25µg/m³ whereas the WHO recommends a limit of 10µg/m³ and the US annual standard is 12µg/m³. The monetary health benefits from complying with the WHO guidelines for PM_{2.5} would amount to some €31.5 billion annually and could save 22 months of life expectancy for persons of 30 years of age and older (APHEKOM). The EU should therefore update its standards and provide mid and long term AQ objectives in order to reach the ambition level of at least the latest WHO recommendations. In parallel, the EU must speed up implementation and enforcement of existing standards.

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) (optional)

Yes

No

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) (optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

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) (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)

No flexibility mechanisms should be introduced

Don't know

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)

*
(compulsory)

Yes

No

Don't know

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

(optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

Section 6/6: Addressing major air pollution sources

Sub-section 6.1: Road transport

28. Which additional measures should be taken to address air emissions from road transport? (Please rank as many of the following options as you wish in order of preference from 1 (most preferred) to 8 (least preferred))

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
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 <i>(optional)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Develop a new, more stringent standard to be mandatory for motor vehicles after 2020 <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Introduce standards to retrofit existing heavy duty vehicles (e.g. trucks, buses) to reduce their air pollution emissions <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduce a mandatory road charging scheme for heavy duty vehicles that incorporates air pollutant emissions ("eurovignette directive") <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please provide comments in question 29) <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No additional measures should be introduced <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Don't know <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					

29. Please feel free to comment on your answers regarding regulation of road transport emissions: (optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

Standards for road vehicles (Euro standards) directly impact ambient air quality. But for several reasons they fail to deliver enough improvements in air quality. Standards are not stringent enough, tend not to deliver in real world driving, and in-use compliance checking is poor. Euro standards should be designed so as to ensure that the emission levels are also low under real world conditions. Real world condition emission tests, especially referred to high traffic urban areas conditions, should be made more stringent as they have recently proven to be extremely relevant to identify heavily polluting vehicles that may have nominal low values of emissions however showing extremely higher emissions in at pace, stop/go situation. Also, the European Commission should introduce a EURO 7/VII standard to further reduce pollution from road vehicles and improve in use compliance. Finally, clean and sustainable transport modes (public transport, cycling, walking) should be actively promoted by the EU.

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

30. Which additional measures should be introduced for non-road machinery? (Please rank as many of the following options as you wish in order of preference from 1 (most preferred) to 5 (least preferred))

	1	2	3	4	5
Extend the scope of application of current Stage IV NRMM standards to additional power classes and applications, including stationary applications (optional)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
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. (optional)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensure that approval emission tests reflect the machinery's emissions in real world circumstances (optional)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensure that there are incentives for retrofitting and/or replacing older inland waterway vessels' engines by newer and cleaner ones (optional)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please provide comments in question 31) (optional)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No additional measures should be introduced (optional)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Don't know (optional)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

31. Please feel free to comment on your answers regarding regulation of emissions from off-road transport and non-road machinery: (optional)(maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

In view of the recent evidence of the impact of diesel emissions on human health (WHO), the rapid introduction of new regulatory emissions stages for all types of non-road engines is crucial to guarantee a sufficient level of protection for people's health. In particular, the Commission should extend the

scope of the regulation to also cover the smallest and largest engine categories, to include stationary applications. It should propose a stringent particulate number (PN) limit that will guarantee the rapid introduction of the best available technology (closed particulate filters) to address all fractions of PM emissions (including ultra-fine particles and black carbon). Both the introduction of stringent PN limits for new machines and retrofit schemes for existing ones will be absolutely necessary if we want to reduce harmful impacts from this sector. Moreover, the Commission should follow the call from the co-legislators to align the next NRMM stages with the most recent standards for heavy-duty vehicles (Euro VI).

Sub-section 6.3: Agricultural sector

32. Which additional measures should be taken to address air emissions from the agricultural sector? (Please rank as many of the following options as you wish in order of preference from 1 (most preferred) to 5 (least preferred))

	1	2	3	4	5
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 <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
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 <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Promote good practices in manure management and manure spreading in Member States through support from the Rural Development Fund <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Introduce measures to ban or restrict the burning of agricultural waste <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Other (please provide comments in question 33) <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
No additional measures should be introduced <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Don't know <i>(optional)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				

33. Please feel free to comment on your answers regarding regulation of emissions from the agricultural sector: *(optional)* (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

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) (optional)

- Extend in future the forthcoming harmonised limit values under the Ecodesign Directive (2009/125/EC) to control emissions from installations above the Ecodesign capacity threshold (please elaborate in question 35 up to which capacity level).
- Develop a supplementary and more stringent standard for installations below the Ecodesign capacity threshold for use in national and local measures such as fiscal incentives to be applied in zones that are in non-compliance with air quality limits
- Regulate combustion installations above the Ecodesign capacity threshold but below the 50MW threshold set in the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)
- No additional measures should be introduced
- Other (please elaborate below)
- Don't know

35. Please feel free to comment on your answers regarding regulation of emissions from the small/medium combustion sector: (optional)(maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

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) (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
- Reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from ships in EU waters by setting speed restrictions.
- Aim for a reduction of total NOx emissions from shipping by retrofitting all vessels with NOx abatement equipment.
- Require continuous monitoring of the emissions of sulphur dioxide, NOx, particulate matter (fine dust) as it is practised on many industrial installations on land.
- Other (please elaborate below)

37. Please feel free to comment on your answers regarding regulation of emissions from the shipping sector: (optional) (maximum 1200 characters; count: 0)

Air pollution from shipping is projected to increase and a lack of action will undermine efforts made in other sectors. With land based emission sources being continuously reduced and ship emissions steadily growing, ship emissions of nitrogen oxides may well exceed all EU land based sources combined by 2020. The recent adoption of a revised Directive on the sulphur content of marine fuels is a first step to address emissions of SO₂ and PM. The European Commission and Member States should now focus making sure that all sea areas around Europe become combined SO₂/PM/NO_x Emission Control Areas, on developing rules and/or instruments to control NO_x emissions from existing ships, introduce mandatory speed limits for ships as well as ensuring that ships actually comply with EU and IMO environmental standards. Moreover, while the Commission is exploring ways to reduce GHG emissions from ships, it should seek for opportunities to establish an integrated approach for all air emissions (including SO_x, NO_x and primary PM).

Final comments

38. Please feel free to provide any further comments related to the revision of the Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution: (optional) (maximum 2400 characters; count:0)

Most important issues:

- Urgency to take EU-wide emission abatement measures in key sectors, i.e. agriculture (ammonia and PM); international shipping (SO₂, NO_x, PM); domestic solid-fuel combustion (PM, VOCs); non-road mobile machinery (NO_x, PM); road vehicles (NO_x, PM); and small industrial combustion plants (NO_x,

SO₂, PM).

- Such action on specific sources of pollution is crucial to ensure quick and effective reductions of the harmful effects of air pollutants to the environment and people's health. We therefore call upon the European Commission to this year propose ambitious and comprehensive legislative action in all those sectors, either via new or revised sector specific legislation (or both). In some cases, such action is long overdue.

- In order to achieve necessary reductions in ozone levels, EU and member states must take additional measures to reduce VOC emissions. According to projections under the Baseline scenario the most important VOC-emitting sectors to address are solvent use, industrial processes, domestic combustion and road transport.

- Urgency to set new, stricter national emission ceilings under the National Emissions Ceilings Directive. Binding ceilings should be set for 2020, 2025 and 2030. The level of ambition for 2020 must go significantly beyond those of the revised Gothenburg Protocol and the 2005 Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution, and for 2030 the level of ambition aim should be to achieve – to the extent possible – the long term objectives of the 6th EAP, i.e. to achieve “levels of air quality that do not give rise to significant negative impacts on and risks to human health and the environment.”

- Speed up infringement action under Ambient Air Quality Directive to trigger immediate action by Member States to achieve the air quality standards and thus to better protect citizens suffering from air pollution.

- Provide mid and long term AQ objectives in order to reach the ambition level of at least the latest WHO recommendations.