



Council of the European Union  
General Secretariat

---

---

**Interinstitutional files:  
2022/0347 (COD)**

---

---

**Brussels, 09 February 2024**

**WK 2122/2024 ADD 1**

**LIMITE**

**ENV**

**ENER**

**IND**

**TRANS**

**ENT**

**SAN**

**AGRI**

*This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.*

## **CONTRIBUTION**

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Working Party on the Environment
N° Cion doc.:	ST 14217/22 + ADD 1
Subject:	Air Quality Directive: Follow-up to the WPE on 5 February 2024 - comments from delegations

Following the call for comments on the above set out with WK 1873/2024, delegations will find attached comments from BG, HU and PL.

## **BULGARIA**

### ***Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe***

#### **Follow-up of the discussions in the WPE on 05.02.2024**

#### **Documents: WK 1511/2024 + ADD 1-3**

Bulgaria would like to thank the Presidency for the detailed explanatory note prepared in view of the discussions at the meeting of the Working Party on the Environment on 05.02.2024.

### Table for delegations' comments on steering note questions

+ = Support

- = Oppose

/ = No comments

Subject	Row 4- column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Steering note questions	Delegation position	Additional comments
Green/Yellow rows	Row 198	/	/	-	We have concerns about the lowering of the alert thresholds, including the introduction of alert thresholds for PM. Exceeding the PM alert thresholds and taking urgent action in the context of domestic heating remains a very serious issue and problem for us.
	Row 199	/	/	-	We do not support the introduction of new information thresholds.
Sampling points and supersites	Rows 163b (=149), 165, 166, 169, 169b	Art 9, art 10, Annex VII -1	Question 1	-	We appreciate the efforts of the Presidency, but we have not supported the inclusion of fixed or indicative measurements of carbon monoxide, sulphur dioxide and benzene in urban and rural supersites. We also do not support the Presidency's current proposal for flexibility regarding measurements at urban stations of pollutants that are below the assessment thresholds, also the mandatory measurement of carbon monoxide in rural supersites, and mandatory monitoring of metal deposition, BaP and PAHs, also in urban supersites. We understand that the purpose of the supersites is to collect information for long-term trend analysis, but we believe a balance is needed as all these requirements lead to substantial additional financial and administrative burden.
Alert and information thresholds	/	Annex I section 4	Question 2	-	We appreciate the Presidency's efforts, but we cannot be flexible regarding the introduction of new information thresholds for SO <sub>2</sub> , NO <sub>2</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> , including on the proposed values, as they are not supported by arguments, including with regard to health impacts. With regard to PM, the specificities of the reference method should be taken into account in terms of the possibility of informing public as soon as possible. We also have concerns about lowering of the alert thresholds, including the alert thresholds for PM. Exceeding the PM alert thresholds and taking urgent action in the context of domestic heating remains a very serious issue and problem for us. Please see our comments to Row 198 and Row 199.
Short-term action plans	Row 246	Art 20(1)	Question 3	-	The proposed wording of Article 20(1), line 246 reflects to some extent Bulgaria's concerns regarding the establishment of short-term action plans for PM <sub>2.5</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub> and the possibility of implementing measures when PM alert thresholds are exceeded. However, given our reasoning, we cannot support the deletion of the derogation for PM in line 246.
Transboundary air pollution	Rows 251a - e	Art 21(-1b)	Question 4		We appreciate the efforts of the Presidency and the proposed changes to Article 21, on which we are flexible. We note that the proposed revisions create opportunities to take into account and demonstrate transboundary pollution. However, we stress once again that the problem of transboundary pollution to Member States that are bordering on the EU and its resolution is

					frankly ignored, leaving MS to deal with it themselves and therefore bear the consequences of it in order to achieve the objectives of the Directive.
Transmission of information and reporting	Row 272	Art 23(3)	Question 5	-	We do not support the proposal to reduce the timeframe for reporting ambient air quality data, as this activity requires process time for analysis to take place once the full data set has been submitted to the National Ambient Air Quality Monitoring System. We also note the need for technological time to implement the possibility of deducting exceedances provided for in Articles 16 and 17. According to the opinion of our Environment Agency, maintaining the current requirement to report data no later than 9 months after the end of the year is optimal.
Limit values, target values, AECO, AERO	/	Annex I section 5.B	Question 6		AERO – scrutiny reservation.  Art. 13 and Annex I – We do not support EP’s proposed changes which require achieving interim air quality standards by 2030 at the latest and the WHO-proposed levels by 2035, Article 13 and Annex I respectively. As we have expressed in the negotiations in the WPE so far, for us the deadlines proposed by the EC are too ambitious. However, the EP's proposals are also unrealistic. These requirements will lead to a significant number of infringement procedures, which are not measures to achieve the higher requirements for clean air.
Postponement and exemptions	Row 214	Art 18 (1)	Addendum question 1	-	We stick to the General approach. We do not support the proposed amendments. Priority for us is the inclusion of sulphur dioxide and heavy metals in the list of pollutants, given the serious risks that the air quality standards cannot be achieved within the set timeframes, taking into account the situation at the moment as well.
Postponement and exemptions	Rows 215 - 218	Art 18 (1) (a) - (d)	Addendum question 2		We do not support the EP proposal for the requirement to meet the current limit values as a condition to apply for postponement. Row 214a should be deleted.  We could be flexible for the proposed option b: <i>b. The inclusion of air quality projections in the roadmap/air quality plan under Article 19(4), showing that the limit values will be attained by the end of the postponement period (which is also a condition in the current directive)</i>
Postponement and exemptions	New	Art 18 (3)	Addendum question 3		Our first preference is to keep the General approach. As a compromise we could be flexible on the proposed option c: <i>c. Establishment of a regular (annual, biennial, ...) implementation report to describe and demonstrate progress in the implementation of the measures described in the roadmap. This report should include emission projections and, where possible, air quality projections.</i>
Air quality plans	Rows 224 - 232	Art 19(1) - 19(4)	Question 7	+	Row 224 – given the Commission's original proposal and that of the EP, which coincide in terms of the timeframes (up to 2 years for the development and 3 years for the implementation of the plans), as a compromise, in order to protect it, we could support the Presidency's proposed 5-year period for the plans. From the experience we have so far, we believe that it is much more realistic in terms of the time needed to implement certain measures (for example in

					the field of domestic heating) than the proposal of 3 years.
				+	Row 225 – as a compromise, we could support the text proposed by the Presidency, which is linked to that in row 224.
				-	Row 226, 226a, 227 – We continue to believe that the preparation of air quality plans for ozone is an additional administrative burden. Their usefulness remains unclear, given the global scale of the problem, the high impact of transboundary pollution and the complex nature of the chemical processes involved. In this regard, we stick to the Council's mandate. The text of row 227 contradicts with the rest of the text.
				-	Row 229 – we cannot be flexible on the proposal. There is no added value from the proposed provision, which involves the development of air quality plans in different territorial units in relation to the obligation to reduce the indicator of average exposure of the population. The proposed provision makes the air quality plans more numerous and complex and leads to an additional administrative burden. In our view, flexibility should be given to MS, as has been given for ozone. We do not believe that it is possible to integrate the art. 19(1) and art. 19(3) plans into one plan, even though they may address the same pollutants and limit values, as they will have different territorial scope. We see no need to introduce a uniform 5-year planning and update cycle.
				-	Row 231 – We cannot support 2025 as a reference year.
Air quality plans	Rows 233, 236 - 240	Art 19(5) - 19(7), Annex VIII	Question 8		Row 233 – We do not support the roadmap terminology for practical, financial and administrative reasons. Row 236 and Row 237 – as a compromise, we could support the Presidency's proposals - the wording <i>where appropriate</i> and <i>'shall include, where relevant'</i> . Annex VIII - Our first preference is to stick to the General approach. As a compromise we could be flexible while maintaining the indicative nature of the requirements in Annex VIII.
Access to justice	Rows 301, 305, 306, 307a	Art 27	Question 9	-	We stick to the general approach. We do not support the proposed amendments, which relate to the EP's proposed amendments to Article 27, as these in turn are overly broad in scope, which could lead to a de facto inability to adopt and implement any measures to improve air quality, reduce pollution and therefore achieve the objectives actually set out in the Directive.
Compensation	Rows 311, 316	Art 28	Question 10	-	We continue to maintain our position that the texts for the compensation are inapplicable in the area of air quality.
Penalties	Rows 320, 321- 325	Art 29	Question 11	-	We do not support the proposals made. We stick to the General approach. In our view, it is difficult to draw a parallel between the IED texts and the AAQ directive, and for this reason we do not see any possibility of moving closer to the EP texts.

## HUNGARY

Comments on steering note questions

+ = support

- = Oppose

/ = No comments

Subject	Row 4-column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Steering note questions	Delegation position	Additional comments
Green/Yellow rows	/	/	/	/	
Sampling points and supersites	Rows 163b (=149), 165, 166, 169, 169b	Art 9, art 10, Annex VII -1	Question 1	/	Hungary can accept the compromise package proposed by the EP on Articles 9 and 10 and Annex VII. Remark: The measurement of CO is not justified because the concentration of CO in the air is so low, in both rural and urban locations, that the instrument cannot accurately measure it. The data are below the detection limit, therefore it is unnecessary to maintain instruments for this, we consider it unnecessary to measure this component, but we would like to emphasize that we are flexible.
Alert and information thresholds	/	Annex I section 4	Question 2	/	
Short term action plans	Row 246	Art 20(1)	Question 3	/	
Transboundary air pollution	Rows 251a - e	Art 21(-1b)	Question 4	/	

Transmission of information and reporting	Row 272	Art 23(3)	Question 5	+	Hungary can accept the proposal.
Limit values, target values, AECO, AERO	/	Annex I section 5.B	Question 6	/	
Postponement and exemptions	Row 214	Art 18 (1)	Addendum question 1		We are concerned about the deletion of the reference to socio-economic aspects, but as a compromise we can accept the reference to domestic heating systems in points (b) and (c) of the proposal.
Postponement and exemptions	Rows 215 - 218	Art 18 (1) (a) - (d)	Addendum question 2		Any of the proposals or a combination of them is acceptable to us.
Postponement and exemptions	New	Art 18 (3)	Addendum question 3		<p>Points a.3 and b. of the above proposal are acceptable. A scheduled implementation remains the preferred option, a step-by-step approach could be a solution, or the possibility of repeating the derogation, In line with point b., the possibility of a 5+5 year delay, as previously discussed in the Council Working Group, could be acceptable.</p> <p>The implementation report under points (c) and (d) has little added value but involves a lot of administration. Member States were required to develop national air pollution control programmes under the NEC Directive, aiming at reducing emissions, which also have an impact on concentrations. The programme must be updated continuously (every 18 months) on the basis of emission projections data if they are deviating from the emission reduction path. One way to reduce administration could be to link the two</p>

					programmes and include air quality projections in the national air pollution reduction programme.
Air quality plans	Rows 224 - 232	Art 19(1) - 19(4)	Question 7	/	
Air quality plans	Rows 233, 236 - 240	Art 19(5) - 19(7), Annex VIII	Question 8	/	
Access to justice	Rows 301, 305, 306, 307a	Art 27	Question 9	/	
Compensation	Rows 311, 316	Art 28	Question 10		Please reinsert the phrase "committed intentionally or negligently". Hungary proposes that, if the Article is maintained, the provision on the right of appeal should be limited to cases where plans are not prepared in time or are not adopted.
Penalties	Rows 320, 321-325	Art 29	Question 11	/	

---



## **POLAND**

### **Commentary to the document**

#### **“Air Quality Directive: WPE on 5 February 2024 – Presidency steering note”**

On the basis of:

- 1) “Air Quality Directive: WPE on 5 February 2024 – Four-column table and annexes”, 1 February 2024, No. 1511/2024 ADD 1
- 2) “Air Quality Directive: WPE on 5 February 2024 - Presidency steering note”, 1 February 2024, No. 1511/2024 INIT
- 3) “Air Quality Directive: WPE on 5 February 2024 – Addendum to the Presidency steering note”, 2 February 2024, No. 1511/2024 ADD 2

and after the discussions at the WPE forum on the 5 February 2024 below Poland would like to present its comments.

#### **General comments:**

1. The PL sees no justification for the introduction of air quality roadmaps. This is an additional document for which PL sees no added value, but only additional costs, administrative burden and, worse, possible delays in implementing measures due to possible Article 27 challenges to these documents.
2. PL would like to emphasize that it is very important to maintain the target values for benzo(a)pyrene and heavy metals.
3. PL sees no justification for the introduction of the concept of hotspots. Such a concept will generate problems in the interpretation and implementation of the Directive.

## Table for delegations' comments on steering note questions

+ = support

- = Oppose

/ = No comments

Subject	Row 4column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Steering note questions	Delegation position	Additional comments
Green/Yellow rows	/	/	/		
Sampling points and supersites	Rows 163b (=149), 165, 166, 169, 169b	Art 9, art 10, Annex VII -1	Question 1	+	In the spirit of compromise, PL can support this package.
Alert and information thresholds	/	Annex I section 4	Question 2	-	PL proposes for SO2 and NO2 information and alert thresholds an averaging period of 3 hours. The others, as was agreed upon at COREPER, although PL's preferred approach is to stick to the Council's mandate (if there is a choice only between the EP proposal and the Council proposal). We note that in this proposal the alert and information thresholds have already been tightened very significantly (values and averaging period at the same time).
Short term action plans	Row 246	Art 20(1)	Question 3	+	PL accepts the proposed new wording of Article 20(1).
Transboundary air pollution	Rows 251a - e	Art 21(-1b)	Question 4	+	PL accepts the proposed solution for Article 21.

Subject	Row 4column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Steering note questions	Delegation position	Additional comments
Transmission of information and reporting	Row 272	Art 23(3)	Question 5	-	<p>PL finds no justification for the Presidency's compromise proposal, under which the 9-month deadline for submitting air quality data will be maintained until 2029, and a 6-month deadline will be introduced starting in 2030.</p> <p>As explained earlier, the proposed 6-month deadline is not feasible, both technically and institutionally. Reducing the deadline to 6 months may result in unreliable and inadequate quality data being submitted.</p>
Limit values, target values, AECO, AERO	/	Annex I section 5.B	Question 6	-	PL prefers the provisions of the Council's mandate.
Postponement and exemptions	Row 214	Art 18 (1)	Addendum question 1	-	<p>PL does not accept any of the above proposals, as it is unclear how such a reason for postponement will be evaluated. It should be noted that PL is already allocating significant financial resources, is making every effort to replace as many domestic heating systems using solid fuels as possible by 2029, but the number and quality of equipment will determine the granting of the postponement, as the measures taken may still be insufficient to achieve the required air quality condition. PL of the proposals available "on the table" supports the Council's mandate.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PL does not accept deletion of the modelling condition.</li> <li>2. PL finds no justification for the proposal to add to the conditions for applying for a postponement on:</li> </ol>

Subject	Row 4column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Steering note questions	Delegation position	Additional comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- regarding adverse climatic conditions - the phrase "exceptional and unpreventable" - how can a Member State affect climatic conditions? In PL's view, there is an overextension of the condition that adds nothing,</li> <li>- requirement to maintain current limit values.</li> </ul> <p>3. roadmap/air quality plan - the wording of roadmaps was not in the Council's mandate.</p> <p>4. PL supports the Presidency insisting on the reintroduction of the climatic conditions alongside the dispersion characteristics and orographic boundary conditions.</p>
Postponement and exemptions	Rows 215 - 218	Art 18 (1) (a) - (d)	Addendum question 2		<b>PL may, by way of compromise, accede to the Presidency's proposal in A</b> (inclusion of air quality forecasts in the air quality plan in accordance with Article 19(4), showing that the limit values cannot be achieved by the attainment date (2030)), but without introducing the concept of air quality roadmaps.
Postponement and exemptions	New	Art 18 (3)	Addendum question 3	-	<p>This section only mentions air quality roadmaps - PL finds no justification for introducing this concept. In addition:</p> <p>1a: PL does not support the introduction of a trajectory. Alternatively, one may wonder about 3, but it should be worded more softly (e.g., that a Member State seeks to maintain a downward trend).</p> <p>b: PL finds no justification for an air quality roadmap. It could possibly be in an air quality plan. Also, we don't think the terms quite match up. In addition, it should be remembered that in case of updating air</p>

Subject	Row 4column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Steering note questions	Delegation position	Additional comments
					<p>quality plans if Article 27 is maintained, we may have to deal with challenges to them in courts and delay implementation of measures.</p> <p>c and d: PL does not support this solution. Additional reports are an additional burden on the administration.</p>
Air quality plans	Rows 224 - 232	Art 19(1) - 19(4)	Question 7		<p>Comments below:</p> <p>224 - PL proposes to maintain the Council's mandate. However, as a compromise, PL can accept a change in the wording of the provision.</p> <p>225 - PL can accept the proposed wording of paragraph 2 in paragraph 1.</p> <p>226 - PL can, in a spirit of compromise, agree to the wording of paragraph 2.</p> <p>226a - PL accepts that the proposal in the second column can be applied.</p> <p>227 - PL believes that the proposal of the provision in this line contradicts the previous provisions so PL proposes to delete it.</p> <p>228 - PL does not find justification for the provision that would specify the obligation to include corrective actions in the national air pollution programme (resulting from the NEC Directive). PL proposed that actions due to O3 could possibly be included in NAPPs during their update.</p> <p>This would not result in excessive costs and administrative burden of developing these programs.</p>

Subject	Row 4column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Steering note questions	Delegation position	Additional comments
					<p>We propose the following wording of paragraph 2, subparagraph 4, PL proposes to amend the wording of the provision:</p> <p><i>For <del>NUTS-1</del> territorial units where the ozone target value is exceeded, Member States shall ensure that the relevant <b>updates of</b> national air pollution control programme prepared pursuant to Article 6 of Directive (EU) 2016/2284 includes measures addressing <del>those exceedances</del> <u>ozone precursors covered by that Directive</u>.</i></p> <p>229 - PL could support the wording of paragraph 3.</p> <p>230a - PL believes that the proposed provision is incomprehensible and redundant. PL therefore proposes its deletion.</p> <p><b>231 - PL finds no justification for the introduction of this provision. The introduction of an obligation to establish air quality roadmaps in the event that air quality standards are exceeded in 2025 and 2026, in order to ensure that standards are achieved by the end of 2028 is procedurally unfeasible. It should be emphasized that Member States will not complete the transposition of the legislation by this date - according to the draft (Council mandate), the deadline for transposition of the directive is currently 2 years (and PL does not agree to shorten this period), so the units responsible for preparing air quality plans (in PL these are provincial authorities) will have no legal basis to start work in this regard.</b></p> <p><b>It will also not be possible to obtain funding for this task, without prior statutory assurance of funding for their development.</b></p> <p><b>Besides, the air quality roadmaps will duplicate the air quality plans currently being implemented in Member States resulting in</b></p>

Subject	Row 4column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Steering note questions	Delegation position	Additional comments
					<p><b>unjustified spending of funds on the same task - which may result in a violation of public finance discipline.</b></p> <p>232 - PL can support the idea of combining tasks in air quality plans (but without introducing the concept of air quality roadmaps) for cases of exceedances of standards for various pollutants, Activities in this regard are already carried out in PL in accordance with the Polish Environmental Law.</p>
Air quality plans	Rows 233, 236 - 240	Art 19(5) - 19(7), Annex VIII	Question 8		PL finds no justification for air quality roadmaps.
Access to justice	Rows 301, 305, 306, 307a	Art 27	Question 9		<p>PL finds no justification for adding in Article 27 a mandate for an appeal procedure for public concerned regarding the network, location and relocation of sampling points in accordance with Article 9, as well as for adding in this Article wording for air quality roadmaps.</p> <p>PL believes that making the preparation of air quality roadmaps mandatory will duplicate the task for the public administration responsible for preparing air quality plans. The new documents - air quality roadmaps will not improve air quality but may only delay the implementation of the air quality plans, by duplicating tasks and imposing duplicate duties, and placing a financial burden on Member States' budgets.</p> <p><b>Expanding the catalogue of organisations (including those concerned with health) with an appeal mandate may result in the inability to adopt an air quality plan for implementation by way of an act of law</b></p>

Subject	Row 4column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Steering note questions	Delegation position	Additional comments
					<p>(in PL it is a local legal act), and thus its implementation which will delay improvements in air quality.</p> <p>There is also a risk that there may be individuals among interested groups who will challenge these plans, as the actions set forth in them may result in the inhibition of business development - which may have the opposite effect.</p> <p>PL proposes to leave Art. 27 (3a) in place.</p>
Compensation	Rows 311, 316	Art 28	Question 10		
Penalties	Rows 320, 321-325	Art 29	Question 11		<p><b>PL has a scrutiny reservation to the change in the wording of the article on penalties.</b> PL is concerned that due to the source of exceedances of air quality standards – which in PL is predominantly the residential heating sector, the penalties may affect the elderly, the poor and those affected by energy poverty, who will not be able to afford to pay the penalties and will only exacerbate their poverty.</p> <p>Article 29 (3c) PL asks for clarification, what specifically is being referred to? What specifically is being referred to here, or ecosystems?</p>

**Additional comments:**



Row 4column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Comments
Row 144	Art 8 (3)	The phrase "may be used" is unnecessary. In addition, it may imply that modeling cannot be used in other zones. PL proposes to delete.
Row 147	Art. 8 (5)	<p>PL proposes to leave the provisions as in the Council's mandate.</p> <p>According to PL, there must be at least 2 years to put the new station into operation, if it is to be fixed measurements. Otherwise it is unrealistic to put up a new station in such a timeframe.</p> <p>PL supports the change from 'in the area of the maximum concentration' to 'in the area of the modeled exceedance'.</p>
	Annex VII, section 3, C	PL prefers not to introduce mandatory UFP measurements.
	Annex IX, 1(b)	PL suggests removing the text "how they compare with the most recent guideline values recommended by the WHO". First, a Member State applies to EU limit and target values, not WHO values. Second, some of the WHO values are for annual averages and 24-hour averages (only NO2 and CO have a 1-hour guideline value). It is impossible to compare individual measurement results (e.g., measured 1-hour or 24-hour averages with WHO annual average values, or measured 1-hour values with WHO 24-hour values. Thirdly, we have been fighting for years against misinformation on the Internet, i.e. comparing 1-hour and 24-hour measurement results with limit values, or WHO recommended values with a different averaging time. This misleads the public.
	Annex IX, 3	PL prefers the Council's mandate here. Different action is taken when there is a risk of exceeding these values and different action is taken when an exceedance is found.
	Table 1 of Annex VII (proposed footnote by the Presidency)	PL wishes to point out that there is an error in several places in the 4-column document and here. EMEP's guidelines and criteria can only be applied to rural background supersites, because the EMEP program only applies to such stations, not urban background stations. From the EMEP strategy (Monitoring strategy for the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe for the period 2020–2029): "Observations are made at remote and regional background sites and enable, in combination with other monitoring efforts within the ECE area, the evaluation and assessment of regional and transboundary contributions to local air pollution."

Row 4column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Comments
Row 119	Art. 4 p. 38	PL has a scrutiny reservation to the definition of public concerned.
	Art. 19	<p>Timelines for the air quality plans:</p> <p>PL notes the desirability of unifying the timeline for the various steps of air quality plan work referred to in Article 19, paragraphs 2 and 3. <b>PL proposes in paragraph 3 to use the timeline as for paragraph 2.</b></p> <p>This will make it possible to organize the work related to the preparation and implementation of the air quality plan for territorial units.</p>
	Annex IV, B.2(g)	<b>PL accepts the proposal.</b>
	<b>Annex IV, C, b</b>	<p>For PL, the preferred height of the inlet sampling point is 1.5-4 m above ground level.</p> <p>This notation regarding inlet height of 0.5 m is incorrect for several reasons. For example, there are no PM analysers or samplers on the market that have an intake (inlet) height of 0.5 m, so it will not be possible to take measurements at a height of 0.5 m above ground level, but if such a provision must necessarily be found here, PL supports it.</p>

Row 4column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Comments
	Annex VIII	<p><b><u>General comment:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PL finds no justification for expanding the title and introducing the term "air quality roadmap" into the scope of Annex VIII in all points of the Annex (and throughout the draft directive).</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PL objects to such a significant expansion of the scope of the air quality plan to include measures related to the reduction of emissions from the road transport sector.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>The air quality plan is to be consistent with other strategic documents that affect air quality, including those relating to urban transportation development and urban policy. but may not contain such an extensive scope. This will result in a drastic increase in the cost of air quality plans and a longer timeframe for their preparation and agreement.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PL sees a serious risk of not being able to agree on air quality plans of such scope. These documents will be challenged primarily by citizens who will not be able to afford zero-emission means of individual transportation, and who, for example, due to age and illness, cannot do without cars, and public administration units that will be obliged to purchase them. This also threatens to bankrupt transport companies.</u></b></p> <p>We also note that expanding this annex will lead to a significant increase in the cost of developing air quality plans. If Article 27 is retained, and because of the extensive public consultations, it will also lead to great difficulties in enacting and implementing air quality plans.</p> <p>Given a choice between the compromise proposal and the Council mandate - PL prefers the Council mandate.</p>
	Annex VIII, A, 2, c	<p>PL asks for clarification on what "the most recent data" means? This passage needs to be rewritten. We can only talk here about data from the year for which the annual air quality assessment was performed (annual air quality assessment) - that is, 2 years back, otherwise you would never enact a new or updated air quality plan, but only keep updating the draft.</p>

Row 4column table	Article, paragraph or Annex	Comments
	<b>Annex VIII, A, 4a</b>	PL can support this.
	<b>Annex VIII, B (introduction)</b>	PL proposes instead the wording "may include," although this too may not be sufficient to prevent problems associated with challenging air quality plans (Art. 27)and thus preventing implementation of corrective actions to reduce pollutant concentrations.
	<b>Annex VIII, B, 1, c</b>	PL opposes a change in the wording of this provision.  PL points out that zero-emission vehicles do not always fulfil their role as measures for public entities.
	<b>Annex VIII, B, 1, ca</b>	PL proposes to delete.
	<b>Annex VIII, B, 1, cb</b>	PL proposes to delete.  PL has a scrutiny reservation regarding the obligation to apply measures to improve the quality, efficiency, affordability and connectivity of public and public transportation. It is necessary to ask who will bear the costs in this regard?
	<b>Annex VIII, B, 1, d, i-xii</b>	PL proposes to remove this section. PL finds no justification for expanding the catalogue of measures to be included in air quality plans. These measures should be included in a strategy for development of road transport in cities, not in the air quality plans. The proposed scope of the air quality plans will result in a significant increase in the cost of preparing these plans - a burden on the state budget and the impossibility of implementing these plans within 2 years (in fact, it is 16 months in PL according to the Polish law).
	<b>Annex VIII, B, 1, e, i-iv</b>	PL proposes to delete.