Consultation on the revision of Regulation (EU) No 443/2009 and Regulation (EU) No 510/2011 setting CO₂ emission performance standards for light duty vehicles

The statistics provided in this document are meant to give an overview of the 203 replies* received to the abovementioned consultation, which took place between 20 July and 28 October 2016.

A more extensive analysis of the replies received (including those submitted in the free text fields) will be provided in the future impact assessment.

In what capacity are you completing this questionnaire?

		Answers	Ratio
As an individual / private person		82	40.39%
Public authority	•	10	4.93%
Academic / Research institution	I	6	2.96%
International organisation	I	4	1.97%
Civil society organisation		33	16.26%
Professional organisation		30	14.78%
Private enterprise		28	13.79%
Other	•	10	4.93%
No Answer		0	0%

Is your company an SME? (For more information, please see http://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/sme-definition/index_en.htm)

	Answers	Ratio
Yes - medium-sized enterprise (having less than 250 staff and/or	2	0.99%
turnover below €50m and/or a balance sheet below €43m)		
Yes - small enterprise (having less than 50 staff and/or turnover below	0	0%
€10m and/or a balance sheet below €10m)		
Yes - micro enterprise (having less than 10 staff and/or turnover below	1	0.49%
€2m and/or a balance sheet below €2m)		
No	25	12.32%
I don't know	0	0%
No Answer	175	86.21%

^{*} It should be noted that 2 additional replies (one from a public authority and one from a professional organisation) were received outside the EU Survey and are not included in these statistics. However, these replies will also be taken into account for the further analysis.

Where are your member companies located?

		Answers	Ratio
Afghanistan		0	0%
Åland Islands		0	0%
Albania		0	0%
Algeria		0	0%
American Samoa		0	0%
Andorra		0	0%
Angola		0	0%
Anguilla		0	0%
Antarctica		0	0%
Antigua and Barbuda		0	0%
Argentina		0	0%
Armenia		0	0%
Aruba		0	0%
Australia		0	0%
Austria		2	0.99%
Azerbaijan		0	0%
Bahamas		0	0%
Bahrain		0	0%
Bangladesh		0	0%
Barbados		0	0%
Belarus		0	0%
Belgium	L	5	2.46%
Belize		0	0%
Benin		0	0%
Bermuda		0	0%
Bhutan		0	0%
Bolivia		0	0%
Bosnia and Herzegovina		0	0%
Botswana		0	0%
Bouvet Island		0	0%
Brazil		0	0%
British Indian Ocean Territory		0	0%

British Virgin Islands	0	0%
Brunei	0	0%
Bulgaria	0	0%
Burkina Faso	0	0%
Burundi	0	0%
Cambodia	0	0%
Cameroon	0	0%
Canada	0	0%
Cape Verde	0	0%
Cayman Islands	0	0%
Central African Republic	0	0%
Chad	0	0%
Chile	0	0%
China	0	0%
Christmas Island	0	0%
Clipperton	0	0%
Cocos (Keeling) Islands	0	0%
Colombia	0	0%
Comoros	0	0%
Congo	0	0%
Cook Islands	0	0%
Costa Rica	0	0%
Côte d'Ivoire	0	0%
Croatia	0	0%
Cuba	0	0%
Curaçao	0	0%
Cyprus	0	0%
Czech Republic	1	0.49%
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0	0%
Denmark	0	0%
Djibouti	0	0%
Dominica	0	0%
Dominican Republic	0	0%
Ecuador	0	0%

El Salvador 0 0% Equatorial Guinea 0 0% Eritrea 0 0% Estonia 0 0% Ethiopia 0 0% Faeroe Islands 0 0% Falkland Islands 0 0% Fiji 0 0% Finland 1 0.49% France 1 0.49% French Guiana 0 0% French Polynesia 0 0% French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Georgia 0 0 Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0 0% Greece 0 0 0% Greenland 0 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0 0% Guine	Egypt		0	0%
Eritrea 0 0% Estonia 0 0% Estonia 0 0% Ethiopia 0 0% Faceroe Islands 0 0% Falkland Islands 0 0% Fijj 0 0% Finland 1 0.49% France 1 0.49% French Guiana 0 0% French Polynesia 0 0% French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% 0% Gibraltar 0 0% 0% Greece 0 0 0% Greanda 0 0% 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% 0% Guadeloupe 0 0 0%	El Salvador		0	0%
Estonia 0 0% Ethiopia 0 0% Faeroe Islands 0 0% Falkland Islands 0 0% Fiji 0 0% Finland 1 0.49% France 1 0.49% French Guiana 0 0% French Polynesia 0 0% French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% 0% Greece 0 0% 0% Grenada 0 0% 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% 0% Guadeloupe 0 0 0% Guirea 0 0 0% Guireansey 0 0 0%	Equatorial Guinea		0	0%
Ethiopia 0 0% Faeroe Islands 0 0% Falkland Islands 0 0% Fijj 0 0% Finland 1 0.49% France 1 0.49% French Guiana 0 0% French Polynesia 0 0% French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% 0% Greece 0 0% 0% Greenland 0 0% 0% Greenland 0 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% 0% Guadeloupe 0 0 0% Guirea 0 0 0% Guirea-Bissau 0 0 <td>Eritrea</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td>	Eritrea		0	0%
Faeroe Islands 0 0% Falkland Islands 0 0% Fijji 0 0% Finland 1 0.49% Finland 1 0.49% France 1 0.49% French Guiana 0 0% French Polynesia 0 0% French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% 0% Greece 0 0% 0% Greenland 0 0% 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% 0% Guam 0 0% 0% Guarmala 0 0 0% Guinea 0 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0	Estonia		0	0%
Falkland Islands 0 0% Fiji 0 0% Finland 1 0.49% France 1 0.49% French Guiana 0 0% French Polynesia 0 0% French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% 0% Greece 0 0 0% Grenada 0 0% 0% Grenada 0 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0 0% Guam 0 0 0% Guarnsey 0 0 0% Guinea 0 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0 0% Guinea-Bissau <t< td=""><td>Ethiopia</td><td></td><td>0</td><td>0%</td></t<>	Ethiopia		0	0%
Fiji 0 0% Finland 1 0.49% France 1 1 0.49% French Guiana 0 0% French Polynesia 0 0% French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% 0% Greece 0 0 0% Greenland 0 0% 0% Grenada 0 0% 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% 0% Guam 0 0% 0% Guireasey 0 0% 0% Guinea 0 0% 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% 0% Guiyana 0 0% 0%	Faeroe Islands		0	0%
Finland 1 0.49% France 1 0.49% French Guiana 0 0% French Polynesia 0 0% French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% 0% Greece 0 0% 0% Greenland 0 0% 0% Grenada 0 0% 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% 0% Guam 0 0% 0% Guireasey 0 0% 0% Guinea 0 0% 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% 0% Guyana 0 0% 0% Haiti 0 0% 0%	Falkland Islands		0	0%
France 1 0.49% French Guiana 0 0% French Polynesia 0 0% French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% 0% Greece 0 0% 0% Greenland 0 0% 0% Grenada 0 0% 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% 0% Guam 0 0% 0% Guernsey 0 0% 0% Guinea 0 0% 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% 0% Haiti 0 0% 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0% <td>Fiji</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td>	Fiji		0	0%
French Guiana 0 0% French Polynesia 0 0% French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% Greece 0 0% Greenland 0 0% Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guarnsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Finland		1	0.49%
French Polynesia 0 0% French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% Greece 0 0% Greenland 0 0% Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guarmala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0 0%	France		1	0.49%
French Southern and Antarctic Lands 0 0% Gabon 0 0% Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% Greece 0 0% Greenland 0 0% Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	French Guiana		0	0%
Gabon 0 0% Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany I 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% Greece 0 0% Greenland 0 0% Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guirneasey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	French Polynesia		0	0%
Gambia 0 0% Georgia 0 0% Germany 1 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% Greece 0 0% Greenland 0 0% Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	French Southern and Antarctic Lands		0	0%
Georgia 0 0% Germany I 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% Greece 0 0% Greenland 0 0% Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Gabon		0	0%
Germany I 6 2.96% Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% Greece 0 0% Greenland 0 0% Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Gambia		0	0%
Ghana 0 0% Gibraltar 0 0% Greece 0 0% Greenland 0 0% Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Georgia		0	0%
Gibraltar 0 0% Greece 0 0% Greenland 0 0% Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Germany	I	6	2.96%
Greece 0 0% Greenland 0 0% Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Ghana		0	0%
Greenland 0 0% Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Gibraltar		0	0%
Grenada 0 0% Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Greece		0	0%
Guadeloupe 0 0% Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Greenland		0	0%
Guam 0 0% Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Grenada		0	0%
Guatemala 0 0% Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Guadeloupe		0	0%
Guernsey 0 0% Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Guam		0	0%
Guinea 0 0% Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Guatemala		0	0%
Guinea-Bissau 0 0% Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Guernsey		0	0%
Guyana 0 0% Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Guinea		0	0%
Haiti 0 0% Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Guinea-Bissau		0	0%
Heard Island and McDonald Islands 0 0% Honduras 0 0%	Guyana		0	0%
Honduras 0 0%	Haiti		0	0%
	Heard Island and McDonald Islands		0	0%
Hong Kong 0 0%	Honduras		0	0%
	Hong Kong		0	0%

Hungary	3	1.48%
Iceland	0	0%
India	0	0%
Indonesia	0	0%
Iran	0	0%
Iraq	0	0%
Ireland	1	0.49%
Isle of Man	0	0%
Israel	0	0%
Italy	0	0%
Jamaica	0	0%
Japan	0	0%
Jersey	0	0%
Jordan	0	0%
Kazakhstan	0	0%
Kenya	0	0%
Kiribati	0	0%
Kuwait	0	0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	0%
Laos	0	0%
Latvia	0	0%
Lebanon	0	0%
Lesotho	0	0%
Liberia	0	0%
Libya	0	0%
Liechtenstein	0	0%
Lithuania	0	0%
Luxembourg	0	0%
Macao	0	0%
Macedonia	0	0%
Madagascar	0	0%
Malawi	0	0%
Malaysia	0	0%
Maldives	0	0%

Mali	0	0%
Malta	0	0%
Marshall Islands	0	0%
Martinique	0	0%
Mauritania	0	0%
Mauritius	0	0%
Mayotte	0	0%
Mexico	0	0%
Micronesia	0	0%
Moldova	0	0%
Monaco	0	0%
Mongolia	0	0%
Montenegro	0	0%
Montserrat	0	0%
Morocco	0	0%
Mozambique	0	0%
Myanmar/Burma	0	0%
Namibia	0	0%
Nauru	0	0%
Nepal	0	0%
Netherlands	0	0%
New Caledonia	0	0%
New Zealand	0	0%
Nicaragua	0	0%
Niger	0	0%
Nigeria	0	0%
Niue	0	0%
Norfolk Island	0	0%
North Korea	0	0%
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0%
Norway	0	0%
Oman	0	0%
Pakistan	0	0%
Palau	0	0%

Panama	0	0%
Papua New Guinea	0	0%
Paraguay	0	0%
Peru	0	0%
Philippines	0	0%
Pitcairn Islands	0	0%
Poland	1	0.49%
Portugal	0	0%
Puerto Rico	0	0%
Qatar	0	0%
Réunion	0	0%
Romania	0	0%
Russia	0	0%
Rwanda	0	0%
Saint Barthélemy	0	0%
Saint Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha	0	0%
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0	0%
Saint Lucia	0	0%
Saint Martin	0	0%
Saint Pierre and Miquelon	0	0%
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0	0%
Samoa	0	0%
San Marino	0	0%
São Tomé and Príncipe	0	0%
Saudi Arabia	0	0%
Senegal	0	0%
Serbia	0	0%
Seychelles	0	0%
Sierra Leone	0	0%
Singapore	0	0%
Sint Maarten	0	0%
Slovakia	0	0%
Slovenia	0	0%
Solomon Islands	0	0%

Somalia	0	0%
South Africa	0	0%
South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands	0	0%
South Korea	0	0%
South Sudan	0	0%
Spain	1	0.49%
Sri Lanka	0	0%
Sudan	0	0%
Suriname	0	0%
Svalbard and Jan Mayen	0	0%
Swaziland	0	0%
Sweden	0	0%
Switzerland	0	0%
Syria	0	0%
Taiwan	0	0%
Tajikistan	0	0%
Tanzania	0	0%
Thailand	0	0%
the Holy See/Vatican City State	0	0%
Timor-Leste	0	0%
Togo	0	0%
Tokelau	0	0%
Tonga	0	0%
Trinidad and Tobago	0	0%
Tunisia	0	0%
Turkey	0	0%
Turkmenistan	0	0%
Turks and Caicos Islands	0	0%
Tuvalu	0	0%
Uganda	0	0%
Ukraine	0	0%
United Arab Emirates	0	0%
United Kingdom	3	1.48%
United States	0	0%

United States Minor Outlying Islands	0	0%
Uruguay	0	0%
US Virgin Islands	0	0%
Uzbekistan	0	0%
Vanuatu	0	0%
Venezuela	0	0%
Vietnam	0	0%
Wallis and Futuna	0	0%
Western Sahara	0	0%
Yemen	0	0%
Zambia	0	0%
Zimbabwe	0	0%
No Answer	178	87.68%

Please give your country of residence/establishment:

		Answers	Ratio
Austria		10	4.93%
Belgium		34	16.75%
Bulgaria		1	0.49%
Croatia		0	0%
Cyprus		0	0%
Czech Republic		2	0.99%
Denmark		17	8.37%
Estonia		0	0%
Finland	I	3	1.48%
France		15	7.39%
Germany		26	12.81%
Greece	I	1	0.49%
Hungary	•	13	6.4%
Ireland	I	4	1.97%
Italy	I	6	2.96%
Latvia		1	0.49%
Lithuania		1	0.49%
Luxembourg		1	0.49%

			001
Malta		0	0%
Netherlands		17	8.37%
Poland		1	0.49%
Portugal		2	0.99%
Romania		1	0.49%
Slovakia		0	0%
Slovenia		1	0.49%
Spain	I	3	1.48%
Sweden		4	1.97%
United Kingdom		18	8.87%
Other		12	5.91%
No Answer		9	4.43%

In your view, how important is the following action?: Setting CO2 emission targets for new cars and light commercial vehicles in the EU in order to reduce emissions from this segment and contribute to meeting the EU's overall climate goals

		Answers	Ratio
Very important		152	74.88%
Important		37	18.23%
Somewhat important	I	6	2.96%
Not important		1	0.49%
I don't know	I	4	1.97%
No Answer	I	3	1.48%

In your view, what would be likely to happen without EU action?: Member States would individually implement legislation to reduce LDV CO2 emissions

		Answers	Ratio
Likely		76	37.44%
Neutral		45	22.17%
Unlikely		79	38.92%
No Answer	I	3	1.48%

In your view, what would be likely to happen without EU action?: Legislation introduced by individual Member States would lead to market fragmentation and higher costs

		Answers	Ratio
Likely		167	82.27%
Neutral		22	10.84%
Unlikely	I	8	3.94%
No Answer	I	6	2.96%

In your view, what would be likely to happen without EU action?: Member States would have difficulty to achieve the necessary reductions to meet EU climate goals

		Answers	Ratio
Likely		161	79.31%
Neutral		28	13.79%
Unlikely	I	7	3.45%
No Answer	I	7	3.45%

In your view, how important are the following objectives for future LDV CO2 legislation?: Continuing to reduce CO2 emissions from cars and light commercial vehicles cost effectively and in line with EU climate and energy goals

	Answers	Ratio
Important	189	93.1%
Neutral	10	4.93%
Unimportant	0	0%
No Answer	4	1.97%

In your view, how important are the following objectives for future LDV CO2 legislation?: Ensuring technology neutrality (e.g. between different powertrains)

		Answers	Ratio
Important		99	48.77%
Neutral		58	28.57%
Unimportant		40	19.7%
No Answer	I	6	2.96%

In your view, how important are the following objectives for future LDV CO2 legislation?: Ensuring competitive neutrality between manufacturers

		Answers	Ratio
Important		119	58.62%
Neutral		60	29.56%
Unimportant		19	9.36%
No Answer	I	5	2.46%

In your view, how important are the following objectives for future LDV CO2 legislation?: Preserving the competitiveness of EU automotive manufacturing

	Answers	Ratio
Important	101	49.75%
Neutral	58	28.57%
Unimportant	38	18.72%
No Answer	6	2.96%

In your view, how important are the following objectives for future LDV CO2 legislation?: Ensuring that the legislation's impacts are socially equitable

		Answers	Ratio
Important		127	62.56%
Neutral		56	27.59%
Unimportant		13	6.4%
No Answer	I	7	3.45%

In your view, how important are the following objectives for future LDV CO2 legislation?: Promoting the market uptake of low-emission and zero-emission vehicles

		Answers	Ratio
Important		153	75.37%
Neutral		34	16.75%
Unimportant		10	4.93%
No Answer	I	6	2.96%

In your view, how important are the following objectives for future LDV CO2 legislation?: Contributing to reducing air pollution caused by cars and light commercial vehicles (emissions of nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, ...)

		Answers	Ratio
Important		181	89.16%
Neutral		14	6.9%
Unimportant		4	1.97%
No Answer	I	4	1.97%

Please indicate your preference for the following options to reduce new LDV CO2 emissions, and contribute to the 2030 Energy and climate targets (with 1st being your most preferred option and 7th the least preferred)?: Legislation setting LDV CO2 emissions targets at EU level

	Answers	Ratio
1st	102	50.25%
2nd	42	20.69%
3rd	24	11.82%
4th	14	6.9%
5th	8	3.94%
6th	1	0.49%
7th	0	0%
No Answer	12	5.91%

Please indicate your preference for the following options to reduce new LDV CO2 emissions, and contribute to the 2030 Energy and climate targets (with 1st being your most preferred option and 7th the least preferred)?: Use of vehicle or fuel taxes or other incentives by Member States to affect vehicle choice and use

		Answers	Ratio
1st		31	15.27%
2nd		68	33.5%
3rd		40	19.7%
4th		28	13.79%
5th		18	8.87%
6th	I	8	3.94%
7th		0	0%
No Answer	•	10	4.93%

Please indicate your preference for the following options to reduce new LDV CO2 emissions, and contribute to the 2030 Energy and climate targets (with 1st being your most preferred option and 7th the least preferred)?: A voluntary agreement with industry to reduce new vehicle CO2 emissions

	Answers	Ratio
1st	5	2.46%
2nd	9	4.43%
3rd	23	11.33%
4th	23	11.33%
5th	68	33.5%
6th	47	23.15%
7th	5	2.46%
No Answer	23	11.33%

Please indicate your preference for the following options to reduce new LDV CO2 emissions, and contribute to the 2030 Energy and climate targets (with 1st being your most preferred option and 7th the least preferred)?: Member State actions to influence vehicle choice in other ways such as restricting access to urban areas for certain types of vehicles

		Answers	Ratio
		Allowers	Natio
1st		10	4.93%
2nd		30	14.78%
3rd		43	21.18%
4th		54	26.6%
5th		26	12.81%
6th		17	8.37%
7th	I	6	2.96%
No Answer		17	8.37%

Please indicate your preference for the following options to reduce new LDV CO2 emissions, and contribute to the 2030 Energy and climate targets (with 1st being your most preferred option and 7th the least preferred)?: Development of international standards for LDV fuel economy

		Answers	Ratio
1st	I	7	3.45%
2nd		27	13.3%
3rd		49	24.14%
4th		55	27.09%
5th		39	19.21%
6th	I	5	2.46%
7th		2	0.99%
No Answer		19	9.36%

Please indicate your preference for the following options to reduce new LDV CO2 emissions, and contribute to the 2030 Energy and climate targets (with 1st being your most preferred option and 7th the least preferred)?: No action

	Answers	Ratio
1st	0	0%
2nd	1	0.49%
3rd	1	0.49%
4th	2	0.99%
5th	7	3.45%
6th	42	20.69%
7th	113	55.67%
No Answer	37	18.23%

Please indicate your preference for the following options to reduce new LDV CO2 emissions, and contribute to the 2030 Energy and climate targets (with 1st being your most preferred option and 7th the least preferred)?: Other

	Answers	Ratio
1st	41	20.2%
2nd	14	6.9%
3rd	7	3.45%
4th	7	3.45%
5th	12	5.91%
6th	34	16.75%
7th	22	10.84%
No Answer	66	32.51%

In comparison to the current reduction rates, do you think new targets for the period after 2020 should be set at levels which require:

	Answers	Ratio
a rate of reduction less than that required under the current	33	16.26%
Regulations?		
a similar rate of reduction to that required under the current	38	18.72%
Regulations?		
a higher rate of reduction than that required under the current	112	55.17%
Regulations?		
No Answer	20	9.85%

Do you think EU legislation to regulate CO2 emissions for LDVs will:: Increase the competitiveness of EU industry on the global market

		Answers	Ratio
Agree		125	61.58%
Neutral		58	28.57%
Disagree		14	6.9%
No Answer	I	6	2.96%

Do you think EU legislation to regulate CO2 emissions for LDVs will:: Increase the likelihood of the EU automotive industry developing further CO2 reducing technology for conventional engines

		Answers	Ratio
Agree		138	67.98%
Neutral		41	20.2%
Disagree		16	7.88%
No Answer	•	8	3.94%

Do you think EU legislation to regulate CO2 emissions for LDVs will:: Increase the likelihood of the EU industry developing technology for alternative powertrains

	Answers	Ratio
Agree	168	82.76%
Neutral	28	13.79%
Disagree	0	0%
No Answer	7	3.45%

The following questions seek your views on this issue:: Is the distributional impact of LDV CO2 legislation likely to lead to benefits for lower income social groups and countries?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	71	34.98%
No	43	21.18%
Neutral	75	36.95%
No Answer	14	6.9%

The following questions seek your views on this issue:: Should the impact on second hand LDV purchasers be considered when assessing the social impacts of the legislation?

		Answers	Ratio
Yes		106	52.22%
No		25	12.32%
Neutral		57	28.08%
No Answer	•	15	7.39%

The following questions seek your views on this issue:: Should cross-border trade in second hand vehicles be taken into consideration in assessing the impacts of the legislation?

		Answers	Ratio
Yes		105	51.72%
No		19	9.36%
Neutral		64	31.53%
No Answer	•	15	7.39%

.: In addition to cars (M1) and Light Commercial Vehicles (N1), should the legislation also cover heavier vehicles (N2 type)?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	140	68.97%
No	25	12.32%
Neutral	29	14.29%
No Answer	9	4.43%

.: Should the car Regulation also include small Light Commercial Vehicles?

		Answers	Ratio
Yes		143	70.44%
No		25	12.32%
Neutral		25	12.32%
No Answer	•	10	4.93%

.: Should cars and Light Commercial Vehicles be covered by the same Regulation?

		Answers	Ratio
Yes		91	44.83%
No		60	29.56%
Neutral		42	20.69%
No Answer	•	10	4.93%

.: Should the current approach where manufacturers are the regulated entity be replaced by regulating manufacturer groups?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	39	19.21%
No	70	34.48%
Neutral	82	40.39%
No Answer	12	5.91%

.: Should the current Tank To Wheel (TTW) metric be replaced by a Well To Wheel (WTW) metric?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	85	41.87%
No	74	36.45%
Neutral	31	15.27%
No Answer	13	6.4%

.: Should the current approach based on CO2 emissions be replaced by an approach based on energy use?

		Answers	Ratio
Yes		39	19.21%
No		111	54.68%
Neutral		44	21.67%
No Answer	•	9	4.43%

.: Should the metric used to set the target also include emissions occurring during manufacturing and at the time of disposal of the vehicle ?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	90	44.33%
No	74	36.45%
Neutral	27	13.3%
No Answer	12	5.91%

In view of this:: Do you think the Commission should explore what potential exists to further reduce the divergence between the test cycles and real world emissions?

		Answers	Ratio
Yes		169	83.25%
No		14	6.9%
Neutral		10	4.93%
No Answer	•	10	4.93%

In view of this:: Should supplemental driving tests be implemented to give values closer to real emissions?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	153	75.37%
No	23	11.33%
Neutral	14	6.9%
No Answer	13	6.4%

In view of this:: Should data based on mass monitoring of fuel consumption in vehicles be used for monitoring programmes?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	111	54.68%
No	27	13.3%
Neutral	49	24.14%
No Answer	16	7.88%

In view of this:: Other

		Answers	Ratio
Yes		45	22.17%
No	I	7	3.45%
Neutral		50	24.63%
No Answer		101	49.75%

.: Should manufacturers be given the freedom to choose the mix of technologies and emission levels for their vehicles provided they meet the overall target set for them?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	147	72.41%
No	29	14.29%
Neutral	17	8.37%
No Answer	10	4.93%

.: Should specific CO2 targets be set for different fuel types or technologies?

		Answers	Ratio
Yes		42	20.69%
No		130	64.04%
Neutral		21	10.34%
No Answer	•	10	4.93%

.: Should manufacturer's targets continue to be set based on their sales weighted average registrations (as in the current legislation)?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	94	46.31%
No	48	23.65%
Neutral	50	24.63%
No Answer	11	5.42%

.: Should average mileage by fuel and vehicle segment be taken into account in establishing targets?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	61	30.05%
No	74	36.45%
Neutral	56	27.59%
No Answer	12	5.91%

.: Should a utility parameter be used to distribute the effort between different vehicle manufacturers (as in the current legislation)?

	Answers	Ratio
No	24	11.82%
Yes	72	35.47%
Neutral	88	43.35%
No Answer	19	9.36%

.: Which utility parameter should be used?

		Answers	Ratio
Mass		26	12.81%
Footprint		38	18.72%
Other (please speficy below)	I	4	1.97%
No Answer		135	66.5%

.: If mass is to be used as the utility parameter, should the slope as set out in the current Regulations be maintained?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	9	4.43%
No	5	2.46%
Neutral	8	3.94%
No Answer	181	89.16%

.: Should there be a mechanism in the CO2 legislation to encourage the deployment of low- and zeroemissions vehicles?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	143	70.44%
No	18	8.87%
Neutral	29	14.29%
No Answer	13	6.4%

Please answer the following questions:: Should manufacturers be required to produce and sell a minimum proportion of low- and zero emission vehicles?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	82	40.39%
No	37	18.23%
Neutral	21	10.34%
No Answer	63	31.03%

Please answer the following questions:: Should other types of incentives be put in place for low- and zeroemission vehicles (instead of requirement to produce and sell a minimum proportion of low- and zero emission vehicles)?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	92	45.32%
No	12	5.91%
Neutral	34	16.75%
No Answer	65	32.02%

What criteria should be used for defining low- and zero-emissions vehicles?: CO2 emission performance

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	140	68.97%
No	17	8.37%
Neutral	30	14.78%
No Answer	16	7.88%

What criteria should be used for defining low- and zero-emissions vehicles?: Zero emission range (km)

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	70	34.48%
No	61	30.05%
Neutral	50	24.63%
No Answer	22	10.84%

What criteria should be used for defining low- and zero-emissions vehicles?: Other

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	72	35.47%
No	18	8.87%
Neutral	62	30.54%
No Answer	51	25.12%

.: Should CO2 emission reductions arising from the deployment of technology which reduces emissions in normal driving but whose benefit is not shown in the normal test cycle be taken into account in the legislation?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	114	56.16%
No	29	14.29%
Neutral	46	22.66%
No Answer	14	6.9%

If yes, please show your preference for the following options with 1st being your most preferred option:: Continuation of the current eco-innovation scheme

		Answers	Ratio
1st		35	17.24%
2nd		36	17.73%
3rd		21	10.34%
4th	I	5	2.46%
No Answer		106	52.22%

If yes, please show your preference for the following options with 1st being your most preferred option:: List of technologies eligible for off-cycle credits

		Answers	Ratio
1st		17	8.37%
2nd		35	17.24%
3rd		33	16.26%
4th	I	7	3.45%
No Answer		111	54.68%

If yes, please show your preference for the following options with 1st being your most preferred option:: An approach based on measuring in-use fuel consumption from vehicles fitted with the technology

	Answers	Ratio
1st	31	15.27%
2nd	11	5.42%
3rd	33	16.26%
4th	21	10.34%
No Answer	107	52.71%

If yes, please show your preference for the following options with 1st being your most preferred option:: Other – please specify below

	Answers	Ratio
1st	17	8.37%
2nd	11	5.42%
3rd	1	0.49%
4th	20	9.85%
No Answer	154	75.86%

.: Should derogations for small volume manufacturers (less than 10,000 registrations per year) be continued?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	60	29.56%
No	41	20.2%
Neutral	79	38.92%
No Answer	23	11.33%

.: Should derogations for niche manufacturers (10,000 to 300,000 registrations per year) be continued

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	36	17.73%
No	92	45.32%
Neutral	53	26.11%
No Answer	22	10.84%

.: If derogations are continued, should these be based on worldwide sales (instead of EU sales) for those manufacturers?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	68	33.5%
No	63	31.03%
Neutral	48	23.65%
No Answer	24	11.82%

.: Should derogations be granted for certain types of vehicles rather than for manufacturers?

	Answers	Ratio
Yes	40	19.7%
No	86	42.36%
Neutral	54	26.6%
No Answer	23	11.33%