



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
CLIMATE ACTION  
Directorate C - Mainstreaming Adaptation and Low Carbon Technology  
**CLIMA.C.2 - Transport and Ozone**

Brussels,  
CLIMA C.2/CP Ares(2012)

## **Reducing Heavy-Duty Vehicle (HDV) CO<sub>2</sub> emissions**

### **Stakeholder consultation meeting**

**22 February 2012**

**Borschette Centre, rue Froissart 36, 1040 Brussels**

### **SUMMARY OF THE MEETING**

**Chairman: Philip Owen, DG Climate Action**

**List of participants in annex**

## **1. Reducing Heavy-Duty Vehicle (HDV) CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, ways and scope**

### **Introduction**

An EU strategy for reducing LDV CO<sub>2</sub> emissions was adopted in 2007 and legislation has been enacted setting limits on car and van CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In contrast HDV emissions have so far not been regulated and therefore the Commission announced in 2010 that it would prepare an HDV emissions strategy. A public internet consultation was held in Autumn 2011 and responses largely support such a strategy. In September 2011 the Commission started work on the Impact Assessment which will assess options for the strategy, expected to be adopted in 2013. The aim of this meeting was to discuss the potential for curbing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and policy options. A second meeting would take place later before the summer, to discuss possible approaches for the EU strategy.

### **Presentation of analysis on potential for reduced HDV emissions**

The contractor<sup>1</sup> presented the main findings from a recent report on *European Union Greenhouse Gas Reduction Potential for Heavy Duty Vehicles*. The study found that across the eight HDV segments examined, potential CO<sub>2</sub> savings from all technologies available during the years 2015-2020 range from 30 to 52% for new vehicles. Applying these fuel-saving technologies to all new vehicles as of 2020 had the potential to reduce fleet-wide HDV greenhouse gas emissions to 28 % below projected business-as-usual levels in 2030, in spite of significant expected HDV fleet growth. This is broadly

---

<sup>1</sup> TIAX consulting, author of the report of December 2011 on European Union Greenhouse Gas Reduction Potential for Heavy Duty Vehicles.

[http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/transport/vehicles/heavy/docs/icct\\_ghg\\_reduction%20\\_potential\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/transport/vehicles/heavy/docs/icct_ghg_reduction%20_potential_en.pdf)

consistent with findings from a previous Commission study on HDV emissions in the EU<sup>2</sup>.

### **Summary of discussion**

Stakeholders generally welcomed the consultation. A number asked for clarifications regarding underlying assumptions of the study.

Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) expressed doubts with regard to the magnitude of achievable HDV fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions. In contrast it was stated by an NGO that experience shows ex-ante estimated costs are always higher than the outcome for environmental measures. OEMs noted that one of the effects of environmental legislation to reduce pollutant emissions (Euro IV, V and VI standards) had been some loss in fuel efficiency and increased CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Some technologies would be more promising for specific vehicle segments than others, and there were in particular uncertainties as regards the possible costs and rate of uptake of hybridisation.

There was consensus that improved aerodynamics could play a role. A number of figures were quoted all pointing to small changes enabling significant benefits at low costs.

Several participants considered that increasing weights and dimensions of HDVs could achieve additional savings. This was contested by others who argued that longer and heavier vehicles would not be a solution in view notably of rebound effects of increasing load and dimensions.

Participants from the transport and logistics sector reported that a number of schemes were already in place in their sector to reduce freight fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. New initiatives were being launched to measure transport's carbon footprint: a collective approach was preferable in this respect, and many improvements in fleet operations were taking place without legislation. Driver training was considered important, but needed to be followed by actions managing driver performance and actual fuel consumption. It was suggested that it was more important to focus on the results than the training. Public transport operators insisted on the importance of modal shift to public transport as a means of reducing emissions, and the need for improved operating conditions, notably an increased operational speed of buses in cities.

The metric for a future measurement methodology and efficiency registration was considered sensitive by a number of participants and should not merely be based on fuel and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per km.

One NGO participant considered that there was a clear market failure in view of the lack of recent new HDV performance improvements and the very short payback periods considered by operators.

## **2. Discussion of policy options to curb emissions**

Participants were invited to indicate which options the Commission should consider and privilege among a number of listed possible policy options.

---

<sup>2</sup> AEA – Ricardo report, February 2011: Reducing and Testing of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Heavy-Duty Vehicles: Lot1: Strategy

[http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/transport/vehicles/docs/ec\\_hdv\\_ghg\\_strategy\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/transport/vehicles/docs/ec_hdv_ghg_strategy_en.pdf)

A methodology and tool to measure emissions in a standard way, thereby ensuring transparency and comparability, was considered by most stakeholders as a priority. Testing procedures are key to ensuring this is relevant to real world operations. One manufacturer suggested that engine rather than full vehicle emissions should be targeted.

According to numerous participants the strategy should be comprehensive and aim at reinforcing European HDV manufacturers perceived leadership, encouraging continuous improvement in HDV performance. Manufacturers and operators generally expressed preferences for a non regulatory approach. Transport and logistics operators' representatives generally favoured industry initiatives, several noting the advantages of collective approaches. According to a number of participants incentives would be welcome to support industry initiatives, the use of biofuels, and investments in refuelling infrastructure for alternative less GHG intensive fuels. Subsidies to support R&D were also needed to prepare future more efficient vehicles. Participants also stated that due consideration should be taken of the fact that transport is very much an SME activity.

It was suggested that economic factors such as fuel price escalators, fuel price cost pass through clauses and the possibility for third party logistics providers to profit on sub-contractors' fuel costs all reduced incentives to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. There was evidence that the level of fuel use is linked to the type of contract in force. An OEM noted that uncertain fuel prices hamper investments in technology.

There was a widespread view that vehicle emissions certification could be beneficial and improve transparency once an emissions measurement tool is in place. Labelling was favoured by a number of participants but needed cautious consideration in view of the variety of vehicles, technologies and operating conditions.

A strategy should encompass already existing actions such as the existing type approval legislation. A number of participants considered that EU legislation on weights and dimensions, currently under review, should be made more flexible, allowing for larger trucks, and/or more aerodynamic ones.

The possible inclusion of HDV emissions in the European Trading System was briefly discussed. It was pointed out that it would be ineffective since in view of the relative costs the transport sector would rather purchase allowances than invest in CO<sub>2</sub> emission abatement.

NGOs noted that voluntary processes and regulatory approaches were not necessarily contradictory as this has been the approach followed so far in Japan and the US. A step-wise comprehensive approach to curb HDV CO<sub>2</sub> emissions would be required.

Some Member States participants considered that a strategy should take into consideration specific national situations and be technology neutral (Finish Transport Safety Agency). A comprehensive long-term strategy would be needed (Swedish Transport Administration), including possibly a regulatory approach over the long term. The UK (Office of Low Vehicle Emissions) favoured an integrated approach based notably on support to industry initiatives and the uptake of more efficient vehicles rather than recourse to regulatory measures.

### **Commission closing remarks**

The Commission chairman confirmed that a holistic approach would be required. Some avenues already appeared more promising than others. Commission services remained available for further bilateral contacts with stakeholders. Before the completion of the Impact Assessment foreseen by the end of 2012 another stakeholder meeting will be organised in June or July.

## Annex: list of participants

Organisation	
AB Volvo	
Association des Industries de Marque	AIM
Association for Emissions Control by Catalyst	AECC
Austrian Ministry of Transport and Noise	
Belgian Shippers' Council	OTM
Belgium Ministry of the Environment	
Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit (DE)	
Bundesverband Güterkraftverkehr Logistik und Entsorgung	BGL
Community of European Railways	CER
Cummins Ltd	
DAF Trucks N.V.	
Daimler AG	
Danish Transport Authority	
DHL	
Environmental Ministry Belgium	
Europe (Natural & Bio Gas Vehicle Association Europe)	NGVA
European Aluminium Association	
European Association of Automobile Suppliers	CLEPA
European Automobile Manufacturers' Association	ACEA
European Biodiesel Board	EBB
European Brands Association	AIM
European Express Association	EEA
European Road Haulers Association	UETR
EVO – The Dutch Shippers' Council	
EvoBus GmbH / Daimler Buses	
Fédération Nationale des Transports Routiers	
Fédération Nationale des Transports Routiers (F)	FNTR
Finnish Transport Safety Agency	
FLUXYS SA/NV	
Freight Transport Association	FTA
Greater Than	
Heineken	
International Association of Public Transport	UITP
International Council on Clean Transportation	ICCT
International Road Transport Union	IRU
KTI Institute for Transport Sciences (Budapest)	
La Poste (F)	
Liaison Committee of the Body and Trailer Building Industry	CLCCR
Low Carbon Vehicle Partnership (UK)	
MAN SE	
MAN Truck & Bus AG	
Meta-Ricerche Cornetti Diol. (It)	
Ministère de l'Écologie, du Développement durable, des Transports et	MEDDTL

du Logement	
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment (NL) Climate, Air Quality and Noise Department-Environmental Protection Office	
Natural & bio Gas Vehicle Association	NGVA Europe
Nordic Logistics Association	
Permanent Representation of the Netherlands to the EU	
Permanent Representation of the Republic of Poland to the EU	
Polish Automotive Industry Association	
Procter & Gamble	
Ricardo UK Ltd	
Scania	
Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders	SMMT
Spanish Federation of Transport by Bus	Fenebus
Spanish Urban Collective Surface Transport Association	
Swedish Transport Administration	
Tesco	
The European Tyre and Rubber Manufacturers' Association	ETRMA
TNO	
Transfrigoroute International	
Transport & Environment	
Transport & Environment	
Transport and Logistics Netherlands	
Transport en Logistiek Nederland	
TU Delft – Delft University of Technology	
United Parcel Service	UPS
Verband der Automobilindustrie	VDA
Vlaamse overheid, Departement Leefmilieu, Natuur en Energie	
Volvo Buses	
Wirtschaftskammer Österreich	