REPORT ON THE EFCA SYMPOSIUM ON AP AND CC POLICY INTEGRATION IN EUROPE

EFCA is committed to open meetings and scientifically based confrontations, and wishes to serve as a **catalyst** to raise awareness amongst the air pollution and climate scientific communities, European policy makers and concerned stakeholders (industry, civil society, local authorities) on the need for integrated policies, on a science-to-policy process basis. Its aim in organizing this symposium was not to provide an exhaustive review of all scientific aspects of the issue of AP and CC interactions, but instead to help identifying further needs for investigations and tools, and drawing the frame of desirable and possible solutions to the **design and implementation of co-benefits policies in Europe**.

The EFCA task force set up to organise this meeting has mobilised its whole network to **involve experts form the main European institutions** – EEA, JRC, EEB, DG Environment, from the European Topic Centres, and other international (IIASA) laboratories. Some European and American states have come to testify about their actions and problems. **The European Commission**, through Mr André Zuber, **and the European Parliament** (in the name of Mrs Catherine Trautmann, vice-president of the Industry, Research and Energy Committee) have helped drawing the main outputs of this meeting and concluding the debates.

As a reminder of the **scientific background** of the questions addressed by the symposium, Prof. Roy Harrison, from the University of Birmingham has drawn, in his keynote address, a wide and comprehensive picture of the complex interactions, with both synergetic and antagonistic effects, of air pollution and climate change phenomena. Despite uncertainties inherent to this sort of scientific approach, and the need for further investigation, it has been recognised that the present level of knowledge is sufficient to inform policy making in a meaningful way, and that **remaining uncertainties must not prevent from making decisions now**. We must not tend to “analysis paralysis”.

Though robust tools such as the GAINS model developed by IIASA already allow calibration of cost-effective measures and pointing at possible trade-offs, attention must still be given to where further work is required, notably to develop **Life Cycle Analysis**, integrated **modelling capacities** and a **set of integrated indicators** to help policy choices. There is still a need for closer links between scientific communities, so as to structure a **“one atmosphere” approach.**

A number of integrated assessment reports have indicated that GHG mitigation costs are lower due to costs savings on air pollution and that benefits of GHG mitigation are higher due to reduced air pollution.

On the short term, AQ policies aimed at reducing **methane, ozone** (through its precursors) and **black carbon** will have immediate benefits on climate. Some stand-alone air pollution policies, notably aimed at abating sulphur oxides and secondary aerosols, will warm even stronger, thus stronger reduction of GHGs is needed to avoid long term warming.

GHG mitigation strategies have substantial co-benefits on **human health** (and on ecosystems) via lower air pollution, and at a lower cost. However, some popular GHG mitigation measures exhibit clear **trade-offs**. The measures encouraging **Wood burning, bio-fuels and diesel cars** have been discussed at the symposium as the examples of how not to develop integrated environment policies. This points to the fact that integrating interactions from the beginning is most desirable, instead of having to merge differently originated policies that have already been structuring economic, social or political developments.

More generally, it can be considered that separately, AP and CC policies are insufficient to reach both targets, but can deliver substantial **co-benefits when combined**.

There is a need not only for project but also for **strategic impact assessment** concerning large policy sectors such as biomass for example. Policy makers still need integrated indicators and tools like Life Cycle Analysis and modelling capacities to help balance between different stakes and impacts so as to allow optimised decisions.

Examples have been given (from France, UK and the US) of how awareness of the need for closer integration emerged at national and local levels and how pragmatically developed approaches could tackle the two challenges in a cost-effective way.

At the European Community level, climate change and energy policy has become a major challenge and of top priority. The challenge is to limit the global temperature increase to 2 degrees C.

Considering that institutional and political barriers to an immediate structural integration of AP and CC policies remain within the European Community, the **Climate and Energy Package** currently in its adoption phase will be the main instrument to harvest co-benefits. It sets Community targets for 2020: 20 % reduction of GHG emissions compared to 1990 and a 20 % share of renewable energy.

Energy policies are effectively the key drivers to harvest co-benefits in the mid and long term whilst ensuring a competitive and secure energy supply. The “low hanging fruits” of **energy efficiency**, **energy conservation** and energy **demand management** must be collected as soon and completely as possible. However, internalising environment externalities pleads in favour of end-use energy efficiency measures too and a change in the **consumers' behaviour**.

Some policy makers and persisting industrial development logics are in favour of **end of pipe** measures. But these tend to be more and more costly with less marginal benefits and a cost in additional energy expenses. Integrated approaches at an early stage are much more efficient, but capital intensive investments need **planning certainties** that measures setting successive interim targets are incompatible with.

Renewable energies usually have less impact than fossil fuels, but there are still concerns on the **environmental sustainability of bio-fuels.**

The **European Strategic Energy Technology (SET)** Plan provides a common tool to pave the path for technological progress and future more efficient energies, showing the expected share of improvement for each type of technology on the time frame, from wind to fusion.

The EU will not propose co-measures immediately. The **Energy and Climate Package** contains assessments of co-benefits, but does not integrate AP policies. The political priority is so high on CC that we will have to wait a few years before considering a more integrated package. On the longer term, the **international conventions on AP and on CC** will have to meet, discuss and study the stakes and effects on a common ground. There does not seem to be any opportunity between now and the Copenhagen meeting for the post Kyoto round to bring in AP concerns into the CC negotiations.

This symposium can be taken as the European step of a larger initiative of the **IUAPPA** to foster integration of AP and CC policies at regional, hemispheric and global levels. The IUAPPA held in September, in **Stockholm**, a major conference, under the logo of the Global Atmospheric Pollution Forum, on co-benefits in partnership with the UNECE, UNEP, and regional AP networks of different continents. The conclusions of the two conferences are of course similar on the fundamentals of AP and CC interaction and the need for policy integration, but the stakes, ways and means to achieve these objectives are specific at the European scale.

The event has been organised by the French Air Pollution Prevention Association (**APPA**) and sponsored by the French Environment Agency and the regional and local authorities of **Alsace and Strasburg** city and urban community. Some 130 participants from 28 countries have attended the symposium and contributed to the debates.

There has been a wide recognition of the interest and added value of this EFCA initiative, which will reinforce EFCA legitimacy as a catalyst for the improvement of European and national policies addressing the atmospheric environment.

The presentations, summaries of debates and principal conclusions can be found on the dedicated website: http://www.efcasymposium.eu/

The principal conclusions and recommendations will be put at the disposal of the European commission, the European Parliament, and all national and local concerned stakeholders, notably through a special issue of the French journal “Pollution Atmosphérique”.