

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999



2004

Session document

FINAL
A5-0232/2002

19 June 2002

*****I**

REPORT

on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Directives 70/156/EEC and 80/1268/EEC as regards the measurement of carbon dioxide emissions and fuel consumption of N₁ vehicles (COM(2001) 543 – C5-0516/2001 – 2001/0255(COD))

Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy

Rapporteur: Robert Goodwill

Symbols for procedures

- * Consultation procedure
majority of the votes cast
- **I Cooperation procedure (first reading)
majority of the votes cast
- **II Cooperation procedure (second reading)
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend
the common position*
- *** Assent procedure
*majority of Parliament's component Members except in cases
covered by Articles 105, 107, 161 and 300 of the EC Treaty and
Article 7 of the EU Treaty*
- ***I Codecision procedure (first reading)
majority of the votes cast
- ***II Codecision procedure (second reading)
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend
the common position*
- ***III Codecision procedure (third reading)
majority of the votes cast, to approve the joint text

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the Commission)

Amendments to a legislative text

In amendments by Parliament, amended text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Highlighting in *normal italics* is an indication for the relevant departments showing parts of the legislative text for which a correction is proposed, to assist preparation of the final text (for instance, obvious errors or omissions in a given language version). These suggested corrections are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

CONTENTS

	Page
PROCEDURAL PAGE	4
DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION.....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	9

PROCEDURAL PAGE

By letter of 24 October 2001 the Commission submitted to Parliament, pursuant to Article 251(2) and Article 95 of the EC Treaty, the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Directives 70/156/EEC and 80/1268/EEC as regards the measurement of carbon dioxide emissions and fuel consumption of N₁ vehicles (COM(2001) 543 - 2001/0255 (COD)).

At the sitting of 12 November 2001 the President of Parliament announced that she had referred this proposal to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy as the committee responsible and the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy and the Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism for their opinions (C5-0516/2001).

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy appointed Robert Goodwill rapporteur at its meeting of 20 November 2001.

The committee considered the Commission proposal and draft report at its meetings of 26 March and 17 June 2002.

At the last meeting it adopted the draft legislative resolution by 41 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions.

The following were present for the vote: Caroline F. Jackson, chairman; Alexander de Roo and Anneli Hulthén, vice-chairmen; Robert Goodwill, rapporteur; Per-Arne Arvidsson, Jean-Louis Bernié, Hans Blokland, David Robert Bowe, John Bowis, Hiltrud Breyer, Dorette Corbey, Chris Davies, Avril Doyle, Karl-Heinz Florenz, Cristina García-Orcoyen Tormo, Laura González Álvarez, Françoise Grossetête, Anneli Hulthén, Eija-Riitta Anneli Korhola, Torben Lund, Jules Maaten, Minerva Melpomeni Malliori, Jorge Moreira da Silva, Eluned Morgan (for Anne Ferreira), Emilia Franziska Müller, Antonio Mussa (for Mauro Nobilia), Riitta Myller, William Francis Newton Dunn (for Astrid Thors), Ria G.H.C. Oomen-Ruijten, Marit Paulsen, Fernando Pérez Royo (for Bernd Lange), Frédérique Ries, Dagmar Roth-Behrendt, Guido Sacconi, Karin Scheele, Horst Schnellhardt, Inger Schörling, Jonas Sjöstedt, María Sornosa Martínez, Catherine Stihler, Charles Tannock (for María del Pilar Ayuso González), Nicole Thomas-Mauro, Antonios Trakatellis, Kathleen Van Brempt, Phillip Whitehead.

The Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy decided on 18 December 2001 not to deliver opinion. The Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism decided on 19 December 2001 not to deliver opinion

The report was tabled on 19 June 2002.

The deadline for tabling amendments will be indicated in the draft agenda for the relevant part-session.

DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Directives 70/156/EEC and 80/1268/EEC as regards the measurement of carbon dioxide emissions and fuel consumption of N₁ vehicles (COM(2001) 543 – C5-0516/2001 – 2001/0255(COD))

(Codecision procedure: first reading)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the European Parliament and the Council (COM(2001) 543¹),
 - having regard to Article 251(2) and Article 95 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Commission submitted the proposal to Parliament (C5-0516/2001),
 - having regard to Rule 67 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy (A5-0232/2002),
1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;
 2. Asks to be consulted again should the Commission intend to amend the proposal substantially or replace it with another text;
 3. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 1
Article 3a (new)

3a. Where a vehicle produced by a specialist coach builder fits within the criteria of one of the families of vehicles of the manufacturer of the base vehicle, the coach builder may use the data on fuel efficiency and CO₂ production supplied by that manufacturer.

Justification

Small coach builders often only carry out modifications which do not fundamentally change

¹ OJ C 51 E, 26.02.2002, p. 317.

the vehicle from that tested by the manufacturer.

Amendment 2
ANNEX, POINT 1
Annex I, point 1, indent 1 (Dir. 80/1268/EEC)

- the engine type fitted to that type of vehicle
has received type-approval pursuant to
Directive 88/77/EEC, **and**

- the engine type fitted to that type of vehicle
has received type-approval pursuant to
Directive 88/77/EEC, **or**

Justification

The requirements may be waived in the case of small-volume manufacturers producing a wide range of types in small quantities, since the effort/expense involved is disproportionate to the benefits.

ANNEX, POINT 3a (new)
Annex I, point 11 (Dir.80/1268/EEC amended by Commission Dir. 93/116/EC)

In point 11. "EXTENSION OF APPROVAL", the following points 11.1a (new) and 11.1b (new) are added:

"For N_1 vehicles, an approval to this Directive may be extended in either of the following ways:

11.1a N_1 Vehicles powered by an Internal Combustion Engine

11.1a.1. The type approval can be extended to vehicles of the same type and from within the same family, (as defined in 11.3 below)

or

11.1a.2. The type approval can be extended to vehicles from the same type or from a different type differing with regard to the following characteristics of Annex 3 if the CO₂ emissions measured by the technical service do not exceed by more than 6% the type approved value:

***Mass
Maximum Authorised Mass
Type of Bodywork: van, pick-up,
chassis- cab, crew-cab
Overall Gear ratios
Engine Equipment and Accessories***

11.1b. N_1 vehicles may grouped together into a family for the purposes of this directive if the following parameters are identical or within the specified limits.

11.1b.1. Identical parameters are:

Manufacturer

Engine capacity and type
Emission control system type
Fuel system type

11.1b.2. *Similar parameters are:*

*Transmission overall ratios (within
8% of the lowest geared)*
*Reference mass (within 220 kg of
the heaviest)*
*Frontal area (within 15% of the
largest)”*

Justification

It is proposed that, for N_1 vehicles powered by an internal combustion engine only, the conditions for the extension of an approval should be extended. This establishes the principle of "families" and also recognises the greater variation between N_1 vehicles than M_1 vehicles due to the number of options available.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

1) The concept of vehicle "families"

This proposal will enable CO₂ and fuel consumption figures to be determined for N1 vehicles (Vans and light commercial vehicles) in the same way that data is already available for M1 vehicles (Cars and Sports Utility Vehicles). There are fundamental problems associated with merely extending the system in use for cars to these light commercials.

The proposal grossly underestimates the number of different models and derivatives available on the EU market. There may well be 94 base models available, as the Commission says but these are marketed in a vast number of engine, body, drive train, wheel base and tyre combinations. The Volkswagen LT, for example, is available in 4,650 variations to meet the individual customer specification. There are also many specialist coach builders in the SME sector. These manufacture specialist vehicles such as ice cream vans, hydraulic platform vehicles, fire tenders, refrigerated vans, hearses, ambulances and armoured security and military vehicles. In the majority of cases the base vehicle is one bought from a major manufacturer and converted for local or specialised use.

It is therefore necessary to introduce the concept of vehicle families to reduce the number of variants to be tested to manageable proportions. There is already provision to allow for variation within a specific model of a car (M1 vehicle) in Directive 80/1268/EEC, as last amended by Directive 99/100/EC. This allows for a 4% variation in CO₂ emissions due to variation in certain parameters such as mass and also variations in bodywork. In the case of N1 vehicles this should be increased to 8% to take account of the range of bodies and tyre/axle combinations fitted to these vehicles. There should also be a range of 220 kg in weight from the heaviest in the family to take account of options or specialist equipment fitted to the vehicle. In many cases this will allow coach builders and specialist converters to "piggy back" the fuel efficiency data determined by the manufacturer of the base vehicle.

Probably the single most critical variant between vehicles of the same basic model is the frontal area. The additional wind resistance from the fitting of a high roof van body has a marked effect on the fuel efficiency of a vehicle. It is therefore important to set a quite narrow range in the frontal area of vehicles that can be placed in the same family. If the frontal area of two vehicles which are similar in other ways differs by more than 15%, then they must be placed in different families.

Where a vehicle produced by a specialist coach builder fits within the criteria of one of the families of vehicles of the manufacturer of the base vehicle, the coach builder may use the data on fuel efficiency and CO₂ production supplied by that manufacturer.

2) Exemptions

The proposal already exempts manufacturers whose world-wide production is less than 2,000 units per annum when the engine fitted meets the requirements of Directive 88/77/EEC. This exemption should be extended to include manufacturers whose world-wide production may exceed 2000 units but whose annual EU sales do not exceed 500 units. This will remove a barrier to new manufacturers or new models entering the European market thus increase

consumer choice and competition.

There should also be an exemption of special purpose vehicles such as Motor Caravans, Armoured Vehicles, Ambulances and Hearses, which may be produced by large manufacturers but in relatively small numbers.

3) Vehicle payload

The payload carried by the vehicle has an impact on fuel efficiency. It is not, however, practical to test vehicles at different levels of load. The additional testing required would be out of all proportion to the value of the data produced. There is, anyway, a fairly good correlation between fuel efficiency of empty and loaded vehicles as outlined by the Commission.

4) Use of data

The data produced by extending the directives to N1 vehicles could have three main uses;

a) To facilitate eco-labelling

It would be useful to be able to display and advertise the fuel performance of N1 vehicles. This is already the case with M1 vehicles (Directive 1999/94/EC). There are reasons why this is not so important as with M1 vehicles. Firstly the fleet users already test demonstrator vehicles in actual use before buying in quantity. This testing will accurately reflect the differing conditions experienced by, for example, long distance, motorway operators or local delivery firms. This data is much more useful to the purchaser than any standardised test data. There is also data freely available in the specialist media on fuel efficiency tests carried out in real conditions.

b) Fiscal measures

Taxation is not within the competence of the European Union but Member States could use data to set vehicle taxes. Fuel is, however, very highly taxed which already gives operators a big incentive to buy fuel-efficient vehicles. Local delivery can displace private car journeys and should not be penalised by fiscal measures. There could also be the temptation to overload smaller vehicles to fit into a lower taxation class. This would have safety implications. Although larger vehicles use more fuel the CO₂ emissions per tonne carried is substantially less.

c) To monitor and set targets for CO₂ reduction

There is a voluntary agreement to reduce CO₂ emissions from passenger cars to 140 g/km by 2008. Similar targets could be set for N1 vehicles. It is unlikely, however, that this would contribute significantly to progress that is already being made. There are a number of reasons for this;

- i) Many of these vehicles, particularly class 1 (car derived vans) share engine and other technical features of vehicles included in the agreement and will therefore automatically give improved fuel performance.
- ii) There is already over 90% diesel usage in this class with limited scope for improvement.

- iii) Operators are very aware of fuel costs and prioritise this already. The market will favour efficient N1 vehicles without any intervention from the EU. This is a very different situation from M1 vehicles where fuel economy is often a secondary issue to performance or brand appeal.
- iv) Tighter standards for vehicle emissions will result in a fuel efficiency loss of up to 5%.
- v) Potential design improvements in the area of aerodynamics or weight are very limited because of the need to carry heavy or bulky loads in the vehicle.

It could therefore be concluded that there is very little to gain from a voluntary agreement or legislation to reduce CO2 emissions from these vehicles over and above improvements that the industry is being driven to develop by this intensely competitive and operating cost conscious market.