



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

7/5/2021

SEC(2021) 560

REGULATORY SCRUTINY BOARD OPINION

Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council
on the deployment of alternative fuels infrastructure, and repealing
Directive 2014/94/EU

{COM(2021) 559}

{SWD(2021) 631, 632, 637, 638}



Brussels,
RSB

Opinion

Title: Impact assessment/ Revision of Alternative Fuels Infrastructure Directive

Overall opinion: POSITIVE

(A) Policy context

To achieve climate neutrality by 2050, the Commission has proposed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 55% by 2030, compared to 1990. This impact assessment analyses how a revision of the Directive on Alternative Fuels Infrastructure can contribute to this objective as part of a wider package of policies.

The Directive aims to ensure that infrastructure is in place to allow for a widespread uptake of alternatively fuelled vehicles throughout the EU. It sets minimum requirements for Member States to implement through national policy frameworks. It relies on common technical specifications for recharging and refuelling points and for user information. To ensure connectivity across borders, the Directive also has requirements for alternative fuels infrastructure along the core network of the Trans-European Transport Network and its urban nodes.

(B) Summary of findings

The Board notes the useful additional information provided in advance of the meeting and commitments to make changes to the report.

The Board gives a positive opinion. The Board also considers that the report should further improve with respect to the following aspects:

- (1) The difference between the options and how they link to the identified problems is not always clear.**
- (2) The report is not sufficiently nuanced on the extent to which the expected impacts stem from this specific initiative or from other policies, or a combination thereof.**

(C) What to improve

- (1) The report should clarify the content of the options and be more explicit about the differences between them. It should clarify which measures are part of which options. It should better link the options to the problems they are expected to address.**

This opinion concerns a draft impact assessment which may differ from the final version.

(2) The report should better explain which climate and pollution impacts can reasonably be attributed to the Alternative Fuels Infrastructure initiative. It should take into account that climate impacts largely derive from other ‘Fit for 55’ initiatives. Qualitative analysis could indicate the kinds of impacts this initiative could have.

(3) The report could better explain the assumptions and logic of the investment needed for the deployment of the infrastructure. It should show how and why public support is expected to decrease over time and where and when private sector investment is foreseen.

(4) The report should better explain the coherence and interaction between the proposed options and the obligation from the FuelEU Maritime initiative for certain types of ships to use onshore power supply.

(5) The report could make better use of stakeholder views when describing the problem and the options. It should provide a break down of views across different groups.

The Board notes the estimated costs and benefits of the preferred option in this initiative, as summarised in the attached quantification tables.

Some more technical comments have been sent directly to the author DG.

(D) Conclusion

The DG may proceed with the initiative.

The DG must take these recommendations into account before launching the interservice consultation.

Full title	Revision of Directive 2014/94/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Deployment of Alternative Fuels Infrastructure
Reference number	PLAN/2019/6184
Submitted to RSB on	7 April 2021
Date of RSB meeting	5 May 2021

ANNEX – Quantification tables extracted from the draft impact assessment report

The following tables contain information on the costs and benefits of the initiative on which the Board has given its opinion, as presented above.

If the draft report has been revised in line with the Board’s recommendations, the content of these tables may be different from those in the final version of the impact assessment report, as published by the Commission.

I. Overview of Benefits (total for all provisions) – Preferred Option - PO2 (expressed relative to the baseline)		
Description	Amount	Comments
Direct benefits		
Consumer and business benefits		Consumers and businesses will directly benefit from a dense and fully interoperable recharging and refuelling infrastructure for their low and zero emission vehicles as well as from transparent information and better infrastructure use services (location, accessibility, pricing transparency, payments) which will simplify vehicle operation and save informational cost. These are equally important factors when it comes to purchase decisions and therefore a prerequisite for the widespread uptake of such vehicles.
Indirect benefits		
Reduction of external costs related to CO ₂ emissions relative to the baseline (i.e. present value over 2021-2050)	€429 billion	Indirect benefit to society at large. It is the effect of the reduction in the CO ₂ emissions resulting from the uptake of low- and zero-emission vehicles. The reduction in the external costs of CO ₂ emissions is estimated at around €429 billion relative to the baseline over the 2021-2050 period, expressed as present value. These reductions are driven by other policies, but enabled by the uptake of infrastructure.
Reduction of external costs related to air pollution emissions relative to the baseline (i.e. present value over 2021-2050)	€70 billion	Indirect benefit to society at large. It is the effect of the reduction in the air pollution emissions resulting from the uptake of low- and zero-emission vehicles. The reduction in the external costs of air pollution emissions is estimated at around €70 billion relative to the baseline over the 2021-2050 period, expressed as present value. These reductions are driven by other policies, but enabled by the uptake of infrastructure.
Innovation in the mobility sector		Provisions for static and dynamic data on recharging and refuelling infrastructure to national (and common) access points of Member States will create a commonly accessible database that will contribute to the development of new innovative services for using that infrastructure. Such common data infrastructure can particularly benefit service innovation and other innovation by SMEs. Moreover, standardisation of interoperability for smart recharging services will enable better innovative service development which will finally benefit electric vehicle users. This is particularly relevant for smart recharging services that will draw on such common technical specifications. They can bring benefits in terms of remuneration of recharging services, particularly for large-scale corporate fleet operators.

II. Overview of costs – Preferred option - PO2 (expressed relative to the baseline)							
		Citizens/Consumers		Businesses		Administrations	
		One-off	Recurrent	One-off	Recurrent	One-off	Recurrent
Investments and operation costs due to the requirements for infrastructure deployment (average annual costs relative to the baseline)	Direct costs	-	-	-	<p><i>Investments</i> €1.28 bn total average annual investments for 2021-2030 (€0.85 bn for road transport; €0.3648 bn for waterborne; €0.0672 bn for aviation); €5.57 bn total average annual investments for 2031-2050 for road transport. <i>Operation costs</i> €0.15553 bn total average annual operation costs for 2021-2030 (€0.14 bn for road transport; €0.01553 bn for waterborne); €1.63553 bn total average annual operation costs for 2031-2050 (€1.62 bn for road transport; €0.01553 bn for waterborne).</p>	-	<p><i>Investment support</i> €0.77 bn total average annual investments for 2021-2030 (€0.65 bn for road transport; €0.1217 bn for waterborne) €0.62 bn total average annual investments for 2031-2050 for road transport</p>
Administrative and monitoring costs	Direct costs						<p>The costs to public authorities from the requirements to review and update the national policy frameworks (NPFs) and report on the implementation are the same as in the baseline. Monitoring costs may increase to some extent to report on compliance with the strict targets set. The additional costs relative to the baseline can't be quantified; and the provision of standardised data formats, digitised</p>

II. Overview of costs – Preferred option - PO2 (expressed relative to the baseline)

							data transfer and a common system of reporting to national access points of Member States will simplify overall reporting under the Directive.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--