Contribution ID: 6ad2c93a-2edf-4f2e-88a1-4663615b3d89

Date: 16/12/2020 19:39:00

Evaluation and Impact Assessment of the Fagas Regulation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.	
-------------------------------------	--

Introduction

Fluorinated gases (F-gases) are strong, man-made greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming. The most relevant F-gases are hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), as well as perfluorocarbons (PFCs) and sulphur hexafluoride (SF6). Since 1990, EU emissions of F-gases almost doubled until 2014, after which they started to decline due to EU legislation. They are used in various applications (e.g. refrigeration, airconditioning, insulation foams), but also in some industrial processes and electrical transmission (SF6). The current F-gas Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 517/2014) applies since 2015 and aims at reducing EU F-gas emissions by two-thirds by 2030, compared to 2010 levels.

The F-gas Regulation preceded the passing of both the Paris Climate Agreement and the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on substances that deplete the ozone layer, where Parties agreed to limit progressively the production and consumption of HFCs. More recently, the EU Commission adopted the European Green Deal Communication and proposed a European Climate Law establishing the framework for achieving the objective of climate neutrality by 2050, including increasing the ambition of 2030 climate targets. Ambitious action to avoid emissions of high global warming potential (GWP) greenhouse gases such as F-gases is key to reaching these objectives.

The inception impact assessment on the F-gas Regulation can be found here.

The purpose of this open public consultation (OPC) is to determine public opinion on the performance of the existing F-gas Regulation to date and on the choice and potential impacts of future policy options. As the evaluation of the current Regulation will be conducted back-to-back with the impact assessment of the Commission proposal for revising the rules, this consultation will cover both.

This questionnaire is split into three parts: general awareness of F-gas (policy) (Part 1), general views on the F-gas Regulation (Part 2) and specialised views on the choice and impacts of the envisaged policy options (Part 3).

About you

- *Language of my contribution
 - Bulgarian
 - Croatian
 - Czech
 - Danish

	Dutch
•	English
	Estonian
	Finnish
	French
	Gaelic
	German
	Greek
0	Hungarian
	Italian
0	Latvian
	Lithuanian
	Maltese
	Polish
	Portuguese
0	Romanian
0	Slovak
0	Slovenian
	Spanish
0	Swedish
*I am	giving my contribution as
	Academic/research institution
	Business association
•	Company/business organisation
	Consumer organisation
	EU citizen
	Environmental organisation
	Non-EU citizen
	Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
0	Public authority
	Trade union
0	Other

^{*}First name

	Jeremy			
*Su	rname			
00	Nicholson			
	NICHOISOH			
*En	nail (this won't be p	oublished)		
	nicholson@ifieceurope.o	org		
*Or	ganisation name			
2	55 character(s) maximum			
	IFIEC Europe The International Federa	ation of Industrial Energy Co	onsumers in Europe	
*Or	ganisation size			
	Micro (1 to 9 em	nployees)		
	Small (10 to 49	employees)		
	Medium (50 to 2	249 employees)		
	Large (250 or m	ore)		
_				
	ansparency registe 55 character(s) maximum	r number		
Ch	eck if your organisation is		<u>er</u> . It's a voluntary database fo	r organisations seeking to
inf	luence EU decision-makin	g.		
	1978775156-31			
* Cc	ountry of origin			
		origin, or that of your organis	sation.	
	Afghanistan	Djibouti	Libya	Saint Martin
	Åland Islands	Dominica	Liechtenstein	Saint Pierre
				and Miquelon
	Albania	Dominican	Lithuania	Saint Vincent
		Republic		and the
		0 -		Grenadines
	Algeria	Ecuador	Luxembourg	Samoa
	AmericanSamoa	Egypt	Macau	San Marino

Andorra	El Salvador	Madagascar	São Tomé and Príncipe
Angola	Equatorial Guinea	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
Anguilla	Eritrea	Malaysia	Senegal
Antarctica	Estonia	Maldives	Serbia
Antigua and Barbuda	Eswatini	Mali	Seychelles
Argentina	Ethiopia	Malta	Sierra Leone
Armenia	Falkland Islands	Marshall Islands	Singapore
Aruba	Faroe Islands	Martinique	Sint Maarten
Australia	Fiji	Mauritania	Slovakia
Austria	Finland	Mauritius	Slovenia
Azerbaijan	France	Mayotte	Solomon
			Islands
Bahamas	French Guiana	Mexico	Somalia
Bahrain	French Polynesia	Micronesia	South Africa
Bangladesh	French Southern and Antarctic Lands	Moldova	 South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
Barbados	Gabon	Monaco	South Korea
Belarus	Georgia	Mongolia	South Sudan
Belgium	Germany	Montenegro	Spain
Belize	Ghana	Montserrat	Sri Lanka
Benin	Gibraltar	Morocco	Sudan
Bermuda	Greece	Mozambique	Suriname
Bhutan	Greenland	Myanmar /Burma	Svalbard and Jan Mayen
Bolivia	Grenada	Namibia	Sweden
Bonaire SaintEustatius andSaba	Guadeloupe	Nauru	Switzerland

Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guam	Nepal	Syria
Botswana	Guatemala	Netherlands	Taiwan
Bouvet Island	Guernsey	New Caledonia	Tajikistan
Brazil	Guinea	New Zealand	Tanzania
British Indian	Guinea-Bissau	Nicaragua	Thailand
Ocean Territory		_	
British Virgin	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
Islands			
Brunei	Haiti	Nigeria	Timor-Leste
Bulgaria	Heard Island	Niue	[◎] Togo
	and McDonald		
	Islands		
Burkina Faso	Honduras	Norfolk Island	Tokelau
Burundi	Hong Kong	Northern	Tonga
		Mariana Islands	
Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea	Trinidad and
			Tobago
Cameroon	Iceland	North	Tunisia
		Macedonia	
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	Turkmenistan
Cayman Islands	Iran	Pakistan	Turks and
			Caicos Islands
Central African	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
Republic			
Chad	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New	United Arab
		Guinea	Emirates
Christmas	Italy	Paraguay	United
Island			Kingdom
Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	United States

0	Cocos (Keeling) Islands	Japan	Philippines	0	United States Minor Outlying Islands
0	Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands		Uruguay
0	Comoros	Jordan	Poland		US Virgin
					Islands
0	Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal		Uzbekistan
0	Cook Islands	Kenya	Puerto Rico		Vanuatu
0	Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar		Vatican City
0	Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion		Venezuela
0	Croatia	Kuwait	Romania		Vietnam
0	Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia		Wallis and
					Futuna
0	Curaçao	Laos	Rwanda		Western
					Sahara
0	Cyprus	Latvia	Saint		Yemen
			Barthélemy		
0	Czechia	Lebanon	Saint Helena		Zambia
			Ascension and		
			Tristan da		
			Cunha		
	Democratic	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and		Zimbabwe
	Republic of the		Nevis		
	Congo				
	Denmark	Liberia	Saint Lucia		

*Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

☑ I agree with the personal data protection provisions

Are you involved in any of the following activities with respect to F-gases?

	yes	no
Manufacture/trade/sale of gases	0	•
Manufacture/trade/sale of equipment	0	•
Use of equipment	•	0
Installing, maintenance, leakage checks	•	0
Recovery, recycling, reclamation or destruction	0	•
Training and certification	•	0
Manufacture/trade/sale of equipment with F-gas alternatives	0	•
Use of equipment with F-gas alternatives	•	0
Other	0	0

Please specify:

100 character(s) maximum

Our members are downstream users of equipment filled with SF6.

Which F-gas sector are you active in?

- Stationary refrigeration/AC
- Mobile AC
- Transport refrigeration
- Fire protection
- Electronics manufacture
- Switchgear and related equipment
- Aerosols
- Foams
- Other

Part 1 - Awareness of F-gases

Part 1 seeks to explore your general awareness of F-gas policy

1. Are you informed about:

	Very well informed	Reasonably well informed	Poorly informed	Not informed
Different types of F-gases, their sources, uses and emissions	©	•	0	0
Impact of F-gases on climate change	0	•	0	0
EU F-gas policies	0	•	0	©
International F-gas policies	0	•	0	0
General international and EU climate policies (Paris Agreement, European Green Deal)	0	•	0	0

2. Are you familiar with:

	Very familiar	Somewhat familiar	Not very familiar	Not familiar
Containment of F-gases	0	•	©	0
Training and certification for F-gas personnel	0	•	©	0
Restrictions related to use of F-gases and equipment	0	•	0	0
Quota system for F-gases	0	0	0	•
Company reporting and verification	0	0	0	•

Part 2 - General views on the F-gas Regulation

Part 2 seeks to gather general views as regards the performance of the F-gas Regulation and the need for any changes

3. What impact has the F-gas Regulation had with respect to its objectives?

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	Cannot say
Contribute towards meeting the EU's climate targets	0	•	0	0	0	0
Facilitate the agreement to phase down HFCs under the Montreal Protocol	0	0	0	0	•	•
Discourage the use of F-gases with high GWP in the EU	0	0	0	0	0	•
Promote the use of alternative substances or technologies	0	0	0	0	0	•

Prevent leakage and ensure proper end-of-life treatment of equipment	0	•	0	0	0	•
Stimulate innovation and develop green technologies	0	0	0	0	0	•

4. To what extent does the F-gas Regulation contribute to recent related EU or international objectives?

	Contributes strongly	Some contribution	Neutral	Adverse contribution	Cannot say
European Green Deal	0	•	0	0	0
Montreal Protocol (Kigali Amendment)	0	•	0	0	0
Paris Climate Agreement	0	•	0	0	0

5. To what extent has the F-gas Regulation been coherent with other EU and international legislation?

	Fully coherent	Somewhat coherent	Not coherent	Cannot say
Montreal Protocol (Kigali Amendment)	0	0	0	•
Paris Climate Agreement	0	•	0	0
Mobile Air Conditioning (MAC) Directive	0	0	0	•
Ozone Regulation	0	•	0	0
Ecodesign Directive	0	•	0	0
WEEE Directive and other waste legislation	0	0	•	0
Customs legislation	0	0	0	•

Please elaborate:

1000 character(s) maximum

The EU F-Gas Regulation limits the emissions of F-Gases, thus contributes to the International Agreement to reduce Global Warming. EU F-Gas also promotes collection & recycling of F-Gases. Recycling is complex as the collected F-gases are considered under the Waste Legislation as waste. Therefore the collection and recycling is not fostered by Waste Legislation. An exemption would help develop the recycling of F-Gases.

	The EU F-Gas Regulation implementation is very diverse Europe wise. The mapping of the installed equipment highly varies from a country to another. Consequently the control of deficient equipment or behaviour may be improved. As well the collection of data might be enhanced by a better coverage of existing equipment.								
8. Have the following factors presented important challenges for implementing the F-gas Regulation? Please rate from 1 (= no challenge) to 5 (=very serious challenge)									
		1	2	3	4	5	Cannot say		
	Lack of technical solutions	0	0	0	•	0	0		
	Lack of information and awareness	0	•	0	0	0	0		
	General economic situation	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	F-gas policies in non-EU countries	•	0	0	0	0	0		
	Unjustified barriers in safety standards and codes	0	0	0	0	0	0		

6. Does the F-gas Regulation cover all relevant sectors and sub-sectors using F-

7. To what extent have the Regulation's requirements been effective regarding its

Effective

0

0

Very

effective

Not very

effective

0

Cannot

say

0

Ineffective

0

gases?

Yes

No

Don't know

Containment

Labelling

Please elaborate:

1000 character(s) maximum

Recovery and producer

responsibilities schemes

Training and certification

HFC quota system

Reporting and verification

Collection of emissions data

Restrictions on use and equipment

objectives (see question 3 above)?

Lack of training on F-gas alternatives	•	0	0	0	0	0
Illegal imports	0	0	0	0	•	0
Misuse of quota system	0	0	0	•	0	0
High number of new market players	0	0	0	0	•	0
COVID-19 pandemic	•	0	0	0	0	0

Other challenges:

1000 character(s) maximum

The purpose of the F-Gas Regulation is to limit emissions of F-Gases. The most efficient way to reach this target is before changing the actual Regulation, to implement it strongly and uniformly Europe wise. All other measures would have a limited impact reaching the overall purpose.

9. Have the following measures been effective in preventing illegal activities?

	Very effective	Effective	Not very effective	Ineffective	Cannot say
Inspections	0	0	0	0	•
Penalties	0	0	0	0	•
Customs control	0	0	0	0	•
Market surveillance	0	0	0	0	•
Reporting and verification	0	0	0	0	•

Please elaborate:

1000 character(s) maximum

Our sector used SF6, as F-Gas. To our best knowledge, SF6 is not heavily impacted by the illegal import of F-Gases.

10. Has the F-gas Regulation been flexible enough to respond to:

	Yes	No	Cannot say
Delays in technological developments and/or market disruptions	0	0	•
New or emerging issues	0	0	•

11. In what way has the F-gas Regulation impacted:

	Very positively	Positively	Neutral	Negatively	Very negatively	Cannot say
EU competitiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trade with third countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Better stewardship of F-gases by equipment operators	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-gas policies by other countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
EU credibility in this area	0	0	0	0	0	0

- 12. Has the COVID-19 crisis negatively impacted any F-gas sectors?

 yes
 - o no

13. Have the costs of the following measures been justified to achieve the objectives (see question 3)?

Please rate from 1 (benefits significantly outweigh the costs) to 5 (Costs significantly outweigh the benefits)

ase rate from 1 (benefits significantly outweight the costs) to 3 (Costs significantly outweight the bene					
1	2	3	4	5	Cannot say
0	0	0	•	0	0
0	•	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	•
0	0	0	0	0	•
0	0	0	0	•	0
0	0	0	0	•	0
0	0	0	0	•	0
					1 2 3 4 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

14. How costly have the following measures been for business?

Rate from 1(marginal costs) to 5 (very high costs)

	1	2	3	4	5	Cannot say
Containment	0	•	0	0	0	0
Training and certification	•	0	0	0	0	0
Recovery and producer responsibility schemes	0	•	0	0	0	0
Labelling	•	0	0	0	0	0
Restrictions on use and equipment	0	0	0	0	0	•
HFC quota system	0	0	0	0	0	•
Reporting and verification	0	0	0	0	0	•

16. Is the F-gas Regulation

Rate from 1 (fully agree) to 5 (absolutely not)

	1	2	3	4	5	Cannot say
clear?	0	0	0	•	0	0
consistent?	0	•	0	0	0	0

Please elaborate:

1000 character(s) maximum

As users of some equipment filled with SF6 or energy consumers, the price of the electricity is influenced by the Regulation on SF6.

17. The F-gas Regulation has

Rate from 1 (fully agree) to 5 (absolutely not)

	1	2	3	4	5	Cannot say
levelled the playing field across the EU	0	0	0	•	0	0
increased the level of policy ambition across the EU	0	0	0	•	0	0
improved consistency of relevant safety standards and codes across the EU	0	0	0	•	0	0

18. Do you consider that the F-gas Regulation may lead to an increased
accumulation of persistent chemicals in the environment?

V	\sim
- 1 (-:>

O No

Cannot say

19. Any other comments

5000 character(s) maximum

Please include any further information useful for this evaluation and impact assessment. In particular, please provide public references to relevant studies, position papers, and case studies or upload relevant documents.

The actual EU F-Gas Regulation focuses on controlling & limiting emissions of Fluorinated Greenhouse Gases. We strongly support this target. This is why we strongly believe that implementing uniformly in Europe measures to control leakages and emissions are the most efficient measures to reach this target. We would highlight that any ban of substance is not efficient. A strict control of substance emissions during lifecycle of this substance prevents to impact the environment. We would like to stress that socio-economical impact of potential measures should be seriously assessed before implemented.

Please upload your file

The maximum file size is 1 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Part 3 - Specialised views on policy options

Part 3 seeks to gather specialised views on the existing regulatory provisions and considered changes to the existing rules. It requires detailed technical knowledge of the F-gas Regulation.

Information for stakeholders:

The following policy options are under consideration:

- 1. Seeking alignment with the Montreal Protocol
 - Add new phase-down steps beyond 2030
 - Remove some exemptions and thresholds not foreseen by the Montreal Protocol
 - Make separate HFC production phase-down
 - Add flexibility to align with future Montreal Protocol decisions
- 2. Raising ambition in line with European Green Deal
 - Increase HFC phase-down ambition
 - Prohibit the use of F-gases where feasible
- 3. Improve implementation and enforcement
 - Training on non-F-gas alternatives
 - Detailed rules for customs and surveillance authorities, and facilitating the use of the EU Single Window environment for customs
 - Strengthen obligations of economic operators to prevent illegal trade
 - Limit the market players to legitimate participants
 - More comprehensive monitoring

20. Do you agree that the following review objectives are relevant:

Rate from 1 (fully agree) to 5 (strongly disagree)

	1	2	3	4	5	Cannot say
Ensure EU long-term compliance with Montreal Protocol	0	•	0	0	0	0
Raise ambition in light of the Green Deal and technological progress	0	0	•	0	0	0
Improve implementation and enforcement	•	0	0	0	0	0

21. Do you see any other main objective for the revision, keeping in mind that a large number of changes may delay the negotiations and thus prevent quickly fixing urgent implementation issues? Please elaborate:

1000 character(s) maximum

As industrial energy consumers, this is crucial that the socio-economic impact of future measure is seriously assessed. The competitiveness of the European Economy would be seriously impacted by an increase of the price of the electricity.

To improve the collection and recycling of F-Gases through a straight forward measure is to not treat

collected F-Gases as waste. This would facilitate the process of collection and recycling. To insure safety of users of recycled F-Gases, reclaimed gases should demonstrate identical properties as virgin ones.

22. Do you think the original objectives of the F-gas Regulation (see question 3)
and the proposed policy options (see information above) could be better achieved
at EU Member State level?

- Yes
- No
- Cannot say

Information for stakeholders: The <u>EU Single Window Environment for Customs</u> involves establishing automatic links between the F-gas Portal and the IT systems of the Member States' customs authorities via a central system supported by the Commission. This will facilitate the customs clearance process by enabling automatic checks of data in customs declarations with data in the F-gas Portal. Further, it would allow for quantity management of F-gases imported in the Union and help to prevent illegal imports.

23. How important are the following measures for improving implementation and enforcement?

Rate from 1 (very important) to 5 (not important)

	1	2	3	4	5	Cannot say
Training of technicians on F-gas alternatives	0	0	0	0	•	0
Strengthen the role of customs and facilitate the link with the EU Single Window Environment for customs	•	0	0	0	0	0
Strengthen obligations of economic operators to prevent illegal trade	©	•	0	0	0	0
Limit the market players to legitimate participants	•	0	0	0	0	0
More comprehensive monitoring	0	•	0	0	0	0
Minimum requirements for penalties at Member State level	•	0	0	0	0	0

Any other relevant measure for improving enforcement, please specify:

1000 character(s) maximum

European mapping of the installation would help tracing emission sources.

24. To what extent will the following policy options reduce emissions?

Rate from 1 (large savings) to 5 (no benefit)

1	2	3	4	5	Cannot say

Increase HFC phase-down ambition in line with technological development	0	0	•	0	0	0
Prohibit the use of HFCs in applications where they are no longer needed	0	0	0	0	•	0
Prohibit the use of other F-gases (i.e. SF6, PFCs,) in applications where these gases are no longer needed	0	0	0	0	•	0

25. To what extent will the following policy options impact administrative costs?

	Reduce significantly	Reduce	No impact	Increase	Increase significantly	Cannot say
Add new HFC phase-down steps beyond 2030	0	0	0	•	0	0
Remove some exemptions and thresholds not foreseen by the Montreal Protocol	0	0	0	•	0	0
Make separate HFC production phase-down	0	0	0	•	0	0
Add flexibility to align with future Montreal Protocol decisions	0	0	0	•	0	0
Increase HFC phase-down ambition	0	0	0	•	0	0
Prohibit the use of F-gases in products or equipment, where these gases are no longer needed	0	0	0	•	0	0
Technicians training on non-F-gas alternatives	0	0	0	•	0	0
Detailed rules for customs and surveillance authorities	0	0	•	0	0	0
Strengthen obligations of economic operators to prevent illegal trade	0	0	•	0	0	0
Limit the market players to legitimate participants	0	•	0	0	0	0
More comprehensive monitoring	0	0	•	0	0	0

(E	EUR or person hours) per relevant option:	
1	1000 character(s) maximum	

26. Where you expect administrative costs to be significant, please quantify them

27. To what extent will the following policy options impact operational costs?

	Reduce significantly	Reduce	No impact	Increase	Increase significantly	Cannot say
Add new HFC phase-down steps beyond 2030	0	0	•	0	0	0
Remove some exemptions and thresholds not foreseen by the Montreal Protocol	0	0	0	•	0	0
Make separate HFC production phase-down	0	0	0	0	0	•
Add flexibility to align with future Montreal Protocol decisions	0	0	•	0	0	0
Increase HFC phase-down ambition	0	0	0	•	0	0
Prohibit the use of F-gases in products or equipment, where these gases are no longer needed	0	0	0	0	•	0
Technicians training on non-F-gas alternatives	0	0	0	•	0	0
Detailed rules for customs and surveillance authorities	0	0	•	0	0	0
Strengthen obligations of economic operators to prevent illegal trade	0	0	•	0	0	0
Limit the market players to legitimate participants	0	0	•	0	0	0
More comprehensive monitoring	0	0	•	0	0	0

28. Where you expect operational costs to be significant, please quantify them (EUR or person hours) per relevant option:

1	000 character(s) maximum

29. Do you expect any of the policy options to impact on:

	Significant effect	Slight effect	No effect	Cannot say
EU competitiveness	•	0	0	0
Trade with non-EU countries	•	0	0	0
Employment	•	0	0	0
Consumer prices	•	0	0	0
R&D and innovation	0	0	•	0
Internal market	0	•	0	0
Specific regions	0	•	0	0
Non-EU stakeholders and international relations	0	0	•	0
SMEs	•	0	0	0
Public health and safety	0	0	•	0

Where significant, please describe effect for the relevant option:

1000 character(s) maximum

The potential limitation of the use of SF6 will need some unbudgeted investments at TSO and DSO. As consequence energy distributors will cascade those costs to the downstream users. Thus the inevitable increase of the price of electricity would impact all the downstream users in Europe. In addition power industry has equipment at site currently using SF6 and a limitation will require costly investments. Consequently the competitiveness of Europe base industry would suffer.

Contact

Contact Form