

## Deception of EU-Parliament?

Before the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Safety of the EU-Parliament is at present an update of Directive 98/67 NRMM (Non Road Mobile Machinery), called "[Draft Report](#)" on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 97/68/EC as regards the provisions for engines placed on the market under the flexibility scheme (COM(2010)0362 – C7-0171/2010 – 2010/0195(COD))

Essentially, this Draft-Legislation deals with increasing the so-called flexibility scheme to grant manufacturers a smoother transition between different stages of rules for the exhaust (from Stage IIIA to Stage IIIB). Contention is due to the poor state of the economy companies who have not accomplished improvements of their engines should be granted an extension. **To this author's opinion, apparently experts of the High Commission and following suit the EU-Parliament have been deceived when reading the following paragraph ( see quote below page 7 of the Draft).**

### Amendment 3

#### Proposal for a directive – amending act Recital 2

*Text proposed by the Commission*

(2) The transition to Stage III B involves a step change in technology requiring significant implementation costs for redesigning the engines and for developing advanced technical solutions. *The transition occurs at the same time when industry faces sever economic difficulties.*

The above quoted paragraph and similar ones imply that there exists only one way to achieve the goal of Stage IIIB which is to modify the internal combustion process; admittedly this way is cumbersome.

**However, legislation does never request a specific mode for obtaining a cleaner engine, modification of the internal combustion process is one way; in contrast, purification of the exhaust constitutes another method – a method which has not been considered at all.**

Engine manufacturers who did not make it to modify their engines should be required to homologize their engines with suitable filters (tested according to VERT-testing\*) procedure or California Air Resources Board TIER4).

There are some than 50 filter-types (DPF-systems) on the market, several times 10'000 retrofits have been done and in OEM (Peugeot) several hundred thousand have been delivered.

Neglect of suitable after-treatment of exhaust constitutes a serious flaw of this draft legislation.

Moreover, it has been demonstrated and it is documented in literature of rank, that Stage IIIB can be substantially exceeded by means of suitable (= VERT-tested) DPF-systems.

**Why not provide similar to "EEV" (Enhanced Emission Vehicle) in On Road a parallel for Off-Road, say EEE (Enhanced Emission Engine)? In the latter case a public subsidy up to one third**

of the costs would be EU-conform, triggering a stimulus for the economy and as well a measurable improvement in public health.

Feb.28<sup>th</sup>, 2011

F. J . LEGERER, P.Eng.  
General Manager,  
VERT-Association

e.: [office@vert-certification.eu](mailto:office@vert-certification.eu)

\*) *VERT-certification is an **industrial standard**, off-spring of the original Swiss Standard prior to its dilution in 2009.*

*VERT-certification requires: Reduction of PM10 at least 1 order of magnitude (more than 90% of particle mass) and at least 2 orders of magnitude of ultra-fine particles, nano-particles sometimes denoted PM1 (more than 99% by number, see EURO 6); this fraction is exceptionally harmful to human health and on top of it there is the requirment: no deterioration after 2000 hours of operation*

*“VERT®”, “VERT-certification®” and “VERT-DPF®” are registered trade-marks in the EU and many other countries. In an expertise for the States of New York and New Jersey, the eminent expert on exhaust purification, Dr John J. Mooney, co-inventor of the 3-way cat for gasoline engines, denoted the VERT testing procedure in comparison to CARB and EPA as the superior method from viewpoint of completeness and costs for industry.*