



Impact Assessment for the revision of the Directive on the Deployment of Alternative Fuels Infrastructure Survey

Eurelectric response



Eurelectric represents the interests of the electricity industry in Europe. Our work covers all major issues affecting our sector. Our members represent the electricity industry in over 30 European countries.

We cover the entire industry from electricity generation and markets to distribution networks and customer issues. We also have affiliates active on several other continents and business associates from a wide variety of sectors with a direct interest in the electricity industry.

We stand for

The vision of the European power sector is to enable and sustain:

- A vibrant competitive European economy, reliably powered by clean, carbon-neutral energy
- A smart, energy efficient and truly sustainable society for all citizens of Europe

We are committed to lead a cost-effective energy transition by:

investing in clean power generation and transition-enabling solutions, to reduce emissions and actively pursue efforts to become carbon-neutral well before mid-century, taking into account different starting points and commercial availability of key transition technologies;

transforming the energy system to make it more responsive, resilient and efficient. This includes increased use of renewable energy, digitalisation, demand side response and reinforcement of grids so they can function as platforms and enablers for customers, cities and communities;

accelerating the energy transition in other economic sectors by offering competitive electricity as a transformation tool for transport, heating and industry;

embedding sustainability in all parts of our value chain and take measures to support the transformation of existing assets towards a zero carbon society;

innovating to discover the cutting-edge business models and develop the breakthrough technologies that are indispensable to allow our industry to lead this transition.

Dépôt légal: D/2020/12.105/74

Alternative Fuels Infrastructure Survey

Response ID:231 Data

1. Objectives of the study

The European Commission is conducting an Impact Assessment for the revision of the [Directive on the Deployment of Alternative Fuels Infrastructure 2014/94/EU](#) (henceforth the Directive or AFID). The Directive was adopted in 2014 and creates a common framework of measures for the deployment of alternative fuels infrastructure in the EU.

The Commission has contracted a team led by consultants [Ricardo](#) (including [Transport and Environmental Policy Research \(TEPR\)](#) and [E3-Modelling \(E3M\)](#)) to undertake a study to support a possible revision of the Directive and to help assess possible impacts of measures considered.

Within the study, a comprehensive long-list of policy measures was compiled based on a review of the literature and other inputs. The list intended to identify potential improvements to the provisions of the Directive, as well as other measures that might be implemented to promote the uptake of alternative fuels across the EU.

The purpose of this exercise is to explore the policy measures further with a wide range of EU and Member State level stakeholders. Your responses will be used to help us further develop the content and feasibility of each policy measure while also assessing the likely impacts of these measures.

The roadmap of the impact assessment process can be found [here](#).

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at AFInfrastructure.IA@ricardo.com.

How to take this survey

Please enter your responses using the online survey form. If you wish to return to the survey to complete your response at a later time/date, please use the 'Save & Continue' function in the toolbar (at the top of your screen). You will be asked to enter your email address to receive a link to return to your survey later. When you use the 'Save & Continue' feature, all survey progress up to that point is saved.

When returning to your saved survey, please remember to submit when complete.

Please note: Although we will only accept responses submitted through the online survey form, you may download a [PDF](#) or [Word](#) version of the survey to consider your responses before submitting them. Also note that the downloaded version will contain all questions while the online version contains logic that will only display relevant questions based on your answers.

2. Use of your input

The study team will make use of your contribution (information/data provided) only for the needs of this study and of any subsequent related report prepared by the Commission services. Your responses will be shared with the Commission services. Responses will not be published. However, we may refer to information provided in this questionnaire, within the final report, except where there are specific confidentiality considerations identified. Ricardo and partners are happy to discuss and agree confidentiality requirements where this would be necessary.

1. Please indicate how you would like us to present the information provided during our discussion and any other information or data you provide to us:

Your contribution will be referenced to the organisation represented;

3. Contact information

In order to analyse the input to this interview, we ask you to provide some personal information (name, email address, telephone number, etc). Undertaking this interview means you are providing consent to Ricardo to store your data for the purposes of the study. Your personal data will not be shared with any third party outside of this study and your responses will be treated as specified in the box above (see 'Use of your input'). You can read our policy on how we process data [here](#).

2. Please provide the information below:

Organisation name:

Eurelectric aisbl

What type of organisation do you represent?

Industry

What type of industry organisation do you represent? (if more than one applies, please indicate the option that is most representative)

EU industry/business association

Please specify your (members') type of industry organisation.

Energy service providers

Please indicate the type of alternative fuels that your organisation has an active interest in (on the basis of business activity, expertise, responsibility). (Select all applicable)

Electricity

Please indicate the type of transport mode that your organisation has an active interest in (on the basis of business activity, expertise, responsibility). (Select all applicable)

Road - freight

Road - passenger

Maritime

Inland waterways

What is the geographical scope of your activities? (Select all applicable)

EU-wide

Are you willing to be contacted again in relation to this study on the Alternative Fuel Infrastructure Directive?

Yes

Contact name:

Petar Georgiev

Position/role in the organisation:

Advisor - E-mobility Lead

Email address:

pgeorgiev@eurelectric.org

Telephone number:

+32 485 58 64 46

4. Introduction

The evaluation of the AFID Directive has identified a number of problems and limitations of the Directive. These have been grouped in four problem areas (A-D). The survey aims to obtain your input on the potential policy measures identified to address the problem areas.

A short introduction is provided for each of these problem areas and subsequently, a description of each of the proposed policy measures. For each of the measures, questions focus on the following:

Extent to which the measure addresses the problems identified.

Effectiveness of the measure in achieving objectives.

Issues and problems relating to the implementation of the measure.

Expected impacts relating to the implementation of the measures.

Expected costs relating to the implementation of the measure (where appropriate).

The survey is structured as follows:

General questions about the structure of the legislative instrument itself.

Problem Area A: Planning and roll out of alternative fuels infrastructure (AFIs) to enable mobility across the EU is not coherent across the transport network (at least in terms of TEN-T and comprehensive networks). Questions on this problem area will be split into the following sections:

Targets for road transport.

Targets for other modes (aviation, rail and waterborne transport).

Assessment of other measures.

Problem Area B: There are still issues of interoperability in deployed AFI in terms of physical connections, communication standards and payment services.

Problem Area C: Consumers do not have adequate information on AFI and there is insufficient transparency and certainty, and no standardisation, of availability/compatibility and prices/fees.

Problem Area D: Integration of electro-mobility into the electricity system is not efficient and cyber security is not ensured.

5. Structure of the legislative act

The first set of measures under discussion relate to the appropriate legislative instrument, how it should be set up and the monitoring process that should be followed.

3. Measure G1: The proposed measure would be a change of legal instrument. The existing Directive would be replaced with an EU Regulation.

Do you agree with the measure to replace the existing Directive with a Regulation (for part or all of the legislation)?

Yes, parts of the legislation should become a Regulation, but parts should become a Directive

Please explain your answer, indicating which parts of the legislation should be replaced with an EU Regulation (if you chose that option).

The European Commission must perform a thorough analysis of the trade-off between a Regulation and a Directive before supporting either of the options.

In any case, a Regulation could help promoting a consistent and enforceable nature of the legislation, notably in view of potential discrepancies arising from the transposition into national laws. In addition, a Directive supposes a longer process before implementing the agreed provisions which is contrary to the urgency to improve EU's transport infrastructure laws.

Unified approach to technical requirements can be reached easier through a regulation as well. This would in turn provide competitive advantage for European companies in global markets. The EU should work towards global standards and in turn foster greater possibilities for EU companies.

Yet for certain aspects, non-binding tools are good options – e.g. certain standards, the EU could put guidance on standard development or recommendations for standards bodies.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

4. Measure G2: The proposed measure would introduce the requirement, in EU legislation, for Member States to report on a set of binding data in their National Implementation Reports (NIRs) every three years. Compared to the current situation, the legislation would further define detailed requirements on the data to be reported. The target date would be 2025.

Do you agree with the measure to require Member States to report on a set of binding data in their National Implementation Reports (NIRs) every three years?

Yes

Please explain your answer

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

5. Measure G3: The proposed measure would require that central EU monitoring of the deployment of infrastructure is undertaken, i.e., the MS reporting of MS on infrastructure development would be replaced by a central EU monitoring. Market actors would be required to report directly to the Commission and a central monitoring platform would be created. The target year would be 2025, and then every three years.

Do you agree with the measure to require central EU monitoring of the deployment of infrastructure, with market actors reporting to the Commission?

No

Please explain your answer

Do you expect any additional direct costs or savings (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

6. Measure G4: Under the proposed measure, alternative fossil fuels (i.e. LNG, CNG, LPG) used for road transport will no longer fall within the scope of the Directive and Member States will be expected to remove any relevant targets from the NPFs and NIRs. Policy support measures in relation to these fuels will also not fall within the scope of the Directive.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?*

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

6. Groups of measures

In this questionnaire we will ask you about a number of measures related to different topics, modes, and alternative fuels. The questions relate to the appropriateness of the measures, their costs, their economic and environmental impacts, etc.

7. Please select below which group of measures you would like to comment on:

- Measures for road transport AFI for light duty vehicles (cars/vans) (including electric charging, hydrogen, CNG)
- Measures for road transport AFI for heavy duty vehicles (including electric charging, electric road systems, hydrogen, LNG, CNG)
- Measures related to electric charging infrastructure outside of the road network (e.g. requirement for chargers on petrol stations, public and private buildings)
- Measures for waterborne transport (including electric charging, LNG, hydrogen)
- Measures related to technical specifications of electric chargers (e.g. design requirements), interoperability (e.g. roaming protocols and connectivity) and market access (ad-hoc/subscription payments)
- Measures related to smart-charging, grid integration and access to battery data
- Measures for road transport AFI for two-wheelers (motorbikes) and for ride sharing/taxis/ride hailing (electric charging only)
- Measures related to information available to consumers/users (e.g. signposting on the road network, fuel labelling requirements, information on prices)

7. Problem Area A - Planning and roll out of AFI to enable mobility across the EU is not coherent across the transport network

Problem Area A has been defined as:

***Planning and roll out of AFI to enable mobility across the EU is not coherent across the transport network* (at least in terms of TEN and comprehensive networks).**

The main factors underlying this problem are:

Different and fragmented approach to the roll out of AFI for different fuels across Member States.

Setting of targets for the roll out of alternative fuel infrastructure is not consistent with market developments and the increased urgency to reduce the environmental impact of transport.

Scope of the EU policy framework is not consistent with market and technological developments

8. Problem definition and underlying causes

Do you agree with the identified problem definition and the underlying causes?

Yes

Please explain your answer.

9. Policy objectives

The proposed policy objective of the intervention in Problem Area A is:

Ensure adequate level of roll-out of alternative fuels infrastructure (AFI) along the EU transport network.

Do you agree with the policy objective identified?

Yes

Please explain your answer.

8. Problem Area A - Targets for road transport

Problem Area A is defined as "*planning and roll out of AFI to enable mobility across the EU is not coherent across the transport network*".

This section considers the implications of introducing mandatory infrastructure targets in road transport for different alternative fuels and for different types of vehicles (LDVs, HDVs, etc).

Targets for light duty vehicles (LDVs)

10. Measure A1 - Electric charging for LDVs: The proposed measure would include the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of electric charging points for light duty vehicles (cars and vans) (LDVs). The legislation may require Member States to set their own targets (in their updated National Policy Frameworks (NPFs)) or may define them directly within the text of the legislation (on the basis of appropriate criteria). They may also cover some or all part of the road network.

In your view, should the target be set by Member States separately or be defined in the text of the legislation?

Other (please specify): At EU level, framework conditions should be established that enable the Member States to set dynamic targets that reflect market developments and take into account customer needs, usage behaviour, locations and the development of the number and technologies of vehicles. The detailed regulation should take place at the national level on the basis of the respective market conditions. The method for determining and monitoring the

strategic framework should be kept up to date consistently again at EU level.

In your view, for which parts of the road transport network should there be minimum targets for the availability of electric charging points for LDVs?

Urban nodes and TEN-T core and comprehensive networks

Please explain your answer.

In your view, which of the following approaches would be more appropriate when defining targets set concerning the availability of chargers with different level of power delivery?

Other (please specify): Targets should be set with consideration of total power needed and available, while differentiating the power level of the chargers. The objective is to provide all EU EV users access to a sufficient number of chargers in specific areas with adequate power (meaning consistence with charging use cases in those areas).

Please explain your answer.

In the case that targets are set at EU level, what should be the target set for a minimum level of electric recharging points for LDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network*?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target	X				
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology			X		
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS			X		
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS		X			

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network*?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target		X			
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology		X			
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS		X			
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS		X			

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, what should be target date for achieving the minimum targets?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

11. Measure A2 - Hydrogen for LDVs: The proposed measure would include the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of hydrogen refuelling points for light duty vehicles (cars and vans). The legislation may require Member States to set their own targets (in their updated National Policy Frameworks (NPFs)) or may define them directly within the text of the legislation (on the basis of appropriate criteria). They may also cover some or all part of the road network.

In your view, should the target be set by Member States separately or be defined in the text of the legislation?

In your view, for which parts of the road transport network should there be minimum targets for the availability of hydrogen refuelling points for LDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, what would be the appropriate technology for hydrogen refueling points for LDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, should hydrogen refueling stations be designed for the use of both, cars/LDVs and HDVs or is a separate infrastructure required?

Please explain your answer.

In the case that targets are set at EU level, what should be the target set for a minimum level of hydrogen refuelling points for LDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network*?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network*?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, what should be target date for achieving the minimum targets?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

12. Measure A3 - CNG for LDVs: The proposed measure would include the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of CNG refuelling points for LDVs. The legislation may require Member States to set their own targets (in their updated National Policy Frameworks (NPFs)) or may define them directly within the text of the legislation (on the basis of appropriate criteria). Another possibility would be to remove all targets for CNG, given that it is a non-carbon neutral fuel.

In your view, should the target be set by Member States separately or be defined in the text of the legislation?

In the case that targets are set at EU level, what do you consider should be the target that should be set for a minimum level of CNG refuelling points for LDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, what should be target date for achieving the minimum targets?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

Targets for heavy-duty vehicles (HDVs)

13. Measure A4 - Electric charging for HDVs (road network): The proposed measure would include the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of electric charging points for heavy duty vehicles (HDVs). The legislation may require Member States to set their own targets (in their updated National Policy Frameworks (NPFs)) or may define them directly within the text of the legislation (on the basis of appropriate criteria). They may also cover some or all parts of the road network.

In your view, should the target be set by Member States separately or be defined in the text of the legislation?

Other (please specify): At EU level, framework conditions should be established that enable the Member States to set dynamic targets that reflect market developments and take into account customer needs, usage behaviour, locations and the development of the number and technologies of vehicles. The detailed regulation should take place at the national level on the basis of the respective market conditions. The method for determining and monitoring the strategic framework should be kept up to date consistently again at EU level.

In your view, for which parts of the road transport network should there be minimum targets for the availability of electric charging points for HDVs?

Urban nodes and TEN-T core and comprehensive networks

Please explain your answer.

In your view, what would be the required level of power delivery for electric charging points for HDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, which of the following approaches would be more appropriate when defining targets set concerning the availability of chargers with different levels of power delivery?

Other (please specify): Targets should be set with consideration of total power needed and available, while differentiating the power level of the chargers. The objective is to provide all EU EV users access to a sufficient number of chargers in specific areas with adequate power (meaning consistence with charging use cases in those areas).

Please explain your answer.

In the case that targets are set at EU level, what should be the target set for a minimum level of electric recharging points for HDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network*?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, what should be target date for achieving the minimum targets?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Not relevant	Don't know
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

14. Measure A5 - Electric charging for HDVs (logistic hubs/distribution centres): The proposed measure would include the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of electric charging points for heavy duty vehicles (HDVs)

in logistic hubs (e.g. ports and multimodal hubs accessible to multiple companies) or private logistic centres (e.g., private depots belonging to a single company). The legislation may require Member States to set their own targets (in their updated National Policy Frameworks (NPFs)) or may define them directly within the text of the legislation (on the basis of appropriate criteria).

In your view, should the target be set by Member States separately or be defined in the text of the legislation?

Set specific minimum targets at EU level in the legislation for publicly-accessible logistic hubs and private logistic centres

In the case that targets are set at EU level, what should be the target set for a minimum level for publicly-accessible and private logistic hubs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network*?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
Inclusion of requirements/targets by MS in NPFs concerning minimum infrastructure in publicly-accessible logistic hubs.					
Set specific minimum targets at EU level in the legislation for publicly-accessible logistic hubs.					
Set specific minimum targets at EU level in the legislation for publicly-accessible logistic hubs and private logistic centres.					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network*?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
Inclusion of requirements/targets by MS in NPFs concerning minimum infrastructure in publicly-accessible logistic hubs.					
Set specific minimum targets at EU level in the legislation for publicly-accessible logistic hubs.					
Set specific minimum targets at EU level in the legislation for publicly-accessible logistic hubs and private logistic centres.					

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, what should be target date for achieving the minimum targets?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Not relevant	Don't know
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

15. Measure A6 - Electric road system for HDVs: The proposed measure would include the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of electric road systems for HDVs. The legislation may require Member States to set their own targets (in their updated National Policy Frameworks (NPFs)) or may define them directly within the text of the legislation (on the basis of appropriate criteria).

In your view, should the target be set by Member States separately or be defined in the text of the legislation?

Allow MS to define their own targets in the NPFs

In your view, what would be the preferred technology choice for electric road systems for HDVs?

Please explain your answer.

Both catenary and induction technologies offer a good potential to diversify charging of electric vehicles. As these are currently developed only in some countries, it would be difficult to enforce minimum targets for all governments

In the case that targets are set at EU level, what should be the target set for a minimum level of availability for electric road systems for HDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define their own targets in the NPFs					
In the case that the requirement requires MS to define their own targets in the NPFs					
In the case that there are specific minimum targets at EU level in the legislation for the TEN-core network					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define their own targets in the NPFs					
In the case that the requirement requires MS to define their own targets in the NPFs					
In the case that there are specific minimum targets at EU level in the legislation for the TEN-core network					

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, what should be target date for achieving the minimum targets?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Not relevant	Don't know
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

16. Measure A7 - Hydrogen for HDVs: The proposed measure would include the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of hydrogen refuelling points for heavy duty vehicles (HDVs). The legislation may require Member States to set their own targets (in their updated National Policy Frameworks (NPFs)) or may define them directly within the text of the legislation (on the basis of appropriate criteria). They may also cover some or all part of the road network.

In your view, should the target be set by Member States separately or be defined in the text of the legislation?

In your view, for which parts of the road transport network should there be minimum targets for the availability of hydrogen refuelling points for LDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, what would be the preferred technology choice for hydrogen refueling points for HDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, should hydrogen refueling stations be designed for the use of both, cars/LDVs and HDVs or is a separate infrastructure required?

Please explain your answer.

In the case that targets are set at EU level, what should be the target set for a minimum level of hydrogen refuelling points for HDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?*

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, what should be target date for achieving the minimum targets?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

17. Measure A8 - LNG for HDVs: The proposed measure would include the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of LNG refuelling points for heavy duty vehicles (HDVs). The legislation may require Member States to set their own targets (in their updated National Policy Frameworks (NPFs)) or may define them directly within the text of the legislation (on the basis of appropriate criteria). Another possibility would be to remove all targets for LNG, given that it is a non-carbon neutral fuel.

In your view, should the target be set by Member States separately or be defined in the text of the legislation?

In the case that targets are set at EU level, what should be the target set for a minimum level of LNG refuelling points for HDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					
In the case that the legislation removes all targets for LNG					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					
In the case that the legislation removes all targets for LNG					

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, what should be target date for achieving the minimum targets?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

18. Measure A9 - CNG for HDVs: The proposed measure would include the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of CNG refuelling points for HDVs. The legislation may require Member States to set their own targets (in

their updated National Policy Frameworks (NPFs)) or may define them directly within the text of the legislation (on the basis of appropriate criteria). Another possibility would be to remove all targets for CNG, given that it is a non-carbon neutral fuel.

In your view, should the target be set by Member States separately or be defined in the text of the legislation?

In the case that targets are set at EU level, what should be the target set for a minimum level of CNG refuelling points for HDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network*?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					
In the case that the legislation removes all targets for CNG					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network*?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
In the case that the requirement allows MS to set their own target					
In the case that the requirement allows MS to define targets using a common EU methodology					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, common for all MS					
In the case that specific minimum targets are set at EU level in the legislation, but differentiate among MS					
In the case that the legislation removes all targets for CNG					

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, what should be target date for achieving the minimum targets?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

Targets for two wheelers (motorbikes)

19. Measure A10 - Electric charging for two-wheelers: The proposed measure would include the requirement for Member States to define minimum targets for the availability of electric charging points for two wheelers (motorbikes). The legislation may require Member States to set their own targets (in their updated National Policy Frameworks (NPFs)) or may define them directly within the text of the legislation (on the basis of appropriate criteria).

In your view, should the target be set by Member States separately or be defined in the text of the legislation?

In the case that targets are set at EU level, what should be the target set for a minimum level of electric charging points for HDVs?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
MS to define targets through NPF (mandatory inclusion)					
Mandatory targets on TEN-T core, comprehensive and urban nodes					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
MS to define targets through NPF (mandatory inclusion)					
Mandatory targets on TEN-T core, comprehensive and urban nodes					

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, what should be target date for achieving the minimum targets?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

Targets for transport network companies (i.e. ride sharing/taxis/ride hailing)

20. Measure A11 - Electric charging for transport network companies: The proposed measure would include the

requirement for Member States to define minimum targets in their NPFs for the availability of electric charging points for Transport Network Companies (i.e. ride sharing/taxis/ride hailing) in urban areas. The target would be defined in relation to the number of vehicles of Transport Network Companies. The target year for the measure would be 2030.

In the case that MS are required to define minimum targets in their NPFs, what do you consider should be the target that should be set for a minimum level of electric charging points for transport network companies? Please indicate the type of target that should be set (e.g. based on the number of vehicles in the fleet) and the numerical figure that could be appropriate as a minimum for such a target.

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network*?

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network*?

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2030?

Please explain your answer, including your proposed date if you think it should be sooner/later than the proposed date.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

9. Problem Area A - Targets for other modes

As mentioned earlier, Problem Area A is defined as "*planning and roll out of AFI to enable mobility across the EU is not coherent across the transport network*".

This section considers the implications of introducing mandatory infrastructure targets other than road transport for different alternative fuels.

Waterborne transport

21. Measure A12 - Onshore power supply (OPS) for maritime transport: The proposed measure would include in EU legislation the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of shore-side electricity in maritime ports. The legislation may require the availability of shore-side electricity in some or all ports. The target year to implement this measure would be 2030.

In your view, for which maritime ports should there be mandatory targets?

Shore-side electricity available in all ports and berths

Please explain your answer.

In your view, for which ships should there be mandatory targets?

Shore-side electricity available for all ships

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network*?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
Shore-side electricity available in all TEN-T core ports and berths for cruise ships and/or container ships.					
Shore-side electricity available in all TEN-T core and comprehensive ports and berths for cruise ships and/or container ships.					
Shore-side electricity available in all ports and berths for cruise ships and/or container ships.					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network*?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
Shore-side electricity available in all TEN-T core ports and berths for cruise ships and/or container ships.					
Shore-side electricity available in all TEN-T core and comprehensive ports and berths for cruise ships and/or container ships.					
Shore-side electricity available in all ports and berths for cruise ships and/or container ships.					

Please explain your answer.

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2030?

Please explain your answer, including your proposed date if you think it should be sooner/later than the proposed date.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vessels					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

22. Measure A13 - Onshore power supply (OPS) for inland waterways: The proposed measure would include in EU legislation the requirement for the definition by Member States of minimum targets for the availability of shore-side electricity in inland ports. The legislation may require the availability of shore-side electricity in some or all ports. The year this measure would come into force would be 2030.

In your view, for which inland ports should there be a mandatory targets?

Shore-side electricity available in all **TEN-T Core and Comprehensive ports and some berths** (at least 1 berth per port).

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
Shore-side electricity available in all TEN-T core ports and some berths (at least 1 berth per port).					
Shore-side electricity available in all TEN-T core and comprehensive ports and some berths (at least 1 berth per port).					
Shore-side electricity available in all ports and some berths (at least 1 berth per port).					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?*

		Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
Shore-side electricity available in all TEN-T core ports and some berths (at least 1 berth per port).						
Shore-side electricity available in all TEN-T core and comprehensive ports and some berths (at least 1 berth per port).						
Shore-side electricity available in all ports and some berths (at least 1 berth per port).						

Please explain your answer.

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2030?

Please explain your answer, including your proposed date if you think it should be sooner/later than the proposed date.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vessels					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

23. Measure A14 - LNG for maritime transport: The proposed measure would include in EU legislation the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of LNG in maritime ports. The legislation may require LNG refuelling points in some or all TEN-T core and comprehensive ports. The target year to implement this measure would be 2025.

In your view, for which maritime ports should there be a mandatory targets?

Please explain your answer.

If possible, please suggest criteria for identifying which ports need to be equipped with LNG bunkering.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll-out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
LNG refuelling points in some TEN-T core ports (1 refuelling point per port).					
LNG refuelling points at all TEN-T core (and some comprehensive) ports (1 refuelling point per port).					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?*

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
LNG refuelling points in some TEN-T core ports (1 refuelling point per port).					
LNG refuelling points at all TEN-T core (and some comprehensive) ports (1 refuelling point per port).					

Please explain your answer.

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Please explain your answer, including your proposed date if you think it should be sooner/later than the proposed date.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vessels					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

24. Measure A15 - LNG for inland waterways: The proposed measure would include in EU legislation the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of LNG in inland ports. The legislation may require LNG refuelling points in some or all TEN-T core and comprehensive ports. The target year to implement this measure would be 2030.

In your view, for which inland ports should there be a mandatory targets?

Please explain your answer.

If possible, please suggest criteria for identifying which ports need to be equipped with LNG bunkering.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
LNG refuelling points in some TEN-T core ports (1 refuelling point per port).					
LNG refuelling points at all TEN-T core (and some comprehensive) ports (1 refuelling point per port).					

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?*

		Not at all	To a limited extent	To a significant extent	Fully	Don't know
LNG refuelling points in some TEN-T core ports (1 refuelling point per port).						
LNG refuelling points at all TEN-T core (and some comprehensive) ports (1 refuelling point per port).						

Please explain your answer.

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2030?

Please explain your answer, including your proposed date if you think it should be sooner/later than the proposed date.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vessels					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

25. Measure A16 - Hydrogen for maritime transport and inland waterways: The proposed measure would include in EU legislation the requirement for definition of minimum targets for the availability of hydrogen refuelling infrastructure in TEN-T core ports (1 refuelling point per port). The target year to implement this measure would be 2030.

In your view, what would be the preferred technology choice for hydrogen refueling points for maritime transport and inland waterways?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, should hydrogen at maritime and inland ports be available only to supply waterborne vessels, or should it be available to other modes of transport that come into the ports as well? Select all that apply.

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network*?

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network*?

Please explain your answer.

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2030?

Please explain your answer, including your proposed date if you think it should be sooner/later than the proposed date.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles/vessels/rolling stock					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

10. Problem Area A - Assessment of other measures (non-targets)

In this section we ask you to provide input on a set of measures identified to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network*.

For each measure, questions are asked about the following:

Extent to which the measure addresses the problems identified;

Effectiveness of the measure in achieving objectives;
Issues and problems relating to the implementation of the measure;
Expected impacts relating to the implementation of the measures;
Expected costs relating to the implementation of the measure (where appropriate).

Road transport

26. Measure A20: The proposed measure will make mandatory that Member States include hydrogen for road transport in their National Policy Frameworks (NPFs).

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll-out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

27. Measure A21: The proposed measure will introduce an obligation for Member States to ensure that consumers have the right to request that a publicly accessible recharging point is installed within a specific distance from their home (distance to be defined by Member States).

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?*

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

28. Measure A22: The proposed measure would define, in EU legislation, the rights of owners of parking places in private buildings to install electric rechargers for light duty vehicles (cars/vans) under certain conditions. The proposed target year for the entry into force of the measure is 2025.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI to enable mobility across the EU is not coherent across the transport network?*

To a limited extent

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective

of ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?

To a limited extent

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, which of the following alternative sub-options could be appropriate requirements that should apply under this measure?

Grant owners of parking places in condominiums / apartment blocks the right to install rechargers in their parking without agreement of co-owners ("right to plug").

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Yes

Please explain, including your proposed date if you think it should be sooner/later than the proposed date.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

29. Measure A23: The proposed measure includes the introduction of mandatory requirements (level to be defined in EU legislation) for the availability of recharging points in all public parking facilities (e.g. supermarkets, car park operators, shopping malls, etc.). The proposed target year for the entry into force of the measure is 2030.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll*

out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, which of the following alternative sub-options could be appropriate requirements that should apply under this measure?

Just a general requirement for the installation of such publicly available rechargers, but no target set in EU legislation.

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2030?

Please explain, including your proposed date if you think it should be sooner/later than the proposed date.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

30. Measure A24: The proposed measure would include in EU legislation the obligation for petrol station operators to equip petrol stations with a minimum number of publicly accessible re-charging points. The measure could apply to all petrol

stations or to petrol stations of a minimum size. Target year: 2025.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll-out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network*?

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network*?

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

In your view, should the scope of the proposed measure be limited to petrol stations of a minimum size?

No, it should apply to all petrol stations, irrespective of size

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Yes

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

Waterborne transport

31. Measure A25: The proposed measure will make mandatory that Member States include hydrogen for waterborne transport in their National Policy Frameworks (NPFs).

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

32. Measure A26: Article 5 of the AFID currently stipulates that "Member States shall ensure, by means of their national policy frameworks, that an appropriate number of refuelling points for LNG are put in place at maritime ports, to enable LNG inland waterway vessels or seagoing ships to circulate throughout the TEN-T Core Network by 31 December 2025". This proposed measure would further define in EU legislation what the need to "enable the circulation on TEN-T Core Network" means in practical terms (e.g. to ensure the availability and density of LNG refuelling points throughout the network).

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *planning and roll out of AFI is not coherent across the transport network?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective

of ensuring adequate level of roll-out of AFI along the EU transport network?

Please explain your answer.

What would you consider an appropriate definition of "enable the circulation on TEN-T Core Network" to be included in revised legislation?

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Level of greenhouse gas emissions					
Level of air pollution					
Level of noise					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

11. Problem Area B - There are still issues of interoperability in deployed AFI in terms of physical connections, communication standards and payment services

Problem Area B has been defined as:

There are still issues of interoperability in deployed AFI in terms of physical connections, communication standards and payment services.

The main factors underlying this problem are:

Technical specifications for refuelling/recharging are still varied and cover only the physical connection of vehicle and infrastructure.

Communication protocols for electric vehicles not specified.

Framework (provisions/requirements/standards) concerning ad hoc payment options at charging points not in place.

33. Problem definition and underlying causes

Do you agree with the identified problem definition and the underlying causes?

Yes

Please explain your answer.

34. Policy objectives

The proposed policy objective of the intervention in this problem area is:

Ensure full interoperability (in terms of physical connections, communication standards and payment services) of infrastructure for all alternatively fuelled vehicles.

Do you agree with the policy objective identified?

Yes

Please explain your answer.

12. Problem Area B - Assessment of measures

In this section we ask you to provide input on a set of measures identified to address the problem that *there are still issues of interoperability in deployed AFI in terms of physical connections, communication standards and payment services.*

For each measure, questions are asked about the following:

Extent to which the measure addresses the problems identified;

Effectiveness of the measure in achieving objectives;

Issues and problems relating to the implementation of the measure;

Expected impacts relating to the implementation of the measures;

Expected costs relating to the implementation of the measure (where appropriate).

Technical specifications and design requirements

35. Measure B1: The proposed measure would introduce in EU legislation mandatory design requirements for selected or for all new recharging/refuelling infrastructure for users with disabilities (e.g. at least one 'accessible' charger in recharging stations of a certain size). The target year for the measure is 2025.

In your view, should the scope of the proposed measure be limited to just some or all new recharging/refuelling infrastructure?

Please explain your answer. If you selected the second option please indicate which criteria should be used to decide whether or not new recharging/refuelling infrastructure should take into consideration the design requirements for users with disabilities.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *there are still issues of interoperability in deployed AFI in terms of physical connections, communication standards and payment services?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring full interoperability of infrastructure for vehicles and users?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Accessibility to AFI for persons with disabilities					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

36. Measure B2: This proposed measure would allow the Commission to adopt secondary legislation with regards to technical specifications for infrastructure.

In your view, what should the scope of the proposed measure be? (you can select multiple options)

Set technical specifications for recharging infrastructure for heavy duty vehicles.

Set technical specifications for communication protocols between the recharging point and the vehicle

Please explain your answer.

Setting certain specifications for the protocols but not setting specific protocols in legislation as such

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *there are still issues of interoperability in deployed AFI in terms of physical connections, communication standards and payment services?*

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring full interoperability of infrastructure for vehicles and users?*

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

37. Measure B3: The proposed measure would introduce additional requirements for every charging point to provide EV-users with a common ad-hoc payment method (i.e. without subscription). The target year is 2025.

In your view, what should the scope of the proposed measure be? (select your preferred option)

Every publicly accessible recharging point to provide EV-users with a common ad hoc payment option.

Please explain your answer. In particular, signal which kind of common payment method would be desirable and which chargers could be exempted.

Ad-hoc charging is important in order to guarantee interoperability and charging access to every customer. However, a customer-friendly charging network for electric vehicles should provide different payment methods for the consumer. The question of which payment methods are integrated should remain part of the competitive development and not be regulated even more closely. Fundamental intervention in the hardware should be avoided, a mobile website as the payment method is enough. The integration of physical terminals into the architecture of the charging stations leads to many unresolved questions or demonstrably leads to a significant increase in hardware costs. At the same time, however, it remains questionable whether consumer-friendliness would increase. In a young, innovation-driven market, such interventions by the legislature can prevent important investment decisions by the private sector, and thus, slow down the necessary development of the market around the charging station.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *there are still issues of interoperability in deployed AFI in terms of physical connections, communication standards and payment services?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring full interoperability of infrastructure for vehicles and users?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

38. Measure B4: This proposed measure would introduce interoperability and design requirements for all rechargers (e.g. in terms of the connector standards or the measurement equipment to be used). The target year is 2025.

In your view, what should the scope of the proposed measure be? (select your preferred option)

To introduce common requirements on shutters for all new chargers

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *there are still issues of interoperability in deployed AFI in terms of physical connections, communication standards and payment services?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring full interoperability of infrastructure for vehicles and users?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

Connectivity

39. Measure B5: This proposed measure would introduce specific requirements to ensure full connectivity of rechargers to ensure that information on location and availability can be provided to the EV-user. Target date: 2025.

In your view, what should the scope of the proposed measure be? (you can select multiple options)

- Oblige CPOs to make location information available for free, e.g. through National Access Points
- Oblige CPOs to make information on technical availability of the recharger available for free in near real time
- Oblige CPOs to make information on occupancy of the recharger available for free in near real time

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *there are still issues of interoperability in deployed AFI in terms of physical connections, communication standards and payment services?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring full interoperability of infrastructure for vehicles and users?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

40. Measure B6: This proposed measure would introduce specific requirements to ensure user friendly roaming. They will apply to charge point operators and/or roaming platforms and cover the terms of access of EMSPs, mandatory roaming and transparency of prices. (See detailed definition of alternative options below). Target date: 2025.

In your view, what should the scope of the proposed measure be? (you can select multiple options)

Introduce requirements for CPOs that all re-charging points offering contract-based charging must also offer roaming.

Introduce requirement to oblige all CPOs operating publicly accessible rechargers to allow all EMSPs to operate on their network on a non discriminatory basis.

Oblige all EMSPs to provide information on the costs for a recharge at every recharging point, e.g. through an app.

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *there are still issues of interoperability in deployed AFI in terms of physical connections, communication standards and payment services?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of ensuring full interoperability of infrastructure for vehicles and users?

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

		Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)						
Level of transport activity						
Operation of the EU internal market and competition						
Innovation						
Industry competitiveness						
Level of employment and job skills						
Costs to consumers						
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information						
Other (please specify below)						

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

13. Problem Area C - Consumers do not have adequate information on location/availability of AFI and there is a lack of price transparency

Problem Area C has been defined as:

Consumers do not have adequate information on AFI and there is insufficient transparency and certainty, and no standardisation, of availability/compatibility and prices/fees.

The main factors underlying this problem are:

No uniform signposting rules for alternative fuel recharging/refuelling along highways or in other areas.

Information on location/availability of recharging refueling stations is not widely available online.

Common standards on fuel labelling are not in place.

41. Problem definition and underlying causes

Do you agree with the identified problem definition and the underlying causes?

Yes

Please explain your answer.

42. Policy objectives

The proposed policy objective of the intervention in this problem area is:

Ensure adequate information is available for consumers, including:

Information on location/availability of infrastructure through appropriate tools and adequate signposting.

Understandable and reliable information on the compatibility of fuels and recharging infrastructure with the powertrains of their vehicles, vessels and aircraft.

Comprehensive information on prices for recharging/refuelling services as well as on additional services, that are also accessible to consumers with disabilities.

Do you agree with the policy objective identified?

Yes

Please explain your answer.

14. Problem Area C - Assessment of measures

In this section we ask you to provide input on a set of measures identified to address the problem that *consumers do not have adequate information on AFI and there is insufficient transparency and certainty, and no standardisation, of availability/compatibility and prices/fees.*

For each measure, questions are asked about the following:

Extent to which the measure addresses the problems identified;

Effectiveness of the measure in achieving objectives;

Issues and problems relating to the implementation of the measure;

Expected impacts relating to the implementation of the measures;

Expected costs relating to the implementation of the measure (where appropriate).

43. Measure C1: This proposed measure would introduce standardised and mandatory signposting in certain parts of the TEN-T network. Target date: 2025.

In your view, what should the scope of the proposed measure be? (select your preferred option)

Standardised and mandatory signposting on TEN-T core, comprehensive and urban nodes network

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *consumers do not have adequate information on AFI and there is insufficient transparency and certainty, and no standardisation, of availability/compatibility and prices/fees?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate information is available for consumers?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Accessibility to AFI for persons with disabilities					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

44. Measure C2: This proposed measure would introduce one or multiple requirements related to the pricing of alternative fuels. Target date: 2025.

In your view, what should the scope of the proposed measure be? (you can select multiple options)

Introduce standardised information and display requirements for price components for **CONTRACT-BASED recharging through electronic means (e.g. app)**.

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *consumers do not have adequate information on AFI and there is insufficient transparency and certainty, and no standardisation, of availability/compatibility and prices/fees?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate information is available for consumers?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Accessibility to AFI for persons with disabilities					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

45. Measure C3: This proposed measure would strengthen the fuel labelling requirements. It would include more detailed provisions on ensuring full transparency on the compatibility of fuels with the vehicle's engine. Target date: 2025.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *consumers do not have adequate information on AFI and there is insufficient transparency and certainty, and no standardisation, of availability/compatibility and prices/fees?*

Fully

Please explain your answer, especially indicating if you currently see a problem either with the labelling provisions in the directive or with the implementation of the provision in Member States.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate information is available for consumers?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Accessibility to AFI for persons with disabilities					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

46. Measure C4: This proposed measure would introduce a mandatory requirement for recharging/refuelling operators to provide real-time data on ad-hoc prices and infrastructure availability. Data would be used by third party market actors and consumers. Target date: 2025.

In your view, what should the scope of the proposed measure be? (select your preferred option)

Data be provided at a "reasonable cost" (to be defined later)

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *consumers do not have adequate information on AFI and there is insufficient transparency and certainty, and no standardisation, of availability/compatibility and prices/fees?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate information is available for consumers?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

47. Measure C5: This proposed measure would introduce standards for data quality and frequency requirements for that data. Target date: 2025.

In your view, what should the scope of the proposed measure be? (select your preferred option)

Standardise static (e.g. location) **AND** dynamic (e.g. availability) data in terms of quality and frequency

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *consumers do not have adequate information on AFI and there is insufficient transparency and certainty, and no standardisation, of availability/compatibility and prices/fees?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate information is available for consumers?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

48. Measure C6: This proposed measure would introduce a requirement for digital connectivity of all new re-chargers at re-fuelling stations. Target year for the measure would be 2025.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *consumers do not have adequate information on AFI and there is insufficient transparency and certainty, and no standardisation, of availability/compatibility and prices/fees?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate information is available for consumers?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Please explain, including your proposed date if you think it should be sooner/later than the proposed date.

Do you expect any direct costs for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

49. Measure C7: The proposed measure would introduce specific rights to EV-users, such as always having the option to overwrite automatic authentication. The target date is 2025.

In your view, what should the scope of the proposed measure be? (multiple options possible)

At every charging point the EV-user can overwrite the automatic authentication and can either pay ad hoc or – if the charge point is equipped accordingly – with a contract.

At every charging point the EV-user can choose to pay with a contract.

Every charging point to provide contract based recharging and co-operate with other EMSPs on a non discriminatory basis to allow roaming.

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *consumers do not have adequate information on AFI and there is insufficient transparency and certainty, and no standardisation, of availability/compatibility and prices/fees?*

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring adequate information is available for consumers?*

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

15. Problem Area D - The integration of electro-mobility into the electricity system is not efficient and cyber security is not ensured

Problem Area D has been defined as:

Integration of electro-mobility into the electricity system is not efficient.

The main factors underlying this problem are:

EV charging points are not required to have smart charging and vehicle to grid operations functionalities.

No framework in place covering the availability and access of battery data to third parties.

50. Problem definition and underlying causes

Do you agree with the identified problem definition and the underlying causes?

Yes

Please explain your answer.

51. Policy objectives

The proposed policy objective of the intervention in this problem area is:

Ensuring efficient integration of electric vehicles/vessels in the electricity system to:

Fully enable smart charging and vehicle to grid.

Ensure that recharging points do not pose a (cyber) security risk to the electricity system.

Do you agree with the policy objective identified?

Yes

Please explain your answer.

16. Problem Area D - Assessment of measures

In this section we ask you to provide input on a set of measures identified to address the problem that *the integration of electro-mobility into the electricity system is not efficient*.

For each measure, questions are asked about the following:

Extent to which the measure addresses the problems identified;

Effectiveness of the measure in achieving objectives;

Issues and problems relating to the implementation of the measure;

Expected impacts relating to the implementation of the measure;

Expected costs relating to the implementation of the measure (where appropriate).

52. Measure D1: This proposed measure would introduce mandatory requirements for smart charging capabilities on different types of chargers. Target date: 2025.

In your view, what should the scope of the proposed measure be? (select your preferred option)

Introduce mandatory requirements for smart charging capability for **all new publicly accessible, semi-publicly accessible and private DC/AC chargers**.

Please explain your answer.

Even if smartcharging is not required to be effective in all charging points, the potential of smart charging is quite important for home charging and should be included in new requirements to encourage development of those services (including V2X).

In your view, how can smart functionality (e.g. smart meters, smart recharging infrastructure, etc.) on different types of chargers be ensured?

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *the integration of electro-mobility into the electricity system is not efficient*?

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring efficient integration of electric vehicles/vessels in the electricity system*?

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

Yes

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

53. Measure D2: This proposed measure would introduce requirements to provide guaranteed access to battery data to any service provider following EV-user consent and respecting GDPR. Target date: 2025.

In your view, to what extent would the proposed measure contribute to address the problem that *the integration of electro-mobility into the electricity system is not efficient?*

Fully

Please explain your answer.

In your view, to what extent do you expect the proposed measure(s) to contribute towards achieving the objective of *ensuring efficient integration of electric vehicles/vessels in the electricity system?*

To a significant extent

Please explain your answer.

Do you envisage any issues/problems in relation to the implementation of the specific measure?

Do you agree with the proposed target date of 2025?

No, it should be sooner

Please explain your answer.

Do you expect any additional direct costs (compared to the current situation) for your organisation or your members as a result of the implementation of the measure?

Do you expect the proposed measure to have an impact in any of the following impact categories?

	Negative impact	No impact	Positive impact	Don't know	Not relevant
Uptake of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)					
Level of transport activity					
Operation of the EU internal market and competition					
Innovation					
Industry competitiveness					
Level of employment and job skills					
Costs to consumers					
Consumer choice, consumer access to alternative fuels infrastructure and to information					
Other (please specify below)					

Please explain your answer.

If applicable, please specify what other impact category/categories you believe would be affected.

17. Thank you!

Please include here any further comments you might have.

18. Thank You!

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important to us.

If you have any questions, please get in touch via: AFInfrastructure.IA@ricardo.com.

Eurelectric pursues in all its activities the application of the following sustainable development values:

Economic Development

- Growth, added-value, efficiency

Environmental Leadership

- Commitment, innovation, pro-activeness

Social Responsibility

- Transparency, ethics, accountability



Union of the Electricity Industry - Eurelectric aisbl
Boulevard de l'Impératrice, 66 – bte 2 – 1000 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: + 32 2 515 10 00 – VAT: BE 0462 679 112 • www.eurelectric.org
EU Transparency Register number: 4271427696-87