**Summary of Working Group #3:**

The conversation began with a question about perceptions of harm: was air pollution a recognized crisis?

The answer: not especially or consistently. There were episodes of severe pollution that caught peoples’ attention, but these were short-lived. Everyday exposure and air quality didn’t seem to be seen as as much of a serious problem as the overall numbers would indicate. [**Implication: there is scope for attracting attention to the need for policy and other measures to manage air quality, but campaign should be well-timed during higher-pollution months.]**

More generally, the lack of public awareness pointed to the **need for more consistent monitoring and reporting of air quality**, in ways that were easily intelligible to the public – e.g. neighborhood color-coding, “smog alerts,” etc.

We then reviewed the current system for air quality management in India (outlined in the inception note). Two important points were noted: limited monitoring infrastructure, except around some industrial areas; and absence of structural coordination between the pollution control authorities (central and state pollution control boards) and land use planning, infrastructure, and other decision-making that contributes to emissions. The first makes it difficult to track performance, identify hotspots, enforce national standards; the second makes it difficult to develop and implement long-run action plans

We moved onto two broad areas for responses:

First, to motivate states and cities to tackle air pollution in whatever way was most appropriate for their ecological setting, infrastructure, economic structure, etc by **creating a performance-linked incentive fund.**  The central government (or international development bank, or somebody!) would first have to develop the monitoring infrastructure to track performance as well as decide on mutually acceptable performance goals. But once the goals were set and rewards for achievements determined, it was felt that this kind of “challenge fund” approach could lead to innovative measures that then might also contribute to national learning. The fund would also create a “demand” for experience and best practices in air quality management – including tools like SIPs – that could then be shared through CA-India (or other) capacity-building initiatives.

Second, we turned to addressing emissions from the vehicle fleet. Several points were noted:

* There is already a roadmap for cleaner fuels and tighter emissions standards. The question is how to **accelerate access to fuels and enforcement of emissions standards** so that the anticipated fleet expansion would come in as cleaner vehicles. 2025 might be too late to achieve air quality goals through fleet turnover, as the rate of growth will be slower by then – can this be moved forward to 2020?
* **Would it make sense to leapfrog to Euro VI?** Something to be investigated. We discussed the costs of refinery conversion and costs to customers of cleaner fuel. ICCT analysis showed that an up-front cost on the order of $5 billion and a per-litre cost of 50 paise. This was later questioned by Mr. Singh.
* Retrofitting would have to happen along with the new vehicle standards in order to have a significant impact on air quality. **This could start by picking the high-emitting “captive fleets”** such as drayage, city vehicles (trash trucks), buses and public fleets. The costs of retrofitting need to be established, along with the potential for indigenous filter technology development.
* These measures would require significant amounts of funding. Perhaps these could come as some kind of climate mitigation finance.