

## Pressemeddelelse:

### **Danmark overskrider både FN's og EU's grænser for luftforurening**

Danmark vil i år overskride 40 procent af udledningsgrænserne for helbreds- og naturskadelig luftforurening i FN's Göteborgprotokol og EU's National Emission Ceilings Direktiv. Årsagen er partikelforurening fra brænderøg og ammoniakforurening fra landbruget. Konsekvenserne kan blive en traktatkrænkelsessag ved EU-domstolen og/eller en sag ved de danske domstole.

Ifølge DCE ved Aarhus Universitet dør ca. 4.200 danskere hvert år af luftforurening, dvs. 7-8 procent af alle danske dødsfald skyldes luftforurening. Det gør luftforurening til vores tredje største risikofaktor kun overgået af rygning og fysisk inaktivitet. Luftforureningen er ligeledes en væsentlig årsag til sygdom. Helbredsskaderne koster Danmark ca. 80 mia. kr årligt, hvilket svarer til 3-4 procent af landets BNP.

Helbredsskaderne skyldes både national og grænseoverskridende luftforurening. For at dæmme op for den grænseoverskridende luftforurening har FN besluttet Göteborg Protokollen (GP). EU har i forlængelse heraf besluttet National Emission Ceilings Direktiv (NECD). Begge sætter nøje grænser for, hvor meget luftforurening nationer må udlede i 2020 for fem typer særlig skadelig grænseoverskridende forurening: Kvælstofoxider, flygtige organiske forbindelser, svovldioxid, ammoniak og fine partikler.

Kommissionens seneste vurdering – baseret på medlemsstaternes indberetninger – viser nu, at Danmark ikke vil opfylde udledningsgrænserne i 2020 for ammoniak og fine partikler (se vedlagte). Ca. 95 procent af ammoniakudledningen kommer fra landbrug, mens 60-65 procent af partikeludledningen er brænderøg.

”Politikerne bør straks gribe ind med skatter på brænderøg og forbud imod brændefyring uden effektiv røggasrensning i byers boligområder. Dertil bør kravene til landbruget skærpes. Det er pinligt, at et såkaldt *grønt* foregangsland som Danmark, ikke engang opfylder FN's og EU's helt basale miljøkrav,” siger Kåre Press-Kristensen, seniorrådgiver for luftkvalitet & klima i Rådet for Grøn Omstilling.

Den danske indberetning til EU Kommissionen viser ligeledes, at Danmark i 2030 vil overskride 60 % af udledningsgrænserne i NECD, hvis ikke politikerne griber målrettet ind – særligt over for brænderøg.

”Politikerne er nødt til at komme ind i kampen og forstå alvoren. Både i forhold til luftforureningens enorme helbredsskader og risikoen ved en EU traktatkrænkelsessag,” slutter Kåre Press-Kristensen.

### **Yderligere oplysninger:**

Kåre Press-Kristensen, seniorrådgiver, Rådet for Grøn Omstilling, tlf. 22 81 10 27.

EU's vurdering af DK: [https://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/pdf/reduction\\_napcp/Annex%20Risk%20assessment%20final\\_8Jun20.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/pdf/reduction_napcp/Annex%20Risk%20assessment%20final_8Jun20.pdf)

Nationale indberetninger til EU under NECD: <https://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/reduction/NAPCP.htm>

Mere om NECD: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/air/air-pollution-sources-1/national-emission-ceilings>

# Projected emissions

## Attainment of the Emissions Reduction Commitments in the “With Measures” projections submitted in 2019

	AT	BE	BG	HR	CY	CZ	DK	EE	FI	FR	DE	EL	HU	IE	IT	LV	LT	LU	MT	NL	PL	PT	RO	SK	SI	ES	SW	UK	✓	*
NO <sub>x</sub>	2020	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	22	6
	2030	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	13	15
NMVOCs	2020	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	20	8	
	2030	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	12	16	
SO <sub>2</sub>	2020	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	27	1	
	2030	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	16	12	
NH <sub>3</sub>	2020	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	#	13	
	2030	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	9	19	
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	2020	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	21	7	
	2030	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	13	15	





Ricardo  
Energy & Environment

**Aether**

## Review of National Air Pollutant Projections and Assessment of National Air Pollution Control Programmes – Appendix B

---

Risk of non-compliance: Appendix B to the Horizontal Review Report for  
European Commission – DG Environment  
070201/2018/791186/SER/ENV.C.3

## A.7 Denmark

### Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO <sub>2</sub>	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOC	NH <sub>3</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Partially	Yes	Partially	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Partially	Yes	n/a	No	Partially
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (37)	Yes (5)	Yes (11)	No (-8)	No (-8)
	WAM	Yes (39)	Yes (8)	Yes (11)	No (-8)	No (-7)
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	L	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	The review has concluded that Denmark is at a high-risk of non-compliance with NH <sub>3</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> emission reduction commitment for 2020-2029. This is driven by Denmark projecting to miss these emission reduction commitments according to their projections and WM and WAM scenarios in the NAPCP (despite introducing additional PaMs).					

## Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO <sub>2</sub>	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOC	NH <sub>3</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Partially	Yes	Partially	Partially
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Partially	Yes	n/a	No	Partially
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (-14)	No (2)	Yes (13)	No (-7)	No (-32)
	WAM	No (2)	Yes (11)	Yes (14)	No (-7)	No (-29)
<b>Risk of non-compliance</b>		<b>H</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>H</b>
<b>Additional comments on high risk scores</b>	<p>The review has concluded that Denmark is at a high-risk of non-compliance with SO<sub>2</sub>, NH<sub>3</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission reduction commitments for 2030 and onwards.</p> <p>For SO<sub>2</sub> this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emission reductions from additional PaMs selected for adoption in the NAPCP to reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions not being quantified. No PaMs were selected for adoption in the main sectors emitting SO<sub>2</sub>.</li> <li>Low margin of projected compliance</li> </ul> <p>For NH<sub>3</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Denmark projecting to miss these emission reduction commitments according to their projections and WM and WAM scenarios in the NAPCP (despite adopting additional PaMs).</li> </ul>					