

6th December 2024 : Clean Air Collective Convening, Bangalore

POLICY (Group 1)

Re-imagining NCAP 2.0

Subu - CSTEP

Ninad - GDI Partners

Indu - Clean Air Punjab

Shweta - Clean Air Punjab

Pavan - WRI India

Samarth - APAG - TCF Network

Vinuta - Asar

Santosh Harish - Open Philanthropy

Bhargav - Sustainable Futures

Pavan - WRI India

Sharmila - Parisar

* Comments / suggestions / questions by the full group during presentations on the 7th, not part of the group's discussion

1) Swach Vayu **Mission**

- Change narrative to mission mode rather than program
- Different levels of governance as well as actions at National, state, city level
- Airshed / regional approach

By giving it the essence of a mission which is generally long term rather than a program which ends in a shorter period, it gains a sense of continuity. The asks can be for a much larger funding and for a longer span to see real on ground results.

The actions are city focused now, those too restricted only to the 131 non-attainment cities, thereby excluding the remaining areas which are also polluted, as well as those which are showing good air quality and hence should be encouraged to continue the actions by which they have achieved good results. For this the program needs to have a national focus in a true sense. Rather than planning for cities, actions should be strategised for larger geographical regions which could crosscut across states too.

Why national or regional level, why not district level?

To this the group responded that a regional approach will give a much larger scope in terms of analysing different kinds of pollution across boundaries, will drive a wider set of actions and the asks can be for bigger investments.

2) What are the standards that impact health?

Make it a single focus pollutant? PM2.5 +, (NO2, O3)

The current pollutant being used as standard is PM10. Some members felt that the narrative needed a larger focus on the health angle, and hence suggested that the standard pollutant should be PM2.5 as it has larger health impacts.

With PM 10, the actions focus on sources like dust, construction etc, while the combustible sources get sidelined.

There was also a suggestion that along with PM2.5 other pollutants like NO2 and O3 are also considered as they too show a greater health impact.

Counter / suggestion - it was mentioned that the focus should not be on a single pollutant, rather all the pollutants and their impacts should be considered.

3) Recognise who is responsible / accountable? - which is the governing / implementing body? Which is the ministry the Mission should sit under? Moefcc does not have power / is not effective.

While the NCAP sits under the MoEF&CC, there was a lack of confidence in its effectiveness, and there was a discussion of whether it should even be under it, or even if the CPCB should be its implementing body. The narrative then shifted to not worrying too much about it as there should just be a better implementation of the NCAP irrespective of which authority it falls under.

The question of whether the role of steering committees at various levels and their efficacy was discussed was put forth. The presenting group had not taken up that point for discussion.

4) Narrative on NCAP.....what is priority?

Contemplate on the failures, build a new narrative based on those

A need was felt to relook at the Program, and reimagine and build a new narrative based on the gaps and learnings.

5) Synergising existing programs / missions - convergence

It was felt crucial to do a sector wise analysis to see what actions were needed for mitigation, which agencies and governing bodies were either responsible for those, or could be approached, and what other schemes besides the NCAP funding could be harnessed for support.

Some other points that were touched upon during the presentations

i) Urban crematoria guidelines do not exist - some kind of policy is needed for that

ii) Can the cities who are performing well in pollution mitigation and are relatively cleaner be seen as exit points of pollution and declared as green corridors?

Takeaways:

NCAP's choice of pollutants drives action and hence the toxic component, PM2.5 rather than PM10 standards should be considered as standard. In absence of this, important sources of combustion get excluded and more PM 10 sources like dust get focus. The health angle is disregarded.

A regional airshed approach has to be adopted under which State attainment standards can be set, identifying the sectoral focus in each airshed. This will increase the scope of actions.

Mapping

A mapping exercise needs to happen at 3 levels i.e. central, state, and local government bodies. Every initiative that can be taken under each source of the pollution needs to be mapped with responsible bodies at these 3 levels. By doing so the scope of NCAP will evolve from being a city level program to a regional one. This mapping will also pave the way for the distribution of responsibilities and accountability amongst all the stakeholders.

*The following table is only illustrative of what can be done, it is not a comprehensive tool yet

	SOURCES ----->	TRANSPORT	BIOMASS (Stubble burning)	INDUSTRY	MSME, kilns, bakery, crematoria etc	COOKING	TPPS (Thermal plants)	Waste (wet)
POLICY / NORM / REGULATION		emission norms - BS VI, Scrapage policy, CAFE, PME Drive national charging infrastructure for electric freight(trucks), PUC (redundant), parking and congestion, scrapage to be mandatory	i) MSP for alternatives , incentives / disincentives ii) Machinery access (in situ) , financial support iii) Investments in ex-situ solutions iv) Crop diversification			PMUY expanded (Bio - CNG)		swach bharat mission

