COMMENTS FROM THE E-MOBILITY ECO-SYSTEM ON EP TRAN COMMITTEE'S POSITION ON AFIR

The recently adopted TRAN Committee's position on the Alternative Fuel Infrastructure Regulation has brought clarity on the cross-political group approach the European Parliament is taking. We, the co-signed below - as representatives of industry and consumers, and as such representing the whole e-mobility eco-system - would like to take this opportunity to welcome the progress made in light of the Compromise Amendments. At the same time, we would like to clarify certain points that do not account for operational realities and depict an opposition between the interests of the consumers and that of industry. The electric vehicle market is gradually moving to the tipping point of becoming the main automotive market. In this context, it is even more significant that availability and access for the consumer lie at the core of the business case for charging infrastructure.

1. Remain ambitious on targets

We commend the revised Articles 3 and 4, which set out an ambitious rollout trajectory for charging infrastructure all across the Union. These targets will guarantee that the growth of the European network will remain in line with EV deployment and that users will not have to worry about range when travelling on the TEN-T network. We particularly welcome the provisions for early market stages and the increased ambition on charging infrastructure for heavy-duty vehicles, which are already coming to market and for which charging infrastructure cannot be a bottleneck if Europe is to reach its climate aims. Moreover, we suggest that once AFIR is under review and only when a mature EV market is reached, an end to mandatory build-up targets should be considered.

---

2. Maintain useful clarification on retrofits

To achieve the quick and comprehensive rollout Europe needs over the coming years, it is **imperative to exploit the useful lifespan of existing recharging stations to the fullest**. Hence, we welcome the vigilance some of the adopted Compromise Amendments have taken on the burden that new far-reaching retrofitting requirements for existing charging infrastructure would imply. This includes the proposed provisions on smart recharging:

Article 5(8) (adopted Compromise Amendment 2)
Art. 5(8) From **[date of entry into force of this Regulation]**, operators of recharging points shall ensure that all **newly built or renovated** publicly accessible recharging points operated by them are capable of smart recharging.

---

3. Balance payment obligations

We remain concerned about the **obligation to install card payment systems** as well as its link to the obligation for retrofit. We strongly support the facilitation of a seamless, accessible, user-friendly and interoperable European charging network. However, requiring the **installation of full card readers**

with PIN pads at every single charging point across the Union would carry a **disproportionate cost.** This would be particularly counterproductive for comparatively cheap recharging stations with a power below 50kW. Requiring fully fledged card readers for these stations increases the price of deployment by up to 200%[1] and therefore decreases the availability of such charging options. These constitute the vast majority of chargers in the EU[2] and are often the cheapest, most readily available and used option for consumers.

Article 5(2) (adopted Compromise Amendment 2)
Art. 5 (2)(a) To that end, operators of recharging points shall, at publicly accessible recharging stations deployed from **[date of entry into force of this Regulation]**, accept electronic payments through terminals and devices used for payment services, including at least **payment card readers or devices with a contactless functionality that is at least able to read payment cards. Additionally, if possible, devices using an internet connection with which for instance a Quick Response code can be specifically generated and used for the payment transaction may be provided**.

We support the differentiation between recharging points on the basis of their power output, as included in the original Commission proposal and Council General Approach. We welcome the focus on core and comprehensive TEN-T infrastructure as regards retrofits as set out in the Council General Approach [Art. 5(2) and its reference to Art. 3(2)] and would like to highlight that normal refurbishment patterns suggest a technically appropriate timeframe beginning in 2030. We also encourage an explicit clarification that payment should be possible at dedicated payment terminals within a recharging pool, instead of needing to be integrated at every single recharging station.

---

4. Guarantee consumer freedom on pricing

Limiting billing to payment per kWh takes away the opportunity to also levy time- or session-based charges, hampering competition and consumer choice. EV drivers should be free to pick any pricing model that suits them best, as long as all relevant pricing information is clearly communicated to them. At a very minimum, scope needs to be left to levy "overtime charges'' to steer charging behaviour, i.e., in case an EV blocks a charging point long beyond the actual duration of the charging session.

In addition, we encourage clarifications as to how prices have to be made available for consumers – requiring displays on every individual charging station would add significant costs and disproportionately affect cheaper chargers, such as AC chargers, at little added value to consumers. Digital means or providing information at centralised payment terminals for each recharging pool would be preferred.

---

[1] Example Vienna: cost of a new charging point (up to 11 kW) 900-2500€, price for a new card terminal: approx. 3000€ + around 600€ per year of operation. For the consumer, transaction cost of 1-3% + 10 cents per transaction (current tariff 60-70 cents per hour). Costs for adapting chargers and back-end, as well as for technical approval, are not yet factored into this equation.

[2] Approx. 90% of charging points in the EU are below 50 kW. Source: EAFO

Article 5(5) (adopted Compromise Amendment 2)
Art. 5 (5) Operators of recharging points shall clearly display the ad hoc price ***per kWh*** and all its components at all publicly accessible recharging stations operated by them so that ***this information*** **is** known to end users before they initiate a recharging session.

We instead support the Council General Approach in relation to price components, and particularly the useful clarification introducing differentiated display obligations between chargers with a power below 50kW and those above.

---

5. Safeguard both consumer safety and privacy

We first and foremost welcome the Parliament's focus on **customer's safety** and appreciate the effort to **safeguard charging equipment** from any criminal activity. Yet, in the interest of proportionality and to strike an appropriate balance with user privacy, we believe that the installation of specific tools should remain **at the discretion of the operator** who is best placed to understand local risks. As such, we would like to invite clarification that the following proposal **does not imply a blanket obligation to install equipment at every public charging point across the EU, whilst also ensuring that Member States cannot block the installation when operators find appropriate**.

Article 5(11)(b) (adopted Compromise Amendment 2)
Art. 5 ***(11)(b)*** **At unattended charging stations, Member States shall facilitate the installation of camera surveillance systems and an emergency call button for immediate contact with local emergency services.**

We support a clarification of the above Compromise Amendment to ensure that "facilitate" is read as "support, where appropriate" rather than "mandate".

---

6. Acknowledge technical limitations to consumer information

We fully support the opportunity for consumers to make the most appropriate choice based on their **values and interests**, including charging with the electricity with the lowest carbon footprint available in a way that stimulates consumption not only when the price is low but also when the production of renewable energy is high. However, the adopted Compromise Amendment 2 (introducing the new subparagraph Art 5.6a) suggests a solution which is not feasible in all cases, hence should not be understood as an obligation to provide such information, but a recommendation. Furthermore, compiling information on the exact **proportions or close estimations thereof of the sources where electricity is pooled at the grid level, is not possible**. The technical possibilities of RES-E data collection differ across Member States. Additional information may be required from the customers to make accurate predictions when it comes to bi-directional charging (V2G). Moreover, with respect to disclosing the greenhouse gas content, the calculation of the carbon content of electricity is a complex matter and does not fall within the scope of transmission system operators, who do not supply and do not always have insight into the composition of the suppliers. Second, this would entail developing guidelines on accounting GHG allocated to electricity coming from storage technologies and, importantly, originating from V2G recharging operations.

Article 5(6)(a) (adopted Compromise Amendment 2)
Art. 5 ***(6)(a)*** **Operators of smart or bidirectional recharging points shall make available information that they receive from transmission system operators, electricity suppliers, or via their own electricity production, on the share of renewable electricity in the transmission system and the associated greenhouse gas emissions. That information shall be made available in regular real time intervals, it shall be accompanied by forecasting, where available, and, where applicable, the terms of the contract with the electricity provider shall apply.**

Given these challenges, we support recommending the provision of such information, without mandating it, and aligning these rules with other relevant legislation, such as the provisions in the System Operation Guidelines and, more importantly, the Renewable Energy Directive under revision.

---

7. Timeline

Article 24 of the Commission proposal sets out that the Regulation will enter into force on the 20th day following its publication in the EU Official Journal. The article is referenced throughout the legislation as a target date, such as Article 5 with regard to card payments and smart recharging. We would like to generally note that a short implementation date after the finalisation of trilogues does not give industry sufficient time to adapt supply chains, business strategies and production lines to the requirements on the scale that would be sought for an extensive roll-out. To illustrate, this includes resourcing of critical components (such as semiconductors), acquisition of hardware in bulk, and site developments with long grid connection times. Too short transition periods would lead to limited availability of hardware and could stall deployments at a critical period in the energy transition. In light of these constraints, business and operation plans currently put into action already look at 2023 and 2024.

We support longer implementation times as set out in the General Approach. Yet, in light of our support for ambitious targets, we would suggest an already ambitious one-year grace period with specific regard to Article 5, and not for the whole proposal.