

(ETRT) ON THE COST-BENEFIT-ANALYSIS BY EMISIA**TYRES ROAD NOISE****MAIN MESSAGES FROM THE PRESENTATION(S) and SUMMARY**

An essential part of the EMISIA study[1] is the cost-benefit analysis for different scenarios that were set up by the EMISIA partners. This document shows that:

- A study from Switzerland used by EMISIA to justify the assumption of a possible 3 dB limit reduction was falsely interpreted
- The scenario for quieter tyres simulated in the CBA contains an unrealistic timeline for the implementation and was called “purely fictional” by a member of the EMISIA project

The EMISIA study presents the results of this fictional scenario without any marking alongside the simulation results of fact-based scenarios for traffic noise improvements.

This might be misleading for readers trying to assess and to qualify the reported benefits for traffic noise.

ADDITIONAL POINTS FROM DISCUSSIONS IN THE UN TF-VS

- It has been reminded that tyres were out of the scope of the Emisia study. So in the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis), this is purely fictional. It is mentioned in the Introduction of the Chapter 5 of the Emisia study “Proposal for Phase 4 limit values” that the tyres were out of the scope without mention to the level of realism of the scenario.

REFERENCES

- [TFVS-11-06 \(ETRT\)](#): On the Cost-Benefit-Analysis by EMISIA

[1]

- [GRBP-73-23](#) (EC): Study on sound level limits of M- and N-category vehicles – intermediate report,
- [TFSL-02-08](#) (EC): M- and N- sound limit study – intermediate report,
- [EC Study for M/N-cat.](#) or [TFVS-07-11](#) (EC/EMISIA): Study on sound level limits of M- and N-category vehicles – full report, <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/d23a63bc-8310-11ec-8c40-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>
- [TFVS-09-03 Rev.1](#) (EC-HSDAC): presentation of the EC study for M_N vehicles