

## **Skipping BS III - Part II**

Click here for Skipping BS Norms Part I

 $n\n$ 

## What is the issue?

 $n\n$ 

\n

- The Supreme Court's verdict banned the sale of vehicles meeting Bharat Stage-III (BS-III) emission norms from April 1.
- $\bullet$  The industry had been asking for an extension of the deadline.  $\n$
- $\bullet$  It said that the entire industry was stuck with more than 800,000 vehicles, mostly two-wheelers and three-wheelers. \n
- $\bullet$  But the SC rejected the plea stating that the health of the people is more important than the commercial interests of the manufacturers.  $\$

 $n\$ 

## Why extension should not be allowed?

 $n\n$ 

\n

• **Established guidelines** - The road map for the upgrade from BS-III to BS-IV was clearly laid out.

۱n

• For new models, the new norms were supposed to come into effect from April 1, 2016.

\n

• For the existing models, the industry was given 12 months to transit to <a href="BS-IV">BS-IV</a> norms.

\n

• This was done because companies needed to make investments in plant and machinery.

\n

• The Environment Pollution (Prevention and Control) Authority (EPCA) had been working with the manufacturers since October last year to help manage the transition.

\n

• Yet, close to the deadline, the industry was seeking an extension, claiming huge inventory.

\n

• **Precedence** - If allowed, it would have undermined policy credibility and adherence.

\n

• Such a transition is neither the first one nor the last.

• An extension now would lay down a wrong precedent for the future when India intends to adopt BS-V and BS-VI norms.

\n

• Also the transition to BS-IV is not a new development.

• 13 Metro cities adopted this norm way back in April 2010.  $\n$ 

• **Discriminatory** - The extension would penalise those manufacturers that followed the rules.

\n

- e.g Bajaj Auto had upgraded its factories to produce BS-IV vehicles. It argued that companies such as itself were being priced out of the market because of the extra cost, and price, of such enhancement.
- Manufacturers are unwilling to make investments in safety and environment protection, claiming that India is a highly price-sensitive market and any such upgrade bumps up the price.
- $\bullet$  But this can hardly be an excuse to compromise on safety and emissions although it reflects poorly on Indian consumers' priorities as well. \n
- The Supreme Court judgment should make automobile manufacturers wary of asking for an extension when the emission norms are upgraded next.

\n

 $n\n$ 

 $n\n$ 

**Source: Business Standard** 

