**Is lowering the tolerated level of fine particles a solution against air pollution?**

With smog regularly surrounding cities like London, air pollution often hits the headlines – as is the case in this dossier. Composed of three press articles from *The Guardian*, the *LA Times* and the *Sydney Morning Herald* from 2014, it details the deleterious effects of air pollution on our health and the solutions that could be implemented against it in the UK, the US and Australia. It leads us to wonder if toughening the standards of air pollution might be a necessity to save lives.

All three documents agree that the levels of air pollution are too high. The *Sydney Morning Herald* mentions high levels of ozone or nitrogen dioxide in Australian cities, two gases which are also found in high quantity in the American air : according to the *LA Times*, 185 counties out of 715 do not respect the legal levels of ozone in the air. This pollution, which is mainly due to diesel cars and polluting industries according to *The Guardian*, results in health issues for the population, ranging from impaired breathing to lung cancers and sometimes death - thousands of people are said to die due to air pollution in the UK every year.

Therefore, it seems urgent to take measures. As we learn from the *LA Times*, the American government is considering toughening the tolerated levels of ozone in the air of urban areas, which are too high to guarantee ahealthy atmosphere for the population. This is why the EU wants the UK to reduce pollution by restricting diesel cars and implementing low-emission zones. The *LA Times* also suggests developing alternative fuels – which is urgent, as the *Sydney Morning Herald* asserts that a 17-percent decrease of fine particles in the air would save 140 lives a year in Sydney alone.

However, the efficiency of toughening standards can be questioned. First, the Republicans argue that it may harm the economy : if the new levels are too restrictive, some companies might outsource jobs. Secondly, the current standards are already not respected : 40 out of 43 British urban zones exceeded NO2 pollution limits in 2010. Besides, the new limits would also take time to be implemented : Los Angeles, for instance, would have until 2037 to meet the new standards – while a quick improvement is needed today.

Eventually, it is clear that something must be done to fight air pollution and save lives, but stricter limits would take too long to be implemented and meanwhile, no silver bullet has been found yet.

TITRE : phénomène central du dossier + son évolution (amélioration/dégradation) + contexte.

INTRODUCTION : phrase d’amorce + mention du dossier + présentation des documents avec leur date et source + problématique explicite.

DEVELOPPEMENT : deux à trois parties contenant chacune au moins deux références aux documents et un chiffre/exemple concret extrait du dossier.

Les idées doivent être reliées par des mots de liaison pour expliciter leurs liens logiques. Elles doivent être suffisamment explicitées pour qu’un correcteur n’ayant pas lu le dossier puisse le comprendre.

En aucun cas le plan ne peut suivre l’ordre du dossier (~~partie 1 = document 1~~)

|  |
| --- |
| CONCLUSION : une courte conclusion qui réponde à la problématique est attendue ; elle ne doit en aucun cas ajouter une idée (pas d’ouverture !) ou exprimer un point de vue. L’ensemble de la synthèse doit être neutre. |