



# The FAIRMODE Δ-Emis tool - Simplified guide

Emissions



## THE BAR-PLOT

## 1) Evaluate the overall total emissions per sector and pollutant

This first screening gives an overview of the different interinventories emission ratios, and allows to identify the largest/lowest over or underestimation (discrepancies) of the total emissions per sector and pollutant. E.g. the largest discrepancies are observed for PPM10 - DOM sector and SO2 – TRAFF sector. The best agreement seems to be for NOx.

#### 2) Consistency for a given activity sector

For a given sector, the activity is the same for all pollutants therefore the BUP/TOD ratio also provides information about the emission factors ratios. It is expected that for a given sector, the sign (under/overestimations) is the same.



## THE DIAMOND DIAGRAM

#### 1) Evaluate the overall distribution

Identify which points (sector-pollutant) are further away from the origin. E.g. most of the points are outside the red diamond (factor 2), indicating issues to be solved.

#### 2) Analyze total emissions per sector

Over/underestimation of total emissions are identified by the distance of the points from the diagonal -1. It is expected that points representing pollutants are very close to each other within a given sector. If not, this may indicate a problem in terms of weighted emission factors (i.e. emission factors or activity shares).

#### 3) Emission factors vs. activities

Identify if inconsistencies are mainly related to emission factor, activity and/or total emissions. The distance along the X axis indicates inconsistencies dominated by weighted emission factors (under/overestimations), whereas along Y axis provides information in terms of activity.



### THE DIAMOND DIAGRAM

#### 4) Identify compensation vs. adding-up

Points in the compensation zone are characterized by 1) over-estimation of the activity and under- estimation of the emission factor (left-top corner) or by 2) under-estimation of the activity and over-estimation of the emission (right-bottom corner). Similarly, adding-up zones are identified.

#### 5) Assess distances between points

Distances along the X axis provide information on pollutant ratios, and along the Y axis, the distance between the different sector lines indicates discrepancies in terms of relative sectorial emission ratios between the two inventories.





### **PER-CAPITA DIAGRAM**

#### 1) Evaluate if the top-down ranking is reasonable

For each sector/pollutant point the position along the X axis provides information on how the city/region is considered within the top-down inventories. E.g. the position of the points along the X axis shows large distances between pollutants belonging to the same macro-sector. This may indicate inconsistencies in the TOD emission inventory.

#### 2) Check if the BUP and TOD ranking are consistent

The consistency can be seen by the distance from the diagonal. In addition to the overall under- or over-estimation it is important to assess whether the ranking difference is important with regards to the overall EU variability (e.g. do we remain within the range of the top-down ranking?)



## **RATIO DIAGRAM**

## 1) Evaluate if all pollutant ratios are consistent among each other for a given macro-sector

A reasonable ratio between two pollutants might be obtained although the two pollutant emission estimates are wrong (e.g. compensation of overestimations). Cross-checking the consistency of all ratios is therefore important.

## 2) Check if the BUP/TOD differences are reasonable with regards to the EU reference scale

The EU country scale provides minimum and maximum bounds against which it is interesting to put the BUP-TOD difference in perspective.

### 3) Is there any information about underlying processes that can be extracted See examples in the table



## **RATIO DIAGRAM**

							SNAP04	SO <sub>2</sub> /NO <sub>x</sub>	0.3	3.2	23	0.4	Very high values identify processes in petroleum industries (i.e. sulphur recovery plants) aluminium and
													sulphuric acid production plants
MS	Ratio		2015		Variability	Commont		PPM <sub>10</sub> /NO <sub>x</sub>	0.4	1.9	15	1.1	High values identify coke ovens and aluminium and
	Nauv	min	2013 mod	05n	2025/2015								fertilizer production plants
SNAP01	NO /SO	0.2	1.4	<u> </u>	1 1	Close to 0 for liquid or coal based fuel. Much higher for		NH <sub>3</sub> /NO <sub>x</sub>	0.1	0.4	2.6	1.0	High values identify ammonia and fertilizer production
	$NO_x/SO_2$	0.5	1.4	4.0	1.1	close to 0 for inquid of coal based fuel. Much higher for		SO <sub>2</sub> /NH <sub>3</sub>	1.5	9.6	44	1.2	Low values identify ammonia and fertilizer production
	$NO_x/FFM_{10}$	1.5	15	20 172	1.2	Low if SCP or SNCP systems are in place. Higher		$PPM_{10}/SO_2$	0.1	0.6	10	1.1	Low values identify refinery, aluminium and sulphuric
	NOX/INH <sub>3</sub>	17	119	475	0.4	values indicate incomplete reaction of NH <sub>3</sub> additive							acid plants and high values identify fertilizer production plants
	VOC/PPM <sub>10</sub>	0.2	1.4	3.4	1.5	Close to 1 for liquid or coal based fuel and much higher	SNAP07	NO <sub>x</sub> /SO <sub>2</sub>	273	548	848	0.6	High values indicate move to ultra-low sulphur content
						for natural gas		PPM <sub>10</sub> /SO <sub>2</sub>	19	44	73	1.3	
	$SO_2/PPM_{10}$	1.5	8.6	27	0.6	Very high for liquid based fuel, high for coal based fuel and close to one for natural gas		NO <sub>x</sub> /PPM <sub>10</sub>	5.6	12	17	0.7	High values identify gasoline-powered vehicles or modern Euro diesel-powered vehicles equipped with
SNAP02	SO <sub>2</sub> /NO <sub>x</sub>	0.1	0.5	4.0	0.9	Close to 0 for natural gas. Much higher for liquid or			22	40	00	0.0	particle filters
	PPM <sub>10</sub> /NO <sub>x</sub>	0.2	1.3	4.7	0.9	coal based fuel		NOX/ NH <sub>3</sub>	22	49	90	0.9	Values between 10 and 50 indicate SCR systems.
	PPM <sub>10</sub> /VOC	0.2	0.5	1.1	0.9	Close to 1 for liquid, coal or biomass based fuel and much higher for natural gas		NO <sub>x</sub> /VOC	1.2	4.2	8	0.8	High values for gasoline-powered vehicles and much
	$PPM_{10}/SO_2$	0.4	2.9	13	0.9	Very low for liquid based fuel, low for coal based fuel, close to one for natural gas and higher for biomass	SNAP08	SO <sub>2</sub> /NO <sub>x</sub>	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	High values for fuels with high sulphur content values, usually related to maritime activities (e.g. residual oil)
SNAP03	SO <sub>2/</sub> NO <sub>x</sub>	0.2	0.6	1.3	0.9	Close to 0 for natural gas and higher for liquid or coal based fuel		NO <sub>x</sub> /PPM <sub>10</sub>	9.9	14	22	1.2	Values are usually stable (several dozen). Very high values (several hundreds) identify air traffic activities
	NO <sub>x</sub> /PPM <sub>10</sub>	1.7	8.7	34	1.0	Low for liquid or coal based fuel and high for natural		VOC/SO <sub>2</sub>	0.8	13	116	0.8	Very high values identify industrial or agricultural
						gas		$PPM_{10}/SO_2$	0.2	3.5	34	0.3	machinery and low values identify port facilities
	PPM <sub>10</sub> /VOC	0.3	1.7	9	0.7	Very high for process furnaces and processes with	SNAP09	PPM <sub>10</sub> /NO <sub>x</sub>	5.5	17	173	1.6	Above means unabated PM low values indicate reverse
						contact (e.g. iron and steel industries)	SNAP10	PPM <sub>10</sub> /NO <sub>x</sub>	8.5	58	744	1.0	High values identify manure management
	SO <sub>2</sub> /PPM <sub>10</sub>	1.6	6.4	16	0.9	Very low for biomass, low for coal based fuel, close to		PPM <sub>10</sub> /VOC	1.4	6.3	117	1.0	
						1 for natural gas and much higher for liquid based fuel		NH <sub>3</sub> /VOC	4.6	64	1106	1.0	Low values for cultures without fertilizers
								NH <sub>3</sub> /PPM <sub>10</sub>	3.0	8.2	35	0.9	Low values (<15) indicate manure management rather
													than crop production (>40)

## **REFERENCE MATERIAL**

- Cuvelier, C., Thunis, P., 2015. User manual Emis\_Benchmark Tool. Available from: <u>http://fairmode.jrc.ec.europa.eu/</u>
- A benchmarking tool to screen and compare bottom-up and top-down emission inventories, M. Guevara, S. Lopez-Aparicio, C. Cuvelier, L. Tarrason, A. Clappier and P. Thunis, Submitted to Environmental Modelling and Software, 2015.
- A novel approach to screen and compare bottom-up vs. top-down emission inventories, P. Thunis, B. Degraeuwe, K. Cuvelier, M. Guevara, L. Tarrason and A. Clappier, Submitted to Atmospheric Environment, 2015.

## **CONTACT PERSONS**

- LEONOR, MARC, PHILIPPE, KEES, SUSANA
- ??????