

Fairmode technical meeting: Oslo 18-20/10/2022

Agenda

Tuesday 18/10		
Official opening of the meeting by Norwegian authorities		
Purpose of the meeting		
09:00-09:20		
09:20-12:30 (incl. coffee break)	<p>Exceedances and spatial representativeness indicators (CT8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Station representativeness (SR)</u>: is the guidance achieved satisfactory and useful? How do we consolidate its use in reporting under AAQDs? What are the remaining open issues that have to be tackled? • <u>Exceedance and exposure indicators</u>: Is the proposed timing of the reporting of the indicators more realistic and in line with current practices in Member States? Can we propose better ways to report the exceedance situations indicators under the AAQD? What additional guidance is needed for the estimation of the indicators? Do we need additional intercomparison studies? • <u>Monitoring network design linked to SR</u>: what intercomparison studies are necessary to provide guidance for the optimization of network design? What can be learnt from a network cluster analysis? • Is there a use for FAIRMODE <u>composite mapping</u> under CT8? 	<p>Source apportionment (CT1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where do we stand with the <u>SA Guidance on fit for purpose</u>? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use of combined approaches (e.g. tagging and brute force) - extension of the current section on receptor models? - extension to other species (further analysis on NO2?, Ozone?) • <u>Advanced RMs applications</u> (including OM): can advanced RMs technique provide open new opportunities to support AQ assessment? • <u>SA protocol</u>: do we need a specific protocol for SA applications? • <u>CEN</u>: can FAIRMODE provide a renewed support to CEN activities with specific focus on Source oriented Models?
Lunch break		
13:30-16:00	<p>Air Quality Projections (CT9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the <u>status of the CT9 exercise</u>? Are the current indicators relevant enough? • Should we focus on short-term exercises and address less cities, areas? • Are there any particular physical processes, specific set-up we should isolate to better understand the behaviour of models to simulate the impact of emission reductions? • Would it be useful to use observation data and apply simulated delta to simulate the impact of emission reductions on exceedances? 	<p>Emissions (CT7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>What have we achieved</u> in CT7 "high resolution emissions" in the last 2, 5 years? (meta-data, benchmarking, best practices)? • <u>Metadata</u>: How do we identify the relevant meta-data to document emissions used under the AAQD, and how should we link this to e-Reporting? • <u>Best practices</u>: How can we best support the revision of the gridded emission chapter under TFEIP, in particular with the guidance on spatial mapping? • <u>Benchmarking</u>: How to increase the use of the emission composite map (ECM) for benchmarking activities? Do we want the ECM to become a common free EU repository?
16:30-18:00	<p>Air Quality Management Practices (CT5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did we achieve up to now in the FAIRMODE group 'best practices for air quality management'? • <u>Current work</u>: how can we improve the 'reporting of abatement measures'? • <u>What's next?</u> What are the community needs 	<p>Microscale modelling (CT4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of latest results of the <u>intercomparison exercise</u> • Is an unsteady simulation for a complete year better than the wind sector approaches? (results from SZE?) • Other related works beyond the CT4 exercise (presentation of Xavier Jurado, Strasbourg) • Are the draft recommendations written in summer good enough (feedback from participants)? • Starting <u>paper preparation</u>?

Wednesday 19/10		
09:00-10:00	<p style="text-align: center;">Air Quality Management Practices (CT5)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(continued)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Microscale modelling (CT4)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(continued)</p>
10:30-12:30	<p style="text-align: center;">Forecast (CT3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the side outcomes (MPI diagram, POD & SR diagram on stations, summary report, Air Quality Index diagram) adequate to support the model evaluation, especially for experts? • Does the current <i>methodology</i> look sufficiently complete? What (if any) important features are missing? • Should the <i>Air Quality Index diagram</i> be improved (with Multi-category Contingency Tables)? • Can/should we plan an <i>application</i> of the methodology on <i>European scale</i> (e.g. on CAMS data)? 	<p style="text-align: center;">Low-cost sensors (CT6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Where do we stand</u> in our knowledge of data from sensor networks? • <u>What are the expected developments</u> in sensor networks? • <u>Can we support the AAQD</u> with technical guidance on data from sensor networks?
Lunch break		
14:00-15:30	<p style="text-align: center;">QA/QC protocol (CT2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>What have we achieved</u> in CT2 "QA/QC of modelling assessments" in the last 2,5 years? • Where do we stand with the <u>linkage between emission and concentration</u> QA/QC (indicators, meta-data...)? • <u>Reporting MQOs</u>: How to improve the current scheme for reporting the MQO (e.g. metadata)? What recommendations do we have for e-reporting of MQOs? • How to support the <u>CEN WG43</u> process, in particular with the conditions for applying the MQO? What will be the role of CEN guidance vs FAIRMODE guidance in the revised AAQDS? • <u>Guidance calculating MQO</u>: Is the guidance to calculate MQI and establish fit-for-purpose modelling adequate to support the implementation of modelling under AAQDs? How can it be improved? • How can we further develop the FAIRMODE <u>Composite mapping</u> (CM) platform to host QA/QC exercises? Is there a use of CM for QA/QC purposes? 	
16:00-18:00	<p style="text-align: center;">Future CT activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Where do we stand</u> with the work in a specific CT? Did we delivered what we planned? • For each CT, Is there <u>scope for keeping the CT active</u> in the next 3 years? If so what would be the priorities? • For each CT, Is there <u>need to merge/share activities</u> with other groups? 	

Thursday 20/10

09:00-11:00	<p style="text-align: center;">FAIRMODE evolution: An increased role for modelling in EU legislation: how can FAIRMODE adapt?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How can FAIRMODE act to cope with a <i>more formal role in legislation</i> in the future?• What are the CTs that have succeeded and can be concluded?• Are there any CT that need to be prolonged in a modified form or merged with others?• Do we need <i>new CTs</i> to be created to address new challenges in FAIRMODE?• What are our recommendations for the FAIRMODE work plan <i>priorities for 2023-2025</i>?
11:30-12:30	<p style="text-align: center;">Support COST action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How can we design a COST action in support to FAIRMODE?
12:30-13:00	Conclusions and Closing of the meeting
13:00-14:00	Lunch