

Estonian Environmental Research Centre

# FAIRMODE Technical Meeting 2018



- **FAIRMODE Technical Meeting** will be held in Tallinn, Estonia
- 26-28 of June 2018
- Organized by **Estonian Environmental Research Centre**



# Links

- **EERC**
- <http://www.klab.ee/en/>
- **Air quality in Estonia**
- <http://www.ohuseire.ee/en>
- Possible location (to be confirmed)
- <https://www.tallinkhotels.com/tallink-spa-conference-hotel/>



European  
Commission

## Closing session

Baveno

**27 February 2018**



### Joint Research Centre

the European Commission's  
in-house science service

# Overall points

- Many interesting points of discussions
- New knowledge (too much?) brought in by the WGs
- We agree that we do not agree on everything
- But we did not aim for an immediate consensus

- **MQO** should be used to assess if a model is good enough for assessment purposes. QC in CEN-WG43, QA in FAIRMODE.
- Need for better specifying the **purpose of the recommendations** for assessment (as well as better wording).
  - Better understanding of current situation as starting point for air quality management → identify hot-spots in a region
  - Use of models in the IPR as complementary information to observations → formal process
- **When is a model fit-for-purpose?**
  - Guidance on the spatial scale is lacking up to now
  - Starting point for AQ management → Ambition of assessment modelling should be to reproduce what is observed in atmosphere (including traffic hot spots in urban environment)
  - IPR → spatial scale should start from the stations you want to complement

- Agreement on the need to specify the requirements on the methodology used to produce the emission inventory for air quality assessment, planning & source apportionment.
- Agreement to ~~extend~~/fill/contribute to the EMEP/EEA emission guidebook (urban focus). Practical process to be discussed.
- Agreement to introduce benchmarking activities to identify inconsistencies in air quality assessment.



- WG3 Intercomparison clarified difference between techniques
- New knowledge welcome but need time to mature
- Need to further clarify the role of source apportionment in a planning context
- Need for guidance on these aspects.
- Src. Apportionment is in the directive (IPR), it is up to us to set the stringency of the definition. We should however not limit ourselves to a definition issue. It is rather a problem of proper applicability of each method and guidance to support its use, beyond the scope of the IPR.
- Option 1: prescriptive, Option 2: free choice of method but metadata required.



What about model diversity? – Interesting discussion but not a clear outcome → Design of an exercise (related to SSA of WG3? ; links to CAMS?)

## Effective two-way feedback

- FAIRMODE to improve tools on the basis of feedback (documentation, review...)
- (Some) pilots identified inconsistencies between BU and TD
- Main issue: how can we ensure that understood inconsistencies lead to permanent improvements (work for WG2)
- Interactions with WG2 are formally over but pilots are encouraged to keep the connections on-going.

# Timeline

15/03/2018: Revised recommendations sent to community

15/04/2018: Deadline for comments

30/05/2018: “Final” version to be used for Technical meeting