FAIRMODE WG5,

status,
future activities and links with AAQD,
proposal for new activity and discussion

Status

WG5 – History of the work

- At first we had the pilot exercise:
  - ensure that FAIRMODE methodologies are applied at all levels (national to local).

- Then
  - we worked on the ‘Handbook’: best practices to support local and national authorities in quantifying emission / concentration changes from a set of measures
  - we suggested recommendations for the AAQD revision
  - we propose now to work on a template for measures reporting

Handbook – key outcomes

Complexity in defining measures:

- i.e. LEZ could mean various things (how it is implemented?)

Stressing the importance of a coherent view:

- ‘National Air Pollution Control Programmes’ – interaction with NEC
- Climate / Energy plans …

Integrated Assessment Modelling can help … link with sectoral policies

Recommendations linked to the AAQD

Use (benchmarked) air quality models when designing air quality plans.

Models are needed to:

- identify and quantify the sources that contribute to air pollution;
- identify mitigation measures and evaluate their effectiveness.

Need to develop guidance for air quality plans preparation, and to set up group of experts to revise how to report air quality plans in the IPR

Template for reporting

Need to share experiences among member states on measures, to replicate good ideas and avoid possible mistakes. We had

- Catalogue of AQ measures - CAQM
- FAIRMODE WG5 (best practices document)
- Data flow K (MS offical reporting)

But still information is lacking / unclear ... it should be simple enough to report and complete enough to be used

In Oslo we had a practical exercise on this.

Template

1. Context and measure's general description

- General information of the domain under study:
  - Size of the city
  - Orography
  - Other important information to characterize the city
- Information on the current situation in terms of:
  - Level of activities
  - Emissions
  - Concentration composition
- General description of the measure, with sufficient detail to allow for possible replicability

2. 'Source' (emissions)

- Over which **spatial area** is the measure applied (city, core city, street, …)?
- Over which **time period** is the measure applied (hours, days, year, …)?
- Over **which sectors/activity** is the measure applied (specific sectors? specific pollutants?)
- By **how much** does the measure/set of measures reduce the emissions (full, 20%, …)?
- Which is the **methodology** used to evaluate the emission change?

Issue: is the measure structural or temporary?

3. 'Receptor' (concentrations)

- Over which **spatial area** is the indicator averaged (city, core city, street, set of stations, …)?
- Over which **time period** is the indicator averaged (hours, days, year, …)?
- **Which indicator** is selected to assess the impact of the measure?
- By **how much** the indicator (concentrations) change due to the measure?
- Which is the **methodology** used to evaluate the concentration change?

4. Methodology

- Which is the estimated benefit of the measure?
- Which is the estimated cost of the measure?
- Which methodologies are used to estimate the benefit and cost?

Should we focus on measures' acceptability?
Should we focus on ex-post analysis?

Future activities and link to AAQD

European Commission

Future roadmap – discussion in Oslo

Is WG5 still needed? Yes, but need for a more comprehensive approach … building an ’air quality management process

Checklist, to help preparing/reporting a plan:

- Link to WG1 (to know main sources of pollution), WG7 (emissions), WG8 (exposure) and WG9 (dealing with scenarios and measures’ impact)
- Coordination among levels (EU, country, …) and sectoral (energy, …) policies
- Reflecting on the link with IPR

ETC HE Report 2022/7: main message is to simplify reporting for air quality plans … develop a checklist

Links with the AAQD proposal

Article 19: Plans are mandatory when limit values, O3 target value or average exposure reduction obligations are exceeded

Article 20: demonstrate why a short-term action plan would not be effective

Article 21: cooperation among MS to address breaches of air quality standards due to transboundary air pollution

Links with the AAQD proposal

Annex VIII, point A:

1. **Localisation of excess pollution**
2. **General information (polluted area and of population exposed)**
3. Responsible authorities
4. **Origin of pollution (main emission sources, quantity of emissions, geographical sources of emissions, source apportionment)**
5. **Impact of measures on concentrations**
6. **Annex 1: details of measures (list, quantification of emission reductions and concentration change)**

Links with the AAQD proposal

Annex VIII, point B: **indicative list of measures**

1. Emission from stationary sources (including biomass)
2. Vehicle retrofitting with zero emissions powertrains
3. Public authority procurement
4. Traffic control (congestion pricing, different parking fees…)
5. Encourage a shift towards less polluting form of transport,
6. …

Proposal for a new activity

Putting everything together: a new proposal

Develop checklist for reporting measures in a plan (context, source, receptor, methodology)
Co-developed with relevant WGs

WG5 Intercomparison

- 3 key measures selected and reported, based on the checklist
- Each modelling team simulate the impact of the measures (on activities, emissions, concentrations, costs)

Improving the checklist,
Creating a database with measures impact,
Harmonizing approaches…

Discussion