



WG5-WG9 intercomparison exercise, to improve how we report and apply air quality measures and policies

Enrico Pisoni¹, Joana Soares²

¹ JRC - European Commission Joint Research Centre

² NILU - Climate and Environmental Research Institute

FAIRMODE TM, October the 6th, 11:30-13:00

PART 1: the current plan

WG5 – Efficient and robust AQ measures (from the Roadmap)

- AIM: help designing efficient and coherent measures; comparability / exchange of practices.
- Using a ‘checklist / guidance’, to help preparing/reporting a plan
- Coordinate with geographical (EU, country,, ...) and sectoral policies
- The last step of the work will be to extend the testing of the ‘checklist’ with partner cities (involve EURO CITIES ?)

To design an air quality plan (in FAIRMODE):

- The general steps to be followed when building a plan are:
 - a) Measuring an exceedance (WG8). This triggers the plan's development.
 - b) Understanding the emission sources contributing to the exceedance (WG1, WG7)
 - c) Defining a measure / package of measures (WG5)
 - d) Quantifying the emissions change due to the selected measure / measures (WG5, WG7)
 - e) Quantifying the resulting concentration change (WG9)
- Our main focus are c), d), e)

What we could do

- we know the steps needed to build an air quality plan
- we have a draft checklist to report measures, developed in previous meetings
- **possible intercomparison / common exercise**

Current checklist

PART 1: CHECKLIST FOR AIR QUALITY MEASURES

1. Context and measure's general description
 - General information about the domain under study:
 - General features of the domain
 - Emissions and concentration overview
 - Existing **Sectoral or Geographical plans** that could impact future air quality
 - 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, ...)?
 - Is the measure applied year long, or for specific **time periods** (only winter...)?
 - Over **which sectors/activity** is the measure applied?
 - Over **which pollutants**?
 - By **how much** does the measure reduce the overall emissions (full, 20%, ...)?
 - Which **methodology** do you use to estimate the emission change?
3. 'Receptor' (concentrations)
 - **Which indicator** do you select to assess the impact of the measure (e.g. concentration, population exposure)?
 - Over which **spatial area** do you average the indicator (city, street, set of stations, ...)?
 - Over which **time period** do you average the indicator (hours, days, year, ...)?
 - By **how much** does the indicator change as a response to the application of the measure?
 - Which **methodology** do you use to quantify the concentration change (e.g. brute force modelling)?
4. Cost-benefit and ex-post analysis
 - What is the estimated cost of the measure?
 - What is the estimated benefit of the measure?
 - Which methodologies are used to quantify/estimate benefit and cost?
 - Did you consider issues on acceptability of the measure?
 - Did you perform an ex-post analysis of the impact of the measure?

Possible common reporting and modelling exercise

- We ask to compile the ‘checklist’
- We collect and discuss experiences:
 - Check and compare the proposed methodologies
 - Check the variability in terms of estimated emission and checklist changes
 - Plan a modelling exercise
- **The exercise should also involve modelling: test the checklist of others on your domain**

Timing

- September:
 - We collected few reported measures
- October:
 - we discuss, start analyzing the results, discuss the modelling steps.

The checklist to be filled in is available online at:

<https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/runner/3e2da71b-e20d-50c7-cfda-854d7b458d08>

PART 2: interactive exercise

We received 9 plans ... selected 6 here

- SE, Helene: reduce traffic AADT
- FR, Elsa: incentives to renovate houses
- BE, Stijn: harbour electrification
- IT, Elena: electrification of cars, LEZ
- PT, Alexandra: multiple measures
- NO, Joana: reduced speed of cars

Work for the next 30 minutes

1. Split in groups (11:45)
2. Each group get a plan, read and discuss it. Questions:
 - Do you understand the plan, or are there missing bits or redundancies?
 - From a modelling perspective, is the information sufficient to allow replicability?
3. In each group, the 'owner of the plan' act as observer (reply to questions if needed)
4. Then, we reconvene in plenary, and the 'owner of the plan' report to the plenary (12:15)

PART 3: wrap-up (12:45)

Wrap-up

- Can we improve the checklist? What is missing? What is unclear?
- We want to collect additional plans. Who is contributing?
- Can we plan a modelling activity to test the impact of these plans? I.e. based on WG9 work?