

E-REPORTING (DATASETS H-K)

PROVISIONAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS COLLATED FROM DIFFERENT SOURCES

VERSION 2.0 (4 MAY 2016)

VERSION HISTORY

Version	Date	Focus	Changes to previous version
1.0	31 JULY 2015	Follow-up to Workshop on E-Reporting of Plans & Programmes (Datasets H-K) of 29 June 2015, to provide provisional answers to questions raised before, during or after the workshop. Replies were collated to 87 primarily technical questions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 87 replies added, focused on technical issues (i.e. numbered 1 through 87)
2.0	4 MAY 2016	Addition of provisional answers to questions of a more conceptual nature, as a follow-up to the Ambient Air Quality Expert Group meeting of 4 March 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 10 replies added, focused on conceptual issues (i.e. numbered I through X)• No changes related to the previous 87 replies (except regarding layout, and cross-referencing, as appropriate)

Note that this is a 'living document', and additional questions and replies may be added as warranted to future versions.

The content of this document does not reflect the official opinion of the European Commission.

SECTION 1. CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

(I.E. ADDITIONAL REPLIES OF 4 MAY 2016)

Number	Question	Reply
I	Guidance documents on H-K.	<p>'Directives' 2004/107/EC and 2008/50/EC set out the reporting requirement, 'Implementing Decision' 2011/850/EU lays down the rules for exchange of information and reporting, the 'IPR Guidance Part I' provides further guidance especially related to Annex I and II of the Implementing Decision, the 'IPR Guidance Part II' provides a more detail schemata for electronic submission of data flows, and the 'e-reporting tool' offers the platform to facilitate reporting according to the above.</p> <p>This translates into a hierarchy. In other words, the e-reporting tool does not change the obligations set in the Directives, the Decision, or the IPR Guidance.</p> <p>Note that IPR Guidance Part I provides guidance to data flows H to K are on pages 63-68: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/quality/legislation/pdf/IPR_guidance1.pdf</p> <p>Note that the latest version of IPR Guidance Part II (Schemata) is available here: http://www.eionet.europa.eu/aqportal/datamodel ("EXCEL FILE with latest data model mapping v1.0").</p> <p>In addition there is a JRC technical guide on the e-reporting tool: http://www.eionet.europa.eu/aqportal/plansandprogrammes/JRC26862_AQPlans_en.pdf</p> <p>Finally a user guide on XML, recently prepared by the ETC and due to be uploaded soon.</p>
II	Interface to H-K (Plans and Programmes) information.	An interface to reported information on H to K can be accessed via the Official Repository in the AQ Portal. All dataflows are visible in HTML and as an Excel output.

Number	Question	Reply
III	How to deal with the reporting of old plans and programmes under the new system	<p>For existing plans: a link should be made to all the plans reported under Commission Decision 2004/224/EC (unless the old data has been converted into the xml new format).</p> <p>For new and/or updated plans: a new plan has to be reported under the new e-reporting system.</p>
IV	The user manual and the guiding note on reporting IPR data flows H to K do not address situations where time extension has been granted.	<p>Article 22 of the AQD (time extensions) does not apply to plans adopted after the adoption of the IPR.</p> <p>For information on how to report existing plans, please see Question III</p>
V	How to report measures not included in an AQ Plan:	<p>Directive 2008/50/EC (Article 23) states the obligation to report AQ plans, therefore, under Directive 2008/50/EC, it is not mandatory to report on measures that have not been included in an AQ Plans (reporting of such additional measures can nevertheless be done on a voluntary basis).</p> <p>Directive 2004/107 only requires reporting on particular measures to comply with the limit values. In the e-reporting tool, Dataflow G is linked to Dataflow I and J, and the latter are not required in Directive 2004/107/EC.</p> <p>In any case, the tool can be used to report a measure under Dataflow K without linking this to Dataflow I and J. The status will appear as “draft” but the XML file can be generated and reported.</p>
VI	What’s a new exceedance?	<p>New exceedances refer to a new couple zone/pollutant (a new exceedance – i.e. above the limit value, plus margin on tolerance – of a specific pollutant in a specific zone that did not previously occur).</p> <p>See reply to Question 85.</p>

The content of this document does not reflect the official opinion of the European Commission.

Number	Question	Reply
VII	Could the Plans and Programmes be reported before N-2?	Commission Implementing Decision 2011/850/EC (Article 13) lays down the procedure regarding making air quality plans available. Accordingly, Member States shall make available information regarding the air quality plans " <u>without delay, and no later than 2 years after the end of the calendar year in which the first exceedance was observed.</u> " Therefore, they could and should be reported before.
VIII	The first year of exceedance.	The first year of exceedance is the first year of a new exceedance, please also see Question VI .
IX	Dataset J: the impact of some measures (e.g. incitement to car-sharing) may be difficult to quantify and flexibility should be allowed.	<p>IPR Guidance Part I notes as regards Dataflow K: <i>"For monitoring the effectiveness of a measure, it is usually not sufficient to just follow how the concentration level changes, as the change may be due to other causes. Hence, it is important to follow the progress of the measures with suitable indicators that relate more directly to the measure. The expected impact upon concentrations in the Projection year i.e. a reduction in concentration level is to be given as a positive number. For annual mean metrics this reduction should be presented in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ at the monitoring site where the highest levels are recorded. Where there is an exceedance situation without a monitoring site, the point of highest modelled concentrations should be used. <u>Deviation from this rule has to be indicated and explained</u>".</i></p> <p>See reply to Question 77.</p>

Number	Question	Reply
X	<p>The requirements for reporting on action plans and programmes need to be reviewed, in particular the requirements for detailed <u>source apportionment</u> and evaluation scenarios. Since this information requires detailed modelling, we would like to see the FAIRMODE community take an active role in defining relevant requirements for these datasets.</p>	<p>FAIRMODE has presented a number of recommendations concerning source apportionment, how to streamline the reporting of this kind of data and make figures more coherent with the current development of the methodologies in this field. These recommendations include</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="1086 384 2098 448">1. to open the possibility to report either the increments or absolute contribution of every source at a given site.<li data-bbox="1086 456 2098 520">2. to refer to the latest NFR-UNECE emission source classification (aggregation for gridding).<li data-bbox="1086 528 2098 592">3. to use source apportionment methodologies which results are reliable and comparable throughout Europe. <p>Concerning the scenarios, technical work is in progress. The outcome of the tests is expected to provide the basis for guidelines and recommendations.</p>

SECTION 2. TECHNICAL ISSUES

(I.E. REPLIES OF 31 JULY 2015)

Number	Question	Reply
1	Numbering of the fields in the tool is not identical to the specification in Part II of the guidance document from 07/15/2013; Which document is the basis for the tool?	The numbering is based on the version of the schemata (Part II) available via the EEA Air Quality Portal. We are able to accommodate changes to that if provided with concrete details on what needs to be changed.
2	For data that are "conditionally" , please note a mark similar to the "red star" of the mandatory fields. It is usually interpreted as fundamentally "voluntarily".	We will change the interface to reflect conditional fields through the inclusion of a blue star together with a tooltip with the actual conditions under which the field becomes mandatory.
3	Why the alternative text will be displayed so short? The size of the display should be adjusted for better readability. Why is there a constraint of characters in textual fields? Sometimes 45, 255 or 100 are allowed. How do we know this constraint?	The tooltips are now with equal size. When the mouse is positioned on top of the name of each field (e.g. "A.8.1 Local Id") the information which is contained in the tooltip is displayed indefinitely. In terms of content the tooltips, for consistency reasons, contain information equivalent to the content of the mapping excel table (as available within the AQ portal - http://www.eionet.europa.eu/aqportal/datamodel/IPR_MappingDoc.xlsx)
4	The edit mode in the countries subject to different responsibilities. Can more be "user level" supplemented? The user who creates the data to a plan could create contacts store who can also edit the data records.	The system is implemented with a hierarchy of users on three levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) European level (overview of all data, no edit rights) 2) National administrator(s) with full access and user management right for the country 3) Regular users <p>The decision on how to manage the levels 2 and 3 is to be taken on a national level. If those using the system should be able to create own users, then our recommendation would be to ,upgrade' them to National administrators. Then they would be able to create own user, and have write access to data. Appropriate training and a responsible attitude are of course a precondition.</p>

Number	Question	Reply
5	<p><u>Is it possible to set up a filter that allows a specific assignment is possible for plans and agents (e.g. area codes)?</u> Thus, only that is visible to the user, which is allowed to edit.</p> <p>Is it possible that filters are inserted for exceedance situations after years and countries?</p>	<p>The system is implemented, so that filtering is done for all columns in the overview tables (landing pages on each of the four tabs – H, I, J, K). The filter (right side of the table) allows all data to be filtered, incl. by the username, email, or LocalID of the records which are being created. Furthermore, this applies for the records which are displayed, as well as for those on the next pages (if more than the default 10 are available).</p>
6	<p><u>There is no clear definition of</u> what is expected on line 83 "AQP report identifier" and what is the difference with the line 102 Local ID of "Plan identifier". Can it be the same reference for both of them?</p>	<p>Definition of a Local ID: A local identifier, assigned by the data provider.</p> <p>The local identifier is unique within the namespace, i.e. no other spatial object carries the same unique identifier. Note that it is the responsibility of the data provider to guarantee uniqueness of the local identifier within the namespace. Further information: http://inspire.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reports/ImplementingRules/inspireDataspecD2_5v2.0.pdf</p> <p>Both Local IDs in the "Reporting header for air quality plan" (line 84) and in the "Plan identifier" (line 102) have to be unique, so these Local IDs have to be different</p> <p>In the tool, the local ID is inserted only once under „H.1.1 INSPIRE Id“ – „A.8.1 Local Id“ (to modify the one created by default by the tool). Then, the tool uses the string inserted to create the LocalIDs that appear in the XML file: for the Air quality plan report identifier (line 84) it is created as „HDR_“+“string“; and for the Plan Identifier as „string“. To sum up:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When you create a new plan the system assigns a local id which is „Draft_date_internal identifier“. 2. Then this local id can be changed by the user 3. The tool uses it when creating the XML for the air quality plan report identifier and for the plan identifier
7	<p><u>Line 120:</u> Specification should be "menu" but not "text" and xpath should be "aqd:AQD_Plan/aqd:timescale" but not "aqd:AQD_Plan/aqd:timeTable"</p>	<p>If we make line 120 ("Time table of implementation") to follow the menu under "timescale", only "long term", "medium term", "short term" and "unknown" are possible. If we keep it as a "text", more flexible and precise information on the timetable of implementation can be added (for instance "2014-2018", but also "long term", "medium term" and "short term"). "xpath" cannot be changed because it indicates the position of the element in the XML file.</p>
8	<p><u>Line 316:</u> specification should be "text" but not "link" because the description is textual.</p>	<p>Correct. The mapping table will be changed to "text".</p>

Number	Question	Reply
9	In the previous years, we added two new “reason codes” : S16 = Conditions météorologiques propices à la formation d’ozone sur cocktail de polluants and S17 = Emissions dues à des travaux BTP à proximité. Could you please add them in your codelist? If not, where could we declare them?	Change of the P&P solution can be implemented through importing all codelist values in the solution’s Postgres database. A precondition for that would be that the codelist is updated on the EEA AQ portal. In the meanwhile, it is possible to specify these other reasons in “A.2.8 Other reason” and “A.2.9 Comments”.
10	In the guiding note on reporting AQ plans & programmes, in option C, are the two steps necessary? In step C.1, could you explain what does “filename” mean? What does “tabnumber” mean?	The steps in the guiding note are to be read as follows: A: Either A1 or A2 B: Either (B1 and B2) or B3 C: Either C1 or C2. D: Either D1, or D2, or D3. “Filename” refers to the name of the Excel file of the old P&P questionnaire and “tabnumber” means the Excel sheet name in that file. The guiding note will be clarified accordingly.
11	Clarification about how set the code for field A.8.1 - Local Id ; For instance, it can be possible to provide for this item the following code ? “ IT_xx_Y_zz” where ‘IT’ identify our nation, ‘xx’ is a number that identify regional code, ‘Y’ is the reporting reference year (‘2012’ is the reporting reference year for the first year that is possible e-reporting of information of air quality plan) and ‘zz’ is a progressive number”	Definition of a Local Id: A local identifier, assigned by the data provider. The local identifier is unique within the namespace, i.e. no other spatial object carries the same unique identifier. Note that it is the responsibility of the data provider to guarantee uniqueness of the local identifier within the namespace. Further information: http://inspire.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reports/ImplementingRules/inspireDataspecD2_5v2.0.pdf See also Question 6 : Once the Localid has been uniquely defined by the data provider in „H.1.1 INSPIRE Id“, the tool will use it to generate the Local Ids of both the Air quality plan report identifier and the Plan identifier

Number	Question	Reply
12	<p>H.1.4.1 Reporting period</p> <p>Reporting period = the year in which the exceedance has been detected in 2012?</p> <p>“Reporting period”</p> <p>Since this requirement is not in the IPR, it is assumed to be from INSPIRE. It is, however, not clear how this should be reported. Guidance is needed and should be included in the pop-up text boxes provided in the tool.</p>	<p>The reporting year is the year you are reporting on. For example, if you report today on events (measurements, exceedances, plan etc...) which happened in 2013, then the reporting year is 2013.</p> <p>For yearly reporting, the reporting start date is 01/01/YYYY and the end date is 31/12/YYYY where YYYY is the reporting period (year)</p> <p>The reference year is the year in which the exceedances triggering the plan were first observed or in the case of an update the reference year for the updated exceedance situations.</p>
13	<p>H.2.5 Time position</p> <p>Is the year of the first exceedance at all always meant, which has attracted a preparation of the plan? Why is the word "first" set in the alternate text in brackets? (In a continuation of the plan the year of the exceedance situation is entered, which had an update result?</p>	<p>However reporting plan updates should be further clarified and the codelist modified accordingly and to take into account Question 15.</p>
14	<p>H.2.6 Status - Status value</p> <p>Entry “Plan adopted during reporting year”: What is meant here by "reporting year"? 2014 (very likely) in relation to exceeding in 2012.</p>	<p>See also reply to Question 72 and Question 86.</p>
15	<p>H.2.6 Status - Status value</p> <p>“Status value”</p> <p>Add “Under implementation” to the codelist. Currently the process goes from “First year of implementation, adopted in reporting year” to “Implemented”. Plans often take longer than one year to implement, so this extra category is needed.</p>	
16	<p>H.2.13 Comment</p> <p>Is an indication of stream "G" as link this really necessary when there is a choice of exceedance situations under H.2.14? A link to data by averaging Excel 2014 questionnaire for the reference year 2012 seems to be more appropriate.</p>	<p>The requirement for linking to dataflow “G” is in accordance with the final version of the AQD e-reporting model (http://www.eionet.europa.eu/aqportal/datamodel), and the JRC “Plans and Programs” tool is implemented accordingly.</p> <p>The JRC tool is following the requirements of the schemata, in order to ensure consistency of the data, and further validation against the schemata.</p>

Number	Question	Reply
17	<p>H.2.13</p> <p>Clarification about the string that a member state have to supply for the reporting year 2012 in filling <i>field H.2.13</i>; in IPR meeting, It was exemplified the required string as follow:</p> <p><< http://urltoCDRfolder/filename/tabnumber/LVno2ameanhealth.zo <i>necode</i>>></p> <p>this is the string to supply in the case that a member state have to supply exceedances reported in form 11f or 8b of air quality questionnaire? How a member state have to change this string to achieve connection among exceedances or compliance declaration and the appropriate form of its air quality questionnaire for year 2012 (Italy sent for 2012, 21 different questionnaires)”</p>	See Question 10 and Question 66 .

Number	Question	Reply
18	<p>Definition for the terms 'Macro exceedance situation' and 'Parent exceedance situation' in data set I.</p>	<p>A description of a "macro exceedance situation" is provided in the IPR Guidance (H) Information on air quality plans and (I) Information on source apportionment (Article 13), page 63. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/quality/legislation/pdf/IPR_guidance1.pdf</p> <p><i>"An exceedance situation shall be understood as an amalgamation of individual exceedances which by virtue of their similar source apportionment can be managed together. Where several individual exceedance situations (e.g. different exceedances observed by traffic stations and/or predicted at the roadside by model within the same city) have been grouped into one <u>macro exceedance situation</u>, the source apportionment presented must be relevant to each of the individual exceedance situations and be applicable to the monitoring station or modelled location with the maximum concentration/number of hours exceeding the limit value. If there is a significant difference in source apportionments across the individual exceedance situations, Member States should consider whether it is legitimate to group them into a macro exceedance situation or whether it would be better to split them into smaller groups".</i></p> <p>Also, following definition (which is a summary of the one above) was provided at the 10th IPR Pilot Meeting Copenhagen 3 & 4 April 2014 http://www.eionet.europa.eu/aqportal/pmeet/AQDpil10/Day1_1130-1230_HKschema_AQPnP_KSchleidt.pdf</p> <p><i><u>Macro Exceedance Situation</u>: grouping of all Micro Exceedance Situations in a zone with similar source apportionment into a larger representative Exceedance Situation. A zone may have one or more Macro Exceedance situations.</i> <i>Note: used in Dataset I Source Apportionment</i></p> <p>See reply to Question 67.</p>

Number	Question	Reply
19	I.2.6 Definition for ‘Parent exceedance situation’ in data set I.	A parent exceedance situation is the individual exceedance situation declared in dataset G. It is described by all individual exceedances grouped in their macroexceedance situations and represented by the highest concentration of all these macroexceedance situations. See reply to Question 67 .
20	Clarification about how set the code for the item ‘Local Id’ in data set I.	Definition of a Local Id: A local identifier, assigned by the data provider. The local identifier is unique within the namespace, i.e. no other spatial object carries the same unique identifier. Note: is the responsibility of the data provider to guarantee uniqueness of the local identifier within the namespace. Further information: http://inspire.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reports/ImplementingRules/inspireDataspecD2_5v2.0.pdf
21	Clarification about how to provide numerical values in items A.2.1 , A.2.2 and A.2.3 requested for field I.2.6-Macro exceedance situation ; items A.2.2 (numerical exceedance is the value of highest concentration recorded, or the range of concentration recorded separated by semicolon?) and A.2.3 (number of exceedances is the number of exceedances recorded in monitoring station referred in item A.2.2 only if there are exceedances beyond hourly or daily limit value) are not mandatory to provide?”	According to IPR Guidance, page 63, “the source apportionment presented must be ... applicable to the monitoring station ... with the maximum concentration/number of hours exceeding the limit value” See reply to Question 68 .
22	Clarification about how to supply values for items A.2.5.6(a), A.2.5.6(b) requested for <i>field I.2.6-Macro exceedance situation, Area of the exceedance situation</i> ; in item A.2.5.6(a), which monitoring stations are requested? Station with exceedances, or station used for air quality simulations run to calculate the areas of exceedances?”	This should be a list of all stations used to estimate the area exceeding & therefore will be only those exceeding. The list should be taken from stations listed in dataflow D. If other stations not included in data flow D are used, please list them and provide a URL to a web resource describing them in the comments field. The same applies in case of models. See reply to Question 69 .

Number	Question	Reply
23	<p>1.2.2. Reference year for which source apportionment has been applied. Year of exceeding for this reporting (eg 2012)? Or is asking the year, which was used as a basis for source analysis in the plan?</p>	<p>According to page 64 in the IPR Guidance, “The ‘reference year’ refers to the year for which the exceedance has been assessed”. So It refers to the year for which the source apportionment study was made.</p>
24	<p>A.2.2. An identification of the field as a condition linked to a specification is helpful. All fields without "red star" otherwise be understood as optional.</p>	<p>We will change the interface to reflect conditional fields through the inclusion of a blue star together with a tooltip with the actual conditions under which the field becomes mandatory</p>
25	<p>A.2.3 Number of exceedances. An identification of the field as a condition linked to a specification is helpful. All fields without "red star" otherwise be understood as optional.</p>	<p>We will change the interface to reflect conditional fields through the inclusion of a blue star together with a tooltip with the actual conditions under which the field becomes mandatory.</p>
26	<p>A.2.4.3 Adjustment source. How can you set a made selection to "zero"? How to deselect?</p>	<p>Records can be ‘unselected’ or ‘selected’ through holding the “CTRL” key.</p>
27	<p>A.2.5.3 Area estimate [km²]. Field will probably not be completed because not marked as a mandatory field; Data query "Section I" does not include the data specified in Part II of instructions for Commission Decision of 12.12.2011 (please specify source)</p> <p>Uniform interpretation is not given in the countries; Handling of input data and determining the values different</p>	<p>The field is modelled as conditional (mandatory “if the exceedance is not only linked to the road network”) in accordance with the e-reporting schema and corresponding mapping table. An update of the P&P solution is planned where conditional fields are highlighted with a blue star, and explanation of the actual conditions which apply.</p> <p><u>See also 25.</u></p>
28	<p>A.2.5.4 Road length estimate [km]. Field will probably not be completed because not marked as a mandatory field; Data query "Section I" does not include the data specified in Part II of instructions for Commission Decision of 12.12.2011 (please specify source)</p> <p>Uniform interpretation is not given in the countries; Handling of input data and determining the values different</p>	<p>The field is modelled as conditional (mandatory “if exceedance area linked to the road network”) in accordance with the e-reporting schema and corresponding mapping table. An update of the P&P solution is planned where conditional fields are highlighted with a blue star, and explanation of the actual conditions which apply.</p> <p><u>See also 25.</u></p>

Number	Question	Reply
29	<p>A.2.5.6(a) Station used. Field will probably not be completed because not mandatory; Data query "Section I" does not include the data specified in Part II of instructions for Commission Decision of 12.12.2011 (please specify source)</p> <p>Tool tip is incorrect at this point, a station with code must be specified mandatory here? (list referred to here is not deposited), the figure refers solely to the source assignment?</p>	<p>The field is modelled as conditional (mandatory in the case a station is used) in accordance with the e-reporting schema and corresponding mapping table. An update of the P&P solution is planned where conditional fields are highlighted with a blue star, and explanation of the actual conditions which apply.</p> <p><u>See also 25.</u></p> <p>If a station is reported, it should be identified according to the code provided in data flow D.</p> <p><u>See also 22.</u></p>
30	<p>A.2.5.6(b) Model used. Field will probably not be completed because not mandatory; Data query "Section I" does not include the data specified in Part II of instructions for Commission Decision of 12.12.2011 (please specify source)</p> <p>Tool tip is incorrect at this point, a model must be specified mandatory here? (list referred to here is not deposited), the figure refers solely to the source assignment?</p>	<p>The field is modelled as conditional (mandatory in the case a model is used) in accordance with the e-reporting schema and corresponding mapping table Data is already reported in dataflow "D". This field should just point to the right INSPIREid of what is already reported in "D".</p> <p>The tool tip will be corrected so that it will say "model metadata" instead of "station metadata"</p> <p><u>See also 22 and 25.</u></p>
31	<p>A.2.6.1 Exposed population. Field will probably not be completed because not mandatory; Data query "Section I" does not include the data specified in Part II of instructions for Commission Decision of 12.12.2011 (please specify source); To be completed only on a voluntary basis?</p>	<p>According to the mapping table, this field is conditional ("X" in case of health protection target). An update of the P&P solution is planned where conditional fields are highlighted with a blue star, and explanation of the actual conditions which apply.</p> <p><u>See also 25.</u></p>
32	<p>A.2.6.2 Exposed area [km²]. Field will probably not be completed because not mandatory; Data query "Section I" does not include the data specified in Part II of instructions for Commission Decision of 12.12.2011 (please specify source); To be completed only on a voluntary basis?</p>	<p>According to the mapping table, this field is conditional (mandatory in the case of vegetation/ecosystem protection target)</p> <p>An update of the P&P solution is planned where conditional fields are highlighted with a blue star, and explanation of the actual conditions which apply <u>See also 25.</u></p>

Number	Question	Reply
33	<p>A.2.6.3 Sensitive resident population. Field will probably not be completed because not mandatory; Data query "Section I" does not include the data specified in Part II of instructions for Commission Decision of 12.12.2011 (please specify source); To be completed only on a voluntary basis?</p>	<p>According to the mapping table, this field is "X". Sensitive pop is voluntary in the IPR (as it does not appear in the section (I) in Annex II to the IPR Decision) <u>See also 25.</u></p>
34	<p>A.2.6.4 Relevant infrastructure. Field will probably not be completed because not mandatory; Data query "Section I" does not include the data specified in Part II of instructions for Commission Decision of 12.12.2011 (please specify source); To be completed only on a voluntary basis?</p>	<p>According to the mapping table, this field is "X". Infrastructure is voluntary in the IPR (as it does not appear in the section (I) in Annex II to the IPR Decision) <u>See also 25.</u></p>
35	<p>A.2.6.5 Reference year. Field will probably not be completed because not mandatory; Data query "Section I" does not include the data specified in Part II of instructions for Commission Decision of 12.12.2011 (please specify source); To be completed only on a voluntary basis? What is meant with „reporting year“?</p>	<p>See <u>Question 12</u> and <u>Question 23</u> See also <u>Question 25.</u></p>
36	<p>I.2.9 Parent exceedance situation. Extension to multiple selection. Thus, "J" for NO2 (a) and NO2 (h) could be created together.</p>	<p>That would not be possible with the current e-reporting model, interdependencies between J and the other data flows (H, I and K). The P&P e-reporting system is implemented in accordance with the model.</p>
37	<p>Urban background. In the tool the title "Urban background" misses the word "Increment". Please get the word supplement.</p>	<p>We will change the interface as suggested.</p>
38	<p>J.2.6.2 & J2.7.2 "Total emissions [kt/yr]" This should not be a mandatory filed. This is less relevant information than expected concentration levels and exceedences, which are voluntary.</p>	<p>According to the section J) in Annex II to the IPR Decision, these fields are mandatory.</p>

Number	Question	Reply
39	<p>J.2.6.6 “Measures” (Baseline scenario) It should not be mandatory to select measures included in the baseline scenario. These are not always reported according to dataset K.</p>	<p>According to the section (J) in Annex II to the IPR Decision, these fields are mandatory</p>
40	<p>References J.2.6.4 and J.2.7.4 : how can we link those two parameters (number of exceedances per year) with a precise exceedance situation when in J.2.8 it refers to an AQ plan (by a link to H.2). For example, We declare an exceedance situation at a precise sampling point but how can we know this site? There is no reference to this sampling point (max value declared)? In J.2.8, there is only a link to a plan? How can we know that it concerns the exact site of exceedance?</p>	<p>The reference is done to a parent exceedance. There is indeed no direct link to the station where the max exceedance has been observed. Under the scenario the max concentration or max exceedance (the ones to be reported in these J fields) might occur at a different station.</p>
41	<p>J.2 should be repeated as many times as there are scenario, but this is not possible due to cardinality equal to 1”</p>	<p>There is no “J.2” field in the tool. This question seems to be related to the next one (please clarify), meaning a scenario per pollutant. In any case, in “J” there is a section for “baseline scenario” and a section for “projection scenario”, which are the two possible scenarios. “J” has to be filled for every pollutant/environmental objective, since every J is linked to a unique “I” and every “I” is linked to a unique parent exceedance.</p>
42	<p>How can we know what is (are) the pollutant(s) addressed by a given scenario. In particular, what is (are) the pollutant(s) associated with the fields J2.6.2, J2.6.3, J2.6.4 and J2.7.2, J2.7.3, J2.7.4. Is the link done through the associated source apportionment and then with the parent exceedance situation?</p>	<p>See Question 41.</p>
43	<p>Some association seem to be redundant : fields K.2.17 and J.2.7.6</p>	<p>In “K.2.17” you link the measure to an “Evaluation scenario”. And in this evaluation scenario you classify the measure either in the baseline scenario (J.2.6.6) or in the projection scenario (J.2.7.6)</p>

Number	Question	Reply
44	Clarification about how set the code for the item 'Local Id' in data set J.	Definition of a Local Id: A local identifier, assigned by the data provider. The local identifier is unique within the namespace, i.e. no other spatial object carries the same unique identifier. Note: is the responsibility of the data provider to guarantee uniqueness of the local identifier within the namespace. Further information: http://inspire.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reports/ImplementingRules/inspireDataspecD2_5v2.0.pdf
45	K.2.5 "Classification" The codelist for classification of measures needs revising. For example, the classification "Other" is present numerous times. Also, there is nowhere to provide a comment if you select "Other, please specify". Please add "Ban on polluting activities" to this codelist.	Correct. There is an "Other" for every type of measures (fuels, traffic...). So only one "Other" should be kept and a text box should be open when it is selected. This, however, would imply a modification of the schema. Once the codelists are changed this can easily be reflected within the P&P e-reporting solution.
46	K – Generally. List of general measures are even covered by the users assigned (without allocation of the province or territory) and J K is reduced to general information and recreated only when needed - Reporting period is removed - Times are set to "9999-01-01" or "9999-12-31"; Reduction potentials are "J" collected (of measures)	We have resolved this issue through the introduction of dummy timestamps for both fields of concern, in order to pass xml validation. The tooltips for the two fields of concern clearly state that, and the system is populated with dummy values on the backend.
47	K.1.2 Provider. Why doesn't exist information on the "Competent Authority" in data set "K"? This specification is at this point more effective than giving the "Provider" (standardized mention of the deposited UBA-contact)	Good point but would require modification of schemata.

Number	Question	Reply
48	K.1.4.1. Reporting start date. Why is this query at this point? Thus, each measure has to be adjusted each reporting?	The date is always equal to the day when the system is accessed. There is no other means to change the date, and unfortunately this would require intervention by the users, so that the proper date is set. See also reply to Question 72 .
49	K.1.4.2 Reporting end date. Why is this query at this point? Thus, each measure has to be adjusted each reporting?	
50	K.2.6. "Type" There is nowhere to provide a comment if you select "Other, please specify".	We are currently investigating a possible solution to that issue.
51	K.2.8 "Time scale" The codelist needs to be reviewed and clarified. The current description of medium term (i.e. 1 year) seems questionable. There are two aspects to consider regarding time scales for measures. The first is whether the measure is aimed at reducing short-term exposure (i.e. hourly or daily episodes) or long-term exposure (annual means). The second aspect regards the time scales for implementation. Emergency measures such as warnings and dust-binding, which are implemented whenever necessary, are considered to be short term measures. Medium term measures might be information campaigns and other schemes which last a couple of years. Long term measures are things like infrastructure improvements. The following descriptions are considered more relevant for this codelist: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Long term (more than 5 years) ○ Medium term (1 – 5 years) ○ Short term (less than 1 year) 	If a new definition of the different time scales is agreed the codelist could be updated accordingly.
52	Definition for the terms 'begin position' and 'end position' requested for describe implementation measures period." in data set K.	It means respectively starting date and ending date. The labels could be modified in the tool. See reply to Question 71 .

Number	Question	Reply
53	Clarification about how set the code for the item 'Local Id' in data set K.	Definition of a Local Id: A local identifier, assigned by the data provider. The local identifier is unique within the namespace, i.e. no other spatial object carries the same unique identifier. Note: is the responsibility of the data provider to guarantee uniqueness of the local identifier within the namespace. Further information: http://inspire.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reports/ImplementingRules/inspireDataspecD2_5v2.0.pdf
54	<i>Precautions have to be taken when giving names to some items so that they are well identified in the different datasets (H, I, J, K).</i>	Where there are cross overs in concepts B-G and H-K the codelists will be reused. Else new codelists & vocabularies will be prepared
55	<i>Could information be given on the data saving process and more generally on the service level for the P&Ps submitted by Member States on the online tool?</i>	The service level for the P&Ps and data saving process are still to be defined.
56	In the guiding note on reporting AQ plans & programmes, it is said in option A that in case of already known exceedances which have been reported (old excel questionnaire) and addressed in existing Air Quality Plans, we must use the comment field H.2.13 and provide the URL to the reported AQ questionnaire (Step A.1). But, have we to provide URL of AQ plan or multiple URLs of many plans (step A.2) too?	Yes, if your exceedance has been previously documented in in a 461 questionnaire or AQ Plan provide URLs to all these documents.
57	Dataset J: the pollutants involved in the emission reduction and the targeted pollutant may not be the same. Example: reduction of NOx emissions to reduce NO ₂ concentrations; reduction of NOx or NH ₃ emissions to reduce the formation of secondary aerosol and therefore PM ₁₀ . Does the data model allow this distinction?	If pollutants in the emission reduction and the targeted pollutant may not be the same, there is provision for describing in J2.6.1, J2.6.5 (baseline) and J2.7.1, J2.7.5 (projection). Please provide only a short note in a longer description in J2.6.5, J2.7.5
58	General: Please provide code list with full and completed clarification in order to provide correct information for reporting.	The codelists for H-K are in preparation

Number	Question	Reply
59	<p>General: Please clarify items: unknown, unpopulated and withheld in the reporting.</p>	<p>These options shall be used by MS in the event of a mandatory field not being available for reporting. MS should select the most appropriate description for the reason for the data element not being available</p> <p>The three values (unknown, unpopulated and withheld) are used in INSPIRE within a codelist for explaining the reasons for voiding a value. The meanings of each of them is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unknown: The correct value for the specific spatial object is not known to, and not computable by, the data provider. However, a correct value may exist. • Unpopulated: The characteristic is not part of the dataset maintained by the data provider. However, the characteristic may exist in the real world. • Withheld: The characteristic may exist, but is confidential and not divulged by the data provider. <p>Additional information and examples is available through the INSPIRE codelist registry: http://inspire.ec.europa.eu/codelist/VoidReasonValue/</p>
60	<p>Section H Within reporting it is necessary to provide information about reporting period (H.1.4) and for time table of implementation (H.2.9). According to your answer of question referring to reporting period I do not see any difference. I will try to clarify it on this example. We observed first exceedance in 2012. We adopted a plan in June 2014. Within the plan measures are set up which have to be implemented from June 2014 till 2019. According to your answer of question No. 12 reporting period is 1.6.2014 – 31.12.2019. Time table of implementation is the same 1.6.2014 – 31.12.2019. Is it true? If not, please correct date in this example and please give your explanation why.</p>	<p>The reporting period (H.1.4) is mandatory and shall contain information on the calendar year(s) in which the exceedances triggering the plan were first observed. H2.9 refers to the implementation date of the plan</p>

Number	Question	Reply
61	Is information which must be provided under demand in H.2.11 answers for designed indicators in point K.2.12.6?	<p>H.2.11 should point to a website where information about the implementation of the AQ Plan can be found, while K.2.12.6 is dedicated to indicators for monitoring progress.</p> <p>Examples of indicators are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have the planned parking fees been implemented [y/n] and to what extent [number of parking places affected]; - has the planned permit revision been implemented [y/n]; - how much has the traffic volume on a road gone down [% heavy duty vehicles].
62	<p>Section I: No all categories of points I.2.3, I.2.4 and I.2.5 are relevant for each zone where it was observed exceedance. Therefore we suggest, for all categories of points I.2.3, I.2.4 and I.2.5 to have opportunity to put information “Irrelevant for this case”.</p>	<p>MS may choose not to report on individual contribution by selecting the A13.1 option & providing a reason code (unknown, unpopulated or withheld) & a comment (A13.2) if required. According to the IPR Guidelines, sources contributing less than 3% may be labelled as not significant. Moreover, The identification of the transboundary fraction of a pollutant is independent from the classification into activity categories.</p>
63	<p>Section J: Please give several good examples which help us do projections easier.</p>	<p>Good examples will be selected after making a first analysis of the reported information under H to K obligations</p>
64	<p>Section K: Please clarify items in point K.2.12.1 and give some examples in which case we can use them.</p>	<p>Good examples will be selected after making a first analysis of the reported information under H to K obligations</p>
65	<p>Section K: Please give a list of effective measures for reduction emission with experience of its implementation, especially for domestic heating and transport.</p>	<p>Good examples will be selected after making a first analysis of the reported information under H to K obligations. For info on plans and abatement measures we suggest:</p> <p>http://www.appraisal-fp7.eu/site/ http://airuse.eu/en/ http://www.apice-project.eu/ http://www.aceptair.prd.uth.gr/ http://www.atmospolres.com/articles/Volume6/issue3/APR-15-048.pdf http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/lrtap/ExecutiveBody/2006.Strat.PoliciesReview.E.pdf</p>

Number	Question	Reply
66	<p>This table - answer n. 17) we need for a clarification about the string that a member state have to supply for the reporting year 2012 in filling field H.2.13; in IPR meeting, it was exemplified the required provisional string as follow: <<http://urltoCDRfolder/filename/tabnumber/LVno2ameanhealth.zonecode>>; this is the string to supply in the case that a member state have to supply exceedances also reported for NO2, but is unclear if the value to supply for 'tabnumber' is 'form11f' or 'form8b'; both of this forms are related to the declaration of exceedances of NO2 annual limit value in air quality questionnaire. Moreover with the aim that all member states decline the above mentioned provisional string, for each pollutant and each limit value, to achieve connection among the appropriate form of air quality questionnaire, could information be given such a codelist for the first half of the sub-string: "LVno2ameanhealth.zonecode"?</p>	<p>The attainment statement with in the 461 questionnaire is made by form(s) 8. Substitute the appropriate form name for "tab number".</p>
67	<p>This table - answer n. 18, n.19) definition supply for 'parent exceedance situation' is unclear and not clearly related with Presentation of 10th IPR Pilot Meeting; in particular we need for a clarification about relationship among 'zone', 'pollutant', 'parent exceedance situation' and 'macro exceedance situation';</p>	<p>Parent exceedance situation is the situation described by data flow G or forms(s) 8 of the 461 questionnaire, it is derived from the worst case exceedance situation for each 'zone', 'pollutant', 'environmental objective'. Macro exceedance situation is the Parent exceedance situation broken down into situations with the same source apportionment.</p>
68	<p>This table - answer n. 21) provide information for field A.2.2 it should be done alternatively to compile the field A.2.3? when we compile field A.2.2 (numerical exceedance) we provide the annual average over the limit value and when we compile field A.2.3. (number of exceedances) we provide the number of exceedances daily or hourly over the hours / days in the permitted limit value. Is proper follow this input method?</p>	<p>Yes, this is the correct logic.</p>

The content of this document does not reflect the official opinion of the European Commission.

Number	Question	Reply
69	<p>This table - answer n. 22) It's yet unclear how provide information for items A.2.5.6(a) and A.2.5.6(b) in particular if the area of the exceedance situation is estimated by model; please provide example of compilation;</p>	<p>The same logic should be used for the population of these fields in data flow. Provide a link to the sampling points, models / methods included in data flow D. If you cannot provide this information in data flow D describe you method in the comments field I2.7 & provide a URL to the a more detailed description.</p>
70	<p>Moreover we need more clarification on the options A, B, C and D, reported in document "Guiding note" (http://www.eionet.europa.eu/aqportal/plansandprogrammes) and we underline the following question: P&P tool does not facilitate communication of information related to measures adopted to comply with target values of Directive 2004/107/EC; for these measures we must provide only information foreseen in dataset K, but not information related to dataset I and dataset J, that are requested by tool (in other word tool request for measures adopted for exceedances of target values for arsenic, cadmium, nickel and benzo(a)pyrene information on source apportionment and on evaluation scenarios that are not available;</p>	<p>To facilitate communication of information related to measures adopted to comply with target values of Directive 2004/107/EC the procedure is to populate that information required by K ONLY, export it as XML & deliver to the CDR.</p>
71	<p>This table - answer n. 52) Explanation for terms 'begin position' and 'end position' requested for describe implementation measures period is yet unclear;</p>	<p>These are the planned and actual timeframes over which the measures we active</p>

Number	Question	Reply
72	<p>This table - answer n. 12, n. 48, n.49) In “Provisional answers to questions ...”, the <i>Reporting period</i> assumes different meanings depending on the dataset:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">in dataset H, <i>Reporting period</i> (fields H.1.4.1. and H.1.4.2) <i>is the year you are reponging on</i>, that is the year in which the events (measurements, exceedances, ...) happened (see question 12);</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">in dataset K, (fields K.1.4.1 and K.1.4.2) <i>is when the system is accessed</i>;</p> <p>What meaning does <i>Reporting period</i> assume in dataset I and in dataset J? (It is worth noting that in <i>IPR_MappingDoc_schemaV1.0.7_20140702_clean</i>, the description for <i>Reporting period</i> was the same for all of the datasets H-K, that is <i>Date when dataset was made available</i>).</p>	<p>In all cases for H-K reporting period must relate the calendar year that id triggering the requirement to report H-K.</p>
73	<p>We point out the problem above mentioned also for communication of action plans that may be adopted for all pollutant regulated by Directive 2008/50/EC (also for these plans we must provide only information forseen in dataset K).</p>	<p>For exceedances of LVs & TVs under Directive 2008/50/EC all data flows H, I, J & K are required.</p>
74	<p>Could information be given on the data saving process and more generally on the service level for the P&Ps submitted by Member States on the online tool?</p>	<p>The online tool stores data in a relational database (PostgreSQL), and access to the content is managed through the European Commission Authentication Service (ECAS). Data is visible on a European level all the time, but without edit rights. Information which is prepared by the tool is still to be submitted to the AQ portal in xml format.</p>
75	<p>During the Pilot meeting of November 2014, there was much discussion about the conditions for reporting P&Ps, in particular : is it necessary or not to report an existing plan in case of a new exceedance already covered by that plan?</p>	<p>The guiding principle is that a plan only has to be reported once.</p>

Number	Question	Reply														
76	<p>Documentation and tool: Comment sent to EEA on March 2, 2015: <i>Documentation on the reporting of datasets H, I, J and K is missing. The XML user guide only deals with datasets B to G. So does the page dedicated to codelists on the AQ portal (http://www.eionet.europa.eu/aqportal/codelists). The JRC technical report only provides guidelines for dataset H, not for datasets I to K. The terminology used should be harmonized between the IPR guidance part 2 or mapping file and the codelists (for example, the word “traffic” is used in the IPR mapping file (1.2.4.2, line 189) and “transport” in the AQD-AQ Plans-Source sector codelist.)</i></p>	<p>To use a widely accepted and updated terminology, a convenient option for the future would be to report contribution of the emission sources according to NFR aggregation for gridding (categories) reported below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1088 379 1955 651"> <tbody> <tr> <td>A_PublicPower</td> <td>H_Aviation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B_Industry</td> <td>I_Offroad</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C_OtherStationaryComb</td> <td>J_Waste</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D_Fugitive</td> <td>K_AgriLivestock</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E_Solvents</td> <td>L_AgriOther</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F_RoadTransport</td> <td>M_Other</td> </tr> <tr> <td>G_Shipping</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Those wishing to give more details can always use the full NFR classification, which is coherent with this one.</p> <p>The secondary pollutants should be attributed to the source of their precursors, if possible, especially for ozone. The secondary fraction that cannot be attributed to their sources should be reported as such.</p>	A_PublicPower	H_Aviation	B_Industry	I_Offroad	C_OtherStationaryComb	J_Waste	D_Fugitive	K_AgriLivestock	E_Solvents	L_AgriOther	F_RoadTransport	M_Other	G_Shipping	
A_PublicPower	H_Aviation															
B_Industry	I_Offroad															
C_OtherStationaryComb	J_Waste															
D_Fugitive	K_AgriLivestock															
E_Solvents	L_AgriOther															
F_RoadTransport	M_Other															
G_Shipping																
77	<p>Dataset J: the impact of some measures (e.g. incitement to car-sharing) may be difficult to quantify and flexibility should be allowed. It seems that such flexibility exists but we would like to get confirmation of that: same comments and questions as for dataset I (source apportionment).</p>	<p>IPR Guidance (dataset K): "For monitoring the effectiveness of a measure, it is usually not sufficient to just follow how the concentration level changes, as the change may be due to other causes. Hence, it is important to follow the progress of the measures with suitable indicators that relate more directly to the measure.</p> <p>The expected impact upon concentrations in the Projection year i.e. a reduction in concentration level is to be given as a positive number. For annual mean metrics this reduction should be presented in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ at the monitoring site where the highest levels are recorded. Where there is an exceedance situation without a monitoring site, the point of highest modelled concentrations should be used. Deviation from this rule has to be indicated and explained".</p> <p>An existing comment field could be used, to be decided.</p>														

Number	Question	Reply
78	<u>What should be reported if the old AQ Plan has not delivered expected results?</u>	<p>The are two options to report in this case:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – New measures linked to the old plan. These additional measures need to be reported separately in dataset K. If new measures are included, then J is required to show what they will deliver in the projection year. If source apportionment has changed then I is required. – A new plan is adopted and full datasets as in H-K are reported. The new plan should be reported in the next reporting cycle after adoption.
79	<u>P&P-reporting is not annual</u> if the plan doesn't change.	YES.
80	<u>Target value exceedances and measures according to dataset K</u> can be reported with the tool but datasets H, I and J are not required?	In the case of a target value exceedance under Directive 2008/50/EC, datasets H-K are required (section A, Annex XV). Note that the situation differs for Directive 2004/104/EC
81	<u>AQD 2008/50/EC Annex XV, Part A, Point 7 requires that “Details of those measures or projects for improvement which existed prior to 11 June 2008”</u>	This requirement is obsolete, if the information requested was already provided by the MS, it doesn't need to be reported again.
82	Guidance is needed on best practice for e-Reporting of AQ Plans and Attainment information in the new system including periodic updates to AQ Plan. What to do if the exceedance situation(s) in the AQ plan differ from those observed in the original reference year triggering the requirement for a plan?	According to IPR Decision of 12 December 2012, a MS can update the information made available to the data repository. In such a case (article 5.5), when making the updated information available in the data repository, the MS shall describe the differences between the original information and the reasons for the update. Therefore, if a new body of evidence arises in the preparatory works required for an AQP and as a consequence of this new evidence the exceedance situations in the original year might be different to those in the AQP, the original information should be updated. This update shall be made available in the CDR and comply with all the data requirements set in the AQD.

Number	Question	Reply
83	Demand " H.2.11 Reference to implementation " should be demand of type "conditional", because there can be provided information only if plans are implemented. In this reporting reference to implementation can be provided only for measures which were implemented. What about rest of measures, which is not implemented in that time, when we report.	According to Directive 2008/50/EC, the air quality Plans need to be established where in given zones or agglomerations the limit value, plus any relevant margin of tolerance in each case, is exceeded. Also, when the attainment deadline is expired, the AQP shall set out appropriate measures so that the exceedance period is kept as short as possible. All the measures in the AQP have to be reported. The planned implementation (start date, end date) also needs to be reported (IPR Annex II, K (14))
84	Section I For the purpose of source apportionment we think that it is not necessary to distinguish local and urban background increment. Is it possible to provide data only for increment, in which will be included both of them. So increment would be mandatory data and urban background increment and local increment would be voluntary data.	This comment is in line with the FAIRMODE position: the constraints of the „incremental approach “should be relaxed to allow also reporting the actual contributions (instead of increments) of sources at a given point or cell. At the moment this can be implemented by mentioning in the comment whether the values reported are increments or actual contributions.
85	What's a new exceedance? One which has never be known and reported in dataset G? A new couple zone/pollutant with no implemented plans and programs? A new but known couple zone/pollutant with an implemented plan?	New exceedance: a new couple station (zone)/pollutant.
86	This table - answer n. 13) definition for field H.2.5 (Reference year of first exceedance) is yet unclear; first year of exceedance of a pollutant is different if we consider the exceedance respect to limit value or respect limit value plus Margin of tolerance? Please add exemplification of this first reference year for each pollutant;	The exceedance of the limit value or target value, plus any relevant margin of tolerance in each case, triggers article 23 of the AQD.
87	How to report AQ Plans not related to an individual exceedance situation. I.e. a plan with general national measures which complement the various specific air quality plans in each area to help meet the objectives	The topic should be discussed during the next IPR meetings, in order to understand the existing practices and perspectives of different Member States.