

Recommendations of the 15th Meeting of the AQUILA Network

➤ Recommendation 20 (June 2010):

AQUILA re-iterates that it is the responsibility of the Competent Authority (CA) in a given Member State to decide whether any test report on the “equivalence” of a monitoring method is applicable to its Member State or not.

AQUILA therefore recommends that the relevant CA evaluates rigorously the validity and applicability of the test report for:

- its complete conformance with *all* the relevant requirements of the published “Guide to the Demonstration of Equivalence of Ambient Air Methods” or for the validation of an alternative approach if the Guide has not been applied;
- any significant errors or omissions in the report;
- the applicability of the test report to monitoring in the MS, particularly for PM methods since the particulate matter composition and many other properties, and the standard operating procedures (SOP), may be different when the equivalence tests were carried out in another MS or in another region of the same MS.

AQUILA further recommends that, where the validity and/or applicability of the test report are not complete, the relevant C A rejects the report and take appropriate actions. It is also recommended that this decision be provided to AQUILA for use in future cases.

➤ Recommendation (AQUILA Action) 21 (June 2010):

Following specific requests from certain NRLs, *AQUILA agrees* to prepare a document (checklist) in order to support the technical advice that NRLs provide to the Competent Authorities in the Member States concerning the assessment of the validity and applicability of test reports and their conformance with the “Guide to the Demonstration of Equivalence of Ambient Air Methods”, or on the validation of an alternative approach if the Guide has not been applied.

➤ Recommendation 22 (June 2010):

AQUILA states (notes? emphasizes?) that all non-trivial modifications to the standard operating procedures used with any non-reference monitoring method may affect the future performance of the method.

AQUILA recommends that all modifications must be evaluated to take account of all factors – including, where necessary, using the continual procedure for the demonstration of equivalence against the reference method, and the associated ongoing QA/QC procedures.

AQUILA also recommends that the justification and all the results of this evaluation, used to support the continuing equivalence of the method, must be documented thoroughly as part of the QA/QC documentation.

AQUILA further recommends that networks that apply the same demonstration of equivalence and the same ongoing QA/QC procedure for a specific non-reference

method should exchange information concerning their implementation experience, and should also harmonize modifications to their standard operating procedures. NRLs involved in the original demonstration of equivalence, and in the ongoing QA/QC activities, should also be involved.

➤ **Recommendation 23 (June 2010):**

AQUILA interprets the provisions of the legislation with respect to legislative requirements for measurement uncertainty of the measured data as follows:

- Estimates of measurement uncertainty must be available for all measurement data that are used for the assessment of air quality in Member States under the AQDs. Estimates shall be prepared following the provisions of Directive 2008/50/EC Annex I Chapter A.
- The relevant DQO must be conformed with where the data is reported as assessment information under AQD. If a specific situation (unforeseen events, malfunction etc.) occurs, and the competent authority decides to report the data that does not conform to the DQO, such data must be clearly flagged.

AQUILA recommends that where there are clear indications that the measurement uncertainty of previous and existing already-reported data may be higher than the relevant DQO, the best estimate of the measurement uncertainty should be documented and made available to the data users. (This may occur because, for example, a reference method with the required performance characteristics was unavailable at the time.) The data should be flagged as: 'Measurement uncertainty may be higher than the DQO' in all datasets where conformance with the DQO is assumed.

AQUILA also recommends that in specific cases where there is a sound metrological basis for modifications of this existing data to reduce the measurement uncertainty, for example if bias has been identified, these data should be modified as far as possible.

The relevant NRL should be involved in these decisions and support the preparation of any potential resubmissions by the Competent Authority.

➤ **Recommendation 24 (June 2010):**

AQUILA notes that in Directive 2008/50/EC in Annex VI.E it is stated: "In carrying out the type approval to demonstrate that equipment meets the performance requirements of the reference methods listed in Section A, competent authorities and bodies designated pursuant to Article 3 shall accept test reports issued in other Member States by laboratories accredited to EN ISO 17025 for carrying out such testing."

AQUILA strongly recommends and asserts that all the requirements specified in standards EN 14211, 14212, 14625, 14626 and 14662-3 shall be incorporated correctly into the type-approval test reports for this to be accepted by the Competent Authority, and that all these type-approval reports carried out according to the above standards, "**shall be available to the public**" (see e.g. EN 14211, clause 11.1).