



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
1 July 2016

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range
Transboundary Air Pollution

**Steering Body to the Cooperative Programme for
Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range
Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe**

Working Group on Effects

Second joint session*

Geneva, 13–16 September 2016

Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda

**Progress in emissions inventories and other emissions-
related issues: improvement of emission data**

Present state of emission data, review process and new gridding system

Report by the Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections

Summary

The present report was prepared by the Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections in line with its mandate under the 2016–2017 workplan for the implementation of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (ECE/EB.AIR/133/Add.1, items 1.1.1.21, 1.1.2.1, 1.1.2.3, 1.1.2.6, 1.1.2.7 and 3.4) as well as the tasks set out in the informal document submitted to the Executive Body for the Convention at its thirty-fourth session, “Basic and multi-year activities in the 2016–2017 period” (items 1.4.5, 1.4.6, 1.4.7 and 1.5.1).

* The Executive Body to the Convention agreed that, as of 2015, the Working Group on Effects and the Steering Body to the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe should meet jointly, to achieve enhanced integration and cooperation between the Convention’s two scientific subsidiary bodies (ECE/EB.AIR/122, para. 47 (b)).



The report reflects progress in emissions reporting under the Convention in the 2016 reporting round. It summarizes the main conclusions of the annual review of emission data carried out under the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transboundary Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe, and presents the outcome of the stage 3 in-depth reviews of national inventories in 2016 and the plans for 2017–2018. It also looks at the review of adjustment applications submitted by Parties, as well as progress in developing the new gridding system. Annexed to the document is a table summarizing the status of emission reporting as of 10 June 2016 by Party.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1–3	3
I. Present state of emission data.....	4–17	3
II. Emission data for modellers	18–22	5
III. Technical review of inventories	23–28	6
IV. Review of submitted adjustment applications	29	7
V. Development of a new gridding system	30–33	7
VI. Conclusions	34–42	8
Annex		
Status of emission reporting as of 10 June 2016		10

Introduction

1. The present report reflects progress in emission reporting under the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution in the 2016 reporting round (2014 emission data, including resubmissions for previous years, activity data and projections, as well as gridded and large point source data). It summarizes the main conclusions of the annual review¹ and the review of compliance with reporting obligations of emission data carried out under the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transboundary Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP), in line with the 2016–2017 workplan for the implementation of the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/133/Add.1).

2. At its thirty-second session (Geneva, 9–13 December 2013), the Executive Body for the Convention adopted the Guidelines for Reporting Emissions and Projections Data under the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (Reporting Guidelines) (ECE/EB.AIR/125) through its decisions 2013/3 and 2013/4 (see ECE/EB.AIR/122/Add.1). The Reporting Guidelines were adopted for application in 2015 and subsequent years and contain background information on the reporting requirements, deadlines and procedures for reporting emissions under the Convention and their review.

3. The present report was prepared by the EMEP Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections (CEIP),² hosted by the Environment Agency Austria (Umweltbundesamt).

I. Present state of emission data

4. Out of the 51 Parties to the Convention, 45 submitted data in 2016. All countries reported data in the new formats (i.e., Nomenclature for Reporting, NFR14). No data were received from Albania, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Greece, Monaco or Montenegro. An up-to-date overview of the data submitted by Parties during the 2016 reporting round is available on the CEIP website³ and in an annex to the present document. In addition, the latest version of officially reported emission data can be accessed in an online database.⁴ Most of the Parties that submitted data also provided the secretariat with the notification form.

5. *Review of inventories:* The main objective of the technical review of inventories is to assist countries in improving their data for the next reporting round. All inventories submitted by Parties were tested via RepDab⁵ and imported into the central CEIP database. As a next step, a technical review of all inventories was carried out.⁶ At each stage of the review, Parties had the opportunity to clarify issues and to provide additional information. The process is seen by Parties as valuable and the feedback is provided to CEIP by means of e-mail communications and also during meetings of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections.

6. *Stage 1 and 2 reviews:* The findings of the stage 1 review were communicated to the national designated experts through the country-specific status reports by 30 March 2016.

¹ Annual technical review is carried out in cooperation with the European Environment Agency and its European Topic Centre on Air and Climate Change Mitigation.

² CEIP was established by the Air Convention's Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session (ECE/EB.AIR/91, para. 27 (f)) and began operating on 15 January 2008. See <http://www.ceip.at>.

³ See http://www.ceip.at/status_reporting/2016_submissions.

⁴ See http://www.ceip.at/webdab_emepdatabase/reported_emissiondata.

⁵ The RepDab tool is also available from the CEIP website at http://www.ceip.at/repdab_howtouse.

⁶ Background information on the technical review process is described in ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/8 and at http://www.ceip.at/review_process/review_process_general.

The findings from the stage 2 review were included in synthesis and assessment reports, which were issued by 3 May 2016. An overview of the findings for the stage 1 and 2 reviews is summarized in the joint CEIP-European Environment Agency *Inventory Review Report 2016*,⁷ which will be made available on the CEIP website.

7. *Timeliness*: Twenty-nine Parties reported emission data by the due date of 15 February 2016. Twenty-four Parties resubmitted data, as compared with twenty-five in 2015 (Parties were to provide resubmissions within four weeks after 15 February, but the latest resubmission was provided on 13 May 2016).

8. *Pollutants*: Forty-five Parties to the Convention submitted inventories, but not all submissions contained all the pollutants required by the Reporting Guidelines. All 45 Parties reported their 2014 data on the main pollutants. Cadmium, mercury and lead emissions were provided by 40 Parties, additional heavy metals by 34, particulate matter by 45 and priority persistent organic pollutants by 40 Parties. Activity data were reported by only 37 Parties.

9. *Black carbon*: Thirty-four Parties reported black carbon emissions (on a voluntary basis) and twenty-three Parties submitted the black carbon emission time series (in 2015).

10. *Time series*: Complete time series of the main pollutants in NFR14 format for the years 1990–2014 were reported by 33 Parties. Thirty-one Parties provided complete time series (1990–2014) of the main heavy metals. Thirty-six Parties reported requested time series of particulate matter (2000–2014). Thirty-two Parties provided full time series (at least 1990–2014) of persistent organic pollutants. Five Parties submitted only 2014 data.

11. *Recalculations*: All emission estimates within a time series should be calculated consistently, i.e., the time series should be calculated using the same method and data sources for all years. Of the 45 reporting Parties, 40 provided recalculated data for at least some pollutants. Review of submitted inventories identifies annually significant recalculation (more than +/- 30 per cent) of historical emissions in individual countries.⁸

12. *Projections*: In 2016, emission projections were submitted by 8 Parties (22 in 2015).

13. *Documentation*: Only 76 per cent of Parties reporting inventories also submitted informative inventory reports (IIRs) in 2016. The consistency, transparency and comparability of IIRs are steadily improving. CEIP evaluates the IIRs⁹ annually and the best national teams receive awards during the meetings of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections. However, there are still reports which do not follow the template. Parties are urged to use the recommended structure for documentation, i.e., the reporting templates in annex II to the Reporting Guidelines.¹⁰

14. *Emissions per capita and emissions per gross domestic product (GDP)*: These indicators¹¹ are calculated for all Parties that submit total national emissions of main pollutants, particulate matter, heavy metals and persistent organic pollutants by using information on population and GDP available from the World Bank database. Significant differences are observed across Parties and years.

⁷ *Inventory review 2016*, CEIP technical report 1/2016 (Vienna, Environment Agency Austria, 2016, forthcoming).

⁸ *Ibid.*, annex I.

⁹ See http://www.ceip.at/status_reporting/2016_submissions.

¹⁰ In particular, according to the Reporting Guidelines, Parties should submit IIRs in one of the official ECE languages (English, French and Russian). The reporting templates are available from the CEIP website at http://www.ceip.at/reporting_instructions. For 2016 and subsequent years revised reporting guidelines and reporting templates have to be used.

¹¹ Inclusion of these tests was recommended by the Task Force expert panel on review.

15. *Access to the information:* CEIP updated its website to reflect revisions in the Reporting Guidelines and to improve the transparency and accessibility of data for Parties, the EMEP Steering Body, the Implementation Committee and the public. Websites with information on adjustment procedures, adjustment applications, review, findings and approved adjustment have been updated as well.

16. *Interactive data viewer:* CEIP provides its users with an online interactive data viewer¹² that can help with the analysis and visualization of the officially reported emissions data submitted by countries under the Convention. The viewer provides users with a flexible, intuitive and user-friendly access to some of the data collated by CEIP. The data viewer includes filters, pop-up information boxes and various flexible disaggregation options.

17. *Support to the Implementation Committee and the secretariat:* CEIP provides detailed information on an annual basis to the Implementation Committee under the Convention on how the Parties to the Convention's protocols are fulfilling their reporting obligations. CEIP assessed the reporting or non-reporting of emissions for the base year and the actual year of Parties to the individual protocols and provided the corresponding trend and overview tables to the secretariat for each of the Convention seven protocols.

II. Emission data for modellers

18. *Reporting of gridded data and large point source data:* Gridded data is part of the quinquennial reporting obligation, which was not officially due in 2016. Nevertheless, four Parties submitted gridded data and six Parties submitted large point source data. These data were checked with respect to their format, internal consistency and completeness.

19. *Gridded data for modellers:* CEIP prepared data sets for sulphur oxides (SO_x), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOC), ammonia (NH₃) and particulate matter (PM₁₀, PM_{2.5} and PM_{coarse}) on Selected Nomenclature for Air Pollution (SNAP) sector level in 50 x 50 square kilometre (km²) resolution, based on the gridding system developed by the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West and also on aggregated sectors gridded NFR (GNFR) sector level in 0.1° x 0.1° grid resolution, based on the gridding system developed by CEIP. The CEIP system uses the Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR) data and is upgraded by point source information available under the European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (E-PRTR)¹³ for the distribution in areas where no reported gridded data in the 0.1° x 0.1° resolution is available.

20. *Gap-filled and gridded data sets:* Gap-filled and gridded data sets were calculated for 2014 with the latest submitted data. Estimates from the Regional Air Pollution Information and Simulation (RAINS)/Greenhouse Gas and Air Pollution Interactions and Synergies (GAINS) model were used for the gap-filling where sufficient reported data was not available.

21. *Heavy metals:* Furthermore, CEIP prepared gridded data for three heavy metals (mercury, lead and cadmium) and six persistent organic pollutants (dioxins and furans, benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(b)fluoranthene, benzo(k)fluoranthene, indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene and hexachlorobenzene). The gap-filling and gridding of heavy metals and persistent organic pollutants was done on GNFR14 sector level (instead of national total level as in 2015). All polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons compounds were gap-filled and gridded separately.

¹² See http://www.ceip.at/data_viewers/official_tableau/.

¹³ See <http://prtr.ec.europa.eu/#/facilitylevels>.

22. Gap-filled and gridded emission data from 1990 to 2014 were distributed to the modellers and have been publicly accessible on the CEIP website since 30 May 2016.¹⁴

III. Technical review of inventories

23. The stage 3 review is an in-depth review of inventories to support Parties in compiling and submitting high quality inventories and to increase confidence in the data used for air pollution modelling. The aim is to conduct a stage 3 review for every Party¹⁵ at least once in a five-year period. Resources are required from the expert review team,¹⁶ the reviewed Parties and CEIP. CEIP coordinates the whole process.

24. Parties are expected to nominate review experts to the EMEP roster and provide sufficient resources to enable them participation in the process. Eighty-eight reviewers from 22 Parties (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) are listed on ECE/CEIP roster of experts. The nominated experts are suitably qualified to review all emission sectors and general inventory issues (good practice, uncertainties, quality assurance/quality control, etc.).

25. The first cycle of in-depth reviews was completed in the period 2008–2012: 44 Parties were reviewed in total — all those that submitted relevant data. The results are published on the CEIP website. Reviewers identified areas for improvement in all the inventories that were checked. The Parties had the opportunity to provide comments before the reports were published.

26. A long-term plan for Stage 3 reviews for the period 2013–2018 was updated by CEIP based on submitted inventories (see table below), for approval during the next joint session of the Steering Body to EMEP and the Working Group on Effects. The plan will be modified if Parties do not submit the requested information¹⁷ within the reporting deadlines.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Country for review</i>
2013	Bulgaria, France, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Sweden
2014	Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Greece, Germany, Hungary and Spain
2015	Azerbaijan, Belarus, Czech Republic, Ireland, the Netherlands, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia and Ukraine
2016	Estonia, Iceland, Luxembourg, Russian Federation, ^a Serbia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and United Kingdom

¹⁴ See http://www.ceip.at/webdab_emepdatabase/emissions_emepmodels.

¹⁵ Participation of the United States of America and Canada in the inventory in-depth review process is to be discussed.

¹⁶ It is estimated that members of the expert review team dedicate around 10 to 15 days to their tasks, which includes preparation, participation in the week-long review meeting and follow-up activities, including finalizing the country review reports.

¹⁷ As defined in the “Methods and Procedures for Review”, submission of NFR tables and an informative inventory report is a prerequisite for a Party to be included in the stage 3 in-depth review.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Country for review</i>
2017	Armenia, ^a Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, ^b European Union, Georgia, Kazakhstan, ^a Liechtenstein, Malta, Monaco and Montenegro
2018	Albania, ^b Finland and Kyrgyzstan ^a

^a Party did not submit a complete emission inventory in standard format and/or did not submit an IIR within the last three years.

^b Party did not submit either inventory data or an IIR within the last three years

27. The 2013, 2014 and 2015 stage 3 in-depth reviews took place at the European Environment Agency in Copenhagen in June. For details, see previous CEIP Status reports to the EMEP Steering Body and the country reports which are available online.¹⁸ The feedback during the meetings of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections indicates that inventory compilers consider the in-depth reviews useful and recommend continuing them.

28. The in-depth review plan for 2016 has been modified. The changes were agreed during the joint meeting of the Bureaux of the EMEP Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects in March 2016. Ten countries were reviewed (Estonia, Iceland, Luxembourg, Russian Federation, Serbia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United Kingdom). A total of 20 experts accepted the invitation to join the centralized review 2016: 3 each from Germany and the United Kingdom; 2 each from the European Union, Latvia and the Netherlands; and 1 each from Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France and Spain.

IV. Review of submitted adjustment applications

29. Two Parties, Germany and Luxembourg,¹⁹ submitted new adjustment applications in 2016 to the ECE secretariat. Seven parties (Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Finland, France, Luxembourg and Spain) submitted annex VII with adjustments approved in 2014 and/or in 2015. CEIP developed a website tool²⁰ where all information submitted by Parties can be easily compared. All submitted applications, both new and already approved, have been reviewed by the expert review team. The activity was covered by EMEP mandatory contributions. Detailed information on the review process and findings is provided in a special status report on adjustments.

V. Development of a new gridding system

30. CEIP began implementation of the new gridding system in higher spatial resolution (0.1° x 0.1°) in 2013 and is continuing the work in 2016. Gridded NO_x, NMVOC, NH₃, SO_x, CO, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀ and PM_{coarse} emissions on GNFR14 sector level for 2014 were provided to the EMEP modellers on 2 May 2016. Gridded data in the 0.1° x 0.1° resolution and on GNFR14 sector level is also available for the years 2011, 2012 and 2013. So far only Spain, Switzerland and the United Kingdom have reported gridded data in the new format on a voluntary basis.

¹⁸ See http://www.ceip.at/review_results/stage3_country_reports.

¹⁹ See http://www.ceip.at/adjustments_gp.

²⁰ See <http://webdab.umweltbundesamt.at/cgi-bin/adj.pl>.

31. CEIP did a detailed comparison of gridded emissions from the old gridding system in 50 x 50 km² resolution with gridded emissions from the new gridding system in 0.1° x 0.1° resolution on national total level. The comparison results are available on the CEIP website.²¹

32. Further, a comparison of gridded emissions with E-PRTR point sources and also with selected surrogate data, like roads or land use data, is planned. This procedure is extremely time-consuming and the scope will be limited by the available budget.

33. The production of gridded data in higher resolution requires a huge increase of annual gap-filling and gridding work for CEIP and to do this in the limited space between the submission of data (15 March) and the deadline for the production of gridded data (beginning of May) is a big challenge.

VI. Conclusions

34. *Timeliness and completeness:* In 2016, 45 Parties submitted their inventories. The completeness of information on the main pollutants, main heavy metals and PM emissions is reasonable for the European region, but information provided to CEIP covers less than 50 per cent of the extended EMEP area. The persisting problem with data completeness and quality could not be resolved. However, some improvements in emission reporting have been observed in Parties that profited from the capacity-building activities enabled through ECE grants (i.e., Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan). ECE should consider continuation of the capacity-building programme and awareness-raising in countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, and in the Western Balkan countries.

35. *Failure to report:* Countries such as Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Greece and Montenegro have not reported emission data to CEIP within the past three or more years.

36. *Gridded data and large point sources:* Information reported to CEIP on gridded and large point source data is rather limited in spite of the fact that such information is in many cases available at country level.²² The total number of countries that submitted 2010 gridded sectoral data is still 30, and corresponds to 59 per cent of Parties.

37. *Recalculations of emissions:* Review of submitted inventories identifies significant recalculations every year. This fact seems to indicate relatively high uncertainty of emission estimates on the sectoral/country level. Furthermore, it is observed that Parties do not use Tier 2 methods for all identified key categories. Some Parties indicated that resources are a limiting factor for the development of more robust inventories.

38. *Stage 3 in-depth reviews:* CEIP successfully organized the Stage 3 review 2016, reviewing 10 countries. The country reports will be published prior to the second joint session of the EMEP Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects in September 2016. Parties clearly recognize the value of the review process in terms of improving the quality of their national inventories, but difficulties are regularly encountered when EMEP requests complete inventory data and relevant explanatory information in a transparent format.

²¹ See http://www.ceip.at/new_emep-grid/grid_comparisons.

²² For example, information on facilities reported by countries under the E-PRTR or European Union directives (i.e., Directive 2008/1/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 January 2008 concerning integrated pollution prevention and control; and Directive 2001/80/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2001 on the limitation of emissions of certain pollutants into the air from large combustion plants).

39. *Review of adjustment applications.* The assessment of adjustment applications was organized in line with the Executive Body decisions 2012/2, 2012/13 and 2014/1. Details on the process and findings are provided in separate report (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2016/10–ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2016/18).

40. A persisting key constraint for both reviews is the limited number of nominations to the roster of review experts. The number of experts has almost doubled compared with 2010, but a pool of 88 experts (from 22 countries) is still not sufficient for a sustainable review process. Each year a subset of these experts cannot accept the invitation due to technical reasons or lack of resources. EMEP may wish to consider how to financially support²³ the participation in the review process of experts from Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and Balkan countries.

41. *The new gridding system:* A new gridding system (higher resolution of 0.1°×0.1° longitude-latitude, geographic coordinate system WGS84 and the use of 13 GNFR sectors) is available, but needs to be adjusted and updated every few years. The production of gridded data in higher resolution requires a huge increase of annual gap-filling and gridding work for CEIP and to do this in the limited space between the submission of data (15 March for inventory data and 1 May for gridded data) and the deadline for the production of gridded data (beginning of May) is a big challenge.

42. To increase reliability of emission data, it is extremely important that from 2017 onwards Parties start to report gridded data in the new system in line with the revised Reporting Guidelines.

²³ From 2010 to 2012, the European Environment Agency covered travel costs of seven experts (from the Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Kazakhstan and Latvia) and two trainees (from Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) to enable their participation in stage 3 reviews.

Annex

Status of emission reporting as of 10 June 2016

<i>Party</i>	<i>Submission date</i>	<i>Resubmission date</i>	<i>NFR template</i>	<i>IIR 2014</i>	<i>Notification form</i>	<i>New Application</i>	<i>Annex VII</i>
Albania							
Armenia	19.02.2016		2008-1		x		
Austria	15.02.2016		2014-2	x	x		
Azerbaijan	09.02.2016	15.03.2016	2014-1	x	x		
Belarus							
Belgium	15.02.2016	04.04.2016	2014-1	x	x		x
Bosnia and Herzegovina							
Bulgaria	15.02.2016	07.04.2016	2014-1	x	x		
Canada	15.02.2016		2014-1	x	x		
Croatia	15.02.2016	15.03.2016	2014-1	x			
Cyprus	15.02.2016	17.03.2016	2014-2	x	x		
Czech Republic	16.02.2016	05.05.2016	2014-2	x	x		
Denmark	15.02.2016		2014-1	x	x		x
Estonia	12.02.2016	15.03.2016	2014-2	x	x		
European Union	28.04.2016		2014-2	x	x		
Finland	15.02.2016	15.03.2016	2014-1	x	x		x
France	12.02.2016		2014-2	x	x		x
Georgia	19.02.2016	29.03.2016	2014-1	x	x		
Germany	10.02.2016		2014-2	x	x	x	x
Greece							
Hungary	15.02.2016	29.02.2016	2014-1	x	x		
Iceland	11.02.2016		2014-1	x	x		
Ireland	15.02.2016	13.05.2016	2014-2		x		
Italy	15.02.2016	15.03.2016	2014-1	x	x		
Kazakhstan	15.02.2016		2014-1	x	x		
Kyrgyzstan	15.02.2016		2009-1				
Latvia	12.02.2016	06.05.2016	2014-2	x	x		

<i>Party</i>	<i>Submission date</i>	<i>Resubmission date</i>	<i>NFR template</i>	<i>IIR 2014</i>	<i>Notification form</i>	<i>New Application</i>	<i>Annex VII</i>
Liechtenstein	15.02.2016	22.02.2016	2004-1		x		
Lithuania	15.02.2016		2014-1	x	x		
Luxembourg	16.02.2016	15.03.2016	2014-2	x	x	x	x
Malta	01.02.2016		2014-1				
Monaco							
Montenegro							
Netherlands	15.02.2016		2014-1	x			
Norway	15.02.2016	14.03.2016	2014-2	x	x		
Poland	05.02.2016		2014-1	x	x		
Portugal	15.02.2016	15.03.2016	2014-1	x	x		
Republic of Moldova	15.02.2016	19.02.2016	2014-2	x	x		
Romania	15.02.2016	15.03.2016	2014-1	x	x		
Russian Federation	03.03.2016		2014-2	x	x		
Serbia	11.02.2016		2014-1	x	x		
Slovakia	16.02.2016	15.03.2016	2014-2	x	x		
Slovenia	11.02.2016		2014-2	x	x		
Spain	15.02.2016	14.03.2016	2014-2	x	x		x
Sweden	12.02.2016	24.02.2016	2014-1	x	x		
Switzerland	10.02.2016		2014-2	x	x		
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	15.02.2016	06.04.2016	2014-1	x	x		
Turkey	15.02.2016		2014-1	x	x		
Ukraine	15.02.2016		2014-2				
United Kingdom	15.02.2016	14.03.2016	2014-2	x	x		
United States	03.03.2016		2014-2	x	x		