



Ricardo
Energy & Environment

Aether

Review of National Air Pollutant Projections and Assessment of National Air Pollution Control Programmes – Appendix B

Risk of non-compliance: Appendix B to the Horizontal Review Report for
European Commission – DG Environment
070201/2018/791186/SER/ENV.C.3

Customer:

European Commission - DG Environment

Customer reference:

070201/2018/791186/SER/ENV.C.3

Confidentiality, copyright & reproduction:

This report is the Copyright of European Commission. This document has been prepared by Ricardo Energy & Environment, a trading name of Ricardo-AEA Ltd under contract 070201/2018/791186/SER/ENV.C.3 dated 29/11/2018 for the European Commission. However, it reflects the views only of the authors, and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein. The contents of this report may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, nor passed to any organisation or person without the specific prior written permission of European Commission. Ricardo Energy & Environment accepts no liability whatsoever to any third party for any loss or damage arising from any interpretation or use of the information contained in this report, or reliance on any views expressed therein, other than the liability that is agreed in the said contract

Contact:

Natalia Anderson
Ricardo Energy & Environment
Gemini Building, Harwell, Didcot, OX11 0QR,
United Kingdom

t: +44 (0) 1235 75 3055

e: natalia.anderson@ricardo.com

Ricardo is certificated to ISO9001, ISO14001
and OHSAS18001

Author:

Natalia Anderson

Approved By:

Chris Green

Date:

08 June 2020

Ricardo Energy & Environment reference:

Ref: ED11495 - Issue Number 3

Contents

A.1	Austria	3
A.2	Belgium.....	5
A.3	Bulgaria	7
A.4	Cyprus	9
A.5	Czechia.....	11
A.6	Germany.....	13
A.7	Denmark.....	15
A.8	Estonia.....	17
A.9	Greece.....	19
A.10	Spain	20
A.11	Finland.....	22
A.12	France	24
A.13	Croatia	26
A.14	Hungary.....	28
A.15	Ireland.....	29
A.16	Italy (draft NAPCP).....	31
A.17	Lithuania	33
A.18	Luxembourg.....	35
A.19	Latvia (draft NAPCP).....	36
A.20	Malta.....	38
A.21	Netherlands	39
A.22	Poland	41
A.23	Portugal	43
A.24	Romania	45
A.25	Sweden.....	46
A.26	Slovenia.....	48
A.27	Slovakia	50
A.28	United Kingdom.....	51

A.1 Austria

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	Yes	Yes	Partially	Yes	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	n/a	Yes	n/a	No	Yes
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (28)	Yes (20)	Yes (10)	No (-12)	Yes (16)
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	M	H	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review concluded that there is a high risk of non-compliance with the NH₃ emission reduction commitment for 2020-2029. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austria projecting to miss its 2020-29 emission reduction commitment for NH₃ by 12% under WM scenario. • Austria not including a WAM scenario with projections submitted under Article 10(2). • Estimated emission reductions are not presented in the NAPCP for 2020-29 for the PaMs adopted that target NH₃ emission reductions. 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	NR	<i>NR</i>	NR	NR
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	Yes	Yes	Partially	Yes	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption (WAM)?	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	Yes	<i>n/a</i>	No	Yes
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (11)	No (-4)	No (1)	No (-30)	No (-1)
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Risk of non-compliance		L	H	M	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review concluded that there is a high risk of non-compliance with the NO_x, NH₃ and PM_{2.5} emission reduction commitments for 2030. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Austria projecting to miss its 2030 emission reduction commitments under the WM scenario Austria not including a WAM scenario with projections submitted under Article 10(2). <p>Austria has reported projections under a WAM scenario for NO_x, NH₃ and PM_{2.5} as part of its NAPCP. According to the NAPCP projections, under a WAM scenario, Austria is projected to meet the 2030 NO_x and PM_{2.5} with a margin of compliance of 1 and 3 percentage points, respectively. For NH₃, it is projected to miss the commitment. The PaMs presented in the NAPCP are credible for NO_x and PM_{2.5}, but not for NH₃.</p>					

A.2 Belgium

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (47)	Yes (16)	Yes (25)	No (4)	Yes (22)
	WAM	Yes (52)	Yes (17)	Yes (25)	No (4)	Yes (22)
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	L	M	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	The review has concluded that Belgium is not at high risk of missing any of the emission reduction commitments for 2020-2029.					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	Partially	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (19)	Yes (16)	No (5)	No (-2)	Yes (7)
	WAM	Yes (32)	Yes (23)	Yes (10)	Yes (7)	Yes (20)
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	L	M	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	The review has concluded that Belgium is not at high risk of missing any of the emission reduction commitments for 2030 onwards.					

A.3 Bulgaria

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	No	No	No	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Partially	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	Yes
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (53)	No (10)	No (-6)	No (8)	No (-17)
	WAM	Yes (54)	No (13)	No (3)	No (10)	Yes (10)
Risk of non-compliance		M	H	H	H	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Bulgaria is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitment for NO_x, NMVOC and NH₃ for 2020-2029. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major improvements to the projection's methodologies recommended in the review. Compliance projected by a margin lower than 20%. 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	No	No	No
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	No	No	No	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Yes	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	Yes
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (10)	No (-11)	No (-19)	No (-3)	No (-1)
	WAM	Yes (11)	No (3)	No (1)	No (4)	Yes (57)
Risk of non-compliance		L	H	H	H	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Bulgaria is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitment for NO_x, NMVOC and NH₃ for 2030. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major improvements to the projection's methodologies recommended in the review. Compliance projected by a margin lower than 20%. 					

A.4 Cyprus

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	Yes	Partially	Partially	Yes	No
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (45)	No (1)	No (5)	Yes (28)	Yes (24)
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Risk of non-compliance		L	M	M	L	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	The review has concluded that Cyprus is not at a high-risk of non-compliance with any of the emission reduction commitments for 2020-2029.					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Partially	Partially	Yes	No
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption (WAM)?	WAM	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (50)	Yes (18)	No (5)	Yes (22)	No (0)
	WAM	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Risk of non-compliance		M	L	M	L	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Cyprus is at a high-risk of non-compliance with PM_{2.5} emission reduction commitment for 2030 and onwards. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PM_{2.5} projections requiring major improvements due to missing emission sources. Exact compliance with emission reduction commitment (with no margin). No additional PaMs selected for adoption in the NAPCP. <p>It is noted however that Cyprus states that it will adopt additional PaMs under the NECP by December 2019. These PaMs are expected to contribute further to emission reductions of NECD pollutants. These emission reductions were excluded from the air pollutant emission projections reported by Cyprus, as they were in draft at the time of the NAPCP submission.</p>					

A.5 Czechia

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOG	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	No	No	No	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (29)	No (15)	No (16)	No (8)	Yes (23)
	WAM	Yes (29)	No (15)	No (16)	No (8)	Yes (23)
Risk of non-compliance		L	H	H	H	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Czechia is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitment for NO_x, NMVOG and NH₃ for 2020-2029. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projection's methodologies found to require major improvements • Compliance projected by a margin lower than 20%. 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOG	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State meet the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	No	No	No	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (16)	No (-7)	No (-12)	No (-19)	No (1)
	WAM	Yes (24)	No (3)	No (0)	No (6)	Yes (29)
Risk of non-compliance		L	H	H	H	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Czechia is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitment for NO_x, NMVOG and NH₃ for 2030. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projection’s methodologies found to require major improvements • Lack of credibility of additional PaMs selected to tackle NO_x and NMVOG emissions. • Compliance projected by a margin lower than 20%. 					

A.6 Germany

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partially	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partially	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (19)	Yes (1)	Yes (18)	No (-3)	Yes (9)
	WAM	Yes (29)	Yes (7)	Yes (18)	No (-3)	Yes (11)
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	L	H	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Germany is at a high-risk of non-compliance with the NH₃ emission reduction commitment for 2020 - 2029. This is driven by Germany projecting to miss this emission reduction commitment according to their projections submitted under Article 10(2) under both WM and WAM scenarios.</p> <p>However, for the projections used in the NAPCP, Germany applies an adjustment for NH₃ emissions under the WAM scenario to exclude emissions from plant residue for the 2020 emission reduction projection. With the adjustment applied, Germany is projecting to achieve the NH₃ commitment by 3 percentage points – if applied to the projections submitted under Article 10(2), the risk of non-compliance would be medium rather than high.</p>					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No	No	Yes	No	No
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partially	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption (WAM)?	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partially
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (-16)	No (-18)	Yes (3)	No (-28)	No (-4)
	WAM	Yes (19)	No (1)	No (4)	No (2)	No (2)
Risk of non-compliance		L	M	M	M	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Germany is at a medium risk of non-compliance with NO_x, NMVOC, NH₃ and PM_{2.5} emission reduction commitment for 2030 and onwards. This is driven by the low margin of projected compliance under the WAM scenario.</p> <p>For NH₃, this is also driven by a need for minor improvements identified in the review for the NH₃ emission projections.</p> <p>For PM_{2.5}, this is also driven by a potential implementation issue for the retention of regulation for solid fuel boilers may affect the likelihood with which the projected emissions will be achieved.</p>					

A.7 Denmark

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Partially	Yes	Partially	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Partially	Yes	n/a	No	Partially
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (37)	Yes (5)	Yes (11)	No (-8)	No (-8)
	WAM	Yes (39)	Yes (8)	Yes (11)	No (-8)	No (-7)
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	L	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	The review has concluded that Denmark is at a high-risk of non-compliance with NH ₃ and PM _{2.5} emission reduction commitment for 2020-2029. This is driven by Denmark projecting to miss these emission reduction commitments according to their projections and WM and WAM scenarios in the NAPCP (despite introducing additional PaMs).					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Partially	Yes	Partially	Partially
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Partially	Yes	n/a	No	Partially
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (-14)	No (2)	Yes (13)	No (-7)	No (-32)
	WAM	No (2)	Yes (11)	Yes (14)	No (-7)	No (-29)
Risk of non-compliance		H	L	L	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Denmark is at a high-risk of non-compliance with SO₂, NH₃ and PM_{2.5} emission reduction commitments for 2030 and onwards.</p> <p>For SO₂ this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emission reductions from additional PaMs selected for adoption in the NAPCP to reduce SO₂ emissions not being quantified. No PaMs were selected for adoption in the main sectors emitting SO₂. Low margin of projected compliance <p>For NH₃ and PM_{2.5} this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denmark projecting to miss these emission reduction commitments according to their projections and WM and WAM scenarios in the NAPCP (despite adopting additional PaMs). 					

A.8 Estonia

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	Partially	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Partially	Partially	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	No	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (56)	Yes (8)	Yes (21)	No (-8)	Yes (47)
	WAM	Yes (57)	Yes (7)	Yes (22)	No (-7)	Yes (47)
Risk of non-compliance		M	M	M	H	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Estonia is at a high-risk of non-compliance with NH₃ emission reduction commitments for 2020-2029. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estonia projecting to miss this emission reduction commitment according to their WM projections. No PaMs selected for adoption (PaMs targeting NH₃ emission reductions from the agriculture sector are considered but not adopted). Also according to their hypothetical WAM projections (which includes additional PaMs considered but not adopted), Estonia is projecting to miss this emission reduction commitment. 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	Partially	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Partially	Yes	<i>Partially</i>	Partially
	WAM	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (51)	No (1)	No (1)	No (-18)	Yes (27)
	WAM	Yes (56)	Yes (18)	Yes (9)	No (-3)	Yes (35)
Risk of non-compliance		L	M	L	H	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Estonia is at a high-risk of non-compliance with NH₃ emission reduction commitments for 2030 onwards. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estonia projecting to miss this emission reduction commitment according to their WM projections. No PaMs selected for adoption (PaMs targeting NH₃ emission reductions from the agriculture sector are considered but not adopted). Also according to their hypothetical WAM projections (which includes additional PaMs considered), Estonia is projecting to miss this emission reduction commitment. 					

A.9 Greece

NAPCP was not reported to the European Commission by the time of submission of this report.

A.10 Spain

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Partially	Partially	Partially	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partially	Yes
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (48)	Yes (6)	No (5)	No (2)	Yes (7)
	WAM	Yes (49)	Yes (9)	No (5)	No (2)	Yes (7)
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	M	M	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	The review has concluded that Spain is not at a high risk of missing any of the emission reduction commitments for 2020-2029.					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No	No	No	No	No
	WAM	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Yes	Yes	<i>Partially</i>	Partially	Yes
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	<i>No (-14)</i>	<i>No (-29)</i>	<i>No (-22)</i>	<i>No (-14)</i>	<i>No (-40)</i>
	WAM	Yes (32)	Yes (10)	<i>No (-15)</i>	Yes (6)	No (1)
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	H	M	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Spain is at a high risk of missing emission reduction commitments for NMVOC for 2030 onwards. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spain projecting to miss the emission reduction commitment under both WM and WAM scenarios. 					

A.11 Finland

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (39)	Yes (16)	Yes (17)	No (1)	Yes (9)
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Risk of non-compliance		M	M	M	H	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Finland is at a high risk of missing the emission reduction commitment for NH₃ for 2020-2029. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projections methodology found to need minor improvements • Minor inconsistencies between the projections reported under Article 10(2) and those presented in the NAPCP • No additional PaMs selected for adoption, despite a small projected margin of compliance 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption (WAM)?	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (47)	Yes(27)	No (3)	Yes (6)	Yes (16)
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Risk of non-compliance		M	M	H	M	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Finland is at a high risk of missing the emission reduction commitment for NMVOC for 2030 onwards. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projections methodology found to need minor improvements • Minor inconsistencies between the projections reported under Article 10(2) and those presented in the NAPCP • Small projected margin of compliance (lower than 5%) 					

A.12 France

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Partially	Partially	Yes	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Partially	No	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially
	WAM	<i>Partially</i>	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially	<i>Partially</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	No	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	No	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (47)	No (-3)	Yes (13)	No (-3)	Yes (22)
	WAM	Yes (53)	Yes (6)	Yes (12)	No (0)	Yes (22)
Risk of non-compliance		M	M	M	H	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that there is a high-risk of non-compliance with the 2020-29 emission reduction commitment for NH₃. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistency between the projections reported under Article 10(2) and the NAPCP • PaMs aimed at reducing emissions of this pollutant being judged in the review as not credible. 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Partially	Partially	Yes	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	No	No	No	Partially	No
	WAM	No	Partially	No	Partially	Partially
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	No	Partially	Partially	No	Partially
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (4)	No (-10)	Yes (6)	No (-7)	Yes (2)
	WAM	Yes (31)	Yes (16)	Yes (8)	No (3)	No (0)
Risk of non-compliance		M	M	M	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that there is a high-risk of noncompliance with the 2030 onwards emission reduction commitment for NH₃ and PM_{2.5}.</p> <p>For NH₃ this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistency between the projections reported under Article 10(2) and the NAPCP PaMs aimed at reducing emissions of this pollutant being judged in the review as not credible. <p>For PM_{2.5} this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projections methodologies found in the review to require minor improvements Inconsistency between the projections reported under Article 10(2) and the NAPCP Compliance under WAM scenario projected to be achieved exactly, with no margin. 					

A.13 Croatia

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	Partially	No	No	No
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	No	No	No	No	No
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (62)	Yes (25)	Yes (26)	Yes (29)	Yes (45)
	WAM	Yes (72)	Yes (25)	Yes (28)	Yes (31)	Yes (45)
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	M	M	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	The review has concluded that Croatia is not at a high risk of missing any emission reduction commitments for 2020-2029. Despite major improvements recommended to the projection's methodologies for NMVOC, NH ₃ and PM _{2.5} , there is a large margin of compliance projected which is judged to reduce the risk of non-compliance.					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	Partially	No	No	No
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>No</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (6)	No (2)	No (14)	No (0)	No (16)
	WAM	Yes (35)	Yes (10)	Yes (25)	Yes (25)	Yes (28)
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	M	M	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	The review has concluded that Croatia is not at a high risk of missing any emission reduction commitments for 2030. As is reported in relation to the 2020-29 emission reduction commitments, there is a large margin of compliance projected which is judged to reduce the risk of non-compliance.					

A.14 Hungary

Not assessed as the NAPCP was submitted too late for inclusion in. this report.

A.15 Ireland

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partially	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	No	No	Partially	Partially	No
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (46)	Yes (14)	No (-18)	No (-9)	Yes (29)
	WAM	Yes (46)	Yes (15)	No (-18)	No (-9)	Yes (28)
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	H	H	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	The review has concluded that there is a high risk of missing the emission reduction commitments for 2020-2029 for NMVOC and NH ₃ . This is driven by the Member State projecting to miss the emission reduction commitment under WAM scenario and the large compliance gap projected.					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No	No	No	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partially	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption (WAM)?	WAM	Partially	No	No	No	No
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (-3)	No (-17)	No (-35)	No (-20)	Yes (13)
	WAM	Yes (30)	No (-4)	No (-34)	No (-19)	Yes (17)
Risk of non-compliance		M	H	H	H	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	The review has concluded there is a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitments for 2030 for NO _x , NMVOC and NH ₃ . This is driven by the Member State projecting to miss the emission reduction commitment under WAM scenario and the large compliance gap projected (whereby NH ₃ even follows an upwards trajectory). The PaM selected to reduce SO ₂ emissions is not well described and so it is not possible to determine its credibility.					

A.16 Italy (draft NAPCP)

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	No	No	No	No	No
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (43)	No (5)	No (-4)	No (2)	No (8)
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Risk of non-compliance		M	H	H	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review concluded that there is a high risk of non-compliance with the NO_x, NMVOC, NH₃ and PM_{2.5} emission reduction commitment for 2020-2029. For all pollutants, this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projections methodology found to need major improvements • Margins of compliance with emission reduction commitments lower than 20%. • Lack of WAM scenario submitted with Article 10(2) projections (for NMVOC where non-compliance under the WM scenario is reported) 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	No	No	No
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	No	No	No	No	No
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption (WAM)?	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (9)	No (-7)	No (-10)	No (-5)	No (-12)
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Risk of non-compliance		H	H	H	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review concluded that there is a high risk of non-compliance with all emission reduction commitment for 2030 onwards. For all pollutants, this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projections methodology found to need major improvements • Margins of compliance with emission reduction commitments lower than 20%. • Lack of WAM scenario submitted with Article 10(2) projections (for NO_x, NMVOC, NH₃ and PM_{2.5}) 					

A.17 Lithuania

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially	Partially	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	No	<i>No</i>	No	<i>No</i>	No
	WAM	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	No	<i>No</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (28)	No (-50)	Yes (3)	No (-1)	Yes (7)
	WAM	Yes (28)	No (-47)	No (5)	Yes (7)	Yes (14)
Risk of non-compliance		M	H	H	M	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Lithuania is at a high risk of missing the emission reduction commitment for NO_x and NMVOC for 2020-2029.</p> <p>For NO_x this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lithuania projecting non-compliance with the commitment under WM and WAM scenarios in the projections reported under Article 10(2). <p>For NMVOC this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistency between the projections included in the NAPCP and submitted under Article 10(2). Lithuania projects compliance under WAM scenario in the projections reported under Article 10(2) but projecting non-compliance under the WAM scenario presented in the NAPCP. Margin of projected compliance lower than 5 percent. 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	No	No	No
	WAM	Yes	No	No	No	No
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	No	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
	WAM	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (17)	No (-61)	No (-26)	No (-8)	No (-14)
	WAM	Yes (18)	No (-60)	No (-25)	No (-2)	No (-14)
Risk of non-compliance		M	H	H	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	The review has concluded that Lithuania is at a high risk of missing the emission reduction commitment for NO _x , NMVOC, NH ₃ and PM _{2.5} for 2030 onwards. This is driven by Lithuania projecting to miss the emission reduction commitments for these pollutants according to the WM and WAM scenarios in the latest set of projections reported under Article 10(2).					

A.18 Luxembourg

Not assessed as the draft NAPCP had not been formally published and released on CDR by the time of this report.

A.19 Latvia (draft NAPCP¹)

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	n/a ²	Yes	n/a*	Yes	n/a*
	WAM	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*	n/a
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Yes	<i>Partially</i>	Yes	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (43)	No (-20)	Yes (6)	No (-13)	Yes (19)
	WAM	Yes (37)	No (-11)	Yes (8)	No (-6)	Yes (23)
Risk of non-compliance		L	H	L	H	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Latvia is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitments for NO_x and NH₃ for 2020-2029. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected non-compliance for the two pollutants under both WM and WAM scenarios. 					

¹ The final NAPCP was submitted too late for inclusion in this report.

² Latvia has provided draft NAPCP and Article 10(2) projections. However, the NAPCP projections are presented in histograms with no data labels and the precise emission levels are difficult to read. Therefore, assessment of the consistency of the two projections sets has been performed only in the instances where an indication of the emission level or margin of compliance has been provided within the text of the NAPCP.

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
	WAM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes** ³	Yes**	Yes**	Yes**	Yes**
	WAM	Yes**	Yes**	Yes**	Yes**	Yes**
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Yes	Partially	Yes	Partially	Partially
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (4)	No (-10)	No (4)	No (-20)	No (-8)
	WAM	Yes (8)	No (3)	Yes (7)	No (2)	Yes (22)
Risk of non-compliance		L	H	L	H	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Latvia is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitments for NO_x and NH₃ for 2030 onwards. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projections methodologies found to require minor improvements. • Issues with the credibility of the PaMs aimed at reducing emissions of these pollutants. • Compliance projected by a margin lower than 5 percent. 					

³ An assessment of consistency between the Article 10(2) projections and the draft NAPCP projections has been possible in all instances under the WAM scenario since Latvia has provided indication of the emission level or margin of compliance has been provided within the text of the draft NAPCP.

A.20 Malta

Assessment of the NAPCP was ongoing at the time of finalisation of this report.

A.21 Netherlands

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOc	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	Partially	No	Partially	No	No
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Yes	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Yes
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (38)	No (17)	Yes (19)	No (11)	Yes (28)
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Risk of non-compliance		L	H	M	H	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that the Netherlands is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitment for NO_x and NH₃ for 2020-2029. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projections methodology found to need major improvements • Compliance projected by a margin lower than 20%. 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	n/a	Yes	Yes	n/a	n/a
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	Partially	No	Partially	No	No
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Partially	Partially	Yes	Partially
	WAM	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (1)	No (7)	Yes (10)	No (10)	No (14)
	WAM	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Risk of non-compliance		M	H	M	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that the Netherlands is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitment for NO_x, NH₃ and PM_{2.5} for 2030 onwards. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projections methodology found to need major improvements • Compliance projected by a margin lower than 20%. 					

A.22 Poland

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	No	No	No	No	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	No	No	Yes	Partially
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Partially	Partially	Partially	n/a	n/a
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (-13)	No (-6)	No (-10)	No (4)	Yes (12)
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Risk of non-compliance		H	H	H	H	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review concluded that Poland is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitment for 2020-2029 for SO₂, NO_x, NMVOC and NH₃.</p> <p>For SO₂, NO_x and NMVOC this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poland projecting to miss its 2020-29 emission reduction commitments for these pollutants under WM scenario. Poland not including a WAM scenario with projections submitted under Article 10(2) which would demonstrate attainment of emission reduction commitments. <p>For NH₃ the high-risk score is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projections methodology found to need major improvements Margin of compliance lower than 20 percent. 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	No	No	No	No	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	No	No	Yes	Partially
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption (WAM)?	WAM	Partially	n/a	n/a	Partially	Partially
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (-8)	No (5)	No (4)	No(-19)	No(-28)
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Risk of non-compliance		H	H	H	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Poland is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitments for all pollutants for 2030 onwards.</p> <p>For SO₂, NH₃ and PM_{2.5} this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poland projecting to miss its 2020-29 emission reduction commitments for these pollutants under WM scenario Poland not including a WAM scenario with projections submitted under Article 10(2) which would demonstrate attainment of emission reduction commitments <p>For NO_x and NMVOC this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projections methodology found to need major improvements Margin of compliance lower than 20 percent. 					

A.23 Portugal

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	No	No	No	No	No
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (54)	No (16)	No (8)	No (8)	Yes (21)
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Risk of non-compliance		M	H	H	H	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Portugal is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitments for NO_x, NMVOC and NH₃ for 2020-2029. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The projection's methodologies found to require major improvements • Compliance margins are less than 20% 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	No	No	No	No	No
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	<i>No</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>No</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>No</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (10)	No (10)	No (-6)	No (2)	No (-25)
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Risk of non-compliance		H	H	H	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Portugal is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitments for all pollutants for 2030 onwards. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The projection's methodologies found to require major improvements • Portugal projecting non-compliance under WM scenario and not providing WAM scenario (for NMVOC and PM_{2.5}) • Margins of compliance are lower than 20% (for SO₂, NO_x and NH₃). 					

A.24 Romania

NAPCP was not reported to the European Commission by the time of finalisation of this report.

A.25 Sweden

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	Partially	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	Partially	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (35)	Yes (13)	Yes (16)	No (-2)	Yes (23)
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Risk of non-compliance		L	L	L	H	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Sweden is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitments for NH₃ for 2020-2029. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sweden projecting to miss the commitment according to the WM projections submitted under Article 10(2). Sweden not reporting a WAM scenario with their Article 10(2) projections Furthermore, the compliance margin projected in the NAPCP is low (0 percentage points). 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NMVOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM, WAM	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Yes	<i>Partially</i>	Yes	<i>Partially</i>	Yes
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (36)	<i>No (-21)</i>	Yes (8)	<i>No (0)</i>	Yes (30)
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Risk of non-compliance		L	H	L	H	L
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Sweden is at a high risk of non-compliance with the 2030 onwards emission reduction commitments for NO_x and NH₃. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sweden is projecting to miss the commitments according to the projections submitted under Article 10(2). Note that the NH₃ commitment is projected to be missed by 0.04 kt according to the projections submitted under Article 10(2). The projections used in the NAPCP are not presented with decimal points and so the same risk of non-compliance is not apparent according to the NAPCP projections. 					

A.26 Slovenia

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM ₂ VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	No	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Partially	No	Partially	Partially	Partially
	WAM	n/a	NR	n/a	n/a	NR
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	n/a	No	n/a	n/a	n/a
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (67)	No (-1)	Yes (12)	Yes (8)	Yes (11)
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Risk of non-compliance		M	H	M	M	M
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Slovenia is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitments for NO_x for 2020-2029. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slovenia projecting non-compliance with the NO_x emission reduction commitment under the WM scenario submitted under Article 10(2) Lack of WAM scenario demonstrating how the commitment will be achieved. 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	No	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	No	Yes	Partially	Partially	Partially
	WAM	NR	n/a	NR	n/a	NR
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	n/a	No	No	n/a	No
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (-6)	No (2)	No (-35)	No (2)	No (-4)
	WAM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Risk of non-compliance		H	M	H	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that Slovenia is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitments for SO₂, NMVOC, NH₃ and PM_{2.5} for 2030 onwards.</p> <p>For SO₂, NMVOC and PM_{2.5} this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slovenia projecting to miss the emission reduction commitment according to the projections submitted under Article 10(2) under WM scenario Lack of WAM scenario demonstrating how the commitment will be achieved. <p>For NH₃, this is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor improvements to the projection's methodology recommended in the review. Minor inconsistencies between the projections reported under Article 10(2) and those presented in the NAPCP. Small margin of compliance with the emission reduction commitment. 					

A.27 Slovakia

Assessment of the NAPCP was ongoing at the time of finalisation of this report.

A.28 United Kingdom

Risk of non-compliance with 2020-2029 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2020 – 2029				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	Partially	Partially	Partially	Yes	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	Partially	Partially	Partially	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	Yes (59)	Yes (7)	Yes (7)	No (-11)	No (-11)
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Risk of non-compliance		M	M	M	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that the UK is at a high risk of non-compliance with the emission reduction commitments for NH₃ and PM_{2.5} for 2020-2029. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UK projecting non-compliance with emission reduction commitments for these pollutants under the WM scenario; • The UK not providing a WAM scenario with Article 10(2) projections to demonstrate how emission reduction commitments can be achieved with additional measures 					

Risk of non-compliance with 2030 emission reduction commitments

Decision tree question	Relevant scenario	2030 onwards				
		SO ₂	NO _x	NM VOC	NH ₃	PM _{2.5}
Can the Member State achieve the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No	No	No	No	No
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Are the projections submitted under Article 10(2) considered to be of good quality?	WM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	Yes	Yes
Are the NAPCP projections consistent with the latest projections submitted under Article 10(2)?	WM	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
	WAM	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Does the NAPCP present credible additional PaMs selected for adoption?	WAM	Yes	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Partially</i>
Is the margin of compliance (percent of the compliance threshold) likely to ensure compliance with the emission reduction commitments? (projections submitted under Article 10(2))	WM	No (-11)	No (-19)	No (-3)	No (-21)	No(-37)
	WAM	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Risk of non-compliance		H	H	H	H	H
Additional comments on high risk scores	<p>The review has concluded that the UK is at a high risk of non-compliance with the 2030 onwards emission reduction commitments for all pollutants. This is driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UK projecting non-compliance with emission reduction commitments for these pollutants under the WM scenario; • The UK not providing a WAM scenario with Article 10(2) projections to demonstrate how emission reduction commitments can be achieved with additional measures 					

