



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
6 July 2015

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

First joint session*

Geneva, 14–18 September 2015

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 development of a 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 2014–2015 workplan for the implementation of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (ECE/EB.AIR/122/Add.2, items 1.3, 1.4, 1.7, 3.1 and 3.2).

The report reflects progress in emissions reporting under the Convention in the 2015 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-

* 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 present document is being issued without formal editing.

GE.15-11306 (E)



* 1 5 1 1 3 0 6 *

Please recycle The universal recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



range Transboundary Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe, and presents the outcome of the stage 3 in-depth reviews of national inventories in 2015 and the plans for 2016–2018.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1–3	4
I. Present state of emission data (workplan items 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 3.1, 3.2).....	4–17	4
II. Emission data for modellers (workplan item 1.4.4)	18–23	6
III. Technical review of inventories (workplan item 1.4.3).....	24–30	7
IV. Review of submitted adjustment applications (workplan item 1.7.1)	31	8
V. Development of a new gridding system (workplan item 1.3.1)	32–35	8
VI. Conclusions	36–43	9
Annex		
Status of emission reporting as of 8 June 2015		11

Introduction

1. The present report reflects progress in emission reporting under the Convention in the 2015 reporting round (2013 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 items 1.4.1 to 1.4.4, 1.4.7, 3.1 and 3.2 of the 2014–2015 workplan for the implementation of the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/122/Add.2).

2. At its thirty-second session (Geneva, 9–13 December 2013), the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (CLRTAP) adopted the Guidelines for reporting emissions and projections data under the Convention (Reporting Guidelines; ECE/EB.AIR/122/Add.1, decisions 2013/3 and 2013/4). The Reporting Guidelines are adopted for application in 2015 and subsequent years. The Guidelines build on the Guidelines for Reporting Emission Data under the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (Reporting Guidelines) (ECE/EB.AIR/97) and the Methods and Procedures for the Technical Review of Air Pollutant Emission Inventories Reported under the Convention and its Protocols (Methods and Procedures for Review) (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/16), which contain background information on the reporting requirements, deadlines and procedures for reporting emissions under the Convention and their review.

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

I. Present state of emission data (workplan items 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 3.1, 3.2)

4. Forty-four Parties (from 51) submitted data in 2015. All countries reported data in the new formats (Nomenclature for Reporting - NFR14). No data from Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Greece, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Monaco and Montenegro were received. An up-to-date overview of the data submitted by Parties during the 2015 reporting round is available at the CEIP website³ and in an annex to this document. In addition, the latest version of officially reported emission data can be accessed in an online database.⁴ Most Parties that submitted data also provided the secretariat with the notification form.

5. All inventories submitted by Parties have been tested via RepDab⁵ and imported into the central CEIP database.

6. *Review of inventories:* All data submitted to CEIP have been reviewed. The technical review of inventories is carried out in three stages.⁶ At each stage of the review,

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/2015_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.

Parties have the opportunity to clarify issues and to provide additional information. The main objective of the technical review is to assist countries in improving their data for the next reporting round. The process is seen by Parties as valuable and the feedback is provided to CEIP during meetings of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections (TFEIP).

7. The findings of the stage 1 review were communicated to the national designated experts through the country-specific status reports by 27 March 2015. The findings from the stage 2 review were included in synthesis and assessment reports, which were issued by 19 May 2015. An overview of the findings for the stage 1 and 2 reviews is summarized in the *CEIP and EEA Technical Review Report 2015* available on the CEIP website.

8. *Timeliness/Completeness*: Thirty Parties reported emission data by the due date of 15 February 2015. 23 Parties resubmitted data comparing to 13 in 2014 (Parties should provide resubmissions within four weeks after 15 February).

9. *Completeness/pollutants*: Forty-four Parties to the Convention submitted inventories, but not all submissions contained all pollutants required by the Reporting Guidelines. All forty-four Parties reported their 2013 data on main pollutants. Cadmium, mercury and lead emissions were provided by 40 Parties, additional heavy metals by 34, particulate matter (PM) by 43 and priority persistent organic pollutants (POPs) by 40 Parties. Activity data were reported only by 34 Parties.

10. *Black carbon (BC)*: Parties reported BC emissions (on a voluntary basis) for the first time and 23 Parties submitted the BC time series.

11. *Completeness/time series*: Complete time series of the main pollutants in NFR14 format for the years 1990–2013 were reported by 31 Parties (out of 44). Five Parties that are also Parties to the Convention protocols (Canada, Denmark, Finland, France and Switzerland) submitted in addition 1980–1989 time series. Twenty-seven Parties provided complete time series (1990–2013) of the main heavy metals. Thirty-four Parties reported requested time series of PM (2000–2013). Twenty-eight Parties provided full time series (at least 1990–2013) of POPs. Four Parties submitted only 2013 data.

12. *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 44 reporting Parties, 40 provided recalculated data for at least some pollutants.

13. *Projections*: In 2015, emission projections were submitted by 22 Parties, 20 of which also provided data for 2030.

14. *Documentation*: 84 per cent of Parties reporting inventories also reported Informative inventory reports (IIRs) in 2015. The consistency, transparency and comparability of IIRs are steadily improving. CEIP is annually evaluating the IIRs⁷ and the best national teams are awarded during TFEIP meetings. 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.⁸

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.

⁷ See http://www.ceip.at/status_reporting/2015_submissions.

⁸ 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 2015 and subsequent years revised reporting guidelines and reporting templates have to be used.

15. *Emissions per capita and emissions per gross domestic product (GDP)*: These indicators⁹ are calculated for all Parties that submit total national emissions of main pollutants, PM, heavy metals and POPs by using information on population and GDP available from the World Bank database. This type of information provides reviewers with an indicator of potential problems when checking national inventories during stage 3 reviews.

16. *Access to the information*: CEIP updated its website to reflect revisions of the Reporting Guidelines and to improve 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.

17. *Support to the Implementation committee and UNECE secretariat*: CEIP provides detailed information on an annual basis to the Implementation Committee on how the Parties to the Convention's protocols fulfil their reporting obligations. CEIP assessed the reporting/non-reporting 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 UNECE secretariat for each of the Convention seven protocols.

II. Emission data for modellers (workplan item 1.4.4)

18. *Gridded data and large point source (LPS) data*: Gridded data is part of the quinquennial reporting obligation, which was not officially due in 2015. Nevertheless, two Parties submitted gridded data and five Parties submitted LPS 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 oxide (SO_x), nitrogen oxide (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOC), ammonia (NH₃) and particulate matter (PM₁₀, PM_{2.5} and PM_{coarse}) on SNAP sector level for modellers based on the gridding system developed by the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W).

20. *Gap-filled and gridded datasets* were calculated not only for 2013, but also for the whole time-series from 1990 to 2013 with the latest submitted data, which includes also current recalculations for previous years. 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 not sufficient reported data was available. Overall 1920 grids for main pollutants and PM were provided in 2015.

21. *Heavy metals*: Furthermore, CEIP prepared gridded data for three heavy metals (mercury, lead and cadmium) and six POPs (dioxins and furans, benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(b)fluoranthene, benzo(k)fluoranthene, indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene and hexachlorobenzene). This year the gap-filling and gridding of heavy metals and POPs was done on GNFR14 sector level instead of national total level like in previous years. In addition, all polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) compounds were gap-filled and gridded separately instead of providing only the aggregated PAH. This increased the amount of provided grids from six grids on national total level in previous years to 117 grids on sectoral level in 2015.

⁹ Inclusion of these tests was recommended by the Task Force expert panel on review.

22. Gap-filled and gridded emission data from 1990 to 2013 were distributed to the modellers and have been publicly accessible on the CEIP website since 8 June 2015.¹⁰

23. *Comparison of reported emissions with RAINS/GAINS emissions:* To improve the consistency of data across different EMEP activities, CEIP compared gap-filled emissions on national total level for the years 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005 and 2010 with emission estimates from the RAINS/GAINS model. Total EMEP emissions for individual pollutants match reasonably, but there have been observed some significant differences on a country level. An assessment of these findings is in progress.

III. Technical review of inventories (workplan item 1.4.3)

24. *The stage 3 review* is an in-depth review of inventories with the purpose 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 Party¹¹ at least once in a five-year period. Resources are required from the expert review team (ERT), the reviewed Parties and CEIP. CEIP is coordinating the whole process.

25. 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.

26. *Parties shall nominate review experts* to the EMEP roster and provide sufficient resources to enable them participation in the process. Eighty-three reviewers from 22 Parties (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, European Union (EU), 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 in UNECE/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.). It is estimated that members of the ERT 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.

27. *The first cycle of in-depth reviews was completed in the period 2008–2012.* 44 Parties have been reviewed in total (all those that submitted relevant data). The results are published on the CEIP website. Reviewers identified areas for improvements in all checked inventories. The countries had the opportunity to provide comments before the reports have been published.

28. *A long term plan for Stage 3 reviews* from 2013 to 2018 has been updated by CEIP based on submitted inventories (see table below) for approval during the next SB meeting: The plan will be modified if Parties do not submit requested information within reporting deadlines.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Country</i>
2013	Bulgaria, France, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Sweden

¹⁰ See http://www.ceip.at/webdab_emepdatabase/emissions_emepmodels.

¹¹ Participation of the United States and Canada in the inventory in-depth review process is to be discussed.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Country</i>
2014	Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Greece, Germany Hungary, and Spain
2015	Azerbaijan, Belarus, Czech Republic, Ireland, Netherlands, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia and Ukraine
2016	Armenia ^a , Estonia, Finland, Kazakhstan ^b , Luxembourg, Serbia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and United Kingdom
2017	Austria, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina ^b , European Union, Georgia, Iceland, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Malta and Monaco
2018	Montenegro and Russian Federation ^a

^a Party did not submit a complete emission inventory in standard format nor/or did not submit an IIR within the last three years.

^b Party did not submit neither inventory data nor an IIR within the last three years

29. *The 2013 and 2014 stage 3 in-depth reviews* took place in June 2013 and June 2014, respectively at EEA in Copenhagen. For details, see previous the CEIP Status reports to the EMEP Steering Body; country reports are available online.¹² The feedback during TFEIP meetings indicates that inventory compilers consider in-depth reviews useful and recommend continuing them.

30. *The in-depth review plan for the year 2015 has been modified.* The changes have been agreed during the EMEP Steering Body bureau meeting in March 2015. Nine countries have been reviewed (Azerbaijan, Belarus, Czech Republic, Ireland, Netherlands, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia and Ukraine). 20 experts in total accepted the invitation to the review (three each from Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, two each from the European Union and Sweden), and one each from Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France and Latvia accepted the invitation to the centralized review 2015.

IV. Review of submitted adjustment applications (workplan item 1.7.1)

31. Seven parties (Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Finland, France, Luxembourg, and Spain) submitted their applications for adjustments to the UNECE secretariat during 2015. CEIP developed a website¹³ where all information submitted by Parties is freely accessible. All submitted applications have been reviewed by the expert review team (ERT). The activity was covered by EMEP mandatory contributions and partly by a contribution from Luxembourg (directly to CEIP). Detailed information on the review process and findings is provided in a special status reports on adjustments.

V. Development of a new gridding system (workplan item 1.3.1)

32. *New gridding system:* To improve the quality of environmental assessment, it was agreed that models should use gridded emissions in higher spatial resolution (0.1° x 0.1°) in

¹² See http://www.ceip.at/review_results/stage3_country_reports.

¹³ See http://www.ceip.at/adjustments_gp.

geographical coordinates and a more detailed sector split (GNFR categories). This innovation is increasing the volume of processed data by one order of magnitude.

33. CEIP started with the implementation of the new gridding system in 2013 and is continuing the work in 2015. A test version of the new gridding system is available since April 2014 and the results with gridded SO_x and NO_x emissions for 2011 were provided to the modellers with the request for comments. Gridded NMVOC, NH₃, CO, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀ and PM_{coarse} emissions are also ready for evaluation. It is planned to deliver gridded data for 2012 and 2013 in the new resolution and on GNFR14 sector level to the modellers at MSC-W in 2015. To increase reliability of emission data it is extremely important that Parties start to report gridded data in the new system in line with the revised reporting Guidelines. (So far only Spain, Switzerland and the United Kingdom reported gridded data in the new format on a voluntary basis.)

34. CEIP is in parallel developing procedures for the data control. As a first step the distribution of emissions from the new and the old system have been compared. Further, a comparison of gridded emissions with the European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (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.

35. 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 submitted data (15 March) and the deadline for production of gridded data (beginning of May) is a big challenge.

VI. Conclusions

36. *Timeliness and completeness:* In 2015, 44 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 EMEP/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 of emission reporting is observed in Parties (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia) that profited from the capacity building activities under the Grant agreement (ECE.GC.2014.06.021) between UNECE and CEIP/UBA Vienna. UNECE should consider continuation of the capacity building program and awareness raising in countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, and in the West Balkan countries.

37. Countries such as Bosnia and Herzegovina or Kazakhstan have not reported emission data to EMEP within the last five years. Albania, Greece and Montenegro did not report data in 2014 and 2015.

38. *Gridded data and LPS:* Information reported to EMEP/CEIP on gridded and LPS data is rather limited in spite of the fact that such information is in many cases available at country¹⁴ level. The total number of countries which submitted 2010 gridded sectoral data increased to 30 and corresponds to 59 per cent of Parties.

39. *Stage 3 in-depth reviews:* CEIP successfully organized Stage 3 review 2015, by reviewing 9 countries. The country reports will be published prior to the first joint session

¹⁴ E.g. information on facilities reported by countries under the European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register or the EU Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) and Large Combustion Plant (LPC) Directives.

of EMEP Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects in September 2015. 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 transparent format.

40. *Review of adjustment applications.* The assessment of adjustment application was organised in line with the Executive Body decisions 2012/2 and 2012/13 and 2014/1. Details on the process and findings are provided in separate report (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2015/10–ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2015/13).

41. A persisting key constraint for both reviews is the limited number of nominations to the roster of review experts. The number of experts almost doubled compared to 2010, but a pool of 83 experts (from 24 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 unavailable resources. The representation of experts from the eastern part of the EMEP region is rather limited. EMEP may wish to consider how to financially support¹⁵ the participation of experts from Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and Balkan countries in the review process.

42. *Development of new the gridding system:* Currently a new gridding system is under development (higher resolution of 0.1°×0.1° longitude-latitude, geographic coordinate system WGS84 and the use of 13 GNFR sectors). 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 submitted data (15 March) and the deadline for production of gridded data (beginning of May) is a big challenge. It has to be noted that further improvements of the new system will be an ongoing process also in 2016/17. Feedback from the Parties with no reported gridded emission is inevitable to ensure the quality of gridded emissions for the whole grid domain.

43. EMEP may wish to consider establishing cooperation *with North African and Asian* countries on the voluntary exchange of emission data with a view to obtaining input data for models in these areas (from 30°N northward within the new domain borders of 30°N-82°N and 30°W-90°E).

¹⁵ From 2010 to 2012, EEA covered travel costs of seven experts (from Estonia, the Czech Republic, Greece, Kazakhstan and Latvia) and two trainees (from Macedonia and Serbia) to enable their participation in stage 3 reviews.

Annex

Status of emission reporting as of 8 June 2015

<i>Party</i>	<i>Submission date</i>	<i>Resubmission date</i>	<i>NFR template</i>	<i>Other format</i>	<i>IIR 2013</i>	<i>Gridded (3A)</i>	<i>LPS (3B)</i>
Albania	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Armenia	13.02.2015	—	—	x	—	—	—
Austria	12.02.2015	15.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Azerbaijan	12.02.2015	01.05.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	2013
Belarus	08.06.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Belgium	13.02.1015	14.03.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Bosnia and Herzegovina	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bulgaria	13.02.2015	30.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Canada	13.02.2015	—	2014-1	x	x	—	—
Croatia	11.02.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	2013
Cyprus	13.02.2015	30.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Czech Republic	15.02.2015	08.06.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Denmark	13.02.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Estonia	12.02.2015	27.03.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
EU	18.05.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Finland	13.02.2015	10.03.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
France	12.02.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Georgia	03.04.2015	17.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	2013
Germany	04.02.2015	29.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Greece	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	20.02.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Iceland	06.05.2015	—	2014-1	—	—	—	—
Ireland	13.02.2015	14.05.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Italy	01.04.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Kazakhstan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyzstan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Latvia	14.02.2015	30.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Liechtenstein	16.02.2015	—	2004-1	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	13.02.2015	23.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Luxembourg	16.02.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Malta	25.03.2015	—	2014-1	—	—	—	—
Monaco	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Montenegro	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Netherlands	15.02.2015	30.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Norway	13.02.2015	23.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—

<i>Party</i>	<i>Submission date</i>	<i>Resubmission date</i>	<i>NFR template</i>	<i>Other format</i>	<i>IIR 2013</i>	<i>Gridded (3A)</i>	<i>LPS (3B)</i>
Poland	06.02.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Portugal	13.02.2015	22.05.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Republic of Moldova	20.02.2015	—	2014-1	—	—	—	—
Romania	13.02.2015	30.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Russian Federation	19.03.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Serbia	13.02.2015	24.02.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Slovakia	16.02.2015	02.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Slovenia	12.02.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Spain	13.02.2015	13.03.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Sweden	10.02.2015	11.03.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Switzerland	11.02.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	1980 - 2013	2010
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	13.02.2015	04.05.2015	2014-1	—	—	2010	2013
Turkey	11.02.2015	—	2014-1	—	x	—	—
Ukraine	16.02.2015	—	2009-1	—	—	—	—
United Kingdom	13.02.2015	13.03.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—
United States of America	12.03.2015	15.04.2015	2014-1	—	x	—	—