

Annex 4

Local Verification results - Prague



Table of Contents

	Page
Indicator 1: Accuracy of DOAS equipment compared with traditional equipment.....	3
Indicator 2: Accuracy of roadside description, air models.....	3
Indicator 3: Accuracy of roadside description, Noise models.....	3
Indicator 4: Testing processes of DSS interfaces	3
Indicator 5: Testing DSS modelling and forecasting processes.....	6
Indicator 6: Testing DSS operator interface and scenario processes.....	7
Indicator 7: Testing the functioning of the main system components and their interaction	9
Indicator 8: User acceptance by professional users	10
Indicator 9: User acceptance by the general public	13

LOCAL VERIFICATION RESULTS - PRAGUE

Indicator 1: Accuracy of DOAS equipment compared with traditional equipment

This indicator is not applicable for Prague

Indicator 2: Accuracy of roadside description, air models

This indicator is not applicable for Prague

Indicator 3: Accuracy of roadside description, Noise models

This indicator is not applicable for Prague

Indicator 4: Testing processes of DSS interfaces

Indicator 4a: Test Interface to Traffic Monitoring Process

CRITERION	Testperiod / frequency	Value	Success criterion	OK / NOT OK or N/A
Number of system failures	3 days	None		OK
Operational time	3 days	100%	> 95 %	OK
Correct data in and out, referred to data in monitoring station	tested once	YES	Data in DSS equals data in monitoring station	OK
Speed	3 days	15 minutes	Fast enough to allow the entire system to reach an hourly update	OK

To which process(es) does the above table refer?	data monitoring and verification
What method(s) were used for testing?	statistics analysis
Which organization(s) did the testing?	TSK
When did the testing take place?	December 2001 – January 2002
Any other remarks concerning this sub-indicator?	No

Indicator 4b: Test Interface to Meteo Monitoring Process

CRITERION	Testperiod / frequency	Value	Success criterion	OK / NOT OK or N/A
Number of system failures	3 days	none		OK
Operational time	3 days	100%	95 % operational	OK
Correct data in and out, referred to data in monitoring station	YES	YES / NO	Data in DSS equals data in downloaded from monitoring station	OK
Speed	3 days	15 minutes	Fast enough to allow the entire system to reach an hourly update	OK

To which process(es) does the above table refer?	data monitoring, verification and transfer
What method(s) were used for testing?	standard CHMI operational internal procedures
Which organization(s) did the testing?	CHMI
When did the testing take place?	January 2002
Any other remarks concerning this sub-indicator?	data transfer is provided via modems and radio connection

Indicator 4c: Test Interface to Environmental Monitoring Network Process

CRITERION	Testperiod / frequency	Value	Success criterion	OK / NOT OK or N/A
Number of system failures	3 days	None		OK
Operational time	3 days	100 %	95 % of time operational	OK
Correct data in and out, referred to data in monitoring station	tested once	YES	Data in DSS equals data downloaded from monitoring station	OK
Speed	3 days	15 minutes	Fast enough to allow the entire system to reach an hourly update	OK

To which process(es) does the above table refer?	data monitoring, verification and transfer
What method(s) were used for testing?	standard CHMI operational internal procedures

Which organization did the testing?	CHMI
When did the testing take place?	January 2002
Any other remarks concerning this sub-indicator?	data transfer is provided via modems and radio connection, the average time from data measurement to the delivery into CHMI is 15 min.

Indicator 4d: Test Interface to Static & Infrequently Updated Information Process

CRITERION	Testperiod / frequency	Value	Success criterion	OK / NOT OK or N/A
Number of system failures	3 days	None		OK
Operational time	3 days	100%	95 % of time operational	OK
Correct data in and out, referred to data in source	YES	YES / NO	Data conversion and import OK	OK
Speed **	N/A		Fast enough to allow the entire system to reach an hourly update	N/A

** N/A for Prague

To which process(es) does the above table refer?	Off-line data collection and re-format
What method(s) were used for testing?	internal operational procedures
Which organization(s) did the testing?	URM, CHMI
When did the testing take place?	November 2002
Any other remarks concerning this sub-indicator?	

Indicator 4e: Test Interface to Information Flow Process

CRITERION	Testperiod / frequency	Value	Success criterion	OK / NOT OK or N/A
Number of system failures	3 days	1		OK
Operational time	3 days	99%	95 % of time operational	OK
Correct data in and out, referred to data in DSS database	tested once	YES	Data information presentation equals data downloaded from the DSS information server	OK
Correct data in and out, referred to data in	N/A			N/A

monitoring station				
Speed update every 6 hours	3 days	15 minutes	Fast enough to allow the entire system to reach an hourly update	OK,

To which process(es) does the above table refer?	Airviro on-line data import
What method(s) were used for testing?	standard CHMI operational internal procedures
Which organization(s) did the testing?	CHMI
When did the testing take place?	January 2002
Any other remarks concerning this sub-indicator?	the testing will continue in February 2002

Indicator 5: Testing DSS modelling and forecasting processes

Indicator 5a: Test Air Quality Emission Process

CRITERION	Testperiod / frequency	Value	Success criterion	OK / NOT OK or N/A
Number of system failures	3 days	None		OK
Operational time	3 days	100%	95 % of time operational	OK
Speed update every 6 hours	3 days	15 minutes	Fast enough to allow the entire system to reach a 6 hourly update	OK

To which process(es) does the above table refer?	on-line emission calculation
What method(s) were used for testing?	standard CHMI operational internal procedures
Which organization(s) did the testing?	CHMI
When did the testing take place?	January 2002
Any other remarks concerning this sub-indicator?	

Indicator 5b: Test Air Quality Concentration Process

CRITERION	Testperiod / frequency	Value	Success criterion	OK / NOT OK or N/A
Number of system failures	3 days	None		OK
Operational time	3 days	100 %	95 % of time operational	OK
Speed update every 6 hours	3 days	15 minutes	Fast enough to allow the entire system to reach an hourly update	OK

To which process(es) does the above table refer?	Concentration calculation
What method(s) were used for testing?	standard CHMI operational internal procedures
Which organization(s) did the testing?	CHMI
When did the testing take place?	January 2002
Any other remarks concerning this sub-indicator?	

Indicator 5c: Test Noise Modelling Process

This indicator is not applicable for Prague

Indicator 5d: Test Traffic Modelling and Forecast Process

This indicator is not applicable for Prague

Indicator 5e: Test Result processing Process (just Rotterdam)

This indicator is not applicable for Prague

Indicator 6: Testing DSS operator interface and scenario processes

Indicator 6a: Test DSS Operator interface presentation process

CRITERION	Testperiod / frequency	Value	Success criterion	OK / NOT OK or N/A
Number of system failures	3 days	None		OK
Operational time	3 days	100 %	95 % of time operational	OK
Correct data in and	tested once	YES	Presented data in interface	OK

out, referred to data in monitoring station			equals data in DSS information server	
Speed	3 days	15 minutes	Fast enough to allow the entire system to reach an 6 hourly update	OK

To which process(es) does the above table refer?	Airviro user interface – result administration
What method(s) were used for testing?	CHMI standard internal procedures
Which organization(s) did the testing?	CHMI
When did the testing take place?	January 2002
Any other remarks concerning this sub-indicator?	

Indicator 6b: Test DSS Operator interface intervention process

CRITERION	Testperiod / frequency	Value	Success criterion	OK / NOT OK or N/A
Number of system failures	3 days	None:		OK
Operational time	3 days	100%	95 % of time operational	OK
Correct data in and out, referred to data in monitoring station	tested once	YES		OK
Speed	3 days	15 minutes	Fast enough to allow the entire system to reach an hourly update	OK

To which process(es) does the above table refer?	Airviro user interface – data import administration
What method(s) were used for testing?	CHMI standard internal procedures
Which organization(s) did the testing?	CHMI
When did the testing take place?	January 2002
Any other remarks concerning this sub-indicator?	

Indicator 6c: Test DSS Scenario Process

CRITERION	Testperiod / frequency	Value	Success criterion	OK / NOT OK Or N/A
-----------	------------------------	-------	-------------------	--------------------

Number of system failures	3 days	None		OK
Operational time	3 days	100%	95 % of time operational	OK
Correct data in and out, referred to data in monitoring station	tested once	YES		OK
Speed **	N/A			N/A

** N/A in Prague

To which process(es) does the above table refer?	Airviro user interface – data export administration
What method(s) were used for testing?	CHMI standard internal procedures
Which organization(s) did the testing?	CHMI
When did the testing take place?	February 2002
Any other remarks concerning this sub-indicator?	

Indicator 7: Testing the functioning of the main system components and their interaction

CRITERION	Testperiod / frequency	Value	Success criterion	OK / NOT OK Or N/A
Number of system failures	3 days	None		OK
Operational time	3 days	100%	90 %of time operational	OK
Speed	3 days	15 minutes	Fast enough to allow the entire system to reach an hourly update	OK

Which organization(s) did the testing?	CHMI, URM
What method(s) were used for testing?	CHMI standard internal procedures
When did the testing take place?	February 2002
Any other remarks concerning this sub-indicator?	

Indicator 8: User acceptance by professional users

V.8a Does the DSS meet the system requirements as described in WP5?

Questions about Functional Requirements “To which extend are the following requirements implemented satisfactory?” Rating 1-5 (1=not at all satisfactory 5=very satisfactory) When the rating is below 4, please ask explanation		User 1	User 2	User 3	User 4	User 5
Traffic information management						
1	Does the system support on-line network traffic monitoring through interface with the traffic control and monitoring systems	4	4	4	4	4
2	Does the system support accurate and efficient incident detection?	-	-	-	-	-
3	Does the system support recording of traffic data and formation of historical series and statistics	5	4	4	5	4
4	Does the system support traffic forecasting?	-	-	-	-	-
5	Does the system support traffic demand modelling?	4	5	4	4	5
6	Does the system support the optimisation of traffic control?	-	-	-	-	-
7	Does the system support the evaluation of short-term and long-term traffic measures?	5	5	4	5	5
8	Does the system support near real-time traffic status representation for the whole demonstration area	5	5	5	5	5
Air quality modelling						
9	Does the system support emissions modelling based on near real-time traffic measurements?	5	5	5	5	5
10	Does the system support emissions modelling based on modelled traffic data?	5	4	4	5	5
11	Does the system support pollutants dispersion modelling at the street and area levels?	4	4	4	4	4
12	Does the system support recording of monitored pollutant levels and modelled data?	5	5	5	5	5
13	Does the system support background pollution modelling?	4	4	4	4	4
14	Does the system support noise modelling at the <i>hotspots</i> ?	-	-	-	-	-
15	Does the system support air quality modelling based on current traffic levels and on predefined traffic and demand management scenarios?	4	4	4	4	4
16	The system shall support evaluation of the environmental effect of short and long term transport policies	5	5	5	4	5

V8.b Is the information provided by the system easy to understand?

Questions about understandable information Rating 1-5 (1=not at all satisfactory 5=very satisfactory) When the rating is below 4, please ask explanation	User 1	User 2	User 3	User 4	User 5
Information presentation					
Does the system support data representation via maps, charts and generic tables	5	5	5	5	5
Environmental maps					
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>maps</i>	5	5	5	5	5
How easy to use is the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>maps</i>	5	4	5	4	5
How usefull is the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>maps</i> to manage urban mobility	5	5	5	4	5
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the colour codes used on the <i>maps</i>	5	5	5	5	5
Is the level of geographical detail presented in maps satisfactory	5	5	5	5	4
Environmental charts and generic tables					
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>charts and generic tables</i>	4	5	5	5	5
How easy to use is the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>charts and generic tables</i>	4	5	4	4	5
How usefull is the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>charts and generic tables</i> to manage urban mobility	4	5	5	4	5
Traffic maps					
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>maps</i>	-	-	-	-	-
How easy to use is the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>maps</i>	-	-	-	-	-
How useful is the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>maps</i> to manage urban mobility	-	-	-	-	-
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the colour codes used on the <i>maps</i>	-	-	-	-	-
Is the level of geographical detail presented in maps satisfactory	-	-	-	-	-
Traffic charts and generic tables					
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>charts and generic tables</i>	-	-	-	-	-
How easy to use is the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>charts and generic tables</i>	-	-	-	-	-
How usefull is the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>charts and generic tables</i> to manage urban mobility	-	-	-	-	-

Questions about understandable information Rating 1-5 (1=not at all satisfactory 5=very satisfactory) When the rating is below 4, please ask explanation	User 1	User 2	User 3	User 4	User 5
Health information					
How do you rate the comprehensibility of health information presented	-	-	-	-	-
How easy to use is the health information presented	-	-	-	-	-
Information output					
Does the system deliver reports dealing with model outputs and evaluation of traffic demand management strategies	4	4	4	4	5
Does the system support attention and alarm pollutant levels achievement detection and forecast	4	4	5	5	4
Is Information presentation driven through a suitable MMI	5	4	4	4	5
Are you satisfied with the update interval of the information	5	5	5	4	5
Operator interface					
Does the system interface support operator driven scenario definition	4	4	5	4	4
Is the system interface for support of operator driven definitions comprehensible?	5	5	5	5	5
Is the system interface for support of operator driven definitions easy to use?	5	5	5	5	5
Is the system interface for support of operator driven definitions useful to manage urban mobility?	5	4	5	5	5
Does the system interface drive the operator through the tasks related to off-line evaluation of the impact of scenarios on the environment	4	4	4	4	4
Are these procedures comprehensible	4	4	4	4	4
Are these procedures easy to use	4	4	4	4	4

Indicator 9: User acceptance by the general public

Questions on understandable information					
Rating 1-5 (1=not at all satisfactory 5=very satisfactory)					
When the rating is below 4, please ask explanation	User 1	User 2	User 3	User 4	User 5
Information presentation	5	4	5	4	5
Environmental maps					
How readable is HEAVEN information via <i>maps</i>	5	5	5	5	5
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>maps</i>	5	4	5	5	5
How easy to use is the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>maps</i>	5	4	5	5	5
How usefull is the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>maps</i>	5	5	5	5	5
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the colour codes used on the <i>maps</i>	5	4	5	5	5
Is the level of geographical detail presented in maps satisfactory	5	5	5	5	5
Environmental charts and generic tables					
How readable is HEAVEN information via <i>via charts and generic tables</i>	4	5	5	5	5
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the HEAVEN information presentation <i>via charts and generic tables</i>	4	5	5	4	5
How easy to use is the HEAVEN information presentation <i>via charts and generic tables</i>	4	5	5	4	5
Traffic maps					
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>maps</i>	-	-	-	-	-
- How easy to use is the HEAVEN information presentation via <i>maps</i>	-	-	-	-	-
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the colour codes used on the <i>maps</i>	-	-	-	-	-
Is the level of geographical detail presented in maps satisfactory	-	-	-	-	-
Traffic charts and generic tables					
How do you rate the comprehensibility of the HEAVEN information presentation <i>via charts and generic tables</i>	-	-	-	-	-
How easy to use is the HEAVEN information presentation <i>via charts and generic tables</i>	-	-	-	-	-
Health information					
How do you rate the comprehensibility of health information presented	-	-	-	-	-
How easy to use is the health information presented	-	-	-	-	-



Deliverable D7.1
Final Verification Report – Annex 4

