



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

EB.AIR/WG.5/74
7 October 2002

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

EXECUTIVE BODY FOR THE CONVENTION ON
LONG-RANGE TRANSBOUNDARY AIR POLLUTION

Working Group on Strategies and Review

REPORT OF THE THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

Introduction

1. The thirty-fourth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review was held in Geneva from 18 to 20 September 2002.
2. The session was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention: Armenia; Austria; Belgium; Bulgaria; Canada; Croatia; Cyprus; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Ireland; Italy; Latvia; Monaco; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Republic of Moldova; Russian Federation; Sweden; Switzerland; Ukraine; United Kingdom; United States of America; and the European Community (EC).
3. Representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as well as of the International Union of Producers and Distributors of Electrical Energy (UNIPEDE) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) attended. The following EMEP Centres also participated: Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM), Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E), and Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W).
4. The meeting was chaired by Mr. R. BALLAMAN (Switzerland).

Documents prepared under the auspices or at the request of the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution for GENERAL circulation should be considered provisional unless APPROVED by the Executive Body.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5. The Working Group adopted the provisional agenda as contained in document EB.AIR/WG.5/73.

II. DRAFT LEGAL INSTRUMENT ON THE FINANCING OF CORE ACTIVITIES

6. The secretariat reminded delegations that the Executive Body, at its nineteenth session, had decided to finalize its work on the long-term financing of core activities at its twentieth session and to prepare input on it to the Ministerial Conference "Environment for Europe" scheduled for May 2003 in Kiev. It provided an overview of the state of voluntary financial contributions to the core activities other than EMEP made in response to Executive Body decision 2001/5. A little over 10% of the recommended contributions for 2002 had been received by 1 September 2002 in cash to the trust fund. This table did not include the contributions made by Parties directly to the centres, as the secretariat was not informed about such contributions. The secretariat also informed the Working Group that Azerbaijan had ratified the Convention recently so becoming the Convention's 49th Party.

7. The Chairman drew the attention of delegations to the discussions at the meeting of heads of delegation on 25-26 April 2002 (EB.AIR/WG.5/72). A revised preliminary draft protocol (annex I) and a draft decision (annex II) were annexed to the report of the meeting as the basis for preparing a report to the Executive Body.

8. The Working Group adopted the report on the meeting of heads of delegation (EB.AIR/WG.5/72).

9. Mr. H. GREGOR (Germany), Chairman of the Working Group on Effects, explained the budget for the International Cooperative Programmes (ICPs) operating under the Working Group on Effects. The annual budget for effect-oriented activities covered only the essential coordinating costs, while the total cost of the work was estimated at some US\$ 40 million annually. The ICPs coordinated the work of more than 40 participating Parties. Mr. Gregor thanked the lead countries of the ICPs for their continuing support. He appealed to the Working Group on Strategies and Review to take a long-term perspective when preparing the financing scheme.

10. Mr. M. AMANN (CIAM) explained that CIAM relied on voluntary contributions to be able to conduct its work. He expressed his appreciation to the Parties that had contributed to CIAM either directly or through the trust fund. He pointed out that the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) had cut its budget and that this would affect the support it could give to CIAM. A major contract had, however, been granted by the EC, which would fund much work that would also be useful for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol.

11. As announced at the meeting of heads of delegation (EB.AIR/WG.5/72, para. 19), the Chairman called upon every delegation, in a tour-de-table, to state its position with respect to the protocol and whether it would be ready to sign such an instrument.

12. All delegations present stated their positions. A large majority of Parties indicated that they were ready or expected to be ready in Kiev to sign a protocol as presented in the report of the meeting of heads of delegation (EB.AIR/WG.5/72, annex I). Some indicated that they could state their formal positions only once the final text of the protocol was available. Others pointed to recent changes of government or to upcoming elections that required, or might require, a re-evaluation of their positions. A number of delegations noted that while they were in favour of signing a protocol, their positions were dependent on whether there was widespread support for the protocol and whether most of the major contributors were also ready to join.

13. A number of delegations indicated that, in principle, they were not in a position to support a financing protocol and did not expect their position to change over the coming months. They reiterated, however, their support for the core activities under the Convention and stressed that they would continue to contribute financial and other resources to the work.

14. A number of delegations suggested additional amendments to the preliminary draft protocol. One delegation expressed its regret that its annex I did not include any centre in Eastern Europe. It also suggested making the protocol more attractive by listing some direct benefits for its Parties such as giving access to the centres' databases.

15. In the light of the positions expressed, the Working Group:

(a) Noted that there was no consensus for a protocol at present;

(b) Decided to submit to the Executive Body:

(i) The preliminary draft protocol text set out in annex I to document EB.AIR/WG.5/72, noting that this was the best possible draft it could produce at present; and

(ii) The draft Executive Body decision on financing of core activities set out in the annex below;

(c) Recommended to the Executive Body to adopt the draft decision and report to the Ministerial Conference in Kiev on this result of its efforts, and seek ministerial support for the full implementation of the decision.

16. The delegations of Denmark and the Netherlands declared that they regretted very much

that there was not sufficient support for the two-track approach with both a protocol for mandatory contributions and a decision for voluntary contributions. They were worried about the future of the scientific support for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol and the other protocols.

17. In discussing appendix II to the draft decision, the Working Group took note of the concerns of the Russian Federation with regard to assigning a specific percentage to it in the second column of appendix II. It agreed that, in the interest of making progress at the twentieth session of the Executive Body, it would be appropriate to refer to the suggested contribution of the Russian Federation in square brackets with a footnote indicating that it was subject to review at a forthcoming session of the Executive Body.

18. The Working Group also noted that the earlier draft appendix should be updated to include Azerbaijan as a new Party to the Convention and to list the percentages as calculated on the basis of the 2003 scale of assessments of the United Nations.

III. PREPARING FOR THE REVIEW OF THE GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL

19. The secretariat informed the Working Group that, with the ratifications by Denmark, Norway and Sweden in 2002, in addition to the one by Luxembourg in 2001, there were now four ratifications. Several delegations reported on their ratification processes. Nine delegations indicated that they expected to complete ratification before the end of 2003.

20. The Chairman of the Working Group on Effects reported on the state of work on acidification, eutrophication, ozone and particulate matter (PM) with reference to documents EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/2 and 3. He stressed that the recent meetings of the Working Group on Effects and of the EMEP Steering Body had shown that all required input to the work would be forthcoming as agreed. He mentioned the continuous update of the critical loads database, the progress in data quality and comparability, and the move towards the application of dynamic modelling supporting inter alia an assessment of time delays in the recovery of ecosystems caused by changes in deposition trends.

21. Mr. Gregor also drew attention to the technical report on the economic impact of ozone pollution on agricultural crop production in Europe (EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/10) and reported on progress in the development of approaches to deriving critical levels for ozone. The report on the health effects of PM prepared by the Task Force on the Health Aspects of Air Pollution would be updated by 2003 with EC support, and a report on ozone's health impacts would be prepared by 2003/04. The Working Group on Effects had decided to prepare for 2004 a substantive report on the assessment of air pollution effects and their recorded trends, and this should contain useful information for the review of the Protocol. He asked for assistance from the Working Group on Strategies and Review, in particular through its Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic

Instruments (NEBEI), in assessing the economic impacts of air pollution.

22. The delegation of the Netherlands reported on preparations for the next workshop of NEBEI, on the economic valuation of ecosystem effects, to be held on 2-3 October 2002 in Scheveningen (Netherlands) and made available a preliminary programme. The Working Group on Effects and its ICPs had been invited, and could use this workshop to gain support for the work on the substantive report.

23. The delegation of Sweden informed the Working Group about the intention of ICP-Materials to put greater focus on air pollution damage to cultural heritage. Italy had agreed to set up a sub-centre to address this work.

24. Mr. A. ELIASSEN (MSC-W) informed the Working Group about some of the relevant activities under EMEP. This year, EMEP celebrated its 25th anniversary and at this stage it was preparing an assessment report evaluating the data, in particular monitoring data, collected during its lifetime. The report would be finalized in 2004 and EMEP had agreed to cooperate with the Working Group on Effects in this effort. MSC-W had made significant progress in the development of the unified Eulerian model to cover acidification, ozone and particles. Basic model development was expected to be completed by the end of the year, so that preliminary results could be made available for integrated assessment modelling in 2003 while model validation would continue. Source-receptor relationships that could be used for policy discussions were expected for 2004. The Chemical Coordinating Centre (CCC) was currently evaluating the EMEP monitoring strategy. EMEP expected a proposal that would follow a more differentiated approach, whereby CCC would recommend different monitoring tasks to different Parties to ensure a broad coverage of the EMEP region.

25. The delegation of Germany informed the Working Group about preparations for the EMEP workshop on hemispheric air pollution to be held in Bad Breisig (near Bonn, Germany) and organized jointly with the United States. This was a follow-up to the workshop on photo-oxidants, particles, and haze across the Arctic and the North Atlantic: Transport observations and models, held in Palisade, New York (United States), on 12-15 June 2001 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2001/11).

26. The delegation of the Netherlands drew attention to the adoption by the EMEP Steering Body of the Guidelines on Estimating and Reporting of Emissions Data (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/7). It noted that the guidelines might, for some Parties, change the estimated level of emissions and, in some cases, affect a Party's ability to meet its Gothenburg Protocol emission ceilings. The secretariat explained that the Gothenburg Protocol (art. 7, para. 1 (b) (iv)) gave a Party the opportunity to report on any exceptional circumstances justifying emissions that were temporarily higher than the ceilings and this could include changes in the methodology to estimate emissions.

Furthermore, the Guidelines differentiated in some cases between emission data reported for modelling purposes by EMEP (where a consistent set of data was required), and those reported for compliance purposes, where a method appropriate to national circumstances might be chosen. In this connection, the delegation of Sweden drew attention to the coming workshop on validation and evaluation of air emission inventories on 14-16 October 2002 in Gothenburg (Sweden).

27. Mr. R. MAAS (Netherlands), Chairman of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, reported on progress (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/1), including the results of the twenty-seventh meeting of the Task Force, held in Oslo on 13-15 May 2002 and of the workshop on uncertainty treatment in integrated assessment modelling held at IIASA on 24-25 January 2002. A full set of papers and presentations were posted on the Internet at www.unece.org/env/tfiam. He highlighted the discussion on the target variables and other policy-relevant model output. CIAM was in the process of developing the baseline scenario and integrated assessment for the EC Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme. The work on the CAFE baseline scenario was to be completed in September 2003 and national submissions were expected by the end of 2002. Also, a peer review of the RAINS model was planned in cooperation with EC. A workshop on this review, organized in the framework of the Task Force, would be held in autumn 2003. Mr. Maas highlighted the need for Parties to present data to CIAM to develop the baseline scenario. He suggested to the Working Group to lend its support to the work and appeal to Parties to prepare the required data, especially the data on projected activity levels up to 2020.

28. Mr. M. Amann presented the CIAM report on a methodology to estimate changes in statistical life expectancy due to the control of particulate matter air pollution. Its main purpose was to present the methodology that introduced life expectancy as an end-point in the evaluation of abatement strategies, but it also gave illustrative results. The loss of life expectancy had been significant in Europe in 1990 and the situation would be much improved through existing policies by 2010. However, further improvements were possible. The work still required a further analysis of uncertainties. Work was also needed to address morbidity effects, and this should also cover those related to ozone exposure.

29. The delegation of the United States pointed out that similar modelling work was under way in North America. It expressed its hope that in the review of the Gothenburg Protocol the analytical work would not only cover the EMEP area but could also make a link to North American work. This would also take better account of the hemispheric scale of some phenomena. The delegation offered to cooperate with the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling in this respect.

30. Mr. Amann also informed the Working Group about work at CIAM, expected to be financed by the Netherlands, on developing cost curves for the greenhouse gases under the Kyoto

Protocol and on introducing them into the RAINS model. This work was part of an attempt to explore more generally the links between regional air pollution and climate change. The work at present focused on three aspects: (i) air pollutants (e.g. ozone, SO₂, aerosols) that are responsible for radiative forcing; (ii) air pollutants and greenhouse gases that have common sources; (iii) the control of air pollutants and greenhouse gases which may be most cost-effective if focusing on measures where there are joint benefits. It would be possible to extend the modelling framework of RAINS to include methane (as an ozone precursor and a greenhouse gas) and other greenhouse gases and to assess radiative forcing as an end-point. A workshop of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, scheduled at IIASA at the end of January 2003, would be devoted to the links between regional air pollution and climate change and to the evaluation of structural and non-technical measures to reduce air pollution impacts.

31. Several delegations commented on the plans to address the links to climate change. A number of delegations welcomed the prospect of exploring and quantifying the synergies between the two policy areas. Such data would greatly facilitate policy discussions and might reveal areas where significant savings could be made. Such work could also evaluate the cost-effectiveness of structural measures that had to be included in the review of the Gothenburg Protocol. It could also establish a link to air pollution at a hemispheric scale that was becoming increasingly important. One delegation warned of mixing the different policy areas and suggested following the traditional approach focusing on a single pollutant or a group of pollutants. Two delegations drew attention to the complexity of climate modelling and suggested establishing close collaboration with climate change modelling groups for this work, as it would go beyond the modelling capabilities of EMEP.

32. The representative of EC also welcomed the proposed work to examine the synergies between air pollution and climate change policies. These would also be taken into account under the CAFE programme. A number of delegations stressed that the choice of energy scenarios and the determination of energy policies was the responsibility of Parties; they suggested comparing, where available, different scenarios.

33. The secretariat introduced the report by the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/3), including the results of the meeting on 26-28 November 2001 in Bologna (Italy). It highlighted the main conclusions, emphasizing the need for further work on non-agricultural ammonia emissions and the importance of monitoring (separating ammonia and ammonium and covering long-term trends). Further work would continue on the review and possible revision of the Guidance Document on Control Techniques for Preventing and Abating Emissions of Ammonia, taking into account the Framework Advisory Code of Good Agricultural Practice for Reducing Ammonia Emissions and the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Best Available Techniques reference document of EC for pigs and poultry.

34. The delegation of Austria announced that its Government would host the next meeting of

the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement on 28-30 October 2002 in Vienna to be held jointly with the Agricultural Panel of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections.

35. A number of delegations stressed the importance of further work on non-agricultural emissions of ammonia and suggested looking carefully at non-agricultural sources in the next reporting round, as these were probably underestimated in emissions inventories. The delegation of Germany suggested that the Expert Group, when examining abatement measures in animal housing, should also try to include experts on animal behaviour in order to be able to consider the question of animal welfare.

36. The representative of EC informed the Working Group about recent activities under the European Commission's CAFE programme, highlighting the results of the latest meeting of its Steering Group. A working group on PM was set up in 2002 and would, inter alia, address the health effects of PM, based on the work of the World Health Organization (WHO) and examine abatement options. A working group on target setting and policy analysis had been set up to take a strategic view at the work and had started to consider indicators to be used for policy work. The European Commission explained that it intended to prepare, by 2004 or 2005, a thematic strategy on air quality in Europe. The CAFE web site (<http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/environment/air/cafe.htm>) was being updated to provide an overview of these and other CAFE programme activities.

37. The delegation of Sweden informed the Working Group about progress in its programme on International and National Abatement Strategies for Transboundary Air Pollution (ASTA). A synthesis report had been published to summarize the results of the first four years of work and was available on the Internet (asta.ivl.se). A new programme was drawn up to cover work up to 2006. Greater emphasis would be placed, inter alia, on cost-benefit analysis and on uncertainty analysis. Sweden was ready to offer hosting a major workshop in 2004, as a follow-up to the workshop in Saltsjöbaden in 2000. It should assess the state of science and review the basis for air pollution policies to serve both the review of the Gothenburg Protocol and the CAFE programme. The delegation invited other Parties, including Parties in North America, to join the organizing committee.

38. The delegation of Canada thanked Sweden for the invitation and announced that it would be pleased to work with Sweden in preparing for such a workshop, acknowledging the importance of such a meeting in view of the review of the Gothenburg Protocol.

39. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the progress made by EMEP and the Working Group on Effects in preparation for the Gothenburg Protocol's review;

(b) Also took note of the report on integrated assessment modelling (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/1), including the conclusions of the workshop on uncertainty treatment in integrated assessment modelling;

(c) Called upon Parties to make every effort to support both programmes by providing the necessary data (emissions, monitoring, critical loads, etc.) and, in particular, to support the work of CIAM on the baseline scenario by providing by early 2003 the necessary data, especially data on projected activities up to 2020;

(d) Noted with interest the plans of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling to examine the links and synergies between regional air pollution and climate change, and agreed to draw the attention of the Executive Body to this work;

(e) Took note of the report of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/3), encouraged the further review of, and possible revisions to, the Guidance Document on Control Techniques for Preventing and Abating Emissions of Ammonia (EB.AIR/1999/2, chapter V), and stressed the importance of close cooperation with EMEP;

(f) Welcomed the offer of Austria to host the next meeting of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement, jointly with the Agricultural Panel of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections on 28-30 October 2002 in Vienna;

(g) Expressed its appreciation to Sweden for its offer to organize in 2004 a workshop to take stock of the state of science and prepare an assessment for policy discussions for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol and for the CAFE programme.

IV. PREPARING FOR THE REVIEW OF THE PROTOCOL ON HEAVY METALS

40. The secretariat informed the Working Group on the status of ratifications. With 12 ratifications in place and the ratification of the Republic of Moldova expected to arrive soon, the Protocol was approaching entry into force.

41. Mr. S. DUTCHAK (MSC-E) informed the Working Group about the progress of EMEP in its work on heavy metals. The evaluation of pollution levels in Europe had progressed considerably. While total emission and pollution levels in Europe in 2000 had decreased in comparison with previous years, monitoring data had not shown a clear trend for all parts of Europe over the past five years. Results showed that the contribution of transboundary transport to deposition exceeded 50% in many countries. A first evaluation of mercury hemispheric transport had been completed.

42. The Chairman of the Working Group on Effects presented the progress of the Working Group in preparing for a review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals. He stressed that the ICPs had pursued this work as a matter of high priority and he highlighted some of their findings.

43. Mr. J.-P. HETTELINGH (CCE) presented the report on preliminary modelling and mapping of critical loads for cadmium and lead in Europe prepared jointly with MSC-E. The full report was available on the Internet at www.rivm.nl/cce. A summary was presented in document EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/13.

44. The representative of UNEP informed the Working Group that, in response to an initiative by several countries and on the recommendation of the Executive Body, its Governing Council had initiated work on a mercury assessment. A working group had been established for that purpose and it had completed most of the work. The results, including the draft report, were available on the Internet at www.chem.unep.ch/mercury. The UNEP working group had concluded that there was sufficient evidence of significant global adverse impacts to warrant international action to reduce the risk to human health and the environment arising from the release of mercury into the environment. The working group had recommended a number of immediate actions. The representative of UNEP pointed out that there was close cooperation between the secretariats of UNEP and of the Convention both on heavy metals and POPs and expressed his expectation that UNEP would continue to closely cooperate with the work in the UNECE region.

45. Several delegations commended the two programmes for their work. A number of delegations suggested that it would be useful to set up an ad hoc group of experts to prepare for the review of the Protocol. Work should cover the possible addition of other metals to the Protocol and the review of abatement options and should take into account the work conducted outside the region.

46. One delegation drew attention to the importance of cadmium deposition to agricultural soils and suggested linking the work to that on other agricultural emissions. Another delegation noted that coal combustion was also an important source of cadmium.

47. The Working Group:

- (a) Took note of the progress in the work of EMEP and the Working Group on Effects;
- (b) Took note of the progress in the work of CCE and MSC-E on the mapping and modelling of critical loads for cadmium and lead, expressing its hope that this work could soon be used as a basis for policy discussions;
- (c) Decided to recommend to the Executive Body to set up an expert group on heavy metals to start work in 2003 by drawing up proposals for a work programme;
- (d) Agreed that the expert group should, inter alia:
 - (i) Collect available information within and outside the framework of the Convention on the effects of heavy metal pollution;

- (ii) Review information on abatement options and their costs, taking into account the synergies with the abatement of PM;
 - (iii) Review the information on heavy metals not yet included in the Protocol; and
- (e) Called upon Parties to consider taking the lead for this expert group.

V. PREPARING FOR THE REVIEW OF THE PROTOCOL ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS

48. The secretariat informed the Working Group on the status of ratifications. With 12 ratifications in place and the ratification of the Republic of Moldova expected to arrive soon, the Protocol was approaching entry into force.

49. Mr. D. STONE (Canada), Chairman of the Expert Group on POPs, presented its report (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/2), reflecting the discussions at its second and third meetings held in Torun (Poland) on 24-26 October 2001 and in Geneva on 5-6 June 2002. The report provides summaries of information relating to the scheduled reassessments of substance-related provisions in the Protocol on POPs and associated expert judgements. It also contains summaries of information on substances not included in the Protocol. The full compendium of information dossiers on the substances covered by the Expert Group had been printed and distributed as an informal background document by the Netherlands, the co-lead country of the Expert Group. Mr. Stone expressed his great appreciation to the experts in the Group that had conducted the assessment of the substances and conveyed his special thanks to Mr. E. van de PLASSCHE (Netherlands), who had assumed an exceptionally large amount of work.

50. The Expert Group was continuing the assessments started on dicofol, short-chained chlorinated paraffins and pentachlorophenol. In addition, Germany had announced that it was preparing a dossier on endosulphan and it explained that this would be ready by the end of 2002.

51. The delegation of Norway announced that it was ready to host the fourth meeting of the Expert Group in Oslo in March 2003. It suggested inviting to this meeting representatives from the OSPAR Commission for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic and from the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP).

52. Several delegations expressed their appreciation for the excellent work of the Expert Group, thanking Mr. Stone for his able chairmanship.

53. MSC-E presented a summary of recent results of the work of EMEP on POPs. While there had been good progress, POPs were monitored only at 14 sites and there were important gaps in the coverage of Europe. Emission data reporting was improving, but as there continued to be gaps and concerns about data quality, it was still necessary to complement the data with expert estimates. The POPs modelling of MSC-E followed a multi-compartment approach in order to trace all relevant paths of pollution in the environment. For benzo(a)pyrene, as an indicator for

PAHs, data on transboundary transport were available. The MSC-E model had been further refined for dioxins/furans and for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB). Comparison with measurements showed a significant improvement. Work conducted for AMAP had shown the importance of hemispheric transport and this work was being pursued as a matter of high priority.

54. A number of delegations welcomed the presentation and the good progress it reflected. In response to a question, MSC-E explained that in 2003 it would not be able to advance modelling of dioxin/furan transport sufficiently to present final source-receptor matrices.

55. Mr. Stone also informed the Working Group about the work of the Task Force on the Health Aspects of Air Pollution, led by the World Health Organization (WHO). The Task Force conducted a health risk assessment of POPs, which had been presented to the Working Group on Effects at its twenty-first session (EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/14). The full report would be published by WHO. The report provided useful complementary information to the information collected by the POPs Expert Group. Mr. Stone noted that WHO had been able to attract highly qualified experts for the assessment and this resource could also be of value to the Executive Body when it reviewed proposals for adding substances to the Protocol.

56. One delegation noted that in view of the expected entry into force of the Protocol in 2003, some Parties might soon be coming forward with formal proposals for adding substances to the Protocol. While Executive Body decision 1998/2 detailed the information requirements and some of the procedures for adding substances, it might be useful to develop further guidance on how such proposals and other review items could be handled. The delegation suggested asking the two Co-chairs of the Expert Group to prepare suggestions in that respect.

57. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the report on further assessment of POPs (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/2), expressing its appreciation to the experts that had conducted the work, to Mr. Stone for his chairmanship and to the co-lead countries, Canada and the Netherlands;

(b) Decided to submit the summaries and conclusions presented by the Expert Group to the Executive Body, so that they could be taken into account when reviewing the Protocol following its entry into force;

(c) Requested the Expert Group to continue its work in 2003 on the substances that it had not yet addressed and those that Parties had previously decided to bring to its attention;

(d) Thanked Norway for its offer to host the fourth meeting of the Expert Group in March 2003 in Oslo;

(e) Invited the two Co-chairs of the Expert Group to prepare suggestions for the process of handling proposals for adding substances to the Protocol and other review items after it had entered into force and present them at its thirty-fifth session; and

(f) Took note of the information provided by EMEP and by the Task Force on the Health Aspects of Air Pollution, noting with appreciation the excellent progress.

VI. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY

58. Ms. B. OUDART (France) presented the first report of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/4), including recommendations from a meeting on waste incineration, as the first sample sector analysed by the Group. She said that the Group would meet annually to carry out its main tasks and review the progress made in the sectoral meetings. Techno-economic data generated by the Group would be provided to CIAM for cost-curve generation. Cooperation with CIAM and its expectations regarding the validated data and their aggregation would be clarified. Six sectoral meetings were planned for the end of 2002, the results of which would be transmitted to the Expert Group at its next meeting in 2003 (see www.citepa.org/forums/egtei/egtei_index.htm).

59. The delegation of France explained that it was supporting the major part of the work under the Expert Group (84%), but it solicited support from other Parties or industry associations to cover the other 16%, which amounted to approximately €250,000. The delegation of Germany indicated that it would examine the possibility of supporting the work on emerging technologies of the Expert Group through a project.

60. In response to a question on the work on emerging technologies, Ms. Oudart confirmed that the Expert Group would include information on this in its database.

61. One delegation stressed the importance of coordinating the work of the Expert Group with the work on integrated assessment modelling. CIAM confirmed that it was working in close cooperation with the Expert Group. If the data were prepared in the first half of 2003, the cost data used in RAINS could be made available for national review before the end of 2003.

62. Mr. J. ZUREK (Poland) presented the report of the workshop on control technologies for emissions from stationary sources held in Warsaw on 5-7 December 2001 (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/5). Participants had explored the possibilities for organizing future workshops, in particular on the subject of control techniques for PM.

63. A number of delegations underlined the importance of the workshop in enhancing the exchange of technologies and developing contacts among countries with economies in transition, but felt the conclusions and recommendations were not sufficiently concrete. The delegation of the Russian Federation pointed out that more effective measures to exchange information on technologies, and to assist countries with economies in transition experiencing difficulties in ratifying protocols could accelerate the ratification process for the protocols and thus expedite their entry into force.

64. Ms. K. SCAVO (United States) introduced the executive summary (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/6) of a report on the control of mercury emissions from coal-fired electric utility boilers made available by the delegation of the United States. She highlighted the follow-up work and the suggested areas of future research.

65. The secretariat informed the Working Group about a project proposal that it had drawn up after consultation with Kazakhstan. The project on capacity building for air quality management and the application of clean-coal-combustion technologies in Central Asia had been proposed for funding to the United Nations Development Account. An important part of the proposed project aimed at helping Kazakhstan to develop plans for the implementation of the Convention and its protocols. The experience in Kazakhstan would then be used in workshops, to which experts from other countries of Central Asia would be invited. As a component of the project the upgrading, and inclusion in the EMEP network, of an air monitoring station in the region was proposed.

66. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the report of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/4), endorsed the tasks set out in paragraphs 7-14 of its report, and encouraged Parties that were not already participating in the Expert Group to nominate a point of contact;

(b) Also took note of the report on the workshop on control technologies for emissions from stationary sources (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/5);

(c) Requested its Bureau to consider appropriate ways and means to facilitate the exchange of information and technology taking into account the needs of countries in transition and to report back to it at its next session;

(d) Invited Parties to consider organizing further workshops on a specific topic, such as control techniques for PM;

(e) Took note of the executive summary (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/6) of a report on the control of mercury emissions from coal-fired electric utility boilers made available by the delegation of the United States, expressing its appreciation to the delegation for its contribution.

VII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

67. The Working Group re-elected Ms. K. SCAVO (United States) and Mr. J. ZUREK (Poland) as Vice-Chairpersons. It elected Ms. N. KARPOVA (Russian Federation) and Mr. J. SLIGGERS (Netherlands) as new Vice-Chairpersons.

68. It expressed its great appreciation to Mr. D. JOST (Germany) and Mr. V. SOKOLOVSKY

(Russian Federation), who were leaving the Bureau, for their valuable contribution to the work under the Convention. Both Mr. Jost and Mr. Sokolovsky had been among the founding fathers of the Convention and in various positions they had shaped much of its development. It was due to the personal dedication of personalities like Mr. Jost and Mr. Sokolovsky that the Convention had achieved the success of reducing air pollution in the UNECE region.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

69. The secretariat informed the Working Group about preparations for a workshop on enhanced communications for the Convention. The objectives of the workshop would be to: identify implementable actions to improve the Convention's visibility and profile; increase awareness about air pollution and improve the dialogue on its abatement with Parties and other stakeholders. Organized with the assistance of the Stockholm Environment Institute, through its office in York, and financed by Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States, the workshop would be held in spring 2003 in London and would bring together communications experts with experts on the Convention.

70. The delegation of Canada stressed the importance of improving the communication of the Convention to the public, and informed the Working Group that, with the assistance of Switzerland, it had reprinted the brochure on the Gothenburg Protocol.

71. On 20 September, an informal information session on transboundary air management in North America took place. The Working Group expressed its thanks to the delegations of Canada and the United States for the excellent presentations and hoped that similar sessions could be arranged in the future.

72. The thirty-fifth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review was scheduled for 15-19 September 2003.

IX. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

73. The Working Group adopted the report of its thirty-fourth session on 20 September 2002.

Annex

DRAFT DECISION ON THE FINANCING OF CORE ACTIVITIES

The Executive Body,

Noting that the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution and, with one exception, its Protocols do not contain any provision for the long-term financing of core activities,

Recalling that in 1984 the Parties adopted a Protocol to the 1979 Convention to provide for long-term financing of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP),

Considering that in the 1999 Gothenburg Ministerial Declaration the Parties noted that the efficient operation of the Convention and its Protocols required there to be stable, long-term funding arrangements for their core activities,

Convinced that it is necessary to make appropriate arrangements regarding this matter,

Decides that:

1. For the purposes of this decision,

(a) “Financial year” means the financial year of the United Nations, and “annual budget” shall be construed accordingly;

(b) “General Trust Fund” means the General Trust Fund for the Financing of the Implementation of the Convention, which has been established by the Secretary-General of the United Nations;

(c) “Designated international centres” means the international centres for the coordination of effect-related activities and integrated assessment modelling under the Convention that are specified in appendix I below;

(d) “Costs of core activities” means the costs of the international coordination of health, materials and ecosystem effect-related activities and integrated assessment modelling at the designated international centres that are covered by the work-plan adopted by the Executive Body, but excluding costs covered by the EMEP Protocol;

(e) “Contributions in kind” means contributions made by a Party or Signatory to the Convention directly to a designated international centre in respect of its work on core activities, as

well as any other contributions recognized in decisions by the Executive Body as contributions in kind for the purpose of the present decision.

2. An annual budget for the costs of core activities should be adopted by the Executive Body by consensus in advance of the beginning of the financial year to which it applies and, at the same time, provisional budget totals drawn up for each of the two succeeding financial years.
3. The costs of core activities specified in the annual budget should be met from contributions made in cash and/or in kind by any Party or Signatory to the Convention, as well as, subject to approval by the Executive Body on the recommendation of the Working Group on Effects or the EMEP Steering Body, by any other country, organization or individual wishing to contribute to the costs of core activities.
4. All contributions in cash should be deposited in the General Trust Fund account.
5. The contributions referred to in paragraph 3 should be made in accordance with the scale of contributions set out in appendix II below.
6. The secretariat should present for the consideration of the Executive Body at each annual session a list of the contributions, whether in cash or in kind, made in the preceding financial year towards the costs of core activities under the Convention and its Protocols. The secretariat should list contributions in kind to a designated international centre based on information provided to it by the contributing Party and confirmed by the centre receiving the contribution.

Appendix I

DESIGNATED INTERNATIONAL CENTRES

Programme Coordination Centre for the International Cooperative Programme on Effects of Air Pollution on Natural Vegetation and Crops:

at the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Bangor, United Kingdom.

Programme Centre for the International Cooperative Programme on Integrated Monitoring of Air Pollution Effects on Ecosystems:

at the Finnish Environment Institute, Helsinki, Finland.

Programme Main Coordinating Centre for the International Cooperative Programme on Assessment and Monitoring of Air Pollution Effects on Forests:

at the Federal Research Centre for Forestry and Forest Products, Hamburg, Germany.

Programme Centre for the International Cooperative Programme on Assessment and Monitoring of Acidification of Rivers and Lakes:

at the Norwegian Institute for Water Research, Oslo, Norway.

Main Research Centre for the International Cooperative Programme on Effects of Air Pollution on Materials, including Historic and Cultural Monuments:

at the Swedish Corrosion Institute, Stockholm, Sweden.

Coordination Center for Effects for the International Cooperative Programme on Modelling and Mapping:

at the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment, Bilthoven, Netherlands.

Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling for the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling:

at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria.

Centre for Work on the Health Effects of Air Pollution:

at the World Health Organization's European Centre for Environmental Health, Bonn, Germany.

Appendix II

SCALE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

The following is the scale of contributions referred to in paragraph 5:

Parties to the Convention a/	Per cent
Armenia	0.005
Azerbaijan	0.009
Belarus	0.044
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.009
Bulgaria	0.030
Croatia	0.091
Cyprus	0.088
Czech Republic	0.472
Estonia	0.023
Georgia	0.012
Hungary	0.279
Iceland	0.077
Kazakhstan	0.065
Kyrgyzstan	0.002
Latvia	0.023
Liechtenstein	0.014
Lithuania	0.039
Malta	0.035
Monaco	0.009
Norway	1.501
Poland	0.878
Republic of Moldova	0.005
Romania	0.135
Russian Federation	[2.788] b/
Slovakia	0.100
Slovenia	0.188
Switzerland	2.960
The FYR of Macedonia	0.014
Turkey	1.022
Ukraine	0.123
Yugoslavia	0.046
Austria	2.200
Belgium	2.623
Denmark	1.740
Finland	1.213
France	15.021
Germany	22.694
Greece	1.252
Ireland	0.683
Italy	11.766
Luxembourg	0.186
Netherlands	4.037
Portugal	1.073
Spain	5.851
Sweden	2.385
United Kingdom	12.860
European Community	3.330

a/ Canada and United States: voluntary contributions.

b/ To be reviewed at a forthcoming session of the Executive Body.