



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

EB.AIR/WG.5/76
8 October 2003

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-FIFTH SESSION

Introduction

1. The thirty-fifth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review was held in Geneva from 16 to 19 September 2003.
2. The session was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention: Armenia; Austria; Belgium; Bulgaria; Canada; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Georgia; Germany; Hungary; Ireland; Italy; Kyrgyzstan; Latvia ; Netherlands; Norway; Republic of Moldova; Russian Federation; Serbia and Montenegro; Slovenia; Sweden; Switzerland; Ukraine; United Kingdom; United States of America; and the European Community (EC).
3. Representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Health Organization's European Centre for Environment and Health (WHO/ECEH), Bonn Office, attended. The European Crop Protection Association (ECPA), the Union of the Electricity

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.

Industry (EURELECTRIC), the World Chlorine Council and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) also attended. The EMEP Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM) also participated.

4. The meeting was chaired by Mr. R. Ballaman (Switzerland).

5. The Director of the Environment and Human Settlements Division of UNECE addressed the Meeting. He welcomed the imminent entry into force of the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants, which provided an opportunity to further develop the work under the Convention. He drew attention to the Ministerial Conference "Environment for Europe" held in Kiev in May 2003 and noted the parts of the Ministerial Declaration relating to air pollution as well as the Environment Strategy adopted by the Ministers to increase the focus on Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA).

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

6. The Working Group adopted the provisional agenda as contained in document EB.AIR/WG.5/75, whilst agreeing to also discuss the financing of core activities as item 5 bis of the agenda.

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

7. Mr. D. Stone, Co-Chairman of the Expert Group on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), presented its report (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/3), reflecting the discussions at its fourth meeting held in Oslo on 17-19 March 2003. The report provided a review of three additional substances to those in the compendium, dicofol, short-chain chlorinated paraffins and endosulfan. An annex to the compendium of dossiers had been prepared for publication and was made available. Mr. Stone also drew attention to the Expert Group's conclusion that degradation products could be an important consideration when evaluating POPs. Mr. Stone highlighted the emissions characteristics, the environmental levels and bioavailability of the three substances. The dossiers found that all three of them met the indicative values outlined in Executive Body decision 1998/2. The authors of the dossiers had concluded that short-chain chlorinated paraffins were a candidate for inclusion in the Protocol on POPs, while dicofol and endosulfan could be considered for inclusion. Industry had submitted additional technical information, but it was received too late to be incorporated in the preliminary dossier and would be transmitted to the experts. He noted that the Expert Group had considered its work to be complete and had not scheduled any further meetings.

8. Mr. J. Schneider, Chairman of the Steering Body to EMEP, drew attention to the report, prepared by the Task Force on the Health Aspects of Air Pollution and published by WHO, entitled Health Risks of POPs from Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution. He informed the

Working Group about the results of the twenty-seventh session of the EMEP Steering Body, held from 8 to 10 September 2003, and in particular on progress in the monitoring and modelling of POPs. He stressed that the two EMEP Centres, the Chemical Coordinating Centre (CCC) and the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E), had fulfilled their work programmes and provided important information on the depositions and concentrations of some substances covered by the Protocol. MSC-E would concentrate on further improving and validating its model. As this was a multi-compartment model, data were needed on the concentrations of POPs not only in the air, but also in other media. He drew attention to the country-specific reports prepared by MSC-E and invited Parties to consider these carefully and provide their comments to MSC-E. He noted the need for improved data collection and urged Parties to report emissions according to the new emission guidelines and to enhance their work on concentration measurements of POPs.

9. Mr. B. Wahlström (UNEP) noted that the Stockholm Convention on POPs had received 37 of the 50 ratifications needed for entry into force. It was expected that entry into force would take place in 2004 and that the first conference of the Parties would meet in spring 2005, possibly in Uruguay.

10. In the following discussion, delegations expressed their appreciation for the work done by the Expert Group on POPs and the experts who had prepared the draft dossiers. It was noted that the dossiers represented the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Expert Group.

11. Mr. J. Sliggers, Co-Chairman of the Expert Group, presented proposals on methods and procedures for reviewing the Protocol on POPs (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/8). He noted the need for agreeing such procedures to enable the Executive Body and Parties to the Protocol to have a clear mechanism to address the review requirements of the Protocol. He drew particular attention to the three elements for the review procedure, the sufficiency and effectiveness reviews, the substances scheduled for use reassessment and the addition of new substances, as well as to the proposal for the Executive Body to establish a task force on POPs. He stressed that the mandate of the task force should be targeted at the technical work required by the Parties for the review and use reassessment processes under the Protocol. Participation should be open to experts from all Parties to the Convention as well as from recognized intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, but any final decision-making should remain with the Parties to the Protocol.

12. In the discussion that followed, delegations expressed their appreciation for the work done by the two Co-Chairs of the Expert Group. They agreed that it was important to keep the momentum of the work already done and broadly supported the proposed review procedures contained in document EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/8, while agreeing upon some amendments to the text, including that of the draft decision in the annex.

13. The European Community reported on recent developments within the European Union (EU), in particular a proposal for a regulation on POPs, amending directives and fulfilling the

requirements of the Protocol on POPs and the Stockholm Convention on POPs. It also noted a proposal whereby EC would be the only EU Party able to propose new substances for the Protocol. The delegation of the Netherlands announced its intention to propose four new substances after the entry into force of the Protocol in October.

14. A number of Parties highlighted that proposals for adding new substances to the Protocol in 2003 could not be formally considered at the Executive Body's session in December, since the required 90-day period for distributing such proposals before the session could not be met. However, informal work by Parties to improve dossiers could continue.

15. The delegation of the United States suggested a need for detailed terms of reference for the proposed task force and agreed to present a draft proposal for consideration by the Executive Body. The secretariat drew attention to the existing guidelines used by the Convention's task forces and expert groups. The delegation of the United States also suggested that, prior to considering proposals to add substances submitted 90 days in advance of an Executive Body session, the Executive Body should adopt a new decision defining the procedures for considering such proposals.

16. One delegation suggested that the Executive Body should designate the experts participating in the task force. After discussion, the Working Group agreed to recommend the established practice of the Parties nominating their experts. It was also noted that task forces were open to recognized experts from industry and NGOs.

17. Delegations stressed that the task force should not have any decision-making powers. Its function was to collect technical information and present it to the Working Group. It was proposed that negotiations should take place within the Working Group, while decisions relating to the Protocol should be made by its Parties at a session of the Executive Body.

18. The Working Group:

(a) Noted with appreciation the work of the Expert Group on POPs, and took note of the report of its fourth meeting (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/3), whilst gratefully acknowledging the work of national experts in producing the compendium and its addendum;

(b) Expressed its thanks to Mr. Stone and Mr. Sliggers, the Co-Chairs of the Expert Group, and to the lead countries, Canada and the Netherlands, for their support;

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

(d) Noted with appreciation the publication by WHO of the Health Risks of POPs from

Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution prepared by the Task Force on the Health Aspects of Air Pollution;

(e) Urged Parties to enhance their work on measurements and emission data reporting on POPs as requested by the EMEP Steering Body;

(f) Concluded that, with the entry into force of the Protocol, the work of the Expert Group had been accomplished; but

(g) Welcomed the proposed decisions and procedures, including the setting-up of a task force, drawn up by the Co-Chairs of the Expert Group (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/8), and recommended them as amended to the Executive Body.

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

19. The secretariat informed the Working Group on the status of ratifications. With 15 ratifications confirmed and others expected soon, the Protocol would enter into force shortly. However, because of the 90-day period after the sixteenth ratification, this might not be before the next session of the Executive Body.

20. Mr. D. Jost (Germany) presented the report of the first meeting of the Expert Group on Heavy Metals held on 21 - 22 March 2003 in Geneva (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/4). The meeting had been well attended by experts and representatives of the Convention's bodies and centres. He noted the importance of future collaboration with ongoing activities under the Convention. He stressed the need for further scientific discussions to address particular topics and noted that the Expert Group had identified a need for improving emission inventories for heavy metals, for developing an effects-based approach and for quantifying non-atmospheric inputs to soil, especially for cadmium. The Expert Group had highlighted the importance of considering mercury speciation and the transport of mercury on the hemispheric scale. Mr. Jost drew attention to the work-plan elements included in the report, noting that there were some errors in relation to activities identified for certain countries. He informed the Working Group that the second meeting of the Expert Group was planned for March 2004. Germany would also host a scientific and technical workshop on 17 - 18 November 2003.

21. Mr. H. Gregor, Chairman of the Working Group on Effects, summarized the work by the International Cooperative Programmes (ICPs) that could contribute to preparations for the review of the Protocol. Nearly all ICPs had ongoing activities and several had contributed to the Expert Group's meeting. He drew particular attention to the activities of ICP Modelling and Mapping, which had an expert panel that was working on the elements of an effects-based approach. An expert meeting on critical limits for heavy metals had been held on 2 - 4 December 2002 in Berlin (EB.AIR/WG.1/2003/10/Add.1).

22. Mr. J. Schneider, Chairman of the Steering Body of EMEP, outlined the work on heavy metals under the EMEP Steering Body, noting in particular the work by CCC and MSC-E in monitoring and in developing and validating transport models. Comparisons of modelled data with measurements showed increasingly good results for cadmium, lead and mercury, and an in-depth review of the model was planned for 2004. He noted that completeness and quality of emissions data were a limiting factor for model development and that greater effort was needed by Parties to report their data. He drew attention to country-specific reports prepared by MSC-E, and available on its web site (<http://www.msceast.org/EMEP.html>), on concentration, deposition and transboundary fluxes of metals. Parties had been invited to comment.

23. Mr. B. Wahlström (UNEP) outlined his organization's continuing activities on mercury. The Working Group on Global Mercury Assessment had reported to the UNEP Governing Council and this had resulted in the Global Mercury Programme. He noted continued collaboration with the Convention, in particular through a workshop to be organized by Sweden. Information on related UNEP activities was available through its web site (<http://www.chem.unep.ch/mercury>).

24. In the following discussion, delegations expressed their appreciation for the work done by the Expert Group on Heavy Metals thus far and thanked the Chairman for his efforts. They noted the excellent collaboration with EMEP and the Working Group on Effects, and stressed the importance of continuing this for the future. The delegation of the United Kingdom highlighted that there would be a need for the Expert Group and the Working Group to consider whether to propose an effects-based approach or to focus on best available techniques when preparing for the review of the Protocol. The delegation of the United States noted that mention of its name in the report of the Expert Group regarding work on reviewing and assessing information on metals not in the Protocol (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/4, para. 25 (a) and (b)) was in error.

25. Two delegations expressed the need for a more consistent and transparent process in expert groups and task forces, including the importance of a better understanding of the procedures. They suggested improved planning of meetings to allow for adequate preparation and consultation time, and review of reports before the close of meetings.

26. Mr. K. Bull, of the secretariat, drew attention to the secretariat's guidelines for expert groups, which identified inter alia responsibilities for reporting. He regretted if experts to the first meeting of the Expert Group had been misled by the secretariat with regard to established practices, but hoped that the guidelines would provide sufficient help in the future. He indicated that the secretariat would work with the Chairman and lead country to provide reports to the satisfaction of the Parties.

27. Several Parties indicated that they would ratify the Protocol soon, and some suggested that there might be a need to consider the establishment of a task force on heavy metals to mirror the

approach being proposed for POPs. The delegation of the United States suggested that terms of reference should be agreed for such a task force.

28. Sweden announced that it was planning to hold a workshop on 29 - 30 March 2004 in Brussels on mercury and its environmental problems. It was to be organized in cooperation with the Convention, EC and UNEP, and would cover critical loads, exposure and impacts, atmospheric mercury, the mercury market, abatement strategies and waste treatment.

29. The Working Group:

(a) Welcomed the start made by the Expert Group to address preparations for the review of the Protocol and took note of the report, including work-plan elements;

(b) Confirmed that the Expert Group should give first priority to cadmium, lead and mercury, though future work should not be restricted to these;

(c) Welcomed the involvement of other subsidiary bodies and their programmes and international centres, and stressed the importance of coordinating the supporting work to the Expert Group;

(d) Requested the Expert Group to agree a clear timetable for developing and evaluating an effects-based approach;

(e) Noted that the second meeting of the Expert Group was to be held on 31 March - 1 April 2004 in Brussels and that Germany would host a scientific and technical workshop on 17 - 18 November 2003 in Langen (Germany);

(f) Welcomed the offer of Sweden to host a workshop on mercury and its environmental problems on 29 - 30 March 2003 back to back with the Expert Group's meeting in Brussels.

IV. PREPARING FOR THE REVIEW OF THE GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL

30. The Working Group was informed that, with the ratifications by Romania and EC in 2003, there were now six ratifications to the Protocol. Eleven delegations reported on their ratification processes. Four delegations indicated that they expected to complete ratification before the end of 2003, and three in the first half of 2004.

31. The delegation of the Netherlands noted that, during its ratification process, industry had signalled that the NO_x limit values for stationary gas and diesel engines in annex V, paragraph 12, table 4, to the Protocol were too strict. The Netherlands had started a project to investigate the figures. It indicated that its ratification had proceeded leaving open the possibility of using the "alternative" reduction strategies allowed under article 3, paragraphs 2 and 3, and suggested that

Parties should take note of the issue. A number of countries, including Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro and United Kingdom, also expressed some concern that these NO_x limit values might be too strict.

32. The delegation of Norway stressed that it was facing the challenge of reducing NO_x emissions from its shipping and fishery sectors, and invited other Parties facing a similar challenge to cooperate in finding solutions.

33. Mr. J. Schneider made an overview of the progress in work under the EMEP Steering Body in preparation for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol. He highlighted the considerable progress achieved in the development of the unified Eulerian model and its good performance in predicting the trends for some pollutants such as sulphur, nitrogen oxides and ozone. There was already an indication that the results produced by the Eulerian model were better than those of the Lagrangian model used as the basis for negotiating the Gothenburg Protocol. A review of the unified model, at a workshop in November, was expected to confirm that the model was fit for policy purposes. The Task Force on Measurements and Modelling would continue discussions on the model's performance in April 2004. There was a clear signal from the Steering Body of the need to strengthen work with regard to source-receptor relationships and particulate matter (PM). He stressed the importance of the measurements provided by Parties for the work of EMEP; he requested all Parties to consider carefully the draft monitoring strategy and provide their comments to the Task Force. He drew attention to the EMEP assessment report, to be finalized next year. He also stressed the need to improve the quality of emissions data. Finally, he highlighted some more recent interests of EMEP, namely on the urban and hemispheric scales, drawing attention to the intercontinental transport of some pollutants.

34. In the discussion that followed, the delegation of the Netherlands notified that it had written a letter to the Chair of the Steering Body of EMEP about inconsistencies between the new guidelines and those used at the time of negotiation of the Gothenburg Protocol. While the issue was being addressed by the EMEP Steering Body and its Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, he stressed aircraft emissions still needed further consideration.

35. Mr. H. Gregor drew attention to progress in the work under the Working Group on Effects, noting the medium-term work-plan that was intended to address the needs of the Convention. He drew attention to the work to harmonize land-cover maps, the new critical levels for ozone and empirical critical loads for nitrogen to be found in the revised Mapping Manual, and the substantive report being prepared for 2004. He noted the progress in dynamic modelling and requested guidance on the choice of "target years" for dynamic model calculations.

36. There was general agreement that 2030 or 2050 might be suitable as "target years" for dynamic modelling. However, some delegations expressed concern over using 2100 for this purpose.

37. Mr. J. Schneider reported on progress in work carried out by WHO/ECEH to evaluate the health effects from exposure to ozone and particulate matter (PM) under a project funded by EC. It aimed to provide input into the Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme but would also be useful for the Convention. The first phase of the project had focused on three key pollutants: particulate matter, ozone and nitrogen dioxide. For particulate matter, there was evidence for health effects and clear links to morbidity and mortality; it had been recommended that PM 2.5 should be used as an indicator for effects. For ozone, short-term exposure might cause morbidity and mortality at concentrations well below the current WHO air quality guideline. Work was continuing on the development of concentration-response functions that might be used for health impact assessments.

38. In the discussion that followed, it was stressed that, while PM 2.5 might be recommended as an indicator for PM-related health effects, continued attention should be paid to PM 10, as it was still used for air quality standards.

39. Mr. R. Maas (Netherlands), Chairman of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, reported on progress (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/5), including the results of the twenty-eighth meeting of the Task Force, held in Haarlem (Netherlands) on 7 - 9 May 2003. He noted that several new insights would lead to the conclusion that it would be harder to meet the environmental objectives of the Gothenburg Protocol regarding the protection of ecosystems and human health. For example: EURO 2 and possibly also EURO 3 heavy-duty vehicles (HDV) appeared to emit more NO_x than originally expected; there were indications that adverse health effects already occurred at ozone concentrations below 60 ppb; effects on vegetation occurred at ozone levels lower than 40 ppb; and, with the new EMEP model, deposition to forests was much higher than before and so considerably more ecosystems in Europe than previously calculated would need protection. Moreover, PM_{2.5} exposure created serious adverse health effects. Additional measures would be needed, both at the regional and at the hemispheric level, if policy makers still wished to meet their original ambitions. On the other hand, effective reduction in national greenhouse gas emissions, as agreed under the Kyoto Protocol, might substantially reduce the costs of implementing the Gothenburg Protocol.

40. It was clarified that the only non-technical measures included so far in the work were the Kyoto scenario (which was partly technical) and the EU common agricultural policy's reform scenario. Non-technical measures for local road traffic were not taken on board.

41. Mr. M. Amann (CIAM) reported on progress in the work on integrated assessment modelling. CIAM was in the process of developing baseline scenarios for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol. Attention was drawn to some elements of the baseline scenario, such as emission inventories for 2000, atmospheric dispersion calculations, quantification of health risks and ecosystem impacts. CIAM had carried out an in-depth review of national emissions

submissions in cooperation with the European Topic Centre (ETC) and MSC-W. Where discrepancies and uncertainties had been found, questionnaires had been sent to the countries. Bilateral consultations with Parties would be held in autumn 2003. Work on the exposure of the urban population would continue in 2004 using the results from the project phases 1 and 2. Its preliminary results showed that fine-scale models (down to 5 km) were not significantly better than the 50 km models; there were no major benefits from fine-scale modelling given the available data, particularly the meteorological and emissions data. Work would also continue on the assessment of linkages and synergies between regional air pollution and climate change to provide policy makers with the necessary information.

42. The importance of having good-quality information on the Parties not covered by CAFE was stressed. Several delegations also stressed the importance of bilateral consultations between such countries and CIAM. It was noted that there might be funding from EMEP for such consultations and CIAM indicated its readiness to start. Mr. Amann drew attention to the fact that while CIAM had received projections for economic activities for the CAFE countries from the European Commission, such projections for the countries outside the CAFE programme were required from the countries themselves, in accordance with reporting obligations under EMEP. However, very few countries had submitted such data.

43. The importance of emission data quality was also stressed. The delegation of Slovenia drew attention to the difficulties that might arise when compliance reviews had to take account of revised emission values that were a result of using new inventory methodologies in accordance with the reporting guidelines.

44. Mr. Amann reported on the results of a workshop held in Laxenburg in early 2003 on the linkages of regional and global emission control (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/5/Add.1). He highlighted that there were links concerning sources, atmospheric chemistry, impacts and controls. Understanding these links would be essential to avoid any future trade-offs and to use possible synergies between regional and global emission controls.

45. The importance of running alternative scenarios, taking into account different structural measures, e.g. energy-efficiency measures, was highlighted. This would necessitate making assumptions for the potential for such measures in different countries, and these should be agreed. This could be discussed in the bilateral consultations between CIAM and countries. In relation to future work on linkages and synergies between air pollution and climate change policies, it was noted that funding to CIAM from the CAFE programme focused on air pollution aspects. It was suggested that the attention of the Executive Body should be drawn to the need for continued funding for these new activities.

46. The delegation of Sweden provided information on preparations for a workshop on the review and assessment of air pollution policy to be held, tentatively, in October-November 2004

in Sweden. The objectives of the workshop would be to review and assess: the objectives and targets for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol and the EC CAFE strategy, in view of the scientific knowledge and scenario analysis; further policy options for the Convention and the CAFE programme in relation to the development within sectors and other policy areas; and the needs for further scientific research and supporting knowledge after the planned Convention and EC decisions.

47. Mr. J. Bartaire (EURELECTRIC) introduced a paper on behalf of the Union of Industrial and Employers' Confederations of Europe (UNICE), presenting the position of European industries on integrated assessment modelling and the CAFE process. He stressed the importance of taking into account the costs involved and the feasibility of any proposed action.

48. The delegation of the United States drew attention to its web site, which provided information on the review of particulate matter air quality standards (see documents for review on www.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs).

49. The delegation of the United Kingdom expressed its willingness to continue to lead the Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Instruments (NEBEI). Following the stepping-down of Mr. David Pearce (United Kingdom) as rapporteur of the network, the United Kingdom was nominating Mr. Ståle Navrud (Norway) as the new rapporteur. The subject for the next meeting of NEBEI, possibly in Italy in spring 2005, had tentatively been described as damage to materials including cultural heritage.

50. Mr. Sliggers (Netherlands) presented the results of the second workshop of NEBEI on the valuation of ecosystem benefits from air pollution abatement' (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/1). The workshop had discussed the role of benefit estimation in the work under the Convention, the different approaches to ecosystem valuation, and specific valuation studies, including examples on forests and nature in general, water ecosystems, terrestrial ecosystems and groundwater. One of the main conclusions of the workshop was that economic valuation should continue to be seen as a complement to, not a substitute for, the ecological (intrinsic) value of nature. Furthermore, the need for further studies on the valuation of ecosystems was identified, and the need for close links between natural scientists and economists in this work.

51. The delegation of the United States announced the development of its environmental Benefits Mapping and Analysis Program (BenMAP), a new geographic information system (GIS) tool for estimating the health and environmental impacts of environmental regulations and policies. It was currently under peer review and would be publicly available, free of charge, in the near future. The delegation of EC stressed that the RAINS modelling framework would assess the costs of different actions and would only partly quantify ecosystem benefits. The EC was concluding a contract for cost-benefit analysis within the framework of the CAFE programme, which would include multi-criteria analyses for those benefits that could not be quantified fully.

The delegation of Italy announced the recent establishment of a sub-centre of ICP Materials that would be responsible for addressing the effects on cultural heritage.

52. Ms. A. Vipond (United Kingdom) presented the report of a joint meeting of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement and the panel on agriculture and nature of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/2), held on 28 - 30 October 2002 in Vienna. The priorities of the Expert Group were seen as: the continued review and revision of the Guidance Document on Control Techniques for Preventing and Abating Emission of Ammonia (EB.AIR/1999/2, chap. V); the promotion of the Framework Advisory Code of Good Agricultural Practice for Reducing Ammonia Emissions (EB.AIR/WG.5/2001/7); the further examination of non-agricultural sources of ammonia emissions; collaboration with the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues. At the joint meeting it had been noted that developments in inventory methods were likely to lead to changes in emission totals, particularly where new sources of non-agricultural sources were included. The meeting had agreed to reflect its conclusions in the Convention's work-plan. Ms. Vipond also presented the report of the joint meeting of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement and the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/6), held on 11 - 12 June 2003 in Paris, noting that a new Chairman of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement, Mr. Jim Webb (United Kingdom), had taken over from Mr. Ian Davidson. National experts had presented information on abatement techniques for ammonia emissions from agriculture and had agreed on the need for better information on abatement techniques and their costs. The Expert Group had agreed to prepare a questionnaire with CIAM to circulate to Parties to gain information on agricultural practices for the RAINS model. Nine countries had responded to the questionnaire and others were planning to do so. It was proposed to hold a workshop to assist countries with economies in transition with their agricultural emission abatement options and improved inventories of agricultural and non-agricultural ammonia emissions.

53. The delegation of Slovenia requested CIAM to forward a copy of the questionnaire on agricultural activity data and farm practices to the heads of delegation to the Working Group to ensure coordinated replies. The delegation of the United Kingdom noted that uncertainties in ammonia emissions had important implications for ammonia emission inventories and their use for addressing compliance issues relating to emission ceilings under the Gothenburg Protocol.

54. The Chairman of the Working Group reminded Parties of the need to transpose the Framework Code of Good Agricultural Practices to the national level and noted that experts were available to assist with this if necessary.

55. The Working Group:

- (a) Welcomed the progress in the work for the preparation for the review of the

Gothenburg Protocol, expressing its appreciation for the work of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and CIAM, and for the contributions made by other subsidiary bodies; urged that the work should continue and that it be reported to it at its thirty-sixth session;

(b) Welcomed the conclusions of the workshop on linkages and synergies of regional and global emission control (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/5/Add.1), noting the recommendations made, especially those identifying the need for strengthening links between bodies and for further work in this area;

(c) Agreed that attention should be drawn to the NO_x limit values in annex V, paragraph 12, table 4, when the annexes to the Protocol were considered for review, following the Protocol's entry into force;

(d) Urged Parties to ratify the Gothenburg Protocol as early as possible, preferably well before the 25th anniversary of the Convention in November 2004;

(e) Took note of the report on integrated assessment modelling (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/5);

(f) Called upon Parties to make every effort to support the work 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 2004, the necessary data, in particular those data on projected activities up to 2020;

(g) Drew attention to the inconsistencies between the new emission inventory guidelines and those used at the time of the negotiations for the Gothenburg Protocol, noted that these were being partly addressed by EMEP, but also noted that there was an outstanding issue related to aircraft emissions;

(h) Welcomed the progress in work on PM, noted the importance of PM 2.5 for health effects whilst identifying the need to continue consideration of PM10 as they were still used as air quality standards;

(i) Thanked Mr. David Pearce for his work as rapporteur of NEBEI and in his previous role as Chair of the Task Force on Economic Aspects of Abatement Strategies, and the United Kingdom for continuing to act as lead country for NEBEI;

(j) Welcomed the results of the workshop on the valuation of ecosystem benefits from air pollution abatement (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/1) and took note of the conclusions, especially those indicating work required for the review of the Protocol;

(k) Took note of the report of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/2) and the report of the joint meeting of the Expert Group with that on

Techno-economic Issues (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/6), and thanked the outgoing Chairman, Mr. Ian Davidson (United Kingdom), for his leadership;

(l) Welcomed the proposal to have a workshop in Poland, targeted at countries with economies in transition, on agricultural emission abatement options and emission inventories, and agreed to include it in the draft work-plan for 2004;

(m) Requested collaboration between CIAM, the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections and the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement, to continue to work with Parties to improve the quality of ammonia emission inventories and measurements and to carry out further work on non-agricultural ammonia emissions;

(n) Requested the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement to continue its work to revise the Guidance Document on Control Techniques for Preventing and Abating Emissions of Ammonia in preparation for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol;

(o) Welcomed the proposal by Sweden to host a workshop on the review and assessment of air pollution policy;

(p) Urged Parties to continue their efforts to promote and implement the Framework Advisory Code of Good Agricultural Practice for Reducing Ammonia Emissions at the national level.

V. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY

56. Mr. B. Calaminus (French-German Institute for Environmental Research (IFARE)) and Ms. Nadine Allemande (Interprofessional Technical Centre for Studies on Atmospheric Pollution (CITEPA)) presented the report of the meetings held in 2003 by the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues. These included eight sector panels, approximately 40 industry meetings, two core steering group meetings, a workshop on the Expert Group's database (ECODAT) and a meeting held jointly with the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/6).

57. Mr. Calaminus presented progress on the work of the Expert Group and on the development of the techno-economic database (ECODAT). Recalling that the aim of the Expert Group was to validate techno-economic data on reference installations and control technologies essential to integrated assessment modelling, he noted that the work involved input from Parties and industry. Nineteen Parties had nominated national experts to the Expert Group; other Parties were encouraged to do so. He stressed that the participation of Parties from Central and Eastern Europe could be financed by France, the lead country. He explained the process of data collection for ECODAT. Using existing databases and RAINS as a basis, data were provided by national experts and information in reference documents by industry. Data were made available to experts

for further consultation with industry to achieve agreement, and subsequently transmitted to CIAM for use in RAINS. The database included information on: application rates of techniques, fuel characteristics, energy data, prices, parameters for calculation of variable costs and fixed operating costs. While the database only covered techniques under the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) Directive's Best Available Technology Reference documents (BREFs), and did not reflect new and emerging technologies, a project by the European IPPC Bureau in Seville, Spain, would target this. The Expert Group's next meeting would be held on 9 - 10 October 2003 in Angers (France) to assess the level of data flow. The first round of data would be transmitted to CIAM by the end of November 2003.

58. The delegation of the United States announced that it would host a workshop on control technologies for particulate matter on 23-25 June 2004 in Indianapolis (United States). It would be held under the auspices of the Urban International Forum of the Air and Waste Management Association, and the United States would aim to finance participation of some experts from countries with economies in transition.

59. Mr. B. Libert, a regional advisor of UNECE, informed the Working Group about progress made on a TACIS project on "Air Pollution and Emission Inventories" involving Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and the Republic of Moldova. As this project was also based on the situation in Kazakhstan as a pilot country, it would link directly to and facilitate the preparation of the proposed United Nations Development Account (UNDA) project on capacity-building in Central Asia. The UNDA project was aiming at developing abatement strategies, capacity-building for air quality management and the application of clean-coal combustion technologies. The project was expected to be funded by UNDA and would aim at supporting Parties in the subregion and other interested countries. Kazakhstan had specifically requested help on implementation at the nineteenth session of the Executive Body, and the project aimed to develop plans for the implementation of the Convention and its protocols. Depending on the success of the project, the experience in Kazakhstan could be used as a model for similar projects in other countries in Central Asia. The possible inclusion in the EMEP network of an air monitoring station in the region had also been proposed.

60. Delegations congratulated the Expert Group on its work and thanked France for its leadership. A few raised concerns about resource constraints in providing and validating data. Several delegations enquired if ECODAT would be maintained in the long term.

61. The delegation of France indicated that the budget provided by the lead country for the Expert Group covered about 90 per cent of the necessary financing of the work and invited other Parties to provide additional financing.

62. The EC representative noted that the European Commission had difficulties financing long-term projects. However, due to the deadlines for the baseline scenarios and thematic

strategies for 2005, it was essential to have validated data on activities within the RAINS framework so the work of the Expert Group would be considered at the CAFE Steering Group's next meeting. He also drew attention to studies on new and emerging technologies in the industrial sector being carried out by the Joint Research Centre. He stressed that very small combustion (domestic) installations would become increasingly important so there might be a need to consider setting standards.

63. The delegation of the Russian Federation noted that non-participation by Parties from Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) was often due to organizational obstacles. It indicated that there were sometimes difficulties in accessing documents, lists of meetings and registration forms, especially for countries without reliable Internet access.

64. The secretariat drew attention to the procedures for meetings, noting that mailing lists needed to be kept up to date and inviting Parties to provide the necessary information. An annual list of meetings for the coming year was drawn up and appended to the report of the Executive Body. This was kept up to date on the web site of the Convention. Parties were invited to provide information for updates. For task force and expert group meetings and for workshops, invitations were the responsibility of the lead country, but the secretariat could provide contact names and addresses if required. It was stressed that the secretariat was always willing to help if there were difficulties.

65. Ms. N. Karpova (Russian Federation), Vice-Chair of the Working Group, noted that the Working Group at its thirty-fourth session (EB.AIR/WG.5/74, para. 66 (c)) had requested its Bureau to consider ways and means to facilitate the exchange of information and technology in order to address specific problems that EECCA countries faced in implementing and ratifying the protocols to the Convention. She drew attention to the need for intensifying work in the EECCA region to facilitate the ratification of the Protocols on POPs and on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol. She indicated that the Russian Federation was prepared to draft a questionnaire aimed at identifying problems with the ratification of the Protocol on POPs, the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol in EECCA countries, as well as the needs of those countries in relation to the implementation of the three Protocols. She suggested that a workshop on the practical aspects of complying with the obligations under the three Protocols could be held once a year for EECCA countries in one of the countries of the region. Furthermore, she noted the need for preparing an implementation guide for the three Protocols.

66. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the report of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/6), welcomed the progress made in developing the techno-economic database (ECODAT) and encouraged Parties to come forward with additional financing for the work;

(b) Endorsed the proposed timetable and work-plan for the Expert Group, agreeing it would meet the needs for a future review of the Gothenburg Protocol;

(c) Noted with appreciation the proposal by the United States to hold a workshop on control technologies for particulate matter in Indianapolis on 23 - 25 June 2004;

(d) Took note of the current TACIS project on "Air Pollution and Emission Inventories" involving Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and the Republic of Moldova; also took note of the proposed UNDA project on capacity-building in Central Asia which could be a basis for developing abatement strategies for Parties and other interested countries in the subregion and could provide a means for encouraging accession to protocols as well as providing an opportunity for developing better links with UNEP Asia and the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP);

(e) Thanked the delegation of the Russian Federation for offering to draft a questionnaire for the EECCA countries, and invited the secretariat to cooperate with the Russian Federation in circulating the questionnaire and collating the responses;

(f) Noted the need for organizing annual workshops among the EECCA countries and for preparing implementation manuals/guides for the Protocol on POPs, the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol; requested this be drawn to the attention of the Executive Body, while stressing the need to ensure adequate resources for this work.

VI. FINANCING OF CORE ACTIVITIES

67. The delegation of the Netherlands drew attention to the tables drawn up by the secretariat for past sessions of the Executive Body, showing voluntary contributions to, and expenditure from, the Trust Fund supporting the core activities not covered by the EMEP Protocol. It proposed a number of additions that provided for greater transparency and clarity of the contributions made in relation to the amounts requested by the secretariat, in keeping with the decision.

68. The secretariat explained that, with the recent Executive Body decision 2002/1, it was revising its methods of presenting contributions to allow for, inter alia, contributions in kind. The proposals by the Netherlands were useful and timely and would be incorporated into the report to the Executive Body.

VII. COMMUNICATION STRATEGY FOR THE CONVENTION

69. Mr. M. Chadwick, the coordinator and organizer of the workshop on a Communication Strategy for the Convention, held in London on 9 - 11 April 2003, introduced its report (EB.AIR/WG.5/2003/7) and noted its recommendations. The workshop had brought together

communications experts and those involved with the Convention to consider how to make the Convention and its achievements better known. It had recommended three items for immediate attention: activities to mark the 25th anniversary of the Convention in 2004; setting up an expert group on communications; and action for a global forum on air pollution issues. Mr. Chadwick also noted a number of other issues to be addressed over the longer term, including the importance of assessing and redeveloping the Convention's Internet site. The secretariat summarized initial ideas for celebrating the 25th anniversary.

70. Delegations supported the idea of marking the 25th anniversary, pointing out that there were very few environmental conventions with such a long history of success. They identified the need for a planning committee. Activities suggested included a publication on the history of the Convention, a travelling exhibition, a poster competition for children, a press conference at the time of the twenty-second session of the Executive Body and a party or dinner to mark the event. While recognizing the importance of drawing up a strategy for the future work of the Convention, several delegations believed 2004 provided too little time. Several delegations noted that it would be difficult to attract ministers to the celebrations so it should not be a ministerial conference. The entry into force of the Gothenburg Protocol could be celebrated but the timing was uncertain. Suggestions for guests included the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Executive Director of UNEP. The delegation of Hungary proposed that every Party should be invited to prepare press releases and scientific articles to promote the Convention at the time of the anniversary. The Chairman noted that for the present the Executive Body's Bureau would act as the planning committee for the anniversary celebrations and noted the need for funding for the event. He also noted the reports by the Working Group on Effects and EMEP to be produced in 2004. An attractive brochure could also be published.

71. Several delegations expressed interest in establishing a group on communications issues. A few delegations supported the idea of developing a network with experts from other regions. While some considered it premature to launch a global forum, the sharing of information and encouragement of participation of experts from other regions in the Convention's meetings were supported.

72. Delegations stressed the importance of redesigning the Convention's web site, including as an immediate objective a news page, e-news letter, public-press summaries of interesting documents, etc. The United States had made an expert available to help develop the web site.

73. The delegation of France noted that it was important to ensure that a press dossier was drawn up to allow access by the press throughout the world, as well as being accessible to the public. The EC noted the importance of determining clear objectives for a communication strategy.

74. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the report of the workshop and thanked Mr. Chadwick for his excellent organization in preparing and running the workshop;

(b) Recommended that the results of the workshop should be drawn to the attention of the Executive Body, noting it might wish to draw these to the attention of other UNECE environmental conventions;

(c) Recommended the Executive Body to organize a celebration for the 25th anniversary of the Convention, including a press conference, the forthcoming publications of EMEP and the Working Group on Effects, and other materials and activities, depending on available resources; the celebration could take place at the time of the Executive Body's session but it was recognized that an additional day might be required to accommodate such an event;

(d) Proposed the setting-up of an expert group drawn from interested Parties to consider issues of communications initially with a view to preparing for the 25th anniversary of the Convention;

(e) Welcomed the offer of the United States to help with the redesign of the Convention's web site and with the development of an electronic newsletter.

VII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

75. The Working Group expressed its sadness at the death of Mr. Janusz Zurek, former Vice-Chairperson of the Working Group. It recognized the important contribution that he had made to the work of the Convention, which included the Working Group, the Executive Body and other subsidiary bodies, and took note that the secretariat had sent a message of sympathy to the Polish Government and Mr. Zurek's family.

76. The Working Group re-elected Ms. K. Scavo (United States), Ms. N. Karpova (Russian Federation) and Mr. J. Sliggers (Netherlands). It elected Mr. P. Jilek (Czech Republic) as new Vice-Chairperson.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

77. There were no issues for consideration under this agenda item.

IX. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

78. The Working Group adopted the report of its thirty-fifth session on 19 September 2003.