



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/84
4 October 2006

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

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

Working Group on Strategies and Review

Thirty-eighth session
Geneva, 19–22 September 2006

REPORT OF THE THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION

1. The thirty-eighth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review was held in Geneva from 19 to 22 September 2006.
2. The session was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention: Albania, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United States and the European Community.
3. The EMEP¹ Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM) and the Coordinating Centre for Effects (CCE) were represented. Also attending were representatives of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), CEFIC (the European Chemical Industry Council), CONCAWE (the oil companies' European association for environmental and health

¹ Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe.

protection), Eurelectric, Eurochlor, the European Environmental Bureau, the European Association of Internal Combustion Engine Manufacturers (EUROMOT), the European Semiconductor Industry Association (SEMI), the International Council of Chemical Associations, the International Council for Mining and Metals and the World Chlorine Council.

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

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5. The Working Group adopted the agenda of the meeting as set out in ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/83.

II. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE HEADS OF DELEGATION

6. The Working Group adopted the report of the Meeting of the Heads of Delegation as set out in ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/82.

III. REVIEW OF THE 1998 PROTOCOL ON HEAVY METALS

7. The Chair of the Task Force on Heavy Metals, Mr. D. Jost (Germany), presented the report of the Task Force on Heavy Metals (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/2). He concluded that data on emissions of cadmium, lead and mercury showed overall decreases up to 2000; emissions had since levelled off. Best available techniques (BAT) had been identified that could further reduce heavy metal emissions from most sectors. He noted there were products and product management measures in addition to those listed in the annexes. He presented the emission limit values (ELVs) for mercury from existing chlor-alkali plants and from mercury-containing emissions from medical waste incineration, as required by the Protocol. He , noted that these had been agreed to by the Task Force with the exception of two experts, one from industry. .

8. The Chair of the Working Group on Effects, Mr. H.-D. Gregor (Germany), described progress made in developing an effects-based approach using critical loads. He noted the long history of the work and stressed that the Working Group on Effects had again confirmed that the underlying methodology was scientifically sound and formed a satisfactory basis for the application of an effects-based approach, and had recommended that the results be used in work under the Convention, in particular in the review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals.

9. The Chair of a panel of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling of the Working Group on Effects, Ms. G. Schutze (Germany), presented recent work on, *inter alia*, ecotoxicological effects of heavy metals on human health and ecosystems. She noted that

uncertainties in critical loads exceedance calculations were mainly due to uncertainties in emissions.

10. The Chair of the EMEP Steering Body, Mr. J. Schneider (Austria), reported on work carried out on heavy metals by EMEP's Meteorological Synthesizing Centre – East (MSC-E). A recent review of MSC-E's model had confirmed that it was state-of-the-art and fit to assess long-range transboundary transport of heavy metals in Europe. However, the model underestimated deposition compared with measurements. This was due to underestimation of national emissions.

11. Mr. J. Sliggers (Netherlands) presented the results of phase II of a study on the effectiveness of the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the costs of additional measures for European countries by the Netherlands Organization for Applied Scientific Research (TNO). He concluded that full implementation of the Protocol on Heavy Metals would yield considerable emission reductions of both heavy metals and particulate matter. Possible additional measures on top of the full implementation of the Protocol were presented, and the costs of reduction for all European countries were calculated. Decreasing mercury emissions would also reduce other gaseous emissions such as dioxins and furans. Measures additional to those in the Protocol would lead to further significant decreases in emissions.

12. Mr. J. P. Hettelingh (CCE) presented information on critical loads and their exceedances for cadmium, lead and mercury and tentative results for the six other metals. He concluded that lead and mercury significantly exceeded critical loads, while for the other metals there were no widespread exceedances in Europe. He stressed that continued emphasis on cadmium, lead and mercury was justified.

13. The delegation of Finland drew attention to the informal document it had made available to the Working Group and noted that if non-atmospheric additions of cadmium, like the use of fertilizers, were taken into account, the risks of adverse effects might be more severe and critical cadmium loads would be more commonly exceeded in agricultural soils than indicated in the Task Force report.

14. Mr. Schneider noted that the Task Force on Health Aspects of Air Pollution had indicated that there might be no threshold for effects for concentrations of cadmium, lead and mercury, which suggested that a precautionary principle should be applied.

15. In the following discussion, delegations commended the Task Force for its work and noted its results. They also noted the other work done to support the Task Force activities. There was general agreement that the review of the sufficiency and effectiveness of the Protocol was

completed. A number of delegations drew attention to specific points of relevance to decisions on future work.

16. The United States did not oppose further technical work but wished to use alternative approaches, as it lay outside the EMEP region. Its representative suggested that now was not an opportune time to consider revision of the Protocol and that implementation of the Protocol should be the priority. The United States disagreed with the current ELVs in the Protocol and was considering its own values.

17. Canada noted that it would supply information on effects-based approaches other than the critical loads approach. In general, Canada used a weight-of-evidence approach in combination with other measures to achieve reductions and obtain emission levels. These included Canada-wide standards, pollution prevention plans, codes of practices and guidelines, and industrial approvals. The Executive Body needed to set priorities for its technical work. In light of the other work of the Convention on emerging issues such as persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and particulate matter (PM) and the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, revising the Protocol on Heavy Metals might not be a priority.

18. The European Community appreciated the results of the technical work and the summary report of the review of sufficiency and effectiveness. It reiterated the importance of following the work on the Global Mercury Assessment under the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The European Community would like to see the revision of the Protocol on Heavy Metals proceeding as soon as possible. However, the first phase of the revision should assess the adequacy of the appropriate information available.

19. Norway and Switzerland believed it was possible to work on the technical elements for a possible revision of the Protocol as well the strategic ones that might be considered by the Working Group. The report of the Task Force, as well as other studies, clearly indicated that additional emission reductions, beyond the levels required by the Protocol, were warranted. In addition, the report demonstrated that additional measures were well known and available. Therefore, taking into account article 10, paragraph 4 of the Protocol, the countries believed the Working Group should recommend to the twenty-fourth session of the Executive Body a workplan for revision and strengthening of the Protocol, bearing in mind the precautionary principle.

20. The Netherlands supported further work to be done by the Task Force but believed it was not necessary to collect additional data before starting work on a possible revision of the Protocol.

21. Germany indicated that it was willing to continue to lead the Task Force but stressed that it required clear direction for its future work.

22. The Working Group:

(a) Noted the report of the Task Force on Heavy Metals (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/2);

(b) Took note of the evaluations made by the Task Force for ELVs for mercury from existing chlor-alkali plants and from mercury-containing emissions from medical waste incineration (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/2, annexes I and II), as required by the Protocol (annex V, paragraphs 19 and 23(c)), and forwarded the evaluations to the Parties for consideration;

(c) Concluded that the work by the Task Force on the sufficiency and effectiveness review of the Protocol, in accordance with article 10, paragraph 3 of the Protocol, had been completed and agreed to submit the report to the Executive Body for consideration by the Parties to the Protocol;

(d) Noted the desirability of increasing the number of ratifications in order to reduce heavy metals emissions;

(e) Noted that information on an effects-based approach using critical loads had been provided for the EMEP region and invited Canada to explore and report on other effects-based approaches and management approaches;

(f) Noted that, in accordance with article 10, paragraph 4 of the Protocol, the following elements should be reflected in the workplan of the Task Force for 2007:

(i) Explore, from a technical point of view, potential options for further reducing emissions of the heavy metals listed in annex I. Advantages and disadvantages of the options will be compiled. In undertaking this work the Task Force may consult other relevant bodies as appropriate;

(ii) Assess quantitative and, where this is not possible, qualitative information on health and ecosystem benefits of further measures to reduce emissions of the heavy metals listed in annex 1.

(g) Noted the ongoing work of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, UNEP's Mercury Programme and its lead and cadmium reviews;

(h) Noted the global dimension of mercury pollution and requested the Executive Body to support initiatives by UNEP to address mercury emissions at the global level; and

(i) Drew the Executive Body's attention to the need to improve the quality of emission data on heavy metals and requested the Executive Body to ask EMEP to keep the Working Group informed on progress of its work on improving emission inventories for heavy metals.

IV. REVIEW OF THE PROTOCOL ON POPS

23. The Co-Chairs of the Task Force on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), Ms. C. Heathwood (Canada) and Mr. J. Sliggers (Netherlands), presented the results of the track A and track B technical reviews of hexachlorobutadiene (HCBd), octabromodiphenyl ether (OctaBDE), polychlorinated naphthalenes (PCN), pentachlorobenzene (PeCB) and short-chained chlorinated paraffins (SCCP), as well as results of the track B reviews and exploration of management options for pentabromodiphenyl ether (Penta-BDE) and perfluorooctane sulfonates (PFOS) (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/10). They drew attention to the Task Force's conclusions that, in relation to Executive Body decision 1998/2, there was sufficient information to support the dossiers' findings that HCBd, OctaBDE, PCN, PeCB and SCCP should be considered POPs for purposes of the Protocol.

24. Concerning track B reviews on HCBd, OctaBDE, PCN, PeCB and SCCP, reviewers agreed that the information in the dossiers provided a starting point for gathering information necessary to determine possible risk management actions that could be taken. They noted, however, that cost-benefit analyses might not be needed for substances already being phased out.

25. Regarding the track B reviews on Penta-BDE and PFOS, reviewers found that substances had been largely phased out, but that for PFOS there were still uses for which no alternatives could be found. The Task Force noted the need for further work on management options, alternatives, international regulations and quantification of emissions and use. It would circulate a questionnaire to stimulate interest and elicit inputs for further work.

26. The European Community indicated that it could support a revision of the Protocol on POPs. Such a revision could include the proposals made in the sufficiency and effectiveness review, with the addition of substances to the respective annexes where the review process had concluded that substances were POPs, as well as consideration of a new amendment procedure.

27. The United States disagreed with the conclusions of the Task Force concerning the five substances being considered POPs in the context of the Protocol, specifically asserting that indicative values were not met for HCBd (for persistence and bioaccumulation), for OctaBDE (for bioaccumulation) or for PCN (for persistence). It expressed the view that there was

insufficient information in the dossiers to determine that the five substances met the requirements of paragraph 2(b) of decision 1998/2, and that they should therefore not be considered POPs.

28. The representative of the International Association of Chemicals and the World Chlorine Council believed there was a lack of scientific information for evaluation of substances, including the way information was handled and the peer reviews were carried out. It believed the Task Force should increase the scientific rigor of its evaluations, clarify the mandate for further work on paragraph 2(b) of Executive Body decision 1998/2 and defer consideration of specific chemicals until these issues had been addressed.

A. Guidance to the Task Force

29. The Co-Chairs noted that the Task Force had asked the Working Group for guidance on the roles of observers in the Task Force; the interpretation of paragraph 2(b) of Executive Body 1998/2; the treatment of additional information and comments on dossiers; and the objectivity of the summaries of track A reviews.

30. Regarding observers in Task Force meetings, the Chair noted that Executive Body decision 2003/10 indicated the Task Force was composed of nominated experts. While observers might take part in discussions, conclusions were those of the nominated experts. While reports should reflect all views, it should be made clear which were those of observers.

31. Concerning the interpretation of paragraph 2(b) of 1998/2, Mr. Gregor noted that the Task Force on Health had discussed the interpretation of paragraph 2(b) and confirmed that actual observed health effects were not a prerequisite for including a substance in the Protocol on POPs. The likelihood of such effects due to potential build-up in the environment and bioaccumulation was considered sufficient. Mr. D. Stone (AMAP) recalled the preamble of the Protocol, where Parties were “Resolved to take measures to anticipate, prevent or minimize emissions of POPs”, which underlined the need to use a precautionary approach.

32. The European Community and Norway recalled that there was a consensus by Parties to the Protocol at the twenty-third session of the Executive Body that there was no need for further clarification of paragraph 2(b), but that peer reviewers should record the factors taken into account in determining significant adverse effects on human health and/or the environment.

33. The United States expressed concern that, due to the different interpretations of paragraph 2(b) of Executive Body decision 1998/2, the Task Force had had difficulty in reaching agreement on whether sufficient information existed to determine that a substance was likely to have

significant adverse human health and/or environmental effects from long-range transboundary transport. The United States reiterated the need for reviewers and the Task Force to record the factors they used to reach their conclusions under subparagraphs (a)–(d) of paragraph 2(b) of the decision.

34. Canada noted that reviewers had expressed the view that dossiers should reflect the most recent information and clearly address indicative values; it suggested that proposing Parties be requested to ensure that dossiers were scientifically robust.

B. Mechanisms for amending the Protocol

35. The Chair of the Ad Hoc Group of Legal Experts, Mr. M. Goote (Netherlands), presented the results of the Group's discussions on mechanisms for amending the Protocol (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/11). He noted the three categories of procedures identified in the report. He stressed that a hybrid amendment procedure could no longer be introduced into the Protocol but that adoption of an opt-out procedure would result in a similar system, where Parties could choose whether to use a classical ratification procedure or be bound by the speedier opt-out mechanism. He also noted that whether a bundled or individual approach was used was independent of the type of amendment procedure and was for the Executive Body to decide.

36. Mr. Sliggers presented the results of a study by TNO on the effectiveness of the Protocol and the costs of additional measures that might be required for a possible revision of the Protocol. He concluded that full implementation of the Protocol would result in important further reductions of emissions of hexachlorobenzene (HCB), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins and furans (PCDD) and polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDF) and would effectively address remaining polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) emissions. Measures were available to sufficiently reduce emissions of any proposed substances at very reasonable costs. The report recommended improvements to POPs emission data, as well as to information on sales and usage.

37. Mr. J. Schneider provided information on POPs emissions. He noted the review of the MSC-E POPs model, which had concluded that the model was state of the art and fit for purpose. There was fairly good agreement between modelled concentrations and observations. The EMEP Steering Body was focusing attention on unintentionally released substances, such as dioxins, HCB and PAHs.

38. The United States believed that the Protocol's amendment procedure was sufficient and had the advantage of encouraging full compliance. There was currently no need to change the procedure.

39. The European Community wished to see a procedure that would increase efficiency and indicated it preferred an opt-out approach. It noted that the current amendment procedure allowed both a bundled and an individual approach and hoped the Executive Body would decide upon this on a case-by-case basis.

40. Norway noted that it was important to increase efficiency and avoid solutions that would complicate implementation. It supported a speedier procedure for amendment and a bundled approach.

41. The delegation of the Russian Federation expressed concern that cost estimates for reducing POPs and heavy metal emissions separately might be exaggerated and suggested that combined controls could lead to lower overall costs. It drew attention to the need to further investigate this issue.

42. The Working Group:

(a) Welcomed the work of the Task Force on consideration of proposed new substances (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/10), thanked Norway and Sweden for the additional information provided, and thanked the reviewers and their nominating countries for the work on the track A and track B reviews;

(b) Noted the conclusions of the Task Force on the track B reviews and its proposals for further work on pentabromodiphenyl ether (Penta-BDE) and perfluorooctane sulfonates (PFOS);

(c) Noted the conclusions of the Task Force, together with the reservation of the United States, that HCB, OctaBDE, PCN, PeCB and SCCP should be considered POPs as defined under the Protocol, and agreed to forward this information to the Executive Body for its consideration; it proposed that the Track B reviews on these substances be continued;

(d) Took note of the concerns raised in the Task Force and advised that the summaries of additional information made by proposing Parties and the Track A peer review summaries should be prepared in an objective manner so that they were unbiased and concise; and

(e) Thanked the ad hoc group of legal experts for its work and agreed to draw the attention of the Executive Body to its results while noting there were differing views on the mechanisms for amending the Protocol.

V. REVIEW OF THE GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL

43. The Working Group considered the document on inputs to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/1/Rev.1), revised by the secretariat to reflect views expressed at the meeting of the Working Group's Heads of Delegation held in April 2006, taking into account the time schedule appended to the report of that meeting. The secretariat took note of further amendments proposed.

44. Mr. Gregor presented progress in the work of the Working Group on Effects to support the review of the Protocol. He drew attention to the substantive report on effects, as well as to work of the International Cooperative Programmes presented at the twenty-fifth session of the Working Group. Inputs to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol from the Working Group on Effects would focus on the monitoring, modelling and assessment of effects, critical loads exceedances, dynamic modelling and assessment of economic impacts of air pollution on materials. Mr. Gregor reiterated that the Working Group would deliver all necessary inputs on time and following the outline proposed.

45. Mr. Schneider noted progress in EMEP to support the Protocol review, highlighting the source-receptor calculations for 2010 and 2020, progress towards Protocol goals according to emission trends from 1994 to 2004, existing uncertainties, methodological changes and the progress in the assessment of hemispheric transport of air pollution. Noting conclusions that PM was a transboundary problem, he also drew attention to the results of stage 3 of the inventory improvement programme, the updating of the *EMEP/CORINAIR Emission Inventory Guidebook* and the revision of the Emission Reporting Guidelines.

46. The Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, Mr. R. Maas (Netherlands), reported on progress in integrated assessment modelling, including the results of the thirty-first and thirty-second meetings of the Task Force, held in Gothenburg on 8–9 September 2005 and in Rome on 17–19 May 2006 (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/5 and ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/6), as well as the results of the ASTA workshop on European air pollution policies held in October 2005 in Gothenburg and the Workshop on Non-Technical Measures for Air Pollution Abatement held back-to-back with the thirty-second meeting of the Task Force. He also presented the preparations of the inputs for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol and plans for future work, including for a possible revision of the Protocol. He explained the consequences of the methodological changes in modelling after adoption of the Gothenburg Protocol. He noted in particular the new Eulerian dispersion model, ecosystem-dependent deposition rates, the ozone flux-based approach, the health effects of particles and ozone, and new national projections up to 2020. He stressed that, with the new information available, the Protocol was not sufficient to meet its ambitions.

47. Mr. M. Amann (CIAM) presented a detailed overview of the work by CIAM in 2006, including the development of baseline scenarios for countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) and the development of the GAINS model. In contrast to the RAINS model, GAINS had potential for reductions from structural measures, and from both technical and non-technical measures. Mr. Amann drew attention to the strong relationship between CO₂ mitigation and air pollutant emissions, as shown by GAINS. He noted EU funding under the LIFE programme for a European Consortium for Modelling of Air Pollution and Climate Strategies (EC4MACS) that included the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) and MSC-W. The project would run from 2007 to 2012 with funding of 4.4 million euros. A tutorial session for experts from non-EU countries was planned back-to-back with the next meeting of the Task Force in May 2007.

48. In the following discussion, one delegation stressed the importance of developing alternative energy scenarios. It was noted that gaps in the emission sectors and the differences in the emission factors used were the main reasons for the discrepancy between the officially reported data and the results of the RAINS model for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀.

49. Several delegations highlighted the importance of including non-EU countries in integrated assessment modelling and ensuring that they had opportunities to verify and update the input data. Mr. Amann drew attention to CIAM's report presenting the input data and energy projection scenarios up to 2020. He invited Parties, especially those which had not had bilateral consultations, to provide comments or updates by December 2006 so that these could be taken into account in the review process. One delegation was concerned that this deadline might be too tight.

50. The representative of the European Union said that in the review of the Gothenburg Protocol there were advantages to using the GAINS model instead of the RAINS model. The European Union therefore, proposed that GAINS be used in the review, though without optimizing for greenhouse gases or setting ceilings for them. Also, future decisions with regard to a follow-up to the Gothenburg Protocol should not be based on the outcome of the review of the Protocol only, but also on additional information such as the proposal of the European Commission for the revised National Emission Ceilings directive, the interim report of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, the reports of other relevant task forces and expert groups, the results of the "Saltsjöbaden III" workshop and the results of wider discussions with all Parties to the Convention.

A. Techno-economic Issues

51. The Co-Chair of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, Mr. J.-G. Bartaire (France), presented the report of the Expert Group (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/6), noting progress

on the large combustion plant sector. Meetings had been held with representatives of the glass and refinery industries to update the synopsis sheet and cost data. He noted work on emerging technologies and proposed that the Expert Group continue to look at these and their evolution up to 2030, with a focus on PM and NO_x, and on small combustion plants as a priority sector; he invited support for this work. He noted the Expert Group's close cooperation with the Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (IPTS) in Seville; it would provide cost information to IPTS for BAT reference documents. Regarding the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, the Expert Group would work on the revision of the technical annexes, particularly annexes IV and V. Finland offered to lead work to revise annex V, table IV on limit values for NO_x emissions released from new stationary engines. For annex VIII on limit values for fuels and new mobile sources, it was suggested to use work being done by the European Community on EURO 5 and 6 standards.

52. The Co-Chair of the Expert Group, Mr. T. Pignatelli (Italy), presented the results of a survey by Italy on boilers burning gas and oil, concluding that in the future he expected boiler users to switch from oil to gas use. Data on costs were poor and limited. The tenth meeting of the Expert Group was scheduled for 23 November 2006, followed by a meeting on emerging technologies on 24 November 2006, tentatively in Paris. The eleventh meeting of the Expert Group would be held in Rome in April 2007.

53. Poland stressed the importance of including EECCA countries in the work of the Expert Group and proposed a workshop on abatement techniques. Kazakhstan agreed to host the workshop, back-to-back with the CAPACT workshop in 2007. The Czech Republic noted that it was testing methodologies used by the Expert Group on large combustion plants to obtain data on emissions resulting from reduction measures. Sweden indicated that it would test the methodology for large combustion plants in 2007 and aimed to do this with Denmark and Finland; it supported work on emerging technologies.

54. The Netherlands noted difficulties in funding but supported work on updating technical annexes on emission limit values and BAT. It proposed more work on emerging technologies and on links between climate change and technology, such as the use of biomass energy.

55. CIAM underlined the importance of the work on emerging technologies. For the review of the Protocol, it was of utmost importance to incorporate technologies that could be on the market beyond 2010.

56. Mr. Ballaman proposed that the Working Group revisit this issue in April 2007 to refine inputs for review of the Gothenburg Protocol.

B. Ammonia abatement

57. Ms. S. Amin-Hanjani (United Kingdom), on behalf of the lead country, described the results of the seventh meeting of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement, held with an expert panel on agriculture and nature of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections. She thanked Mr. J. Webb, the outgoing Chair of the Expert Group, and welcomed the new Chair, Mr. K. Smith. She noted the work on updating the *EMEP/CORINAIR Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook* with new background information and new emission factors for ammonia sources. She also noted that the updated Guidance Document on Control Techniques for Preventing and Abating Emissions of Ammonia was available in English. She noted continuing work on improving ammonia emission inventories and support for EECCA capacity-building activities. A workshop would be held, jointly with EMEP's Task Force on Monitoring and Modelling, on 4–6 December 2006 in Edinburgh (United Kingdom). An International Conference on Ammonia in Agriculture, organized by the Netherlands and Germany, was to be held on 19–21 March 2007 in Ede (Netherlands).

58. The Chair invited comments on the Guidance Document by 1 December 2006 so that it could be submitted as an official document to the Working Group with a view to finalizing it for submission to the Executive Body in December 2007.

C. Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Instruments

59. The delegation of the United Kingdom presented the results of the Workshop on Economic Impacts of Air Pollution on Cultural Heritage, held in April 2006 in Catania (Italy), drawing attention to its conclusions (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/5).

D. North America and hemispheric transport

60. The delegations of the United States and Canada summarized their transboundary efforts in support of the Gothenburg Protocol, drawing attention to the finalization of the annex on ground-level ozone to the 1991 Canada–United States Air Quality Agreement, the establishment of a Pollution Emission Management Area (PEMA), their specific commitments and emission reduction achievements, and their next steps.

61. The United States and the European Community, lead Parties of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, informed the Working Group on progress in the preparation of the interim assessment report intended as input to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol in 2007. They drew attention to workshops organized by the Task Force and to the results of its second meeting, held in June 2006. Mr. A. Zuber (European Community), Co-Chair of the Task Force, stressed the importance of participation by non-UNECE countries in the

northern hemisphere and noted the efforts made by the Co-Chairs in this respect. He also noted the secretariat's participation in activities of the East Asian Acid Deposition Monitoring Network, the Commission on Sustainable Development and UNEP.

E. Particulate matter

62. The Co-Chair of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter, Ms. M. Wichmann-Fiebig (Germany), presented the results of the second and third meetings of the Expert Group, drawing attention to the transboundary character of PM and its significant health effects. She highlighted the significantly lower controls of PM emissions in non-EU countries in the EMEP region.

F. Conclusions

63. The Working Group:

(a) Welcomed the progress made by subsidiary bodies and centres in the work for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol and urged them to make their contributions to review documents in accordance with the timetable;

(b) Agreed with the technical elements and the draft annotated report outline, presented in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/1/Rev.1, as amended, and requested the secretariat to submit it to the Executive Body for consideration;

(c) Expressed its appreciation of the work of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and CIAM, and of the contributions made by other subsidiary bodies to integrated assessment modelling; urged that efforts for this work continue and that results be reported to the Working Group at its thirty-ninth session;

(d) Invited the non-EU countries which had not had bilateral consultations to review the data on energy projections used in the RAINS model and provide feedback to CIAM by 1 December 2006;

(e) Noted with appreciation the conclusions of the second and third meetings of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter and invited it to report on progress at the thirty-ninth meeting of the Working Group;

(f) Thanked Mr. J. Webb, the outgoing Chair of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement, welcomed the conclusions of Expert Group, invited comments (to be sent to the secretariat by 1 December 2006) to the Guidance Document on Control Techniques for

Preventing and Abating Emissions of Ammonia, and requested that the finalized document be submitted to the Working Group;

(g) Welcomed the invitation of the Russian Federation to hold the next meeting of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement and an English-Russian seminar and urged participation of experts from EECCA countries;

(h) Welcomed the readiness of Kazakhstan to host a workshop on state-of-the-art abatement techniques, to be held back-to-back with the CAPACT workshop in 2007;

(i) Welcomed the progress made by the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, took note of the conclusions of its ninth meeting and the seminar on emerging technologies and recognized the importance of further work in this area;

(j) Took note of the North American activities in relation to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol; and

(k) Welcomed the offer of Sweden to hold a "Saltsjöbaden III" workshop on future directions for European and hemispheric air pollution policies.

VI. FINANCING OF CORE ACTIVITIES NOT COVERED BY THE EMEP PROTOCOL

64. The Chair introduced the agenda item by drawing attention to the proposals of the meeting of the heads of delegation of the Working Group on Strategies and Review and noting that the secretariat had drafted a brief document substantiating the request for contributions in 2006 for consideration by the delegations of Canada, Germany and Spain.

65. Mr. Gregor reported that the Working Group at its twenty-fifth session had considered that identifying specific tasks or activities to be supported by individual Parties as contributions in kind would go beyond Executive Body decision 2002/1. It had asked its Bureau and the programmes to suggest such activities for support outside decision 2002/1.

66. The ensuing discussion emphasized the need for more complete information and transparency on the resources at the disposal of the programme centres and that this information should be provided by the Parties. The delegation of France asked that consideration be given to documenting as appropriate any contributions not falling under decision 2002/1 but important for the work of the Convention.

67. Concerning the distribution of the incoming non-earmarked cash contributions, the Netherlands noted that, in spite of the request of the Executive Body at its twenty-third session, the Working Group on Effects still insisted on an equal distribution among the centres. This led to anomalies such as a centre receiving more than 100 per cent of its budget. The Netherlands found that unacceptable and requested a simple distribution according to normal bookkeeping rules without opening discussions on the budgets of the centres.

68. The European Community noted its position as stated in the Working Group on Effects. It believed the primary aim of funding was to ensure full contributions from Parties to the core activities and requested that the secretariat's letter to Parties be closer in language to decision 2002/1.

69. Mr. Beat Achermann, Vice-Chair of the Working Group on Effects, noted that the Bureau of that Working Group considered transparent information on financial resources directed towards ICP programme centres from lead Parties to be a prerequisite for allocating Trust Fund contributions in an optimal way. The Bureau itself was not in a position to request the disclosure of financial data from Parties; it hoped the Executive Body would take the necessary steps for this. As long as such information was not available and non-earmarked contributions to the Trust Fund formed only a small percentage of the budgets for essential coordination work, the Bureau considered equal sharing of non-earmarked contributions between programme centres to be appropriate.

70. The Working Group agreed to report on progress in this area to the Executive Body.

VII. 2007 DRAFT WORKPLAN

71. The Working Group discussed its draft workplan for 2007 (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/9) and agreed on a number of amendments. It requested the secretariat to reflect these in a revised document and submit it for consideration by the Executive Body.

72. The delegation of Sweden announced that it would host a "Saltsjöbaden III" workshop on the future of air pollution policy on 12–14 March 2007 in Gothenburg. It stressed that the participation of EECCA countries was welcome.

VIII. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY

73. The secretariat provided information on progress with the CAPACT² project, drawing attention to the forthcoming workshop on international air pollution monitoring, data, reporting and environmental effects on 17–19 October 2006 in Almaty (Kazakhstan).
74. The secretariat introduced the progress report on the implementation of the Action Plan for EECCA Countries (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/12). The Working Group discussed the progress report and proposed a number of amendments to reflect the new information provided by delegations. It asked the secretariat to reflect these in a revised version of the document and submit it for consideration at the twenty-fourth session of the Executive Body.
75. The delegate of Belarus informed the Working Group about the development of a new national environmental action plan, which includes the implementation of the provisions of the three most recent protocols to the Convention. NO_x emissions from traffic were a major problem for Belarus, which requested assistance in establishing limit values for passenger cars.
76. The delegate of Georgia informed the Working Group that Georgia was considering accession to the EMEP Protocol and the Protocol on POPs. Georgia could build upon the results of a programme carried out under the Stockholm Convention to facilitate accession to the Protocol on POPs. It was not considering accession to the other protocols at this stage. The country needed to establish a national monitoring system and introduce national monitoring standards in accordance with the EMEP standards.
77. The delegate of Kazakhstan drew attention to the problems of stocks of obsolete pesticides stored in inappropriate facilities and the lack of public awareness of the potential hazards. He requested assistance in this respect and reiterated the full commitment of Kazakhstan to implementing the CAPACT project.
78. The delegation of Canada drew attention to the valuable work under the Arctic Council Action Plan on Obsolete Pesticides that EECCA countries might wish to learn from.
79. The Republic of Moldova expressed its intention to ratify the EMEP Protocol next year and expressed appreciation for the support provided by Norway for its monitoring activities. The delegation of the Czech Republic elaborated on the support (of approximately US\$ 110,000) it would provide to UNECE technical cooperation activities, in particular the implementation of

² Project on Capacity-Building for Air Quality Management and the Application of Clean Coal Combustion Technologies in Central Asia.

the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution and the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents in one EECCA country (Republic of Moldova). With regard to the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, the support to the Republic of Moldova would focus on harmonizing the national legislation with the provisions of the Gothenburg Protocol, as well as on emission inventories and projections and integrated assessment modelling.

80. The delegation of the Russian Federation informed the meeting of a comprehensive evaluation of the technical and economic readiness of the country for accession to the three most recent protocols. Preliminary results indicated that the Russian Federation might be able to comply with the emission ceilings. In terms of priorities, it would consider acceding to the Protocol on POPs first, and to the Gothenburg Protocol second. Implementing the technical provisions of the Gothenburg Protocol might present particular difficulties for countries with economies in transition.

81. The delegate of Ukraine said that the reduction of SO_x and NO_x emissions and the development of technological standards for major stationary sources in different branches of industry were priorities for the country. Measures would be taken to improve emission inventories, including those on mobile sources. Ratification of any of the three most recent protocols was not envisaged in the near future, as the conditions for their implementation were not yet fulfilled. Ukraine was proceeding with the final stage of a project to develop a national model on the impact of heavy metals, which is also an in-kind contribution to EMEP, and was planning the development of a national model for the transmission of pollution at the local level. Ukraine was interested in learning about the experiences of other countries with the application of the EMEP Emission Reporting Guidelines.

82. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia informed the meeting that it was reporting to EMEP and had established its first emission inventory this year with the help of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections. Steps for ratification of the Protocol on POPs and the Protocol on Heavy Metals were also being assessed.

83. The delegation of the Netherlands drew attention to a forthcoming Dutch contribution of approximately 600,000 euros for the countries in South-Eastern Europe (SEE) through the Netherlands Regional Programme on Environment in the Western Balkans. The contribution would be aimed at helping the countries implement the three most recent protocols to the Convention.

84. The Working Group agreed that workshops and activities organized under the CAPACT project should be open to participation of experts from countries in SEE if they expressed

interest. It also agreed that the scope of the Action Plan for EECCA countries should be extended to include the countries in SEE.

85. The delegation of Canada briefly informed the Working Group about the Canada POPs Fund available for projects to implement activities under the Stockholm Convention and noted that countries might wish to consider applying to the fund.

86. The delegation of Poland informed the meeting about the training of 12 monitoring experts from EECCA countries that had taken place in connection with the workshop on enterprise monitoring on 4–6 September 2006 in Warsaw. A workshop with the UNECE Working Group on Environmental Monitoring, with a focus on environmental indicators, was planned for the end of October in Donetsk (Ukraine). Representatives of Balkan countries would be invited to the workshop organized by the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, which would be organized back-to-back with the CAPACT workshop in 2007.

87. The secretariat reported on the development and translation of implementation guides for the three most recent protocols to the Convention. The draft guide on the Protocol on POPs had been provided to the Working Group. The secretariat could take into account comments and feedback received by 30 October 2006.

88. The Working Group:

(a) Welcomed the progress in the implementation of the CAPACT project and its workshop on international air pollution monitoring data, reporting and environmental effects in Almaty (Kazakhstan);

(b) Expressed its appreciation for the development of the implementation guides and invited the secretariat to finalize them and translate them into Russian;

(c) Welcomed the steps taken towards implementation of the Action Plan;

(d) Noted the lack of action on some parts of the plan and requested its Bureau to play an active role in stimulating activities in these areas;

(e) Urged Parties, task forces, expert groups and programme centres to continue their work towards implementation of the Action Plan, and in particular items 9, 10 and 12;

(f) Approved its report on the implementation of the Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/12), as amended, and requested the secretariat to submit a revised version for the twenty-fourth session of the Executive Body;

(g) Invited the secretariat to write to the chairs of task forces and expert groups to get updated information on efforts to encourage participation from countries of EECCA and SEE; and

(h) Expressed its appreciation for the training of monitoring experts from EECCA countries organized by the Government of Poland in September 2006.

IX. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

89. The Working Group re-elected Ms. N. Karpova (Russian Federation), Mr. J. Sliggers (Netherlands) and Mr. P. Jilek (Czech Republic) as Vice-Chairs. It thanked Ms. K. Scavo (United States) for her work as a Vice-Chair over the past years. It elected Ms. C. Heathwood (Canada) as a new Vice-Chair.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

90. The delegation of the Netherlands raised the issue of further improving the Questionnaire on Strategies and Policies. The Working Group agreed to propose to the Executive Body that an informal ad hoc group be established to assist the secretariat in the development of the 2008 Questionnaire.

XI. ADOPTION OF THE DECISIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP

91. In accordance with the revised practice adopted by the Executive Body at its twenty-third session, the Working Group adopted the decisions taken during the session.