



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

EB.AIR/2003/1/Add.1  
2 October 2003

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH

---

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

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

Twenty-first session  
(Geneva, 15–18 December 2003)  
Item 3 of the provisional agenda

**THE SIXTH REPORT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**  
**Addendum**

**II. COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING OBLIGATIONS**

**A. Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2002/9**

1. In its decision 2002/9, the Executive Body requested the Committee to review the progress made towards compliance with the reporting requirement of the Sulphur and NO<sub>x</sub> Protocols by Luxembourg, including its recent submission, and by Ukraine. The secretariat informed the Committee about the letter it received from Luxembourg on 10 December 2002 with data on sulphur emissions for the years 1987-89 and 1991-92 and on NO<sub>x</sub> emissions for 1991-92, as well as about a submission it received from Ukraine on 5 April 2003 with sulphur and NO<sub>x</sub> emission data for 1998 and 1999.

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.
--

2. The Committee noted with satisfaction the progress that had been made by the two Parties concerned. It was in a position to report to the Executive Body that both Parties addressed in decision 2002/9 had now complied with the request to submit the data on the two Protocols that had long been outstanding.

### **B. Compliance with emission data reporting obligations**

3. As requested by the Executive Body in its work plan (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.2, annex XIII, item 1.2), the Implementation Committee evaluated compliance with the emission data reporting obligations by the Parties to the four Protocols that are in force. The evaluation covered both the completeness and the timeliness of reporting. It was based on the information presented in the report on the present state of emission data (EB.AIR/GE.1/2003/6), which covered emission data reported up to 1 June 2003. The deadline for reporting set in the reporting guidelines was 15 February 2003, but the present report takes account of submissions received up to 3 September 2003. Tables 1-4, updating the information presented by the Committee to the Executive Body up to 2002 (EB.AIR/2002/2), give an overview of emission data reported under each Protocol, showing the date of entry into force of the Protocol for each Party and whether the data were reported for the base year, if applicable, and successive years starting with the year of entry into force for that Party.

#### **1. 1985 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with article 4, reporting of annual emissions**

4. Table 1 below gives an overview of emission data reported by the Parties to the 1985 Sulphur Protocol. Twenty of the 22 Parties submitted emission data under the Protocol. Fourteen Parties (Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden and Switzerland) submitted final and complete data for 2001 by 15 February 2003. Four other Parties (Estonia, Germany, Luxembourg and Ukraine) submitted final and complete data for 2001 by 3 September 2003. Two Parties (Belgium and Hungary) submitted only preliminary estimates. Two Parties (Italy, Russian Federation) have not yet submitted any data for 2001. Eighty-two per cent of the required annual total emission data for 2001 have been reported as final and complete.

5. In its fifth report (EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, para. 8), the Committee concluded that five Parties were not yet in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under article 4 of the 1985 Sulphur Protocol: Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands and Ukraine. All of these Parties have now complied with their emission reporting obligations up to and including 2000.

6. The Committee concluded that, as of 3 September 2003, the following four Parties were not yet in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under article 4 of the 1985 Sulphur Protocol for the year 2001: Belgium, Hungary, Italy and the Russian Federation.

**2. 1988 Nitrogen Oxides Protocol: compliance with article 8,  
concerning emission data reporting**

7. Table 2 below gives an overview of emission data reported by the Parties to the 1988 NO<sub>x</sub> Protocol. Twenty-five of the 28 Parties submitted emissions data under the Protocol. Sixteen Parties (Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom) submitted final and complete data for 2001 by 15 February 2003. Two Parties (Belgium and Hungary) submitted only preliminary estimates. Seven other Parties (Estonia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, Ukraine and United States of America) submitted final and complete data for 2001 by 3 September 2003. Three Parties (Italy, Russian Federation and European Community) have not yet submitted any data for 2001. Eighty-two per cent of the required annual total emission data for 2001 have been reported as final and complete.

8. In its fifth report (EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, para. 11), the Committee concluded that five Parties were not yet in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under article 8 of the 1988 NO<sub>x</sub> Protocol: Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Ukraine and European Community. All of these Parties have now complied with their emissions reporting obligations up to and including 2000.

9. The Committee concluded that, as of 3 September 2003, the following five Parties were not yet in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under article 8 of the 1988 NO<sub>x</sub> Protocol for 2001: Belgium, Hungary, Italy, Russian Federation and European Community.

**3. 1991 VOC Protocol: compliance with article 8, paragraph 1,  
concerning emission data reporting**

10. Table 3 below gives an overview of emission data reported by the Parties to the 1991 VOC Protocol. All 21 Parties submitted emissions data under the Protocol. Fifteen Parties (Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom) submitted final and complete data for 2001 by 15 February 2003. Four other Parties (Estonia, Germany, Italy and Luxembourg) submitted final and complete data for 2001 by 3 September 2003. Two Parties (Belgium and Hungary) submitted only preliminary estimates. Ninety per cent of the required annual total emission data for 2001 have been reported as final and complete.

11. In its fifth report (EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, para. 14), the Committee concluded that two Parties were not yet in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under the 1991 VOC Protocol: Italy and Netherlands. Both of these Parties have now complied with their emissions reporting obligations up to and including 2000.

12. The Committee concluded that, as of 3 September 2003, the following two Parties were not yet in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under article 8 of the 1991 VOC Protocol for 2001: Belgium and Hungary.

**4. 1994 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with article 5, paragraphs 1 (b) and 2, concerning emission data reporting**

13. Table 4 below gives an overview of emission data reported by the Parties to the 1994 Sulphur Protocol. Twenty of the 25 Parties submitted emissions data under the Protocol. Fifteen Parties (Austria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom) submitted final and complete data for 2001 by 15 February 2003. Four other Parties (Germany, Greece, Ireland and Luxembourg) submitted final and complete data for 2001 by 3 September 2003. Hungary and Monaco did not have to report data for 2001 as the Protocol entered into force for them only in 2001. One Party (Belgium) submitted only preliminary estimates for 2001. Three Parties (Croatia, Italy and European Community) have not yet submitted data for 2001. Eighty-three per cent of the required annual total emission data for 2001 have been reported.

14. Nineteen of the 25 Parties submitted final and complete sectoral emission data for 2001 (Austria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom). One Party (Belgium) submitted only preliminary estimates. Fourteen Parties submitted gridded data for 2000 (Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom) by February 2003. Three Parties (Croatia, Italy and European Community) have not yet submitted sectoral emission data for 2001, and seven Parties (France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and European Community) have not yet submitted gridded data for 2000. Eighty-seven per cent of the required sectoral emission data for 2001 and 67% of the required gridded data for 2000 have been reported.

15. In its fifth report (EB.AIR/2002/Add.1, para. 17), the Committee concluded that four Parties were not yet in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol: Croatia, Italy, Netherlands and European Community. All four of these Parties have now complied with these emissions reporting obligations up to and including 2000.

16. The Implementation Committee concluded that, by 3 September 2003, four Parties were not yet in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol for 2001: Belgium, Croatia, Italy and European Community.

**5. Conclusion**

17. The Committee reached the following conclusions, which it draws to the attention of the Executive Body. In reaching its conclusions, the Committee took into account its previous conclusions regarding emission data (EB.AIR/1998/4, EB.AIR/1999/4, para. 28, EB.AIR/2000/2, para. 21, EB.AIR/2001/3, para. 41, and EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, para. 18):

- (a) The Committee noted the continued improvement in the completeness of emission

data reported by Parties to the 1985 Sulphur, 1988 NO<sub>x</sub>, 1991 VOC and 1994 Sulphur Protocols over the six years that it had examined compliance with emission data reporting obligations. Over that period, most Parties had made a great effort to come into full compliance. The coverage of emission data reporting (expressed as the percentage of required emission data submitted in the table below) had improved significantly since the Implementation Committee started examining the completeness of reported data:

	Final and complete emission data reported for:			
	1985 Sulphur Protocol (%)	1988 NO <sub>x</sub> Protocol (%)	1991 VOC Protocol (%)	1994 Sulphur Protocol (%)
First report (1998)	86	82	-	-
Second report (1999)	89	86	76	-
Third report (2000)	90	89	82	81
Fourth report (2001)	91	92	87	86
Fifth report (2002)	97	97	98	88
Sixth report (2003)	99	99	98	93

Nevertheless, while these improvements showed a good average over all years for which emission data were due, it should be noted that for the most recent year (2001) a number of Parties had by 3 September 2003 submitted merely preliminary or incomplete data or no data at all;

(b) As in previous years, the Committee continued to stress the importance of reporting on time. In the most recent reporting round, the timeliness of reporting, compared to the previous year, had again improved. The Committee continued to see this as an encouraging sign, especially given that many Parties had only recently converted to reporting data in a new reporting format. Nevertheless, there remained room for improvement. Late reporting placed undue pressures on the secretariat and the responsible EMEP centre, the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W), in handling the submissions. Moreover, as previously noted, it made the Implementation Committee's work more difficult as data compilations often reached it too late to receive sufficient attention.

The Implementation Committee wished to remind Parties both of the importance of complying fully with their reporting obligations and of the importance of submitting their final data on time.

### **C. Compliance by Parties with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for air pollution abatement**

18. As requested by the Executive Body in its work-plan (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.2, annex XIII, item 1.2), the Implementation Committee evaluated compliance with the reporting obligations under the four Protocols in force relating to strategies and policies, including technology-related reporting obligations. This evaluation was made on the basis of the original replies by Parties to the 2002 questionnaire on strategies and policies, which have been made available on the Internet (<http://www.unece.org/env/eb/2002questionnaire.htm>), and additional information received by the secretariat since the twentieth session of the Executive Body. Table 5 below provides an

overview of reporting by Parties to the Protocols that are in force. No Party provided the information required under the Protocols outside the framework of the questionnaire.

**1. 1985 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with article 6 concerning reporting on national programmes, policies and strategies**

19. Twenty-one of the 22 Parties to the 1985 Sulphur Protocol replied to the section of the questionnaire relating to the Protocol (question 1). Luxembourg did not reply to the questionnaire and was not in compliance with its reporting obligations under article 6 of the 1985 Sulphur Protocol.

**2. 1988 Nitrogen Oxides Protocol: compliance with article 8, paragraph 1 (a)-(f), concerning information exchange and annual reporting**

20. Twenty-six of the 28 Parties to the 1988 Nitrogen Oxides Protocol replied to one or more of the questions in the section relating to the Protocol (questions 2 to 8). Two Parties to the Protocol (Luxembourg and European Community) did not reply to the questionnaire. One Party (Estonia) did not reply to questions 5 and 7. The following three Parties were not in compliance with their reporting obligations under article 8 of the 1988 NO<sub>x</sub> Protocol: Estonia, Luxembourg and European Community.

**3. 1991 VOC Protocol: compliance with article 8, paragraphs 1 and 2, concerning information exchange and annual reporting**

21. Twenty of the 21 Parties to the VOC Protocol replied to one or more of the questions in the section relating to this Protocol (questions 9 to 17). Luxembourg did not reply to any part of the questionnaire. Three Parties submitted only partial replies: Estonia did not reply to questions 11-12 and 14-17; France did not reply to questions 15-17; and Spain did not reply to questions 15-17. The following four Parties were not in compliance with their reporting obligations under the 1991 VOC Protocol: Estonia, France, Luxembourg and Spain.

**4. 1994 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with article 5, paragraph 1 (a) and (c), concerning reporting**

22. Twenty-three of the 25 Parties to the 1994 Sulphur Protocol replied to the questions in the section relating to this Protocol (questions 18 to 27). Two Parties to the Protocol (Luxembourg and European Community) did not reply to the questionnaire and were not in compliance with their reporting obligations under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol.

23. In conducting the in-depth review of the 1994 Sulphur Protocol (see chap. III below), the Committee noted that some Parties had not yet submitted sufficiently complete information to enable it to assess compliance with their respective substantive obligations.

## **5. Conclusion**

24. The following five Parties were, as of 3 September 2003, not yet in compliance with their reporting obligations, based on an evaluation of their replies to the 2002 questionnaire on strategies and policies:

- 1985 Sulphur Protocol: Luxembourg;
- 1988 NO<sub>x</sub> Protocol: Estonia, Luxembourg and European Community;
- 1991 VOCs Protocol: Estonia, France, Luxembourg and Spain;
- 1994 Sulphur Protocol: Luxembourg and European Community.

The Committee recommends that the Executive Body reminds Parties of the importance of reporting as required by the protocols and calls upon those Parties that have not yet done so to report or to complete their reports as soon as possible.

### **D. Questionnaire for the 2004 Review on strategies and policies for air pollution abatement**

25. The secretariat presented to the Committee the draft questionnaire for the 2004 review on strategies and policies for air pollution abatement. Its purpose, as explained by the secretariat, was both to facilitate Parties' implementation of various reporting requirements related to strategies and policies and to facilitate the Implementation Committee's review of compliance with Parties' reporting and other obligations. The questionnaire was accompanied by a note explaining the changes made to the 2002 questionnaire to address concerns raised by the Executive Body, the Committee, Parties when filling out the questionnaire, and the secretariat in summarizing the replies. In accordance with the decision of the Executive Body at its twentieth session, the 2004 questionnaire contained only the protocol-related questions; general questions would be asked in 2006.

26. The Committee recommended to the secretariat a number of changes to the content and format of the questionnaire, including suggestions for redrafting some of the new notes, and it invited the secretariat to consider them when preparing its final draft for submission to the Executive Body at its twenty-first session. Given the limited amount of time it had to discuss the substance of the questionnaire, the Committee's comments on the text were not exhaustive, particularly with respect to its legal aspects.

27. It was noted that over the longer term, if the Executive Body agreed, further attempt could be made to restructure the questionnaire with the aim of producing yet more useful results. This might include, for example, the development of model replies and objective criteria for determining compliance on the basis of replies to the questionnaire.

### **III. IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE BY PARTIES WITH THEIR OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE 1994 SULPHUR PROTOCOL**

28. As requested by the Executive Body in its work-plan (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.2, annex XIII, item 1.2), the Implementation Committee carried out an in-depth review of compliance by Parties with their obligation under the 1994 Oslo Protocol on Further Reduction of Sulphur Emissions, including their national emission obligations. It used as a basis the emission data reported by Parties to EMEP (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/8 and Corr.1), updated with data submitted in the 2003 reporting round (data due by 15 February 2003), and the responses to the questionnaire for the 2002 Review on strategies and policies. The Committee limited its review to the Protocol's key obligations, i.e. those in article 2, paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 (a) and (c). The reporting obligations in article 5, paragraphs 1 and 2, are dealt with in chapter II, section C.4, above.

#### **1. Compliance with article 2, paragraphs 2 and 3**

29. Article 2, paragraph 2, of the Protocol requires Parties to reduce and maintain their annual sulphur emissions in accordance with the timing and levels specified in annex II, whilst article 2, paragraph 3, requires each Party whose territory includes an area listed as a sulphur oxides management area (SOMA) in annex III to reduce and maintain its annual sulphur emissions in the area so listed in accordance with the timing and levels specified in annex II. All Parties to the Protocol are subject to article 2, paragraph 2, with the exception of Canada (annex III specifies a SOMA in Canada). For two Parties (Hungary and Monaco), the Protocol entered into force only in 2002 and therefore, for the purposes of assessing compliance with article 2, paragraphs 2 and 3, they were under no obligation for 2000 or 2001.

30. Regarding article 2, paragraph 2, officially submitted emission data showed that all the Parties to the Protocol that were bound by its provisions met their national emission reduction obligation in 2000 and that 18 of the 21 Parties concerned, i.e. excluding Canada, met their national emission reduction obligations in 2001. This can be seen from table 6, which presents the emission ceilings specified for each Party in annex II to the Protocol and their reported emission data for 2000 and 2001.

31. Regarding article 2, paragraph 3, officially submitted emission data showed that Canada complied in 2000 and 2001 with its obligation.

32. Three Parties (Croatia, Italy and European Community) did not comply with their reporting obligations under article 5, paragraph 1 (b) (see chap. II, sect. C.4, above), and did not submit data for 2001, and so evaluation of compliance with their obligations under article 2, paragraph 2 has not been possible.

#### **2. Compliance with article 2, paragraph 5 (a)**

33. Article 2, paragraph 5 (a), requires Parties to apply emission limit values (ELVs) at least

as stringent as those specified in annex V to all new major stationary combustion sources.

34. The Committee concluded that the responses to the 2002 questionnaire on strategies and policies, in particular the responses to question 20, showed that 16 of the 25 Parties complied with this obligation (see table 7). The obligation does not apply to one Party, namely Canada (but it does apply to Hungary and Monaco which became Parties in 2002). The Committee found two Parties to be in non-compliance with their obligations under paragraph 5 (a) of article 2 and two other Parties in non-compliance with their obligations under paragraph 1 (a) and (c) of article 5 as it relates to paragraph 5 (a) of article 2. For four Parties, it found the reported information to be insufficient to enable it to judge their compliance.

35. The Committee concluded that: (a) Slovakia was in non-compliance with its obligation under paragraph 5 (a) of article 2 because the ELVs it reported were higher than those required; and (b) Switzerland was in non-compliance with its obligation under paragraph 5 (a) of article 2 because it had reported that it did not have a standard for gaseous fuels.

36. Luxembourg and the European Community did not respond to the questionnaire. Due to their failure to comply with the reporting obligation under article 5, paragraph 1 (a) and (c), of the Protocol (see chap. II, sect. C.4, above), the Committee was not in a position to evaluate whether they complied with their obligation under article 2, paragraph 5 (a).

37. Finland and Sweden submitted information that is either too general or insufficient to assess their compliance with this obligation. Similarly, Spain and the United Kingdom made reference to EU directives but did not show that the directives met the Protocol's obligation or indicate that the directives' requirements had been transposed into national legislation.

38. No Party reported that it had made use of the exemption foreseen in the third paragraph of footnote a/ to part A in the table in annex V to the Protocol.

### **3. Compliance with article 2, paragraph 5 (c)**

39. Article 2, paragraph 5 (c), requires Parties to apply national standards for the sulphur content of gas oil which are at least as stringent as those specified in annex V not later than two years after the entry into force of the Protocol.

40. The Committee concluded that the responses to the 2002 questionnaire on strategies and policies, in particular the responses to question 23, showed that 12 of the 25 Parties complied with this obligation (see table 7). The obligation does not apply to one Party, namely Canada, but it does apply to Hungary and Monaco, which became Parties in 2002. The Committee found two Parties to be in non-compliance with their obligations under paragraph 5 (c) of article 2 and two other Parties to be in non-compliance with their obligations under paragraphs 1 (a) and (c) of article 5 as it relates to paragraph 5 (a) of article 2. For eight Parties, it found the reported information to be insufficient to enable it to judge their compliance.

41. The Committee concluded that: (a) the Czech Republic was in non-compliance with its obligation under paragraph 5 (c) of article 2 for the years 2000, 2001 and 2002 because it reported that the legislation that set the required standard was to enter into force only in 2003; and (b) Croatia was in non-compliance with this obligation because it had reported that the standards it had introduced in accordance with annex V were not met in practice.

42. Luxembourg and the European Community did not respond to the questionnaire. Due to their failure to comply with the reporting obligation under article 5, paragraphs 1 (a) and (c), of the Protocol (see chap. II, sect. C.4, above), the Committee was not in a position to evaluate whether these Parties have complied with their obligation under article 2, paragraph 5 (c).

43. Belgium, France, Monaco and Sweden submitted information that was either too general or insufficient to assess their compliance with this obligation. Similarly, Ireland, Slovenia, Spain and United Kingdom made reference to EU directives but did not show that the directives met the Protocol's obligation or indicate that the directives' requirements had been transposed into national legislation.

#### **4. Conclusions**

44. On the basis of the information reviewed, the Committee concluded that nine Parties (Austria, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Liechtenstein, Netherlands and Norway) were in compliance with all the key obligations under in article 2, paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 (a) and (c), of the 1994 Sulphur Protocol applicable to them and that seven Parties (Croatia, Czech Republic, Italy, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Switzerland and European Community) were in non-compliance with one or more of the key obligations. For the nine other Parties (Belgium, Finland, France, Ireland, Monaco, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom), however, the Committee was not able to assess compliance with one or more of the key obligations due to incomplete information.

45. The above conclusions may appear more negative than the situation warrants, but this is to a large extent because for many Parties the information reported was insufficient to enable the Committee to evaluate compliance. Moreover, on the more positive side it should be noted that the Committee found that all Parties that had reported emission data for the years 2000 and/or 2001 were in compliance with their emission reduction obligations under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol. It also found that all but four Parties (Croatia, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Switzerland), for which there was sufficient information, had complied with their obligations to apply emission limit values and standards for the sulphur content of gas oil.

#### **IV. COOPERATION WITH OTHER BODIES**

46. At its tenth meeting, the Committee considered that it would be useful to continue its cooperation with EMEP concerning the quality of emission data in the context of the follow-up to the EMEP workshop on emission data validation and verification held in Gothenburg (Sweden) in

October 2002 (EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, para. 48).

47. Mr. M. Woodfield (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, attended part of the eleventh meeting of the Committee. He summarized the work of EMEP concerning emission data review and quality as well as its plans for the future.

48. The Committee discussed how the outcome of this work would relate to its needs concerning emission data quality, including with reference to paragraph 3 (c) of its terms of reference. It explained how the EMEP work could be relevant to its tasks, emphasizing that it had to focus on individual cases which were presented to it by Parties or through secretariat referrals. The Committee noted that it had a great interest in high-quality emission data and therefore welcomed any activities of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections that would enhance data quality. The Committee indicated its willingness to cooperate further with the EMEP Steering Body and the Task Force and asked the secretariat to provide it with further information about the issue at its meeting in spring 2004.

49. At the Committee's twelfth meeting, Mr. K. Bull informed it about the Kiev Ministerial Conference in May 2003. The Ministers and Heads of Delegation had endorsed the Guidelines for Strengthening Compliance with and Implementation of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (ECE/CEP/107) as "an important tool to strengthen compliance with and implementation of regional environmental conventions and protocols, recognizing that each agreement is negotiated in a unique way and enjoys its own independent legal status."

50. Mr. Bull also reported on the joint meeting on 3 July 2003 of the Bureaux of the UNECE Committee on Environmental Policy and the governing bodies of the UNECE environmental conventions. Of most relevance to the Committee was their discussion of the recently endorsed Guidelines for Strengthening Compliance with and Implementation of Multilateral Environmental Agreements in the UNECE Region (the Compliance Guidelines), as well as of plans to discuss implementation issues jointly among the UNECE environmental conventions' governing bodies at a future meeting.

51. At the Committee's eleventh meeting, Mr. T. Kuokkanen had presented the final version of the Compliance Guidelines. The Committee thanked Mr. Kuokkanen for representing it in the Task Force which had drawn up the Guidelines and decided to discuss at its next meeting the potential relevance of the Compliance Guidelines to its work.

52. At its twelfth meeting, the Implementation Committee reviewed with interest the Compliance Guidelines, as adopted, having followed their development over the past two years.

53. The Committee noted that several of the obstacles to national implementation/compliance set forth in paragraph 5 of the Guidelines, such as changes in economic circumstances and unforeseen costs of implementation, had been identified by Parties to various protocols as

explanations for their compliance difficulties. It also noted that many Parties referred to problems with uncertain or inaccurate data.

54. Several of the elements contained in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Compliance Guidelines (relating to cross-cutting issues) have been relevant to the Committee's work. For example, the Committee had repeatedly recognized the importance of clear language in treaty obligations and in relevant decisions thereunder. For its part, the Committee had always sought to play a useful role in ensuring clarity in the development of reporting requirements under the Protocols, as well as in the development of questionnaires aimed at facilitating implementation and review of Parties' reporting and other obligations.

55. The implementation chapter of the Compliance Guidelines was designed to help States take the necessary steps before ratification with a view to enabling their compliance with a particular agreement. It appeared to the Committee that such steps, if followed, would decrease the likelihood of instances of non-compliance with the Convention's obligations. In addition, the Committee had employed some of these steps with respect to Parties that found themselves in non-compliance after ratifying a protocol, e.g. calling upon Parties to set forth the precise steps they intended to take to get back into compliance.

56. The Compliance Guidelines' section on setting up a compliance regime under an MEA was of less relevance to the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution than to other, newer UNECE agreements, as its compliance regime was already fairly well developed.

57. Concerning reporting, it appeared that the Convention's reporting system, including the use of questionnaires, already reflected many of the suggestions contained in the Compliance Guidelines. The suggestion in paragraph 22 (a) that Parties should be informed as to how much detail was being requested of them was of particular relevance to the Committee's work this year, as it might not have been clear to some Parties how much detail was required to demonstrate their compliance with certain obligations (see paras. 25-27 above). Another useful suggestion was that questionnaires might invite comments from the users on how to improve the questionnaire, so that ambiguities could be avoided in the future.

58. Apart from the Compliance Guidelines, the Committee agreed that it would be useful to keep in contact with other compliance regimes, in particular those served by the UNECE secretariat. In this regard, the Chairman reported that on 28 May 2003 he had, in response to a formal request from his opposite number in the Espoo Convention's Implementation Committee, written describing the Committee's experience with, and approach to, the issue of participation in its work by a Party that was the subject of a submission or referral.

## V. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

59. The Committee turned its attention to the question of whether there was a need for additional measures for dealing with non-compliance beyond those already used by the

Implementation Committee and the Executive Body and, if so, what kind of measures. Its thoughts on this issue were still at a preliminary stage and so the Committee agreed to continue its consideration of the matter in 2004.

## **VI. FURTHER WORK**

60. The Implementation Committee reviewed its work-plan for 2004 and made suggestions to the secretariat for inclusion in the proposal to be presented to the Executive Body. The Committee proposed, among other things, that it should be asked to prepare the ground for a future in-depth review of compliance by Parties with the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

61. It tentatively scheduled its thirteenth meeting for 4-6 May 2004 and its fourteenth meeting for 22-24 September 2004. Both meetings would be held in Geneva, unless the Committee received an invitation to hold its thirteenth meeting at another location.

Table 1. National total annual emissions reported by Parties to the 1985 Sulphur Protocol (a)

	Entry into force	Base year, 1980	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Austria	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Belarus	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Belgium	9/7/89	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	
Bulgaria	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Canada	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Czech Republic	4/1/93	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Denmark	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Estonia	6/5/00	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	
Finland	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
France	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Germany	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X	X	
Hungary	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	
Italy	5/6/90	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	
Liechtenstein	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Luxembourg	11/22/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Netherlands	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Norway	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Russian Federation	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	-	
Slovakia	8/26/93	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Sweden	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Switzerland	12/20/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Ukraine	9/2/87	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Total:	22 Parties	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	82%	99%

Notes:

Information based on most recent submissions up to 3 September 2003.

X Final and complete data available for that year.

P Preliminary or partial data available for that year.

T Submission received by the deadline set in the guidelines.

- No emission data were reported for that year.

n/a Not applicable.

(a) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution on the Reduction of Sulphur Emissions or their Transboundary Fluxes by at least 30 per cent, adopted 8.7.1985 in Helsinki.

Table 2. National total annual emissions reported by Parties to the 1988 NOx Protocol (a)

	Entry into force	Emission data reported for:												
		Base year	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Austria	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Belarus	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Belgium	29/01/2001	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	P	
Bulgaria	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Canada	4/25/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Czech Republic	4/1/93	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Denmark	5/30/93	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Estonia	6/5/00	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	
Finland	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
France	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Germany	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X	X	
Greece	7/28/98	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	X	X	
Hungary	2/10/92	X	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	
Ireland	1/15/95	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Italy	8/17/92	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	
Liechtenstein	6/22/94	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Luxembourg	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Netherlands	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Norway	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Russian Federation	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	-	
Slovakia	8/26/93	X	n/a	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Spain	3/4/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Sweden	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Switzerland	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Ukraine	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
United Kingdom	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
United States	2/14/91	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
European Community	3/17/94	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	
Total:	28 Parties	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	82%	99%

Notes: Information based on most recent submissions up to 3 September 2003.

X Final and complete data available for that year.

P Preliminary or partial data available for that year.

T Submission received by the deadline set in the guidelines.

- No emission data available for that year.

n/a Not applicable.

(a) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution concerning the Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides or their Transboundary Fluxes, adopted 31.10.1988 in Sofia.

Table 3. National total annual emissions reported by Parties to the 1991 VOC Protocol (a)

	Entry into force	Base year	Emission data reported for:						
			Base year	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Austria	9/29/97	1988	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Belgium	1/29/01	1988	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	P	
Bulgaria	5/28/98	1988	X	n/a	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Czech Republic	9/29/97	1990	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Denmark	9/29/97	1985	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Estonia	6/5/00	1988*	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	
Finland	9/29/97	1988	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
France	9/29/97	1988	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Germany	9/29/97	1988	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X	X	
Hungary	9/29/97	1988	X	X	X	X	X	P	
Italy	9/29/97	1990	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Liechtenstein	9/29/97	1984	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Luxembourg	9/29/97	1990	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Monaco	10/24/01	1990	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X <sup>T</sup>	
Netherlands	9/29/97	1988	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
Norway	9/29/97	1988	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Slovakia	3/14/00	1990	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Spain	9/29/97	1988	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Sweden	9/29/97	1988	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Switzerland	9/29/97	1984	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	
United Kingdom	9/29/97	1988	X	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	
Total:	21 Parties		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%	98%

Notes: Information based on most recent submissions up to 3 September 2003.

X Final and complete data available for that year.

P Preliminary or partial data available for that year.

T Submission received by the deadline set in the guidelines.

- No emission data available for that year.

n/a Not applicable.

\* To be confirmed.

(a) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution concerning the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or their Transboundary Fluxes, adopted 18.11.1991 in Geneva.

Table 4. Emission data reported by Parties to the 1994 Sulphur Protocol (a)

	Entry into force	Annual totals reported for:				Sectoral emissions reported for:				Gridded data for:	
		1998	1999	2000	2001	1998	1999	2000	2001	2000	
Austria	25/11/1998	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
Belgium	29/01/2001	n/a	n/a	n/a	P	n/a	n/a	n/a	P	n/a	
Canada	05/08/1998	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	n/a	
Croatia	26/07/1999	n/a	X	X	-	n/a	Y	Y	-	X	
Czech Republic	05/08/1998	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
Denmark	05/08/1998	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
Finland	06/09/1998	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
France	05/08/1998	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	-	
Germany	01/09/1998	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X	X	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y	-	
Greece	05/08/1998	X	X	X	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	
Hungary	06/09/2002	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Ireland	03/12/1998	X	X	X	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	
Italy	13/12/1998	X	X	X	-	Y	Y	X	-	-	
Liechtenstein	05/08/1998	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	-	
Luxembourg	05/08/1998	X	X	X	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	
Monaco	07/08/2002	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Netherlands	05/08/1998	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
Norway	05/08/1998	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
Slovakia	05/08/1998	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
Slovenia	05/08/1998	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
Spain	05/08/1998	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
Sweden	05/08/1998	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
Switzerland	05/08/1998	X	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
United Kingdom	05/08/1998	X	X	X <sup>T</sup>	X <sup>T</sup>	Y	Y	Y <sup>T</sup>	Y <sup>T</sup>	X	
European Community	05/08/1998	X	X	X	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	
Total:	25 Parties	100%	100%	100%	83%	100%	100%	100%	83%	67%	92%

Notes: Information based on most recent submissions up to 3 September 2003.

X Final and complete data available for that year.

Y Sectoral emission data reported for that year.

P Preliminary or partial data available for that year.

T Submission received by the deadline set in the guidelines.

- No emission data were reported for that year.

n/a Not applicable.

(a) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution on Further Reduction of Sulphur Emissions, adopted 14.6.1994 in Oslo.

**Table 5. 2002 Review on Strategies and Policies:  
Responses received by Parties to the Protocols in force**

<b>Party*</b>	<b>1985 Sulphur Protocol</b>	<b>1988 Nitrogen Oxides Protocol</b>	<b>1991 VOC Protocol</b>	<b>1994 Sulphur Protocol</b>
<b>Austria</b>	A	A	A	A
<b>Belarus</b>	A	A	n/a	n/a
<b>Belgium</b>	B	B	B	B
<b>Bulgaria</b>	A	A	A	n/a
<b>Canada</b>	A	A	n/a	A
<b>Croatia</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	B
<b>Czech Republic</b>	A	A	A	A
<b>Denmark</b>	B	B	B	B
<b>Estonia</b>	B	C (not Q.5 and 7)	C (not Q. 11-12, 14-17)	n/a
<b>Finland</b>	A	A	A	A
<b>France</b>	B	B	C (not Q. 15-17)	B
<b>Germany</b>	A	A	A	A
<b>Greece</b>	n/a	A	n/a	A
<b>Hungary</b>	A	B	A	A
<b>Ireland</b>	n/a	B	n/a	B
<b>Italy</b>	A	A	A	A
<b>Liechtenstein</b>	A	A	A	A
<b>Luxembourg</b>	None	None	None	None
<b>Netherlands</b>	A	A	A	A
<b>Monaco</b>	n/a	n/a	B	A
<b>Norway</b>	A	A	A	A
<b>Russian Federation</b>	B	B	n/a	n/a
<b>Slovakia</b>	B	B	B	B
<b>Slovenia</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	A
<b>Spain</b>	N/a	A	C. (not Q. 15-17)	A
<b>Sweden</b>	A	A	A	A
<b>Switzerland</b>	A	A	A	A
<b>Ukraine</b>	B	B	n/a	n/a
<b>United Kingdom</b>	n/a	B	B	B
<b>United States</b>	n/a	A	n/a	n/a
<b>European Community</b>	n/a	None	n/a	None

*\*The following Parties provided supplemental information or modifications to their replies to the 2002 questionnaire, by 15 August 2003: Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Monaco, Norway, Switzerland, Ukraine and United Kingdom.*

- A: Response to all questions related to the Protocol received by 22 April 2002.  
 B: Response to all questions related to the Protocol but not by 22 April 2002.  
 C (not Q.): Response to all questions related to the Protocol except those specified.  
 None: No response to any question of the section.  
 n/a: Not applicable (not Party to the Protocol).

Table 6. Compliance with the emission reduction obligation of the 1994 Sulphur Protocol

Party	Date of entry into force	Sulphur emission ceiling for 2000	Reported emissions for 2000	Reported emissions for 2001	Ceiling met in 2000	Ceiling met in 2001
		(kt SO <sub>2</sub> per year)			(art.2.2 and art. 2.3)	
Austria	25/11/1998	78	38.05	36.67	YES	YES
Belgium	29/01/2001	248	164.72	161.86	YES	YES
Canada national SOMA	05/08/1998	3200	2460	2488	YES	YES
		1750	1221	1196	YES	YES
Croatia	26/07/1999	133	58.10	-	YES	-
Czech Republic	05/08/1998	1128	264	251	YES	YES
Denmark	05/08/1998	90	27.73 <sup>a</sup>	25.33	YES	YES
Finland	06/09/1998	116	73.5	85.24	YES	YES
France	05/08/1998	868	653.6 <sup>a b</sup>	609.8 <sup>a b</sup>	YES	YES
Germany	01/09/1998	1300	638	650	YES	YES
Greece	05/08/1998	595	483	485	YES	YES
Hungary	09/06/2002	898	486.2	400.48	n/a	n/a
Ireland	03/12/1998	155	131.5	125.8	YES	YES
Italy	13/12/1998	1330	759	-	YES	-
Liechtenstein	05/08/1998	0.1	0.0534	0.0508	YES	YES
Luxembourg	05/08/1998	10	3.092	3.215	YES	YES
Monaco	08/07/2002	0.07	0.067	0.065	n/a	n/a
Netherlands	05/08/1998	106	91.52	88.9	YES	YES
Norway	05/08/1998	34	26.6	24.75	YES	YES
Slovakia	05/08/1998	337	124	129	YES	YES
Slovenia	05/08/1998	130	96	66	YES	YES
Spain	05/08/1998	2143	1516.9 <sup>a</sup>	1424.9 <sup>a</sup>	YES	YES
Sweden	05/08/1998	100	57.24	60.29	YES	YES
Switzerland	05/08/1998	60	19.26	21.08	YES	YES
United Kingdom	05/08/1998	2449	1188.3	1125.3	YES	YES
European Community	05/08/1998	9598	5750	-	YES	-
<i>No of Parties in compliance with art. 2, para. 2</i>					22	19
<i>No of Parties in compliance with art. 2, para. 3</i>					1	1
<b>Total No of Parties in compliance</b>					<b>23</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Share of Parties in compliance</b>					<b>100%</b>	<b>87%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Data include those emissions located within the EMEP area only.<sup>b</sup> National totals do not include international air traffic and international sea traffic.

**Table 7. Compliance with other key obligations of the 1994 Sulphur Protocol**

Party	Emission limit values for new major stationary sources	Sulphur content of gas oil
	Art. 2, para. 5 (a)	Art. 2, para. 5 (c)
Austria	YES	YES
Belgium	YES	*
Canada		
national	n/a	n/a
SOMA	n/a	n/a
Croatia	YES	NO
Czech Republic	YES	NO
Denmark	YES	YES
Finland	*	YES
France	YES	*
Germany	YES	YES
Greece	YES	YES
Hungary	YES	YES
Ireland	YES	*
Italy	YES	YES
Liechtenstein	YES	YES
Luxembourg	-	-
Monaco	YES	*
Netherlands	YES	YES
Norway	YES	YES
Slovakia	NO	YES
Slovenia	YES	*
Spain	*	*
Sweden	*	*
Switzerland	NO	YES
United Kingdom	*	*
European Community	-	-
<b>No of Parties in compliance</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Share of Parties in compliance</b>	<b>at least 67%</b>	<b>at least 50%</b>

## Notes

YES compliance.

NO non-compliance.

- no information available (no response to the questionnaire).

\* insufficient information available (either insufficient or too general).

n/a not applicable.