



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

ECE/EB.AIR/77  
16 January 2003

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

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

**REPORT OF THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE BODY**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
Introduction.....	1 - 6
I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA .....	7
II. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE FIFTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF THE ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE AND THE NINTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY.....	8 - 9
III. FINANCING OF CORE ACTIVITIES.....	10 - 20
IV. COMPLIANCE WITH PROTOCOL OBLIGATIONS .....	21 - 35
V. REVIEW OF PROTOCOLS AND OTHER STRATEGY ACTIVITIES .....	36 - 48
VI. PROGRESS IN CORE ACTIVITIES .....	49 - 61
A. Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP) .....	49 - 56
B. Effects of major air pollutants on human health and the environment .....	57 - 61
VII. STRATEGIES AND POLICIES OF PARTIES AND SIGNATORIES TO THE CONVENTION FOR THE ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION.....	62 - 77
VIII. ACTIVITIES OF ECE BODIES AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS RELEVANT TO THE CONVENTION.....	78 - 85
IX. WORK-PLAN FOR 2003.....	86 - 87

**CONTENTS** (continued)

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
X. FINANCIAL ISSUES .....	88 - 92
XI. OTHER BUSINESS .....	93 - 96
XII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS.....	97 – 98
XIII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT.....	99

Annexes

I. Decision 2002/1 on the financing of core activities (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
II. Statement to Ministers from the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution on the preparation of a long-term funding arrangement for Core Activities (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
III. Decision 2002/2 on compliance by Norway with its obligations under the 1991 VOC Protocol (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
IV. Decision 2002/3 on compliance by Finland with its obligations under the 1991 VOC Protocol (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
V. Decision 2002/4 on compliance by Italy with its obligations under the 1991 VOC Protocol (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
VI. Decision 2002/5 on compliance by Sweden with its obligations under the 1991 VOC Protocol (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
VII. Decision 2002/6 on compliance by Greece with its obligations under the 1988 NO <sub>x</sub> Protocol (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
VIII. Decision 2002/7 on compliance by Ireland with its obligations under the 1988 NO <sub>x</sub> Protocol (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
IX. Decision 2002/8 on compliance by Spain with its obligations under the 1988 NO <sub>x</sub> Protocol (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
X. Decision 2002/9 on compliance by Parties with their reporting obligations (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
XI. Decision 2002/10 on emission data reporting under the Convention and the protocols in force (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
XII. Long-term Financing of EMEP (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1)	
XIII. Work-plan for the implementation of the Convention in 2003 (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.2)	
XIV. List of Meetings in 2003 (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.2)	
XV. Trust funds (see ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.2)	

## **Introduction**

1. The twentieth session of the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution was convened in Geneva from 10 to 13 December 2002.
2. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention: Austria; Belgium; Canada; Cyprus; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Ireland; Italy; Monaco; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Russian Federation; Slovakia; Sweden; Switzerland; United Kingdom; United States of America; and the European Community (EC).
3. Representatives from the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) attended. The European Environment Agency (EEA) was also represented.
4. The Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E), the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W), and the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM) of EMEP were also represented.
5. Mr. H. Dovland (Norway) chaired the meeting.
6. The Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe, Ms. B. Schmögnerová, addressed the Meeting. She drew attention to the World Summit on Sustainable Development held in Johannesburg, South Africa in 2002 and the importance of the follow-up activities especially with regard to the role of the regional commissions and specific issues of air pollution raised at the summit. She noted the work of the Convention, its successes and the activities related to implementation whilst stressing that it was important to ensure that the countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia became Parties to protocols as well as to the Convention, and noting the UNECE application for funds from the United Nations Development Account for a project aimed at developing capacity building for air quality management in Central Asia. She also urged delegates to address the ratification of the three protocols to the Convention that had not yet entered into force. The Executive Secretary informed the Executive Body of the preparations for the fifth Ministerial Conference “Environment for Europe”, which was to take place in May 2003; at this Conference three legal instruments would be adopted and signed by Ministers.

## **I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

7. The agenda (ECE/EB.AIR/76) was adopted on the understanding that item 6 (b) would be taken up on Thursday, 12 December.

## **II. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE FIFTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF THE ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE AND THE NINTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY**

8. The Director of the Environment and Human Settlements Division, Mr. K. Bärlund, provided further information on the preparations for the fifth Ministerial Conference “Environment for Europe” in Kiev in May 2003. He noted the importance of the process whilst informing the Executive Body that the future of “Environment for Europe” was under review. It was important to consider how to avoid an increase in the number of ministerial meetings in the future. He also drew attention to the possibilities for the Convention, through EMEP, to collaborate with the Committee on Environmental Policy’s Working Group on Environmental Monitoring to develop monitoring networks in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. He noted that many UNECE environment activities were taking place under the conventions. There was a continuing need to look at the interlinkages of these activities, though without necessarily seeking to coordinate them, and a meeting of the Bureaux of the five conventions was planned for mid-2003.

9. Mr. K. Bull, of the secretariat, noted Azerbaijan’s accession to the Convention in 2002, making it the 49<sup>th</sup> Party. He also informed the Executive Body of the status of ratification of the protocols, noting that both the 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals and the 1998 Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) now had 13 ratifications, three short of the number required for entry into force. The 1999 Gothenburg Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone had to date a total of just four ratifications.

## **III. FINANCING OF CORE ACTIVITIES**

10. The Chairman reminded delegations of the importance of establishing a stable long-term solution to the financing of core activities under the Convention as called for by Ministers in the Gothenburg Declaration (ECE/EB.AIR/68, annex II). He explained that this was the last possibility to reach agreement, as decided by the Executive Body at its nineteenth session (ECE/EB.AIR/75, para. 18), before the Ministerial Conference “Environment for Europe” to be held in Kiev in May 2003.

11. Mr. R. BALLAMAN (Switzerland), Chairman of the Working Group on Strategies and Review, presented the results of the negotiations by the Working Group on a secure, long-term mechanism for financing the core activities (other than those of EMEP) under the Convention, including the results of its thirty-fourth session (EB.AIR/WG.5/74) and the meeting of heads of delegation (EB.AIR/WG.5/72). He indicated that the negotiations presented two instruments: a preliminary draft protocol and a draft decision. The Working Group had recommended the draft decision as there was unanimous support for it and it had the potential to provide for a stable long-term solution. The protocol might provide an even stronger basis to ensure the funding, but in the Working Group there had not been sufficient support for it.

12. The delegation of the Netherlands informed the Executive Body that it had made bilateral contacts with some Parties to obtain their support for a protocol. It believed that there was now broader support for a protocol and suggested pursuing a two-track approach with a protocol and a decision. The decision would cover the period until a protocol would enter into force and apply to those Parties that were not or not yet able to sign up to a protocol.

13. The delegation of Germany drew attention to its difficult budgetary situation indicating that for this reason it would not be in a position to sign a protocol. The delegation of Italy pointed out that it had no objection of principle to a protocol, but it could not commit itself to paying the expected contribution under a decision as there was no provision for doing so in the national budget. Both delegations reiterated their reservations on the draft decision raised during the meeting of heads of delegation (EB.AIR/WG.5/72, para. 16).

14. The delegation of Portugal indicated that its position was similar to that of Germany and that it could not support a protocol at this stage.

15. The delegation of the United Kingdom reiterated its previous position favouring a protocol, as long as it was widely supported and that such support would cover the majority of the funding.

16. The delegation of France expressed its support for a protocol as the best solution noting, however, that it would pose problems if not all the main contributors adhered to a protocol.

17. The delegation of the Russian Federation explained it was not in a position to agree to a protocol at this stage. Since the meeting of the Working Group on Strategies and Review it had examined the issue and was trying to find resources to enable it to make at least a partial contribution to the trust fund. It suggested that it could be cheaper to perform some of the tasks if centres were located in countries with economies in transition.

18. A number of delegations stated their preference for a funding protocol expressing concern over the fact that a decision merely recommending contributions might not be sufficient to ensure adequate funding.

19. Delegations recognized, however, that there was a new element in the draft decision as it foresaw the recording of contributions made directly to the centres. Such direct contributions had secured the funding of the centres in the past.

20. As a result of the discussion, the Executive Body:

(a) Took note of the deliberations concerning the financing of core activities at the thirty-fourth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review (EB.AIR/WG.5/74) and the report of the meeting of heads of delegation (EB.AIR/WG.5/72);

(b) Adopted decision 2002/1 on the financing of core activities (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1, annex I);

(c) Approved the statement to Ministers at the Ministerial Conference "Environment for

Europe” in Kiev in May 2003 informing them of the action taken in response to the 1999 Gothenburg Ministerial Declaration and the related paragraph for inclusion in the draft Ministerial Declaration for Kiev (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1, annex II); and

(d) Requested the secretariat to ensure that the statement was drawn to Ministers’ attention and the paragraph reflected in the draft Ministerial Declaration for Kiev.

#### **IV. COMPLIANCE WITH PROTOCOL OBLIGATIONS**

21. Mr. P. Széll (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Implementation Committee, introduced its fifth report (EB.AIR/2002/2 and Add.1) on compliance by Parties with their protocol obligations, including the results of the ninth and tenth meetings of the Committee. He drew attention to the recommendations made by the Committee, in particular its proposed decisions concerning the compliance by four Parties with their obligations under the 1991 VOC Protocol (EB.AIR/2002/2): Norway (para. 8), Finland (para. 12), Italy (para. 16), and Sweden (para. 21), and by three Parties with their obligation under the 1988 NO<sub>x</sub> Protocol (EB.AIR/2002/2): Greece (para. 28), Ireland (para. 37), and Spain (para. 44). He also highlighted the draft decision concerning compliance by Luxembourg and Ukraine with their reporting obligations under various protocols (EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, para. 30); and the Committee’s suggestion on how to take forward the in-depth review of the 1994 Sulphur Protocol (see EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, para. 38).

22. Mr. Széll pointed out that the work of the Implementation Committee had reached a new phase. The number of references had substantially increased in 2002. This placed an increasingly heavy workload on the Committee. For the first time it had been called on to examine referrals made by the secretariat. These required particularly careful consideration to ensure that all relevant issues were taken into account and that due process was properly observed.

23. Many delegations expressed their appreciation to the Implementation Committee, its Chairman and the secretariat for their excellent work over the year.

24. With reference to paragraph 35 of EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, the delegation of Canada apologized for its failure to provide data on time and informed the Executive Body that it had recently submitted emission data for the Sulphur Oxides Management Area (SOMA) that it had specified under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol.

25. With reference to paragraphs 22 and 23 of EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, the delegation of the United Kingdom apologized for its failure to provide all data on time and informed the Executive Body that it had recently submitted a response to the question that had been omitted from its original response.

26. With reference to paragraphs 8, 11, 14 and 17 of EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, the delegation of the Netherlands expressed regret for its failure to provide final emission data on time and informed the Executive Body that it had done so in the meantime.

27. The delegation of Sweden informed the Executive Body that it was re-evaluating its VOC

emission estimates. According to a preliminary review of new data covering the period back to its base year (1988) under the VOC Protocol, it seemed that in 2001 Sweden had been in compliance with its 30% emission reduction obligation and it might actually never have been in non-compliance. The new data would be submitted as soon as the review had been finalized. Sweden explained that it supported the decision recommended by the Implementation Committee and that it would prepare the information requested therein in good time for the Committee to consider it at its next meeting.

28. The delegation of Norway expressed regret over its continued failure to comply with its obligations under the VOC Protocol. Emission licences issued to the oil companies involved in loading and storing crude oil offshore were being implemented as outlined in Norway's report to the Implementation Committee in July 2002. It was not able to provide any new information other than that given in its July 2002 report. It announced that it would report to the Committee on progress as requested in the recommended decision.

29. The delegation of Finland explained that it seemed that it might already have achieved compliance in 2001. It would report to the Implementation Committee on progress made.

30. The delegation of Ireland indicated that it had nothing to add to the information presented by the Implementation Committee. It would report to the Committee on progress in reducing NO<sub>x</sub> emissions, as requested.

31. The delegation of Belgium apologized for not having responded to the 2002 questionnaire on strategies and policies. Belgium was committed to meeting its obligations and would submit the missing information as soon as possible.

32. The secretariat confirmed having received information from Canada, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden. Some of the emission data submitted late were presented in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/8/Corr.1. On 10 December 2002, the secretariat had received a submission from Luxembourg with emission data for SO<sub>2</sub> for 1987, 1988, 1989, 1991 and 1992 and for NO<sub>x</sub> for 1991 and 1992. These data had been identified as missing in the report by the Implementation Committee and the Executive Body had requested these data in its decisions 2000/2 and 2001/4. It was possible, as a result, for the Executive Body to modify the action proposed in the decision that the Implementation Committee had prepared for it.

33. The secretariat also explained that the late submission of many national reports continued to pose an additional burden on the Implementation Committee. It resulted in the Committee being unable to finalize work-plan items at its first meeting in the year and having to revert to them at the second meeting.

34. The Executive Body approved the fifth report by the Implementation Committee (EB.AIR/2002/2 and Add.1), expressing its great appreciation to the Committee members, its Chairman and the secretariat. It adopted:

- (a) Decision 2002/2 (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1, annex III) concerning compliance by Norway with its obligations under the 1991 VOC Protocol;
- (b) Decision 2002/3 (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1, annex IV) concerning compliance by Finland with its obligations under the 1991 VOC Protocol;
- (c) Decision 2002/4 (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1, annex V) concerning compliance by Italy with its obligations under the 1991 VOC Protocol;
- (d) Decision 2002/5 (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1, annex VI) concerning compliance by Sweden with its obligation under the 1991 VOC Protocol;
- (e) Decision 2002/6 (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1, annex VII) concerning compliance by Greece with its obligations under the 1988 NO<sub>x</sub> Protocol;
- (f) Decision 2002/7 (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1, annex VIII) concerning compliance by Ireland with its obligations under the 1988 NO<sub>x</sub> Protocol;
- (g) Decision 2002/8 (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1, annex IX) concerning compliance by Spain with its obligations under the 1988 NO<sub>x</sub> Protocol; and
- (h) Decision 2002/9 (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1, annex X) concerning compliance by the Parties with their reporting obligations.

35. Furthermore, the Executive Body:

- (a) Requested the secretariat to communicate these decisions to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Parties in question;
- (b) Reminded Parties of the importance of timely reporting as required by the protocols and called upon those Parties that had not yet done so to report or complete their reports as soon as possible;
- (c) Invited the Parties, especially those referred to in the report of the Committee (EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, para. 37), to complete, as necessary, their reports on the implementation of the 1994 Sulphur Protocol and to submit additional information by 31 January 2003;
- (d) Requested the Implementation Committee to finalize its in-depth review of the 1994 Sulphur Protocol taking this information into account;
- (e) Noted that seven members remained on the Committee for another year: Ms. Sue BINIAZ (United States); Mr. Volkert KEIZER (Netherlands); Mr. Tuomas KUOKKANEN (Finland); Mr. Lars LINDAU (Sweden); Mr. Stephan MICHEL (Switzerland); Mr. Ivan MOJÍK (Slovakia); and Mr. Patrick SZÉLL (United Kingdom) as Chairman;
- (f) Re-elected Mr. Cristiano PIACENTE (Italy) as a member for a second term of two years; and
- (g) Elected Ms. Melanija LESNIAK (Slovenia) as a new member to the Committee.

## V. REVIEW OF PROTOCOLS AND OTHER STRATEGY ACTIVITIES

36. The Chairman of the Working Group on Strategies and Review presented the report of its thirty-fourth session (EB.AIR/WG.5/74) with regard to the preparations for the review of protocols, the exchange of technology and the development of a communications strategy. Mr. Ballaman highlighted the work on mercury, including the assessment by MSC-E of atmospheric transport across the northern hemisphere. He also stressed the importance of preparing for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol in close collaboration with the European Commission's Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme.

37. Mr. Ballaman highlighted the results of the workshop on the valuation of ecosystem effects organized under the Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Instruments (NEBEI) in Scheveningen (Netherlands) on 2-3 October 2002. The next workshop of NEBEI should cover material damage and especially damage to cultural heritage and preferably be organized in the autumn of 2003.

38. Mr. Ballaman also stressed the important policy implications of the work on hemispheric air pollution. A draft summary report of the EMEP workshop on hemispheric air pollution held in Bad Breisig (Germany) on 7-9 October 2002 was made available. This issue was related to the work to study the linkages between regional air pollution and climate change. A workshop on the latter under the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling would be held at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in Laxenburg (Austria) on 27-29 January 2003.

39. Mr. D. Stone (Canada), Co-chairman of the Expert Group on POPs, informed the Executive Body about the work done by the Expert Group (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/2) and preparations for its next meeting on 17-19 March 2003 in Oslo. Besides updates to previous assessments, the Expert Group would consider new information on endosulfan, dicofol, short-chain chlorinated paraffins and pentachlorophenol. Mr. Stone also noted the work to prepare suggestions for the process of handling proposals for adding substances to the Protocol on POPs and other review items. Furthermore, he gave an overview of the report on POPs by the Task Force on the Health Aspects of Air Pollution.

40. The delegation of Germany announced its readiness to take the lead of the Expert Group on Heavy Metals with Mr. D. JOST as Chairman and suggested organizing a first meeting in April/May 2003.

41. The delegation of Sweden underlined the importance of further work on measures to reduce mercury emissions. It would host a workshop on critical limits for heavy metals in autumn 2003 or spring 2004.

42. Two delegations noted that, while they supported the establishment of an expert group on heavy metals, they would not want it to deal with policy questions. Prior to entry into force of the Protocol on Heavy Metals, work should be limited to preparing a review by collecting information.

43. The delegation of the United Kingdom informed the Executive Body that Prof. David PEARCE, Rapporteur of NEBEI, had resigned. The United Kingdom was ready to continue to lead the network, but was still in the process of designating a successor.

44. The delegation of the Netherlands informed the Executive Body that it had contracted IIASA to introduce data on measures and costs for reducing emissions of the greenhouse gases under the Kyoto Protocol into the RAINS model. This was part of an attempt to explore the synergies between regional air pollution and climate change, which could have significant implications for future policy discussions. It could enable formulation of more cost-effective abatement strategies in both forums. The delegation called upon other Parties to join its efforts and also fund such tasks under the work-plan.

45. The delegation of Finland indicated it was finalizing the procedure for ratification of the Gothenburg Protocol. In this it had encountered a problem related to the limit values for new stationary engines given in annex V to the Protocol. It was able to fulfil its obligations through alternative emission reduction strategies, but suggested reviewing this limit value at the earliest opportunity.

46. The delegation of the Netherlands informed the Executive Body that it had finalized all preparations and intended to ratify the Gothenburg Protocol in May 2003.

47. The Chairman called upon delegations from Parties that were Signatories to the protocols that were not yet in force to speed up the ratification process. The Chairman reminded delegations that only Parties to the protocols could decide upon amendments to those protocols, including the addition of substances, and such amendments could be considered only after entry into force.

48. The Executive Body:

(a) Took note of the report of the Working Group on Strategies and Review (EB.AIR/WG.5/74), expressing its appreciation to the Working Group and its Chairman;

(b) Expressed its appreciation for the report on the further assessment of POPs (EB.AIR/WG.5/2002/2) and agreed to take it into account when reviewing the Protocol following its entry into force;

(c) Noted with satisfaction that the Expert Group on POPs would continue its work in 2003 and that the Working Group on Strategies and Review had invited the Expert Group's Co-Chairs to prepare suggestions for the process of handling proposals for adding substances to the Protocol and other review items;

(d) Noted the excellent progress in and contributions to the work on POPs made by EMEP and the Task Force on Health Aspects;

(e) Noted the progress of the scientific work on heavy metals, including the mapping and modelling of critical loads of cadmium and lead, hoping that it could soon contribute to policy discussions;

(f) Decided to set up an Expert Group on Heavy Metals, led by Germany, to start work in 2003 by drawing up proposals for a work programme that should include, inter alia:

(i) Collection of available information on the effects of heavy metal pollution from within and outside the framework of the Convention;

(ii) Review of information on abatement options and their costs, taking into account the synergies with the abatement of particulate matter;

(iii) Review of information on heavy metals not yet included in the Protocol;

(g) Expressed satisfaction with the progress made in preparing for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, calling upon Parties to support the scientific activities by providing the necessary data (emissions, modelling, critical loads, etc.), including those on particulate matter, and, in particular, to report early in 2003 on projected activities up to 2020;

(h) Noted with interest the plans of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling to examine the links and synergies between regional air pollution and climate change, and requested the Working Group to keep it informed of progress;

(i) Welcomed the collaboration between the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement and EMEP;

(j) Expressed its gratitude to Prof. D. Pearce (United Kingdom) for his work on economic aspects and as rapporteur to NEBEI and agreed that the next workshop of NEBEI, preferably in 2003, should cover damage to materials, in particular cultural heritage;

(k) Noted with appreciation the offer by Sweden to organize a workshop in 2004 to take stock of the state of science and prepare an assessment for policy discussions for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol and for the CAFE programme;

(l) Noted the start made by the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, recognizing the need for some Parties to nominate national experts and to participate in the work of the Expert Group and its sectoral panels;

(m) Noted the progress on exchanging information and technology, in particular, through the Warsaw workshop on control technologies for emissions from stationary sources and welcomed the efforts of the Bureau of the Working Group to consider ways and means to facilitate the exchange of information and technology taking into account the needs of countries with economies in transition;

(n) Noted with appreciation the offers of Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States to organize a workshop on communications on 9-11 April 2003 in London to improve the visibility of the Convention.

## VI. PROGRESS IN CORE ACTIVITIES

### A. Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP)

49. Mr. J. SCHNEIDER (Austria), Chairman of the EMEP Steering Body, reported on the activities of EMEP, including the results of the twenty-sixth session of its Steering Body (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/2). With reference to documents EB.AIR/2002/3 and Add.1, he provided a summary of the main issues. He highlighted that emission data were now accessible on an Internet-based database at <http://webdab.emep.int>. Mr. Schneider also stressed the need for continued efforts to monitor air pollution and suggested that Parties should delay any changes to their monitoring network that might affect EMEP until the new monitoring strategy was adopted in 2003. Finally, he drew attention to the work on the EMEP assessment report, which was being prepared in a joint effort by Parties and the EMEP centres.

50. The delegation of Poland announced its continued interest in taking over as lead country of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, expressing its hope of doing so jointly with Norway as co-chair. A final confirmation of this offer would be made in early 2003.

51. With reference to the new emission reporting Guidelines (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/7 and Corr.1), one delegation noted that some changed definitions might have a substantial impact on the estimation of emission levels and stressed that this should not change the Parties' ability to comply with their obligations under protocols setting emission ceilings. Paragraph 2 of annex I to the Guidelines stated that the definition for mobile sources was "without prejudice to a Party's ability to report emissions on the basis of effective methods appropriate to its national circumstances [...] for purpose of assessing compliance with Protocol obligations".

52. Two Parties made reference to the informative inventory report that Parties would be encouraged to submit according to paragraph 38 of the new Guidelines. They pointed out that such a report could be very voluminous and would be needed only if there was an interest in detailed validation of some of the data. While they were ready to provide any required information with respect to specific data, when this was required, they would not prepare the information on a routine basis. They stressed that they would strongly object to any proposal in the future to make this requirement mandatory.

53. One Party drew attention to the difficulties linked to the reporting of emission projections. Such projections depended on assumptions made by each Party about the development of sectoral activities, which were already uncertain for 2015 and even more so for 2020.

54. The delegation of Sweden emphasized the importance of further work on emission data validation following on from the results of the workshop held on 14-16 October 2002 in Gothenburg. This work would be highly relevant to the Implementation Committee.

55. In response to questions concerning the superstation monitoring network, Mr. Schneider

explained that this concept was being developed as part of the monitoring strategy. For POPs, at present, superstations existed only in Northern and Central Europe. The strategy would define the requirements of such specialized and costly stations, and recommend locations to be considered for establishing sites.

56. The Executive Body:

(a) Took note of the report of the twenty-sixth session of the EMEP Steering Body (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/2);

(b) Thanked Mr. Martin WILLIAMS (United Kingdom), the outgoing Chairman of the Steering Body, for his excellent chairmanship over many years;

(c) Agreed that there was no need for derestricting technical reports and notes, and decided to delete paragraph 4 (f) in the Steering Body's mandate (ECE/EB.AIR/68, annex III, appendix III);

(d) Noted the progress made on heavy metals modelling, monitoring and emission reporting, and called upon Parties to further develop heavy metals emission inventories;

(e) Noted the progress made on POPs modelling, monitoring and emission reporting;

(f) Noted the progress in the development of the unified Eulerian model for acidifying and eutrophying pollutants, ozone and particulate matter, recognized that the model validation should be pursued in 2003 as a matter of high priority, and called upon Parties to consider supporting the model validation work at MSC-W by taking up specific tasks;

(g) Noted the progress in particulate matter (PM) emission data reporting and called upon all Parties that had not yet done so to make every effort to develop emission inventories, including those for the year 2000;

(h) Taking note of the work on a new monitoring strategy for EMEP to be finalized in 2003, called upon Parties to wait for the adoption of this strategy before taking any decision to reduce the number of monitoring sites reporting to EMEP, but to take up the monitoring of PM as soon as possible if they had not yet done so and to examine possibilities for establishing a superstation or contributing to such a station;

(i) Noted the progress in the work on hemispheric air pollution, welcomed the readiness of the United States to continue to support the series of workshops and invited other Parties to lend support to this work;

(j) Approved the Guidelines for Estimating and Reporting Emissions Data (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/7 and Corr.1) and called upon Parties to make every effort to report according to the new Guidelines as soon as possible, and also to report emissions data for 2000 according to this format, if they had not done so in the previous reporting round;

(k) Adopted decision 2002/10 on emission data reporting under the Convention and the

protocols in force (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1, annex XI);

(l) Accepted with appreciation the offer by the United Kingdom to lead the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and welcomed the proposal that Mr. R. Derwent would co-chair the Task Force;

(m) Took note of the work on a new monitoring strategy for EMEP and encouraged the Steering Body to finalize this work in 2003;

(n) Took note of the results of the workshop on uncertainty treatment in integrated assessment modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/5, annex) and requested all subsidiary bodies providing input to integrated assessment modelling to take these conclusions into account when planning further work;

(o) Recognized the importance of the work to develop a baseline scenario for integrated assessment modelling, welcomed the cooperation with the European Community and the CAFE programme in this work, and invited other Parties to actively participate;

(p) Recognized the important links between regional air pollution and climate change, welcomed the work initiated to explore such links and requested EMEP to address all relevant aspects of these links in its future work; and

(q) Approved the proposed budget of CIAM for 2003 and 2004 as set out in the report of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/5, para. 55) and agreed to keep the 2005 budget at the same level.

B. Effects of major air pollutants on human health and the environment

57. Mr. H. Gregor (Germany), Chairman of the Working Group on Effects, introduced the report on its twenty-first session (EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/2). He drew attention to the most important results of the Working Group on Effects, its International Cooperative Programmes (ICPs) and the Task Force on the Health Aspects of Air Pollution as summarized in EB.AIR/2002/3, paragraphs 24-40. He welcomed the increasing number of Parties taking part in the monitoring activities of ICPs and stressed the importance of the data collected.

58. He drew special attention to the harmonization of the Working Group's medium-term work-plan with that of the EMEP Steering Body as requested by the Executive Body at its nineteenth session. To this end the Extended Bureau of the Working Group on Effects had met with the Bureau of the EMEP Steering Body in February 2002. A harmonized work-plan had been drawn up an exchange of information agreed.

59. Mr. Gregor further noted:

(a) The offer from Italy to establish a sub-centre under ICP Materials to take responsibility for stock at risk and cultural heritage;

(b) The important work on dynamic modelling being done by ICPs, in particular ICP on

Modelling and Mapping, and the Joint Expert Group on Dynamic Modelling (EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/11). At its recent meeting, the Joint Expert Group had identified the need for links between dynamic models and critical loads and also integrated assessment models. He thanked the United Kingdom and Sweden for their continued support to the Group's activities;

(c) The important results of the Task Force on the Health Aspects of Air Pollution presented in its report on the Health Effects of Persistent Organic Pollutants from Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, as summarized in the executive summary presented to the Working Group (EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/14);

(d) The progress made in the modelling and mapping of critical loads for the heavy metals lead and cadmium (EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/13) and the further work planned in collaboration with MSC-E of EMEP;

(e) The recent workshop on critical levels for ozone which had reconfirmed the methodologies appropriate for integrated assessment modelling and indicated that (flux-based) methods might be appropriate for national assessments.

60. Delegations stressed the importance of establishing the Italian sub-centre to work on cultural heritage. This had been an area of work that had not been addressed effectively in the past but which was assuming increasing importance.

61. The Executive Body:

(a) Took note of the report of the twenty-first session of the Working Group on Effects (EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/2);

(b) Noted the further progress in developing the effect-oriented activities and the important results achieved by the International Cooperative Programmes and the Task Force on the Health Aspects of Air Pollution in implementing the Convention (EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/3);

(c) Reiterated the importance of the active participation of all Parties to the Convention, the effective cooperation among the programmes, task forces and coordinating centres and their close collaboration with EMEP, and welcomed the further development of close links with relevant institutions and organizations outside the Convention;

(d) Agreed to establish a new programme sub-centre for stock at risk and cultural heritage of ICP Materials and welcomed the willingness of Italy to organize it;

(e) Took note of the updated medium-term work-plan for the further development of the effect-oriented activities (EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/4) and invited the Working Group on Effects and the Steering Body of EMEP to continue their close cooperation in implementing the priority tasks of the Convention;

(f) Noted the annotated outline of the 2004 substantive report on the review and assessment of present air pollution effects and their recorded trends (EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/5);

(g) Appreciated the progress achieved in the application of dynamic modelling and the steps taken in linking it to integrated assessment;

(h) Confirmed that, if present deposition was below critical loads, increasing a deposition and filling the gap up to the critical load would not be in line with the accepted critical load approach and would be against the spirit of the Convention, aiming, inter alia, to control and, if possible, decrease air pollution and its effects and prevent any deterioration of the environment;

(i) Welcomed the preparation of the report on the health risks of persistent organic pollutants from long-range transboundary air pollution and its executive summary (EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/14);

(j) Noted the first preliminary results of the modelling and mapping of critical loads of cadmium and lead in Europe, and stressed the need for the continuing development and application of clearly defined and harmonized methods for deriving and mapping critical loads on the European scale;

(k) Welcomed progress in developing the methodology for modelling ozone fluxes and deposition, and in deriving level II critical levels for ozone;

(l) Noted document EB.AIR/WG.1/2002/6 on the financing of the effect-oriented activities.

## **VII. STRATEGIES AND POLICIES OF PARTIES AND SIGNATORIES TO THE CONVENTION FOR THE ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION**

62. The secretariat presented the 2000 Executive Summary of Strategies and Policies for Air Pollution Abatement, prepared by the secretariat and a consultant from the United States on the basis of replies to the 2000 questionnaire on strategies and policies, and printed by the United States. It attempted to use a more concise and readable format than in the past.

63. The Chairman thanked the United States for its assistance in publishing the report in English, French and Russian, noting it was available on the Convention's web site.

64. Several delegations expressed their appreciation, indicating that the quality of the review was continuing to improve.

65. The secretariat noted the use of the Internet for the 2002 questionnaire on strategies and policies made available to Parties in January, and the feedback it had received on it (EB.AIR/2002/7).

66. Several delegations expressed their satisfaction with the new system, which they found innovative and user-friendly, although certain technical difficulties were met at the outset. Some Parties regretted the imposition of character limitations on replies, and felt that the space provided was insufficient.

67. The Chairman expressed gratitude to Canada for providing an Internet server, the

Netherlands for helping to formulate questions for the general section, Slovenia for donating funds, and the United States for again providing consultant support.

68. The Executive Body took note of the feedback. It agreed on the effectiveness of the Internet-based approach and its potential use for future questionnaires.

69. The secretariat presented the results of the 2002 questionnaire as a draft summary review (EB.AIR/2002/1 and Add.1). Parties were requested to provide to the secretariat any corrections or modifications before 31 January 2003. The summary would then be produced as a United Nations publication for submission to the Executive Body at its twenty-first session.

70. The delegation of Belgium regretted that it had not been able to provide a response to the 2002 questionnaire and offered to submit its reply before the 31 January 2003 deadline. The delegation of the Czech Republic appreciated the draft summary but found some inaccuracies and would provide corrections by the deadline.

71. The delegation of Germany regretted its late provision of emissions data. It had informed the secretariat that it had provided emission limit values where required and requested that this should be reflected in the published summary review.

72. The delegation of Norway clarified that it had provided its replies to the mandatory part of the questionnaire on time, although its replies to the optional part were late, and suggested making a distinction in future between the timeliness of Parties' replies to the mandatory sections versus the optional sections.

73. The secretariat drew attention to the options for the future review of strategies and policies (EB.AIR/2002/7, paras. 15-23), in particular the separation of questions into protocol-related and general sections, the frequency of circulating questionnaires, the mechanisms for completing the questionnaire, e.g. tick boxes, and the methods of reporting results.

74. Several delegations indicated that they would like to see the questionnaire separated into two parts, reflecting the increasing importance of the work of the Implementation Committee (the protocol-related questions) and the efforts to develop a communication strategy for the Convention (the general questions).

75. The delegation from the Netherlands expressed its appreciation for the work of the secretariat and the consultant from the United States, and requested that in future both an executive summary and a summary review, including an expanded chapter on measurements and modelling, reflecting the vast monitoring network and including contact information (e-mail and web addresses), should be published.

76. Several delegations underlined the importance of streamlining the reporting procedures with those of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and other international organizations. The secretariat had made contact with the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and would pursue collaboration in future to

minimize the response burden on Parties.

77. The Executive Body:

(a) Took note of the draft summary of the 2002 review (EB.AIR/2002/1 and Add.1), thanked Canada, the Netherlands, Slovenia and the United States for their support, and agreed to its publication, with amendments, to be presented at the next session;

(b) Invited Parties to submit corrections and detailed amendments to the draft summary to the secretariat before 31 January 2003;

(c) Decided to separate the review process (and questionnaire) into two parts: one protocol-related, the other general policy;

(d) Decided to carry out the protocol review every two years and the general review every four years;

(e) Agreed to make national responses available on the Internet, request preparation of a summary of the protocol-related part for the Implementation Committee, and a review and executive summary of the general part for the Executive Body;

(f) Agreed to restructure the questionnaire to avoid overlapping subjects and to encourage Parties to provide information on the costs and effectiveness of measures.

## **VIII. ACTIVITIES OF ECE BODIES AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS RELEVANT TO THE CONVENTION**

78. Mr. B. Libert (ECE secretariat) described two ECE project proposals for implementation of the Convention and its protocols, responding to a request from Kazakhstan. They would have value throughout the region as they included international meetings. One, with European Union Technical Assistance to the Commonwealth of Independent States (TACIS) funding for 2003, on air pollution monitoring included national plans for monitoring, modelling, and preparing emission inventories. The other, Capacity Building for Air Quality Management and the Application of Clean Coal Combustion Technologies in Central Asia, was submitted to the United Nations Development Account. Work packages included: implementing protocols; developing subregional cooperation; linking European and Asian air monitoring and evaluation. The project had been short-listed; a final decision on funding was awaited. The secretariat would contact CCC, MSC-E and MSC-W on their possible participation in these projects.

79. Mr. K. Bull provided information on the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network for East Asia's (EANET) second Scientific Advisory Committee and fourth Intergovernmental meetings held in November. He noted the continuing collaboration between EANET and the Convention, in particular with EMEP, ICP Forests, and with the work on hemispheric modelling. The EANET secretariat was now established at the UNEP Regional Resource Centre for Asia and the Pacific. The Network continued to expand in terms of the countries participating, number of monitoring sites, pollutants monitored and range of activities.

80. Mr. P. Wicks (European Community) noted developments in the Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme. He highlighted the work of IIASA for the development of the baseline scenario, and the upcoming review of the RAINS model that would benefit both CAFE and the Convention. He noted that the new Working Groups on Target Setting and Policy Assessment, and on Particulate Matter, had both started their work. He stressed the broad remit of CAFÉ, while noting the proposed timescale for developing a thematic strategy was still early 2005. He noted good links with EMEP and WHO, and emphasized the need for continued collaboration with the Convention.

81. Mr. B. Wahlström (UNEP) noted that the Stockholm Convention on POPs had 23 ratifications; entry into force was expected in 2004. The Interim Negotiating Committee was overseeing interim implementation measures and preparing for the first conference of the Parties. He noted that Global Environment Facility (GEF) funds for developing national implementation plans could help implement other instruments such as the Protocol on POPs. He drew attention to effective collaboration between UNEP and the Convention's secretariat noting inter alia the participation of UNEP in the Expert Group on POPs and the secretariat's participation in the UNEP Advisory Group to the Global POPs Monitoring Network. A workshop for the Network was planned on 24-27 March 2003 in Geneva. He noted the UNEP global mercury assessment report for its Governing Council's session next year (details at [www.chem.unep.ch/mercury](http://www.chem.unep.ch/mercury)).

82. Mr. J. Schneider (WHO) drew attention to the various references to WHO work made throughout the session. He noted the ongoing review of the Air Quality Guidelines and the publication of the report on POPs. He indicated that WHO would be pleased to continue to lead the Task Force on the Health Aspects of Air Pollution.

83. Ms. L. Jalkanen (WMO) noted several meetings of relevance during 2002. The WMO Commission for Atmospheric Sciences emphasized regional environmental issues and suggested that the Global Atmosphere Watch (GAW) should consider more global assessments in support of international conventions. She stressed WMO was pleased to host the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and EIONET meetings in Geneva in 2002. Co-chairing the Task Force was important for collaboration and harmonizing measurements and modelling between EMEP and GAW. She noted that the GAW Training and Education Centre conducted biannual training sessions on measurement techniques, quality assurance and data analysis.

84. Mr. R. van Aalst (EEA) noted areas of close cooperation between EEA, the Convention and ECE. For example, EEA was finalizing its Kiev report for the Ministerial Conference next May and EEA was linked to the monitoring project in the newly independent States (NIS). CAFE was a key activity and the EEA Topic Centre on Air and Climate Change was collaborating with EMEP centres to consider baseline projections for EEA's outlook report for 2004. He noted practical cooperation between EEA and EMEP in work on emission inventories and projections, air quality assessment and integrated assessment. He drew attention to reports on transport and environment, available on the EEA web site ([www.eea.eu.int](http://www.eea.eu.int)), and on energy and environment.

85. The secretariat drew attention to written reports made available by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the OSPAR Commission for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic with updated information on their activities.

### **IX. WORK-PLAN FOR 2003**

86. The secretariat introduced the draft work-plan for the implementation of the Convention (EB.AIR/2002/4) and the provisional list of meetings for 2003, amended to reflect the discussion and the decisions that the Executive Body had taken earlier in the session.

87. The Executive Body adopted its work-plan for 2003 as annexed below (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.2, annex XIII). The provisional list of meetings is set out in annex XIV (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.2).

### **X. FINANCIAL ISSUES**

88. The secretariat introduced the note on the financial requirements for the implementation of EMEP (EB.AIR/2002/5). The note presented inter alia proposals for an amendment to the annex to the EMEP Protocol, the detailed budget of EMEP for 2003 and its provisional budget for 2004. The secretariat explained that since preparing the note the outstanding contributions for 2002 had been received from Belgium, Croatia, Greece and Spain, leaving only Bosnia and Herzegovina and Ukraine as not having paid their 2002 contributions and Italy as not yet having paid the full amount due.

89. In response to a question, the secretariat explained that the small differences in table 1 of EB.AIR/2002/5 between the amounts expected and those received were probably due to banking charges. Such differences had appeared for many payments and Parties would be reminded next year to cover the outstanding difference.

90. The Executive Body:

(a) Decided on the detailed use of resources in 2003 as set out in table 2 and on the scale of mandatory contributions as set out in table 3 (last two columns);

(b) Supported the Steering Body's call on the Parties to the EMEP Protocol to consider making voluntary contributions (in kind, or in cash through the trust fund) to ensure that the work, especially the difficult tasks required in 2003 for the preparation for the protocol reviews, including the work on integrated assessment modelling, could be accomplished as foreseen in the work-plan (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/2, para. 80 (h));

(c) Decided to increase the EMEP budget for the period 2004 to 2006 to US\$ 2,142,520;

(d) Requested the Steering Body, with the assistance of its Bureau, to present the details of the 2004 budget together with the work-plan for approval by the Executive Body at its twenty-first session;

(e) Decided to apply the 2003 United Nations scale of assessments as a basis for calculating the EMEP scale of mandatory contributions from 2004 to 2006, and adopted, in accordance with article 4, paragraph 3, of the EMEP Protocol, the revised annex to the Protocol set out in annex XII (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.1); and

(f) Urged Parties that had not yet done so to pay their 2002 contributions in cash to the Trust Fund and, in 2003, to pay their contributions so that they reached the trust fund in the first half of the year.

91. The secretariat introduced document EB.AIR/2002/6, which contained the budget for 2003 of the core activities not funded by the EMEP Protocol, as well as their provisional budgets for 2004 and 2005. In answer to questions the secretariat explained that the increases in the budgets for these activities over the past 10 years amounted to approximately 2% per year.

92. In keeping with decision 2002/1, the Executive Body decided to adopt, for the core activities not funded by EMEP, a budget for 2003 of US\$ 2,008,500 and a provisional budget for 2004 and 2005 of US\$ 2,096,050.

## **XI. OTHER BUSINESS**

93. The secretariat drew attention to document ECE/EB.AIR/40/Corr.1, the corrigendum to the 1994 Protocol on Further Reduction of Sulphur Emissions, which reflected decisions taken at the nineteenth session to enable Monaco's accession to the Protocol.

94. The Chairman indicated that a number of countries with economies in transition had requested support for attending the current session. As decision 2001/6 on the facilitation of participation of countries with economies in transition did not make clear provision for support at all sessions of the Executive Body, the secretariat had not been able to respond positively.

95. In the resulting discussion a number of Parties stressed the importance of having good representation at sessions of the Executive Body whilst noting the need for careful use of limited funds.

96. The Executive Body:

(a) Agreed to fund participation of eligible Parties that requested funding for the twenty-first session of the Executive Body and decided to reconsider decision 2001/6 again at that session;

(b) Urged Parties to make voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund for supporting the participation of countries with economies in transition in the coming year. (Details of methods of payment are provided in annex XV, ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.2).

## **XII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

97. Mr. H. Dovland (Norway) was elected Chairman. Messrs. W. Harnett (United States), L. Lindau (Sweden) and I. Mojík (Slovakia) were elected Vice-Chairmen. The Chairmen of the

EMEP Steering Body (Mr. J. Schneider, Austria), the Implementation Committee (Mr. P. Széll, United Kingdom), the Working Group on Strategies and Review (Mr. R. Ballaman, Switzerland) and the Working Group on Effects (Mr. H. Gregor, Germany) were also elected as Vice-Chairmen. Mr. R. Ballaman was re-elected as Chairman of the Working Group on Strategies and Review.

98. The Executive Body expressed its thanks to Mr. D. Hrcek (Slovakia), the outgoing Vice-Chairman.

### **XIII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

99. The Executive Body adopted for general distribution the report of its twentieth session on 13 December 2002.