



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

EB.AIR/GE.1/2003/9  
23 June 2003

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

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

Steering Body to the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation  
of the Long-range Transmission for Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP)  
(Twenty-seventh session, Geneva, 8-10 September 2003)  
Item 3 of the provisional agenda

**ACTIVITIES OF THE EMEP BUREAU**

Note prepared by the secretariat based on the minutes of the Bureau meetings

**Introduction**

1. This note presents a summary of the work of the Bureau, including the results of the two meetings of the extended EMEP Bureau held in Vienna on 6-7 November 2002 and in Geneva on 26-28 February 2003. The joint proposal by the Bureau and the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling on the approval of monitoring data reports is presented in the report of the Task Force (EB.AIR/GE.1/2003/3, chap. V). The Bureau's proposals related to the financing of EMEP are presented in the document on financial and budgetary matters (EB.AIR/GE.1/2003/11).

2. One or both of the Bureau meetings were attended by the following Bureau members: Mr. J. SCHNEIDER (Austria) as Chairman, Mr. S. DOYTCHINOV (Italy), Mr. P. GRENNFELT (Sweden), Mr. R. VAN AALST (Netherlands), Mr. J. SANTROCH (Czech Republic), Ms. S. VIDIC (Croatia) and Ms. M. WICHMANN-FIEBIG (European Community). Mr. Grennfelt and Mr. van Aalst did not participate at the meeting in Vienna in November 2002. Mr. Doytchinov did not participate at the meeting in Geneva in February 2003.

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.

3. Representatives from the four EMEP centres, the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM), the Chemical Coordinating Centre (CCC), the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E) and the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W), the UNECE secretariat and Mr. M. WOODFIELD (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, participated in both meetings. Mr. R. DERWENT (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, and Mr. L. BARRIE (World Meteorological Organization (WMO)) participated in part of the meeting in February 2003.

## **I. PROGRESS IN EMEP ACTIVITIES AND PLANNING OF FUTURE WORK**

4. The Bureau discussed progress in EMEP activities and future work following the order of the Executive Body's 2003 work-plan (ECE/EB.AIR/77/Add.2, annex XIII, item 2). It received oral reports from the task forces and the centres on progress in implementing the work-plan. Summaries of the discussions on this item are given in the minutes of the Bureau meetings, which can be accessed as informal documents in English on the Internet at [http://www.unece.org/env/emep/emep\\_docs.html](http://www.unece.org/env/emep/emep_docs.html) (end of the page).

5. The draft work-plan presented to the Steering Body (EB.AIR/GE.1/2003/10) was prepared by the secretariat, in consultation with the centres, on the basis of this discussion. The members of the Bureau provided comments on the draft.

6. The Bureau noted the usefulness of its meeting in the autumn. It agreed to its autumn meeting for strategic discussions, while its spring meeting would be devoted to more detailed planning. The next meeting was scheduled for the week of 3 November in Oslo to be held in conjunction with the workshop of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling on the evaluation of the Eulerian model.

## **II. CONTRIBUTIONS TO EMEP**

### **A. Status of mandatory and voluntary cash contributions**

7. The secretariat reported on the status of cash contributions, stressing the positive financial situation. All Parties to the EMEP Protocol, except Ukraine, had paid at least part of their contributions for 2002. Italy had paid only half of the sum required in 2002. Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia and Montenegro had paid their arrears.

8. The Bureau welcomed the positive situation and the fact that most arrears had been paid. It reiterated its call to those Parties to the Convention that had not yet joined the EMEP Protocol to consider accession. It noted that bilateral efforts should be made to that effect. It also noted with satisfaction that Lithuanian delegates had indicated that their country might soon accede.

9. The arrears paid by Serbia and Montenegro dated back to the year when its succession to the EMEP Protocol became effective (1992, at that time the Party was called Yugoslavia). Serbia and Montenegro had also paid its current contributions. What remained outstanding were contributions from the former Yugoslavia prior to 1992 amounting to US\$ 18,974. These arrears dated back to the time before the country had split up.

10. The Bureau welcomed the efforts made by Serbia and Montenegro. It decided to recommend to the Steering Body not to pursue the arrears of the former Yugoslavia dating back to the period before 1992 and proposed that the secretariat should delete them from the summary table in the future.

#### **B. Status of mandatory contributions in kind: Belarus and Ukraine**

11. Concerning the contribution by Belarus, the Bureau was informed about the work carried out in 2002 (on draft amendments to the EMEP/CORINAIR Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook related to heavy metals taking into account the specific characteristics of members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), the work-plan and budget for 2003 (on HCB and PCB emission inventory improvement in CIS), and the proposal by Belarus for its contribution for 2004 (on draft amendments to the EMEP/CORINAIR Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook related to HCB and PCB emission inventory improvement in CIS).

12. Mr. Woodfield reported on contacts between the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, in particular its combustion and industry panel, and the expert from Belarus responsible for producing the report that constituted its contribution in kind. The panel experts considered the work to be useful for the panel and for updating the EMEP/CORINAIR Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook. They recommended its acceptance as a contribution in kind. The proposed contribution for 2004 was also considered useful.

13. The Bureau recommended that the EMEP Steering Body should approve the contribution by Belarus for 2002. It approved the proposed contribution for 2004 on the understanding that it would be conducted in close consultation with the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections or one of its panels.

14. The secretariat informed the Bureau about the progress with Ukraine's contribution in kind. Ukraine's proposal to cover its arrears in kind with a project to develop a national model for environmental impact assessment of heavy metal emissions had been approved by the Bureau in 2001 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2001/10, para. 23). The project would be equivalent to US\$ 140,989 (the outstanding contributions for 1992-1994) and was to run from January 2002 to December 2003. It would be conducted in close collaboration with MSC-E and the Polish Institute of Environmental Protection. At the time of the Bureau meeting, it appeared that the project had not yet been initiated.

15. The secretariat received a proposal from Ukraine for a project to cover its arrears for the period from 1996 to 2001, equivalent to US\$ 175,205. The proposal was to establish an international benchmark station for EMEP background monitoring on the Black Sea island of Zmejiny. The project was to run from 2004 to 2006. The secretariat pointed out that this proposal marked a departure from the previous announcement of Ukraine that it would pay its contributions from 1999 onwards in cash, but, in its letter, Ukraine referred to its difficult economic situation.

16. The Bureau welcomed Ukraine's proposal as a signal that the Party intended to resolve its situation. The Bureau noted that the proposal provided a satisfactory basis for finding a solution to the problem of Ukraine's arrears. It stressed that prior to finalizing any agreement on a new proposal, Ukraine should inform the Bureau about the progress in the proposal that had been approved to cover the arrears from 1992 to 1994. It also expressed its hope that Ukraine would soon pay the outstanding contribution for 2002 and 2003 in cash to the trust fund.

17. The Bureau agreed that setting up a supersite was an activity that went beyond the usual EMEP monitoring tasks conducted by Parties. It could therefore be considered as a contribution in kind. It should be understood that the subsequent running of the monitoring site should be a national responsibility of Ukraine and Ukraine should make a commitment to that effect. A monitoring station in the Black Sea area could be of significant value to EMEP. It should, however, be ensured that the station was set up in a way to make certain that the EMEP monitoring quality criteria were satisfied and that the EMEP monitoring programme was observed. The Bureau requested the secretariat to respond to Ukraine inviting Ukrainian experts to finalize the proposal in consultation with CCC to ensure that it provided a valuable contribution to EMEP.

### **C. Use of resources in 2002 and the detailed budget for 2004**

18. The Bureau, without the participation of the centres, discussed the allocation of the budget for 2004. As decided by the Executive Body at its twentieth session, the budget was increased by 5% (some \$100,000). As background material, the Bureau had before it the reports on the use of resources in 2002 by CCC and MSC-E. The financial statement from MSC-W had been delayed due to administrative problems.

19. The Bureau agreed that a relatively large share (two fifths) of the increase should be used to improve the funding of the work on integrated assessment modelling. The remainder should be distributed to the other three centres. For CCC, the emphasis should be on improving the monitoring of heavy metals and POPs in view of the expected entry into force of the Protocols on those substances. Acidification monitoring should be further reduced and work on particulate matter (PM) monitoring strengthened. The amount to be spent on the assessment report could be decreased for MSC-W, as most work should be finalized in early 2004. The budget for work on hemispheric air pollution should be increased for both CCC and MSC-W. The secretariat was requested to fine-tune the budget, based on the decisions of

the Bureau in discussion with the centres and to aim at a presentation of round figures that were adequate for a budget.

### **III. COOPERATION WITH THE WORKING GROUP ON EFFECTS AND OTHER NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMMES**

20. The Bureau held a joint meeting with the Bureau of the Working Group on Effects on 27 February 2003. The note on the joint meeting can be accessed as an informal document on the Internet at [http://www.unece.org/env/emep/emep\\_docs.html](http://www.unece.org/env/emep/emep_docs.html) (end of the page).

21. At both of its meetings, the Bureau also discussed cooperation with other national and international organization and programmes, including cooperation with the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), the European Commission's Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme, the European Environment Agency, the second phase of the EUREKA Environmental Project on the Transport and Chemical Transformation of Environmentally Relevant Trace Constituents in the Troposphere over Europe (EUROTRAC-2), the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM), the Oslo-Paris Commission for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPARCOM), the Mediterranean Pollution Monitoring and Research Programme (MEDPOL), the United Nations Environment Programme and WMO.