



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/2
29 September 2005

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 of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP)

REPORT ON THE TWENTY-NINTH SESSION

Introduction

1. The Steering Body held its twenty-ninth session in Geneva from 5 to 7 September 2005. The session was attended by representatives from the following Parties to the Convention: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States and the European Community (EC).
2. Representatives of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the European Environment Agency (EEA) and the four EMEP centres (Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM), Chemical Coordinating Centre (CCC), Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E) and Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W)) attended.

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. Mr. J. SCHNEIDER (Austria) chaired the meeting.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

4. The Steering Body adopted the provisional agenda as contained in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/1.

II. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT ON THE TWENTY-EIGHTH SESSION

5. The Steering Body adopted the report on its twenty-eighth session (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/2).

III. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE BODY AND ACTIVITIES OF THE EMEP BUREAU, INCLUDING COOPERATION WITH THE WORKING GROUP ON EFFECTS

6. Mr. K. BULL, Chief of the Pollution Prevention Team of the UNECE Environment and Human Settlements Division, provided information on the present status of the Convention and its protocols and the main decisions of the twenty-second session of the Executive Body, including the setting up of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, the Task Force on Heavy Metals and the Expert Group on Particulate Matter. He noted the Gothenburg Protocol entered into force on 17 May 2005. All presentations made at the session would be available on the Convention's website (www.unece.org/env/lrtap).

7. The Chairman of the Working Group on Effects, Mr. H. GREGOR (Germany), noted the results of its recent twenty-fourth session (EB.AIR/WG.1/2005/2). He drew attention to the revised long-term strategy of the Working Group including synergies with climate change effects. Attention was drawn to a new set of data rules that would be discussed with the EMEP Bureau with the aim of developing rules applicable to the Convention's activities.

8. The Chairman of the Working Group on Strategies and Review, Mr. R. BALLAMAN, drew attention to the current status of work related to the review of the three most recent protocols, particulate matter, hemispheric transport of air pollution and cooperation with the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA). He noted the need for work on monitoring and emission inventories. He referred to the table of inputs for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol made available as an informal document to the Steering Body. The question was still open whether primary particulate matter (PM) should be an additional element to a revised Gothenburg Protocol or in a separate protocol on PM. The Steering Body could provide input to such decisions. Mr. Ballaman emphasized the need for a realistic action plan and timetable to support EECCA countries acceding to and implementing the protocols to the Convention.

9. The Chairman presented the summary report on the work of the EMEP Bureau between the Steering Body's twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth sessions, including cooperation with the Working Group on Effects (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/9). He reported on the joint meeting of the Bureaux of the EMEP Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects, held in Geneva on 24 February 2005 (<http://www.unece.org/env/emep/welcome.html>), stressing the usefulness of the joint meetings and the intention to continue them. He pointed out that the document on the future priorities of the Convention (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/13) contained the summary of the conclusions and recommendations of the workshop held in Gothenburg on 25-27 October 2004. The delegation of Sweden announced the recent publication of the full report from the workshop and its availability on the Internet at <http://asta.ivl.se/Workshops/WORKSHOPREPORT.pdf>.

10. The Steering Body took note of this information and agreed to bear it in mind in its discussions. In particular, it:

- (a) Took note of the report on the activities of the EMEP Bureau;
- (b) Also took note of the information provided by the Chairmen of the Working Group on Effects and the Working Group on Strategies and Review;
- (c) Noted the results of the joint meeting between the Bureaux of the Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects and agreed to take them into account in preparing its workplan;
- (d) Expressed its readiness to cooperate with the Working Group on Effects to ensure that the Convention's priorities were addressed effectively.

IV. PROGRESS IN ACTIVITIES IN 2005 AND FUTURE WORK

11. The Chairman invited the Steering Body to discuss separately each area of work, considering progress made in 2005 with respect to the Convention's workplan (ECE/EB.AIR/79/Add.2, annex XII, item 2) and taking into account the draft workplan for 2006 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/10), which would be discussed under agenda item 6.

A. Acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants

12. Ms. L. TARRASON (MSC-W) presented an overview of activities on monitoring and modelling of acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants, including progress in work at CCC, work at CIAM, its own work and the discussions at the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/3). She noted in particular the issue of meteorological variability of different air quality indicators and its implications for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol and described plans for work up to 2007. She drew attention to the EMEP Status Report 1/05. For the review of the Gothenburg Protocol she stressed it was important to ensure representativeness of the meteorology. Therefore, five different years, including 2003, were

proposed for the review, selected on the basis of data availability and climatological representativeness.

13. In the discussion that followed it was suggested that no rapid conclusions should be made on the basis used for a 4 or 5 year average, as the choice of years may have important consequences for the distribution of effects between countries; the matter should be further analysed jointly by MSC-W and CIAM. Mr. S. DUTCHAK (MSC-E) noted that meteorological variability was also discussed at MSC-E and proposed more detailed technical discussions at the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling. MSC-E would provide additional information on meteorological variability. The delegation of Sweden noted the importance of long-term meteorological trends and suggested the issue also be discussed in a more policy-relevant light in terms of integrated assessment modelling.

14. The Steering Body noted that despite the satisfactory development of the EMEP model over past years, the limitations observed earlier in reproducing the pollution levels were also observed in 2003. Problems remained with frequency distributions for some of the main pollutants and there was a need to improve particle modelling, e.g. in relation to carbonaceous species. Implementation of the EMEP monitoring strategy, in particular at levels 2 and 3, and refining the scale of the model would contribute to its further understanding. It was suggested that limitations of the model with implications for integrated assessment modelling should be tackled as a priority in the short term.

15. The Steering Body:

(a) Expressed its appreciation to MSC-W, CIAM and CCC for the progress in the work on acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants;

(b) Took note of the Status Report 1/05;

(c) Recommended that the issue of meteorological variability is further analyzed by MSC-W in cooperation with CIAM and guidance from the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling;

(d) Noted the needs for further development of the EMEP model and the importance of level 2 and 3 monitoring data to validate the model.

B. Heavy metals

16. Mr. S. DUTCHAK presented an overview of activities on monitoring and modelling heavy metals, including progress in work at CCC, its own work, the discussions at the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/3) and plans for work up to 2007. He introduced the EMEP Status Report 2/05 on lead, cadmium and mercury. He highlighted the

discrepancies between modelled and measured concentrations and depositions of heavy metals, in particular if emission data submitted by Parties were used. This raised important questions on the quality of the data. Mr. Dutchak stressed that for the review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals investigations of intercontinental transport of mercury would need the support of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution. He drew attention to the preparations for the forthcoming workshop on the review of the MSC-E models on 13-14 October 2005 in Moscow.

17. Several delegations agreed that MSC-E should give a clear indication whether data submitted by Parties or expert estimates should be used for the review of the Protocol. It was also noted that all such data and the associated critical load exceedance maps should be termed "preliminary". The delegation of the United Kingdom stressed the need for coordination between the Convention bodies to resolve these uncertainties.

18. Mr. GREGOR noted that the heavy metals' apostrophe critical loads from the recent call for data of the Coordinating Center for Effects (CCE) were adopted by the Working Group on Effects and recommended for use by the Convention. He stressed that revised deposition data were needed for the planned activities of the Working Group in 2006.

19. The delegation of Germany described current progress in the intercomparison of mercury measurements.

20. The Steering Body:

(a) Noted with appreciation the work and progress in the monitoring and modelling of heavy metals at CCC and MSC-E;

(b) Took note of the Status Report 2/05;

(c) Welcomed the preparations by MSC-E for the review of its model at a workshop on 13-14 October 2005 and invited Parties to send their experts to the workshop;

(d) Noted with concern the discrepancies between the model results and measured concentrations when using data communicated by Parties and invited MSC-E to look further into this issue in cooperation with appropriate Convention bodies, such as the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections;

(e) Noted the efforts of MSC-E related to the modelling of mercury on a global scale and invited it to cooperate with the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution on this matter.

C. Particulate matter

21. Mr. K. TORSETH (CCC) presented an overview of activities on atmospheric monitoring and modelling of PM (EMEP Status Report 4/05), including progress in work at MSC-W and CIAM, its own work, the discussions within the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/3) and plans for work up to 2007.

22. Ms. M. WICHMANN-FIEBIG, Co-Chair of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter, informed the Steering Body about the results of the first meeting of the Expert Group. She stressed that while options existed in most countries to reduce PM, the potential to cut levels in EECCA was substantial. Questions raised by the Expert Group concerning the robustness of the emission data, the sources, trends and relevant abatement options would be discussed at a workshop in London in November 2005. Mr. SCHNEIDER informed the Steering Body about the forthcoming publication of a report by the World Health Organization on "Health Effects of Particulate Matter from Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution".

23. The Steering Body:

(a) Noted with appreciation the work done by MSC-W, CIAM and CCC on PM and welcomed the progress made;

(b) Took note of the Status Report 4/05;

(c) Called upon Parties to enhance their efforts to improve the quality of their emission reporting of PM;

(d) Welcomed the progress in extending the monitoring of PM and urged the Parties to implement fully the EMEP monitoring strategy;

(e) Took note of the European Aerosols Supersite initiative;

(f) Stressed that further work on carbonaceous species, in particular secondary organic aerosols, was needed to improve the model performance;

(g) Took note of the results of the meeting of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter and expressed support for its future work.

D. Persistent organic pollutants

24. Mr. V. SHATALOV (MSC-E) presented an overview of activities on monitoring and modelling of persistent organic pollutants (POPs), including progress in work at CCC, its own work, the discussions within the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/3) and plans for work up to 2007. He drew attention to the EMEP Status

Report 3/05 and to the MSC-E contributions to the review of the Protocol on POPs. He reported a slight improvement in the reporting of the emission data and monitoring data for POPs. He highlighted that there was generally good agreement between model results and measured concentrations.

25. In the following discussions some delegates drew attention to the lack of quality of some of the POPs emission data available. The Steering Body noted that nationally submitted data and expert estimates might both be of value for comparison with measurements.

26. The Czech Republic announced that it was establishing the Central and European Centre for POPs. It would operate under the Ministry of the Environment and be located at Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic. The Centre would contribute to the work of EMEP and collaborate closely with MSC-E and CCC whilst focusing on POPs pollution problems in Central and Eastern Europe.

27. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the report of MSC-E and expressed its appreciation of the work and results of MSC-E and CCC;

(b) Took note of Status Report 3/05;

(c) Called upon Parties to enhance their efforts to improve the quality of their emission reporting of POPs;

(d) Noted that monitoring of POPs was improving but further efforts were needed to improve quality and coverage;

(e) Welcomed the preparations for the review of the MSC-E POPs model at the workshop on 13-14 October 2005 and invited Parties to send their experts to the workshop;

(f) Noted the importance of hemispheric transport of POPs and invited MSC-E to continue its collaboration with the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution;

(g) Welcomed the initiative of the Czech Republic to establish the Central and European Centre for POPs and encouraged future collaboration with EMEP.

E. Measurements and modelling

28. Ms. L. JALKANEN (WMO), Co-Chair of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, reported on progress, including the results of its sixth meeting, held in Zagreb on 4 to 7 April 2005 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/3).

29. Mr. R. DERWENT (United Kingdom), Co-Chair of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, presented the results of a workshop hosted by CCC in Oslo in November 2004 to consider methodologies for implementing the monitoring strategy. He also presented plans for the work of the Task Force, drawing attention to the four additional items proposed for inclusion in the workplan, in particular a particle assessment report. He stressed that the EMEP model was not representing PM 10 and PM 2.5 fully and that the Task Force would rely on the national experts to bring together information on particle composition. The matter would be discussed at the seventh meeting of the Task Force and at a workshop on this issue in autumn 2006.

30. Mr. TORSETH presented the status of the implementation of the monitoring strategy. He stressed that the only way to ensure successful implementation of level 2 and level 3 monitoring was to coordinate efforts with EC and national research projects. He expressed satisfaction that many countries with previously few measurement activities were now making efforts to implement level 1. However, CCC did not have information for all countries.

31. The delegate of Sweden stressed the importance of uncertainty analysis and the biases of the underlying models and data for integrated assessment modelling and suggested that the Task Force pursued its work on uncertainties.

32. Several delegations noted that information on particle assessment would be needed by the end of 2006 for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol and suggested that the planned workshop be held as early as possible in 2006. It was also suggested that a more detailed outline of the report on particles assessment, identifying the different responsibilities, be prepared, if possible, in time for the second meeting of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter to be held on 7-8 November in London.

33. The EC delegation noted that the European Commission was sponsoring a costing activity on health and PM that could be used to support the work of EMEP. The second position paper on PM, prepared under the European Commission's Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme and published at the end of 2004, should also be taken into account when preparing the particle assessment report.

34. The delegation of France expressed its country's willingness to participate in the four additional work items, and in particular on the PM and ozone assessment at an urban scale. They also stressed these activities should be coordinated with similar activities of the EC, such as the CITY DELTA and MEDI DELTA projects.

35. Mr. DERWENT stressed the important role of national experts in this work and agreed that for the particle assessment report there was an urgent need to bring ongoing EC projects (e.g. CREATE, COST, ACCENT) into the framework of EMEP. He stressed the important role of MSC-W in view of the short time scale.

36. Ms. Tarrason informed the Steering Body about the steps undertaken to make the EMEP model source code available on the Internet.

37. In a tour de table, Parties shared information about their plans to implement the EMEP monitoring strategy. The Steering Body was encouraged that most Parties were making efforts to establish new sites or upgrade existing ones to meet the strategy requirements. The EC delegate noted existing EC legislation to support EMEP monitoring background activities. The fourth daughter directive on air quality required countries to set up one monitoring station for each 100,000 sq. km.

38. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the report by the Task Force, expressing appreciation for its work and that of MSC-W, MSC-E and CCC;

(b) Took note with appreciation of the plans of the Parties to implement the monitoring strategy, invited them to continue their efforts and requested CCC to continue coordinating and supporting Parties in this;

(c) Welcomed the 2006 monitoring campaign coordinated by CCC and invited Parties to participate in it;

(d) Welcomed the proposal by the Task Force to compile a particle assessment report and invited the Co-Chairs to prepare an outline of the report as soon as possible and to identify responsibilities for its preparation, preferably in time for the second meeting of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter to be held on 7-8 November in London;

(e) Requested CCC to improve further the EMEP manual to ensure that Parties' monitoring activities were harmonized;

(f) Welcomed the opening of the EMEP model source code and encouraged national experts to make use of it;

(g) Invited the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling to work further on the uncertainties of monitoring and modelling in cooperation with CIAM and the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling;

(h) Welcomed the additional work items presented in the report of the Task Force (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/3) and invited the Co-Chairs of the Task Force to provide a more detailed workplan on these issues for discussion at the next meeting of the EMEP Bureau;

(i) Expressed its appreciation to the United Kingdom and WMO for leading the Task

Force and to Finland for offering to host its seventh meeting on 10 to 12 May 2006.

F. Integrated assessment modelling

39. Mr. R. MAAS, Chairman of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling reported on progress in integrated assessment modelling, including the review of the RAINS model (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/6) and the results of the thirtieth meeting of the Task Force, held in Berlin on 25 to 27 May 2005 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/5). He also announced the workshop on non-technical measures to be held on 7 to 9 December 2005 in Gothenburg (Sweden). He presented the action plan for EECCA countries prepared by the Task Force.

40. Mr. M. AMANN (CIAM) presented a detailed overview of the work by CIAM in 2004 and 2005. He stressed the results of the baseline scenarios developed for the European Union (EU) Member States as part of the CAFE programme. Funding was needed to validate also the data for non-EU countries. He stressed the conclusion that calculations did not reproduce fully the PM mass and that there was a need to focus on the anthropogenic fraction of PM.

41. In the discussion that followed, the Steering Body noted the usefulness of projects like EURODELTA and CITYDELTA. However, several delegations expressed concern that the results from CITYDELTA were based on just eight European cities and therefore should be used with caution in integrated assessment modelling. Mr. Amann explained the procedure for integrating the PM results of CITYDELTA into integrated assessment modelling. Functional relationships to estimate the urban increment were derived from the CITY DELTA project, calculations were made for 200 cities and results were compared with urban PM measurements. Mr. Amann noted that there were few measurements and some were poorly documented, but that the situation was improving. It was suggested that it would be useful to make available the calculations for each city so they could be checked by national experts.

42. Concerning the approach on target setting to be used for review of the Gothenburg Protocol, the Steering Body agreed that a set of different approaches should be presented to the Working Group on Strategies and Review and the Executive Body to enable Parties to decide which would be the most appropriate.

43. Regarding the involvement of EECCA countries in integrated assessment modelling, Mr. Ballaman expressed the view that these countries should ratify the EMEP Protocol with priority.

44. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the report of the Task Force, expressing its appreciation to the Chairman, the lead country and IIASA, which hosted CIAM;

- (b) Took note with satisfaction of the work on integrated assessment modelling accomplished by CIAM partially funded by the Trust Fund for core activities not covered by the EMEP Protocol;
- (c) Requested CIAM and the Task Force to continue their work on uncertainty analysis, using techniques such as error propagation, and on investigating biases;
- (d) Invited CIAM and the Task Force to explore further the urban increment for PM and ozone titration and effects in cities, in collaboration with national experts;
- (e) Welcomed the plans for holding a workshop on non-technical measures on 7 to 9 December 2005 in Gothenburg (Sweden);
- (f) Drew the Executive Body's attention to the Task Force's proposal for an action plan for involving EECCA countries in this work;
- (g) Invited the Executive Body to urge all Parties and relevant bodies under the Convention to provide the necessary data for integrated assessment modelling;
- (h) Agreed to revert to the proposed budget for CIAM under financial and budgetary matters.

G. Emissions

45. Ms. K. RYPDAL (Norway), Chair of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, reported on its progress, including the results of its meetings in Pallanza (Italy) on 19 to 20 October 2004 and in Copenhagen on 6 to 7 June 2005 and presented proposals for an emission inventory review and improvement programme (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/7).

46. Ms. Tarrason described the status of emission data reporting and the results of the 2005 emission reporting round (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/8). While timeliness and use of correct formats had improved, there remained problems of completeness and consistency for POPs, heavy metals and PM. Regarding emissions from fuels, all but one Party reported "fuels consumed" rather than "fuels sold". Ms. Tarrason stressed the importance of revising the Guidelines, though the use of memo items had allowed differences in national totals to be traceable. The planned revision of the Emission Reporting Guidelines by the Task Force would be coordinated with the revision of the EU National Emission Ceilings (NEC) Directive.

47. The secretariat presented a draft decision on emission data reporting under the Protocol on Heavy Metals, the Protocol on POPs and the Gothenburg Protocol (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/8, annex I) for consideration by the Steering Body and a draft decision for the Steering Body to forward to the Executive Body (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/8, annex II).

48. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the results and conclusions of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, expressed its appreciation to Norway for leading the Task Force and to EEA for its support and welcomed the offer of Sweden to co-chair the Task Force;

(b) Expressed its appreciation to MSC-W, MSC-E, CCC, CIAM and the Task Force for the progress in their work on emission inventories and projections, as well as to EEA and its Topic Centre on Air and Climate Change for their collaboration;

(c) Took note of the next meeting of the Task Force in Rovaniemi (Finland) on 19 to 21 October 2005, preceded by a capacity-building workshop for EECCA countries on air emission inventories (17 to 18 October 2005) and a scientific workshop on POPs and heavy metals (18 to 19 October 2005);

(d) Encouraged those Parties that had not reported, to do so in the next reporting round (by the deadline of 15 February 2006) and in accordance with the revised Emission Reporting Guidelines;

(e) Stressed once more the importance of reporting emissions of POPs, heavy metals and PM;

(f) Welcomed the plans to revise the Emission Reporting Guidelines and approved the timetable proposed for this revision;

(g) Recognized the importance of updating the EMEP/CORINAIR Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook and urged Parties to support this activity;

(h) Welcomed the draft methods and procedures for review of emission inventories and agreed to submit these to the Executive Body for consideration;

(i) Welcomed the work accomplished so far in the review of emission data and the planned focus on PM in 2006 and invited Parties to participate in the planned trial centralized review both by nominating reviewers and by providing their emission data and informative inventory reports;

(j) Urged Parties to prepare informative inventory reports in accordance with the model to be developed by the Task Force;

(k) Invited the Task Force to explore uncertainties in a systematic way in the medium term;

(l) Adopted the draft decision on emission data reporting under the Protocol on Heavy

Metals, the Protocol on POPs and the Gothenburg Protocol, as contained in annex I of EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/8

(m) Invited the Executive Body to adopt the draft decision on emission data reporting under the Protocol on Heavy Metals, the Protocol on POPs and the Gothenburg Protocol, as contained in annex II of EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/8.

H. Hemispheric air pollution

49. Mr. A ZUBER (EC) and Mr. T.KEATING (United States), Co-Chairmen of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, presented the results of its first meeting held on 1 to 3 June in Brussels (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/12). All presentations made at that meeting were available on the website at www.htap.org. Mr. Zuber invited Parties to nominate additional experts to the Task Force. He also outlined a list of activities potentially contributing to its work and stressed the importance of outreach beyond the Convention. Mr. Keating noted that the involvement of countries from outside the UNECE region had been very good and he presented plans for the future work of the Task Force.

50. In the discussion that followed, delegates stressed the need to harmonize the workplans of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution. They noted there was good understanding between the Task Force Co-Chairmen and the EMEP centres with regard to the division of work and the input to each other's activities. Some delegates suggested that the Task Force should consider pollution in the Arctic region. The Steering Body agreed there was a need for a more concrete workplan indicating the outputs that might be used by other bodies and centres. It stressed that while attention might be given to all pollutants subject to intercontinental transport, immediate priority should provide input to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol.

51. MSC-W presented information on modelling of hemispheric air pollution and plans for future work. CCC gave a brief overview of the observations on a hemispheric scale, stressing the need to use national ground-based observations and satellite data.

52. The Steering Body:

(a) Thanked the lead Parties for their efforts, expressed appreciation for the work accomplished by the Task Force and noted the results of its first meeting;

(b) Requested the Co-Chairmen of the Task Force to prepare a more detailed workplan including a timetable for delivery of the results and present this to the Bureau of the Steering Body for its consideration;

(c) Invited the Co-Chairmen of the Task Force to prepare a brief summary of the first

meeting as an informal document for the twenty-third session of the Executive Body;

(d) Requested the Task Force to consider all pollutants which were subject to intercontinental transport, but confirmed that ozone was a priority pollutant in light of the forthcoming review of the Gothenburg protocol;

(e) Took note of the relevance of the work of the Task Force in view of the levels of background air pollution in Europe, a factor which may influence the review of the Convention's protocols;

(f) Noted with appreciation the progress in the modelling work related to hemispheric air pollution achieved by the centres.

**V. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMMES,
INCLUDING THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION AND ITS CAFE PROGRAMME, EEA,
WMO, UNEP, THE MARINE COMMISSIONS, THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION
(WHO) AND NATIONAL PROGRAMMES**

53. A number of organizations provided information on progress in their relevant activities. WMO gave information on its Global Atmosphere Watch programme and cooperation with EMEP and International Global Atmospheric Chemistry (IGAC), its future strategic plan, information on training courses and recent publication of manuals and reports. EEA noted its recent and forthcoming publications and the successful cooperation with the Convention's bodies, stressing that in 2006 it would continue cooperation with the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, support the inventory improvement programme and further support the links with relevant activities in the European Community. The EC described the current status of the CAFE programme, stressing that the European Commission's Thematic Strategy would be accompanied by a proposal to revise the existing EU air quality legislation. The European Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC) reported on the collaboration with the EMEP centres and Task Forces on modelling activities, model inter-comparisons and monitoring, as well as other activities of interest to EMEP.

54. The delegation of Canada reported on relevant activities in the field of policy, regulations and assessments, as well as on monitoring and modelling of air pollution. The United States provided updated information on its Clean Air Rules, the NARSTO Emissions Assessment, the development of an inventory of sulphur emissions from marine sources, ecosystem management, field monitoring campaigns for long-range transport of air pollution and the development of pollution models.

55. The delegation of Sweden drew attention to the implementation of the international nitrogen initiative in Europe through a European Science Foundation COST activity (www.cost729.org).

56. The Steering Body took note of the information presented by other organizations and programmes, welcomed the useful cooperation, expressed its gratitude for the contributions made to EMEP and the Convention and stressed the importance of continued cooperation.

VI. WORKPLAN FOR 2006

57. The secretariat introduced the draft workplan for 2006 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/10), prepared on the basis of the priorities of the Executive Body reflected in recent workplans, as well as the input by the task forces and centres.

58. Delegations and centres proposed amendments to the workplan and the Steering Body agreed on the changes to be made.

59. The Steering Body agreed its draft workplan for 2006 as in EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/10, as amended, and requested the secretariat to include the necessary amendments and submit it to the Executive Body for its consideration.

VII. FINANCIAL AND BUDGETARY MATTERS

60. The secretariat introduced the note on financial and budgetary matters (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/11), informing the Steering Body on the current state of contributions. An updated table on the state of contributions was circulated during the session. The note also presented the budget proposal for 2006 prepared on the basis of the decisions of the Bureau and the decision by the Executive Body on the overall budget levels for the period 2004 to 2006. The secretariat drew attention to the revised annex to the EMEP Protocol and the revised 2006 EMEP scale of mandatory contributions based on the 2004 United Nations scale of assessments, as requested by the Executive Body at its twenty-second session (ECE/EB.AIR/83, para. 89(f)). The secretariat also drew attention to issues related to proposed decisions.

61. The delegation of the European Community drew attention to the upper cap imposed by the European Commission on financial contributions to international activities and requested the 2006 EMEP scale of contributions as presented in table 4 of document EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/11 be revised accordingly.

62. The delegation of Germany expressed a reservation with regard to its contribution for 2006 calculated on the basis of the 2004 UN scale of assessments.

63. The delegation of Ukraine reported on progress made in two projects approved by the

EMEP Steering Body to cover its arrears. The project on the development of a national model of environmental impact assessment of heavy metal's emissions would be completed in the first quarter of 2006. Ukraine expressed its intention to pay its arrears for 2002, 2003 and 2004 and its contribution for 2005 in cash.

64. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the status of contributions to the financing of EMEP provided in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/11 and the additional information provided by the secretariat during the session;

(b) Approved the use of resources by the EMEP centres in 2004 as presented in table 2 of EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/11;

(c) Also approved the 2004 contribution in kind from Belarus;

(d) Agreed on the detailed budget for 2006 set out in table 3 of document EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/11;

(e) Also agreed on the proposed budget of CIAM for 2006 as set out in the report of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2003/4, para. 59) and on keeping the proposed budgets for 2007 and 2008 at the same level;

(f) Requested the secretariat to revise the schedule of mandatory contributions from Parties for 2006 as set out in the last column of table 4 of document EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/11 to reflect the upper cap on the contribution of the European Community;

(g) Recommended that the Executive Body should adopt the 2006 budgets and the revised schedule of contributions;

(h) Recommended that the Executive Body should amend the Protocol by adopting, in accordance with its article 4, paragraph 3, of the Protocol, the revised annex set out in the annex to document EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/11;

(i) Called upon 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 2006 for the preparation of the protocol reviews, including the work on integrated assessment modelling, could be accomplished as foreseen in the workplan;

(j) Invited all Parties which had not yet paid their contributions for 2005 to do so as soon as possible;

(k) Invited all Parties to pay their arrears without delay;

(l) Took note of the progress in the implementation of the project on development of a national model for environmental impact assessment of heavy metal emissions approved by the Bureau in 2001 as a contribution in kind from Ukraine to cover its arrears for 1992-1994 and invited Ukraine to complete the project as soon as possible, discuss the results with MSC-E and report to the Bureau at its meeting in spring 2006;

(m) Took note of the development of the project for establishing an international EMEP site as a contribution in kind from Ukraine to cover its arrears for 1996-2001 and invited Ukraine to proceed with the implementation of the project in cooperation with CCC without delay and to report on progress to the Bureau at its meeting in spring 2006.

VIII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

65. The Steering Body re-elected Mr. J. Schneider (Austria) as Chairman. It also re-elected Mr. P. Grennfelt (Sweden), Mr. J. Rea (United Kingdom), Mr. J. Santroch (Czech Republic), Ms. S. Vidic (Croatia), Mr. K. Wieringa (Netherlands) and Ms. M. Wichmann-Fiebig (Germany) as Vice-Chairpersons. It expressed its thanks to Mr. S. Doytchinov (Italy) for his work as a Vice-Chairman during the past years. It elected Ms. Laurence Rouil (France) as a new Vice-Chairperson. The Steering Body agreed that its Bureau should invite a member of the CAFE secretariat to attend its meetings as an observer and proposed that the Bureau should invite Mr. Stefan Jacobi to its next meeting.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

66. The Steering Body expressed its thanks to Mr. Niels Heidam (Denmark) for his contribution to the EMEP work over the past years.

X. CLOSING OF THE TWENTY-NINTH SESSION

67. Based on an informal outline of the report, presented by the secretariat, the Steering Body agreed on the main decisions taken during the session.

68. The thirtieth session of the EMEP Steering Body was scheduled to take place on September 2006. 4 – 6