



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/2
3 October 2006

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)

Thirtieth session
Geneva, 4–6 September 2006

REPORT ON THE THIRTIETH SESSION

Introduction

1. The Steering Body held its thirtieth session in Geneva from 4 to 6 September 2006. The session was attended by representatives from the following Parties to the Convention: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the 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.

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.1/2006/1.

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

5. The Steering Body adopted the report on its twenty-ninth session (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/2).

III. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE TWENTY-THIRD 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, Housing and Land Management Division, provided information on the present status of the Convention and its protocols and the main decisions of the twenty-third session of the Executive Body, including the approval of the emission inventories improvement. He highlighted decisions made in relation to the protocol reviews, and in particular the review of the Gothenburg Protocol.

7. The Chair 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 and the implementation of the action plan for the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA). He noted work on the review and evaluation of substances proposed for addition to the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). With regard to the review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals, he drew attention to the importance of modelling heavy metals to support future work. Mr. Ballaman informed about the decisions made at the meeting of the Heads of Delegation to the Working Group on Strategies and Review in April 2006, related to the ongoing review of the Gothenburg Protocol and drew attention to document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/14. He stressed the tight schedule for the completion of the review, and in particular the need to discuss a first draft of the review report in spring 2007. He noted the decision of the Executive Body to extend the review of the Protocol to all Parties to the Convention and to include particulate matter in it.

8. The former Chair of the Working Group on Effects, Mr. H. Gregor (Germany), noted the results of its recent twenty-fifth session (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2006/2). He drew attention to the successful cooperation between the Working Group on Effects and EMEP, and in particular the collaboration of the International Cooperative Programme (ICP) Materials, ICP Vegetation and the work carried out on health effects. The Working Group on Effects will give support to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol (ECE/EB.AIR.GE.1/2006/14). It would be mainly through its

2006 substantive report. He highlighted the contributions made to the sufficiency and effectiveness review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals, and the Working Group's assessment that an effects-based approach would be feasible for heavy metals. He drew attention to the data rules prepared by the Bureau of the Working Group on Effects, which were made available as an informal document to the Steering Body for consideration and comment. He stressed the usefulness of the joint meeting of the Bureaux of the Working Group on Effects and the EMEP Steering Body and proposed that the next such meeting be held on 15 February 2007.

9. The Chair presented the summary report on the work of the EMEP Bureau between the Steering Body's twenty-ninth and thirtieth sessions, including cooperation with the Working Group on Effects (EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/9). He reported on the joint meeting of the Bureaux of the EMEP Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects, held in Geneva on 2 March 2006 (<http://www.unece.org/env/emeep/welcome.html>), stressing the usefulness of the joint meetings and the intention to continue them. He pointed out that the Bureau had agreed on key questions in order to provide a better focus for the discussions under item 4 of the agenda; these were contained in the annex to the document. He invited participants to provide feedback on these questions when contributing to the discussion. He highlighted the importance of the work on emissions and the continued attention of the Bureau to this matter. Mr. Anton ELIASSEN (MSC-W) stressed that MSC-W intended to focus its work on items related to the modelling of air pollution. He suggested that the Bureau further explore the issue of reorganizing emissions-related work within EMEP.

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 Chairs 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 appreciation of the cooperation with the Working Group on Effects and noted its intention to continue this to ensure that the Convention's priorities were addressed effectively;

(e) Took note of the draft Executive Body decision on data availability under the Convention and proposed amendments to it;

(f) Invited its Bureau to explore further the issue of reorganizing emissions-related work within EMEP and to report back to the thirty-first session of the EMEP Steering Body.

IV. PROGRESS IN ACTIVITIES IN 2006 AND FUTURE WORK

11. The Chair invited the Steering Body to discuss separately each area of work, considering progress made in 2006 with respect to the Convention's workplan and taking into account the draft workplan for 2007 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/10), which would be discussed under agenda item 6.

A. Acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants

12. Ms. L. Tarrasón (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.1/2006/3). She noted the inputs to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, highlighting the effect of meteorological variability. She stressed that some substances were still not reported according to the monitoring strategy. Ms. Tarrasón explained that the source-receptor relationships for 2004 would be delayed until 1 December 2006 with the agreement of the Bureau, because priority had to be given to the source-receptor calculations needed for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol. She described the trends in ambient concentrations and depositions from 1990 to 2004, in view of the progress toward achieving the goals of the Gothenburg Protocol. The Steering Body agreed that MSC-W should focus its further work on deposition and emission fluxes both for nitrogen and ozone.

13. The Steering Body discussed the consequences of the switch from AOT 40 to the flux-based approach for ozone. While the AOT approach accentuated a strong north-south gradient, the flux-based approach presented more evenly distributed ozone effects on vegetation. A further increase in hemispheric background ozone would also have a considerable effect on achieving the environmental objectives of the Gothenburg Protocol. The Steering Body noted that some emissions reported by countries were replaced with estimates by CIAM for modelling purposes. In the absence of CIAM estimates, data from the EDGAR database were used. The Steering Body emphasized that it should be made transparent which emission data were used for the assessments.

14. Ms. Tarrasón presented perspectives for extending the scales of the EMEP model. Extending the model to the hemispheric scale had already been on the EMEP workplan for two

years and this year the first preliminary results were available (MSC-W report 2006/2). She also reported on the use of the EMEP Unified models with different drivers to increase the spatial resolution. She noted the hemispheric EMEP model had a similar performance to the regional scale model. It showed a slightly worse correlation with primary species and ozone due to a coarser resolution (100×100 km), but a better performance for ozone in the Mediterranean areas as well as for secondary inorganic aerosols and wet deposition. A comparison with measured data and the CTM2 model showed that the performance of the model was better over Europe than over Asia, possibly due to better emission data.

15. In the discussion that followed, the value of extending the EMEP model on a hemispheric scale, in view of the limited resources available and of the existence of similar models such as the CTM2 model, was discussed. It was concluded that there were in principle different possibilities to include the hemispheric scale in EMEP modelling. The Steering Body noted the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport on Air Pollution would welcome a contribution from EMEP dealing with the hemispheric scale modelling. It stressed, however, that the main priority, especially in the light of the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, was the extension to the local scale.

16. 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 1/06;
- (c) Noted the delays in the calculation of source-receptor relationships for 2004 and invited MSC-W to finalize these calculations by 1 December 2006;
- (d) Noted the use of emission estimates in the modelling work and observed that all conclusions made on the basis of such estimates should be used with caution;
- (e) Noted the consequences of the switch from the AOT-based to the flux-based approach for ozone and invited MSC-W to make these changes transparent in the context of the review of the Gothenburg Protocol;
- (f) Stressed the importance of modelling at both the regional and local scales and invited MSC-W to explore ways for further development of hemispheric modelling, taking into account possible collaboration and synergies with other modelling activities;

(g) Stressed the importance of the proper inclusion of the Central Asia region in the modelling activities; and

(h) Invited MSC-W to continue its collaboration with Parties in local-scale modelling activities.

B. Heavy metals

17. 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.1/2006/3) and plans for work up to 2008. He introduced the EMEP Status Report 2/06 on lead, cadmium and mercury and outlined work on some second priority metals. He compared model results versus observations, based on official emission data and on expert estimates, drawing attention to the much larger discrepancy between measured and modelled results when official emission data were used. He noted that the discrepancies between measurements and modelling were mainly, but possibly not only, due to uncertainties in emission estimates. Proper treatment of re-suspension was also a challenge. Mr. Dutchak also drew attention to the conclusions and recommendations of the workshop on the review of the MSC-E models held on 13–14 October 2005 in Moscow.

18. In the discussion that followed, the possible reasons for the discrepancies between the official emission data and the expert estimates were discussed. One delegation suggested that priority should be given to the verification and validation of emission data.

19. MSC-E sought guidance from the Steering Body on the spatial coverage of its modelling activities. Currently, the modelling activities covered only the EMEP region, except for the modelling of mercury, which was done on a hemispheric scale. The Steering Body reiterated the importance of the countries of EECA for the Convention and encouraged the centres to explore ways of involving them in the routine EMEP modelling.

20. The delegation of Germany reported on the results of the field intercomparison of EMEP mercury measurements carried out in close cooperation with CCC in 2005.

21. The delegation of the Netherlands presented the results of a study of the effectiveness of the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Protocol on POPs and the costs of additional measures. The issue was raised to what extent the effects currently observed were the result of historic emissions and to what extent to current emissions.

22. 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 2/06;
- (c) Welcomed the outcome of the workshop on the review of the MSC-E model on heavy metals on 13–14 October 2005;
- (d) Noted with concern that there were still discrepancies between the model results and measured concentrations when using data reported by Parties and urged Parties to carefully re-evaluate their emission estimates;
- (e) Appreciated the work started on this issue and invited MSC-E in close collaboration with the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections to look further into this issue;
- (f) Noted that the main priority for future work would be on lead, mercury and cadmium;
- (g) Noted the need to extend the modelling domain to the EECCA countries, including the entire territory of the Russian Federation, not only for mercury, but also for other metals and invited MSC-E to explore ways to include these countries in its modelling activities.

C. Particulate matter

23. Mr. K. Torseth (CCC) presented an overview of activities on atmospheric monitoring and modelling of particulate matter (PM) (EMEP Status Report 4/06), 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.1/2006/3) and plans for work up to 2008. There was still a lack of data, and the implementation of the EMEP monitoring strategy was a top priority. He drew attention to intensive campaigns at level 2 and level 3 sites and the development of the protocol for elemental and organic carbon (EC/OC) sampling and analysis. He outlined recent developments in the PM model and stressed that PM was a transboundary problem. The further development of the PM model was limited due to uncertainties in emissions data and a lack of observation data for validation.

24. The Steering Body noted the ongoing work under the EUSAAR project on the development of a standardized method for EC/OC measuring. It was informed that an interim method developed by CCC would be included in the EMEP manual by the end of 2006. It was

suggested that Parties follow this interim method until a final protocol for measuring EC/OC was in place.

25. Ms. M. Wichmann-Fiebig, Co-Chair of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter, informed the Steering Body about the future work of the Expert Group and expressed its appreciation for the contribution made by EMEP to its work.

26. 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 4/06;

(c) Noted that there were still considerable uncertainties with PM emission inventories and urged Parties to enhance their efforts to improve the quality of their PM emission reporting;

(d) Noted the gaps in PM monitoring, urged CCC to continue its efforts to develop an agreed standardized method for PM monitoring, including PM speciation, and to include this in the EMEP Manual as soon as possible; it called upon Parties to work towards full implementation of the monitoring strategy;

(e) Took note of the progress achieved in PM modelling and invited MSC-W to work towards its further improvement, especially with regard to carbonaceous species;

(f) Welcomed the cooperation with the Expert Group on Particulate Matter and encouraged the centres to continue to contribute to its work.

D. Persistent organic pollutants

27. 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.1/2006/3) and plans for work up to 2008. He drew attention to the EMEP Status Report 3/06 and to the conclusions and recommendation of the workshop on the review of the MSC-E models, held in Moscow in October 2005.

28. Mr. Shatalov reminded Parties that when recalculating their emission data for POPs, the whole time series should be included. He also pointed out the significance of POPs re-emissions and the relevance of transcontinental transport for several POPs.

29. Mr. K. Wieringa (Netherlands) presented the results of the second part of a study of the effectiveness of the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Protocol on POPs, related to a possible revision of the Protocol on POPs.

30. In the discussion that followed, it was noted that there were still considerable gaps in the monitoring of dioxins and furans. In view of the interest in extending the model to include substances that were not currently covered by the Protocol, it was suggested that the issue of emissions of such substances be discussed at the next meeting of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections. It was also recommended that CCC and MSC-E should actively cooperate with the UNEP on the monitoring of POPs.

31. 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 3/06;
- (c) Welcomed the outcome of the workshop on the review of the MSC-E model on POPs held on 13–14 October 2005;
- (d) Invited MSC-E to take all necessary steps to implement the recommendations of the workshop on the review of its model on POPs;
- (e) Noted the gaps in monitoring, in particular on dioxins and furans, and urged Parties to make efforts to fill in these gaps;
- (f) Noted that there were considerable uncertainties in the emission data and invited Parties to enhance their efforts to report reliable data;
- (g) Encouraged MSC-E and CCC to continue their cooperation with the Stockholm Convention on POPs, the Task Force on POPs and other relevant organization on the issue of POPs;

(h) Agreed that, in terms of the supporting scientific information, the focus should be shifting from the substances included in annex I to the Protocol, most of which were banned, to those which were unintentionally released and the new substances proposed for addition to the Protocol;

(i) Took note of the TNO report on the estimated emission reduction and cost of options for a possible revision of the Protocol on POPs and invited MSC-E to take it into account in its work.

E. Measurements and modelling

32. Ms. L. Jalkanen (WMO), Co-Chair of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, reported on progress, including the results of its seventh meeting, held in Helsinki on 10 to 12 May 2006 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/3), and plans for up to 2008. She drew attention to the discussions on the national implementation of the monitoring strategy. The Task Force recognized that without a full commitment by Parties, the data needed for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol would not arrive on time.

33. Mr. R. Derwent (United Kingdom), Co-Chair of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, drew attention to the results of the review of the MSC-E models and the preparation of the PM assessment report. He also described the arrangements for further work on the urban decrements of ozone and PM increments.

34. Ms. Wichmann-Fiebig observed that the work on the increments and decrements of PM and ozone was very timely given that current results were not very convincing and were contradictory to measurements. It was also important that national experts could scrutinize the modelling data at the proposed joint workshop with the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling in November 2006. She expressed the interest of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter in the PM assessment report and requested that a preliminary draft of the report be presented to its meeting in early 2007, if available.

35. The Steering Body agreed that work on the PM assessment report should be based on the information contained in the EMEP status report on PM, complemented by results from national studies on PM. The added value of the PM assessment report was feeding the knowledge available at the national level into EMEP. In view of the concerns about the tight schedule for the preparation of the PM assessment report (September 2007), it was proposed to have an update to the report after 2007, which could provide input to a possible revision of the Gothenburg Protocol.

36. Mr. A. Eliassen confirmed that it was possible for MSC-W to produce calculations for PM and ozone by September of each year for the preceding year, if it did not have to update emissions.

37. The delegation of the EC informed the Steering Body about a COST action on PM and health, aimed at understanding whether differences in health effects could be due to PM characteristics. As there was some overlap between this task and the PM assessment report, it was important to avoid duplication of work.

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) Welcomed the progress achieved in the national implementation of the monitoring strategy and urged Parties to continue their efforts towards full implementation of the strategy;

(c) Welcomed the proposed structure of the PM assessment report and called upon Parties to provide national contributions on PM assessment and to collaborate as close as possible with the Expert Group on Particulate Matter in order to identify the questions of highest relevance to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol;

(d) Welcomed the proposal to hold a workshop on the PM assessment report on 29 November – 1 December 2006 in Paris and recommended that the Bureau of the Executive Body includes it in the workplan for 2006;

(e) In view of the tight schedule for the completion of the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, invited the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and CCC to start preparations for the assessment report without delay;

(f) Welcomed the proposal to hold a joint workshop between the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling on urban fine-scale modelling in November 2006 in Laxenburg and recommended that the Bureau of the Executive Body includes in the workplan for 2006;

(g) Requested the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling to explore further the discrepancies between modelled and measured data for heavy metals.

(h) Welcomed the offer of MSC-W to provide the Steering Body with preliminary concentration fields for ozone and PM for the most recent year.

F. Integrated assessment modelling

39. Mr. R. Maas, Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, reported on progress in integrated assessment modelling, including results of the thirty-first and thirty-second meetings of the Task Force, held in Gothenburg on 8 to 9 September 2005 and in Rome on 17–19 May 2006 (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/5 and ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/6), as well as the results of the workshop on European Air Pollution Policies held in October 2005 in Gothenburg and the workshop on non-technical measures for air pollution abatement, held back-to-back with the thirty-second meeting of the Task Force. He also presented preparation of the inputs for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol and plans for future work, including for a possible revision of the Gothenburg Protocol. He shed light on the consequences of the methodological changes introduced in modelling after the negotiation of the Gothenburg Protocol. He noted in particular the new Eulerian dispersion model, the changes in the ecosystem dependent deposition rates, the ozone flux-based approach, the health effects of particles and ozone and the new national projections up to 2020.

40. In the discussion that followed it was noted that currently the optimization calculations were made based on the AOT approach for ozone, but it was possible to make calculations using the flux-based approach. For the Gothenburg Protocol review, it was possible to make both sets of calculations. It was agreed that the same approach was used in the review as in the negotiation of the Protocol (AOT). The flux-based approach could be used in the eventual revision of the Protocol.

41. Several delegations noted the importance of disseminating the available information about non-technical measures. It was noted that the currently available information on measures in the transport, agriculture and energy sectors, as presented during the workshop in December 2005, was accessible on the website of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling.

42. It was stressed that the review of the Gothenburg Protocol should cover the whole of Convention area. Attention was drawn to the need for data for North America and the EECCA region, comparable to that available for the EC countries.

43. Mr. M. Amann (CIAM) presented a detailed overview of the work by CIAM in 2006, including the development of the baseline scenarios for the EECCA countries and the introduction of the GAINS model. The Steering Body noted with satisfaction that the emission

projections for quite a few of the non-EC countries had been updated, but noted also with concern that activity projections for some Parties might be outdated.

44. Mr. Amann presented the first results of the GAINS model. In contrast to the RAINS model, the GAINS model included the potential for reductions from structural measures, and both technical and non-technical measures. Mr. Amann drew attention to the strong relationship between CO₂ mitigation and air pollutant emissions, demonstrated by the GAINS model.

45. Mr. Maas highlighted that the Gothenburg Protocol review process aimed to show the effectiveness of the Protocol, as well as which measures were more effective than others. The GAINS model was not included in the review process, but for a possible revision process greenhouse gas emission control measures could be included if there was a request by policymakers. It was agreed that the Executive Body should be asked for guidance on the possible application of the GAINS model in a possible revision of the Gothenburg Protocol.

46. Mr. Amann informed the Steering Body of the European Union (EU) funding under the LIFE programme for a European Consortium for Modelling of Air Pollution and Climate Strategies (EC4MACS). The consortium included several institutions including IIASA and MSC-W. The project would run from 2007 to 2012 and funding amounted to 4.4 million euros on a co-funding basis.

47. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the report of the Task Force, expressing its appreciation to the Chair, 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) Noted the methodological changes in RAINS and acknowledged that these changes represented clear improvements and took note of the consequences of these changes for achieving the objectives of the Gothenburg Protocol;

(d) Encouraged the involvement of the EECCA countries in integrated assessment modelling;

- (e) Invited the Executive Body to urge all Parties and relevant bodies under the Convention to provide the necessary data, including activity data, for integrated assessment modelling, and in particular the non-EU countries in the EMEP domain;
- (f) Took note of the first results of the GAINS model and the important interlinkages between climate change mitigation measures and air pollution abatement measures;
- (g) Welcomed the funding provided by the European Commission for integrated assessment modelling;
- (h) Welcomed the new LIFE project which would also provide funding and invited MSC-W to contribute to the implementation of this project;
- (i) Agreed to revert to the proposed budget for CIAM under financial and budgetary matters.

G. Emissions

48. Ms. K. Rypdal (Norway), Chair of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, reported on progress, including the results of the fifteenth and sixteenth meetings held on 19–21 October 2005 in Rovaniemi (Finland) and on 12–14 June 2006 in Amersfoort (Netherlands). She noted the proposed updating of the *EMEP/CORINAIR Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook*, including proposals by EEA and the European Commission for further harmonization with the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Guidelines and the proposal for a database of emission factors. She noted the conclusions of the trial in-depth review (stage 3) of emission data, held in February 2006, that the Informative Inventory Reports (IIR) were indispensable for the review of data, that activity data were needed, that the Emission Reporting Guidelines were not sufficiently robust to serve as a necessary basis for stage 3 reviews and that decisions on the timing, methods and procedures for such reviews should be postponed until after the revision of the Guidelines in 2007. The draft revised Guidelines would be discussed at the seventeenth meeting in Thessaloniki (Greece) in November 2006 and submitted to the EMEP Steering Body at its thirty-first session.

49. Attention was drawn to the proposal of the Task Force for strengthening the requirements under the Guidelines, in particular to make the IIRs mandatory and to require Parties to report emissions of PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀, as these were not covered by any protocol. Ms. Rypdal underlined the importance of defining the scope for national totals, in particular the estimation of emissions from road transport and whether to include forest fires. It was indicated that total suspended particulates (TSP) were not well-defined and would not be included in the Guidelines.

50. The delegations of Luxembourg and Switzerland stated their preference for reporting road transport emissions on the basis of fuels consumed, whereas the European Commission (stating a coordinated position of EU Member States) preferred reporting emissions on the basis of fuels sold. An approach could be to allow Parties the flexibility to report according to either method.

51. The Steering Body noted that heavy metal and POPs inventories continued to have significant uncertainties, an indication that official estimates were too low. A joint workshop with the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, planned for autumn 2007, would address inventory uncertainties from a modelling perspective.

52. The secretariat provided information on the workshop under the CAPACT project, to be held on 17–19 October 2006 in Almaty. It would be followed by a training seminar on emission inventories on 19–20 October, organized by EEA and TACIS.

53. Ms. Rypdal noted the Task Force would devote greater resources to supporting the participation of experts from EECCA countries and that EEA and TACIS were translating the *Guidebook* into Russian.

54. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the results and conclusions of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, expressed its appreciation to MSC-W, CIAM and EEA for their work in this area;

(b) Took note of preparations under way for the next meeting of the Task Force in Thessaloniki (Greece) on 31 October – 2 November 2006, to be preceded by a workshop on emission projections on 30–31 October 2006 organized by the United Kingdom and in collaboration with the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling;

(c) Invited Parties to report their emission data in the next reporting round (by the deadline of 15 February 2007) in accordance with the revised reporting templates available on the EMEP website, to use REPDAB to verify submissions before sending them, to submit Informative Inventory Reports (IIR) by 15 March 2007 and stressed the importance of including emissions of POPs, heavy metals and PM;

(d) Welcomed the trial in-depth stage 3 review of emission data and invited the Task Force to develop proposals on the scope, responsibilities, methods and procedures for work for consideration by the Steering Body at its thirty-first session in 2007;

(e) Expressed interest in further work on capacity-building in air emission inventories in EECCA countries through the CAPACT project and EEA/TACIS initiatives and welcomed results being presented to the Steering Body; it noted that reliable and robust emission data were a prerequisite to include these region in atmospheric modelling activities within EMEP and urged results to be conveyed to the Working Group on Strategies and Review as part of the Convention's action plan for EECCA countries;

(f) Welcomed the progress in revising the *EMEP/CORINAIR Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook*; stressed the importance of updating it to reflect changes in abatement technologies and strengthen information on projections, and thanked EEA and TACIS for translating parts of it into Russian;

(g) Noted the updating of the chapter on PM and agreed the preliminary publication of this chapter before final approval to support national activities to compile PM inventories;

(h) Noted the progress in preparing the revision of the Guidelines, invited the Task Force to include reporting of projected emission and activity data to promote transparency and stressed the revision should not increase Parties' reporting burden;

(i) Stressed that EMEP would benefit from mandatory reporting of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} and a mandatory requirement to prepare IIRs; it further stressed that reporting on emissions from fuel sold and fuel used would provide valuable information;

(j) Noted with appreciation the proposals from EEA and the European Commission for restructuring and updating the *Guidebook*, stressed the need for close collaboration with the Task Force, expressed its concern that this would not focus on heavy metals and POPs and invited the Task Force to explore possibilities to facilitate this work;

(k) Reiterated its invitation to its Bureau as indicated in paragraph 9(f) above.

H. Hemispheric air pollution

55. Mr. T. Keating (United States), Co-Chair of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, presented the results of its second meeting held on 6–8 June in Moscow (EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/12), including the results of the Workshop on Intercontinental Transport Modelling Intercomparison held in January 2006 and plans for future work. He drew attention to the interim assessment report, which was being prepared by the Task Force and intended as an input to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol. He sought guidance on whether the proposed

outline and process for preparing the 2007 interim report were sufficient to meet the needs of the Gothenburg review and the expectations of the Steering Body for the 2009 report.

56. The Steering Body:

- (a) Thanked the lead Parties for their efforts, expressed appreciation for the work accomplished by the Task Force;
- (b) Approved the outline of the 2007 assessment report;
- (c) Took note of the conclusions and recommendations of the June Task Force with a focus on POPs, Hg and methane.

I. Inputs to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol

57. The secretariat presented the draft annotated report outline, revised in view of the discussions at the Meeting of the Heads of Delegation to the Working Group on Strategies and Review held in Geneva on 19–21 April 2006 (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/14). Attention was drawn to the timetable for the preparation of the final report on the review, presented in the annex to the report of that meeting (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/82).

58. The Steering Body expressed its understanding that section IV of the draft annotated report outline did not imply the development of new emission ceilings for the review of the Protocol. One delegation noted that the issue of the urban scale should be reflected in the review report.

59. The delegation of Sweden announced its plans to hold a “Saltsjöbaden III” workshop in Gothenburg in March 2007, which would also deal with a possible revision of the Protocol.

60. The Steering Body:

- (a) Took note of the preparations for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol;
- (b) Agreed with the draft annotated report outline and requested the secretariat to submit it to the Executive Body for consideration;
- (c) Urged the EMEP task forces and centres to make their contributions in accordance with the timetable;

(d) Welcomed the offer of Sweden to host a “Saltsjöbaden III” workshop in March 2007.

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

61. EEA noted its close cooperation with the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections in the updating of the *EMEP/CORINAIR Emission Inventory Guidebook* and the inventory review and improvement programme. Attention was drawn to the pilot Web-based emission factor database which might be used to complement the *Guidebook*, as well as to recent and future publications, including the preparation of the Belgrade assessment report for 2007.

62. WMO informed about the preparation of the next Global Atmosphere Watch (GAW) strategic plan for the period 2008–2015, including the International Global Atmospheric Chemistry (IGAC) framework, the integration of data and models, GAW training courses in cooperation with Germany and new publications.

63. In relation to the discussion of the draft data rules proposed by the Working Group on Effects, attention was drawn to the ongoing discussion on how to acknowledge research data produced by the level 3 monitoring stations, which were joint EMEP/GAW sites.

64. The European Commission’s Joint Research Centre (JRC) reported on the recent developments and publications within the ACCENT network of excellence relevant to the review and revision of the Gothenburg Protocol.

65. On behalf of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), the delegation of Norway expressed the willingness of AMAP to continue its cooperation with the Convention and its subsidiary Bodies. He provided information on the 2006 AMAP Assessment of Acidification, Arctic Haze and Acidification Effects in the Arctic to be presented to the Arctic Council of Ministers in October. The report recognized the important and mutually beneficial cooperation between EMEP and AMAP (in relation to cost-efficient operation of monitoring networks, data handling, modelling and assessment, etc.) and indicated the need for similar cooperation with programmes such as the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET) in Asia.

66. 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, including the

intercomparison of its air quality forecasting models. The United States provided updated information on its national ambient air quality standards, a new NARSTO assessment the national acid precipitation program, a new atlas on national atmospheric deposition and a field monitoring campaign focusing on ozone and fine particulates as well as a new version of the CMAQ model.

67. 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 2007

68. The secretariat introduced the draft workplan for 2007 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/10), 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.

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

70. The Steering Body agreed its draft workplan for 2007 as in EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/10, 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

71. The secretariat introduced the note on financial and budgetary matters (EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/11), 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 2007 prepared on the basis of the decisions of the Bureau. The secretariat drew attention to the 2007 EMEP scale of mandatory contributions based on the 2004 United Nations scale of assessments. The secretariat also drew attention to issues related to proposed decisions.

72. The delegation of the European Community noted the upper cap imposed by the European Commission on financial contributions to international activities and requested the 2007 EMEP scale of contributions as presented in table 4 of document EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/11 be revised accordingly.

73. The delegation of Germany expressed a reservation with regard to its contribution for 2007 calculated on the basis of the 2004 UN scale of assessments.

74. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the status of contributions to the financing of EMEP provided in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/11 and the additional information provided by the secretariat during the session;

(b) Approved the use of resources by the EMEP centres in 2005 as presented in table 2 of EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/11;

(c) Also approved the 2005 contribution in kind from Belarus;

(d) Agreed on the detailed budget for 2007 set out in table 3 of document EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/11;

(e) Also agreed on the proposed budget of CIAM for 2007 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 2008 and 2009 at the same level;

(f) Requested the secretariat to adjust the schedule of mandatory contributions from Parties for 2007 as set out in the last column of table 4 of document EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/11 to reflect the upper cap on the contribution of the European Community;

(g) Recommended that the Executive Body should adopt the 2007 budgets and the adjusted schedule of contributions;

(h) 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 2007 for carrying out the protocol reviews, including the work on integrated assessment modelling, could be accomplished as foreseen in the workplan;

(i) Invited all Parties which had not yet paid their contributions for 2006 to do so as soon as possible;

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

(k) Noted with concern the lack of information on 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 2007;

(l) Noted with concern the lack of information on 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 2007.

VIII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

75. The Steering Body re-elected Mr. J. Schneider (Austria) as Chair. It also re-elected Mr. P. Grennfelt (Sweden), Mr. J. Rea (United Kingdom), Ms. L. Rouil (France), Ms. S. Vidic (Croatia), Mr. K. Wieringa (Netherlands) and Ms. M. Wichmann-Fiebig (Germany) as Vice-Chairs. The Steering Body expressed its thanks to Mr. J. Santroch (Czech Republic), who announced his forthcoming retirement, for his contribution to the work of EMEP over the years. The Steering Body agreed that it should invite a representative from the European Commission to attend the meetings of its Bureau.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

76. There were no issues for discussion under this agenda item.

X. CLOSING OF THE THIRTIETH SESSION

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

78. The thirty-first session of the EMEP Steering Body was scheduled to take place on 3–5 September 2007.