

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

Bureau to the Executive Body

**REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE BUREAU  
TO THE EXECUTIVE BODY FOR THE CONVENTION  
17 September 2007, Geneva**

**Prepared by the secretariat in consultation with the Bureau**

The second meeting of the Bureau in 2007 was chaired by the Chairman of the Executive Body, Mr. M. Williams (United Kingdom), and was attended by Vice-Chairpersons Mr. R. Ballaman (Switzerland), Mr W. Harnett (United States), Mr. T. Johannessen (Norway), Ms. M. Lešnjak (Slovenia) and Mr. J. Schneider (Austria). Mr. S. Michel (Switzerland) and Ms. S. Nurmi (Finland) sent their apologies. Mr. K. Bull attended for the UNECE secretariat. Mr E. Dame (European Commission) attended as observer.

**I. NOTE OF THE BUREAU MEETING OF 13 MARCH 2007  
(EB BUREAU/2007/1) INCLUDING MATTERS ARISING NOT ELSEWHERE  
ON THE AGENDA**

1. The note of the meeting had been circulated and the Bureau agreed that it should be placed on the Convention's website at [www.unece.org/env/eb/bureau](http://www.unece.org/env/eb/bureau).

**II. "ENVIRONMENT FOR EUROPE" BELGRADE MINISTERIAL  
CONFERENCE**

2. The secretariat noted that preparations for the Conference, which was to take place in October, were being completed. The finalized MEA paper still included the outreach activities that were important to the Convention. IUAPPA had planned a side event on the Global Atmospheric Pollution Forum (GAPF); Ms Karadjova would assist on behalf of the secretariat.

3. The Ministerial Declaration was still being discussed with many unresolved issues; it was likely to be debated even the week of the Conference. The secretariat would make the text available to members of the Bureau when it was available.

**III. TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE BODY**

4. The secretariat provided an update on the preparations for the session. The agenda had been submitted for translation as required by the 12-week rule. The secretariat noted the need for mandates in documents; this was being increasingly strictly applied by the UN Documents Management Section. Proposals by the secretariat to be put before the Executive Body could help solve current problems.
5. The Bureau discussed the issue of no longer having a translated report available for adoption at the end of the session. It recognized that the Executive Body decision on this change was only for two years so a further decision should be taken at the twenty-fifth session. While the Bureau noted adopting decisions in English provided some streamlining of the timetables of meetings and that the focus on decisions was enhanced, some members felt that something was lost by not having text in three languages at the end of the session and by not having key descriptive paragraphs in addition to the decisions.
6. The secretariat was invited to look into clarifying the position regarding in-session translations to facilitate a decision by the Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session.

#### **IV. OPENING THE CONVENTION**

7. The Bureau agreed that, with regard to the legal and technical elements, it had nothing to add to the document put before the Executive Body in 2006. Bureau members felt that there were other issues relating to the opening of the Convention that could be presented to the twenty-fifth session, such as exchange of information and the GAPF. It proposed preparation of a short report for the Executive Body and invited the secretariat to produce a draft for its consideration.
8. To encourage participation of non-UNECE countries in Convention activities, the Bureau invited the secretariat to send invitations for the Executive Body session to all UN countries as in 2006.

#### **V. ACCREDITATION OF NGOS**

9. The secretariat noted that only one organization had applied for accreditation to the Convention – the European Federation of Clean Air and Environmental Protection Associations (EFCA). The secretariat provided information on this organization and the Bureau agreed to recommend its accreditation under decision 2006/11.

#### **VI. ELECTIONS**

10. The Bureau noted that a number of new members should be elected to the Implementation Committee in December and discussed the possible options available. Members also indicated possibilities for their own positions on the Bureau for 2008.

## **VII. RESULTS OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY STUDY ON OZONE**

11. The Bureau noted that the UK Royal Society had indicated it wished to present the results of its studies on ground-level ozone in the 21<sup>st</sup> century to the Executive Body.

12. The Bureau suggested that the Royal Society be urged to provide information before the Executive Body session and asked the secretariat to suggest to the Society that a short presentation was possible under the item on the Gothenburg Protocol review.

## **VIII. EMISSION INVENTORIES**

13. Mr Ballaman noted that the EMEP Steering Body had finalized its preparation of the technical parts of the Guidelines on Emission Inventories in readiness for their use in 2009. The Working Group on Strategies and Review's ad hoc group of legal experts had considered the extent of the mandatory nature of the Guidelines and had reported that the strength of reporting was through the protocols and associated Executive Body decisions. The Guidelines were better to use the word "should" than "shall".

14. Mr. Dame suggested that the technical part of the Guidelines be adopted through an Executive Body decision as they might be needed for EU Directives. He also stated that the European Commission did not fully agree with the ad hoc group of experts regarding the binding/non-binding nature of the Guidelines. More proposals could be made at the Working Group on Strategies and Review and these would need further investigation. It would therefore not be appropriate for the Executive Body to adopt the non-technical parts of the Guidelines in December.

## **IX. REVIEW AND REVISION OF PROTOCOLS**

15. Mr. Ballaman drew attention to work on the Gothenburg Protocol and the expected completion of its review by the Executive Body in December. He noted the requirements of the Protocol that indicated the need for revision. He pointed out that the current Protocol had two tracks, one for Europe and one for North America. He suggested, as proposed at the "Saltsjöbaden workshop" that a revised protocol might have three tracks, the third for EECCA countries that might not be based upon integrated assessment modelling. A method of engaging EECCA countries was needed and more dialogue with those countries was required.

16. The Bureau discussed how to characterize the Working Group's work for the future, e.g. discussion, negotiation, etc.

17. Mr Ballaman noted that for the Protocol on POPs the Working Group could make a decision on revision or could wait until next year. He proposed that the expedited procedure be forwarded to the Executive Body for its consideration. Amendment of the annexes would be needed for the new substances being reviewed.

18. Mr. Ballaman considered the way forward for the Protocol on Heavy Metals was not clear. The review had been completed but Parties did not seem certain of what to do now. There could be revision to the non-binding annexes. There should also be discussion on how to increase the number of ratifications to the Protocol. He noted the need for guidance in Russian for EECCA countries to support their efforts towards accession.

## **X. FOLLOW UP TO SALTSJOBADEN III**

19. The Bureau noted the new EECCA Action Plan and the proposals for a new group on nitrogen that had resulted from discussions at the “Saltsjöbaden” workshop. How to link with climate change remained an issue. The Working Group on Strategies and Review would have the opportunity to discuss follow-up at its session.

## **XI. OUTREACH**

20. Mr. Bull noted the plans of the GAPF to have a meeting at the time of the Malé Declaration. A presentation for the Malé Declaration would be prepared which would be given by Mr. Lars Nordberg.

21. Mr Williams noted his attendance at a meeting on nitrogen in the Netherlands organized by UNEP. He noted the global interest in the excess nitrogen problem.

## **XII. SECRETARIAT STAFFING**

22. Mr. Bull provided an update of the secretariat staffing noting that Mr Johansson’s position had changed slightly and that his post was now vacated. Recruitment procedures had been initiated for two vacant posts that would provide support to the Convention’s activities.

## **XIII. FUNDING OF PARTICIPATION OF COUNTRIES WITH ECONOMIES IN TRANSITION**

23. The secretariat drew attention to requests it had received, for support to meetings, from delegates of countries not eligible for support under Executive Body decision 2006/13. The Bureau recognized the importance of participation and the need to support the Trust Fund. It agreed that individual cases of “exceptional” support be delegated to the Chair in consultation with the secretariat.

24. The Bureau further recognized that there might be instances of Trust Fund support needed for members of the Implementation Committee from countries eligible for support and agreed this was important and should be included in the Executive Body decision. Also, for members of the Bureau of the Executive Body from countries eligible for support, it agreed that, if funds were sufficient, such support should be made available from the Trust Fund.

#### **XIV. SEE/EECCA PROJECTS**

25. Mr Schneider described an informal meeting held with delegates from EECCA countries at the time of the EMEP Steering Body. The delegates had indicated that the countries were keen to make use of nominated focal points and stressed the importance of using the Russian language in documents. He noted the implications might result in an increased budget but hoped that the new emissions centre would provide better support to the EECCA region.

26. Mr Ballaman noted the importance of the CAPACT project which was now coming to an end. Similar projects, closely linked to the Convention's work, would be very useful in the future.

27. The secretariat drew attention to a project for SEE which it was still negotiating with the Netherlands. It was planned to involve 5 countries with a total estimated cost of about US\$ 900,000

#### **XV. OTHER BUSINESS**

28. The Bureau discussed plans for upcoming meetings.

#### **XVI. DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING**

29. The Bureau agreed that it should meet prior to the twenty-fifth session of the Executive Body. As this was scheduled to start at 3 p.m. on 10 December, the Bureau agreed to meet in the morning of the 10 December.

30. The observer from the European Commission indicated that staff changes had further disrupted possibilities for holding a High-level Coordinating Group meeting. The secretariat and the Commission staff would continue to seek possible dates for a meeting.