



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/2  
21 September 2007

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)

Thirty-first session  
Geneva, 3–5 September 2007

**REPORT OF THE STEERING BODY ON THE THIRTY-FIRST SESSION**

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	1 – 3	3
I. Adoption of the agenda .....	4	3
II. Adoption of the report on the thirtieth session.....	5	3
III. Matters arising from recent meetings of the Executive Body and its subsidiary bodies and activities of the EMEP Bureau .....	6 – 13	3
IV. Progress in activities in 2007 and future work.....	14 – 61	5
A. Acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants .....	15 – 20	6
B. Heavy Metals .....	21 – 25	7
C. Particulate Matter.....	26 – 31	8
D. Persistent organic pollutants .....	32 – 36	10
E. Measurements and modelling.....	37 – 47	11
F. Integrated assessment modelling .....	48 – 50	13
G. Emissions .....	51 – 58	14

## CONTENTS (continued)

		<u>Paragraph</u>	<u>Page</u>
	H. Hemispheric air pollution .....	59 – 61	17
V.	Review of the Gothenburg Protocol .....	62 – 65	18
VI.	Cooperation with other organizations and programmes.....	66 – 75	18
VII.	Workplan for 2008 .....	76 – 78	20
VIII.	Financial and budgetary matters.....	79 – 83	21
IX.	Election of officers .....	84	23
X.	Other business .....	85	23
XI.	Closing of the thirty-first session .....	86 – 87	23

## **Introduction**

1. The Steering Body held its thirty-first session in Geneva from 3 to 5 September 2007. The session was attended by representatives from the following Parties to the Convention: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Moldova, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, 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), the European Commission and its Joint Research Centre (JRC) and the four EMEP centres (Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM), Chemical Coordinating Centre (CCC), Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-East) and Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-West)) attended. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET), and the Union of the Electricity Industry (EURELECTRIC) were also represented.
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.1/2007/1.

### **II. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT ON THE THIRTIETH SESSION**

5. The Steering Body adopted the report on its thirtieth session (EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/2).

### **III. MATTERS ARISING FROM RECENT MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE BODY AND ITS SUBSIDIARY BODIES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE EMEP BUREAU**

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-fourth session of the Executive Body, including the adoption of decision 2006/1 on data availability under the Convention.

7. Mr. R. Ballaman (Switzerland), Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review, drew attention to the current status of work related to the review of the three most recent protocols and the follow-up on the action plan for the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA), adopted in 2005. He noted work on the review and evaluation of seven substances proposed for addition to the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and drew attention to planned negotiations in 2008 for a new or a revised protocol. With regard to the review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals, he stressed that the priority for work on modelling and effects remained for the three main metals: cadmium, lead and mercury. Mr. Ballaman reported on the review of the 1999 Gothenburg Protocol, drawing attention to the question of whether to address particulate matter (PM) through the Protocol on Heavy Metals or in a revised Gothenburg Protocol. Mr. Ballaman further informed the session about discussions of the options for strengthening the Emission Reporting Guidelines and the conclusions of an ad hoc group of legal experts on this matter.

8. Mr. T. Johannessen (Norway), Chair of the Working Group on Effects, noted the results of its recent twenty-sixth session (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2007/2). He drew attention to the cooperation between the Working Group on Effects and the EMEP Steering Body, and in particular the collaboration with the International Cooperative Programme (ICP) Forests, ICP Waters, ICP Materials, and ICP Vegetation and the work carried out on health effects. He reported on the results of the latest call for updated critical loads data and stressed the good cooperation with the EECCA countries in updating the data for health effects for heavy metals, ozone and PM.

9. The Chair presented the summary report on the work of the EMEP Bureau between the Steering Body's thirtieth and thirty-first sessions (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/9). He drew attention to the proposals by the Bureau for extending the spatial scales of the EMEP modelling work, including the extension of the EMEP grid to the east and the future change of the EMEP grid projections to the longitude-latitude projection system, thus using the synergies between the two modelling centres. Mr. Schneider also presented the proposal drawn up by the Bureau, at the request of the EMEP Steering Body at its thirtieth session (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2006/2, para. 10(f)), for a structural rearrangement of the work on emissions within EMEP. He also introduced the proposal by the Bureau for an increase in the EMEP budget.

10. Mr. P. Grennfelt (Sweden) reported on the outcomes of the "Saltsjöbaden 3" workshop. He drew attention to the recommendations related to the linkages with climate change issues and to the integrated approach to nitrogen (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/5). Mr. J. Rea (United Kingdom) provided further information about a proposal for the establishment of a task force on reactive nitrogen, stressing that such a task force would take over the work of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement, but would widen the scope of the work and would also link it to other

bodies under the Convention and to other conventions and international organizations dealing with the issues of nitrogen.

11. Mr. F. Raes (JRC) drew attention to the “Gothenburg questions” on linkages between air pollution and climate change issues drafted by the ACCENT network as a follow-up to the “Saltsjöbaden 3” workshop and invited delegations to provide feedback for prioritizing the questions. Mr. R. Maas (the Netherlands), Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, discussed further work on the linkages with climate change and on nitrogen and their implications for the work of the Task Force. The secretariat stressed the importance of effects in the linkages with climate change.

12. Belarus informed the session that they were considering accession to the 1994 Protocol on Sulphur and the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), but stressed the need for further guidance. EECCA countries having specific requests for assistance for accession to protocols were invited to contact the secretariat.

13. 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 Chair of the Working Group on Effects and the Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review;
- (c) 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;
- (d) Took note of the recommendations of the “Saltsjöbaden 3” workshop, and thanked Sweden for organizing it.

#### **IV. PROGRESS IN ACTIVITIES IN 2007 AND FUTURE WORK**

14. The Chair invited the Steering Body to discuss separately each area of work, considering progress made in 2007 with respect to the Convention’s workplan and taking into account the draft workplan for 2008 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/10 and Corr.1), which would be discussed under agenda item 7.

**A. Acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants**

15. Ms. L. Tarrasón (MSC-West) presented an overview of activities on monitoring and modelling of acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants, including progress in work at CCC, work at CIAM, MSC-West's own work and the discussions at the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/3). She made an overview of the status of transboundary pollution in 2005 and the main related findings, including considerable uncertainties relating to the emission data in EECCA countries, measurement data, and model description and parametrizations. She stressed that country-specific reports for Parties from the EECCA region were available in Russian. Ms. Tarrasón noted that the differences between officially reported emission data and the expert estimates were largest in the EECCA countries. Some sources were missing in the official reports from the EECCA countries. The issue was further complicated by the limited amount of observational data from these countries. She stressed the need for training and guidance to the EECCA countries in this respect.

16. Ms. Tarrasón also informed the Steering Body on new developments related to the application of the EMEP model at the national and local scales. The main goals of such projects were to allow national experts to do their own assessments of the origin of local air pollution with consistent boundary conditions and to allow improved effects impact estimates at the national level.

17. She also presented in detail the proposal to extend the EMEP grid to include the EECCA countries as a first step from 2008 and to switch to longitude-latitude projections at a later stage, while stressing the cooperation with the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, especially on emissions and measurements.

18. Mr. D. Simpson (MSC-West) gave a presentation on biology-climate-chemistry interactions and their implications for the EMEP modelling.

19. The Steering Body expressed its satisfaction with the presentation of transboundary air pollution and related uncertainties adopted in this year's Status Report, and recommended the same approach for use in future reports.

20. The Steering Body:

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

(b) Took note of the Status Report 1/07;

(c) Invited MSC-West and MSC-East to proceed with a common plan for extending their work to the global scale and report on progress to the Bureau in 2008;

(d) Agreed on the need to extend the geographical scope of EMEP to include the EECCA countries, and invited MSC-East and MSC-West to include them in their calculations from 2008;

(e) Recommended to MSC-East and MSC-West to switch to longitude-latitude projections as a second step;

(f) Recognized the unresolved issues and biases in modelling and monitoring and invited MSC-West and CCC to initiate work to address these.

## **B. Heavy metals**

21. Mr. O. Travnikov (MSC-East) presented an overview of activities on monitoring and modelling heavy metals, including progress in work at CCC, MSC-East's own work, the discussions of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/3), and plans for work up to 2009. He introduced the EMEP Status Report 2/07 on lead, cadmium and mercury, and drew attention to the comparison of officially reported data with expert estimates. Detailed results of this analysis showed that the difference could be quite significant, both as a national total and in terms of the contribution of the different sectors. With regard to the minimum reporting, he pointed out that there were incomplete data on national totals and limited data on spatial distribution. He also pointed out that in some parts of Europe there were no measurements of heavy metals at all.

22. Mr. Travnikov informed about the implementation of the recommendations of the workshop on the review of the MSC-East model on heavy metals. The evaluation of driving meteorological fields and the extension of the model for the second priority metals were already done. Work was ongoing on implementing other recommendations, such as the use of the European Centre for Medium-range Weather Forecasting (ECMWF) data for meteorological fields pre-processing. He outlined the uncertainties and further research necessary for the improvement of dust suspension parametrization, the refinement of soil properties data, and data collection on heavy metals content in soils. In presenting the assessment of the heavy metals pollution in 2005, Mr. Travnikov demonstrated the usefulness of high resolution temporal data in understanding some of the discrepancies between the model performance and the measured data.

23. M. Travnikov further presented the hemispheric modelling of mercury and noted the cooperation with the Task Force on the Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, as well as the proposed workplan items in relation to the global model development.

24. In the discussion that followed, MSC-East explained their plans to address the large discrepancies between officially submitted data and expert data, but expressed the hope that the issue would be addressed in depth through the reorganized work on emissions.

25. The Steering Body:

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

(b) Took note of the Status Report 2/07;

(c) Noted with concern that there were still discrepancies between the model results and measured concentrations when using data reported by Parties, and invited MSC-East and CCC to explore the issue further in close collaboration with the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections;

(d) Welcomed the steps taken by MSC-East to implement the recommendations of the workshop for the review of the MSC-East model for heavy metals;

(e) Welcomed the further work on the extension of the model to the global scale.

### **C. Particulate matter**

26. Mr. K. Tørseth (CCC) presented an overview of activities on atmospheric monitoring and modelling of particulate matter (PM), including progress in work at MSC-West and CIAM, his organization's own work, the discussions within the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/3), and plans for work up to 2009.

27. Mr. R. Derwent (United Kingdom), Co-Chair of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, presented the PM Assessment report and the answers given about the current level of confidence in the PM modelling.

28. Mr. Simpson presented the latest developments under the CARBOSOL project, giving an overview of the situation of carbonaceous aerosols in Europe. He stressed that the data were still

limited, but observations suggested a very strong component of biogenic secondary aerosol in summertime and a strong contribution from wood burning in winter.

29. In the discussion that followed, Mr. A. Zuber (European Commission) stressed the policy relevance of PM and expressed concern that the message given by the conclusions of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling might be too negative. Ms. M. Wichmann-Fiebig (Germany), Co-Chair of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter, was of the opinion that the PM Assessment report was an excellent way to complement the work of the Expert Group. She considered that the report reflected the current status of the knowledge on PM realistically and did not see the message given by its conclusions as negative. Mr. Ballaman drew attention to paragraph 28 of the report of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/3), stressing the positive note contained in it. Mr. Grennfelt pointed out that monitoring of PM had achieved a high degree of mass closure since the review of the unified EMEP model in 2003.

30. The Steering Body agreed that it should not send a message implying that knowledge on PM was uncertain and that it was premature to move ahead with exploring abatement options.

31. The Steering Body:

- (a) Noted with appreciation the work done by MSC-West, CIAM and CCC on PM, and welcomed the progress made;
- (b) Took note of Status Report 4/07 and the PM Assessment Report;
- (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 high degree of mass closure achieved in monitoring;
- (e) Took note of the significant progress achieved in PM modelling and the good level of agreement for PM<sub>2.5</sub>, noted that the main limitations were now the primary emissions (e.g. wood combustion, traffic) in winter, and secondary organic aerosol in summer, and agreed with the need for supplementary measurements (e.g. HNO<sub>3</sub>, levoglucosan, <sup>14</sup>C) when interpreting model-measurement comparisons;

(f) Agreed that despite remaining uncertainties in PM emissions and modelling, available data could be utilized in integrated assessment modelling to identify cost-effective emission reduction strategies to reduce PM exposure;

(g) 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**

32. Mr. V. Shatalov (MSC-East) presented an overview of activities on monitoring and modelling of persistent organic pollutants (POPs), including progress in work at CCC, MSC-East's own work, the discussions within the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/3), and plans for work up to 2009. He drew attention to EMEP Status Report 3/07.

33. Mr. Shatalov presented the further development of the MSC-East model for POPs following the recommendations of the workshop on the model review, in particular on the refinement of data on aerosol and OH-radical, the modification of aerosol spatial distribution, the trajectory analysis, and the approach to inverse modelling and the contribution of re-suspension.

34. Mr. Shatalov also presented progress in the work on source-receptor relationships at the regional level and the cooperation with the Task Force on POPs, the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution and national experts, as well as its contribution to the REACH<sup>1</sup> process.

35. In the discussion that followed it was pointed out that monitoring of POPs would probably improve in the European Union (EU) countries due to recently enacted EU legislation. It was also noted that the passive sampling campaign for POPs was still ongoing and the evaluation would take place next year. All measurements would be analysed at a central laboratory. In conclusion, it was stressed that to provide reliable tools for policymaking, MSC-East needed further improvements in the emissions and monitoring data.

36. The Steering Body:

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

---

<sup>1</sup> EC regulation on the registration, evaluation, authorization and restriction of chemical substances.

- (b) Took note of Status Report 3/07;
- (c) Invited MSC-East to take all necessary steps to implement the recommendations of the workshop on the review of its model on POPs;
- (d) Noted the gaps in monitoring in different environmental compartments, and urged Parties, in close collaboration with CCC, to make efforts to fill in these gaps;
- (e) Noted that there were considerable uncertainties in the emission data and invited Parties to enhance their efforts to report reliable data;
- (f) Encouraged MSC-East and CCC to continue their cooperation with the Task Force on POPs, the Stockholm Convention on POPs, the EC in the context of the REACH regulation, and other relevant organizations on the issues of POPs.

#### **E. Measurements and modelling**

37. Ms. L. Jalkanen (WMO), Co-Chair of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, reported on progress, including the results of its eighth meeting, held in Dessau, Germany, from 25 to 27 April 2007 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/3).
38. The delegation of the United Kingdom announced that it would no longer lead the Task Force and that Mr. Derwent would step down as Co-Chair. The delegation of France announced that it would take over the lead, with Ms. L. Rouil replacing Mr. Derwent as Co-Chair.
39. Ms. Rouil drew attention to the plans for work for 2008 as presented in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/3, adding the item of the linkages between air pollution and climate change.
40. Mr. Tørseth reported on the national implementation of the monitoring strategy, drawing attention to the three-level approach introduced in it. He also gave an overview of the achievements of the monitoring strategy, in particular the increased awareness, the improvements with aerosol supersites, the improvements of the spatial coverage, and the intensive measurement campaigns. He highlighted in particular the establishment of new monitoring sites in the EECCA region (in Kazakhstan, Moldova, Georgia and Armenia), with support from Norway. Mr. Tørseth stressed that, along with cooperation with the Group on Earth Observations (GEO), the Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS) and the Global Monitoring for Environment and Security (GMES), synergies with monitoring for climate change should be taken into account in the future development of the EMEP monitoring. He

drew attention to challenges such as the unresolved issues of eutrophication, PM, photo-oxidants, heavy metals, POPs and acidification.

41. Mr. Tørseth introduced an approach for the revision of the strategy for the period after 2009, stressing that it represent a number of adjustments rather than a major revision; he noted it should be closely linked to the revision of the EMEP strategy and should be carried out with the active involvement of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, and the Steering Body. In terms of a timetable, he pointed out that the current strategy should be reviewed in 2008 for identification of gaps and the new strategy should be finalized by 2009. He also suggested that the overall EMEP Strategy should be reviewed.

42. The secretariat stressed the importance of the EMEP monitoring data for the effects-oriented work and recommended that the Working Group should be consulted in the revision process. It was agreed that the practical arrangements for this would be discussed at a joint meeting of the Bureaux of the Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects.

43. The delegation of Ireland welcomed the cooperation with GMES and GEOSS and provided updated information on their recent meetings.

44. The delegation of Georgia expressed its gratitude to Norway for the establishment of its first monitoring station and announced that Georgia had started preparations for accession to the EMEP Protocol.

45. The delegation of the EC announced that the European network of excellence for atmospheric composition change (ACCENT) considered providing a broader scientific support to the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling. The delegation of the United States welcomed the possibility of further cooperation with regional modelling groups in North America.

46. The delegation of Germany agreed with the proposed approach for revising the EMEP monitoring strategy, including the importance of linking with other monitoring networks and programmes, but reminded participants that such programmes may have different aims, site selection criteria, and references and methodologies which might not fit the EMEP criteria, and therefore this should be kept in mind if there was any exchange of data with them.

47. The Steering Body:

- (a) Took note of the report by the Task Force, expressing appreciation for its work and that of CCC, MSC-West, MSC-East and CCC;
- (b) Expressed its gratitude to the United Kingdom for leading the Task Force and to Mr. Derwent for his valuable contribution as its Co-Chair, and welcomed the proposal by France to lead the Task Force;
- (c) Welcomed the progress achieved in the national implementation of the monitoring strategy, including its extension to the EECCA countries, and urged Parties to continue their efforts towards full implementation of the strategy by 2009;
- (d) Welcomed the proposal to hold a workshop on the synthesis of the new monitoring data obtained through the strategy and the modelling activities of the EMEP centres to mark the completion of the current strategy;
- (e) Invited the Task Force to scrutinize the implementation of the current strategy and identify gaps as a basis for revising it;
- (f) Invited the Bureau to review the EMEP strategy with a view to identifying the needs for revising it and report back at its thirty-second session.

#### **F. Integrated assessment modelling**

48. Mr. Maas, presented recent activities on integrated assessment modelling and the results of the workshop “Cost-effective control of urban air pollution”. He noted that the GAINS model, enlarged from the RAINS model to capture greenhouse gases in addition to air pollutants, employed multi-pollutant abatement measures instead of earlier single-pollutant controls, however it gave the same optimization results as the RAINS model, if run in the traditional mode. He introduced a draft report of the Task Force on the review of the Gothenburg Protocol and stressed the need for more ratifications of the Protocol. He also noted the importance of the emissions from international shipping, which were currently relatively large compared to land-based emissions.

49. Mr. M. Amann (CIAM) described the identification of uncertainties in baseline emission scenarios, including the need for countries to harmonize their national data updates with their climate policies and the necessary improvements in data quality of data from some non-EU countries. He also drew attention to some unexplained differences in some per capita emissions of PM<sub>2.5</sub> between different EU member States. Although the urban increments of PM<sub>2.5</sub> required

more observational data for further validation, these had little impact on optimized emission ceilings.

50. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of progress in integrated assessment modelling, in particular the background document for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol prepared by the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling;

(b) Took note of the report of the Task Force, expressing its appreciation to the Chair, the lead country and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), which hosted CIAM;

(c) Took note of the results of the first phase of the review of the GAINS model and the methodological changes made to it, while keeping compatibility with earlier results from the RAINS model, and welcomed preparations for a full review (phase 2) of the GAINS model;

(d) Encouraged a stronger involvement of the EECCA countries in integrated assessment modelling and invited the Executive Body to urge non-EU countries to provide up-to-date validated national information for use in the development of the emission control scenarios;

(e) Took note of the recommendations of the workshop on cost-effective control of urban air pollution, in particular the need to further scrutinize the assumptions and the data used in the city-delta approach and the need for further information;

(f) Welcomed the plans to hold a workshop on integrated assessment modelling of nitrogen from 28 to 30 November 2007 at IIASA in Laxenburg, Austria, and recommended to the Bureau of the Executive Body that it include the workshop in its workplan for 2007.

## **G. Emissions**

51. The Chair introduced the proposals by the Bureau on the reorganization of the emissions work under the Convention, allocation of additional funds to this work from the EMEP budget, and the establishment of a new EMEP emission centre that would closely collaborate with the Task Force on Emission Inventories and the other EMEP centres. He drew attention to the offer made by Austria to host such a centre. Mr. O. Hov (MSC-West) highlighted the benefits of the proposed reorganization in terms of the cost-effectiveness of the emission work, the quality of the emission data, and the future strategic needs of emission abatement, taking into account the

links between air pollution and climate change. MSC-West expressed its willingness to cooperate closely with the new centre in 2008 to ensure a smooth transition period. Mr. M. Ritter (Austria) informed the session that priority tasks for the new centre would include assessment of the needs of the Parties and improvement of the quality of the emission inventories in the EMEP area, including through data verification, harmonization of the emission factors, and enhanced dialogue with the countries in EECCA and South-East Europe.

52. Mr. Ballaman stressed the need for capacity building activities to support countries efforts in providing data. Ms. Bieber (Germany) drew attention to the role of the new centre in supporting the Implementation Committee in checking compliance by Parties with their reporting obligations

53. Ms. K. Rypdal (Norway), Chair of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, reported on progress, including the results of the seventeenth and eighteenth meetings of the Task Force (Thessaloniki, Greece, 31 October–2 November 2006 and Dessau, Germany, 23–24 May 2007).

54. She informed the Steering Body that the Task Force, in collaboration with the European Topic Centre on Air and Climate Change (ETC-ACC) and MSC-West, had finalized its work in revising the *Emission Reporting Guidelines* and its annexes, which include definitions, reporting templates and a recommended outline for the Informative Inventory Reports (IIRs). The question on the legal standing of the *Guidelines* and a number of issues with policy implications had been referred to the Working Group on Strategies and Review. The Netherlands had proposed that the *Guidelines* not cover POPs that have been phased out. Mr. Ballaman noted that the *Guidelines* were only legally binding through existing protocol obligations. He also referred to Executive Body decisions 2002/10 and 2005/1, which provided legally binding effect to protocols. He noted that in line with the provisions in the Gothenburg Protocol, Parties chose to report either on fuel used or on fuel sold.

55. Mr. Rea (United Kingdom) noted the importance of projections and indicated that the United Kingdom led an expert panel on projections of the Task Force on Emission Inventories. Following discussions, the Steering Body agreed that to analyse links between air pollution and climate change, it would be useful to consider long-term targets. It recommended that the revised *Guidelines* invite Parties to report on projections for 2030 and 2050.

56. Ms. Rypdal presented progress made in the restructuring and updating of the *EMEP/CORINAIR Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook* by EEA, EMEP and the EC in collaboration with the Task Force. She also reported that Germany had offered to complete the

*Guidebook* for heavy metals and stressed that a similar offer for POPs was desirable. A new draft of the *Guidebook* would be presented for consideration by the Steering Body in 2008.

57. The Steering Body was informed on the further development of the methods and procedures for the technical review of emission inventories. New elements included centralized in-depth stage 3 reviews to assist Parties in improving their national inventories and providing the Steering Body and the Implementation Committee with an assessment of the quality of the quantitative and qualitative information submitted.

58. The Steering Body:

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

(b) Welcomed the proposals by its Bureau regarding the reorganization of the emissions work under the Convention and the establishment of a new EMEP centre for emissions and recommended that the Executive Body accept the offer of the Umweltbundesamt Wien to host the new centre. It invited MSC-W and Umweltbundesamt Wien to cooperate closely during 2008 to ensure a smooth transition and continuity for the Parties;

(c) Took note of preparations under way for the next meeting of the Task Force and appreciated the focus on heavy metals;

(d) Welcomed the enhanced focus on projections, including through the Task Force's establishment of an expert panel on projections;

(e) Invited Parties to report their emission data in the next reporting round (by the deadline of 15 February 2008) in accordance with the templates available on the EMEP website, to use the electronic checking tool REPDAB to verify submissions before sending them, to submit Informative Inventory Reports (IIR) by 15 March 2008, and stressed the importance of including emission data on POPs, heavy metals and PM;

(f) Stressed the importance of reviewing the emission data and approved the proposals on the scope, responsibilities, methods and procedures for the emission inventory reviews, noted that the review process would have resource requirements, and invited Parties to contribute;

(g) Welcomed the progress in revising the *EMEP/CORINAIR Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook* and the support for this process from the European Commission and Germany, and recommended the endorsement of the updated chapters on PM, emissions from cars and road transport;

(h) Stressed that EMEP would benefit from mandatory reporting of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> and a mandatory requirement to prepare IIRs;

(i) Recommended that the Executive Body should adopt the revised *Emission Reporting Guidelines*, bearing in mind that further discussions on non-technical issues will take place at fortieth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review and that the revised *Guidelines* and its templates would be the basis of reporting as of 2009.

## **H. Hemispheric air pollution**

59. Mr. T. Keating (United States), Co-Chair of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, reported on the third meeting of the Task Force held in Reading, United Kingdom, from 30 May to 1 June 2007 (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/12), (b) the results of the workshop on emission inventories and projections, held in Beijing in October 2006; (c) the workshop on integrated observation for assessing hemispheric transport of air pollution, held in Geneva in January 2007; (d) the conclusions of the interim assessment report (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/13); and (e) plans for future work.

60. Mr. Keating drew attention to the findings of the interim report, noting that a draft of the complete report was available at [www.htap.org](http://www.htap.org). He noted that the results in the report demonstrating the importance of hemispheric transport, especially for fine particles and for ozone. He also highlighted the recommendations of the report that stressed the need for an integrated approach using observations, emissions and models, and that listed the specific challenges remaining for the Task Force.

61. The Steering Body:

(a) Thanked the lead Parties for their efforts and expressed appreciation for the work accomplished by the Task Force;

(b) Took note of the progress made in the work of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution and invited it to proceed with its work as planned;

(c) Encouraged a more active participation of national experts in the work of the Task Force;

(d) Endorsed the findings of the interim report of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/13), and agreed to forward it to the Executive Body.

## **V. REVIEW OF THE GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL**

62. The secretariat introduced the main review document for the Gothenburg Protocol Review (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/6).

63. Mr. Maas drew attention to the draft report on the review of the Protocol prepared by the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling.

64. The Steering Body discussed and provided comments and recommendations for finalizing the documents and submitting them to the twenty-fifth session of the Executive Body in December 2007.

65. The Steering Body:

(a) Approved the relevant conclusions of the Gothenburg Protocol review documents;

(b) Invited the secretariat to submit the documents as amended to the Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session;

## **VI. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMMES**

66. Mr. Keating introduced the invitation to the Convention from the GEO secretariat to become a participating organization of GEO, noting the common interests of GEO and the Convention and the willingness of GEO to support the mission of the Convention. Cooperation had already been established at the working level with the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution through its co-hosting with GEO of the Workshop on Integrated Observations for Assessing Hemispheric Air Pollution in January 2007. The Bureau agreed that a more formal relationship between GEO and the Convention would benefit EMEP and the Task Force.

67. EEA noted some recent processes which might be of interest to the Convention. It was noted that EEA would be running the European Commission's air data centre and attention was drawn to its next five-year strategy. 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 in the inventory review and improvement programme, as well as its contribution to the compilation of the PM assessment report.

68. The JRC (Joint Research Centre) of the EC reported on its recent contributions to the activities of the EMEP task forces and its collaboration with the EMEP centres. Attention was drawn to its support to the implementation and further development of the EMEP monitoring strategy (e.g. artifact-free organic carbon/elemental carbon aerosol monitoring, linking ground-based and satellite-based aerosol measurements). Its contribution to the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution (e.g. the organization of model intercomparisons and the EDGAR-HTAP global emission inventory) and the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (PM assessment report) was also highlighted.

69. The UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific presented information about the activities on regional air pollution in Asia. The representative informed the session of the progress of activities related to the Atmospheric Brown Cloud (ABC), the Malé Declaration, and the Global Atmospheric Pollution Forum. He also identified potential areas for collaboration between developing networks in Asia and EMEP: (a) technology transfer for monitoring; (b) harmonization of guidelines and methodologies; and (c) joint work.

70. EANET provided information about its recent activities, including first Periodic Report finalized in 2006, which evaluated the development of the network over the previous five years, discussions on an appropriate instrument and its legal status to provide a sound basis for financial contribution, and a strategy on EANET Development for the period 2006–2010 monitoring activities and data reporting procedures. The existing cooperation between EANET and the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution and the Working Group on Effects (ICP Forests) was highlighted and future possibilities for intensified cooperation with EMEP were outlined, including through holding a Task Force workshop in Asia next year, an exchange of air pollution data, participation in meetings and activities concerning EMEP, and cooperation in monitoring activities in Central Asia.

71. WMO informed the session about some activities during the past year. Attention was drawn to the publication of the Global Atmosphere Watch (GAW) strategic plan for the period 2008–2015. It was stressed that WMO had been very active in building expertise for sand and dust storm warning systems, with nodes in Barcelona, Beijing and Toronto. Predictive capability was being improved in several disaster risk reduction projects. The GAW Urban Research Meteorology and Environment Project was participating in the Shanghai Multi-hazard Early Warning System, which was expected to provide enhanced operational forecasts. The importance of collaboration between GAW and EMEP was stressed, especially by the co-chairing the Task

Force on Measurements and Modelling and continuing interaction with the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution.

72. UNEP Chemicals introduced the UNEP Mercury programme, drawing attention to a decision to update information on emission sources, fate and transport, and measures for reducing emissions. An open-ended working group would explore options for addressing the priority areas in the future, including though new or existing voluntary or legally binding measures. UNEP would welcome possibilities to cooperate with relevant bodies such as the EMEP centres and task forces in the preparation of a report on mercury emissions.

73. The delegation of the United States updated information on analyses being performed for an upcoming review of its national ambient air quality standards, the preparation of a NARSTO draft assessment report by spring 2008 and a multi-partner field campaign in North Carolina to investigate ammonia bidirectional fluxes for North American conditions and crop types. The development of a 2008 version of the CMAQ model and the completion of a mercury model intercomparison were also presented.

74. 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. It drew attention to the 2006 AMAP Assessment of Acidification, Arctic Haze and Acidification Effects in the Arctic, which was based on data from the Working Group on Effects and EMEP.

75. The Steering Body:

(a) 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;

(b) Welcomed the offer by the GEO secretariat and recommended to the Executive Body to accept the invitation to join GEO as an official participating organization.

## **VII. WORKPLAN FOR 2008**

76. The secretariat introduced the EMEP draft workplan for 2008 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/10 and Corr.1), 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.

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

78. The Steering Body:

(a) Requested the secretariat to amend the workplan to reflect the decisions taken by it during the present session and the suggestions made by delegations under this agenda item;

(b) Agreed its draft workplan for 2008 as presented in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/10, as amended, and recommended it to the Executive Body for adoption.

### **VIII. FINANCIAL AND BUDGETARY MATTERS**

79. The secretariat introduced the note on financial and budgetary matters (EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/11) informing the Steering Body on the current state of contributions. The note also presented the budget proposal for 2008 prepared on the basis of the decisions of the Bureau. The Chairman introduced the proposed increase in the EMEP budget and its distribution. The secretariat drew attention to the 2008 EMEP scale of mandatory contributions based on the 2007 United Nations scale of assessments and the proposed increased budget. The secretariat also drew attention to issues related to proposed decisions.

80. The Steering Body noted with concern the lack of information from Ukraine on progress in the implementation of the two projects, approved by the Steering Body to cover Ukraine's arrears for the periods 1992–1994 and 1996–2001, amounting to a total of US\$ 343,657.

81. The delegation of the EC supported the proposed increase of the EMEP budget, but noted that additional resources would be needed by countries in order to carry out the envisaged activities.

82. The delegation of Germany informed the session that it was still in the process of investigating support for such an increase now and in the future. It expressed a reservation with regard to the proposed increase of the budget and its contribution for 2008, calculated on the basis of the 2007 United Nations scale of assessments.

83. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the status of contributions to the financing of EMEP provided in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/11 and the additional information provided by the secretariat during the session;

- (b) Approved the use of resources by the EMEP centres in 2006 as presented in Table 2 of EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/11;
- (c) Approved the 2006 contribution in kind from Belarus;
- (d) Agreed to increase the total budget of EMEP to \$2,358,700 for the period 2008–2010;
- (e) Agreed on the detailed budget for 2008 set out in Table 3 of EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/11 and the schedule of mandatory contributions from Parties for 2008, as set out in the last column of Table 4 of that document;
- (f) Also agreed on increasing the total budget of CIAM for 2008 to \$395,000 and on keeping the provisional budgets for 2009 and 2010 at the same level;
- (g) Recommended that the Executive Body adopts the 2008 budgets and the revised 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 2008 for carrying out the protocol reviews and revisions and 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 2007 to do so as soon as possible;
- (j) Invited all Parties to pay their arrears without delay;
- (k) Recommended to the Executive Body to amend the EMEP Protocol by adopting, in accordance with article 4, paragraph 3, of the Protocol, the revised annex set out in the annex to document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2007/11;
- (l) Requested Ukraine to inform the secretariat in writing of its intention to implement the project on the development of a national model for environmental impact assessment of heavy metals emissions, approved by the Steering Body in 2001, and the project for the establishment of an international benchmark station for EMEP background monitoring approved by the Steering Body in 2004 to cover its arrears, or alternatively pay its arrears in cash.

## **IX. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

84. The Steering Body re-elected Mr. Schneider (Austria) as Chair. It also re-elected Mr. Grennfelt (Sweden), Mr. Rea (United Kingdom), Ms. S. Vidic (Croatia), Mr. K. Wieringa (Netherlands) and Ms. Wichmann-Fiebig (Germany) as Vice-Chairs. The Steering Body agreed that it should invite a representative from the European Commission to attend the meetings of its Bureau.

## **X. OTHER BUSINESS**

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

## **XI. CLOSING OF THE THIRTY-FIRST SESSION**

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

87. The thirty-second session of the EMEP Steering Body was scheduled to take place from 8 to 10 September 2008.