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-third session
Geneva, 7–9 September 2009

REPORT OF THE STEERING BODY TO THE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMME FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF THE LONG-RANGE TRANSMISSION OF AIR POLLUTANTS IN EUROPE ON ITS THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraphs</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Introduction</td>
<td>1–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Attendance</td>
<td>2–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Organizational matters</td>
<td>4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Matters arising from recent meetings of the Executive Body and its subsidiary bodies and activities of the EMEP Bureau</td>
<td>7–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>In-depth discussion of activities relevant to the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Progress in activities in 2009 and future work:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Measurements and modelling (acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants, heavy metals, particulate matter, persistent organic pollutants):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Integrated assessment modelling:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Emissions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Hemispheric air pollution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>EMEP strategy for 2010–2019:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Cooperation with other organizations and programmes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Outreach and sharing information with other regions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Financial and budgetary matters:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Workplan for 2010:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Other business:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Closing of the thirty-third session:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. INTRODUCTION

1. The EMEP Steering Body held its thirty-third session from 7 to 10 September 2009 in Geneva.

A. Attendance

2. The session was attended by representatives from the following Parties to the Convention: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America. Representatives of the European Community also attended.

3. Representatives of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the European Environment Agency (EEA), the European Commission and its Joint Research Centre (JRC) and the five EMEP centres (the Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections (CEIP), the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM), the Chemical Coordinating Centre (CCC), the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-East) and the 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 and Oxidant Research Center (ADORC), the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) and the Bromine Science and Environmental Forum (BSEF) were also represented.

B. Organizational matters

4. The Steering Body adopted the provisional agenda as contained in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/1. It regretted that Russian and French translations of the draft agenda had not been made available in time for the meeting.

5. The Steering Body considered the report on its thirty-second session (EB.AIR/GE.1/2008/2). The delegation of Spain proposed amending paragraph 32 of the report, concerning its own intervention, by adding the following text to it: “As regards the monitoring strategy, the Spanish delegation proposed to include PM1 mass measurements in level 2 site measurements because this parameter, principally influenced by combustion sources, was increasingly used in climate studies and likely to be useful for the validation of models. This could also yield information for further review of selection of air quality parameters for future standards. On modelling, the Spanish delegation made the following observations. First, for
validation of PM modelling in Southern Europe it was of special relevance to reproduce mineral dust (anthropogenic and natural). Moreover, the Spanish delegation requested the inclusion of dust parameterization in further modelling activities of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling. Second, it was important to focus on the implementation of modelling and validation of results in the entire EMEP region. The Spanish delegation requested that the modelling validation work was not considered finished until the validation requirements were met in all the modelled area. It emphasized that the reproduction of the Mediterranean conditions was a key issue within the EMEP strategy and future activities.”

6. The Steering Body:
   (a) Re-elected Ms. S. Vidič (Croatia) as Chair;
   (b) Re-elected Mr. J. Macoun (Czech Republic), Mr. Y. Viisanen (Finland), Ms. M. Wichmann-Fiebig (Germany), Ms Z. Ferenczi (Hungary), Mr. X. Querol (Spain) and Mr. P. Grennfelt (Sweden) as Vice-Chairs;
   (c) Agreed to continue allowing representation of the European Commission, as observer, at the meetings of the Bureau.

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

7. A representative of the secretariat provided information on the present status of the Convention and its protocols and the main decisions of the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body in 2008 (ECE/EB.AIR/96 and Adds.1 and 2), including the approval of the revised Guidelines for Reporting Emission Data (ECE/EB.AIR/97) as well as decision 2008/16 on emission data reporting under the Convention.

8. The Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review, reported on the relevant outcomes of its forty-third and forty-fourth sessions¹, providing an update on the revisions of the 1998 Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and the 1999 Gothenburg Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone (Gothenburg Protocol) and the review of the 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals.

9. The Chair of the Working Group on Effects informed the session about the Working Group’s upcoming twenty-eighth session, drawing attention to the following documents: (a) the

¹ ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/94 and ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/96, respectively.
report on the effects of airborne nitrogen (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2009/15) prepared by the Working Group in collaboration with Task Forces on Integrated Assessment Modelling and Reactive Nitrogen; and (b) the report on indicators and targets for air pollution effects (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2009/16) prepared by the Working Group’s Extended Bureau.

10. The Chair presented the summary report on the work of the EMEP Bureau carried out between the Steering Body’s thirty-second and thirty-third sessions (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/12), drawing attention to the decision by the Bureau to change the format of the Steering Body’s sessions, with a focus on one thematic topic proposed by the Bureau, in order to increase the dynamism and interest of the meetings and to present the outcomes of the scientific activities in a more harmonized and integrated manner.

11. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the report on the activities of the EMEP Bureau;

(b) Also took note of the information provided by the secretariat on matters arising from the Executive Body’s twenty-sixth session, as well as that provided by the Chairs of the Working Group on Strategies and Review and the Working Group on Effects;

(c) Based on the information provided by the Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review, concluded that Parties should report emission inventories on the following POPs: polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), dioxins/furans, hexachlorobenzene, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and hexachlorocyclohexane (HCH) (including all isomers). The Steering Body also invited CEIP to adjust accordingly the online reporting templates annexed to the Guidelines for Reporting Emission Data.

III. IN-DEPTH DISCUSSION OF ACTIVITIES RELEVANT TO THE REVISION OF THE GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL

12. The Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling presented the structure for the in-depth discussions of EMEP activities relevant to the revision of the obligations of the Gothenburg Protocol. This included a series of presentations to describe the development of the GAINS (Greenhouse Gas and Air Pollution Interactions and Synergies) model and its coordination with relevant EMEP centres and task forces in view of informing the revision. He emphasized that a key aim of the in-depth discussions was to understand the robustness and possible biases of the integrated modelling approach in supporting the policy negotiations.
13. The Head of CIAM noted the importance of using cost-effective optimization for controlling emissions to reduce environmental and health effects. Ex-post analyses of the sufficiency and effectiveness of abatement would be carried out in collaboration with the Working Group on Effects.

14. CEIP and CIAM concluded that estimates of PM$_{2.5}$ emissions were significantly more uncertain than those of the pollutants regulated by the Gothenburg Protocol. For many countries, PM$_{2.5}$ emission data were lacking or incomplete. However, in many cases reported emissions exceeded the estimates by GAINS, which were derived from statistical data on activity levels. The centres recommended further analysing the substantial differences in emission factors reported by countries.

15. MSC-West concluded that the nitrate chemistry and the meteorological input data had been updated with the best available scientific knowledge. These improvements had not caused systematic changes in source-receptor relationships. MSC-West further noted that the model still substantially and systematically underestimated fine PM (PM$_{2.5}$) concentrations and secondary inorganic aerosols. Possible explanations included missing anthropogenic sources, residence time, transboundary transport lacking knowledge on biogenic production of secondary organic aerosols.

16. The Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution concluded that estimates of the rising background concentrations of ozone in the Northern Hemisphere showed large differences. The best estimate of 1.2 parts per billion (ppb) per decade increase was used in the GAINS model. The Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution recommended sensitivity analyses on higher values. It concluded that the anthropogenic contribution to hemispheric ozone formation might be underestimated. Methane emission reductions anywhere would reduce ozone background concentrations, with the largest cost-effective potential being in developing countries.

17. MSC-West concluded that including ozone flux to forests and vegetation in the GAINS model would prevent a systematic policy bias. Health protection targets would not be sufficient alone to avoid ozone damage to vegetation and forests in the central and northern parts of Europe. Additional data for forests and soils would be needed to assess potential ozone impacts on carbon sequestration in collaboration with the Working Group on Effects.

18. The Task Force on Measurements and Modelling concluded that models still showed a systematic underestimation of the population exposure to PM$_{2.5}$. Urban emission estimates indicated differences between countries for wood-burning and transport emissions. It
recommended improving access to urban input data, e.g. by using satellite information, model comparisons and verification with observational data.

19. The Steering Body concluded that:

(a) Current status of knowledge was comprehensively covered by the EMEP activities, in particular the in-depth discussion confirmed the usefulness of the GAINS model to support the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol. Furthermore, past experience confirmed that emission reduction requirements had not been overestimated; However, any uncertainties had to be communicated clearly;

(b) The modelling framework had improved considerably in recent years together with the input data submitted by Parties. However, further work was necessary to improve PM exposure, the eutrophication of ecosystems, in particular natural areas, and the links with climate change and long-term ozone exposure;

(c) Accuracy of the input data depended fully on the quality of data submitted by Parties, therefore Parties should continue improving their data. Furthermore, current inaccuracies in emission data would require quantitative uncertainty analyses to assess the error propagation in the GAINS model;

(d) Possible systematic biases required additional sensitivity analyses with the EMEP and GAINS models, e.g. on background ozone boundary conditions;

(e) Due to current uncertainties in PM emissions, absolute emission ceilings for PM would be difficult to set, but relative emission reductions would be practical at this stage.

IV. PROGRESS IN ACTIVITIES IN 2009 AND FUTURE WORK

20. The Chair invited the Steering Body to separately discuss each area of work, considering progress made in 2009 with respect to the Convention’s workplan and taking into account the draft workplan for 2010 (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/13).
A. Measurements and modelling (acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants, heavy metals, particulate matter, persistent organic pollutants)

1. Progress by the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and draft revised monitoring strategy

21. The Co-Chair of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, Ms. L. Rouil (France), reported on progress, including the results of the eighth meeting of the Task Force (Paris, 15–16 June 2009) that were presented in document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/3. She drew attention to the outcomes of the two PM and PM speciation-focused field measurement campaigns held during 2008–2009, which had demonstrated that the campaigns were an efficient way for getting new relevant observation data related to specific topics. The Task Force had concurred on the importance of publishing the results of the field campaigns as soon as possible, to allow experts to proceed with their analysis at the national level.

22. Delegations appreciated the Task Force’s broad range of activities and its role in bringing together national modelling communities and in improving mutual understanding and communication, also between the air quality and satellite communities. The delegation of Germany noted, however, that although the meetings of the Task Force were scientific and also open to representatives from scientific communities outside of EMEP, their agenda should be somewhat more linked to the priorities of the Convention, such as the revision of the Gothenburg and POPs Protocols, in order to ensure the best target-oriented results of this work.

23. A representative of CCC presented the draft revised monitoring strategy for EMEP for 2010-2019 as contained in document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/15. He stressed that the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling had discussed the fourth draft of the revised strategy at its meeting in June, and approved its main contents. The Task Force and CCC had also addressed a number of questions and concerns related to the implementation of the new strategy, which was considered challenging by a number of experts.

24. In the discussion that followed, the delegation of Spain indicated that it would have liked the monitoring strategy to include more flexibility as regards some parameters. The Chair pointed out, however, that the strategy already accorded countries much flexibility as to its implementation. The European Community noted that the overall long-term strategy of the Convention was under preparation and that this could lead in the future to a need to adjust the monitoring strategy accordingly, including with a view to establishing links to the global processes under United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Stockholm Convention on POPs and the UNEP mercury programme. Regarding the obligatory monitoring
of PM, the delegation of Germany was in favour of introducing a cut of at PM$_{2.5}$ for more consistency with regulations of the European Union (EU). The Steering Body did not support this proposal, as it has been customary for EMEP to collect all data on PM, without excluding its coarse fraction, and considered this to be particularly relevant in view of protecting human health.

25. The Chair concluded that the new EMEP monitoring strategy was and should be future-oriented and ambitious, because one of its roles was to allow for new scientific developments, but that there was always room for compromises with respect to its implementation. CCC and the Task Force on Measurements and Monitoring were invited to actively support the implementation of the strategy and to address the exemptions and slight delays that were likely to be needed in some cases. The Chair concluded, furthermore, that the contents of the monitoring strategy were unlikely to substantially shift as a result of the future adoption of the long term strategy of the Convention, but that some adjustments could always be made, as needed.

26. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the report by the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, expressing appreciation for its work and for that of MSC-West, MSC-East and CCC;

(b) Invited countries to contribute to the assessment of model responses to emission reduction scenarios by running their atmospheric models in the framework to be defined by the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling;

(c) Welcomed the initiative of MSC-East and the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling to conduct a case study for assessing heavy metal pollution, and invited Parties to volunteer for the study;

(d) Adopted the revised EMEP monitoring strategy and urged Parties to take the necessary steps to ensure its effective implementation;

(e) Invited the Executive Body to approve the monitoring strategy at its twenty-seventh session in December 2009, and called upon Parties to ensure that resources were available for its implementation at the national level;

(f) Expressed its appreciation to CCC for preparing the draft monitoring strategy and welcomed its offer, in collaboration with the Task Force, to provide guidance to national experts
and to assist them in the implementation of the monitoring strategy, including through organizing a workshop on the implementation of the strategy in 2010;

(g) Acknowledged the importance of increasing cooperation with international networks, such as the Global Atmospheric Watch network of the World Meteorological Organization and research programmes in order to benefit from the high-level observations they provide to promote the achievement of the objectives of the monitoring strategy without duplication of efforts. The Steering Body also welcomed the efforts of the Task Force to enhance the dialogue with the satellite and remote-sensing community, including through establishing a joint sub-group;

(h) Welcomed the offer by a Czech scientific centre, RECETOX, to provide assistance to EMEP in monitoring POPs and a strategic partnership to all Parties not covered by any other monitoring centres under the Stockholm Convention on POPs;

(i) Thanked EEA for its cooperation with CCC on near-real time data collection and access, with a view to minimizing the risk of duplication and the possible burden on countries.

2. Progress reports from Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West, Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East and the Chemical Coordinating Centre

27. A representative of MSC-West gave an overview of the activities on monitoring and modelling of acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants, including progress in work at CCC and CIAM, in MSC-West’s own work and on plans for work up to 2010. She also provided information on the meeting of the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen.

28. In the discussion that followed, MSC-West replied to the delegation of Norway that it intended to look in detail into the impact of international shipping emissions and how they would affect the source receptor relationships. It informed the delegation of Germany about its work on fine resolution supported through voluntary projects, stressing that it was up to the EMEP Steering Body to instruct whether this work should be further prioritized in the future. Questioned by the European Commission on the availability of information on the inter-annual variation between the source-receptor relationships, MSC-West explained that the issue had been looked into in the context of transboundary fluxes, to evaluate the variability of the meteorological factors. In any case, the meteorological variability of the emissions was a parameter that had already been included into the GAINS model.

29. A representative of MSC-East presented an overview of MSC-East and CCC activities on monitoring and modelling of POPs and plans for future work. He introduced the Status Report
3/09, focusing on (a) monitoring and modelling assessment of environmental pollution and (b) MSC-East’s contribution to the review of the five new substances proposed to be included into the Protocol on POPs. In the discussion that followed, MSC-East clarified that the EMEP model was able to point out episodic transport events and problem zones, e.g. during forest fires.

30. A representative of CCC introduced the status report 4/09 and presented an overview of activities on atmospheric monitoring and modelling of PM, including progress made with respect to work at MSC-West and CIAM, its own work, the results of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, and plans for work up to 2010. She stressed that the PM concentrations covered for the first time the extended EMEP area, with altogether 50 sites that reported PM data. In addition, according to the GAINS model, residential combustion was the largest source of black carbon and organic carbon, but transport was also an important source of black carbon.

31. The delegation of Spain, supported by the delegation of Cyprus, regretted the lack of data and focus on the Mediterranean countries in the report of CCC, which concentrated mainly on the impact of wood-burning in the Northern and Central Europe that was considered of less relevance to the Southern European countries. The Spanish delegation stressed the necessity of covering the entire EMEP territory. CCC assured that although data from Spanish sites had already been included, the next intensive campaign would focus even more on Southern Europe as well as on the eastern part of the EMEP region. Cyprus was invited to participate in the next campaign. The Chair encouraged further improving the communication between research communities in the different parts of the EMEP region, and including countries in the measurement campaigns in a more balanced way. The Steering Body agreed, moreover, that when selecting the data to show validation of models and origins of the pollutants, the entire region should be covered.

32. The Chair supported the recommendation by the delegation of Germany to opt for a common reference method for elementary carbon/organic carbon (EC/OC) measurement between the EU and EMEP to avoid having countries apply different methods, and to further increase coordination and cooperation to this end.

33. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the Status Reports 1/09, 2/09, 3/09 and 4/09;

(b) Expressed its appreciation to MSC-West, CCC and CIAM for the work on acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants; to MSC-East and CCC for the work on heavy metals; and to MSC-East for the work on POPs and to CCC for the work on PM; and welcomed the progress made.
B. Integrated assessment modelling

34. The Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling presented the work on supporting the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol, in particular in developing the baseline scenario using national data submitted by 13 Parties. The development also used additional data from the 2007 PRIMES energy baseline for the 27 EU Member States and the 2008 World Outlook of the International Energy Agency for countries that have not updated their activity data. He also noted the progress in quantifying the target for 2020 and non-binding aspirational targets for 2050, indicating that particular action would be required on nitrogen emissions.

35. The Head of CIAM presented the baseline scenario development. He noted that the assumptions on economic growth, energy prices and climate policies varied in the 13 national submissions on requested activity data update. These data were based on projections made before the recent economic crisis, and the use of post-crisis economic growth would suggest lower baseline emissions for 2020. He also informed that the new 2009 PRIMES data would be used to construct a coherent scenario for EU Member States. He noted that the application of four key measures in the Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) subregion would provide a significant reduction in health effects of PM.

36. The Steering Body:

(a) Invited CIAM to send the developed baseline data in the GAINS model format to all Parties for validation; encouraged to update agricultural emission data in collaboration with the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen; requested the Parties to respond before the end of 2009; and invited CIAM to present the consolidated baseline for discussion in the thirty-seventh meeting of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, tentatively to be held from 22 to 24 February 2010 in Geneva;

(b) Requested CIAM to explore the ambition levels proposed in the technical annexes developed by the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues in relation to emission levels, costs, environmental endpoints and environmental effects; noted that this technology-oriented analysis was in addition to the already proposed effects-oriented analysis of modelled, optimized scenarios covering the whole geographic scope of EMEP (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/13);

(c) Invited the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and CIAM to collaborate with the Working Group on Effects on environmental target-setting, in particular at the Task Force’s thirty-sixth meeting, to be held on 5 and 6 October 2009 in Laxenburg, Austria; and to inform on the progress at the twenty-seventh meeting of the Executive Body in December
Welcomed the plans to consolidate the baseline scenario in the thirty-eighth meeting of the Task Force, tentatively scheduled to be held from 17 to 19 May 2010 in Dublin, and to analyse the sensitivity analyses on the GAINS model in a workshop, tentatively scheduled to be held in October 2010 in Laxenburg, Austria.

C. Emissions

37. The Chair of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections reported on progress made, including the results of that Task Force’s twenty-first and twenty-second meetings (Milan, Italy, 10–11 November 2008 and Vienna, 11–12 May 2009, respectively)\(^2\), presenting progress made with respect to the updating of the *EMEP/EEA\(^3\) Air Pollutant Emission Inventory Guidebook* (hereinafter, the Guidebook) as well as elements for the draft of its maintenance and improvement plan.

38. 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 CEIP, CIAM and EEA for their work in this area;

(b) Thanked the two Vice-Chairs of the Task Force who had stepped down, Ms. A. Mourleatou (EEA) and Ms. K. Kindbom (Sweden), for their dedicated work, and welcomed Mr. M. Adams (EEA) and Ms. K. Saarinen (Finland) as the new Vice-Chairs of the Task Force;

(c) Expressed its appreciation to the Task Force for its work for improving the Guidebook, and to the European Commission and the EEA for their support in this work;

(d) Adopted the revised and substantially updated Guidebook and recommended its subsequent endorsement to the Executive Body at its twenty-seventh session in December 2009;

---

\(^2\) See the Chair’s report (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/6).

\(^3\) European Environment Agency.
(e) Thanked EEA for having made the updated Guidebook available on the EEA website\(^4\), as well as for its plans to officially launch it jointly with EMEP;

(f) Reiterated the importance of having the updated Guidebook translated into Russian, and urged delegations as well as the Executive Body to identify opportunities to provide funds for carrying out this work during the first half of 2010;

(g) Welcomed the draft elements of an emission inventory Guidebook maintenance and improvement plan; and invited the Task Force to further elaborate the plan on the basis of the feedback provided during and after the session, prior to presenting it for adoption to the Steering Body at its thirty-fourth session in September 2010. The Steering Body also invited delegations to forward further comments to the Chair of the Task Force by the end of March 2010.

39. A representative of CEIP informed the Steering Body about the status of emissions data reporting (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/7) and reported on progress in the inventory improvement programme, in particular as regards the stage 3 in-depth reviews of the emission inventories\(^5\), its own work and the work of CIAM on data quality.

40. In the discussion that followed, representatives of EECCA countries in commented on the proposed future in-depth review of their emission inventories. They agreed on the potential benefits of the exercise for the improvement of their national inventories, but also stressed the difficulties they would have in presenting comprehensive inventories for the review. EECCA representatives expressed their need for assistance in compiling the inventories.

41. The delegation of Norway acknowledged the work undertaken by CEIP. It underlined that emission data used in modelling formed the basis for negotiations e.g. in the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol obligations. It therefore requested that the officially submitted emission trends be reflected in the emission data used for modelling.

42. The Steering Body:

(a) Expressed its appreciation to CEIP for its work in collecting, reviewing, reporting on and publishing emissions and projections submitted under the Convention;


\(^5\) See document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/8 on the Stage 3 in-depth reviews of emission inventories.
(b) Took note of the results of the 2009 reporting round, and urged countries to improve their reporting of sectoral data, activity data and data on large-point sources;

(c) Welcomed the data submissions of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, and Montenegro, which were not yet Parties to the protocols with reporting obligations, and strongly encouraged other non-Parties to submit data. The Steering Body urged delegations and the EMEP centres, in collaboration with the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, to assist countries in EECCA with the data reporting;

(d) Took note with appreciation of the information on the stage 3 in-depth reviews of the emission inventories, including the outcomes of the 2008 voluntary review of the inventories of France, Norway, Portugal and Sweden, and also the preliminary findings from the first compulsory review of the inventories of Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Spain carried out in June 2009;

(e) Thanked the review experts from Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the European Community for their work, and EEA for hosting the review teams;

(f) Urged other Parties to nominate further experts to the roster of review experts, as well as to financially support the participation of representatives from EECCA in the reviews, so as to allow for the successful conducting of the in-depth reviews in the future as well;

(g) Approved a proposed list of Parties to be reviewed in 2010 (Czech Republic, Cyprus, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Switzerland and the United Kingdom) and invited these Parties to make available national experts during the review process;

(h) Approved a tentative schedule for in-depth reviews of Parties to the Convention between 2011 and 2013 as follows: for 2011, Austria, Belarus, Croatia, Estonia, Greece, Iceland, Luxembourg, Malta, Slovenia and Ukraine; for 2012, Georgia, European Community, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; and for 2013, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, France, Montenegro, Norway, Portugal and Sweden. The Steering Body noted that countries that were not Parties to the Protocols were not obliged to participate in the reviews, but were strongly encouraged to do so, with a view to improving the quality of inventories;
(i) Invited the secretariat to forward the tentative schedule for in-depth reviews to the Executive Body at its twenty-seventh session in 2009 for endorsement.

D. Hemispheric air pollution

43. The Co-Chairs of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution reported on the results of: (a) the international workshop on regional and intercontinental air pollution with the focus on Asia (Hanoi, 13–14 October 2008); (b) its fifth meeting (Paris, 19 June 2009); (c) the joint workshop with Task Force on Measurements and Modelling on linkages between regional and global modelling and between air quality and climate (Paris, 17–19 June 2009); and (d) progress in the preparation of the 2010 assessment report. They stressed the importance of focusing on interlinkages between air pollution and climate change not only within the Task Force but also within other task forces and centres. A clear mandate from the EMEP Steering Body would be needed to increase efforts in this field.

44. The delegation of Sweden invited the delegations to a workshop organized by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (“Intermediate climate policies: The contribution of air-pollution policies in relation to climate stabilization and co-control”, Gothenburg, Sweden, 19–21 October 2009).

45. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the progress made in the work of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution on emission and projections, integration of observational evidence and multi-model experiments, as well as noted its important contribution to outreach through holding meetings outside the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) region;

(b) Welcomed the joint activities of the Task Force with the other EMEP task forces and centres, and stressed the importance of these cooperative efforts also in the future;

(c) Invited all Parties to participate in the future work of the Task Force;

(d) Noted the plans of the Task Force to finalize a 2010 assessment report and invited the Task Force to present the outcomes of this report to the Steering Body at its thirty-fourth session for adoption.

6 See report by the Co-Chairs (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/11).

7 For more information, see the workshop’s webpage: www.naturvardsverket.se/airclimconf.
V. EMEP STRATEGY FOR 2010–2019

46. The Steering Body discussed and commented the draft strategy for EMEP for 2010–2019, prepared by the Bureau of the EMEP Steering Body in consultation with the EMEP centres, as requested by the Steering Body at its thirty-second session in 2008.

47. A number of delegations stressed the importance of ensuring the consistency between the new strategy for EMEP and the long-term strategy for the Convention that the Executive Body was expected to adopt in 2010. The delegation of Norway noted that it would have been more appropriate if the adoption of the overall strategy for the Convention had preceded that of the EMEP strategy. The Chair explained that she had been and would continue to be closely consulted in the drafting of the strategy for the Convention and that she had not detected any contradiction or overlap with the EMEP strategy and the Convention strategy. However, the Steering Body agreed to reserve the possibility to adapt the EMEP strategy accordingly, as needed.

48. The delegation of Norway acknowledged the improvements made to the draft strategy since the last version that had been submitted for consideration by the Steering Body at its thirty-second session, appreciating also that several comments it had provided had been taken into account. However, Norway considered that there would still have been room for further improvements to make the document more concise and specific. Although it supported the contents of the chapter on scientific goals of EMEP as such, it considered that the formulation of these goals was likely to be too descriptive to allow for a proper assessment of their accomplishment in the future.

49. During the detailed discussions of the draft strategy, the delegations made a number of specific amendments to its text prior to adopting it with the amendments.

50. The Steering Body

(a) Emphasized that “EMEP” was the short name of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe, and decided that as such, “EMEP” should continue to figure in the titles of the Strategy document as well as of all the other relevant official documents; The Steering Body urged the secretariat to ensure the implementation of this decision when issuing EMEP documents in the future;

(b) Considered the draft strategy for EMEP for 2010–2019, and invited the secretariat to incorporate the proposed changes into the document;

(c) Adopted the strategy with these amendments, noting that the document should
be reconsidered and amended as needed in 2011, following the expected adoption of the long-term strategy for the Convention by the Executive Body in 2010;

(d) Agreed that the strategy should be presented to the Executive Body for approval at its twenty-seventh session in December 2009.

VI. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMMES

51. A representative of the UNECE secretariat presented information on the Working Group on Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, which had operated under the Committee on Environmental Policy of UNECE since 2000 and pursued the objectives of strengthening environmental information and observation capacities in EECCA and South-Eastern Europe (SEE) as well as harmonizing procedures, indicators and methodologies. This work was carried out with a view to assisting EEA develop the pan-European assessment reports issued at the “Environment for Europe” Ministerial Conferences. The next Conference would be held in Astana in 2011. The Working Group’s current activities also included the development of practical guidance to enterprises on environmental monitoring and reporting, and the review of implementation of the recommendations of the UNECE environmental performance reviews.8

52. EEA provided information (in writing) about its new organizational structure that would enable it better deliver the objectives set in its new five-year strategy (2009–2013), as well as about its recent and future publications, including on summer ozone, spatial assessment of air quality in Europe and ground-level ozone assessment. Attention was drawn to the close collaboration of EEA and its European Topic Centre on Air and Climate Change with the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections in the regular updating of the EMEP/EEA Air Pollutant Emission Inventory Guidebook as well as in the review and improvement of annually submitted emission inventories by Parties to the Convention and to the National Emission Ceilings Directive9.

53. The (Joint Research Centre) of the European Community reported on its recent collaboration with the EMEP task forces and centres. Attention was drawn, inter alia, to its active contributions to the work of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollutants on modelling and model intercomparisons and to the activities of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections on emissions.

8 Further information is available at: http://www.unece.org/env/europe/monitoring/index.html.

54. A representative of the Acid Deposition and Oxidant Research Center (ADORC) provided information about recent and planned activities in the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET), drawing attention to the outcomes of the first Periodic Report on the States of the Acid Deposition in East Asia and to the preparation of the second report for 2011. Active cooperation with the Convention was highlighted, including cooperation with the International Cooperative Programmes of the Working Group on Effects and the organization of a joint workshop with the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution. Proposed activities for future cooperation involved contributions to the preparations of the assessment report on hemispheric transport, the exchange of air pollution monitoring data, and participation in cooperative modelling and assessment activities.

55. The delegation of United States of America made available an informal document informing the Steering Body about: (a) its air quality management activities, the NARSTO Multi-pollutant Assessment of the technical challenges of designing and implementing multi-pollutant air quality management with an accountability framework; (b) the study by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences of the significance of international transport of air pollutants for the achievement of environmental policy objectives; (c) a multi-partner field campaign to investigate ammonia bi-directional fluxes for North American conditions and vegetation types; and its activities in the field of modelling and monitoring.

56. 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.

VII. OUTREACH AND SHARING INFORMATION WITH OTHER REGIONS

57. The Chair drew attention to the decision by the Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session in 2007, encouraging its subsidiary bodies to collaborate with relevant experts and organizations from outside the region to share the Convention’s experiences and useful information. To this end, the bodies, task forces, expert groups and programme centres were invited to review all their current activities linked to outreach and to explore opportunities for including items on outreach in their future workplans.

58. The Steering Body referred to the relevant activities presented by the task forces and centres in chapter IV above, as well as to the planned activities included in the draft workplan for 2010.
59. The Steering Body welcomed the activities undertaken with other regions by the task forces and centres, and encouraged the development of further outreach links in the future.

VIII. FINANCIAL AND BUDGETARY MATTERS

60. The secretariat introduced the note on financial and budgetary matters (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/14) informing the Steering Body of the current state of contributions. The note also presented the budget proposal for 2010, prepared on the basis of the decisions of the Bureau, and the 2010 EMEP scale of mandatory contributions. The secretariat also drew attention to issues related to proposed decisions.

61. The Steering Body noted with concern the limited progress made by Ukraine in implementing the two projects through which it was expected to cover its pending arrears for the periods 1992–1994 and 1996–2001, amounting to a total of US$ 343,657: (a) the development a national model for environmental impact assessment of heavy metal emissions; and (b) the establishment of an EMEP monitoring station in close cooperation with CCC. The Steering Body also regretted the inability of Ukraine to respond in a timely manner to the requests of information concerning the implementation of the projects. At its thirty-second session in 2008, the Steering Body, in agreement with the representative of Ukraine, had concluded that the first project was no longer of the same relevance and had requested Ukraine to propose a new focus for it at the Executive Body’s twenty-sixth session or alternatively pay its arrears in cash. In absence of any information from Ukraine, the Executive Body requested Ukraine to provide to the secretariat, in early 2009, the requested information to enable the Bureau of the Steering Body to consider the matter at its meeting in March 2009. Not having received a reply from Ukraine in advance of its meeting, the Bureau decided that Ukraine should cover its arrears by translating into Russian documents of relevance to EECCA countries in the field of EMEP activities, starting with the *EMEP/EEA Air Pollutant Emission Inventory Guidebook*.

62. The delegation of Ukraine informed the Steering Body that it had now completed the “Project on Development of National Model of Estimation of Heavy Metals Emissions Impact on Environment of Ukraine for 1992–1994” (equivalent to $140,989), and that the model could be presented for international use. Concerning the second project, equivalent to $175,205, the Steering Body was informed that the Ministry of Environment Protection of Ukraine planned to conduct additional consultations with CCC, with the aim to choosing the final location of the station and continuing implementation of the project of creating an international EMEP station in the Ukrainian part of the Danube River delta. A letter from Ukraine to the secretariat, containing the above information was also made available to the Steering Body as an informal document.
63. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the status of contributions to the financing of EMEP provided in document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/14 and the additional information provided by the secretariat during the session;

(b) Approved the use of resources by the EMEP centres in 2008, as presented in table 2 of ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/14;

(c) Agreed on the detailed budget for 2010 set out in table 3 and the schedule of mandatory contributions from Parties for 2010, as set out in the last column of table 4 of document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/14;

(d) Also agreed to keep the total budget of CIAM for 2010 at $395,000 and the provisional budgets for 2011 and 2012 at the same level;

(e) Recommended that the Executive Body adopt the 2010 budgets and schedule of contributions;

(f) 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 2010 for carrying out the protocol revisions, including the work on integrated assessment modelling, could be accomplished as foreseen in the workplan;

(g) Invited all Parties which had not yet paid their contributions for 2009 to do so as soon as possible;

(h) Requested Ukraine to take urgent action to cover its long-standing arrears and to provide the secretariat, by February 2010, with detailed information on the implementation of the in-kind contributions through which it is to cover its arrears for 1992–1994 (equivalent to $140,989) and for 1996–2001 (equivalent to $175,205), so they could be considered by the EMEP Bureau at its meeting in 2010.

IX. WORKPLAN FOR 2010

64. The Chair introduced the EMEP draft workplan for 2010 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/13), 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.
65. Delegations and centres proposed amendments to the workplan, and the Steering Body agreed on the changes to be made.

66. 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 2010 as presented in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/13, as amended, and recommended it to the Executive Body for adoption.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

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

XI. CLOSING OF THE THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

68. The Steering Body agreed on the main decisions taken during the session.

69. The thirty-fourth session of the EMEP Steering Body was scheduled to be held from 13 to 15 September 2010 in Geneva.

-------