



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2009/13  
18 June 2009

Original: ENGLISH

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

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

Working Group on Strategies and Review

Forty-fifth session  
Geneva, 31 August–4 September 2009  
Item 6 of the provisional agenda

**EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY**

**PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACTION PLAN FOR EASTERN  
EUROPE, CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIA**

Note by the secretariat

**INTRODUCTION**

1. At its forty-second session, the Working Group on Strategies and Review requested the secretariat to update document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/11 on progress in the implementation of the Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) and to present it at the forty-fifth session of the Working Group. The Working Group also requested a document on the outcomes of the informal consultations of EECCA and South-East European (SEE) countries, held in conjunction with its forty-third and forty-fourth sessions.

2. Part I of this note summarizes actions taken since the forty-second session of the Working Group. Part II presents an overview of the outcomes of the informal consultations of EECCA and SEE countries on obstacles to ratification of the 1998 Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), the 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol<sup>1</sup>, prepared by the delegation of the Czech Republic.

## **I. SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE THE FORTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE WORKING GROUP**

3. On 2 December 2008, a delegation from the Executive Body Bureau and the secretariat, including the Chairman of the Executive Body, the Chairman of the Working Group on Strategies and Review, a representative of the secretariat and a Regional Advisor of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), visited the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of the Russian Federation. The goal of the visit was to discuss how to improve that country's involvement with the Convention. It included a meeting chaired by Mr. S. Ananiev, Deputy Minister of Natural Resources and Environment, and was attended by some 25 participants including a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The meeting discussed how to promote more active work concerning accession to the Protocols and emphasized the importance of flexibility mechanisms such as differentiated compliance schedules and the implementation of technical annexes.

4. At the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body in December 2008, the delegation of the Russian Federation offered to hold a special session of the Executive Body in Saint Petersburg in April 2010 to promote the active participation of EECCA countries and to highlight the Convention's thirtieth anniversary.

5. The delegation of the Russian Federation also presented a project for assisting EECCA countries with accession to the Convention's Protocols. The project proposal was further elaborated and presented at the forty-fourth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review. The project consisted of five stages and amounted to a total of €40,000. The Working Group noted that only partial funding was available from the Russian Federation for the project's implementation, and invited Parties to explore ways and means to financially support the project.

6. A kick-off meeting on 25 February 2009 in Belgrade marked the start of the Dutch-funded project aimed at assisting SEE countries with implementing and ratifying the Convention's protocols. The meeting provided the countries with the very much needed practical

---

<sup>1</sup> 1999 Gothenburg Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone.

solutions to reaching the project objectives. Since the meeting, the work of the countries has been focused on preparing the national action plans, whose final versions should be submitted to the secretariat by 1 September 2009. To ensure that all the countries meet the agreed deadline, the secretariat has maintained regular contact with the countries, receiving information about the progress achieved as well as the problems encountered. Having seen that some countries faced more difficulties and could benefit from learning about the actions undertaken by their neighbours, the secretariat suggested organizing a consultation meeting between the countries in the beginning of July.

7. The Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Moldova designated a new beneficiary organization, the Carbon Fund Office, to be the implementing agency for the project funded by the Czech Republic to strengthen the implementation of the Gothenburg Protocol. This caused some delay with the project's start date, planned for February 2009. The secretariat took the necessary steps to establish new terms of reference and grant proposal. The project is expected to start in July 2009.

8. A tutorial workshop on the GAINS<sup>2</sup> model was organized by the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM) of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP) in close cooperation with the Swedish Institute for Environmental Research (IVL) from 23 to 25 February 2009 in Laxenburg, Austria. The workshop sought to offer insights into methodology as well as practical hands-on experience to users of the GAINS model. The primary audience included national experts who analysed and processed data for the whole air pollution cycle, in particular those from the EECCA countries that were included in the current version of the GAINS model. Presentations and training introduced the GAINS methodology of calculating emissions of air pollutants, costs of emission control strategies and the resulting environmental impacts. The principles of searching for cost-efficient emission ceilings, as used in the review of the Gothenburg Protocol and the proposed revision of the National Emission Ceilings Directive of the European Union (EU), were also presented.

9. The Czech Republic, as the Presidency of the EU, organized, with help of a representative of Bulgaria and the secretariat, two informal consultation meetings with representatives of EECCA and SEE countries in connection with forty-third and the forty-fourth sessions of the Working Group on Strategies and Review. The meetings were held with the goal of finding out in more detail the possible obstacles for these countries in becoming Parties to the Convention's three most recent Protocols. Particular importance was given the

---

<sup>2</sup> Greenhouse gas – air pollution interactions and synergies.

identification of the right flexibility measures in options for revisions of the Protocols. The meetings also sought to provide direction for the steps that might be taken by EECCA and SEE countries to overcome problems encountered with ratification of the Protocols. The active political engagement of EECCA and SEE could be considered one of prerequisites for successful conclusion of the Protocols' revision, and therefore would be beneficial for the whole UNECE region. A detailed overview of the outcomes of the consultations is presented in part II below.

## **II. OUTCOMES OF THE INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF EASTERN EUROPE, CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIA AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE REGARDING OBSTACLES TO RATIFICATION OF THE PROTOCOL ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS, THE PROTOCOL ON HEAVY METALS AND THE GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL**

### **A. First consultation meeting (9 March 2009)**

10. An informal questionnaire sent to EECCA and SEE countries prior to the forty-third session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review (Geneva, 9–13 March 2009) served as a background document for the first consultation meeting on 9 March 2009 in Geneva. Due to the lack of sufficient time for detailed discussion at that meeting, the EECCA and SEE countries were invited to provide to the Czech Presidency of the EU with additional information on the issues covered by the questionnaire by 30 March 2009. Two countries sent further replies to the questionnaire.

11. The informal questionnaire consisted of six parts. Part one related to (a) bans or limits of substances for use and production in the Protocol on POPs (article 3.1, annexes I and II) and (b) bans and restrictions on certain products in the Protocol on Heavy Metals (unleaded gasoline and mercury products, article 3.3). The questionnaire asked whether the countries had legislation in place to ban or limited substances or whether they would need to implement this kind of legislation first. Furthermore, the countries were asked to explain barriers related to the ban or limitation of substances and to give some suggestions to overcome them. Part two related to the obligations to destroy or dispose waste containing POPs (articles 1.b and 3.3 of the Protocol on POPs). This part included a question on whether and why the countries had difficulties with these obligations, and encouraged the countries to provide suggestions on how to address these difficulties.

12. Part three related to the obligations to apply best available technologies (BAT) and emission limit values (ELVs) for new and existing stationary installations, which are contained in all three Protocols. Countries were asked if they had legislation in place that would allow them to transpose ELVs and BAT from the Protocols into their legislation, whether they agreed that

new sources should be state-of-the-art, and whether raising the standards for existing sources was problematic. They were also asked to identify difficulties with fulfilling the obligations on limit values for fuels and new mobile sources as well as obligations on ammonia control measures and BAT to prevent and reduce ammonia emissions as set by the Gothenburg Protocol. In this regard, they were also encouraged to suggest the timescales needed to implement these limits.

13. Part four related to the obligations of the Protocol on POPs and the Protocol on Heavy Metals that require Parties to reduce emissions from a base year in the period 1985–1995. Countries were asked whether they were able to provide emission inventories for this period. As regards the Gothenburg Protocol, they were asked whether they were able to make an emission baseline and calculate emission projections for 2010 and 2020, and whether they would accept and implement emission ceilings for 2010–2020. Part five aimed to find a response to the question whether the countries wanted an amended Protocol on POPs or a new one. Part six included questions related to the general problems encountered with ratification of the Protocols, including suggestions on how to address them.

14. The replies to the questionnaire gave an overall view on the difficulties with ratification, as well as some initial steps that might be taken to address these problems.

15. In most countries, appropriate legislation existed, allowing for the effective transposition of ELVs and BAT from the relevant Protocols. All countries agreed that new sources should be state-of-the-art; according to some countries, new legislative measures should be introduced to prevent the construction of installations that could not meet stricter ELVs and BAT. All countries also agreed that more time would be needed to ensure that existing sources complied with the provisions of the Protocols. Some countries could not specify the time frame needed for reaching compliance with the Protocols. Other countries considered that the reasonable period for reaching compliance was between 10 and 20 years. A number of countries mentioned that they had problems with the quality of fuel imported from neighbouring States. Others expected to be able to comply with fuel quality norms in the near future, whilst another group of countries would need to conduct a cost-benefit analysis in order to determine the implementing measures necessary for reaching the fuel quality standards set out in the Protocols. Almost all countries considered ammonia emissions from agriculture to be a major problem. Finally, some countries considered that additional work would be required to determine the necessary time for implementing ELVs and BAT as they were currently defined in the Gothenburg Protocol.

**B. Additional replies from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine**

16. Both the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine were Parties to the Stockholm Convention on POPs. Both stated they had problems complying with the obligations of the current Protocol on POPs with regard to the destruction or disposal of PCBs<sup>3</sup>. There was a lack of technology and equipment for the destruction of pesticides. Another problem was that some POPs had been identified in potential or already existing waste products. Both countries had taken several steps to overcome these problems. One had developed a national implementation plan for the reduction and elimination of POPs and a law on the manner and condition for handling with PCBs. It had also ratified the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal (Basel Convention) and had a Strategy for waste management for 2008–2012. The other was planning to introduce a national plan in the end of 2009 and had carried out an inventory of electrical equipment. Further improvements in legislation, allowing for the effective transposition of ELVs and BAT from the Protocols, would be needed in both countries.

17. One country replied that it had developed its own national base for BAT and its enterprises used the European database as well, although the difficulty was that it was not in Russian. The country added that an assessment of POPs emissions for the period 1985–1995 had been carried out, and as a result 1990 had been chosen as a base year. The last inventory and analysis of POPs emissions had been carried out during the development of the National Action Plan for the Stockholm Convention on POPs using the United Nations Environment Programme guidebook. Emission inventories of heavy metals had been prepared in 2001. The other country explained that a law for ELVs for new and existing stationary sources was under preparation. Its national period for application of BAT and ELVs for existing stationary sources was 2014. However, there was no period for application of BAT and ELVs for new stationary sources. The country had prepared some emission inventories of POPs in the framework of the national plan for reduction and elimination of POPs in 2003. Emission inventories of heavy metals were made in 2004.

18. Both countries saw problems with the upgrading of existing sources due to lack of finance and old technology. Both countries had undertaken some steps to raise the quality of fuels, including the gradual phasing-out of leaded fuel. Standards for limit values for fuels and new mobile sources were close to the EU standards. One country had adopted national standards for gasoline and had initiated a project to support good agricultural practices.

---

<sup>3</sup> Polychlorinated biphenyls.

19. As regards the base year, one country supported setting emission ceilings for 2020 within the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol. The other country stated that it would not be possible to fix the base year and to make provisions for 2010 and 2020 as well. Both countries would not support a new Protocol on POPs. One country intended to ratify the existing Protocol; the process of ratification and preparations of implementation of the Protocol could be finished in 2010. There was also a plan to complete ratifications of the two other Protocols to the Convention in that year, but help would be needed from the Convention community with preparations of national implementation plans. This country would welcome a more active role of industry in the implementation of the Protocols and in terms of financial support. The other country required translation of documents of the Convention into Russian and help with harmonization of methodology for monitoring of hazardous substances with standards used by the EU.

### **C. Second consultation meeting (20 April 2009)**

20. The second round table on the outcomes of the informal questionnaire was held on 20 April 2009, in connection with forty-fourth session of Working Group (Geneva, 20–23 April 2009). Based on additional replies to the questionnaire, the Czech Republic, as the Presidency of the EU, prepared another set of issues that were discussed at the meeting with a main focus on the identification of possible obstacles to ratification of the Gothenburg Protocol. The following questions were asked to countries:

- (a) Do you have inventories for emissions for total suspended particulates (TSP) and particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>), and if yes, for which years?
- (b) What would be the preferred timescales for applying ELVs for stationary and mobile sources, as well as for agriculture sources?
- (c) Would you prefer that existing regulation through ELVs and BAT is sustained or that more flexible attitude is introduced for some sectors and sources without ELVs and setting only obligation to apply BAT?
- (d) Could you identify the main difficulties relating to application of BAT?
- (e) What timescales should be set for existing sources in a revised Gothenburg Protocol?
- (f) Do you expect to meet any problems with the use of guidelines on emission inventories and in this connection? Would you support the introduction of mandatory use of guidelines?
- (g) Would you be in favour of having a provision in the Protocol to increase participation of Parties in the effects-oriented activities and voluntary use of Guidelines for reporting on the monitoring and modelling air pollution effects?

(h) What is your level of ambition for ammonia abatement? Do you consider further mandatory commitments particularly linked to low-emission techniques for field spreading of liquid and solid manure, to animal housing and to the use of mineral fertilizers?

21. Based on the outcomes of the discussions at the forty-third session of the Working Group, the Czech Republic as the Presidency of the EU also prepared other questions related to obstacles to ratifications of the Protocol on POPs and the Protocol on Heavy Metals. These were the following:

(a) Which definition of PCBs as regards their removal and elimination, defined in annex I of the Protocol on POPs as 2025 or 2029, would you agree with?

(b) Would it be more difficult for your country to introduce implementation plans instead of timescales of 15 years to be set for application of ELVs and BAT in annex VI of the Protocol on POPs and annex IV of the Protocol on Heavy Metals? What are the preconditions for the introduction of implementation plans?

(c) Would you agree with changing annex V of the Protocol on POPs and annex III of the Protocol on Heavy Metals into guidance documents, forming integral parts of the respective Protocols?

22. The EECCA and SEE countries were invited to provide any other relevant information on all the issues covered by the questionnaire and the other set of questions that were discussed at the forty-fourth session of the Working Group by 8 May 2009. Additional replies were received from four countries and included in an overview of replies below. The countries would be invited to reflect upon the outcomes of the meeting in the light of the ongoing process of the revision of the Protocols.

**D. Obstacles to the ratification of the Gothenburg Protocol: overview of replies from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**

23. None of the countries had an appropriate system for monitoring of TSP and PM from industrial sources. One country replied that it compared the data by using the CORINAIR methodology and the national methodologies for inventory of emissions. Only CORINAIR provided data for TSP, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> separately. One country stated that inventory for TSP emissions had been established for 1980; however, there were no inventories for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Two other countries also lacked such inventories. However, one of them stated that CORINAIR inventory for TSP emissions for 2004 had been prepared in the period August 2005–January 2006. A new inventory cycle had been under preparation for data from 2008 for TSP. The emission data would be reported in 2010. Regarding air quality, PM<sub>10</sub> was measured by 15

air quality monitoring stations, but it was planned to change some of the stations to PM<sub>2.5</sub> measurements. Another country stated that it had carried inventory only for TSP since 1995.

24. All countries would need more time for implementation of ELVs for stationary and mobile sources. One country stated that a five-year period for new stationary sources and the year of 2020 for existing stationary sources might be introduced. With regard to the application of ELVs for mobile sources listed in annex VIII, it should be clarified which EURO standard these ELVs could correspond to. One country proposed the period of 15–20 years after ratification of the Protocol as timescales for ELVs for existing stationary sources and would agree with a five-year period after ratification of the Protocol for new stationary sources. Another country presented steps to be taken at the national level that would transpose the EU Directives 2001/80/EC and 1999/13/EC. Regarding the ELVs for mobile sources, its existing law on liquid fuel was in accordance with the provisions of the Gothenburg Protocol. A law on emission limit values of substances in waste gases from mobile pollution sources would be prepared next year within a twinning project and would enter into force by 2013. Timescales or a transition period for introduction of ELVs would be identified in both laws.

25. Countries expressed their concerns about the application of measures in the agricultural sector due to lack of experience. Agriculture was the most complicated sector for applying ELVs. One country highlighted that other aspects, such the health and the economic situations, had to be taken into account by the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen. Another country stated that the provisions of the Gothenburg Protocol could be transposed into the national legislation in this regard. Limit values for agriculture sources would be set with the law on limit values for allowed levels of emissions and type of pollutants in exhaust gases and fumes emitted by the stationary sources. Another country explained that it had transposed the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) Directive of the EU into its national legislation. Additionally, guidelines on BAT had been produced for certain sectors (e.g. non-ferrous metals processing, iron and steel, self-monitoring, cement clinker production, wastewater and waste gases treatment, production of ceramics, intensive poultry farming and monitoring). To comply with BAT and ELVs, more time and investment would be required. In this regard, the flexibility that was needed for some sectors would be identified in the implementation action plans for all the protocols to the Conventions; these would be prepared by September 2009. Only one country would agree with existing regulation through ELVs and BAT.

26. Most countries had not developed an appropriate system for the application of BAT. Some planned to apply BAT for small- and medium-scale installations and a combination of BAT and ELVs for big installations. Some countries were going to change legislation in order to apply BAT. One country confirmed that its new law on atmospheric air protection introduced the application of BAT, but was applicable to installations, which were considerable sources of

emissions. There was no legally binding instrument for the application of BAT. All countries stated that the main problem for the application of BAT was the lack of finances. One country had added terms for application. Some countries would first apply the BAT developed at the national level and after that they would accept the application of BAT that was in accordance with the Protocol. Most of the countries would prefer a step-by-step approach regarding the application of BAT in different industrial sectors. The application should start with less considerable and complicated sectors. One country added that the difficulties besides lack of financial resources were old technologies, the low quality of raw materials, inadequate legislation on air emissions and International Organization for Standardization (ISO)/European Committee for Standardization (CEN) standards that were not introduced in all stationary sources.

27. Concerning the question raised in paragraph 19 (e), EECCA and SEE participants considered the following suggestions could be further discussed at the national level, with a view to including them in a revised Gothenburg Protocol, particularly with regard to EECCA and SEE countries: (a) timescales within which a base year could be selected should include a period between the year 1985 and the year of accession to the Protocol; (b) the transition period should be at least 15 years from accession to the Protocol; and (c) fulfilment of obligations under the Protocol should be carried out in accordance with national implementation plans, which would prioritize the sequence of implementation of obligations for different industrial sectors and different territories.

28. One country stated that before starting the discussion on the timescales it would need to know what ELVs would be set in the revised Protocol for existing sources, which pollutants would be covered by the revised Protocol, and what base year would be proposed in the revised Protocol. Another country replied that it could only calculate the emissions levels for 2010, as its State programmes were until 2015 and 2020 (for the energy sector).

29. One country highlighted importance of a project funded by the Netherlands to promote ratification and implementation of the Protocols to the Convention. It expected that these protocols would be ratified in 2010. Therefore, the timescales could be set as stated by the existing Gothenburg Protocol for a country with economy in transition. Nevertheless, according to the national legislation of this country, the ELVs and BAT should be implemented by 2013–2014, including a provision that an additional period of five years could be granted by governmental approval for the installations, requiring more investment in order to comply with BAT. Flexibility for some sources with regard to setting timescales could be introduced after national implementation action plans had been prepared for all the Protocols. In conclusion, most countries would support a period of 15–20 years after ratification of the Gothenburg Protocol for existing sources.

30. Most countries would not object to the mandatory use of the EMEP *Emission Reporting Guidelines*. However, they would require more time (e.g. 2–5 years) for introducing the necessary provisions in their legislation. Some countries had concerns about using the methodology at the national level. One saw the preparation of emission inventory using the EMEP Guidelines as problematic due to the lack of national emission factors for setting ELVs that were used by the EU. Two other countries expressed concerns about adaptation of these guidelines to local conditions, or saw difficulties with the collection of primary data in this regard, and asked for technical and financial assistance.

31. All countries were in favour of having a provision in the Gothenburg Protocol to increase participation of Parties in the effect-oriented activities and a voluntary use of the Guidelines for reporting on the monitoring and modeling air pollution effects. One country asked the Working Group on Effects for more clarification related to increased participation of Parties in the effects-oriented activities. Another country requested more time and financial support.

32. None of the countries was in a position to express an exact level of ambition for ammonia abatement. Due to difficult conditions within the agricultural sector, one country admitted that it did not have any ambitions for abatement. Another group of countries asked for the definition of advantages of having higher level of ambitions. One country stated that its ammonia emissions from agriculture sources had been estimated in CORINAIR inventories prepared for the period 2005–2006. The new cycle for 2008 was under preparation. The emission ceiling for ammonia would be established by a law on national emission ceilings and measures for ammonia reduction would be described in a national emission reduction plan to be prepared next year. One country admitted that measures aimed at abatement of ammonia emissions from agriculture would not be applicable for economical reasons. Another pointed out that inappropriate application of ammonia and of liquid and solid manure and its incorrect storage had led to ammonia emissions in all parts of environment. Moreover, due to difficult economic conditions, the country would not be able to apply high environmental standards for ammonia abatement. One country complained about the lack of an inventory for ammonia.

**E. Obstacles to the ratification of the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Protocol on Heavy Metals: overview of replies from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**

33. Most countries would prefer the definition of PCBs in annex I of the Protocol on POPs that is stated for their removal and elimination as of 2029. One country recommended harmonization with the Stockholm Convention on POPs in this regard. However, the year 2025 would be acceptable for some of them, as this was in accordance with their national plans.

Another country referred to national legislation and ongoing projects with regard to the removal and elimination of PCBs, while accepting the year 2025.

34. One country replied that it had taken the initial steps to develop national implementation plans for the Protocol on POPs and Protocol on Heavy Metals. However, there were some doubts about the application of BAT and ELVs that would correspond to provisions in the existing Protocols. Most countries would agree with timescales of 15 years to be set for the application of ELVs and BAT in annex VI of the Protocol on POPs and in annex IV of the Protocol on Heavy Metals. One country would prefer the introduction of national implementation plans for reaching specific goals to the timescales of 15 years to comply with the obligations of the Protocols. Another country requested more flexibility for some sectors in terms of setting timescales, for reasons related to its national implementation plans to be prepared for all the Protocols by September 2009. This country explained the preconditions for the introduction of implementation plans, in particular an emission inventory of heavy metals and POPs and the establishment of national emission ceilings and relevant legislation. Most of these could be accomplished by 2011. All countries agreed with changing annex V of the Protocol on POPs and annex III of the Protocol on Heavy Metals into guidance documents.

35. One country referred to obsolete legislation as the main obstacle to compliance with the Protocol on POPs. However, certain steps, including a preparation of a plan for gradual transition to the European standards, had been undertaken. A national action plan for POPs had been developed; two projects concerning depleting of DDT<sup>4</sup> and PCBs from old capacitors and transformers were going to be implemented. Legislation, based on the European Commission standards, had been also set in place for new stationary installations. Furthermore, this country explained that after the break-up of the Soviet Union most of the industrial plants had stopped working, so there had been no collection of data from 1991 to 1994. The year 2003 had been adopted as a base year for POPs.

#### **F. Next steps proposed by the countries**

36. It was proposed by the countries that the *EMEP/EEA Air Pollutant Emission Inventory Guidebook* and available guidance on BAT be translated into Russian. The Russian Federation, Belarus and Kazakhstan would like to launch a project that would promote ratification of the Protocols. Details of the project were presented at the forty-fourth session of Working Group in April 2009. One country would support a step-by-step approach for joining all the protocols to the Convention, but only if the protocols took into account the capacities of the concerned

---

<sup>4</sup> Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane.

countries and established terms that allowed them to comply with their obligations. Modernization of the monitoring system would also be needed. Hence, the possible development of an overall strategy for air quality management should take into account the common difficulties of EECCA countries when they become Parties to the Protocols.

-----