



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
24 February 2011  
Original: English

## Economic Commission for Europe

### Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution

#### Twenty-eighth session

Geneva, 13–17 December 2010

### Report of the Executive Body on its twenty-eighth session

#### Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction.....	1–10	3
A. Attendance.....	2–6	3
B. Organizational matters.....	7–11	3
I. Accreditation of non-governmental organizations.....	12	4
II. Matters arising from meetings of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and other related meetings.....	13–15	4
III. Progress in core activities.....	16–25	5
A. Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe.....	16–19	5
B. Effects of major air pollutants on human health and the environment.....	20	5
C. Hemispheric transport of air pollution.....	21–22	6
D. Black carbon.....	23–25	6
IV. Review and revision of protocols and other strategy activities.....	26–64	7
A. 1999 Gothenburg protocol.....	27–46	7
B. Protocol on Heavy metals.....	47–57	10
C. Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants.....	58–64	12
V. Compliance with protocol obligations.....	65–76	13
VI. Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia and capacity-building activities in countries with economies in transition.....	77–83	16
VII. Long-term strategy for the Convention.....	84–86	17

---

VIII.	2011 Workplan for the implementation of the Convention.....	87–89	17
IX.	Draft rules of procedure .....	90–93	17
X.	Strategies and policies of Parties and signatories to the Convention for the abatement of air pollution .....	94–97	18
XI.	Activities of bodies of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and international organizations relevant to the Convention .....	98–101	18
XII.	Financial requirements for implementation of the Convention .....	102–105	19
XIII.	Election of officers .....	106–108	20
XIV.	Adoption of decisions taken at the twenty-eighth session.....	109	21
Annex			
	Annex referred to in article 4 of the Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution on Long-term Financing of the Cooperative Programme for the Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP) .....		22

## Introduction

1. The twenty-eighth session of the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution was held from 13 to 17 December 2010 in Geneva. The decisions adopted by the Executive Body at the session can be found in a first addendum to the present report (ECE/EB.AIR/106/Add.1). The 2011 Workplan for the implementation of the Convention, also adopted by the Executive Body at its twenty-eighth session, has been set out in a second addendum (ECE/EB.AIR/106/Add.2).

### A. Attendance

2. The session was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and the European Union (EU).

3. The following States not party to the Convention were represented: Ghana.

4. Representatives from the European Environment Agency (EEA), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM), the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E) and the Network Center for the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET) also attended.

5. The Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East and the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP) were represented.

6. Representatives of various non-governmental organizations (NGOs) attended: the Clean Air Task Force; the European Environmental Bureau; the Global Atmospheric Pollution Forum; the International Cryosphere Climate Initiative; and the International Union of Air Pollution Prevention and Environmental Protection Associations. Industry was represented by the Bromine Science and Environmental Forum; Croplife International; the European Association of Internal Combustion Engine Manufacturers; the European Petroleum Industry Association; and the European HBCD Working Group.

### B. Organizational matters

7. Mr. M. Williams (United Kingdom) chaired the meeting.

8. The Director of the Environment, Housing and Land Management Division of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) welcomed the participants. He highlighted the excellent work and results produced by some task forces and expert groups under the Convention, which had proved the existence of significant intercontinental transport of air pollution between North America, Europe and Asia, the importance of methane emissions as a precursor of tropospheric ozone and the importance of black carbon as an air pollutant and short-term climate forcer. The Convention had been an example of successfully linking science and policy issues for three decades; now it was hoped the Executive Body would take the appropriate actions and measures to provide a policy response to the latest important scientific results presented to it.

9. The Executive Body adopted its agenda, as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/105, while agreeing to change the order of some agenda items.

10. The Chair reminded delegations that the decisions taken at the twenty-seventh session had been approved at that session. The full report on the twenty-seventh session of the Executive Body was contained in document ECE/EB.AIR/99 and Add.1 and 2. The delegation of the EU proposed an amendment to paragraph 107 of the report to reflect the election of Ms. Marta Dopazo (Spain) as a Vice-Chair.

11. The Executive Body adopted the report of its twenty-seventh session (ECE/EB.AIR/99 and Adds.1 and 2), as amended.

## **I. Accreditation of non-governmental organizations**

12. Two non-governmental organizations had submitted applications for accreditation to attend meetings of the Executive Body and its main subsidiary bodies in accordance with decision 2006/11: the Clean Air Task Force and the International Cryosphere Climate Initiative (ICCI). The Bureau had reviewed both applications and recommended them for accreditation. The Executive Body granted an accreditation to both organizations as recommended by the Bureau (ECE/EB.AIR/2010/3, para. 6).

## **II. Matters arising from meetings of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and other related meetings**

13. The secretariat informed the Executive Body about the decisions of the Committee on Environmental Policy at its seventeenth session in November 2010, and drew attention to the preparations for the seventh “Environment for Europe” Ministerial Conference to be held in Astana in 2011. The secretariat also provided details on the activities of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on Coal Mine Methane, and drew attention to the first UNECE workshop on Effective Methane Drainage and Use in Coal Mines in China in October 2010, as well as the signing of a memorandum between UNECE and the Convention on Biodiversity. It also informed the Executive Body about a request from the UNECE Timber Committee related to particulate matter (PM) emissions from wood fuel.

14. The secretariat further reported that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had ratified the three most recent Protocols to the Air Convention — the 1998 Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs); the 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals; and the 1999 Gothenburg Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone (the Gothenburg Protocol) — on 1 November 2010, as a direct result of the capacity-building project for the five Balkan countries funded by the Netherlands and managed by the secretariat. Several months earlier, in March 2010, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had ratified the 1984 Protocol on Long-term Financing of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP); the 1985 Protocol on Further Reduction of Sulphur Emissions; the 1988 Protocol concerning the Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides or Their Transboundary Fluxes; the 1991 Protocol on the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or their Transboundary Fluxes; and the 1994 Protocol on Further Reduction of Sulphur Emissions.

15. The secretariat related that, following the depositary notification of the amendments to the Protocol on POPs on 14 September 2010, amendments to annexes V and VII would become effective on 14 December 2010 for all Parties, except for the Czech Republic and

Canada, which had submitted notifications in accordance with the provisions of article 14, paragraph 5, of that Protocol.

### **III. Progress in core activities**

#### **A. Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe**

16. Ms. S. Vidič (Croatia), Chair of the EMEP Steering Body, reported on the Programme's activities, including the results of the Steering Body's thirty-fourth session (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2010/2). She highlighted the conclusion of the EMEP Steering Body that there were compelling reasons to consider the short-lived climate forcing of air pollution in the integrated assessment of control strategies, and that CIAM had developed a sound approach for including short-lived climate forcing elements into integrated assessment modelling that could be useful for prioritizing control strategies for PM.

17. At the same meeting, the EMEP Steering Body had approved the draft Maintenance and Improvement Plan for the EMEP/EEA Air Pollutants Emission Inventory Guidebook (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2010/7), developed by the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections as requested by the Executive Body at its twenty-seventh session in 2009.

18. The EMEP Chair introduced the changes to the tentative schedule for in-depth reviews of emission inventories for Parties to the Convention, endorsed by the Executive Body at its twenty-seventh session, in particular noting that Malta had requested to postpone its stage-3 in-depth review of its emission inventories to 2012 instead of 2011, while the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had agreed to be reviewed in 2011.

19. In the discussion that followed, the issue of changing the EMEP grid scale was raised, as well as the difficulties related to emission and monitoring data collection, particularly in countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. It was stressed that further work and technical support were needed for Eastern European, Caucasian and Central Asian countries to increase the quality and the quantity of measurements and thus improve modelling results.

#### **B. Effects of major pollutants on human health and the environment**

20. Mr. T. Johannessen (Norway), Chair of the Working Group on Effects, reported on effects-oriented activities, including the results of the Working Group's twenty-ninth session (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2010/2). He drew attention to the latest results from the monitoring and modelling activities, and in particular: the slow biological recovery of ecosystems from acidification, the remaining problem of eutrophication, new evidence of adverse health effects of ozone, increased evidence of impacts of ozone to vegetation and of adverse effects of PM on health, as well as increased mercury levels in fish despite decreasing emissions. He highlighted the plans for performing ex post analysis of scenarios as a contribution to the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol in 2011, a planned "Feasibility study of the assessment of health impacts of PM and health benefit analysis of PM reduction in the countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia", to be performed by the Task Force on Health in cooperation with the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, as well as plans for a joint workshop on issues common to EMEP and the Working Group on Effects.

### **C. Hemispheric transport of air pollution**

21. The co-Chairs of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution presented the executive summary of the 2010 assessment report prepared by the Task Force (ECE/EB.AIR/2010/10, Corr.1 and 2), as well as the note summarizing the implications of the Task Force findings for the revision of the Convention protocols and workplan (informal document No. 3). They drew attention to the need for further reductions of ozone precursors to address a rising trend in baseline ozone, and in particular the importance of methane and carbon monoxide (CO) as precursors of tropospheric ozone that were not currently addressed by the Gothenburg Protocol. Also highlighted were the findings about the contribution of tropospheric ozone, methane, other ozone precursors and black carbon (BC) to climate change, and the potential benefits of further emission controls, as well as the suggestion for the Convention to consider taking steps to formalize cooperation on air pollution issues beyond the UNECE through a “confederation” of regional initiatives.

22. A number of delegations congratulated the Task Force for the quality of its 2010 assessment report, recognizing that it was a milestone in the understanding of intercontinental transport of air pollution and the first comprehensive assessment of intercontinental transport of ozone, PM, mercury and POPs. The EU noted that the report contained valuable information to further guide and inspire the work related to the revision of the protocols to the Convention and further work on intercontinental transport of air pollution.

### **D. Black carbon**

23. The co-Chairs of the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Black Carbon presented the key findings and recommendations of the report produced by the Ad Hoc Expert Group in accordance with the mandate given to it by the Executive Body in decision 2009/5 (ECE/EB.AIR/2010/7), highlighting the general scientific consensus that mitigation of black carbon would lead to positive regional impacts by reducing black carbon deposition in areas with snow and ice, and that the reduction of primary PM would benefit public health and would provide substantial room for improvement of the existing knowledge base for black carbon, in particular with respect to emissions and impacts. They also outlined the key recommendations for actions to be taken by the Executive Body as part of its 2011 workplan and considerations for inclusion in the Gothenburg Protocol.

24. A number of delegations expressed appreciation for the high quality of the report that had been produced within such a short time. The delegation of the EU noted that the findings of the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Black Carbon would provide a solid basis for the further negotiations and the implementation of the long-term strategy, in particular on the interlinkages between climate change and air pollution, and stressed the need for further work to advance the knowledge on black carbon in the short and medium term. The delegation of Norway supported the inclusion of BC and methane and CO in the context of the Protocol.

25. Following the discussions on the different issues presented under this agenda item, the Executive Body:

(a) Took note of the report of the thirty-fourth session of the EMEP Steering Body and noted the progress achieved in measurement and modelling activities, as well as the efforts made for improvement of the emission inventories by its centres and task forces;

(b) Adopted the draft Maintenance and Improvement Plan for the EMEP/EEA Air Pollutants Emission Inventory Guidebook approved by the Steering Body, and invited delegations to identify funding opportunities for the implementation of the Plan;

- (c) Invited Parties to nominate experts to the roster of reviewers and lead reviewers, and to support their participation in the scheduled reviews;
- (d) Invited Parties to take part in the EMEP case study on heavy metals that additionally supported the efforts to improve emission inventories of heavy metals, monitoring and modelling activities and the assessment of heavy metal pollution levels in Europe;
- (e) Took note of the report of the twenty-ninth session of the Working Group on Effects;
- (f) Encouraged further strengthening of the cooperation and coordination between the EMEP Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects;
- (g) Expressed its appreciation for the work of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution and the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Black Carbon, and took note of their conclusions and recommendations and in particular:
- (i) Acknowledged the importance of intercontinental transport of air pollutants, particularly of ozone and its precursors and PM, for air quality in the UNECE region;
  - (ii) Acknowledged the importance of methane and CO as precursors of tropospheric ozone that were currently not addressed by the Gothenburg Protocol, and the conclusion that increases in methane concentrations might offset significant decreases of ozone levels resulting from local and regional emission reductions;
  - (iii) Acknowledged the global nature of the transport of POPs and mercury;
  - (iv) Acknowledged that, based on the available information, there were clear environmental benefits for human health, ecosystems and climate change from reducing emissions of black carbon, and took note of the rationale for addressing black carbon as a component of PM under the Convention;
  - (v) Acknowledged the need to enhance the current state of knowledge related to black carbon;
- (h) As part of the Convention's outreach activities, requested the secretariat to disseminate the Executive Summary of the Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution assessment report and the report of the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Black Carbon to interested organizations;
- (i) Adopted decision 2010/1 concerning the revised mandate for the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution.

#### **IV. Review and revision of protocols and other strategy activities**

26. Mr. R. Ballaman (Switzerland), Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review, reported on the discussions and decisions of the Working Group at its forty-sixth and forty-seventh sessions of relevance to the review and revision of the three most recent protocols to the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/100 and ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/102).

##### **A. 1999 Gothenburg Protocol**

27. The Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review highlighted the progress of the Working Group with regard to the revision of the text of the Gothenburg Protocol and its annexes, including the definition of critical loads for nitrogen and ozone flux and the

updating of annex I by the Working Group on Effects, progress in the setting of the baseline scenarios for 2020 and the further development of hybrid scenarios. Concerning possible abatement measures, he underlined that for the countries with economies in transition a small package of key actions could lead to major improvements.

28. The Head of CIAM reported on progress with the development of hybrid scenarios requested by the Working Group on Strategies and Review. By February 2011 CIAM could include mitigation measures on carbon deposition into the Arctic and the Alps and radiative forcing in the EMEP domain. He noted that the costs of ammonia reductions were overestimated in the GAINS model. There was also a need for the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen to provide updated costs on ammonia measures by the end of December 2010, so that they could be used in the scenarios which would be presented at the forty-eighth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review in April 2011.

29. The Executive Body considered the implications of the reports of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution and the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Black Carbon for further work under the Convention.

30. The Chair of Working Group on Strategies and Review expressed the view that it was possible to include new substances in the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol, and in particular BC, CO and methane, with regard to emission reduction measures (e.g., measures for small scale combustion, diesel engine filters for off-road machinery and vehicles). The difficulty was with setting emission ceilings; a flat reduction rate, e.g., -30% compared to a reference year, was a possible solution. When national inventories for BC were established in future, the Gothenburg Protocol could be updated, possibly with setting emission ceilings.

31. The delegation of the EU stressed the importance of completing the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol by the end of 2011 and expressed some concern with the progress to date. Most items remained open, including the question whether the Protocol should be revised or whether a new protocol should be drafted. There was also significant work remaining to establish the overall ambition level and objectives, increase the flexibility of the Protocol, and to set individual obligations, such as limit values for individual sources, national ceilings and related reporting provisions. There was a need for the active involvement of non-Parties to the current Protocol in the negotiations in order to ensure an increased number of ratification while maintaining the level of ambition.

32. In the discussion that followed it was noted that, in the absence of a decision on drafting a new protocol, negotiations would lead to a revised Protocol.

33. The EU proposed that the Working Group on Strategies and Review be requested at its forty-eighth session, in April 2011, to narrow down the currently outstanding options to amend the Protocol, particularly those related to setting the objectives (identified by the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling) and the measures in the agricultural sector (discussed by Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen). The Working Group would also have to narrow down the number of options of limit values.

34. The EU also agreed that measures on PM and BC emission reduction on small scale installations and unregulated diesel engines were likely to be win-win measures for air pollution and climate change. International shipping also contributed to BC emissions, which would have to be addressed by international organizations like the International Maritime Organization (IMO).

35. While the EU could not commit to including binding ceilings and strict obligations on BC in the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol in view of the rather limited information on the impacts and policy options available, it was willing to discuss text on prioritizing

PM measures that also to reduce BC. The Convention should pursue technical and science work with the aim of including specific measures for BC at a later stage.

36. The delegation of the United States concurred with the view of the EU and saw value in signing a revised Gothenburg Protocol by 2011 so long as it included meaningful measures to encourage ratification by countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, included treatment of PM and some treatment of BC.

37. The delegation of Switzerland said that BC was a very important component of fine PM (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and stressed that major abatement measures to abate BC were the same as to abate PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Switzerland supported the target of completing the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol in 2011, while including PM, BC, methane (as a precursor of ozone) and CO in order to achieve co-benefits with efforts to address climate change.

38. The delegation of Belarus reiterated that BC needed to be treated on a regional rather than a global scale due to its short lifetime. Special arrangements should be foreseen for countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, like capacity-building, flexibility and exemptions. Belarus hoped that it could propose some alternative measures and/or exemptions at the forty-eighth session of the Working Group in April 2011 that would give sufficient flexibility and would allow wide ratification by those countries.

39. The delegation of Canada expressed its support for inclusion of BC, recognizing that work on it needed to continue.

40. The delegation of the United States recalled that the issue of agricultural and forest fires had not been dealt with, and it would be necessary to include relevant work items in future workplans.

41. It was suggested that the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport should continue its work focusing on policy options, and its mandate should be extended to include interlinkages with climate change with respect to short-lived climate forcers. The United States expressed support for further work on the long-range transport of ozone, CO and methane. It pointed to the need to look at methane within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Global Methane Initiative to avoid overlaps with work elsewhere.

42. The Head of CIAM noted that it was not realistic to have robust quantitative provisions for CO and methane in 2011.

43. It was recognized that those pollutants should be addressed in some form, but a 2011 timescale limited the available options. It was agreed that, with regard to BC, more work was needed on inventories, measurements and effects (including health effects), and that priority should be given to control strategies for PM<sub>2.5</sub>, which also led to BC reductions, and that more work was needed on precursor reductions including methane and CO.

44. The Chair drew the attention of the Executive Body to the policy brief on nitrogen management interactions with climate change (informal document No. 9) prepared by the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen to inform the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol.

45. The Executive Body adopted decision 2010/2 on the implications of the reports of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution and the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Black Carbon.

46. The Executive Body:

(a) Took note of the reports of the forty-sixth and forty-seventh session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review and, in particular, the progress on the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol;

- (b) Decided that the revision of the Protocol should include meaningful measures designed to increase the possibility for ratification of an amended Protocol by countries not yet party to the Protocol, especially such countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia;
- (c) Emphasized the importance of dedicating at least one day at the forty-eighth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review in April 2011, with interpretation, to considering potential revisions to the technical annexes to the Gothenburg Protocol, and related issues in the Protocol on Heavy Metals;
- (d) Requested the Working Group on Strategies and Review to continue negotiations with a view to including in the revised Protocol text to address the issues identified in paragraph 4 of decision 2010/2;
- (e) Requested the Working Group on Strategies and Review to include PM as a pollutant subject to controls under the Protocol;
- (f) Requested the Working Group on Strategies and Review to consider including a review clause and an expedited procedure to allow for rapid adjustments of the Gothenburg Protocol, if necessary, as emerging research and other knowledge became available;
- (g) Requested the Working Group on Strategies and Review to continue negotiations with a view to concluding the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol, and presenting proposed amendments that accomplish the goals set out above for adoption at the twenty-ninth session of the Executive Body in 2011;
- (h) Requested the co-Chairs of the former Ad Hoc Expert Group on Black Carbon to prepare draft textual proposals for revisions to the Gothenburg Protocol consistent with decision 2010/1, and to present such proposals in sufficient time for them to be considered by the Parties in advance of the forty-eighth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review in April 2011;
- (i) Invited Parties to the Convention to present draft textual proposals for revisions to the Gothenburg Protocol consistent with decision 2010/2; and
- (j) Accepted the main messages of the report on nitrogen and climate interaction prepared by the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen.

## **B. Protocol on Heavy Metals**

47. The Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review reported on progress in the negotiation of amendments to the Protocol on Heavy Metals in accordance with the mandate given to it in December 2009 (see ECE/EB.AIR/99/Add.2). He also highlighted the conclusions of the Task Force on Heavy Metals with regard to further work on the technical review of the proposal to add mercury-containing products to annex VI to the Protocol on Heavy Metals, carried out at the request of the Executive Body in 2009 (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2010/9) and the conclusion of the Working Group that the track B review had been completed. He presented a proposal to extend the negotiating mandate to include amendments to Annex VI, and take into account mercury-containing waste and limit values for coal-fired combustion plants.

48. In the discussion that followed, a number of delegations expressed support for expanding the scope of the negotiation mandate agreed in December 2009 to include the proposal to add mercury-containing products to the Protocol. The EU said that such negotiations should be based on the proposal by the EU to amend Annex VI, and consider the work carried out by the Task Force on Heavy Metals and the relevant text proposals

submitted by Switzerland, presented in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2010/6, including consequential changes to other parts of the Protocol text and its Annexes, in particular on mercury waste resulting from proposed measures. Norway expressed its support for further work to consider measures on mercury-containing waste and on coal combustion installations.

49. A number of delegations reiterated that the main purpose of revising the Protocol should continue to be introduction of flexibility in order to increase ratifications.

50. The delegation of the United States noted that there were still some gaps in the technical review that had taken place with regard to the proposal to add mercury-containing products, e.g., there was a lack of information from countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. The delegation of the EU proposed that in order to increase the involvement of those countries in the technical preparatory negotiations it would be particularly important to include in the forty-eighth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review in April 2011 at least one day (and preferably two) with interpretation focusing on revisions to the technical annexes to the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol.

51. The delegation of Belarus noted that countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia might need financial assistance for the implementation of some measures such as the introduction of amalgam separators.

52. The delegation of Canada highlighted the importance of the efforts to increase ratifications by countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, and stressed that any new measures should not compromise that. The negotiations should be limited to the proposed six categories of products and the consequential changes to the Protocol.

53. Several delegations referred to the negotiations on a globally binding instrument on mercury currently taking place under UNEP and stressed the need to coordinate action at the global and the regional level and take into account developments under UNEP in any further work on heavy metals under the Convention. One delegation noted that one of the areas of significant interest under the UNEP process was the area of products.

54. The question of the timescale for completion of the negotiations on the revision of the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the organization of work by the Working Group on Strategies and Review was also raised. The United States expressed the view that it might not be realistic to complete negotiations on amendments to two protocols in the same year and it might be necessary to reconsider the deadline of 2011 set by the mandate agreed at the twenty-seventh session in 2009. It proposed that in the coming year work on the revision of the Protocol on Heavy Metals should be focused on the areas of overlap with the Gothenburg Protocol. The EU expressed its preference that the forty-eighth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review should be devoted predominantly to negotiations on the Gothenburg Protocol, but also covering common issues to the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol, e.g., on PM emissions.

55. The Executive Body took note of the report of the forty-seventh session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review and, in particular, the update on the progress of negotiations and the discussion by the Working Group of the work of the Task Force on Heavy Metals regarding the proposal by the EU to add certain mercury-containing products to Annex VI of the Protocol.

56. The Executive Body decided to revise the mandate given to the Working Group on Strategies and Review on 18 December 2009 to start negotiations with a view to presenting proposed amendments to the Protocol on Heavy Metals, as set out in the paragraph below.

57. The Executive Body:

(a) Mandated the Working Group on Strategies and Review to continue negotiations with a view to finalizing the discussions and presenting proposed amendments to the Protocol on Heavy Metals at the thirtieth session of the Executive Body in 2012 at the latest. It requested the Working Group to consider potential revisions to the Protocol on Heavy Metals that fell within the following scope:

(i) As a first priority, any revision possibilities for increasing ratifications of the Protocol, taking into consideration possible options put forward by the Task Force on Heavy Metals;

(ii) Potential revisions to the text of the Protocol and annexes I to VII, taking into consideration possible options put forward by the Task Force on Heavy Metals, as well as the relevant adopted amendments to the Protocol on POPs and the proposed amendments to the Gothenburg Protocol, provided that such revisions would not make it more difficult to achieve increased ratifications;

(iii) Possibilities to make the Protocol more adaptable to future developments by producing a guidance document on best available techniques extracted from annex III and updated as appropriate;

(b) Requested that in 2011 the negotiations would focus on those proposed amendments aimed at increasing ratifications and that addressed issues raised also in the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol;

(c) Requested the Working Group on Strategies and Review, in considering proposals for amendments to Annexes VI and VII regarding mercury-containing products based on the proposal by the EU and the work of the Task Force on Heavy Metals, to be mindful of the work of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee under the auspices of UNEP working towards a legally binding global instrument to address mercury, which was also addressing mercury-containing products;

(d) Requested the Bureau of the Executive Body to consider the outcomes of the forty-eighth session of the Working Group in April 2011 and, depending on the progress achieved, and after consultation with the Parties, to provide guidance for the preparation of the agenda and the continuation of work at the forty-ninth session of the Working Group in September 2011;

(e) Requested the Working Group on Strategies and Review to report on its progress to the twenty-ninth session of the Executive Body in 2011; and

(f) Invited the secretariat to include paragraphs 17–20 from the annex to document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2010/6 into the negotiating document being prepared for consideration by the Working Group in April 2011.

### **C. Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants**

58. The Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review presented the conclusions of the Task Force on Persistent Organic Pollutants contained in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2010/8 and its recommendations with regard to endosulfan, dicofol and hexabromocyclododecane (HBCD) as well as its conclusions with regard to pentachloroanisole/pentachlorophenol (PCA/PCP) and trifluralin.

59. The delegation of Norway supported the recommendation by the Working Group on Strategies and Review for adding endosulfan, dicofol and HBCD to the Protocol on POPs. PCA/PCP and trifluralin should be considered POPs under the Protocol.

60. The delegation of Canada said that the Government of Canada had decided to ratify the amendments to the POPs Protocol adopted by the Executive Body in 2009. Recent

developments under the Stockholm Convention with regard to endosulfan and HBCD and the long-term strategy had implications for the decision to start negotiations on adding endosulfan, HBCD and dicofol to the Protocol, as well as its timing.

61. The delegation of the EU expressed its opinion that that there was sufficient evidence to consider that all five substances, including trifluralin and PCP/PCA, were POPs in accordance with the criteria of the Protocol. It was also of the opinion that sufficient information had been presented on the management options on all five substances to allow to start negotiations on listing of all five substances in the annexes to the Protocol. Nevertheless, the EU considered that a decision on that matter should be postponed until the twenty-ninth session of the Executive Body in December 2011 in order to give priority to the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol and the Protocol on Heavy Metals, to take into account further developments under the Stockholm Convention and to take advantage of the expedited procedure for amendments to the annexes of the Protocol that might be available in 2012.

62. In the discussion that followed, it was proposed to put on hold the consideration of amending the Protocol and come back to the question in 2011. It was suggested that the Working Group on Strategies and Review should consider any new scientific information with regard to trifluralin and/or PCA/PCP that might be submitted in time for its forty-ninth session in September 2011.

63. The Executive Body:

(a) Thanked the Task Force on POPs and the reviewers for the work on the technical reviews of endosulfan, dicofol, HBCD, PCP/PCA and trifluralin, as presented in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2010/8;

(b) Took note of the report from the Working Group on Strategies and Review, from its forty-seventh session and the Working Group's recommendations on the five substances;

(c) Invited the Working Group on Strategies and Review to consider any of the following information which might be submitted by Parties in advance of the Working Group's forty-ninth session in September 2011, and to review and revise its recommendations as appropriate regarding:

(i) Any additional new scientific information on trifluralin related to significant adverse human health impacts and environmental effects as a result of long-range transport;

(ii) Any additional new scientific information on persistence in water or soil or sediments for PCP/PCA; or

(iii) Information on international development(s) on all five substances.

64. The Parties to the Protocol on POPs decided to come back to the issue at the twenty-ninth session of the Executive Body in December 2011 with a view to making a decision regarding endosulfan, dicofol, HBCD, PCP/PCA and trifluralin.

## V. Compliance with protocol obligations

65. The Chair of the Implementation Committee, Mr. Meulepas (Belgium), introduced the Committee's thirteenth report (ECE/EB.AIR/2010/2) on Parties' compliance with their protocol obligations, including the results of the Committee's twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth meetings. He drew attention to the Committee's recommendations (ECE/EB.AIR/2010/6) with regard to individual cases of non-compliance with basic obligations, as well as on

compliance by Parties with their emission reporting obligations, as well as their obligations to report on strategies and policies.

66. The Chair of the Implementation Committee noted that an information-gathering mission to Greece had taken place in November 2010 in accordance with paragraph 8 of decision 2009/6 regarding its compliance with the 1988 Protocol concerning the Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides or their Transboundary Fluxes. However, since that mission had taken place after the Committee's twenty-sixth meeting, the information gathered could not be taken into account by the Committee in its recommendation to the Executive Body.

67. The Chair of the Implementation Committee also drew attention to the large number of new referrals by the secretariat in 2010 on possible cases of non-compliance with the obligations under the Protocol on POPs and the Protocol on Heavy Metals. There were large uncertainties in the reported emissions in a number of cases. The Committee was concerned that Parties should be able to rely on valid and consistent emission factors in preparing their estimates, and therefore particularly sought information on the use and development of emission factors. The Committee recommended that the Executive Body instruct the EMEP Steering Body to provide assistance to the Implementation Committee, upon its request, in its review of the reporting of POPs data and the information received by Parties.

68. The delegation of Spain made a presentation as called for in decision 2009/8 on its compliance with the 1991 Protocol concerning the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or their Transboundary Fluxes, specifically concerning the additional information requested in paragraph 5, and in particular presented its progress on the revision of the Spanish national emission inventory and its work identifying activities or sectors where there was still potential to further reduce emissions.

69. The delegation of Cyprus informed the Executive Body about recent progress in projects and measures undertaken by the government to achieve compliance with the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and the Protocol on Heavy Metals. The complexity of the construction of a terminal for the import and storage of natural gas, the main measure aimed at reducing NO<sub>x</sub> emissions, had experienced some delays, as a result of which compliance with the Protocol on NO<sub>x</sub> was expected in 2014. As fuel combustion was the main source of cadmium emissions in Cyprus, that measure would also be effective in achieving compliance with the Protocol on Heavy Metals with regard to cadmium emissions, as fuel oil would be replaced by natural gas. In addition, recent developments and restructuring in the cement industry in Cyprus were expected to lead to compliance with the Protocol on Heavy Metals with regard to mercury emissions by 2012.

70. The delegation of Denmark informed the Executive Body that it expected to publish its new national strategy focused on mitigating the emissions of particles and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) from wood burning boilers and stoves in 2011. A reduction of the PAH emissions in the period 2012–2020 was expected as a result of implementing the measures in the strategy.

71. With regard to paragraph 110 of the Implementation Committee's report, and table 8 in informal document No 2 concerning compliance by Parties with their reporting obligations, the delegations of the Czech Republic, Portugal and the United Kingdom noted that they had provided complete replies to the 2010 questionnaire and proposed that paragraphs 3 (c), 3 (g) and 3 (l) of the Committee's recommendation presented in ECE/EB.AIR/2010/6, section I, be deleted.

72. Consistent with the recommendation and request by the Implementation Committee to all Parties to the Convention, the United States indicated that it would present the Committee with information on emissions factors and effectiveness of controls for POPs emissions from residential combustion.

73. The Executive Body took note of the thirteenth report of the Implementation Committee, and expressed its appreciation to the members of the Committee for their work over the past year.

74. The Executive Body adopted the following decisions:

(a) Decision 2010/3 concerning compliance by Greece with its obligations under the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides;

(b) Decision 2010/4 concerning compliance by Spain with its obligations under the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides;

(c) Decision 2010/5 concerning compliance by Spain with its obligations under the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds;

(d) Decision 2010/6 concerning compliance by Denmark with its obligations under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants;

(e) Decision 2010/7 concerning compliance by Cyprus with its obligations under the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides;

(f) Decision 2010/8 concerning compliance by Cyprus with the Protocol on Heavy Metals (cadmium);

(g) Decision 2010/9 concerning compliance by Cyprus with the Protocol on Heavy Metals (mercury);

(h) Decision 2010/10 concerning compliance by Croatia, Estonia, Germany, Italy, and Latvia with the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants;

(i) Decision 2010/11 concerning compliance by Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland\*, Romania, the Russian Federation, Spain and Switzerland with their obligations to report on strategies and policies;

(j) Decision 2010/12 concerning compliance by Albania, France, Ireland, Lithuania, Monaco and the European Union with their obligations to report on strategies and policies;

(k) Decision 2010/13 concerning compliance by Greece and Latvia with their obligations to report on strategies and policies;

(l) Decision 2010/14 concerning compliance by the Republic of Moldova with its reporting obligations;

(m) Decision 2010/15 concerning compliance by Iceland with its obligations to report on emissions; and

(n) Decision 2010/16 concerning compliance by Luxembourg with its reporting obligations.

75. The Executive Body requested the secretariat to communicate those decisions to the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the Parties in question.

76. With regard to the membership of the Implementation Committee, the Executive Body:

(a) Noted that Ms. Hamilton (United Kingdom), Ms. Karjalainen (Finland), Mr. Olsson (Sweden), Mr. Schroeder (Germany), Ms. Muñoz Cuesta (Spain), Mr. Michel

---

\* At the time of publication of this report Iceland had complied with its obligation.

(Switzerland) and Mr. Buchholz (United States) would remain on the Committee for another year;

(b) Re-elected Mr. Meulepas (Belgium) and Mr. Angelov (Bulgaria) for another term of two years;

(c) Elected Mr. Meulepas Chair of the Implementation Committee.

## **VI. Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia and capacity-building activities in countries with economies in transition**

77. The secretariat introduced the terms of reference for the Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia Coordinating Group, provisionally approved by the Executive Body Bureau, and its recommendation to the Executive Body that it adopt a decision on the establishment of that group as presented in the annex to the report on the activities of the Bureau (document ECE/EB.AIR/2010/3). It also presented an overview of progress and results of the implementation of capacity-building projects carried out, coordinated or assisted by the secretariat in 2010, along with the provisional budget for capacity-building activities in 2011.

78. The delegation of the Russian Federation presented the results of the first meeting of the Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia Coordinating Group held in Novopolotsk, Belarus, in November 2010 and their plans for future work under the joint project between the Russian Federation, Belarus and Kazakhstan (in coordination with the Scientific Research Institute for Atmospheric Air Protection of the Russian Federation “SRI Atmosphere”).

79. The delegation of Belarus presented progress with respect to the joint project and plans for future work.

80. The delegations of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Albania and Montenegro presented their progress under the project to support the implementation and ratification of the Convention and its Protocols in Western Balkans countries, funded by the Netherlands. The secretariat presented statements on behalf of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia summarizing their progress under the project.

81. The delegation of the Republic of Moldova presented its progress under the Czech Republic-financed project to assist it in implementing and ratifying the Gothenburg Protocol.

82. The delegation of the EU suggested that it would be useful to provide information on further actions and initiatives in implementation of the revised Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia to be taken into account in the ongoing revisions of the Gothenburg Protocol and the Protocol on Heavy Metals. It also suggested that the revised action plan, dating from 2007, be examined to see if it needed any updates in view of the priorities set in the long-term strategy.

83. The Executive Body:

(a) Adopted decision 2010/17 on establishment of a Coordinating Group on the promotion of action towards implementation of the Convention in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, and welcomed the offer of the Russian Federation to lead it;

(b) Welcomed the efforts made by countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and in South-Eastern Europe to move towards ratification;

(c) Reiterated that the implementation of the Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia remained a priority, and requested the secretariat to continue with its activities to promote ratification and implementation of the Convention's protocols in the region.

## **VII. Long-term strategy for the Convention**

84. In accordance with the request and the guidance by the Executive Body at its twenty-seventh session in 2009, the Bureau finalized the draft long-term strategy and submitted it for consideration and adoption to the Executive Body. In the process of its preparation, comments by the main subsidiary bodies and their bureaux had been collected and reflected in it.

85. The delegation of Canada raised the issue of elaborating an implementing plan and timetable for the strategy, and suggested that that process could be conducted intersessionally by the Executive Body Bureau. The delegation of the United States agreed that it might be useful to have an implementing plan. The Chair of the Working Group on Effects noted that the Working Group considered its workplan as the implementing plan for its strategy.

86. The Executive Body adopted decision 2010/18 on a Long-term Strategy for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution and Action Plan for its implementation.

## **VIII. 2011 workplan for the implementation of the Convention**

87. The secretariat introduced the draft 2011 workplan for the implementation of the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/2010/5). It also presented the comments and proposals for amendments made by the Working Group on Strategies and Review (see ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/102), the EMEP Steering Body (see ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2010/2), the Working Group on Effects (see ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2010/2) and the Implementation Committee (see ECE/EB.AIR/2010/2). It also introduced the provisional list of meetings for 2010.

88. A number of additional amendments were also proposed in light of the discussions and decisions of under the previous agenda items.

89. The Executive Body adopted its workplan as amended, instructing the secretariat to incorporate the changes and append the workplan to its report and post the report on the Convention website.

## **IX. Draft rules of procedure**

90. The Chair of the ad hoc group of legal experts presented the draft rules of procedure (ECE/EB.AIR/2010/9) elaborated by the ad hoc group at the request of the Executive Body. The draft rules of procedure were based on the UNECE Rules of Procedure, and drew upon the rules of procedure for other multilateral environmental agreements.

91. A number of delegations made comments and suggested amendments to the draft presented. Following a discussion, the Executive Body agreed on a final draft.

92. The Executive Body adopted decision 2010/19 on rules of procedure, and requested the secretariat to post them on the Convention website.

93. One delegation commented on the provision of rule 17.1 that provided that officers of the Executive Body “may not serve more than two consecutive terms unless the Executive Body decides otherwise.” There was a concern that the exception, if too frequently relied upon, would potentially undermine the intent of the rule, and it was suggested that the Executive Body should have a significant reason for deciding to elect an officer for a third or subsequent terms.

## **X. Strategies and policies of Parties and signatories to the Convention for the abatement of air pollution**

94. The secretariat introduced the draft report on strategies and policies as presented in documents ECE/EB.AIR/2010/8 and Add.1 and 2, as well as some recommendations made by a consultant with regard to the preparation of the next questionnaire.

95. Regarding the draft review, the delegation of the EU proposed that paragraph 55 of document ECE/EB.AIR/2010/8 be modified to reflect that the proposal to establish the coordinating group had been agreed at the twenty-seventh session of the Executive Body in 2009. In addition, the information in paragraph 18 of document ECE/EB.AIR/2010/8/Add.1, which applied to the sulphur content of diesel for road and off-road use, belonged to paragraph 25, while the second sentence of paragraph 25, regarding diesel fuel, was linked with positive ignition which was incorrect.

96. Several delegations suggested that the Executive Body could consider ways for improving the strategies and policies questionnaire and the process for drafting and publication of future reviews based on it, for example by focusing on new information that was not covered by other reports or the website.

97. The Executive Body requested the secretariat, taking into account comments made during the session, to finalize and publish the 2010 review and also to make it available on the Convention website.

## **XI. Activities of bodies of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and international organizations relevant to the Convention**

98. Representatives of EANET, the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), the Helsinki Commission (HELCOM), the European Environment Agency, the European Commission and UNEP presented their recent activities relevant to the Convention. The Chair drew attention to informal document No. 11 presented by the Global Atmospheric Pollution Forum (GAPF), on developing a global approach to tackle atmospheric pollution. The secretariat presented its recent activities on outreach to other regions (EANET), including plans for future cooperation with the North-East Asian Subregional Programme for Environmental Cooperation (NEASPEC).

99. The Executive Body took note of the information presented and encouraged cooperation with those organizations wherever possible.

100. The Executive Body discussed the recommendation of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution for the creation of a global confederation or interregional partnership (see ECE/EB.AIR/2010/10, paras. 67 and 68). It agreed that it provided an opportunity for the Convention to show leadership on the global stage by encouraging such an initiative and by playing a leading role as one of the world’s foremost regional agreements on environmental issues.

101. In order to implement the recommendations within the report of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution on wider global cooperation the Executive Body:

(a) Requested the Bureau of the Executive Body, in consultation with the Bureaux of the EMEP Steering Body, the Working Group on Effects and the Working Group on Strategies and Review, and the secretariat, to develop a set of questions designed to evaluate the level of interest and capacity of relevant organizations outside the UNECE for further cooperation;

(b) Requested the Bureau to explore the most effective ways of furthering that cooperation; and the Chairs of the Working Group on Effects and the EMEP Steering Body to report on the progress of such consultations to the Working Group on Strategies and Review;

(c) Requested the Working Group on Strategies and Review to report on that work, and recommend further follow-up action, to the Executive Body at its twenty-ninth session in 2011.

## **XII. Financial requirements for implementation of the Convention**

102. The secretariat introduced the note on the financial requirements for the implementation of the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/2010/1 and Corr.1).

103. The Executive Body:

(a) Adopted, in accordance with article 4, paragraph 3, of the EMEP Protocol, the revised annex, which included the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, as set out in the annex below;

(b) Decided on the detailed use of resources in 2011, as set out in table 2 of document ECE/EB.AIR/2010/1 and Corr.1, and on the scale of mandatory contributions, as set out in table 3 of that document;

(c) Supported the Steering Body's call on the Parties to the EMEP Protocol to consider making additional voluntary contributions (in kind or in cash through the trust fund) to ensure that the work, especially the difficult tasks required in 2011 for carrying out the protocol reviews and revisions, including the work on integrated assessment modelling, could be accomplished as foreseen in the 2011 workplan (ECE/EB.AIR/106/Add.2);

(d) Requested the Steering Body, with the assistance of its Bureau, to present the details of the 2012 budget together with the workplan for approval by the Executive Body at its thirtieth session in 2011;

(e) Urged Parties that had not yet done so to pay their 2010 contributions in cash to the trust fund and, in 2011, to pay their contributions so that they reached the trust fund in the first half of the year;

(f) Requested Ukraine to take urgent action to finalize the project for establishing an EMEP monitoring site as an in-kind contribution to cover its long-standing arrears for 1996–2001 (equivalent to \$175,205).

104. With regard to the trust fund for financing effects-oriented activities, the Executive Body:

(a) Took note of the contributions made to the trust fund for 2010, and welcomed the payments made, but also expressed disappointment at the lack of response by many Parties;

(b) Decided that the essential international coordination costs for financing the core activities of the Convention and its protocols, other than those covered by the EMEP Protocol, would be \$2,152,700 in 2011, and would provisionally be \$2,152,700 in 2012 and \$2,152,700 in 2013;

(c) Revised decision 2002/1 by adopting the 2010 United Nations scale of assessments for use in calculating the recommended contributions as set out in table 9 of document ECE/EB.AIR/2010/1;

(d) Requested the secretariat to inform Parties of the decided contributions to meet the 2011 budget, inviting them to make them as agreed in revised decision 2002/1;

(e) Urged all Parties which had not yet done so to consider providing the decided contributions to the trust fund for financing core activities without undue delay;

(f) Noted with appreciation the essential support provided to the Convention and its bodies by lead countries, countries hosting coordinating centres and those organizing meetings, as well as countries that fund activities of their national focal centres/points and the active participation of national experts.

105. With regard to the Trust fund for financing activities in countries in transition, the Executive Body:

(a) Reiterated its strong support to that element of the work programme, the success in an enlarged implementation of the Convention in countries in transition of Eastern Europe being crucial for the future of the Convention;

(b) Welcomed the contributions to the trust fund and thanked those countries that had contributed;

(c) Welcomed the direct contributions in kind and in cash made by several countries to promote capacity-building in the countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and South-Eastern European (SEE) countries, especially through meetings of task forces or expert groups and workshops held in those subregions;

(d) Approved the list of activities and the proposed budget for project E112 of \$941,855 for 2011;

(e) Urged all Parties to make contributions to the trust fund, as early as possible in 2011, so that the secretariat could implement its plans, and especially urged those not contributing to consider doing so;

(f) Invited again all Parties, but especially those that led task forces and expert groups, to promote activities such as special workshops in the countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and SEE countries, and to collaborate with the secretariat in developing such projects;

(g) Invited Parties to make contributions to enable the secretariat to strengthen its staff resources to support the capacity-building activities in countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and SEE countries and the implementation of the Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia, as adopted by the Executive Body in 2007 (ECE/EB.AIR/91, para. 51 (a)).

### **XIII. Election of officers**

106. Mr. R. Ballaman was elected Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review.

107. Mr. M. Williams was elected Chair of the Executive Body. Ms. N. Karpova (Russian Federation), Mr. T. Spranger (Germany) and Mr. F. San Martini (United States)

were elected Vice-Chairs. The Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review (Mr. R. Ballaman), the Chair of the Working Group on Effects (Mr. T. Johannessen), the Chair of the EMEP Steering Body (Ms. S. Vidič) and the Chair of the Implementation Committee (Mr. P. Meulepas) were also elected Vice-Chairs.

108. The Executive Body expressed appreciation to Ms. V. Galatone (Canada) and Ms. M. Dopazo (Spain) for their valuable contribution to the work of the Bureau.

#### **XIV. Adoption of decisions taken at the twenty-eighth session**

109. The Executive Body adopted the decisions taken at its twenty-eighth session on 17 December 2010.

## Annex

**Annex referred to in article 4 of the Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution on Long-term Financing of the Cooperative Programme for the Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP)**

Mandatory contributions for sharing of costs for financing EMEP shall from 2011 onwards be calculated according to the scale set out in the following table.\*

<i>Contracting Party</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
Belarus	0.0755
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.0289
Canada	Voluntary
Croatia	0.2178
Liechtenstein	0.0200
Monaco	0.0067
Montenegro	0.0067
Norway	1.9531
Russian Federation	2.8885
Serbia	0.0800
Switzerland	2.5352
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0.0133
Turkey	1.3887
Ukraine	0.1333
United States	Voluntary
Austria	1.9109
Belgium	2.4130
Bulgaria	0.0844
Cyprus	0.1044
Czech Republic	0.7821
Denmark	1.6509
Estonia	0.0889
Finland	1.2710
France	13.7360
Germany	17.9866
Greece	1.5487
Hungary	0.6533

\* The order in which the Contracting Parties are listed in this annex is specifically made in relation to the cost-sharing system agreed upon by the Executive Body for the Convention. Accordingly, the listing is a feature which is specific to the Protocol on the Financing of EMEP.

---

<i>Contracting Party</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
Ireland	1.1176
Italy	11.2141
Latvia	0.0844
Lithuania	0.1444
Luxembourg	0.2022
Malta	0.0378
Netherlands	4.1595
Poland	1.8598
Portugal	1.1443
Romania	0.2444
Slovakia	0.3200
Slovenia	0.2311
Spain	7.1280
Sweden	2.3886
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14.8159
European Union	3.3300

---