



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
6 November 2012

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

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

Working Group on Strategies and Review

Fiftieth session

Geneva, 10–14 September 2012

Report of the Working Group on Strategies and Review on its fiftieth session

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1–8	2
A. Attendance	2–3	2
B. Organizational matters	4–8	2
II. Options for revising the Protocol on Heavy Metals	9–29	3
III. Draft guidance document on best available techniques for controlling emissions of heavy metals and their compounds from the source categories listed in annex II.....	30–33	6
IV. Draft guidance documents to the revised 1999 Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone.....	34–48	7
V. Progress in the implementation of the 2012–2013 workplan	49–57	9
VI. Other business	58–63	11
VII. Adoption of the decisions of the Working Group	64	12

I. Introduction

1. The fiftieth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review was held in Geneva, Switzerland, from 10 to 14 September 2012.

A. Attendance

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

3. Representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) attended the meeting. Representatives of the Coordinating Centre for Effects, 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) and the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues were present. Also present were representatives of the oil companies' European association for environment, health and safety in refining and distribution (CONCAWE), the Union of the Electricity Industry (EURELECTRIC), the European Steel Association (EUROFER) and the European Association of Internal Combustion Engine Manufacturers. The International Cryosphere Climate Initiative was also represented.

B. Organizational matters

4. The meeting was chaired by Mr. R. Ballaman (Switzerland).

5. The Working Group adopted the agenda for the meeting as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/107.

6. The Working Group adopted the report of its forty-ninth session as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/106.

7. The Chair recalled the establishment of the ad hoc group of legal experts by the Executive Body for the Convention at its twenty-sixth session to address matters of a legal nature identified by the Working Group on Strategies and Review. The ad hoc group had significantly supported the work on the revision of Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (Protocol on POPs) and the Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone (Gothenburg Protocol). Recalling the voluntary nature of the group, the Chair requested delegations to nominate new legal experts, as well as to review and update existing nominations, and to inform the secretariat accordingly.

8. The Working Group:

(a) Invited Heads of delegations to submit further nominations for members of the ad hoc group of legal experts to the secretariat;

(b) Invited the secretariat to continue updating the list of members of the ad hoc group, based on the nominations provided by the heads of delegation during and after the session.

II. Options for revising the Protocol on Heavy Metals

9. A representative of UNEP presented the latest developments in the negotiations on a global legally binding instrument on mercury, and provided some background. The International Negotiating Committee (INC) on mercury had been established by the UNEP Governing Council in February 2009. Negotiations had started in June 2010 and were due to be completed at the fifth session of INC in January 2013, prior to the twenty-seventh session of the UNEP Governing Council in February 2013. In line with UNEP decision 25/5, which established the negotiation process, the main purpose of the future instrument was to reduce the risk that mercury posed to human health and the environment.

10. The mandate to develop a comprehensive and suitable approach to mercury included the following provisions:

- (a) To reduce the supply of mercury and enhance the capacity for its environmentally sound storage;
- (b) To reduce the demand for mercury in products and processes;
- (c) To reduce international trade in mercury;
- (d) To reduce atmospheric emissions of mercury;
- (e) To address mercury-containing waste and remediation of contaminated sites;
- (f) To increase knowledge through awareness-raising and scientific information exchange;
- (g) To specify arrangements for capacity-building and technical and financial assistance;
- (h) To address compliance.

11. At the fourth session of INC, held in Uruguay from 27 June to 2 July 2012, contact groups had been established to discuss a number of specific issues. For almost all issues, new text had been developed by the contact groups and presented to INC in plenary. In addition to provisions on emissions to air, a number of delegations had strongly supported the inclusion of provisions on releases to water and land. A number of Parties had also requested a dedicated health article (article 20 bis). UNEP was requested to prepare a document on emissions and releases, in cooperation with the co-chairs of that contact group, during the intersessional period between the fourth and fifth sessions of INC. UNEP had also been asked to prepare an analysis of the health-related provisions in the treaty text, in close cooperation with the World Health Organization. The INC Chair was to prepare a Chair's text to serve as the basis for negotiations at the fifth and final session of INC, which would be held in Geneva in January 2013.

12. Regional consultations would be held in preparation for the fifth session, in particular to consider the Chair's text. Following the conclusion of the negotiations, the global legally binding instrument on mercury would be opened for signature at a conference of plenipotentiaries to be held in late 2013 in Japan.

13. The UNEP representative also noted that, at its twenty-fifth session in February 2009, the UNEP Governing Council had also requested an update of the 2008 Global Atmospheric Mercury Assessment report,¹ which addressed atmospheric air emissions, as

¹ UNEP, *The Global Atmospheric Mercury Assessment: Sources, Emissions and Transport* (2008). Available from http://www.chem.unep.ch/mercury/Atmospheric_Emissions/UNEP%20SUMMARY%20REPORT%2

well as releases of mercury into the environment. Work to update the report was being undertaken in close cooperation with many of the technical experts active in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution, and benefitted from regional-level expertise and agreements. The UNEP Global Mercury Partnership area on mercury transport and fate research also provided information important to understanding mercury emission sources and pathways.

14. The Chair of the Task Force on Heavy Metals presented the work completed by the Task Force over the past five years and, in particular, the workshop to promote the ratification of the Protocol on Heavy Metals, which had been held in Berlin in April 2012 with support from the Government of Germany. The workshop had been organized to raise awareness of the upcoming negotiations, to provide information on technical and legal measures for implementation, to prepare a draft guidance document on best available techniques (BAT) for presentation to the Working Group and to discuss the inclusion of specific sub-sectors.

15. Over the past five years, several workshops had been held specifically for the countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and in South-Eastern Europe to improve understanding of the obstacles faced by countries of the subregion and the flexibilities required to build capacity and exchange experiences. The Chair of the Task Force on Heavy Metals thanked the countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and South-Eastern Europe for their cooperation and, in particular, the countries that had hosted and financially supported the workshops.

16. Furthermore, the Task Force had developed proposals for emission limit values for chlor-alkali installations and medical waste incineration. It had concluded a sufficiency and effectiveness report. It had also identified options for the further reduction of heavy metals from stationary sources and products. In 2009 and 2010, a thorough technical review of the products had been conducted (track A and track B review), following the proposal by the EU on adding mercury-containing products to annex VI to the Protocol.

17. The Chair of the Task Force on Heavy Metals explained why further reductions of emissions of heavy metals, in addition to those stipulated in the 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals, were important. The mercury levels in many EMEP countries still posed a significant risk to human health and the environment. There was still a high concentration in northern lakes and soils due to deposition of heavy metals. Further reducing the emissions into the atmosphere and the long-range transport of pollution was therefore of great importance. A modern and technically up-to-date Protocol on Heavy Metals could take into account flexibilities for timelines and the base year. It could include an expedited amendment procedure, up-to-date technical annexes and guidance documents, and contain new products. The experience gained when negotiating an amended Protocol on Heavy Metals in the framework of the ECE could inform the negotiations on a global legally binding instrument for mercury conducted within the framework of UNEP.

18. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the information provided by UNEP and the Chair of the Task Force on Heavy Metals;

(b) Invited the secretariat to continue the exchange of information with the UNEP secretariat on linkages between the INC process on a legally binding instrument on mercury and the consideration of an amended Protocol on Heavy Metals.

19. The Working Group continued negotiating options for revising the Protocol on Heavy Metals, in line with the relevant decisions by the Executive Body at its twenty-eighth session in 2010 and with a view to presenting amendment proposals to the Parties to the Protocol meeting within the Executive Body at its thirty-first session in 2012. It considered options for revising the Protocol on Heavy Metals contained in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/19 and information in informal document No. 1, as well as amendments proposed during the session.

20. A representative of Belarus said that over the past two years a comprehensive national exercise had been conducted to define the major sources of heavy metals. The necessary steps towards accession to the Protocol on Heavy Metals had also been analysed, in view of the Protocol's obligations. It was hoped that the revised Protocol would include the flexibilities required for Belarus to accede to it, while maintaining the principle objective of reducing emissions.

21. A representative of the Russian Federation confirmed the country's interest in acceding to an amended Protocol on Heavy Metals. The Protocol's unique feature was its binding commitments regarding the quantities of emissions. Efforts in the framework of the Convention to negotiate amendments to the Protocol on Heavy Metals did not compete with the global process of negotiating a legally binding instrument on mercury. However, clearly defined flexibility mechanisms would assist the Russian Federation in acceding to the Protocol in the future. In that connection, the Coordinating Group on promotion of actions towards implementation of the Convention in countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia (Coordinating Group for Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia) had developed proposals related to such flexibilities.

22. The Chair invited a general reflection on the adoption of similar approaches in the amended Protocol on Heavy Metals to the recently amended Gothenburg Protocol. Similarities could concern the adoption of emission limit values for the same installations, the definition of new stationary sources and potential increased flexibilities and timelines. Representatives of the EU and the United States agreed that the negotiation should be inspired by amendments to the Gothenburg Protocol adopted in May 2012, while keeping in mind that heavy metals were different from the pollutants regulated by the Gothenburg Protocol and not every approach would be suitable.

23. A representative of the EU expressed the commitment of the EU to proceed to the extent possible at present and future meetings with the objective of concluding the negotiations. The Protocol should be revised with a view to attracting new ratifications while maintaining a high level of ambition with regard to the protection of the environment.

24. Several delegations mentioned the need to be mindful of ongoing negotiations on a global legally binding instrument on mercury at UNEP, in particular as concerned the scope and level of ambition for restricted mercury-containing products. It would be important for Parties to have regular contact at the national level with colleagues following the negotiations in the framework of UNEP.

25. A representative of the United States agreed that an amended Protocol on Heavy Metals could add value from the point of view of environmental protection. The United States hoped to complete the work as had been done for the Protocol on POPs. Increased flexibilities to encourage the accession of new Parties was a key issue.

26. In that context, with regard the new annex X to the amended Gothenburg Protocol, a United States representative highlighted that its structure included different emission limit values for the EU, the United States and Canada. Comparing the measurements of those emission limit values would not be easy as different units were being used.

27. Another representative of the United States presented information on its Air Toxics programme, and suggested that the format for listing respective United States regulations in annex V to the amended Protocol on Heavy Metals be similar to that of the Gothenburg Protocol. The United States would provide a preliminary list of references to all the regulations concerned. Since the legislation was subject to change and technology review, that was the approach the United States favoured.

28. A representative of the EU mentioned that Parties in the EU could learn from Parties in North America about the process of setting emission limit values. It was proposed to cooperate in finding an agreed approach to the presentation of the information contained in annex V to the amended Protocol on Heavy Metals.

29. The Working Group:

(a) Requested the secretariat to produce an updated version of an informal document, in English and Russian, indicating modifications proposed to the 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals, for presentation to the Executive Body at its thirty-first session;

(b) Requested the ad hoc group of legal experts, in cooperation with the secretariat, to prepare two formal decision documents, in accordance with the two amendment procedures stipulated in article 13 of the 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals, so that they could be translated into all working languages in time to permit their consideration and possible adoption by the Executive Body;

(c) Requested the secretariat to arrange for the translation of the official draft decision documents and their submission to the Executive Body at its thirty-first session.

III. Draft guidance document on best available techniques for controlling emissions of heavy metals and their compounds from the source categories listed in annex II

30. The Chair of the Task Force on Heavy Metals presented a draft proposal for a guidance document based on the former annex III to the Protocol on Heavy Metals (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2012/1). The document presented an update of the version tabled in 2011. Two chapters, on non-ferrous metals and combustion plants, had been added.

31. A representative of Canada, referring to the discussions at UNEP on a global legally binding instrument on mercury, noted that decisions taken in that framework could also impact the elements included in the guidance document. Following her proposal, the Working Group agreed to place text concerning the possible inclusion of information on manganese production in square brackets, pending the outcome of discussions on adding manganese production as a listed stationary source category in annex II to the Protocol on Heavy Metals.

32. Several modifications to the guidance document were suggested during the discussions. The Chair of the Task Force on Heavy Metals revised the document accordingly and presented a new version to the Working Group for consideration during the current session.

33. The Working Group:

(a) Expressed its appreciation to the Task Force on Heavy Metals for its work on the draft guidance document on best available techniques for controlling emissions of heavy metals and their compounds from the source categories listed in annex II;

(b) Considered the draft guidance document on best available techniques for controlling emissions of heavy metals and their compounds from the source categories

listed in annex II (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2012/1), as amended during the session, and decided to forward it to the Executive Body with a recommendation that it be adopted;

(c) Requested the ad hoc group of legal experts, in cooperation with the secretariat, to prepare a draft decision on the guidance document on best available techniques for controlling emissions of heavy metals and their compounds from the source categories listed in annex II for the consideration of and possible adoption by the Executive Body at its thirty-first session.

IV. Draft guidance documents to the revised 1999 Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone

34. The Working Group considered the draft guidance documents to the revised Gothenburg Protocol. It expressed its appreciation for the work of all experts and technical groups who had contributed to the preparation of the documents and thanked the respective lead countries.

35. The co-Chair of the Expert Group on Techno-Economic Issues presented the draft guidance document on control techniques for emissions of sulphur, nitrogen oxides (NO_x), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), dust (including coarse particulate matter (PM₁₀), fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and black carbon) from stationary sources (informal document No. 11), and said that it had benefited from a further harmonization and description of BAT. The guidance document was a result of work done over the past few years in close cooperation with the Institute for Prospective Technological Studies in Seville, Spain. It included various types of emissions reductions by industry, highlighting different reduction technologies and cost. The document reflected the latest developments regarding BAT carried out within the EU. Information on black carbon had been added.

36. The co-Chair of the Expert Group noted that a courtesy Russian translation of the document, funded by Switzerland, had recently become available. It was envisaged to also add the information on black carbon to an updated Russian version of the guidance document. The Chair of the Coordinating Group for Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia expressed the Group's gratitude to the Swiss authorities for having provided the funding for the Russian translation.

37. A representative of the United States highlighted several issues, which, in his view, merited additional attention, in particular concerning the section on black carbon. Based on a proposal by the EU, it was agreed that the comments by the United States would be forwarded to the Expert Group on Techno-Economic Issues for review and updating of the guidance document. The Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review mentioned that timing should be taken into account, in particular in view of the fact that the present guidance document on stationary sources dated back to 1999 (ECE/EB.AIR/1999/2). Adopting the document at the forthcoming Executive Body session would allow Parties wanting to ratify the amendments to the Gothenburg Protocol to refer to an up-to-date guidance document on stationary sources.

38. The Working Group decided to forward the draft guidance document on control techniques for emissions of sulphur, NO_x, VOCs, dust (including PM₁₀, PM_{2.5} and black carbon) from stationary sources developed by the Expert Group on Techno-Economic Issues to the Executive Body with a recommendation that it be adopted, subject to changes made during the session and further changes to be incorporated by the Expert Group, as discussed during the Working Group's fiftieth session.

39. The Working Group then considered the draft guidance document on economic instruments to reduce emissions of regional air pollutants (informal document No. 3)

developed by the Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Instruments (NEBEI). The guidance document represented a compilation of various existing economic instruments, mainly in the EU. A representative of the EU mentioned that the document had been reviewed by different experts and organizations. As the document was limited in scope, it was suggested that it might be worthwhile revisiting it in several years' time, when there was more experience in the use of economic instruments.

40. A representative of the United States suggested including in the guidance document, as well as in all the other guidance documents, a reference to the respective paragraphs of the Gothenburg Protocol.

41. The Working Group decided to forward the guidance document on economic instruments to reduce emissions of regional air pollutants developed by NEBEI to the Executive Body with a recommendation that it be adopted at its thirty-first session.

42. The Working Group next considered the draft guidance document on health and environmental improvements (informal document No. 4), as presented by the Head of the Coordinating Centre for Effects. The guidance document represented a follow-up to the guidelines for reporting on the monitoring and modelling of air pollution effects. Its aim had been to develop indicators quantified to support an integrated assessment of emission scenario alternatives. A group of health indicators, well-known exceedances of critical load and assessments of biodiversity and yield had been included.

43. Representatives of the United States and the EU expressed the opinion that the guidance document could be updated to reflect, instead of emission commitments based on national legislation, the scenario that represented the emission reductions stipulated by the Gothenburg Protocol. The Head of the Coordinating Centre for Effects mentioned that, working in close cooperation with the Working Group on Effects and EMEP, a final draft of the guidance document could be completed in 2013.

44. The Working Group on Strategies and Review invited the Working Group on Effects, in cooperation with the EMEP Steering Body, to update the draft guidance document on health and environmental improvements, to better reflect the commitments of the revised Gothenburg Protocol, namely to include 2005 as the base year and 2020 emission reduction commitments. It furthermore invited the Working Group on Effects and the EMEP Steering Body to adjust their workplan for 2013 to that effect and to forward respective recommendations to the Executive Body.

45. A representative of the lead country (United Kingdom) of the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen presented the draft guidance documents on national nitrogen budgets (informal document No. 5) and on preventing and abating ammonia emissions from agricultural sources (informal document No. 6). An expert translation of the latter document into Russian had also been prepared.

46. A representative of the EU expressed appreciation for the progress achieved by the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen over the past few years. He suggested some modifications to the guidance document on national nitrogen budgets to reflect the fact that the guidance was for EMEP rather than for Parties.

47. The Working Group:

(a) Decided to forward the draft guidance document on national nitrogen budgets developed by the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen, with the suggested modifications made to its preamble, to the Executive Body with a recommendation that it be adopted at its thirty-first session;

(b) Decided to forward the draft guidance document on preventing and abating ammonia emissions from agricultural sources developed by the Task Force on Reactive

Nitrogen to the Executive Body, with a recommendation that it be adopted at its thirty-first session.

48. Furthermore, the Working Group requested the ad hoc group of legal experts, in cooperation with the secretariat, to prepare draft decisions on the adoption of the guidance documents approved by the Working Group (informal documents Nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6) for the Executive Body's consideration and possible adoption at its thirty-first session.

V. Progress in the implementation of the 2012–2013 workplan

49. The Working Group considered progress on the 2012–2013 workplan for the implementation of the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/109/Add.2), in particular section 1, dealing with strategies and policies. The Working Group recognized that numerous activities had already been completed, and it thanked the lead countries for their support.

50. The Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling presented the outcome of the most recent meeting in May 2012 and the results of the modelling of the amended Gothenburg Protocol commitments. Model comparison of the new 2020 commitment with the previous 2010 commitments had revealed that ambitions for countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia were high, while they were rather limited for countries in the EU. It should be noted that benefits of the high, low and medium emission scenarios would be much higher than the costs.

51. Despite meeting the Gothenburg Protocol commitments, in accordance with the modelling results exceedances of air quality limit values would remain, implying problems for health and ecosystems, including biodiversity, the Task Force Chair said. Possibilities to increase welfare had not been fully utilized. A longer-term vision could prevent a potential lock-in to existing technologies. Improved linkages with climate policy would lead to improved effects on climate pollutants. Local actions would also be needed to ensure that air quality limit values in all countries of the EU were met. The eminent scientific and policy questions of the balance between European-wide and local efforts and their cost-effectiveness would need to be addressed. Other issues for policymakers included national ambitions for health and ecosystem protection beyond 2020 and the timing to address increasing ozone exposure, as well as eutrophication.

52. The Task Force Chair noted that, for modelling purposes, additional information, such as reference figures by countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia would be useful in order to continue the analysis of the impact of the Gothenburg Protocol in countries without specific targets. A representative of the Russian Federation said that no specific figures were available at present, as work was under way to introduce new legislation and regulations. Presently, the Russian Federation was considering various scenarios for economic growth. A representative of Belarus mentioned that countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia had difficulties in developing scenarios on their own.

53. The Working Group:

(a) Expressed appreciation for the work of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and took note of its conclusions, in particular the need for analyses of longer-term scenarios linked to climate and energy policies; a wider geographical scope for the assessment of abatement options aimed at ozone and other short-lived climate forcers; the identification of possible synergies with other environmental issues and energy, transport and agriculture policies; and the efficient distribution of costs of local and European-wide measures;

(b) Supported the continuation of the Task Force's work and further sensitivity analysis, and stressed the need for a good communication between representatives of the Working Group on Strategies and Review and national experts on the Task Force and the support of those experts in preparing bilateral consultations on the data used in the Greenhouse Gas and Air Pollution Interactions and Synergies (GAINS) model;

(c) Requested countries to submit data for 2030, to enable the Task Force to update its input data for integrated assessment modelling;

(d) Recommended that the Executive Body request the EMEP Steering Body to consider the inclusion of the ozone flux-based approach in integrated assessments;

(e) Encouraged the Executive Body to invite the EMEP Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects to add elements to their workplan with regard to the contribution of European-wide nitrogen abatement measures to prevent the loss of biodiversity in protected nature areas;

(f) Encouraged the Executive Body to invite the EMEP Steering Body to continue to address the linkages between air and climate policy, as well as the effects of ozone and black carbon in integrated assessment modelling and the consideration of long-term scenarios;

(g) Encouraged the continuation of technical assistance to countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and that the best formats possible be considered in that regard, and requested Parties to consider funding such capacity-building efforts and/or to work with individual countries in the region on a bilateral basis;

(h) Requested heads of delegation from countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia to nominate institutes and experts to work on national integrated assessment modelling in the coming years through technical assistance.

54. A representative of the International Cryosphere Climate Initiative presented the effects of agricultural burning, a major source of emissions of particulate matter (PM) and black carbon. While the revised Gothenburg Protocol addressed PM and black carbon, it did not contain provisions to control emissions from agricultural burning. Furthermore, agricultural burning was a major source of VOCs. Guidelines for the control of emissions of PM, including black carbon, from agricultural and forest sources had been prepared. The guidelines considered a ban on open-field burning of agricultural waste and harvest residue, the alternative use of harvest residue and waste, as well as the incorporation of harvest residues in the soils, in accordance with improved techniques to limit nutrient losses and emissions into the atmosphere. The Working Group took note of the presentation by the International Cryosphere Climate Initiative and the draft guidelines on possible action.²

² The guidelines are available on the website of the Working Group's fiftieth session: <http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=29873>.

55. The co-Chair of the Expert Group on Techno-Economic Issues briefed the Working Group on the work completed, in particular cooperation with the Coordinating Group for Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and its activities with respect to countries of that subregion to promote the amended Gothenburg Protocol. In addition, the Expert Group had made progress in estimating the costs of reduction techniques, had updated the methodologies for large combustion plants and had improved their representation in the GAINS model, had updated the guidance document to the Gothenburg Protocol with information on black carbon and had begun the application of the methodology for comparison of the annex emission limit values and the emission scenarios developed by the GAINS model.

56. A representative of the French Environment and Energy Management Agency presented the work undertaken by the Expert Group on Techno-Economic Issues on emerging techniques and technologies to abate emissions from combustion plants, with a core focus on plants between 50 megawatts thermal (MWth) and 500 MWth.

57. The Working Group:

(a) Expressed its appreciation for the work of the Expert Group on Techno-Economic Issues, in particular its work on emerging techniques and technologies for large combustion plants with up to 500 MWth capacity;

(b) Invited heads of delegations to nominate experts on techniques to abate emissions from mobile sources (off- and on-road) to participate in the work of the Expert Group in further revising the draft guidance on control techniques for emissions of sulphur, NO_x, VOCs and dust (including PM₁₀, PM_{2.5} and black carbon) from mobile sources;

(c) Supported efforts being made to ensure cooperation between experts from the Expert Group and the Institute for Prospective Technological Studies in Seville, Spain, and welcomed cooperation with the countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia;

(d) Supported the initiative by the Task Force on Heavy Metals to cooperate with the Expert Group on Techno-Economic Issues in the provision of technical support facilitating the accession of countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia to the Protocol on Heavy Metals.

VI. Other business

58. The Chair of the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution briefed the Working Group on the activities by the ad hoc group of legal experts, as mandated in the Action Plan for the Implementation of the Long-term Strategy for the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/109/Add.1, decision 2011/14).

59. The results of the ad hoc group's work had been consolidated into one official document (ECE/EB.AIR/2012/15) to be presented to the Executive Body at its thirty-first session in December 2012, in addition to several informal documents. The information and activity flows were presented in the form of a science, policy and legal compliance pillar. The ad hoc group of experts recommended that the Executive Body take decisions on the existence of task forces and other subsidiary bodies in the light of the Convention's work and priorities. Communication was also given prominence and several recommendations were stipulated in that regard.

60. The secretariat updated the Working Group on transboundary air pollution activities supported by the Subregional Office for East and North-East Asia of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) and its North-East

Asian Subregional Programme for Environmental Cooperation (NEASPEC). A one-year project being carried out by the Russian Federation within the NEASPEC framework aimed to study existing subregional and international mechanisms on transboundary air pollution and to identify gaps in knowledge, priority needs and to propose a set of options for a strengthened multilateral approach.

61. During a recent expert meeting (Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, July 2012), the Russian Federation announced that a project proposal was forthcoming that, among others, would look into policy aspects of transboundary air pollution. It was expected that the developments in North East Asia might lead to the establishment of a policy-type umbrella framework that would cover the existing monitoring and modelling programmes like the Joint Research Project on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollutants³ and the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia.⁴ The six countries in North-East Asia (China, the Republic of Korea, North Korea, Japan, Mongolia and the Russian Federation), accounted for one fourth of the world's population, gross domestic product and trade. Adverse effects of air pollution, in particular PM_{2.5}, black carbon and ground-level ozone, caused damage to crops and affected millions of people, leading to premature deaths, breathing problems, asthma and other chronic respiratory diseases.

62. The Working Group took note of the information provided by the secretariat regarding cooperation with the ESCAP and welcomed developments conducive to furthering cooperation with North-East Asia in addressing transboundary air pollution.

63. The Working Group briefly discussed the timing for the holding of its next meeting. The secretariat announced that rooms in the Palais des Nations had been provisionally booked for 16 to 19 September 2013. During the discussion, delegates discussed the benefits and drawbacks of having the Working Group meeting in spring rather than in September each year.⁵

VII. Adoption of the decisions of the Working Group

64. On 14 September 2012, the Working Group on Strategies and Review adopted the decisions taken at its fiftieth session.

³ This is a joint research project among China, Japan and the Republic of Korea.

⁴ See <http://www.eanet.cc/>.

⁵ Following the recommendation of the Executive Body Bureau, the secretariat provisionally booked a room for the period 29 April to 3 May 2013. Should a decision on holding the next Working Group meeting in April/May be taken by the Executive Body at its thirty-first session, the week of 16 to 19 September 2013 could be used for the holding of the high-level meeting on transboundary air pollution.