

Report of the ad hoc group of experts on the review of the International Cooperative Programmes of the Working Group on Effects.

Comments and proposals for modifications by France and individual ICPs.

Comments by ICP Materials:

ICP Materials appreciate the report and especially the mentioning of UNESCO sites as a high profile activity for the Convention. To strengthen the message regarding monitoring activities, especially related to particulate matter and black carbon as short lived climate forcer, would also be greatly appreciated, as this is potentially one activity that could broaden interaction with other bodies of the Convention.

Comments by ICP Waters:

We are happy with the review and have only a few comments.

1. It is not clear to us in the conclusions for ICP Waters what is meant by 'lack of broad participation'. We have collaborations with many countries in Europe, and with USA and Canada - so a good international participation. We collaborate well with other ICPs. So perhaps this sentence could be specified.
2. The focus on lakes rather than streams. We have both streams and lakes in our database, but probably more lakes than streams. Much of the biological monitoring data comes from rivers. So we don't think that the description of 'focus on lakes rather than rivers' is justified.
3. Cooperation with ICP IM - we are open for more cooperation and see that the catchment approach of ICP IM fits very well with the water chemistry monitoring data we analyse.

Comments by ICP Forests:

- In general thanks and support to the report
- WGE reporting system is core to future set up and success. Thematic reports are supported, they would need to be linked to the demands of the EB and in an optimum case be underpinned by a scientific conference. Operational details of such conferences (concurrency to already existing ICP Forests Science Conferences, travel costs for selected experts, timing – every 2nd, 3rd, 4th year ...?) need to be considered.
- Set aside portion of the Trust Fund for studies: seen critical given the anyhow small budget of the Trust Fund.
- Recommendations to ICP Forests: Level I is essential – see my presentation and comments in the room. It's mainly based on (i) forest health assessments which are not very expensive and (ii) the soil survey – which has very high impact as the only European forest soil information on harmonized bases, but this this does not need to be repeated in the coming

5 years.

- As concerns more focus on air pollution – see my presentation: our Expert Panel on Deposition is the most active one. In addition there is, from the scientific communities and the Parties, increasing interest in multifunctional monitoring which we should not restrain as long as the core business is fully operational. CLRTAP has also benefit from this – see contributions to biodiversity and climate change questions in relation to air pollution.

Comments by ICP Integrated Monitoring:

First ICP IM appreciates the report and expresses its Thanks.

However, it should be noted regarding the sites included that we added sites also and especially a new country, i.e. Ukraine as well as Polen is showing interest to add more sites.

To add a sentence to the Recommendations text below;

Recommendations

“Consider merging the activities (in particular interpretations) undertaken within this programme with ICP Waters and/or ICP Forests; increase the focus of activity to cover carbon and nitrogen pools and fluxes, more specifically.”

Addition:

"To increase the collaboration and assessments between ICPs, especially for ICP Forests, ICP Waters and ICP Integrated monitoring, joint workshops and thematic reporting would be a beneficial route forward."

We would also wish to emphasise that ICP IM recently has produced high-profile scientific papers and other information in the field of impacts of N deposition on biodiversity and ecosystem service indicators (forest floor vegetation changes and N and heavy metal retention). The ICP IM sites are located in undisturbed areas (Natura2000 areas in the EU-countries) providing the links also to policies on biodiversity, ecosystem services and climate change impacts, and their interactions with air pollutants.

Comments by ICP Vegetation:

The following comments and modifications are proposed:

II. Review of WGE/ICP Operations

...

Conclusions and Recommendations

It is recognized that nationally funded activities must continue and that without them, the Convention (and the EU) would not be able to fulfill its aims regarding the abatement of air pollution effects. Such multiple uses of outputs from scientific projects is clearly beneficial but there is a requirement to ensure that research priorities, data collection and availability, reporting, organizational requirements and policy messages meet the needs and requirements of the Parties to the Convention. For example, annual reports may be needed to meet contractual requirements of funders but are not otherwise necessary for the

Comment [h1]: Frequency and details can certainly be reduced for some reporting, but how can we streamline this with the very workplan with detailed deliverables for 2014/15?

Question to Secretariat: are detailed deliverables required in workplan for satisfying Trust Fund obligations and also scrutiny of the workplan by EB? Would EB be satisfied with a much less detailed workplan focussing on integrated deliverables, e.g. from thematic reports?

Comment [h2]: and required to show visibility of contributions NFC to the Party/funder

Convention; annual meetings of networks/programmes are useful for maintaining the participation of the relevant science community but are not essential for the Convention unless individuals' participation depends on the status of such meetings as official Convention meetings. The Convention requires that well founded, highest scientific quality and most appropriate messages are delivered into the policy level (WGSR/EB). As the capacity at the political level is limited, too much information to the policy level can cause information overload. This can lead to the key messages being overlooked. It is important, therefore, that the ICPs, together with the WGE, ensure clear communication focused on the most appropriate messages. This is only possible, however, if the EB and WGSR are clear in their expectations.

Comment [h3]: Again, some Parties based funding on the outcome/recommendations from the annual meeting.

...
RECOMMENDATION; There should be an obligation for the WGSR/EB to take note of any output requested from the WGE/ICPs and to provide appropriate feedback.

Comment [h4]: This is the important statement, taking note only will not be sufficient

...
RECOMMENDATION; The WGE should take steps to developing and adopting appropriate common data standards for all ICPs and develop a 'portal' approach to facilitate and improve data access via the web. WGE should develop a work and time plan for this activity.

Comment [h5]: Not a trivial task. Also issues with ownership for some data.

...
RECOMMENDATION; assess the options for establishing integrated science and TF meetings and for re-invigorating the annual WGE meeting. Such meetings may be organized as common (CLRTAP or WGE) scientific meetings or as topical workshops e.g. due a certain request from the EB.

Comment [h6]: Good to have these in addition to regular Task Force meeting. Task Force meetings/expert group meetings less frequent than ones a year might lead to losing interests and momentum from participation by experts from Parties.

...
III. Review of the ICPs

...
A. ICP Vegetation

The potential for damage to crops by air pollution in many areas of Europe is high and the annual economic cost may be considerable. The programme was therefore established to consider the underlying science for quantifying crop damage but later to also include semi-natural vegetation.

Comment [h7]: Not from N (has fertilisation effect)

The objectives of ICP Vegetation are to; evaluate the effects of air pollutants and other stresses on crops and non-wood plants by monitoring the onset of injury and reductions in the yield/biomass of sensitive species; identify realistic dose-response functions, incorporating modifying (level II) factors for a range of economically important crops and for crops at risk from pollution; validate and substantiate critical levels of ozone for crops and non-wood plants including incorporation of level II factors; facilitate the production of European maps showing where critical levels for ozone are exceeded; assist in assessing the economic loss due to ozone pollution; conduct literature reviews and specific experiments on the accumulation of atmospheric deposition of heavy metals and other substances via moss monitoring. The ICP Vegetation is planned and coordinated by a Task Force led by the United Kingdom and supported by a coordination centre at the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (CEH) in Bangor, United Kingdom.

Comment [h8]: ICP Vegetation also coordinates development of ozone critical levels for trees in cooperation with ozone experts from ICP Forests. Validation to some extent also done by ICP Vegetation experts.

...
Recommendations

Expand the focus from ozone to include other air pollutants, particularly nitrogen; pursue the reorganization of moss monitoring to focus on the Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia countries where heavy metal pollution continues to be a major air pollution issue; look for further opportunities to cooperate with EMEP. ICP Vegetation and ICP Forest should increase their cooperation with respect to ozone impacts to forests, including carbon sequestration.

Comment [h9]: Already happening in ECLAIRE project. Freeing up time and funding from moss survey might allow incorporation for more N work in collaboration with CCE.

Comment [h10]: This is not mentioned specifically under other ICPs; ICP Vegetation already has extensive collaboration with EMEP (Centres, TFIAM/CIAM, TF HTAP). Discussing collaboration with HTAP in ozone workshop organised in China next year.

Comment [h11]: Maybe not that transparent in the official structure but this is already ongoing between the relevant experts from both ICPs.

Comment by France:

France supports the remark by Switzerland underlining that competitive commissioning on relatively small amounts of money may represent a very large administrative burden compared to the funds allocated.

Comments by ICP Modelling and Mapping (M&M):

- (1) ICP M&M supports the recommendations that encourage the EB and WGSR to provide feedback on WGE and ICPs reports and activities.
- (2) The current description of ICP M&M activities is incomplete, ignoring the development of methods, models and databases in the field of dynamic modelling and heavy metals. Terms as “compiling” (p. 12, 3rd para) or “administer” (see review report, p.14, second para, first phase) do not convey the actual nature of the work of the ICP M&M.

Therefore the description of the ICP M&M activities should bear upon the mandate (UNECE document EB.AIR/WG.1/2000/4, Annex VII) or use the texts in the WGE workplans that summarize the activities of the ICP M&M (e.g. WGE workplan 2011-2012)

Therefore it is proposed to replace:

“The objectives of the ICP Modelling and Mapping ... which is used for integrated assessment modelling by the TFIAM and its CIAM.”

By the following text:

“Description/objectives: Determine critical loads and levels and their exceedances for selected pollutants. Develop and apply other methods for effects-based approaches, such as dynamic modelling. Model and map the present and projected status of and trends in impacts of air pollution. A Programme Task Force led by France is responsible for the detailed planning and coordination of activities. The Task Force uses available and accepted data, drawing on the work of other task forces, ICPs and EMEP. The Coordination Centre for Effects (CCE, at the RIVM, Bilthoven, Netherlands) provides scientific and technical support to the Task Force and to other effects-related activities. It develops methods and models for calculating critical loads and levels and for other effects-based approaches, and produces maps of critical loads and levels and their exceedance and other risk parameters related to potential damage and recovery. At present, 30 countries have contributed national data.

CCE developed and uses various European databases on soil, land, climatic and other variables to calculate critical loads for countries that are unable to provide While CCE is charged with compiling European critical loads/levels maps and databases, NFCs are responsible national data. It maintains a database of critical loads data, which is used for integrated assessment modelling by the TFIAM and its CIAM.”

- (3) The description of the Modelling and Mapping Manual should mention that the manual integrates policy relevant methods and outcomes from different ICPs and contributes to the harmonization of methods.
- (4) The recommendation under the section of the ICP-Materials to collaborate with the ICP M&M with respect to a call for data should clearly state the role of the ICP M&M can only be advisory. The network of the ICP M&M is significantly different from the NFC network of ICP-M.