



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
23 December 2013

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

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

Steering Body to the Cooperative Programme for
Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range
Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe

Thirty-seventh session
Geneva, 9–11 September 2013

Report of the Steering Body to the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe on its thirty-seventh session

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1–5	3
A. Attendance.....	2–3	3
B. Organizational matters.....	4–5	3
II. Matters arising from recent meetings of the Executive Body and its subsidiary bodies and activities of the Bureau of the Steering Body	6–8	3
III. Update of the Guidelines for Reporting Emission Data under the Convention	9–11	4
IV. Adjustments under the Gothenburg Protocol to emission reduction commitments or to inventories for the purposes of comparing total national emissions with them.....	12–14	5
V. Progress in activities in 2013 and future work	15–38	6
A. Measurements and modelling (acidification, eutrophication, and photo-oxidants, heavy metals, particulate matter and persistent organic pollutants)	17–26	6
B. Integrated assessment modelling	27–29	8
C. Emissions.....	30–33	9

GE.13-26690



* 1 3 2 6 6 9 0 *

Please recycle



D.	Hemispheric transport of air pollution.....	34–35	10
E.	Joint session of the Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects	36–38	10
VI.	Information sharing by Parties on implementation of their national monitoring programmes.....	39–48	11
VII.	Cooperation with other organizations and programmes	49–52	13
VIII.	Draft 2014–2015 workplan or the implementation of the Convention	53–54	14
IX.	Financial and budgetary matters	55–57	14
X.	Closing of the thirty-seventh session	58–59	15
Annex			
	List of presentations made during the joint session of the Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects		16

I. Introduction

1. The Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution Steering Body to the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP) held its thirty-ninth session from 17 to 19 September 2013 in Geneva, Switzerland.

A. Attendance

2. The session was attended by representatives from the following Parties to the Convention: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, European Union (EU), Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America. A representative of Japan also attended.

3. Also attending were representatives of the following international processes, institutions and organizations: the World Meteorological Organization (WMO); the World Health Organization (WHO); the secretariat of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Basel Convention), the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade (Rotterdam Convention) and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (Stockholm Convention) under the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); the Chemical Coordinating Centre (CCC); the Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections (CEIP); the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM); the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E); the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W); the Coordination Centre for Effects; and the European Environment Agency (EEA).

B. Organizational matters

4. The Steering Body adopted its provisional agenda as contained in document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2013/1 and /Corr.1.

5. The Steering Body considered and adopted the report of its thirty-sixth session as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2012/2.

II. Matters arising from recent meetings of the Executive Body and its subsidiary bodies and activities of the Bureau of the Steering Body

6. The secretariat presented the main results of the thirty-first session of the Executive Body for the Convention (Geneva, 11–13 December 2012), including the decision on the revision of the Protocol on Heavy Metals. The amended Protocol included flexibilities (transitional arrangements) for existing emission sources applicable for countries in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. The Executive Body also adopted four guidance documents for the recently amended Protocol to Abate Acidification,

Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone (Gothenburg Protocol). The only pending guidance document for the Gothenburg Protocol, on health and environmental improvements, had been recently elaborated and would be presented at the Working Group on Effects at its thirty-second session (Geneva, 12–13 September 2013). The Executive Body had also requested its Bureau to develop, with support from the secretariat, a draft workplan for 2014–2015 for the implementation of the Convention.

7. The Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review presented the highlights of the fifty-first session of the Working Group (Geneva, 30 April–3 May 2013). The main issues discussed included the review of the structure and operation of the Convention, the draft workplan for 2014–2015 (ECE/EB.AIR/2013/6) and further implementation of the Convention. The Parties' needs and obstacle to ratifying the latest three protocols to the Convention had been discussed in a dedicated session, prepared by Belarus, with a focus on countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. At the same time, nine Parties to the Gothenburg Protocol had provided information on their successful measures and policies to reduce air pollutant emissions in selected sectors.

8. The Chair of the Steering Body then presented a brief summary of the work of the Bureau of the Steering Body between the Steering Body's thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh sessions, highlighting the EMEP budgetary issues and the workplan for 2014–2015 for the implementation of the Convention.

III. Update of the Guidelines for Reporting Emission Data under the Convention

9. Mr. Martin Adams, a co-Chair of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, presented the proposal for an update to the Guidelines for Reporting Emission Data under the Convention (Emission Reporting Guidelines) (ECE/EB.AIR/97), developed by the Task Force in collaboration with CEIP and the EMEP Centres. The proposed updated Guidelines included changes introduced to improve the quality of emissions information available under the Convention, to reflect recent amendments to the Gothenburg Protocol, the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants, to ensure consistency with emission reporting guidelines under UNFCCC and to introduce the new EMEP grid projection and spatial resolution.

10. Following the presentation and subsequent discussion, the Steering Body thanked the Task Force for the high quality of the presentation and the proposal. It further requested the co-Chairs of the Task Force to revise the proposal, taking into account the agreed recommendations given below, and to submit it to the Executive Body for its consideration and approval at its thirty-second session (Geneva, 9–13 December 2013):

(a) Maintain the current practice of estimating and reporting total sulphur emissions expressed as sulphur dioxide (SO₂), as there was currently insufficient guidance that would allow Parties to report only SO₂ emissions and avoid unnecessary duplication of effort;

(b) Maintain the yearly deadlines of 15 February for annual reporting of national emission estimates and activity data (for n-2, where n is the year in which reporting occurs n-2) and 15 March for the Informative Inventory Report;

(c) Align the reporting frequency of emission projections, gridded emissions and data on large point sources (LPS), including information on the LPS stack heights, to a biennial cycle. Parties were encouraged to regularly update their projections whenever new data became available and to ensure reported LPS emissions data were consistent with data reported under the European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (E-PRTR) and the

Protocol on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers to the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters;

(d) Move the deadline for the two-yearly reporting of gridded emissions, and LPS data to 1 May, and maintain the deadline for projections data at 15 February;

(e) For consistency purposes, maintain the flexibilities for the EU with respect to the deadlines for reporting its total and gridded emissions, emission projections and LPS data;

(f) For consistency purposes, maintain the requirement for all Parties to report transport emissions on the basis of fuel sold statistics, while maintaining the possibility for Parties wishing to present, in addition, their emission estimates based on fuel used statistics to be used for compliance assessment with the 2010 emission ceilings of the Gothenburg Protocol;

(g) Strengthen the emission reporting obligations as formulated in the Emission Reporting Guidelines by introducing, when justified by developments in science, further mandatory requirements in accordance with the key goals of the Convention as expressed in its Long-term Strategy.

11. The Steering Group further noted the request from several Parties that legal clarification be provided concerning the use of fuel used emission estimates for future compliance assessment with the 2020 emission reduction commitments of the amended Gothenburg Protocol.

IV. Adjustments under the Gothenburg Protocol to emission reduction commitments or to inventories for the purposes of comparing total national emissions with them

12. Mr. Chris Dore, a co-Chair of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, presented information on the proposed additional guidance to the adjustments under the Gothenburg Protocol to emission reduction commitments or to inventories for the purposes of comparing total national emissions with them. The information focused on the process of the review of Parties' applications for an adjustment, and in particular on the key role of CEIP that was foreseen in that process. Several clarifications were presented and discussed, namely: the content of the applications (a template was developed by the Task Force); the timing of the review process; and associated funding mechanisms to address associated costs. A template for reporting approved adjustments was also presented (annex VII and extended annex I to the proposed revised Emission Reporting Guidelines (see sect. III above)). The additional guidance was provided to supplement the provisions outlined in Executive body decision 2012/12.

13. The Steering Body considered the information presented and the additional guidance and recommended that:

(a) Each Party wishing to submit an application for an adjustment or adjustments to its emission inventory and to its emission reduction commitments, should submit its application individually; the application might include a request for a single or for a number of adjustments for one or more pollutants. A group of Parties could provide the same supporting information for an adjustment or adjustments based on similar reasoning;

(b) CEIP would initially screen the completeness of any applications for an adjustment or adjustments before its review and evaluation. When reviewing a Party's application, CEIP might contract and supervise independent reviewers with proven

experience and expertise. CEIP would then forward the report from the review to the EMEP Steering Body for its consideration and approval. The review report should clearly recommend to the Steering Body whether to approve or to reject the Party's application, and the basis for that recommendation;

(c) Unless additional funding was provided to CEIP to cover the additional costs incurred in the review of applications, each Party submitting a request for an adjustment or adjustments was obliged to cover the costs of the review. The cost of reviewing a single application had been set at US\$ 10,000–15,000.

14. The Steering Body requested the co-Chairs of the Task Force to reflect the proposed additional guidance relevant to information to be annually reported with emission inventory submissions in the text of the draft updated Emission Reporting Guidelines, as appropriate, taking into consideration the recommendations outlined above.

V. Progress in activities in 2013 and future work

15. The Chair invited the Steering Body to separately discuss each area of work, considering progress made in 2013 with respect to the 2012–2013 workplan for the implementation of the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/109/Add.2).

16. The Steering Body noted that all the status reports relevant for the evaluation of progress in implementation of the workplan for 2013 had been prepared by the EMEP Centres on time and were all available on the EMEP website.¹

A. Measurements and modelling (acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants, heavy metals, particulate matter and persistent organic pollutants)

17. The Chair of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (France) reported on progress, including the results of the fourteenth meeting of the Task Force (Zagreb, 6–8 May 2013). The Task Force had discussed the 2012–2013 EMEP Intensive Observation Periods, implementation of the EMEP monitoring strategy (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/15),² heavy metals test-case studies, modelling activities, including the EURODELTA model intercomparison project (EURODELTA3),³ as well as emission issues and trends analyses. National experts contributed actively with several presentations on those items.

18. In particular, the Task Force discussed the benefits of Intensive Observation Periods as part of the EMEP monitoring strategy, considering the results achieved so far. Unique sets of data were now available to support investigations on air pollution in Europe (especially particulate matter (PM) issues). Such initiatives also helped in tightening ties with the research community. The analysis and expertise phase would continue to allow interpretation by the EMEP Centres, national experts and modelling teams and the definition of future needs. In parallel, with the help of CCC, the Parties had been invited to

¹ See <http://www.emep.int>.

² Available from

<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/documents/2009/EB/ge1/ece.eb.air.ge.1.2009.15.e.pdf>.

³ See P. Thunis and others, *EURODELTA: Evaluation of a Sectoral Approach to Integrated Assessment Modelling — Second Report*, European Commission Joint Research Centre (JRC) Scientific and Technical Reports (Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, 2010); available from http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/11111111/14758/1/reqno_jrc59501_ed_final%5B1%5D.pdf.

review their contribution to the EMEP monitoring network and to assess their level of compliance with the EMEP monitoring strategy.

19. The Task Force acknowledged the continued cooperation of MSC-E with national expert teams participating in pilot studies on inconsistencies between heavy metals emissions, measurements and modelling. Pilot studies involving Croatia and the Czech Republic had been completed and the one involving the Netherlands was still ongoing. The studies had proven to be successful initiatives that also made it possible to identify country-specific issues for a better management of air pollution. As requested by the Task Force, a brochure synthesizing the main lessons learned had been presented by MSC-E.

20. The Task Force acknowledged good progress on the EURODELTA3 intercomparison model exercise, formally involving six national modelling teams and MSC-W. The first phase of that project had been completed (simulation of the EMEP Intensive Observation Periods) and a report would be published by the end of 2013. The second phase, a retrospective analysis since 1990, should start at the same time. Availability of historical data sets for emissions was one of the main difficulties.

21. The Task Force stressed that modelling activities required more and more accuracy and inputs from emission inventories. Those needs were reviewed during the meeting and a “wish list” established for further discussions with the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections and the emission community. The Task Force on Measurements and Modelling also investigated fostering closer cooperation through pilot studies or investigations on inverse modelling.

22. The Task Force agreed on the fact that relevant measurement and modelling data were now available through EMEP and national programmes to establish long-term trends (20 years) on air pollution. A lot of work on that issue was provided by the EMEP Centres and by national bodies. Therefore, the Task Force’s objective was to promote common and best practices for trends analyses, to compare data and conclusions and to provide the Convention with a shared overview of the evolution of air pollution throughout Europe over the past 20 years, from the angle of policy-relevant questions (e.g., the actual impact of emission control policies).

23. A representative of MSC-E presented an overview of the activities on heavy metals and persistent organic pollutant (POPs) assessments, focusing on the quality of assessment results, recent research developments and dissemination of output information. He gave an overview of progress made with respect to work at CCC, the work of MSC-E, discussions within the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and plans for work in 2014-2015. The research developments included the refinement of model parameterizations of atmospheric processes and the application of inverse modelling for assessing model performance and quality of emissions data. A new format had been developed for presentation of the Status Report. The focus was on providing country-specific information (some in Russian) with user-friendly access via the CCC website.

24. A representative of MSC-W gave an overview of the activities on monitoring and modelling of acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants, including progress made with respect to work at CCC, CEIP and CIAM, the work of MSC-W, discussions within the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and plans for work in 2013–2014. MSC-W had been working on the new EMEP grid, the linkages between air pollution and climate change and trends in air pollution from (1990) 2000 onwards. Consistent trends had been constructed using all EMEP information available on emissions, measurement and modelling, showing that abatement in air pollution had been achieved over the past two decades, in particular for sulphur.

25. A representative of CCC presented an overview of activities on atmospheric monitoring, emissions and modelling of PM, including progress made with respect to work

at MSC-W and CIAM, CCC work, the results of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and plans for 2014–2015. Attention was drawn to the broad involvement of Parties, Centres and external partners (projects) in organizing the EMEP Intensive Observation Periods in summer 2012 and winter 2013, and the extensive data set produced as a result. Further attention was drawn to the development of the monitoring programme of aerosol properties and the increased number of available measurement data. Those measurements facilitated the possibilities for model development, i.e., to include size-distributed particle number concentration in the EMEP model.

26. The Steering Body:

- (a) Took note of the reports by the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling as well as the status reports by MSC-W, MSC-E and CCC;
- (b) Approved the executive summaries of the status reports and decided to present the summaries to the Executive Body;
- (c) Stressed the need for the continuous expansion of cooperation between the Centres and the Parties.

B. Integrated assessment modelling

27. The Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling provided an overview of recent changes in the Greenhouse Gas and Air Pollution Interactions and Synergies (GAINS) model, as well as the following elements of the workplan of the Task Force and CIAM introduced upon the request of the Working on Strategies and Review:

- (a) Assessment of cost-effective strategies with a wider geographical scope, including linkages with climate change;
- (b) Development of cost-effective strategies to improve population exposure to air pollution, including emissions from residential wood burning, and to protect nature areas from excess nitrogen;
- (c) Provision of support to Parties in the development and use of integrated assessment models.

28. The Head of CIAM provided an overview of current and planned activities by the Centre, highlighting the current political focus on health protection and the need for the assessment of the benefits of ecosystem protection. He also stressed the need for continued communication with national experts. In particular, the following trends were noted:

- (a) After the adoption of the amendments to the Gothenburg Protocol, attention had shifted to the years 2025 and 2030; up until the present, only limited consultations with Parties had been carried out for that time horizon;
- (b) Given the lack of a monetary evaluation of eutrophication/biodiversity impacts, attention had turned to health impacts from PM and ozone;
- (c) There were significant uncertainties in the PM emission inventories for wood (and coal) heating in the domestic sector in the eastern member States of the EU;
- (d) In addition to maximizing benefits for human health, policy attention was increasingly shifting to compliance with air quality limit values; while a new downscaling method had been developed for the EU, improved spatial resolution of EMEP calculations would increase the salience of the EMEP model.

29. The Steering Body acknowledged the work carried out by CIAM and the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and supported the continuation of their work.

C. Emissions

30. The Chair of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections reported on progress made, including the results of the Task Force's twenty-sixth meeting (Istanbul, 14–15 May 2013) and an expert workshop on Stakeholder Consultation on 13 May. All tasks planned for 2013 had been completed, including the update of the *EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook*, the compilation of a draft proposal for revised Emission Reporting Guidelines, the compilation of draft technical guidance and templates to be used by Parties when submitting a request for the application of the adjustment procedure following the Executive Body decisions 2012/3, 2012/4 and 2012/12 and a technical guidance document on the adjustment procedure. Future work would focus on improving communications and liaison across selected EMEP Centres and Task Forces.

31. The Steering Body:

(a) Acknowledged the work carried out by the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections and the progress made, and supported the continuation of that work in 2014;

(b) Noted the work undertaken to update the *EMEP/EEA air pollutant emissions inventory guidebook*, and decided to recommend its adoption by the Executive Body at its thirty-second session in December 2013;

(c) Recognized the concern expressed by the Task Force regarding the insufficient support from Parties for the stage 3 inventory review process and that that might lead to suspension of a stage 3 review in 2014, and requested the Parties meeting at the Executive Body session to give serious consideration to that issue.

32. A representative of CEIP informed participants about the Centre's key activities in 2013, and provided information on the status of reporting of emissions, gridded and LPS data. The review of inventories had been performed in three stages in line with the EMEP review guidelines, and all the review results had been provided to Parties. The CEIP representative also presented an updated proposal for stage 3 reviews for the period 2013–2017, and gave an overview of awards presented to Parties for best Informative Inventory Reports and best reporting over the period 2010–2013, which had been awarded in five different categories — most comprehensive inventory, most transparent inventory, best small country (below 5 million inhabitants), most complete reporting and most significant improvement. Furthermore she detailed the development of the new gridding system (spatial resolution 0.1° x 0.1° longitude/latitude) and the support that had been provided by the Centre to the Implementation Committee.

33. The Steering Body:

(a) Acknowledged the work carried out by CEIP and the progress made, and supported the continuation of that work in 2014;

(b) Noted the increased workload for CEIP in 2014–2015 connected with development of the new gridding system, implementation of the revised Emission Reporting Guidelines in the database system and supporting the secretariat and the Implementation Committee in assessment of Parties' compliance;

(c) Noted the gaps and inconsistencies in the national emission inventories submitted, acknowledged the work of CEIP in addressing those issues to improve the quality of the emission data, and invited Parties that still had not reported their emission data in agreed formats to do so;

(d) At the request of CEIP, approved the list of Parties scheduled for stage 3 reviews in 2014, namely, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, the Netherlands, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation and Spain;

(e) Invited Parties scheduled for an in-depth review in 2014, in particular the Russian Federation and the Republic of Moldova, to submit their Nomenclature for Reporting tables and Informative Inventory Reports within the deadlines, in order to enable the reviews to take place, and requested the secretariat to send letters to those Parties to remind them about that obligation;

(f) Further encouraged Parties to nominate experts to the roster of reviewers and lead reviewers, and to support their participation in the scheduled reviews;

(g) Noted that reporting of gridded and LPS data was not sufficient, and invited Parties to start with the development of the new gridding system as soon as possible to ensure reporting of gridded data in finer resolution by May 2016.

D. Hemispheric transport of air pollution

34. The co-Chairs of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution reported on progress in implementing the Task Force's multi-year workplan. They summarized the outcome of an October 2012 workshop on global emissions scenarios, which had been hosted by CIAM, and a March 2013 meeting focusing on the data management infrastructure supporting cooperative international atmospheric studies, which had been hosted by WMO in conjunction with the Global Atmospheric Watch 2013 Conference. The co-Chairs also reported on the development of new 2008 and 2010 global emissions estimates, which had been led by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre.

35. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the progress in developing 2008 and 2010 global emissions mosaics and 2010–2030 emissions scenarios, and the efforts to coordinate global and regional modelling experiments for 2008–2010;

(b) Acknowledged the important contributions of EMEP Centres to the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution's workplan and the opportunities for greater cooperation with the Working Group on Effects and other EMEP Task Forces;

(c) Supported the proposed plan for next steps regarding the hemispheric transport of air pollution, as described in the Task Force's draft 2014–2015 workplan.

E. Joint session of the Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects

36. The purpose of the joint session of the Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects, which was held during the Steering Body's thirty-seventh session, was to allow for an in-depth presentation and discussion of activities relevant to both bodies. Seven presentations (see annex) were provided by representatives of the two subsidiary bodies and an invited guest, covering issues of common interest, including:

(a) The key outcomes of the Saltsjöbaden V workshop (Gothenburg, Sweden 24–26 June 2013);

(b) Recent progress in the GAINS model and integrated assessment modelling;

(c) A draft guidance document on health and environmental improvements, using new knowledge, methods and data;

- (d) Information from heavy metals and POPs modelling of relevance for the effects community;
- (e) Main pollutant, ozone and PM modelling, supporting the mapping and modelling work at the Coordination Centre for Effects;
- (f) The benefits of air pollution control for biodiversity and ecosystem services;
- (g) Past and planned joint assessment reports by EMEP and the Working Group on Effects.

37. The presentations were followed by a discussion with a focus on common issues relevant to both the Working Group on Effects and EMEP, bearing in mind the relevance of effects-based research for the implementation of the Long-term Strategy for the Convention.

38. Following a discussion on the topics presented, the Steering Body found that both groups should continue to organize joint workshops and produce joint reports on issues of common interest including country reports. The joint reports should be developed in cooperation with the Parties, and be aimed at national and international policymakers.

VI. Information sharing by Parties on implementation of their national monitoring programmes

39. In response to the request of the Executive Body (ECE/EB.AIR/113, paras. 23 and 24.), a representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia presented to the Steering Body a revised proposal for its 2010 emission ceilings of SO₂, nitrogen oxides, non-methane volatile organic compounds and ammonia to be added to annex II of the Gothenburg Protocol in line with the provisions of article 13 of the Protocol. She also presented new emission estimates for the base year 1990, providing a detailed rationale for all the new estimates.

40. The Steering Body:

- (a) Welcomed the information provided by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;
- (b) Considered the comments provided by a representative of CIAM in response to the presentation by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and concerning, in particular the trend of sulphur emissions and comparison of base year emissions with estimates for 2010–2011;
- (c) Decided to forward the new proposed base (1990) and target (2010) year estimates for nitrogen oxides, non-methane volatile organic compounds and ammonia to the Executive Body for consideration at its thirty-second session recommending their approval;
- (d) Encouraged the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to reconsider and resubmit its estimates for SO₂ emissions, bearing in mind, the need to comply with the main goal of the Gothenburg Protocol, namely reducing air pollution emissions by 2010 compared with base year levels.

41. The Executive Body at its thirty-first session (ECE/EB.AIR/113, paras. 22 and 24) had requested Montenegro to present to the Steering Body at its thirty-seven session the rationale behind its proposal for emission ceilings to be added to annex II of the Gothenburg Protocol, in line with the provisions of article 13 of the Protocol. A representative of Montenegro informed the Steering Body about difficulties Montenegro faced (insufficient capacities both human and technical) making it unable to respond to the Executive Body's request. He appealed to the Steering Body to provide support to

Montenegro especially with respect to national inventory development, gridding emissions and providing emission projections.

42. The Steering Body approved the proposal from the Chair of the Steering Body that she, with support from the secretariat, would write an explanatory letter to the respective Montenegrin authorities containing a proposal on how to proceed in addressing the difficulties they were encountering.

43. A representative of Finland presented information about national background air quality networks in Finland implementing the EMEP monitoring strategy. She presented an overview of measured substances in deposition, in PM and in air. Furthermore, she supported the idea of harmonization of the EMEP and EU measurement programmes (e.g., regarding chemical composition of coarse PM (PM₁₀) and fine PM (PM_{2.5})), which could help the Parties facing constraints owing to limited human and financial resources.

44. A representative of France presented information about the implementation of the EMEP and Working Group on Effects monitoring strategies in France. She provided information about the scope of monitoring in level 1 and 2 measurement sites. The focus was on PM speciation. The BRAMM (*Biosurveillance des retombées de métaux par les mousses*) network provided information on metal and nitrogen deposition via biomonitoring on mosses, while the RENECOFOR (*Réseau National de suivi à long terme des ECosystèmes FORestiers*) network provided information on long-term changes in forests ecosystems. Modelling and measurements were both part of the monitoring strategy, with the CHIMERE national chemistry-transport model providing maps of the selected indicators.

45. A representative of Croatia reported on precipitation chemistry in Croatia. The measurement programme was based on the EMEP monitoring strategy. Priority was given to measurements of ozone and PM, both PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀.

46. A representative of Germany presented information on the implementation strategy using a duplicate approach, combining long-term monitoring sites focusing mainly on EMEP level 1 and 2 measurements with EMEP level 3 platforms focusing on advanced, research-oriented measurements. She encouraged further harmonization between the implementation of the EMEP monitoring strategy and background measurements under the EU Air Quality Directive.⁴

47. A representative of Poland presented an overview of EMEP monitoring activities (levels 1-3). She elaborated on measurements of PM (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) focusing on inorganics. For the purposes of heavy metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and PM_{2.5} measurements under the EU Air Quality Directive, three rural stations were in operation: one was an EMEP station and the other two were newly established stations.

48. The Steering Body welcomed the information presented on the implementation of national EMEP monitoring programmes in Croatia, France, Finland, Germany, Norway and Poland, and noted that the monitoring had continued despite challenges caused by insufficient funding and human resources. The Steering Body called for further harmonization of the EMEP monitoring activities with background measurements under the EU Air Quality Directive.

⁴ Directive 2008/50/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2008 on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe.

VII. Cooperation with other organizations and programmes

49. A representative of the secretariat of the Stockholm Convention reported on recent activities of relevance for EMEP, focusing on emission inventories of unintentional releases of POPs, best available techniques (BAT) and best environmental practices (BEP) and a Global Monitoring Plan for POPs. In particular, there had been a recent revision of the Toolkit for Identification and Quantification of Releases of Dioxins, Furans and other Unintentional POPs,⁵ and two new draft guidance documents on BAT and BEP. Following paragraphs 16 (f) and (j) of the Long-term Strategy for the Implementation of the Convention, which identified areas of joint work with the Stockholm Convention, she called for enhanced cooperation between the two Conventions with respect to:

(a) Compilation, storage and analysis of monitoring data on POPs in air (EBAS database at CCC);

(b) POPs emission inventories (CEIP/Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections) and on long-range transport modelling of POPs (MSC-E);

(c) Effects of POPs in core media other than air (Working Group on Effects and, in particular, the International Cooperative Programme (ICP) on Assessment and Monitoring of Acidification of Rivers and Lakes, the ICP on Effects of Air Pollution on Natural Vegetation and Crops and the ICP on Integrated Monitoring of Air Pollution Effects on Ecosystems);

(d) Modelling work under the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, which could be very useful for effectiveness evaluation, assessment of changes in POPs levels over time and assessment of regional and long-range transport.

50. A representative of WMO informed the Steering Body about events and activities within the WMO/Global Atmosphere Watch (GAW) Programme,⁶ and highlighted a number of activities of relevance for EMEP, including a number of scientific conferences, workshops and other technical meetings, as well as those made in cooperation with EMEP in areas of common interest, like the measurement of air pollutants and modelling activities. She also reported on recent WMO and GAW publications dealing with black carbon and other air pollutants measurements, as well as trainings for station personnel. EMEP continued to be a core network contributing to GAW and should continue to improve all aspects of mutual cooperation.

51. A representative of the UNFCCC secretariat informed the Steering Body of three areas in which the UNFCCC secretariat could cooperate with EMEP:

(a) *Emission reporting by Parties* — aligning, to the extent possible and within the mandates of the two Conventions, the reporting guidelines on the greenhouse gas inventory, including adherence and common understanding and application of the principles for inventory preparation, use of common terminology, the scope and type of gases covered, consistent use of methodologies and establishment and use of common national institutional arrangements for the inventory work;

(b) *Capacity-building* — encouraging Parties to both Conventions to avail themselves of the training opportunities provided by the UNFCCC secretariat, first by participating in the annex I inventory reviews and undertaking courses and examinations available and, second, in the case of developing country Parties, by participating in the

⁵ See <http://toolkit.pops.int/>.

⁶ http://www.wmo.int/pages/prog/arep/gaw/gaw_home_en.html.

training offered by the Consultative Group of Experts for non-annex I national communications supported by the UNFCCC secretariat;

(c) *Outreach and information sharing.*

52. The Steering Body:

(a) Expressed its gratitude for the contributions made by WMO, UNEP and UNFCCC, and stressed the benefits and importance of continued cooperation;

(b) Welcomed the proposal to enhance long-term cooperation between subsidiary bodies under the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution and the Stockholm Convention, and recognized the importance for both ECE and UNEP to sign a Memorandum of Understanding to provide opportunity for a closer cooperation, as well as to enhance the transfer of scientific knowledge and for capacity strengthening on a global level.

VIII. Draft 2014–2015 workplan for the implementation of the Convention

53. The Chair briefly informed the Steering Body about the process of developing a workplan for 2014–2015 for the implementation of the Convention.

54. The Steering Body considered the science part of the draft workplan (informal documents No. 1 and 7), proposed a number of modifications, and decided to forward the modified draft of the Science part of the 2014–2015 workplan to the Working Group on Effects for its further elaboration. The Steering Body also invited the secretariat to combine the Science part with other parts of the workplan and to submit the modified draft 2014–2015 workplan to Executive Body for its consideration and adoption at its thirty-second session.

IX. Financial and budgetary matters

55. The secretariat introduced the note on financial and budgetary matters (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2013/9), informing the Steering Body of the current status of contributions made up to 1 July 2013. At its sixty-seventh session, the United Nations General Assembly had decided on the scale of assessments for the period 2013–2015 (2013 United Nations assessment rates).⁷ Based on the new assessment rates, the respective EMEP shares and the EMEP scale of contributions had been computed (*ibid.*, table 3). The new EMEP shares and scales of contributions took into account the accession of Georgia to the Protocol on Long-term Financing of EMEP (EMEP Protocol) in February 2013. The schedule of mandatory contributions from Parties for 2014 was set out in the last column of table 3. The draft revised annex to the EMEP Protocol was set out in an annex to that document. The Steering Body might wish to recommend to the Executive Body to amend the EMEP Protocol accordingly.

56. The secretariat reported on the status of the open-ended Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) between the Economic Commission for Europe and the EMEP Centres. The appendices for 2013 to the MoUs had been signed with the respective 2013 workplan items, annual budgets and performance indicators.

⁷ See A/RES/67/238, available from <http://www.un.org/arabic/docs/viewdoc.asp?docnumber=A/RES/67/238>.

57. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the status of contributions to the financing of EMEP provided in table 1 of document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2013/9 and the additional information provided by the secretariat during the session;

(b) Approved the use of resources by the EMEP Centres in 2012, as presented in table 2 of that document;

(c) Agreed to recommend to the Executive Body to set the total budget for 2014 for CIAM at \$155,000 (unchanged compared with 2013), for CCC at \$820,000 (\$50,000 less than in 2013), for MSC-W at \$570,000 (\$10,000 less than in 2013), for MSC-E at \$455,000 (\$10,000 less than in 2013) and for CEIP at \$290,000 (\$70,000 more than in 2013) to reflect priorities identified in the draft workplan for 2014–2015;

(d) Recommended that the Executive Body adopt the amended annex to the EMEP Protocol, which now included Georgia as it had joined the Protocol on 7 February 2013, as set out in the annex to document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2013/9;

(e) Recommended that the Executive Body adopt the 2014 schedule of contributions as presented in table 3 of document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2013/9;

(f) Called upon the Parties to the EMEP Protocol to consider making voluntary contributions (in kind or in cash through the trust fund) to ensure that the work could be accomplished as foreseen in the draft workplan;

(g) Invited all Parties that had not yet paid their contributions for 2013 to do so as soon as possible;

(h) Invited Ukraine to provide information on its progress in the establishment of the EMEP station for background monitoring and to provide CCC with the contact details of an English-speaking focal point to facilitate further cooperation;

(i) Invited the Bureau of the EMEP Steering Body to discuss the 2015 budget for the EMEP Centres at its next meeting, scheduled for March 2014, taking into account the draft workplan for 2014–2015 for the implementation of the Convention to be considered and adopted by the Executive Body at its thirty-second session.

X. Closing of the thirty-seventh session

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

59. It was agreed to hold the thirty-eighth session of the EMEP Steering Body from 15 to 17 September 2014 in Geneva. The meeting of the Extended Steering Body Bureau was tentatively scheduled to be held in Geneva from 24 to 26 March 2014.

Annex

List of presentations made during the joint session of the Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects

1. “Taking international air pollution policies into the future — outcome of the Saltsjöbaden V workshop, Gothenburg, 24–26 June 2014” by Mr. John Munthe.
 2. “Recent progress in the GAINS impact assessment” by Mr. Markus Amann.
 3. “Guidance document on health and environmental improvements, using new knowledge, methods and data” by Mr. Jean-Paul Hettelingh.
 4. “Information for the effects community” by Mr. Victor Shatalov.
 5. “MSC-W work in support of Coordination Centre for Effects/Working Group on Effects activities” by Ms. Hilde Hagerli.
 6. “Benefits of air pollution control for biodiversity and ecosystem services” by Mr. Harry Harmens.
 7. “Assessment reports” by Mr. Rob Maas.
-