



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
1 July 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

Agenda item 3 of the provisional agenda

**Matters arising from recent meetings of the Executive Body
and its subsidiaries bodies and activities of the Bureau of
the Steering Body**

Activities of the Bureau of the Steering Body

Note by the secretariat

Summary

At its thirty-sixth session (Geneva, 17–19 September 2012), the Steering Body to the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP) requested its Chair to provide information on the activities of the Bureau at the Steering Body's next session (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2012/2 (forthcoming), para. 10 (e)).

The present note provides a report of the discussions at and outcomes of the meeting of the Bureau and the Extended Bureau held from 18 to 20 February 2013 in Geneva, Switzerland.

Introduction

1. The present note details the activities of the Bureau of the Steering Body to the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP), reporting the results of the meeting of the Bureau and the Extended Bureau held from 18 to 20 February 2013 in Geneva, Switzerland.¹

A. Attendance

2. The following Bureau members attended the Extended Bureau meeting: Ms. Sonja Vidič (Croatia), Chair of the Steering Body; Mr. Peringe Grennfelt (Sweden), Mr. Xavier Querol (Spain), Mr. Jan Macoun (Czech Republic) and Mr. Paul Ruysenaars (Netherlands). Mr. Yrjö Viisanen (Finland) and Mr. Savvas Kleanthous (Cyprus) were unable to participate. Mr. Martin Williams (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Chair of the Executive Body to the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (Air Convention), also attended.

3. The meeting of the Extended Bureau was attended by representatives from the four EMEP centres: the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E); the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W); the Chemical Coordinating Centre (CCC); and the Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections (CEIP). Ms. Laurence Rouil (France) and Ms. Oksana Tarasova (World Meteorological Organization (WMO)), co-Chairs of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, Mr. Christopher Dore (United Kingdom), co-Chair of the Task Force on Emission inventories and Projections, Mr. Frank Dentener, co-Chair of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution and Mr. Jean-Paul Hettelingh (Netherlands), head of the Coordination Centre for Effects (CCE), also participated in the meeting. The secretariat of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) Air Convention, EMEP's parent body, was also represented.

4. Ms. Anna Engleryd, co-Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, and Mr. Terry Keating, co-Chair of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, took part in the discussions via telephone connection.

B. Organization of work

5. The Bureau took note of the oral reports from the EMEP Task Force Chairs and Centres — as well as written reports from the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM)) — on the progress made in implementing the workplans for 2012 and 2013.

¹ The Bureau's proposals related to the financing of EMEP are presented in document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2013/9.

I. Matters arising from the thirtieth and thirty-first sessions of the Executive Body and the thirty-sixth session of the EMEP Steering Body

A. Review of topics discussed, conclusions and decisions

6. The secretariat drew attention to the major outcomes of the thirty-first session of the Executive Body for the Convention and, in particular, the adoption of amendments to the Protocol on Heavy Metals. The Chair of the EMEP Steering Body summarized the highlights and outcomes of the Steering Body's thirty-sixth session, as well as those of the thirty and thirty-first sessions of the Executive Body that related to EMEP, including: an in-depth discussion on emission inventories covering both science and policy aspects, i.e., spatial resolution of the EMEP domain and grid projection, adjustments under the revised Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone (Gothenburg Protocol), emission reduction commitments and inventories;² and an evaluation of emission inventories for persistent organic pollutants (POPs).³ The EMEP Chair also stressed the need for a better communication and service between the EMEP Centres and the Parties and briefly outlined the steps that had been taken to develop the Convention's 2014–2015 workplan.

7. The Bureau said that more efforts were needed to ensure the visibility of EMEP; targeted reports and improved websites could be the means to achieve that goal. The need for more direct contacts between the Parties and the EMEP Centres was also underscored.

B. 2014–2015 workplan for the implementation of the Convention

8. The Chair of the Executive Body presented the preparations for the 2014–2015 workplan for the Convention, noting that, unlike previous years, the new workplan should seek a better balance between top-down and bottom-up approaches: i.e., with input from the Executive Body, other subsidiary bodies, and from the Centres, Task Forces and expert groups. The new workplan should also improve the visibility of the Convention and its achievements. Efforts should be made, furthermore, to make the workplan more user friendly for the general public and non-experts. The Bureau discussed the format of workplan and agreed that:

(a) It should focus on deliverables, like reports and other written materials, and responses to Parties' needs by providing requested information/data and guidance, workshops, trainings, development and extension of databases, models, etc.;

(b) Each activity should be linked to either the Convention's Long-term Strategy (ECE/EB.AIR/106/Add.1, decision 2010/18), the Action Plan for the implementation of the Long-term Strategy (ECE/EB.AIR/109/Add.1, decision 2011/14) or other Executive Body/EMEP Steering Body decisions;

(c) For each activity an estimate of the total cost and source of funding (e.g., lead country, EMEP trust fund, in-kind contributions, pending) should be given.

² Executive Body decision 2012/3 on adjustments under the Gothenburg Protocol to emission reduction commitments or to inventories for the purposes of comparing national total emissions with them, and 2012/4 on provisional application of the amendment to the Gothenburg Protocol (see ECE/EB.AIR/111/Add.1).

³ Executive Body decision 2012/24 concerning the reporting of persistent organic pollutants (see ECE/EB.AIR/113/Add.1).

9. The Bureau noted that the terms of reference/mandates for the Centres might also be updated. The workplan should include links to the updated mandates. MSC-W volunteered to prepare, in collaboration with other EMEP Centres, a draft of the 2014–2015 workplan in the new format by 5 April 2013. The secretariat offered to prepare a template for the new workplan based on the elements listed above and the formats of the workplans of other ECE multilateral environmental agreements.

C. Implications of the Long-term Strategy for the Convention and its Action Plan on EMEP future work

10. The Bureau discussed the implications of the Long-term Strategy for the Convention and the Action Plan for its implementation for EMEP monitoring and its future workplans. In general, the EMEP long-term strategy was in line with that of the Convention. However, some elements of the Convention's strategy, like outreach activities beyond the ECE region and cooperation with other environmental conventions and organizations, were not yet fully reflected in the EMEP workplan. In addition, cooperation between EMEP and Parties needed to be strengthened and monitored.

D. Implementation of the EMEP monitoring strategy 2010–2019

11. The Bureau discussed the implementation of the EMEP monitoring strategy 2010–2019 (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2009/15), focusing on current measuring programmes and the needs of the Parties. It noted that strategy implementation was primarily as task for the Centres. A representative of CCC presented an overview of countries reporting to the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution global database (EBAS).⁴ Countries might wish to comment on that information during the forthcoming meeting of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (6–8 May 2013). Compliance criteria had been included in the EMEP monitoring strategy. The Bureau invited the co-Chairs of the Task Force to draft a letter to be sent to EMEP representatives prior to the meeting requesting Parties to present their experiences with the implementation of the monitoring strategy at the meeting.

E. Cooperation with the Working Group on Effects

12. The Chair informed the Bureau about the outcome of the thirty-sixth session of the EMEP Steering Body (Geneva, 17–19 September 2012) and the thirty-first session of the Working Group on Effects (Geneva, 20–21 September 2012), stressing the links between EMEP and the activities under the Working Group. The Bureau agreed that the joint workshop during the thirty-sixth session of the EMEP Steering Body had been a successful step towards a more integrated collaboration between EMEP and the effects-oriented programmes. The Bureau extended an invitation to the effects community to broadly participate in the sessions of the EMEP Steering Body in the future. It was agreed that meetings of task forces and workshops could provide a platform for more frequent interactions between monitoring and modelling experts from the two scientific bodies of the Convention.

13. On the afternoon of 20 February the Bureau held a joint session with the Extended Bureau of the Working Group on Effects. Presentations were made by a representative of the International Cooperative Programme (ICP) on Effects of Air Pollution on Natural Vegetation and Crops on the benefits of air pollution abatement for biodiversity and

⁴ <http://ebas.nilu.no/>.

ecosystems services — a joint effort by ICPs under the Working Group on Effects (report to be submitted to the Executive Body and brochure) — and by a representative of CCE on progress in updating the guidance document on health and environmental improvements (for the revised Gothenburg Protocol). In addition, the following topics were discussed:

(a) The consistent presentation of data elaborated by EMEP and the Working Group on Effects on monitoring, modelling, effects, etc., and the possibility of setting up a joint website for the scientific part of the Convention;

(b) The evaluation of past air pollution abatement policies and the science developed under the Convention in the form of assessment report(s) similar to reports by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change;

(c) The pros and cons of merging the two bodies into one scientific programme under the Convention, and the ongoing review of the ICPs. In connection with the latter, it was noted that a workshop would be held in mid-April in conjunction with the meeting of the Task Force on Modelling and Mapping, which would be attended by all ICPs.

In addition, the Chair of the Working Group on Effects announced plans for the forthcoming Saltsjöbaden V workshop (Gothenburg, Sweden, 24–26 June 2013). That workshop series provided a platform for the exchange of views and new ideas among various stakeholders (Parties, scientists, non-governmental organizations and industry) on the future priorities of the Convention.

14. The Bureau recommended that efforts to achieve closer cooperation between the two scientific groups should continue and that both short- and long-term objectives should be developed with respect to integration efforts with the Working Group on Effects.

II. Progress of work

A. Emissions

15. The representative of CEIP presented the status of emission data reporting in 2012, as well as tasks of CEIP in relation to stage 1, 2 and 3 reviews of the data, including online support to the national experts. Almost all (94 per cent) of Parties to the Convention submitted their emission inventories in 2012. Only Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kazakhstan did not provide any estimates of their national emissions. An important element of CEIP work in 2013 would be support to Parties with respect to reporting emissions of POPs in view of Executive Body decisions 2011/13 and 2012/14 on that issue. The *EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook*⁵ did not provide viable emission factors for a number of sources, which might lead to further omissions or confusion with national emission estimates. Attention was drawn to the collaboration between CEIP, the European Environment Agency (EEA) and the European Union (EU) Joint Research Centre on exchange of data (the Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR)) and inventory development and reviews. Participants were also informed about preparations for the 2013 in-depth reviews of the emission inventories. In that connection, Parties that were to be reviewed under the stage 3 review needed to submit their informative inventory reports (IIRs). The introduction of a new EMEP gridding system based on geographical coordinates would bring new challenges and opportunities for Parties and for CEIP, and would be the key task for CEIP in the 2014–2015 workplan.

⁵ Available from <http://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/air/emep-eea-air-pollutant-emission-inventory-guidebook/emep>.

16. The co-Chair of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections presented the main outcomes of the twentieth anniversary Task Force meeting and follow-up activities to the workshop on POPs emissions held by the Task Force in 2011. The Implementation Committee under the Convention had requested the Task Force to review POPs emissions data from specific countries. The Task Force proposed that that work be undertaken by CEIP as part of the stage 3 emission inventory reviews. The other goals of the Task Force meeting were the in-depth discussion on verification of the national emission inventories and the draft guidance on the adjustment procedure under the Gothenburg Protocol.⁶ He also drew attention to the latest updates of the EMEP/EEA guidebook and to the ongoing work to update the Guidelines for Reporting Emission Data Under the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/97), including its annexes. With respect to future work, the Task Force needed additional funding to support emission inventory work in the countries of Southern and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia.

17. The Bureau welcomed the progress made by CEIP and the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections and concluded that additional funding for 2014–2015 would be necessary to support stage 3 reviews and assessment of Parties' requests for applications of the adjustment procedure under the Gothenburg Protocol. It recommended that the EMEP Steering Body at its thirty-seventh session pay special attention to the update of the Guidelines for Reporting and to the emissions-related work in the 2014–2015 workplan, as well as to the funding needs. The Bureau requested the secretariat to inform the respective Parties regarding missing emission data (including large point source emissions) and to request them to respond as to when the data could be delivered to CEIP.

B. Monitoring

18. A representative of CCC informed the Bureau about the monitoring activities of CCC, highlighting EMEP intensive monitoring campaigns and collaboration with the Global Atmospheric Watch (GAW) programme, the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants and its Global Monitoring Programme (GMP), WMO, the Arctic Council and the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme. CCC was one of the two data centres under GMP. CCC had also closely cooperated with EBAS. In addition, CCC informed about bilateral dialogue with Parties with respect to monitoring obligations, data reporting, quality assurance and quality control, etc. The secretariat informed the Bureau about a request from the Stockholm Convention to EMEP and the Working Group on Effects to contribute to GMP.

C. Atmospheric modelling of acidifying and eutrophying pollutants, photo-oxidants and fine particles

19. The Bureau acknowledged the progress presented by the representative of MSC-W in the atmospheric modelling of acidifying pollutants, photo-oxidants and fine particles, drawing attention to its work on fine spatial resolution, 10-year trends in modelling and measurements and the accomplishments with respect to the implementation of the 2012-2013 workplan. Modelling of particulate matter had improved and a secondary organic aerosol module had been included in the standard version of the unified model. The MSC-W representative also presented an overview of relevant cooperation with the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution and activities on the global and regional

⁶ See the draft guidance on adjustment under the amended Gothenburg Protocol to emission reduction commitments or to inventories (informal document No. 2, thirty-sixth session of the EMEP Steering Body), available from <http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=30313>.

scales, including a number of EU-funded projects like AeroCom,⁷ IMPACT2C,⁸ ECLAIRE⁹ and PEGASOS.¹⁰ The Bureau looked forward to receiving further results of the model development and improvements.

D. Hemispheric transport of air pollution

20. The co-Chair of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution reported on the progress made in the Task Force's activities, drawing attention to regional versus extraregional influences on air quality and its adverse health and environmental effects and impacts on climate. He also informed the Bureau about the Task Force plans for the remaining part of 2013 and in 2014. EMEP and Working Group on Effects work was central for EU policymaking with respect to emission inventories, air quality assessment and integrated assessment modelling. The Task Force was also a key tool for the EU and the United States of America for science outreach beyond the ECE region, in particular towards key countries like India, China and Japan.

E. Atmospheric modelling and monitoring of persistent organic pollutants and heavy metals

21. The Bureau appreciated the progress presented by the representative of MSC-E in the atmospheric modelling of POPs and heavy metals, as well as the work done on the further development of the Global EMEP Modelling System (longitude-latitude projection, regional to global spatial scales) and on the calculation of ecosystem-dependent deposition fluxes. MSC-E continued to provide support to countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and the Central Asia with information required for ratification by those countries of the Protocols on Heavy Metals and on Persistent Organic Pollutants. Attention was drawn to the cooperation by MSC-E with a number of Convention bodies, including the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, as well as with other international programmes and organizations, such as Global Mercury Assessment 2013 (for the Minamata Convention on Mercury) the Arctic Council and the European Commission. The Bureau requested MSC-E and MSC-W to draft a letter to Parties on their needs and obligations with respect to modelling data.

F. Integrated assessment modelling

22. The Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling provided information on progress in the implementation of the workplan items for 2012–2013, in particular the contributions of the Task Force work to the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol.

23. The representative of CIAM reported on the work done with respect to updates to the Greenhouse Gas and Air Pollution Interactions and Synergies (GAINS) model, including the recently introduced finer spatial resolution from 28 kilometres (km) x 28 km of the EMEP model to 7 km x 7 km resolution used for computing population exposure and health impacts from fine particulate matter. Other updates included new critical loads for acidification and eutrophication provided by CCE and revised ground-level ozone

⁷ See http://aerocom.met.no/cgi-bin/aerocom/surfobs_annualrs.pl?MODELLIST=EMEP

⁸ See

http://www.hzg.de/science_and_industrie/eu_projects/fp7/climate/012508/index_0012508.html.en.

⁹ See <http://www.eclair-fp7.eu/>.

¹⁰ See <http://pegasos.iceht.forth.gr/>

background concentrations (input from the work of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution). CIAM had held bilateral consultations with 14 Parties to validate the current GAINS database and introduce new information from recent national emission inventories as reported to EMEP.

III. Preparations for the thirty-seventh session of the EMEP Steering Body

24. The Bureau discussed the draft agenda and the format for the thirty-seventh session of the Steering Body, to be held from 9 to 11 September 2013 back to back with the thirty-second session of the Working Group on Effects. It recommended continuing the format of the Steering Body's sessions adopted last year. The Bureau agreed that in 2013 the Steering Body would be invited to focus on three main issues: the update of the Guidelines for Reporting of Emission Data under the Convention; adjustments under the Gothenburg Protocol to emission reduction commitments or to inventories for the purposes of comparing total national emissions with them; and the draft 2014–2015 workplan for the implementation of the Convention. The Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections and CEIP would take the lead when discussing the first two items. Also as in 2012, the Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects might wish to hold a joint session on issues of common interest for the two bodies. The common issues could include: the assessment report for the amended Gothenburg Protocol (informal document No. 6); a joint EMEP-Working Group on Effects assessment report planned for completion in 2015; country reports; issues of common relevance for the review of the Convention work; issues emerging from the Saltsjöbaden V workshop; common websites; and other issues of common interest. The Bureau appreciated the willingness of the Extended Bureau of the Working Group on Effects to help coordinate the preparations for the joint session. The Bureau also agreed that a new regular agenda item should be introduced into the sessions of the Steering Body: information sharing by Parties on the implementation of EMEP. Parties would be invited to present their national experiences, successes and challenges, as well as their collaboration with EMEP Centres.

IV. Financial issues, use of resources and the budget for 2013

A. Status of mandatory and voluntary cash contributions

25. The secretariat reported on the status of cash contributions to the EMEP Trust Fund, stressing that 32 Parties to the 1984 Geneva Protocol on Long-term Financing of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe had paid at least part of their contributions for 2012. The total of contributions received in 2012 for the EMEP Trust Fund was US\$ 2,532,624, or 107 per cent of the US\$ 2,358,700 budgeted (France had paid its contributions for both 2011 and 2012). Several Parties had accumulated arrears prior to 2012. The Bureau welcomed the 2012 financial situation. There had been no in-kind contributions by the Parties reported in 2012.

B. Use of resources in 2012 and the budget for 2014

26. The Bureau considered the yearly financial statements of MSC-E, MSC-W and CCC for 2012. It was satisfied that the resources for 2012 had been used as budgeted, and noted the significant voluntary contributions by the Centres as presented in their financial

statements. The three Centres informed the bureau — in their financial statements — about the in-kind contributions by the host countries.

27. The Bureau, without the presence of the Centre representatives, discussed the distribution of the budget for 2014 in depth. It noted that the structure and distribution of the EMEP budget among the Centres did not correspond to the current needs. New priorities for the Convention were set in the Long-term Strategy,¹¹ including the need for further scientific development. The Convention's 2014–2015 workplan needed to be approved before the adoption of the budget. The Convention should also be able to react quickly to issues reported by media that were important to the general public, such as air pollution episodes (particulate matter, forest fires, high ozone spells, urban pollution). In the short and medium term (2013–2015), there was a need for more work related to emission inventories, which required extra funding that had not yet been secured: e.g., updating of the emission reporting guidelines; further development of methodologies for estimation of elemental/black carbon emissions; carrying out stage 3 reviews; and assessment of Parties' requests for application of the adjustment procedure for the Gothenburg Protocol targets. The Bureau decided to continue its work on the 2014–2015 budget for the EMEP Centres in a modified format, corresponding to the new format of the 2014–2015 workplan for the implementation of the Convention.

¹¹ ECE/EB.AIR/106/Add.1 Executive Body Decision 2010/18 on Long-term strategy for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution and Action Plan for Its Implementation (see ECE/EB.AIR/106/Add.1).