



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
9 October 2015

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

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

Thirty-fourth session

Geneva, 18 December 2015

Item 4 of the provisional agenda

**Matters arising from meetings of the United Nations Economic
Commission for Europe, meetings of the Convention's
subsidiary bodies and other related meetings**

Progress report on the work of the Implementation Committee*

Submitted by the Implementation Committee

Summary

In accordance with the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee under the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, the Committee is required to report at least once a year on its activities to the Executive Body for the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/113/Add.1, decision 2012/25, annex, para. 9).

The progress report on the work of the Committee contains information on activities in 2015 with regard to individual Parties' compliance with their emission reduction and reporting obligations under the Convention and its protocols, and in particular summarizes the work carried out at the Committee's thirty-fifth session (Budapest, 27–29 May 2015).

* The present document is being submitted for publication without formal editing.



Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1–3	3
II. Compliance with emission reduction obligations.....	4–117	3
A. Inventory adjustment procedure under the Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone	4–22	3
B. Follow-up to Executive Body Decisions	23–75	6
C. Referrals initiated by the secretariat in 2013 still under consideration by the Committee.....	76–117	13
III. Compliance with reporting obligations	118–136	18
A. Follow-up to Executive Body decisions 2013/18, 2013/19 and 2014/8 on reporting.....	119–134	19
B. New referrals and compliance with emission data reporting obligations by Protocol.....	135–136	22
IV. Template for preparation of the Committee’s report and checklist on introducing the Committee cases.....	137–138	23
V. Membership of the Committee and sequence and timing of its meetings	139–141	23

I. Introduction

1. At its thirty-first, thirty-second and third-third sessions (Geneva, 11–13 December 2012, 9–13 December 2013 and 8–11 December 2014, respectively), the Executive Body for the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution elected the following members to the Convention's Implementation Committee: Ms. Maria Bors (Republic of Moldova); Mr. John Burnett (Canada); Mr. Emmanuel Fiani (France); Ms. Alice Gaustad (Norway); Ms. Diana Kiss (Hungary); Ms. Aleksandra Nestorovska-Krsteska (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); Mr. Manfred Ritter (Austria); Mr. Marcus Schroeder (Germany) (Chair); and Mr. Felix Zaharia (Romania).

2. At the Implementation Committee's thirty-fourth session (Geneva, 8–10 September 2014), taking into account the change in the sequence of meetings of the main subsidiary bodies under the Convention, the Committee agreed to hold one session in 2015 (see ECE/EB.AIR/2014/3, paras. 58–60). The thirty-fifth session of the Committee was held in Budapest from 27 to 29 May 2015. The meeting was serviced by the ECE secretariat of the Convention.

3. At its Budapest meeting in May 2015, the Committee noted that the thirty-fourth session of the Executive Body would, on an exceptional basis, last only one day. Based on the request from the Bureau to the Executive Body, the Committee therefore agreed to produce the present progress report for that Executive Body session, while reserving its recommendations and possible draft decisions for submission to the Executive Body at its thirty-fifth session (Geneva, 2–4 May 2016).

II. Compliance with emission reduction obligations

A. Inventory adjustment procedure under the Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone

4. At its thirty-fifth session, the Implementation Committee considered cases that had been previously suspended due to the submission of applications by Parties concerned for adjustments under the Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone (Gothenburg Protocol) to emission reduction commitments or to inventories for the purposes of comparing total national emissions with them, in accordance with paragraph 9 of Executive Body decision 2012/3. In addition, the Committee was informed by the secretariat of new applications for adjustments in relation to cases that had been reviewed by the Committee at its previous sessions.

Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Croatia with the Gothenburg Protocol (ref. 2/13 (NH₃))

Background

5. The Committee considered the secretariat's referral concerning Croatia's compliance with the Gothenburg Protocol. According to the latest emission data submitted in 2015, emissions of ammonia (NH₃) in Croatia in 2013 were 33.7 kilotons, which was above Croatia's emission ceiling of 30 kilotons. This information suggested that Croatia was in non-compliance with its obligation under article 3, paragraph 1, of the Gothenburg Protocol.

6. In 2013, the secretariat had informed Croatia about the intention to refer the issue of its compliance with the Gothenburg Protocol with regard to NH₃ to the Committee and of the opportunity to provide a response, which Croatia had done. In a subsequent letter, the secretariat had informed Croatia about the referral of its case, indicating that the issue would be on the agenda of the Committee's thirty-first session (Paris, 22–24 May 2013). In follow-up to that session, the secretariat requested Croatia to provide additional information which it did. In addition, Croatia participated in the Committee's thirty-second session (Geneva, 9–11 September 2013).

7. In 2014, Croatia submitted an adjustment application on its NH₃ emissions. Pursuant to paragraph 9 of decision 2012/3, the Committee therefore suspended action on that case.

8. At its thirty-eighth session (Geneva, 15–17 September 2014), the Steering Body to the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollution in Europe (EMEP) decided to support the recommendations put forward by the Expert Review Team on the rejection of Croatia's adjustment application (see ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2014/2). In addition, Croatia withdrew its adjustment application through its letter to the secretariat dated 1 September 2014. Pursuant to paragraph 5 of decision 2012/3, the secretariat had therefore referred the matter back to the Implementation Committee.

Consideration

9. In the light of the comprehensive information provided by Croatia in 2013, the Committee had developed detailed considerations in its sixteenth report to the Executive Body's thirty-second session (ECE/EB.AIR/2013/4, paras. 86–90). Those considerations had addressed key sources of emissions and emission inventory recalculations. The Committee had also noted at that time the list of measures and their projected effects that Croatia had provided and their reassessment, which Croatia had planned to carry out in 2014. The Committee had also addressed obligations related to 2010 and 2020 ceilings in the amended Gothenburg Protocol that would apply to Croatia.

10. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee noted that the emission trend had shown some slight improvement for the past few years. However, the Committee also noted that Croatia's emissions of NH₃ were still above its ceiling under the Gothenburg Protocol.

11. In view of the previous suspension of the case in accordance with decision 2012/3, the Committee resumed its consideration as the application for inventory adjustment was not successful and concluded that an update of the information supplied by Croatia was required.

12. The Committee therefore requested the secretariat to write to Croatia:

(a) Indicating that as the application for inventory adjustment had not been successful the Committee had resumed the consideration of the case;

(b) Indicating that the information available would suggest non-compliance with respect to its obligations under the Gothenburg Protocol;

(c) Inviting Croatia to provide, by 30 November 2015, an update of the information it had supplied in 2013, especially on the new NH₃ emission reduction programme;

(d) Requesting updates on:

(i) The list of specific measures Croatia intended to take to reduce its NH₃ emissions;

- (ii) The quantitative projected effects on NH₃ emissions of the measures listed up to and including the year of expected compliance;
- (iii) A timetable specifying the year by which Croatia expected to be in compliance.

Follow-up to decision 2013/13 concerning compliance by Denmark with the Gothenburg Protocol (ref. 3/13 (NH₃))

13. Following the adoption by the Executive Body of decision 2013/13 concerning compliance by Denmark with the Gothenburg Protocol, Denmark had submitted an application for adjustment to its inventory in line with paragraph 2 of decision 2012/3. Consequently, the Committee had suspended its consideration of the case until the adjustment was assessed by the EMEP Steering Body.

14. The Committee continued to review the case at its thirty-fifth session, following the finalization of the assessment of the adjustment application by the EMEP Steering Body. The Committee specifically noted that, at its thirty-eighth session, the EMEP Steering Body had approved the recommendation of the Expert Review Team to accept the application of Denmark for an adjustment to its NH₃ inventory, which had resulted in the adjusted emissions of NH₃ being below the ceiling for Denmark under the Gothenburg Protocol. In the light of that information, the Committee concluded that there was no reason to continue to review the case.

Follow-up to the referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Germany with the Gothenburg Protocol (ref. 9/13 (NO_x))

15. The Committee had suspended its consideration of the case referred by the secretariat concerning compliance by Germany with the Gothenburg Protocol until the application of Germany for adjustment to the nitrogen oxides (NO_x) inventory was assessed by the EMEP Steering Body.

16. The Committee continued to review the case at its thirty-fifth session following the finalization of the assessment of the adjustment application by the EMEP Steering Body. The Committee specifically noted that, at its thirty-eighth session, the EMEP Steering Body had approved the recommendation of the Expert Review Team to accept the application of Germany for an adjustment to its NO_x inventory, which had resulted in the adjusted NO_x emissions being below the ceiling for Germany under the Gothenburg Protocol. In view of that information, the Committee concluded that there was no reason to continue to review the case.

Follow-up to decision 2013/15 concerning compliance by Finland with the Gothenburg Protocol (ref. 6/13 (NH₃))

17. At its thirty-fourth session the Committee had reviewed compliance by Finland with the Gothenburg Protocol and had requested the secretariat to send a letter to Finland asking it to provide additional information.

18. The Committee continued to review the case at its thirty-fifth session. It was particularly grateful to Finland for additional information it had provided in its letter of 31 March 2015, which included the list of measures it was taking and planning to undertake.

19. The Committee further noted that in 2015 Finland had submitted an application for adjustment to its inventory in line with paragraph 2 of decision 2012/3. Consequently, the Committee suspended its consideration of the case until the application was assessed by the EMEP Steering Body.

Follow-up to decision 2013/16 concerning compliance by Luxembourg with the Gothenburg Protocol (ref. 13/13 (NO_x))

20. At its thirty-fourth session the Committee had reviewed compliance by Luxembourg with the Gothenburg Protocol and had requested the secretariat to send a letter asking the Government to provide additional information.

21. The Committee continued to review the case at its thirty-fifth session. It was particularly grateful for additional information provided by Luxembourg in its letter of 31 March 2015, and for the presentation delivered by teleconference at the Committee's thirty-fifth session.

22. The Committee noted that in 2015 Luxembourg had submitted an application for adjustment to its NO_x inventory in line with paragraph 2 of decision 2012/3. Consequently, the Committee suspended its consideration of the case until the application was assessed by the EMEP Steering Body.

B. Follow-up to Executive Body Decisions**1. Protocol concerning the Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides or their Transboundary Fluxes****Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2014/4 concerning compliance by Cyprus with the Protocol concerning the Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides or their Transboundary Fluxes (ref. 1/08)***Background*

23. In decision 2014/4 the Committee was requested to review the progress of Cyprus and a timetable for achieving compliance with its obligations under the Protocol concerning the Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides or their Transboundary Fluxes (Protocol on NO_x).

24. At the thirty-fifth session, the secretariat informed the Committee that it had communicated decision 2014/4 to Cyprus and had received a response describing progress towards compliance. In addition, Cyprus had participated in the thirty-fifth session of the Committee by teleconference.

Consideration

25. The Committee noted that the latest officially submitted data showed that NO_x emissions in Cyprus in 2013 were 16.2 kilotons, which was slightly above the target level of 16 kilotons.

26. The Committee was grateful for the information provided by Cyprus in its recent report and at the Committee session and appreciated the continuous active cooperation and participation of the country in the Committee sessions.

27. The Committee further noted that NO_x emissions had dropped between 2012 and 2013 by 24 per cent and that, in 2013, Cyprus had been close to compliance. Such a reduction in emissions mainly originated from two major contributing source categories. A representative of Cyprus informed the Committee that the restoration of the Vasilikos power plant was now fully completed, which had resulted in the decrease in NO_x emissions from energy industries back to the level they had been before 2011. In addition, between 2010 and 2015, measures had been gradually implemented by Cyprus in order to improve public transportation and to encourage its use. Those measures had resulted in a continuous decrease in NO_x emissions from road transport by 31 percent between 2010 and 2013.

Furthermore, Cyprus expected an additional decline in NO_x emissions in the future owing to changes in its energy mix and thanks to the implementation of Directive 2010/31/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 May 2010 on the energy performance of buildings.

28. The Committee noted that Cyprus expected to be in compliance within the next few years and that the emission trend showed major improvements. It welcomed the efforts made towards compliance and agreed to continue to review the case after the 2016 reporting cycle was completed.

2. Protocol on Heavy Metals

(a) Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2013/5 concerning compliance by Cyprus with the Protocol on Heavy Metals (ref. 1/10 (Cd))

Background

29. In its decision 2013/5, the Executive Body strongly urged Cyprus to fulfil its obligations with respect to cadmium (Cd) emissions under the Protocol on Heavy Metals. In 2014, the Implementation Committee had reviewed the progress and timetable of Cyprus with respect to its efforts to reach compliance, and had reported to the Executive Body thereon at its thirty-third session (see ECE/EB.AIR/2014/2, paras. 12–17). A representative of Cyprus participated in the thirty-fourth session of the Committee, reporting that Cyprus expected to reach compliance with the Protocol by the next reporting round. After assessing information submitted by the Party, the Committee agreed to continue to review the case at its thirty-fifth session.

30. Cyprus participated in the thirty-fifth session of the Committee by teleconference.

Consideration

31. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee noted that the latest officially submitted data showed that cadmium emissions in Cyprus in 2013 were 0.048 tons compared with 0.085 tons in 1990, the base year for Cyprus. That information suggested that Cyprus was in compliance with its obligation under article 3, paragraph 1, of the Protocol on Heavy Metals.

32. The Committee further noted that cadmium emissions time series for Cyprus reported in 2015 showed significant changes compared with those reported in 2014, including the base year emissions, which were set at 0.085 tons in the 2015 reporting compared with 0.051 tons as reported in 2014. In addition, the chapter dedicated to recalculations in the Informative Inventory Report submitted by Cyprus in 2015 had not provided specific details on the major recalculation of the cadmium inventory.

33. The Committee was grateful for the information provided by Cyprus at its thirty-fifth session. The representative indicated that recalculations were based on major changes in emission factors, taking into account the latest version of the *EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook* (EMEP/EEA Guidebook),¹ and on some changes in the activity data. The Committee encouraged Cyprus to give more details on its recalculation process, for instance by comparing previous and current cadmium emission factors used by

¹The EMEP and European Environment Agency (EEA) guidebook, regularly updated, is designed to facilitate reporting of emission inventories by countries to the Convention as well as under the relevant European Union directive. See <http://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/air/emep-eea-air-pollutant-emission-inventory-guidebook>.

Cyprus, in its 2016 Informative Inventory Report. The Committee was of the view that the experience of Cyprus in inventory recalculations could help other Parties facing difficulties on the same issue. Cyprus agreed to include such information in its next Informative Inventory Report.

34. Based on the latest submitted data, the Committee concluded that Cyprus was in compliance with its obligations under the Protocol on Heavy Metals concerning cadmium emissions and that there was no reason to further review the case.

(b) Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2014/5 concerning Compliance by Liechtenstein with the Protocol on Heavy Metals (ref. 23/13 (Cd); ref. 24/13 (Hg))

Background

35. In decision 2014/5 the Committee was requested to review progress by Liechtenstein in achieving compliance with article 3, paragraph 1, of the Protocol on Heavy Metals with respect to mercury (Hg) and cadmium.

36. The secretariat informed the Committee that it had communicated decision 2014/5 to Liechtenstein and had received a response on 30 March 2015 indicating that the country was continuing to investigate the results of the analysis it had conducted in 2013 regarding emission factors and emission models for mercury and cadmium. That work was proceeding to the extent that limited available resources allowed, and Liechtenstein sought the understanding of the Implementation Committee while the work continued.

Consideration

37. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee noted with appreciation the response of Liechtenstein of 30 March 2015.

38. In its response, Liechtenstein pointed out that many of the emissions in question came from illegal waste incineration, and that some measures to address those emissions had been taken.

39. The Committee also noted that the latest official data submitted showed that mercury emissions in Liechtenstein in 2013 were 0.21 kilograms (kg), which was 40 per cent above the 1990 base year target level of 0.15 kg.

40. The Committee further noted that the latest official data submitted showed that cadmium emissions in Liechtenstein in 2013 were 2.5 kg, which was 14 per cent above the 1990 base year target level of 2.2 kg.

41. The Committee found the response by Liechtenstein helpful, in particular the acknowledgement that the country continued its work on emission factors and models for mercury and cadmium. Nevertheless, while the emissions might be small in absolute terms, the exceedances remained high in relative terms.

42. The Committee concluded that the issue would continue to remain under consideration. It requested the secretariat to invite Liechtenstein to provide further information on its progress regarding the issues outlined above. In particular, the Committee would welcome any views from Liechtenstein as to whether additional measures could be taken in relation to emissions from the illegal waste incineration category. In that respect, the Committee also sought to remind Liechtenstein of the opportunity to participate at its next session.

3. Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants

(a) Follow-up to decision 2014/6 concerning Compliance by Estonia with the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (ref. 2/10 (HCB))

Background

43. In its decision 2014/6, the Executive Body recalled its earlier decisions 2011/6 and 2012/17 and urged Estonia to fulfil its obligation to reduce its national annual emissions of hexachlorobenzene (HCB) so that they did not exceed emissions in 1995. It also requested the Implementation Committee to further review progress by Estonia in achieving compliance with article 3, paragraph 5 (a), of the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (Protocol on POPs).

44. At the Committee's thirty fifth session, the secretariat said that it had communicated decision 2014/6 to Estonia and had received a response to its letter in April 2015 indicating that Estonia had recalculated its national emission inventory submitted in 2015 compared with previous years, based on the new methodology provided in the EMEP/EEA Guidebook and on the national emission factors.

45. Based on those recalculations, the emissions of HCB in Estonia were 0.28 kg according to the latest reported data for 2013, which was below the emissions of 0.32 kg in 1995, the base year under the Protocol on POPs for Estonia.

Consideration

46. The Committee was grateful for the information provided by Estonia and appreciated in particular the updated information on recalculations provided in Estonia's 2015 Informative Inventory Report.

47. The Committee noted that Estonia was in compliance with article 3, paragraph 5 (a) of the Protocol on POPs with respect to HCB and concluded that there was no reason to further review the compliance of Estonia.

(b) Follow-up to EB decision 2014/7 concerning compliance by Latvia with the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (ref. 3/10 (HCB); ref. 11/10 (diox./furan))

Background

48. In decision 2014/7 the Committee was requested to review Latvia's progress for achieving compliance with article 3, paragraph 5(a) of the Protocol on POPs.

49. At the Committee's thirty fifth session, the secretariat informed the Committee that it had communicated the decision to Latvia and had received no response to its letter. The secretariat had also reminded Latvia of the invitation by the Committee to attend its next meeting, and no response from Latvia had been received.

Consideration

50. The Committee noted that Latvia still had not provided the information requested in decision 2014/7.

51. The Committee expressed regret that Latvia had not provided an update on its national emissions factors for relevant persistent organic pollutants and recalled that this issue has also been the subject of earlier Executive Body decisions 2011/6 and 2012/17. The Committee urged Latvia to provide the required information before its thirty-sixth meeting in 2016.

52. The Committee noted that the latest officially submitted data showed that HCB and dioxins/furan emissions in Latvia in 2013 were 0.37 kg and 51.5 g respectively, which was above the 1990 target level of 0.20 kg and 32.3 g, respectively. Moreover, the Committee noted that the emissions continued to increase compared to previous years.

53. The Committee concluded that with no additional information provided by Latvia on its efforts to comply with its obligation to reduce HCB and dioxins/furan emissions, the situation of non-compliance had not improved.

54. The Committee concluded to continue its consideration of this case at its thirty-sixth session and invited Latvia to participate in that session.

55. The Committee therefore requested the secretariat to send another letter to Latvia to address its concerns on this issue, and in response to Executive Body decision 2014/7. The Committee requested the secretariat to address the letter to the Permanent Representative of Latvia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, with a request to provide by 30 November 2015 the following information:

(a) A list of the specific measures Latvia intends to take to fulfil its emission reduction obligations under the Protocol on POPs;

(b) The quantitative and projected effects of further and more effective measures to reduce its HCB and dioxins/furan emissions up to and including the year of predicted compliance; and

(c) A revised timetable specifying the year by which Latvia expects to be in compliance.

(c) **Follow-up to EB decision 2013/8 concerning compliance by Denmark with the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (ref. 1/06 (PAH))**

Background

56. In its decision 2013/8, the Executive Body requested the Implementation Committee to review the progress and timetable of Denmark, and to report to the Executive Body thereon at its thirty-third session in 2014. At its thirty-third session (Oslo, 26-28 May 2014), the Committee considered information provided by Denmark on 27 March 2014 and concluded that it required additional background information.

57. In its last response from March 2014, Denmark had specified that it expected to be in compliance by 2018. The Committee had acknowledged the information previously provided by Denmark as well as timetable toward reaching compliance.

Considerations

58. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee noted that the latest officially submitted data showed that polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) emissions in Denmark in 2013 were 7.18 tons, which was 50 per cent above the 1990 base year emission level of 4.8 tons.

59. The Committee noted that according to Denmark's 2015 Informative Inventory Report the most important source of PAH emissions was the combustion of wood in the residential sector making up 68 per cent of the total emission in 2013. The PAH emission from combustion in residential plants had increased by 47 per cent from 1990 to 2013. Emission factors time series for residential wood combustion had been estimated for 1990-2000. In previous inventories the emission factors were assumed constant for that period, which led to the overestimation of emissions.

60. The Committee took note that the emission trend showed some improvement (reduction of 7 per cent compared to 2012), and that the estimated emissions so far were

following the trend of the projected emissions. Therefore, the Committee appreciated Denmark's efforts to comply with the Protocol on POPs.

61. The Committee felt that an update of information would be substantial for further review of the case; therefore, it requested the secretariat to send a letter to Denmark reminding it of the possibility of participating in one of its sessions in 2016 and requesting:

(a) An update of information on the outcome of the review of the Statutory Order (see ECE/EB.AIR/2014/2, para. 30) and effectiveness of implemented measures;

(b) Information on obstacles observed (if there are any) that may prevent the Party to reach compliance with the Protocol on POPs in 2018.

(d) Follow-up to EB decision 2013/10 concerning compliance by Luxembourg with the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (ref.14/13(HCB))

Background

62. In its decision 2013/10, the Executive Body requested the Implementation Committee to review the progress and the timetable of Luxembourg, and to report to it thereon at its thirty-third session in 2014.

63. At its thirty-fourth session, the Committee had noted that Luxembourg was to submit its emission data on POPs as part of its official reporting in 2015. It had further noted, that Luxembourg had submitted preliminary POPs emission data for 2011. The Implementation Committee had also then concluded that it could not make any recommendation regarding this case until Luxembourg officially submitted updated inventory data.

64. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee noted that Luxembourg submitted its missing annual emission data under the Protocol on POPs in March 2015 together with a detailed report on the status and trends of POPs emissions in the country. The Party also participated at the Committee session via teleconference.

65. Based on Luxembourg's report and presentation, following a substantial increase in the HCB emissions in the second half of the nineties and some interchanging upward and downward trends since 1999, the emissions in Luxembourg had been decreasing since 2009 with a total reduction of 7.2 percent from 1990 to 2013. The sharp increase of HCB emissions between 1993 and 1999 had predominantly been caused by the steel industry, which put three new electrical steel plants into operation. In the transport sector, a growing number of diesel vehicles led to an increase of HCB emissions by a factor of five within the same period. Between 2003 and 2008, modernised emission control in the steel industry helped to cut HCB emissions from the industrial sector by about 70 per cent. Iron and steel production made up almost half of the national total emissions in 2013. A third of emissions originated from the road transport.

Consideration

66. The Committee noted that based on the latest submitted data, the emissions of HCB in Luxembourg in 2013 (0.373 kg) were below the 1990 base year emissions (0.403 kg). In light of the information provided, the Committee concluded that there was no reason to further review the compliance of Luxembourg.

4. Gothenburg Protocol

Follow-up to decision 2013/14 concerning compliance by the European Union with the Gothenburg Protocol (ref. 5/13 (NO_x))

Background

67. In decision 2013/14 the Committee was requested to review the progress and timetable of the European Union (EU) in achieving compliance with article 3, paragraph 1, of the Gothenburg Protocol with regards NO_x emissions.

68. The Implementation Committee had considered this case during its thirty-third and thirty-fourth sessions in 2014 and reported on its conclusions regarding this case in its seventeenth report to the Executive Body (see ECE/EB.AIR/2014/2, paras. 51-58).

69. Following those considerations, the Committee had concluded at its thirty-fourth session that the EU was in compliance with its obligations under the Gothenburg Protocol and that there was no reason to further review the case.

70. At the Executive Body's thirty-third session, concerns were raised by one Party regarding the Committee's considerations of the compliance of the EU with the Gothenburg Protocol. The concerns related in particular to the scope of the legal analysis underlying the Committee's finding that the EU should be treated as the "EU 15" for purposes of its obligations under article 3 of the Protocol (see ECE/EB.AIR/127, para. 42).

71. The Executive Body therefore decided to request the Implementation Committee to continue to review the compliance of the EU with article 3, paragraph 1, of the Gothenburg Protocol and to report the results of its further considerations to the Executive Body. It was also decided that the Implementation Committee could invite interested Parties to provide it with additional information related to the issues addressed at the Executive Body session (ibid, paras. 42-45), but not to attend its meetings.

Considerations

72. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee noted that the EU had informed the Committee through its message of 20 May 2015 of its intention to provide additional information related to the issues addressed at the thirty-third session of the Executive Body, but had not yet finalized the required analysis.

73. The Committee took note of the Executive Body's decision to request the Committee to continue to review the case, and particularly welcomed the notion of inviting interested Parties to provide additional information related to the issue.

74. The Committee therefore invited interested Parties to provide to it through the secretariat views on the issues raised in paragraphs 42-45 of the report of the Executive Body on its thirty-third session as soon as possible and no later than by 30 June 2016. Such information could also include possible suggestions with a view to securing a constructive solution for the Committee to consider, bearing in mind the Convention's primary objectives to protect human health and the environment against air pollution.

75. Noting the EU's intention to provide further information based on the analysis it was undertaking, the Committee requested the secretariat to send a letter to the EU welcoming the offer to submit information. To facilitate the work of the Committee, the Committee would welcome the receipt of this information through the secretariat no later than by 30 June 2016.

C. Referrals initiated by the secretariat in 2013 and 2014 and still under consideration by the Committee

1. Gothenburg Protocol

(a) Follow-up to the referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Norway with the Gothenburg Protocol (ref. 18/13 (NO_x))

Background

76. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee continued its consideration of the secretariat's 2013 referral concerning compliance by Norway with its obligations under the Gothenburg Protocol, following its earlier consideration of the case at its thirty-third session (see ECE/EB.AIR/2014/2, paras. 81-88).

77. At its thirty-fifth session the Committee noted that, according to the emission data reported in 2015, emissions of NO_x in Norway in 2013 were 154.5 kilotons, which is below the applicable ceiling of 156 kilotons. That information suggested that Norway is in compliance with its obligations under article 3, paragraph 1, of the Gothenburg Protocol.

Considerations

78. According to Norway's 2015 Informative Inventory Report, the largest source of NO_x emissions in 2013 was transport with 35 per cent share of the total emissions. The second and third largest sources of emissions were combustion in energy industries (33 per cent) and other combustion (18 per cent).

79. According to the report, the NO_x emissions had been reduced thanks to policy measures. The reduction of emissions in navigation was achieved partly through the implementation of the NO_x Fund, which was financed by industry and businesses. In addition to the effect of the NO_x Fund, the consumption of marine fuels also decreased. This resulted in the navigation no longer being the largest emission source within the transport sector in 2013. The report also noted that stricter emission requirements for new passenger cars were additionally contributing towards the reduction of emissions.

80. The Committee felt that participation of Norway at its thirty-third session and the acknowledgement by the Committee of the fact that Norway prioritized the implementation of efficient measures for the reduction of NO_x emissions over the submission of an application for an inventory adjustment procedure further encouraged the Party towards reaching compliance with its NO_x emission ceiling under the Gothenburg Protocol.

81. Based on the latest submitted emission data in 2015, the Committee concluded that there was no need to further review the compliance by Norway with its NO_x obligations under the Gothenburg Protocol.

(b) Follow-up to the referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Norway with the Gothenburg Protocol (ref. 26/13 (NH₃))

Background

82. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee continued its consideration of the 2013 referral by the secretariat concerning Norway's compliance with the Gothenburg Protocol regarding NH₃ emissions.

83. The Committee recalled the comprehensive information that had been provided by Norway at the Committee's thirty-third session (see ECE/EB.AIR/2014/2, para. 93). It

specifically recalled that Norway had indicated that the results of the process to improve its NH₃ emissions calculations would be reflected in its 2015 inventory submission.

Consideration

84. The Committee noted that based on the latest submission of emission data received from Norway, emissions of NH₃ in Norway in 2013 (27.2 kilotons) were still above the applicable ceiling of 23 kilotons. Referring to the information that had been provided by Norway at the Committee's thirty-third meeting, the Committee concluded that it would continue to review Norway's compliance.

(c) Follow-up to the referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Spain with the Gothenburg Protocol (ref. 19/13 (NH₃))

Background

85. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee continued its consideration of the 2013 referral by the secretariat concerning Spain's compliance with the Gothenburg Protocol regarding NH₃ emissions.

86. The Committee recalled that following its thirty-third session it had sent a letter to Spain requesting a list of specific measures Spain intended to take to fulfil its emission reduction obligations under the Protocol and a timetable specifying the year by which Spain expected to be in compliance. At its thirty-fourth session, the Committee had expressed its regret that Spain had not provided its answer and asked the secretariat to write again to the Party, requesting it to reply by 31 March 2015 and inviting it to attend its next session in 2015. Spain replied to that letter and participated at the Committee's thirty-fifth session via teleconference.

Consideration

87. The Committee welcomed Spain's reply as well as its presentation at the thirty-fifth Committee session. It noted Spain's conclusion that current NH₃ emissions in the country may have been overestimated and that the implementation of control or abatement techniques could have led to a significant reduction in estimated emissions that could result in emissions falling below the applicable ceiling. The Committee also welcomed the Action Plan drafted by Spain to address compliance with its NH₃ emission obligations. The Committee noted that the Action Plan addressed both the specific measures and the timetable requested earlier by the Committee. The Committee highly appreciated Spain's commitment to comply with the Gothenburg Protocol.

88. In the light of the information provided, the Committee concluded to continue to review Spain's progress in implementing its Action Plan and requested the secretariat to write a letter to Spain asking for a progress report to be sent in advance of the Committee's next session.

(d) Follow-up to the referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Slovenia with the Gothenburg Protocol (ref. 5/14(NO_x))

Background

89. At its thirty-fourth session, the Implementation Committee had noted that the exceedance of NO_x emissions by Slovenia amounted to 1 per cent and concluded to reassess Slovenia's compliance in 2015. The Committee had also requested the secretariat to send a letter to Slovenia requesting additional information.

90. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee appreciated Slovenia's response received in March 2015 outlining specific measures to address the issue of non-compliance. The Committee also noted that based on the latest submission of NO_x emission data received from Slovenia, emission of NO_x in 2013 (42.9 kilotons) were below the indicated ceiling of 45 kilotons.

Consideration

91. In light of this information, the Committee concluded that there was no reason to further review the compliance of Slovenia.

2. 1985 Protocol on the Reduction of Sulphur Emissions or their Transboundary Fluxes by at least 30 per cent

Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia with the 1985 Sulphur Protocol (ref. 1/14)

Background

92. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee continued to consider the secretariat's referral concerning the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia's compliance with the 1985 Protocol on the Reduction of Sulphur Emissions or their Transboundary Fluxes (1985 Sulphur Protocol). According to the latest emission data, sulphur emissions were 82.2 kilotons in 2013, an exceedance of the applicable emission reduction target of 44 kilotons (70 per cent of the 1980 base year emissions) by approximately 87 percent. This information suggested that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was in non-compliance with its obligation under article 2 of the 1985 Sulphur Protocol.

93. The Committee recalled its earlier consideration of the case at its thirty-fourth session (see ECE/EB.AIR/2014/2, paras. 121-129). The Committee had then agreed to continue to review the compliance by the Party with the 1985 Sulphur Protocol and had requested the secretariat to send a letter, requesting the Party to provide by 31 March 2015:

- (a) Information on the outcomes of the recalculation of sulphur emissions for the base year;
- (b) An update of the information previously provided.

94. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia provided the information requested for the Committee to consider at its thirty-fifth session.

Consideration

95. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee was grateful for the information provided by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The Party particularly informed that the emissions inventory had been recalculated in December 2014. As the data received from the power plant operators were incomplete, only minor recalculations were performed, which did not significantly influence the national total emissions of sulphur for 1980, the base year under the 1985 Sulphur Protocol.

96. The Party stated further that the contribution of the energy sector to the total sulphur emissions was 92 per cent, with two power plants being the major contributors. According to the latest reported data, the sulphur emissions were reduced by 8 per cent from 2012 to 2013, but this was due to the fact that one of those two power plants had worked with reduced capacity due to the reduction of coal reserves near the installation. The other power plan had during 2013-2014 focused on reducing NO_x emissions, but had also started preparations for tender procedures to apply sulphur emissions reduction measures.

97. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia also informed that it expected to adopt a Strategy on Energy Development until 2035 at the end of 2015. At the same time, the operators of the power plants were to send to the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning their official reports on their choice of options under a new Energy Community Decision. With those two documents, the future steps in energy sector were expected to be clarified. The timetable for compliance with the 1985 Sulphur Protocol would then be accordingly defined by the Party. Finally, the Party obliged itself to inform the secretariat of the progress with regard to activities towards reducing sulphur emissions as well as to provide a timetable for the country's expected compliance with its obligations under the 1985 Sulphur Protocol.

98. The Committee noted the information provided by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia on its efforts to comply with its obligation to reduce sulphur emissions, and acknowledged that the emission trend showed some improvement, noting however that the exceedance of the emission reduction target was still significant.

99. The Committee expressed its appreciation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia's engagement in communication with the Committee and took particular note of its intention to inform the Committee of its progress and provide a timetable of the expected date of compliance. The Committee concluded to continue to review this case at its next session.

3. Protocol on Heavy Metals

Follow-up to the referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Latvia with the Protocol on Heavy Metals (ref. 2/14 (Cd))

Background

100. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee continued to consider the secretariat's referral concerning Latvia's compliance with the Protocol on Heavy Metals. According to the latest emission data, cadmium (Cd) emissions were 0.596 tons in 2013 compared to emissions of 0.47 tons in the base year of 1990, an exceedance of 27 per cent. This information suggested that Latvia was in non-compliance with its obligation under article 3, paragraph 1 of the Protocol on Heavy Metals.

101. The secretariat had informed Latvia about the intention to refer the issue to the Committee prior to its thirty-fourth session, and of the opportunity to provide a response, however no response had been provided by Latvia. As a follow-up to that Committee session, the Committee requested the secretariat to request from Latvia the following information: a) the list of specific measures Latvia intends to take to fulfil its emission reduction obligations under the Protocol; b) the quantitative and projected effects of such measures to reduce its cadmium emissions up to and including the year of predicted compliance; c) a timetable for specifying the year by which Latvia expects to be in compliance. Latvia had provided no response to that letter.

Consideration

102. In the light of the above, the Committee requested the secretariat to write another letter to Latvia inviting it to participate at its next session and requesting it to provide by 30 November 2015:

(a) A list of the specific measures Latvia intends to take to fulfil its emission reduction obligations under the Protocol;

(b) The quantitative and projected effects of further and more effective measures to reduce its cadmium emissions up to and including the year of predicted compliance; and

(c) A revised timetable specifying the year by which Latvia expects to be in compliance.

4. Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants

(a) Follow-up to the referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Estonia with the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (ref. 3/14 (PAH))

Background

103. At its thirty-fourth session, the Implementation Committee had concluded that Estonia was in non-compliance with its obligation under the Protocol on POPs with respect to PAH emissions and requested the secretariat to write a letter to Estonia requesting it to provide further information.

104. In April 2015, Estonia provided a response where it informed about recalculations that had taken place in its national emission inventory submitted in 2015 compared to previous years based on the new methodology that included national emission factors.

105. Based on those recalculations, the emissions of Estonia were now below its emission ceiling under the Protocol on POPs in accordance with article 3, paragraph 5 (a) of the Protocol. According to the latest emission data, PAH emissions were 7.2 tons in the latest reported 2013 data compared to the emissions of 10.1 tons in 1995, the base year for Estonia.

Consideration

106. The Committee was grateful for the information provided by Estonia and appreciated in particular the updated information on recalculations provided in Estonia's 2015 Informative Inventory Report.

107. The Committee noted that Estonia was in compliance with article 3, paragraph 5 (a) of the Protocol on POPs with respect to PAH and concluded that there was no reason to further review the case.

(b) Follow-up to the referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Liechtenstein with the Protocol on Persistent organic Pollutants (ref.4/14(PAH))

Background

108. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee continued its consideration of the 2014 referral by the secretariat concerning Liechtenstein's compliance with the Protocol on POPs regarding emissions of PAH. According to the latest emission data, PAH emissions were 0.050 tons in 2013 compared to the emissions of 0.017 tons in 1990, the base year for Liechtenstein, which amounts to an exceedence of 194%. This information suggested that Liechtenstein was in non-compliance with its obligations under article 3, paragraph 5 (a) of the Protocol on POPs.

109. At its thirty-fourth session, the Implementation Committee had concluded that Liechtenstein was in non-compliance with its obligation under the Protocol on POPs with respect to PAH emissions. It had then opted to keep the case under review until its next session in 2015.

110. The Implementation Committee also had requested the secretariat to write a letter to Liechtenstein requesting it to provide further information relevant to the case (see ECE/EB.AIR/2014/2, para. 142). In March 2015, Liechtenstein responded to that request.

Consideration

111. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee was grateful for the information provided by Liechtenstein. As was already indicated by the Party in its letter in 2014, Liechtenstein still considered that the increase in PAH emissions was mainly a result of the increase in wood firing in the past years. Moreover, Liechtenstein referred to the low total PAH emission level, albeit recognizing that it was not in compliance with the Protocol. Liechtenstein was of the view that due to the absence of other relevant PAH emitters than wood firing, it considered that no specific and effective measures to reduce PAH emissions were available.

112. Though total emissions in Liechtenstein were at levels lower than 0.1 tons, the Committee felt that the case was significant as the exceedence of the emission reduction target was close to 200 per cent. From an environmental perspective, even low amounts of POPs are of concern since those pollutants are bioaccumulative in nature.

113. The committee took note of Liechtenstein's point of view that wood combustion is the only relevant source and that no specific and effective measures to reduce PAH emissions were available. However, the Committee underlined the fact that several Parties to the Convention had faced similar issues with respect to wood combustion as the main source of PAH and that some of them succeeded in developing additional measures to cut PAH emissions.

114. The Committee therefore invites Liechtenstein to seek information from Parties which had faced similar issues in the past and which had developed additional measures to reduce PAH emission from wood combustion.

115. The Committee concluded that Liechtenstein remained in non-compliance with its obligation under article 3, paragraph 5(a) of the Protocol on POPs with respect to PAH emissions.

116. In light of the information received from Liechtenstein, the Committee requested the secretariat to send a letter to Liechtenstein requesting it to provide additional information on:

- (a) A list of specific measures Liechtenstein intends to take to fulfil its emission reduction obligation under the Protocol on POPs, taking into account the opportunity to use experiences of other Parties to achieve the appropriate solutions;
- (b) The quantitative and projected effects of possible effective measures in relation to emission reduction from wood firing; and
- (c) Revised timetable specifying the year by which Liechtenstein expects to be in compliance.

117. The Committee will continue to review this case and invites Liechtenstein to take part in the next Implementation Committee session to clarify possible ways to reach compliance.

III. Compliance with reporting obligations

118. At its thirty-fifth session, the Implementation Committee also considered the follow-up to Executive Body decisions on reporting. In addition, in accordance with the Implementation Committee's terms of reference, its functions and procedures for review (ECE/EB.AIR/113/Add.1, decision 2012/25, annex), the Committee considered referrals from the secretariat regarding cases of potential non-compliance by Parties with their reporting obligations, identified on the basis of information provided by the Centre on

Emission Inventories and Projections. The reporting obligations are set out in the respective protocols to the Convention as well as various Executive Body decisions on reporting (decisions 2002/10, 2005/1 and 2008/16) and the Guidelines for Reporting Emission Data under the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/125).

A. Follow-up to Executive Body decisions 2013/18, 2013/19 and 2014/8 on reporting

119. In decisions 2013/18, 2013/19 (see ECE/EB.AIR/122/Add.1) and 2014/8 (see ECE/EB.AIR/127/Add.1), the Executive Body urged Parties that were in non-compliance with their obligations with respect to reporting to provide the missing data. On the basis of information provided by the secretariat, the Committee reviewed the responses of Parties to those decisions.

Follow-up action taken by the Committee

120. With respect to decisions 2013/18, 2013/19 and 2014/8, the Committee was able to conclude that the following Parties had provided the missing data, and therefore recommended no further action with respect to those issues:

(a) Russian Federation had provided its missing annual emission data for 2011 under the 1985 Sulphur Protocol and the Protocol on NO_x;

(b) Norway had provided its missing gridded data for 2005 and 2010 under the Protocols on POPs and Heavy Metals;

(c) Switzerland had provided its missing gridded data for HCB for 2005 under the Protocol on POPs;

(d) The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had provided its missing gridded data for 2010 under the Protocol on Heavy Metals;

(e) Luxembourg had provided its missing annual emission data for 2011 and 2012 under the Protocol on POPs.

121. At its thirty-third session, following its consideration of the follow-up to decisions on reporting, the Committee requested the secretariat to write a letter to those Parties that remained in non-compliance with their reporting obligations to remind them of relevant decisions and ask them to provide the Committee with a summary of their current and next steps to ensure the preparation of the missing data to be submitted as part of the reporting period in 2015. In addition, following the adoption of decision 2014/8 on reporting at the thirty-third session of the Executive Body, the secretariat had sent a letter to relevant Parties communicating the decision and its provisions. At its thirty-fourth session, the Committee continued its review of the decisions on reporting in the light of the responses received from Parties.

122. A number of Parties, however, had not provided the missing data by the time of the Committee's thirty-fifth session. The status of these issues is reported below.

Consideration of decision 2014/8

123. In decision 2014/8, paragraph 4 (a), the Executive Body urged Albania to provide its missing annual emission data for 2010, 2011, 2012 and the base years under the 1985 Sulphur Protocol and the Protocol on NO_x. The Executive Body also reminded Albania that in accordance with article 2 of the 1985 Protocol on Sulphur the applicable base year for Albania is 1980 and that in accordance with article 2 of the Protocol on NO_x the applicable base year is 1987. The secretariat informed the Committee that, as of 13 May 2015, Albania

had not provided its missing data and had also not submitted annual data for 2013. In its letter of 13 February 2015, Albania noted that emission inventory data were not completed on time due to the lack of expertise in this field of relevant national authorities. Underlining its commitment to comply with the requirements of the Convention's Protocols, Albania informed about an upcoming project scheduled to start in March 2015 that would assist in the establishment of national air emission inventory under the Convention. As for the base years under the 1985 Protocol on Sulphur and the Protocol on NO_x, Albania asserted again that based on its national emission inventory data, the base year for Albania under both of these protocols should be 1990. As a result, the Committee was not in a position to assess its findings on the base years put forward by Albania. The Committee also noted that at the moment of accession to both Protocols Albania had not provided any declaration and/or reservation and, moreover, that the issue had already been addressed by the Committee (see ECE/EB.AIR/2014/3, para. 7) and reflected in the text of decision 2014/8.

124. In paragraph 4 (b) of decision 2014/8, Liechtenstein was urged to provide its missing annual emission data for 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and the base year for HCB under the Protocol on POPs. The secretariat informed the Committee that, as of 13 May 2015, Liechtenstein had not provided its missing data and that, in addition, the 2013 annual emission data for HCB was also missing. In its letter of 30 March 2015, Liechtenstein informed that it had to check the matter in more detail and that it would provide more information as soon as possible.

125. In paragraph 4 (c), the Executive Body urged Luxembourg to provide its missing annual emission data for 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 under the Protocol on Heavy Metals, its missing gridded data for 2005 and 2010 under the Protocols on POPs and Heavy Metals, and its missing projections data for 2015 and 2020 under the Gothenburg Protocol. The secretariat informed the Committee that, as of 13 May 2015, Luxembourg had not provided those missing data. Luxembourg presented the status of preparation of its missing reporting data at the Committee's thirty-fifth session. Specifically it noted that its missing annual emission data under the Protocol on Heavy Metals would be submitted by the end of July 2015 while the missing gridded data under the Protocol on POPs and Heavy Metals were planned to be submitted in the course of 2016. Finally, Luxembourg communicated that its missing projections data under the Gothenburg Protocol would be submitted around September 2015. The Committee was grateful for the information provided and appreciated the efforts taken by Luxembourg to complete its reporting.

126. In paragraph 4 (d), the Executive Body urged Montenegro to provide its missing annual emission data for 2012 under the Protocols on POPs and Heavy Metals. The secretariat informed the Committee that, as of 13 May 2015, Montenegro had not provided its missing data and had also not submitted annual emission data for 2013. In a message of 25 February 2015, Montenegro informed the Committee that due to technical problems it was not in a position to submit data for 2012 and 2013 in a timely manner. Montenegro hoped to overcome this inconvenience soon and fulfil its reporting obligations as soon as possible.

127. Finally, in paragraph 4 (e), the Executive Body urged Sweden to provide its missing gridded data for HCB for 2005 under the Protocol on POPs. The secretariat informed the Committee that, as of 13 May September 2015, Sweden had not provided its missing gridded data. In a message of 12 February 2015, Sweden reiterated that it would include the missing data in its submission for 2017 as it was currently working to improve its inventory of emissions to air with a view to submitting more complete and representative gridding of its HCB emissions by 2017.

128. Following the review of the implementation of decision 2014/8 by the Parties concerned, at its thirty-fifth session, the Committee concluded that all of them remained in non-compliance regarding its provisions (partially in case of Luxembourg). At the same

time, the Committee was grateful for updates from some Parties regarding the status of preparation and schedule for submission of missing data. In light of the lack of progress from Albania and Liechtenstein, the Committee agreed to request the secretariat to write a letter to those Parties:

- (a) Emphasizing the importance of the provision of reporting for the functioning of the Convention and its protocols;
- (b) Reminding the Party of the respective Executive Body decision concerning non-compliance with reporting obligations;
- (c) Asking the Parties to provide, by 30 November 2015, to the Implementation Committee, through the secretariat, a summary of the Party's current and next steps in order to ensure the preparation of the missing emission data, including updates on the implementation of ongoing relevant projects.

Consideration of decision 2013/18

129. In paragraph 4 (b) of decision 2013/18 the Executive Body urged Croatia to provide its missing annual emission data for the base years under the Protocol on NO_x and the Protocol concerning the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or their Transboundary Fluxes (Protocol on VOCs). The secretariat informed the Committee that as of 13 May 2015, Croatia had not provided its missing base year emission data under both Protocols.

130. In paragraph 4 (d) of decision 2013/18 the Executive Body urged Romania to provide its missing annual emission data for the base year under the Protocol on Heavy Metals. The secretariat informed the Committee that as of 13 May 2015 Romania had not provided the missing data.

131. In the absence of progress and additional information from Croatia and Romania, the Committee agreed to continue to review these reporting cases at its next session and requested the secretariat to write a letter to those Parties:

- (a) Emphasizing the importance of the provision of reporting for the functioning of the Convention and its protocols;
- (b) Reminding the Party of the respective Executive Body decision concerning non-compliance with reporting obligations;
- (c) Asking the Parties to provide, by 30 November 2015, to the Implementation Committee, through the secretariat, a summary of the Party's current and next steps in order to ensure the preparation of the missing data, including updates on the implementation of ongoing relevant projects.

Consideration of decision 2013/19

132. In paragraph 4 (c) of decision 2013/19 the Republic of Moldova was urged to provide its missing gridded data for 2005 and 2010 under the Protocols on POPs and Heavy Metals. The secretariat informed the Committee that, as of 13 May 2015, the Republic of Moldova had not provided its missing gridded data under either Protocol.

133. In decision 2013/19, paragraph 4 (d), Romania was urged to provide its 2005 gridded data under the Protocols on POPs and Heavy Metals. The secretariat informed the Committee that, as of 13 May 2015, Romania had not provided its 2005 gridded data under either Protocol.

134. In the absence of progress and additional information from the Republic of Moldova and Romania, the Committee agreed to continue to review these reporting cases at its next session and requested the secretariat to write a letter to those Parties:

- (a) Emphasizing the importance of the provision of reporting for the functioning of the Convention and its protocols;
- (b) Reminding the Party of the respective Executive Body decision concerning non-compliance with reporting obligations;
- (c) Asking the Parties to provide, by 30 November 2015, to the Implementation Committee, through the secretariat, a summary of the Party's current and next steps in order to ensure the preparation of the missing data, including updates on the implementation of ongoing relevant projects.

B. New referrals and compliance with emission data reporting obligations by Protocol

135. In line with item 3.1 of the 2014–2015 workplan for the implementation of the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/122/Add.2), the Committee evaluated compliance by Parties with their emission data reporting obligations under the seven Protocols in force on the basis of information provided by the secretariat. The evaluation covered the completeness and timeliness of reporting. The information provided by the secretariat is presented in informal document No. 1 and covers data reported up to 1 September 2015. Tables 1–7 included in informal document No. 1 give an overview of the status of emission data reporting under the seven Protocols in force in 2013.

136. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee considered the new referrals submitted by the secretariat, as described below, and concluded to continue to review these cases at its next meeting:

- (a) 1985 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with article 4, concerning reporting of annual emissions:
 - (i) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Belarus with its reporting obligations under the 1985 Protocol on Sulphur (R1/15).
- (b) Protocol on NO_x: compliance with article 8, concerning emission data reporting:
 - (i) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Belarus with its reporting obligations under the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides (R2/15);
 - (ii) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Greece with its reporting obligations under the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides (R3/15).
- (c) Protocol on VOCs: compliance with article 8, paragraph 1, concerning emission data reporting:
 - (i) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Monaco with its reporting obligations under the Protocol on VOCs (R4/15).
- (d) 1994 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with article 5, paragraphs 1 (b) and 2, concerning emission data reporting:
 - (i) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Monaco with its reporting obligations under the 1994 Protocol on Sulphur (R5/15);

- (ii) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Greece with its reporting obligations under the 1994 Protocol on Sulphur (R6/15).
- (e) Protocol on Heavy Metals: compliance with article 7, paragraph 1 (b), concerning emission data reporting:
 - (i) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Monaco with its reporting obligations under the Protocol on Heavy Metals (R7/15).
 - (f) Gothenburg Protocol: compliance with article 7, paragraph 1 (b), concerning emission data reporting on sulphur, NO_x, ammonia and VOCs:
 - (i) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Croatia with its reporting obligations under the Gothenburg Protocol (R8/15) (2025 and 2030 emission projections);
 - (ii) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by France with its reporting obligations under the Gothenburg Protocol (R9/15) (2025 and 2030 emission projections);
 - (iii) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Hungary with its reporting obligations under the Gothenburg Protocol (R10/15) (2025 emission projections);
 - (iv) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by Luxembourg with its reporting obligations under the Gothenburg Protocol (R11/15) (2025 and 2030 emission projections);
 - (v) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia with its reporting obligations under the Gothenburg Protocol (R12/15) (2020 (NH₃ missing only), 2025 and 2030 emission projections).
 - (g) Obligations under several Protocols:
 - (i) Referral by the secretariat concerning compliance by the European Union with its reporting obligations under the Protocol on NO_x, the 1994 Protocol on Sulphur, the Protocol on POPs, the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol (annual data and 2025 and 2030 projections) (R13/15).

IV. Template for preparation of the Committee's report and checklist on introducing the Committee cases

137. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee discussed the template for preparing its report to the Executive Body and a draft checklist on introducing cases at the Committee sessions. The Committee members found both documents useful in their preparation for the Committee meetings and in drafting considerations.

138. The Committee requested the secretariat to post both documents on the internal members' area of the Committee webpage, and invited its members to suggest their ideas on further improving the documents, specifically in relation to formatting.

V. Membership of the Committee and sequence and timing of its meetings

139. At its thirty-fifth session, the Committee also discussed its membership in light of the completion of terms of eight of its nine members in December 2015. Taking into account the extraordinary short duration of the December 2015 session of the Executive

Body and the need to maintain the continuity of work of the Committee to prepare its recommendations for the May 2016 session of the Executive Body, the Committee agreed on the usefulness of the prolongation of the current terms of the Committee members until the next Executive Body meeting in 2016.

140. Taking into account the new sequence of meetings of the Executive Body and its subsidiary bodies as well as the deadlines for submission of emission data by Parties, the Committee agreed to amend its cycle of meetings, so that its first meeting following an Executive Body session would be held around early September of each year and the second session around late January of the following year. The reports of the Committee to the Executive Body, including its recommendations for decision, would therefore be produced at its January sessions. Thus, the Committee would maintain holding two sessions per year in line with decision 2012/25. It was agreed to tentatively hold the thirty-sixth session of the Committee from 26 to 28 January 2016 and the thirty-seventh – in September 2016.

141. The Committee requested the secretariat to consider the possibility of organizing its September sessions back to back with the joint sessions of the EMEP Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects.
