

Informal meeting on financing issues for scientific activities under EMEP and WGE Preliminary outcome

BRUSSELS 26 APRIL 2016

Invitations and participation

Participants: Representatives from Austria, Denmark, European Commission, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, the chairs of EMEP SB and WGE, UN ECE secretariat

Additional invitations: Canada, Norway (written comments), Russian (written comments) and the United States

Status quo

- The scientific work under the Convention relies on various funding pathways.
 - **National monitoring activities** are almost always financed through national funding.
 - The **EMEP Programme Centers** receive a basis for their work through the trust fund under the EMEP Protocol. In most cases additional support is needed to fully finance the activities. Hosting countries have a particular responsibility but from time to time other sources support project-oriented activities.
 - For the **ICPs under WGE**, there is a voluntary trust fund covering 20-25% of the overall costs. Most of the additional costs are taken by the lead country for the respective program centre. These costs are in most cases transferred directly to the program centre (not through the voluntary trust fund)
 - Costs for (chairing) **Task Forces** are taken by lead countries for the TFs.
 - Finally, **project-based activities** are often supported by Parties. These activities may include scientific development, assessments and meetings.

Hosting countries views

- All the hosting countries (Except NL/CCE) will continue to support the ICPs, TFs and technical centres. However, UK, Finland and France regularly review their work programmes and/or mentioned potential difficulties to keep the effort at the same level.
- Indirect or project based support is provided several countries by Austria (CEIP), Switzerland (various), Germany (M&M, TFH, TFRN) and others.
- There are various co-benefits to lead countries for having (and funding) a center, e.g. serving as a hub for international scientist networks.
- The European Commission indicated that it may remind Member States at high levels on the importance of the scientific work undertaken by the Convention for the EU air quality policy and the importance of supporting the activities

EMEP/WGE activities in a larger perspective

New needs for data for performance review of the Protocols as well as for further amendments may occur by 2018-2020(?). The time up to that may give an opportunity for reconsidering organisation and priorities, in particular in the long term

There are needs for EMEP/WGE competence and data in a variety of international organisations and processes outside CLRTAP. These should be identified and (formal) discussions on collaboration should be undertaken.

The European Commission indicated that there is a need for updated information from EMEP/WGE around 2020 in connection with a new policy round within the EU.

The inclusion of effects-oriented monitoring in the EU NERC Directive presently under negotiation will stabilize monitoring systems and increase the interest of Member States in the functioning of the ICPs and related centres.

CCE – NL has announced no financial support from 2017

- The CCE (and its strong support from the Netherlands) have played a crucial role for the Convention. There was a common request that the work should be maintained, although, the centre may need to move and the level of work reduced. The critical loads work is also central for the EU.
- The Netherlands roughly estimates costs of the most «important» / strategic activities of the CCE (i.e. call for data and data management) at 130 k€. This includes salaries, travel and expert contracts, but no methodological development, heavy metals, or bilateral support. Unclear whether this includes biodiversity or not. At present, no funding is foreseen for 2017. The meeting suggested that a budget of 200 keuros/year for CCE activity should be what we should aim for.
- The meeting expressed the need that the Dutch Ministry (not RIVM) should send a letter to the EB clarifying its decision on support to the CCE and whether the structure as such will remain
- It was also asked whether CCE could still be kept at RIVM (at least for 2017) with support from other countries financing experts from CCE at RIVM, or whether it could/should be moved elsewhere
- Finally EC mentioned that there might be organizations within the EU system that could be interested in taking over effect databases management.

Setting priorities for sustainable funding

- The timing is good to review WGE and EMEP activities, because we are in-between revision processes. The Parties should be active in this process, through questionnaires, surveys ...
 - To what extent are products used by Parties?
 - Would it for example be sufficient to compute S/R matrices every 2-3 years instead of every years?
 - Need for country reports on effects ?
- The work plan is the appropriate tool to allow the Parties to set budget on the activities they are willing to support. But in its current shape, this is very difficult, since activities are not associated with any estimates of costs.
- There is a distinction between long term priorities, which also concern core activities, and short term ones that could relate to specific projects (2 or 3 years). Both aspects should be reviewed
 - « core activities » have been mentioned in various CLRTAP documents; however, they are defined in a rather open way as activities that are necessary to meet requests under “basic obligations in the work plan”

Setting priorities for sustainable funding

- There is a question about the need for science that seems to raise while a lot has already been achieved. Some Parties are not sure that we should maintain it at the same level as today
 - Implementation, especially in the EECCA region should drive some activities but it should complement science and not replace it. But we have to find the good balance between both. Review of the EMEP and WGE deliverables and products should help
 - Science and monitoring is the guidance of and basis of long-term policies. A focus on emerging problems and avoidance of short-term reactions saves costs. We should actively communicate this (see e.g. Assessment Report).
 - Annual requests for funding sent out by the secretariat, especially for the WGE, should be accompanied with a presentation of what Parties will gain from the work. . E.g. add a list of deliverables.
 - Promote and disseminate EMEP/WGE labelled products to encourage the Parties to support their development

Some notes on the financial report

- Note ECE/EB.AIR/2015/03
- A better understanding of the funding infrastructure is required. Some of the countries also expressed the need for a common way of presenting national contributions to the centres.
- There are contradictory figures in the underlying financial claims. In one case there is a difference of a factor of more than 2 between recorded contribution for an ICP and what is reported as consumed.
- There are sometimes unexpected large differences in costs for the same kind of activities depending on the ICP. This concerns in particular database management.

Additional views to optimise financial resources:

- Streamline some activities (e.g. effects databases management ?)
- Better and easier-to-access info on ICPs
- Develop cooperation with other programs likely to fund, or provide synergies with, EMEP/WGE activities : Copernicus, Stockholm and Minamata Conventions, Arctic Council, OECD...
- Look for a larger involvement of national experts in technical tasks that would support the work of the Convention (Parties are more willing to pay for their own experts). Tasks that should be borne by national experts should be identified
- Focus on EECCA countries (most need for science base and most return on investments), especially on emission inventories but also effects and air pollution monitoring
- Look for more support from the EU, especially through funding mechanisms like LIFE, LIFE+, etc.

Thank you
