



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/2
30 September 2004

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 (EMEP)

REPORT ON THE TWENTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Introduction

1. The Steering Body held its twenty-eighth session in Geneva from 6 to 8 September 2004.
2. The session was attended by representatives from the following Parties to the Convention: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States and the European Community (EC).
3. Representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the European Environment Agency (EEA) and the four EMEP centres (Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM), Chemical Coordinating Centre (CCC), Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E) and Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W)) attended. A representative of the Union of the Electricity Industry (EURELECTRIC) was also present.

Documents prepared under the auspices or at the request of the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution for GENERAL circulation should be considered provisional unless APPROVED by the Executive Body.

4. Mr. J. SCHNEIDER (Austria) chaired the meeting.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5. The Steering Body adopted the provisional agenda as contained in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/1.

II. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT ON THE TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

6. The Steering Body adopted the report on its twenty-seventh session (EB.AIR/GE.1/2003/2).

III. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE TWENTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE BODY FOR THE CONVENTION AND ACTIVITIES OF THE EMEP BUREAU, INCLUDING COOPERATION WITH THE WORKING GROUP ON EFFECTS

7. Mr. K. BULL, Chief of the Air and Water Team of the UNECE Environment and Human Settlements Division, provided information on the present status of the Convention's protocols and preparations for the Convention's twenty-fifth anniversary. He drew special attention to the new United Nations guidelines on reports drafted and/or compiled in the secretariat, which emphasized the focusing on recommendations and conclusive decisions only. All presentations made at the session are available on the Convention's web site (www.unece.org/env/lrtap).
8. The Chairman of the Working Group on Effects, Mr. H. GREGOR (Germany), informed the Steering Body about the discussions held at its recent twenty-third session (EB.AIR/WG.1/2004/2). He drew attention to a cooperative study with MSC-West showing higher values of critical loads exceedances for ecosystems in Europe than anticipated at the time of the Gothenburg Protocol due to model and data improvements including ecosystem-specific deposition data and the use of the higher spatial resolution Eulerian model.
9. The Chairman of the Working Group on Strategies and Review, Mr. R. BALLAMAN, drew attention to priority issues for consideration by the Steering Body related to the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). He noted the importance of extending the EMEP models to the hemispheric level, of building on synergies with work on climate change and of having a good balance with work on urban pollution.
10. The Chairman presented the summary report on the work of the EMEP Bureau between the Steering Body's twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth sessions, including cooperation with the Working Group on Effects (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/12). He reported on the third joint meeting of the Bureaux of the EMEP Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects, held in Geneva on 18 March 2004 (<http://www.unece.org/env/emep/welcome.html>). He stressed the usefulness of the joint meetings and the intention to continue them.

11. The Steering Body took note of this information and agreed to bear it in mind in its discussions. In particular, it:

- (a) Took note of the report on the activities of the EMEP Bureau;
- (b) Also took note of the information provided by the Chairmen of the Working Group on Effects and the Working Group on Strategies and Review;
- (c) Noted the results of the joint meeting between the Bureaux of the Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects and agreed to take them into account in preparing its work-plan;
- (d) Expressed its readiness to cooperate with the Working Group on Effects to ensure that the Convention's priorities were addressed effectively.

IV. PROGRESS IN ACTIVITIES IN 2004 AND FUTURE WORK

12. The Chairman invited the Steering Body to discuss separately each area of work, considering progress made in 2004 with respect to the adopted work-plan (ECE/EB.AIR/79/Add.2, annex XII, item 2) and taking into account the draft work-plan for 2005 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/13), which would be discussed under agenda item 6.

A. Acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants

13. Ms. L. TARRASON (MSC-W) presented an overview of activities on monitoring and modelling of acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants, including progress in work at CCC, progress in work at CIAM, its own work and the discussions at the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/3), noting in particular the calculation of the source-receptor relationships for 2010, the changes in the risk estimates of ecosystem and health damage, and plans for work up to 2006. She drew attention to the EMEP Status Report 1/04.

14. Mr. R. DERWENT presented the results of the workshop on the review of the EMEP unified Eulerian model, held in early November 2003 in Oslo (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/6). He stressed the improvements of the new EMEP model over the old Lagrangian model, in particular the higher spatial resolution, the more reliable treatment of transboundary transport and the ecosystem-specific deposition. He stressed the conclusion that the model could be used for integrated assessment modelling for acidification, eutrophication and ground-level ozone. He drew attention to further work needed to improve confidence in modelling fine particles mass, even though the model calculated regional anthropogenic particulate matter (PM) fractions sufficiently accurately to assess the outcome of different control measures. He indicated that the recommendations of the workshop should be taken into account in the future work-plan.

15. Ms. Tarrason presented source-receptor calculations carried out by MSC-W in 2004. She stressed that changes to the risk estimates of ecosystem and health damage resulted from updates to emission data, new critical loads, the increased spatial resolution of the unified EMEP model and the use of land-cover-specific deposition data. She also drew attention to the importance of the inter-annual meteorological variability, especially its effects on ozone concentrations, which were very different for different regions. For the Gothenburg Protocol, five and ten-year averages were used for the source-receptor calculations for ozone concentrations and pollution deposition, respectively. Additional runs would be necessary with the new EMEP model.

16. Several delegations stressed the importance of properly understanding the effect of inter-annual variability of meteorology on air concentrations and deposition and requested MSC-W to investigate this item as a priority.

17. The delegation of Croatia noted that it had successfully used the results of the EMEP model for its region and expressed a strong interest in model runs for additional years.

18. The Steering Body discussed the importance of and possibilities for extending the model to the hemispheric scale as well as applications at the local scale.

19. After discussions, MSC-W agreed, in view of the time constraints, to include the average and two extreme years in its source-receptor calculations for further investigating meteorological variability.

20. The Swedish delegation presented the results of the workshop on base cation deposition, held in Gothenburg (Sweden) on 26-28 November 2003 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/11).

21. The Steering Body:

(a) Expressed its appreciation to MSC-W, CIAM and CCC for the progress in the work on acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants;

(b) Took note of the Status Report 1/04;

(c) Took note of the results of the workshop on the review of the EMEP model and expressed its gratitude to Norway for hosting it;

(d) Acknowledged that, in terms of acidification, eutrophication and photo-oxidants, the EMEP model was state of the art and could be used for policy applications;

(e) Took note of the conclusions of the workshop on base cation deposition (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/11) and expressed its gratitude to Sweden for hosting it;

(f) Took note of the increases in ecosystem areas at risk of exceeding critical loads for acidification and eutrophication due to model and data improvement and, in view of the policy

implications, requested its Chairman to bring this to the attention of the Working Group on Strategies and Review and the Executive Body;

(g) Requested MSC-W to assess the robustness of the effects indicators for ozone from a modelling point of view and report thereon at its twenty-ninth session;

(h) Invited MSC-W to further investigate as a high priority the influence of inter-annual meteorological variability on source-receptor matrices and to explore interactions with climate change;

(i) Agreed on the importance of hemispheric and local-scale modelling and requested MSC-W to continue work on both.

B. Heavy metals

22. Mr. S. DUTCHAK of MSC-E presented an overview of activities on monitoring and modelling heavy metals, including progress in work at CCC, its own work, the discussions at the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/3) and plans for work up to 2006. He introduced the EMEP Status Report 2/04 on lead, cadmium and mercury and Information Note 2004/4, the EMEP contribution to the preparatory work for the review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals prepared by MSC-E. Work in 2005 would focus on the review of the MSC-E model. Resources would be limited for work on the hemispheric model.

23. Several delegations drew attention to the quality of emission data, noting that for heavy metals emissions were clearly underestimated in some countries and there was a need to take action to improve that situation now that the Protocol on Heavy Metals had entered into force.

24. The Chairman of the Working Group on Effects reported that it had agreed that an effects- based approach was feasible and a methodology had been included in the Mapping Manual.

25. Mr. Dutchak presented plans for preparing for the review of the MSC-E model, which would be further discussed at the technical meeting of the EMEP centres in January 2005.

26. The delegation of Sweden drew attention to the results of a workshop on mercury, held in Brussels in March 2004, which had considered a broad perspective of mercury pollution (www.ivl.se/nytt/konferenser/mercury/).

27. The delegation of Germany announced plans for 2005 to fund and support a field intercomparison of mercury measurements in air. The study would be in close cooperation with CCC and European Committee for Standardization (CEN) on mercury standards. Results would be reported to the Steering Body in 2006. Delegates were requested to convey information to their EMEP laboratories. It was stressed that activities on mercury monitoring under EMEP and CEN/TC 264 (air quality) should be harmonized as far as possible.

28. The Steering Body:

- (a) Noted with appreciation the work and progress in the monitoring and modelling of heavy metals at CCC and MSC-E;
- (b) Took note of the Status Report 2/04;
- (c) Welcomed the Information Note 2004/4 on the EMEP contribution to the preparatory work for the review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals, and requested MSC-E to deliver it to the Working Group on Strategies and Review;
- (d) Welcomed the preparations by MSC-E for the review of its models at a workshop in November 2005 and invited MSC-E to work closely with the scientific community, the EMEP centres and the task forces in this process;
- (e) Invited MSC-E and CCC to support the Expert Group on Heavy Metals as appropriate;
- (f) Took note of the results of the workshop on mercury held in Brussels in March 2004;
- (g) Called upon Parties to report emissions of heavy metals and invited the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections to provide guidance to Parties for improving the quality of their emission data;
- (h) Welcomed the offer of Germany to organize and support an intercomparison study for mercury measurements in 2005.

C. Particulate matter

29. Mr. K. TORSETH (CCC) presented an overview of activities on atmospheric monitoring and modelling of PM (EMEP Status Report 4/04), including progress in work at MSC-W and CIAM, its own work, the discussions within the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/3) and plans for work up to 2006. He provided details on emission inventories and the monitoring and model results, stressing the scientific problems and uncertainties. He further stressed the importance of improving the quality of emission data and the availability of monitoring data including PM speciation.

30. Mr. R. DENNIS (United States) presented the results of the workshop on particulate matter measurements and modelling, held in New Orleans, United States, on 19-23 April 2004 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/16).

31. The Steering Body recognized the need for further close cooperation on PM between North American and European experts. Germany announced plans to organize with the United States a

workshop on ozone and possibly particulate matter.

32. The Steering Body:

- (a) Noted its appreciation for the work done by MSC-W, CIAM and CCC on PM and welcomed the progress made;
- (b) Took note of the Status Report 4/04;
- (c) Took note of the conclusions and recommendations of the workshop on PM measurement and modelling, and expressed its gratitude to the United States and Canada for hosting the workshop;
- (d) Recognized that emission data, especially for primary PM, were not good and requested Parties and the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections to work on improving their quality;
- (e) Recognized the need for monitoring the chemical composition of PM and urged Parties to initiate monitoring programmes to address this.

D. Persistent organic pollutants

33. Mr. V. SHATALOV (MSC-E) presented an overview of activities on monitoring and modelling POPs, including progress in work at CCC, its own work, the discussions within the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/3) and plans for work up to 2006. He drew attention to the EMEP Status Report 3/04 and Information Note 5/2004 on the EMEP contribution to the Task Force on POPs.

34. The representative of UNEP described plans to initiate work on monitoring POPs under the Stockholm Convention. It was agreed that future cooperation between the two Conventions should focus on two major issues of importance to EMEP: emission inventories and global monitoring of POPs in the air. Work-plans should be harmonized accordingly. It was suggested that the UNEP secretariat to the Stockholm Convention might collaborate with the EMEP centres regarding the future establishment of POP measurement centres. It was recognized that emission estimates would always be difficult for POPs. Nevertheless, good modelling of these substances was very important.

35. The delegation of the Netherlands provided information about a study for improving the European emission inventories and projections for heavy metals and POPs by the Netherlands research organization TNO. Results would be available in 2005.

36. The Steering Body:

- (a) Expressed its appreciation for the work by MSC-E and CCC on POPs and

welcomed the progress made, recognizing its relevance and timeliness to the review of the Protocol on POPs;

(b) Took note of Status Report 3/04;

(c) Welcomed preparations by MSC-E for the review of its model on POPs and invited MSC-E to work closely with the scientific community, the EMEP centres and the task forces in this process;

(d) Welcomed Information Note 2004/5 on the EMEP contribution to the preparatory work for the review of the Protocol on POPs, and requested MSC-E to make it available to the Working Group on Strategies and Review;

(e) Urged MSC-E and CCC to continue to provide support to the Task Force on POPs;

(f) Invited MSC-E and CCC to cooperate closely with the UNEP secretariat to the Stockholm Convention on improving emission inventories and the monitoring of POPs, and requested its Chairman to draw this to the attention of the Executive Body;

(g) Requested MSC-E to continue working on the hemispheric modelling of POPs and invited it to cooperate with the UNEP secretariat to the Stockholm Convention in this work;

(h) Called upon Parties to report emissions of POPs, noting that the Protocol had entered into force, and invited the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections to provide guidance to the Parties for improving the quality of their emission data;

(i) Welcomed the study on improving European emission inventories and projections on heavy metals and POPs launched by the Netherlands.

E. Measurements and modelling

37. Ms. L. JALKANEN (WMO), Co-Chair of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, reported on progress, including the results of its fifth meeting, held in Prague on 31 March - 2 April 2004 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/3).

38. Mr. Torseth presented the revised draft monitoring strategy (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/5).

39. The delegate of the United Kingdom noted that the monitoring strategy required a minimum of 20-30 level 2 sites for each topic area. But for some priority items, e.g. PM, he suggested that a greater number of sites was required. In addition, he suggested that a site should meet a significant number of level 2 requirements before it was defined as level 2. He expected that the table presented in the strategy would be subject to constant review and revision, as appropriate.

40. The delegation of Sweden proposed amending chapter IV of the strategy by placing paragraphs 28 and 29 before 26 and 27, since paragraphs dealing with compliance and implementation should precede the paragraphs dealing with relaxation. It also proposed adding at the end of paragraph 26 the sentence “Any major change in the monitoring programme of a Party should be made in consultation with CCC”.

41. CCC stressed that increasing the number of monitoring stations in Eastern Europe was a significant challenge requiring both technical and financial assistance. CCC would provide technical support, but implementation would need national and possibly external financial resources.

42. The Steering Body noted that the monitoring strategy could in principle facilitate inverse modelling. It recognized the usefulness of inverse modelling as a top-down check on emissions, as well as the challenges it presented. It agreed to refer this for consideration by the Task Force together with the issue of target densities of monitoring sites.

43. The Steering Body took note of the suggestion to co-locate greenhouse gas monitoring at selected EMEP sites.

44. Mr. A. ELIASSEN (MSC-W) presented the EMEP assessment report including its summary (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/4). It was agreed that any further comments on it should be provided by 17 September. The report would then be finalized by its editor in consultation with the Steering Body's Bureau and published in time for the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the Convention.

45. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the report by the Task Force, expressing appreciation for its work and that of MSC-W, MSC-E and CCC;

(b) Adopted the monitoring strategy as amended and urged Parties to take the necessary steps to ensure its effective implementation;

(c) Requested the Executive Body to approve the strategy and call upon Parties to ensure that resources were available for its implementation at the national level;

(d) Expressed its appreciation to CCC for preparing the draft monitoring strategy and welcomed its plans to organize a workshop on the implementation of the strategy on 22-24 November 2004;

(e) Expressed its appreciation to all the experts involved in drafting the assessment report, endorsed the contents of the report including its summary and recommended its publication;

(f) Requested CCC to follow closely the activities within CEN on the establishment of reference monitoring standards in its efforts to further develop the EMEP monitoring manual;

(g) Expressed its appreciation to the United Kingdom and WMO for leading the Task Force and to Croatia for offering to host its sixth meeting in April 2004.

F. Integrated assessment modelling

46. Mr. M. AMANN (CIAM) reported on progress in integrated assessment modelling, including the results of the twenty-ninth meeting of the Task Force, held in Amiens (France) on 10-12 May 2004 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/7).

47. Mr. P. GRENNFELT (Sweden) reported on the review of the RAINS integrated assessment model, concluding that RAINS was a scientifically reliable tool for policy advice. He drew attention to the need for addressing the impacts of climate change policy and effects and the inter-annual variation of source-receptor relationships, as well as including marine emissions in the model. Mr. Amann announced plans for a workshop on integrated assessment methodologies related to RAINS in January 2005 at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA).

48. In the discussion that followed it was stressed that the recommendations from the review should be taken up by CIAM.

49. Mr. Amann described the development of draft Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme baseline scenarios (www.iiasa.ac.at/rains). He showed preliminary results that indicated expected improvements to several environmental areas resulting from current legislation. However, problems concerning PM, ozone, acidification and eutrophication would remain beyond 2020. A presentation of the final CAFE baseline scenario was scheduled for 27 September 2004 in Brussels.

50. Delegations discussed the choice of a baseline year and suggested further exploring the use of different meteorological years for presenting the results.

51. Some delegations were concerned that the intense consultations between CIAM and national experts had concentrated on European Union (EU) member states. For future work on the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, it would be essential to establish and fund a similar procedure for the other Parties to the Convention.

52. Mr. Amann presented progress in work on exploring different linkages and synergies between air pollution and climate change policies. He reported that six greenhouse gases had been included in RAINS and an extension of the model allowed analysis of flexible mechanisms such as joint implementation, emission trading, etc. Preliminary model runs indicated that there was a huge potential for cost savings when addressing climate measures simultaneously with those to

reduce classical air pollutants.

53. Mr. Amann also reported on progress in the development of the CITY-DELTA project and on integrating its results concerning urban PM and ozone pollution into integrated assessment modelling.

54. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the report of the Task Force, expressing its appreciation to the Chairman, the lead country and IIASA, which hosted CIAM;

(b) Welcomed the intention of IIASA to organize a workshop in January 2005 on the progress of the RAINS model;

(c) Agreed that there may be a need for two meetings of the Task Force in 2005 in view of the development of baseline scenarios and of further work needed in preparation for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol;

(d) Invited the Executive Body to urge all Parties to, and relevant bodies under, the Convention to provide the necessary data for integrated assessment modelling;

(e) Took note of the preliminary results of the RAINS review and expressed its gratitude to the team which carried out the review and to the European Community for supporting this work;

(f) Took note of the work on the linkages with climate change and requested that the information presented should be drawn to the attention of other relevant bodies under the Convention;

(g) Welcomed progress in the development of the CITY-DELTA project and invited CIAM to proceed with integrating its results into the RAINS model and report thereon at its twenty-ninth session;

(h) Agreed to revert to the proposed budget for CIAM under financial and budgetary matters.

G. Emissions

55. Ms. K. RYPDAL (Norway), Chair of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, reported on its progress, including the results of its meeting in Warsaw on 23-25 October 2003 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/9), and introduced document EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/15 on emission inventory review and data quality assurance.

56. The delegation of Sweden expressed its intention to continue to support the Task Force's

expert panel on review. The European Community and EEA recalled that Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change had set up national emission systems that included quality control and quality assurance mechanisms. They emphasized the importance of developing synergies between the two Conventions in this area. The Chair underlined the need for additional resources to support the work on inventory review and improvement.

57. MSC-W described the status of emission data reporting (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/10) and progress made in developing an inventory improvement programme. The timeliness and completeness of submissions had improved over the previous year, though there were still gaps in the time series for many Parties, especially for the 1980s, and there was still incomplete reporting of POPs, heavy metals and particulate matter. MSC-W stressed the importance of gridded sectoral data for atmospheric model results and urged Parties to compile and report such data. MSC-W requested Parties to verify the internal consistency of data before submission, preferably with REPDAB, the data verification software developed for this purpose.

58. Ms. Rypdal introduced a note on the differences between the revised and the previous emission reporting guidelines (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/8). Such differences might imply differences between the reporting of national emission totals for the Gothenburg Protocol with those reported under the EU National Emissions Ceilings (NEC) Directive. She proposed technical adjustments to the reporting templates, such as memo items for inland shipping, so that differences between the guidelines would be traceable and transparent. Regarding the differences due to reporting on national territories and those required by protocols, a short-term solution would be to add a memo item to allow Parties with outlying territories to differentiate their emissions.

59. The delegation of the Netherlands supported the introduction of memo items but stressed that this was a temporary solution. It believed the only solution was to revise the 2002 guidelines. If that was not possible in the short term, an interim solution would enable Parties to present different emissions by including memo items for compliance reasons. The European Commission was also of the view that the 2002 guidelines should be revised as soon as possible.

60. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the results and conclusions of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, welcomed the note on emission data review and stressed the need to further develop an inventory improvement programme to increase the quality of reported emission data; it urged all Parties, the EMEP centres and the Task Force to make further efforts to improve emission inventories;

(b) Took note of the preparations for the next meeting of the Task Force (19-20 October 2004, Milan, Italy), preceded by a scientific workshop on PM inventories and emission factors (18 October) and followed by a training seminar on data quality control and assessment (21 October);

- (c) Recommended that the Task Force should hold two meetings per year, with the spring meeting focused on inventory review, to enable it to report results to the Steering Body in September;
- (d) Encouraged those Parties that had not reported to do so in the next reporting round (by the deadline of 15 February 2005) and in accordance with the revised Emission Reporting Guidelines, including gridded data and memo items;
- (e) Invited the secretariat to adjust the reporting templates, such as adding memo items, so that differences between the old and the new guidelines were traceable;
- (f) Urged Parties to prepare national inventory reports in accordance with the model to be developed by the Task Force;
- (g) Invited the Chair of the Steering Body to report on the differences between the revised and the previous emission reporting guidelines to the Working Group on Strategies and Review at its thirty-sixth session and request further guidance;
- (h) Expressed its appreciation to Norway for leading the Task Force and to EEA for its support.

H. Hemispheric air pollution

- 61. MSC-W reported on progress and presented its plans for modelling hemispheric air pollution stressing the possible benefits of this work, such as including new Parties in the modelling domain, modelling the European background, preparing EMEP for future policy challenges and fostering the scientific link between EMEP and the climate communities.
- 62. The Steering Body noted with appreciation the progress in the modelling work on hemispheric air pollution, invited MSC-W to continue this work and invited the other EMEP centers and the Task Force to collaborate.

V. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMMES, INCLUDING THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION AND ITS CAFE PROGRAMME, EEA, WMO, UNEP, THE MARINE COMMISSIONS, THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO) AND NATIONAL PROGRAMMES

- 63. The following organizations provided information on progress in their relevant activities: the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) on its contribution to the review of the Protocol on POPs; EEA on emissions, air quality and links to climate change issues, including the European pollutant emission register; the European Commission on the development of the CAFE thematic strategy, input from EMEP to the baseline scenario, revision of the NEC Directive and the proposed fourth daughter directive on air quality and activities at its Joint Research

Centre; WMO on its Global Atmosphere Watch programme and cooperation with EMEP level 2 monitoring sites, on training courses on measurements calibration and urban-scale projects; UNEP on preparations for the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention, including the establishment of a global monitoring network for POPs; the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM) on the cooperative activities between its Working Group on Monitoring and Assessment and EMEP; WHO on the formulation of indicators for health impact of air pollutants in cooperation with CIAM. The delegate of the United States announced plans for the next hemispheric modelling workshop in 2006, new regulatory initiatives to reduce SO_x and NO_x from utilities and possibly reduce mercury emissions and the development of air pollution models.

64. Mr. Eliassen, speaking as Chair of the Council of the European Centre for Medium-range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF), proposed the signing of a formal working arrangement between ECMWF and EMEP through an exchange of letters between the Director of ECMWF and the Chair of the Executive Body (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/12, annex). He proposed some amendments to the draft text (See annex below).

65. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the information presented by other organizations and programmes, welcomed the useful cooperation, expressed its gratitude for the contributions to EMEP and stressed the importance of continued cooperation;

(b) Approved the draft letters on a formal working arrangement between EMEP and ECMWF, with the proposed amendments, and recommended them to the Executive Body for signature (annex).

VI. WORK-PLAN FOR 2005

66. The secretariat introduced the draft work-plan for 2005 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/13) prepared on the basis of the long-term priorities up to 2004 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2001/9) adopted by the Steering Body at its twenty-fifth session as well as the input by the task forces and centres.

67. The Steering Body:

(a) Requested the secretariat to amend the work-plan to reflect the decisions taken by it during the present session and the suggestions made by delegations concerning items 2.2 (c), 2.3 (a) and 2.6;

(b) Agreed on the draft work-plan for 2005 as presented in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/13, as amended, and recommended it to the Executive Body.

VII. FINANCIAL AND BUDGETARY MATTERS

68. The secretariat introduced the note on financial and budgetary matters (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/14), informing the Steering Body on the current state of contributions. An updated table on the state of contributions was circulated during the session. The note also presented the budget proposal for 2005 prepared on the basis of the decisions of the Bureau and the decision by the Executive Body on the overall budget levels for the period 2004 to 2006. The secretariat also drew attention to issues related to proposed decisions.

69. The secretariat provided updated information on progress in the implementation of the project on development of a national model for environmental impact assessment of heavy metal emissions approved by the Bureau in 2001 as a contribution in kind from Ukraine to cover its arrears for 1992-1994. The secretariat's information was based on an official letter from the Ukrainian authorities received in April 2004. It was noted that the results of the work mentioned in the letter had not been discussed with MSC-E.

70. The Steering Body welcomed the progress made by Ukraine in implementing this project. It urged Ukraine to discuss the results with MSC-E and provide a report to the Bureau at its meeting in spring 2005.

71. CCC reported on the feasibility of the project for establishing an international EMEP site on the Black Sea island of Zmejniy in compliance with the new EMEP monitoring strategy, proposed by Ukraine as a contribution in kind to cover its arrears for 1996-2001. After discussions with the Ukrainian experts, CCC considered that the proposed activity would be a significant contribution to the EMEP network, taking into account the lack of data from the region where the site was located. It also believed that the technical infrastructure and the institutional capabilities of operating the site according to EMEP criteria could be developed through the proposed activity. CCC recommended that the Steering Body should endorse the proposal.

72. The Steering Body invited Ukraine to explore ways to pay its arrears for 2002 and 2003 and its contribution for 2004 in cash.

73. The Steering Body:

(a) Took note of the status of contributions to the financing of EMEP provided in document EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/14 and the additional information provided by the secretariat during the session;

(b) Welcomed the payment by Italy of all its arrears up to 2002;

(c) Approved the use of resources by the EMEP centres in 2003 as presented in table 2 of EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/14;

- (d) Also approved the 2003 contribution in kind from Belarus to MSC-E;
- (e) Agreed on the detailed budget for 2005 set out in table 3 of document EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/14 and the schedule of mandatory contributions from Parties for 2005 as set out in the last column of table 4 of that document;
- (f) Also agreed on the proposed budget of CIAM for 2005 as set out in the report of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2003/4, para. 59) and on keeping the proposed budgets for 2006 and 2007 at the same level;
- (g) Recommended that the Executive Body should adopt the 2005 budgets and the revised schedule of contributions;
- (h) Called upon the Parties to the EMEP Protocol to consider making voluntary contributions (in kind or in cash through the trust fund) to ensure that the work, especially the difficult tasks required in 2005 for the preparation of the protocol reviews, including the work on integrated assessment modelling and its extension to non-EU countries, could be accomplished as foreseen in the work-plan;
- (i) Recommended that the Executive Body should take account of the accession of Lithuania to the EMEP Protocol and amend the Protocol by adopting, in accordance with its article 4, paragraph 3, the revised annex set out in the annex to document EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/14;
- (j) Invited all Parties which had not yet paid their contributions for 2004 to do so as soon as possible;
- (k) Invited all Parties to pay their arrears without delay;
- (l) Approved the proposed project for establishing an international EMEP site on the Black Sea island of Zmejiniy as a contribution in kind from Ukraine to cover its arrears for 1996-2001 inviting Ukraine to start implementation of the project in cooperation with CCC without delay and to report on progress to the Bureau at its meeting in spring 2005.

VIII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

74. The Steering Body re-elected Mr. J. Schneider (Austria) as Chairman. It also re-elected Mr. S. Doytchinov (Italy), Mr. P. Grennfelt (Sweden), Mr. J. Rea (United Kingdom), Mr. J. Santroch (Czech Republic), Ms. S. Vidic (Croatia), Mr. K. Wieringa (Netherlands) and Ms. M. Wichmann-Fiebig (Germany) as Vice-Chairpersons. The Steering Body agreed that its Bureau should invite a member of the CAFE secretariat to attend its meetings as an observer, and proposed that the Bureau should invite Mr. Stefan Jacobi to its next meeting.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

75. There were no issues for consideration under this agenda item.

X. CLOSING OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH SESSION

76. Based on an informal outline of the report, presented by the secretariat, the Steering Body agreed on the main decisions taken during the session.

77. The twenty-ninth session of the EMEP Steering Body was scheduled to take place on 5 - 7 September 2005.

Annex

WORKING ARRANGEMENT ON COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN CENTRE
FOR MEDIUM-RANGE WEATHER FORECASTS AND THE CONVENTION ON LONG-
RANGE TRANSBOUNDARY AIR POLLUTION

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS

**I. DRAFT LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR
MEDIUM-RANGE WEATHER FORECASTS TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE
BODY OF THE CONVENTION ON LONG-RANGE TRANSBOUNDARY AIR
POLLUTION**

Dear Mr. Dovland,

Our two organizations have corresponded with regard to collaboration between the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) and the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution. As a result of that correspondence and in accordance with the decision of the Council of the ECMWF, I now have the honour to propose that the Working Arrangement between the ECMWF and the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution be based on the following:

- a. The ECMWF and the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, with a view to facilitating the effective attainment of the objectives set forth in the respective constituent instruments of the two organizations, will act in close cooperation with each other and will consult each other regularly on matters of common interest. In particular such cooperation and consultation will be set up for the purpose of effective coordination of activities and procedures arising from the activities of the two organizations.
- b. The Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution and the ECMWF will keep each other informed concerning programmes of work and projected activities in which there may be mutual interest and will exchange publications concerning these and related fields.
- c. Recognizing the great value of the archived meteorological data held by the ECMWF for the chemical atmospheric transport modelling system of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP), the ECMWF will make available to the EMEP Technical Centres archived data required by these centres.
- d. Archived data from the ECMWF that are supplied to the EMEP Technical Centres will not be distributed or disseminated by them or in any other way made available by them to third parties without the prior written consent of the ECMWF. The application and use by the EMEP Technical Centres of archived data that they have received from the ECMWF under the terms of this working arrangement will in no way engage the responsibility of the ECMWF.
- e. The Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution will provide information regularly to the ECMWF on the application by the EMEP Technical Centres of archived meteorological data provided by the ECMWF, as well as quantified information on air

pollution in Europe and the methods used by EMEP to obtain these results.

f. Information provided by the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution to the ECMWF on the results of the work of the EMEP Technical Centres and their methods will not be distributed or disseminated by the ECMWF or in any other way made available by it to third parties without the prior written consent of the Executive Body. The application and use by the ECMWF of information from the EMEP Technical Centres under the terms of this working arrangement will in no way engage the responsibility of the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution.

g. No expenses in connection with activities under this Working Arrangement will be incurred unless authorized by the governing bodies of the two organizations.

h. Staff of the EMEP Technical Centres may participate in training courses of the ECMWF under the same conditions as apply to participants from other international organizations.

i. This Working Arrangement will continue to have effect until [...] unless terminated by either Party giving three months' notice in writing.

If the Working Arrangement set out above is acceptable to the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, I suggest that this letter and your reply should be considered as the basis for the understanding between our two organizations regarding collaboration and that the Working Arrangement will come into effect on [the date of your reply].

Yours sincerely,

**II. DRAFT LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE BODY TO THE
CONVENTION ON LONG-RANGE TRANSBOUNDARY AIR POLLUTION TO THE
DIRECTOR OF THE ECMWF**

Dear Mr. Marbouty,

I have the honour to refer to your letter of [...] regarding collaboration between the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) and the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, which proposed that the Working Arrangement between the ECMWF and the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution should be based on the following:

a. The ECMWF and the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, with a view to facilitating the effective attainment of the objectives set forth in the respective constituent instruments of the two organizations, will act in close cooperation with each other and will consult each other regularly on matters of common interest. In particular such cooperation and consultation will be set up for the purpose of effective coordination of activities and procedures arising from the activities of the two organizations.

b. The Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution and the ECMWF will keep each other informed concerning programmes of work and projected activities

in which there may be mutual interest and will exchange publications concerning these and related fields.

c. Recognizing the great value of the archived meteorological data held by the ECMWF for the chemical atmospheric transport modelling system of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP), the ECMWF will make available to the EMEP Technical Centres archived data required by these centres.

d. Archived data from the ECMWF that are supplied to the EMEP Technical Centres will not be distributed or disseminated by them or in any other way made available by them to third parties without the prior written consent of the ECMWF. The application and use by the EMEP Technical Centres of archived data that they have received from the ECMWF under the terms of this Working Arrangement will in no way engage the responsibility of the ECMWF.

e. The Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution will provide information regularly to the ECMWF on the application by the EMEP Technical Centres of archived meteorological data provided by the ECMWF, as well as quantified information on air pollution in Europe and the methods used by EMEP to obtain these results.

f. Information provided by the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution to the ECMWF on the results of the work of the EMEP Technical Centres and their methods will not be distributed or disseminated by the ECMWF or in any other way made available by it to third parties without the prior written consent of the Executive Body. The application and use by the ECMWF of information from the EMEP Technical Centres under the terms of this Working Arrangement will in no way engage the responsibility of the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution.

g. No expenses in connection with activities under this Working Arrangement will be incurred unless authorized by the governing bodies of the two organizations.

h. This Working Arrangement will continue to have effect until [...] unless terminated by either Party giving three months' notice in writing.

I have the honour to inform you that, in accordance with the decision of the Executive Body of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, the above Working Arrangement is acceptable to the Executive Body and to confirm that your letter and this reply will place on record the understanding of our two organizations regarding collaboration and that the Working Arrangement will come into effect on the date of this letter.

Yours sincerely,