



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/3
25 June 2002

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)
(Twenty-sixth session, Geneva, 2-4 September 2002)
Item 3 of the provisional agenda

ACTIVITIES OF THE EMEP BUREAU

Note prepared by the secretariat based on the minutes of the Bureau meeting

Introduction

1. This note presents a summary of the work of the Bureau, including the results of the meeting of the extended EMEP Bureau held in Geneva from 28 February to 1 March 2002. The Bureau's proposal for the structure of work on the assessment report is presented in the report of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/4, paras. 10-11) together with a report on progress in the work on the assessment report. The Bureau's proposals related to the financing of EMEP are presented in the document on financial and budgetary matters (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/12). Chapter IV below contains a proposal by the Bureau on the future procedure for reporting by the EMEP centres.
2. The extended Bureau meeting was attended by the following Bureau members: Mr. M. WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) as Chairman, Mr. S. DOYTCHINOV (Italy), Mr. P. GRENNFELT (Sweden), Mr. J. SANTROCH (Czech Republic), Mr. R. VAN AALST (Netherlands) and Ms. S. VIDIC (Croatia). Ms. L. EDWARDS had informed the Bureau that she was resigning from her post on the Bureau as she had left the European Commission.

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.

3. Representatives from the four EMEP centres: Mr. M. AMANN from the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM), Mr. O. HOV and Mr. K. TORSETH from the Chemical Coordinating Centre (CCC), Mr. S. DUTCHAK and Ms. M. VARYGINA from the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E), and Mr. A. ELIASSEN and Ms. L. TARASSÓN from the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W)) as well as Mr. J. SCHNEIDER (Austria), Chairman of the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling, and Mr. M. WOODFIELD (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, attended. Mr. K. BULL, Ms. B. WACHS and Mr. H. WUESTER from the secretariat participated. Furthermore, Ms. L. JALKANEN of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and Mr. H. GREGOR (Germany), Chairman of the Working Group on Effects, participated for part of agenda item 3.

I. PROGRESS IN EMEP ACTIVITIES AND PLANNING OF FUTURE WORK

4. The Bureau discussed progress in EMEP activities and future work following the order of the Executive Body 2002 work-plan (ECE/EB.AIR/75, annex VI, item 2). It received oral reports from the task forces and the centres on progress in implementing the work-plan. A summary of the discussions on this item is given in the minutes of the Bureau meeting, which can be accessed on the Internet at www.unece.org/env/emep.

5. The draft work-plan presented to the Steering Body (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/9) was prepared by the secretariat, in consultation with the centres, on the basis of this discussion. The members of the Bureau provided comments to the draft.

6. The Bureau took into account the results from the joint meeting with the Bureau of the Working Group on Effects held on 27 February 2002. It agreed that the joint meeting had been useful. The note on the joint meeting can also be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.unece.org/env/lrtap/2002-02-jm.htm>.

II. CONTRIBUTIONS TO EMEP

A. Status of mandatory cash contributions

7. The Bureau took note with satisfaction of the significant improvement with respect to the status of mandatory contributions. It noted, in particular, that Italy had paid its arrears, which had accumulated over several years, thus preventing any shortfall in funds to cover the expenses of the centres. It also welcomed the fact that 34 of the 38 Parties had paid their 2001 contributions. It noted with concern that, for the third consecutive year, Ukraine had not paid its contribution.

8. The Bureau noted that Yugoslavia had paid its contribution in 2001. It agreed to recommend to the EMEP Steering Body to deal with the arrears of Yugoslavia, accumulated between 1992 and 2000, in the same way as the United Nations, once the General Assembly had taken a decision in that respect.

9. The Bureau welcomed the accession to the EMEP Protocol by Estonia to be effective in March 2002 and requested the secretariat to send to Estonia a package with some basic information about EMEP to welcome it as a new Party. It also noted with satisfaction that Lithuania was planning to accede to the EMEP Protocol and that other Parties to the Convention that were not yet Party to the EMEP Protocol were considering acceding.

B. Status of mandatory contributions in kind

10. To cover its contribution in kind for 2001, Belarus, in close consultation with MSC-E, carried out a project on the preparation of additions and refinements to the EMEP/CORINAIR Guidebook regarding persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in view of the special circumstances in the members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). It presented a report to the EMEP centres and to the Bureau of the EMEP Steering Body. The EMEP centres, at their meeting on 17 January 2002 in Moscow, had reviewed the outcome of the project and considered that it fulfilled the requirements of the contribution from Belarus for 2001. The Bureau suggested that the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections or one of its panels should review the contribution from Belarus and invited the Chairman of the Task Force to initiate such a review. Unless the Task Force objected, the Bureau recommended the Steering Body to approve the contribution in kind from Belarus for 2001.

11. In 2001, the Bureau had approved a project on draft amendments to the EMEP/CORINAIR Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook related to heavy metals taking into account the specific characteristics of CIS members (EB.AIR/GE.1/2001/10, para. 22) to cover the 2002 contribution from Belarus. Belarus had submitted a proposal, as well as the budget requirements for its contribution for 2003. The expected contribution in kind from Belarus to MSC-E was equivalent to US\$ 2,753. It would consist of a project on HCB and PCB emission inventory improvement in the CIS (taking the example of Belarus). The Bureau emphasized that both the 2002 and the 2003 projects should be conducted in close consultation with the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections or one of its panels. It invited the Chairman of the Task Force to initiate a review of the proposal for the contribution by Belarus for 2003 in order to advise the Bureau on whether it could approve this proposal. It invited Belarus to cooperate closely with the Task Force on this matter.

12. The Bureau took note of the programme and the inception report for the "Development of a national model for environmental impact assessment of heavy metal emissions", presented

by Ukraine in order to cover its arrears to EMEP for 1992-1994 and budget requirements for 2002 and 2003. The proposal by Ukraine to cover its arrears in kind had been approved by the Bureau in 2001 (EB.AIR/GE.1/2001/10, para. 23). The project, aimed at the development of a national model for the assessment of the environmental impact of heavy metals emissions, would be equivalent to US\$ 140,989 (the outstanding contributions for 1992-1994) and would run from January 2002 to December 2003. It would be conducted in close collaboration with MSC-E and the Polish Institute of Environmental Protection. The Bureau urged Ukraine to make a proposal for work to cover the remaining outstanding contributions in kind and to initiate payment of its outstanding cash contributions.

C. Voluntary contributions to the EMEP Trust Fund

13. The Bureau noted with appreciation the voluntary contributions of US\$ 21,739 that Switzerland had paid into the trust fund in 2001. This contribution was used to support Parties in the drawing-up of their particulate matter (PM) emission inventory for the year 2000. The project was conducted by the Netherlands consultancy TNO, operating under contract to MSC-W in close consultation with the European Environment Agency (EEA).

III. USE OF RESOURCES IN 2001 AND THE BUDGET FOR 2003 AND BEYOND

14. The Bureau took note of the financial reports by CCC, MSC-E and MSC-W on their use of resources in 2001. The centres provided some additional explanation to the summary tables. A large share of the expenditure related to the acidification and eutrophication was devoted to the work on the assessment report. The preparation of the training courses by CCC was financed from the budget for cooperation with national programmes.

15. The Bureau recognized the importance of the voluntary contributions in kind received by the centres to support their work. It expressed its appreciation to Norway for the considerable support given to MSC-W. It agreed that the significance of contributions in kind reflected the requirements of the EMEP work-plan and the inadequacy of the budget to cover it. The large share of contributions in kind posed some problems to the budgeting procedure. Contributions in kind to EMEP were projects carried out by the EMEP centres, but funded from sources other than the EMEP trust fund, which contributed to activities set out in the EMEP work-plan. It requested the centres to fully report on contributions in kind defined in that way and to specify in more detail the projects that were funded. The secretariat was requested to present this information in the financial document that it would prepare for the Steering Body. Wherever possible, centres were invited to present planned projects already in advance.

16. Based on the 2002 EMEP budget (EB.AIR/2001/7, table 2), the Bureau prepared the detailed budget for 2003. It recognized that it should avoid any major shift from one year to the

next, but show the longer-term direction of changes to allow centres to adapt to changing priorities. It also recognized that the total amount of the budget for 2003 would have to remain unchanged. In order to be able to perform the tasks set out in the work-plan, EMEP had to rely again on voluntary contributions. It recommended to the EMEP Steering Body to call 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 for the preparation of the protocol reviews, could be accomplished. It requested the centres to propose a more detailed account for some of the larger budget items, to highlight the work for the assessment report and the preparations for hemispheric measurements and modelling, and to differentiate between running costs and the costs of building up the infrastructure (databases, model development, etc.). Centres should try to highlight in which areas of work they would require voluntary contributions. The Bureau expressed the hope that the work on hemispheric measurements and modelling would attract some contributions from the two Parties to the EMEP Protocol that contributed only on a voluntary basis.

17. The Bureau agreed that there should be a continuous shift of resources from the traditional pollutants to the new priorities, in particular the work on PM. It also decided to introduce a small budget line on emissions for CCC to cover the work on expert estimates of POP and heavy metal emission. To do this it would split the part "G. Emission data" into two sub-items "Database" and "Verification and expert estimates". The detailed budget proposed by the Bureau is set out in the document on financial and budgetary matters prepared by the secretariat (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/12).

18. The Executive Body at its nineteenth session requested the Steering Body, assisted by its Bureau, to consider the budget requirements for the years after 2003 and to prepare a proposal (ECE/EB.AIR/75, para. 97 (d)). The results of the discussion of the Bureau on this point are presented in chapter IV of the document on financial and budgetary matters prepared by the secretariat (EB.AIR/GE.1/2002/12).

IV. REPORTING BY THE CENTRES TO EMEP

19. At its meeting on 3 September 2001, the EMEP Bureau had decided to review the procedure for reporting by the centres and for derestricting reports by the Steering Body. It had informed the Steering Body about this plan and invited Parties to comment (EB.AIR/GE.1/2001/2, para. 8).

20. In reaching its conclusions as set out below, the Bureau took the following main points into consideration:

- (a) The volume of information presented by the centres to the Steering Body has

become too large to allow for adequate attention to the content of reports. In addition, reports often arrive too late and the workload of the centres is very unevenly spread throughout the year with a need to finalize all reporting before the summer;

(b) One of the roles of the Steering Body is to give strategic direction to the work of EMEP (see para. 4 (b) of the mandate of the Steering Body (ECE/EB.AIR/68, annex III, appendix III)). It can, therefore, not address detailed technical or data questions. The task forces can better perform such tasks and they are also in a better position to conduct technical reviews;

(c) Another important function of the Steering Body is to review the efficient use of EMEP resources;

(d) As the first function set out in its mandate (ECE/EB.AIR/68, annex III, appendix III, para. 4 (a)), the Steering Body should provide the Executive Body and other subsidiary bodies annually with an overall analysis of transboundary air pollution.

21. According to its mandate (ECE/EB.AIR/68, annex III, appendix III, para. 4 (f)), the Steering Body should derestrict the technical reports and notes. The Bureau noted that it did not make sense to restrict reports that were prepared using public funds. It also noted that the formal documents were not restricted but were for general distribution, while they carried a disclaimer that they should be considered as provisional unless approved by the Executive Body. It proposed to follow a similar procedure for EMEP reports and notes, and to consider all material unrestricted but provisional until the EMEP Steering Body had approved or taken note of it. It requested the secretariat to bring this proposal to the attention of the Bureau of the Executive Body and suggested that the Executive Body should consider modifying paragraph 4 (f) of the Steering Body's mandate accordingly.

22. The Bureau recommended that the Steering Body should adopt the guidelines for reporting under EMEP set out in the annex.

V. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMMES

23. MSC-E informed the Bureau that it was conducting a project for the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) on the assessment of long-range atmospheric transport of mercury, PCBs and HCH to the Russian North. The work was funded with US\$ 60,000 under the Global Environment Facility project on persistent toxic substances, food security and indigenous peoples in the Russian North and would be completed in 2002. MSC-E prepared a progress report presenting the results of the work in 2001.

24. The Bureau noted that the second phase of the EUREKA Environmental Project on the Transport and Chemical Transformation of Environmentally Relevant Trace Constituents in the

Troposphere over Europe (EUROTRAC-2) was coming to an end and discussions had started on follow-up activities. The Chairman would make a plenary presentation on transboundary air pollution at the upcoming EUROTRAC-2 symposium. The Bureau agreed that EMEP and the Convention had an interest in seeing some of the valuable work continue and should examine ways in which it could support a follow-up.

25. The Bureau welcomed the continued cooperation with the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM) and the Oslo-Paris Commission for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPARCOM). It noted the interest expressed by the Mediterranean Pollution Monitoring and Research Programme (MEDPOL) to cooperate with EMEP and requested the secretariat to respond positively to the initiative.

26. The Bureau noted that the Working Group on Environmental Monitoring, set up under the UNECE Committee on Environmental Policy, had, at two of its sessions, been informed about the work of EMEP. It had received a note prepared by MSC-E on the state of emission and monitoring work in the newly independent States succeeding the former Soviet Union. The Bureau reiterated its support for close cooperation with the Working Group on Environmental Monitoring with a view to improving the cooperation between EMEP and the newly independent States. It requested CCC and MSC-E to respond positively to requests for assistance and accepted the offer of CCC to draft a note on monitoring requirements in the newly independent States.

27. The Bureau also discussed under this item cooperation with the Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme, EEA and WMO.

Annex

GUIDELINES FOR REPORTING UNDER EMEP

1. The following reporting tasks by the EMEP centres can be distinguished:
 - (a) Data reports;
 - (b) Reports/notes on new scientific developments; and
 - (c) Status reports on progress in the main work-plan areas.

2. **Data reports.** EMEP deals with large databases covering emissions, measurements and socio-economic data used for integrated assessment modelling. Some of the data are received from Parties; other data are based on expert estimates conducted within and outside the centres. Data reports are necessary to allow Parties to review specific data. This task can be done via Internet-based databases. At specific intervals it will also be necessary to document the status of databases for future reference. In such cases printed data may be necessary or useful. It will be left to the responsible centre to determine the best way in which it presents data to the Parties. Data reports should be presented to experts nominated for the responsible task forces and should be approved by that task force or through electronic communication independent of task force meetings. The reports shall be considered provisional until the session of the EMEP Steering Body following such approval.

3. **Reports on new scientific results or methodological developments,** when models are under development, should be presented in a way that enables expert review. Such reviews may be conducted within the framework of task forces, at workshops organized in the framework of the Convention, or at scientific events outside. They may be conducted by submitting papers to peer-reviewed journals or through experts specifically designated to fulfil a review task. Given this broad range of review possibilities, different types of reports may be suitable for these reviews. EMEP centres are encouraged to improve the review of their findings through all possible channels. The task forces should play a key role in discussing new developments so that these are well accepted by experts from the Parties to the Convention and, where appropriate, by other stakeholders. Reports/notes on new scientific developments should be presented to the responsible task forces, unless, in a given case, the Steering Body decides otherwise. The reports shall be considered provisional until the session of the EMEP Steering Body following task force approval.

4. **Status reports** serve the purpose of informing the Parties, in particular those that finance the work, about progress in the tasks defined in the work-plan. In line with the mandate, these tasks are to provide the basis for international and national air pollution

abatement policies. Status reports should summarize developments in a defined area of work that are of importance from a policy perspective. There should be a status report for each of the main substantive areas of work (at present: acidification and eutrophication, photochemical pollution, particulate matter, heavy metals and persistent organic pollutants). Each status report should report on changes in atmospheric pollution in the EMEP area, present scientific progress, and highlight issues that need to be addressed in future work. They should be succinct and focused and provide examples to illustrate the main points. Status reports should be accompanied by an executive summary.

5. Status reports will be scrutinized and approved by the EMEP Steering Body in view of its function to safeguard the efficient use of resources and steer the work of the centres. Policy-relevant issues should be presented in status reports in a way that enables the Steering Body to communicate them to the Working Group on Strategies and Review and to the Executive Body. They should also be written so that national EMEP representatives can make good use of the material nationally and, hence, help to raise the profile of EMEP. Once a common approach to writing the executive summaries has evolved, they can be put together to form a single summary report that may be presented separately from the status reports as an annual substantive report by EMEP.