



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

EB.AIR/WG.5/78  
1 October 2004

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

EXECUTIVE BODY FOR THE CONVENTION ON  
LONG-RANGE TRANSBOUNDARY AIR POLLUTION

Working Group on Strategies and Review

**REPORT OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION**

**Introduction**

1. The thirty-sixth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review was held in Geneva from 13 to 16 September 2004.
2. The session was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America and the European Community (EC).
3. Representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Health Organization (WHO) attended. The EMEP Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM), the EMEP Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W) and the Coordination Center for Effects (CCE) also participated. The following non-governmental organizations were also represented: Bromine Science and Environmental Forum (BSEF), Centre interprofessionnel technique d'études de la pollution atmosphérique (CITEPA), Euro Chlor, the Oil Companies' European Organization for Environment, Health and Safety (CONCAWE), Union of the Electric Industry (EURELECTRIC).

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. The meeting was chaired by Mr. R. Ballaman (Switzerland).
5. The Director of the Environment and Human Settlements Division noted the Convention's 25th anniversary this year. He urged Parties to announce ratification or near-readiness to ratify the Gothenburg Protocol before the anniversary event planned for the twenty-second session of the Executive Body (29 November - 3 December 2004). He stressed priority work associated with entry into force of the protocols and drew attention to the need for support for countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA).
6. The secretariat drew attention to the guidelines for the preparation of documents sent out by the Secretary-General, noting that reports should focus on conclusions and points of substance.

#### **I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

7. The Working Group adopted the provisional agenda as contained in document EB.AIR/WG.5/77 whilst agreeing to include under item 4 a proposal to establish an expert group on particulate matter (PM) and under item 5 discussions on the differences between the revised and the previous emission reporting guidelines.

#### **II. PREPARING FOR THE REVIEW OF THE PROTOCOL ON HEAVY METALS**

8. The secretariat pointed out that the 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals had entered into force on 29 December 2003. The Protocol now had 22 ratifications and the first meeting of its Parties would take place at the next session of the Executive Body.
9. Mr. D. Jost, Chairman of the Expert Group on Heavy Metals, presented the report of the scientific and technical workshop on heavy metals, held on 17-18 November 2003 in Langen (Germany) (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/2), and the report of the second meeting of the Expert Group on Heavy Metals, held on 31 March – 1 April 2004 in Brussels (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/3). The workshop had considered the scientific basis for an effects-based approach for reviewing the Protocol on Heavy Metals. He also introduced draft decisions on methods and procedures for reviewing the Protocol, evaluating certain limit values and considering proposals for additional heavy metals (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/4). He noted that the Expert Group had discussed emission limit values for chlor-alkali plants, medical waste incineration and other source categories in annexes III and V to the Protocol, as well as measures for emission abatement and their costs. It had drawn up work-plan elements for a proposed task force on heavy metals for the technical work on reviewing the sufficiency and effectiveness of the Protocol.
10. Mr. J. Schneider (Austria), Chairman of the Steering Body of EMEP, outlined its work on heavy metals (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/2), in particular the state of emission data, the deposition trends and the important work of the EMEP centres in monitoring and modelling transport emissions.

He indicated that the centres were ready to support elements of the review of the Protocol. He stressed the large areas not covered by existing monitoring stations and urged Parties to implement the recently adopted EMEP monitoring strategy. Emission data for 2002 showed decreases in all three metals covered by the Protocol, but improvements were needed, both in coverage and in data quality. Comparisons of measurements and modelled results appeared to show that emissions were underestimated. The EMEP Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E) model would be reviewed in 2005.

11. Mr. L. Lindau (Sweden) presented the report of the workshop held on 29-30 March 2004 in Brussels (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/3/Add.1), noting that there was clear consensus to reduce the global demand for mercury, that waste definitions and storage strategies were considered important priorities, and that the applicability of the critical loads concept in Europe had been discussed and given support. A detailed report would be available soon.

12. Mr. H. Gregor (Germany), Chairman of the Working Group on Effects, summarized the work of its International Cooperative Programmes (ICPs) (EB.AIR/WG.1/2004/2). Monitoring results showed heavy metals accumulating in soils, exceeding critical limits at several sites. All programmes would be ready to deliver material for the review of the Protocol, including critical load maps for cadmium, lead and mercury, and risk assessments for other metals. The Working Group had recommended a methodology for an effects-based approach.

13. Mr. J.P. Hettelingh (CCE) informed the Working Group about critical loads and limits for heavy metals, stressing cooperation with EMEP. Since the first call for data on heavy metals in 2002 (see collaborative report at [www.rivm.nl/cce](http://www.rivm.nl/cce) for preliminary maps) health-based critical limits had been introduced. Critical loads were mapped for cadmium and lead, and mercury would follow. Exceedance maps would be produced, as in 2002, in collaboration with MSC-E. Non-atmospheric heavy metal inputs to agricultural soils as a result of the use of fertilizers would have to be considered when assessing exceedances. For full European coverage of critical loads, national data may need to be complemented with default data from the CCE database. The next call for data would be in September 2004; maps would be available by April 2005.

14. The delegation of the Netherlands noted a project by the Organization for Applied Scientific Research (TNO) on the effectiveness of the Protocols on POPs and on Heavy Metals and the costs of additional measures. Phase one, to be reported at the end of 2004, involved review of countries' emission data through bilateral consultations with some national experts.

15. The delegation of Canada stressed that an effects-based approach was not the primary focus for the review of the Protocol, noting that some Parties to the Convention did not use this approach and suggested striking out the square-bracketed text in EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/3, annex.

16. The delegation of the United States requested that paragraphs 9 and 21 in

EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/4 should clarify that Parties may adopt amendments either separately or jointly. The Working Group agreed that amendments could be adopted separately or jointly.

17. The Working Group considered draft elements for the 2005 work-plan of a possible task force on heavy metals, incorporating elements from documents EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/3 and 4. A small drafting group was convened to propose text for the work-plan.

18. The Working Group agreed a draft work-plan, with elements as amended, and requested the secretariat to reflect it in the draft 2005 work-plan of the Convention to be submitted to the Executive Body at its twenty-second session (EB.AIR/2004/3, item 1.6).

19. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the conclusions and recommendations of the scientific and technical workshop on heavy metals and the workshop on mercury;

(b) Took note of the report of the second meeting of the Expert Group, acknowledging the work of national experts and Karlsruhe University in preparing material useful for the review of the Protocol;

(c) Expressed its appreciation for the work done by the Expert Group on Heavy Metals, thanked the Chairman for his efforts and concluded that the work of the Expert Group had been accomplished;

(d) Recommended the draft methods and procedures for review of the Protocol including the draft decision to establish a task force on heavy metals (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/4) for consideration by the Executive Body;

(e) Noted Germany's offer to act as lead country for the proposed task force;

(f) Welcomed the involvement of other subsidiary bodies and their programmes and centres in the work on heavy metals, and stressed the need to coordinate the future work of these bodies to meet the needs of the Protocol's review; and

(g) Stressed the need for the proposed task force to plan its work effectively including the preparation of a clear timetable for its work-plan.

### **III. PREPARING FOR THE REVIEW OF THE PROTOCOL ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS**

20. Mr. Schneider presented progress on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in EMEP. He drew attention to the EMEP contribution to the preparatory work for the review of the Protocol, prepared by MSC-E. He stressed that POPs monitoring sites were unevenly distributed, which

called for some improvements in monitoring. He stressed the importance of full implementation of the new EMEP monitoring strategy. The combination of measurements and modelling was needed for evaluating contamination levels. He drew attention to the planned review of the MSC-E POPs model.

21. Mr. Gregor provided information on the planned activities on POPs of the Task Force on Health and ICP Waters. He noted that their main input to the Protocol's review would deal with the health effects.

22. Mr. D. Stone and Mr. J. Sliggers, Co-Chairs of the Task Force on POPs, presented its technical input for reviewing the Protocol, prepared on the basis of discussions at its first and second meetings held in the Hague (Netherlands) and Prague in May/June 2004.

23. Mr. Stone presented the summary of the revised dossiers of the pollutants scheduled for re-evaluation in the Protocol (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/1, annex I). He drew attention to the Task Force's conclusions that the exemptions for several substances specified in the annexes to the Protocol were no longer relevant.

24. Mr. Sliggers presented the draft annotated chapters for the sufficiency and effectiveness reviews (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/1, annex II). He stressed that, in addition to the technical elements of the sufficiency and effectiveness review identified by the Task Force, two additional elements that required guidance from the Working Group had been identified, namely (a) an overview of possible emission sources of substances listed in annexes I, II and III not addressed by the Protocol and (b) information on management strategies to phase out articles in use containing POPs for sources not covered by the Protocol. He outlined a proposed schedule of work and identified lead countries for each of the elements.

25. The delegation of Norway noted that its experts were considering preparing a report for item (b) above related to strategies used in Norway. The delegation of the Netherlands indicated that its TNO project (see para. 14 above) would not include sources not covered by the Protocol.

26. The representative of UNEP stressed the importance of harmonizing as much as possible the gathering of information for the sufficiency and effectiveness review of the Protocol with a similar review to be undertaken for the Stockholm Convention.

27. In view of the heavy workload and particularly the preparation of the first draft of the sufficiency and effectiveness review, concern was expressed that one meeting of the Task Force in 2005 might not be sufficient. The Co-Chairs may organize informal open-ended meetings as required prior to the third meeting of the Task Force scheduled for late May/early June 2005. The ad hoc meetings would not be part of the Executive Body's work-plan.

28. Mr. Stone presented the draft generic guidelines for the technical review of dossiers of proposed new substances, as prepared by the Task Force in the context of Executive Body decision 1998/2 (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/1). He proposed a timetable for review should a new substance proposal be presented at the twenty-second session of the Executive Body. He stressed the strategic approach taken in developing the guidelines, i.e. the task was to review and not elaborate the dossier. He noted that the Task Force had requested guidance on the composition of a proposed five-person peer review selection team and on whether there should be public access to the review process. In view of the tight schedule suggested by the Task Force, Mr. Stone proposed bringing forward the deadline for nominating experts for the peer review team from 15 to 10 December.

29. The Chair of the Working Group asked if any countries were able to conduct work on any of the “orphan topics” of the annotated chapter headings for the sufficiency and effectiveness review. No volunteers came forward and it was pointed out by one of the Task Force’s Co-Chairs that this would almost certainly result in the exclusion of these topics from the review, the first draft of which was to be completed by 15 January 2005. It was suggested that the lack of interest in contributing to the orphan topics reflected a collective view of their relative significance.

30. Delegations expressed general support for the strategic approach and for the two-track approach that had been proposed for the review. They agreed that a five-person peer review selection team was appropriate and nominated persons for the team. Regarding the composition of the review team, it was recognized that, although giving preference to experts from Parties to the Protocol might help speed up ratifications, the aim should be to ensure that the most relevant available expertise was selected. There was a general view that public access to the review process was useful; this could be ensured by making all nominations, reports and documents available on the Convention’s web site.

31. In accordance with the work-plan for the implementation of the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/79/Add.2, item. 1.5 (b)), the Working Group reviewed paragraph 2 of Executive Body decision 1998/2 to provide guidance on how “deemed acceptable” might be understood and applied by the Executive Body to avoid unnecessary delays in the technical review of proposed substances.

32. The Working Group:

(a) Expressed its appreciation for the work carried out by the Task Force on POPs;

(b) Took note of the elements for the technical reviews regarding the scheduled use reassessments, evaluations and reviews of the substance-related provisions of the Protocol proposed by the Task Force (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/1, annex I) and agreed to submit them to the Executive Body for its consideration;

(c) Took note of the draft annotated chapters and the organization of work for the sufficiency and effectiveness review as proposed by the Task Force on POPs (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/1, annex II) and recommended them to the Executive Body;

(d) Noted the two additional elements for the sufficiency and effectiveness review identified by the Task Force and that volunteer lead countries were still needed for three elements and agreed to bring these to the attention of the Executive Body;

(e) Agreed that, should a new substance be proposed for inclusion in the Protocol at the twenty-second session of the Executive Body, the deadline for nominating experts for the peer review team(s) should be 10 December 2004;

(f) Established a peer review team selection panel of Mr. D. Stone and Mr. J. Sliggers, Co-Chairs of the Task Force on POPs, Mr. R. Ballaman, Chair of the Working Group, Mr. L. Lindau, Vice-Chair of the Executive Body, and a member of the secretariat;

(g) Agreed that participation in the peer review teams should be open to experts from all Parties to the Convention;

(h) Invited the secretariat to make all documents related to the review process available on the Convention's web site to provide public access to the information;

(i) Noted that under paragraph 2 of Executive Body decision 1998/2, the Executive Body must deem whether a risk profile of a proposed substance was acceptable for technical review to determine whether the substance was a POP and proposed that, as a minimum, the risk profile must therefore contain material relevant to each element listed in decision 1998/2, paragraph 1 (a) - (d);

(j) Further proposed that for each substance proposed for addition to the Protocol, the secretariat should report (without conclusion or recommendation) to the Executive Body to indicate whether the risk profile for the proposed substance contained material relevant to each element in decision 1998/2, paragraph 1 (a) - (d);

(k) Requested the Co-Chairs to prepare an options paper to examine ways to deal with all of the emerging possibilities for amendments to the Protocol including results of reassessments, the sufficiency and effectiveness review, and new substances.

#### **IV. PREPARING FOR THE REVIEW OF THE GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL**

33. Mr. Gregor introduced the substantive report on effects and stressed that it also provided summary information for the review of the Protocols.

34. Mr. Schneider introduced the summary of the EMEP assessment report. He also presented EMEP progress on items related to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, in particular the conclusions of the review of the unified EMEP model. The model was state of the art with regard to nitrogen, sulphur and ozone. However, he stressed that, in its present form, the EMEP model significantly underestimated the total PM concentrations due to unknown processes and emissions, but was able to calculate the regional component of the main anthropogenic PM fractions with sufficient accuracy for the assessment of control measures. Priorities for 2005 would focus on the inter-annual variability of source-receptor relationships and the evaluation of the effect of spatial distribution of emissions on model results.

35. Ms. L. Tarrason (MSC-W) presented the results of source-receptor calculations carried out in 2004, stressing that changes in meteorological conditions introduced variability in the scenario analysis that was comparable to the expected variations in PM and ozone concentrations due to emission reductions in 2010. The review of the Gothenburg Protocol would need to take into account meteorological variability. She presented a proposal to use averaged source-receptor calculations for four selected years from 1995-2002, and include results for 2003 separately in the optimization to illustrate the results for an extreme year.

36. Concerning the performance of the EMEP model, it was reiterated that the results for some of the PM components could be used to design regional control strategies but would not yet be suitable to support any limit value approach. Attention was drawn to the importance of the rapid implementation of the monitoring strategy.

37. Mr. Hettelingh provided a progress report on work on critical loads and dynamic modelling. He stressed the importance of ecosystem-specific deposition, and showed that the area exceeding critical loads for both acidity and nutrient nitrogen was much larger than had been calculated at the time of the Gothenburg Protocol. Guidance was requested as to the preliminary choice of 2015 as an implementation year, and 2030, 2050 and 2100 as target years.

38. It was noted that the recovery rates of lakes and soils were very different. With regard to the choice of years, it was recommended to use 2020 rather than 2015 for implementation, and 2030 and 2050 as target years. It was recognized that 2100 might be important from a scientific point of view, for testing the robustness of the model and verification of the model results, but it would not be useful for policy purposes.

39. Mr. J. Rea (United Kingdom) presented, on behalf of the lead country, the report of the second joint meeting of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement and the panel on agriculture and nature of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/7), held on 29-30 April 2004 in Poznan (Poland). The meeting included a one-day workshop devoted to assisting countries with economies in transition in the areas of emission inventories and ammonia emission abatement options and costs.



40. Mr. M. Krzyzanowski (WHO) presented work carried out by the Task Force on Health to assess the health risk of PM. He drew attention to the WHO project "Systematic review of health aspects of air quality in Europe" and a number of other publications and reports on this issue. He presented recent evidence for increased mortality and reduced life expectancy as a result of long-term exposure to PM, as well as the chemical and physical characteristics of PM responsible for health effects. As recent evidence showed that there was no threshold for PM 10 health impacts, it was proposed to replace the threshold concept with exposure risk functions. To prevent significant health impacts from long-term exposure and short-term peaks of PM 2.5 it was necessary to reduce the mean exposure of the population.

41. In the discussion that followed, Mr. Krzyzanowski stressed that the recommendation of the Task Force on Health was to use PM 2.5 as a health effects indicator and address it effectively in legislation, while continuing to address PM 10 at least through observations and monitoring.

42. The delegation of the United States noted that its Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) draft document on PM continued to show strong links between exposure, health effects and shortened life expectancy. The document would serve as a basis for considering revision of national air quality standards. EPA intended to finalize a clean air interstate rule that addressed the transboundary nature of PM within the United States by setting SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emission reduction requirements based on capping electricity-generating units.

43. Mr. M. Amann (CIAM) presented the results of the twenty-ninth meeting of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/5) and plans for future work. He also presented the draft Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme baseline scenarios. He drew attention to the lack of PM emission data from many countries. He concluded that, with decreasing pollution, impacts were expected to decline in the future. However, the problems with PM, ozone, acidification and eutrophication would not be fully solved.

44. The issue was raised of how non-European Union (EU) countries within the EMEP region would be involved in the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, noting the need for bilateral consultations to validate the inputs of CIAM to RAINS. The EMEP budget did not foresee funds for this activity. Mr. Amann underlined the importance and the usefulness of these consultations and stressed the amount of preparatory work needed by the national experts before such consultations.

45. Mr. A. Zuber (European Commission) provided updated information on the developments under CAFE. He drew attention to the revision of the National Emissions Ceilings (NEC) Directive, the development of the Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution and related strategies and projects, and reiterated the importance of harmonized approaches for developing strategies within the European Community and the Convention. He noted the conclusions of the RAINS review

and the need to include climate change policy and effects, as well as the effects of inter-annual meteorological variability, in the model.

46. Mr. Amann presented information on linkages and synergies between air pollution control and greenhouse gas mitigation. This included the development of global NO<sub>x</sub> and CO emission trends, the impact of CH<sub>4</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>/VOC controls on ozone, and changes in background ozone. He noted the significant savings possible by dealing with pollutant and greenhouse gases simultaneously.

47. The delegation of Sweden provided information on a workshop on the review and assessment of European air pollution policies to identify future policy options and research needs (25-27 October 2004, Gothenburg, Sweden) and invited delegates to register for it.

48. The Working Group:

(a) Welcomed progress in EMEP modelling work, in particular the conclusions of the review of the unified EMEP model and took note of the need for its further development with regard to particulate matter;

(b) Took note of the report of the meeting of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement and thanked Poland for hosting the meeting and also a workshop targeted at countries with economies in transition on agricultural ammonia emission abatement options;

(c) Noted with appreciation the work of CIAM in developing a questionnaire on farm practices and agricultural ammonia abatement techniques and requested it to prepare a note on the results of the questionnaire for the next meeting of the Expert Group;

(d) Urged continued cooperation between the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement and the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues in order to further develop information on costs and cost-curves for ammonia abatement techniques and their applicability and reduction efficiencies;

(e) Requested the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement to continue its work on revising the guidance document on control techniques for preventing and abating emissions of ammonia (EB.AIR/1999/2, chap. V) in preparation for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol;

(f) Urged Parties to continue their efforts to promote and implement the Framework Advisory Code of Good Agricultural Practice for Reducing Ammonia Emissions (EB.AIR/WG.5/2001/7) at the national level;

(g) Noted that Spain had offered to host the next meeting of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement in April or May 2005 in Segovia;

(h) Welcomed progress made in integrated assessment modelling, the conclusions of the review of the RAINS model, as well as work by CIAM exploring linkages and synergies between climate change and air pollution effects and policies; welcomed the plans of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling to organize a workshop on integrated assessment methodologies related to RAINS, at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in 2005, and took note of the need to hold two task force meetings in 2005;

(i) Took note of the progress in the development of the baseline scenario by CIAM, expressing its concern that it did not cover the whole of the EMEP region;

(j) Thanked Sweden and the European Community for organizing a workshop on the review and assessment of European air pollution policies on 25-27 October 2004 in Gothenburg.

## **V. ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EXPERT GROUP ON PARTICULATE MATTER**

49. The delegation of Germany presented a proposal for the establishment of an expert group on PM. It stressed that the proposed expert group would concentrate on scientific and technical issues and it would not be giving legal or policy advice.

50. The Working Group discussed the draft proposal for a decision of the Executive Body and the draft terms of reference for the expert group distributed by Germany. Several delegations expressed support for the German proposal noting its timeliness; it was stressed that it was important to extend the participation in this group beyond Europe.

51. It was noted that PM was a typical hemispheric problem and the Convention was the right forum to address the issue. The Working Group amended both proposals and agreed that they should be submitted to the Executive Body, as amended.

52. The delegation of Germany announced that it would host a symposium to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Convention and to highlight the new work on particulate matter (8-9 November 2004, Berlin); support was available for participation from countries with economies in transition. It also announced that it intended to organize the first meeting of the expert group on PM in spring 2005.

53. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the work carried out by the Task Force on Health to assess the risk of particulate matter;

(b) Recommended to the Executive Body to adopt the proposed draft decision establishing an expert group on PM (see annex below);

(c) Agreed on the proposed draft terms of reference for an expert group, as amended, and requested the secretariat to reflect these in the draft 2005 work-plan of the Convention (EB.AIR/2004/3) to be submitted to the Executive Body at its twenty-second session.

## **VI. EMISSION INVENTORIES AND DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE**

54. Mr. Schneider presented a note on emission data reporting, identifying quality assurance issues and proposals for improving data quality, in particular through an inventory improvement programme under the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/9).

55. Mr. Schneider presented a draft note, requested by the Executive Body at its twenty-first session, on the differences between the revised Emission Reporting Guidelines (2002) and the previous emission reporting guidelines (1997), used when setting the national emission ceilings for the Gothenburg Protocol (EB.AIR/GE.1/2004/8). He drew attention to inconsistencies in the calculation of emissions from air traffic and fuels and in the treatment of national territory for purposes of reporting national emission totals under the Convention and its protocols. He noted that the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections had considered this issue and proposed to resolve some of the technical problems by amending the reporting tables in the Guidelines. Other differences were considered to be policy issues and required consideration by other bodies.

56. The delegation of France noted that its national emissions submitted for the NEC Directive were nearly the same as those submitted under the Convention.

57. The delegation of the Netherlands noted that the solutions proposed did not sufficiently address the fact that national totals submitted under the NEC Directive and the Convention may not be identical. For this reason, the Task Force's proposed inclusion of memo items in reporting of emissions to make the differences transparent was an effective short-term solution. Parties should be given guidance by the secretariat on how to do this. For the longer term, the Guidelines should be revised accordingly. Contrary to the findings reported by France, the Netherlands had found some large difference in the emissions that it reported for the NEC Directive and the Convention.

58. The European Commission underlined the importance of harmonizing reporting under the NEC Directive and the Convention, especially since the NEC Directive would also be reviewed shortly. The delegation of Norway stressed the importance of emission data for modelling purposes and urged a quick and effective solution.

59. Mr. Schneider noted that the Guidelines would be revised by 2007 at the latest. It was important not to re-open the discussion on the Guidelines too early, since Parties were only just getting used to the new reporting formats.

60. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the work being done, recognized the importance of developing an emission inventory improvement programme and encouraged the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections and the Parties to implement it;

(b) Noted the differences between the previous and the revised Emission Reporting Guidelines, agreed that these had been partly addressed by the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, but noted that there were outstanding policy issues related to national territory, transport emissions and emissions calculated on the basis of fuels sold or consumed. A short-term solution was the addition of memo items in the reporting tables. A long-term solution implied further revision of the Guidelines, by 2007 at the latest.

## VII. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY

61. Mr. M. Rico (France) presented the report of the fifth and sixth meetings of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, held in Angers (France) on 9-10 October 2003 and Paris on 18 June 2004 (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/8). He reported on progress made on the techno-economic database (ECODAT) and the work on a possible revision of the technical annexes to the Gothenburg Protocol. The next meeting of the Expert Group would be in January 2005 in Laxenburg (Austria), back to back with the meeting of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling. He noted that Mr. J. Bartaire (CITEPA) had been nominated Chairman, as the former Chairman, Mr. R. Bouscaren, would retire. He invited other Parties to co-chair the Expert Group and, if possible, to provide support.

62. The delegation of the United States presented the results of the International Forum on Urban Air Quality of the Air and Waste Management Association held on 23-25 June 2004 in Indianapolis (United States) on the subject of control technologies for particulate matter. The United States was grateful for the participation of experts from the Convention, including those from the secretariat and from France as lead country for the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues. A final report with recommendations would be available shortly.

63. The Working Group:

(a) Welcomed the progress made by the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues on developing a techno-economic database (ECODAT), noting its usefulness for integrated assessment modelling and as input to the CAFE baseline scenario;

(b) Expressed its appreciation to the Expert Group's outgoing Chairman, Mr. R. Bouscaren, and welcomed the new Chairman, Mr. J. Bartaire;

(c) Welcomed the report by the United States on the workshop on control technologies for particulate matter.

### **VIII. INFORMAL SEMINAR ON AIR POLLUTION ISSUES IN EECCA**

64. An informal seminar was held to address air pollution issues and problems encountered in ratifying and implementing the Convention and its protocols in the East European, Caucasian and Central Asian (EECCA) countries. The seminar was chaired by Ms. K. Scavo (United States).

65. National presentations were given by: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation and Ukraine. Mr. Krzyzanowski presented WHO activities on air quality and health in EECCA. A representative of UNEP Chemicals presented work related to the Stockholm Convention on POPs, in particular that funded by the Global Environment Facility.

66. The secretariat provided updated information on the progress in the UNECE project for capacity-building for air quality management and the application of clean coal combustion technologies in Central Asia (CAPACT), funded by the United Nations Development Account, stressing that the project aimed at raising awareness in Central Asia on air quality management and international cooperation on transboundary transport of air pollution as a basis for accession to the Convention and its protocols. Attention was also drawn to the establishment of a plan for cooperation on air pollution monitoring and evaluation between Central Asia, on the one hand, and Europe and Asia, on the other, as part of the project.

67. The secretariat introduced a note summarizing the responses to the questionnaire circulated to the EECCA countries with the aim of identifying obstacles to ratification of the Protocol on POPs, the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol, as well as the needs for technical assistance (EB.AIR/WG.5/2004/6).

68. The delegate of the Russian Federation noted the replies to the questionnaire showed that all responding countries needed both technical and financial assistance. Without these, ratification of the protocols would be difficult. The need to develop of national plan(s) for the implementation of the three protocols was highlighted.

69. The Working Group:

(a) Thanked the Russian Federation for drafting the questionnaire for EECCA countries to identify obstacles to ratifying the three most recent protocols to the Convention;

(b) Supported the recommendations of the WHO European Centre for Environment and Health on air quality and health in EECCA countries;

(c) Recognized the need to promote the development of national implementation plans for EECCA countries, in particular for the Protocols on POPs and on Heavy Metals and for the

Gothenburg Protocol, taking into account activities under the Stockholm Convention;

(d) Urged EECCA Parties to the EMEP Protocol to use existing mechanisms under EMEP, e.g. the inventory improvement programme under the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, to facilitate the ratification and implementation of the Protocols;

(e) Took note of the CAPACT project and recognized the possibilities for similar projects in other EECCA countries;

(f) Identified a need for a training workshop on the implementation of the Convention's protocols, with priority given to those on POPs and heavy metals, which may include the development of a framework for national implementation plans; requested the secretariat to call upon Parties in EECCA to host such a workshop;

(g) Took note of the secretariat's draft implementation guides to the recent protocols and urged it to seek the necessary resources to complete them, including their translation into Russian.

#### **IX. COMMUNICATION STRATEGY FOR THE CONVENTION: TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONVENTION**

70. The secretariat noted the activities planned to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Convention, including the EMEP and Working Group on Effects's reports, a book on the history of the Convention that was an initiative of the Netherlands, a new brochure on the Convention from Canada, children's games produced by Switzerland and UNECE, and statements by Environment Ministers sent by many Parties. A special event would be held on Wednesday, 1 December 2004, with invited speakers and press coverage. It was hoped for broad participation and invitations would be sent to heads of delegation, task force and expert group chairs and programmes centres.

71. The secretariat noted improvements to the Convention's web site, including a new logo developed by Canada, and a page devoted to the anniversary including links to the ministerial statements.

72. The secretariat reported on the meeting held by the International Union of Air Pollution Prevention Associations in London on 23-27 August 2004. A special forum of regional networks and agreements had discussed common interests and the possibilities for future collaboration.

73. The delegation of the Netherlands noted the importance of publicizing the activities and documents associated with the Convention's work. The secretariat noted that e-mail subscriber lists were already used by UNECE. It invited Parties to provide information on activities and reports in order to make this available on the Convention's web site.

74. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the information provided by the secretariat and encouraged further development of the Convention's web site including the possibilities for providing more information on meetings and documents;

(b) Took note of developments in cooperation with other regional networks and agreements and welcomed further efforts in such activities;

(c) Requested the secretariat to make effective use of the Convention's new Logo and make it available for more general use.

**X. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

75. The Working Group re-elected Ms. K. Scavo (United States), Ms. N. Karpova (Russian Federation), Mr. J. Sliggers (Netherlands) and Mr. P. Jilek (Czech Republic) as Vice-Chairs.

**XI. OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**XII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

77. The Working Group adopted the report of its thirty-sixth session on 16 September 2004.



## Annex

### DRAFT DECISION ON ESTABLISHING AN EXPERT GROUP ON PARTICULATE MATTER

#### The Executive Body,

Recognizing that the effects of particulate matter are not directly covered by any of the protocols to the Convention,

Noting that results from a recent review of the health effects of air pollution by WHO confirms that particulate matter still poses a considerable threat to human health and that preliminary results from integrated assessment modelling indicate that present policies will not be sufficient to eliminate the risks,

Noting also that the European Community including its member States in the “Clean Air for Europe” programme are paying special attention to particulate matter, that its work could make an important contribution to the ongoing work under the Convention and that it is important to ensure the most efficient use of resources of the Parties to the Convention,

Recalling the views of the Parties on dust, soot and particulate matter,

Considering that several technical and scientific bodies under the Convention are carrying out work on particulate matter under the Executive Body’s current work-plan,

Convinced that improved coordination of activities would help address the problems of particulate matter in a more timely manner,

Underlining that in the context of this decision particulate matter refers exclusively to anthropogenic particulate matter,

1. Establishes the Expert Group on Particulate Matter, under the leadership of a Party or Parties to the Convention, as identified in the annual work-plan, to:

(a) Assess the degree of control of pollutants that contribute to the formation of particulate matter already provided by existing protocols to the Convention and other instruments;

(b) Review current work on particulate matter under the Convention, taking also into account the latest results of the forthcoming Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution of the European

Community and similar strategies of other Parties;

(c) Consider the scientific and technical requirements, as well as non-technical measures, needed for possible options for assisting Parties in developing further measures to reduce particulate matter;

(d) Give technical support also to other abatement strategies of Parties to the Convention, including the Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution of the European Community;

(e) Carry out such other tasks as the Executive Body may assign to it in the annual work-plan;

2. Decides that the lead country or countries will assume the principal responsibility for coordinating the work of this Expert Group, for organizing its meetings, for designating its chair(s), for communications with participating experts, and for other organizational arrangements in accordance with the work-plan;

3. Also decides that the Expert Group will carry out the tasks specified for it in the work-plan adopted annually by the Executive Body and will report thereon to the Working Group on Strategies and Review;

4. Requests other subsidiary bodies and programme centres under the Convention that are working on particulate matter to participate actively in the work of the Expert Group;

5. Urges Parties to the Convention to nominate experts for the Expert Group and to inform the secretariat of their names as soon as possible.