



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/11
19 June 2008

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

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

Working Group on Strategies and Review

Forty-second session
Geneva, 1–5 September 2008
Item 6 of the provisional agenda

EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY

**PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACTION PLAN FOR EASTERN
EUROPE, CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIA**

Note by the secretariat

INTRODUCTION

1. At its thirty-seventh session, the Working Group on Strategies and Review agreed on an Action Plan to involve Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) countries in the work of the Convention. At the request of the Working Group, the Action Plan was revised in line with the recommendations of the “Saltsjöbaden III” workshop held in, March 2007 in Gothenburg, Sweden (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2007/9) and presented at the Working Group’s fortieth session (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2007/17). The Executive Body, at its twenty-fifth session, adopted the revised Action Plan for EECCA. It welcomed the steps being taken towards implementing the Action Plan, but stressed that more still needed to be done with respect to certain items listed in the plan. It urged all Parties and Convention bodies to address the issues as

GE.08-23468

a matter of priority and invited the Working Group to report on progress at its next session (ECE/EB.AIR/91, para. 51 (b)).

2. This note presents progress in the implementation of the revised Action Plan for each of its items.

I. ACTION PLAN

Action 1: Raise the political profile of the Convention activities in the region, through the following actions:

(a) Hold a high-level meeting on transboundary pollution in 2009, in connection with the thirtieth anniversary of the Convention (Action: Executive Body, EECCA countries);

(b) Assure political commitment at the ministerial level by agreement on priority air pollution problems, the need for international cooperation, the steps to be taken, and who to involve (Action: Executive Body, EECCA countries);

(c) Create awareness of potential health and environment problems in EECCA, as well as of the nature of transboundary influences and links with other environmental problems, by compiling national and international expert reports (Action: Working Group on Effects jointly with the World Health Organization);

(d) Highlight the importance of particulate matter (in particular PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) (Action: Executive Body, EECCA countries);

(e) Initiate studies on health and environmental effects, as necessary, for considering these effects in the development of abatement strategies (Action: Executive Body, EECCA countries);

(f) Highlight the high benefit-to-costs ratio for air pollution measures (Action: Executive Body, EECCA countries);

(g) Consider the possible co-benefits from climate change policies in the development and implementation of air pollution measures (Action: Executive Body, EECCA countries).

Progress achieved: A workshop on developing a framework for integrated co-benefits strategies will be held in cooperation with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Global Atmospheric Pollution Forum from 17 to 19 September in Stockholm.

Action 2: Encourage ratification of the protocols, in particular the EMEP Protocol¹, the Protocol on Heavy Metals, the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), and the Gothenburg Protocol², through the following actions:

(a) Use the EMEP Protocol as an important first step for all countries for achieving major benefits from cooperation with the Convention's programme centres and other Parties (Action: EECCA countries);

Progress achieved: At its fortieth session, the Working Group noted the need to identify both the problems encountered in ratification and the steps that might be taken to address these problems, and requested the secretariat to write to non-Parties to the EMEP Protocol, the Protocol on Heavy Metals, the Protocol on POPs and the Gothenburg Protocol, inviting them to share their experiences (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/88, para. 61 (c) (i)). Armenia and Moldova replied that they intended to ratify the EMEP Protocol later in 2008. The other countries that replied were Parties to the EMEP Protocol. The detailed results of the questionnaire are presented in the annex.

(b) Develop a ratification process with recommended technical annexes or flexible time schedules for compliance; since relaxing the provisions of existing protocols would require amendments, this might be best addressed during the revision of the protocols (Action: Working Group on Strategies and Review, Executive Body);

Progress achieved: Based on the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, at its twenty-fifth session the Executive Body agreed that any revision of the Gothenburg Protocol should consider building more flexibility into some of the current and new annexes and obligations, e.g. with respect to timescales for implementation of obligations. At its forty-first session, the Working Group on Strategies and Review agreed that the best available techniques (BAT) approach and defining sets of measures with high potential for emission reductions could be useful for EECCA countries and should be explored in the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/90, para. 49 (h)).

¹ The 1984 Geneva Protocol on Long-term Financing of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe.

² The 1999 Gothenburg Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone.

(c) Support the EECCA countries at various stages of the ratification processes
(Action: secretariat, donors);

Progress achieved: The UNECE CAPACT³ project, finalized in 2007, supported Kazakhstan in developing a national plan for the three most recent protocols. Other EECCA countries also benefited from the project. Although workshops held under the project were initially targeted at Central Asian States, additional funding provided by some Parties enabled the participation of experts from all EECCA countries. As a result, a network of experts was successfully developed. A project aimed at supporting Moldova to implement and ratify the Gothenburg Protocol, funded by the Czech Republic, was about to enter its implementation phase in the beginning of 2008. However, the project start was delayed awaiting some final clarification on the use of resources by Moldova.

(d) Using the synergies with the ratification of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, help countries ratify the Protocol on POPs; (Action: Convention secretariat, EECCA countries);

Progress achieved: The secretariat has identified those countries that are Parties to the Stockholm Convention that are not Party to the Protocol. It has written to Heads of delegation to these countries stressing the possibilities for accession to the Protocol.

(e) Analyse the option of applying the pollution emissions management area of the Gothenburg Protocol (Action: EECCA countries).

Progress achieved: Delegations of EECCA countries may wish to report on their activities for analysing this option.

Action 3: Increase the cooperation and exchange of information through expanding the modelling and monitoring activities:

(a) Expand the EMEP monitoring network; (Action: EECCA countries, EMEP Chemical Coordinating Centre, donors);

Progress achieved: With assistance from Norway and the Chemical Coordinating Centre (CCC), monitoring stations were or are being established in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Moldova. CCC also provided support to the establishment of a monitoring station in Kazakhstan in the

³ Capacity Building for Air Quality Management and the Application of Clean Coal Combustion Technologies in Central Asia.

framework of the CAPACT project. CCC is also assisting Ukraine to implement its project for establishing an international EMEP monitoring site in the delta of the Danube River as an in-kind contribution to cover part of its arrears under the EMEP Protocol.

(b) Provide practical, methodological support and capacity-building (including assessment of resources needed) for the establishment of new stations and programmes related to EMEP and the Working Group on Effects activities (Action: Working Group on Effects, EMEP Steering Body, EECCA countries);

Progress achieved: CCC provides support for the purchase of equipment as well as training of the personnel in the new monitoring stations established in the EECCA region.

(c) Provide high-quality emissions data and other input data needed for integrated assessment modelling (Action: EECCA countries);

Progress achieved: The Executive Body, at its twenty-fifth session in December 2007, agreed to increase the EMEP budget by 10 per cent in order to support the increased resources requirements for the work under EMEP, in particular for work on emissions data and work to strengthen the involvement of the EECCA countries. Part of the additional resources from this increase (US\$ 75,000) is earmarked for cooperation with EECCA countries, in particular for the improvement of the input data for integrated assessment modelling.

(d) Extend the EMEP modelling domain (Action: EMEP Meteorological Synthesizing Centres-West and -East).

Progress achieved: The EMEP Steering Body, at its thirty-first session in September 2007, agreed on the need to extend the geographical scope of EMEP to include the EECCA countries, and invited MSC-East and MSC-West to include them in their calculations in 2008. New source-receptor relationships are being calculated for five countries in the EECCA subregion.

Action 4: Support EECCA countries' involvement in the activities of the Convention through the following actions:

(a) Make more material available in Russian (Action: Executive Body, Convention secretariat, EECCA countries);

Progress achieved: The Mapping Manual for Effects and the EMEP monitoring manual have been translated into Russian. The secretariat is discussing the possibilities for translating the

EMEP CORINAIR Guidebook with the European Environment Agency and the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections.

(b) Organize joint activities/workshops for EECCA countries on important technical issues such as emissions inventories, PM measurements, ecosystem monitoring and emissions monitoring, with the participation of both decision makers and specialists (Action: Executive Body, Convention secretariat, EECCA countries);

Progress achieved: The Task Force on Heavy Metals held a workshop on the ratification of the Protocol on Heavy Metals in May 2008 in Yerevan, which was organized jointly by Armenia and Germany (see ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/9, annex). The Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues is planning to organize a workshop, supported by France, to be held in October 2008, tentatively in Kazakhstan.

(c) Use the MSC-East as a facilitator in the implementation of the Action Plan for EECCA;

Progress achieved: The secretariat sent a letter to Norway requesting additional resources for MSC-East to be able to undertake this role.

(d) Carry out a regular review of the implementation of the action plan (Action: Executive Body).

Annex

Overview of the replies to the questionnaire to EECCA and SEE countries on implementation and ratification of protocols to the Convention

1. At its fortieth session, the Working Group on Strategies and Review noted the need to identify both the problems encountered in ratification and the steps that might be taken to address these problems, and requested the secretariat to write to non-Parties to the EMEP Protocol, the Protocol on Heavy Metals, the Protocol on POPs and the Gothenburg Protocol, inviting them to share their experiences (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/88, para. 61 (c) (i)).
2. The secretariat drafted a short questionnaire, in cooperation with the Chair, containing questions relevant to the ratification of the four Protocols mentioned above, and sent it to the Heads of delegation of the EECCA and SEE countries.
3. The secretariat sent out the questionnaire on 29 October 2007 requesting early replies in order to report on the results at the twenty-fifth session of the Executive Body in December 2007. The following Parties replied: Armenia, Belarus, Croatia (only to the Gothenburg Protocol), Moldova and Ukraine. The secretariat informed the Executive Body about the preliminary results and requested Parties that had not yet replied to the questionnaire to do so as soon as possible. In addition, it sent written reminders on the 7 March 2008 to Albania, Georgia, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. No additional replies were received. The Working Group requested that the results of the questionnaire be presented as an official document to its forty-second session for further discussion.
4. The questionnaire contained four parts, one for each protocol.

Part I. EMEP Protocol

5. The questionnaire asked whether the countries that were not Parties to the protocols, intended to ratify them in 2008 or later. Armenia and Moldova replied that they intended to ratify the EMEP Protocol later in 2008. The other countries that replied are already Parties to the EMEP Protocol.
6. The second question asked was: What were the major difficulties that explained the non-ratification? One country, Moldova, responded that these were implementation guidance,

methodologies, financial support for the implementation of measures and political interest. A particular problem was the lack of data from the left bank of the Dniestr river.

7. The third question asked whether the countries had established an emissions inventory for the following pollutants: sulphur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), ammonia (NH₃), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), primary PM_{2.5}, primary PM₁₀ and total suspended particulates (TSP). All four countries that replied have established an emissions inventory for SO₂, NO_x, NH₃ and VOCs. Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine have also established emissions inventories for TSP. Only Moldova has an inventory for primary PM_{2.5} and primary PM₁₀. In the other countries, an inventory is missing.

8. The fourth question asked if there was at least one operational EMEP monitoring station in each of the countries. Two of the countries that replied have stations that are providing data to EMEP (Belarus and Moldova), and the establishment of two other stations is under way (in Armenia and Ukraine).

Part II. Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants

9. The questionnaire asked whether the countries that were not Parties to the protocols intended to ratify them in 2008 or later. Of the four countries that replied, only Moldova is a Party to the Protocol on POPs. Two countries (Belarus and Ukraine) were working on ratifying the Protocol and hoped to do so in 2008, but Armenia does not have such plans for the time being. All four countries, however, are Parties to the Stockholm Convention.

10. Among the major difficulties that explain the non-ratification, countries mentioned the need for technical assistance, implementation guidance and methodologies. One country (Armenia) mentioned the need for financial support for the implementation of the measures. Moldova, which is a Party to the Protocol, responded that it has had most difficulties with the implementation of article 3, paragraph 5, regarding the emissions limit values (ELVs) and BAT as well as effective measures for restriction of emissions from mobile sources, and annex VII regarding the recommended measures of regulation for reduction of POPs emissions from mobile sources.

11. The questionnaire also asked whether the POPs listed in annexes I and II of the Protocol were still under production or in use in the countries. The countries have generally banned the production and use of these substances, except for PCBs⁴ in Belarus and Ukraine. Except for

⁴ Polychlorinated biphenyls.

Armenia, all countries that replied to the questionnaire had an overview of the stockpile of these substances.

Part III. Protocol on Heavy Metals

12. Of the four countries that replied, only one (Moldova) is a Party to the Protocol on Heavy Metals. One country (Belarus) indicated that it planned to ratify the Protocol. Armenia and Ukraine mentioned that they have no such plans, at least not for 2008. Ukraine gave as a reason the fact that existing sources cannot implement the requirements of the Protocol within the given time frame.

13. Among the major difficulties that explain the non-ratification, countries mentioned the need for technical assistance, implementation guidance and financial support. Moldova, which is a Party to the Protocol, answered that it has had the most difficulties with the implementation of article 6 and annex IV on the timescales for the application of ELVs and BAT to new and existing stationary sources.

14. Of the four countries that replied, two have established an inventory for mercury, lead and cadmium (Ukraine and Belarus), although Belarus indicates that the data requires further detail. Moldova mentioned its problem with the lack of data from the left bank of the river Dniestr for political and economic reasons. Armenia stated that it needs financial assistance for a full inventory of heavy metals emissions and the assessment of the country's potential to implement the obligations under the Protocol.

15. The questionnaire asked was: What were the major difficulties with the application of the limit values for new and existing stationary sources? Armenia and Belarus mentioned technical and economic difficulties as well as financial support for the implementation of measures. Moldova lacked methodology for ceiling values definitions. Ukraine replied that it had adopted ELVs for new and existing sources, but it is not clear whether these meet the requirements of the Protocol.

16. All Parties replied positively that a later implementation date for existing installations would help ratification.

17. Unleaded petrol has been phased out of use in all the replying countries.

Part IV. Gothenburg Protocol

18. None of the countries that replied is a Party to the Gothenburg Protocol. Croatia replied that it had plans to ratify the Protocol in 2008. It received support from Belgium for a project to support the implementation of the European Union National Emission Ceilings Directive (2001/81/EC). The project will result in a programme for the reduction of the pollutants covered by the Directive and will serve as a basis for ratification of the Protocol. Croatia is already taking some steps for implementation. The country has a total of 35 existing large combustion plants, two of which are coal-fired, with the rest using liquid or gas fuels. Only one large combustion plant, constructed in 1999, uses modern equipment to reduce emissions into the air and thus complies with the ELVs for the existing combustion plants. Based on the national legislation, emission reduction plans for existing large combustion plants have to be drafted in 2008 on the basis of programmes made by owners or operators of such plants prepared in 2007. These programmes include measures applied to achieve the reduction of emissions as well as timetables and financing plans.

19. Belarus and Moldova have similar plans for the future, whereas Armenia and Ukraine have no such plans. Ukraine gave as a reason the inability of the existing installations to fulfil the requirements of the Protocol within the given time frame.

20. Among the obstacles for ratification are the needs for technical assistance, implementation guidance, methodologies and financial support. Moldova also mentioned the lack of political interest and certain articles and annexes of the Protocol, including annex I and annexes IV, VI, and VIII regarding ELVs from stationary and mobile sources.

21. Among the major difficulties with the application of the limit values for new and existing stationary sources and mobile sources, countries mentioned the economic difficulties related to the application of BAT (Armenia), the lack of methodology (Moldova) and the inability of the existing sources to fulfil the requirements of the Gothenburg Protocol within the timescales defined in the Protocol.
