



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3
21 October 2008

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

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

Twenty-sixth session
Geneva, 15–18 December 2008
Item 9 of the provisional agenda

COMPLIANCE WITH PROTOCOL OBLIGATIONS

ELEVENTH REPORT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE¹

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Page
INTRODUCTION	1–2	5
I. SUBMISSION AND REFERRALS CONCERNING COMPLIANCE BY PARTIES WITH THEIR PROTOCOL OBLIGATIONS	3–30	5
A. Follow-up to Executive Body decisions 2007/2, 2007/3, 2007/4, 2007/5 and 2007/6	3–25	5
1. Follow-up to decision 2007/2 on compliance by Norway with the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds	4–6	5
2. Follow-up to decision 2007/3 on compliance by Greece with the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides.....	7–12	7

¹ In accordance with Executive Body Decision 1992/2 (ECE/EB.AIR/68, annex III, appendix V).

3.	Follow-up to decision 2007/4 on compliance by Spain with the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides	13–16	10
4.	Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/5 on compliance by Spain with the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds	17–20	13
5.	Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/6 on compliance by Denmark with the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants ..	21–25	16
B.	Referrals by the secretariat.....	26–30	18
1.	Referral by the secretariat concerning Cyprus’s compliance with the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides	26–30	18
II.	COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING OBLIGATIONS	31–87	21
A.	Follow-up to Executive Body decisions 2007/7, 2007/8, 2007/9 2007/10.....	31–43	21
1.	Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/7	31–34	21
2.	Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/8	35–37	22
3.	Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/9	38–41	22
4.	Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/10	42–43	23
B.	Compliance with emission data reporting obligations	44–74	23
1.	1985 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with article 4 concerning reporting of annual emissions.....	45–47	24
2.	Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides: compliance with article 8 concerning emission data reporting.....	48–50	25
3.	Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds: compliance with article 8.1 concerning emission data reporting.....	51–53	25
4.	1994 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with articles 5.1(b) and 5.2 concerning emission data reporting.....	54–58	26
5.	Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants: compliance with article 9.1 (b) concerning emission data reporting	59–63	27
6.	Protocol on Heavy Metals: compliance with article 7.1 (b) concerning emission data reporting on sulphur, nitrogen oxides, ammonia and volatile organic compounds	64–68	28
7.	Gothenburg Protocol: compliance with article 7.1 (b) concerning emission data reporting on sulphur, nitrogen oxides, ammonia and volatile organic compounds.....	69–73	29
8.	Conclusions	74	30

C.	Compliance by Parties with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for air pollution abatement.....	75–86	31
1.	1985 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with article 6, concerning reporting on national programmes, policies and strategies	77	31
2.	Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides: compliance with article 8.1 (a)–(f) concerning information exchange and annual reporting	78–79	31
3.	Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds: compliance with article 8.1 and 8.2 concerning information exchange and annual reporting	80–81	32
4.	1994 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with articles 5.1(a) and 5.1 (c) concerning reporting	82	32
5.	Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants: compliance with article 9.1 (a) concerning reporting	83	32
6.	Protocol on Heavy Metals: compliance with article 7.1 (a) concerning reporting	84	32
7.	Gothenburg Protocol: compliance with article 7.1 (a) concerning reporting	85	33
8.	Conclusions	86	33
D.	Recommendations to the Executive Body	87	34
1.	Compliance by Liechtenstein with its obligations to report on emissions	87	34
2.	Compliance by Luxembourg with its obligations to report on emissions	87	35
3.	Compliance by Greece, Lithuania, Romania and the European Community with their obligations to report on emissions	87	35
4.	Compliance by certain Parties with their obligations to report on emissions	87	36
5.	Compliance by Liechtenstein and Luxembourg with their obligations to report on strategies and policies	87	38
6.	Compliance by Greece, Latvia and the European Community with their obligations to report on strategies and policies.....	87	39
7.	Compliance by Estonia, France, Italy and Monaco with their obligations to report on strategies and policies.....	87	40

8	Compliance by the Republic of Moldova and the Russian Federation with their obligations to report on strategies and policies.....	87	41
III.	IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE BY PARTIES WITH THE PROTOCOL ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS AND THE PROTOCOL ON HEAVY METALS	88	42
IV.	COOPERATION WITH OTHER BODIES UNDER AND OUTSIDE THE CONVENTION.....	89–90	43
V.	OTHER BUSINESS	91	43
VI.	FURTHER WORK	92–93	43
	Table 1: Emissions reported by Parties to the 1985 Sulphur Protocol		45
	Table 2: Emissions reported by Parties to the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides		46
	Table 3: Emissions reported by Parties to the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds in accordance with Executive Body decision 2002/10		47
	Table 4: Emissions reported by Parties to the 1994 Sulphur Protocol in accordance with Executive Body decision 2002/10		48
	Table 5: Emissions reported by Parties to the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants in accordance with Executive Body decision 2005/1		49
	Table 6: Emissions reported by Parties to the Protocol on Heavy Metals in accordance with Executive Body decision 2005/1		51
	Table 7: Emissions reported by Parties to the Gothenburg Protocol in accordance with Executive Body decision 2005/1		52
	Table 8: 2008 Review on Strategies and Policies: Responses received by Parties to the Protocols in force.....		53
	Annex: Draft workplan for 2009		54

INTRODUCTION

1. At its twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth sessions, the Executive Body elected the following members to the Implementation Committee: Mr. Atle Fretheim (Norway, Chairman), Ms. Clare Hamilton (United Kingdom), Mr. Helmut Hojesky (Austria), Ms. Anneli Karjalainen (Finland), Ms. Johanne Forest (Canada), Mr. Christian Lindemann (Germany), Mr. Peter Meulepas (Belgium), Mr. Larsolov Olsson (Sweden) and Ms. Sonja Vidič (Croatia).

2. The Implementation Committee held two meetings in 2008. Its twenty-first meeting was held from 7 to 9 April in Dubrovnik, Croatia, and its twenty-second meeting was held from 14 to 16 July in Geneva. Ms. Forest and Mr. Meulepas did not attend the twenty-second meeting. A representative of the Convention secretariat participated in both meetings.

I. SUBMISSIONS AND REFERRALS CONCERNING COMPLIANCE BY PARTIES WITH THEIR PROTOCOL OBLIGATIONS

A. Follow-up to Executive Body decisions 2007/2, 2007/3, 2007/4, 2007/5 and 2007/6

3. Based on recommendations made by the Implementation Committee (in its tenth report (ECE/EB.AIR/2007/3), at its twenty-fifth session the Executive Body adopted decisions concerning compliance by Denmark, Greece, Norway and Spain. As requested by the Executive Body, the secretariat sent letters to the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the Parties concerned informing them about the decisions.

1. Follow-up to decision 2007/2 on compliance by Norway with the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds² (ref. 1/01)

Background

4. In its decision 2007/2, the Executive Body welcomed the fact that Norway's final volatile organic compounds (VOCs) data for 2005 continued to confirm a downward trend in its tropospheric ozone management area (TOMA) emissions, and that, according to preliminary data for 2006, Norway appeared to be in compliance in that year with its obligation to reduce its VOCs emissions in the TOMA by 30 per cent from its 1989 level, as required by article 2.2 (b) of the Protocol. It requested the Committee to review Norway's final data for 2006 and report to it thereon at its twenty-sixth session. The secretariat informed the Committee that it had sent a

² 1991 Protocol Concerning the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or Their Transboundary Fluxes.

letter on 8 February 2008 to Norway's Ambassador in Geneva, drawing her attention to the decision. The secretariat had received a written submission from Norway on 14 March 2008 in response to the decision. The response had been circulated to the Committee.

Consideration

5. The Committee was grateful to Norway for its written submission and carefully considered the information provided. The Committee noted that the latest officially submitted emission data showed that Norway had achieved compliance with regard to its VOCs emissions in its TOMA in 2006.

Recommendation to the Executive Body

6. On the basis of the above consideration, the Committee recommends that the Executive Body adopt the following decision:

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

(a) *Recalls* its decisions 2001/1, 2002/2, 2003/1, 2004/6, 2005/2, 2006/4 and 2007/2;

(b) *Notes* the report provided by the Implementation Committee on the progress made by Norway, based on the information provided by Norway on 14 March (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 4–6), and in particular its conclusion that Norway was in 2006 in compliance with its emission reduction obligations of the 1991 Protocol Concerning the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or Their Transboundary Fluxes for its tropospheric ozone management area;

(c) *Welcomes* the achievement by Norway of compliance with its emission reduction obligation for its tropospheric ozone management area in 2006, after seven years of non-compliance;

(d) *Decides* that there is no reason for the Implementation Committee to continue to review Norway's compliance with its obligation under article 2.2 (b) of the Protocol.

2. Follow-up to decision 2007/3 on compliance by Greece with the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides³ (ref. 2/02)

Background

7. In its decision 2007/3, the Executive Body requested the Committee to review Greece's progress and timetable for achieving compliance with article 2.1 of the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x). The secretariat informed the Committee that on 8 February 2008, the Executive Secretary of the UNECE had sent a letter to Greece's Minister of Foreign Affairs and its Minister of Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works, drawing their attention to the decision. The secretariat had received written submissions from Greece on 7 April and 3 July 2008. The responses had been circulated to the Committee. Three representatives of Greece (Mr. Hadjidakis, Mr. Papastamou and Professor Ziomas) participated in the consideration by the Committee on 14 July 2008, in accordance with paragraph 8 of the Implementation Committee's terms of reference. Mr. Hadjidakis and Professor Ziomas introduced the written responses and answered questions put to them by the Committee.

Consideration

8. The Implementation Committee was grateful to Greece for its responses to the secretariat's letter from 8 February 2008 and carefully considered the written information submitted by Greece as well as the additional information presented by the Greek representatives. The Committee noted that Greece had revised its base year data to be consistent with the rest of the data series, as requested in paragraph 8 of decision 2006/5. It further took note of the Greek representatives' presentation of a package of policies and measures, parts of which were undergoing the required consultation process in Greece at the time of the presentation. This package comprised, inter alia, prescriptive and incentive measures concerning cars and road transport, connecting certain electrically isolated islands to the national grid and switching fuel from oil to natural gas for electricity production in some parts of the country. Emission reductions through the use of solar and wind energy were already contained in the projected figures. The representatives of Greece stated that these policies and measures would enter into force or would become effective soon. The Committee was informed by the representatives of Greece that they expected the effects of this package to bring Greece into compliance possibly by 2010.

9. However, the Committee was not convinced that the information about the measures and

³ 1988 Protocol Concerning the Control of Nitrogen Oxides or Their Transboundary Fluxes.

projected effects provided by Greece were sufficient to substantiate such an expectation. The measures envisaged by Greece were not specified in detail, there was no timetable containing annual steps for the achievement of these measures and the projected effects of each of the envisaged measures on Greece's NO_x emissions per year were not spelled out and substantiated. The Committee had doubts as to whether the envisaged measures could be implemented so that the effects would lead to compliance by 2010.

10. The Committee concluded that the information received did not meet the requirements of paragraph 6 of decision 2005/4, as reiterated in paragraph 7 of decision 2007/3. It therefore requested the secretariat to remind Greece to make a presentation at the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body in accordance with paragraph 8 of decision 2005/4.

11. In 2007, the Committee had also considered recommending that the Executive Body issue a caution to Greece that more severe measures would need to be applied if Greece did not take appropriate measures to come into compliance as soon as possible. Upon the Committee's suggestion, the matter was first discussed at the twenty-fifth session of the Executive Body. The Executive Body agreed that the Committee should continue its discussions on possible stronger measures in cases with alarmingly long periods of non-compliance. In the light of the information presented by Greece at its twenty-second meeting, the Committee felt that it should adjourn its discussion on stronger measures until after Greece had submitted the detailed report to the Executive Body required under paragraph 8 of decision 2005/4. The Committee remains committed to discussing and proposing stronger measures should it become clear that Greece has not adopted and effectively implemented the measures necessary to achieve compliance with its obligations or should Greece fail to give sufficient attention to the matter of its continuing long-lasting non-compliance with the obligations under the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides.

Recommendation to the Executive Body

12. On the basis of the above consideration, the Implementation Committee recommends that the Executive Body adopt the following decision:

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

- (a) *Recalls* its decisions 2002/6, 2003/5, 2004/7, 2005/4, 2006/5 and 2007/3;
- (b) *Notes* the report provided by the Implementation Committee on the follow-up to

decision 2007/3 on compliance by Greece with its obligations under the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides, based on the information provided by Greece in April and July 2008 (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 7–12), and in particular its conclusion that the information provided by Greece did not meet the requirements of decision 2005/4, as reiterated in decision 2007/3;

(c) *Expresses its increasing disappointment* at the continuing failure of Greece to fulfil its obligation to adopt and implement effective measures to control and/or reduce its national annual emissions so that these do not exceed its emissions in 1987, and at its continuing non-compliance since 1998 with the emission reduction obligation under article 2.1 of the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides;

(d) *Notes with concern* that Greece has not provided the Implementation Committee with information meeting the requirements of paragraph 6 of decision 2005/4, as reiterated in paragraph 7 of decision 2007/3;

(e) *Once again strongly urges* Greece to fulfil its obligation under article 2.1 of the Protocol as soon as possible, and to adopt and effectively implement the measures necessary to achieve compliance with its obligations;

(f) *Reiterates its requests* to Greece as articulated in paragraphs 6 and 8 of its decision 2005/4, namely to provide the Implementation Committee, through the secretariat, by 31 March of each year until compliance is achieved, with a report describing the progress it has made towards achieving compliance and listing the specific measures taken and scheduled, including the measures referred to in paragraph 5 of decision 2005/4, to fulfil its emission reduction obligations under the Protocol, setting out a timetable containing annual steps for the achievement of these measures and indicating the projected effects of each of these measures on its nitrogen oxide emissions per year up to and including the year of predicted compliance and, until such time as it achieves compliance, to make a presentation containing this information to the next annual session of the Executive Body, in any year in which it fails to provide that information to the Implementation Committee in time for its second meeting of the year;

(g) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review Greece's progress and timetable, and to report to the Executive Body thereon at its twenty-seventh session.

3. Follow-up to decision 2007/4 on compliance by Spain with the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides (ref. 4/02)

Background

13. In its decision 2007/4, the Executive Body requested the Implementation Committee to review Spain's progress and timetable for achieving compliance with its obligations with article 2.1 of the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides. The secretariat informed the Committee that it had sent a letter on 8 February 2008 to Spain's Ambassador in Geneva, drawing his attention to the decision. After a second reminder in April 2008, it had received a written progress report from Spain in May 2008 in response to the decision.

Consideration

14. The Implementation Committee was grateful to Spain for its written response, although it was submitted more than a month late. The Committee carefully considered the information contained in Spain's report on its efforts to reduce NO_x emissions, which was a brief update of the report submitted in 2007. The Committee noted that, despite the fact that Spain has already been in non-compliance for 14 years, the country currently does not expect to achieve compliance before 2017, even with the application of additional measures and policies. In considering the information on implemented and planned policies and measures mentioned in the report, the Committee regretted that the effects of these measures were still not quantified, as had been requested by the Executive Body. The Committee found that the 2008 report contained the same list of measures as presented in the 2007 report, without any estimates of projected effects of each of these measures. The Committee expressed deep concern over the serious and predicted long-lasting period of further non-compliance, and concluded that substantial additional measures are urgently required in order to reduce the expected period of non-compliance. The Committee noted with concern that Spain repeatedly referred to the considerable economic, population and energy consumption growth in the period 1996–2006 as reasons for continuous and long-lasting non-compliance and emphasized that these factors do not in any way affect Spain's legal obligations to comply with the provisions of the Protocol.

15. Despite the request of the Executive Body, as articulated in paragraph 5 of decision 2007/4, to address the inconsistencies on emission data and projections contained in the written and oral reports in 2007, the Committee still noted inconsistencies in the information submitted by Spain in its 2008 report. For instance, (a) historic emission data shown in figures 1, 2 and 3 of both reports do not correspond to reported emission data, which in effect eradicates the projected effects of reduction measures as the difference amounts to more than 100 kt, and (b) the updated report refers to a recalculated national inventory for the period 1990–2006, stating that the new

figures are 3 per cent lower than the previous inventory results, but this statement does not correspond with the 2007 reported emission data. In addition to these inconsistencies, some of the specific measures mentioned in the updated report are not quantified and those listed in table 3 of the report do not seem to be sufficient for the achievement of the target of 1091 kt in the near future. The Committee concluded that, considering these inconsistencies and the lack of adequate information referred to in paragraph 14 above, the requirements under paragraph 5 of decision 2005/6 still had not been met. It therefore requested the secretariat to remind Spain to make a presentation at the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body in 2008 in accordance with paragraphs 5 and 7 of that decision.

Recommendation to the Executive Body

16. On the basis of the above consideration, the Implementation Committee recommends that the Executive Body adopt the following decision:

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

- (a) *Recalls* its decisions 2002/8, 2003/7, 2004/9, 2005/6, 2006/6 and 2007/4;
- (b) *Notes* the report provided by the Implementation Committee on the follow-up to decision 2007/4 on compliance by Spain with its obligations under the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides, based on the information provided by Spain in May 2008, (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 13–16), and in particular its conclusion that the information provided by Spain did not meet the requirements under paragraph 5 of decision 2005/6;
- (c) *Reiterates its increasing disappointment* at the continuing failure of Spain to fulfil its obligations to adopt and implement effective measures to control and/or reduce its national annual emissions so that these do not exceed its emissions in 1987 and at its continuing non-compliance with the emission reduction obligations under article 2.1 of the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides since 1994;
- (d) *Notes with concern* that Spain has still not provided the Implementation Committee with information meeting the requirements of paragraph 5 of decision 2005/6 and as reiterated in paragraph 7 of decisions 2006/6 and 2007/4, namely to provide a report describing the progress it has made towards achieving compliance and listing the specific measures taken and scheduled to fulfil its emission reduction obligations under the Protocol; setting out a

timetable containing annual steps for the achievement of these measures; and indicating the projected effects of each of these measures on its emissions per year up to and including the year of predicted compliance;

(e) *Expresses its concern* that Spain does not seem to give sufficient attention to the matter of continuing and long-lasting non-compliance with its obligations under the Protocol;

(f) *Urges* Spain once again to address the inconsistencies identified by the Implementation Committee on emission data and projections contained in Spain's written and oral submissions;

(g) *Once again strongly urges* Spain to fulfil its obligation under article 2.1 of the Protocol as soon as possible, and to adopt and effectively implement the measures necessary to achieve compliance with its obligation;

(h) *Reiterates its requests* to Spain as articulated in paragraphs 5 and 7 of its decision 2005/6 and as reiterated in paragraph 7 of its decisions 2006/6 and 2007/4;

(i) *Requests* the Executive Secretary of UNECE to bring this serious matter of continuing and long-lasting non-compliance to the attention of Spain's Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of Environment;

and

[(j) *Requests* the Executive Secretary to present details of Spain's non-compliance in its annual report to the UNECE Committee on Environmental Policy and to prepare an information note detailing Spain's non-compliance, to send copies of it to each of the Parties to the Protocol and to publish it on the home page of the Convention and in the UNECE newsletter;]

and/or

[(k) *Requests* Spain to invite the Implementation Committee in accordance with paragraph 6 (b) of decision 2006/2, to conduct an in-depth review of Spain's compliance on the basis of decisions 2005/6, 2006/6 and 2007/4;]

and/or

[(l) *Decides* to caution Spain that stronger measures will be considered by the

Executive Body at its twenty-seventh meeting unless, by the time of its twenty-fourth meeting, the Implementation Committee is satisfied that significant progress has been made towards bringing Spain into compliance;]

(m) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review Spain's progress and timetable, and report to the Executive Body thereon at its twenty-seventh session.

4. Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/5 on compliance by Spain with the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds (ref. 6/02)

Background

17. In its decision 2007/5, the Executive Body requested the Implementation Committee to review Spain's progress and timetable for achieving compliance with article 2.2 (a) of the Protocol on VOCs. The secretariat informed the Committee that it had sent a letter on 8 February 2008 to Spain's Ambassador in Geneva, drawing his attention to the decision. After a second reminder in April 2008, it had received a written progress report from Spain in May 2008 in response to the decision.

Consideration

18. The Implementation Committee was grateful to Spain for its written response, although it was submitted more than a month late. The Committee carefully considered the information contained in Spain's report on its efforts to reduce VOCs emissions, which was a brief update of the report submitted in 2007. The Committee noted that, despite the fact that it has already been in non-compliance for nine years, Spain does not expect to achieve compliance before 2020, even with the application of additional policies and measures. It also noted that in revising its total emissions in the base year 1988 from 1510 kt to 999 kt, Spain is even further away from achieving compliance than reported earlier. The Committee further noted with great concern that according to Spain's last report the total emissions is expected to raise gradually after 2010, which makes the prediction of compliance by 2020 seem unlikely. In considering the information on implemented and planned policies and measures mentioned in the report, the Committee regretted that the effects of these measures were still not quantified, as requested by the Executive Body. The Committee found that the 2008 report contained the same list of measures as presented in the 2007 report, without any estimates of projected effects of each of these measures. The Committee expressed deep concern over the serious and predicted long-lasting period of further non-compliance, and concluded that substantial additional measures are urgently required in order to reduce the expected period of non-compliance. The Committee noted with concern that Spain repeatedly referred to the considerable economic, population and

energy consumption growth in the period 1996–2006 as reasons for continuous and long-lasting non-compliance and emphasized that these factors do not in any way affect Spain's legal obligations to comply with the provisions of the Protocol.

19. Despite the specific request of the Executive Body, as articulated in paragraph 5 of decision 2007/5, Spain still has not addressed the inconsistencies in emission data and projections contained in the written and oral submissions of 2007, as well as inconsistencies in the information submitted by Spain in the updated report of 2008. For instance, (a) historic emission data shown in figures 1, 2 and 3 of both reports do not correspond to reported emission data which in effect eradicates projected effects of reduction measures, and (b) the updated report refers to recalculated national inventory for 1990–2006 stating that new figures are 2.5 per cent lower than the previous inventory calculations, but this statement does not correspond with the 2007 reported emission data. In addition to these inconsistencies, some specific measures mentioned in the updated report are not quantified and those listed in table 3 of the report do not seem to be sufficient for the achievement of the target of 999 kt in the near future. The Committee concluded that considering these inconsistencies and the lack of information referred to in paragraph 18 above, the requirements of paragraph 6 of decision 2006/7 still had not been met. It therefore requested the secretariat to remind Spain to make a presentation at the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body in accordance with paragraphs 6 and 8 of that decision.

Recommendation to the Executive Body

20. On the basis of the above consideration, the Implementation Committee recommends that the Executive Body adopt the following decision:

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

- (a) *Recalls* its decisions 2003/8, 2004/10, 2005/7, 2006/7 and 2007/5;
- (b) *Notes* the report provided by the Implementation Committee on the follow-up to decision 2007/5 on compliance by Spain with its obligations under the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds, based on the information provided by Spain in May 2008 (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 17–20), and in particular its conclusion that the information provided by Spain did not meet the requirements under paragraph 6 of decision 2006/7;
- (c) *Reiterates its increasing disappointment* at the continuing failure of Spain to fulfil

its obligation to adopt and implement effective measures to reduce its national annual emissions by at least 30 per cent by the year 1999, using 1988 as its base year and its continuing non-compliance with the emission reduction obligations under article 2.2(a) of the Protocol since 1999;

(d) *Notes with concern* that Spain has still not provided the Implementation Committee with information meeting the requirements of paragraph 6 of decision 2006/7, as reiterated in paragraph 7 of its decision 2007/5, namely to provide a report describing the progress it has made towards achieving compliance and listing the specific measures taken and scheduled to fulfil its emission reduction obligations under the Protocol, setting out a timetable containing annual steps for the achievement of these measures and indicating the projected effects of each of these measures on its emissions per year up to and including the year of predicted compliance;

(e) *Expresses its concern* that Spain does not seem to give sufficient attention to the matter of continuing and long-lasting non-compliance with its obligations under the Protocol;

(f) *Urges* Spain once again to address the inconsistencies identified by the Committee on emission data and projections contained in Spain's written and verbal reports;

(g) *Strongly urges* Spain to fulfil its obligation under article 2.2 (a) of the Protocol as soon as possible, and to adopt and effectively implement the measures necessary to achieve compliance with its obligation;

(h) *Reiterates* its requests to Spain as articulated in paragraphs 6 and 8 of its decision 2006/7 and as reiterated in paragraph 7 of its decision 2007/5;

(i) Requests the Executive Secretary of UNECE to bring this serious matter of continuing and long-lasting non-compliance to the attention of Spain's Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of Environment;
and

[(j) *Requests* the Executive Secretary to present details of Spain's non-compliance in its annual report to the UNECE Committee on Environmental Policy, to prepare an information note detailing Spain's non-compliance, to send copies of it to each of the Parties to the Protocol and to publish it on the home page of the Convention and in the UNECE newsletter;]
and/or

[(k) Requests Spain to invite the Implementation Committee in accordance with paragraph 6 (b) of decision 2006/2, to conduct an in-depth review of Spain's compliance on the

basis of decisions 2006/7 and 2007/5;]

and/or

[(l) *Decides* to caution Spain that stronger measures will be considered by the Executive Body at its twenty-seventh meeting unless, by the time of its twenty-fourth meeting, the Implementation Committee is satisfied that significant progress has been made towards bringing Spain into compliance;]

(m) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review Spain's progress and timetable, and report to the Executive Body thereon at its twenty-seventh session.

5. Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/6 on compliance by Denmark with the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants⁴ (ref. 1/06)

Background

21. In its decision 2007/6, the Executive Body requested the Implementation Committee to review Denmark's progress and timetable for achieving compliance with article 3.5 (a) of the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). The secretariat informed the Committee that it had sent a letter on 8 February 2008 to Denmark's Ambassador in Geneva, drawing her attention to the decision. It had received a written submission from Denmark on 28 March 2008 in response to the decision. The secretariat further wrote to Denmark on 30 April requesting further information on issues raised by the Committee at its twenty-first meeting. It received a response on 20 May 2008. Both responses provided by Denmark had been circulated to the Committee.

Consideration

22. The Implementation Committee was grateful to Denmark for delivering its written submissions on time and carefully considered the information provided. The Committee noted that the latest officially submitted emission data showed that emissions of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in Denmark in 2006 had continued to increase. The Committee noted the explanation by Denmark that the increased emissions of PAHs resulted from the increased use of biomass for domestic heating, partly due to efforts to combat climate change.

⁴ 1998 Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

23. The Committee noted the new information Denmark had provided on adopting product standards for new wood-fired stoves and boilers in 2007 and on a national information campaign to improve the wood-burning habit of Danish residents as well as planned subsidies for scrapping the oldest existing stoves. It also recognized when viewing the latest information that the amount of wood-fired modern and new stoves and new boilers will gradually increase in Denmark, resulting in reductions in PAH emissions, and that PAH emissions from residential combustion are expected to start to slowly but continuously decrease from 2010.

24. While acknowledging the further technological measures and the informative programme to reduce PAH emissions from wood-burning, the Committee again raised its concern that compliance by Denmark with its obligation to reach the PAH emissions from their level in 1990 did not seem to be achievable in the near future. According to the submission from Denmark, compliance is expected several years before 2020, but the revised timetable will not be delivered until the end of 2009. Notwithstanding this, the Committee considered that Denmark should provide an interim revised timetable as soon as it is available, and at the latest by 31 March 2009.

Recommendation to the Executive Body

25. On the basis of the above consideration, the Implementation Committee recommends that the Executive Body adopt the following decision:

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2);

(a) *Recalls* its decision 2006/8 and 2007/6;

(b) *Notes* the report provided by the Implementation Committee on the follow-up to decision 2007/6 on Denmark's compliance with its obligation under article 3.5 (a) of the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants, based on the information provided by Denmark on 28 March and 20 May 2008 (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 21–25), and in particular its conclusion that Denmark had failed to comply with the emission reduction obligation with regard to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons;

(c) *Remains* concerned that, in spite of the efforts made, Denmark is still failing to fulfil its obligation to reduce the emissions of each of the substances listed in annex III of the Protocol from their level in 1990 by taking effective measures, as required by article 3.5 (a) of

the Protocol;

(d) *Expresses disappointment* that Denmark has once again indicated that it will not achieve compliance for many years;

(e) *Urges* Denmark once again to speed up implementation by considering whether there are any further additional measures that could be taken in order to shorten the period of expected non-compliance with its obligation under the Protocol;

(f) *Requests* Denmark to provide the Implementation Committee, through the secretariat, by 31 March 2009, with a report describing the progress made towards compliance, inter alia:

- (i) Setting out a revised timetable that also specifies the year by which Denmark expects to be in compliance;
- (ii) Listing specific measures referred to in paragraph e) to fulfil its emission reduction obligations under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants;
- (iii) Indicating the quantitative and projected effects of each of these measures on its polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons emissions up to and including the year of predicted compliance;
- (iv) Providing information on the application of best available techniques to reduce PAH emissions from residential combustion, taking into consideration annex V to the Protocol.

(g) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review Denmark's progress and timetable, and report to the Executive Body thereon at its twenty-seventh session.

B. Referrals by the secretariat

1. Referral by the secretariat concerning Cyprus's compliance with the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides (ref. 1/08)

Background

26. Acting under paragraph 5 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 1997/2, annex, as amended in 2001, ECE/EB.AIR/75, annex V), the secretariat made a referral to the Implementation Committee concerning Cyprus's compliance with paragraph 1 of article 2 of the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides. The Protocol entered into force for Cyprus on 1 December 2004. According to the latest submission of emission data received by the secretariat from Cyprus, NO_x emissions in Cyprus in 2006 were

17.56 kt, which is above the 16 kt that was reported for the year 1987. Reported emission levels for 2005 and 2004 were also above the 1987 level. The reported NO_x emissions (in kt) for 1987 and for the period 2004–2006 were as follows:

1987	2004	2005	2006
16	18.26	17.31	17.56

This information suggests that Cyprus is in non-compliance with its obligation under article 2.1 of the Protocol.

27. The secretariat informed Cyprus, for the Executive Body, in a letter dated 3 December 2007 addressed to its head of delegation for about the Executive Body's intention to refer the issue to the Implementation Committee unless Cyprus provided information to resolve the issue by showing that it was in fact in compliance with the Protocol. Cyprus submitted information by 4 March 2008 as requested. In a letter of 7 March, the secretariat had informed Cyprus about the referral of its case, indicating that the issue would be on the agenda of the twenty-first meeting of Implementation Committee. In accordance with Executive Body decision 2006/2, a representative of Cyprus (Mr. Chrysanthos Savvides) participated in the consideration by the Committee at its twenty-first meeting (Executive Body decision 2006/2, para. 8, ECE/EB.AIR/89, Add.1). The secretariat again wrote to Cyprus on 29 April 2008 requesting further clarification of issues raised by the Committee. It received a response on 20 May 2008. Both of the responses provided by Cyprus were circulated to the Committee.

Consideration

28. The Committee was grateful to Cyprus for its timely response and its oral presentation at the Committee's twenty-first meeting, as well as the additional information provided by Cyprus in May 2008. The Committee carefully considered the secretariat's referral and the information provided by Cyprus. The Committee noted that Cyprus had ratified the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides in 2004, committing to an emission target level of 16 kt, while a year later, in 2005, it had proposed a 2010 emission ceiling of 23 kt for the Gothenburg Protocol⁵. The Committee also noted that the Gothenburg Protocol does not supersede the obligations contained in the 1988 Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides, even though the emission ceiling in the Gothenburg Protocol is considerably higher.

29. The Committee took note of the envisaged measures presented by Cyprus but was of the

⁵ 1999 Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone.

view that they were partial and would not be sufficient to achieve of compliance with its obligation under the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides for several more years. It also noted that the majority of the emission reduction is attributed to the electric power plant sector as a result of the introduction of liquefied natural gas from 2012 onward (4.5 kt). Other measures in this sector that could be implemented in 2008 and 2009 were not sufficient (0.39 kt) to bring Cyprus into compliance sooner than previously indicated. Measures in the traffic sector were implemented in 2004 and are accounted for in national emission totals for 2006. Moreover, the report indicates an increase of emissions in this sector by 3 per cent as compared to 2006, as well as in the electric power generation sector (2.5 kt), as a result of the increased capacities by 2013. In the cement industry sector, no emission reductions are foreseen, as the improvements due to introduction of new technology are cancelled out by increased production. The Committee was therefore concerned to see that Cyprus did not expect to have reduced its emissions below the required baseline level until 2013, by which time it will have been in non-compliance for almost 10 years.

Recommendation to the Executive Body

30. Based on the above consideration, the Implementation Committee recommends to the Executive Body that it adopt the following decision:

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

(a) *Notes* the report provided by the Implementation Committee (EB.AIR/2008/2, paras. 26–30) concerning Cyprus's compliance with the requirements of paragraph 1 of article 2 of the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides the referral by the secretariat pursuant to paragraph 5 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee, and in particular the Committee's conclusion regarding Cyprus's failure to comply with the emission reduction obligation of the Protocol;

(b) *Expresses* its concern at the failure by Cyprus to fulfil its obligation to take effective measures to control and/or reduce its national annual emissions so that these do not exceed emissions in 1987, as required by paragraph 1 of article 2 of the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides;

(c) *Notes* with concern that Cyprus does not expect to achieve compliance until 2013;

(d) *Urges* Cyprus to fulfil its obligation under the Protocol as soon as possible;

(e) *Requests* Cyprus to provide to the Implementation Committee through the secretariat by 31 March 2009 a report providing the national emission totals for each of the emission sectors from 2004 onward as well as their projections until 2013, as well as describing the progress made towards compliance by setting out a timetable that specifies the year by which Cyprus expects to be in compliance, listing the specific measures taken or scheduled to fulfil its emission reduction obligations under the Protocol and setting out the projected effects of each of these measures on its emissions of nitrogen oxides up to and including the year of compliance;

(f) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review Cyprus's progress and timetable, and report to it thereon at its twenty-seventh session.

II. COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING OBLIGATIONS

A. Follow-up to Executive Body decisions 2007/7, 2007/8, 2007/9 and 2007/10

1. Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/7

31. In its decision 2007/7 the Executive Body noted with regret that the following eight Parties: Estonia, France, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, Portugal and the European Community were still not in compliance with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for 2006. It urged in particular these eight Parties to provide responses to the 2008 questionnaire without delay in order to comply with their reporting obligations. The secretariat informed the Committee that it had sent a letter to the above-mentioned Parties on 8 February 2008, drawing their attention to the Executive Body's decision and asking them to provide complete responses by 31 March 2008.

32. The secretariat reported that five of the above mentioned Parties had replied partially or fully to the 2008 questionnaire: Lithuania had provided responses to all questions and Estonia to all but one by 31 March 2008. Portugal had provided responses to some questions by 31 March and completed its response by 30 June 2008. France and Monaco had provided partial responses by 20 June 2008 (see table 8).

33. The secretariat informed the Committee that despite the letters and reminders sent by it, as of 30 June 2008 Greece, Latvia and the European Community had not yet provided any responses to the 2008 questionnaire.

34. The Committee expressed its concern that Greece, Latvia and the European Community

had not complied with the request in decision 2007/7 and thus remained in non-compliance with their obligation to report on strategies and policies for third consecutive year.

2. Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/8

35. In its decision 2007/8, the Executive Body expressed its regret that the following six Parties had still not reported final and complete emission data for the period up to 2005: Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Romania and the European Community. It also expressed its regret that the following five Parties had still not reported gridded data up to 2005 under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol⁶: Croatia, France, Greece, Luxembourg and the European Community. It urged these Parties to provide the missing annual and/or gridded data. The secretariat informed the Committee that it had sent a letter to the above-mentioned Parties on 8 February 2008, drawing their attention to the Executive Body's decision and asking them to provide the missing data to the EMEP⁷ Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections.

36. The secretariat reported that Croatia, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania and the European Community had provided some or all of the missing data as requested in decision 2007/8. France had informed the secretariat that it would not be in a position to submit the missing gridded data under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol before the end of 2008.

37. The Committee noted with regret that France, Greece, Luxembourg and Romania had not yet provided any of the missing data requested in Executive Body decision 2007/8 and thus remained in non-compliance with their emission reporting obligations.

3. Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/9

38. In its decision 2007/9, the Executive Body expressed its concern that Iceland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and Romania had not responded to the 2004 questionnaire on strategies and policies, and also had not responded to the request made in decisions 2005/8 and 2006/10 to reply to the 2006 questionnaire, and thus remained in non-compliance with their obligation to report on strategies and policies for four consecutive years. It urged the above four Parties to provide responses to the 2008 questionnaire without delay in order to comply with their reporting obligation. The secretariat informed the Committee that it had sent a letter to

⁶ 1994 Protocol on Further Reduction of Sulphur Emissions.

⁷ Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe.

these four Parties on 8 February 2008, drawing their attention to the Executive Body's decision and asking them to provide complete responses by 31 March 2008.

39. The secretariat reported that two of these Parties, Iceland and Romania, had replied to the 2008 questionnaire by the deadline of 31 March 2008, thus complying with the request made in decision 2007/9.

40. The secretariat informed the Committee that despite the letters and reminders sent by it, by 30 June 2008, Liechtenstein and Luxembourg had not yet complied with the request made in decision 2007/9.

41. The Committee was deeply concerned that Liechtenstein and Luxembourg had not complied with the request made in decision 2007/9 and thus remained in non-compliance with their obligation to report on strategies and policies for a fifth consecutive year.

4. Follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/10

42. In its decision 2007/10, the Executive Body expressed its concern that Liechtenstein was the only Party that had not reported emission data since 2002 and had thus remained in non-compliance with the obligation to report emission data for four consecutive years. It urged Liechtenstein to provide, as a matter of urgency, all the missing data up to 2005 under the six Protocols to which it is a Party. The secretariat informed the Committee that it had sent a letter to Liechtenstein on 8 February 2008, drawing its attention to the Executive Body's decision and asking them to provide the missing data to the EMEP Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections. It sent a further reminder to Liechtenstein on 11 June 2008. The secretariat informed the Committee that as of 2 July, Liechtenstein had not yet submitted any of the missing data.

43. The Committee was deeply concerned that Liechtenstein had not complied with the request in decision 2007/10 and thus remained in non-compliance with its emission data reporting obligations for a fifth consecutive year.

B. Compliance with emission data reporting obligations

44. As requested by the Executive Body in its workplan (item 1.2; ECE/EB.AIR/91/Add.2), as adopted by the Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session), the Committee evaluated compliance with the emission data reporting obligations under the seven Protocols in force. The evaluation covered the completeness and timeliness of reporting, but not its quality. It was based on the data reported to the secretariat up to 2 July 2008. (The legally binding deadline for the

Protocol on VOCs, the 1994 Sulphur Protocol, the Protocol on POPs⁸, the Protocol on Heavy Metals⁹ and the Gothenburg Protocol¹⁰, and the recommended deadline for the other Protocols was 15 February 2008.) Tables 1 to 7 give an overview of the emission data reported under the seven Protocols in force in 2006. The overview shows whether the data were reported for the base year, if applicable, and for the most recent years since the entry into force of the Protocols for individual Parties. The Committee also assessed for the first time compliance by Parties with their obligation to report gridded data for 2005 under the Protocol on POPs, the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol.

1. 1985 Sulphur Protocol¹¹: compliance with article 4, concerning reporting of annual emissions

45. Table 1 gives an overview of emission data reported by the Parties to the 1985 Sulphur Protocol and shows that reporting under the Protocol is not yet complete. Nineteen of the 22 Parties to which the obligation applied have submitted complete emission data for 2006 under the Protocol: Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland and Ukraine. No data had been received from Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and the Russian Federation. Liechtenstein was also missing data for 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 and Luxembourg for 2005.

46. In its tenth report (ECE/EB.AIR/2007/3, para. 33), the Committee concluded that, as of 25 July 2007, three Parties were not yet in compliance with their emission reporting obligations under article 4 of the 1985 Sulphur Protocol: Liechtenstein for 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005; and Italy and Luxembourg for 2005. Italy has since provided the missing data for 2005, but Liechtenstein and Luxembourg remained in non-compliance.

47. The Committee concluded that, as of 16 July 2008, the following three Parties were not in compliance with the emission data reporting obligations under article 4 of the 1985 Sulphur Protocol: Liechtenstein for the years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006; Luxembourg for 2005 and 2006; and the Russian Federation for 2006.

⁹ 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals.

¹¹ 1985 Protocol on the Reduction of Sulphur Emissions or their Transboundary Fluxes by at least 30 per cent.

2. Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides: compliance with article 8, concerning emission data reporting

48. Table 2 gives an overview of emission data reported by the Parties to the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides and shows that reporting under the Protocol is not yet complete. Twenty-eight of the 31 Parties to which the reporting obligation applied had submitted complete emission data for 2006 under that Protocol: Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United States and the European Community. No data were received from Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and the Russian Federation. Liechtenstein was also missing data for 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005; and Luxembourg for 2005.

49. In its tenth report (ECE/EB.AIR/2007/3, para. 10), the Implementation Committee concluded that, as of 25 July 2007, four Parties were not in compliance with their emission reporting obligations under article 8 of the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides: Liechtenstein for 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005; and Italy, Luxembourg and the European Community for 2005. Italy and the European Community had since submitted the missing data for 2005, but Liechtenstein and Luxembourg remained in non-compliance.

50. The Committee concluded that, as of 16 July 2008, the following three Parties were not in compliance with the emission data reporting obligations under article 8 of the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides: Liechtenstein for the years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006; Luxembourg for 2005 and 2006; and the Russian Federation for 2006.

3. Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds: compliance with article 8.1 concerning emission data reporting

51. Table 3 gives an overview of the emission data reported by the Parties to the Protocol on VOCs and shows that reporting under the Protocol is not yet complete. Sixteen of the 21 Parties to the Protocol submitted complete and final data for 2006 by 15 February 2008, the legally binding deadline (see Executive Body decision 2002/10): Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Monaco, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Three Parties submitted data after the deadline: the Netherlands on 19 February, Spain on 15 March 2008, and Italy on 29 April 2008. No data were received from Liechtenstein and Luxembourg. Liechtenstein was also missing data for 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 and Luxembourg for 2005.

52. In its tenth report (ECE/EB.AIR/2007/3, para. 39), the Committee concluded that, as of 25 July 2007, three Parties were not in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under article 8 of the Protocol on VOCs: Liechtenstein for the years 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005; and Italy and Luxembourg for 2005. Italy had since submitted the missing data for 2005. Liechtenstein and Luxembourg remained in non-compliance.

53. The Committee concluded that, as of 16 July 2008, the following two Parties were not in compliance with the emission data reporting obligations under article 8.1 of the Protocol on VOCs: Liechtenstein for the years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006; and Luxembourg for 2005 and 2006.

4. 1994 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with articles 5.1 (b) and 5.2 concerning emission data reporting

54. Table 4 gives an overview of the emission data reported by the Parties to the 1994 Sulphur Protocol and shows that reporting under the Protocol is not yet complete. Eighteen of the 26 Parties within the geographic scope of EMEP to which the obligation applied submitted emission data for 2006 under the Protocol by 15 February 2008, the legally binding deadline (see Executive Body decision 2002/10): Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Monaco, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Six Parties submitted data for 2006 after the legally binding deadline: Croatia and the Netherlands on 19 February 2008, Spain on 13 March 2008, Greece on 21 April, Italy on 29 April and the European Community on 10 May 2008. No data were received from Liechtenstein and Luxembourg. Liechtenstein was also missing data for 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005; and Luxembourg for 2005.

55. The Committee noted that one Party outside the geographic scope of EMEP (Canada) had also submitted data.

56. Twenty of the 24 Parties to which the obligation applied (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the European Community) submitted gridded data for 2005 by 16 July 2008. Four Parties (France, Greece, Italy and Luxembourg) have not yet submitted any gridded data for 2005. Three Parties (Greece, Luxembourg and the European Community) had not yet submitted gridded data for 2000. The Committee noted that gridded data were very important for modelling transboundary air pollution, and that it was therefore concerned to see that, six years after the deadline, these three Parties had still not provided the secretariat with this information.

57. In its tenth report (ECE/EB.AIR/2007/3, para. 43), the Committee concluded that, as of 25 July 2007, the following Parties were not in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol: Liechtenstein for 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005; Italy, Luxembourg and the European Community for 2005; Croatia, France and the Netherlands for gridded data for 2005; and Greece, Luxembourg and the European Community for gridded data for 2000 and 2005. Italy had since provided the missing annual data, but not the gridded data for 2005; Croatia and Netherlands had provided the missing gridded data for 2005; and the European Community had provided the missing annual and gridded data for 2005, but not the gridded data for 2000. France, Greece and Luxembourg had not provided any of the missing data.

58. The Committee concluded that, as of 16 July 2008, the following six Parties were not in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol: France and Italy for gridded data for 2005; Greece for gridded data for 2000 and 2005; the European Community for gridded data for 2000; Liechtenstein for 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006; and Luxembourg for 2005 and 2006, as well as for gridded data for 2000 and 2005.

5. Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants: compliance with article 9.1 (b) concerning emission data reporting

59. Table 5 gives an overview of the emission data reported by Parties to the Protocol on POPs and shows that reporting under the Protocol is not yet complete. Twenty of the 27 Parties within the geographic scope of EMEP to which the reporting obligation applied had submitted emission data for 2006 for all three of the reported POPs by 15 February 2008, the legally binding deadline (see Executive Body decision 2005/1): Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. The Netherlands reported on POPs on 19 February and the data from the Republic of Moldova was received on 6 March 2008. Italy submitted annual 2006 data for the three POPs on 29 April, the European Community on 10 May and Iceland on 26 June 2008. No data for 2006 were received from Liechtenstein and Luxembourg. Liechtenstein was also missing data for the base year, 2003, and for 2004 and 2005. Luxembourg was also missing data for 2004 and 2005. Romania was missing data for the base year and for 2004.

60. The Committee noted that one Party outside the geographic scope of EMEP (Canada) had also submitted data.

61. Nineteen of the 26 Parties to which the obligation applied (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands,

Norway, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the European Community) submitted gridded data for the three POPs for 2005 by 16 July 2008. Two Parties (Denmark and Estonia) submitted gridded data for 2005 for dioxins and PAHs, but not for hexachlorobenzene (HCB). Five Parties (France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg and the Republic of Moldova) have not yet submitted any gridded data for 2005.

62. In its tenth report (ECE/EB.AIR/2007/3, para. 46), the Committee concluded that, as of 25 July 2007, the following seven Parties were not in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under the Protocol on POPs: Iceland and the European Community for 2005, Italy for the base year and 2005; Lithuania for the base year; Luxembourg for 2004 and 2005; Romania for the base year and 2004; and Liechtenstein for the base year, 2003, 2004 and 2005. The European Community, Iceland, Italy and Lithuania had since provided the missing data. Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and Romania remained in non-compliance.

63. The Committee concluded that, as of 16 July 2008, the following nine Parties were not in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under the Protocol on POPs: France, Iceland, Italy and the Republic of Moldova for gridded data for 2005 for all three POPs; Denmark and Estonia for gridded data for 2005 for HCB; Liechtenstein for annual data for the base year, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006; Luxembourg for annual data for 2004, 2005, 2006 and gridded data for 2005; and Romania for annual data for the base year and 2004.

6. Protocol on Heavy Metals: compliance with article 7.1 (b) concerning emission data reporting

64. Table 6 gives an overview of emission data reported by the Parties to the Protocol on Heavy Metals and shows that reporting under the Protocol is not yet complete. Twenty-one of the 26 Parties within the geographic scope of EMEP to which the reporting obligation applied had submitted complete emission data for 2006 by 15 February 2008, the legally binding deadline (see Executive Body decision 2005/1): Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, Norway, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. The Netherlands submitted complete data for 2006 on 19 February 2008. Data from the Republic of Moldova was received on 6 March 2008, and from the European Community on 10 May 2008. No data were received from Liechtenstein and Luxembourg. Liechtenstein was also missing data for the base year, 2003, 2004 and 2005; and Luxembourg for 2004 and 2005. Romania was missing data for the base year, 2003 and 2004.

65. The Implementation Committee noted that the two Parties outside the geographic scope of EMEP (Canada and the United States) had also submitted data.

66. Twenty of the 24 Parties to which the obligation applied (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the European Community) submitted gridded data for heavy metals for 2005 by 16 July 2008. Four Parties (France, Luxembourg and Republic of Moldova) have not yet submitted any gridded data for 2005.

67. In its tenth report (ECE/EB.AIR/2007/3, para. 49), the Committee had concluded that, as of 25 July 2007, the following four Parties were not in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under the Protocol on Heavy Metals: Liechtenstein and the European Community for the base year, 2003, 2004 and 2005; Romania for the base year, 2003 and 2004; and Luxembourg for 2004 and 2005. The European Community had since provided the missing data. Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and Romania remained in non-compliance.

68. The Committee concluded that, as of 16 July 2008, the following five Parties were not in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under the Protocol on Heavy Metals: France and the Republic of Moldova for gridded data for 2005; Liechtenstein for annual data for the base year, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006; Luxembourg for annual data for 2004, 2005 and 2006 and gridded data for 2005; and Romania for annual data for the base year, 2003 and 2004.

**7. Gothenburg Protocol: compliance with article 7.1 (b)
concerning emission data reporting on sulphur, nitrogen oxides, ammonia and volatile
organic compounds**

69. Table 7 gives an overview of emission data reported by the Parties to the Gothenburg Protocol and shows that reporting under the Protocol is not yet complete. Sixteen of the 20 Parties within the geographic scope of EMEP to which the reporting obligation applied had submitted complete emission data for 2006 by 15 February 2007, the legally binding deadline (see Executive Body decision 2005/1): Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. The Netherlands had submitted complete data for 2006 on 19 February 2008, Spain on 15 March 2008 and the European Community on 10 May 2008. No data had been received from Luxembourg. Luxembourg was also missing data for 2005.

70. The Committee noted that one Party outside the geographic scope of EMEP (Canada) had also submitted data.

71. Nineteen of the 20 Parties to which the obligation applied (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal,

Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the European Community) had submitted gridded data for 2005 for the pollutants covered by the Gothenburg Protocol by 16 July 2008. One Party (Luxembourg) had not yet submitted any gridded data for 2005.

72. In its tenth report (ECE/EB.AIR/2007/3, para. 51), the Committee concluded that, as of 25 July 2007, the following two Parties were not in compliance with their emission data reporting obligations under the Gothenburg Protocol: Luxembourg and the European Community for 2005. The European Community had since submitted the missing data. Luxembourg remained in non-compliance.

73. The Committee concluded that, as of 16 July 2008, one Party was not in compliance with its emission data reporting obligations under the Gothenburg Protocol: Luxembourg for annual data for 2005 and 2006 and gridded data for 2005.

8. Conclusions

74. The Implementation Committee, taking into account its previous conclusions regarding Parties' reporting of their emission data¹², noted that there was continuing improvement in the completeness of emission data reported by Parties under the protocols, including the more recently-in-force Protocols on POPs and Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol, although timeliness in the reporting could still be improved. The Committee noted that only three Parties had not reported 2006 emission data under the Protocols to which they are Party (Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and the Russian Federation). Three Parties were still missing historical and base-year data under one or more of the Protocols to which they are Party (Liechtenstein for 2002-2005 under all the Protocols to which it is a Party; Luxembourg for 2004 and 2005 under all the Protocols to which it is a Party; and Romania for the base year and 2004 under the Protocols on POPs and Heavy Metals, as well as for 2003 under the Protocol on Heavy Metals). Eight Parties had not yet completed their reporting of gridded data for 2005 as required under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol, the Protocol on POPs, the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol, although the deadline was 1 March 2007 (Denmark, Estonia, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg and Republic of Moldova). Moreover, three Parties had not yet submitted gridded data for 2000 under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol six years after the deadline, 1 March 2002 (Greece, Luxembourg and the European Community).

¹² See EB.AIR/1998/4; EB.AIR/1999/4, para. 28; EB.AIR/2000/2, para. 21; EB.AIR/2001/3, para. 41; EB.AIR/2002/2/Add.1, para. 18; EB.AIR/2003/1/Add.1, para.17; EB.AIR/2004/6/Add.1, para. 19; EB.AIR/2005/3/Add.1, para. 27; EB.AIR/2006/3/Add.1, para. 25; and ECE/EB.AIR/2007/3, para. 52.

C. Compliance by Parties with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for air pollution abatement

75. As requested by the Executive Body in its workplan (item 1.2; ECE/EB.AIR/91/Add.2, as adopted by the Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session), the Implementation Committee evaluated compliance with the reporting obligations under the seven Protocols in force relating to strategies and policies, including technology-related reporting obligations. This evaluation was made on the basis of the replies by Parties to the 2008 questionnaire on strategies and policies, which have been made available on the Internet. Table 8 below provides an overview of reporting up to 30 June 2008 by Parties to the Protocols that are in force. No Party provided the information required under the Protocols outside the framework of the questionnaire.

76. It should be noted that, as in previous years, the Committee only considered timeliness and completeness of Parties' replies to the most recent questionnaire, not the quality or the adequacy of the answers.

1. 1985 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with article 6 concerning reporting on national programmes, policies and strategies

77. Twenty of the 23 Parties to the 1985 Sulphur Protocol replied to the section of the questionnaire relating to the Protocol (question 1). Cyprus, Slovenia and the United Kingdom also replied to this section, although they are not Parties to the Protocol. Three Parties (Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and the Russian Federation) did not reply to the questionnaire and therefore may not be in compliance with their reporting obligations under article 6 of the 1985 Sulphur Protocol.

2. Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides: compliance with article 8.1 (a)–(f) concerning information exchange and annual reporting

78. Twenty-seven of the 32 current Parties to the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides replied to all the questions in the section relating to the Protocol (questions 2–6). Five Parties (Greece, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Russian Federation and the European Community) did not reply to the questionnaire. Five Parties therefore may not be in compliance with their reporting obligations under article 8 of this Protocol.

79. It should be noted that Croatia replied to all the questions in this section on 15 April, although it ratified the Protocol on 3 March 2008.

3. Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds: compliance with articles 8.1 and 8.2 concerning information exchange and annual reporting

80. Nineteen of the 23 current Parties to the Protocol on VOCs replied to all questions in the section relating to this Protocol (questions 7–12). Canada, Cyprus, Slovakia and Ukraine also replied to questions in this section, although they are not Parties to the Protocol. Two Parties did not reply to all questions: Estonia to question 10 and Italy to question 9. Two Parties (Liechtenstein and Luxembourg) did not reply to the questionnaire. Four Parties therefore may not be in compliance with their reporting obligations under the Protocol.

81. It should be noted that Croatia replied to all the questions in this section on 15 April, although it ratified the Protocol on 3 March 2008.

4. 1994 Sulphur Protocol: compliance with articles 5.1 (a) and 5.1(c) concerning reporting

82. Twenty-two of the 27 Parties to the 1994 Sulphur Protocol, to which the obligation applied, replied to all questions in the section relating to this Protocol (questions 13–17). One Party (Monaco) did not reply to question 13. Four Parties (Greece, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and the European Community) did not reply to the questionnaire. Five Parties therefore may not be in compliance with their reporting obligations under the Protocol.

5. Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants: compliance with article 9.1 (a) concerning reporting

83. Twenty-three of the 29 Parties to the Protocol on POPs replied to all the mandatory questions in the section relating to this Protocol (questions 18–31). One Party did not reply to all mandatory questions: France to questions 23, 24 and 31. Five Parties (Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Republic of Moldova and the European Community) did not reply to the questionnaire. Six Parties therefore may not be in compliance with their reporting obligations under the Protocol.

6. Protocol on Heavy Metals: compliance with article 7.1 (a) concerning reporting

84. Twenty-three of the 29 Parties to the Protocol on Heavy Metals, to which the obligation applied, replied to all mandatory questions in the section relating to this Protocol (questions 32–38). Iceland and Ukraine also replied to questions in this section, although they are not Parties to the Protocol. One Party (Monaco) did not reply to questions 32, 33 and 34. Five

Parties (Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Republic of Moldova and the European Community) did not reply to the questionnaire. Six Parties therefore may not be in compliance with their reporting obligations under the Protocol.

7. Gothenburg Protocol: compliance with article 7.1 (a) concerning reporting

85. Twenty of the 24 Parties to the Gothenburg Protocol replied to all questions in the section relating to this Protocol (questions 39–66). Canada, Cyprus and Iceland also provided replies to questions in this section, although they are not Parties to the Protocol. One Party (France) did not reply to questions 60 to 66. Three Parties (Latvia, Luxembourg and the European Community) did not reply to the questionnaire. Four Parties therefore may not be in compliance with their reporting obligations under the Protocol.

8. Conclusions

86. Eleven Parties were, as of 30 June 2008, not in compliance with all their reporting obligations under the seven Protocols, based on the evaluation of their replies to the 2008 questionnaire on strategies and policies:

- (a) 1985 Sulphur Protocol: Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and the Russian Federation;
- (b) Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides: Greece, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Russian Federation and the European Community;
- (c) Protocol on VOCs: Estonia, Italy, Liechtenstein and Luxembourg;
- (d) 1994 Sulphur Protocol: Greece, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco and the European Community;
- (e) Protocol on POPs: France, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Republic of Moldova and the European Community;
- (f) Protocol on Heavy Metals: Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Republic of Moldova, Monaco and the European Community;
- (g) Gothenburg Protocol: France, Latvia, Luxembourg and the European Community.

D. Recommendations to the Executive Body

87. In view of the fact that certain Parties have not complied with their reporting obligations, the Committee recommends that the Executive Body adopt the following decisions:

1. Compliance by Liechtenstein with its obligations to report on emissions

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

(a) *Recalls* its decision 2007/10;

(b) *Takes note* of the eleventh report of the Implementation Committee with respect to compliance by Parties with their emission data reporting obligations under the Protocols, identified on the basis of information provided by EMEP (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 44-70 and tables 1-7);

(c) *Remains concerned* that Liechtenstein has still not provided any of the missing data for the years up to 2005, despite the request in decision 2007/10;

(d) *Regrets* that Liechtenstein has not reported emission data for 2006 either;

(e) *Reiterates* its concern that Liechtenstein is the only Party that has not reported emission data since 2002 and has thus remained in non-compliance for five consecutive years;

(f) *Urges* Liechtenstein to provide, as a matter of urgency, all the missing data for 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006 under the 1985 Sulphur Protocol, the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides, the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds and the 1994 Sulphur Protocol; and data for the base year, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006 under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Protocol on Heavy Metals;

(g) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review the progress made by the Liechtenstein with regard to its emission reporting obligations and to report thereon at its twenty-seventh session;

(h) *Decides* to caution Liechtenstein that stronger measures will be considered by the Executive Body at its twenty-seventh session, unless Liechtenstein has provided the missing data by 15 February 2009.

2. Compliance by Luxembourg with its obligations to report on emissions

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

(a) *Recalls* its decision 2007/8;

(b) *Takes note* of the eleventh report of the Implementation Committee with respect to compliance by Parties with their emission data reporting obligations under the Protocols, identified on the basis of information provided by EMEP (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 44-70 and tables 1-7);

(c) *Notes* with concern that Luxembourg has still not provided any of the missing data for the years up to 2005, despite the request in decision 2007/8;

(d) *Regrets* that Luxembourg has not reported emission data for 2006 either;

(e) *Urges* Luxembourg to provide, as a matter of urgency, all missing data for 2005 and 2006 under the 1985 Sulphur Protocol, the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides and the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds; data for 2005 and 2006 and gridded data for 2000 and 2005 under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol; data for 2004, 2005 and 2006 and gridded data for 2005 under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Protocol on Heavy Metals, as well as data for 2005 and 2006 and gridded data for 2005 under the Gothenburg Protocol;

(f) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review the progress made by the Luxembourg with regard to its emission reporting obligations and to report thereon at its twenty-seventh session.

3. Compliance by Greece, Romania and the European Community with their obligations to report on emissions

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

(a) *Recalls* its decision 2007/8;

(b) *Takes note* of the eleventh report of the Implementation Committee with respect to compliance by Parties with their emission data reporting obligations under the Protocols, identified on the basis of information provided by EMEP (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 44–70 and tables 1–7);

(c) *Notes* that the European Community has provided the missing data requested in decision 2007/8, except for gridded data for 2000 under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol;

(d) *Regrets* that Greece and Romania have still not provided the missing data up to 2005, as requested in decision 2007/8;

(e) *Urges*:

(i) Greece to provide the missing gridded data for 2000 and 2005 under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol;

(ii) Romania to provide its missing data for the base year and 2004 under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants;

(iii) The European Community to provide its missing gridded data for 2000 under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol.

(f) *Reminds* all Parties of the importance not only of complying fully with their obligations to report emission data under the Protocols, including (where applicable) in accordance with any legally binding deadlines and formats, but also of submitting their final and complete data on time to ensure the efficient operation of the Convention;

(g) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review the progress made by the above-mentioned Parties with regard to their emission reporting obligations and to report thereon at its twenty-seventh session.

4. Compliance by certain Parties with their obligations to report on emissions

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

(a) *Takes note* of the eleventh report of the Implementation Committee with respect to compliance by Parties with their emission data reporting obligations under the Protocols, identified on the basis of information provided by EMEP (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 44–70 and tables 1–7);

(b) *Regrets* that the Russian Federation has still not reported final and complete emission data for 2006;

(c) *Also regrets* that Denmark, Estonia, France, Iceland, Italy and the Republic of Moldova have still not reported gridded data for 2005 under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol, the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Protocol on Heavy Metals;

(d) *Urges*:

(i) Denmark to provide the missing gridded data for hexachlorobenzene for 2005 under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants;

(ii) Estonia to provide the missing gridded data for hexachlorobenzene for 2005 under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants;

(iii) France to provide the missing gridded data for 2005 under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol, the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Protocol on Heavy Metals;

(iv) Iceland to provide its missing gridded data for 2005 under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants;

(v) Italy to provide its missing gridded data for 2005 under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol and the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants,

(vi) The Republic of Moldova to provide its missing gridded data for 2005 under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Protocol on Heavy Metals;

(vii) The Russian Federation to provide the missing data for 2006 under the 1985 Sulphur Protocol and the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides;

(e) *Reminds* all Parties of the importance not only of complying fully with their obligations to report emission data under the Protocols, including (where applicable) in accordance with any legally binding deadlines and formats, but also of submitting their final and complete data on time to ensure the efficient operation of the Convention;

(f) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review the progress made by the above-mentioned Parties with regard to their emission reporting obligations and to report thereon at its twenty-seventh session.

5. Compliance by Liechtenstein and Luxembourg with their obligations to report on strategies and policies

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

(a) *Takes note* of the eleventh report of the Implementation Committee with respect to:

- (i) The follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/9 regarding compliance by Iceland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and Romania with their reporting requirements (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 38–41);
- (ii) Compliance by Parties with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for air pollution abatement (EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 71–82 and table 8);

(b) *Recalls* that its decision 2007/9 expressed its concern that Iceland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and Romania had not responded to the 2004 questionnaire on strategies and policies and did not respond to the request made in decisions 2005/8 and 2006/10 to reply to the 2006 questionnaire, and thus remained in non-compliance with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for fourth consecutive year, and that those Parties were called upon to provide responses to the 2008 questionnaire without delay in order to comply with their reporting obligations (ECE/EB.AIR/91/Add.1);

(c) *Notes with satisfaction* that Iceland and Romania provided complete replies to the 2008 questionnaire and have thus complied with their obligations to report on strategies and policies;

(d) *Notes with regret* that Liechtenstein and Luxembourg did not reply to the 2008 questionnaire and thus are not in compliance with their strategies and policies reporting obligations for 2008;

(e) *Expresses its concern* that Liechtenstein and Luxembourg remain in non-compliance with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for five consecutive years;

(f) *Urges* Liechtenstein and Luxembourg to provide responses to the 2008 questionnaire as a matter of urgency and in any case not later than 28 February, in order to comply with their reporting obligations;

(g) *Reminds* all Parties of the importance not only of complying fully with their obligations to report on their strategies and policies, as required under the protocols, but also of submitting their reports on time;

(h) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review the progress made by Liechtenstein and Luxembourg with regard to their reporting on strategies and policies and to report thereon at its twenty-seventh session;

(i) *Decides* to caution Liechtenstein and Luxembourg that stronger measures will be considered by the Executive Body at its twenty-seventh session, unless Liechtenstein and Luxembourg have complied with their obligations to report on strategies and policies by 28 February 2009.

6. Compliance by Greece, Latvia and the European Community with their obligations to report on strategies and policies

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

(a) *Takes note* of the eleventh report of the Implementation Committee with respect to:

(i) The follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/7 regarding compliance by certain Parties with their reporting requirements (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 31–34);

(ii) Compliance by Parties with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for air pollution abatement (EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 71–82 and table 8);

(b) *Recalls* that its decision 2007/7 noted that Greece, Latvia and the European Community were not in compliance with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for 2006, and that those Parties were called upon to provide responses to the 2008 questionnaire without delay to comply with their reporting obligations (ECE/EB.AIR/91/Add.1);

(c) *Notes with regret* that Greece, Latvia and the European Community did not reply to the 2008 questionnaire and thus are not in compliance with their strategies and policies reporting obligations for 2008;

(d) *Expresses its concern* that Greece, Latvia and the European Community remain in non-compliance with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for three consecutive years;

(e) *Urges* Greece, Latvia and the European Community to provide responses to the 2008 questionnaire without delay and not later than 28 February 2009, in order to comply with their reporting obligations;

(f) *Reminds* all Parties of the importance not only of complying fully with their obligations to report on their strategies and policies, as required under the protocols, but also of submitting their reports on time;

(g) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review the progress made by the above-mentioned Parties with regard to their reporting on strategies and policies and to report thereon at its twenty-seventh session.

7. Compliance by Estonia, France, Italy and Monaco with their obligations to report on strategies and policies

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

(a) *Takes note* of the eleventh report of the Implementation Committee with respect to:

(i) The follow-up to Executive Body decision 2007/7 regarding compliance by certain Parties with their reporting requirements (ECE/EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 31–34);

(ii) Compliance by Parties with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for air pollution abatement (EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 71–82 and table 8);

(b) *Recalls* that its decision 2007/7 noted that Estonia, France, Lithuania, Monaco and Portugal were not in compliance with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for 2006, and that those Parties were called upon to provide responses to the 2008 questionnaire without delay in order to comply with their reporting obligations (ECE/EB.AIR/91/Add.1);

(c) *Notes with satisfaction* that Lithuania and Portugal provided complete replies to the 2008 questionnaire and have thus complied with their obligations to report on strategies and policies;

(d) *Notes* that Estonia, France and Monaco provided replies to the 2008 questionnaire, but that these replies were not complete, and thus they have not yet fully complied with the request in decision 2007/7;

(e) *Also notes* that Italy has not yet completed its replies to the 2008 questionnaire;

(f) *Urges* :

(i) Estonia to complete its responses to the 2008 questionnaire relating to the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds without delay and not later than 28 February 2009, in order to comply with its reporting obligation;

(ii) France to complete its responses to the 2008 questionnaire relating to the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Gothenburg Protocol without delay and not later than 28 February 2009, in order to comply with its reporting obligations;

(iii) Italy to complete its responses to the 2008 questionnaire relating to the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds without delay and not later than 28 February, in order to comply with its reporting obligations;

(iv) Monaco to complete its responses to the 2008 questionnaire relating to the 1994 Sulphur Protocol and the Protocol on Heavy Metals not later than 28 February;

(g) *Reminds* all Parties of the importance not only of complying fully with their obligations to report on their strategies and policies, as required under the protocols, but also of submitting their reports on time;

(h) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review the progress made by the above-mentioned Parties with regard to their reporting on strategies and policies and to report thereon at its twenty-seventh session.

8. Compliance by the Republic of Moldova and the Russian Federation with their obligations to report on strategies and policies

The Executive Body,

Acting under paragraph 11 of the structure and functions of the Implementation Committee (Executive Body decision 2006/2),

(a) *Takes note* of the eleventh report of the Implementation Committee with respect to compliance by Parties with their obligations to report on strategies and policies for air pollution abatement (EB.AIR/2008/3, paras. 71–82 and table 8);

(b) *Notes with regret* that the Republic of Moldova and the Russian Federation did not reply to the 2008 questionnaire and thus are not in compliance with their strategies and policies reporting obligations for 2008;

(c) *Urges* the Republic of Moldova and the Russian Federation to provide responses to the 2008 questionnaire without delay and not later than 28 February 2009, in order to comply with their reporting obligations;

(d) *Reminds* all Parties of the importance not only of complying fully with their obligations to report on their strategies and policies, as required under the protocols, but also of submitting their reports on time;

(e) *Requests* the Implementation Committee to review the progress made by the above-mentioned Parties with regard to their reporting on strategies and policies and to report thereon at its twenty-seventh session.

III. IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE BY PARTIES WITH THE PROTOCOL ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS AND THE PROTOCOL ON HEAVY METALS

88. At its twenty-fifth session, the Executive Body requested the Implementation Committee to start in-depth reviews of compliance by Parties with their obligations under Protocol on POPs and the Protocol on Heavy Metals, with a view to completing them in 2009. To this end, the Committee reviewed and decided on the scope of the in-depth reviews of the two Protocols on the basis of draft tables summarizing the obligations for priority review for each of the Protocols. The tables also listed those provisions of the Protocol that were associated with each obligation, as well as the information sources on which the review would be based. The Committee also reviewed a first draft of the in-depth reviews prepared by a consultant and made a number of comments and suggestions for further work on these reviews.

IV. COOPERATION WITH OTHER BODIES UNDER AND OUTSIDE THE CONVENTION

89. In 2007, the Implementation Committee asked the secretariat to keep it informed of further developments in relation to improving the quality of the emission data reported by Parties. Accordingly, the secretariat informed the Committee about the reorganization of the emissions work under the Convention and the establishment of the new EMEP Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections.

90. The secretariat further informed the Committee about the planned stage-three in-depth review of emission inventories and projections that would provide it with succinct and concise information about the quality of the reported emission data for five Parties a year. The Committee welcomed the efforts made towards improving the quality of the emission data under the Convention, as well as the possibility of recommending Parties for inclusion in the stage 3 review in a given year. The Committee noted that this would be particularly helpful for Parties whose cases of non-compliance were being reviewed by it, and agreed that the inclusion of Spain among the countries to be reviewed in 2009, for example, would be particularly relevant. The Committee thanked the secretariat for the information, decided to discuss the issue further, and invited the secretariat to present a written paper for its twenty-third meeting further explaining the process and informing it about the discussions and the decisions by the Executive Body on this item, as well as to inform the Committee on the ways in which the reviews could assist the Committee in its work.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

91. The Implementation Committee continued its deliberations on possible stronger measures for application in cases of long-lasting non-compliance, as requested by the Executive Body (ECE/EB.AIR/91, para. 77). The Committee discussed some issues related to the possible use of stronger measures in cases of long-lasting non-compliance in relation to the submission on compliance by Greece with the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides (see report on agenda item 3 (b)). The Committee agreed to continue the discussions on stronger measures at its meetings in 2009, both in general and in relation to specific cases of non-compliance. The Committee further agreed that a document would be prepared by Ms. Hamilton for further discussion of these issues.

VI. FURTHER WORK

92. The Implementation Committee considered and approved its draft workplan for 2009 (see annex) and agreed to submit it to the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body.

93. The Committee tentatively scheduled its twenty-third meeting to be held from 28 to 30 April 2009, tentatively in Geneva, and its twenty-fourth meeting to be held from 22 to 24 September 2009 in Geneva.

Table 1. Emissions reported by Parties to the 1985 Sulphur Protocol

Party	Base year	Annual totals				
	1980	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Austria	X	X	X	X	X	X
Belarus	X	X	X	X	X	X
Belgium	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bulgaria	X	X	X	X	X	X
Canada	X	X	X	X	X	X
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X	X	X
Denmark	X	X	X	X	X	X
Estonia	X	X	X	X	X	X
Finland	X	X	X	X	X	X
France	X	X	X	X	X	X
Germany	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hungary	X	X	X	X	X	X
Italy	X	X	X	X	X	X
Liechtenstein	X	-	-	-	-	-
Lithuania	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Luxembourg	X	X	X	X	-	-
Netherlands	X	X	X	X	X	X
Norway	X	X	X	X	X	X
Russian Federation	X	X	X	X	X	-
Slovakia	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sweden	X	X	X	X	X	X
Switzerland	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ukraine	X	X	X	X	X	X
Total (percentage)	100	95	95	95	91	86

*Notes:*X^T Data received on time (only for the current reporting round)

X Data received late (only for the current reporting round)

- No data received

n/a Not applicable

NA "Not Applicable" (notation key from the Emission Reporting Guidelines signifying that emissions are considered by the Party to never occur)

NE "Not Estimated" (notation key from the Emission Reporting Guidelines, signifying that emissions may occur, but have not been estimated in the submission. Parties are requested to give the reason emissions have not been estimated. (In the case of the European Community, EU-25 totals are difficult to estimate given the lack of information from individual States). Norway referred to "technical irregularities in introducing a new national database" and will forward these data in question when it becomes available and at the latest as part of the 2009 reporting round

Table 2. Emissions reported by Parties to the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides

Party	Base year	Annual totals				
	1990	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Austria	X	X	X	X	X	X
Belarus	X	X	X	X	X	X
Belgium	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bulgaria	X	X	X	X	X	X
Canada	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cyprus	X	n/a	n/a	X	X	X
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X	X	X
Denmark	X	X	X	X	X	X
Estonia	X	X	X	X	X	X
Finland	X	X	X	X	X	X
France	X	X	X	X	X	X
Germany	X	X	X	X	X	X
Greece	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hungary	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ireland	X	X	X	X	X	X
Italy	X	X	X	X	X	X
Liechtenstein	X	-	-	-	-	-
Lithuania	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X
Luxembourg	X	X	X	X	-	-
Netherlands	X	X	X	X	X	X
Norway	X	X	X	X	X	X
Russian Federation	X	X	X	X	X	-
Slovakia	X	X	X	X	X	X
Slovenia	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X
Spain	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sweden	X	X	X	X	X	X
Switzerland	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ukraine	X	X	X	X	X	X
United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X	X
United States	X	X	X	X	X	X
European CommunityC	X	X	X	X	X	X
Total (percentage)	100	96	96	97	94	90

*Notes:*X^T Data received on time (only for the current reporting round)

X Data received late (only for the current reporting round)

- No data received

n/a Not applicable

Table 3. Emissions reported by parties to the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds in accordance with Executive Body Decision 2002/10

Party	Annual totals / TOMAs ¹				
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Austria	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Belgium	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Bulgaria	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Denmark	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Estonia	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Finland	X	X	X	X	X ^T
France	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Germany	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Hungary	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Italy	X	X	X	X	X
Liechtenstein	-	-	-	-	-
Luxembourg	X	X	X	-	-
Monaco	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Netherlands	X	X	X	X	X
Norway	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Slovakia	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Spain	X	X	X	X	X
Sweden	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Switzerland	X	X	X	X	X ^T
United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X ^T
Total (percentage)	95	95	95	90	90

Notes:

¹ Reported according to the format in annex I and annex III, table III of the Emission Reporting Guidelines; see Executive Body decision 2002/10, para. B 2 (a). Gridded data reported according to Executive Body decision 2002/10, para. B 2 (c) will be shown each fifth year starting with 2005 data.

X^T Data received on time (only for the current reporting round)

X Data received late (only for the current reporting round)

- No data received

n/a Not applicable

Table 4. Emissions reported by parties to the 1994 Sulphur Protocol in accordance with Executive Body decision 2002/10

Party	Annual totals / SOMAs ¹					Gridded data for EMEP Parties ²	
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2000	2005
Austria	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
Belgium	X	X	X	X	X ^T	n/a	X
Bulgaria	n/a	n/a	X	X	X ^T	n/a	X
Canada*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Croatia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cyprus	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X ^T	n/a	X
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
Denmark	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
Finland	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
France	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	-
Germany	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
Greece	X	X	X	X	X	-	-
Hungary	X	X	X	X	X ^T	n/a	X
Ireland	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
Italy	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
Liechtenstein	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	n/a
Luxembourg	X	X	X	-	-	-	-
Monaco	X	X	X	X	X ^T	n/a	n/a
Netherlands	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Norway	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
Slovakia	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
Slovenia	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
Spain	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sweden	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
Switzerland	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X	X
European Community	X	X	X	X	X	-	X
Total (percentage)	96	96	96	92	92	85	83

*Notes:*X^T Data received on time (only for the current reporting round)

X Data received late (only for the current reporting round)

- No data received

n/a Not applicable

¹ Reported according to the format in annex I and annex III, table III of the Emission Reporting Guidelines; see Executive Body decision 2002/10, para. C.4² Reported according to the format of 50 x 50 km grid specified in annex V of the Emission Reporting Guidelines; see Executive Body decision 2002/10, para. A.1 (c). Gridded data only required on five-yearly basis, 2005 data submitted in 2007.

* Party outside the geographic scope of EMEP

Table 5. Emissions reported by Parties to the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants in accordance with Executive Body decision 2005/1

Party	Base year			Annual totals												Gridded data		
	1990			2003			2004			2005			2006			2005		
	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB
Austria (1987)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X
Belgium	X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X
Bulgaria	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X
Canada*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Croatia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cyprus	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X
Denmark ¹	X	X	NA	X	X	NA	X	X	NA	X	X	NA	X ^T	X ^T	NA ^T	X	X	-
Estonia (1995)	X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	-
Finland (1994)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X
France	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	-	-	-
Germany	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X
Hungary	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	-	-	-
Iceland	X	X	NE	X	X	NE	X	X	NE	X	X	NE	X	X	NE	-	-	-
Italy	X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
Latvia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	NA
Liechtenstein	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lithuania	X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	NA	X ^T	X ^T	NA ^T	X	X	NA
Luxembourg	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Norway	X	X	NE	X	X	X	X	X	NE	X	X	NE	NE ^T	NE ^T	NE ^T	NE	NE	NE
Republic of Moldova	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
Romania (1989)	-	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	-	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	NE	NE	NE
Slovakia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X

Party	Base year			Annual totals												Gridded data		
	1990			2003			2004			2005			2006			2005		
	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB	Dioxins	PAHs	HCB
Slovenia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X
Sweden	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	NE
Switzerland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	NA ^T	X	X	X
United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X
European Community	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	X	X	X
Total	93	93	93	95	95	95	88	88	88	93	93	93	93	93	93	81	81%	73%

Notes:

X^T Data received on time (only for the current reporting round)

X Data received late (only for the current reporting round)

- No data received

n/a Not applicable

NA "Not Applicable" (notation key from the Emission Reporting Guidelines signifying that emissions are considered by the Party to never occur)

NE "Not Estimated" (notation key from the Emission Reporting Guidelines signifying that emissions may occur, but have not been estimated in the submission. Parties are requested to give the reason emissions have not been estimated. (In the case of the EC, EU25 totals are difficult to estimate given the lack of information from individual States)

* Party outside the geographic scope of EMEP

¹ Denmark submitted a letter explaining that HCB inventory was not available

Table 6. Emissions reported by Parties to the Protocol on Heavy Metals in accordance with Executive Body decision 2005/1

Party	Base year	Annual totals				Gridded data
	1990	2003	2004	2005	2006	2005
Austria (1985)	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Belgium	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Bulgaria	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Canada*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Croatia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cyprus	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Denmark	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Estonia	X	n/a	n/a	X	X ^T	X
Finland	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
France	X	X	X	X	X ^T	-
Germany	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Hungary	X	n/a	X	X	X ^T	X
Latvia	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Liechtenstein	-	-	-	-	-	n/a
Lithuania	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Luxembourg	X	X	-	-	-	-
Monaco (1992)	X	X	X	X	X ^T	n/a
Netherlands	X	X	X	X	X	X
Norway	X	X	X	X	NE ^T	NE
Republic of Moldova	X	X	X	X	X	-
Romania (1989)	-	-	-	X	X ^T	NE
Slovakia	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Slovenia	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Sweden	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
Switzerland	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X
United Kingdom	X	n/a	X	X	X ^T	X
United States*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
European Community	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	X
Total (percentage)	92	91	88	92	92	88

*Notes:*X^T Data received on time (only for the current reporting round)

X Data received late (only for the current reporting round)

- No data received

n/a Not applicable

NA "Not Applicable" (notation key from the Emission Reporting Guidelines, signifying that emissions are considered by the Party to never occur).

NE "Not Estimated" (notation key from the Emission Reporting Guidelines signifying that emissions may occur, but have not been estimated in the submission. Parties are requested to give the reason emissions have not been estimated. (In the case of the European Community, EU-25 totals are difficult to estimate given the lack of information from individual States). Norway referred to "technical irregularities in introducing a new national database" and will forward these data in question when it becomes available and at the latest as part of the 2009 reporting round.

* Party outside the geographic scope of EMEP

Table 7. Emissions reported by Parties to Gothenburg Protocol in accordance with Executive Body decision 2005/1

Party	Base year				Annual totals								Gridded data			
	1990				2005				2006				2005			
	SO ₂	NO _x	VOCs	NH ₃	SO ₂	NO _x	VOCs	NH ₃	SO ₂	NO _x	VOCs	NH ₃	SO ₂	NO _x	VOCs	NH ₃
Bulgaria	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Denmark	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Finland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
France	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Germany	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Hungary	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Latvia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Lithuania	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Luxembourg	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Norway	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Portugal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Romania	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Slovakia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Slovenia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Spain	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sweden	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
Switzerland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X ^T	X	X	X	X
United States*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
European Community	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Total (percentage)	100	100	100	100	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95

Notes:

X^T Data received on time (only for the current reporting round)

X Data received late (only for the current reporting round)

- No data received

n/a Not applicable

NA "Not Applicable" (notation key from the Emission Reporting Guidelines signifying that emissions are considered by the Party to never occur).


NE "Not Estimated" (notation key from the Emission Reporting Guidelines signifying that emissions may occur, but have not been estimated in the submission. Parties must explain why emissions have not been estimated.

*Party outside the geographic scope of EMEP

Table 8. 2008 review on strategies and policies: responses received by Parties to the Protocols in force

Party Protocol	1985 Sulphur (Q.1)	1988 NOx (Q.2–6)	1991 VOCs (Q.7–12)	1994 Sulphur (Q.13–17)	1998 POPs (Q.18–31)	1998 Heavy Metals (Q.32–38)	1999 Gothenburg (Q. 39–66)
1. Austria	A	A	A	A	A	A	
2. Belarus	B	B					
3. Belgium	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
4. Bulgaria	A	B	B	A	B	B	B
5. Canada	A	A	R	A	A	A	R
6. Croatia		B	B	B	B	B	R
7. Cyprus	R	A	R	A	A	A	A
8. Czech Republic	A	A	A	A	A	A	B
9. Denmark	A	B	A	B	B	B	B
10. Estonia	A	A	C (q.10)		A	A	
11. Finland	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
12. France	B	B	B	B	C (q. 23, 24, 31)	B	C (q..60-66)
13. Germany	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
14. Greece		None		None			
15. Hungary	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
16. Iceland					A	R	R
17. Ireland		B		B			
18. Italy	A	A	C (q. 9)	B	B		
19. Latvia					None	None	None
20. Liechtenstein	None	None	None	None	None	None	
21. Lithuania	A	A	A	R	A	A	A
22. Luxembourg	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
23. Monaco			B	C (q. 13)		C (q. 32, 33, 34)	
24. Netherlands	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
25. Norway	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
26. Portugal							B
27. Republic of Moldova					None	None	
28. Romania					A	A	A
29. Russian Federation	None	None					
30. Slovakia	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
31. Slovenia	R	A	R	A	A	A	A
32. Spain		A	A	A			B
33. Sweden	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
34. Switzerland	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
35. Ukraine	A	A	R	R	R	R	R
36. United Kingdom	R	A	A	A	A	A	A
37. United States		A				B	A
38. European Community		None		None	None	None	None

Notes:

- A: Response to all questions related to the Protocol received by 1 April 2008.
- B: Response to all questions related to the Protocol received, but not by 1 April 2008.
- C (no...): Response to all questions related to the Protocol received, except those specified.
- None: No response received to any question regarding the Protocol.
- : Not applicable (not Party to the Protocol).
- R: Reply by a non-Party to the Protocol

Annex

DRAFT WORKPLAN FOR 2009

1.2 COMPLIANCE REVIEW

Description/objectives: Review of compliance by the Parties with their obligations under the Protocols to the Convention.

Main activities and time schedule: Any submission or referral made under paragraph 3 (b) of the Implementation Committee's functions will be dealt with as a priority, and the Committee may have to adjust its workplan and time schedule accordingly. In this regard, the Committee will continue to review the progress made by the Parties in response to decisions taken by the Executive Body based upon the Committee's recommendations, as well as the need for possible additional measures for dealing with non-compliance on a case-by-case basis. The Committee will also evaluate the reporting by the Parties on their emissions data and their strategies and policies, including the reporting on technology-related obligations. It will complete the in-depth review of compliance by the Parties with the 1998 Protocol on POPs and the 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals. The Committee will continue its dialogue with appropriate bodies and experts. It will also continue to consider, as appropriate, compliance issues related to obligations in the protocols that are not subject to specific reporting requirements, such as provisions dealing with research and monitoring. Furthermore:

(a) The twenty-third meeting of the Implementation Committee will tentatively be held from 28 to 30 April 2009 in Geneva;

(b) The twenty-fourth meeting of the Implementation Committee will tentatively be held from 22 to 24 September 2009 in Geneva;

(c) The twelfth report by the Implementation Committee will be submitted to the Executive Body at its twenty-seventh session.
