



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/92  
1 October 2008

Original: ENGLISH

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

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

Working Group on Strategies and Review

Forty-second session  
Geneva, 1–5 September 2008

**REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON STRATEGIES AND REVIEW  
ON ITS FORTY-SECOND SESSION**

CONTENTS<sup>1</sup>

	Paragraphs	Page
Introduction .....	1–4	3
I. Adoption of the agenda .....	5	3
II. Adoption of the report of the forty-first session.....	6–7	3
III. Preparatory work for the negotiation of a revised Gothenburg Protocol.....	8–34	4

---

<sup>1</sup> Sections I to XI of this document correspond to items 1–11 of the provisional agenda (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/91).

**CONTENTS (*continued*)**

	Paragraph	Page
IV. Options for revising the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants.....	35–42	11
V. Follow-up on the review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals .....	43–50	14
VI. Exchange of information and technology .....	51–62	16
VII. 2009 workplan.....	63–64	18
VIII. Outreach activities.....	65–66	19
IX. Election of officers .....	67	19
X. Other business .....	68–70	19
XI. Adoption of the decisions of the Working Group .....	71	20

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. The forty-second session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review was held from 1 to 5 September 2008 in Geneva.
2. The session was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom and the United States. The European Community was also represented.
3. The Coordination Centre for Effects, the Oil Companies European Organization for Environmental and Health Protection (EUROPA/CONCAWE), the World Chlorine Council, the International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), the European Environmental Bureau (EEB), the Union of the Electricity Industry (EURELECTRIC), the European Semiconductor Industry Association (SEMI), the Bromine Science and Environmental Forum (BSEF), the Chlorinated Paraffins Industry Association (CPIA), and the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) were represented.
4. The meeting was chaired by Mr. R. Ballaman (Switzerland).

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

5. The Working Group of Strategies and Review adopted the agenda of the meeting as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/91.

### **II. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE FORTY-FIRST SESSION**

6. The Working Group considered the report of its forty-first session as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/90.
7. The presidency of the European Union (EU) informed the meeting that the EU Member States were still considering whether to propose further amendments to the draft revised Emission Reporting Guidelines (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/1) at the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body with a view to strengthening the Guidelines' implementation. The Chair stressed the importance of adopting the draft revised Guidelines in 2008 to allow Parties to use them as a basis for reporting in 2009, as had been decided by the Working Group at its forty-first session,

and suggested focusing any possible further amendments on the draft Executive Body decision on emission data reporting under the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/90, annex).

### **III. PREPARATORY WORK FOR THE NEGOTIATION OF A REVISED GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL**

8. Mr. T. Johannessen, Chair of the Working Group on Effects, informed the session about the Working Group's consolidated report on air pollution effects and its executive summary (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2008/15), suggesting that continued monitoring was essential to addressing the sufficiency of emission abatement. He emphasized the new knowledge on the effects of nutrient nitrogen compiled within the Working Group, indicating that detrimental effects were observed at both low and high nitrogen deposition levels. He also noted that draft guidelines for reporting on the monitoring and modelling of air pollution effects (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2008/16) prepared to enhance the policy use of results from effects-oriented activities and to strengthen the participation to effects-oriented work.

9. Mr. J.-P. Hettelingh, Head of the Coordination Centre for Effects, described a Europe-wide map depicting the changes of species richness fraction, based on exceedance of empirical critical loads using experimental data, as an indicator on the regional loss of biodiversity. He also presented established knowledge on the relationship between nitrogen deposition, biodiversity and public health, e.g. via reduced crop growth, pollen and emergence of diseases. He proposed using the updated critical load data from 2008, including new data and receptor ecosystems, for the work on the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol.

10. The delegation of the Netherlands welcomed the work on the effects indicators and expressed its hope that it will be used in the work on integrated assessment modelling. The Dutch delegation also expressed its satisfaction with the preparation of the guidelines for reporting on the monitoring and modelling of air pollution effects.

11. Mr. J. Schneider, Chair of the EMEP<sup>1</sup> Steering Body, informed the session about progress made in the work under EMEP of relevance to the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol. He highlighted the results of latest emission reporting round and noted that the newly established Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections, fully operational since the beginning of the year, had effectively collected and reviewed Parties' emission inventories. He noted that 21 Parties had provided full time series (2000–2006) on particulate matter (PM) emissions, currently not part of the Gothenburg Protocol. Mr. Schneider also reported that EMEP had

---

<sup>1</sup> Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe.

started work on a new monitoring strategy, which built on experiences with the current strategy, and noted that the strategy would have a strong focus on PM. EMEP had also started revising its strategy for the period 2010–2019, taking into account the achievements of the previous strategy as well as considering possible changes in goals as well as policy and scientific issues.

12. Mr. M. Amann, Head of the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM), reported on progress on baseline scenario development, described in detail in CIAM report 2/2008, “Baseline emission projections for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol up to 2020”. Emissions and impacts were expected to decrease only in the EU without clear trends elsewhere. Further improvements were technically feasible. Further analysis would require agreed key assumptions, such as activity pathways, emission control legislation and policies on climate, agriculture, energy security and shipping.

13. Mr. R. Maas, Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, informed the session that the Task Force had requested Parties to update national emission projections by September but no updates were received yet. He noted the European Commission’s proposal on baseline scenarios and ambition levels for the EU region and encouraged non-EU countries to update data necessary for the revision work. He also noted that Parties might consider exploring further improvements for ozone exposure and eutrophication.

14. The delegation of Germany raised the issue of whether it would be more pertinent to stick to the timetable as contained in the annex to document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/13 or to wait for the formulation of the climate and energy policy in the EU, which was currently not reflected in the PRIMES model. It was indicated that there was no timetable set for the negotiations for the climate and energy policy in the EU. In view of this, it was necessary to adopt a scenario based on the PRIMES model as currently available, while adjusting it for those countries that are not part of PRIMES.

15. The delegation of France, speaking on behalf of the EU, noted that the timetable was too tight and some flexibility may need to be introduced. It would be good to adjust this timetable in order: (a) to take into account new developments in EU policies; (b) to allow the EECCA countries to provide more reliable data and to better assess their potential for measures; (c) to elaborate draft annexes taking into account the constraints that might be expressed by EECCA countries; and (d) to take into account the results of the work on hemispheric transport, critical loads, nitrogen, international shipping emissions. This would benefit the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol both in terms of input data quality and objectives.

16. The delegation of the Netherlands expressed its view that the latest scientific knowledge and latest critical loads data should be used in the scenario development and suggested that the

Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling should explore eutrophication and ozone for nature. With regard to the need for data from the EECCA countries, it was suggested that CIAM could undertake action with these countries on a bilateral basis. It was stressed that in EECCA and South-East European (SEE) countries the main difficulties with ratification and implementation of protocols were related to accepting and implementing the emission limit values for existing installations.

17. The delegation of Switzerland indicated that it would have difficulty coming up with revised data by September, and was in favour of postponing the deadline from September 2008 to the end of the year. It was also of the view that the most recent data available should be used to define the ambition level and that the most recent critical loads data would be used for the methodology for ecosystem effects.

18. Mr. Amann recalled that the steps leading to an agreed baseline scenario as a basis for negotiation of the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol. He stressed that the current projections were not consistent with the recent policy targets for climate, and that this needed to be corrected. The next step was to decide on the type of analysis to be carried out, such as whether optimization for the whole UNECE region, or part of it, would be needed, or whether another approach would need to be adopted. Only after the completion of these steps would it be appropriate to discuss target-setting and sensitivity analysis.

19. A number of delegations indicated that they were developing new sets of projections. Concerning international shipping emissions, Mr. Amann stressed that these were currently not part of the national emissions. The Working Group on Strategies and Review would have to decide whether the conclusions of the International Maritime Organization, when available, should be taken into account.

20. The delegation of the Russian Federation informed the Working Group that the work on the scenarios for the Russian Federation should be redone using more recent data obtained in the framework of the Swedish-Russian project. A pilot project for one district was starting in February 2009, and it was expected that calculations would be available for all districts by the end of May 2009.

21. The delegation of Belarus indicated that it had prepared a scenario but had encountered a number of problems, and stressed the importance of providing an algorithm for the preparation of scenarios. Analysis had shown that a number of technical measures had already been taken by Belarus and therefore no big emission could be assumed in the future. Belarus was also in favour of a more flexible approach for the timetable. It requested that the format for sending the

necessary data, together with the energy scenario be made available to EECCA countries, as soon as possible.

22. Mr. Amann underlined the importance of the bilateral cooperation between Sweden and Russia and suggested that similar types of bilateral cooperation should be undertaken to establish a reliable database for the Convention. The delegation of the Netherlands suggested that CIAM could take the initiative for such cooperation, through a letter from the secretariat, if necessary.

23. The delegation of Croatia informed the meeting that it had made projections for the transposition of the National Emissions Ceilings (NEC) Directive in the framework of a bilateral cooperation project with Belgium. It was expected that the data would be available at the end of October and could be used for the work under the Gothenburg Protocol.

24. The Working Group agreed that the baseline scenario to be established had to include national projections and to take into account the energy and climate scenarios up to 2020. This necessitated revision of the current scenarios. It agreed on 15 February 2009 as the deadline for submission of national data, the national energy projections and activity data. It requested those countries that might not be able to manage to meet this deadline to communicate their revised data to CIAM by the end of May 2009. It invited CIAM to present a consolidated baseline scenario in September 2009. The ambition levels could be considered by the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and the Working Group on Effects and a hypothesis for sensitivity analysis could be presented to the Working Group on Strategies and Review. It was also proposed that a tutorial session/workshop be organized on the GAINS model prior to the meeting of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling for the non-EU countries which were not familiar with it.

25. The Working Group discussed the issue of a possible decision at the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body negotiating a new Gothenburg Protocol and a new persistent organic pollutants/mercury protocol.

26. In a *tour de table*, most of the delegations of the EECCA and SEE countries expressed the view that they were in favour of new protocols, as they would give them the opportunity for more flexibility in implementation.

27. The delegation of the United States noted that the same objective could be achieved either through a new or an amended protocol. While it was open to both legal options, it stressed that a new protocol would lose all the members of the existing protocol, while with an amended one the existing parties would still be bound by the existing obligations and only have to ratify the amendments.

28. Several delegations expressed the view that the discussion of whether to opt for an amended or a new protocol should be postponed until the details of the proposal were put on the table.

29. The delegations of Canada and the United States made a joint statement on the status of their bilateral negotiations under the Canada-United States Air Quality Agreement, stressing their commitment to add a PM annex to the agreement, while actively developing and implementing emission reduction programmes to reduce fine particle concentrations.

30. Mr. J-G. Bartaire, Co-Chair of the Expert Group on Techno-economic issues, presented the results of the thirteenth meeting on techno-economic issues (Stockholm, April 2007; EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/14), as well as the main outcomes of the Expert Group's subgroup on emerging technologies for large combustion plants. He informed the Working Group about the division of labour, the contributions needed from experts outside the Expert Group, and the methodology and the provisional timetable agreed by the Expert Group for carrying out the preparatory work for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol and in particular the proposals for revised annexes IV, V, VI and VIII to the Protocol, a possible new annex on limit values for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) contents in products, as well as the revision to the guidance documents on sulphur, nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and VOCs (and adding PM).

31. Mr. M. Sutton, Co-Chair of the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen, presented the results of the Task Force's first meeting, which had drafted workplan items for the short and long term, with an emphasis on nitrogen budgets. He noted in particular that the choice of food diet had a considerable effect on the nitrogen cycle. He also confirmed the continuation of work of the former Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement. The Task Force would contribute to the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol, including updating annex IX on ammonia.

32. The delegation of the United Kingdom informed the Working Group about the preliminary conclusions of the Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Instruments' workshop on costs and benefits of the Gothenburg Protocol, held on 27 June 2008 in Gothenburg as part of the annual conference of the European Association of Environmental and Resource Economists. The workshop had aimed to explore the role of cost-benefit analysis for the Gothenburg Protocol and identify uncertainties and research needs in order to improve cost-benefit analyses and the implementation of international protocols such as the Gothenburg Protocol.

33. The Working Group on Strategies and Review discussed the draft plan for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/13), as amended by the secretariat to reflect



the comments and suggestions made at the forty-first session of the Working Group in April 2008, and suggested further amendments.

34. The Working Group:

(a) Welcomed the contributions made by the Working Group on Effects and EMEP as well as the Convention's task forces, expert groups and programme centres in the work for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol;

(b) Noted with appreciation the recent work under the Working Group on Effects, in particular the consolidated report on air pollution effects, the draft guidelines for reporting on the monitoring and modelling of air pollution effects, and the CCE work on the new biodiversity indicator on species richness. The Working Group recognized the importance of using the new 2008 critical loads data for work under the Convention;

(c) Took note of the current bilateral discussions between Canada and the United States on revising their Air Quality Agreement to include PM;

(d) Expressed its appreciation of the work of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and CIAM, and urged Parties to ensure that all necessary emission projections data were provided for integrated assessment modelling work;

(e) Welcomed the ongoing bilateral cooperation projects between individual EECCA and SEE countries and other Parties to the Convention, and invited Parties to continue and expand such initiatives;

(f) Invited the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling to organize a tutorial session on the GAINS model for EECCA and SEE countries back-to-back with a meeting of the Task Force, preferably in early 2009, in particular for those countries involved in bilateral cooperation projects;

(g) Invited the secretariat to send a letter to countries within the geographic scope of EMEP reminding them of the need to revise their energy projections, including climate change policy measures and national shipping emissions, and to submit them by 15 February 2009 under the regular emission reporting procedure, and in any case not later than 31 May, and also to present them to the meeting of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling in June 2009. The Working Group and also invited Parties that are not within the geographic scope of EMEP to submit appropriate emission projections;

(h) Invited CIAM and the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling to review these data on a country-by-country basis and establish a consolidated baseline scenario for the Working Group's consideration in September 2009;

(i) Agreed that a common baseline scenario should be compiled first before deciding on specific options for analysis, target-setting and sensitivity estimates, and also encouraged Parties outside the geographic scope of EMEP to submit comparable information;

(j) Noted the need to consider the needs for updating the workplan of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling in view of the above;

(k) Repeated its invitation to the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, in cooperation with the Working Group on Effects, to discuss and present the merits of the different options for target-setting for 2020 and aspirational non-binding targets for 2050, using the most recent critical loads and levels data, keeping in mind that the ambition level for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol should, as previously agreed by the Working Group, be defined according to the objective set out in article 2 of the Protocol (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/90, para. 49 (e));

(l) Invited the ad hoc group of legal experts to prepare an informal document clarifying the legal aspects of the options available for further work on revising the Gothenburg Protocol, as well as identifying the links between various protocols, and to make this available for the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body and the forty-third session of the Working Group in March 2009;

(m) Invited the secretariat and Bureau to prepare, in collaboration with additional experts as needed, and taking note of suggestions proposed by Parties, a working document exploring the options for revision of the Gothenburg Protocol including, inter alia, the addition of PM, and the introduction of flexibility to promote ratifications by EECCA and SEE countries, and to present this document to the forty-fourth session of the Working Group in April 2009;

(n) Welcomed the results of the first meeting of the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen and invited that Task Force to provide input for revision of annex IX to the Gothenburg Protocol as well as to update, where necessary, the Framework Code on Good Agricultural Practice, taking into consideration the guidance document on ammonia adopted by the Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session;

(o) Noted the conclusions of the thirteenth meeting of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues and welcomed its work related to large combustion plants, as well as the work to review the limit values for NO<sub>x</sub> emissions for stationary engines;

(p) Invited the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues to continue its work on the draft guidance document on a source category basis and technical annexes on sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs (including solvent contents in products), as well as to elaborate a new draft guidance document and technical annex on PM and the draft technical annex VIII in accordance the time schedule outlined in its report (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/14);

(q) Took note of the need for inputs from experts representing national administrations, industries, the Expert Group on PM and the Task Force on Heavy Metals for carrying out the work by the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, and invited Parties to ensure that such inputs are provided in a timely manner;

(r) Adopted the timetable in annex to document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/13 as amended, and invited the secretariat to submit a revised document to the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body.

#### **IV. OPTIONS FOR REVISING THE PROTOCOL ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS**

35. The Chair presented the draft working document on options for possible revision of the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/8), which he had prepared in collaboration with the Co-Chairs of the Task Force on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), Ms. C. Heathwood (Canada) and Mr. J. Sliggers (the Netherlands) and the secretariat at the request made by the Working Group at its forty-first session. The Chair drew attention to a mistake in the document on page 9, paragraph 6 (g), clarifying that the proposal on polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in question erroneously attributed to Canada should be deleted.

36. The Working Group discussed each of the draft proposals for amending annexes I to III to the Protocol contained in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/8 and invited the secretariat to prepare a revised document presenting all the draft proposals as they had been agreed by the Working Group at its forty-first and forty-second sessions for submission to the Executive Body at its twenty-sixth session.

37. The delegation of Canada noted that it opposed to the inclusion of petachlorobenzene (PeCB), polychlorinated naphthalene (PCN) and hexchlorobutadiene (HCBd) in annex III and

stressed that voluntary reporting of emissions for these substances should be encouraged through the Emission Reporting Guidelines.

38. The Chair of the ad hoc group of technical experts, Mr. C. Braams (the Netherlands), reported on the deliberations that the group had pursued in parallel to the plenary session on: (a) the proposed amendments to annexes IV and V to the Protocol; (b) proposals for best available technology (BAT) for new substances (PeCB, PCN and HCBD); and (c) reduction of emissions of POPs from waste treatment of electronic and electrical equipment, furniture and car interiors (see informal document 5). The Working Group commented on the proposals and invited the secretariat to present the report of the ad hoc group's meeting and the informal document on annexes IV and V, as amended by the Working Group, to the Executive Body at its twenty-sixth session.

39. The delegation of Canada suggested moving the more detailed BAT guidance from the annex V into a non-binding guidance document in order to facilitate regular updates of the technical information. The delegation of the Netherlands reminded the session that, in line with the procedure set out in article 14 to the Protocol, any amendments to the Protocols should be circulated to the Parties 90 days in advance. The delegation of France, speaking on behalf of the EU, underlined the importance of updating BAT on a regular basis, and proposed extending the mandate of the Task Force on POPs to cover this work.

40. Ms. Clare Hamilton (the United Kingdom), Chair of the ad hoc group of legal experts, presented a draft text for articles 14 and 16 of the Protocol on POPs (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/8, annex), which had been agreed by the members of the ad hoc group as requested by the Working Group at its forty-first session. The proposal covered three separate issues: (a) clarification that the time at which the number of Parties should be counted for the purpose of entry into force of amendments was the time of adoption of the amendment in question; (b) the introduction of an expedited amendment procedure for annexes I to IV, VI and VIII to the Protocol; and (c) preserving the ability of Parties to the Convention that were not yet Parties to the Protocol to choose on ratification of the Protocol, which of the two amendment procedures would apply to them, while ensuring that the current amendment procedure and the expedited amendment procedure functioned properly in parallel.

41. Furthermore, following discussions with those members of the ad hoc group present at the session, Ms. Hamilton advised the Working Group on two additional questions raised during the session, as follows:

(a) Concerning the choice of annex, Ms. Hamilton indicated that there were no legal requirements in the Protocol on POPs that set criteria for determining whether a substance

should be listed in annex I or in annex II. However, some guidance could be taken from article 3(1)(a), which provided that if a substance was listed in annex I, both production and use were banned other than in accordance with any ‘exemption’ explicitly provided in annex I; and article 3(1)(c), which provided that annex II should be used for substances the use of which was restricted. annex II did not cover production, which meant that substances listed in annex II could still be produced, but could only be used in accordance with the use restrictions set out in annex II. She noted that split listing was possible (i.e. listing in both annexes I and II), as had already been done for DDT<sup>2</sup>, where production was banned by virtue of listing in annex I; and use was restricted to those uses listed in annex II. She also noted that, at present, the “exemptions” in annex I that did not relate to countries with economies in transition were all time-limited. There was, however, no legal requirement for such time limitations to be included when a permitted use was listed in annex I.

(b) Regarding the application of environmentally sound management to substances listed in annex II, Ms. Hamilton noted that article 3(1)(b)(i)–(iii) set the conditions for the destruction, disposal and transboundary movement of substances listed in annex I, and provided that Parties: (a) “shall take effective measures” to ensure that the destruction and disposal was undertaken in an environmentally sound manner; (b) endeavour to ensure that disposal takes place domestically; and (c) ensure that transboundary movement took place in an environmentally sound manner. Article 3(3) similarly provided that each Party “shall take appropriate measures” to ensure that substances listed in annexes I, II and III, on becoming waste (either in themselves or in products), were destroyed or disposed of in an environmentally sound manner. There were, however, no requirements for environmentally sound management in respect of transboundary movement of substances listed in annexes II or III; nor was there any requirement for Parties to endeavour to dispose of substances listed in annexes II or III domestically.

#### 42. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the working document on options for revising the Protocol on POPs (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/8) and invited the secretariat to prepare a revised document, reflecting the outcomes of the discussions at its forty-second session, for submission to the Executive Body at its twenty-sixth session;

(b) Approved the possible amendments prepared by an ad hoc group of legal experts to the expedited procedure for amending the Protocol, as contained in articles 14 and 16 of the

---

<sup>2</sup> Dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane.

Protocol on POPs, (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/8, annex) and agreed to forward them to the Executive Body at its twenty-sixth session;

(c) Took note of the discussions by the ad hoc group of technical experts on possible amendments to annex IV and on those related to existing substances in annex V, as well as additional possible amendments proposed by delegates, and agreed to forward these proposals to the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body;

## **V. FOLLOW-UP ON THE REVIEW OF THE PROTOCOL ON HEAVY METALS**

43. Ms. K. Kraus (Germany), Chair of the Task Force on Heavy Metals, presented the results of the fifth meeting of that Task Force (4-6 June 2008, London) as well as the conclusions from the workshop to promote the ratification of the Protocol on Heavy Metals across the entire UNECE region (Yerevan, 14-16 May 2008; ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/8 and annex). She stressed that the Task Force considered that it had finalized the technical work on options for updating BAT. She drew attention to the recommendations made for better addressing the specific needs of EECCA and SEE countries and for promoting the ratification and implementation of the Protocol. She mentioned that the presentations made at the Yerevan workshop were available on the Task Force's website, and that the proceedings would be published by the end of year. Ms. Kraus invited delegations to consider contributing to the financing of a second workshop that the Task Force was planning to organize in an EECCA country, possibly in collaboration with the Expert Group of Techno-economic Issues and tentatively focusing on monitoring and reporting issues.

44. Mr. Johannessen drew attention to the importance of focusing on effects monitoring in addition to air quality monitoring and invited the Task Force to consider this in its future work.

45. The delegation of Armenia thanked Germany for having provided the funds for the Yerevan workshop in and for having organized it as part of the activities of the Task Force on Heavy Metals. The Armenian delegation also expressed its gratitude for the bilateral project between Armenia and Germany that was being considered as a follow-up activity to assist Armenian experts in implementing and ratifying the Protocol.

46. The delegation of Belarus stressed that the recommendations from the workshop were jointly developed by the EECCA countries themselves, and that it hoped that these could be taken into account within the possible future revision of the protocols, in particular as regards the application of regulations on existing equipment for which the countries would require longer deadlines. Belarus considered the workshop to have been extremely useful, and expressed a wish

for the organization of similar workshops in the future as well as for receiving assistance to prepare national action plans for the implementation of the protocols.

47. The delegation of France, on behalf of the EU, welcomed the conclusions of the workshop and supported further organization of workshops. The EU also supported the options proposed by the Task Force, as outlined in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/8. It favoured updating of BAT for all sources, as well as updating of the source categories included in the Protocol. France considered that, in the light of the work undertaken by the Task Force, revisions of the Protocol on Heavy Metals could be prepared with the aims of: (a) increasing flexibility so as to ease ratifications; and (b) updating BAT, taking account of the impact on annexes to other protocols, including revision of the Gothenburg Protocol.

48. The delegation of the Netherlands underlined that the conclusions reached at the workshop regarding the Protocol on Heavy Metals applied as well to the other protocols to the Convention, and should be made use of within their possible future revision. It also made an offer that the Dutch contributions already made to the Trust Fund could be used for the organization of an additional workshop.

49. The delegation of the United States welcomed the outcomes of the workshop, recommending that the Task Force on Heavy Metals focus its future work on promoting the implementation of the existing regulations through organizing further technical workshops, which it perceived as a more efficient way of achieving emission reduction than amending the protocols. Furthermore, it expressed its view that if amendments were made to the protocols in the future, they should focus on increasing the flexibility for EECCA.

50. The Working Group on Strategies and Review:

(a) Thanked Germany and Armenia for organizing the workshop to promote the ratification of the Protocol on Heavy Metals across the entire UNECE region (Yerevan 14–16 May 2008) and welcomed the proposal of the Task Force on Heavy Metals to hold, possibly in collaboration with the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, another workshop in the EECCA region in 2009. The Working Group urged delegations to explore opportunities to contribute to the financing of this workshop through, inter alia, providing funds to the Convention's trust fund;

(b) Welcomed and took note of the conclusions and recommendations from the Yerevan workshop regarding problems encountered and possible solutions for increasing ratification of the Protocol on Heavy Metals by countries in EECCA and SEE, and

acknowledged the relevancy of the conclusions and recommendations for the implementation of the EECCA Action Plan;

(c) Noted the possible options for relaxing the basic obligations of the Protocol on Heavy Metals to promote its ratification as put forward by the Task Force on Heavy Metals (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/9, para. 8 (a)–(c)) and agreed to forward the report of the Task Force to the Executive Body at its twenty-sixth session;

(d) Recognized the possibilities for increasing ratifications of the protocols to the Convention, for example, through adding flexibility regarding the timescales for implementation, as well as through providing bilateral support and capacity-building activities for countries in EECCA and SEE;

(e) Took note of the possible technical options for updating BAT in line with state-of-the-art technologies for the reduction of emissions from heavy metals listed in annex III of the Protocol as well as potential implications of these updates for other annexes proposed by the Task Force on Heavy Metals (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/9, para. 10 (a)–(b)) and decided to forward the report of the Task Force to the Executive Body at its twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body.

## **VI. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY**

51. The secretariat introduced document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/11, presenting the progress in the implementation of the revised action plan for EECCA countries, adopted by the Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session.

52. Mr. B. Libert, Regional Advisor, Environment, Housing and Land Management Division, UNECE, summarized the results of the CAPACT<sup>3</sup> project, stressing its successes, in particular the existence of one working EMEP station and the plans for ratification of protocols by Kazakhstan. He drew attention to one project element that was still to be finalized, namely the setting-up of a structure for cooperation between the five Central Asian States. He stressed the importance of dedicating some specific resources for coordinating the work with the EECCA countries. Concerning the effectiveness of the project, Mr. Libert highlighted that an external evaluation carried out by an expert from Belarus was under way, and that its results would be posted on the Convention's website when available.

---

<sup>3</sup> Capacity-building for Air Quality Management and the Application of Clean Coal Combustion Technologies in Central Asia.



53. The secretariat informed the Working Group about recent progress in the project to support the implementation of the Gothenburg Protocol in the Republic of Moldova, supported by the Czech Republic.
54. With a view to supporting the objective of increased participation of EECCA countries in the Convention's work, the Working Group discussed the need for a focal point to which EECCA could address their problems and questions, as well as its resource implications. The delegations of EECCA countries were supportive of such an appointment.
55. The delegation of Norway informed about its current efforts to make a contribution for this purpose. It also noted that Norway had provided substantial support for the participation of EECCA countries in different meetings as well as for the establishment of EMEP stations in the EECCA subregion.
56. The delegation of Armenia informed the Working Group that the EMEP station supported by Norway had been equipped in September and would start functioning.
57. The delegation of Republic of Moldova informed the Working Group about problems in implementing the Protocol on POPs and the Protocol on Heavy Metals, in particular with regard to the mapping of critical loads.
58. The delegation of Ukraine provided information on its work on setting emission limit values, monitoring and BAT. It informed the Working Group about plans to ratify the Protocol on Heavy Metals and expressed its need for assistance in the development of a national action plan for reducing heavy metals emissions. It also highlighted that although it was a Party to the Stockholm Convention on POPs and had two projects for reducing POPs emissions, it had encountered difficulties in ratifying the Protocol on POPs.
59. The secretariat informed the Working Group about delays in the publication of the implementation guides for the three most recent Protocols. The Working Group requested the secretariat to put the electronic versions on the website and to make the necessary updates before publishing them in hard copy.
60. The delegation of the Netherlands highlighted the need for translation of the most important part of the BREF documents<sup>4</sup> in Russian, and urged delegations to explore the possibilities to make a financial contribution for this purpose.

---

<sup>4</sup> BAT reference documents.

61. The secretariat also provided information about progress in the implementation of the Dutch-funded project for assisting SEE countries to accede to the Protocols to the Convention. The secretariat highlighted the problems in establishing communication with these countries and stressed the importance of providing it with updated information on the points of contact.

62. The Working Group on Strategies and Review:

(a) Welcomed the progress achieved in the implementation of the revised Action Plan for EECCA as presented in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/11, noting that some items of the Action Plan required stronger efforts, and decided to forward it to the Executive Body for information;

(b) Urged EECCA countries to take further steps to implement the Action Plan, in particular those items that have not been sufficiently addressed, and invited other Parties, task forces and lead countries to support the EECCA countries in their efforts;

(c) Expressed its appreciation for the contributions made by donor countries engaged in bilateral cooperation projects with EECCA countries, and welcomed the expansion of such projects;

(d) Welcomed the start of the project to assist SEE countries to accede to the Convention's protocols and invited the SEE countries to proceed with its implementation without delay; and

(e) Invited the secretariat to seek financial contributions from Parties to the Convention's trust fund to support the more active involvement of EECCA countries in the work of the Convention, drawing attention to the benefits of such cooperation.

## **VII. 2009 WORKPLAN**

63. The Working Group discussed its draft workplan for 2009 (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/12) and agreed on a number of amendments. It requested the secretariat to reflect these in a revised document and to submit the revised workplan for consideration by the Executive Body;

64. The Working Group invited the Executive Body to consider establishing a more permanent group and/or mechanism for providing the Convention bodies with legal expertise in the items of their work plans, as needed, and requested the secretariat to prepare an informal note introducing this item at the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body.

## VIII. OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

65. The Convention secretariat informed the Working Group about outreach activities undertaken under the framework of the Convention, drawing attention to the existing and possible future cooperation between the **Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)** and the Convention. The secretariat also highlighted the development of an outline strategy for the Convention, to be presented at the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body.

66. The Working Group took note of this information and decided to forward it to the Executive Body at its twenty-sixth session.

## IX. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

67. The Working Group on Strategies and Review re-elected Mr. P. Jilek (Czech Republic), Ms. N. Karpova (Russian Federation) and Mr. Sliggers (Netherlands) as Vice-Chairs. It thanked Ms. K. Scavo (United States) for her contribution as a Vice-Chair of the Working Group. It elected Mr. D. Fantozzi (United States) as a new Vice-Chair.

## X. OTHER BUSINESS

68. Mr. T. Pignatelli, Co-Chair of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, presented the latest results of the Expert Group's work on emerging technologies. The Working Group noted the information and invited the Expert Group to continue its work on this issue.

69. Mr. Sliggers reminded delegates of the procedure for submission of dossiers in accordance with article 14, paragraph 2, of the Protocol on POPs, stressing that proposals should be submitted to the secretariat for circulation to the Parties to the Protocol at least 90 days in advance of the next session of the Executive Body, and that Parties, industry and non-governmental organizations could submit comments on these dossiers until the session of the Executive Body in December 2008. He also reminded Parties of the need to designate reviewers for the Track A and Track B reviews of the five new substances, if accepted by the Executive Body, and invited Parties to consider nominations for reviewers.

70. The Chair reminded the Working Group that its forty-third session would be held from 9 to 13 March 2009, focusing on the Protocol on POPs; its forty-fourth session would be held from 20 to 24 April 2009, focusing on the Gothenburg Protocol; and its forty-fifth session would be held from 31 August to 4 September 2009, pending decision of the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body.

**XI. ADOPTION OF THE DECISIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP**

71. In accordance with the revised practice adopted by the Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session, the Working Group on Strategies and Review adopted the decisions taken during the session.

-----