



Economic Commission for Europe
**Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range
 Transboundary Air Pollution**
Twenty-ninth session

Geneva, 12–16 December 2011

Report of the Executive Body on its twenty-ninth session
Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1–14	2
A. Attendance	2–6	2
B. Organizational matters.....	7–14	2
I. Report on credentials.....	15	3
II. Progress in core activities.....	16–18	3
III. Review and revision of protocols and other strategy activities.....	19–29	4
A. Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone ...	19–26	4
B. Protocol on Heavy Metals	27–28	5
C. Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants.....	29	5
IV. Compliance with protocol obligations.....	30–44	5
V. Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia and capacity-building activities in countries with economies in transition	45–46	8
VI. Action Plan for the Implementation of the Long-term Strategy for the Convention	47–49	9
VII. 2012–2013 workplan for the implementation of the Convention	50–52	9
VIII. Strategies and policies of Parties and signatories to the Convention for the abatement of air pollution	53–54	9
IX. Activities of bodies of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and international organizations relevant to the Convention.....	55–56	9
X. Financial requirements for implementation of the Convention	57–60	10
XI. Adoption of decisions taken at the twenty-ninth session	61	11

Introduction

1. The twenty-ninth session of the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution was held from 12 to 16 December 2011 in Geneva. The decisions adopted by the Executive Body at the session can be found in a first addendum to the present report (ECE/EB.AIR/108/Add.1). The 2012–2013 workplan for the implementation of the Convention, also adopted by the Executive Body at its twenty-ninth session, has been set out in a second addendum (ECE/EB.AIR/108/Add.2).

A. Attendance

2. The session was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan and the European Union (EU).

3. The following States not party to the Convention were represented: Japan.

4. Representatives from the European Environment Agency (EEA), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) also attended.

5. The Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM) of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP), the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East, the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West, and the Network Centre for the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET) were represented.

6. Representatives of various non-governmental organizations (NGOs) attended: the Clean Air Task Force; the European Environmental Bureau; the Global Atmospheric Pollution Forum; the International Cryosphere Climate Initiative; and the International Union of Air Pollution Prevention and Environmental Protection Associations. In addition, the following representatives from industry attended: the Bromine Science and Environmental Forum; the oil companies' European association for environment, health and safety in refining and distribution (CONCAWE); CropLife International; the Union of the Electricity Industry (EURELECTRIC); the European Association of Internal Combustion Engine Manufacturers; the European Petroleum Industry Association (EUROPIA); and INEOS Styrenics (a European expandable polystyrene producer).

B. Organizational matters

7. Mr. M. Williams (United Kingdom) chaired the meeting.

8. The Director of the Environment Division of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) welcomed the participants.

9. The Executive Body adopted its agenda, as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/108, while agreeing to change the order of some agenda items and to omit the item on accreditation of NGOS, as no applications for such accreditation had been received.

10. Following a request from the Russian Federation, the agenda was amended to include an item entitled “Report on credentials”, and the Executive Body instructed the secretariat to make that a standing agenda item for all future sessions of the Executive Body.

11. In response to a question from Croatia, it was clarified that the “accredited representatives” referred to in rule 11 of the rules of procedure (ECE/EB.AIR/106/Add.1, decision 2010/19) were the persons to whom credentials were granted. In accordance with rule 13, credentials were granted in accordance with each Party’s domestic procedures other than in situations where new protocols or amendments to protocols were to be adopted, in which case all credentials should be issued either by the Head of State or Government or by the Minister of Foreign Affairs or, in the case of a regional economic integration organization, by the competent authority of that organization. It was also clarified that, in accordance with rule 21, paragraph 6, the requirements regarding representation and credentials set out in chapter V of the rules of procedure (rules 11–15) did not apply to meetings of subsidiary bodies.

12. The Chair reminded delegations that the decisions taken at the twenty-eighth session had been approved at that session, and were included in the report on the session.

13. The delegation of the United States proposed amendments to paragraphs 6, 23, 24, 36 and 40 of the report. The delegation of the EU proposed amendments to paragraphs 24, 85 and 103 (d).

14. The Executive Body adopted the report of its twenty-eighth session (ECE/EB.AIR/106 and Add.1 and 2), as amended, and requested the secretariat to issue a corrigendum and to post it on the website for the Executive Body’s twenty-eighth session.

I. Report on credentials

15. In accordance with rule 13 of the rules of procedure, delegations were invited to submit their credentials to the secretariat within 24 hours after the opening of the session.

II. Progress in core activities

16. Ms. Sonja Vidic, Chair of the EMEP Steering Body, presented the major outcomes of the activities under EMEP over the past year, as well as the results of the Steering Body’s thirty-fifth session, as contained in the session report (ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2011/2). Mr. Tor Johannessen, Chair of the Working Group on Effects, presented the major outcomes of activities over the past year, including the results of the Working Group’s thirtieth session (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2011/2).

17. The Chair presented a summary of the activities of the Executive Body Bureau in 2011 (ECE/EB.AIR/2011/3).

18. The Executive Body:

(a) Noted the information presented by the Chair of the EMEP Steering Body and the Chair of the Working Group on Effects;

(b) Noted the information presented by the Chair on the activities of the Bureau in 2011;

(c) Requested the secretariat to post on the website the minutes of the Executive Body Bureau meetings since April 2009.

III. Review and revision of protocols and other strategy activities

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

19. Mr. R. Ballaman, Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review, presented the progress of the Working Group with regard to the revision of the text of the Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone (Gothenburg Protocol) and its annexes, as presented in the reports of the forty-eighth and the forty-ninth session of the Working Group (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/104 and ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/106). He also presented informal document No. 8, containing corrections to document ECE/EB.AIR/2011/8, and informed participants about progress in updating the guidance documents to the Protocol, noting that the guidance document on stationary sources updated by the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues had been translated into Russian. In the discussion that followed, it was clarified that informal document No. 8 contained suggestions by the Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review, rather than corrections.

20. The delegation of Norway informed the Executive Body about a recent meeting of the Nordic Council of Ministers for the Environment, highlighting their agreement and commitment to cooperate on actions on short-lived climate forcers, including black carbon, through identifying national measures, developing emission inventories and exchange of national plans of action.

21. The Executive Body discussed draft revised annexes I, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, X and XI to the Gothenburg Protocol,¹ and decided on a number of deletions and modifications. The secretariat prepared clean updated versions of these documents in English and Russian and circulated them to delegations.

22. The Executive Body also considered a draft revised annex II prepared by the Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling with the support of the secretariat. Table 1 in that document, which included national emission ceilings for the year 2010 and beyond for those Parties that had ratified the Gothenburg Protocol, should remain in square brackets. The EU would present a new proposal for table 1 before the next session of the Executive Body. The current format of tables 2–6 was provisionally accepted.

23. The Executive Body considered options for the baseline and target year, as well as the views with regard to absolute and percentage reduction. The delegations of Ukraine and Belarus supported the option of a three-year average (2004–2006) for the baseline year. The delegation of the Russian Federation noted its flexibility with both a single-year and a three-year average option, while the delegation of the EU noticed that it would be more beneficial to have a three-year average for the target year. The delegation of Canada agreed that the latter would be a solution addressing meteorological issues, and proposed to adjust the language. The delegations of the United States and Canada noted that they were flexible with regard to an absolute or percentage reduction; the delegation of Belarus found it beneficial to have a percentage option. The delegations of Norway and Switzerland considered that both options should be used: kilotons for the baseline year and percentage reduction for the rest. It was decided to adopt the year 2005 as a base year, with some flexibility added for exceptional circumstances. The emission reduction percentages would

¹ As presented in documents ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/8/Rev.1, ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/9/Rev.1, ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/10/Rev.1, ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/11/Rev.1, ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/12/Rev.1, ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/13, ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/14/Rev.1 and ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/15.

refer to the period between the base year and the year 2020. The emission levels for the base year should be the official reported figures to EMEP. A proposal by Norway on the possibility of averaging emission levels over three consecutive years was included in the new version of the draft revised annex II for consideration by the Parties.

24. The delegation of the EU distributed a conference room paper with proposals related to the revision of annex IX in order to start the discussion and provide the possibility to exchange views in an informal discussion.

25. The Executive Body considered the latest version of the Protocol text as presented in document ECE/EB.AIR/2011/8 and decided on a number of modifications and pending issues. A breakout group worked on the options related to the issue of black carbon.

26. The Executive Body:

(a) Adopted decision 2011/1 on the review and revision of protocols;

(b) Requested the secretariat to present a draft revised annex II as an official document.

B. Protocol on Heavy Metals

27. The Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review reported on progress in the negotiation of amendments to the Protocol on Heavy Metals in accordance with the mandate given to it in December 2009 (see ECE/EB.AIR/99/Add.2).

28. The Executive Body requested the Working Group on Strategies and Review to continue, in accordance with its revised mandate (ECE/EB.AIR/106, para. 57 (a)–(c)), discussions on the Protocol on Heavy Metals at its fiftieth session in September 2012, after finalization of the Gothenburg Protocol revision process, to give the highest priority to securing agreement on the text of an amended protocol before devoting time to any other substantive issues.

C. Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants

29. The Executive Body requested the Working Group on Strategies and Review to defer any work on the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants (Protocol on POPs) in 2012, and decided to address the issue further at the meeting of the Executive Body in December 2012, taking into account ongoing activities under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

IV. Compliance with protocol obligations

30. The Chair of the Implementation Committee, Mr. P. Meulepas (Belgium), introduced the Committee's fourteenth report (ECE/EB.AIR/2011/2) on Parties' compliance with their protocol obligations, including the results of the Committee's twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth meetings. He drew attention to the Committee's recommendations (ECE/EB.AIR/2011/7) with regard to individual cases of non-compliance with basic obligations, as well as on compliance by Parties with their emission-reporting obligations, and their obligations to report on strategies and policies. In addition, and in accordance with the workplan for 2010, the Committee had continued its review of the reporting under the Protocol on POPs. In 2011, the Committee had considered submissions and referrals from 15 Parties, in total accounting for 22 individual cases of non-compliance or possible non-compliance.

31. The Chair of the Implementation Committee expressed concern about informal documents Nos. 1 and 2 posted on the Executive Body's website without the Committee's approval. Informal document No. 1 listed the official correspondence related to the work of the Committee in 2011, and informal document No. 2 presented the tables on reporting obligations referred to in the fourteenth report of the Implementation Committee. The Chair of the Committee urged the secretariat to post corrected versions of informal documents Nos. 1 and 2 on the website as soon as possible. The delegations of the United States, Canada and the EU supported the request by the Chair of the Implementation Committee.

32. The delegation of Spain made a presentation on its progress towards compliance with its obligations under the Protocol concerning the Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides or their Transboundary Fluxes (Protocol on NO_x) and the Protocol concerning the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or their Transboundary Fluxes (Protocol on VOCs). The reported emission data for the year 2009 showed that Spain was finally compliant with the emission-reduction obligation under the Protocol on NO_x; in addition, Spain had reduced its exceedance of the VOCs emission target in 2009 to 3 per cent, thus making considerable progress with regard to the Protocol on VOCs.

33. The Chair of the EMEP Steering Body proposed to modify the proposed decision on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) emissions reporting by deleting paragraphs 10 to 13 and drafting a separate decision on POPs reporting.

34. The United States supported the Committee's recommended decisions and offered its thanks to the Chair of the Committee. With respect to the Committee's findings regarding reporting under the Protocol on POPs, the United States expressed concern that many countries did not seem to be able to measure or control POPs emissions, that some POPs emissions had not been studied or inventoried and that techniques for reducing POPs had in many cases not been included in guidance accompanying the Protocol. The United States indicated it was important that countries kept in mind as they negotiated and included obligations in legally binding treaties as to how they would be able to comply with such obligations

35. The delegation of the United Kingdom made the following statement under this agenda item:

The United Kingdom, as lead country for the International Cooperative Programme on Vegetation, the Task Force on Emissions Inventories and Projections, the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen and the Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Instruments, would like to express its concern about the reduction in secretariat support to these task forces and groups in recent years. In particular, reductions in secretariat attendance at meetings has impacted on the ability of task forces to carry out work, as they feel less engaged in the work of the rest of the Convention and there is less coordination across the work of different task forces. In addition, changes in secretariat support mean that significantly more work now falls to Chairs of the groups. Ultimately this may make Parties less keen to fund task forces — this is certainly a consideration for the United Kingdom. Finally, reductions in the level and quality of support in terms of disseminating information has also impacted on both the work of the group and the communication of that work.

36. The Chair of the Implementation Committee noted that, besides Spain, which had already provided its update, there were several other cases of non-compliance (i.e., concerning Greece, Denmark, and Cyprus), where the delegations had been requested to present updates to the Executive Body. The Chair of the meeting urged those delegations to submit the necessary information to the Implementation Committee as soon as possible.

37. The delegation of Cyprus referred to the tragic accident that affected its major power plant in 2011 and explained that top funding priority had been given to electricity supply.

The delegation was not ready to provide further information with regard to compliance with the Protocol on NO_x. It was noted that certain problems with cadmium emissions were expected as well.

38. The delegation of Denmark expressed its hope that it would be in compliance with its obligations under the Protocol on POPs in the very near future, taking into account the ongoing research on implementation of new technologies and certain changes in the Government.

39. The Executive Body adopted the following decisions:

(a) Decision 2011/2 on compliance by Greece with its obligations under the Protocol concerning Nitrogen Oxides or Their Transboundary Fluxes;

(b) Decision 2011/3 on compliance by Spain with its obligations under the Protocol concerning Nitrogen Oxides or Their Transboundary Fluxes;

(c) Decision 2011/4 on compliance by Spain with its obligations under the Protocol concerning the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or Their Transboundary Fluxes;

(d) Decision 2011/5 on compliance by Denmark with its obligations under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants;

(e) Decision 2011/6 on compliance by Estonia, Germany, Italy and Latvia with their obligations under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants;

(f) Decision 2011/7 on compliance by Iceland with its obligations under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants;

(g) Decision 2011/8 on compliance by the Republic of Moldova with its obligations under the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants;

(h) Decision 2011/9 on compliance by Luxembourg with its reporting obligations;

(i) Decision 2011/10 on compliance by France, Latvia, the Russian Federation and the European Union with their obligations to report on strategies and policies;

(j) Decision 2011/11 on compliance by Albania, Iceland and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia with their obligations to report on emissions;

(k) Decision 2011/12 on compliance by the Republic of Moldova with its obligations to report on emissions;

(l) Decision 2011/13 on persistent organic pollutants emissions reporting.

40. The Executive Body requested the secretariat to communicate those decisions to the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the Parties in question. It also requested the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe to communicate decision 2011/9 to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Environment of Luxembourg.

41. With regard to the membership of the Implementation Committee, the Executive Body:

(a) Noted that Mr. P. Meulepas (Belgium) and Mr. I. Angelov (Bulgaria) would remain on the Committee for another year;

(b) Re-elected Mr. D. Buchholz (United States), Ms. M. Muñoz Cuesta (Spain) and Mr. M. Schroeder (Germany) for a second term of two years and Ms. C. Hamilton (United Kingdom) for a third term;

(c) Elected Mr. M. Ritter (Austria), Ms. J. Carlson (Sweden) and Mr. E. Fiani (France) for a term of two years;

(d) Re-elected Mr. Meulepas as Chair of the Committee.

42. Furthermore, the Executive Body:

(a) Decided that informal documents Nos. 1 and 2 on the Convention's website should be replaced with corrected versions approved by the Implementation Committee;

(b) Noted that the Committee's formal reports for the present year and the previous year omitted details included in prior years and requested the Committee to make a full, formal report to the Executive Body in 2012 and subsequent years including all essential information for consideration by the Executive Body. The Executive Body invited the Committee, being confronted with an increase of referrals, to divide its report into multiple formal documents if necessary to present the information requested to be reported;

(c) Decided that the sections of the 2010 Review of Strategies and Policies for Air Pollution Abatement (ECE/EB.AIR/2010/8 and Add.1 and 2) that addressed compliance should be removed from the document prior to translation and publication;

(d) Requested the secretariat to make publicly available the responses of the Parties to the questionnaire on Strategies and Policies, and to ensure that any technical difficulties interfering with public access to that information were addressed and resolved.

43. At the end of the session, the secretariat reported that informal documents Nos. 1 and 2 had been removed from the website. It confirmed that the necessary corrections to the paragraph numbers and section headings in informal document No. 1 would be made in consultation with the Chair of the Implementation Committee. The secretariat stressed, however, that informal document No. 2 did not contain any mistakes, and the information it presented had served as a basis for the Committee's evaluation of compliance by Parties and its recommendations to the Executive Body. The secretariat confirmed that it would cut out all the text from the document and post only the tables on the website, as requested by the Committee.

44. The secretariat also explained that the responses by Parties to the Internet-based questionnaire on strategies had been made publicly available, but the software application had become outdated and did not function with the recent upgrade of the ECE website.

V. Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia and capacity-building activities in countries with economies in transition

45. The Chair of the Coordinating Group, Mr. A. Nedre (Russian Federation), presented the proposed activities for the implementation of the revised Action Plan listed in informal document No. 14, noting that it was the only document with respect to the Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia subregion with timeframes and estimated costs specified. The workplan of the Coordinating Group on promotion of actions towards implementation of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia (Coordinating Group for Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia) for 2012 was outlined in the informal document No. 17.

46. The Executive Body:

(a) Welcomed efforts made by the Coordinating Group for Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia led by the Russian Federation and its member countries in

Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, as well as in South-Eastern Europe, to move towards ratification;

(b) Took note of the Coordinating Group workplan for 2012;

(c) Supported activities proposed by the Coordinating Group and aimed at implementation of the revised Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia in the framework of the Convention's workplan for 2012–2014, as presented at the session, and urged the Parties to the Convention to contribute the necessary resources as outlined in the proposal.

VI. Action Plan for the Implementation of the Long-term Strategy for the Convention

47. The delegation of the United States introduced the draft action plan for the implementation of the Long-term Strategy for the Convention, presented in informal document No. 9 and kindly translated by Canada into French and Russian.

48. The draft action plan was further discussed and finalized by a small breakout group which regularly reported to the plenary session on its progress.

49. The Executive Body adopted decision 2011/14 on the Action Plan for the Implementation of the Long-term Strategy for the Convention.

VII. 2012–2013 workplan for the implementation of the Convention

50. The secretariat introduced the biannual draft workplan presented in the document ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2011/10–ECE/EB.AIR/2011/5, together with proposals for amendments made by the Working Group on Strategies and Review (see ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/106), the EMEP Steering Body (see ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2011/2), the Working Group on Effects (see ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2011/2) and the Implementation Committee (see ECE/EB.AIR/2011/2). Some changes had been made as compared with workplans for previous years. For example, ongoing activities were now distinguished from new activities in the workplan, and the list of provisional meetings of the Convention bodies and groups had been moved from the workplan to the Convention website.

51. Several of additional amendments were also proposed in light of the discussions and decisions under the previous agenda items.

52. Taking into account proposed amendments to the draft workplan forwarded by the subsidiary bodies and suggestions made by delegations in plenary, the Executive Body adopted the 2012–2013 workplan as amended (see ECE/EB.AIR/109/Add.2).

VIII. Strategies and policies of Parties and signatories to the Convention for the abatement of air pollution

53. The delegation of Switzerland requested that the elaboration and distribution of the questionnaire on strategies and policies be reinstated in the 2012–2013 workplan. The delegation of the EU objected to that proposal, questioning the usefulness of the questionnaire and the responses collected.

54. The Chair concluded that there would be no questionnaire in the biennium 2012–2013 unless the Executive Body decided to amend the workplan for 2013 during one of its 2012 sessions.

IX. Activities of bodies of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and international organizations relevant to the Convention

55. Representatives of EEA, UNEP, ESCAP and WMO were invited to present their relevant activities in a written form to the secretariat.

56. The Executive Body requested the secretariat to make the written documentation received from those organizations available on the web page.

X. Financial requirements for implementation of the Convention

57. The secretariat introduced the note on the financial requirements for the implementation of the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/2011/1 and Corr.1).

58. With regard to EMEP activities, the Executive Body:

(a) Decided on the detailed use of resources for EMEP in 2012 as set out in table 2, and on the scale of mandatory contributions as set out in table 3, of document ECE/EB.AIR/2011/1;

(b) Supported the EMEP Steering Body's call on the Parties to the EMEP Protocol to consider making additional voluntary contributions (in kind or in cash through the trust fund) to ensure that the work, especially the difficult tasks required in 2012–2013 for finalization of the protocol reviews and revisions, including the work on integrated assessment modelling, could be accomplished as foreseen in the draft 2012–2013 workplan;

(c) Requested the Steering Body, with the assistance of its Bureau, to present the details of the 2013 budget for approval by the Executive Body at its thirtieth session in 2012;

(d) Urged Parties that have not yet done so to pay their 2011 contributions in cash to the trust fund and, in 2012, to pay their contributions so that they reached the trust fund in the first half of the year;

(e) Requested Ukraine to take urgent action to finalize the project for establishing an EMEP monitoring site as an in-kind contribution to cover its long-standing arrears for 1996–2001 (equivalent to \$175,205).

59. With regard to the trust fund for financing effects-oriented activities, the Executive Body:

(a) Took note of the contributions made to the trust fund for 2011, and welcomed the payments made, but also expressed disappointment at the lack of response by many Parties;

(b) Decided that the essential international coordination costs for financing the core activities of the Convention and its protocols, other than those covered by the EMEP Protocol, should be \$2,152,700 in 2012, and should provisionally be \$2,152,700 in 2013 and \$2,152,700 in 2014;

(c) Maintained the 2010 United Nations scale of assessments for use in calculating the recommended contributions (see workplan, table 9);

(d) Requested the secretariat to inform Parties at the latest in spring of 2012 of the recommended contributions to meet the 2012 budget, inviting them to make them as agreed in revised decision 2002/1;

(e) Urged all Parties which had not yet done so to consider providing the 2011 recommended contributions to the trust fund and, in 2012, to pay their contributions so that they reached the trust fund in the first half of the year;

(f) Noted with appreciation the essential support provided to the Convention and its bodies by lead countries, countries hosting coordinating centres and those organizing meetings, as well as countries that funded activities of their national focal centres/points and the active participation of national experts.

60. With regard to the trust fund for financing activities in countries in transition, the Executive Body:

(a) Reiterated its support to that element of the work programme, the success in an enlarged implementation of the Convention in countries in transition of Eastern Europe being crucial for the future of the Convention;

(b) Welcomed the contributions to the trust fund and thanked those countries that had contributed;

(c) Approved the proposed budget for trust fund E112 of \$378,550 for 2012 and urged Parties to make contributions to the trust fund;

(d) Requested the secretariat to inform the Parties on the financial situation of the trust fund and to invite them to make voluntary contributions;

(e) Invited all Parties, but especially those that led task forces and expert groups, to promote activities such as special workshops in the countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and South-Eastern European countries, and to collaborate with the secretariat in developing such projects.

XI. Adoption of decisions taken at the twenty-ninth session

61. The Executive Body adopted the decisions taken at its twenty-ninth session on 16 December 2011.