



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

EB.AIR/WG.5/80
4 October 2005

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

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

Working Group on Strategies and Review

REPORT OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Introduction

1. The thirty-seventh session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review was held in Geneva from 26 to 30 September 2005.
2. The session was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention: Armenia; Austria; Azerbaijan; Belarus; Belgium; Canada; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Georgia; Germany; Hungary; Ireland; Italy; Kazakhstan; Kyrgyzstan; Netherlands, Norway; Poland; Republic of Moldova; Russian Federation; Serbia and Montenegro; Slovakia; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; Turkey; Ukraine; United Kingdom; United States of America; and the European Community (EC).
3. The EMEP Centres for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM) and Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-East (MSC-E) and the Working Group on Effects (CCE) as well as the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) were represented.

Documents prepared under the auspices or at the request of the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution for GENERAL circulation should be considered provisional unless APPROVED by the Executive Body.

4. Representatives of the American Chemistry Council/International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), Bromine Science and Environmental Forum (BSEFC), European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC), EuroChlor, Eurelectric, the European Association of Internal Combustion Engine Manufacturers, International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), the French-German Institute for Environmental Research (IFARE), the Oil Companies' Europe Organizations for Environment and Health Protection (CONCAWE), the World Chlorine Council and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) attended.

5. The meeting was chaired by Mr. R. Ballaman (Switzerland).

6. Mr. K. Bull, Chief of the UNECE Pollution Prevention Team, welcomed delegates on behalf of the secretariat. He noted the entry into force of the Gothenburg Protocol on 17 May 2005 and the decisions taken by the Executive Body at its twenty-second session (ECE/EB.AIR/83).

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

7. The Working Group adopted the provisional agenda (EB.AIR/WG.5/79). Presentations made to the Working Group would be made available on the Convention's website.

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

8. Mr. H. Gregor, Chairman of the Working Group on Effects, described scientific progress by the Working Group on Effects, which had recommended that the results of the analyses of critical loads for heavy metals be used in work under the Convention (EB.AIR/WG.1/2005/2, para. 44(d)).

9. Mr. S. Dutchak (MSC-E) reported work by MSC-E for the review of the Protocol. He noted discrepancies between modelled and measured results and underlined the importance of improving emission data for heavy metals. Non-linearities between emissions and deposition data were unexplained as data for atmospheric concentrations were very limited. He noted that EMEP was to hold a workshop to review the model in October 2005.

10. Mr. J. Sliggers (Netherlands) presented results of a study on emissions and emission projections for all European Countries by the Netherlands Organization for Applied Scientific Research (TNO) on the effectiveness of the Protocol. He concluded that full implementation would give considerable emission reductions of both heavy metals and particulate matter (PM).

11. Mr. J. Caicedo (UNEP) described UNEP's activities on heavy metals including its Global Mercury Assessment (GMA), work on partnerships and capacity-building, and the start of activities on cadmium and lead.

12. Mr. D. Johnstone (European Community) outlined the European Commission's mercury strategy including steps to curb the production and export of mercury and to prevent mercury surpluses from returning to the market. Further information was available on the European Commission's website.
13. The United States noted a new national mercury regulation requiring reductions by 2015 through an emissions cap and trade programme.
14. Mr. D. Jost, Chairman of the Task Force on Heavy Metals, presented the report of the first and second meetings of the Task Force (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/2). He noted the technical work accomplished in preparing for review of the Protocol and drew attention to: the scheduled evaluations of emission limit values (ELVs) for mercury from existing chlor-alkali plants (annex I to the report) and from medical waste incineration (annex II); draft annotated chapter headings for the sufficiency and effectiveness review (annex III); and draft generic guidelines for the technical review of proposals for additional metals, product measures or product/product groups (annex IV).
15. The United States proposed that in its view the review of sufficiency and effectiveness should focus exclusively on the three metals listed in annex I of the Protocol to ensure their robust and thorough consideration and that references to other metals were deleted from annex III of EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/2, including the text in square brackets in paragraph 21. The European Community Member States, Norway and Switzerland emphasized the need to include scientifically available information on other heavy metals especially those submitted by Parties to EMEP; they proposed deletion of the square brackets in paragraph 21. Canada proposed that EMEP prepare a summary of submitted data on other heavy metals for the review.
16. At the request of the United States, the Working Group agreed amendments to EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/2, annex III: (i) in paragraph 2, to add Any proposal for adding new metals to the Protocol must follow the process in article 13 of the Protocol (ii) in paragraph 21, to substitute the text in square brackets with An overview of emissions within the geographic scope of EMEP of other metals where emissions data were additionally reported to EMEP may also be included in accordance with article 7.
17. Mr. Jost drew attention to the questionnaire on product management measures for mercury-containing products (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/2, annex III, table 1). The secretariat would circulate this to members of the Task Force, with copies to Heads of Delegation, after the session. He also noted that the Task Force would hold an informal, editorial meeting in February 2006 in Dessau (Germany) on the sufficiency and effectiveness review for experts preparing chapter texts; the Task Force would aim to finalize this work by its third meeting, scheduled tentatively for May 2006.

18. The Working Group:

- (a) Took note of the conclusions and recommendations of the Task Force (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/2);
- (b) Expressed concern at the insufficient quality of the emission data on heavy metals;
- (c) Noted the evaluations of ELVs for chlor-alkali plants and for medical waste incineration (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/2, annexes I and II), and recommended these for consideration by the Executive Body at its twenty-third session;
- (d) Welcomed the offers of experts to contribute to the sufficiency and effectiveness review and agreed to recommend the annotated chapter headings (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/2, annex III) to the Executive Body for consideration at its twenty-third session;
- (e) Recommended the generic guidelines for the technical review of additional metals, product measures or product/product groups that may be proposed by Parties for inclusion into annexes I, VI, and VII to the Protocol (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/2, annex IV) to the Executive Body for consideration at its twenty-third session;
- (f) Welcomed the contributions of other subsidiary bodies to the work of the Task Force and stressed to the Executive Body the importance of coordinating their work to meet the Task Force's continuing needs;
- (g) Concluded that the work for the review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals should be completed in 2006 and invited the Task Force to report to it at its thirty-eighth session.

III. THE REVIEW OF THE PROTOCOL ON POPs

19. Mr. D. Stone and Mr. J. Sliggers, Co-Chairmen of the Task Force on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), presented the results of the technical review of pentabromodiphenyl ether (PBDE) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) conducted by the Task Force (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/1). In accordance with the mandate of the Task Force, the review was of the dossiers submitted, not of the substances. They noted the Task Force had concluded that the contents of both dossiers contained sufficient information to support the conclusion that both substances be considered as POPs in the context of Executive Body decision 1998/2. One expert had had a different view regarding the sufficiency of the information to determine if both substances were likely to have significant adverse impacts as a result of long-range atmospheric transport. Attention was also drawn to supplementary information provided on the PFOS dossier by the 3M company.

20. The Co-Chairmen noted two issues on which the Task Force needed guidance: (i) the need for a transparent and clearly articulated process for providing information for the reviews, and (ii)

the interpretation of paragraph 2(b) of Executive Body decision 1998/2 concerning the term “likely to have significant adverse human health and/or environmental effects as a result of its long-range transboundary atmospheric transport”.

21. The Co-Chairmen presented the sufficiency and effectiveness review conducted by the Task Force, as well as options for dealing with amendments to the Protocol on POPs and priority setting (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/1).

22. Mr. H. Gregor noted the conclusions of the report on the environmental effects of POPs in freshwaters prepared by the International Cooperative Programme (ICP) on Waters. He also expressed the Working Group’s readiness to provide, if requested, information on the effects of POPs, including those on human health.

23. Mr. S. Dutchak (MSC-E) presented the MSC-E contributions to the work on the review of the Protocol on POPs. He stressed that there was not sufficient information for the period from 1990 up to the present to analyze emission trends, which necessitated the use of expert estimates.

24. In the discussion that followed, a number of delegations expressed support for the conclusions of the Task Force regarding the technical review of PBDE and PFOS. The United States expressed the view that there was not sufficient information in the dossiers to determine that PBDE and PFOS met the requirements of paragraph 2(b) of decision 1998/2 and recommended that further Track A technical reviews of them be undertaken by the Task Force.

25. The delegation of the Russian Federation noted that its experts were not able to participate in the work of the Task Force and expressed concern that there was insufficient data on economic impacts related to the new substances proposed for review under the Protocol.

26. Delegations recognized the need for a clear and transparent process to provide information for the review so all information from relevant sources could be taken into account. They also recognized the time constraints involved and the possible work overload of the Task Force.

27. As an interim solution, pending decision by the Executive Body at its twenty-third session, it was suggested that, during the 90-day period between the submission of dossiers and the session of the Executive Body, the dossiers be available on the Convention’s website for comment and submission of additional information by all interested persons or groups. The delegation of Canada suggested inviting the submitting Party to summarize this information so that it be taken into account in the technical review. The Netherlands considered that such an open process might require the nomination of more reviewers; in view of the time constraints, information should not be accepted after the session of the Executive Body.

28. Mr. Stone elaborated further on the request for guidance (para. 20 above), noting that the Task Force and peer reviewers of the dossiers on PBDE and PFOS had encountered difficulties in

interpreting the text, especially with the word “significant”. He suggested clarifying this by identifying the policy intent of both paragraph 2(a) and paragraph 2(b), rather than trying to add precision to “significant”. The policy intent of “significant adverse human health and/or environmental effects” could be understood as “likely to be of concern to environmental and human health regulatory agencies”.

29. With regard to the priorities and two options outlined in EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/1, section IV, several delegations expressed concern about the Task Force being able to manage all the work given to it. The delegations of Canada and the United States noted their disagreement with the conclusions of paragraph 77. They also disagreed with the suggestion in paragraph 80 (c) believing the Task Force should follow the current Track A and B review procedures. They further disagreed with the proposal in paragraph 80 (d) that the Task Force be asked to draft a revised text for (elements of) a Protocol on POPs, as this task was not contemplated in the Executive Body decision 2003/10. The delegation of Canada proposed that the two options be developed in more detail to facilitate discussion by the Executive Body.

30. The Working Group:

(a) Welcomed the work of the Task Force to prepare for the review of the Protocol and to consider new substances;

(b) Took note of the technical elements of the sufficiency and effectiveness review proposed by the Task Force, and recommended them for consideration at the session of the Executive Body;

(c) Approved the conclusions proposed by the Task Force on the technical content of the dossiers on PBDE and PFOS and recommended to the Executive Body that both be considered as POPs as defined under the Protocol;

(d) Proposed to the Executive Body that the Task Force continue with the Track B reviews of PBDE and PFOS and explore management strategies for them;

(e) Invited the Executive Body to adopt a clear and transparent process for dealing with additional information that becomes available after submission of dossiers;

(f) Welcomed the secretariat making available, on the Convention’s website, those substance dossiers submitted for consideration at the twenty-third session of the Executive Body;

(g) Agreed that, pending decision by the Executive Body, comments and additional information on the submitted dossiers provided by interested persons or groups prior to the twenty-third session of the Executive Body be made available on the Convention’s website; the submitting Party shall be invited to provide a summary of all such comments and additional information for consideration in the review process;

(h) Proposed to the Executive Body that in view of the policy intent of paragraphs 2 (a) and 2 (b) of its decision 1998/2, the phrase “significant adverse human health and/or environmental effects” is understood to mean “likely to be of concern to environmental and human health regulatory agencies”;

(i) Took note of the paper on options for making amendments to the Protocol, prepared by a small drafting group, and requested the secretariat to make it available to the Executive Body as an informal document at its next session;

(j) Welcomed the work done by the Working Group on Effects and EMEP in relation to the assessment of possible candidate substances for the Protocol on POPs;

(k) Noted that six new substances were submitted for the twenty-third session of the Executive Body and called upon Parties to consider possible nominations for reviewers.

IV. PREPARING FOR THE REVIEW OF THE GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL

31. Mr. R. Maas, Chairman of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, presented the results of the review of the RAINS model and the report of the thirtieth meeting of the Task Force, held in Berlin on 25 to 27 May 2005 (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/4 and EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/3). He drew attention to the relation between model performance and the quality of input data, the importance of uncertainties and the continued improvement of the model as well as noting the need to include non-technical measures. He highlighted the different approaches to target setting and lessons learned from the European Commission’s Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) process; this had shown that the additional costs of a strategy were often less than the monetary benefits but that the higher the ambition level, the larger the differences in the distribution of costs and benefits.

32. Mr. M. Amann (CIAM) presented progress in integrated assessment modelling at CIAM, including progress on including dynamic modelling of acidification (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/3 and www.iiasa.ac.at/rains/ciam.html).

33. Mr. D. Johnstone (EC) presented information on the European Commission’s Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution. The United States noted a new interstate transport rule requiring NO_x and SO₂ reductions by 2015.

34. In the following discussion, the United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Union (EU) Members States, indicated that it would be preferable for the EU Parties to have one set of emission ceilings for revision of the EU national emission ceilings (NEC) directive and for review/revision of the Gothenburg Protocol, although for the time being it was agreed to work in parallel. There should be as wide a geographic coverage as possible in a revised Gothenburg Protocol.

35. The delegation of the Netherlands drew attention to the importance of validating input data for non-EU Parties as soon as possible, now that the Protocol was in force. In view of the important co-benefits of climate measures for air pollution reduction, it suggested that all scenarios be evaluated with the GAINS model and that some special climate scenarios be developed and calculated and widely communicated. It also expressed its satisfaction that radiative forcing could be calculated with GAINS, in particular with respect to demonstrating the effect of some factors such as diesel cars and biofuels. It also drew attention to the need for including scenarios on ship emissions, stressing the need for internationally agreed abatement measures.

36. Mr. Gregor informed the Working Group on relevant activities carried out by the Working Group on Effects, drawing attention to progress in the development of critical load exceedance maps, the draft report on health risks of PM and the inclusion of PM by ICP Materials in response functions for corrosion. The Working Group on Effects was ready to provide a scientific basis for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, however more work was needed on nitrogen and on PM. He suggested the review should focus on an effects-based gap closure approach as used in the Gothenburg Protocol.

37. In the following discussion several delegations supported the view that an effects-based gap closure approach should be used in the integrated assessment modelling work for Protocol review, noting that there was still much potential for technology-based measures in non-EU countries. Some recognized the useful insights provided by integrated assessment modelling in the CAFE programme and the reasons for shifting to technology-based gap closure scenarios. Others stressed that the choice of effects-based or technology-based scenarios should be kept open.

38. On the question of protocol annexes, some delegations noted it was useful to have measures identified for meeting emission ceilings. However, a majority of delegations considered that detailed mandatory technical annexes might delay ratification. The Russian Federation noted that the substantial economic costs implied by many of the technical annexes prevented its ratification of the Protocol.

39. Mr. J. Webb, Chairman of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement, presented the results of the Expert Group's sixth meeting (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/7) noting the continued updating of the Guidance Document on Control Techniques for Preventing and Abating Emissions of Ammonia, which would be finalized in 2006. Following the fifth meeting, CIAM had developed a survey of farm practices and Poland had published a book on emissions from agriculture. He stressed the need for improved agricultural activity data and recommended a joint workshop with the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling as well as setting up an informal group to examine abatement costs. Work would be extended to Eastern European, Caucasian and Central Asian (EECCA) countries. The seventh meeting of the Expert Group would be held from 26 to 28 April

2006 in Pruhonice, Czech Republic.

40. The Chairman of the Working Group noted the need for Parties to the Gothenburg Protocol to develop national agricultural codes based on the Framework Advisory Code of Good Agricultural Practice for Reducing Ammonia Emissions.

41. The Chairman of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues (Mr. J.-G. Bartaire) presented the results of the seventh and eighth meetings (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/6). He noted that experts had expressed concern about the lack of transparency and insufficient participation by Parties, as well as a need to clarify procedures for data taken into account by CIAM. The Expert Group had responded to these concerns by developing a newsletter, updating its website and producing synopsis sheets for sectors covered by its database (ECODAT). Work would continue on emerging technologies. He noted that work on the costs of ammonia abatement would be done by the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement. Italy had offered to co-chair the Expert Group.

42. Several Parties noted the importance of consistent information between ECODAT and RAINS and stressed that time was needed for experts to study the available synopsis sheets.

43. The Working Group agreed changes to the report (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/6) and requested that the secretariat issue a corrigendum.

44. France noted that it had provided 1.3 million Euros to the Expert Group. It would continue to finance the work but sought funds from other Parties.

45. Mr. Amman confirmed that data for source categories in table 1 of EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/6 had been fully integrated into RAINS and table 2 reflected sectors partially integrated. Sectors in table 3 were important, with off-road sources a priority. He requested that small combustion sources be added to table 3. He noted several reasons why certain sectors were not yet integrated into RAINS.

46. Mr. J. Rea (United Kingdom) presented the results of the workshop of the Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Issues on policy instruments to reduce air pollution, held in Brussels on 11-12 November 2004 (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/5). He noted the conclusion that experimentation with market-based instruments and policy mixes should be encouraged, together with more ex-post evaluations of the instruments currently used.

47. The delegation of the Netherlands suggested that, with the entry into force of the Gothenburg Protocol, the Network might start updating the guidance document on economic instruments.

48. Mr. Martin Meadows (United Kingdom), Co-Chair of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter, presented the results of the first meeting of the Expert Group, held on 25 to 27 May 2005

in Berlin (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/8), drawing attention to the transboundary character of both primary and secondary PM, the importance of reducing not only PM emissions but also public exposure to PM, and the substantial difference in potential for reductions of PM between EU and EECCA countries.

49. The delegation of Poland stressed that it was important to involve EECCA countries in this work and pointed out the need to develop further PM source-receptor matrices for the whole EMEP region.

50. The Working Group:

(a) Welcomed the progress made by the Task Forces, Expert Groups and centres in the work for the preparation for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol;

(b) Expressed its appreciation for the work of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and CIAM, and for the contributions made by other subsidiary bodies to integrated assessment modelling. It urged that efforts for this work continue and that results be reported to the Working Group at its thirty-eighth session;

(c) Took note of the conclusions and recommendations of the thirtieth meeting of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling;

(d) Took note of the need for considering an effects-based approach for integrated assessment modelling, recognized the considerable potential for technical measures in the non-EU countries and invited them to contribute and validate data for integrated assessment modelling;

(e) Noted the conclusions of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement and thanked Poland for publishing the book "Emissions from European Agriculture";

(f) Requested completion of the updating of the Guidance Document on Control Techniques for Prevention and Abating Emissions of Ammonia (including cattle farming) for submission to its thirty-eighth session;

(g) Welcomed the efforts of the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement to extend its work to EECCA countries and the offer of the Czech Republic to host the seventh meeting;

(h) Noted the progress made by the Expert Group on Techno-economic Instruments and the conclusions of its seventh and eighth meetings;

(i) Noted the concern for the lack of communication and transparency in the work of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues and welcomed the newsletter, improved website and synopsis sheets developed by the Expert Group;

(j) Requested the secretariat to inform Heads of Delegation to the Working Group, as well as officially nominated experts of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues and the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, of the availability of synopsis sheets that were ready for review. Also requested Heads of Delegation to consult with their experts on the content and substance of the sheets;

(k) Invited Heads of Delegation to provide comments on the available sheets to the secretariat by 28 February 2006 and to instruct their experts to take these comments for discussion at the meetings of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues and the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling in 2006;

(l) Invited the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and CIAM to consider information in the synopsis sheets as it becomes available and consider how it might be incorporated into the RAINS model;

(m) Requested the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues to report on the discussions with national experts on the synopsis sheets at its thirty-eighth session;

(n) Took note of the conclusions of the workshop of the Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Issues on policy instruments to reduce air pollution;

(o) Agreed that the Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Issues should initiate work on updating the Guidance document on Economic Instruments to the Gothenburg Protocol;

(p) Noted with appreciation the conclusions of the first meeting of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter and drew the Executive Body's attention to the need to improve the quality of PM emission data;

(q) Took note of the significant potential for reducing PM levels in EECCA countries and the importance of their involvement in the work on PM;

(r) Stressed the need for further development of source-receptor matrices for PM for the whole EMEP region;

(s) Invited the Expert Group to analyze options for addressing PM in a future protocol;

(t) Took note of the table of inputs for the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, prepared by the chairs of the subsidiary bodies and the secretariat, and agreed to make it available to the Executive Body as an informal document to facilitate discussion;

(u) Welcomed the offer of Italy to co-chair the Expert Group on Techno-economic issues and to host the fourth workshop of NEBEI in Syracuse (Italy) in April 2006.

V. DRAFT WORKPLAN

51. The Working Group discussed its draft workplan for 2006 (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/11) and agreed a number of amendments. It requested the secretariat to reflect these in a revised document and submit it for consideration by the Executive Body.

52. Regarding item 1.4 (c) of the draft workplan, Canada announced it would prepare a brief document considering the possible revision of the Protocol on POPs, stemming from the sufficiency and effectiveness review, for consideration by the Working Group. Regarding item 1.5 (b) of the draft workplan, Canada stressed the importance of further technical work necessary to assess the extent to which a satisfactory basis exists for the application of an effects-based approach.

53. The United Kingdom expressed concerns about the heavy work-load for the Working Group in 2006 and requested that the Executive Body clarify its ambitions regarding the three protocols.

VI. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY

54. The secretariat provided information on progress in the project for capacity building for air quality management and the application of clean coal combustion technologies in Central Asia (CAPACT). Planned workshops were being extended to include the participation of experts from other EECCA countries with funds provided by the Netherlands.

55. The delegation of Kazakhstan and the delegation of Kyrgyzstan provided information on their involvement with CAPACT. They noted the importance of the project and their efforts to develop national plans and scientific and technical activities as steps towards implementation of the Convention and its protocols.

56. The delegation of the Netherlands expressed support for the activities and called upon other Parties, in particular lead countries of expert groups and task forces, to provide funds for the participation of experts from EECCA countries in the meetings and workshops they host.

57. The delegation of Poland proposed in-kind assistance to EECCA countries for training in air quality monitoring. A future workshop, organized by the UNECE Working Group on Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, could be used as the basis for a training session for technical experts. EECCA countries might also benefit from Poland's experience in the application of clean coal combustion technologies. Other synergies with UNECE activities such as Environmental Performance Reviews and the work of the Committee on Environmental Policy could be explored.

58. The secretariat reported on the development of implementation guides for the three most recent protocols to the Convention. At the Executive Body's request (ECE/EB.AIR/83,

para.56(h)) and with funds from the Government of Canada, the secretariat had employed a consultant to prepare draft guides. These would be finalized and translated into Russian in the near future. It also noted that Canada had translated the Mapping Manual of the Working Group on Effects into Russian to facilitate participation of EECCA countries in the work on effects.

59. The Working Group:

(a) Welcomed the progress in the implementation of the project for capacity-building for air quality management and the application of clean coal combustion technologies in Central Asia (CAPACT) and its workshop on air quality management and the international legal framework (12-14 October in Almaty). It also welcomed the planned workshop on air pollution monitoring and data reporting to be held in 2006;

(b) Welcomed the development of the implementation guides and the plans to translate them into Russian, as well as the translation into Russian of the Mapping Manual of the Working Group on Effect.

VII. FUTURE CONVENTION PRIORITIES

60. The delegation of Sweden introduced the report on future Convention priorities (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/14) summarizing the results of the workshop held in Gothenburg, Sweden on 25 to 27 October 2004. It noted the availability of the full report of the workshop and drew attention to the conclusions on particles, nitrogen, hemispheric transport, “new” sources and development of science and policy tools.

61. In the discussion that followed, delegations stressed the importance of having interim goals as well as long-term objectives. They also noted the need to consider inclusion of non-technical measures in developing future policies.

62. In a tour de table, delegations indicated their plans for ratification of the Protocol on POPs, The Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol. While most Parties were taking steps towards ratification of the protocols, some of the technical annexes to the protocols presented difficulties for implementation and ratification.

63. As requested by the Executive Body (ECE/EB.AIR/83, para. 56(e)) the secretariat reported on the possibilities for extending the geographical scope of the Convention beyond the UNECE region. Other UNECE Convention were aiming to allow accession by Members of the United Nations so the possibility was available to the Executive Body through amendment of the Convention text.

64. The delegation of the United States informed the Working Group about the results of the first meeting of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, drawing attention to

the planned workshops and meetings in 2006. It noted the website of the Task Force (www.htap.org) and the report provided to the EMEP Steering Body (EB.AIR/GE.1/2005/12).

65. The Working Group:

(a) Noted with appreciation the results of the workshop held in Gothenburg (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/14) and agreed to bear them in mind in its future deliberations;

(b) Took note of the results of the first meeting of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution and requested to be kept informed of further progress.

VIII. SEMINAR ON ADDRESSING AIR POLLUTION ISSUES IN THE COUNTRIES IN TRANSITION

66. Mr. Ballaman introduced an informal document on promoting the Convention in EECCA countries. He drew attention to the current activities and noted those planned as well as those that could be planned in the future. Mr. Maas introduced an action plan for the next 2 to 3 years to involve EECCA countries in the work of the Convention. The plan was based on that proposed by the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling (EB.AIR/WG.5/2005/3, annex) and elaborated further by the bureau of the Executive Body and the secretariat.

67. A number of delegations, including those from the EECCA region, welcomed the documents and agreed that they formed a good basis for future planning. A number of non-EECCA delegations indicated their willingness to be involved in the future activities either through help in kind or by contributions to the Trust Fund. Delegations from EECCA countries also indicated their willingness to participate in the activities, especially those that would address their technical and training requirements.

68. Some delegations noted that the Environment for Europe Ministerial Conference, to be held in Belgrade in 2007, might provide a good opportunity to engage at the ministerial level and invited the secretariat to investigate possibilities for this.

69. The Working Group agreed the action plan for involving the EECCA countries in the work of the Convention and requested that it be annexed to its report to enable consideration and approval by the Executive Body.

IX. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

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

X. OTHER BUSINESS

71. The Working Group expressed its deep regret to hear of the death of Prof. David Pearce, former Chair of the Task Force on Economic Aspects of Abatement Strategies and the Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Instruments.

XI. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

72. The Working Group adopted the report of its thirty-seventh session on 30 September 2005.

Annex

ACTION PLAN TO INVOLVE EASTERN EUROPE, THE CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIA (EECCA) COUNTRIES IN THE WORK OF THE CONVENTION (IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION AND ITS PROTOCOLS)

1. Create awareness on potential health and environment problems in EECCA, as well as on the nature of transboundary influences and links with other environmental problems, by compiling national and international expert reports (contributions should be invited from: CCE, WHO, UNECE, UNEP, EEA, non-government organizations and national experts).
2. Assure political commitment at the ministerial level by agreement on priority air pollution problems, the need for international cooperation, the steps to be taken and whom to involve (action required from the Working Group on Strategies and Review and the Executive Body). Priority could be given to the larger countries (e.g. Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan) or other countries with a particular willingness to become involved.
3. Invite the nomination of experts/focal points to task forces and expert groups and further encourage funding by lead countries to enable experts to attend meetings (action: chairpersons of task forces, secretariat).
4. Draw up a provisional budget for action (secretariat), taking into account ongoing work (e.g. UNECE CAPACT project) and discuss funding with possible donors such as the World Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the European Commission and Parties (action: Executive Body, secretariat).
5. Invite Parties, that have not already done so, to ratify the EMEP Protocol as a first step for achieving major benefits from co-operation with the Convention's programme centres and other Parties. This step would lead to support for setting up monitoring stations and for reporting national emission inventories (see below).
6. Consider available EMEP monitoring stations, identify further requirements and priorities, and develop plans for improving the EMEP network by establishing at least one EMEP station in each country (action: EMEP Chemical Coordinating Centre, Task Force on Measurements and Modelling and Parties).
7. Develop best emission estimates and scenarios (for SO₂, NO_x, NH₃, NMVOC, CO, Hg, Cd, Pb, PAHs, dioxins/furans and hexachlorobenzene as a minimum) based on energy statistics, agricultural data, etc, and organize bilateral consultations with EECCA experts (available expert

estimates may be used as a starting point) (action: CIAM, MSC-West).

8. Extend the modelling domain of EMEP to include Central Asia and compare results with available measurement data (action: MSC-West).
9. Participate in ecosystem monitoring networks (using new, existing or previously existing national networks) (action: EECCA countries).
10. Develop and harmonize receptor and ecosystem sensitivity maps and organize bilateral and sub-regional consultations (action: CCE and Working Group on Effects).
11. Develop health damage estimates and organize bilateral and sub-regional consultations (action: Task Force on Health, UNECE).
12. Identify abatement options and develop cost curves (action: Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, CIAM).
13. Gather information on the manufacture and use of substances in annexes I and II of the Protocol on POPs as a preliminary step towards accession to the Protocol (action: EECCA countries).
14. Carry out a regular review of the implementation of the action plan (Working Group on Strategies and Review, EMEP Steering Body, Working Group on Effects).