



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/82  
22 May 2006

Original: ENGLISH

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

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

Working Group on Strategies and Review

Meeting of the Heads of Delegation  
Geneva, 19–21 April 2006

**REPORT ON THE MEETING OF HEADS OF DELEGATION**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. The meeting of heads of delegation of the Working Group on Strategies and Review was held in Geneva from 19 to 21 April 2006.
2. The session was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United States and the European Community.
3. The EMEP<sup>1</sup> Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM) was represented. Also attending were representatives of CONCAWE (the oil companies' European association for environmental and health protection), Eurelectric, the European Environmental Bureau and the European Association of Internal Combustion Engine Manufacturers.

---

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

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

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

5. The heads of delegation adopted the agenda of the meeting as set out in ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/81.

### **II. PREPARATIONS FOR THE REVIEW OF THE 1999 GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL**

6. The Chairman reminded participants that the Executive Body, at its twenty-third session, had initiated the first review of the Gothenburg Protocol to the Convention in accordance with article 10 of the Protocol. In view of its plans to complete the review at its twenty-fifth session in December 2007, the Executive Body invited all bodies of the Convention to plan their work for the review. The secretariat introduced document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/1, which had been prepared to facilitate the further planning of the review process.
7. A number of delegations noted the slow process of ratifications of the Protocol, largely due to the complexity of its technical annexes. It was suggested that this issue was appropriately reflected in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/1 and taken into account in the review process.
8. Concerning the inputs from EMEP to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol, Mr. Jürgen Schneider (Austria), Chairman of the EMEP Steering Body, informed the meeting of the latest developments in improving the quality of emission data. He drew attention to the current revision of the *Guidelines for Estimating and Reporting Emission Data under the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution* and the three-stage emission data review process. The chapters on particulate matter (PM) of the *Emission Inventory Guidebook* were being updated and would be available to Parties for emission reporting in 2007.
9. Mr. Schneider said that the unified Eulerian model was fit to purpose for acidification, eutrophication and ozone modelling, and that there was ongoing work to improve the modelling for primary PM. Some discrepancies between measured and modelled data remained. Source-receptor matrices were available. With regard to the meteorology used, while an average of 10 years had been used during the negotiation of the Gothenburg Protocol, the current source-receptor matrices had been developed for five specific years.
10. Mr. Markus Amann (CIAM) provided updated information on the development of the RAINS model framework and the baseline scenarios. Stressing the recent improvements in the model, including the modelling of ozone in urban areas, he added that calculations for the baseline scenarios focused on 2015 and 2020, and that only indications could be given for 2010. He urged countries which had not provided data to CIAM for the modelling to do so as soon as possible. A first set of baseline scenarios covering most countries in the EMEP domain should be presented in September and a consultation launched before the end of 2006.
11. The delegation of the Netherlands expressed the view that the GAINS model should be used instead of the RAINS model in a possible revision of the Protocol, in order to show the relationship with climate change. In view of this, work should start on checking air pollution data

for non-European Union countries and greenhouse gas data for all countries in the modelling domain.

12. Mr. Rob Maas (Netherlands), Chairman of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, summarized the policy consequences of the most important methodological changes to the RAINS model, noting in particular the increased health effects resulting from long-term exposure to secondary particles in comparison with the acute effects considered for the Gothenburg Protocol; the reduced protection of ecosystems from acidification and eutrophication resulting from the use of ecosystem-specific deposition rates in the EMEP model; the higher contribution of hemispheric sources to the European background levels of ozone and particles; the general increase in base-year emissions due to improvements in emission estimates; the lower than expected effectiveness of some policy measures, especially in the transport sector; and the increase in ship emissions. He noted that the total costs of the Protocol (less than 1% of GDP) were less than expected, due to experience, economies of scale and synergy effects of climate change policies.

13. The heads of delegation took note of the fact that the above observations could lead to the conclusion that, while the current efforts under the protocol could be considered “no-regret”, the Protocol was not sufficient to meet its original ambitions regarding the long-term protection of ecosystems and health. Further measures would be needed.

14. Mr. Andre Zuber (EC), Co-Chair of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, informed the meeting about the future plans of the Task Force and said that, while the main output would be delivered in 2009, the Task Force would provide an interim report in time for the twenty-fifth session of the Executive Body, as an input to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol.

15. Mr. Beat Achermann (Switzerland), Vice-Chairman of the Working Group on Effects, presented the recent developments in effects-oriented activities. He noted that the main conclusions of the 2004 substantive report of the Working Group on Effects were still valid, namely:

(a) While the deposition exceeding critical loads of acidification in Europe was reduced, sensitive ecosystems would not be fully protected by current obligations. Mainly chemical but also biological signs of recovery were being observed.

(b) The critical loads of eutrophication were substantially exceeded in large areas of Europe by oxidized and reduced nitrogen. The stability of ecosystems, including changes in biodiversity, continued to be threatened.

(c) Current levels of ozone were having adverse effects on human health and vegetation.

(d) Current levels of particulate matter (PM) were leading to severe effects on human health and contributing to corrosion and soiling of materials.

(e) Dynamic models that provided information on the time required for ecosystem damage or recovery were available.

16. Mr. Achermann noted that new findings would be reported in 2006 and 2007 and would be available for the review:

(a) The International Cooperative Programmes would provide new results on monitoring, modelling and assessment of effects on human health, ecosystems and materials.

(b) Some Parties had updated critical loads for acidity and nutrient nitrogen in early 2006.

(c) The dynamic models for eutrophication were data-intensive and needed further testing. Parties were invited to conduct and report such studies in 2007.

(d) New approaches for ozone impacts were suggested for use in integrated assessment modelling.

(e) The harmonized land cover map was expected to be finalized in mid-2006.

(f) The new global air quality guidelines (AQG) on human health effects prepared by the World Health Organization included interim and target AQG for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> as annual and daily means and recommended 8-hour values for ozone.

(g) New multi-pollutant exposure-response functions for different materials were available.

17. The delegation of the Netherlands noted that it was necessary to improve the effects indicators, especially with regard to the effects on environment. For instance, excess deposition and its relation to percentage occurrence of species could be presented on maps. Further efforts should be made to quantify damage, where possible.

18. Mr. Tiziano Pignatelli and Mr. Jean-Guy Bartaire, Co-Chairs of the Expert Group on Techno-Economic Issues, described the progress made in assessing the costs of abatement technologies and in the development of ECODAT. They noted that synopsis sheets of background information on selected sectors had been circulated to all Heads of Delegation in September 2005. The Expert Group was currently updating certain parts of annexes IV, V and VIII of the Gothenburg Protocol (in accordance with its article 3.4) and would report on progress at the next meeting of the Working Group on Strategies and Review.

19. The delegation of the Netherlands stressed the importance of updating all information on the annexes and the guidance documents in view of technical developments, including information on PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

20. The Chair introduced the outline for the main review report that would be produced by December 2007 for submission to the Executive Body and noted the timetable for preparation of

the report (see the annex), stressing in particular that the contributions for the first draft of the review should be submitted in November 2006.

21. The delegations of the United States and Canada informed participants that in 2007 they would develop a joint report to assess progress bilaterally on issues related to the Gothenburg Protocol, and in particular concerning PM. This report would be taken into account in the review process. A presentation on the preliminary results would be made to the Working Group at its thirty-eighth session in September 2006. It was agreed that the main review report would include a chapter on progress in North America.

22. In a survey of progress in ratification of the Protocol, relatively few delegations said that they expected ratification by the end of 2006. A number mentioned difficulties in complying with the technical annexes of the Protocol. A specific chapter with possible recommendations for improving the situation would deal with these aspects in the review report.

23. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the work in preparation for the review carried out under EMEP, the Working Group on Effects and the Task Forces and Expert Groups;

(b) Agreed on the list of technical elements to be considered in the review and on the provisional outline, presented in document ECE/EB.AIR/2006/1, section II, as amended;

(c) Requested the secretariat to produce a revised version of document ECE/EB.AIR/2006/1 with the proposed amendments, make a draft version available to Expert Groups and Task Forces, and present it for consideration at the twenty-fifth session of the Working Group on Effects, the thirtieth session of the steering Body to EMEP and the thirty-eighth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review in September 2006;

(d) Agreed on the timetable for the preparation of the Gothenburg Protocol review report as presented in the annex; and

(e) Noted that, in view of the slow process of new ratifications, in-depth consideration should be given to the structural complexity of the Protocol and the possible impediments faced by some countries in meeting the existing Protocol obligations, such as fixed emission ceilings.

### **III. FINANCING OF CORE ACTIVITIES NOT COVERED BY THE EMEP PROTOCOL**

24. The Chair introduced the agenda item by drawing attention to the twenty-third session of the Executive Body, which had noted that decision 2002/1 had not been effective in attracting the necessary funds for coordination of the work not covered by the EMEP Protocol. He requested the Working Group to consider further the issue of funding in order to identify more effective ways to implement or apply decision 2002/1.

25. The secretariat provided updated information on the additional contributions received after the twenty-third session of the Executive Body. The information was made available as an informal document. Germany and the United Kingdom were invited to transmit further clarifications to the secretariat in order to properly reflect the amounts of their contributions (to the centres located on their territory) in that document.

26. The delegation of France considered that the work of the programme centres lacked visibility. It suggested that one way for improving the financing of activities might be to identify tasks/projects that could be financed or executed by one specific Party.

27. The delegation of Spain suggested that the secretariat send out a brief document providing information on the use of the work when requesting the recommended contribution. The delegation of Canada stressed the need for accountability and supported the suggestion of Spain. The delegation of the European Community highlighted the importance of proper accounting of the resources provided and the results achieved.

28. While recognizing the merits of such an approach, the delegation of Norway reminded the meeting that many of the activities were related to monitoring, which might not be attractive to funders. It was important to ensure the activities' continuity and stable financing. The Protocols were effects-based, and scientific and technical input was extremely important for the integrated assessment modelling and hence for the design of cost-effective emission reduction strategies.

29. It was noted that the decision 2002/1 had been taken by consensus by the Executive Body and as such was binding on the Parties and should be respected. Hence the financing of the effects-oriented activities should not be seen as a collection of voluntary funds donated at the Parties' discretion.

30. The delegation of the Netherlands suggested that more funding be directed to those centres that were not fully supported by the lead countries. It reminded the Working Group that the Executive Body had drawn attention to the need for the Working Group on Effects to discuss possibilities for the distribution of trust fund support for core activities not covered by the EMEP Protocol (ECE/EB.AIR/87, para. 95 (j)).

31. The Working Group:

(a) Requested the secretariat to draft a brief document substantiating the request for contributions in 2006 in collaboration with the delegations of Spain, Canada and Germany; and

(b) Invited the Working Group on Effects to consider identifying specific tasks or activities which could be supported by individual Parties as contributions in-kind, in accordance with decision 2002/1.

#### **IV. FURTHER WORK RELATED TO PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS (POPs), HEAVY METALS AND PARTICULATE MATTER**

32. The secretariat informed participants that the Task Force on Heavy Metals had held an informal editorial meeting in Dessau in February 2006 to prepare draft chapters for the sufficiency and effectiveness review of the 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals. The Task Force would finalize the chapters at its third meeting in Ottawa (9–12 May 2006) for submission to the Working Group in September.

33. Ms. Cheryl Heathwood (Canada), Co-Chair of the Task Force on POPs, informed participants of the progress made on track B assessments for the substances proposed for addition to the Protocol annexes (pentaBDE and PFOS) as well as the track A and B reviews of the substances newly proposed by the European Community for addition to the Protocol annexes (hexachlorobutadiene, octaBDE, pentachlorobenzene, polychlorinated naphthalenes and short-chain chlorinated paraffins). The team of independent reviewers had prepared summaries of their reviews, which would be considered at the fifth meeting of the Task Force, to be held from 29 May to 1 June in Tallinn.

34. The United States remained concerned that in their view the summaries were not completely unbiased, and indicated their wish for a discussion on how to structure the summaries.

35. The European Community would inform the Working Group at its thirty-eighth session in September 2006 about the status of three other substances it might propose: endosulphan, dicofol and pentachlorophenol.

36. Ms. Marion Wichmann-Fiebig (Germany), Co-Chair of the Expert Group on Particulate Matter, informed the meeting about the results of the Expert Group's meeting in March 2006 in Dessau (Germany). She presented the draft report outline agreed on by the Expert Group and distributed as an informal document to the Working Group.

37. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the progress achieved by the Task Force on Heavy Metals and the Task Force on POPs;

(b) Took note of the draft report outline agreed on by the Expert Group on PM and requested the Expert Group to continue its work and explore the potential options, including identifying the pros and cons of addressing PM under the Convention (as mentioned in the draft outline), and to report on its progress at the Working Group's thirty-eighth session.

## V. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACTION PLAN FOR EASTERN EUROPE, CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIA (EECCA)

38. Mr. Bo Libert, UNECE Regional Advisor for environment, informed the Working Group about the progress of the CAPACT<sup>2</sup> project and related activities in the EECCA region. He noted the development of implementation plans for the Convention's protocols in the pilot country, Kazakhstan; the involvement of other EECCA country representatives in the workshops under the project in 2005 and 2006 in Almaty; and the translation of major guidance documents into Russian. He also stressed the importance of making ratification of the EMEP Protocol a priority.

39. The delegation of Canada said it could offer assistance for translation of documents and would appreciate a list of necessary actions which could be specifically supported by individual Parties.

40. In a discussion of ratification, it became clear that most EECCA countries which were not Parties to the EMEP Protocol had either started the process of ratification or were intending to do so in the near future. The Working Group noted the plans to establish EMEP monitoring sites in Armenia, Azerbaijan, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, as well as Norway's support for some of these sites. Mr. Libert drew attention to the progress in establishing an EMEP monitoring station in Kazakhstan under the CAPACT project. In addition, countries expressed their willingness to participate in the monitoring of health effects and damage to ecosystems.

41. Concerning the collection of data on the production and sales of POPs, several delegations announced that a POPs inventory was under way in their countries, most often as part of a project under the Stockholm Convention.

42. The main difficulties for EECCA countries relating to the preparation of emission inventories were methodological – for example, discrepancies between their national statistical categories and the SNAP codes. The importance of translating selected key chapters of the *Emission Inventory Guidebook* was emphasized. The delegations of Belarus and Ukraine shared their positive experience in developing a top-down approach to the calculation of emissions and presenting emission data in the format required by the Convention. Mr. Libert drew attention to the Workshop on International Air Pollution Monitoring, Data and Reporting planned under the CAPACT project in October 2006 in Almaty and invited Belarus and Ukraine to present their experience to experts from other EECCA countries.

43. The delegation of Poland confirmed that it would organize training for 12 monitoring experts from the EECCA countries in conjunction with the workshop on enterprise monitoring of the UNECE Working Group on Monitoring and Assessment on 4–6 September 2006 in Warsaw, in accordance with item 1.8 (d) of the workplan for the implementation of the Convention.

44. The delegations of Switzerland and the Netherlands announced that they would make contributions to the E 112 Trust Fund to facilitate participation in major meetings in the coming months. The delegation of the European Commission noted the support it provided to EECCA

---

<sup>2</sup> Capacity-Building for Air Quality Management and the Application of Clean Coal Combustion Technologies in Central Asia.



countries as a lead Party of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution. Mr. J.G. Bartaire, Co-Chair of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, invited EECCA countries to designate focal points for discussion of future cooperation.

45. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the progress of the CAPACT project, recognized its importance for strengthening the implementation of the Convention in the EECCA region and encouraged the active participation of EECCA experts in the project's workshops;

(b) Welcomed the plans of EECCA countries for accession to the EMEP Protocol and their efforts to establish EMEP stations;

(c) Recognized the importance of the translation into Russian of key chapters of the EMEP CORINAIR *Emission Inventory Guidebook* to assist Parties in the construction of emission inventories;

(d) Invited the secretariat to identify the specific needs of the EECCA countries for translation into Russian of other technical and scientific documents, with support from other Parties;

(e) Welcomed the support provided by countries, including that announced by Canada, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Switzerland and the European Community, to the EECCA countries and urged other countries to make efforts to provide similar support; and

(f) Reminded the lead Parties of Task Forces and Expert Groups to involve EECCA experts in their meetings.

## VI. OTHER BUSINESS

46. The Chair reminded the heads of delegation that the thirty-eighth session of the Working Group on Strategies was scheduled for 19–22 September 2006, starting on Tuesday, 19 September at 3 p.m. and finishing on Friday, 22 September at 1 p.m.

## Annex

**TIMETABLE FOR PREPARATION OF THE GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL REVIEW  
REPORT(S)**

<b>Meeting(s)</b>	<b>Report tabled for consideration</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
<b>WGSR</b> (April 2006)	“Preparations for review” (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/1)	Early February 2006
<b>TF/EG/ICP</b>	“Preparations for review” “draft Rev.1”	Feedback before mid-May 2006
<b>WGSR</b> (WGE, EMEP SB) (September 2006)	“Preparations for review” Rev.1 (final draft text)	End-May 2006
<b>EB 24</b> (December 2006)	“Preparations for review” Rev.2 (final text)	End-September 2006
<b>WGSR</b> (April 2007)	First draft of Main Report*	3 February 2007 <b><u>Inputs to first draft required by November 2006</u></b>
<b>TF/EG/ICP</b>	Revised first draft of Main Report	Feedback to secretariat by May 2007
<b>WGSR</b> (WGE/EMEP SB) (September 2007)	Final draft of Main Report	End-May 2007
	Draft subsidiary body reports	May/June 2007
	Unofficial reports**	To Geneva by mid- August 2007
<b>EB 25</b> (December 2007)	Main Report	End-September 2007
	Subsidiary body reports	End-September 2007
	Unofficial reports**	To Geneva by end- November 2007

\* Main review report as described in ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2006/1.

\*\* Additional reports submitted by subsidiary bodies not translated.