

EXECUTIVE BODY FOR THE CONVENTION ON  
LONG-RANGE TRANSBOUNDARY AIR POLLUTION  
Bureau to the Executive Body

**REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE BUREAU  
TO THE EXECUTIVE BODY FOR THE CONVENTION  
17 September 2002, GENEVA**

**Prepared by the secretariat in consultation with the Chairman**

1. The second meeting of the Bureau in 2002 was chaired by the Chairman of the Executive Body, Mr H Dovland (Norway), and was attended by Vice Chairmen Mr L Lindau (Sweden), Mr W Harnett (United States), Mr R Ballaman (Switzerland), Mr P Szell (United Kingdom), Mr M Williams (United Kingdom) and Mr H Gregor (Germany). Mr K Bull and Mr H Wuester (item 1 to 4) attended for the UNECE secretariat. Mr D Hrcek (Slovenia) sent his apologies.

I. NOTE OF THE BUREAU MEETING OF 25 APRIL 2001 (EBBUREAU/2002/1)

2. The note of the previous meeting (EBBureau/2002/1) had been circulated and agreed. The secretariat had subsequently made the note available through the Executive Body's web page. Actions from the previous meeting were dealt with under agenda items below, the subject of a "Saltsjöbaden II" workshop was agreed to taken under item VII.

II. PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE BODY

3. The chairman invited comments on the preliminary draft agenda circulated by the secretariat. In addition to making suggestions for minor amendments, the Bureau noted that some of the text was placed in [ ] since it was dependent upon the outcome of discussions at the Working Group on Strategies and Review later in the week. It was expected that the situation with regard to a possible funding instrument would be resolved to enable a final draft agenda to be submitted for translation and distribution. As previously the secretariat place all documents on the web site as soon as they were available.

4. It was noted that the need for an expert group on heavy metals should be discussed at the Executive Body session. With the Protocol about to enter into force, decisions would be required with regard to a future review exercise including evaluation of the need to add additional substances to the Protocol.

5. Mr Bull drew attention to a decision taken by the Secretary General in May 2002 regarding the length of documents originating in the secretariat. Document services in the UN Geneva were now limiting the length of reports submitted to 20 pages. As a result some documents for the

twentieth session had been divided into two or three parts. The Bureau recognized that there may be some practical advantage for the translators but hoped this would not cause confusion for delegates.

### III. KIEV MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE (ENVIRONMENT FOR EUROPE) AND THE FUNDING OF CORE ACTIVITIES

6. The secretariat outlined the preparations for the Kiev Ministerial Conference noting that a number of protocols for conventions were in the final stages of negotiation ready for signature by ministers at the Conference. Mr Szell noted that, should a funding protocol be acceptable to and adopted by the Executive Body in December, the necessary three month period required by the UN in New York for preparing official texts prior to the signing ceremony at Kiev would be available. The text of such a decision had been prepared by the meeting of Heads of Delegations in May 2002. If agreed by the Executive Body, it would have immediate effect for all Parties to the Convention. It would, nevertheless, be desirable to report it to the ministers at Kiev with a view to them being invited to adopt a ministerial statement or declaration on the matter and, in addition, pledge voluntary contributions.

7. The Bureau discussed the positions that Parties might adopt in the discussions at the thirty-fourth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review and recognized the difficulties that some might have with a funding protocol.

### IV. IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

8. Mr Szell reported on the two meetings of the Implementation Committee held in 2002. Both had had very full agendas but the Committee had succeeded in completing most of its business. Prior to 2002, the individual cases that came before the Committee had all involved Parties reporting their own breaches (i.e. self-reporting). This year, however, the Committee had been called on to consider five referrals made by the secretariat, cases which by their nature had a greater potential to be confrontational and, hence, sensitive. The reactions by the Parties concerned had been mixed. Whilst one had supplied detailed written comments and sent a senior official to explain its position, two others had to date made comparatively little response. In all, 10 cases were currently under consideration by the Committee. Mr Szell noted that with more contentious cases now being brought before the Committee, it would be increasingly important for it to make sure it dealt with them in a demonstrably balanced and sensitive manner. To cite just one instance, the Committee must ensure that Parties which, for whatever reason, did not make an oral presentation to it were not thereby seen in a negative light. He felt that with each successive meeting, the Committee was sharpening and strengthening its approach.

9. Mr Szell informed the Bureau that he and the Committee's secretary were planning to assemble a handbook of Implementation Committee practice to help members of the Committee to maintain a consistent approach when dealing with individual cases.

10. He felt that the Executive Body's decisions on non-compliance were already successfully bringing pressure to bear on Parties. He recalled the approach that the Executive Body and the Committee had adopted to apply gradually greater pressure to those Parties that persisted in their non-compliance. This included the printing of such Parties' names in bold in reports and utilizing tougher or more insistent language in decisions. Mr Wuester stressed that the choice of wording for Executive Body decisions must be made carefully. In this regard, he believed that delegates to the Executive Body needed to be aware that an expression of "concern" in an Executive Body

decision conveys a strong message. The Bureau discussed other options for drawing attention to Executive Body decisions including informing ministers at conferences such as that at Kiev and providing information to the press. Mr Szell felt that the latter might be an ultimate step if Parties were failing to respond.

11. It was noted that in 2003 the Committee proposed to consider more fully the Strategies and Policies that had been reported by Parties and address issues such as Parties' failure to meet reporting deadlines. It was also noted that the Committee aimed to complete its in depth review of the Oslo Protocol next year.

12. The Bureau noted that the Implementation Committee had two members who were due for replacement or re-election at the Executive Body's twentieth session. One, the member from Italy, was available for re-election. The other, from Denmark was unable to stand again. Possible candidates to replace the latter were discussed.

## V. STRATEGIES AND POLICIES REVIEWS

13. Mr Harnett and Mr Bull informed the Bureau about the state of preparation for the publication of the 2000 review of strategies and policies which was being organized by the United States in collaboration with the secretariat. It was planned that the English version, and possibly those in French and Russian, would be ready for the twentieth session of the Executive Body in December.

14. Mr Bull explained the work that had been done for the 2002 review that had again taken advantage of a consultant provided by the United States. The draft summary of the review would be submitted to the Executive Body in December and, following comments and amendments received from Parties, would be published in 2003.

15. Mr Bull drew attention to document EB.AIR/2002/7, the assessment of the 2002 review exercise and options for the future. It raised questions regarding the scope and timescales for reporting. The Bureau felt there might be some value in separating the protocol specific questions from the general questions on strategies and policies and present these to Parties at different time intervals. They believed that 2 years was still an appropriate interval at present for the reporting of protocol related issues, but general questions might be asked every four years, e.g. next in 2006. It was also agreed that there could be value in having a web site that could be accessed over a much longer period (most of the year) but with a clear deadline for completing responses. It was agreed that there was a need to do more work on developing the questions for questionnaires; this should involve the Bureau and Implementation Committee. There was also a need to analyse past responses to provide a good basis for revised questions.

## VI. MEDIUM-TERM TIMETABLE

16. Mr Gregor informed the Bureau of the activities of the Working Group on Effects, stressing the importance of cooperation with EMEP and noting the value of the Joint Bureau meeting that was held between the EMEP Steering Body and the working Group on Effects in the spring. He identified the work ongoing in particular areas and indicated how this related to the medium-term work-plan. He stressed the importance of some of the upcoming workshops including that on ozone critical levels in November 2002 and the NEBEI workshop (in October 2002) on assessing economic damage of ecosystems. He noted the importance of communicating the results of the work to the public and highlighted the need for continued funding of the effects-based activities.

There was good evidence for increased participation in the work of the ICPs but their effective operation was still dependent upon lead countries. He outlined the work for the preparation of the substantive report on status and trends that was planned for completion in 2004.

17. Mr Williams outlined the progress made in finalizing the emission reporting guidelines and in the development of models. The Eulerian model was now nearing the stage where it could be used operationally, while the work on modelling heavy metals and POPs had made good progress. The Task Force on Measurements and Modelling had planned to develop national focal centres to aid interaction between the Task Force and national experts. Mr Williams drew attention to his stepping down as Chairman of the EMEP Steering Body and Mr Schneider's election to the post. As a result of this the UK had offered to take the lead for the Task Force on Measurements and Modelling (with Mr Derwent to co-chair with WMO). It was also understood that Poland may take over from the UK as lead country for the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections. Mr Williams also noted the progress made in the development of the RAINS integrated assessment model but stressed the need for data to prepare the model for the forthcoming reviews.

18. In discussion, the Bureau stressed the importance of future work on mercury noting the recent meeting of UNEP's Working Group on Mercury that had identified the need for action at a global scale. The importance of the effects of pollution on cultural heritage was also noted and Italy's proposal to establish a centre for such work under the ICP Materials was welcomed.

19. The Bureau discussed the budget for the international centres of the programmes of the Working Group on Effects. They expressed some concern about the increases made to the individual programme budgets but recognized that these were small compared with inflation. They requested the secretariat to make all available information available to the Working Group on Strategies and Review for their deliberations on a funding instrument.

## VII. COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION WITH ACTIVITIES OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S CAFE PROGRAMME

20. Mr Lindau informed the Bureau about the European Commission's support for the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling at IIASA. He noted that some Dutch funding was also being provided to the centre to do some work on the links with climate change effects/pollutants. The Commission staff were currently evaluating tenders for work on the TREMOVE traffic model, it was recognized by CAFE that urban links to RAINS needed to be addressed. A tender exercise for a cost-benefit analysis was also underway. CAFE was awaiting the outcome of work by WHO that would have some value to the work of the Convention. At the Steering Group meeting the Commission staff had drawn attention to the need for the preparation of a Strategic Proposal by the end of 2004.

21. Mr Bull reported that the CAFE Steering Group had not been provided with an updated work-plan but this was promised for the near future. He also reported on discussions with Commission staff regarding an independent review of the RAINS model that would be contracted by the Commission for CAFE but would be timely to feed into the work-plan of the Executive Body. The Bureau welcomed this proposal from the Commission and hoped that the contractors report would be available for the review workshop planned for autumn 2003.

22. Mr Lindau also informed the Bureau that the next meeting of the CAFE Steering Group could be deferred from December 2002 until spring 2003. This may have implications if the Bureau wished to hold a High Level Coordinating Group (HLCG) meeting with the Commission

staff at that time. The Bureau discussed the options for a future HLCG meeting taking into account other meetings planned towards the end of 2002 and the beginning of 2003. The secretariat agreed to contact Peter Wicks to ascertain possible options for the next HLCG meeting.

23. In addition,, Mr Lindau reminded the Bureau about the Swedish proposal to hold a “Saltsjobaden II” workshop. He had also made a similar announcement to the CAFE Steering Group. It was planned that the workshop would probably be held in 2004 when both the Convention and CAFE would be considering their future strategic plans and how to implement them.

24. Mr Ballaman noted that there were some clashes of dates between CAFE meetings and workshops and meetings under the Convention. The Bureau hoped that this situation could be avoided in the future.

#### VIII. TRUST FUNDS

25. Mr Bull informed the Bureau of the status of the Convention’s Trust Funds. In particular he noted that while a greater number of contributions had been made to the Trust Fund for effect-oriented activities and integrated assessment modelling, many of these were for small amounts and the total for 2002 so far did not exceed 15% of that required. The Trust Fund for assisting countries with economies in transition had received small contributions but only few countries had taken advantage of using it to attend recent sessions of the Working Group on Effects, the EMEP Steering Body and for the upcoming session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review.

#### IX. KAZAKHSTAN

26. The secretariat provided information on a proposal drawn up by Mr Libert, the regional advisor to the Environment and Human Settlements Division, in collaboration with the secretariat, Mr Lars Nordberg and the UNEP Regional Office for Asia, for a project on capacity building for air quality management for central Asia. The proposal, which included aspects of clean coal combustion technologies, and also involved the ECE Energy Division, had been sent to the UN Development Account and the secretariat was awaiting a decision on funding. The secretariat would keep the Bureau informed of developments.

#### X. OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

27. International Union of Air Pollution Prevention and Environmental Protection Associations (IUAPPA). The secretariat informed the Bureau that a meeting had taken place in Sweden in June involving Mr Mills (Director-General IUAPPA), Mr Nordberg, the secretariat, UNEP Regional Research Centre for Asia and the Pacific, the president of IUAPPA and a number of regional representatives, to discuss the developments of international frameworks for air pollution control. While the meeting had indicated support for IUAPPA proposals for a global mechanism, it had stressed the need for flexibility. The results of the meeting were to be reported to Dr Topfer of UNEP and Mr Mills indicated that he was keen to present proposals to the Executive Body of the Convention in December 2002. IUAPPA intended to further develop its proposals for presentation to the UNEP Governing Council next year. The secretariat noted it had heard nothing from IUAPPA or from Mr Mills, in recent weeks. The Bureau requested the secretariat to find out if IUAPPA was listed on the Roster to ensure that appropriate procedures were used if Mr Mills wished to address the Executive Body session.

28. Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET). The secretariat reported that it had not yet heard when the next meeting of the EANET Intergovernmental Meeting would take place. No invitation had been received from the UNEP secretariat. The Bureau noted that, despite the invitations sent by the secretariat, no representative from EANET had attended the recent sessions of the Working Group on Effects or EMEP Steering Body. Collaboration between EANET scientists and ICP Forests was noted and there were communications with the EMEP centres. The Bureau hoped that future collaboration with EANET could be maintained and requested the secretariat to continue with its efforts.

29. Collaboration with UNEP. The secretariat noted its continuing collaborative activities between UNEP Chemicals in Geneva. It had recently requested a joint secretariat meeting with UNEP Chemicals and this had proved very successful. The Convention's secretariat were involved in the Steering Group of the UNEP/GEF project on Potentially Toxic Substances, the UNEP Advisory Group on Monitoring POPs, and the UNEP Working Group on Mercury (see item VI above). A UNEP Chemicals representative sat on the Convention's Expert Group on POPs.

30. Bad Breisig workshop. It was noted that preparations for the workshop were well in hand and that the workshop aimed to address both technical and policy issues. It was understood that there would be some representation from East Asia at the workshop. The Bureau agreed on the importance of this issue but recognized that future consideration needed to be given in order to decide how the outputs and future work would be used within the Convention.

31. Integrated Assessment of Climate Change. The Bureau briefly discussed the issue of the relationship between the traditional pollutants covered by the Convention and their radiative forcing effects and how these may be addressed through integrated assessment modelling. The Bureau agreed that it was necessary to identify synergies and to include the work in the Executive Body's future work-plan. However, it recognized that the work should not attempt to compete with modelling activities under the Framework Convention on Climate Change.

## XI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ISSUES

32. Mr Ballaman informed the Bureau of the joint meeting between the CEP Bureau and representatives of the Bureaux of the five environmental Conventions of ECE. Consultant reports on public/NGO participation in decision-making under the Conventions had been discussed as well as a paper, prepared by the Chair of CEP, on future strategic directions. The five Conventions all involved NGOs in various ways, and, while recognizing the need for flexibility and change in the future, noted that the Aarhus Convention was a separate legal instrument. The Bureau noted the outcome of the joint meeting, agreed to continue its future collaboration with CEP and the other Conventions, but expressed concern about any future increased level of reporting to CEP or the benefits of regular meetings of the implementation committees of the Conventions.

## XII. COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

33. Mr Ballaman provided an update on the preparations for the workshop on communications strategy. Mr Chadwick was continuing with his preparations and was planning for the workshop in the UK in spring 2003. Dates had yet to be agreed, but the Bureau stressed that the workshop should not clash with other Convention meetings or with the Kiev Ministerial Conference.

34. The secretariat noted that it was continuing to update and improve the Convention's web site, and invited comments or suggestions for further improvements. The Bureau discussed the possibility of extra-budgetary funds to help the secretariat in this work.

### XIII. ECE ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

35. The secretariat informed the Bureau that the Executive Secretary's document on Strengthening the Organization had been discussed at various levels within the secretariat and by ECE. It was still unclear about any future changes that may take place and how these might affect the Convention's secretariat, though major impacts were not yet evident.

36. Mr Bull also reminded the Bureau about forthcoming changes in the secretariat staff due to the retirements of Ms Szabo and Mr Chrast. The Bureau noted their appreciation of the excellent work of the retiring staff members who had served the Convention well for many years. They hoped that replacement staff could be integrated effectively in the near future.

### XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

37. The Bureau discussed the needs for future recruitment of members to the Bureau of the Working Group on Strategies and Review and the Bureau of the Executive Body. They identified possible suitable candidates that may wish to stand for election.

38. The Bureau noted that Mr Hrcek had taken up a post at WMO and was no longer eligible to sit on the Executive Body Bureau (he had sent his apologies for the meeting). The Bureau wished to record its thanks to Mr Hrcek for his enthusiastic input to the work of the Bureau and wished him every success in his future work.

### XV. NEXT MEETING

39. The Bureau agreed that it could be convenient to hold its next meeting in conjunction with a High Level Coordinating Group Meeting (HLCG) with the staff of the European Commission responsible for the CAFE programme. As noted above (para 26) it seemed likely that the CAFE Steering Group meeting planned for November 2002 would be deferred until spring 2003 which may be a suitable time for the Bureau to meet. The secretariat agreed to liaise with the CAFE secretariat regarding a HLCG meeting, and to circulate the Bureau with possible dates for its next meeting.