

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
9.15 a.m. 12 May 2005, Brussels**

Prepared by the secretariat in consultation with the Bureau

1. The first meeting of the Bureau in 2005 was chaired by the Chairman of the Executive Body, Mr H. Dovland (Norway), and was attended by Vice-Chairmen Mr R. Ballaman (Switzerland), Mr P. Széll (United Kingdom), Mr J. Schneider (Austria), Ms P. Farnsworth (Canada), Mr. M. Williams (United Kingdom), Mr. A. Jagusiewicz (Poland). Mr K. Bull attended for the UNECE secretariat. Mr M. Vainio (European Commission) attended as observer. Apologies were received from Mr H. Gregor (Germany).

**I. NOTE OF THE BUREAU MEETING OF 29 NOVEMBER 2004
(EBBUREAU/2004/3) INCLUDING MATTERS ARISING NOT ELSEWHERE ON
AGENDA**

2. The note had been previously circulated and had been placed on the Convention's website.

**II. TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE BODY AND ENTRY
INTO FORCE OF THE GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL**

3. The Bureau agreed that the twenty-fifth anniversary Executive Body session had been a great success and the event had proceeded as planned.

4. The Chairman noted that since the last meeting the sixteenth ratification of the Gothenburg Protocol had been deposited, so entry into force would take place on 17 May 2005. This would have implications for the work of the Convention in the coming year as, under the terms of the Protocol, its review would need to be started by its Parties at the Executive Body session in December.

III. PROTOCOL REVIEWS

5. Mr. Ballaman (Chair of the Working Group on Strategies and Review) noted progress in the review of the Protocol on POPs and the work being done to review the dossiers of PBDE and PFOS with the view to their consideration for addition to the annexes to the Protocol. A report would be made to the Working Group on Strategies and Review and a

proposal submitted to the Executive Body. He noted that a document on PFOS from an industrial company was to be made available to the Task Force, though there were no explicit provisions for such submissions in the currently agreed procedures.

6. In the following discussion the Bureau considered the need for a clear process for assessment of dossiers whilst recognizing the importance of transparency and openness in the work of the Convention. It was confirmed that the Task Force should assess and proceed to the technical review of the submitted dossier as it was noted that well prepared dossiers should make reference to all information of relevance. Other data and information made available by experts could be discussed by the Task Force and reported to the Working Group on Strategies and Review for due consideration. The Bureau also noted the importance of collaboration with the Stockholm Convention on POPs and encouraged the Task Force and the secretariat to continue with their efforts maintaining effective links.

7. The Bureau also discussed the issue of representation of NGOs and industry at meetings held under the Convention. While the UN accredited list of bodies was used for guidance by the Convention, individual experts and organizations had always been received at meetings provided they were under the banner of an appropriate international umbrella body. For the meetings in Geneva this might be seen as an effective filter to ensure proper participation. Task Force and Expert Group Chairs also had the possibility of extending personal invitations to experts.

8. The Bureau agreed that options for due process, especially with regard to participation and presentation of scientific and technical information, should receive further consideration. The secretariat could discuss this with members of the Task Force. The Bureau invited the secretariat to draw up a short paper on “options for process” noting any implications for resources and present it to the twenty-third session of the Executive Body.

9. Mr Ballaman noted progress in the effects-based work on heavy metals but stressed likely underestimates of deposition from the EMEP modelling work perhaps due to poor emission inventories. Mr Schneider indicated that the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections was addressing the issue and the EMEP heavy metals model would be reviewed later in 2005. As yet it did not seem clear how critical loads exceedances would be used in the process of review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals. It was agreed that items for this area of work needed to be prioritized.

10. Mr Ballaman outlined preparations for review of the Gothenburg Protocol noting the availability of updated information and the need to involve non-EU countries. He noted possible inputs from the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution. For particulate matter he suggested there were three options to arrive at emission controls (i) a revised Gothenburg Protocol, (ii) a separate protocol, (iii) a heavy metals protocol that included reference to particles. The Bureau noted that this would be an issue for the Parties to discuss.

11. The Bureau noted the difficulties that some Parties had in ratifying or acceding to the Gothenburg Protocol. It was recognized that the technical annexes presented problems for some.

IV. FUTURE DIRECTION OF THE CONVENTION

12. The Chair noted the importance of nitrogen and the plans of the Netherlands to hold a workshop. The Bureau agreed that the Nanjing Declaration should be placed on the Convention website.

13. The secretariat reported that Canada had donated funds for use in promoting the Convention's work in the EECCA region. Implementation guides were being prepared using the funds. The secretariat proposed to submit a budget for EECCA activities to the twenty-third session of the Executive Body to help identify activities currently funded and those requiring funds.

14. Mr Ballaman noted the Working Group on Strategies and Review would hold a seminar in September on the morning of the final day of its session. This would focus on the EECCA region but detailed plans were still to be drawn up. The secretariat would need to send letters of invitation informing Parties of the seminar. It was suggested that the informal paper on promoting the Convention in EECCA countries should be translated into Russian for the seminar. The secretariat would look into the possibilities for this.

V. DATA ISSUES

15. The secretariat introduced a paper on data issues drawing attention to the existing procedures for making data available as used by EMEP centres and centres under the Working Group on Effects. The procedures differed between different bodies often for reasons that were well understood.

16. The Bureau noted the need for transparency in the Convention's work but recognized the need to take into account resources available especially when preparing/providing data to organizations outside the Convention. The issue of putting data into the public domain was not always simple. The secretariat pointed out that even the Aarhus Convention included recognition of intellectual property rights and the restricted availability of data sets that were in the process of completion.

17. The Bureau agreed that the Extended Bureau of the Working Group on Effects be invited to look at the existing data rules with a view to revising them into a new single set of rules that could be applied across the Convention in the future.

VI. REPORTS AND MEETINGS IN GENEVA

18. The secretariat drew attention to the Secretary-General's guidelines for documentation and the plans for streamlining documents that were being implemented by the Convention's secretariat. The Bureau took note of the plans and requested these be kept under review to ensure that no difficulties arose in the future. It discussed future possibilities for using the Internet to replace hard copy documents, but stressed that this would need to be approved by the Executive Body.

19. The Bureau also discussed the possibilities for adopting just the conclusions and decisions at the end of the sessions of the Working Group on Strategies and Review and the

Executive Body instead of the full report. This would avoid the immediate translation of the complete draft report and save one half day of meeting time, as well as the half day interval waiting for the meeting report documents to be translated and printed (though it was noted that the Working Group on Strategies and Review was making good use of the later for its EECCA seminars).

20. The Bureau agreed that cutting the narrative parts could shorten reports. Some suggested that the trend towards very short reports, as used by some bodies, could be effective. There remained concern that decisions might not be available in translation at the end of meetings, but otherwise the Bureau felt that agreement of conclusions at the end of sessions was sufficient. It agreed the secretariat should feel free to propose to the Executive Body changes to the Convention's current practice.

VII. MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE UNECE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY AND THE UNECE CONVENTIONS BUREAUX

21. The secretariat circulated the agenda for the joint meeting of Bureaux that was scheduled for 6 June 2005. The Bureau noted the items on the agenda and agreed that Mr Dovland and Mr Ballaman would represent their interests at the meeting.

VIII. AARHUS CONVENTION GUIDELINES

22. The draft guidelines on public participation provided by the Aarhus Convention secretariat had been circulated to members of the Bureau. The Bureau took note of these whilst recognizing that the Parties to the Aarhus Convention had not yet adopted the guidelines. [It was suggested that some of the ideas behind the guidelines could be presented in a secretariat paper.]

IX. NEW EXPERT GROUPS/TASK FORCES

23. The Bureau noted that the Task Force on Heavy Metals had already started its work. The final preparations for the Expert Group on Particulate Matter were being made. It was noted that Expert Group, according to its provisional agenda, might go beyond its mandate at its first meeting. Mr Ballaman offered to provide the necessary advice and direction to the Group.

24. Preparations for the first meeting of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution were under way. The Co-Chairs of the Task Force had extended individual invitations to experts outside the UNECE regions and the secretariat had written to UNECE and non-UNECE countries inviting them to send experts.

X. OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

25. The secretariat informed the Bureau of the meetings planned by the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network for East Asia (EANET). The Scientific Advisory Committee would meet

in September and the Intergovernmental meeting in November. The Bureau hoped that EMEP could be represented in September and that the secretariat could attend in November.

26. The Bureau noted the International Union of Air Pollution Prevention and Environmental Protection Associations (IUAPPA) would be holding a global forum seminar in Japan in August.

XI. COMMUNICATIONS

27. The secretariat drew attention to the continuing improvements to the Convention's website and to the new newsletter prepared by the secretariat. The second edition of the newsletter was planned to coincide with the entry into force of the Gothenburg Protocol. The Bureau welcomed these efforts to improve communications.

28. The Bureau welcomed the increased use of the Internet for making available documents and presentations given at Task Force and Expert Group meetings. It suggested that presentations made at the Working Group on Strategies and Review, the EMEP Steering Body and the Working Group on Effects also be made available on the website.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

29. The Bureau noted that at the next meeting of the Executive Body, it would be necessary to elect a greater number than usual of new members to the Implementation Committee. It noted that six of the Committee's nine members were due to complete their terms of office in December and discussed the future balance of expertise and outlook needed if the Committee was to function efficiently. It agreed to return to its deliberations on this topic at its next meeting.

30. The secretariat drew attention to plans to develop an emission inventory review process within the framework of EMEP and its Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections. The Bureau welcomed these plans but stressed the need to take into account resource implications as well as the need for coordination with the EC reporting procedures.

XIII. DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

31. The Bureau agreed to hold its next meeting on the morning of 26 September 2005, prior to the session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review. It was proposed that a High-level Coordinating Group meeting take place on 27 October 2005.