

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  
19 September 2006, Geneva**

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

The second meeting of the Bureau in 2006 was chaired by the Chairman of the Executive Body, Mr. M. Williams (United Kingdom), and was attended by Vice-Chairpersons Mr. R. Ballaman (Switzerland), Mr. H. Gregor (Germany), Mr. A. Jagusiewicz (Poland), Mr. S. Michel (Switzerland), Ms. S. Nurmi (Finland) and Mr. J. Schneider (Austria). Mr W. Harnett (United States) sent his apologies. Mr. K. Bull attended for the UNECE secretariat. Mr. A. Zuber (European Commission) attended as observer.

**I. NOTE OF THE BUREAU MEETING OF 19 APRIL 2006  
(EBBUREAU/2006/1) INCLUDING MATTERS ARISING NOT ELSEWHERE  
ON AGENDA**

1. The note had been circulated and placed on the Convention's website at [www.unece.org/env/eb/bureau](http://www.unece.org/env/eb/bureau).

**II. OPENING THE CONVENTION TO COUNTRIES OUTSIDE THE  
UNECE REGION**

2. The Bureau discussed the draft document that had been prepared for the Executive Body. Amendments were proposed and the secretariat was requested to make the necessary changes to the document before submission.
3. Mr. Zuber stressed the importance of non-UNECE experts in the work of the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution and noted the possibility of a global convention option. Mr. Bull drew attention to the difficulties of getting a global convention agreed but noted the secretariat's intention to invite non-UNECE countries to the Executive Body session in December. The Bureau agreed that this should be done on its behalf.

### **III. ACCREDITATION PROCEDURES FOR NGOS**

4. The Bureau took note of the document prepared for consideration by the Executive Body and requested the secretariat to submit it for translation and publication.

### **IV. PREPARATIONS FOR THE TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE BODY**

5. Mr. Bull provided information on the preparation of documents for the Executive Body session noting that the agenda had been submitted in accordance with the 12-week rule, the preparation of the other documents was ongoing. He noted that the session was scheduled to start at 3 p.m. on Monday 11 December and would finish by 6 p.m. on Thursday 14 December. Mr Belka, the Executive Secretary of UNECE, had been invited to open the session but had not yet confirmed his attendance.

6. The Bureau noted that Spain and Greece were scheduled to give presentations regarding their failure to be in compliance with obligations under protocols. It also noted that one member of the Implementation Committee was scheduled to retire and a replacement needed to be sought.

### **V. AARHUS QUESTIONNAIRE**

7. The Bureau noted that the secretariat had drafted a reply to the questionnaire circulated by the Aarhus Convention. It requested the secretariat to respond to the Aarhus Convention secretariat using the draft as amended previously.

### **VI. PREPARATIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT FOR EUROPE MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE**

8. Mr Bull noted the Ministerial Conference was scheduled for 10-12 October 2007 and that preparations were already well underway. No multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) were to be presented for adoption but all concerned with the Conference were keen to ensure that the five UNECE MEAs received a high profile. Following the joint Bureaux meetings of the MEAs and Committee on Environmental Policy, the secretariat had drawn up proposals for a paper for the conference. Its main focus was implementation of MEAs. A draft outline was available which was to be submitted to the Working Group of Senior Officials for its consideration on 12-13 October 2006. All Convention Bureaux would have the opportunity to contribute to the document and Mr Bull invited comments and suggestions.

9. Bureau members took note of the paper and stressed the importance of implementation and compliance. They noted some of the possible barriers to accession in the Convention's protocols and how these might be addressed.

## **VII. EMISSION INVENTORIES**

10. The Bureau noted the announcement from MSC-West that it no longer wished to continue its activities on collating and managing the Convention's emission inventories, though it would continue this work until an alternative solution could be found. The Bureau recognized that the Bureau of the EMEP Steering Body was considering the matter but stressed that any significant changes to the management of emissions data would need to be endorsed by the Executive Body.

11. Mr Schneider explained the problem. The emissions related work had become increasingly important and more and more demanding on staff time. While the workload of MSC-West continued to increase, the budget had remained much the same. The new emission inventory review process would have further implications on resources. The Bureau of the Steering Body would consider 5 options for the future; its recommendations would be fed back to the Executive Body Bureau to ensure it was keep informed of possible proposals.

12. The Bureau agree to leave the Bureau of the Steering Body to consider the matter further, but stressed it was willing to contribute to the decision-making process.

## **VIII. REVIEW/REVISION OF PROTOCOLS**

13. Mr Ballaman outlined the work scheduled for the next session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review. He noted that discussions on POPs would focus on the track A and track B reviews as well as on the output from the group of legal experts concerning options for amending the Protocol on POPs. For heavy metals, the review of the Protocol was nearing completion and no new substances had been proposed for addition to the Protocol; next year, there would be a need to consider options for further reducing emissions (as required by the Protocol). Mr Schneider noted the discrepancies between modelled and measured concentrations of metals and stressed the need for more scientific work in this area. The Bureau noted that the Task Force on Heavy Metals had indicated it was ready to continue with its work but that there were some uncertainties about the timescale for any revision of the Protocol. The Bureau noted other activities by UNEP and EU that might influence decisions on the timing of action.

14. Mr Ballaman described the situation with regard to the review of the Gothenburg Protocol. Plans were well under way even though the Executive Body had not yet formally agreed the plan for the review. A timetable had been proposed by the meeting of the Heads of Delegation in April that had a completion date of December 2007. The Bureau noted the need to take account of the EU's National Emissions Ceilings Directive revision in the plans for the review. Mr Zuber noted that the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution would produce an interim report in time for consideration in the review of the Protocol.

## **IX. EECCA ACTION PLAN**

15. Mr Ballaman reminded the Bureau about the action plan developed by the Working Group on Strategies and Review that was endorsed by the Executive Body at its twenty-third session. The secretariat noted that the draft implementation guide for the Protocol on POPs was completed and would be circulated at the Working Group on Strategies and Review for comment. The final version would be used to aid completion of the guides for the Heavy Metals and Gothenburg Protocols. The secretariat was also preparing a paper for the next Executive Body session on progress made in the EECCA action plan.

16. Mr Bull noted the importance of the action plan in relation to the Belgrade Conference. Mr Jagusiewicz drew attention to the Polish workshop and training session that had proved a success and recommended further initiatives of this type.

## **X. FINANCIAL MATTERS**

17. Mr Ballaman drew attention to the Working Group on Strategies and Review discussions on financing of core activities not covered by the EMEP Protocol. There had been some discussions on how to make the finances more transparent, but the development of a more effective mechanism for financing was not forthcoming.

18. Mr Bull drew attention to the Trust Funds and in particular to that for supporting countries with economies in transition (E112). He noted that contributions to that Trust Fund had increased though not to the level hoped for at the last Executive Body session. In addition, many of the contributions made to E112 were earmarked and this was creating some difficulties where earmarked contributions for an activity were insufficient. For example, there were currently insufficient funds to cover participation of countries with economies in transition at the Executive Body session in December. He also noted that the Czech Republic was proposing a project targeting Moldova and invited the Bureau to approve the project.

19. The Bureau approved the Czech proposal. It also noted that, with the accession of Albania, the Executive Body needed to revise its decision on funding participation of countries with economies in transition. It further noted that some countries no longer qualified for support to attend the meetings of the Committee on Environmental Policy, which had provided guidance in the past to some of UNECE's MEAs on countries' eligibility for funding. The Bureau requested the secretariat to prepare a revised decision for consideration by the Executive Body.

20. Mr. Bull drew attention to the mechanism currently used by the secretariat to enable its staff to attend meetings under the Convention outside Geneva. Funding of travel and subsistence was usually dependent upon contributions by lead or host countries. While the UN had recommended procedures and scales, few countries adhered to these. In addition, secretariat staff members were usually required to pay for their travel and accommodation in advance and claim afterwards. When a staff member attended several meetings in a short space of time they could be considerably out of pocket until claims were paid. The secretariat had noted that the other UNECE MEAs used their Trust Funds for travel. This enabled purchase of air tickets through

the UN system and advance payments to be made to staff before travel. The secretariat intended to propose to the Executive Body that this procedure should be used in the future. The Bureau agreed that the proposal should be put forward.

## **XI. OUTREACH**

21. Mr. Williams noted that the UNEP/IUAPPA application to Sweden for funding for the Global Atmospheric Forum was being looked upon favourably. The Convention was represented on the Steering Group of the Forum and would be a major player in its future work. Mr. Mills was looking into the possibilities of drawing up Memoranda of Understanding between the various organizations involved in the Forum. The Bureau indicated it wished to be kept informed.

22. Mr. Bull noted the continued support of the Convention's outreach work by Mr L. Nordberg (formerly of the secretariat). He noted presentations made by Mr Nordberg and the regular contacts between him and the secretariat. The Bureau noted Mr. Nordberg's contribution with appreciation and hoped that he could continue to support the Convention's activities.

23. The Bureau agreed that this area of work was important and requested the Chair and the secretariat to continue to explore possibilities for action.

## **XII. THE SALTSJOBADEN III WORKSHOP**

24. The Bureau noted that a meeting was to be held by the organizers later in the week to discuss the detailed plans for the workshop. So far, it appeared that organization was proceeding according to plan.

## **XIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

25. The Bureau noted additional meetings were to be held under the 2006 workplan. A joint workshop of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and the Task Force on Measurement and Modelling on cost-effective control of urban air pollution, was planned to be held at IIASA, Laxenburg on 16 to 17 November 2006. The Task Force on Particulate Matter planned to hold a drafting workshop to begin preparations for its final report in November 2006. The Bureau agreed that these should be included in the 2006 workplan.

26. Mr. Gregor noted that Mr. Johannessen had been elected as Chair of the Working Group on Effects. He had agreed with Mr. Johannessen to share the responsibilities of the Chair up to the Executive Body session in December. He noted that a Canadian delegate had been co-opted onto the Bureau of the Working Group to provide a good geographic balance.

27. The secretariat drew attention to possible dates for meetings in 2008. It proposed a Working Group on Strategies and Review session for the week of 14 to 18 April, and sessions of the Working Group on Effects for 3 to 5 September, the EMEP

Steering Body for 8 to 10 September and the second session of the working Group on Strategies and Review for the week of 22 to 26 September. To allow 11 weeks to the Executive Body session would mean that this would be held the week of 15 to 19 December. The Bureau agreed to these provisional dates.

#### **IX. DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING**

28. The Bureau agreed that it would be useful to hold a meeting prior to the Executive Body session. As the session was due to begin at 3 p.m., the morning of the first day (11 December) would be convenient for most.

29. The Bureau noted that a High-level Coordinating Meeting with the European Commission was long overdue. As it appeared that there would be no CAFÉ Steering Group meeting in the autumn, the secretariat and the European Commission representatives would explore possibilities.