



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/90  
30 May 2008

Original: ENGLISH

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

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

Working Group on Strategies and Review

Forty-first session  
Geneva, 14–17 April 2008

**REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON STRATEGIES AND REVIEW  
ON ITS FORTY-FIRST SESSION**

CONTENTS<sup>1</sup>

	Paragraphs	Page
Introduction .....	1 - 4	3
I. Adoption of the agenda .....	5	3
II. Adoption of the report of the fortieth session.....	6 - 9	3

---

<sup>1</sup> Sections I–IX of this document correspond to items 1–9 of the provisional agenda (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/89).

**CONTENTS** (continued)

	Paragraph	Page
III. Matters arising from the twenty-fifth session of the Executive Body Body and other related meetings .....	10 - 13	4
IV. Negotiation of amendments to the 1998 Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants .....	14 – 20	5
V. Strengthening the draft revised Emission Reporting Guidelines .....	21 – 23	7
VI. Activities to implement the revised Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia.....	24 – 33	9
VII. Preparatory work for the negotiation of a revised Gothenburg Protocol .....	34 – 55	11
VIII. Other business .....	56	17
IX. Adoption of the decisions of the Working Group on Strategies and Review .....	57	17

## INTRODUCTION

1. The forty-first session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review was held in Geneva from 14 to 17 April 2008.
2. The session was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention: Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the European Community.
3. The American Chemistry Council (ACC), the Canadian Chlorine Chemistry Council (CCCC), the European Association of Internal Combustion Engine Manufacturers (EUROMOT), the European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC)/EURO CHLOR, the European Environmental Bureau (EEB), the European Semiconductor Industry Association (SEMI) the International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), the Union of the Electricity Industry (EURELECTRIC) were represented.
4. The meeting was chaired by Mr. R. Ballaman (Switzerland).

### I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5. The Working Group adopted the agenda of the meeting as set out in ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/89.

### II. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE FORTIETH SESSION

6. The Working Group considered the report of its fortieth session as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/88.
7. Ms. C. Hamilton (United Kingdom) proposed replacing paragraph 53 of the report with the following text:

Mrs. C. Hamilton (United Kingdom), member of the Ad Hoc Group of Legal Experts, presented the conclusions of the Group on the Legal Standing of the Emission Reporting Guidelines and the possibilities for strengthening their provisions (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2007/16), explaining though that the Guidelines could not be made legally binding, and that the word “should” (not “shall”) is the appropriate term for

guidelines. The options for strengthening the provisions of the Guidelines included: giving them legally binding effect through a decision by the Executive Body, in line with the earlier decisions on emission reporting (2002/10 and 2005/1); making the text more rigorous and concise through appropriate drafting; amending the Convention or protocols to explicitly include those parts of the Guidelines that Parties wish to make legally binding, or to introduce further enabling provisions that would enable additional parts of the guidelines to be given legally binding effect through a decision of the Executive Body. A number of more practical measures that could help to strengthen the Guidelines were also put forward.

8. The delegation of the United States proposed amending paragraph 28, concerning its own intervention to read as follows:

The United States noted that the Task Force on POPs<sup>1</sup> concluded in its technical review that although the dossier refers to perfluorooctane sulfonates (PFOS) and 96 PFOS-related substances, the dossier only elaborated on the indicative numerical values in Executive Body decision 1998/2 for PFOS.

9. The Working Group adopted the report of its fortieth session as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/88, with the above amendments.

### **III. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE BODY AND OTHER RELATED MEETINGS**

10. The secretariat drew attention to decisions taken by the Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session. It noted the outcome of the Sixth Ministerial Conference “Environment for Europe”, held in Belgrade in October 2007, and its implications with regard to the Convention’s Action Plan for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA).

11. Mr. T. Johannessen (Norway), Chair of the Working Group on Effects, drew attention to the ongoing work on effects, highlighting the further quantification of effects at the request of the Executive Body and the plans for publishing guidelines for monitoring effects.

12. Mr. J. Schneider (Austria), Chair of the EMEP<sup>2</sup> Steering Body, informed the Working Group about recent progress in the work of EMEP, drawing attention to two work items – the

---

<sup>1</sup> Persistent organic pollutants.

<sup>2</sup> The Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe.

revision of the EMEP Strategy and the revision of the EMEP Monitoring Strategy, both due to end in 2009. He also drew attention to the new arrangements for the work on emissions, and in particular the establishment of a new centre hosting the emissions database.

13. It was suggested that a draft strategic plan for the Convention as a whole could be submitted for consideration by the Executive Body at its twenty-sixth session.

#### **IV. NEGOTIATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE 1998 PROTOCOL ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS**

14. The Chair introduced a draft working document on options for possible revision of the Protocol on POPs (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/4), which he had prepared in collaboration with the Co-Chairs of the Task Force on POPs, Mr. J. Sliggers (Netherlands) and Ms. C. Heathwood (Canada), and the secretariat.

15. The delegation of the United States noted that it had consistently expressed disappointment with the technical and scientific bases for the decisions that the proposed seven substances be considered POPs. It expressed its hope that, in the context of the review of future proposals, more robust scientific support be developed to support the conclusion in decision 1998/2, paragraph 2 (b), that a candidate chemical is “likely to have significant adverse human health and/or environmental effects as a result of its long-range transboundary atmospheric transport”.

16. The Chair of the Ad Hoc Group of Technical Experts, Mr. C. Braams (the Netherlands), reported on discussions held in parallel to the plenary session to review annex IV to the Protocol on the limit values for dioxins and furans (PCCD/F) from major stationary sources and annex V to the Protocol on best available techniques to control emissions of POPs from major stationary sources. The Chair invited the group to continue its work in association with the forty-second session of the Working Group. The secretariat was invited to make the proposed amendments to the annexes available on the Internet. Prior to the forty-second session, delegations could forward comments on the document to the delegation of the Netherlands.

17. As suggested by the presidency of the European Union (EU), the Chair of the Working Group acknowledged the need to gather more information about waste treatment. He invited delegations to forward available information to the delegation of the Netherlands that had volunteered to compile and make the information available for the forty-second session of the Working Group.

18. Mr. P. Drost (the Netherlands), Chair of the Ad Hoc Group of Legal Experts, reported on the consultations that Group had held on the expedited procedure for amending the Protocol, as

contained in its article 14. Having failed to reach consensus on this issue, the Group would continue its consultations with a view to reporting to the Working Group at its forty-second session. He highlighted the importance of ensuring the parallel functioning of the new expedited amendment procedure and the classical one. In addition, he asked the Working Group for advice on the following two issues: (a) whether the amendment of the expedited procedure should be considered separate from the other amendments to the Protocol or whether the technical and legal issues were to be bundled, as the latter option could slow down the entry into force of non-contentious issues; and (b) as regards the wording on the entry into force of the amendments in article 14, paragraph 3, should “two thirds of the Parties” be interpreted as “the Parties at the moment of the adoption of the amendment” (fixed target approach) or as “the Parties at the moment when the two thirds are reached” (moving target approach).

19. The delegation of the United States noted that, consistent with international treaty law, nothing in the proposed amendments to article 14 would affect the ability of a State not yet a Party to the Protocol on POPs to become a Party to the underlying treaty, without necessarily accepting the amendments to the Protocol currently being negotiated.

20. The Working Group:

(a) Considered the working document on options for revising the Protocol on POPs (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/4) and agreed to forward the following recommendations regarding the Protocol’s annexes to the Parties to the Protocol at the twenty-sixth session of the Executive Body:

#### **Annex I**

- (i) Delete the conditions for the elimination of the production and use of heptachlor, hexachlorobenzene (HCB) and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that are no longer relevant;
- (ii) Delete the footnote related to “ugilec”;
- (iii) List the following substances in annex I, to prevent production and use:
  - a. Polychlorinated naphthalenes (PCN);
  - b. Pentachlorobenzene (PeCB);
  - c. Hexachlorobutadiene (HCBD);

**Annex II**

- (i) For DDT<sup>3</sup>, delete the specific uses exemption 2 “as a chemical intermediate to produce Dicofol”;

**Annex VII**

- (i) Delete the contents of annex VII, based on the findings of the sufficiency and effectiveness review.

(b) Took note of the discussions by the ad hoc group of technical experts on amendments proposed for annex IV and those related to existing substances in annex V, as well as additional amendments proposed by delegates, and requested the secretariat to make the informal report prepared by this group available on the Internet and to the Working Group on Strategies and Review at its forty-second session;

(c) Invited the secretariat to prepare a revised version of document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/4, and an informal document for consideration by the Working Group at its forty-second session;

(d) Invited an ad hoc group of legal experts to consider further the issue of possible amendments to article 14 and report back to the Working Group at its forty-second session.

**V. STRENGTHENING OF THE DRAFT REVISED EMISSION GUIDELINES**

21. The Chair of the Ad Hoc Group of Legal Experts reported on the work of the Group on the Legal Standing of the Emission Reporting Guidelines carried out in consultation with the Co-Chairs of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, as outlined in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/1. The Group had: (a) explored further all possibilities under the already existing enabling clauses in the Convention and its protocols to give legally binding effect to the draft revised Guidelines or parts of them for Parties to these instruments; (b) drafted possible decisions of the Executive Body; and (c) simplified the language used in the draft revised Guidelines ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/6, both to strengthen the language and to make it more concise and explicit. In addition, the legal experts had identified a number of policy issues for consideration and guidance by the Working Group.

---

<sup>3</sup> Dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane:

22. The legal experts had concluded that should the Parties wish to render further elements or parts of the Guidelines legally binding, they needed to propose amendments to the relevant provisions (new enabling clauses) of the Convention and its protocols. The Chair clarified that, for the time being, in absence of a mandate to revise the protocols, the Working Group could not mandate the legal experts to carry out preparatory work for such amendments.

23. The delegation of the United States reserved its agreement on draft decision D on emission data reporting under the Convention and its protocols until the forty-second session of the Working Group (see annex to this report).

24. The Working Group:

(a) Welcomed the further work of the Ad Hoc Group of Legal Experts on the Legal Standing of the Emission Reporting Guidelines;

(b) Took note of the main conclusions as contained in the report by the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group of Legal Experts (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/1), and agreed to forward the report with revisions to the Executive Body in 2008 for information;

(c) Considered the draft decision on emission data reporting under the Convention and its protocols (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/1, annex) and agreed to forward it as amended to the Executive Body for consideration and adoption, subject to discussions pursuant to subparagraph (f) below (see annex to this report);

(d) Reviewed the text of the draft revised Guidelines for Reporting Emissions and their annex I as revised by the Ad Hoc Group of Legal Experts (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/6), and agreed to forward the revised Guidelines, as amended, to the EMEP Steering Body for information and to the Executive Body at its twenty-sixth session for adoption;

(e) Took note of the reservations of the United States and Canada to the text of the draft revised Guidelines (paras. 15 and 16) and invited them to provide, if necessary, the secretariat with alternative text for the forty-second session before June 2008;

(f) Took note of the reservations of the United States and Canada to the text of the draft decision on emission reporting and invited them to raise this issue at the forty-second session of the Working Group.



## VI. ACTIVITIES TO IMPLEMENT THE REVISED ACTION PLAN FOR EASTERN EUROPE, CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIA

25. The secretariat introduced the results of a questionnaire on obstacles to ratification of the EMEP Protocol<sup>4</sup>, the Protocol on POPs, the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol<sup>5</sup>. The questionnaire had been drafted at the request of the Working Group at its fortieth session and sent to countries in the EECCA and South-Eastern Europe (SEE) subregions. Replies had been received from Armenia, Belarus, Croatia, Moldova and Ukraine. It appeared from these responses that the timescales for implementing some of the requirements in these protocols was an obstacle for all the countries concerned. The Working Group requested that the results of the questionnaire be presented as an official document to its forty-second session for further discussion.

26. The delegation of Croatia confirmed its plans to ratify the Gothenburg Protocol in the first half of 2008.

27. The delegation of the Netherlands urged all countries from these regions to express their views and share their ratification problems at the forthcoming workshop on heavy metals in Armenia.

28. The delegation of Belarus stressed that it had undertaken analysis of the potential for ratification of the protocols and highlighted a number of difficulties, such as the differences between the terms and definitions used in the protocols and their equivalents used in Russian (e.g. the definition of “emission limit value”). It reiterated the need for amending the timescales for implementing some of the requirements contained in the annexes to the protocols.

29. The delegation of Moldova informed the session about a recent change of government and a possible delay in the ratification of the Gothenburg Protocol. The secretariat informed participants that the project for supporting Moldova in the ratification of the Gothenburg Protocol, funded by the Czech Republic, was about to start, pending some final clarification on the use of resources from Moldova.

30. The Chair of the EMEP Steering Body drew attention to the increase of the EMEP budget from 2008 and the allocation of funds to help EECCA countries to improve their monitoring

---

<sup>4</sup> The 1984 Protocol on Long-term Financing of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe.

<sup>5</sup> The 1999 Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone.

activities and their emission inventories. He encouraged countries to contact the EMEP Chemical Coordinating Centre for any questions on the requirements of the EMEP monitoring strategy.

31. The secretariat informed about progress in the project funded by the Netherlands for strengthening the implementation of the Convention in SEE. The secretariat had written to all the recipient countries informing them about the launch of the project and asking them to nominate an official focal point for the project. Positive replies had already been received from Albania and Montenegro, which were already initiating the production of national action plans for ratification of the protocols. Further letters had been sent to the others. The secretariat pointed out that the lack of regular contact points in these countries was a problem for communication.

32. Mr. J.-G. Bartaire (France), Co-Chair of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, informed the session about the proposal of the expert group to organize a workshop in Kazakhstan in October 2008, pending official confirmation from the Kazakh authorities about their willingness to host the workshop. Other proposals from the EECCA countries for this workshop were also welcomed.

33. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the results of the questionnaire on the obstacles for ratification of the protocols presented by the secretariat, and thanked the countries which had responded to it;

(b) Urged those countries which had not yet responded to provide their replies to the secretariat by the 31 May 2008;

(c) Invited the secretariat to present the results of the questionnaire, updated with any new information that might be received, in an official document for the forty-second session of the Working Group;

(d) Welcomed the efforts made by EECCA and SEE countries towards implementation and ratification of the protocols, and expressed its gratitude to those Parties which were supporting such efforts;

(e) Welcomed the initiative of Armenia and Germany to organize a workshop by the Task Force on Heavy Metals in May 2008;

(f) Welcomed the initiative of France to organize a workshop by the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues in October 2008, tentatively to be held in Kazakhstan;

(g) Urged EECCA and SEE countries to participate actively in the negotiations for revision and amendment of protocols to the Convention.

## VII. PREPARATORY WORK FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS OF A REVISED GOTHENBURG PROTOCOL

34. The Chair of the EMEP Steering Body drew attention to progress made in the work under EMEP relevant to the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol. He stressed that, from the technical point of view, it was of the utmost importance to have the best possible emission data for the modelling work. He drew attention to the new arrangements for the emissions work, the review programme for improvement of emission inventories and the revision of the *Emissions Guidebook*, and in particular its chapter on particulate matter (PM). He also reported on some significant developments in the modelling and monitoring activities. An important development for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol was the extension of the modelling domain to cover the EECCA countries in 2008 and the calculation of new source-receptor relationships for five countries in the EECCA subregion. Monitoring sites were also being established in these countries. He further noted that there were still some difficulties with the performance of the EMEP model with regard to PM, but stressed the conclusion of the EMEP Steering Body that the model results could be used for integrated assessment modelling in spite of the remaining uncertainties. Finally, he drew attention to the interim report produced by the Task Force on the Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution, which focused on the pollutants covered by the Gothenburg Protocol and the relevance of intercontinental transport of PM and ozone.

35. The Working Group took note of the information submitted by the Co-Chairs of the Expert Group on PM through an informal document made available in English, French and Russian presented by Ms. Marion Wichmann-Fiebig (Germany). While based on the report of the Expert Group presented to the fortieth session, it reflected the views of the Co-Chairs on policy perspectives, as requested by the Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session. The Working Group noted the Expert Group's conclusions that: (a) PM caused substantial adverse health effects where premature deaths could primarily be attributed to the fine fraction (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), but that there were also significant health effects associated with PM<sub>coarse</sub> (PM<sub>2.5-10</sub>); (b) PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations could be cost-effectively reduced in the Convention area on the basis of a common harmonized abatement strategy, while also noting that PM<sub>coarse</sub> had a smaller, but still significant, long-range component and could also be controlled in this way; and (c) achieving an optimum strategy for PM reduction was likely to involve a combination of several control options. It further noted the Co-Chairs' view that any additional work required on PM should be done through existing bodies under the Convention rather than by the Expert Group on PM.

36. The Chair of the Working Group on Effects, presented the Working Group's review report for the Gothenburg Protocol, based on observations from the seven International Cooperative Programmes (ICPs). He stressed the conclusion that the Gothenburg Protocol had been effective, but not sufficient, as adverse effects from air pollution continued to be observed, and therefore further measures were needed. As a further step in its activities, the Working Group on Effects would produce a consolidated report on air pollution effects, in particular cause-effect relationships, stock-at-risk and links between observations, critical loads and their exceedance. He drew attention to the 2007/2008 call for data to update critical loads, which would be available during the first half of the year. Data update included target loads from dynamic modelling that could be related to scenario assessment and target setting. The Working Group on Effects would provide assistance to the Working Group on Strategies and Review and the integrated assessment modelling work to set environmental targets. He reported further on the development of guidelines for the reporting of monitoring and modelling of effects.

37. Mr. R. Maas (the Netherlands), Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, informed the Working Group on Strategies and Review about the results of the workshop on integrated modelling of nitrogen, held from 28 to 30 November 2007 in Laxenburg, Austria, drawing attention to the recommendations made for the work of the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/3).

38. The European Community supported the view that increasingly the number of Parties was key to addressing PM issues, and agreed that increased flexibility should be considered when revising the text both for the annexes and when considering approaches adopted for emission ceilings. The European Community also considered that PM should be dealt with in the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol to apply a multi-pollutant, multi-effect approach. Such an approach would address PM and its precursors, which would allow consideration of the question of PM as a whole. Technological measures should focus on emissions with a significant transboundary character regardless of whether they contribute to PM<sub>2.5</sub> or PM<sub>coarse</sub>. Emission ceilings should be specified for primary PM<sub>2.5</sub> (relative targets) and for the main precursors of PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

39. The delegation of the United States agreed that PM should be addressed under the Gothenburg Protocol. It disagreed with the views expressed in paragraphs 12 (c) and 14 of the informal document by the Co-Chairs of the Expert Group on PM, stressing that the United States had policies which they were continuing to develop. It also drew attention to the ongoing negotiation of a new PM annex, including PM<sub>2.5</sub> to the overall US-Canada Air Quality Agreement. The delegation of the United States also expressed the view that the guidance referred to in paragraph 15 of the informal document should be non-binding and that such a flexible approach would help more countries to ratify the Protocol. It further highlighted its positive domestic experience with emissions trading and wished that trading would be included

in the Gothenburg Protocol with regard to PM, at least domestically for some countries, although internationally it was not an option.

40. The Working Group thanked the Co-Chairs of the Expert Group on PM for their work and the lead countries for making the informal document available in the three languages. It agreed that the current Gothenburg Protocol already regulated PM precursors, and pursuing a single instrument to address PM and its precursors seemed a more sensible option than dividing obligations (and therefore ratifications) over two separate instruments.

41. The Working Group further agreed that:

- (a) Any new instrument should be designed with the aim of maximizing implementation and ratification to reduce health impacts in the most cost-efficient way;
- (b) Technological measures should focus on emissions with a significant transboundary character regardless of whether they contributed to PM<sub>2.5</sub> or PM<sub>coarse</sub>;
- (c) Controls on specific point emission sources within any new instrument should be based on best available technologies or other cost-efficient approaches, backed up by separate (and updatable) guidance documents defining best practices;
- (d) Opportunities to include annexes that harmonized emission limit values for smaller sources of PM, such as vehicle emission standards, should be investigated;
- (e) Any new instrument should include an obligation to report descriptions of non-technical measures adopted within Parties, although the measures themselves should not be made mandatory;
- (f) For the EMEP region, emission ceilings should be specified for primary PM<sub>2.5</sub> and the main precursors of secondary PM<sub>2.5</sub> Parties to the Convention. Regarding the quality of emission inventories, a percentage reduction in annual emissions against a base year should be envisaged, while emission ceilings for the main precursors of secondary PM<sub>2.5</sub> should be defined as annual tonnages.

42. The Working Group invited Parties to update their current emissions data on PM and to provide projections for 2020 where available.

43. The Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling presented the modelling developments for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol, including defining the ambition levels

and the baseline as well as the sensitivity simulations and the types of abatement options. He drew attention to various other policy processes that might affect the reduction requirements, such as the plans of the International Maritime Organization (IMO). The aspirational targets for 2050 would be explored in a workshop in late 2008. He reminded participants that updated data on energy and activity pathways was requested by the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM) by September 2008.

44. Mr. M. Amann (Austria), Head of CIAM, presented an analysis on emission control potentials in non-EU countries that had not ratified the Gothenburg Protocol. He noted that the national energy projections were mostly out of date for these countries and that the implementation status of current legislation was not clear. He concluded that a few, selected low-cost measures would lead to significant emission reductions in non-EU countries and significantly reduce air pollution impacts.

45. The Working Group agreed that any attempt to devise relevant annexes and guidance information for technological measures should be delegated to the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues (EGTEI) and invited delegations to nominate experts to EGTEI for this work.

46. The Working Group also agreed that work with the GAINS model on new emission ceilings for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol should consider reduction of primary and secondary PM<sub>2.5</sub> and their effects on human health.

47. Mr. T. Pignatelli (Italy) and Mr. Bartaire, Co-Chairs of EGTEI, reported on the outcomes of the twelfth meeting of the EGTEI held on 2 October 2007 in Angers, France (EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/2). The progress in work on emerging technologies for large combustion plants was presented in detail by Mr. G. Guyonvarch (France). The delegation of Finland provided an update on the preparation of technical options for revising the emission limit values for nitrogen oxides from large combustion plants (in table IV of annex V to the Gothenburg Protocol). As regards the expected inputs to the revision of the Protocol, the Co-Chairs stressed that in the field of mobile sources the Group lacked expertise and therefore could only provide a summary of the relevant EU legislation. The Co-Chairs appreciated the offer of Canada and the United States to forward available national information and findings on PM.

48. The lead countries of the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen informed the Working Group about the preparations for the first meeting of that Task Force in May 2008 in the Netherlands. The delegation of the United Kingdom informed the session about plans for a workshop of the Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Instruments (NEBEI) to be held back-to-back with the annual conference of the European Association of Environmental and Resource Economists (EAERE) in June 2008 in Gothenburg, Sweden.

49. The Working Group:

- (a) Took note of the work carried out by CIAM on the scenarios of sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and PM emissions in the non-EU countries up to 2020;
- (b) Requested the secretariat to circulate to the countries concerned the background paper on the scenarios of SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and PM emissions in the non-EU countries up to 2020 as presented by CIAM, and invited those countries to provide their most recent data on projections of the named pollutants, as well as ammonia and volatile organic compounds (VOCs), to CIAM by September 2008;
- (c) Noted the need for updated data on activity projections compatible with climate change policy targets for 2020 from all countries for the preparation of scenarios for the negotiation of a revision to the Gothenburg Protocol, and encouraged all Parties to submit updates of the projections used for the review of the Protocol to CIAM by September 2008;
- (d) Took note of the report by the Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and the options to be explored in the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol,
- (e) Agreed that the ambition level for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol should be defined according to the objective set out in article 2 of the Protocol;
- (f) Invited the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling, in cooperation with the Working Group on Effects, to discuss and present the merits of the different options for target-setting for 2020 and 2050, using the most recent critical loads and levels data;
- (g) Encouraged the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling to develop aspirational targets for 2050 and to explore the steps necessary to reach such targets, taking into account the possibilities of emerging technologies;
- (h) Agreed that the best available techniques approach and defining sets of measures with high potential for emission reductions could be useful for EECCA and SEE countries, and should be explored in the revision of the Protocol;
- (i) Agreed that the baseline scenario should include all officially submitted data consistent with climate policy by Parties to the Convention, and that expert estimates should be used where such data were missing;

(j) Agreed that the GAINS model would use data for the whole geographic scope of EMEP to the extent possible depending on the availability of the activity and sectoral data, as well as the energy projections from countries;

(k) Agreed that the baseline scenario for a revision to the Gothenburg Protocol should include greenhouse gas policy plans complemented by additional analyses on reduction plans for the EECCA and SEE subregions, and other reduction plans such as IMO plans for shipping and those for nitrogen reduction through implementation of the EU Nitrate Directive;

(l) Agreed that an important potential remained for the technical (end-of-pipe) measures, but at the same time the potential of structural changes in energy, transport and agriculture sectors should be further explored and quantified, and invited CIAM to proceed with its efforts for such quantification.

50. The Working Group took note of the continuing bilateral discussions between the United States and Canada that would provide a basis for their negotiations in the development of any revisions to the Gothenburg Protocol, and invited those countries' delegations to make a presentation on their ongoing efforts at the Working Group's forty-second session.

51. The Working Group took note of the NEBEI workshops planned for June and autumn 2008 on: (a) the cost-benefit analysis, methodology and the potential use of economic instruments; and (b) on the new methods for valuation of health impacts. It agreed that the results of these workshops should feed into the negotiations for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol, and that NEBEI should collect further information related to the national use and effectiveness of economic instruments (behavioural changes), with a view to updating the Guidance document on economic instruments to reduce NO<sub>x</sub>, VOCs and ammonia (EB.AIR/1999/2, chapter V).

52. The Working Group took note of the report of EGTEI (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/2), including that on NO<sub>x</sub> emission values for stationary engines and on emerging technologies and techniques for large combustion plants; it invited it to report on further progress at its forty-second session in September 2008.

53. The Working Group took note of the preparations made for the first meeting of the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen and invited delegations to submit to the secretariat nominations of their experts for the Task Force. The Working Group indicated that it expected a review of annex IX on ammonia for the coming revision of the Gothenburg Protocol and an update of the Framework code of agricultural practice, considering the revised Guidance document on control techniques for preventing and abating emissions of ammonia (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2007/13).



54. The delegations of Canada and the United States noted that they did not consider ammonia as a pollutant with transboundary effects in North America.

55. The Working Group discussed and adopted, with some amendments, the draft plan for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol prepared by the secretariat (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2008/5). It invited the secretariat to submit a revised version of the document, reflecting the agreed amendments, to the Working Group's forty-second session in September 2008.

#### **VIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

56. The Chair reminded the Working Group that its forty-second session would be held from 1 to 5 September 2008.

#### **IX. ADOPTION OF THE DECISIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP ON STRATEGIES AND REVIEW**

57. In accordance with the revised practice continued by the Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session, the Working Group on Strategies and Review adopted the decisions taken during the session.

## Annex

### **DRAFT DECISION ON EMISSION DATA REPORTING UNDER THE CONVENTION AND ITS PROTOCOLS**

*The Parties to the Convention, the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides, the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds, the 1994 Sulphur Protocol, the Protocol on Heavy Metals, the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Gothenburg Protocol, meeting within the Executive Body,*

*Referring to the Guidelines for Reporting Emissions Data under the Convention on Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution (hereinafter “the Guidelines”) approved at the [thirty-second] session of the EMEP Steering Body, and adopted by the Executive Body at its [twenty-sixth] session,*

*Recognizing that the Guidelines apply only to Parties within the geographical scope of EMEP, including those Parties whose respective national territories have a part that overlaps within the EMEP emissions reporting grid and another part lying outside the EMEP domain, and that Parties outside the geographical scope of EMEP are encouraged to take the Guidelines into account when preparing and reporting their annual submissions and to exchange available similar information,*

#### **A. Decision under the Convention, the Protocol on Volatile Organic Compounds and the 1994 Sulphur Protocol**

*Recalling the Executive Body’s decision 2002/10 on Emission Data Reporting under the Convention and the protocols in Force,*

*Decide that the Guidelines referred to in decision 2001/10 shall be the above-mentioned Guidelines, noting that no revision to the Guidelines will affect this specification unless and until it has been expressly so decided by the Executive Body.*

#### **B. Decision under the Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides**

*Acting under article 8, paragraph 2, of the 1988 Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides,*

1. *Specify that the uniform reporting framework, referred to in article 8, paragraph 2, of the 1998 Protocol on Nitrogen Oxides, in accordance with which information shall, as far as possible, be submitted, shall be the reporting formats given in annex IV of the above-mentioned*

Guidelines, noting that no revision to the Guidelines will affect this specification unless and until it has been expressly so decided by the Executive Body.

**C. Decision under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol**

*Acting under* article 5, paragraph 1, of the 1994 Sulphur Protocol,

1. *Specify* that the guidelines containing emission data for all relevant source categories used to report on the levels of national annual emission sulphur emissions as mentioned in article 5, paragraph 1(b), of the 1994 Sulphur Protocol are the above-mentioned Guidelines;
2. *Decide* that the format and content for emissions and other reporting under the 1994 Sulphur Protocol are those set out in the above-mentioned Guidelines, noting that no revision to the Guidelines will affect this specification unless and until it has been expressly so decided by the Executive Body.

**D. Decision under the Protocol on Heavy Metals, the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Gothenburg Protocol**

*Acting under* article 7, paragraph 1(b), of the Gothenburg Protocol,

*Recalling* the Executive Body's decision 2005/1 on Emission Data Reporting under the Protocol on Heavy Metals, the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Gothenburg Protocol, and in particular paragraph 1 of decision 2005/1,

1. *Approve* the decision by the EMEP Steering Body at its thirty-second session that, in addition to the emission projections for 2010, 2015 and 2020 as specified in decision 2005/1, Parties within the geographical scope of EMEP shall also report their data on emission projections for 2030 and longer-term projections if available (e.g. 2050).

-----