



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
27 October 2011

Original: English

## Economic Commission for Europe

Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range  
Transboundary Air Pollution

### Working Group on Strategies and Review

Forty-ninth session

Geneva, 12–16 September 2011

## Report of the Working Group on Strategies and Review on its forty-ninth session

### Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction .....	1–9	2
A. Attendance .....	2–4	2
B. Organizational matters .....	5–9	2
II. Options for revising the annexes to the Gothenburg Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone .....	10–38	3
A. Annex II .....	11–22	3
B. Technical annexes .....	23–34	5
C. Annex IX .....	35–38	6
III. Options for revising the Gothenburg Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone.....	39	8
IV. Options for revising the Protocol on Heavy Metals .....	40–41	8
V. Options for revising the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants .....	42–43	9
VI. Exchange of information and technology .....	44–46	9
VII. Draft 2012–2013 workplan for the implementation of the Convention .....	47	10
VIII. Election of officers .....	48	11
IX. Other business .....	49	11
X. Adoption of the decisions of the Working Group .....	50	12

## **I. Introduction**

1. The forty-ninth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review was held in Geneva, Switzerland, from 12 to 16 September 2011.

### **A. Attendance**

2. The session was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution: Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, European Union (EU), Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

3. The following State not party to the Convention was represented: Japan.

4. Representatives of the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM) of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP) and the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues were present. Also present were industry representatives of the Union of the Electricity Industry (EURELECTRIC), the European Association of Internal Combustion Engine Manufacturers (EUROMOT), the oil companies' European organization for environment, health and safety in refining and distribution (CONCAWE) and the European Petroleum Industry Association (EUROPIA). The Clean Air Task Force, the European Environmental Bureau (EEB), the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), CropLife International/Dow Agrosciences, the International Cryosphere Climate Initiative (ICCI), and the World Steel Association (Worldsteel) were also represented.

### **B. Organizational matters**

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

6. The Working Group adopted the agenda for the meeting as set out in ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/105.

7. The Working Group adopted the report of its forty-eighth session as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/104.

8. The delegation of United States noted that the report of the Working Group's forty-seventh session, as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/102, had been adopted with amendments at the forty-eighth session, but no amended version had since been issued. The secretariat noted that according to the established practice, such amended versions of session reports were not issued and amendments proposed at the time of adoption were only noted in the subsequent session report. The delegation of the United States noted that that resulted in the original report listed under the documentation for one session, while the record of its adoption and possible amendments could only be found on the website for the subsequent session. It requested that the secretariat place the report of the forty-seventh session on the website for the forty-eighth session or that it issue a corrigendum next to the original version of the report. The delegation of the EU supported that request.

9. The Working Group requested the secretariat to ensure that the corrections to the report of the forty-seventh session of the Working Group were properly reflected on the Convention website.

## II. Options for revising the annexes to the Gothenburg Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone

10. The Working Group continued negotiating options for revising the Gothenburg Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone (Gothenburg Protocol) and its technical annexes, in line with the relevant decisions by the Executive Body at its twenty-eighth session in 2010, and with a view to presenting amendment proposals to the Parties to the Protocol meeting within the Executive Body at its twenty-ninth session in 2011.

### A. Annex II

11. The Head of CIAM presented updated scenarios for cost-effective emission reductions for the negotiations of the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol (as presented in informal document No. 5), highlighting the comparison of the optimized scenarios (as presented in informal document No. 2) with national data from a technical perspective; incorporation of additional data and comments received from 23 Parties into the Greenhouse Gas and Air Pollution Interactions and Synergies (GAINS) Model; the inclusion of new information on national emission inventories that had been submitted officially to EMEP; and the GAINS training session for experts from Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and South-eastern Europe countries at CIAM in June 2011.

12. The updated scenarios compared to previous estimates (informal document No. 2) saw only minor differences. The change in total costs of emission reduction measures was below 1 per cent, while the differences in emission ceilings exceeded the 5 per cent level for sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) in one Party; for nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) in two Parties; for ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) in eight Parties; for fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) in three Parties; and in five Parties for volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The set of key measures turned out to be robust (no changes). However, larger uncertainties emerged from base year emission inventories due to: unresolved discrepancies between national and EUROSTAT<sup>1</sup> statistics, discrepancies between the emission factor used in some national inventories and those used in the GAINS Model and the continuous updates of historic emission inventories made by some countries.

13. The national emission ceilings calculated with the GAINS Model were based on the PRIMES<sup>2</sup> scenario and the 2005 EUROSTAT statistics. Moreover, the ceilings had been calculated using the same set of emission source sectors for all Parties, while some countries report additional sources in their national inventories (e.g., Germany reported VOC emissions from crops and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from agricultural soils, and Finland reported black liquor emissions).<sup>3</sup>

14. The Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling presented progress made at and after the fortieth meeting of the Task Force in May 2011. Out of the work items planned in the workplan for 2010 and 2011, there were only two outstanding issues: the ex post analysis report being elaborated jointly with the Working Group on Effects

---

<sup>1</sup> Directorate-General of the European Commission located in Luxembourg responsible for statistical information.

<sup>2</sup> As a partial equilibrium model for the EU energy markets, PRIMES is used for forecasting, scenario construction and policy impact analysis up to the year 2030. For further information see <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/pollutants/models/primes.htm>.

<sup>3</sup> All country-specific data are available on the IIASA website at <http://gains.iiasa.ac.at>.

(draft due in December 2011) and — if requested by the Working Group on Strategies and Review — the elaboration of aspirational targets for 2030/2050. It was important to harmonize CIAM data for the calculated emission ceilings (e.g., emission estimates were based on fuel sold statistics and real-life emission factors from the COPERT Model were applied for all countries) and indicated some remaining uncertainties (e.g., the largely varying PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission factors for domestic wood burning in different countries).

15. Based on work by the Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Instruments, the Task Force Chair also highlighted the large benefits in life years gained and the reduced absence from work from reductions in PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions as compared with the benefits from air pollutant emission reductions for crop losses and materials damage. In all scenarios between the Baseline and High\*, the working time gained from less absence of work exceeded the working time required to pay for the measures. The Chair also presented a possible layout of annex II with five tables — one for each pollutant, including a table for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. He also presented briefly the planned activities of the Task Force in the coming months, including a joint workshop with the Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution on global emission scenarios planned for early 2012.

16. The EU delegation appreciated further consultations with Parties that had been conducted between April and August 2011 by CIAM and the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling. The EU was continuing to analyse the results of the updated scenarios and would come back to CIAM with further enquiries and questions.

17. The delegation of Switzerland requested CIAM provide access to files in Excel format with national emission data, key measures and reduction potential. The Head of CIAM informed the Working Group that the updated Excel sheets were indeed available from the IIASA<sup>4</sup> website (see para. 13 above).

18. The delegation of Belarus asked about the significance of additional emission sources reported by some Parties. In some cases (e.g., Germany and Finland) those sources were significant, although they were not yet included in the GAINS Model.

19. The Working Group:

(a) Considered the information presented by the Chair of the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling and the Head of CIAM on the updated scenarios for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol (as contained in informal documents Nos. 1 and 5);

(b) Requested CIAM to respond swiftly to possible enquiries from Parties concerning the details of the development of the updated optimized scenarios;

(c) Requested CIAM to further identify the advantages of using the year 2005 rather than 2000 as the reference year in the tables in annex II;

(d) Requested Parties to analyse the possible layout for annex II, including the issues of absolute vs. relative targets, the selection of the reference year and retaining the 2010 emission ceilings in the revised annex II;

(e) Invited Parties to further analyse the feasibility of the scenarios presented by CIAM and the Task Force to the extent possible, and to communicate the outcomes of that analysis to the secretariat before the twenty-ninth session of the Executive Body;

(f) Welcomed the offer of the EMEP Steering Body, the Working Group on Effects and the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling to prepare a joint background paper reflecting the updated scenarios used in the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol.

---

<sup>4</sup> IIASA is the host organization for CIAM.

20. The Chair of the EMEP Steering Body presented proposed options for flexibility mechanisms, considered by the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections, including relative emission ceilings, accounting for change and uncertainty, time-based mechanisms, domestic pollutant swapping and emission trading scheme variants. The Task Force had concluded that the three-year average mechanism should be included in the revised Gothenburg Protocol as an option that Parties might elect to use, as part of a package of potential flexibility mechanisms. Such a package supported by the Task Force could include relative emission ceilings, accounting for new sources and significant changes to emission factors.

21. The Working Group then held an informal discussion exchanging views with regard to the needs of non-Parties to the current Protocol and possible mechanisms to ensure their accession to a revised Protocol.

22. The representative of the United States presented an overview of the implementation by the United States of its commitments under the Gothenburg Protocol and the planned air pollutant emission reduction goals and measures until 2020. He presented both the federal-level and cross-state domestic legislation regarding air pollutants (e.g., the National Ambient Air Quality Standards) and gave examples of emission reduction results. In 2008-2009, SO<sub>2</sub>, nitrogen dioxide and VOC emissions decreased by 58, 33 and 51 per cent, respectively, from 1990 levels, which had brought significant health benefits and reduction in acidifications of lakes, streams and forests, and in eutrophication of estuaries and coastal waters. The United States projected further air pollutant reductions for 2020 from a 2005 base: e.g., 47 per cent for NO<sub>x</sub>; 58 per cent for SO<sub>2</sub>; 22 per cent for PM<sub>2.5</sub>; and over 40 per cent for black carbon.

## **B. Technical annexes**

23. The Chair of the Working Group on Effects, on the basis of the comments from the Working Group, proposed to delete the entire section VII on recovery of ecosystems in the draft revised annex I on critical loads and levels (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/5).

24. The delegations discussed the need for retaining sections IV–VI of annex I on critical levels of particulate matter, ammonia and materials, and their applicability for Parties in North America. They also discussed the need for section VII on recovery of ecosystems (*ibid.*, paras. 16–17).

25. The Working Group:

(a) Considered the draft revised annex I (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/8) on critical loads for acidity and nutrient nitrogen and on critical levels for ozone, ammonia and materials, and considered several modifications to that document;

(b) Welcomed the proposal by the Russian Federation to modify the pollutant emission management area (PEMA) identified in annex III so that the obligations in a revised Protocol would refer to all of the European territory of the Russian Federation.

26. The French co-Chair of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues described progress in the work of the Expert Group and its contribution to the revision of the technical annexes to the Protocol. He recalled the work on the revision of the annexes and the guidance documents. He also highlighted the current work on cost estimates for certain reduction techniques associated with the draft revised annexes to the Gothenburg Protocol, presented in informal documents Nos. 17 and 18 and the cooperation with Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (IPTS) in Seville in that effort. He informed the Working Group that the Expert Group planned to re-evaluate its methodology for assessment of costs for the large combustion plants, and he drew attention to the ongoing

work on large combustion plants lower than 500 MWth. He also highlighted the collaboration established with the Coordinating Group on Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and the plans for joint work on cost estimates for reduction measures in the electricity sector, including plans for translation of the guidance documents.

27. The Working Group Chair raised the issue of revising the guidance document on mobile sources, and recalled that so far no Party had volunteered to lead that work. While the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues had prepared a revised annex VIII on the basis of information from the European Commission, it did not have experts on mobile sources.

28. The EU delegation reported that the EU had not considered the request for updating the guidance document on mobile sources yet. As that work largely depended on the work done by the ECE Inland Transport Committee, it inquired whether the respective working party under that committee could update the existing document.

29. Concerning the need to update the guidance document on mobile sources, the Working Group requested the secretariat to explore the options for building on the work of the World Forum for Harmonization of Vehicle Regulations and provide information to the Working Group at its next session.

30. The EU delegation presented an analysis of possible options for limiting the number of sectors/activities for which mandatory limit values were set in annexes IV, V, VI, VIII, X and XI, distinguishing between major, moderate and minor source categories in terms of emissions and environmental impact. Within the overall aim to attract more ratifications to a revised Gothenburg Protocol, it was suggested that for major source categories, emission limit values (ELVs) would apply as currently defined in article 3 in the short/medium term. On the other hand, source categories which were considered minor could be removed from the annexes and included in a guidance document. For moderate source categories, various options could be envisaged, such as maintaining binding ELVs, but providing for longer timescales for their application; applying non-binding ELVs in a separate part of the annexes; or removing them from the annexes and including them in a guidance document.

31. The Working Group considered draft revised annex V (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/10) and agreed to delete some of the proposed options.

32. The Working Group requested the secretariat to revise documents ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/8–15, deleting option I as well as taking into account other changes made at the session, and to circulate the documents in the Convention languages without further delay.

33. The Working Group welcomed the offer of the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues to clarify the way ELVs as contained in the technical draft annex VI were determined or calculated.

34. The Working Group considered several proposals to simplify and add flexibility to the technical annexes containing the ELVs.

### **C. Annex IX**

35. The Chair of the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen presented an overview of the European Nitrogen Assessment (informal document No. 11), launched at the Nitrogen and Global Change conference held in Edinburgh from 11 to 15 April 2011, including a video animation of the Assessment for the public made available at [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com). He also presented recent work by the Task Force as contained in the following documents:

(a) A draft revised annex IX, as set out in the annex to the latest report by the Task Force (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/16);

(b) A draft revised Guidance Document on Control Techniques for Preventing and Abating Emissions of Ammonia from Agricultural Sources (informal document No. 21);

(c) A draft guidance document on nitrogen budgets (informal document No. 20).

36. While analysing further possible measures to abate ammonia emissions, the Task Force identified five priorities for commitments in annex IX. The Task Force ranked those priorities according to technical and effectiveness criteria (as described in ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/16) in the following order, with (a) being the highest priority:

(a) Low-emission land application of manure and fertilizer:

(i) Application of cattle, pig and poultry slurry and solid manure (independent of animal category)

(ii) Low emission use of urea fertilizer (ban is not proposed);

(b) Animal feeding strategies to reduce nitrogen excretion, from cattle, pigs and poultry;

(c) Low-emission techniques for all new stores for cattle and pig slurries and poultry manure;

(d) Strategies to improve nitrogen (N) use efficiencies and reduce N surpluses, with N balances on demonstration farms;

(e) Low-emission techniques in new and largely rebuilt pig and poultry housing.

37. The Task Force was planning to hold its seventh meeting in Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, in spring 2012, with a focus on countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. The Co-chairs were seeking funds to help organize the workshop and to ensure a broad participation.

38. The Working Group:

(a) Took note of the Summary for Policymakers of the European Nitrogen Assessment (informal document No. 11), and requested the secretariat to submit it as an official document to the Executive Body for its twenty-ninth session in December 2011;

(b) Considered the draft revised annex IX to the Gothenburg Protocol contained in the annex to the latest report by the Task Force (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/16), the draft revised Guidance Document on Control Techniques for Preventing and Abating Emissions of Ammonia from Agricultural Sources (informal document No. 21) and the draft guidance document on nitrogen budgets (informal document No. 20), and invited Parties to communicate to the secretariat their comments and proposals for modifications to those documents before the end of November 2011;

(c) Considered the discussion paper. "Model strategy for reduction of ammonia emissions — an example of the Republic of Belarus" (informal document No. 7), and invited Parties to communicate to the secretariat their comments to the document before the end of November 2011;

(d) Requested the secretariat to collect the responses from Parties and communicate them to the co-Chairs of the Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen; and requested the Task Force to analyse the information obtained from the Parties, including informal document No. 7, at its next meeting and report the possible changes to the Guidance Document at the fiftieth session of the Working Group;

(e) Invited Parties to provide financial support to the Task Force to ensure broad participation from countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia in the Task Force meeting planned to be held in Saint Petersburg in spring 2012.

### **III. Options for revising the Gothenburg Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone**

39. The Working Group:

(a) Considered options for revising the Gothenburg Protocol contained in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/7 and proposals made during the session and requested the secretariat to produce a new version of the negotiating text for consideration by the twenty-ninth session of the Executive Body in December 2011, reflecting the modifications and proposals made during the session including those regarding an enabling clause (informal document No. 23) and termination of protocols;

(b) Considered options for introducing more flexibility into the Gothenburg Protocol, as proposed by the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections (as presented in informal document No. 3);

(c) Requested the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues to consider the available information on black carbon emission source categories and abatement measures contained in the report of Expert Group on Black Carbon (informal document No. 4 for the twenty-eighth session of the Executive Body) and other reports and assessments on black carbon for inclusion as relevant in the guidance document on best available techniques for stationary sources for the reduction of particulate matter emissions;

(d) Invited Parties to communicate to the secretariat further proposals for options to revise the Gothenburg Protocol as soon as possible, but by no later than 5 December 2011, and to provide informal translations into the Convention languages of any such proposals.

### **IV. Options for revising the Protocol on Heavy Metals**

40. The Chair of the Task Force on Heavy Metals presented a draft proposal for a guidance document based on the former annex III to the Protocol on Heavy Metals (informal documents Nos. 15 and 16). She highlighted new data on techniques concerning emissions of heavy metals that had become available and needed to be incorporated in the draft guidance document, focusing on proposed changes to sub-chapter IV on the non-ferrous metals industry to reflect new available information and simplify its structure. Regarding the next steps for finalizing the draft guidance documents, further discussion was needed on the updated information to be included, on the restructuring of sub-chapter IV and on the inclusion of information on secondary aluminium and manganese production and the handling of waste containing metallic mercury. The document would then be forwarded to the members of the Task Force and to Parties for comments.

41. The Working Group:

(a) Thanked the Chair of the Task Force on Heavy Metals for her efforts to produce a draft guidance document extracted from annex III to the Protocol on Heavy Metals;

(b) Requested delegations to submit comments on informal documents Nos. 15 and 16 by 20 November 2011;



(c) Welcomed the organization of a technical workshop, tentatively scheduled for February 2012, with the support of Germany, to discuss and update the guidance document prior to its submission to the fiftieth session of the Working Group.

## V. Options for revising the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants

42. In line with the Executive Body's request of December 2010, the delegation of Canada submitted additional new scientific information on trifluralin as it related to significant adverse human health impacts and environmental effects as a result of long-range transport. (criteria 2 (b) under Executive Body decision 1998/2). The submission (informal document No. 14) provided further information and additional references showing where trifluralin was included as an analyte in monitoring studies in various media including biota, but was below detection limits and therefore not reported. Most of the information gathered for that purpose had only recently been published or reviewed.

43. The Working Group took note of the new information on trifluralin as presented by Canada and decided to forward it to the Executive Body for consideration in further deliberations and decisions on possible additional amendments to the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

## VI. Exchange of information and technology

44. The Chair of the Coordinating Group on promotion of actions towards implementation of the Convention in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia briefed the Working Group about the latest activities of the Coordinating Group, highlighting the work on flexibility mechanisms for the Protocol on Heavy Metals and the Gothenburg Protocol; a seminar on pilot projects in the framework of the EU-funded "Air Quality Governance" project, with the participation of representatives of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation and Ukraine (30–31 August 2011, Ukraine); and a follow-up consultation on those aspects of the project which would assist the countries' work on implementation and ratification of the Convention's protocols. He also gave an overview of progress on a number of other projects: the joint project between Belarus, Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation aimed at assisting the preparation for the ratification of the three latest protocols to the Convention; the third stage of the Russian-Swedish project on the introduction of the GAINS model for use in the Russian Federation; and a pilot project for cost assessment of air pollution reduction measures from power plants in the north of the Russian Federation developed jointly with the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues. With regard to the model strategy for reduction of ammonia emissions and particulate matter (informal documents Nos. 7 and 8), prepared and translated into English by Belarus, the Coordinating Group would like expert feedback on those two documents.

45. The Coordinating Group Chair also noted that the Scientific Research Institute for Atmospheric Air Protection in Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, was finalizing the translation of the *EMEP/EEA<sup>5</sup> Air Pollutant Emission Inventory Guidebook*, by virtue of a \$15,000 grant from the Russian Federation and Norway. An additional \$7,000 was still needed to finalize the translation. The Coordinating Group, in cooperation with the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, had undertaken the translation of the guidance

---

<sup>5</sup> European Environment Agency (EEA).

document on control techniques for emissions of sulphur, nitrogen oxides, VOCs and particulate matter from stationary sources, with financial support from Switzerland.

46. The Coordinating Group has also discussed various proposals for updating the Revised Action Plan for Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, including the elaboration of a road map to assist countries in ratification and implementation of the Convention Protocols; the publication of the *EMEP/EEA Air Pollutant Emission Inventory Guidebook* in Russian; the translation of methodologies for estimating emissions of black carbon, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and coarse particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) from stationary sources; the continuation of the joint project between Belarus, Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation; and the organization of a high-level conference on air pollution issues in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. The proposals would be further discussed at the national level and submitted to the Executive Body session in December 2011.

## VII. Draft 2012–2013 workplan for the implementation of the Convention

47. The Working Group considered the draft 2012–2013 workplan for the implementation of the Convention as presented in document ECE/EB.AIR/2011/5, in particular section 1 dealing with strategies and policies, and agreed to recommend to the Executive Body to approve it with the following amendments:

(a) *Activities area 1.1, Strategies and review, under Main activities and time schedule*, add a new subparagraph (a): “(a) Finalize negotiations on proposed amendments to the Gothenburg Protocol in 2012, as mandated by the Executive Body;”

(b) *Activities area 1.1, Strategies and review, under Main activities and time schedule*: delete subparagraph (c);

(c) *Activities area 1.2, Compliance review, under Main activities and time schedule*, delete the penultimate sentence beginning “furthermore”;

(d) Add a new activities area 1.3 as follows:

### “1.3 Reviews of strategies and policies for air pollution abatement

*Description/objectives*: To create an overview of air pollution abatement in the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) region, giving a comprehensive description of national and international strategies and policies, including legislation in force, emission levels and future priorities; and to provide, together with emission data, a basis for the Implementation Committee to review compliance by Parties with their obligations under the protocols to the Convention. Reviews for purposes of compliance are carried out every two years and a general policy review is carried out every four years.

*Main activities and time schedule*: A draft review of strategies and policies for air pollution abatement will be made available to the Executive Body in 2012. The draft review will be based on replies to the 2012 questionnaire, to be approved by the Executive Body at its twenty-ninth session and made available by the secretariat through the Convention website; if approved by the Executive Body, the draft review will be published on the website of the Convention.”;

(e) *Activities area 1.6, Reactive nitrogen under Ongoing activities*, replace subparagraph (c) with the following text: “(c) Continue collecting and assessing information from the national focal points regarding their experiences, including any difficulties that they have in developing and implementing an integrated approach;”

(f) *Activities area 1.6, Reactive nitrogen* under *Ongoing activities*, at the end of subparagraph (d) after “emissions” add “in the form of an informal document to the Executive Body, to allow for the possible mandate for a formal document to be presented to the Working Group on Strategies and Review”;

(g) *Activities area 1.6, Reactive nitrogen* under *Ongoing activities*, add a new subparagraph (h), as follows: “(h) Consider the vision and future possibilities for integrating nitrogen management within the Convention and in relation to other ECE and international conventions; and prepare an informal document on this topic for the Executive Body, to allow for the possible mandate for a formal document to be presented to Working Group on Strategies and Review;”

(h) Add the following new activity area 1.8:

#### **“1.8 Review and assessment of heavy metals**

*Description/objectives:* To continue the technical work related to the review of the Protocol on Heavy Metals. The activities related to heavy metals are carried out by the Task Force on Heavy Metals.

*Ongoing activities:* The Task Force on Heavy Metals will:

(a) Following the recommendation of the Working Group on Strategies and Review, review the comments provided by Parties to informal documents Nos. 15 and 16 for the forty-ninth session of the Working Group (draft proposal for a guidance document, former annex III of the Protocol on Heavy Metals, on best available techniques for controlling emissions of heavy metals and their compounds from the source categories listed in annex II);

(b) Hold a technical workshop, tentatively scheduled to be held in Berlin in February 2012, with the support of Germany and continue to discuss and update the draft guidance document extracted from annex III of the Protocol on Heavy Metals prior to its submission to the fiftieth session of the Working Group.”

## **VIII. Election of officers**

48. In accordance with the rules of procedure adopted at the twenty-eighth session of the Executive Body in December 2010, the Working Group elected Ms. J. Kerr (Canada), Mr. I. Angelov (Bulgaria), Ms. A. Engleryd (Sweden) and Mr. A. Pilipchuk (Belarus) as Vice-Chairs for 2012–2014.

## **IX. Other business**

49. The secretariat informed the Working Group about activities of the Subregional Office for East and North-East Asia of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific related to air pollution. Meeting on 1 and 2 September 2011, the sixteenth Senior Officials Meeting of the North-East Asian Subregional Programme of Environmental Cooperation had approved a project proposal submitted by the Russian Federation, “Review of Existing and required Capacities for Addressing Adverse Environmental Impact of Transboundary Air Pollution in North-East Asia”. The project — which would run for approximately a year — was of direct relevance for the EMEP Programme and the Working Group on Effects. The secretariat had helped to finalize the project proposal by providing input to the draft presented during the Expert Consultation meeting held at Incheon, Republic of Korea, on 20 and 21 January 2011.

## **X. Adoption of the decisions of the Working Group**

50. On 16 September 2011, the Working Group on Strategies and Review adopted the decisions taken at its forty-ninth session.

---