

Richard Ballaman  
Chairman of the Working Group  
on Strategies and Review

Berne on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2011

Email: [richard.ballaman@bafu.admin.ch](mailto:richard.ballaman@bafu.admin.ch)

**To Heads of Delegations  
of the Working Group  
on Strategies and Review**

Dear Colleagues,

I have great pleasure to invite you to participate in the forty-eighth session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review to be held in Geneva from 11 to 15 April 2011. The session is scheduled to start at **10 a.m. on Monday** and finish at **1 p.m. on Friday**.

During this session, we will focus our work on the revision of the 1999 Gothenburg Protocol and the 1998 Protocol on Heavy Metals.

The provisional annotated agenda ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/101 and other related official as well as informal documents are available at

<http://www.unece.org/env/lrtap/WorkingGroups/wgs/docs48th%20session.htm> The French and Russian translations of the official documents will be uploaded as they become available.

For the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol, the official documents include the following:

- ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2011/1 on the revisions proposed this far to the Protocol text;
- 2011/2 on proposed further changes to the draft technical annexes as contained in documents ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2009/17-22. In April, delegations will be invited to refer themselves in parallel to documents 2011/2 and 2009/17-22;
- 2011/3 on the draft revised annex IX and 2011/5 on the draft revised annex I.

This letter intends to highlight several important issues on our agenda for which your position should be well prepared:

Items 3, 5 and 6 of the provisional agenda: Options for revising the Gothenburg Protocol

A first priority for the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol will be to consider the results of the integrated assessment modeling work with due consideration to different hybrid scenarios analysis to be presented by CIAM and TFIAM co-chairs. This should serve as an inspiration for the Parties to the Protocol as they agree on the “further obligations to reduce emissions” called for by article 3, para.12. In concrete terms, the Working Group should envisage an optimal ambition level to further abate the emissions beyond 2010 while at the same time finding an appropriate way to accommodate possibilities for non-Parties to ratify the revised Protocol.

In line with the time schedule and the mandate given to WGSR, we are to finalize a draft revised text of the Gothenburg Protocol and its annexes at the WGSR 49 in September **for adoption by the Parties to the Protocol at the 29<sup>th</sup> Executive Body session in December 2011**. Consequently, we need to work on a fast track. It means that by the end of the April meeting, we should have achieved progress on the following key issues:

- To produce a draft revised annex II with preliminary ceilings in square brackets for SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC and NH<sub>3</sub>, as well as some figures for primary PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions (as ceilings or percentage reduction versus a reference year) to allow the delegates to conduct consultations in their capitals in preparation of the final negotiations at the September 2010 session of WGSR.
- To choose one ELV option for each stationary source within stationary source categories which should be in line with the corresponding BAT. (The discussion on these aspects will be started in the plenary session on Monday morning under my chairmanship and with the assistance of the EGTEI co-chairs.)
- To select as far as possible one option for the different ammonia sources in agriculture as listed in the draft revised annex IX. The key decisions in this regard should be taken in April to let then some time for the TF on Reactive Nitrogen to work on more details, if needed, in May, with a view to reporting on them in advance to the WGSR 49 in September.

- To include options for text to address the issues included in para. 4 of Decision 2010/2, taking into consideration proposals brought forward by the lead countries of the former Ad-hoc Expert Group on Black Carbon.

The new draft annex IX addresses about 70 % of the emissions of ammonia from agriculture as these also cover cattle, which is the source of about 50% of the emissions of NH<sub>3</sub> in Europe. In comparison, as presented at our last meeting in September, the 1999 Protocol limits are restricted to pigs and poultry, which cover only 13 % of the ammonia emissions. Consequently, the new draft annex IX would give Parties more means to control their emission ceilings for ammonia.

The various guidance documents describing BAT on SO<sub>2</sub>/NO<sub>x</sub>/NMVOC emission sources were already revised by EGTEI and were reported at WGSR 45 in September 2009 together with a new chapter on PM, presented as informal document 1/2009. Additional information delivered by the ad hoc expert group that met during both WGSR meetings in 2010 will be summarized by the EGTEI co-chairs in April.

As to the countries in Eastern-Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA), I hope that they could accept to follow the BAT approach and the resulting ELVs for new installations at the same level as other Parties to the Protocol. With regard to the retrofitting of the existing installations, WGSR is open to considering the approaches and measures that the EECCA countries will have identified as being the most helpful in facilitating their implementation and ratification of the Gothenburg and Heavy Metals Protocols. The outcomes of the meeting of the EECCA Coordinating Group of 18 March in St Petersburg will hopefully deliver a useful starting point for our discussions in April. One possibility for the EECCA countries would be to identify key sources as mentioned in the CIAM Report 1/2008 on "Scenarios of SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM emissions in the non-EU countries up to 2020" also available in Russian language at: [http://www.iiasa.ac.at/rains/reports/CIAM%20report%201-2008v2\\_RU.pdf](http://www.iiasa.ac.at/rains/reports/CIAM%20report%201-2008v2_RU.pdf) and to focus on these key sectors. In any case, at the April session, I would greatly appreciate if the EECCA countries could clearly specify their positions and how they see the clean-up work of the existing polluting installations.

#### Item 4 of the provisional agenda: Options for revising the Protocol on Heavy Metals

The work will proceed according to the mandate of WGSR to negotiate a revised Protocol on Heavy Metals as decided by the Executive Body at its 27<sup>th</sup> session in December 2009 and taking into account the priorities agreed to by the EB28 in December 2010. The objective is to report on its progress to the 29<sup>th</sup> session of EB in 2011 and to present proposed amendments to the Protocol to the Parties for adoption at the 30<sup>th</sup> EB session in 2012, at the latest.

The discussion on the technical annexes containing emission values should take due consideration of the proposed dust ELVs for revising the Gothenburg Protocol. To this end, following the discussion on the Gothenburg Protocol, we will consider whether the proposed Gothenburg Protocol ELVs are applicable under the Protocol on HM for the same sources. We will also have to negotiate the other specific HMs limitations, in particular for coal fired power plants, using as a basis the proposal of the Task Force on Heavy Metals. After that, we will continue with the treatment of the mercury-containing products and the rest of the Protocol, as far as we can within the available time.

I hope that this information will give you a clear view of my expectations, which hopefully are also shared by the WGSR delegations. The tasks and time schedule ahead are very challenging but it is only through setting ambitious targets that we can achieve great improvements of the air quality all over Europe.

Yours sincerely,  
Richard Ballaman