

Further input to the Assessment Report to be discussed at the meetings with EMEP SEB and WGE September 2014

Peringe Grennfelt Summary Øystein Hov, Hilde Fagerli and Peringe Grennfelt:
2014-09-05

The scientific report should give scientific support to policy questions outlined in the document by Rob and Peringe and discussed at the WGSR (informal document at the EMEP SB and WGE).

(a) The focus of the report should be mitigation actions driven by CLRTAP Protocols up to now and the needs for further actions in the future:

- What has been achieved in terms of reduction in health and ecosystem effects?
- What is the scope for further improvements in air quality and deposition of nutrients, acidifying compounds, HM and POPs?
- What is the scope for further co-benefits with climate change mitigation?

(b) The assessment is not supposed to be a very comprehensive overview of "what do we know and what do we need to know better". It will not have a country-focus, although the EECCA-countries need special attention in order to raise awareness of these issues in these countries.

(c) Two main avenues can be taken:

1. Follow the CIAM-IA approach and respond to the questions (a)
2. Use the comprehensive knowledge in the effects and atmospheric science communities based on observations and model calculations combined, to respond to (a) (+ IA for costs etc.). It is realised that the IA-approach contains this knowledge, but with a number of simplifying assumptions taken in order to do the IA.

(d) The objective of the assessment is to advice EB, national authorities, politicians and policymakers not directly involved in CLRTAP on which air pollution mitigation measures that now can be taken and which are justified in terms of their effect and costs. If CLRTAP is to be used as a mechanism for political action in the future, a sound basis is required to foster willingness to act.

(e) The assessment report should aim to be a publishable review paper, as the questions in (a) have a wide relevance also in the broader science community.

(f) The preparation for the assessment report up to now has been through discussions in EMEP, WGE, EB and WGSR, and it is included in the WP for 2015-2016 (Item 1.9, see EB documents from December 2013). The written outlines have been developed by Peringe Grennfelt and Rob Maas (chairman of WGE and chairman of TFIAM, the latest memo dated 2 July 2014).

(g) The next step is to organise a workshop in November 2014 or January 2015. MSC-W will host it in Oslo with financial support from the Nordic Council of Ministers. An organisation committee is being established: Peringe Grennfelt, Rob Maas, Markus Amann and Hilde Fagerli (Øystein Hov). Others?

(h) The workshop should cover two full days (alternatively start around noon the first day and finish in the afternoon on the second to reduce overnight stay need in Oslo to one night).

The programme should start with "personal" overview papers by a few senior researchers where they sum up their current response to (a).

These speakers should both represent the (c)-1 approach and the (c)-2 approach.

Markus Amann is an obvious choice for (c)-1.

For (c)-2 both the effect-side and the atmospheric science side should talk. Till Spranger, David Fowler, David Simpson (linearities/non-linearities in the atmospheric/deposition response to emission reduction (gases and particles; climate change co-benefits (Michael Schulz?)). HC Hansson could present (relationship between changes in emissions and changes in observed PM and PM properties). Frank Dentener could also be a very good candidate.

Altogether five or so introductory talks to "set the scene" and to create focus and enthusiasm.

(i) The main part of the workshop should be to review and tighten the outline as presented now by Peringe and Rob, so that a realistic scoping is made which addresses (a). For this reason the workshop needs to attract active researchers who would like to devote time to prepare the assessment. Names mentioned were for effects Anne Christine LeGall INERIS, Harry Harmens CEH, Jean Paul Hettelingh, RIVM, Marie-Eve Heroux, WMO, for heavy metals John Munthe, IVL and Knut Breivik, NILU, and for EMEP task force chairs and centres (Sergej et al, Hilde et al., Kjetil et al, Katarina et al.). Additional names are of course welcome. The product of the workshop should ideally be a new outline, distribution of writing tasks, defining the needs for extra resources (money and people) and a timeline.

(j) The number of participants could be up to 20 (not much more as that will reduce the efficiency of the work).

Next steps: The further organisation of the work will be discussed at the EMEP/WGE meetings and the organisational committee should start its work (decide dates, create a Programme, invite people etc). Who will lead the committee?