

Comments on the Report on the review of the rules of procedure (ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/2023/INF.4): statement by the EU and its Member States during the 61st session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review

- Regarding hybrid meetings, this option is currently less relevant but may be required in the future. We note that this issue could also be treated as a matter for an EB decision. Our final position will be prepared following the input of the legal ad hoc group on this proposal.
- Regarding length of terms of office, a simpler solution would be to leave rule 17 unchanged. We propose that the RRG reconsiders and/or simplifies this proposal, taking into account the potential discrepancy between the start and end of terms.
- Regarding elections of officers, the level of detail in the proposed new rule 17b seems disproportionate for the Rules of Procedure. It is not clear that we need such a detailed new procedure. We propose that the RRG reconsiders and/or simplifies the proposal.
- Regarding voting rules, this clarification proposal is relevant to forward to the legal ad hoc group for their opinion. The level of detail of the current proposal (specifying the English language alphabetic roll call order) may be superfluous. We propose that the RRG reviews and simplifies this proposal.
- Regarding the deletion of the reference to Rule 29 in Rule 21.6, making Rule 29 (decision making) also applicable to the other subsidiary bodies, we reiterate that the other subsidiary bodies are not decision-making bodies, but only agree on draft recommendations for the EB or agree on technical documents. Making rules for decision-making also applicable to WGSR, EMEP SB and WGE would further complicate / slow-down the policy preparation and science process and imply that also for the WGSR and EMEP SB we may need to come with credentials. So far we have been able to avoid coordination on science and technical issues within EMEP SB and WGE. This would potentially also have impact on the agreement of the adjustment applications (that we as EU wanted to maintain as a technical procedure). We therefore insist on removing this proposal.
- It is not clear why it would be necessary to repeat the wording of EB Decision 1998/3 as a new rule 30bis; it should be noted that such action would also change the way this procedure can later be amended. We propose to remove this proposal.