



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 11 July 2014
(OR. en)

11625/14

ENV 659
ENT 155
ONU 93

INFORMATION NOTE

From: General Secretariat of the Council
To: Delegations

Subject: LRTAP Convention:
52nd Session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review (WGSR)
(Geneva, 1-3 July 2014)
- Final statements

Delegations will find in the Annex, for information a compilation of statements agreed and delivered at the 52nd Session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review (Geneva, 1-3 July 2014), on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, as transmitted by the Presidency.

**52nd session of the CLRTAP Working Group on Strategies and Review
(Geneva, 1 to 3 July 2014)
Statements delivered on behalf of the EU and its Member States**

WGSR Agenda item 2. Adoption of the report of the fifty-first session of the Working Group

(delivered by the Presidency)

The EU and its Member States agree to adopt the report of the 51st session of the WGSR, as set out in document ECE/EB.AIR/WG.5/111.

We would encourage, however, the Secretariat to make the reports available in accordance with the rules of procedures. This should be within 6 weeks after the session, to allow the Parties proper follow-up, and in particular to prepare for the EB. The timely reporting of meetings of subsidiary bodies will be particularly important when the CLRTAP changes the sequence of meetings in 2015/16.

WGSR Agenda item 3. Progress in the implementation of the 2014-2015 workplan

TF RN report (delivered by the Presidency)

The EU and its Member States wish to emphasize the importance of the strategic nature of TF RN and the 2014/15 deliverables, such as guidance on ammonia emission abatement under the Gothenburg Protocol. Action on the complex issue of agriculture, nitrogen and eutrophication is likely to be key for the future. We therefore encourage all Parties to contribute to the work of the TF and in particular to the framework code on agriculture practice which is currently being updated.

CLRTAP Assessment report (delivered by the Presidency and the Commission)

The EU and its Member States welcome the 2016 Assessment report as it will be important for us to demonstrate the effectiveness of the current instruments, learn from experience of implementing measures and in particular identify future challenges. We believe that the first outline of policy questions largely covers our needs. We would also like to include in the assessment what has been achieved/challenges on HM and POPs and wish to know about the rationale for not including it now but at a much later date.

We have also found that the challenge for the summary report is to make it comprehensive, focused and synthetic for policy makers while not losing the necessary details in science and policy. We therefore think that some priorities of the policy questions would be needed in order to extract the key future challenges and we are willing to work with other Parties to set those priorities. We also have a few detailed comments on the outline of part II of the AR that we wish to share.

On the five key questions the chairs of the WGE and TFIAM have raised in their informal document to this session the EU and its Member States have the following views:

On 1. What should the Assessment Report try to achieve?

One key aim is to raise awareness of the achievements and challenges of the CLRTAP in the EB and beyond. This will generate support by Parties to the future work of the CLRTAP and in particular from decision makers in ministries.

Perhaps a specific target group of the report would be the countries in the EECCA region.

On 2. What policy questions should get priority?

Future challenges for the CLRTAP is a priority for the assessment, this includes the challenge for meeting environmental and health objectives everywhere in particular in the EECCA region as well as how to reach out to other regions (outside the UNECE). The EU and its Member States would also be in favour to include advances and challenges for HM and POPs in the assessment.

On 3. How should the balance in the report be between forward looking challenges and describing past achievements?

Priority on the future challenges, but difficult to point to the parts of the AR that then have to be reduced.

On 4. Should the report be accompanied with brochures or webpages for the larger public or with national policy briefs or fact sheets?

It would be important to have a broad distribution of the results through various channels, including the internet and social media.

On 5. As in the work plan no budget for the Assessment Report is reserved, how do the Parties suggest to cover the co-ordination costs (approximately €250.000) and translation costs? We assume that contributions from Centers can be covered from the budget of the Centers.

Several MS are currently looking into how they can support the process, in particular through in-kind contributions.

In addition we believe that the inclusion of a scientific summary in part II (different from the summary for policy makers in part I) would be useful.

EGTEI report (delivered by the Presidency)

The EU and its Member States welcome the aim of streamlining the work of the subsidiary bodies by providing an extended mandate to a new Task Force on Techno-Economic Issues that also covers issues on the POPs and heavy metals. This will allow for the seamless transition of work from the EGTEI, TF POPs and TF HM to the new Task Force from 2015 onwards. With regard to the details of the draft mandate, we consider that the EGTEI should have the opportunity to consider the mandate before Parties consider it in detail and agree its content at the EB in December. We are, however, eager to listen to first views of other Parties at this meeting. We also wish to highlight the need for sufficient human and financial resources to cover all tasks of this new Task Force. In this context we would already like to invite all Parties to engage with their experts in the ongoing review of the Guidance document on mobile sources – that document will be as important as the other guidance documents under the GP.

TF HM report (delivered by the Presidency)

The EU and its Member States wish to emphasise the importance of the TF HM workshop aiming at informing the countries in the EECCA region on the 2012 amendment to the HM Protocol. Such activities are key to meet the LTS objectives of better implementation of the CLRTAP and ratifications of instruments by new Parties.

TFIAM informal report (delivered by the Presidency)

The EU and its Member States wish to emphasise the importance of the work performed within the Task Force and by the Center in support of policy development.

Chair's suggestion to change TF official reporting to a two year cycle (delivered by the Presidency and the Commission)

The EU and its MSs think that such a change could seriously hamper our desire to have an active science to policy information flow and the possibility for the EB to adjust the work plan on an annual basis. In our view it is essential that the WGSR Agenda provides for thorough discussion of the Task Forces work and results on an annual basis.

WGSR Agenda item 4. Information sharing by Parties on the implementation of the Convention

(delivered by the Presidency and the Commission)

During this session we heard many presentations on PaMs and we learnt a lot about the experience in other countries to tackle air pollution. In many instances these would have triggered questions and a discussion in the plenary – but time did not allow that to the extent needed. We think that is a lost opportunity of interaction.

We therefore view that it is paramount for future session that enough time is provided for questions and discussion of the matter presented so that true interaction and dynamics is created between the Parties and that we genuinely draw from others experience.

It could be useful to have such presentations a little bit in advance of the WGSR session so to have the possibility to know and ask for any additional information and/or clarification, as well as for possible synergic contributions. In addition, we see some room for grouping into environmental themes as we have done during this session such as transport, agriculture, etc. or according to pollutants.

Specifically on the session on PaMs we heard many good examples from Parties and we hope that the experience will be applied also elsewhere. Again too little time was available for discussions.

Specifically on the EECCA part of the session on PaMs it was particularly interesting for us to hear about recent progress in detailing policy and action on improving air quality and we believe the CLRTAP can play an important part in information sharing and capacity building towards an effective air quality policy.

The EU and its MSs believe the exchange of information of PaMs in the format of presentations and discussion very well can replace the previous reporting through questionnaires.

Specifically on the transport session our observation is that the transport sector will still have to be in the prime focus for future action – in particular we need effective transport mobility policy and effective emission standards for mobile sources reflecting the real drive emissions.
