Future Development of the CLRTAP

CONCLUSIONS

Strengths

- The role of the scientific base of the protocols
- The evolution from a flat-rate pollution reduction approach to an effects based approach
- Convention is an example for similar arrangements in other regions
- Flexibility to increase and address a greater number of pollutants and effects
- Flexibility to accommodate different approaches to reducing air pollution across the ECE region
- The institutional structure set up on a long-term basis with ability to adapt according to changing environmental priorities
- The role of the Implementation Committee in assuring compliance with the Protocols
- Differentiated responsibilities and obligations
- Bringing together policy and technical experts from the countries and individual experts from a wide range of institutions

Weaknesses

- Limited financial mechanisms to assist with ratification and implementation
- Different goals and approaches may create confusion at the political level and to the public
- Not all countries participate with the same level of commitment
- Major focus on transboundary air pollution problems and not local or urban problems
- Lack of penalties for failing to comply with the Protocols
- Limited resources for outreach activities

Pollutants

Nitrogen oxides and methane emissions and their relation with ozone are very important at the intercontinental level.

Nitrogen is of increasing concern because of a range of effects and no international policy body has so far taken a holistic view towards addressing those effects.

PM and its precursors are important for transboundary transport but the significance of the intercontinental transport is still to be assessed.

POPs: may in the future be better addressed through the Stockholm Convention while LRTAP should continue the monitoring effort and the use the scientific data collected and processed. LRTAP work should be concentrated on the countries that did not ratify the Protocol yet.

Metals: LRTAP work should be concentrated on the countries that did not ratify the Protocol yet. There are co-benefits in reduction of particulate matter. In addition, further activity should be considered for mercury within UNEP and at the national level.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Maintain the active geographic coverage of the Convention, for example by providing technical assistance to EECCA and SEE countries in implementing the Convention.
- Continue the work with the WHO to improve the scientific basis associated with health effects.
- Consider the additional issues in relation to TFHTAP concerning environmental health effects and possible policy pathways.
- Continue the programme of assessing hemispheric and intercontinental transport.
- Address local air pollution problems within the ECE region
- Provide technical assistance to non-ECE countries to supplement their efforts in addressing air pollution.
- To further develop cooperation with other relevant regional and global programmes and networks beyond ECE including the Global Atmospheric Pollution Forum.
- Consider developing a common framework between the Convention and other regional agreements.
- Reassess the deployment of resources within the Convention in the light of changing priorities.

- The Convention should recognise and build on the links between climate change and air pollution policies.
- Consider the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol in a context of short-term (2020) and long-term (2050) timeframes including the links with climate change and policies to reduce greenhouse gases emissions.

- Consider the establishment of an expert group under the Convention to take a holistic view of how to address nitrogen.

- Perform an integrated assessment of the impact of emissions from aviation and shipping for the purpose of informing policy makers.

TO WHOM ADDRESS THE RECOMMENDATIONS

- Convention Parties