(Unedited) **DRAFT CONCLUSIONS OF THE 24th MEETING OF TFEIP**

(Stockholm, 2-3rd May 2011)

(To be presented to the EMEP Steering Body at its 35th session September 2011)

The Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections (TFEIP) held its 24rd meeting, and 12th joint meeting with the European Environment Agency's (EEA) European Environment Information and Observation Network (EIONET), in Stockholm, Sweden. The meeting was attended by approximately 120 participants, representing over 40 countries as well as international organisations including the EMEP Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections, CIAM, European Commission (Environment DG, the Joint Research Centre and Eurostat), EEA and its European Topic Centre on Air Pollution and Climate Change Mitigation (ETC/ACM), Eurocontrol, and Eurelectric.

The objective of the 24th meeting was to focus on emerging issues, such as revision to the Gothenburg Protocol, emissions of Black Carbon and gridded emissions. The TFEIP meeting was held back to back with a technical workshop looking at the gridding of emissions data, in preparation for the 5 yearly reporting of gridded data due in 2012.

The Task Force:

Information Updates

(a) Noted with regret that the UNECE Secretariat were again not able to attend the meeting;

2011 Emissions Reporting and Review

(b) Were pleased to note that quality of the Informative Inventory Reports (IIRs) is steadily increasing, although the number of Parties submitting IIR's remains largely constant. The Chair encouraged Parties not submitting IIRs to explain the barriers that they face, so that the TFEIP can try to facilitate effective support.

(c) Recognised that the Stage 3 review process has, to date, reviewed Parties who have submitted both emission estimates and informative inventory report (IIRs) – the two prerequisites needed in order that a Stage 3 review can occur . In contrast, the scheduled reviews for the next two years look to be particularly challenging as they involve countries that have either not yet submitted emission datasets and/or IIRs. Unless these Parties report this information in future submission rounds, a Stage 3 review of their emission submission will not be possible.

Reporting from ECCA Countries and Translation of the Guidebook into Russian

(d) Heard from their EECCA country representative that the main reasons for lack of progress in reporting from ECCA countries was considered to be associated with Governmental decisions, rather than the lack of technical capability or availability of guidance. The TFEIP agreed to discuss this issue with the EMEP SB Chair to try to identify ways in which reporting from these countries can be improved, and suggested that one option would be contact the relevant countries by letter, explaining why IIRs are required.

(e) Following a presentation from Russia, noted that the translation of the Guidebook into Russian is nearing completion. The TFEIP agreed that the Russian version of the Guidebook will be trialled across the next inventory compilation cycle, and its use reviewed.

Data Libraries and Information Sharing

(f) Finland provided an update on the Air Pollutant Emission Factor Library. The Chair thanked Finland for their work on this valuable resource, and encouraged Parties to upload emission factors to the library.

(g) A representative from the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis presented an initiative to create an information repository on BC, but flagged the need for funding to support the work. The initiative received support from the TFEIP, and noted close links with the TFEIP workplan (see point j).

Recent Research Projects & Emission Inventory Developments

(h) Welcomed the following presentations as being of value for contributing to further inventory development:

- Emission Estimates from Wood Combustion, presented by Denmark;
- A Tier 3 Methodology for Domestic Wood Combustion, from Italy;
- Current Plans and Work Programme for the TFHTAP, from the European Commission,
- Latest Emission Estimates from the EDGAR emissions model, presented by the JRC.
- Improvements in Emission Factors for the Cement Sector, presented by Belarus.

Estimates of BC, OC, EC and PM_{10}

(i) Considered the specific issue of improving emission estimates of PM and the various metrics being used for carbon (black carbon (BC), organic carbon (OC) and elemental carbon (EC)), and welcomed the following presentations:

- Emissions and Baseline Projections of BC using the GAINS model, from CIAM;
- A European-wide inventory of EC and OC, from the Netherlands;
- An Emissions Inventory of BC, from Denmark;
- A BC Emissions Inventory and Comparison with Other Countries, presented by Finland.

(j) The TFEIP recognised the importance of assessing the current information that is available to make emission estimates of BC, and added this to its workplan.

Flexibility Mechanisms

(k) A representative of the European Union provided an introduction to recent activities on the potential inclusion of Flexibility Mechanisms in the revised Gothenburg Protocol. The Chair then explained the TFEIP's work to date, and the provision of a report to WGSR commenting the

mechanisms proposed by the EU. The Chair then presented an overview of mechanisms more generally to open discussion.

(l) Ireland opened the discussion by indicating strong support for relative ceilings, and in particular a "Kyoto type" of methodology[1]. There was support for this point of view from the UK, the European Topic Centre, and several other countries. However it was noted by the ETC/ACM and the Netherlands that whilst this would address many reporting issues, there are still some challenges associated with a Kyoto type approach.

(m) Numerous countries expressed a clear lack of support for mechanisms which required the preparation of multiple versions of an inventory dataset. Issues associated with reporting, version control, and an increased burden for Parties were all raised. There was a clear preference for a system that improved consistency with the reporting of GHG emissions.

(n) The UK indicated support for flexibility mechanisms in general, and the need to consider a range of different options- a view supported by the Netherlands. However, the UK noted that it was difficult to provide comment until clearer technical guidance had been provided on the current proposals from the European Union.

(o) France proposed some additional mechanisms for consideration. They also noted that the current Stage 3 review process would probably require considerable strengthening if mechanisms were introduced.

(p) France also asked whether flexibility mechanisms might be applied to the existing 2010 ceilings. The EU explained that whilst they do not wish to change the ceilings for 2010, it is possible that the revised Gothenburg Protocol could (subject to outcome of negotiations) retrospectively amend the 2010 emission estimates through flexibility mechanisms.

(q) The ETC/ACM expressed the need for a system that allowed updated emission factors to be more rapidly disseminated for use in national emission inventories. The Chair reminded the TFEIP that draft updated chapters are put in the public domain and may be used before they are formally incorporated into the Guidebook.

(r) Following discussions on the possible inclusion of flexibility mechanisms in the revised Gothenburg Protocol, and the need to provide technical support to the WGSR, the TFEIP agreed to form a Flexibility Mechanism Ad Hoc Group. This group will be tasked with reviewing the technical implications of a range of different options relating to flexibility mechanisms, and provide technical support to the WGSR as appropriate.

---

[1] A percentage reduction on a base year is specified as a target. However, at a predetermined date several years after the start of the Protocol, the most current estimate for the base year is used to express the percentage reduction as an absolute value. This absolute value is fixed as the reduction which is to be achieved, irrespective of subsequent revisions to the base year.

EIONET

The Task Force and EEA EIONET:

(s) The EEA provided a review of recent EEA and EIONET-related activities, and introduced the following presentations:

- A report on the EEA workshop on uncertainty in road transport emissions and the differences in emission arising from new scientific knowledge over time as reflected in changes between the COPERTII and COPERT4 road transport emission model , from the ETC/ACM.
- A new Aviation Inventory Data Portal being developed in collaboration with Eurocontrol, from the EEA.
- An update on the links to emissions with satellite measurement and GMES, from the ETC/ACM.

Guidebook Development

The Task Force:

(t) Heard that the Agriculture and Nature expert panel agreed to postpone the creation of a methodology for NMVOC emissions from agriculture until 2012, due to a lack of resources.

(u) Welcomed the recent contributions to the work of the TFEIP from Eurostat and Eurocontrol.

(v) Received notification from the Combustion and Industry expert panel that updates to a number of chapters have been drafted. These will be made available through the TFEIP website, but will not be incorporated into the Guidebook until the next round of Guidebook updates (currently scheduled for 2013).

(w) The TFEIP also discussed the fact that the Guidebook is revised to provide emission factors which are applicable to the most recent years. Some consideration will need to be given to whether emission factors will need to be provided with the years for which they are applicable. The TFEIP agreed to revisit this issue at its next meeting.

Work plan 2011-2012

(x) The Chair proposed the workplan for 2011-2012, which was agreed by the TFEIP. In addition, the main activities in the areas of Combustion and Industry, Transport, Agriculture and Nature, and Projections were discussed and agreed by the TFEIP.

IIR Best Practise

(y) The ETC/ACM presented some informal awards for IIR best practise. Finland was considered to provide the most comprehensive IIR, Austria the best all-round IIR, Estonia the most improved IIR, and Switzerland and Croatia as the best IIRs from a small party.

Next Meeting

(z) Agreed to hold its next meeting in April or May of 2012, at a venue to be decided

Thanks

(aa) The Task Force thanked the TFEIP chairs and expert panel leaders for their work in preparing and co-ordinating a successful meeting.

(bb) The TFEIP Chairs expressed their appreciation to the Swedish Ministry of Environment and Swedish Environmental Protection Agency for hosting the meeting, and thanked Norway, the UK and the EEA for providing financial support to allow certain representatives to participate in the meeting. They also thanked Julio Lumbreras (Spain) for his past contributions to the work on projections as the panel Co-Chair, and noted the need for a new Co-Chair of the TFEIP's projections expert panel.

(Unedited) **DRAFT CONCLUSIONS OF THE TFEIP/EIONET Workshop on Emissions Gridding and Mapping**

(Stockholm, 4th May 2011)

(To be presented to the EMEP Steering Body at its 35th session September 2011)

The Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections (TFEIP) held a joint workshop with the European Environment Agency's (EEA) European Environment Information and Observation Network (EIONET), in Stockholm, Sweden.

The meeting was attended by approximately 90 participants, representing nearly 40 countries as well as international organisations.
The objective of the workshop was to support countries in preparation for the 5 yearly reporting of gridded data due in 2012.

The workshop received an number of informative presentations before holding discussion sessions:

a) CEIP presented an overview of the proposed new reporting requirements for gridded emissions data, and in particular changes to the EMEP gridding system. It was noted that there was a timing issue with the revision to the EMEP grid because the grid will not be revised in time for the 2012 submission of gridded data. Continuation of 5 yearly reporting would mean that data on a new grid would only be submitted in 2017. Parties were encouraged to report on the old grid in 2012, but prepare for the new grid (which is to be finalised), with the aim of reporting gridded data in 2014 on the new grid.

b) A number of presentations were given to explain the resources and data that are readily available to Parties:
   - The EEA explained how to start creating emission maps for the first time, and explained the readily available datasets which can be used to generate gridded emissions data.
   - The JRC presented an overview of the methods used to generate the spatial datasets in EDGAR.
   - The UK presented methods from the IMPRESAREO and APMOSPHERE projects which that can be used to generate emission maps when little spatial data is available.
   - The sections in the Guidebook which include guidance on mapping were presented, to highlight the flexible approach that can be taken to generating emission maps.

c) A significant number of countries do not report gridded data. The Co-chairs encouraged Parties to draw on the information that had been presented, and hence to submit gridded data. The Co-Chairs also encouraged Parties not reporting gridded data to explain the barriers to reporting. This will allow the TFEIP to identify the barriers, and target their efforts to help increase the level of reporting.

d) A clear need was identified for a repository of spatial datasets, and associated guidance. The EDGAR team at the JRC indicated their willingness to provide underlying datasets to Parties from their project work.

e) It was asked whether it was possible to submit point, line and area sources directly to EMEP rather than gridded data. CEIP indicated that current resources would not be sufficient to process the data, and in particular there are country specific issues which Parties are best placed to address.

f) Issues associated with handling confidential data were raised. It was agreed that this was an important consideration when generating gridded emissions data, particularly as the resolution and detail of emission maps is increasing.

g) Several presentations were given on sophisticated emissions mapping and gridded that is undertaken in Europe:
   - Germany presented the mapped results from the project on the Diffuse Air Emissions in the E-PRTR
   - The UK presented methodologies and results from the highly detailed emissions maps that are compiled for the UK.
   - Denmark presented the methodologies used for the Danish 1x1 km emission maps.
   - Sweden presented the methodologies using bottom-up data for generating emission maps of shipping & road traffic.

h) The Co-Chairs expressed their appreciation to the Swedish Ministry of Environment and Swedish Environmental Protection Agency for hosting the meeting, and thanked Norway and the EEA for providing financial support to allow certain representatives to participate in the meeting.