



Joint TFEIP/EIONET Meeting and Workshop

2nd - 4th May 2011, Stockholm, Sweden
Meeting Conclusions (Technical)

18/05/2011

Chris Dore, Martin Adams, Kristina Saarinen

The TFEIP provide conclusions from its meetings to the EMEP Steering Body. This informal version of the meeting conclusions has been compiled specifically for people in more technical roles, using less formal language.

Session 1: Reporting Review & UN/ECE Developments

Welcome

Dr. Staffan Tillander (Ambassador on Climate Change, from the Swedish Ministry of the Environment) provided an opening presentation on the importance of providing high quality policy support, and welcomed the participants to Stockholm.

Reporting Review

Katarina Mareckova (CEIP) presented a summary of reported data and potential changes to the reporting of gridded emissions data.

It was noted that future Stage 3 Reviews look to be challenging because the countries scheduled for review are not currently reporting emission estimates or IIRs.

Justin Goodwin (ETC/ACM) presented a review of recently submitted IIRs.

The quality of submitted IIRs is increasing. However the number of IIRs submitted remains largely constant.

The Chair encouraged Parties not reporting to discuss the reasons with the TFEIP Co-chairs so that any barriers could be identified, and the TFEIP could identify whether it was possible to provide support. TFEIP or EMEP may write to the relevant countries to encourage discussions.

Activities in EMEP

Chris Dore (Chair/UK) presented a review recent output from the EMEP SB, LRTAP EB, and work of the WGSR. Relevant issues arising were covered in the meeting Agenda, and are considered below.

ECCA Countries and Translation of Guidebook

Olga Yusim (RU) provided an update on the translation of the Guidebook into Russian.

Valentina Idrissova (KZ) highlighted that generally there is no significant improvement in the reporting from ECCA countries. Both thanked organisations (EEA, TFEIP Chair and Norway) for providing financial support to allow their attendance at the meeting.

The main reason for lack of progress in reporting from EECCA countries was generally not considered to be associated with technical limitations, but more to do with Governmental decisions.



Kristina Saarinen (FI) provided an update of work on the Air Pollutant Emission Factor Library, and explained that the update of reporting structure for GHG emission inventories has already been taken into account in the format conversion spreadsheet.

Parties were encouraged to contribute emission factors to the library.

Zig Klimont (IIASA) presented an initiative to create an information repository for information on BC, and hoped that it would be possible to attract longer-term funding from interested Parties.

There was good support for this initiative, and assessing the information currently available on BC will be included in the TFEIP workplan.

Session 2: Recent Research Projects & Emission Inventory Developments

Ole-Kenneth Nielsen (DK) presented the Danish estimates from wood combustion, including the high uncertainty of EFs, and the implications of operating conditions, technology and using different measurement methods.

Carlo Trozzi (IT) presented the latest thinking on a Tier 3 methodology for domestic wood combustion, including the use of energy demand modelling to determine wood consumption.

Andre Zuber (EU) explained the current plans and the work programme for the TFHTAP, and in particular the new work on BC, and invited contribution to this work from the TFEIP. He further invited to broader cooperation between the two task forces such as in outreach to other regions and evaluation of emission inventories through chemical transport models at different scales.

The TFEIP expressed their willingness to work with the TFHTAP on a range of issues, as resources allow, and included this in the TFEIP workplan.

Greet Maenhout (JRC) showed the latest estimates of PM₁₀ from EDGAR, and comparisons with EMEP and other datasets.

Session 3: Meeting of TFEIP Expert Panels

The following Expert Panels met:

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| Combustion and Industry | Transport |
| Agriculture and Nature | Projections |

Minutes and presentations from each of the panels can be found on the relevant pages of the TFEIP website.

Session 4: Estimates of BC, OC, EC and PM10

Zig Klimont (CIAM/IIASA) presented work in progress on the emission estimates of BC from the GAINS model, and other related model outputs.

Jeroen Kuenen (NL) presented results from a recent project developing EC & OC emissions inventories for Europe, including some high resolution maps.



Morten Winther (DK) presented the work undertaken on compiling BC emission estimates in Denmark, including very detailed information on the technology of sources, and data highlighting the substantial increase in domestic wood combustion since 2000.

Niko Karvosenoja (FI) presented the Finnish BC Emissions Inventory, which showed good agreement with other inventory estimates. He also presented a policy scenario to demonstrate the sensitivities associated with good and poor user practise of wood burners in the domestic sector.

The TFEIP noted the progress of BC emission estimates from a number of countries, and included an item in the TFEIP workplan to assess the information that is currently available.

Session 5: Flexibility Mechanisms

Introduction

Andre Zuber (EU) provided an overview on the present discussions in the WGSR on the inclusion of flexibility mechanisms in the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol, and explained the current suggestions from the European Union.

Chris Dore gave a short introduction to a selection of different flexibility mechanisms, and invited comment from the TFEIP.

Discussion

Andre Zuber (EU) explained that the EU presently negotiates amendments for increased flexibility in order to give all parties further flexibilities and to help ratify the Protocol as amended. He confirmed that the European Commission intends to revise the NECD by 2013 at the latest. He also confirmed that whilst the EU does not wish to change the NECD ceilings for 2010, it is possible that the revised Gothenburg Protocols could (subject to outcome of negotiations) retrospectively amend the 2010 emission estimates through flexibility mechanisms.

Paul Duffy (Ireland) suggested that the inclusion of the 3 year average was simple, but that reporting of inventories of two or more different versions would cause significant difficulties associated with reporting (and in particular writing IIRs). He indicated support for percentage reductions.

Anne Wagner (UK) expressed support for flexibility mechanisms in general, and agreed with many points raised by Ireland. She also expressed the need for clear guidance from CION, and noted that it was difficult to provide comment until then. The link with GHG policies was also noted as an important consideration.

Justin Goodwin (ETC/ACM) supported percentage reductions, but noted that there are some difficulties with a Kyoto approach- primarily because it has fixed baselines.

Paul Ruysenaars (ETC/ACM) suggested that there was a need to discuss flexibility mechanisms more widely. He agreed that there may be time pressures in terms of implementing some of the more innovative flexibility mechanisms, but did note that some of them provide solutions to



issues that are not addressed by the simpler mechanisms. He agreed that there are some difficulties with the Kyoto approach. He also commented that the use of relative ceilings do not solve all problems, for example there would still be difficulties associated with the introduction of new sources.

Jean-Pierre Fontelle (France) proposed some additional flexibility mechanisms and agreed that some mechanisms will require an unrealistic increase in resources. He also noted that the current review process will need to be assessed and potentially strengthened. He also asked the EU to confirm whether the introduction of flexibility mechanisms might be applied to the 2010 ceilings (reply from Andre Zuber included above).

Leonidas Ntziachristos (ETC/ACM) noted that percentage reductions or frozen methodology would not have addressed the recent issues with revisions to the road transport emission estimates. He also explained the need for a more rapid incorporation of new emission factors into emission inventories. Currently there is rather a long lead time in getting results from research projects into the Guidebook and disseminated to inventory compilers for use.

Carlo Trozzi (C&I EP) suggested that some source sectors use detailed data, making compliance checking (or the use of mitigating circumstances) rather complex. This linked to earlier discussions on the potential need to review the Stage 3 review procedures.

Wim van der Maas (Netherlands) concluded the discussion by noting that we should be aiming for *more* consistency between GHG and AQ inventories, rather than generating different versions of national AQ emissions datasets.

It was agreed that an Ad Hoc group would be formed to take forward the consideration of flexibility mechanisms. The aim would be to provide a report that could contribute to the work being undertaken by WGSR.

EIONET Session

Eva Goossens (EEA) opened the meeting with a review of the current activities of the EEA.

Leonidas Ntziachristos (ETC/ACM) reported on the EEA workshop on uncertainty in road transport emissions and presented emission differences between COPERTII and COPERT4.

John van Aardenne (EEA) presented the planned development of an Aviation Inventory Data Portal in collaboration with Eurocontrol.

Justin Goodwin (ETC/ACM) provided an update on the links with satellite measurement and GMES.

Session 6: Review of Expert Panel Proceedings

Projections Expert Panel

Melanie Hobson (UK) reported back on the work being undertaken on projections, and noted the need for a new co-chair. In addition, she presented results from a questionnaire about how countries are organising their compilation of projections.



Agriculture and Nature Expert Panel

Nick Hutchings (Denmark) presented the working being undertaken on Agriculture and Nature. A decision was made to postpone recommendations regarding NMVOC emissions until next year. Discussions were held on the emissions from biogas production, and a framework agreed. It is hoped that emission factors will be agreed in 2012.

Combustion and Industry Expert Panel

Jeroen Kuenen (Netherlands) reported back on the work being undertaken on Combustion and Industry sources. Updates to specific Guidebook chapters were proposed, and will be taken forward through the usual channels. It was also noted that information relating to Hg in products will be important going forward as the HMs Protocol will be revised in 2012.

An issue arose in the meeting about the applicability of emission factors to different years. In particular it was noted that updating the Guidebook to provide information means that the Guidebook is always focused on providing information applicable for recent years, rather than historic years.

The TFEIP will need to consider the implications of continually updating the Guidebook, and whether a change is needed to capture the year specificity of emission factors. To be discussed with the Expert Panel leaders in due course.

Sergey Kakareka (Belarus) gave a presentation in the C & I Panel on Guidebook improvements associated with cement production. He thanked the EEA and the TFEIP Chair for providing financial support to allow his attendance at the meeting.

Transport Expert Panel

Leon Ntziachristos (ETC/ACM) gave an overview of work being undertaken on emissions from transport, and in particular the involvement of Eurostat and Eurocontrol.

The findings from these Expert Panel meetings will be used to update the Guidebook Maintenance and Improvement Plan. Presentations will be made available through the Expert Panel pages of the TFEIP website.

Session 7: Decisions and Wrap Up

Chris Dore presented the draft TFEIP workplan for 2011-2012. This was endorsed by the TFEIP.

Justin Goodwin presented some awards for IIR best practise. The results were:

| | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Most Comprehensive | Finland | Best Country | Austria |
| Best Small Parties: | Croatia, Switzerland | Most Improved | Estonia |

The TFEIP participants thanked the TFEIP chairs, secretariat and expert panels for their work in preparing for and co-ordinating a successful 2011 meeting. The TFEIP participants indicated that the meeting, and the work of the TFEIP in general, provides an efficient forum to engage the emissions inventory community and gives a strong impetus for improving the quality of national estimates of emissions used for reporting and international policy decision making.



The Co-chairs thanked the Swedish Ministry of Environment and EPA for hosting the meeting, thanked Norway, the UK and the EEA for providing financial support to allow various representatives to participate in the meeting, thanked Julio Lumbreras (Spain) for his past contributions to the work on projections as the panel Co-Chair, and then closed the meeting.