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# The Review of the Gothenburg Protocol

Within the CLRTAP, the Gothenburg Protocol (GP) is the mechanism which requires Parties to report emission estimates of the “main” pollutants and accompanying information, and meet emission reduction commitments (amongst other things). The CLRTAP has started a review of the Gothenburg Protocol with the intention of updating it.

Discussions have already started about the update process, and different bodies, including TFEIP, within the CLRTAP have been asked to contribute on specific topics. The CLRTAP have already outlined the structure of a draft review report, and we have been asked to make technical contributions to this until the end of September 2022, so that it can be discussed by the CLRTAP Executive Body in December 2022.

The EMEP Steering Body has also agreed that the TFEIP will review the current emissions Reporting Guidelines[[1]](#footnote-1) and will provide feedback on the current required and voluntary information, reporting practices and frequency etc. These reflections will be additional to the formal GP review input, and whilst there is no specific deadline for the TFEIP to provide recommendations relating to updating the Reporting Guidelines, it is sensible to undertake this within the next ~12 months, so that the TFEIP’s recommendations can provide input into the discussions concerning the review of the Gothenburg Protocol.

In short, there is an opportunity for the TFEIP to provide technical input and reflections that relate to emissions reporting to help inform the future reporting requirements of the revised Gothenburg Protocol.

## What are the TFEIP Committed to Contributing?

We have informed the EMEP SB that we will contribute to the two items below in partnership with CEIP. There are also some other technical subjects that we may make small contributions to, but this can be managed on an “as required” basis.

Table 1. The TFEIP’s Contribution to the GP Review

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1. Review of obligations in relation to emission reductions** |  |
| **1.2** | e. **Is the EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook sufficiently comprehensive and fit for purpose** to support quality emission data? What are the main gaps and challenges? For which sectors and pollutants does the guidance need to be further improved? In what way? | CEIP & TFEIP |
|  | **4. Evaluation of mitigation measures for black carbon emissions** |  |
| **4.1** | What is the current coverage and **quality of BC** (elemental carbon and organic carbon) emission reporting? | CEIP & TFEIP |

**Review of Reporting Guidelines**

The TFEIP’s offer of reviewing the current emissions Reporting Guidelines has been accepted. We will include reflections on the Adjustments processes within this.

## What are the TFEIP’s plans?

The Co-Chairs think the best approach will be to deliver three things:

1. Our specific contributions to the GP review as indicated in Table 1.
2. The TFEIP’s reflections on the emissions Reporting Guidelines and Adjustments processes.
3. A technical document that more widely explains the views of the TFEIP about the GP review, and the longer-term future of emissions estimation and reporting within the CLRTAP.

With this in mind, we want to use the TFEIP 2021 meeting to gather thoughts about how we approach and plan this work, and most effectively gather views from the TFEIP across the coming months. There are pressures from the users of our emissions inventories to provide more accurate and more detailed data, and we need to explain the views and position from the emissions inventory community.

# Discussions and Planning at TFEIP2021

## Contributions to the Review of the Gothenburg Protocol

**Is the EMEP/EEA Emissions Inventory Guidebook Fit for Purpose?**

We suggest that best approach for this will be forming a TFEIP ad hoc group which can lead drafting of the text, and also organise a questionnaire that will allow the TFEIP community to provide views.

There will be a number of topics to consider, including:

Guidebook content:

* Should we develop regionally specific EFs for selected sources?
* Can we develop methodologies that account for future changes in climate?

Guidebook management:

* How can we improve the current funding for the EMEP/EEA Guidebook?
* How can we steer source measurement programmes/research to provide input into the priority areas of the Guidebook?

**What is the current coverage and quality of BC emissions reporting?**

This can be led by our BC working group, working closely with the CEIP.

## Reporting Guidelines and Wider Considerations

We expect there to be some challenges here because, typically, users of emissions inventories want more detail and improved accuracy, but in general, inventory compilers are not able to absorb significantly increased workloads.

Points to consider are likely to include:

**National emissions inventory reporting:**

* Mandatory vs voluntary reporting – should all pollutants in the Annex I template be mandatory, or might some be proposed for removal?
* PM and BC - Can we recommend metrics and/or how data should be reported?
* Detail of reporting – Should we report emissions in more detail (e.g. emission by sector and by fuel)?
* Are there sources that are better estimated centrally at the EMEP level e.g. forests, shipping, aviation etc.?
* Is the frequency of reporting different types of information across i. annual and ii. four-yearly cycles still considered appropriate?

**Other datasets and considerations:**

* Do we need more guidance on LCP & Gridded data reporting (specifically on the detail levels and consistency with the national emissions inventory)?
* Are there reported datasets which are not being widely used? E.g. stack heights, emissions for certain sources (see above), spatial datasets?
* Are inventory compilers fully aware of whether their submissions are good enough to be included in the data that is used by the modellers? Do we need more clarity over the use of “non-official” datasets in the CLRTAP?

**Adjustment procedures**

* Are there ways which the adjustments process can be simplified?
* Should we provide more information/worked examples about acceptable methods for determining the “original” emission estimates?

**CLRTAP Inventory Reviews and Capacity Building**

* Are the reviews delivering the improvements that are needed? Should the reviews be more targeted? With follow-up activities?
* Would a focus on ensuring strong institutional arrangementsin Parties be a more effective approach?
* Should we be promoting innovative ideas, e.g. twinning Parties?? A troubleshooting/ capacity building team?

**Longer-term aims**

* Would reporting software help?
* Can we foresee any fundamental changes in the role of the TFEIP across the next 10+ years?

## Next Steps

We will discuss our approach to tackling these questions at the upcoming TFEIP meeting, and we will run a questionnaire during the meeting so that the TFEIP community can express its views about how we should proceed across the coming months.

We will then, of course, provide the opportunity for people to be directly involved in formulating our views and answers to some of the questions and challenges outlined above. This is likely to be either through responding to questionnaire and/or being more directly involved in drafting papers.

1. The 2014 Reporting Guidelines and Annexes are available at: https://www.ceip.at/reporting-instructions [↑](#footnote-ref-1)