

## **Minutes of the EGTEI Steering Group meeting held in Laxenburg on 19<sup>th</sup> of January 2005**

This report has been prepared by Brinda Wachs and will be the basis for reporting to the WGSR and the Executive body of the Convention on long range transboundary air pollution together with the report on the next steering group meeting scheduled on 6<sup>th</sup> June in Rome on the invitation of Italy. The document has not yet been published by the secretariat.

### **I. RESULTS OF THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE EXPERT GROUP**

1. The Expert Group held its seventh meeting on 19 January 2005, back to back with the EMEP Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling workshop on the RAINS methodology, which took place 20-21 January 2005. The meeting and workshop were organized by the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM) and held at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in Laxenburg (Austria).

2. Experts attended from: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Italy, Netherlands, Norway and United Kingdom. Industry was represented by experts from: Technical Association of Hydraulic Binder Industry (ATILH), British Petroleum (BP) International Limited, European Cement Association (CEMBUREAU), European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC), the Oil Companies' European Organizations for Environment, Health and Safety (CONCAWE), European Federation of Glass Industry (CPIV), Electricity of France (EDF), European Federation Electricity Industry (EUROELECTRIC), European Association of the Iron and Steel Industries (EUROFER) and the Federation of Engine Manufacturers in Europe (EUROMOT) and European Association of Printers (Intergraph). Representatives of the Centre for Integrated Assessment Modelling (CIAM) were present, as was a member of the French-German Research... (IFARE) and the Center for Interprofessional... (CITEPA). A member of the European Community (Directorate General for Environment) was present, as was a member of the secretariat.

3. Mr. Jean-Guy Bartaire (France) chaired the meeting.

#### **A. Mandate and objectives**

4. The Chairman of the Expert Group, M. J.G. Bartaire presented the objectives of the meeting: to assess the state of progress in developing a dataset of techno-economic information, to determine the remaining tasks for 2005 and 2006 and to agree conclusions and recommendations on how best to achieve the aims of the Expert Group and target problematic areas. Ms. B. Wachs of the secretariat presented highlights of the 22nd session of the Executive Body, including events to celebrate the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention, underlining the support for the work of the Expert Group and its mandate, as reflected in the 2005 work-plan of the Convention (ECE/EB.AIR/83/Add.2, item 1.7).

4. Mr. R. Ballaman, Chairman of the Working Group on Strategies and Review recalled the impetus for the Expert Group was to create a forum for the exchange of information on techno-economic issues between national experts and industry; to develop a dataset describing emission control options, their costs and ranges of uncertainties; and to evaluate data on typical installations submitted by countries. He noted the priority sectors adopted by the Expert Group were sources

covered by the European Union's VOC directive, paint uses, industrial combustion, industrial processes causing particulate matter emissions, use of wood in small domestic appliances and off-road sectors.

5. The Expert Group recalled that the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol, expected to start in 2006, would involve the updating of technical annexes to reflect new abatement options and the review of guidance documents to take account of new information on Best Available Technologies (BAT). Ammonia and particulate matter should also be considered in greater detail. It agreed cost data on ammonia abatement should not be integrated into ECODAT, the techno-economic database developed by the Expert Group, but should be dealt with by the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement, maintaining close collaboration between the two groups.

6. Mr. D. Johnstone (European Community) informed on the European Commission's Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) Programme and the development of its thematic strategy on air quality and climate change. This would include the revision of air quality directives which required data on the feasibility of optimal control options.

### **B. Progress made by the Expert Group**

7. Ms. N. Allemand (France) presented work carried out since the last meeting of the Expert Group and underlined tasks for the coming year: to propose transparent methods for representing sectors and for estimating costs of emission reduction techniques as an input RAINS. The consolidation of background documents, which are used to describe each of the priority sectors covered by ECODAT and to estimate costs. Documents had been developed in cooperation with industry in order to achieve consensus on measures and costs. The work of the Expert Group had been presented to the American Waste Management Association (AWMA) in June 2004 (Indianapolis), the World Clean Air Congress in July 2004 (London), to the Convention's Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections in October 2004 (Pallanza, Italy) and to the workshop on the review and assessment of European air pollution policies in October 2004 (Gothenburg)).

8. Mr. B. Calaminus (IFARE) presented an update of the work of the Expert Group since the last meeting in June 2004. This included the finalization of several background documents and the integration of these sectors into ECODAT. These sectors included: large combustion plants (> 500 MWth) and smaller combustion plants (300MWth -500 MWth) and refineries, though final validation with industry is still pending. A background document covering NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM and sulphuric acid production was proposed in July 2004. A document covering nitric acid production was finalized and awaiting feedback from industry. More work was needed on iron and steel industries.

9. Mr. J. Vincent (CITEPA) informed on developments in ECODAT. Validation of data and corrections had been finalized for all VOC sectors. The combustion sector had been completed, covering NO<sub>x</sub>, VOCs and SO<sub>2</sub> from installations of 500MWth. A revised version of the database can be accessed and downloaded from the Internet as of January 2005. He demonstrated the database, explaining the use of default data when figures were not available from countries, or to be compared with national data. He also demonstrated the use of data on application rates and expected emissions to 2020.

10. Mr. J. Cofala and Z. Klimont (CIAM) informed on progress made by the Expert Group in implementing data within RAINS. Based on the experience of inputting data from the Expert Group into RAINS, CIAM recommended: better internal and peer review of background documents; reduction of the level of detail in the documents; and endorsement of data by participating countries.

Further work was needed on developing default data for sectors already covered and in collecting missing country-specific information. The deadline for new data submitted by national experts was end-February 2005, before the beginning of bilateral consultations for the revision of the NEC directive.

### **C. Experience in collecting techno-economic data**

11. Several experts expressed frustration at the lack of transparency in the process of constructing ECODAT, the use of resources in collecting data, and time constraints for providing data to the Expert Group. Experts expressed concern that data provided to the Expert Group did not always end up being used by CIAM in RAINS. Countries would like to be informed in future of exactly which data would be used in RAINS. Experts noted the expectations of CIAM were too high in terms of data requested and time constraints. The Expert Group recalled that while the European Commission had a timetable for realizing its thematic strategy and the development of CAFE, the Expert Group must agree on its own level of aggregation, level of detail and time frame (benchmarks) for its work.

12. The representative of CONCAWE said that his organization firmly supported the work of the Expert Group, though recognized that the database was weak in the area of sub-sector activity levels (energy used). Better activity data would help in prioritising sectors in terms of importance.

13. An expert from the Netherlands informed on Dutch emissions and conversion factors, showing the relation between pollutant concentration and the mass flow of pollutant emissions through a conversion factor and suggested the Expert Group use a lower nominal efficiency value that included the availability of equipment. He noted the Dutch industry sectors were structured differently than the sectors in ECODAT, and that the level of detail required was often higher than was available, for example in the Dutch metal sector. An expert from Austria informed about the methodology used in his country for collecting data on VOCs for ECODAT. An expert from Italy described problems met in providing data, citing communication gaps between national experts and CIAM.

14. The Expert Group agreed that it served as an important forum where industry and national experts could field information on costs of abatement technologies and measures. It would develop a consolidated document on each sector that would be agreed by national experts and included figures that were validated or endorsed by industry, to be transmitted for approval to the Working Group on Strategies and Review.

15. The Expert Group discussed the six overarching priority sectors as above, noting they were split into 55 sub-sectors and suggested conducting a risk-assessment to determine where costs were highest and for which sectors there were insufficient cost data.

16. The importance of further work on emerging technologies was underlined, especially technologies used in small combustion plants, which were considered a significant source of PM.

## **II. *CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS***

(a) Recognized that a significant amount of work had been accomplished since the inception of the Expert Group, in bringing together industry and national experts in the development of background information on sectors of highest priority. New approaches for some sectors and country-specific techno-economic data collected had been transmitted to CIAM for use in the RAINS model

which would be crucial in the elaboration of the baseline scenario as well as for the revision of the National Emissions Ceiling (NEC) Directive:

(b) Recognized that there was frustration with the way of working under the Expert Group, resulting mainly from a lack of communication and transparency. There was a need for IIASA to decide on the priority work to be done for a given sector and to indicate the urgency of the data to be collected;

(c) Noted that there was insufficient interest of national experts in the work of the Expert Group. The Chairman of the Working Group on Strategies and a Review, in cooperation with the secretariat, would transmit a message to the heads of delegation to the Working Group encouraging wider participation in the Expert Group. The Chairman of the Expert Group would consider visiting selected national administrations to explain the importance of the work of the Expert Group and encourage greater involvement. Spain and Latvia were cited as possible starting points.

(d) Noted that work on costs of ammonia abatement should be addressed by the Expert Group on Ammonia Abatement rather than the Expert Group on Techno-economic Issues, although cooperation between the two groups was encouraged;

(e) Recognized the importance of promoting work on emerging technologies; the Chairman would meet with the European Commission by end-February 2005 to explore possible synergies with the Expert Group;

(f) Agreed to develop summaries of background documents for priority sectors, to be submitted as informal document to the Working Group on Strategies and Review. This would serve to stimulate interest and increase understanding of the work of the Expert Group and would encourage greater participation from other countries;

(g) Agreed to improve communication among national experts, industry representatives, CITEPA/IFARE, integrated assessment modellers, and members of CIAM. The possibility to circulate a bi- or tri-monthly newsletter, edited by the Expert Group was raised;

(h) Agreed to adapt the data from ECODAT to the level of aggregation used in RAINS; this would be done by the Expert Group, rather than by CIAM;

(i) Recalled that proposals concerning the structure or use of data produced by the Expert Group for inclusion in RAINS would be referred to the Working Group on Strategies and Review and, in case of the need for modification of the model itself, would be referred to the Task Force on Integrated Assessment Modelling.