

Brussels, 15 June 2026  
(OR. en)

10615/26

ENV 743  
ENT 150  
ONU 36

### INFORMATION NOTE

---

From: General Secretariat of the Council  
To: Delegations

---

Subject: Convention on Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution (CLRTAP): 64th  
Session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review (WGSR 64)  
(Geneva, 18–20 May 2026)  
- Statements by the EU and its Member States

---

Delegations will find in the Annex, for information purposes, a compilation of agreed statements as delivered at the abovementioned meeting on behalf of the European Union and its Member States.

**Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (CLRTAP)  
64th session of the Working Group on Strategies and Review (WGSR 64)  
(Geneva, 18-20 May 2026)**

**- Statements by the EU and its Member States –**

**Agenda item 1: Adoption of the agenda**

(Support statement following interventions by Ukraine and/or Russia)

We also confirm again our full solidarity with Ukraine and the Ukrainian people. The EU and its Member States reiterate our strongest condemnation of the unprovoked and unjustified aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine, considering also the implications for air pollution this has.

---

**Agenda item 2: Progress in the implementation of the 2026-2027 workplan**

**2.1 Task Force on Techno-Economic Issues (TFTEI)**

*Regarding the TFTEI report*

EU and its MS would like to thank TFTEI for the report on activities carried out and for providing a status on the progress in the implementation of the workplan.

We appreciate the ongoing work of TFTEI and the ad hoc group of experts in preparing a proposal for the draft updated contents of a possible technical annex on stationary sources, and a possible technical annex on mobile sources.

We look forward to discuss the different aspects raised in the report and in the documents mentioned under agenda item 3.

*Regarding the draft Guidance Document on mobile sources*

EU and its MS thank TFTEI for their hard work on the draft Guidance Document on mobile sources.

We find the updated draft Guidance Document on mobile sources helpful, as far as it gives a good overview of the relevant emission abatement measures for each mobile source category and main fuel types considered.

We can endorse the draft Guidance Document on mobile sources in principle, provided our written comments and a limited number of technical edits that we have provided in writing are incorporated in full.

## **2.2 Task Force on Reactive Nitrogen (TFRN)**

### Regarding the TFRN report

The EU and its MS would like to thank TFRN for the work carried out during the past year. We much appreciated that the TFRN met for a workshop at the premises of the European Commission in Brussels.

In particular, we welcome the draft revised Guidance Document related to Ammonia and the note by the co-chairs reflecting on opportunities for revising Annex IX. On the latter we have submitted written comments that hopefully could prove to be useful for the further discussions.

### Regarding the revised draft Guidance Document related to Ammonia

EU and its MS would like to thank TFRN for their hard work on the draft revised Guidance Document on Ammonia. It provides an excellent overview of emissions from agricultural sources and we look forward to discuss the final version in 2027.

We recall that this document is to be kept at a technical level only: the policy discussions about the future of Annex IX is a separate issue to be discussed later in the agenda.

We could see a benefit for this document to incorporate aspects related to costs and benefits, both economic and environmental, therefore the mentioned overview is welcome. One could also consider if the paper on ‘ammonia mitigation for economic and environmental benefits’ could be added to the ‘Guidance Document on Ammonia’ as a stand-alone chapter or appendix or at least indicating on the level of costs on a high, medium and lower range for the costs. And we would encourage further collaboration with CIAM with regards to integrated the updated data in GAINS.

With regards to the estimation of costs and benefits, we also wonder to what degree if it would be possible, affordable and desirable to have a discussion on costs on a qualitative level (i.e. types and magnitude of costs incurred), if and where a full quantification proves to be difficult. We also realise that some of the costs are dependent on regions and other contextual factors.

As been mentioned earlier today, the Guidance Document on Ammonia might also benefit from including references to bioeconomy, as relevant.

We also recall that future updates to the UNECE Framework Code for Good Agricultural Practice for Reducing Ammonia Emissions should be coherent with this Guidance Document.

The EU and its Members States would like to thank the TFRN for the note on possible integrated initiatives related to nitrogen pollution and bioeconomy.

### Regarding nitrogen pollution and the bioeconomy

The EU and its MS would like to draw the attention of TFRN and the Expert Panel to the EU strategy on bioeconomy to consider possible synergies with existing activities.

Furthermore, we see no reason to change the name and scope of the Expert Panel on Nitrogen and Food – questions of bioeconomy can be addressed under this Expert Panel as it is. The focus of the Expert Panel should continue to primarily contribute to the main focus and purpose of the Air Convention.

In this regard, we could support the proposed initiatives, namely an initial briefing note and workshop in 2027. However, rather than preparing a separate report we would prefer to feed into the Draft Guidance Document on Ammonia, or use one of the other already existing Guidance Documents, as appropriate already in 2027.

The EU and its MS note that TFRN ought to be mindful of the limited resources during the GP revision process, and that focus should be on a possible revision of annex IX, the Ammonia Guidance Document and the Framework Code for Good Agricultural Practice, as well as the necessary cooperation with TFIAM on the updated cost estimates to be included in the upcoming scenarios and the cost-benefit analysis.

In this context, we would also like to express a concern regarding the growing number of Guidance Documents and related reports. Updating and/or expanding an existing document would be preferable to a new document. We see the discussion on bioeconomy to be useful, but shouldn't develop a whole new workflow but be integrated in existing work flows.

### **2.3 Task Force for International Cooperation on Air Pollution (TFICAP)**

#### Regarding the TFICAP report

EU and its MS thank TFICAP for the report on activities carried out.

EU and its MS appreciate the initiative to make a survey of existing projects and activities on strengthening capacity to coordinate the effort.

We would also like to ask when the program for the Global Dialogue on Clean Air there are a certain date for the program to be distributed?

### **2.4 Task Force for Integrated Assessment Modelling (TFIAM)**

#### Regarding the TFIAM report

EU and its MS thank TFIAM for their continuous support – and thank for the presentations provided at the TFIAM meeting and the WGSR preparatory meeting.

The comprehensive work of TFIAM and CIAM keeps informing the GP revision process and by that paves the way for the upcoming critical discussions on ERCs in the fall of 2026. It is highly appreciated.

What you've shown is that it's useful to focus the discussions on why narrowing down the number of scenarios provided might be needed to avoid confusion – or scenario fatigue.

We would therefore recommend TFIAM and CIAM to focus their presentations in line with the directions and wishes expressed at the EB, such as using static population in all scenarios and resources informing the target setting exercise. Other aspects, such as dynamic population and equity considerations, should be addressed in bespoke sensitivity analyses, only once the main scenarios are finalized.

In addition, EB45 noted that Parties that wish to use integrated assessment modelling for setting their emission reduction commitments, prefer using a main scenario with combined health and biodiversity optimization, with the health scenario based on PM2.5 only. The analytical focus should be on this and any ozone considerations might be done as sensitivity analysis at a later stage.

We would welcome further integration of the updated data on ammonia costs in GAINS – taking into account cost estimates as provided by TFRN experts.

---

### **Agenda item 3: Revision of the Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone, as amended in 2012**

#### **3.1 Technical Annexes – general views**

We would like to start by thanking the WGSR Chair and TFTEI for the lead questions and background documents on the possible content for technical annexes. It has all been very useful in the preparation of our position to this meeting.

We recognise a discussion is needed today about the way forward, and we recognise we're at the beginning of that process. [We were grateful to hear Canada agree that there is space between the "yes" and the "no" (i.e. in response to the Chair's question of whether the revised Gothenburg Protocol should include mandatory technical annexes) - and what we're trying to do is explore what a compromise may look like.] With this in mind we would like to reflect on a possible interpretation of a hybrid approach: i.e. similar to what we've proposed before (for EB45), but different enough to not be the same, and to address some of the concerns we highlighted in previous meetings.

Fundamentally, this discussion needs to go back to the key question: What is the role of technical annexes? What is the role of a guidance document? And this links back to the architecture of the Convention and the Gothenburg Protocol: what are we hoping to achieve.

We agree that ERCs are a cornerstone of the Gothenburg Protocol. Having said that, binding commitments ought to be supported by viable and measurable means of implementation of any such commitments that we make to reduce transboundary air pollution – to avoid that the risk that such ERCs are toothless or merely aspirational. This could for example include a number of minimum ELVs and requirements to have mechanisms for approval of new plants and periodic control of emissions, which is not given unless there is a structure to do so.

Also, in the cases of insufficient emission inventories to derive robust ERCs, the technical annexes can still help securing emission reductions of the most polluting sectors.

Likewise, technical annexes in the Gothenburg Protocol, with a number of minimum requirements (ELVs or standards) for key sources, are also to combat emissions and at the same time securing that all Parties have the same minimum ambition level. They have a dual role in helping Parties to set ERCs and follow up on the commitments.

With that said, we fully acknowledge the need to simplify the technical annexes and to look for flexibilities to avoid barriers for non-Parties and to reduce the overall complexity of the framework. In this context, it may also be desirable to focus the technical annexes only on key sources and have tailored solutions for old stationary installations. There is a difference between existing installations and new installations.

We've put forward a proposal for a hybrid approach at the EB45 to provide for such flexibilities. In the view of keeping the technical annexes simple and more concrete, we're open to discussions on how an even more simplified structure of a technical annex could look like.

We think that a combination of ERCs, simple(r) minimum requirements for key sources set in technical annexes, in conjunction with more elaborated guidance documents with recommendations on best available techniques could be mutually complementary to create a structure to achieve emission reductions of transboundary air pollution.

With regards to the format and content of the TA: the EU and its MS can support a restructuring of the technical annexes by sector, with a focus on only the key sources for each sector. There was an interpretation on national level, but maybe we need to find a balance at regional level - to be discussed. This will address the current large number of requirements and sectors in the technical annexes, which we understand is one of the main barriers for ratification.

With regards to ambition level of the TA: We acknowledge that the EB requested TFTEI to explore multiple ambition levels, in order to address different non-Parties. Having seen however the complexity of the new proposed technical annexes with reference to multiple ambition levels, we think the approach would benefit from a single and clear ambition level in the technical annexes on stationary and mobiles sources (while identifying the ranges of emission levels that can be achieved by using available reduction techniques in corresponding Guidance Documents).

We would insist that the lowest level of ambition for the ELVs of the updated TAs at an ambition level would be not lower than today's applicable ELVs or standards for the key sources.

We suggest that a possible way forward would be to explore a simplified interpretation of the hybrid approach:

- Reflecting on the feedback from EB45 and other Parties a possible way forward could be found by looking into four main components:
- Confirmed or interim ERCs (i.e. those non-Parties that do not have emission inventories of adequate quality would still provide interim ERCs towards improved emission inventories and confirmed ERCs). Interim targets could be determined on the basis of the GAINS model,

- Simplified or more focused Technical Annexes that identify key sources for which air pollution control measures are to be taken, with a limited number of mandatory or voluntary ELVs or standards (at an ambition level still to be defined, but not lower than today's applicable ELVs or standards for the key sources), including references to necessary supporting provisions,
- Detailed Guidance Documents including information on best available techniques for all relevant sources and ranges of emission levels that can be achieved using these techniques, and
- Possibly a “(National) roadmap or plan for policies and measures”, or similar, to be submitted at regular intervals that ensures transparency and accountability of policies and measures and traces a pathway towards achieving the ERCs.
- We note that a variety of issues related to a possible way forward for simplified technical annexes and related considerations could be further explored intersessionally and that the Executive Body could request the legal ad-hoc group to explore the legal implications of different options.

### **3.2 Technical Annexes – stationary sources**

First of all, we would like to thank TFTEI for their extensive and impressive work and we acknowledge that the request from EB has not been an easy task.

Our comments to the stationary sources document are also to be seen in the light of the proposed way forward that was discussed before the coffee break. An important feature has been the need for simplification.

We note that the request from EB with three different ambition levels increase complexity which would defeat (one of) the objective(s) of this exercise to reduce complexity. We would therefore reiterate that Technical Annex on stationary sources should include only one ambition level and address only key sources for simplicity and clear minimum requirements. One should consider flexibilities for existing installations. In addition, we foresee the need for more detailed Guidance Documents, where multiple levels of ambitions can remain and the comprehensive work of TFTEI would be very valuable for development of such GD.

In line with what was agreed at the EB, the ambition levels of the specific ELVs should not be lower than in the current technical annexes for potential inclusion in revised TA and or guidance.

We prefer option A (AGP+), with focus only on key sectors, therefore we would be open to consider the need to include additional key sources (MCPs and flaring) if and when relevant, but we would be open to discuss this further.

So, as we've mentioned, we are open to discuss flexibilities as to existing installations, time-based flexibilities and staged approach for ratifications among others.

### **3.3 Technical Annexes – mobile sources**

EU and its MS would like to thank TFTEI for their extensive work. We are generally positive towards the proposed way forward for the content on a Technical Annex for mobile sources with references to already existing standards.

We find that the use of clear correlation tables, which give a transparent overview of how the different ambition levels correspond to different levels of regulations or standards is useful.

We note, as well for the stationary sources, that three different ambition levels increase complexity.

We therefore would recommend also in this TA to include only one ambition level and address only key sources in conjunction with a more detailed Guidance Document.

We prefer option A, (AGP and/or AGP+) for the Technical Annex on mobile sources with focus on key sectors.

We might question whether all non-Parties would be in the position to require Euro 6c cars as a minimum standard. Therefore, we would like to TFTEI to look further into this aspect.

So, although we stress the need for simplification and focus on key sources, we would be open to broaden the scope and consider recommendations on how to address pollution from imported vehicles.

### **3.4 Technical Annexes – agricultural sources/revision annex IX/ Ammonia**

EU and its Member States welcome the paper from TRFN and we would like to express our appreciation of the work done. The paper provides lots of interesting ideas and inspires consideration for a revision of Annex IX. The EU and its Member States have submitted a written commentary to the paper that's been published on the website.

EU and its Member States note that there is an added value of Annex IX for all Parties. For that reason we wish that discussion on the TA on ammonia, Annex IX, is to viewed separately from the overall TA discussion.

In light of the general discussion on the future role of the Technical Annexes we believe that what we – the Convention - need an annex that provides a clear direction for the control of emissions of ammonia, but without detailed rules that would act as a barrier for new ratifications.

Likewise, we don't wish for a revised Annex IX that intends to solely mirror current or future national - including current or future EU - rules. Rather, we believe that a revised Annex IX needs to leave room for national implementation within the Parties.

We also see a need to specifically distinguish between the realities of small farms, and requirements for large farms. At the same time, we do not consider it necessary to define specific thresholds for small farms or for large farms at this stage, but the principle is useful to keep in mind.

Concerning the scope of the Annex, we believe that ammonia should still be the central focus, but we are open to text addressing what the co-benefits and trade-offs with other pollutants could be, where relevant.

Concerning revising the title of the annex, we think that a title can be decided when we are closer to knowing the outcome of the revision. We would be open to reflect on changing the title to “Measures for the control of emissions from agricultural sources, in particular ammonia”.

The paper suggests a number of new elements that could be addressed in a revised Annex IX. We would like to explore some of them further, as mentioned in our submission, but we would once more like to underline, that new provisions should not act as a barrier to ratification nor should they prescribe specific national implementation.

We would also note that EU is considering its internal discussions on UCOL at the moment and we wouldn't want to speculate on the outcome of this in this forum.

With that said, we still would like to underline our principle strong support for an Annex IX that sets a clear direction for reduction of agricultural emissions and that includes provisions on fertilizers, manure application, manure storage and animal housing. The current headings are a unique set of rules that we can be proud of and that we should strive to develop further.

As mentioned, we have submitted further reflections in writing in more detail.

### **3.5 Black Carbon (BC) – potential aspirational goal**

The EU and its Member States acknowledge that BC is a good proxy to monitor progress in reducing harmful PM emissions from incomplete combustion sources, such as residential heating, old diesel vehicles or agricultural burning. We look forward to receiving the final results of the WHO review of the health effects of black carbon.

The EU and its MS also recognize the importance of reducing black carbon emissions in the ECE region due to its contribution to near-term climate warming, especially in the Arctic.

The EU and its MS are willing to support mandatory reporting and projections on BC if it is based on thorough methodological advice and guidance from TFEIP/CEIP on streamlining of definitions and to avoid possible inconsistencies with any eventual future IPCC reporting on BC.

The EU and its MS do not see a need to set separate emission reduction commitments for BC.

The EU and its MS are open to further discuss the added value and nature of a possible aspirational ECE-wide goal for reducing Black Carbon.

We would however be more open for considerations of an EB decision on an aspirational goal instead of integrating it in the AGP, to cover the geographical target group of the implementation of an ECE-wide goal. An ECE-wide goal decided by the Executive Body could then also be referenced in the revised Protocol as necessary, to reinforce the commitment of the Parties to the revised Protocol to reduce emissions.

### **3.7 Workplan GP revision**

The EU and its MS would like to thank the WGSR bureau for the provided proposal on updated table 1 and 2 of the revision plan.

The EU and its MS can support the postponement of the finalisation of the negotiations to 2028 and the accordingly updated time tables, as suggested by the WGSR Bureau.

---

### **Agenda item 4: Other business**

The EU and its MS would like to express a wish for the Secretariat and WGSR Chair to enquire whether UNOC could consider a different week for the WGSR meeting in 2027, as not to collide with the WHO summit.

---