

Working Group 3

Effect-based international air pollution strategies

Outline prepared by co-chairs Brit Lisa Skjelkvåle, Maximilian Posch and Filip Moldan.

Tuesday 25 June 2013, 10:15 – 18:00

Part 1 – Why do ecosystem effects get less attention in current modelling work?

Chair: Brit Lisa Skjelkvåle

Rapporteur: Max Posch

Introduction to the goals and the structure of the session (co-chairs), round the table (all).

Presentation by Rob Maas (co-chair TFIAM): What IAM would like to have from effects-side

Questions for discussion:

- **Pollution has effects (on health, environment and materials) – that is why we are interested in pollution control.** (*This session is mainly on ecosystem effects, for health effects see WG 5 Air quality & health.*)
 - Why have effects received less attention in recent emission reduction agreements?
 - What are the ‘remaining’ negative ecosystems effects – which problems are still concerning people?
 - Are there any *new* ecosystem effects?
 - Why are data and knowledge that is available not used? (e.g. new ozone variables, or target loads) What can we do about it? An example of new policy relevant indicators of O₃ presented by Harry Harmens.
 - What is the current status of the effects on materials?
 - Why have materials effects never been used? (despite the fact that they are monetised easier)
- Do we need even more emission reductions for S and N (in Europe)?
- How to deal with time lags between emission reduction and ecosystem recovery?

Part 2 – How can we improve cooperation and communication?

Chair: Max Posch

Rapporteur: Filip Moldan

Presentation by Harry Harmens (chair ICP Vegetation): Communication of recent WGE results; “Benefits of air pollution control for biodiversity and ecosystem services”

Questions for discussion:

- **Two way communications between science and policy is crucial for science to solve problems relevant to policy and for policy to use results of science.**
- Should we build (more) on existing/successful indicators/concepts?
 - Which indicators do we have?
 - Can we find new, easily understandable, indicators (e.g. for biodiversity)?
 - ... that grab the attention of policy-makers/public?
- Is our communication good enough? Is there equally good communication among scientists, within Convention, to policy-makers and to general public? Which level of communication would need improvements? How can we improve it?
- How to communicate time-lags?
- Are there institutional problems for good communication?

Part 3 – How to ensure that effects on ecosystems make an impact on policy also in the future?

Summing up and preparing for the presentation with major messages

Chair: Filip Moldan

Rapporteur : Brit Lisa Skjelkvåle

Presentation (tentative): Anne-Christine Le Gall (chair ICP M&M): The need for new approaches (highlights from the plenary presentation)

Questions for discussion:

- **Effects on ecosystems were key argument, successfully used to negotiate emission reductions since definition of critical loads at Skokloster critical load workshop in 1988, through 1994 Oslo protocol to 1999 Gothenburg protocol. Recently health effects became equally or even more important argument for further emission cuts, agreed in revised Gothenburg protocol and current negotiations of the NEC directive. How should future (ecosystem) effects work be directed and organised?**
- Is monitoring important and does it provide relevant information? Could monitoring be further rationalized or does it need to be expanded? How can we secure future monitoring?
- Do we have easily understandable indicators of ecosystem effects, including biodiversity, which grab the attention of policy-makers/public?
- Are the other major drivers of ecosystem change handled properly in mapping effects of air pollution?
- Does it help to translate every issue into 'ecosystem services'?
- Monetaring of ecosystem services: Can it be improved? Shall we even try in all cases?
- How to incorporate country-specific problems into the European/UNECE policy?
- How to attract the interest from policy makers?
- How can collaboration within Convention (e.g. HTAP) and with other institutional set-ups be improved (e.g. CCAC, see www.unep.org/ccac)?
- What should be the 3 key next steps to enhance the use of effects-based air pollution strategies?