United Nations ECE/EB.AIR/GE.1/2014/10

# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
5 August 2014

Original: English

## Economic Commission for Europe

Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution

**Steering Body to the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe**

**Thirty-eighth session**
Geneva, 15–17 September 2014
Item 5 of the provisional agenda
**Adjustments under the Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone to emission reduction commitments or to inventories for the purposes of comparing total national emissions with them**

# Review of adjustment applications

## Report by the Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections

*Summary*

The present report was prepared by the Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections in line with its mandate under the 2014–2015 workplan for the implementation of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (ECE/EB.AIR/122/Add.2, item 1.7.1).

The report provides a summary of the 2014 review of applications for adjustments to emission reduction commitments or inventories submitted by six Parties to the Convention — Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany and Spain — in accordance with Executive Body decisions 2012/3, 2012/4 and 2012/12 (see ECE/EB.AIR/111/Add.1 and ECE/EB.AIR/113/Add.1).

# Contents

# Introduction

1. The present report was prepared by the Centre on Emission Inventories and Projections (CEIP) of the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP), in line with its mandate under the 2014–2015 workplan for implementation of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (ECE/EB.AIR/122/Add.2, item 1.7.1). The report provides a summary of the 2014 review of applications for adjustments to emission reduction commitments or inventories submitted by six Parties to the Convention — Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, and Spain — in accordance with Executive Body decisions 2012/3, 2012/4 and 2012/12 (see ECE/EB.AIR/111/Add.1 and ECE/EB.AIR/113/Add.1).

2. CEIP[1] is hosted by the federal Environment Agency Austria (Umweltbundesamt).

3. Parties may apply to adjust their inventory data or emission reduction commitments in extraordinary circumstances which fall into three broad categories:

(a) Emission source categories are identified that were not accounted for at the time when the emission reduction commitments were set;

(b) Emission factors used to determine emissions levels for particular source categories for the year in which emissions reduction commitments are to be attained are significantly different than the emission factors applied to these categories when emission reduction commitments were set;

(c) The methodologies used for determining emissions from specific source categories have undergone significant changes between the time when emission reduction commitments were set and the year they are to be attained.

4. Any Party applying for an adjustment to its inventory is required to notify the Convention secretariat through the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe by 15 February at the latest. All supporting information requested in Executive Body decision 2012/12 must be provided as part of the Party's Informative Inventory Report, or in a separate report, by 15 March of the same year for a review by the Steering Body to EMEP.

# I. Overview of adjustment applications

5. Six parties — Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany and Spain — submitted applications for adjustments to the Convention secretariat in early 2014. Croatia applied for an adjustment to its emission reduction commitment under the Convention's 1999 Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone (Gothenburg Protocol).. The remaining five Parties applied for adjustments to their national emission inventories. The details of the applications are given in table 1 below.

[1] CEIP was established by the Air Convention's Executive Body at its twenty-fifth session (ECE/EB.AIR/91, para. 27 (f)) and began operating on 15 January 2008.

Table 1
**Applications for adjustments to emission reduction commitments or inventories in 2014**

| *Country* | *Sector* | *NFR source category*[a] | *Pollutant* | *Years/emissions reduction commitment* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Belgium | Energy | 1 A 3 e | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 |
| | Road transport | 1 A 3 b i-iv | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 |
| | Off-road mobile machinery | 1 A 2 f ii, 1 A 3 d i (ii), 1 A 3 a i (i), 1 A 3 a ii (i), 1 A 4 a ii, 1 A 4 b ii, 1 A 5 b | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 |
| Croatia | Energy | 1 B 1 b, 1 B 2 a vi | $NH_3$ | Emissions reduction commitment |
| | Agriculture | 4 B | $NH_3$ | Emissions reduction commitment |
| | Waste | 6 B | $NH_3$ | Emissions reduction commitment |
| Denmark | Agriculture | 4 D 1 a, 4 G | $NH_3$ | 2010–2012 |
| France | Road transport | 1 A 3 b i-iv | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 |
| | Off- road mobile machinery | 1 A 2 f i, 1 A 2 f ii, 1 A 4 c ii | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 |
| Germany | Road transport | 1 A 3 b | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 |
| | Agriculture | 4 B, 4 D | $NO_x$ | 2005–2012 |
| Spain | Road transport | 1 A 3 b i, 1 A 3 b iii | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 |

*Abbreviations*: NFR = Nomenclature for Reporting; $NH_3$ = ammonia; $NO_x$ = nitrogen oxides.
[a] For a description of source categories, see the *EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2013*, available from http://www.eea.europa.eu//publications/emep-eea-guidebook-2013.

6. CEIP created a dedicated website[2] with documentation and supporting information on adjustments submitted by Parties in 2014.

# II. Organization of the review

7. As mandated by Executive Body decision 2012/12, applications for adjustments submitted by Parties are subject to an expert review. Technical coordination and support for the 2014 review was provided by CEIP, led by Ms. Katarina Mareckova (Slovakia). The

[2] See http://www.ceip.at/adjustments_gp/.

members of the review team were selected from the review experts nominated by Parties to the CEIP roster of experts.[3]

8. To ensure a consistent approach to the review across Parties, there was a need to develop additional guidance (based on decision 2012/12) for reviewers and templates for the reporting of findings and conclusions. The respective documents were developed by CEIP in cooperation with the Chairs of the EMEP Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections and distributed to the reviewers selected for the review.

9. The adjustment review was performed in parallel with the stage 3 review. The expert review team (ERT) was composed of a lead reviewer, Mr. Chris Dore (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and nine sectoral experts: Mr. Michael Anderl, agriculture (Austria); Mr. Stephan Poupa, stationary energy (Austria); Mr. Jean-Marc Andre, transport (France); Ms. Intars Cakars, waste (Latvia); Mr. Michael Kotzulla, transport (Germany); Mr. Garmt Jans Venhuis, stationary energy (Netherlands); Mr. Dirk Wever, waste (Netherlands); Ms. Yvonne Pang, transport (United Kingdom); and Mr. Jim Webb, agriculture (United Kingdom). ERT assessed the 2014 applications for adjustments and elaborated the relevant documentation.

10. Each sector was reviewed by two independent sectorial experts during May and June 2014 (desk review). The findings were discussed at a meeting held in Copenhagen at the European Environment Agency (EEA) from 23 to 27 June 2014. The conclusions and recommendations from the review for submission to the EMEP Steering Body were discussed during the review week. They are summarized in sections IV and V below.

# III. Assessment of applications for adjustments

## A. Belgium — Energy sector (1 A 3 e)

11. ERT undertook a full and thorough assessment of Belgium's application for an adjustment to its nitrogen oxides ($NO_x$) emissions inventory for 2010–2012 for the Energy sector (Nomenclature for Reporting (NFR) source category 1 A 3 e).

12. ERT concluded that Belgium's application for an adjustment to emissions from the Energy sector does not meet all the requirements laid out in Executive Body decision 2012/12. In particular, ERT notes that this application is not based on one of the three circumstances listed in paragraph 6 of decision 2012/3.

13. Emissions from gas pipeline compressors cannot be considered as a new source. An emission factor is included in the *EMEP/CORINAIR Atmospheric emission inventory guidebook 2000*.[4] Therefore, ERT recommends that the EMEP Steering Body reject this adjustment application.

## B. Belgium — Road transport sector (1 A 3 b i-iv)

14. ERT undertook a full and thorough assessment of Belgium's application for an adjustment to its $NO_x$ emissions inventory for 2010–2012 for the Road transport sector (NFR source categories 1 A 3 b i-iv).

[3] See www.ceip.at/fileadmin/inhalte/emep/pdf/2014/0_Roster_2014.pdf.

[4] EEA online publication (29 February 2000), available from http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/EMEPCORINAIR.

15. Belgium provided information to support its application for an adjustment. During the review, ERT requested additional information from Belgium, in particular, documentation that would make it possible to distinguish the impacts of the revision of the respective emission factors (EFs) from the impacts of other methodological changes introduced in the inventory. The Party indicated that it was able to provide the requested documentation; however, the resources available to ERT did not allow the review of this additional detailed documentation to be completed within the prescribed timescale.

16. Within the available resources and time constraints, ERT was not able to determine whether the application meets all of the requirements laid out in decision 2012/12. Therefore, ERT recommends that the EMEP Steering Body assign an "open" status to this adjustment application, and arrange for further review work on the application in order to conclude whether the application should be accepted or rejected.

## C. Belgium — Off-road mobile machinery sector (1 A 2 f ii, 1 A 3 d i (ii), 1 A 3 a i (i), 1 A 3 a ii (i), 1 A 4 a ii, 1 A 4 b ii, and 1 A 5 b)

17. ERT undertook a full and thorough assessment of Belgium's application for an adjustment to its $NO_x$ emissions inventory for 2010–2012 for the Off-road mobile machinery sector (NFR source categories 1 A 2 f ii, 1 A 3 d i (ii), 1 A 3 a i (i), 1 A 3 a ii (i), 1 A 4 a ii, 1 A 4 b ii, and 1 A 5 b).

18. ERT concluded that Belgium's application for an adjustment to the Off-road mobile machinery sector does not meet all of the requirements laid out in decision 2012/12. In particular, ERT notes that this application is not based on one of the three circumstances listed in paragraph 6 of decision 2012/3.

19. The NFR source categories in question were already included in the Regional Air Pollution and Simulation (RAINS)[5] model used for deriving the 2010 national emission ceilings, and therefore cannot be accepted as new emission sources. Therefore, ERT recommends that the EMEP Steering Body rejects this adjustment application.

## D. Croatia — Energy sector (1 B 1 b, 1 B 2 a iv)

20. Croatia applied for an adjustment to its emissions reduction commitment for ammonia ($NH_3$) under the Gothenburg Protocol by submitting adjusted $NH_3$ emission inventory for three particular sectors to demonstrate that there are new emission sources or new EFs which had not been considered when its Gothenburg Protocol ceilings were set up. Croatia's ammonia emissions in the Energy sector are considered in section D, while Agriculture and Waste sector emissions are considered in sections E and F, respectively.

21. ERT undertook a full and thorough assessment of Croatia's application for an adjustment by analyzing its $NH_3$ emissions for 1990, 2010 and 2012 for the Energy sector (NFR source categories 1 B 1 b and 1 B 2 a iv).

22. ERT concluded that the application for an adjustment to Croatia's $NH_3$ emissions reduction commitment with respect to the Energy sector does not meet all of the requirements laid out in decision 2012/12 of the Executive Body. In particular, ERT notes

[5] See http://www.iiasa.ac.at/web/home/about/achievments/scientificachievementsandpolicyimpact/cleaningeuropeair/The-RAINS-Model.en.html.

that this application is not based on one of the three circumstances listed in paragraph 6 of decision 2012/3.

23. Ammonia emissions from source categories 1 B 1 b and 1 B 2 a iv in the Energy sector cannot be considered as new sources. They are included in the *EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2009*.[6] Therefore, ERT recommends that the EMEP Steering Body reject this adjustment application.

## E. Croatia — Agriculture sector (4 B)

24. ERT undertook a full and thorough assessment of Croatia's application for an adjustment by analyzing its $NH_3$ emissions for 1990–2012 for the Agriculture sector (NFR source category 4 B).

25. ERT concluded that Croatia's application for an $NH_3$ emission reduction commitment adjustment with respect to the Agriculture sector does not meet all of the requirements laid out in decision 2012/12. In particular, ERT notes that this application is not based on one of the three circumstances listed in paragraph 6 of decision 2012/3.

26. *Source categories 4 B 4 (Goats) and 4 B 7 (Mules and asses)*: ERT does not consider goats, mules and asses to be new emission source categories, as they have been included in scientific literature and/or the EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook (EMEP/EEA Guidebook) for numerous years. Therefore, ERT recommends that the EMEP Steering Body reject this adjustment application.

27. *Source categories 4 B 1 a (Dairy Cattle), 4 B 6 (Horses), 4 B 8 (Swine), 4 B 9 (Poultry)*: ERT considers that it is good practice to revise emission factors when productivity and farming practices change. However, revision of emission factors constitutes a routine emissions inventory development and is not an "extraordinary" revision. Furthermore, ERT notes that RAINS model calculations took into account the low milk yields of cattle in Croatia at the time when emission reduction commitments were set. Therefore, ERT recommends that the EMEP Steering Body reject this adjustment application.

## F. Croatia — Waste sector (6 B)

28. ERT undertook a full and thorough assessment of Croatia's application for an adjustment by analyzing its $NH_3$ emissions for 1990–2012 for the Waste sector (NFR source category 6 B (latrines)).

29. ERT concluded that Croatia's application for an adjustment to its $NH_3$ emissions reduction commitment with respect to the Waste sector does not meet all of the requirements laid out in decision 2012/12. In particular, ERT notes that this application is not based on one of the three circumstances listed in paragraph 6 of decision 2012/3.

30. A methodology for estimating $NH_3$ emissions from latrines is available in the *EMEP/CORINAIR Emission Inventory Guidebook*, third edition (2000),[7] and therefore it cannot be considered a new emission source. Therefore, ERT recommends that the EMEP Steering Body reject this adjustment application.

[6] See http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/emep-eea-emission-inventory-guidebook-2009.

[7] See http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/EMEPCORINAIR3.

## G. Denmark — Agriculture sector (4 D 1 a, 4 G)

31. ERT undertook a full and thorough assessment of Denmark's application for an adjustment to its $NH_3$ emissions inventory for 2010–2012 for the Agriculture sector (NFR source categories 4 D 1 a and 4 G).

32. *Source category 4 D 1 a (Synthetic fertilizers)*: Default $NH_3$ emission factors provided in the EMEP/EEA Guidebook for emission category 4 D 1 a have undergone significant changes between the time when emission reduction commitments were set and the year they are to be attained. The use of the revised EFs according to the latest (2013) version of the EMEP/EEA Guidebook resulted in considerably higher estimates as the new EFs are — unlike the EFs in the previous version of the Guidebook — not temperature dependent.

33. *Source category 4 G (emissions from growing crops)*: Denmark identified emission source categories for $NH_3$ which were not accounted for at the time when emission reduction commitments were set. This source category was mentioned for the first time in the EMEP/EEA Guidebook 2002. Following the EMEP/EEA Guidebook 2013, data are currently considered too uncertain to establish separate default EFs for this source. The RAINS model did not consider this emission source at the time when the emission reduction commitment was set and the Greenhouse Gas and Air Pollution Interactions and Synergies (GAINS) model[8] still does not consider this emission source.

34. ERT concluded that the application does meet all of the requirements laid out in decision 2012/12, and therefore recommends that the EMEP Steering Body accept this adjustment application. The impact of the adjustment is summarized in table 2 below.

Table 2
**Impact of adjustment to Denmark's ammonia emissions inventory for the Agriculture sector for 2010–2012**

| | *Thousands of tonnes (ktonnes) of $NH_3$* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *NFR source category(ies)* | *2010* | *2011* | *2012* |
| 4 D 1 a, 4 G | -9.08 | -8.84 | -8.70 |

35. Denmark's national total emissions will be below its ceilings in accordance with the Gothenburg Protocol from 2011 onwards, if the proposed adjustments are accepted.

## H. France — Road transport sector (1 A 3 b i-iv)

36. ERT commenced a full and thorough assessment of France's application for an adjustment to its $NO_x$ emissions inventory for 2010–2012 for the Road transport sector (NFR source category 1 A 3 b i-iv).

37. France provided information to support its application for an adjustment. During the review, ERT requested additional information from France, in particular, documentation that would make it possible to distinguish the impacts of the revision of the respective EFs from the impacts of other methodological changes introduced in the inventory. The Party indicated that it was able to provide the requested documentation; however, the resources

[8] See http://gains.iiasa.ac.at/models/.

available to ERT did not allow the review of this additional documentation to be completed within the prescribed timescale.

38. Within the available resources and time constraints, ERT was not able to determine whether the application meets all of the requirements laid out in decision 2012/12. Therefore, ERT recommends that the EMEP Steering Body assign an open status to this adjustment application, and arrange for further review work on the application in order to conclude whether the application should be accepted or rejected.

## I. France — Off-road mobile machinery sector (1 A 2 f i, 1 A 2 f ii, 1 A 4 c ii)

39. ERT commenced a full and thorough assessment of France's application for an adjustment to its $NO_x$ emissions inventory for 2010–2012 for the Off-road mobile machinery sector (NFR source categories 1 A 2 f i, 1 A 2 f ii and 1 A 4 c ii).

40. ERT concluded that the application does not meet all of the requirements laid out in decision 2012/12. In particular, ERT notes that this application is not based on one of the three circumstances listed in paragraph 6 of decision 2012/3.

41. From the information provided by the Party, ERT concluded that the increase in emission estimates from these source categories (compared with the assumptions made in 1999) results from the implementation of revised and reallocated activity data that allowed the application of specific emission factors which are much higher than those applied in the Party's earlier submissions. This improvement in the inventory with respect to its correctness and transparency is not considered to be "extraordinary", but a routine inventory development. Therefore, ERT recommends that the EMEP Steering Body reject this adjustment application.

## J. Germany — Road transport sector (1 A 3 b)

42. ERT undertook a full and thorough assessment of Germany's application for an adjustment to its $NO_x$ emissions inventory for 2010–2012 for the Road transport sector (NFR source category 1 A 3 b).

43. Germany provided information that transparently presented "extraordinary" revisions to emission factors for $NO_x$, and also clearly quantified the impact of these revisions. ERT concluded that the application does meet all of the requirements laid out in decision 2012/12, and therefore recommends that the EMEP Steering Body accept this adjustment application. The impact of the adjustment is summarized in table 3 below.

Table 3
**Impact of adjustment to Germany's ammonia emissions inventory for the Road transport sector for 2010–2012**

| | *Thousands of tonnes (ktonnes) of $NH_3$* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *NFR source category(ies)* | *2010* | *2011* | *2012* |
| 1 A 3 b | -101.30 | -95.73 | -91.69 |

## K. Germany — Agriculture sector (4 B, 4 D)

44. ERT undertook a full and thorough assessment of Germany's application for an adjustment to its $NO_x$ emissions inventory for 2005–2012 for the Agriculture sector (NFR source categories 4 B and 4 D).

45. Germany has reported $NO_x$ emissions from the agriculture sector since 2002. However, these $NO_x$ emissions were not accounted for when emission reduction commitments were set. ERT concluded that the application does meet all of the requirements laid out in decision 2012/12, and therefore recommends that the EMEP Steering Body accept this adjustment application. The impact of the adjustment is summarized in table 4 below.

Table 4
**Impact of adjustment to Germany's ammonia emissions inventory for the Agriculture sector for 2005–2012**

| | *Thousands of tonnes (ktonnes) of $NH_3$* | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *NFR source category(ies)* | *2005* | *2006* | *2007* | *2008* | *2009* | *2010* | *2011* | *2012* |
| 4 B, 4 D | -112.32 | -111.74 | -104.91 | -113.27 | -103.37 | -103.75 | -112.17 | -106.69 |

46. In its application for an adjustment, Germany noted that from 2013 onwards its national total emissions would be below the Gothenburg Protocol ceilings if the proposed adjustments are accepted.

## L. Spain — Road transport sector (1 A 3 b i, 1 A 3 b iii)

47. ERT commenced a full and thorough assessment of Spain's application for an adjustment of its $NO_x$ emissions inventory for 2010–2012 for the Road transport sector (NFR source categories 1 A 3 b i (passenger cars) and 1 A 3 b iii (heavy-duty vehicles excluding buses)).

48. Spain provided information to support its application for an adjustment. During the review, ERT requested additional information from Spain, in particular, documentation that would make it possible to distinguish the impacts of the revision of the respective EFs from the impacts of other methodological changes introduced in the inventory. The Party indicated that it was able to provide the requested documentation; however, the resources available to ERT did not allow the review of this additional detailed documentation to be completed within the prescribed timescale.

49. Within the available resources and time constraints, ERT was not able to determine whether the application meets all of the requirements laid out in decision 2012/12. Therefore, ERT recommends that the EMEP Steering Body assign an open status to this adjustment application and arrange for further review work on the application in order to conclude whether the application should be accepted or rejected.

# IV. Conclusions and recommendations

50. All six applications submitted by the deadline in 2014 were assessed. In each case, ERT determined that additional information was needed from the Party to enable a sufficiently detailed review. The supply of additional information by Parties is not included

in the process specified in decisions 2012/3 and 2012/12. However, given that this was the first year of the review process, ERT decided to accept additional information provided by Parties and to consider this information in its assessment.

51. Table 5 provides a summary of the adjustment applications received, and the subsequent ERT recommendations to the EMEP Steering Body.

Table 5
**Adjustment applications received and expert review team recommendations**

| *Country* | *Sector* | *NFR* | *Pollutant* | *Years/Emissions reduction commitment* | *ERT recommendation* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Belgium | Energy | 1 A 3 e | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 | Reject |
| | Road transport | 1 A 3 b i-iv | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 | Open status[a] |
| | Off-road mobile machinery | 1 A 2 f ii, 1 A 3 d i (ii), 1 A 3 a i (i), 1 A 3 a ii (i), 1 A 4 a ii, 1 A 4 B ii, 1 A 5 b | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 | Reject |
| Croatia | Energy | 1 B 1 b, 1 B 2 a iv | $NH_3$ | Emissions reduction commitment | Reject |
| | Agriculture | 4 B | $NH_3$ | Emissions reduction commitment | Reject |
| | Waste | 6 B | $NH_3$ | Emissions reduction commitment | Reject |
| Denmark | Agriculture | 4 D 1 a, 4 G | $NH_3$ | 2010–2012 | Accept |
| France | Road transport | 1 A 3 b i-iv | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 | Open status[a] |
| France | Off-road mobile machinery | 1 A 2 f i, 1 A 2 f ii, 1 A 4 c ii | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 | Reject |
| Germany | Road transport | 1 A 3 b | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 | Accept |
| | Agriculture | 4 B, 4 D | $NO_x$ | 2005–2012 | Accept |
| Spain | Road transport | 1 A 3 b i, 1 A 3 b iii | $NO_x$ | 2010–2012 | Open status[a] |

[a] Within the available resources and time constraints, ERT was not able to determine whether these applications for adjustments involving the road transport sector meet all of the requirements laid out in Executive Body decision 2012/12. Therefore, ERT recommends that the EMEP Steering Body assign an open status to these adjustment applications and arrange for further review work to be undertaken by ERT and/or the Party, in order to conclude whether the application should be accepted or rejected.

52. Table 6 provides a summary of adjusted emission quantities (in thousands of tonnes) accepted by ERT during the review performed in May and June 2014.

Table 6
**Adjusted emission quantities (in thousands of tonnes)**

| *Country* | *Sector* | *Pollutant* | *2005* | *2006* | *2007* | *2008* | *2009* | *2010* | *2011* | *2012* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Denmark | 4 D 1 a, 4 G | $NH_3$ | | | | | | -9.08 | -8.84 | -8.70 |
| Germany | 1 A 3 b | $NO_x$ | | | | | | -101.30 | -95.73 | -91.69 |
| Germany | 4 B, 4 D | $NO_x$ | -112.32 | -111.74 | -104.91 | -113.27 | -103.37 | -103.75 | -112.17 | -106.69 |

53. ERT also concluded that there is a need for further guidance for Parties for reporting adjustment applications, particularly for the transport sector. It seeks to arrange for further work to be undertaken to develop such guidance, including tables for the reporting of quantitative information that will be used for the adjustment calculations.

54. The detailed conclusions and recommendations regarding each adjustment applications can be found in section IV of this report. ERT has prepared country-specific reports containing detailed explanations of the findings. These explanations will be made available to the Parties and will also be published on the CEIP website before the thirty-eighth session of the EMEP Steering Body in September 2014. The country-specific reports will be available as informal documents for the Steering Body's thirty-eighth session.

55. It was not possible to complete the review of all adjustment applications due to time and resource constraints. The fact that reviewers were needed for the review of adjustments in 2014 had an adverse impact on Parties making reviewers available for the stage 3 review.

56. The 2014 review has shown that the review of adjustments for the transport sector is more demanding than for other sectors. Based on the experience gained in 2014, guidance will be drafted that will give an indication of the required time for a reviewer to participate in the reviews of adjustment applications.

57. CEIP notes that not all of the countries that submitted an adjustment application in 2014 supported the review process by funding national experts to act as reviewers.

58. CEIP also notes that no additional funding has been made available to it to support the review (in view of the voluntary financial support by Parties under the 2014–2015 workplan item 1.7.1). Therefore, CEIP had to use part of its core budget that had been planned for other activities (development of the new gridding system) in order to provide its support for the review of applications for adjustments.