Joint Workshop between AMAP and LRTAP bodies
Main objectives

- To further define general strategy for cooperation between AMAP and LRTAP bodies (EMEP and WGE)
- To identify possible specific activities to start cooperation and develop implementation plans

- Presenting both frameworks (AMAP/LRTAP) and constrains (budget, priorities)

- Reasons to enhance co-operation:
  - "Streamline" activities to make efficient use of resources: maintaining monitoring infrastructures, data management, QA/QC
  - Programmes harmonization (avoiding duplication)
  - All eight Arctic countries are also CLRTAP parties
National implementation
Regional coordination

AMAP’s Implementation essentially based on national activities

EMEP’s implementation is one of the principle of the Convention LRTAP
### Common areas of interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arctic Council</th>
<th>LRTAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>AC, AMAP WG</td>
<td>Executive Body, WGSR, WGE, EMEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring (trends and effects)</td>
<td>AMAP WG</td>
<td>CCC, TFMM, WGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling</td>
<td>AMAP EGs (SLCFs, POPs, Hg, etc.)</td>
<td>TFHTAP, MSC-E, MSC-W, TFEIP, CEIP, CIAM, TFMM, WGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific assessment</td>
<td>AMAP assessment groups (SLCFs, POPs, Hg, etc.)</td>
<td>EMEP, WGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SOx, NOx, SLCFs (BC, CH₄, O₃, etc.), POPs, Hg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLCP (policy)</td>
<td>AC EG BCM</td>
<td>WGSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated assessment</td>
<td>AMAP assessment groups (SLCFs, POPs, Hg, CEG, HHAG, etc.)</td>
<td>TFIAM, CIAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions: Monitoring

- Interest for AMAP to benefit from the QA/QC and dataflow framework operationally implemented within the EMEP program
- EMEP is aims at developing cooperation with other monitoring programs, in expanding its networks (toward the East part of Europe), in getting more data for assessment.
- Action: Elaborate a list of stations of common interest that could be made labeled under both programmes. Review potential needs in terms of quality assurance and needed actions with the data providers to get the data under the AMAP/EMEP processes. Modelers should be included in this process.
Conclusions: emissions and scenarios

- **Emissions**: emissions inventory process within CLRTAP is a regulatory process. Parties have to report their emissions first for compliance checking.
  - Exchange of information on methodologies, databases, proxies for geographical distribution ...
  - AMAP will submit questions, requests (pollutants..), need for data for which feasibility will be discussed in the EMEP work plan

- **Scenarios**: need for harmonization of the time line, the assumptions and databases (portfolio of mitigation strategies, costs...) because they directly impact policy decisions. Cooperation with IIASA is in place and should develop
Conclusions: modeling and assessment

- Few examples of areas of interest
  - Modeling global mercury
  - POP (regarding the full environmental contamination chain)
  - Critical loads for modeling impacts on ecosystems

- Upcoming assessment initiatives that we allow cooperation and joint work:
  - Scientific contribution to GMA (global Hg assessment) update (2018)
  - Scientific assessment on integrated SLCP modelling, including evaluation of costs (2019)
  - To be confirmed: AMAP POPs and climate change assessment (2017)?
Next steps

- Good time to initiate « more formal » cooperation, regarding the various agendas:
  - AMAP work plan (2017-2019)
  - Mid term review of the CLRTAP strategy

- New meeting point by the end of 2016?