

Common vision of future TF – CCE – NFC collaboration

NEW “YOUNG” TEAM AND CHAIRMANSHIP

- Motivated for and dependent on collaboration with experienced colleagues
- Limited resources
- It's time for a restart including new ideas, new visions
- First task is to discuss
 - scientific priorities,
 - a revised common mandate and
 - procedure of collaboration

COMMON PRIORITY TASK

- Keep ICP M&M data relevant to describe threats for ecosystems by air pollution
 - for policy makers (e.g. upcoming GP review)
 - the interested public (e.g. reports, brochures)
 - and the scientific community (e.g. publications)

Common vision of future TF – CCE – NFC collaboration

MANDATE

- Terms of reference (EB.AIR/WG.1/2000/4, Annexes II-VIII)
- revised mandates will include key objectives and functions of the task forces and centres.
- expected to be in force for the next 5 to 10 years
- Common mandate of TF and CCE, draft 2017
- Approval by WGE, September 2019
- TF (community of NFC)
 - organizes and evaluates the Programme's activities. It reviews and assesses methodologies and databases
- CCE
 - Collaboration with other convention and research groups
 - Reports, database, clearing house, Workshops
 - Develop methodologies and databases for the calculation of critical loads and their exceedances
- Parties (National Focal Centres)
 - ICP Modelling and Mapping activities are based on the contributions of the participating parties, either through their national focal centers or, in some cases, through informal submissions
 - Important role
 - Data collection, contribution to development of methodologies

Common vision of future TF – CCE – NFC collaboration

FINANCIAL STUFF

- CCE receives annual non-earmarked funds from the CLRTAP Trust Fund (= other Centers/TF).
 - 2018: 52.900 \$
 - 2019: 73.200 \$
- 1/3 overhead (→ 30.000 € in 2018) } ca. 110.000 €
- Projects, development, reports (layout)
- In-kind contribution by NFC activities is welcome/needed

NATIONAL FOCAL CENTRE (NFC)

- How many national representatives do we have?
- How important is the official status of NFC?
- What is the difference between NFC and scientific contribution?

CALL FOR DATA, CALL FOR CONTRIBUTION

- evaluate new tasks in the light of mid-term stable assessment data
- national funding of NFC is essential for collaboration
- Define tasks to merge national and International interests

Common vision of future TF – CCE – NFC collaboration

TO ENHANCE COLLABORATIVE CHARACTER, PROPOSAL TO RESTRUCTURE ICP MODELLING & MAPPING

- Proposal: Expert Panels
- e.g. SMB-Modelling, Empirical Critical Loads, CL for biodiversity,
- Stronger separation of the different topics, each of them scientifically challenging
- Chairperson? Mandate? ToR?

STABILIZE ASSESSMENT DATA

- Mid-term continuity of exceedance data, avoid discrepancies between different studies/reports
- Important for policy makers
- Finding modus operandi without making NFCS “unemployed”

JOINT REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS

- Lead CCE, stronger involvement of NFC
- Transparent data assessment, active involvement
- M&M Brochure?

WORKING TOGETHER

- Vital exchange / interaction through-out a year
- Regular sharing of recent scientific forthcoming (new papers, studies)
- Set-up of a mailing –list? Setup of a common working space?
- Critical Load Wiki?

Common vision of future TF – CCE – NFC collaboration

PROPOSALS FOR (MOST URGENT) SCIENTIFIC QUESTIONS

- SMB-Critical Loads (cross-border harmonisation, background database to fill gaps)
- Update of empirical Critical Loads (clarify possible future application in IAM)
- How to move on with CL for biodiversity (WGE still expects developments policy relevant indicators)?
- What shall be done with respect to Critical Levels?
- **Dynamic Modelling?**
- **Heavy Metals?**

**CALL FOR CONTRIBUTION (WITHIN EXPERT GROUPS)
TO BE MOST EFFECTIVE WITH THESE MULTIPLE CHALLENGES?!**