

Outcome of the Gothenburg Workshop on Air Pollution and Climate Change 19-21 October 2009

TFIAM Genève February 2010

Anna Engleryd, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

Objective of the workshop

What can air pollution policies offer to mitigate climate change within an intermediate future?

The workshop

More than 200 participants from more than 30 countries primarily, scientists, experts and policymakers

Workshop format: The same format as used for the "Saltsjöbaden" workshops (2000, 2004, 2007)

Workshop focused on the link between scientific understanding and policies - platforms.

- Agreements on emission reductions of SLCFs may proceed faster at national and regional level, in particular if existing national and regional structures are used. (Regional problems – regional solutions)
- The choice of air pollution strategies may be important for intermediate climate development and may offer an opportunity for mitigation.
- The coming period represents an important opportunity to link air and climate concerns, as the UNEP Governing Board, the Arctic Council and the possible conclusion of the GP revision all occur in 2011.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Address climate effects and SLCF in the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol.
2. Create a CLRTAP Task Force or an expert group to investigate climate change and air quality interactions.
3. Prepare a special report on nitrogen and climate interactions (TFRN).

Conclusions and Recommendations

4. Active contribution from CLRTAP scientists to IPCC-reports.
5. Continue to build links between regional agreements and networks for air pollution and climate change.
6. Explore the need for a protocol addressing background ozone on a hemispheric scale.

Conclusions and Recommendations

7. Health and sustainable development are strong drivers for policy in developing countries.
8. Research on the toxicity of PM-species and ozone within CLRTAP should continue.
9. A clear vision of intermediate and long term air & climate targets from policymakers is needed for a structured scientific work.
10. Geo-engineering is relevant in the cost-benefit debate.

Questions considered by the EB 27

- Should the link between air pollution and climate change within the Convention be strengthened?
- Should climate effects be considered in the GP?
- Which SLCF should be addressed (BC, CO, Methane, Ozone...), and how (ceilings, measures, climate effects)?
- Should a new task force for interactions between air pollution and climate change be created?
- Should a special report on reactive nitrogen and climate interactions be produced?
- Should CLRTAP scientist actively contribute to IPCC-reports?
- Should a new protocol on background ozone be considered?

Thank you!

More information at

www.swedishepa.se/airclimconf