

Strategic discussion

- *Scale*. A reason for the success of the convention has been the focus on the regional scale where it has been beneficial for the parties to cooperate to reach goals that could not be reached on a per country basis and to have optimized solutions based on cost optimization, the polluter pay principle and equal benefits. In the later year, more focus has been given to coupling to local- and global scale. This do make a lot of sense, but how far should we go in this direction?, and can we from the effect group maintain sufficient focus on supporting the policy development in the convention.
- *Optimized solutions*. The basis for the last GP revision was a flat rate reduction and a focus on health. Can and shall we try to get (back to) a situation where also effects on nature, environment, materials, vegetation are included in IAM and to some degree in optimized scenarios.
- *Biodiversity* – has been asked for in the policy process, and it is positive that we are getting in a position to address this, also as support to IAM. It is, however, important to look at what can be delivered now, and what should be the future strategy.
- *Climate change and mitigation* and the influence and interaction with AP effects and policies will be increasingly important
- *Nature restoration*. The condition of many ecosystems are so degraded, and still have deposition levels meaning that recovery cannot be expected in a foreseeable future. Focus in nature polities are therefore shifting from nature protection to nature restauration. We have to start thinking about how this can be reflected in effect assessment and AP policies. I have flagged this up at the EB meeting.