Day One Recap

- There is no question that policy is a key motivator for the assessment since we are responding to the NRC report.
- This raises the question as to the approach to how we present the science in the assessment.
  - Should it be tightly coupled to policy needs throughout or should they be kept separate?
  - PM Assessment started with specific policy questions derived from a cross-section of AQ Managers and revisited them later
- The question of who the primary audience is also important to consider

Day One Recap

- Audience
  - Senior policy advisors who are considerably involved in technical issues
  - Research community – help prioritize future directions
  - CAAC (?)

Day One Recap

- ## MP Approach
  - A multi-pollutant approach needs to co-manage all aspects of a source and the consequences of control actions, positive and negative
  - Does thinking in a MP fashion change how we look at effects (e.g., the scope of a problem) and determine what is important to consider in terms of solutions?
    - For ecological effects the implications of this can vary geographically (i.e., ecosystem sensitivities differ)
  - Are we anywhere near being able to address synergistic effects (human health, environment)?
    - Possibly in a few situations

Day One Recap

- Implications of "multi-pollutant" on science needs and policy messages
  - depends upon if it is approached from the atmospheric science perspective or from an effects perspective
  - It could be useful to have both communities examine what it means to approach their science and needs from with a MP perspective and to then determine the overlap, similarities and differences

Day One Recap

- Adopting a MP approach to AQ Management can't happen overnight
  - What short time frame changes are feasible and what are the technical issues associated with them?
  - Where do we want to be in the long term and what are the technical issues of getting there?

Day One Recap

- What about accountability?
  - A key issue in Canada
- Did not receive as much attention on day 1
  - Is that because it is less controversial and more understood as to what it involves?
- What has been done?
- What can be done?
- How is it linked to MP AQ management?

Truths (?)

- Regardless of whether an AQ management plan is MP or not…..
  - it is mandatory for the subsequent analysis of what happens in the atmosphere, how exposure changes and what the benefits and dis-benefits are to be MP/one-atmosphere
- Few emission reduction measures, technology changes or fuel change have an impact on only one single pollutant

Accepting these truths…

- How would we really rethink the development of AQ management plans?
  - Try to be more source-based
  - With the right knowledge, choose one plan that might exacerbate some pollutants and their effects more than other plans because the net benefit is the greatest
    - Should the net benefits be added across environment and health?
  - Advise decision-makers against certain ('popular') initiatives because of dis-benefits or unintended consequences
    - Would we be better-positioned to identify unintended consequences?

Does MP AQ Management Make Sense?

- Will it really make us more efficient or does it just add unnecessary complexity?

Structure of the assessment document

- Accept the existing outline
- Build it around the components and linkages included in current integrated, risk-based evaluation approaches
- Build it around case studies
- Other
  - Input from authors yesterday and today is essential to a workable direction
- Can we be frank, insightful and useful to our audience?

Day One Recap

- Clearly need to define what we mean as multi-pollutant (Chapter 0)
  - How does this truly intersect with accountability?
- What will be the boundaries of the NARSTO Assessment?
  - Current outline has a huge scope
- There are levels of multi-pollutant assessments of AQ management strategies
  - First level is what might be possible with today's knowledge and tools
  - Second level is where do we think we need to be in the future and how synergy might factor in (a 3rd level, perhaps)
- Ranking of pollutant's or classes according to some fundamental biological response that is considered to be indicative of some key pathway to effects (There could be more than one of these)
- Target accountability tracking on these fundamental responses
- Case studies
- Are the risk frameworks that are thus far put forward are too linear?
  - How to do they push the limits of what multi-pollutant air quality management could involve?