

Comments from Denmark:

Dear Jerzy.

Some few comments to the drFT report "Atmospheric supply of Nitrogen, Lead, Cadmium, Mercury and Diaxins/Furans. As I stated at the meeting, it is a good draft report.

I propose to include a short summary including overall conclusions or main statements - that seems necessary.

Further, I propose a precipitation map 2005 if possible compare with normal precipitation conditions. I know that there is not any simple correlation between patterns of precipitation on the different compound deposited by e.g. wet deposition - but for some compounds there are relations, and you mention precipitation as an explanation for the deposition of some compounds in the report.

Generally the data about ship emissions should be introduced we few sentences, how are they obtained, from which year, what are the estimated uncertainty for ship emission data - and is the uncertainty the same all over the Baltic Sea, how are they included in the calculations. I assumed that many of the compounds from ship emission are deposited quite close to where they are emitted? e.g. some comments needed in relation to fig. 3.6

Text under figure 2 p.5: concentration in air

I do not quite agree in paragraph under figure 2.2 that there "is a clear decrease in concentration from south to north". There is a tendency for some compounds, but not to clear for other compounds.

The different curves in fig. 2.3 to 2.5 and corresponding figures are difficult to distinguish even printing with colours - try also with different thickness of curves or different curve types.

Table 2.2 and 2.3 are very interesting, but more comments are needed to explain why some CP's have very high RSD and DQO. The high Danish DQO for low Pb concentrations is not representative, as Denmark use another method that used in the laboratory and files intercomparison. In Denmark precipitation samples are evaporated before concentration of heavy metals are measured in order to get higher concentration to detect. As the Danish methodology with high concentrations have low DQO this methodologies ensure that DK obtain low DQO at both low and high concentration in the original precipitation samples.

Figure 3.1.: Sum of bars lower than 100%.

Figure 3.2 and 3.3 the unit Mg should be explained when introduced - if was not sure if Mg is mega gram or what it is.

I like figures as 4.1-4.3 although they are a bit small (should be bigger to distinguish the different colours).

Why do you use different units for emission in figure 4.2 compared with 4.3 and 4.4 (and in some other figures).

Figures as 4.9 to 4.17 (and the corresponding figures for the other compounds in chapter 5 etc-) are good and interesting, but when/if data are missing for several sectors as in e.g. for Russia. Latvia etc. these country figures should be omitted because you get wrong comparison with the other CP's - or as a minimum it should be stated that data are missing for some sectors (but the best is to omit CP's with missing sector data).

Table 4.2 and corresponding tables (as 5.2 etc.): Have you considered time series plots for e.g. Helcom sum data.

Figures 4.21 and corresponding figures (as 5.21 etc.). The sums of bars are in fig. 4.21 only 65% (and in some other chapters even lower) - therefore the most important sources are missing. This should at least be explained in the text.

Page 43-51 some of the comparisons between monitoring results and modelling seem fine, but some of them seem less convincing. We need some few comments for the compounds where modelling deviates much from monitoring results.

Best regards
Lars

Projektchef
Lars M. Svendsen
Forsknings-, overvågnings og rådgivningssekretariatet
Danmarks Miljøundersøgelser
Vejlsøvej 25
DK-8600 Silkeborg
tlf. +45 8920 1400; fax: + 45 8920 1401
E-mail: lms@dmu.dk