

The First Special Session of the Working Group
on Future Development of EANET
20 November 2005, Niigata, Japan

REPORT OF THE SESSION

I. Introduction

1. The First Special Session of the Working Group on Future Development of EANET (WGFD-S1) was held in Niigata, Japan on 20 November 2005.
2. Representatives of Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Mongolia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russia, Thailand and Vietnam participated in the Session. Experts also attended the meeting, from the following international organizations: the United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies (UNU-IAS), the United Nations Environment Programme Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (UNEP/ROAP), and the United Nations Environment Programme Regional Resource Center for Asia and the Pacific (UNEP RRC.AP). The list of participants is attached as Annex 1.

II. Opening of the Session (Agenda Item 1)

3. The Session was opened by the Secretariat of EANET. Serving as the chairperson of the Special Session, Dr. Supat Wangwonwatana, Deputy Director General, Pollution Control Department, Thailand, explained that this Session was requested to finalize the reports for the Seventh Session of the Intergovernmental Meeting of EANET (IG7) to be held during the next two days.

III. Adoption of the Agenda (EANET/WGFD 2/2) (Agenda Item 2)

4. The Session adopted the Agenda with the following modifications:
 - Division of the agenda item 5 into two components: “Feasibility Study on an Appropriate Instrument to Provide a Sound Basis for Financial Contribution to EANET Activities” and “Draft Decision 1/IG.7.”
 - Change of the order of agenda items 5 and 6; and
 - Addition of a new agenda item: Consideration on High Level Segment of IG7.The Session adopted the agenda with these changes.

IV. Consideration of the Report on the Review of the Performance of the Secretariat and Network Center (EANET/IG 7/12) (Agenda Item 3)

5. The Chairperson explained that Secretariat and the Network Center (NC) have revised the Report to incorporate the views of participating countries and asked the Session to review and endorse the Report.
6. During the discussion the following major points were raised:
 - Further improvements are needed to boost the efficiency and performance of the Secretariat.
 - It was clarified why large fluctuations in the Secretariat's budget occurred in 2002, 2003 and 2004.
 - It was noted that while some fluctuations are inevitable, every effort should be made to have stability in the amount of EANET administrative expenditures from year to year. This is an important point for countries when they seek contributions from their governments for EANET.
 - It was pointed out that host countries of meetings, especially countries where costs are high, often provide considerable in-kind contributions for events, which helps to control the costs. These in-kind contributions are not included in the budget but arranged directly by host country.
7. The Session agreed that the "Report on the Review of the Performance of the Secretariat and the Network Center" should be submitted to IG7 as it stands. General comments on the performance of the Secretariat and the NC might be further expressed at IG7 as appropriate, based on the Report.

V. Consideration of the "Guidelines on Administration and Financial Management for the Secretariat and the Network Center (EANRT/IG 7/4)" as well as "Draft Procedures and Guidelines for Contribution to EANET (EANET/IG 7/4/1)" (Agenda Item 4)

8. The Secretariat presented the two documents. The Chairperson then invited discussion.
9. During the discussion, the following major points were raised:
 - Participants again expressed their concern about fluctuations in the Secretariat expenditures and urged the Secretariat to make the greatest effort to avoid large year-to-year fluctuations.

- Clarifications were provided on the methods used to calculate overhead of the Secretariat.
 - Since the costs of holding Intergovernmental Meetings and other meetings are a major factor in budget planning, one country recommended using a fixed meeting budget, and asking host countries to provide additional contributions if meeting expenditures are expected to significantly exceed the budget.
 - Under the current Guidelines, the target amounts for voluntary contributions from countries for the Secretariat budget are based on the actual expenditures two years previous. However, several countries mentioned that when seeking contributions for EANET from their home governments, they need more advance notice of the target amounts. It was thus recommended to use the figures from three years previous as the base year instead of two (e.g., the base year for 2006 should be 2003, not 2004).
 - The Chairperson reminded participants that, once adopted, the Guidelines for Contribution to EANET will be in effect until 2007, and that suggestions could be presented at IG8 relating to contributions after 2008.
 - A country suggested that the table on the estimated amount of contributions should not give the impression that contributions are mandatory.
 - A country pointed out that the RRC.AP/AIT system, which was adopted at IG3, might need to be revisited to consider changing to the UN system. It was also pointed out that the Secretariat should investigate the potential for establishment of a trust fund for EANET.
 - It was suggested that a format for the financial reports of the Secretariat and the NC should be developed in a more uniformed way.
 - It was also suggested that rules of procedures should include procedures for deciding participants other than the participating countries to the EANET meetings.
 - It was clarified that IG7 might wish to provide guidance to the WGFD to do additional tasks to address the views and comments of the participating countries.
10. The Session agreed that the two documents would be submitted to IG7, with the following two modifications on the document on EANET/IG 7/4/1.
- “Actual expenditures after two years” in paragraph 7 should be changed to “actual expenditures after three years”; and
 - The last sentence of paragraph 8 should be replaced to “The contribution of the participating countries in 2005 could be shown in Annex 2.”

**VI. Consideration of the Five-Year Medium Term Plan for EANET (EANET/IG 7/7)
(Agenda Item 5)**

11. The NC introduced the revised draft “Five-Year Medium Plan (MTP) for EANET”, focusing on the major comments and their reflections in the MTP. The Chairperson then invited discussion.
12. During the discussion the following major points arose:
- Several countries had questions and concerns about the nature of the MTP. Many participants felt gaps in the following points among the participating countries:
 - ✧ Should the MTP provide general guidance to be a reference in preparation of annual Work Program and Budget for EANET or, on the contrary, it must indicate concrete activities to be achieved in the five years?
 - ✧ Should the monitoring items be limited to acid deposition? Or should they include broader compounds of transboundary air pollution?
 - ✧ Should the scope of the MTP include only acid deposition monitoring? Or should it include broader activities, such as modeling, emission inventories, etc.?
 - Goals and general objectives of the MTP were drawn too broad, making it difficult to evaluate achievement. Appropriate performance indicators should be developed to evaluate the performance and achievements of the MTP;
 - The MTP lists many tasks and looks to be too ambitious for human and financial resources of EANET.
 - The objectives of MTP should concern not only environmental but also economic and social implications.
 - The MTP should be written in such a manner that other stakeholders, including policy makers, could understand the needs of EANET properly.
 - The MTP should reflect clearly that implementation is subject to the availability of resources.
13. After a far-reaching discussion, there was general agreement that it was important for this Session to come up with a presented draft MTP that could be used as a starting point for the next year. It was decided, therefore, to use the citation text of the Work Plan of the WGFD (EANET/IG 6/2 (rev.2) for introduction, which had been adopted at IG6. With a few more additional modifications suggested by participants, the Session endorsed, in principle, the document (the revised draft) to be submitted to IG7, with the understanding that the general framework of the MTP (paragraphs 1

through 7) should be endorsed in principle, and that the WGFD should be charged to elaborate from paragraph 8 until the end of the document in order to present a revised MTP to the Eighth Session of the Intergovernmental Meeting (IG8) for approval.

VII. Consideration of the Report on the Feasibility Study on an Appropriate Instrument to Provide a Sound Basis for Financial Contribution on EANET Activities (EANET/IG 7/5) (Agenda Item 6)

14. The Chairperson explained the process of, and major comments and their reflections in the “Report on the Feasibility Study on a Appropriate Instrument to Provide Sound Basis for a Financial Contribution on EANET Activities (FSR)” and then invited discussion.

15. During the discussion the following major points were raised:

- It was pointed out that the FSR should clearly state that it does not reflect all the opinions from participating countries, and that the FSR will be a reference for the process of discussion, but will not be a necessary basis for the process of discussion. It was agreed that the first point would be added to the Executive Summary of the FSR, and the second in the draft Decision.
- It was pointed out and agreed that “EANET Secretariat” on the cover page should be changed to the “WGFD”.
- It was pointed out that the four options mentioned in the FSR should not be the only options. In response, it was clarified that the point had been discussed and agreed at the Second Session of the Working Group on Future Development of EANET (WGFD2) to insert the following sentence to avoid any possible confusion:
“It should be noted that the possible options may not be limited to the aforesaid four options. There may be rooms for other options in the future where appropriate.”

16. The Session endorsed the document for submission to IG7, with the two modifications mentioned above.

VIII. Consideration of Decision 1/IG7 (Niigata Decision) (Preliminary Draft) (Agenda Item 7)

17. The Chairperson introduced the draft Decision 1/IG.7 (Preliminary Draft) (Niigata Decision). Participating countries raised a number of comments and suggested revisions to the text.

18. China submitted a written text for modifications to be considered by the Session. The Session discussed the draft Decision, based on the Chinese text, and came up with the text to be submitted to IG7, with the two brackets in paragraph 2 of the text, for consideration by IG7. The revised draft Decision is attached as Annex 2.

IX. Consideration on High level Segment of IG7 (Agenda Item 8)

19. It was clarified that the FSR, draft Decision, the Report for Policy Makers (RPM) and the MTP would be discussed at IG7 before presentation at the High Level Segment.

X. Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Session (Agenda Item 9)

20. The Session considered and adopted the Report of the Session.

XI. Closing of the Session (Agenda Item 10)

21. The Chairperson closed the Session.

Annex 1

List of Participants

Participating Countries

Cambodia

Mr. Long Rithirak
Deputy Director General
Ministry of Environment

Mr. Heng Nareth
Director
Department of Pollution Control
Ministry of Environment

China

Prof. Wang Ruibin
Director
Department of Air Quality Monitoring
China National Environmental Monitoring
Center (CNEMC)

Ms. Dong Yao
Program Officer
International Cooperation Department
State Environmental Protection Administration
(SEPA)

Indonesia

Ms. Sulistyowati
Head of Unit
Assistant Deputy for Climate Change Impact
Control
Ministry of Environment

Ms. Kusmulyani Sugiarto
Staff
Assistant Deputy for Climate Change Impact
Control
Ministry of Environment

Japan

Mr. Akinori Ogawa
Director
Global Environment Issues Division
Global Environment Bureau
Ministry of the Environment

Mr. Naoya Tsukamoto
Director
Research and Information Office
Global Environment Bureau
Ministry of the Environment

Ms. Keiko Segawa
Deputy Director
Global Environment Issues Division
Global Environment Bureau
Ministry of the Environment

Mr. Nobukazu Yoshimori
Section Chief
Global Environment Issues Division
Global Environment Bureau
Ministry of the Environment

Mr. Takaaki Kato
Official, Global Environment Division
Global Issues Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Lao PDR

Ms. Monemany Nhoibouakong
Acting Director General
Environment Research Institute
Science Technology and Environment Agency

Ms. Sisouphanh Luangrath
Director of Environment Quality Monitoring
Center
Environment Research Institute
Science Technology and Environment Agency

Malaysia

Ms. Leong Chow Peng
Deputy Director General (Application)
Malaysian Meteorological Service

Ms. Wong Fook Lian
Head, Environment Section
Department of Chemistry Malaysia

Mongolia

Ms. Erdenebaatar Enkhmend
Officer
Strategic Planning, Policy Coordination
Department
Ministry of Nature and Environment

Philippines

Ms. Corazon C. Davis
Regional Executive Director
Department of Environment & Natural
Resources (DENR)

Mr. Alan Benito de Gala
Regional Director
Environmental Management Bureau (EMB)
Department of Environment & Natural
Resources (DENR)

Republic of Korea

Prof. Cho Seog-Yeon
Professor
Department of Environmental Engineering
Inha University

Mr. Yang Jae-Moon
Deputy Director
Air Quality Policy Division
Ministry of Environment

Ms. Park Ju Young
Deputy Director
Environment and Science Division
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Russia

Mr. Valery Chelukanov
Head
Environmental Pollution Monitoring
Department
Federal Service for Hydrometeorology and
Environmental Monitoring

Ms. Veronika Ginzburg
Researcher
Background Monitoring Department
Institute of Global Climate and Ecology
Roshydromet and RAS

Thailand

Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana
Deputy Director General
Pollution Control Department

Mr. Seksan Sangdow
Acting Director of Ambient Air Quality
Division
Air Quality and Noise Management Bureau
Pollution Control Department (PCD)

Mr. Pichaid Atipakya
Environmental Officer
Air Quality and Noise Management Bureau
Pollution Control Department (PCD)

Vietnam

Dr. Duong Hong Son
Director, Center for Environmental Research
Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment

Ms. Be Thi Nguyen
Senior Expert
Plan of Finance Department
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment

International Organization

UNEP ROAP

Dr. Anh Moon-Soo
Senior Programme Officer United Nations
Environment Programme
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
United Nations Building
Thailand

Resource Persons

UNU-IAS

Mr. Katsunori Suzuki
Senior Fellow
United Nations University Institute of Advanced
Studies (UNU-IAS)
Japan

Consultant

Prof. Dilip Biswas
India

Secretariat of the Meeting

UNEP RRC.AP

Mr. Mylvakanam Iyngararasan
Senior Programme Officer, UNEP RRC.AP
Thailand

EANET Secretariat

UNEP RRC.AP
Thailand

Dr. Jiang Wei
Coordinator, EANET Secretariat

Mrs. Adelaida B. Roman
Programme Officer, EANET Secretariat

Ms. Sumana Ratanasawetwad
Administrative Assistant, EANET Secretariat

Network Center

Acid Deposition and Oxidant Research Center
(ADORC)
Japan

Dr. Sergey A. Gromov
Deputy Director General

Mr. Yoshiyuki Yoichi
Deputy Director General

Mr. Randal Helten

Mr. Jiro Sato
Head
Planning and Training Department

Mr. Yutaka Taneoka
Senior Researcher
Planning and Training Department

Dr. Tsuyoshi Ohizumi
Head
Atmospheric Research Department

Niigata Prefecture

Mr. Ken Yamashita
Assistant Counsellor
Environmental Management Division
Department of Civic and Environmental Affairs
Japan

Niigata City

Mr. Masashi Saito
Technical staff
Environmental and Pollution Control Division
Japan

Japan Environmental Technology Association
(JETA)

Mr. Ryozo Goto
Senior Engineer
Technical Committee
Japan

Nagoya University

Dr. Hisakazu Kato
Professor, Graduate School of Law
Japan

Utsunomiya University

Dr. Wakana Takahashi
Associate Professor
Faculty of International Studies
Japan

Kyoritsu Research Institute

Dr. Masazumi Ao
Kyoritsu Research Institute
Japan

Annex 2

(Draft)

DECISION 1/IG.7 (The Niigata Decision)

The Seventh Session of the Intergovernmental Meeting (IG7) on the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET), on 21-22 November 2005 in Niigata, Japan,

Recognizing that the East Asian region faces increasing risks of problems related to acid deposition,

Recognizing that the EANET has been established as an important initiative for regional cooperation, aiming to create common understanding on the state of acid deposition problems and to provide useful inputs to policy makers at various levels,

Recalling the agreements reached at the Second Session of the Intergovernmental Meeting through Decision 2 and paragraph 2 of the Joint Announcement on the Implementation of the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET),

Recognizing that EANET Decision 1/ IG5 clearly states to review the possibility of developing an international agreement to provide a sound basis for financial contribution, and the importance of long-term, secured financial arrangement for the EANET activities,

Taking into account the discussions at the sessions of the Intergovernmental Meeting as well as the Working Group on Future Development (WGFD) of EANET,

Considering that in some countries the negotiations on the new financial arrangement with national financial bodies require legal status and mandate,

1. *Confirms* that the principles that were agreed at the Second Session of the Intergovernmental Meeting should remain as the basic policy of the EANET activities;
2. *Decides* that the participating countries of EANET should begin a process to discuss an appropriate instrument [on acid deposition monitoring] [and its legal status] to provide a sound basis for financial contribution to EANET and will report the results of the discussion to the Tenth Session of the Intergovernmental Meeting for its consideration, and that the “Feasibility Study Report on an Appropriate Instrument to Provide a Sound Basis for Financial Contribution to EANET Activities” will be a reference for the process of discussion, but it will not be a necessary basis for the process of discussion;
3. *Decides* that the above-mentioned process should be carried out on the basis of the best available scientific information from EANET on acid deposition and its impacts;
4. *Decides* that the above-mentioned process should be initiated at the earliest and conducted through WGFD;

5. Suggests that the discussion process should consider the following:

- Elements to be included in the instrument;
- Legal status of the instrument; and,
- Proposed text of the instrument;

6. Requests the Secretariat to provide a working paper on the revised schedule of WGFD for discussion immediately after the IG7.