

Object: RE: For EANET NFPs: Invitation to the EANET Working Group Meeting in 2024 on 20-21 August 2024 (Virtual)

From: 黒田 一樹 (ITSUKI KURODA) <ITSUKI\_KURODA@env.go.jp>

To: UNEP-EANET-Secretariat [eanetsecretariat@un.org](mailto:eanetsecretariat@un.org)

Cc: 亀井 雄 (YU KAMEI) [YU\\_KAMEI@env.go.jp](mailto:YU_KAMEI@env.go.jp)

Date: 14 August 2024

Dear EANET secretariat,

Thank you very much for your hard work to prepare for the upcoming working group meeting. Having gone through the meeting documents, we would like to suggest the following.

1. As for WG2024/7/2, we propose to restructure the contents.

My understanding based on the guideline is that the approved projects that lasts multiple years require the status/progress report based on the workplan but do not require the consideration by PCs. Therefore, we suggest to put the new projects that truly require the consideration of the details come to the beginning of the document to make it clearer which projects PCs truly need to consider while which projects PCs need to monitor have a clearer distinction.

2. We request SEC and NC to present the forecast of this year's financial situation and next year's commitment so that PCs will know where we stand for through consideration, especially for prioritization.

Having said 1. above, multi-year projects may need certain considerations given the dire financial situation, although weight may be different from the consideration of new projects. In this case, we may need to consider the prioritization of the projects and knowing the financial status would facilitate the decision.

3. EANET projects' co-leads should be clearly stated. All the project leads are either SEC or NC in the documents but my understanding is there are several projects that has co-leads from PCs.
4. As for WG2024/5, the meeting report from the informal meeting at the end of May should be attached as a reference document or information document. This will remind PCs of what has been already said so that we do not need to repeat the same activity but rather focus on advancing the discussion and save time. Given that the limitation of time, although our preference is to incorporate what has been expressed in the May meeting into WG2024/5, we understand we do not have such a time. Our proposal is for SEC to incorporate the views expressed by PCs into the PPTs when you present agenda item 5.