

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

## **REPORT OF THE SESSION**

### **I. Introduction**

1. The Session of the Working Group on Future Development of EANET (WGFD) 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. Closing of the Session (Agenda Item 9)**

20. The Chairperson closed the Session

## **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

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  
Gwacheon Government Complex

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 Organizations

---

UNEP ROAP

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

Resource Persons

---

UNU-IAS

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

Consultant

Prof. Dilip Biswas

Secretariat of the Meeting

---

UNEP RRC.AP

Mr. Mylvakanam Iyngararasan  
Senior Programme Officer, UNEP RRC.AP  
c/o Asian Institute of Technology

EANET Secretariat

UNEP RRC.AP  
c/o Asian Institute of Technology

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)

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

Niigata City

Mr. Masashi Saito  
Technical staff  
Environmental and Pollution Control Division

Japan Environmental Technology Association  
(JETA)

Mr. Ryozo Goto  
Senior Engineer  
Technical Committee

Nagoya University

Dr. Hisakazu Kato  
Professor, Graduate School of Law

Utsunomiya University

Dr. Wakana Takahashi  
Associate Professor  
Faculty of International Studies

Kyoritsu Research Institute

Dr. Masazumi Ao  
Kyoritsu Research Institute

**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.