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Why Greater International Cooperation is Desirable

Key problems to solve:
• Overall air pollution is increasing in East Asia
• Transboundary movement is becoming more important
• Need to address multiple issues simultaneously
  – Local air pollution
  – Transboundary aspects
  – Linkage with climate change
• Need to reduce costs of control measures (e.g. through cobenefits)
• Need to strengthen capacity building
• Need more research on air pollution problems
• Strengthen the links between science and policy
• Greater emphasis on reduction/mitigation measures

ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION:
1. Facilitate a common understanding resulting in policy actions
2. Actions should be coordinated to enhance effectiveness and efficiency
## Existing Selected Cooperation Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE</th>
<th>FRAMEWORKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global/hemispheric</td>
<td>UNFCCC, GAPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one subregion</td>
<td>EANET, Joint Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional</td>
<td>ASEAN Haze Agreement, Male Declaration, TEMM, LTP, NEASPEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROBLEMS WITH EXISTING FRAMEWORKS

- Duplication & overlap, extra cost
- Insufficient funding
- Limited effectiveness
- Insufficient scope: need more emphasis on mitigation
- Should strengthen linkage to policy & implementation
Past Efforts to Strengthen International Cooperation in Northeast and Southeast Asia

• Focused on strengthening each framework individually
  – Different countries had different priorities or reservations
  – Results limited: small changes, no significant expansion of scope, no focus on reduction measures
    • EANET: New Instrument
    • NEASPEC: New review study
    • LTP: Currently discussing new stage

• Possibility to merge some frameworks
  – Differences in geographic scope and focus
  – Administrative differences and complexity

➤ A common interest among countries to strengthen international cooperation is emerging
➤ But there are different views on what is the best way
Parameters/Scope of an International Cooperation Framework

Desirable Functions
- Monitoring
- Modelling
- Assessment
- Research
- Emissions Reduction/Mitigation
- Capacity Building

Scope of Pollutants - Options
- Multi-pollutant (more comprehensive)
- Climate/air
- SLCF
- Expandable

Multipollutants-Multieffect Approach is Desirable
- Comprehensive, integrated approach
- Based on scientific modeling to maximize cost effectiveness
Global/Hemispheric Level Options

**RATIONALE**
- Many pollutants are now global or hemispheric: GHG, Ozone, Aerosols
- Desirability of linking & coordinating regional frameworks
- Global scope addresses trade competitiveness concerns of mitigation measures more comprehensively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Global Convention on Atmosphere (Vancouver Declaration 2010, IUAPPA) | • Would be comprehensive  
  • Difficult to agree, long time to negotiate  
  • Linkage/ division of responsibility w/ climate  
  • Structure, focus? Modeled after LRTAP? Binding/Voluntary? Principles/Action? |
| Global standards to link to regional/subregional conventions | • Easier to agree  
  • Could be weaker than a global convention  
  • Would build on existing mechanisms and promote cooperation among them |
### Regional/ Subregional Level Options

**OPTIONS**

1. More coordination among existing frameworks (e.g. strengthen Joint Forum)

   - Good in theory, difficult in practice
   - Does not solve overlap & duplication
   - Information sharing could be main benefit

2. Stronger efforts to strengthen existing frameworks

   - Seems easiest, but limited past effectiveness
   - Does not solve overlap & duplication
   - Hard to increase efficiency & cost effectiveness

3. Merge existing frameworks

   - Better chance to reduce overlap & duplication
   - Challenges: differences in functions, geographic scope, administrative procedures

4. Create new framework (Asian LRTAP?)

   - More optimal scope (more ambitious)
   - How to relate to existing frameworks
   - Cost sharing? Secretariat?

---

**RATIONALE**

- Regional linkage of air pollution is clearer, especially to local aspects
- Easier to reach agreement due to fewer countries
Discussion of Geographic Scope

Regional / subregional focus more realistic in short/medium term.
Advantages & disadvantages of regional/subregional focus

Northeast Asia (subregional)
- Quicker focus on reduction measures is possible
- Which countries to include – 3, 4, 5?

N.E. Asia + Southeast Asia (2 subregions)
- May need to emphasize capacity building
- Trans-subregional aspects (haze, ABC, ozone)

Northeast + Southeast + South Asia (3 subregions)
- Trans-subregional aspects (haze, ABC, ozone)
- May need to emphasize capacity building
- More differences in priority pollutants, emissions sources

Asian participation in global air pollution frameworks should be strengthened (e.g. GAPF, HTAP, etc.)
Strengthening the Science Policy Interface for Air Pollution Issues in Asia

- More scientific capacity building
- More research & cooperative research
- Stronger regional epistemic community
- Common understanding of air pollution problems
- Institutional framework to provide scientific advice to policymakers

Key issue in East Asia

Which of these aspects to focus on?
## Existing Selected Cooperation Frameworks and Science-Policy Interface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE</th>
<th>FRAMEWORKS</th>
<th>SCIENCE-POLICY INTERFACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global/hemispheric</td>
<td>UNFCCC, GAPF</td>
<td>HTAP, IGAC, IPCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one subregion</td>
<td>EANET, Joint Forum</td>
<td>EANET/SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional</td>
<td>ASEAN Haze Agreement, Male Declaration, TEMM, LTP, NEASPEC</td>
<td>ASEAN Haze: Panel of Experts Male Decl.: Stakeholder Forums TEMM, LTP, NEASPEC: governments sponsor projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Problems with Existing Science-Policy Interface

- (Different interfaces have different problems)
- Sometimes difficult for scientists (especially from differing countries) to reach a common understanding
- Governments sometimes restrict the scope of scientific activity and advice, not up to date with latest scientific knowledge
- Advice is not always relevant to governments or communicated effectively
- Interface is sometimes not adequately institutionalized
- Governments often do not take scientific advice (due to different priorities, or inadequate understanding)
Considerations for strengthening the institutional framework for science input into policy

- Create new body or link to existing cooperation framework?
- Organizational format (international science panel?)
  - How to choose members?
  - Governance
  - Secretariat
  - Management procedures
- Funding source?
- Geographical focus: Subregional? Multiple subregions? Global?
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