



**Asian Co-benefits Partnership (ACP)
10th Advisory Group Meeting
Meeting Summary**

**8 November 2019, 09:30-12:00
TKP Shimbashi Conference Center
Tokyo, Japan**



Meeting summary

On 8 November 2019, the Tenth Advisory Group meeting of the Asian Co-benefits Partnership (ACP) was held at TKP Shimbashi Conference Center, Japan. About twenty members from government agencies, international organisations and research institutions joined the ACP meeting and discussed the following: 1) future Work Plan regarding organisation and functions and 2) feedback on the draft of the White Paper 2020.

The ACP Advisory Group then agreed to:

- 1) reflect comments for the future Work Plan and plan to relaunch at the 2020 Clean Air Week in Niigata, Japan and
- 2) revise ACP White Paper 2020 draft based on the discussion and publish due by March 2020.

Meeting Minutes:

09:30 - 09:40 (10 minutes)

Welcome and Objectives

1. Opening remarks: Co-chair, Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana, Thammasat University

The ACP co-chair, Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana, welcomed participants as well as new co-chair, Mr. Takashi Ohmura, IGES Senior Fellow. Dr. Supat noted that discussion at the ACP 10th Anniversary Meeting and ACP-IIASA Workshop held the day before would provide background for this meeting. He further clarified that the revision of the ACP Work Plan and relaunch of the ACP at the Clean Air Week in Niigata, 2020 are among the key points to be discussed during the meeting.

2. Objective of the meeting: ACP Secretariat, IGES

Dr. Eric Zusman of the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) and the ACP Secretariat, explained the main objectives of the meeting as follows: 1) to discuss future ACP Work Plan in terms of possible reorganisation and functions and 2) to collect feedback on the 4th White Paper.

3. Self-introduction by participants

Dr. Supat began the meeting by suggesting that participants offer a brief self-introduction. Participants introduced themselves and new participants at the meeting, Mr. Etsujiro Takai and Dr. Janardhanan Nandakumar of IGES and observers from the Ministry of Environment and Tourism Mongolia, Mr. Batjargal Khandjav and Ms. Anand Tsog. The Secretariat reported Ms. Emi Yoshinaga, United Nations University Institute for the Advance Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS) (the successor of Ms. Nishikawa), Mr. Virender Kumar Duggai of Asian Development Bank (ADB) and Dr. Kevin Hicks of the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) were unable to participate in the meeting. The Secretariat would collect their feedback on issues covered afterwards.

09:40 - 11:00 (80 minutes)

Discussion 1: Feedback on Work Plan (ACP Organisation and Functions)

Facilitator: Co-chair, Mr. Takashi Ohmura

Mr. Ohmura explained that there are plans to relaunch the ACP next year in Niigata with a new Work Plan.

Dr. Zusman, ACP Secretariat, presented the possible new organisation and functions of the new Work Plan based on the discussion the Secretariat conducted with co-chairs in advance and suggestions from the 10th ACP Anniversary Meeting and ACP-IIASA Workshop. The presentation focused on the following:

- I. Refining vision and scope of the ACP: including a clearer definition of co-benefits; implementation of the integrated solutions in Asia; and utilisation of the 25 Solutions Report to frame solutions.
- II. Defining the target audience: the key target would be policymakers, international organisations and private sector as well as extended to media and civil society.
- III. Reorganising the ACP under three pillars:
 - 1) strengthening policy through a policy library or quantification co-benefits cases from Thailand, Indonesia and Mongolia;
 - 2) building capacity at the city level IBAQ under CAA and regional level APCAP under UNEP. Current dissemination newsletters, good practice map and White Paper could remain; and
 - 3) financing technologies through climate finance at the project level i.e. Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and Joint Crediting Mechanism (JCM) or larger scale from Green Climate Fund (GCF) or through Official Development Assistance (ODA) channel such as Short-lived Climate Pollutants (SLCPs) with Japan-India Stakeholders' Matchmaking Platform (JITMAP) and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). This financing would contribute to an effort to enhance ACP functions.
- IV. Other possible changes
 - 1) reducing annual Advisory Group Meeting to every two years and take advantage of virtual meetings and existing meetings of Better Air Quality (BAQ), Asia Pacific Clean Air Partnership (APCAP), Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC) to have focused discussions with partners;
 - 2) using funds saved for meeting to support innovative demonstration projects or to develop funding proposals (i.e. diesel inspection and monitoring programmes, open burning, energy transition. etc.); and
 - 3) publish policy briefs or shorter to target more outputs rather than White Paper.

Dr. Arnico Kumar Panday of the International Centre of Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) pointed to the need to clarify the objectives and priorities of the Asian Co-benefits Partnership as the title itself is too broad. In this connection, he pointed to the need for tagline that more narrowly defined what the ACP hoped to achieve. He also suggested that capacity building and awareness raising of co-benefits objectives should not be limited to policymakers but reach broader audience, including younger people.

Dr. Zusman agreed that there needs to be greater thought into how the three sets of activities—strengthening policy, building capacity, financing technologies—relate to each other under the reorganisation of ACP. He also underlined the need to specify what would be desired final outcome of the ACP: for example, after 5 years co-benefits reflected in wider number of policies and funding for projects. If needed, on-the-ground implementation could become a new category of activities (along with awareness raising and information sharing) rather than capacity building.

Mr. Bjarne Pedersen of the Clean Air Asia (CAA) commented that three objectives could be a basis of the theory of change for the next ACP Work Plan. He also wondered whether there were some sets of activities that were missing from this theory of change such as governance, regulation or monitoring and evaluation.

It should be easier to understand with a full explanation on why these three elements were selected and how they can be built into a theory of change. Regarding relaunching partnership, it should include 10-year vision of 2020-2030 with a frame of how to achieve specific objectives. Ms. Adelaida Roman of the Regional Resource Center for Asia and Pacific, Asian Institute of Technology (RRC.AP/AIT) also suggested that the plan include a detailed strategy; deliverable outcomes and their potential schedule.

Co-chair Takashi reminded participants that the discussion should focus based on the situation that ACP is an expert network with partners. He suggested members to provide feedback on the vision and scope of the first presentation slide with his comments that there should be a clearer definition of co-benefits and an emphasis on the implementation of 25 solutions.

Dr. Panday raised questions about how to encourage piloting solutions when ACP is not the main implementer. Dr. Janardhanan Nandakumar of IGES answered by recalling a presentation from the ACP-IIASA Workshop (held on 7th PM): the case in question came from Mongolia and demonstrated project conveyed to policymakers with simplified results that clearly illustrated the co-benefits. He emphasised the importance of illustrating all of the co-benefits – in India, education is a co-benefit – and communicating to policymakers and other key stakeholders in easy to understand terms. To do so, it would be better to spend energy and funds saved for Advisory Meeting to work on a clear illustration of co-benefits.

Mr. Pederson expressed that in terms of refining vision and scope, the suggested idea from the Secretariat seem to work well such as the ACP vision focus on air pollution, climate and health as well as utilisation of the Solutions Report. Dr. Supat agreed but considered the duplication of UNEP's implementing activities of the Solutions Report. Ms. Kaye Patdu of the UN Environment responded that there is large scope of work needed to implement the 25 clean air measures in the region and UNEP welcomes "Solutions Partners" which can support countries and cities to implement these measures. One area that UNEP is working on to track progress of implementation of the 25 clean air measures in the Asia Pacific region is the "Clean Air Solutions Tracker." There is scope to link or cooperate with ACP's activities on policy library and quantification tools if they can contribute with monitoring (especially with quantification) for the Solutions Tracker. She emphasised the importance of the ACP's wider audience in comparison to those limited to national entities of the UN Environment and suggested ACP to continue discussion and outreach with organizations outside of national governments to support further implementation of the Solution Report.

Dr. Li Liping of the Policy Research Center for Environmental and Economy (PRCEE), China pointed to a need to focus on specific objectives and divide short- and long-term goals to achieve highest outputs and the greater with lowest cost. To achieve it, ACP should clarify and confirm its role and identify the type of its relationship with other organisations. Dr. Yeora Chae of Korea Environment Institute (KEI) added that ACP should aim to communicate better with the policymakers, the ACP's main target audience, by promoting ways to better visualise co-benefits data. When economic valuation is too controversial to compare among Asian countries, ACP's co-benefits (including social and environmental benefits) could be quite helpful.

Co-chair Takashi moved to the next slide on the target audience for the discussion. The main audience ACP provided research to are policymakers, international organisations and private sector as well as media and civil society. He clarified that ACP provide science-based knowledge rather than implementation. Ms. Roman pointed out the slide on reorganisation should cover promoting clean technology. Dr. Supat turned back to the slide on refining the vision and scope to mention the *Solutions Report* to frame the discussions. He suggested that the scope should be down sized and define the measures ACP could focus on and priorities. Coordinate with UN Environment would be helpful in this regard.

Dr. Zusman agreed to limit the scope to a few solutions; for example, ACP select two measures from each category and narrow the scope as well as contribute to the Solution Tracker of the UN Environment so as

to limit duplication. He also agreed that promote quantification tools for short-term goal would be feasible and visualisation for better communication is important. Such an approach could be applied for the demonstration project future ACP and made more persuasive to policymakers.

Mr. Katsumasa Seimaru of the Ministry of the Environment, Japan (MOEJ) basically agreed and supported the ideas suggested by the Secretariat. He expressed his appreciation for the achievement of ACP; to have the common direction and expected to operate ACP activities seek for more synergies with related organisations i.e. UN Environment. Ms. Kaoru Akahoshi of IGES suggested that it will be important in the work plan to clarify the roles and objectives of Advisory Group and the Secretariat for those new activities.

Ms. Anand Tsog of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism Mongolia shared her comments as the observer this year. Anand could see that ACP is the science-based research initiative rather than one that actually implements solutions; it could keep serving the role as the co-benefits library or platform and evaluate climate activities in Asia. Thanks to the IPCC's Special 1.5 Degree Report, a growing audience exists to understand science-based results and act based upon those results. As such, ACP's science-based research could focus on communicating results to the public. Moreover, ACP could offer matchmaking activities through the coordination of partners and similar outreach programmes. Tracking and monitoring should be the main activity of the ACP.

Dr. Supat requested the Secretariat explain the function of future Work Plan based on the virtual meeting co-chairs and the Secretariat had prior to the Advisory Group meeting. The Secretariat collected the activities of all Advisory Group members each year and shared those activities during the Advisory Group meeting; however, when relaunching ACP the goals and functions should be revised. Dr. Zusman agreed that there would be no emphasis from collecting activities from each members as it has shown no additional value. The new work plan should have three to four functions and at least one demonstration project that ACP conducted with members advise. The draft Work Plan reflecting comments received from this meeting with potential timeline would be shared with members shortly.

11:10 - 11:50 (40 minutes)

Discussion 2: Feedback on White Paper

Facilitator: Co-chair, Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana

Co-chair Supat recalled the ACP-IIASA Workshop (7th PM) that framed around three main themes – building capacities for co-benefits solutions, strengthening policies that deliver co-benefits, and financing co-benefits solutions—and these would become the basis of the ACP White Paper 2020.

Dr. Zusman shared contents of the introductory chapter that the Secretariat circulated to the Advisory Group members in advance. The introduction of the White Paper contains the following sequence: 1) general background on ACP and co-benefits; 2) review of co-benefits studies post-2014 (showing more diversification in the types of benefits analysed); 3) ACP supports unifying climate, air pollution and development views on co-benefits is important; and 4) the Solutions Report helps to unify those views and point to the need for implementation. The Secretariat also would synthesize inputs from presentations and panel discussion during ACP-IIASA Workshop as well as comments provided from this meeting. Dr. Nandakumar raised a question of the limited regional coverage and Eric answered the strengthening policy chapter would have cases from each sub-region and each solution while capacity building chapter would be project-based and financing technology on a regional basis.

Co-chair Supat kindly asked the permission from members to use the contents of presentations and discussion for the chapter composition as well as further contribution in drafting. There was no objection

to the Dr. Supat's suggestion. Ms. Roman expressed her willingness to further contribute to the introductory chapter on health issue.

Ms. Patdu expressed her concern about the tone of the White Paper: she noted that it is essential that there are strong and timely messages. These messages can be framed in terms of the 10 years remaining to achieve SDGs. How the White Paper can be used to maximise co-benefits needs to be featured in the White Paper. One way could be to develop key messages to feed into the 2020 Clean Air Week for the discussion and the main output. Dr. Panday wondered about the readership of the previous White Paper such as the number of hardcopy distribution and online downloading. Dr. Zusman agreed timely and strong key messages are critical, and he noted that the distribution of previous White Paper was targeted both at the national and local level audience with 300 hard copy per White Paper.

Mr. Pederson offered feedback on the introductory chapter. He pointed out that the chapter seemed to use the Solutions Report as the justification rather than an optic through which to view the broader issue of co-benefits. He also noted that the sections are rather disconnected. His suggestion was to use the Solutions Report as the optic as the view of White Paper 2020 and the way how co-benefits could contribute to implementation of the Solutions. Narrowing down the number of measures to focus on three other chapters would be useful and strong focus on implementation would be the right direction. Additionally, he recommended to use contemporary climate language i.e. climate crisis, climate emergency, to draw attention to the urgency of the climate issue.

Dr. Nandakumar reminded readers of the expanding scope of co-benefits (i.e. education co-benefits) linking to SDGs and Ms. Roman of including the promotion of clean technology. Eric replied by sharing the continued discussion on the scope of ACP's co-benefits from the previous year meetings—broader conceptual framework, harder to narrow down implementation. To avoid it, this White Paper would stick with the co-benefits between climate change and air pollution. In terms of green technology, the box with case study could be under the financing technology chapter.

Dr. Supat underlined that vision and scope of the ACP should be the co-benefits between climate change mitigation and air quality; these co-benefits deliver other benefits including better health, economic development, achievement of development goals and so forth. The ACP will not exclude or neglect other benefits but will focus mainly on climate change and air pollution.

11:50 - 12:00 (10 minutes)

Wrap Up

Co-chair Supat summed up that Secretariat should reflect comments for the Work Plan and the framing chapter for the White Paper shortly. Also, he encouraged members to provide further comments and feedback for the revised draft. Dr. Zusman proposed to share the first revised draft for the White Paper in early December. The new Work Plan would be drafted and circulated for comments in January 2020 and ready for the relaunch in October at Niigata meeting during the Clean Air Week. The new co-chair Ohmura expressed appreciation to the support from the Advisory Group members and welcomed additional comments as needed.

Meeting Agenda

The 10th Asian Co-benefits Partnership Advisory Group Meeting

8 November 2019 09:30 – 12:00

Conference Room 12H , TKP Shimbashi Conference Center, Tokyo, Japan

AGENDA
<p>09:30 – 09:40</p> <p>■ Welcome and Objectives</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Opening remarks: <i>Co-chair, Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana</i>2) Objective of the meeting: <i>ACP Secretariat, IGES</i>
<p>09:40 – 11:00 (80 minutes)</p> <p>■ <u>Discussion 1: Feedback on Work Plan (ACP Organisation and Functions)</u> <i>Facilitator: Co-chair, Mr. Takashi Ohmura</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assessing and analysing policies that can deliver co-benefits• Facilitating and enabling the transfer of co-benefits technologies/solution• Building capacities for co-benefits technologies/solutions
<p>11:00 – 11:40 (40 minutes)</p> <p>■ <u>Discussion 2: Feedback on White Paper</u> <i>Facilitator: Co-chair, Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Framing Chapter• Chapter 2 to 4• Key Messages and Dissemination
<p>11:40 – 11:50</p> <p>■ Steps for Finalising Work Plan and Relaunching ACP <i>Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana, ACP Secretariat</i></p>
<p>11:50 – 12:00</p> <p>■ Wrap Up <i>Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana, ACP Secretariat</i></p>

Meeting Participants

	Organization	Name	Title, Division
1	Ministry of the Environment, JAPAN	Katsumasa Seimaru	Director, International Cooperation Office, Environmental Management Bureau
2	Ministry of the Environment, JAPAN	Minako Kawai	Section Chief, International Cooperation Office, Environmental Management Bureau
3	Ministry of the Environment, JAPAN	Toru Toyama	International Cooperation Office, Environmental Management Bureau
4	Policy Research Center for Environment and Economy (PRCEE), Ministry of Ecology and Environment, CHINA	Li Liping	Division Director
5	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, THAILAND	Ittipol Pawarmart	Head of Automotive Emission Laboratory, Air Quality and Noise Management Bureau
6	Ministry of Environment and Forestry, INDONESIA	Noor Rachmaniah	Deputy Director for Domestic Water
7	[Co-chair] Thammasat University	Supat Wangwongwatana	Senior Expert, Faculty of Public Health
8	[Co-chair] OECC/IGES	Takashi Ohmura	Senior Fellow
9	International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)	Arnico Kumar Panday	Regional Programme Manager Atmosphere
10	Regional Resource Center for Asia and Pacific (RRC.AP)/AIT	Adelaida B. Roman	Senior Programme Specialist
11	Clean Air Asia (CAA)	Bjarne Pedersen	Executive Director
12	UN Environment	Kaye Patdu	APCAP Coordinator
13	Climate change and Atmosphere research, Korea Environment Institute	Yeora Chae	Chief Research Associate
Observer			
14	Ministry of Environment and Tourism, MONGOLIA	Batjargal Khandjav	Director General, Climate change and international cooperation
15	Ministry of Environment and Tourism, MONGOLIA	Anand Tsog	Climate Change Officer, Climate change and international cooperation
ACP Secretariat			
	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	Eric Zusman	Research Leader
		So-Young Lee	Senior Policy Researcher
		Kaoru Akahoshi	Policy Researcher
		Etsujiro Takai	Policy Researcher
		Janardhanan Nandakumar	Research Manager



Asian Co-benefits Partnership (ACP) 10th Advisory Group Meeting - Meeting Summary

Acknowledgements

This proceeding is the summary of main discussions of the Asian Co-benefits Partnership (ACP) 10th Advisory Group Meeting held on 8 November 2019 at TKP Shimbashi Conference Center, Japan. The Secretariat appreciates all the active supports and participation of the Advisory Group members, as well as financial support from the Ministry of the Environment, Japan.

The Secretariat for the Asian Co-benefits Partnership (ACP), November 2019

For more information about ACP, please visit: <http://www.cobenefit.org/>