



**Asian Co-benefits Partnership (ACP)
8th Advisory Group Meeting
Meeting Summary**

**26 July 2017, 14:00- 17:15
International Organizations Center
Pacifico Yokohama, Japan**



Meeting summary

On 26 July 2017, the Eighth Advisory Group meeting of the Asian Co-benefits Partnership (ACP) was held at Pacifico Yokohama, Japan. About twenty five members from government agencies, international organizations and research institutions joined the ACP meeting and discussed the following: ACP Work Plan 2017-2018 and the Third ACP White Paper publication.

The ACP Advisory Group then agreed to:

- 1) the Work Plan 2017-2018 will be reformatted following small group meetings with the Secretariat and continued advice from the partners, and
- 2) initiate a process of drafting the Third ACP White Paper soon and publish it by March 2018.

Meeting Minutes:

14:00 - 14:10 (10 minutes)

Opening and introduction

1. Self-introduction by participants

Prof. Katsunori Suzuki suggested opening the meeting with self-introduction. Participants introduced themselves briefly including new participants at the meetings, Mr. Armen Rostomyan of the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) and Ms. Junko Nishikawa of the United Nations University Institute for the Advance Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS) (the successor of the Dr. Christopher Doll). Mr. Nathan Borgford-Parnell of the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC), Dr. Kevin Hicks of the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), and Ms. Natalie Harms of the United Nations Environmental Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UN ESCAP) joined via conference call.

2. Opening remarks: Co-chair, Prof. Katsunori Suzuki, Kanazawa University

Prof. Suzuki welcomed participants and briefly introduced the background on the ACP's establishment and progress. Prof. Suzuki noted that the advisory group has been brought together to discuss plans for the ACP, including the contents and format of the future Work Plan as well as the Third White Paper preparation.

3. Objective of the meeting: ACP Secretariat, IGES

Dr. Eric Zusman also provided a brief history of the ACP and the important position of the

ACP given the growing emphasis on integrated approaches to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). He further highlighted that it will be important for strengthening the linkage between climate change activities and air-pollution issues. He, then, explained the two main objectives of the meeting as follows: 1) to review the achievements of the current ACP Work Plan and discuss prospects of future activities and 2) to discuss the outline and the schedule of the Third ACP White Paper.

14:10 - 15:30 (80 minutes)

Discussion 1: Finalizing and Starting New Work Plan

Facilitator: Co-chair, Prof. Katsunori Suzuki

1. Overview of recent activities on co-benefits

The facilitator, Prof. Suzuki, started the session with a recommendation for participants to visit the ACP website where all the archives, including ACP White Paper I and II, Newsletters, etc. for the overview of recent activities on co-benefits. He reminded participants that the objective of the discussion is to revisit the Work Plan contents and format as the issue was raised on 7th Advisory Meeting last year as well as reviewing each institution's progress on relevant activities.

Referring the compiled summary documents, the participants submitted the secretariat prior to the meeting, the brief report of each institution' activities started from the **Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI)**. Dr. Hicks noted that the Long Range Energy Alternatives Planning system-Integrated Benefits Calculator (LEAP-IBC) of the SEI has been used in its trainings in Bangladesh and Nepal and there are plans to implement and apply the LEAP-IBC in the Maldives and the Philippines. In collaboration with IGES, UN Environment (UNE), and CCAC/APCAP, SEI helps coordinate the development of the Asian Air Pollution Solutions Report as well as contributes to the Science Advisory Panel (SAP) of the CCAC. SEI is exploring opportunities for the integration of Short Lived Climate Pollutants (SLCPs) in Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), air quality and energy planning.

Ms. Minako Kawai of the **Ministry of the Environment Japan (MOEJ)** reported on the MOEJ's bilateral cooperation with China and Indonesia. With China, the cooperation has centered on strengthening ultra-low emissions regulations for coal-fired power stations and policy measures aimed at reducing emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) as well as the cooperation in co-benefits research and model work has been conducted. With the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MOEF) of Indonesia, cooperation focused on the agro-fishery sector i.e. activities in the palm oil industry for controlling pollution and introducing technologies as well as the fish processing industry for eliminating high-concentrations of pollution in wastewater and installing wastewater treatment facilities.

Dr. Li Liping of the **Policy Research Center for Environmental and Economy (PRCEE), China** elaborated further on the 3rd phase of China-Japan co-benefits cooperation project which aims to develop the research on the co-benefits of traditional pollutants and GHG emissions, especially VOCs and tropospheric ozone (O₃). This project consisted of pilot studies in cities; launching meeting with experts from both Japan and China; and the visit to Japan follows

this September. The publication entitled “Assessment of the Co-benefits of Air Pollution Control on GHG Emissions Reduction” delivered both in Chinese and English.

Mr. Alan Silayan shared the **Clean Air Asia (CAA)** activities, including the Better Air Quality (BAQ) conference and World Clean Air Conference as well as the launch of IBAQ program site, online Clean Air Scorecard Tool, CAA China Knowledge Hub, and Cities Clean Air Certification. CAA had conducted ADB’s project on transport and GHG database and now on mainstreaming urban air quality management through South-South twinning as well as ASEAN Fuel Economy projects. The activities in Vietnam for the national green freight programs development in collaboration with CCAC in Diesel Initiative were also carried out.

Ms. Kaye Patdu outlined the **UN Environment (UNE)/APCAP** activities, highlighting the development of the Asian Air pollution Solutions Report in collaboration with IGES, SEI, APCAP, and CCAC due for the completion in March 2018. For the climate co-benefits in the transport sector, UNE supported Maldives in developing a Global Environmental Facilities (GEF) proposal highlighting air-pollution. For the future work plan, UNE plans to make stronger interlinkages between climate change programs and other elements of the environment as well as to notice increasing private sector support for co-benefits i.e. tropical landscape financial facility launched in Indonesia and will be in Sri Lanka.

Ms. Junko Nishikawa highlighted, as one of the important co-benefits related the **United Nations Environmental Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNU-IAS)** activities, the Water and Urban Initiatives funded by MOEJ focus on climate change, urbanization, and low-carbon technologies, including water quality and health related disaster. UNU conducted a low-carbon technology assessment in wastewater infrastructure and developed a GHG emission estimation tool. UNU is expecting to contribute with its simulation models, tools and publications to the ACP website.

Mr. Ittipol Pawarmart of the **Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Thailand** noted that there has been policy to implement Euro 5 develop cost-benefit analysis for health impacts and draft electric vehicle standards by the Ministry of Industry. The project is hosted by Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) in collaboration with Asia center for Air Pollution Research (ACAP) conducted the PM2.5 and a Health Impacts Study and developed monitoring system in Bangkok. With ASEAN countries, a fuel economy standards project is moving forward supported by GIZ and a Low Emission Zone is being considered for Bangkok.

Mr. Armen Rostomyan of the **Regional Resource Center for Asia and Pacific, Asian Institute of Technology (RRC.AP/AIT)** reported that it has been managing the Asia Pacific Adaptation Network (APAN) web portal, Environmental Knowledge Hub, kNOWWaste portal of the Global partnership on Waste Management and Male Declaration website for the information sharing and communicate through APAN Adaptation E-Communiqué and Male Declaration Newsletters. RRC.AP/AIT has carried out a capacity building project, forum, workshop, technology assessment project in relation to APAN. They are also collaborating with CCAC on municipal solid waste initiatives and with ASEAN countries on waste management.

Ms. Noor Rachmaniaha of the **Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Indonesia** recalled MOEJ's introduction of its activities in Indonesia. The implementation of co-benefit projects through technical cooperation with Japan i.e. the Swim Bed has been a success, especially in fisheries co-benefits project. The demonstration in waste water pollution control to reduce pollution from fisheries as well as GHGs applied the Swim Bed method. Beside this, additional anaerobic baffled reactor (ABR) technology increases the levels of co-benefits by capturing methane to replace fossil fuel for the boiler in fishery industry.

Dr. Arnico Panday reported on the **International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)** activities. The first was about the brick kilns reducing co-combustion of the GHGs and achieving health impacts. ICIMOD has helped convert the 100 brick kilns in Katmandu as well as Nepal, Bangladeshi, and Pakistan with interests of 100,000 brick kilns development. ICIMOD engaged in producing policy action plan agreement in collaboration with local university and also in cross cooperation for the clean cook stove. ICIMOD headquarter installed solar power on the roof turf generating solar electricity and trading with government. Awareness raising workshops on indoor air-pollution, clean bricks, garbage, and agricultural open burning to reduce the haze related air pollution carried out. The science meeting with policymakers encouraged air pollution impact conveyed in policy.

Mr. Nathan Borgford-Parnell introduced the **Climate and Clean Air Coalition to Reduce Short-Lived Climate Pollutants (CCAC-SLCP)** via conference call. CCAC carried out an analysis on co-benefits in existing nationally determined contributions (NDCs) by identifying NDCs with measures that reduced SLCPs as well as those abating indoor air pollution and delivering health co-benefits. With the CCAC's scientific advisory panel (SAP), it develops climate metrics to help quantify climate and other co-benefits impacts of different measures for next 20 years and is currently seek a way to implement measures that lead to SLCP reductions in countries in Asia – ACP partners are encouraged to reach out if they would like to work on these issues. The CCAC is also developing a pathway task force that is trying to integrate health in development tools and with other tools. The CCAC is becoming increasingly interested in exploring the distribution of co-benefits, for instance, quantifying gender impacts, food security, poverty reduction etc. and ongoing process led by SAP and IIASA.

Ms. Natalie Harms of the **United Nations Environmental Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UN ESCAP)** shared their activities also via conference call. In the UN ESCAP, sustainable development sits under environment and development division and the idea of co-benefits is integrated many streams of work and reflected across different sectors i.e. energy, transport, social development, statistics etc. plus climate change projects. As a regional commission, it works for the broad intergovernmental issues i.e. supporting member countries to achieve their SDGs. With ACP, the UN ESCAP could collaborate especially in water sector regarding low emission development and access water sanitation. It is developing the SDGs Knowledge Platform Help Desk features methods and tools to pull together.

Dr. Eric Zusman at the **Institute for the Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)** explained briefly that the focus of the IGES has been air pollution in past 10 years often working

through the ACP. Beyond the secretariat role, IGES has supported the development of a co-benefits good practice map that includes 20 cases from 9 countries in 4 sectors (www.cobenefit.org). IGES encourages partners to contribute to the map with 2-3 pages cases. Moreover, IGES collaborated with ADB on gender-responsive climate change mitigation, delivered gender co-benefits impact and gain access to climate finance. As much of the work towards not only climate and air-pollution co-benefits but also more integrated framework of SDGs, IGES hopes to see different groups in ACP contribute to implementing co-benefits activities using frameworks such as the SDGs to organize their work.

2. Discussion on future Work Plans

Following the overview of recent activities on co-benefits from each institution, Prof. Katsunori Suzuki suggested that ACP would be well-advised to focus on collaborative activities rather than merely sharing a list of existing activities and projects. And he reminded participants of comments from the previous meeting that the format and contents of the Work Plan should be revised.

Dr. Kevin Hicks started sharing his opinion that information sharing from each institution is still important; however, it would be better to have one focus area that partners could emphasize every year. To do so, Dr. Arnico Panday suggested to establish long term objectives of the ACP and to clarify to where we try to move forward with the Work Plan i.e. the best way to interact among partners. The current Work Plan tended to contain many details but misses the bigger picture.

Prof. Katsunori Suzuki responded that the initial objective of the ACP is to mainstream co-benefits into the policies and background information on this point can be found on the ACP website. He went further to suggest that the ACP should aim to disseminate more information and familiarize stakeholders with the concept of co-benefits while noting the potential to achieve co-benefits in different sectors and countries in Asia. Dr. Arnico Panday suggested the dissemination itself is insufficient; rather it is better to promote two-way dialogue with policymakers, for instance, using statistics on the downloading frequency.

Ms. Kaye Patdu agreed that there have already been a rich set of materials developed and the importance of the linkage the activities to the impact we want to achieve. In terms of the raising the profile of co-benefits for policymakers, since government representatives and ESCAP gathered here this meeting has the potential to increase the visibility of the issue. There are other opportunities such as ministerial submit in September in Bangkok; it may further be feasible to together develop ACP solutions and share at the UNE Assembly (UNEA) to attract attention for the ACP at the global level.

Ms. Nishikawa pointed out that to raise the awareness of policymakers, the first step is making sure that they understand the concept of co-benefits. Following that step, it will be important incorporate that concept into national policies through discussions and dialogues with policymakers. This will not be achieved by merely sharing publications and tools. In a similar connection, she suggested that the ACP needs to build a roadmap that will help clarify objectives and achieve goals. She also agreed many of the initiatives of ACP can focus on developing countries as more development priorities exist in developing countries;

however, the recognition on the benefits from different initiatives has been growing due in part to initiatives such as the SDGs. It is therefore timely that the ACP makes the links between co-benefits.

Dr. Kevin Hicks reminded participants of the importance of financial resources to maintain the connectivity and recommended focusing on joint activity to link together more closely on joint projects. Although the ACP has developed outputs, there has not been adequate budget for joint project work. Prof. Katsunori Suzuki agreed and said attempts have been made with no success yet.

Mr. Armen Rostomyan supported the idea of strengthening the linkage between co-benefits and the SDGs; he also proposed a joint project. Prior to proposing the joint project, it would be better to organize stocktaking process from our stakeholders in Asia to determine what forms of particular assistance they need in achieving SDGs then we could work together for the tailor-made solutions.

Dr. Eric Zusman summarized the follow up work for the Secretariat. First, he highlighted the funding situation as a challenge the Secretariat faced – no extra budget to implement the work plan beyond secretarial services. Second, the current work plan consists with activities related to information sharing, communication, policies and projects, and regional cooperation for co-benefits. Based on the discussion today, the Secretariat will reframe activities pointing more directly influencing and demonstrating on policy. Lastly, the ACP may want to adjust the thematic framing of its work to more broadly define and operationalize co-benefits--i.e. linkages to SDGs and also co-benefits between climate and other development goals.

15:45 - 17:00 (75 minutes)

Discussion 2: The Third White Paper

Facilitator: Co-chair, Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana

1. Overview of recent activities on co-benefits

The second session of the ACP meeting focused on the Third White paper (WP3). The facilitator Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana divided the session into the 1) discussion on the draft outline and contents based on the last meeting; and the 2) preparation of schedules. He proposed that the Secretariat kindly explain the draft outline and contents of the WP3 and then invited participants to provide feedbacks and comments.

Dr. Eric Zusman from the Secretariat provided an overview of the First and the Second White papers: the former emphasized on co-benefits from an air pollution perspective and policies aimed at mitigating SLCPs in Asia; and the latter focused on sector-based case studies of transportation, energy system and waste management. The WP3 has following objectives: 1) provide updates on co-benefits in international climate negotiations and SDGs; 2) describe how different tools and models can be used to quantify co-benefits in cases from Asia; and 3) underline not just co-benefits but also trade-offs. As the list of

contributors is not finalized, further contributions and participation were welcomed (i.e. ICIMOD suggested that they could write on brick kilns). He expected comments and suggestions based on this preliminary outline developed from the last year's discussion.

2. Contents/Contributors

Following the explanation of the proposed structure for the WP3, Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana drew participants' attention to the outline structure as well as contents of the WP3 and opened the floor for discussion.

Mr. Armen Rostomyan pointed out that the Sendai Framework for the disaster risk reduction missed out among the key climate agreements in the proposed chapter one, suggested to have a short paragraph summarizing the importance of climate change adaptation at the local level and also has shown his willingness to contribute text on that theme.

Dr. Arnico Panday suggested creating the relevant chapter titles rather than the institutions in charge of each chapter. ICIMOD's contribution would be on the case of bricks, including tools of GHGs and air pollution reduction based on the monitoring program ICIMOD developed. The other suggestion was to provide the structure of each chapter so that there would be some uniformity across the White Paper. Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana agreed to have the proper title and the format of each chapter.

Ms. Kaye Patdu recommended having a brief overview of the all co-benefits tools beyond those that are the key focal points chapter 2 to 4, i.e. those on the ACP website, for sharing comprehensive information on co-benefits tools. Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana agreed the brief explanation of co-benefits should be located in the introduction chapter. He reminded participants the draft diagram of co-benefits based on the request raised last year's meeting and welcomed further modification from partners. Then, he supported Ms. Patdu's idea having the introduction on the quantification tools that should fit after the co-benefits brief in chapter one.

Dr. Kevin Hicks envisioned the production process through WP3 itself would help the ACP strengthen the integration among partners. He agreed the chapter one should contain the introduction of co-benefits (including a review of tools); it can then provide an update on SDGs and climate agreement. The thematic chapters could explain those tools particularly tools for relevant sectors.

Mr. Nathan Borgford-Parnell said the CCAC frequently employs a sector-based approach and suggested macroeconomics are better for driving action. The CCAC could contribute in any of the sector such as transport, municipal solid waste, as well as tools with SEI.

Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana recalled that the outline of the WP3 has intentionally been organized on a sectoral basis due to discussions at the last Advisory Group; he further remarked that the WP3 should select a wider variety of sectors, covering those not featured in the second White Paper.

Ms. Natalie Harms raised a fundamental question about why the WP3 should focus heavily on air pollution, especially transportation and energy sectors; while links between climate change and sustainable development more broadly are overlooked. She mentioned the identification of the co-benefits concept and target audience should be clarified when we emphasize tools in specific sectors.

Dr. Eric Zusman explained the ACP initially started with air pollution focus, but broader and diverse interpretations are also acceptable. In the case of water and oceans, if there is interest, it could become one chapter; for instance, the UNU has conducted work on water and climate change co-benefits with their quantification tool and they have analysed the waste water issue in Indonesia case. He also responded that the typically the introductory chapter includes definitions, explains why co-benefits are important and will highlight Ms. Natalie Harms' comments i.e. follow-ups, review and also private sector incentives for looking at multiple benefits.

Mr. Nathan Borgford-Parnell added the recent attention from the CCAC on SLCPs has placed a greater emphasis on adaptation and resilience city; however, it is not yet determined how to quantify those co-benefits. It would be worth adding onto the WP3 or possibly for the further work on this issue. Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana clarified that chapter six should explore issues mentioned in this discussion. And he kindly explained that previous two White Papers covered several sectors (beyond air pollution) and we decided to focus on quantification tools for this third one.

Mr. Bjarne Pedersen expressed, firstly, that the last year's discussion on themes and ideas covering SDGs and climate agreements and link to the quantification to the co-benefits indicators fit into well-structured outline. Secondly, pointed out that the comprehensive and integrated report could be the entry point around diverse topics and sectors but it could be unfocused. The WP3 should have a quantification focus thereby differentiating this White Paper from the previous ones. And this is a flagship publication of the ACP so that partners not only contribute substance but help with distribution of dissemination. WP3 would securely anchor in all the ACP's expertise and enable to communicate the benefits of co-benefits in a tangible way to the stakeholders the ACP reaches. Finally, he agreed that the social economic benefits are important to keep in mind (i.e. health and other aspects) in cities those make cases for co-benefits as entry point to provide solutions in emission reduction in city level.

Ms. Natalie Harms agreed with Mr. Pederson suggestion is not to be vague; however, she emphasized not to ignore other benefits beyond air pollution and transport. Monitoring with quantification tools for the follow up impact is important; however, there should be caution that they do not imply other benefits are less valuable. She argued the urban agenda reflects a step toward more integrated city planning (i.e. sustainable resilience including sanitation and health that they link to). Although it would be late to add on other set of co-benefit at this stage, the integrated approach should be clarified and mentioned into introduction or at least footnotes. Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana suggested the Secretariat manages how to handle this issue i.e. covering in the introduction or in the next White Paper.

Mr. Bjarne Pedersen suggested the case studies and tools happening in cities in India should be included in relation to the above discussion. Mr. Armen Rostomyan also brought out the resilient city topic that Regional Resource Centre for the Asian Pacific plans to build resilient cities to climate change and the focus group develops city resilience assessment and action plan; then held the workshop for the roadmap development, and he welcomes the ACP participate in this process.

3. Schedule

Prof. Katsunori Suzuki was happy with the discussion on substance and contents of the WP3; however, the schedule is very tight and the first draft should be ready by the end of September. It would be very helpful to speed up the process if we could clearly identify which part and unit would be conducted by which partners as early as possible.

Dr. Eric Zusman shared his appreciation for the useful feedback and plans to reflect all the comments received (i.e. providing a guidance to the authors in terms of the structure of chapters; not having overly strong focus on air pollution and transport; getting contributions from other sectors feasible; and highlighting bit more on urban agenda in the context of all over the chapters). Meanwhile, though he felt that stretching the concept of co-benefits suggestions on the resilience aspects are leaning to climate adaptation while the ACP traditionally covers climate mitigation One possibility is that the WP3 mentions or brings up some discussion on adaptation linkages with development agenda but not necessary takes it as a key focus or core theme in this report.

Dr. Kevin Hicks shared the current trend of integration between climate mitigation and adaptation through his experience with the project seeks for the Green Climate Fund. The project approached the measurement of the CO2 emission reduction as well as the link to the adaptation aspect – the LEAP model as a means of characterizing adaptation. It is an interesting new link others started to seek for between climate mitigation and adaptation.

Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana appreciated the active discussion – especially for the possible future work the ACP should cover, while elaborating the draft outline will required further discussion.

17:00 - 17:15 (15 minutes)

Wrap Up

Facilitator: Co-chair, Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana

Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana closed the meeting with appreciation, especially those joining via conference call. He summarized that 1) the Work Plan will be reformatted following small group meetings with the Secretariat and continued advice from the partners and 2) the WP3 drafting soon will begin based on the discussion today and look forward to the publication early next year.

Meeting Agenda

The Eighth Asian Co-benefits Partnership (ACP)

Advisory Group Meeting

26 July 2017, 14:00-17:50

International Organizations Centre, Pacifico Yokohama, Room 313-314, Japan

Agenda
<p>14:00 - 14:10 (10 minutes)</p> <p>■ <u>Opening and introduction</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Opening remarks: <i>Co-chair, Prof. Katsunori Suzuki, Kanazawa University</i>2) Objective of the meeting: <i>ACP Secretariat, IGES</i>3) Self-introduction by participants
<p>14:10 - 15:15 (65 minutes)</p> <p>■ <u>Discussion 1: Finalizing and Starting New Work Plan</u></p> <p><i>Facilitator: Co-chair, Prof. Katsunori Suzuki</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Overview of recent activities on co-benefits2) Summary of final status and achievement of Work Plan 2016-20173) Discussion on future Work Plans4) Discussion on ACP activities/membership, and others
<p>15:15-15:30 Group Photo & Coffee Break</p>
<p>15:30 - 17:00 (90 minutes)</p> <p>■ <u>Discussion 2: 3rd White Paper</u></p> <p><i>Facilitator: Co-chair, Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Introduction2) Contents/Contributors3) Schedule
<p>17:00 - 17:15 (15 minutes)</p> <p>■ <u>Wrap up</u></p> <p>Summary of discussion and the next step Dr. Supat Wangwongwatana, ACP Secretariat, IGES</p>

Meeting Participants

	Organization	Name	Title, Division
1	Policy Research Center for Environment and Economy (PRCEE), CHINA	Li Liping	Policy Research Center for Environment and Economy
2	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Thailand.	Ittipol Pawarmart	Head of Automotive Emission Laboratory, Pollution Control Department
3	Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Indonesia	Noor Rachmaniaha	Head of Sub Directorate for Domestic Water Pollution Control
4	Ministry of the Environment, JAPAN	Takaaki Ito	Deputy Director, Policy Planning Division, Environment Management Bureau
5	Ministry of the Environment, JAPAN	Minako Kawai	Section Chief, International Cooperation Office, Environment Management Bureau
6	Ministry of the Environment, JAPAN	Toru Toyama	International Cooperation Office, Environment Management Bureau
7	[ACP Co-chair] Kanazawa University,	Katsunori Suzuki	Professor, Institute of Liberal Arts and Science
8	[ACP Co-chair] Regional Resource Center for Asia and the Pacific (AIT/RRC.AP)	Supat Wangwongwatana	Senior Policy and Technical Advisor
9	Clean Air Asia	Bjarne Pedersen	Executive Director
10	Clean Air Asia	Alan Silayan	Director of Programms
11	Clean Air Asia	Dang Espita	Senior AQ Program Coordinator
12	Clean Air Asia	Fu Lu	China Director
13	Stockholm Environment Institute	William Kevin Hicks	Deputy Director
14	United Nations University-Institute of Advanced Studies (UNU-IAS)	Junko Nishikawa	Project Director / Programme Coordinator
15	Regional Resource Center for Asia and Pacific (AIT/RRC.AP)	Armen Rostomyan	Senior Programme Specialist-Climate Change Adaptation
16	United Nations Environment (UNE)	Kaye Patdu	Coordinator of APCAP
17	International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)	Arnico Kumar Panday	Senior Atmospheric Scientist
18	Climate & Clean Air Coalition to Reduce Short-Lived Climate Pollutants (CCAC)	Nathan Borgford-Parnell	
19	UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)	Natalie Kathrin Harms	
	ACP Secretariat		
20	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	Eric Zusman	Research Leader, Sustainability Governance Centre (SGC)
21		So-Young Lee	Senior Policy Researcher, SGC
22		Kaoru Akahoshi	Policy Researcher, SGC
23		Naoko Matsumoto	Fellow
24		Xinling Feng	Fellow



Asian Co-benefits Partnership (ACP) 8th Advisory Group Meeting - Meeting Summary

Acknowledgements

This proceeding is the summary of main discussions of the Asian Co-benefits Partnership (ACP) 8th Advisory Group Meeting held on 26 July 2017 at Pacifico Yokohama, 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), September 2017

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