



**Northwest  
Pacific  
Action Plan**



Distribution: restricted

UNEP/NOWPAP IG. EO1/3

5 June 2014

Original: English

---

First Extraordinary Intergovernmental Meeting of  
the Northwest Pacific Action Plan  
Seoul, the Republic of Korea, 9-10 April 2014

**Report of the Meeting**

## Introduction

1. The 18<sup>th</sup> IGM (4-6 December 2013 in Toyama, Japan) decided to hold an extraordinary IGM in Korea in 2014 to consider possible decisions on measures to address the concerns of the hosting countries over financial sustainability of the RCU in compliance with the Host Country Agreements. Resolutions of the 18<sup>th</sup> IGM were adopted by correspondence, including the approval of the NOWPAP Programme of Work (PoW) for the 2014-2015 biennium and the budget for 2014. The meeting also agreed that the 19<sup>th</sup> IGM will consider the rest of the 2014-2015 biennium budget and will review the progress of the implementation of the PoW.

2. Following the offer of the government of the Republic of Korea, the first extraordinary NOWPAP IGM was convened on 9-10 April 2014 in Seoul. The meeting was attended by representatives of the NOWPAP member states, namely the People's Republic of China, Japan, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation (referred hereinafter as China, Japan, Korea and Russia) as well as UNEP Headquarters and NOWPAP RCU. The Resolution adopted at the meeting is attached in Annex I to this report. The list of participants is attached as Annex II and the list of documents is attached as Annex III.

### **Agenda: Possible measures to address the concerns of the hosting countries over financial sustainability of the RCU**

3. The first extraordinary NOWPAP IGM was opened at 09:00 on Wednesday, 9 April 2014, in the International Conference Hall of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Korea, by Mr. Kazuhiro TAKAHASHI, the Head of Delegation of Japan and Chairperson of the 18<sup>th</sup> NOWPAP IGM. He extended a warm welcome to all participants of the meeting.

4. Mr. TAKAHASHI expressed his gratitude to the government of Korea and RCU for hosting and preparing the meeting, and welcomed UNEP representatives for their participation. Marking its 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary, NOWPAP has shown the successful cooperation among the member states with common understanding in conserving marine ecosystems and preventing pollution in coastal and marine environment. He appreciated efforts of NOWPAP member states on active discussion during the 18<sup>th</sup> IGM to address the financial situation on RCU. Acknowledging the differences of the opinions on the issue, he asked member states cooperation and compromise to find a solution, indicating that he will play an active role as a Chairperson to facilitate constructive discussions. He underlined the necessity of considering long-term as well as short-term solutions when discussing RCU reform. Then he invited participants to have their opening remarks.

5. Mr. Songhack LIM, a representative of Korea, welcomed all participants for the meeting. He appreciated the Chairperson for his efforts to have the resolutions of the 18<sup>th</sup> IGM approved by the member states through correspondence which allowed this meeting to focus on RCU reform only. While mentioning the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of NOWPAP, he underlined the importance of finding solutions to challenges NOWPAP has been facing.

6. Ms. Li GU, a representative of China, expressed her gratitude to the government of Korea and RCU for organizing the meeting. She also appreciated the efforts of the Chairperson and RCU on reaching agreement on the resolutions of the 18<sup>th</sup> IGM. She expected a fruitful discussion at the meeting.

7. Ms. Natalia TRETIAKOVA, a representative of Russia, expressed her gratitude for participation of several representatives of UNEP, and to the government of the Korea for hosting the meeting. She also appreciated the efforts of member states to reach agreement on the resolutions of the 18<sup>th</sup> IGM and looked forward to finding solutions on the agenda issue of this meeting.

8. Mr. Joji MIYAMORI, a representative of Japan, expressed his gratitude to the government of Korea and RCU for organizing the meeting and appreciated the efforts made by the member states in the adoption of the 18<sup>th</sup> IGM resolutions before the meeting. He mentioned that NOWPAP, as one of UNEP Regional Seas Programmes, has been regarded as a priority by the government of Japan. He also mentioned the annual contribution of US\$ 600,000 provided by Japanese central government and local governments for hosting RCU office in Toyama. Mentioning the difficult financial situation of the RCU offices, he underlined that the RCU reform might be painful but necessary to ensure the RCU financial sustainability.

9. Ms. Elizabeth MREMA, Deputy Director and Officer-in-Charge of the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI) of UNEP, praised the achievements NOWPAP has made and explained difficult financial situation around the world. Mentioning the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of NOWPAP and understanding that the financial situation at present might be different from the one 20 years ago, she asked NOWPAP member states to think carefully about the restructuring of the RCU. She also encouraged member states to consider the agenda not only focusing on financial aspects but also on the efficiency of RCU performance, as the overall goal of NOWPAP is to protect the marine environment in the Northwest Pacific region. While assuring that UNEP will continue to support NOWPAP, she underlined the fact that NOWPAP is the independent programme which is owned by the member states and therefore they are responsible for the reform. She also mentioned that UNEP will be guided by the decisions made by member states but will make sure that these decisions will be enforced in accordance with the relevant UN rules and procedures. She hoped that NOWPAP member states would not forget about the institutional memory and will be proud of their achievements after the next 20 years.

10. Upon the invitation from the Chairperson, Mr. Alexander TKALIN, NOWPAP Coordinator, reminded that the rules of procedures of the UNEP Governing Council would be applied for the meeting with necessary adjustments: meeting will be conducted in English and decisions will be made by consensus. He mentioned that the officers served for this meeting will be the same as for the 18<sup>th</sup> IGM: Chairperson, Mr. Kazuhiro Takahashi of Japan, Vice chairperson, Mr. Yu Tong of China and Mr. Hyunsoo Yun, Rapporteur, Ms. Natalia Tretiakova of Russia. He reminded participants that the resolutions would be adopted at the end of the meeting leaving the meeting report to be adopted by correspondence after the meeting, which has been the usual NOWPAP practice.

11. Upon the request of the Chairperson, NOWPAP Coordinator confirmed that the delegates of China, Japan, Korea and Russia presented their credentials to the Secretariat, which were reviewed and accepted.

12. Referring to the RCU reform, the Chairperson reminded member states of two proposals submitted by Japan and Korea a few days before the meeting and asked if there are any additional options for the meeting to consider.

13. In response to argument by China and Russia that the proposals from Japan and Korea should not be the only options for discussion for the meeting and that whatever proposals should be based on the meeting documents prepared in advance (UNEP/NOWPAP IG. EO1/1 and 1/2), Japan mentioned that the proposal submitted a week earlier was based on the working document UNEP/NOWPAP IG. EO 1/1 and thus was not a new one and therefore could be discussed accordingly. However, China suggested to focusing on two working documents provided earlier instead of including recent proposals submitted by Japan and Korea only a few days before the meeting. In response to the suggestion by China, Korea replied that its proposal was based on information in the working documents, and further encouraged other member states to submit their own proposals so that the meeting could consider all the possible options of the RCU reform.

14. As requested by Russia, NOWPAP Coordinator introduced working documents (UNEP/NOWPAP IG. EO1/1 and 1/2) prepared for the meeting indicating that those proposals made by Japan and Korea a few days before the meeting are actually reflected in paragraphs 27 and 28 of the document UNEP/NOWPAP IG. EO1/1. After his explanation, the meeting proceeded to discussion.

15. Upon the request from Russia, NOWPAP Coordinator further clarified the issues related to the proposals made by Japan and Korea. He repeated what was suggested by Japan and Korea: to downgrade current P5 and P3 posts to P4 and P2 respectively and to abolish the G6 post in Toyama office, to merge the current P4 and P3 posts into a new P3 post, and replace the current G6 post by a non-UN local assistant in Busan office. He explained that merging P4 and P3 posts in Busan office will be resulting in a completely new post which requires new functions to be decided by the member states. The same is applicable to the new posts in Toyama after downgrading P5 and P3 posts. The recruitment for a possible P2 post will be done through the UN Young Professionals Programme roster which is out of control of UNEP. He indicated further that keeping a G6 post either in Toyama or Busan is a necessity for RCU financial operations. He also stated that the option 2 in the table 7 of the document UNEP/NOWPAP IG. EO 1/1 and option 3 in the same table might be appropriate for RCU Busan and Toyama offices respectively from the point of view of saving money. As for the deficit in the QNL accounts for RCU staffing cost (and compensation, if any), existing interest in QNL fund and accumulated surplus in PNL fund can be temporarily used, pending member states agreement (to be returned once the QNL fund is being replenished later on by the savings as the result of the RCU reform).

16. Ms. Mrema, UNEP representative, pointed out that the suggestions for RCU reform could be only short-term solution and urged NOWPAP member states to think carefully about long-term impacts while acknowledging that the impact of the reform may take time to be seen. She said that while considering saving cost member states should not forget the effectiveness of RCU in the future as she mentioned in the opening remarks. She pointed out that for example a P3 post does not include, according to UN generic job description, vision and coordination functions. She also mentioned that relevant information for the functions of the newly suggested posts is necessary for posts re-classification to determine the grade and to initiate recruitment process. She pointed out that because of the "mismanagement" by UNEP and RCU mentioned in the 18<sup>th</sup> IGM meeting report, an audit is under preparation by UNEP. Finally, she suggested considering creation of a reserve fund in order to accommodate any emergency expenditures in the future.

17. Referring to his recent visit to UNEP/IETC, RCU Coordinator suggested member states to consider the option of merging functions of two Administrative Officers between NOWPAP RCU and UNEP/IETC in Osaka which would bring significant savings for both offices. In this connection, China and Russia supported such idea.

18. Japan representative explained about contributions that have been made since 2001 for RCU office in Toyama as well as current status of financial situation since 2011, demonstrating increased amounts of annual deficit and decreased accumulated surplus. He reiterated Japan's suggestion regarding new RCU staffing structure in Toyama by downgrading level of two posts from P5 to P4, and from P3 to P2, with the elimination of G6 post. He suggested that downgrading the P5 and elimination of G6 post could be done when the current staff member contracts expire while downgrading the P3 could be done as soon as possible.

19. In response to the suggestions raised by Russia on merging functions of NOWPAP Administrative Officer with UNEP/IETC in Osaka, Japan mentioned the current situation of UNEP/IETC, including the recent reforms being implemented there. Taking into consideration ongoing restructuring process in IETC (after the second review by the Government of Japan), Japan suggested to consider an option of merging some functions with IETC separately and focus on their original proposal explained above.

20. Korea provided detailed explanation on the past, current and future financial situation of Busan RCU office and their reform proposal: a) eliminate P4 post by giving at least three (3) months' notice in advance and combine some P4 functions into the current P3 post and after the P3's contract expires, recruit new P3; or, b) wait till both current staff members' contracts will expire before recruiting new P3 with revised functions; c) replace G6 post by local non-UN post when the current staff member contract will expire. Korea added that reforming RCU staffing structure should be conducted carefully by minimizing potential negative impacts, and that the "working capital reserve" suggested by UNEP is worth considering for the long-term financial sustainability of the NOWPAP RCU.

21. Russia expressed their concerns on combined functions of P4 and P3 posts which are totally different, and asked UNEP how to solve this matter in a more effective way. In response to inquiry from Russia, UNEP representative explained that clear instructions for re-classification from NOWPAP member states would be necessary. She pointed out that P3 post is more technical and hardly perform any coordination as required from the head of the RCU Busan office. She also mentioned that when discussing reforms, as each level of post has certain established criteria, member states should determine which functions of posts should be performed. She explained briefly that a local assistant can only deal with national issues and cannot touch the trans-boundary matters which are usual for programs like NOWPAP. She pointed out further that such local assistant cannot access UNEP fund management system (e.g., IMIS or Umoja) and urged NOWPAP member states to reconsider carefully the level of the post. Another UNEP representative added that under the UNEP accountability framework, a valid UNEP contract is necessary for the operation of the online UNEP fund management system.

22. In response to the concern raised by Russia, Korea explained that substantial part of the coordination functions of the current P4 post could be transferred to the Coordinator and the new P3 post will focus more on scientific and technical functions which are essential to strengthen development and implementation of NOWPAP projects and substantive activities. Russia proposed to keep the new post at P4 level after the merging and to define its functions as Deputy Coordinator as well as Scientific Affairs Officer, and to keep current G6 post in Busan. China supported suggestions provided by Russia to keep both P4 and G6 posts in Busan RCU office.

23. In response to the suggestions and comments from Russia, UNEP and China, Korea said that they could not afford both P4 and G6 posts in a financially sustainable manner. However, NOWPAP Coordinator explained that forecasted expenditures for both P4 and G6 would be well within the annual contributions made by Korea (with possible savings of about US\$ 100,000 annually). In response to this explanation, Korean representative said that in order to secure long-term financial sustainability of Busan office, it is necessary to maintain a safety margin to meet annual increases in staff salaries, the future rotation of the Coordinator as well as other unexpected expenditures among others. He also noted that even though the forecasted expenditures were within the annual contribution in 2005, the actual cost exceeded Korea's contribution just few years later. When UNEP representative reminded of additional costs related to the proposed reforms together with the cost of next rotation, Russia suggested extending the duration between rotations of Coordinator and Deputy Coordinator from 4 to 6 years. However, NOWPAP Coordinator noted that such increase in the period between each rotation can only postpone the associated payment to the concerned staff members.

24. In order to facilitate the discussion, upon the request of NOWPAP member states, RCU prepared a table containing possible forecasted staffing cost for Busan office till 2020, reflecting 3% annual increase, a rate that the UNEP considers to be "reasonable" for such a forecast, for several options: a) P4 and G6 posts, b) P3 and G5, and c) P3 and a local assistant (non-UN).

25. As the table prepared contained mostly the salary cost, Korea asked UNEP to estimate approximate other associated costs based on their experiences in the management of the UNEP offices. The UNEP representative explained that "standard cost" is applied by considering average family size together with post adjustment, education grants, relocation, home leave, etc.

26. Considering the possible procedure for RCU reform, the UNEP representative explained the financial audit which was requested by member states at the 18<sup>th</sup> IGM, is planned to be conducted for two RCU offices by the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) in June 2014. Logically, it should then be followed by a functional review process, but the evaluation unit schedule for this year has been already fixed and there is no room to accommodate additional requests. However a clear guidance from NOWPAP member states is needed if such review is requested. UNEP representative further continued by introducing the example of the reform implemented at the Mediterranean Action Plan after two functional reviews. Japan insisted that a functional review is important, but the review should be conducted after the reform due to lack of time and money. Korea concurred with Japan and underlined that immediate measures should be taken to address current and future financial difficulties of the RCU offices. After discussion it was agreed to have a functional review 2 years after the completion of RCU reform.

27. Upon the request of NOWPAP member states, NOWPAP RCU prepared additional tables presenting future financial implications in both Busan and Toyama RCU offices. As Korea suggested to have P3 post and G3 post (instead of local assistant) at Busan RCU office, UNEP representative explained that G3 plays a role as a clerk or messenger in the UN system and asked NOWPAP member states to reconsider the level of the suggested post. Japan expressed their disappointment on the fact that the UNEP and RCU had not mentioned or implied that there was such a clear limitation on the function to be fulfilled by each level of the G staff and asked the UNEP and RCU to disclose information in a more timely and appropriate manner.

28. As for Toyama RCU office, Russia suggested to keep P5 Coordinator and P4 Administrative Officer (but shared with IETC in Osaka, saving 50% of the cost for NOWPAP) and asked host countries to consider increase of the annual contributions to support RCU offices. Russia also raised a question about the necessity of revising Host Country Agreements in case if RCU staffing structure is changed. In response to the suggestions by Russia, Japan said that it is not realistic to keep P5 Coordinator because his salary is more than half of the total contribution.

29. China insisted to follow the meeting documents, which do not include G3 post as one of the options. In response to the suggestion from China, both Japan and Korea encouraged member states to consider all possible options, not limited to the ones described in the meeting documents, and mentioned that meeting documents could be used as background information for the meeting.

30. The UNEP representative explained that G3 could not be a sufficient level to implement financial transactions at the RCU using online UNEP fund management system.

31. Russia insisted to reflect their suggestions in the resolutions as well as in the meeting report: that the RCU is an administrative body for the whole NOWPAP and therefore it is necessary to consider P4 and G6 (or at least G5) posts for Busan RCU office and P5 and P4 (shared with IETC Osaka, saving 50% of the cost) posts for Toyama RCU office. In response to suggestions from Russia, Korea replied with disagreement of having a P4 and G6/G5 in Busan, and Japan could not accept P5 post in Toyama due to the lack of financial sustainability. Korea added that Busan Office cannot afford P5 Coordinator when the rotation is in effect. Japan introduced an example that among 25 UN offices in Japan, there are some cases where the level of the head of office is not higher than P4. China asked to consider effectiveness of the NOWPAP RCU and proposed to have P4 and G6/5 posts in Busan and P5 and 50% of P3 (shared with Osaka) in Toyama. Korea responded that as a host country Korea also has a keen interest in effective functioning of the NOWPAP RCU, but such effectiveness should be maximized within the context of securing financial sustainability, and reiterated that such financial soundness cannot be guaranteed by having a P4 staff at the Busan Office.

32. As for the timing of RCU staffing restructuring, Japan proposed to wait until contracts of P5 and G6 staff members to be expired. As for current P3 post occupied by a staff member having a permanent contract, consultation with UNEP HQ will be initiated in order to make changes as soon as possible once the decision on RCU reform will be taken. As for the proposed new P2 post, UNEP representative explained again that as the post will be filled by the UN secretariat (New York) through the Young Professional Programme, recruitment process will be out of UNEP's control. UNEP representative also alerted the meeting that not all functions of the current P3 post could be transferred to P2 post and there is no guarantee that the delegation of

authority as certifying officer will be given to the new P2 staff member. Having heard this explanation, both China and Russia mentioned that P2 is inappropriate for NOWPAP Administrative Officer. However, Japan and Korea reiterated their preference for P2 for the Administrative Officer post, emphasizing that member states should not prejudge the capacity of the new P2 staff member.

33. In order to facilitate the discussion, the Chairperson presented a draft resolution reflecting suggestions provided by NOWPAP member states prepared by the RCU. Lengthy discussion followed on the draft resolution, including the preamble which was copied, inaccurately in part, from the agreed resolutions of the 18<sup>th</sup> NOWPAP IGM.

34. Korea reiterated their suggestion to have a P3 post as Scientific Affairs Officer and encouraged NOWPAP member states to decide the level of such Scientific Affairs Officer first. China urged NOWPAP member states to consider the overall goal of NOWPAP first in order to consider efficiency of RCU operation within limited budget.

35. As for the rotation of Coordinator and Deputy Coordinator, China suggested to terminate the rotation to save cost for Japan and Korea. However, Korea said that the rotation is not a major issue at this moment and notwithstanding pros and cons, it has the merit of sharing financial burden of supporting the RCU among the two host countries.

36. In addition, Korea pointed out that the functions of Coordinator and Deputy Coordinator are not clearly distinguished according to the "2009 Performance review of the NOWPAP RCU". By transferring the responsibility of current Deputy Coordinator to Coordinator, RCU operations can be maintained with a Scientific Affairs Officer who will mainly work on scientific matters, without a Deputy Coordinator post.

37. UNEP representative commented on the proposal of Korea that if the post is called as Scientific Affairs Officer with Deputy Coordinator's responsibilities, the new post might be reclassified as P3 level. However, if the new post is called as Deputy Coordinator, then the new post could be reclassified at P4 level.

38. China insisted to keep Deputy Coordinator post at P4 level in Busan office since no complaints were evoked during the last 10 years and expressed her concerns on decisions which could be made without solid background. Korea explained again the current situation and financial difficulties they are facing which have led to the RCU restructuring. The RCU reform is not being suggested because of unsatisfactory performance made by Coordinator and Deputy Coordinator.

39. NOWPAP Coordinator stressed that even if host countries could not increase their contributions, it is not appropriate to take any actions just to save money. Japan expressed its surprise to the fact that a clear position was expressed by the RCU and explained again the financial situation of the RCU offices.

40. Taking into consideration the current financial difficulties, with regard to the proposal to keep P4 level in Busan Office, Japan expressed their concern because Japan cannot accommodate such level after the next rotation is in effect, as Japan intends to accumulate savings while the new Coordinator (proposed at P4 level) is rotated to Busan.

41. Russia mentioned that so far there were no complaints raised or reported about RCU performance. She also suggested RCU Toyama office to have staff structure composed of P4 Administrative Officer (50% savings due to sharing with IETC in Osaka) and P5 Coordinator.

42. UNEP representative explained that, depending on requirements and expectations for individual posts, the post levels will be determined by the central review panel. Moreover, the representative continued that UNEP may face a litigation in the future after the RCU restructuring (e.g., if the new staff members feel that they are required to do more in reality than what stipulates in the job descriptions or if current staff members feel that they have lost certain benefits due to the RCU reform). As no agreement was reached in plenary on the levels and the functional titles of the suggested posts, Korea proposed to have a small group meeting with participation of delegates of member states only.

43. When plenary meeting resumed, after lengthy discussion, member states agreed to reduce the total number of RCU UNEP staff members from current six to four, leaving the functions of the new posts and proposed grades to be discussed at the forthcoming 19<sup>th</sup> IGM. The meeting adopted the resolution as shown in Annex I (with a table suggesting revised RCU structure). It was agreed that the report of the meeting with its annexes would be distributed by e-mail in due time and then finalized by correspondence.

44. The Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 21:10 on Thursday, 10 April 2014.

## Annex I

**Resolution**

*Recalling the discussions on possible measures to address the future financial situation of NOWPAP at the 16<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> NOWPAP Intergovernmental Meeting (IGM),*

*Taking into account the fact that the 18<sup>th</sup> NOWPAP IGM could not conclude discussions on appropriate measures regarding financial sustainability of the RCU offices,*

*Considering different positions of member states regarding possible measures to address the concerns of the RCU hosting countries over financial sustainability of the RCU,*

*Taking note with appreciation of the necessary data and information provided by NOWPAP RCU and UNEP on the cost implications of the restructuring of NOWPAP RCU,*

The First Extraordinary Intergovernmental Meeting of NOWPAP,

1. Decides to revise the total number of RCU staff members of the UNEP to a maximum of four,
2. Decides that the revised staffing structure of the NOWPAP RCU offices will be as proposed in Table 1,
3. Requests UNEP to conduct a functional review of NOWPAP RCU offices two years after the recruitment of last staff member,
4. Decides to discuss functions of new posts for the two RCU offices at the 19<sup>th</sup> NOWPAP IGM to be held in Russia in the second half of 2014, in order to conclude discussion on appropriate measures regarding financial sustainability of the RCU offices,
5. Requests UNEP and RCU to provide necessary information regarding the rules and procedures, limitations and feasibility of the functions to be performed by each level of staff members in the revised RCU offices well before the 19<sup>th</sup> IGM,
6. Requests UNEP to submit information on matters related to the liability of possible litigation resulting from the restructuring of the two RCU offices to be discussed at the 19<sup>th</sup> NOWPAP IGM well before the meeting,
7. Requests RCU to prepare a paper on possible ways to establish working capital reserve for the QNL and PNL funds for consideration of the matter from the 19<sup>th</sup> IGM.

**Table 1. Suggested restructuring of the NOWPAP RCU offices**

<b>RCU office</b>	<b>New positions</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<b>Busan office</b>	P-Scientific Affairs Officer/Deputy Coordinator	To replace current P3 and P4 posts after incumbent staff member contracts will expire in April 2015 and January 2016, respectively
	G-Administrative Assistant	To replace current G6 Programme Assistant post after incumbent staff member contract will expire in February 2016*
<b>Toyama office</b>	P-Coordinator	To replace current P5 post after incumbent staff member contract will expire in December 2015
	P-50% Administrative Officer/ P-Administrative Officer	To replace current P3 post as soon as possible, after consultation with UNEP HQs
	None	To eliminate current G6 Programme Assistant post after incumbent staff member contract will expire in May 2015

\*Possible location of G-post will be reviewed after the rotation of Coordinator/SAO/Deputy Coordinator in 2017.

## Annex II

## List of Participants

**People's Republic of China****Mr. Yu TONG**

Director of Marine Division

Ministry of Environmental Protection

No.115 Nanxiaojie, Xicheng District, Beijing, People's Republic of China

Tel: +86-10-6655-6273 Fax: +86-10-6655-6272 E-mail: yutong@mep.gov.cn

**Ms. Li GU**

Deputy Director Level

Division of International Organizations and Conventions

International Cooperation Department

Ministry of Environmental Protection

Xizhimennei Nanxiaojie 115#, Beijing, People's Republic of China

Tel: +86-10-6655-6535 Fax: +86-10-6655-6513 E-mail: gu.li@mep.gov.cn

**Japan****Mr. Kazuhiro TAKAHASHI**

Director

Global Environment Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8919, Japan

Tel: +81-3-5501-8245 Fax: +81-3-5501-8244 Email: [kazuhiro.takahashi-2@mofa.go.jp](mailto:kazuhiro.takahashi-2@mofa.go.jp)**Mr. Joji MIYAMORI**

Senior Deputy Director

Global Environment Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8919, Japan

Tel: +81-3-5501-8245 Fax: +81-3-5501-8244 Email: [joji.miyamori@mofa.go.jp](mailto:joji.miyamori@mofa.go.jp)**Mr. Mika NISHIMORI**

Deputy Director

Global Environment Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8919, Japan

Tel: +81-3-5501-8245 Fax: +81-3-5501-8244 Email: [mika.nishimori@mofa.go.jp](mailto:mika.nishimori@mofa.go.jp)**Republic of Korea****Mr. Hyunsoo YUN**

Director

Climate Change and Environmental Affairs Division

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

60 Sajik-ro 8-gil, Jongno-gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Tel: +82-2-2100-7859 Fax: +82-2-2100-7991 E-mail: [hsyun97@mofa.go.kr](mailto:hsyun97@mofa.go.kr)

**Mr. Taeshin HA**

Second Secretary  
Climate Change and Environmental Affairs Division  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
60 Sajik-ro 8-gil, Jongno-gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea  
Tel: +82-2-2100-7748 Fax: +82-2-2100-7991 E-mail: tsha13@mofa.go.kr

**Mr. Songhack LIM**

Director of Marine Environment Policy Division  
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries  
Government Complex Sejong, 5-Dong, 94, Dasom2-Ro, Sejong-City, Republic of Korea  
Tel: +82-44-200-5280 Fax: +82-44-200-5922 E-mail: limsongh@korea.kr

**Ms. Kyoungju CHO**

Assistant Director of Marine Environment Policy Division  
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries  
Government Complex Sejong, 5-Dong, 94, Dasom2-Ro, Sejong-City, Republic of Korea  
Tel: +82-44-200-5286 Fax: +82-44-200-5922 E-mail: [ckj0403@korea.kr](mailto:ckj0403@korea.kr)

**Ms. Joon Young CHANG**

Deputy General Manager of Marine Environment Cooperation Team  
Attorney-at-Law (N.Y.)  
Korea Marine Environment Management Corporation  
Haegong bldg., Samsung-ro 610, Gangnam-gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea  
Tel: +82-2-3498-8588 Fax: +82-2-3462-7707 Email: jychang@koem.or.kr

**Ms. Sunyoung CHAE**

International Affairs Specialist of Marine Environment Cooperation Team  
Korea Marine Environment Management Corporation  
Haegong bldg., Samsung-ro 610, Gangnam-gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea  
Tel: +82-2-3498-7103 Fax: +82-2-3462-7707 Email: sychae@koem.or.kr

**Russian Federation****Ms. Natalia TRETIAKOVA**

Head of Division  
Department for International Cooperation  
Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment  
4/6, Bolshaya Gruzinskaya Street, Moscow 123995, Russian Federation  
Tel: +7-499-254-7947 Fax: +7-499-254-8283 E-mail: nataliat@mnr.gov.ru

**Mr. Alexander SVIRIDOV**

First Secretary  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs  
32/34 Smolenskaya-Sennaya, Moscow 119200, Russian Federation  
Tel: +7-499-244-4211 Fax: +7-499-244-2401 E-mail: dmoecology@mid.ru

**UNEP****Ms. Elizabeth Maruma MREMA**

Deputy Director Officer-in-Charge  
Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI)  
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
P.O. Box 30552, 00100 Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: +254-20-762-4749 Fax: +254-20-762-4249

E-mail: [Elizabeth.Mrema@unep.org](mailto:Elizabeth.Mrema@unep.org)**Ms. Jacqueline ALDER**

Coordinator  
Freshwater and Marine Ecosystems Branch (FMEB)  
Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI)  
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
P. O. Box 30552, 00100, Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: +254-20-762-4662 Fax: +254-20-762-4249

E-mail: [jacqueline.alder@unep.org](mailto:jacqueline.alder@unep.org)**Mr. Didier SALZMANN**

Fund Management Officer  
Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI)  
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
P. O. Box 30552, 00100, Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: +254-20-762-5725 Fax: +254-20-762-4249

E-mail: [Didier.Salzmann@unep.org](mailto:Didier.Salzmann@unep.org)**UNEP NOWPAP RCU****Mr. Alexander TKALIN**

Coordinator  
NOWPAP RCU (Toyama Office)  
5-5 Ushijimashin-machi, Toyama City 930-0856, Japan  
Tel: +81-76-444-1611 Fax: +81-76-444-2780

E-mail: [alexander.tkalin@nowpap.org](mailto:alexander.tkalin@nowpap.org)**Mr. Xiaodong ZHONG**

Deputy Coordinator  
NOWPAP RCU (Busan Office)  
152-1 Haean-ro, Gijang-up, Gijang-gun, Busan 619-705, Republic of Korea  
Tel: +82-51-720-3001 Fax: +82-51-720-3009 E-mail: [xiaodong.zhong@nowpap.org](mailto:xiaodong.zhong@nowpap.org)

**Mr. Sangjin LEE**

Scientific Affairs Officer  
NOWPAP RCU (Busan Office)  
152-1 Haean-ro, Gijang-up, Gijang-gun, Busan 619-705, Republic of Korea  
Tel: +82-51-720-3002 Fax: +82-51-720-3009 E-mail: [sangjin.lee@nowpap.org](mailto:sangjin.lee@nowpap.org)

**Mr. Masakatsu OHYAMA**

Administrative Officer  
NOWPAP RCU (Toyama Office)  
5-5 Ushijimashin-machi, Toyama City 930-0856, Japan  
Tel: +81-76-444-1611 Fax: +81-76-444-2780 E-mail: [masakatsu.ohyama@nowpap.org](mailto:masakatsu.ohyama@nowpap.org)

## Annex III

## List of documents

**Working documents**

UNEP/NOWPAP IG. EO1/1	Possible implications of RCU reforms suggested by NOWPAP member states (prepared by NOWPAP RCU in collaboration with UNEP Headquarters)
UNEP/NOWPAP IG. EO1/2	UNEP views and recommendations regarding possible RCU reforms (prepared by UNEP)

**Information documents**

UNEP/NOWPAP IG. EO1/INF/1	Provisional List of Documents
UNEP/NOWPAP IG. EO1/INF/2	Provisional List of Participants
UNEP/NOWPAP IG. EO1/INF/3	Provisional Timetable
UNEP/NOWPAP IG. 18/INF/4	Host Country Agreements between UNEP, Japan, and the Republic of Korea
UNEP/NOWPAP IG. 18/10/2/Rev. 1	NOWPAP Programme of Work, 2014-2015
UNEP/NOWPAP IG. 18/12	Eighteenth Intergovernmental Meeting of the Northwest Pacific Action Plan: report of the meeting
UNEP/NOWPAP IG. 18/12/Add.1	Resolutions of the 18th NOWPAP IGM adopted by member states

-----