

SESSION 05-02 OF ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES

SUMMARY RECORD

The Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) Council, represented by its Alternate Representatives, met in Los Cabos, Mexico on 7–8 February 2005. Ms. Norine Smith (Canada) chaired the meeting. Mr. José Manuel Bulás and Mr. Jerry Clifford represented Mexico and the United States, respectively. Mr. Arturo Duran, JPAC chair, represented the Joint Public Advisory Committee (JPAC) and Mr. William Kennedy, CEC executive director, represented the Secretariat. Ms. Nathalie Daoust, Council secretary, acted as secretary for the session. Other officials of the Parties and the Secretariat were also in attendance (Annex A).

Item 1 Adoption of the agenda

The Council chair indicated that much needed to be achieved during the meeting to ensure progress in approving the CEC work program and budget for 2005. She added that the minimum obligation of the Parties was to make enough decisions and provide sufficient direction to allow activities to be initiated at the Secretariat. She cautioned that perhaps not all decisions would be made, given the recent project proposals developed by Mexico that might require further consultation. The US and Mexican representatives agreed with the meeting objectives presented by the Chair and adopted the agenda based on the provisional agenda (Annex B).

Item 2 Report by the executive director

The executive director greeted the Alternate Representatives and introduced the new Council secretary, Nathalie Daoust, and JPAC liaison officer, Marcela Orozco. He followed with an overview presentation of the work undertaken thus far in the development of the Operational Plan 2005–2007. He highlighted the hard work carried out by both the Parties and the Secretariat and indicated that, although there had been some delays, the process was nearing completion. He stressed that decisions made at this meeting were critical in terms of results and deliverables to be presented during the upcoming Council Session in June. In referring to the June Council Session, the executive director reminded the Alternate Representatives of the need to begin defining an agenda and deliverables.

Referring to the Secretariat's recent activities, the executive director indicated that work was underway to improve management structures and processes at the Secretariat to ensure better planning, monitoring and reporting. He also referred to his ongoing discussions with members of the private sector to foster increased cooperation and pointed to a meeting on 25 February 2005, involving representatives from the Canadian Council for International Business (CCIB), the United States Council for International Business (USCIB) and the Confederación de Cámaras Industriales (CONCAMIN) (signatories to a 1996 Memorandum of Understanding with the CEC) and others as an attempt to revive the 1996 MOU and to identify potential areas of cooperation in the context of the new work program.

Invited by the Council chair to comment, the US representative indicated that his government had sought the advice of the US NAC and GAC regarding CEC cooperation with the private sector in helping the US prepare for chairing the Council. The US representative welcomed the participation of government representatives from Mexico and Canada at the next meeting of the US NAC and GAC scheduled for 28–29 April 2005, in Washington, DC.

Item 3 Report by the JPAC chair

The JPAC chair thanked the Secretariat for hiring Marcela Orozco as JPAC Liaison Officer. He also reminded the Parties that several communications of Advice to Council remained unanswered. He stressed the importance of establishing good communication between JPAC and the Council. He also indicated that he would like JPAC to focus on future positive outcomes of their relationship with the Council. In relation to cooperation with the private sector, he pointed to JPAC's letter to the Secretariat of 10 September 2004, on this topic and urged that it be considered. He also expressed interest in having JPAC participate in the US NAC and GAC meeting of April 2005.

The JPAC chair reiterated JPAC's interest in increasing the involvement of indigenous people in CEC activities, and noted that JPAC was supportive of any work related to renewable energy. He indicated that he was pleased to note that both interests had been captured in the proposed work program for 2005. He also commended the Parties for giving consideration to current activities while preparing the transition towards new priorities. He indicated that the next JPAC meeting would be held 13–15 April 2005, in San Diego, and would have two main objectives: 1) to develop a work plan which will be aligned with the CEC work program and will include public participation; and 2) to begin preparing for the Council Session. To ensure a fruitful Council Session, he requested that JPAC be included in discussions the Parties will be holding on this topic. In closing, the JPAC chair stressed that his personal objective was to ensure that JPAC provided added value to the Council and indicated he would encourage JPAC members to adopt a more proactive attitude.

The Council chair thanked the JPAC representative and, on behalf of the three Parties, expressed her appreciation for the philosophy put forth regarding the relationship between JPAC and other CEC components. She indicated that she looked forward to a productive exchange and assured the JPAC representative that JPAC would be included in any consultation prior to the Council Session. She also acknowledged that five outstanding responses to JPAC advices were close to finalization and tasked the GSC to meet and reach agreement on these before the end of the meeting. In relation to the development of a JPAC work plan, the US representative suggested that JPAC might also wish to consider its role within the next 10 years of the CEC.

Item 4 Review of project proposals: Information for decision-making

The Council chair invited Bill Jarvis, the Canadian representative on the information experts team, to report on recent discussions and consensus reached by the team. He presented the document, entitled "CEC Planning—Information Program: Issues for Discussion" (Annex C), which was meant to provide guidance to the Secretariat in rewriting the projects. He indicated that the team members shared the same concerns about some of the outcomes described in the

project proposals and agreed that certain projects needed to be articulated differently. The team suggested the development of a separate project for systems integration, data needs identification and data development.

The chair then invited Bill Sonntag, the US representative on the information experts team, to provide insight on the technological aspect of the information for decision-making priority. Mr. Sonntag presented the elements of a CEC Information Agenda (Annex D) and stressed the importance of being creative while making use of the new technologies available for data management. The chair then invited Salvador Sanchez, the Mexican representative on the information experts team, to provide an overview presentation of the Mexican position vis-à-vis the project proposals developed by the Secretariat (Annex E).

Following these presentations, the Alternate Representatives exchanged views and reached general agreement on the projects and budget allocation as per the attached Summary of Decisions (Annex F). The JPAC chair cautioned that although the design phase of these projects was important, emphasis should also be on product delivery for 2005. He added that special consideration should be given to public access and dissemination of information.

The information experts team agreed to meet in Montreal on 22–23 February to work with the Secretariat in finalizing the project proposals and to include more information concerning the timeline and resources required to carrying out the projects. In preparation for this meeting, the Secretariat offered to share with the Parties the study carried out in 2003 on CEC information Management with a view of adapting the recommendations to current needs. The Alternate Representatives agreed that further discussion on these projects would take place among the GSC in late February and that final approval would be given by the Alternate Representatives at their next meeting.

Item 5 Review of project proposals: Capacity Building

The Council chair invited the Mexican representative of the capacity building experts team, Irene Pisanty, to present Mexico's position and introduce the new project proposals developed by Mexico under this pillar. As part of her presentation, Ms. Pisanty indicated that several analyses had already been conducted on the capacity building needs of Mexico and that efforts needed to be concentrated on concrete actions and in filling gaps. She added that the CEC was uniquely positioned to assist Mexico in building its institutional capacity to continue complying with international conventions. The Canadian and US representatives supported the position of Mexico, although they asked Mexico to assemble a document, in advance of the June Council Session, laying out the overarching capacity building needs and principles in a results-oriented strategic plan so as to guide the programming of CEC projects under the capacity building pillar. The JPAC chair reminded the Alternate Representatives of the need to consider the involvement of indigenous people in CEC capacity building activities. The Canadian representative reiterated the need to include JPAC in the next steps of refinement of the work program.

In response to the new project proposals from Mexico, both the US and Canadian representatives expressed the need to hold further consultation internally before making any decisions. Both the US and Canadian representatives were hopeful that their internal consultations could be

completed by 4 March 2005. However, later discussions among the GSC and Parties' experts provided an opportunity to make progress on several issues as per the attached Summary of Decisions (Annex F). In reviewing the budget proposed under both the information and the capacity building pillars, the US and Canadian representatives expressed the need to review budget allocation for each pillar to ensure that the overall budget was met.

Item 6 Review of Current Activities

The Alternate Representatives reviewed and discussed current activities and made decisions concerning which activities to fund for 2005.

Projects to be funded for 2005 include "Successful water quality practices", "Biodiversity-related activities", and the "SMOC-NARAPs", specifically among others (see Annex F).

Item 7 Article 10(6) Environment and Trade Officials Meeting—Development of the Strategic Plan on Trade and Environment

The Canadian trade official, Richard Ballhorn, reported on the meeting of the Article 10(6) working-level meeting held on 7 February. The outcome of their discussions and the status of approval of each project are reflected in the attached Summary of Decisions (Annex F). In discussing the upcoming symposium for fall 2005 in Montreal, the US representative reminded the Secretariat to ensure the Parties are included in the Advisory Group, and involved in the preparation of the symposium. In closing, the trade officials agreed to convene an Article 10(6) working level meeting during the week of 14 February to discuss any outstanding issues related to the approval of projects under this pillar.

Item 8 Next steps

The Alternate Representatives concluded that, although they had agreed in principle on a large number of projects, most project descriptions required further refinement. They agreed that the GSC would be the focal point of the review process over the next three weeks and would be making the appropriate recommendations. The Alternate Representatives agreed to hold a conference call on 10 March 2005, to resolve any outstanding matter requiring their attention.

Item 9 Approval of overall budget for 2005

In addressing this item, the Mexican representative expressed concern about a shortfall of nearly C\$1 million between the projects proposed by Mexico and the amount available for the cooperative work program in the budget presented by the Secretariat. The Canadian representative suggested that the Parties adopt the premise that no additional funds would be available under the cooperative work program apart from the C\$3.2 million allocated in the balanced budget presented by the Secretariat. She encouraged her counterparts to agree to make hard decisions as they redesigned the projects and be willing to phase-out or eliminate less pertinent activities. She indicated that she was confident that the budget shortfall identified by Mexico would be reduced as a result of this exercise. In addressing Mexico's budgetary concerns, the executive director added that any foreseeable payment of Mexico's contribution of

US\$535,000 still pending for 2004 would also address some of the shortfall.

The Alternate Representatives reached consensus on the approach presented by Canada. They also suggested that the restructuring by the executive director of Secretariat human resources in the context of the three new pillars might also accomplish potential savings in salary. They asked the Secretariat to include the allocation of personnel to projects (a sub-set of the C\$3.799 million in the budget line for salaries). They also suggested that the final budget format should present the CEC Operations budget divided in two categories: *Institutional support* and *CEC work program*. The chair summarized four tactics to be undertaken to address the budget shortfall in the cooperative program: 1) the Secretariat will be reviewing human resources needs and identify potential savings; 2) the Parties and the Secretariat will refine the project proposals and eliminate less pertinent activities; 3) decisions can be made to defer activities to 2006; 4) Parties, in reviewing the project proposals, will focus on the core purpose of each pillar and dismiss any unrelated activities.

The Alternate Representatives agreed with the overall amount of funds available to undertake the projects in the work program presented by the Secretariat. However, the exact amounts for each project under the three pillars will continue to be negotiated among the Parties.

Item 10 June 2005 Council Session

The Alternate Representatives exchanged views concerning potential themes for the June Council Session. Some of the suggestions included showcasing CEC air-related activities, highlighting progress on the North American Atlas, holding a parallel symposium on information for decision-making, and profiling the engagement of private sector in CEC activities. The Alternate Representatives tasked the GSC with developing these suggestions prior to the 10 March conference call.

Item 11 Review of 2005–2010 Strategic Plan preliminary draft

The Alternate Representatives decided to defer this item to their next meeting.

Item 12 CEC working groups and involvement of stakeholders in OP2005–2007

The Alternate Representatives decided to defer this item to their next meeting.

Item 13 Other regular business for the Alternative Representatives

Submissions on Enforcement Matters under Articles 14 and 15 (SEM-04-006 Ontario Logging II)

The Alternate Representatives signed Resolution 05-04 instructing the Secretariat to consolidate this submission (SEM-04-006) with the Ontario Logging submission (SEM-02-001) for the purpose of developing one consolidated factual record for both submissions. By way of this resolution, Council further instructed the Secretariat to include in the consolidated factual record the four (4) forest management units identified by the submitters in SEM-04-006.

Next meetings of the Alternate Representatives

The Alternate Representatives confirmed their next conference call of 10 March 2005 and agreed to schedule a face-to-face meeting in early May in Montreal.

In closing, the JPAC chair thanked the Alternate Representatives, congratulated them on this fruitful meeting and reiterated his desire to pursue a productive relationship with them. He reminded Canada of the need to appoint three new Canadian members to JPAC. On behalf of all three Parties the Canadian representative thanked the JPAC chair for joining the meeting and confirmed Canada's engagement in defining in the coming weeks the appointment of the new JPAC members. She also confirmed that responses to 4 JPAC advices had now been finalized by the Parties and that letters would be forthcoming.

SESSION 05-02 OF ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES**Los Cabos, Baja California, 7-8 February 2005****Delegations List**

(as of 3/2/2005)

CANADA**Alternate Representative**

Norine Smith, Environment Canada
 Julie Pelletier, Environment Canada
 Bill Jarvis, Environment Canada
 Tim Gallagher, Environment Canada
 Martin Roy, Foreign Affairs
 Richard Ballhorn, Foreign Affairs
 Kimberly Ferguson, Foreign Affairs

MEXICO**Alternate Representative**

José Manuel Bulás Montoro, UCAI, Semarnat
 Francisco Giner de los Ríos, Subsecretario de Gestión para la
 Protección Ambiental, Semarnat.
 José Manuel Medina Aguilar, UCAI, Semarnat
 Elena Porras, UCAI, Semarnat
 Ramón Carlos Torres Flores, Semarnat
 Olga Briseño Senosiain, Semarnat
 Salvador Sánchez Colón, Semarnat
 Alejandro Monteagudo Cuevas, Secretaría de Economía
 Irene Pisanty, INE

UNITED STATES**Alternate Representative**

Jerry Clifford, USEPA
 Mark Linscott, USTR
 Paul Cough, USEPA
 William Sonntag, USEPA
 Sylvia Correa, USEPA
 Daniel Flores, USEPA
 Robert Wing, USEPA
 Darci Vetter, USTR
 Jean Preston, US Embassy
 Patrick Cotter, USEPA
 Ana Corrado, USEPA
 Nadtya Ruiz, USEPA

JPAC**JPAC Chair**

Arturo Duran
 Marcela Orozco, JPAC Liaison Officer

SECRETARIAT**Executive Director**

William Kennedy
 Doug Wright, Director of Programs
 Nathalie Daoust, Council Secretary
 Hernando Guerrero, Director of Mexico Liaison Office

Geoffrey Garver, Director, Submissions on Enforcement Matters Unit
Evan Lloyd, Director of Communications
Eduardo Delgadillo, Director of Administration
Chantal Line Carpentier, Head, Environment, Economy and Trade
Victor Shantora, Head, Pollutants and Health
Yamirka Gómez, Assistant
Daniel Brevé, Logistics

AGENDA AND PROGRAM

SESSION 05-02 OF ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES AND ARTICLE 10(6) OFFICIALS MEETING

Salón Los Cabos A
Hotel Presidente Intercontinental
Blvd. Mijares S/N San José del Cabo, BCS México
Tel: 011-52 624-142-0211
Fax: 011-52-624 142-1733

Monday, 7 February 2005 from 9:00 to 18:00
and Tuesday, 8 February 2005 from 9:00 to 15:15

Chair: Canada

Sunday, 6 February

20:00 Private dinner for Alternate Representatives, JPAC Chair and Executive Director (Restaurant El Patio, Hotel Presidente Intercontinental)

Monday, 7 February

9:00—9:30 Opening of the Session
Item 1 Adoption of the agenda
Item 2 Report by Executive Director
Item 3 Report by JPAC Chair
9:30- 13:00 Item 4 Review of project proposals: Information for decision-making
13:00—13:30 Working Lunch
13:30—17:00 Item 5 Review of project proposals: Capacity Building
17:00-18:00 Item 6 Review of current activities
18:00—20:00 Article 10(6) working level meeting, Salón San Lucas

Tuesday, 8 February

9:00 – 12:30 Item 7 Article 10(6) Environment and Trade Officials Meeting—
Development of the Strategic Plan on “Trade and Environment”
12:30 – 13:00 Working Lunch

Item 8 Next Steps

13:00 – 15:15 Item 9 Approval of overall budget for 2005

Item 10 June 2005 Council Session

Item 11 Review of 2005-2010 Strategic Plan Preliminary Draft

Item 12 CEC working groups and involvement of stakeholders in OP2005-2007

Item 13 Other regular business for Alt. Reps' discussion

15:15 End of Session

ANNOTATED AGENDA FOR ALT. REPS SESSION 05-02

Meeting Goal:

Review and approve the 2005-2007 Operational Plan.

DAY 1

Item 1 Adoption of the Agenda

The Alternate Representatives shall adopt the agenda.

DOCUMENTS:

- a) Draft annotated agenda (distributed 3/02/2005) C/C.01/05-02/AGEN/01/rev. 2

Item 2 Report by the Executive Director

The Executive Director will briefly address the Council on Secretariat activities and any matter requiring their attention.

Item 3 Report by the JPAC Chair

Under this item the JPAC Chair will provide an update on JPAC's activities.

DOCUMENTS:

- a) Memo from JPAC Chair to Executive Director re: Comments from JPAC members on the proposed Operational Plan (distributed 28/01/2005)
- b) JPAC Advice to Council 04-01: Securing the Long-term Involvement of Indigenous Peoples in the Activities of the CEC (distributed 17/09/2004)
- c) JPAC Advice to Council 04-02: Future Directions for the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (distributed 12/08/2004)
- d) Letter dated 13 April 2004 from JPAC re: maize and biodiversity symposium (distributed 13/04/2004)
- e) JPAC Advice to Council 04-04: New directions for the CEC (distributed 29/11/2004)
- f) JPAC Advice to Council 04-05: Building the Renewable Energy in North America (distributed 29/11/2004)
- g) Letter dated 10 September 2004 from JPAC to the Executive Director re: How to better engage the private sector in CEC activities (distributed 10/09/2004)
- h) Synthesis of advice relating to strategic directions provided over time by JPAC, NACs/GACs (distributed 13/08/2004 and 3/08/2004 respectively)

Item 4 Review of project proposals: Information for decision-making

- a. Overview presentation by the Secretariat.
- b. Discuss and decide on projects/initiatives to be included under this pillar in the 2005-07 Operational Plan.

DOCUMENTS:

- a) New project proposals developed by Mexico (distributed by Mexico 4/02/2005)
- b) Memo from José Manuel Bulás re: position of Mexico on project proposals developed by the Secretariat (distributed by Mexico on 3/02/2005)
- c) Memo dated 10 December 2004 from the Executive Director re: Preliminary Budget for 2005-07 – Updated info (distributed 10/12/2004)
- d) Project proposal re: North American State of the Environment Report (distributed 26/11/2004)
- e) Project proposal re: North American Environmental Atlas (distributed 26/11/2004)
- f) Project proposal re: Law and Policy Information Service (distributed 26/11/2004)
- g) Project proposal re: North American Environmental Indicators: Annual Report (distributed 26/11/2004)
- h) Project proposal re: North American Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (distributed 26/11/2004)

Item 5 Review of project proposals: Capacity Building

- a. Overview presentation by the Secretariat.
- b. Discuss and decide on projects/initiatives to be included under this pillar in the 2005-07 Operational Plan.

DOCUMENTS:

- a) Project proposal re: Capacity Building Needs Assessment for Mexico (distributed 1/12/2004)
- b) Project proposal for Partnerships re: Integrated Environmental Management (distributed 1/12/2004)
- c) Project proposal re: Building Local Capacity re: Integrated Ecosystem Management (distributed 1/12/2004)

Item 6 Review of current activities

- a. Overview presentation by the Secretariat
- b. Discuss the future of current activities, including the potential termination or phasing out of some activities

DOCUMENTS:

- a) Updated table of Status of Current Program vis-à-vis the New Projects (distributed 10/12/2004)
- b) Descriptions of Current Activities, including SMOC NARAPs, Children's Health and Biodiversity activities (distributed 10/12/2004)

DAY 2**Item 7 Article 10(6) Environment and Trade Officials Meeting—Development of the Strategic Plan on “Trade and Environment”**

- a. Opening remarks from the Parties

- b. Review and final approval of the goals and objectives for the CEC Strategic Plan on Trade and Environment
- c. Confirmation of the status of the two outstanding priority areas (invasives and green goods for sustainable use) listed in the Puebla Declaration
- d. Exchange of views and perspectives on the project templates, which have been developed by the CEC Secretariat
- e. Next steps for the drafting of the final versions of the Strategic Plan and the Operational Plan
- f. Closing Remarks

DOCUMENTS:

- a) Project proposal re: Aquatic invasive species (distributed 4/02/2005)
- b) Project proposal re: Green Purchasing (distributed on 3/02/2005)
- c) Project proposal re: Ongoing Environmental Assessment of NAFTA and Environmental Reviews of FTA (distributed 1/12/2004)
- d) Project proposal re: Promotion of a North American market for renewable energy (distributed 1/12/2004)
- e) Project proposal re: Trade and Enforcement of Environmental Laws – Green Customs Initiative (distributed 1/12/2004 and revised version distributed on 3/02/2005)

Item 8 Next Steps

- a. Discuss next steps and decide on work to be done by the Secretariat and the Parties

Item 9 Approval of overall budget for 2005

- a. Overview presentation by the Secretariat
- b. Discuss and decide on overall budget for 2005

Document(s):

- a) Requested new budget format (distributed 1/02/2005)
- b) Background information on operational plan budget scenarios (distributed 20/1/2005)
- c) Revised Preliminary Budget for 2005 (distributed 5/1/2005)
- d) Preliminary cost analysis (distributed on 2/12/2004)

Item 10 June 2005 Council Session

The Alternate Representatives may wish to exchange views on themes and deliverables for the upcoming Council Session to be held in Quebec City in June 2005.

Item 11 Review of 2005-2010 Strategic Plan Preliminary Draft

- a. Overview presentation by the Secretariat of the preliminary draft of the 2005—2010 Strategic Plan.
- b. Exchange of views on the general approach and main messages of the draft Strategic Plan and guidance to the Secretariat for finalizing the document.

Document(s):

- a) Draft Strategic Plan (distributed 30/11/2004)
- b) 2005 Operational Plan program elements - Table of Contents (distributed 26/11/2004)

Item 12 CEC working groups and involvement of stakeholders in OP2005-2007

Having decided on projects/initiatives to be included in the 2005-07 Operational Plan, the Alternate Representatives may wish to revisit the role and mandate of the working groups in relation to the new priorities. In addition, the Parties may wish to explore ways to reach out to other stakeholders in the context of the new approved work program.

Item 13 Other regular business for Alt. Reps' discussion**Submissions on Enforcement Matters under Articles 14 and 15 (SEM-04-006 Ontario Logging II)**

Pursuant to Guideline 10(2), the Secretariat informed the Council on 17 December 2004 that it considers that submission 04-006 warrants developing a factual record, and also recommended, in accordance with Guideline 10(3), that the submission be combined with the Ontario Logging submission (SEM-02-001) for the purpose of developing one consolidated factual record for both.

As provided by Article 15(2) of the NAAEC, Council may, by a two-thirds vote, instruct the Secretariat to prepare a factual record on the matter as per the conditions laid out in the resolution.

Document(s):

- a) Draft Council Resolution (distributed by Canada 4/2/2005)
- b) Secretariat's Article 15(1) notification dated 17 December 2004 (distributed 17/12/2004)

CEC Planning - Information Program Issues for Discussion, February, 2005

The Experts Group on Information has reviewed the proposals for planning purposes provided by the Secretariat which were prepared based on advice from the Experts Group. Significant progress has been made in articulating a new information program. However, the Expert Group has some reservations about the plan as presented, has some specific advice, and has some issues which remain to be resolved amongst the three parties. *More recent advice from Mexico which has not been discussed by the Expert Group, is briefly summarized in Italics in this document.*

General Concerns (from Experts Group)

- All parties agree that there is insufficient focus on delivery capacity and systems integration.
- All parties want to ensure that the CEC information activities and products represent real value added, avoid redundancy with the work of other organizations, and result in real benefits to the lead organizations of the parties.
- All parties agreed that some further discussion of the “strategic vision” for the information program amongst the Alternative Representatives would be helpful in order to provide clear longer term direction to the Secretariat. (Ideas are being prepared for the February, 2005 meeting in Mexico).
- Some concern remains that the longer term strategy is not yet well articulated.
- Some concerns remain regarding the approach for some of the proposed products.

Agreed Recommendations

- All parties agree that the further development and use of the **North American mapping framework** should be pursued actively. The mapping framework is seen as an opportunity: 1) to further integrate the three parties information management systems; 2) to focus on particular narrow data sets for needs

assessment and development; 3) to enable a focus for meeting of experts from the three countries for issue definition and information management integration; and 4) to produce information products of high visibility, wide dissemination and clear integration of the North American context. Creation of a long term strategic work plan for this project is recommended. *Mexico wishes to emphasize the importance of using this project as a platform for data harmonization across a broad scope of potential issues, including some beyond existing CEC work.*

- The parties agree that the **Taking Stock Report** is an important product of the CEC and should continue to be a regular publication. Modifications to ensure it fits with longer term information strategy are recommended.
- The **Law and Policy** project is seen as an important area of intellectual capital created through the CEC, and a useful tool for citizens and various jurisdictions within the three parties. It is seen as amenable to being “outsourced”. It is recommended that the Secretariat investigate how the delivery of the Law and Policy database could be done, with minimal direct costs to the parties (minimal call on the Secretariat’s budget) by a not-for-profit or commercial organization. *Mexico does not see this project having sufficiently high priority to warrant a “substantial” budget allocation.*
- The overall **objectives** and proposed list of **actions** developed in Mexico and reported in Montreal last year remain as agreed. (see annex). These are framed in the context of the **Puebla Declaration** of Ministers regarding **Information for Decision Making**. In particular, the overall intent is for:
 - “the CEC to be recognized for its credible, balanced and timely information on the North American environment” that is “available and accessible to all interested parties”.

Issues for Further Discussion

- Some concerns remain about the design of the **Indicators** proposal. These include: how to avoid duplication of work of others (including the parties separately); how to choose a

desirable set of “key” indicators which can be agreed upon; can existing capacities be aligned with such a small set of indicators in order to produce an early product; will important elements of our shared environment be “excluded” because the set of issues is small; is this already a field which is “too crowded” to enable significant added value. Redesign may provide the basis for a useful, useable, doable project. *Mexico expresses particular concern that the data development and harmonization issues need to be addressed as a basic starting point for this type of report.*

- The **balance** between investment in data and systems on the one hand, and product delivery on the other remains subject to different views. On one hand is the view that most of the CEC efforts should be in integrating the information management systems (gap analysis, data definitions, protocols, meta-data, systems applications etc). On the other is the view that the CEC must be able to speak to a broad North American constituency, and that requires regular, high profile, meaningful and reliable information products. It is reasonably clear that the information program will require something from each view to be successful. The balance is a key issue for decision.
 - **Should product design come first with information system built to satisfy the needs of the products, or should information development and integration come first, with products an outcome based on what has been done to integrate?**
- **Linkages** to and use of other work, in design, in definition, and in reporting, has not been sufficiently explored. Concerns were expressed that the CEC may duplicate existing work, rebuild systems that already exist, or provide redundant reports unless there is a way to provide more extensive review of existing and prospective systems. (The Puebla declaration noted GEOSS as an important potential linkage.) The study presented in Montreal by Ian Crane may provide further guidance.
- It is acknowledged that the CEC mandate includes reporting on the **state of the environment**. The Expert Group has not resolved how this could best be accomplished. Ideas discussed include; a report targeted on specific issues which change for each version of the report; a bi- or –tri-annual report; a report

that is an extension or accumulation of indicators reports; simply using the indicators reports (whatever their substance may be) as SOE reports; using country reports rolled up as a continental report. The need for an SOE report and its desired format will require some direction from alternative representatives. *Mexico recommends that the indicators, atlas and state-of-environment projects be integrated into a strategic approach identifying priority interests (similar to the substantive focus idea below) and data development needs (similar to the bullet #3 under proposals, more directly tied to outputs).*

- **Substantive focus** was suggested at the meeting in Washington as a mechanism to initiate developmental work. **Air quality** remains a priority interest for all parties, and could provide a program focus, for much of the information program, for the coming Budget period.

Proposals

- Fund the development of strategy and early work on data development for production of N.A. maps on air quality and other issues (renewable energy, ecosystems et. al.) Start with an experts meeting of the Atlas groups from the parties to get advice on how to establish capacity within the CEC. *Mexico recommends close linkages with the data development, indicators and SOE recommendations below.*
- Fund Taking Stock as proposed by Secretariat, but with more attention to limiting costs of the overall project, especially with respect to consultations
Create a separate new project for systems integration, data needs identification and data development for this fiscal year and next. Start with air quality data as example. This project funding should provide the basis for a long term plan for information and systems integration. *Mexico sees this project being closely integrated with any indicators/atlas/SOE strategy)*
- Initiate a small project for indicators based on a report within 18 months on various aspects of air quality across N.A. Include creation of a roll out strategy for indicators production on evolving substantive elements (ecosystems, water availability, wildlife et. al.) (Do not include analytical work by

committees – data development only. If other work is needed it should stand on its own merit.) *Mexico has concerns about data availability, and all parties have concerns about potential redundancy.*

- Instruct Secretariat to search for a not-for-profit organization (and failing that a commercial operator) to manage the Law and Policy database. Provide sufficient bridge funding to maximize the likelihood of a continuing effective use of the capital. *Mexico emphasizes the importance of minimizing budget implications.*
- Fund work on design options for SOE reporting to be brought forward for decision before end 2005. *Refer to comments from Mexico re integration above.*
- Provide for the development (with active participation of the parties) of a more detailed strategic approach to the CEC information pillar, linked to these proposals and to the plan for information and systems development (above), but also focusing on product choices, audience identification, impact expectations and desired outcomes.
- *Mexico recommends three additional projects to continue/complete the activities of workgroups: Sound Management of Chemicals; Pathways for invasive species; and information on environmental emergencies. These have not been discussed by the Expert Group.*

Jarvis
February 4, 2005

OBJECTIVES

1. Build and ensure CEC Secretariat and member capacity to provide and use, at all levels of society, information needed to understand North American environmental issues of common concern. **{capacity building}**
2. Establish and maintain the systems design elements of an environmental and information and knowledge framework for North America that identifies and integrates, in a coherent and compatible manner, both data specification and information management systems. **{systems design}**
3. Identify, establish and maintain the information needed to describe the state of the North American environment, to identify emerging trends and issues, and to guide decisions relevant to the shared environmental interests of the parties. **{substance of framework}**
4. Make information from the framework accessible and easily available to citizens and governments of the three parties through information and knowledge products and services, in order to facilitate local, national and regional action. **{communication}**

ACTIONS

1. Capacity building
2. Identification of indicators
3. Development of common techniques (including spatial representation)
4. Design mechanics for interoperability
5. Text information on parties' activities
6. **Develop and provide specific information products and services**
7. Enable expert and scientific exchange

Proposal for CEC Information Agenda/Plan Development Effort

Summary

- parties should undertake a measured, short term effort to further refine the CEC Information Agenda/Plan,.
 - short term analysis and program design effort, guided by basic information strategy development approach, should be conducted.
- Proposals builds off of the concept of a CEC “Information Agenda/Plan” :
 - *Participants propose the development of this Strategic Plan as the next logical step from Pueblo. It would take the goals, objectives and criteria identified above, and apply them to these topical areas. It would also include a scan of current CEC activities to assess their alignment and contribution to these goals, as well as the identification of new activities required. Recent deliberations of the Alternative Representatives and these deliberations of the Meeting Participants clearly indicate that there is a convergence of both interest and ability to begin such a plan. .[1]*
-
- [1] Report to Alternative Representatives Information for Decision-Making
- Meeting of Parties' Experts September 13-14, 2004 Mexico City

Proposed Steps

- 1) Identify, refine and document key CEC information agenda goals and objectives
 - Pueblo declaration, and subsequent work of the alt-reps and the secretariat, there is significant background that can be tapped.
- 2) Codify and document core CEC information products, services and capacities through which CEC seeks to add value.
 - This would include definition of the CEC niche (e.g. is/should CEC be uniquely positioned) for these capacities. (See table below for starting point)

Step 3 Catalog and Scan

- Catalog and conduct a high level scan of current and proposed CEC activities/projects to characterize how/where they use/support the CEC capacities/services identified in #2 above, towards the goals identified in #1 above. This scan would produce the following specific outputs:
 - Revised catalog of project/proposals
 - Overall characterization of the portfolio in terms of
 - Balance across CEC information capacities
 - Balance across information goals / objectives
 - Gaps
 - Specific opportunities for synergy and economies of scale across the projects themselves (i.e. tool or expertise sharing) or in the mechanisms by which CEC is supporting the projects (i.e. common product or investment)

Focus Projects and Final Recommendations

- 4) From this scan identify small set (3-5) of project areas that merit more in-depth consideration.

In consultation and work of the relevant member experts and sponsors assess and develop, in more detail, exactly how the CEC capacities identified in the scan, are implemented and leveraged

- 5) Final Report

- Enhancements to current project to build and leverage CEC capacities
- New projects designed to capitalize on opportunities/gaps identified
- Projects not continued under CEC sponsorship

Information for decision making Mexico delegation

7th February, 2005

Comments on projects proposed

1.- PRTR project.

- + Full agreement
- + Minor modifications/adjustments might be required

2.- Law and policy information service project.

- + Not priority

3.- Environmental Atlas of NA.-

- + Important project,
- + CEC should actively support its further development.
- + Present proposal should be revised
- + Possibility to be integrated into a more comprehensive scheme including other closely related projects.

Comments on projects proposed

4.- North American Environmental Indicators: Annual Report and North American State of the Environment Report

- + In their present form, appear as isolated end-products
- + Summary or compilation of national products
- + Risk of redundancy with other initiatives
- + Only partially address issue of differences among countries as to data availability and data capabilities for acquiring the required data.
- + Previous efforts have demonstrated this problem severely obstaculized the attempts to produce reports based on integrated, harmonized information at the regional level.
- + Suggest the integration of these two initiatives (plus the Environmental Atlas of NA) into a single more comprehensive scheme: ***Environmental Information System of NA.***

Comments on projects proposed

- A) Sound Management of Chemicals – Monitoring & Assessment
- B) Assessing key Pathways and Invasive Alien Species threatening North American Ecosystems and Commerce
- C) NA Information system for environmental emergencies

Draft Summary of decisions
Meeting of the CEC Alternate Representatives
Los Cabos, 7 -8 February 2005

Project proposal and budget requested for 2005 (as per gradual scenario)	Decision	Follow-up	Budget approved
INFORMATION FOR DECISION-MAKING			
“Foundation project” (<i>new proposal – no specific budget requested</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a project for systems integration, data needs identification and data development • Pertinent elements of N.A. Atlas, Indicators project and N.A. SOE report projects should be embedded in this project • Focus on theme which leads to concrete deliverables • Start with air quality as a theme • Other potential themes can include biodiversity, hydrological surveys 	Information experts team to meet in Montreal, February 22-23, and work with Secretariat to finalize project proposal	To be determined within a 600K “envelope”
N.A. State of the Environment report (50K requested over 2 years)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop options for Alt Reps and GSC’s (as reps for the Council) consideration (defining topics and indicators) • The SOE report should reflect information gathered in N.A. environmental indicators report 	Information experts team and Secretariat to rework proposal and make linkages with “foundation project”	20-40K in 2005

N.A. Environment indicators: Annual Report (555K requested in 2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement to include the SMOC monitoring assessment component 	Proposal by Mexico to be reviewed by the Information Experts team on 22-23 February	112K for 2005 (for SMOC monitoring)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air quality monitoring, biodiversity indicators and children's health and environment to be confirmed as topics 	Information experts team to discuss these items at their meeting on 22-23 February	To be determined within a 600K "envelope"
PRTR (520K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceed in 2005 as per project proposal Secretariat to confirm that the budget accommodates reporting on marine emissions. 		520K
N.A. Environmental Atlas (140K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceed in 2005 Important for the CEC to demonstrate success in producing useful information Highlight progress at Council Meeting 	Information experts team and Secretariat to rewrite tasks 1 and 2 of proposal and articulate the content of the first maps to be produced	To be determined within a 600K "envelope"
Law and Policy Information Service (120K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and update of law database only Seek to devolve or establish partnership for continuing, maintenance and updating (undertaken by Sec. staff) Parties to offer expertise and contacts to identify potential partners 	Secretariat to revise proposal to reflect decision by the Parties	20K for 2005
Environmental disasters Info Service (new proposal from	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA and US needing to review this proposal further 	To be discussed by Information experts team on 22-23 February	No decision

Mexico) (no budget figures requested)			
CAPACITY BUILDING			
Capacity Building Needs Assessment (170K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project cancelled 	Mexico to develop overarching framework piece in advance of Council Session to be incorporated in Strategic Plan	No budget required
Partnerships for Integrated Environmental Management (355K requested in Sec. proposal; 273K requested in Mx proposal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clean Electronics to be included in this project Supply chain as pilot project to be included 	Secretariat to work with Parties in elaborating further description of project	Specific budget allocation pending. Proposal for a little over 400K
Building Local Capacity for Integrated Ecosystem Management (185K requested in Sec. proposal; 300K requested in Mx proposal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US and Canada needing to consult internally on new proposal from Mx 		Around 70K
Institutional Strengthening for the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern from CA on budget required CA and US to consult internally 	GSC to discuss further	No decision

Implementation of a national program... (300K requested by Mexico for 2005)			
TRADE and ENVIRONMENT			
Trade and Enforcement of Env. Laws (205K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US suggesting that Task 3 be rewritten taking into consideration criteria laid out by 10(6) team 	10(6) team to define project further with Secretariat and EWG	Specific budget allocation pending
Renewable Energy (325K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original project title to be retained Question raised re: task 4 by CA and US. Mexico to confirm position 	10(6) team to define project further with Secretariat	Specific budget allocation pending
Env. Assessment of NAFTA and FTAs (180K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement to focus on sectors Proposal to highlight sector analysis in project description (and include sharing of methodologies as a means) Parties to resolve inclusion of assessment of FTAs Ensure description meets criteria under T&E Secretariat can initiate work re: meeting to exchange methodologies 	10(6) team and Secretariat to redraft project description to highlight sector analysis	Specific budget allocation pending
Green purchasing (151K needed but not factored in budget presented to Parties)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement on project 	Finetuning required by 10(6) team and Secretariat	Specific budget allocation pending

Market-based mechanisms (25K needed in 2005 but not factored in budget presented to Parties)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA and US to consult internally Project template to be redrafted to reflect 10(6) criteria 	10(6) to work with Secretariat on redrafting Mexican proposal	Specific budget allocation pending
Invasive species (150K needed by Secretariat but not factored in budget presented to Parties; 250K requested in Mexico's proposal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project description to be refined and 10(6) criteria to be applied Important to keep "pathways" focus Agreement to focus on marine species 	Discussion between BCWG and 10(6) team to take place. Rewriting to take place jointly between 10(6) team and Secretariat.	Specific budget allocation pending
CURRENT ACTIVITIES			
Successful water quality practices (30K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of report, publication and distribution only 		5K
Environmental Sound Management of Hazardous waste (10K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceed 		10K
Biodiversity-related Activities (250K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further consultation with BCWG and Secretariat to review what activities can be accomplished within approved budget Parties to reassess need and financing for more activities 		250K

SMOC-NARAPs (291K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New proposal put forward by US for 30K for lindane workshop The US believes that this may be the only activity appropriate for this year, since the Lindane NARAP won't be completed until later this year. The US doesn't believe it is possible to implement this year any of the other proposed activities listed in the 2005 CEC Operating Plan. 	Details of 30K workshop to be discussed by Parties	241K for 2005 (+30K?) 50K deferred to 2006
Regional program of action, DDT (80K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceed 		80K
CEH (no budget requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No project in 2005 		0
NA Air working group (10K requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceed 		10K