

Statement of the representative of the Russian Federation

NEASPEC has made tremendous progress since its establishment becoming one of the most efficient subregion cooperation mechanism in the framework of UN ESCAP. And being the only one dealing successfully with broad list of environmental issues via SOM and project work.

Notwithstanding the fact that outcomes of such multilateral cooperation under the umbrella of NEASPEC are significant and exemplary we should admit that this subregion is facing even greater environmental challenges and it requires further cooperation.

We all have committed to the full implementation of SDGs until 2030. So we have to adjust our policies, driven by intensive economic activity of our countries to preserve the environmental treasuries that our countries have. And climate protection is critical in this regard. Our leaders proved this thesis during Paris Agreement deal.

As you maybe be aware of last September 7th Ministerial Conference on Environment and Development of UN ESCAP tool place in Bangkok. As a result of very intense and difficult negotiations on the outcomes of it a consensus-based Ministerial Declaration has been adopted. Where within the overall context of ESCAP Member States' national circumstances and priorities the Ministers of Asia and Pacific region "noted with concern that environmental degradation, including that exacerbated by climate change, also threatens human livelihoods, health and well-being".

Ministers resolved to "contribute to addressing the harmful effects of climate change through enhanced climate actions".

And they have decided to work together to, inter alia, "promote dialogue to discuss environmental issues, including those that have transboundary impacts".

With that said I would like to express my Government's position on further strengthening of collaboration in the region of North-East Asia.

While we have no strong comments on the objectives and core program of the proposed TOR. We do have the following observations regarding the proposed institutional structure of NEACAP.

1) Committee is enough. No additional Working groups (at least at the beginning).

2) Strongly against the "peer review" process. We find it discriminative at major extent and controversial to the agreed parameters of implementation of Agenda-2030, where the mechanism of "peer learning" is fixed as mutually acceptable.

3) NEACAP should be expert level mechanism with no legally binding decisions to be taken. National circumstances, capacities and priorities should be taken into account in terms of respecting the Member States policies as well as their intentions to move forward in terms of dealing with transboundary impacts of climate change in neighboring countries to better address the possible negative influence of them to national environment.