

1 Background

The 14th NOWPAP IGM (Toyama, Japan, 8-10 December 2009) approved CEARAC 1workplan for the 2010-2011 biennium with the budget cutdown to 107,000US\$. Following the decision on the budget cutdown, allocation of CEARAC budget to each specific project was revised by CEARAC and it was approved by CEARAC Focal Points (FPs) through e-mail correspondence. Yangtze River Estuary and adjacent area in China, Northwest Kyusyu sea area in Japan, Jinhae Bay in Korea and Peter the Great Bay in Russia was selected to conduct eutrophication assessment based on the Common Procedures by the CEARAC FPs at the 7th CEARAC Focal Meeting.

This document is a revised work plan for implementation of the assessment of eutrophication status by the NOWPAP member states.

2 Objective

Objective of this activity is to apply the Common Procedures and to evaluate the suitability of suggested methodology for assessment of eutrophication status in the selected sea areas in the NOWPAP member states.

3 Main tasks

Each NOWPAP member state will be required to conduct an assessment of the eutrophication status in their selected sea areas based on the Common Procedures. The following work will be conducted by the experts nominated by CEARAC FPs under MoU with CEARAC.

3.1 Division of sub areas in each selected area

Divide the assessment area into sub areas if necessary to conduct an assessment effectively.

3.2 Collection of relevant information

Collect information and data on the assessment area(s) from existing monitoring and survey activities based on the common procedures.

3.3 Selection of assessment parameters and data

Select all the assessment parameters from the collected data, and then categorize them into the 4 categories indicated by the common procedures.

3.4 Setting of assessment period

Set the assessment period as long as possible in accordance with the assessment objectives and availability of reliable data.

3.5 Data processing

Process the selected monitoring/survey data into assessment values and prepares data sets to conduct assessment.

3.6 Setting of assessment criteria

Set the assessment criteria for each assessment parameter, category and area/sub areas based on the common procedures.

3.7 Preparation of a report on assessment results

Prepare a report based on the assessment results. Draft table of contents of the report on assessment in each selected area is resented in Annex A.

3.8 Review of the Integrated report

Review the Integrated report on eutrophication assessment in selected sea areas in the NOWPAP region, prepared by CEARAC. Draft table of contents of the integrated report is attached as Annex B.

4. Expected outcomes

The obtained assessment results from each NOWPAP member state will be compiled as an Integrated report on assessment of eutrophication status for the NOWPAP region, hoping that it will provide essential information for proper management of the marine and coastal environment in the NOWPAP region.

5. Potential partners

In order to best utilize obtained assessment results for proper management of the marine and coastal environment, it is necessary to share the obtained assessment results with groups or organizations that are working on coastal area management. CEARAC will form a cooperative relationship with relevant organizations within and without NOWPAP framework, such us NOWPAP RACs, local governments and other relevant organizations.

6. Schedule

Interim results of eutrophication assessment of each selected are in NOWPAP member

states will be reviewed by the CEARAC Expert Meeting scheduled back to back with the 8th CEARAC FPM. Assessment of eutrophication in each selected area will be completed by March 2011, Then CEARAC together with consultant will prepare Integrated report on assessment of eutrophication status in selected sea areas in the NOWPAP region, based on the assessment results of each member state.

Time		Actions	Main body
2010	Jun to July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusion of MoU for implementation of assessment of eutrophication status in selected sea area of each NOWPAP member state 	CEARAC / experts
	Sep (8 th CEARAC FPM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of revised workplan and budget by CEARAC FPs 	CEARAC / CEARAC FPs
	Sep (8 th CEARAC expert meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of the interim result and processes of the eutrophication assessment in each selected area 	CEARAC / experts / CEARAC FPs
	Sep -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuation of eutrophication assessment in each selected area 	CEARAC / National experts
2011	Mar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of eutrophication assessment in each selected area 	National experts or NPEC
	Apr - Jul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of the draft Integrated Report through comparison and harmonization of the eutrophication assessment results in each selected sea area 	
	Aug - Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and revision of the Integrated Report by national experts and CEARAC FPs 	National experts / CEARAC FPs
	Nov	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proofreading of the Integrated Report by consultant 	CEARAC hired consultant
	Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publication of the Integrated Report in an electronic format 	CEARAC
	Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribution of the report at the 15th NOWPAP IGM 	CEARAC

7. Budget

Contract	Timing	Output	To be completed	Counterpart	Budget (US\$)
Implementation of eutrophication assessment in each NOWPAP member state	2010 Q2	Results of eutrophication assessment in each NOWPAP member state	2010 Q4	Expert or organization in China	3,000
				Consultant in Japan	3,000
				Expert or organization in Korea	3,000
				Expert or organization in Russia	3,000
Preparation of integrated report on eutrophication assessment for the NOWPAP region	2011 Q1	Integrated report on eutrophication assessment for the NOWPAP region	2011 Q3	Consultant	4,000
Total					16,000

Annex A

Draft table of contents for a report on eutrophication assessment in each selected sea area

1. Scope of Assessment

1.1 Selection of assessment area

1.2 Collection of relevant information

1.3 Division of assessment area into sub-areas (if necessary)

1.4 Selection of assessment parameters

2. Data processing

2.1 Organization of collected data

2.2 Screening and sorting of data into sub-areas

2.3 Preparation of data sets for assessment

3. Setting of assessment criteria

3.1 Setting of identification criteria of the assessment data

3.2 Setting of classification criteria of the assessment parameters

3.3 Classification criteria of the assessment categories

3.4 Classification criteria of the assessment area/sub-areas

4. Assessment process and results

4.1 Division of assessment areas and assessment categories

4.2 Assessment results in each sub-area

5. Summary

Annex B

Draft table of contents for the integrated report on eutrophication assessment in selected sea area in the NOWPAP region

Executive summary

1. Introduction

2. Results of eutrophication assessment in the selected sea areas

2.1. Scope of Assessment

2.1.1 Selection of assessment area

2.1.2 Collection of relevant information

2.1.3 Division of assessment area into sub-areas (if necessary)

2.1.4 Selection of assessment parameters

2.2. Data processing

2.2.1 Organization of collected data

2.2.2 Screening and sorting of data into sub-areas

2.2.3 Preparation of data sets for assessment

2.3. Setting of assessment criteria

2.3.1 Setting of identification criteria of the assessment data

2.3.2 Setting of classification criteria of the assessment parameters

2.3.3 Classification criteria of the assessment categories

2.3.4 Classification criteria of the assessment area/sub-areas

2.4. Assessment process and results

2.4.1 Division of assessment areas and assessment categories

2.4.2 Assessment results in each sub-area

2.5. Summary

3. Comparison of assessment results in the selected areas in each NOWPAP state

3.1. Similarities and differences in each selected areas

3.2. Comparison of assessment criteria

3.2.1 Similarities and differences in assessment data

3.2.2 Similarities and differences in assessment parameters

3.2.3 Similarities and differences in classification criteria of assessment categories

3.2.4 Similarities and differences in classification criteria of assessment area/sub-areas

3.3. Comparison of assessment results of each selected area

4. Overall conclusions and recommendations