

**Appendix III-b8. Responses to question #17 of the questionnaire.**

**17. If NARSTO ceased to exist, what do you think the impact would be?**

**Responder Comment(s)  
Number**

Q # 2 NARSTO it is an additional source of information where researchers from the three countries contribute, and it is an independent institution.

Q # 5 Perhaps, the greatest impact would be lost coordination in North America.

Q # 7 Fewer authoritative assessments to use to base policy decisions on. Canada, US, Mexico would have less well integrated approach to air quality.

Q # 8 Canada and Mexico would each work separately with the U.S. on common issues. There is currently no mechanism through which to achieve common views of shared air quality issues except NARSTO for Canada and the U.S. - the U.S.-Canada Air Quality Committee does not have the capacity - nor was it designed - to complete science assessments on shared air quality problems.

Q # 9 In some ways, very minimal. There are far more influential organizations such as US EPA and the WHO when it comes to my area (health effects). The adverse impact would be in the loss of an independent voice that is fairly effective in bringing together disparate views and groups.

Q # 11 A gap in unbiased scientific determinations of air pollutants.

Q # 13 The very little interaction among the three countries that we have will cease to exist.

Q # 14 We would lose an important forum for objective discussions between government and industry, and between the three countries. We would sacrifice the data archive, which has the potential for consistent, routine, storage and dissemination of data from multiple North American sources. We would lose an important instrument for pooling of resources, information, and talent, which would result in downstream duplication of effort.

Q # 15 One of the ways to do joint work among US Canada and Mexico will be lost.

Q # 16 Unfortunately, minimal.

Q # 18 A very useful forum for interagency & international collaboration and for the conducting timely assessments of policy-relevant science would be lost, and would need to be replaced by other mechanisms (which would likely be more costly). I don't think any of the alternative existing institutions would or could be as flexible and responsive. The elimination of the NARSTO data archive would be tragic, and would need to be replaced elsewhere.

Q # 19 Not much since the communication among the community would continue in other forums. On the other hand as long as costs are low and the community is willing to get together voluntarily, continuing is OK.

Q # 22 A return to the inefficiency and ineffectiveness of competing public and private air quality research seen by the NAS in the late 1980's that gave rise their call for the creation of an organization like NARSTO. Loss of a strong forum for multi-disciplinary science in air quality. Loss of a unique public / private research leveraging opportunity. Increased process and transaction costs in environmental research and use of environmental science in decision making. The unlikelihood that this unique partnership and organizational structure will ever be recreated, as past scrutiny in Inspector General reviews have gained acceptances but not approvals.

Q # 23 Very significant as there is no other tri-national multi-stakeholder community to take its' place.

Q # 24 Impossible to determine.

Q # 25 We would have to find another way to coordinate with Canada and Mexico on air quality problems affecting the continent. This would take time and resources to recreate the structure and relationships built over the years in the NARSTO community. In the mean time, there would be less focus on international cooperation.

Q # 26 reduced scientific interaction among Mexico, Canada and the US.

Q # 27 Probably would not have a major impact.

Q # 28 A hiatus followed by replacement by another similar group.

Q # 29 Even though there are other atmospheric organizations which do similar work( CEC, IJC) the relationship between government, industry and the academic community would be lost. The CEC and IJC are government controlled NARSTO is not.

Q # 30 Less interaction between US, Canada and Mexican governments and scientists. Less interaction between industry and government.

Q # 31 A fair amount of the work would continue to be done, but the communication and integration of results would be badly impacted

Q # 32 Loss of trusted organization to translate research into material that is useful for air quality management agencies.

Q # 33 A lot depends on how serious non-governmental funding authorities are in supporting key research priorities in air quality - Air quality will increasingly be pushed aside to address climate, yet it appears we are far from finished with remaining AQ issues (see my 2007 AWMA critical review). If private stakeholders want to continue to support, losing NARSTO would

really hinder attempts to coordinate identifying key questions, projects, and data sharing. If the private side doesn't support actual research, the governments always can come up with avenues for interactions under NAFTA or other air agreements. They would lose the insights of knowledgeable private sector experts, who presumably would no longer be in that sector. Discussions with policy types from the private side would become more ad hoc.

Q # 34 It is well known the interchange among different american countries, therefore the antropogenic activities performed could impact each and other .NARSTO put togheter different evidences that help to maker decision.

Q # 35 The air quality scientists and the policy makers will loose an opportunity to carry out research studies where resources are shared by three countries and many minds are brought together to work on a problem.

Q # 37 A useful forum will be lost, it can be more useful than up to now because it is more US centric, but at the end it is the specific weight of the scientfic communities of the three countries.

Q # 38 Other mechanisms would have to be created to facilitate collaboration across North America. The loss of independent scientific assessments would remove an important input to the policy development process, at least in the U.S.

Q # 39 It will probably be more difficult to achieve an interaction between groups.

Q # 40 There would be fewer international interactions, more insularity among member nations; perhaps less understanding and good will of air quality problems faced by member nations.

Q # 41 It takes time and resources to build and foster communications and relations based on trust and cooperation among the different countries. These efforts would be lost and hard to reestablish later on.

Q # 44 Probably minimal, because the issues of emphasis are now climate change, whose impacts ozone are dwarfed by other impacts like drought, hurricanes, etc.

Q # 45 Of course we'd survive without NARSTO just fine.The impact would be that we'd never know what we missed and that eventually, sooner probably rather than later, something similar would likely start, but would be less formal and would, to some extent reinvent the wheel. Given the accomplishments of NARSTO to date and its reasonably well-developed network, not to mention its reasonably solid reputation, for NARSTO to cease would thus, be a shame as it is way out in front compared to whatever would rise in its place. Another impact would be that the third partner Mexico appears to be coming into its own. This provide a great opportunity now to refocus in this new light and move forward. If NARSTO ceased, this opportunity would be lost or would be set back.

Q # 46 I think the impact would be mostly a matter of lost opportunities to advance policy-relevant science on air quality issues.

Q # 47 Lack of valuable interaction between scientists from 3 countries ; lack of valuable interaction between scientists with different backgrounds, lack of timely assessment documents

Q # 48 Loss of a resource of diverse science and international expertise.

Q # 50 Less cooperation across diverse interests at mid-management levels. It's time that the NARSTO concepts need to be reinvented on a grander scale with participation and explicit authorization by top level executives of participating agencies and organizations. Since such executives signed the charter at the White House a decade ago, cognizance of NARSTO at those levels has naturally diluted if not disappeared.

Q # 51 see comments on #19.

Q # 52 Not sure. Perhaps less cooperation between public and private sectors in air quality research would be greatest impact. There is already good cooperation between US and Canada; but US-Mexico research opportunities may suffer.

Q # 53 Reduced opportunity for tri-national collaboration.

Q # 54 If NARSTO ceased to exist it would result in decreased communication and decreased focus on critical air planning needs.