

Japan

Hideaki Ozawa



Kanki Hirata



Nishimura & Partners

1 Environmental Policy and its Enforcement

1.1 What is the basis of environmental policy in Japan and which agencies/bodies administer and enforce environmental law?

The principles of environmental policy under the Basic Environment Law are (i) the enjoyment of environmental endowments and the succession thereof to future generations; (ii) the creation of a society which ensures sustainable development with a reduced environmental load; and (iii) the active promotion of global environmental conservation through international cooperation.

Environmentally-related affairs are either under the exclusive responsibility of the Ministry of the Environment or under the joint responsibility of the Ministry of the Environment and other Ministries.

1.2 What approach do such agencies/bodies take to the enforcement of environmental law?

In the past, regulatory methods (e.g., direction, prohibition) were mainly used by government agencies in order to enforce environmental policies. However, recently not only regulatory methods but also the comprehensive method (e.g., planning, environmental assessments), the inductive method (e.g., bounty, labelling, information distribution), the consensual method (e.g., agreement) and the after-the-fact method (e.g., criminal or administrative penalty) have been taken concomitantly because of the limits of monitoring capabilities and administrative resources under regulatory methods, and because regulatory methods are not necessarily appropriate to deal with issues surrounding environmental risks.

1.3 To what extent are public authorities required to provide environment-related information to interested persons (including members of the public)?

Under the Basic Environmental Law, the State makes efforts to provide the public appropriately with the necessary information on environmental conservation, including information relating to the state of the environment, for the protection of the rights and interests of individuals and legal entities. Thus, in practice, the Ministry of the Environment systematises and furnishes environmental information by posting environmental administrative information, various guidelines and the like on its

website, or by publishing white papers on the environment.

The Information Disclosure Law, established in 1999, enables any person to require the disclosure of any information (including environmentally-related information) by administrative agencies. In particular, all persons (including legal entities, foreigners, etc.) are able to require that an administrative agency disclose documents, images and electromagnetic records which officials of the administrative agency prepared or obtained officially for the administrative agency, excluding the information below:

- information which reveals the identity of a particular individual;
- information which harms the legitimate interests of corporations, etc.;
- information which jeopardises national security, or relations with foreign countries, etc.;
- information that interferes with public safety and the preservation of order;
- information about discussions and deliberations within an administrative agency, or between administrative agencies, that may impede the frank exchange of views, neutrality of decision-making, etc.; and
- information which interferes with the appropriate operation of the administrative agencies.

If the administrative agency decides that the disclosure of any of the above is particularly necessary for the public interest, it may disclose the information.

2 Environmental Permits

2.1 When is an environmental permit required, and may environmental permits be transferred from one person to another?

The prohibition of violations of environmental regulatory standards is mainly adopted in order to prevent environmental pollution. There are also some required permits related to the conservation of the environment. Environmental permits are often required when (i) business cannot be appropriately conducted without special skills or experience, in which case the government agency provides licences to qualified business entities and oversees the effective enforcement of regulations (e.g., collection, transport and disposal of waste); or (ii) only certain individuals are allowed to utilise limited national resources for certain special objectives (e.g., the capture of rare species of wild animals, plants and the like for academic research, breeding, etc.).

The transfer of a permission is in general impermissible.

2.2 What rights are there to appeal against the decision of an environmental regulator not to grant an environmental permit or in respect of the conditions contained in an environmental permit?

If an applicant is not satisfied with an administrative decision refusing to grant an environmental permit, they may protest against the agency or bring an administrative litigation to court. The aforementioned protest will be reviewed by the administrative government agency itself or its supervising agency. Some statutes require such protests as a pre-condition to pursuing administrative litigation.

2.3 Is it necessary to conduct environmental audits or environmental impact assessments for particularly polluting industries or other installations/projects?

The enterprises that are involved in certain infrastructural projects are required to conduct environmental impact assessments. There are thirteen projects listed under the Environmental Impact Assessment Law, including construction of a national road; construction of a railway; construction of an airport facility; construction of a general waste disposal site; construction of an industrial waste disposal site; and the planning of ports and harbours. Large-scale projects, called Class-1 Projects, are always subject to assessment. A project that is smaller in scale than a Class-1 Project is referred to as a Class-2 Project. A Class-2 Project is subject to assessment if so determined through the corresponding screening procedure.

2.4 What enforcement powers do environmental regulators have in connection with the violation of permits?

Environmental actions taken without the requisite permits or with permits that were obtained through dishonest means, and environmental violations, are constrained by all or some of the following measures:

- a. the violator may be ordered to take necessary measures for environmental conservation, such as restoration to the original state;
- b. the violator may be ordered to suspend the entirety or part of its business for a fixed period;
- c. permits may be revoked; and
- d. the violator may be imprisoned or fined, or subjected to both of these punishments.

3 Waste

3.1 How is waste defined and do certain categories of waste involve additional duties or controls?

- 1 "Waste" is defined as garbage, bulky garbage, ashes, sludge, excreta, waste oil, waste acid and alkali, carcasses and other filthy and unnecessary matter whether in a solid or liquid form (excluding radioactive waste and waste polluted by radioactivity). In other words, waste is an object which is unnecessary and which cannot be bought or sold.
- 2 Waste can be broadly categorised as either "general waste" or "industrial waste". Both categories include a sub-category of

"specially managed waste".

"Industrial waste" means waste categories such as ashes, sludge, waste oil, waste acid, waste alkali, waste plastics, and others that are specified by a cabinet order as a result of a business activity, as well as imported waste.

"General waste" means waste other than industrial waste.

"Specially managed waste" means such general waste and industrial waste which, as specified by a cabinet order, is explosive, toxic, infectious or of a nature otherwise harmful to human health or the living environment.

- 3 Business entities are under an obligation to dispose of industrial waste by their own means or to have an authorised disposal entity dispose of the waste at the business entities' cost.

On the other hand, municipalities must collect, transport and dispose of general waste. However, general waste from business activities (e.g., used papers from offices, or garbage from restaurants) must be appropriately disposed of by business entities. In practice, business entities carry the general waste to the municipal treatment facility by their own means or have an authorised transportation entity carry the general waste there. Subsequently, the municipalities dispose of the waste and charge business entities the costs fully or partially.

Standards on the collection, transport and disposal of specially managed general (or industrial) waste and the qualifications of the entity that is authorised to collect, transport and dispose of such waste are stricter than those of other general (or industrial) waste.

3.2 To what extent is a producer of waste allowed to store and/or dispose of it on the site where it was produced?

Business entities are allowed to store and dispose of their industrial waste on the site where such waste was produced, in accordance with the standards described below.

Business entities must store the industrial waste in accordance with industrial waste storage standards (such as creating an enclosure around the circumference of the industrial waste site, displaying a notice board, preventing dispersal, spillage and the like); they must not store the waste for longer than the time required to appropriately dispose of or recycle it; and they must not store it in excess of a volume equal to fourteen times one day's treatment capacity of the facility.

Business entities must furthermore dispose of industrial waste following industrial waste management standards. In particular, the business entities must prevent the scatter or leakage of industrial waste and must protect the living environment from bad odour, noise and vibration. The incineration of industrial waste must be carried out in a particular manner and using a specific structure. The landfill disposal of the waste must be performed in an appropriate manner depending on the type of industrial waste.

3.3 Do producers of waste retain any residual liability in respect of the waste where they have transferred it to another person for disposal/treatment off-site (e.g. if the transferee/ultimate disposer goes bankrupt/disappears)?

Even if a business entity transfers the waste to another person for disposal, if the industrial waste is disposed of in a manner that does not conform with disposal standards for such waste and if the living environment is damaged or threatened by such disposal, the mayor of the municipality may order the business entity to take the

necessary measures within a specified timeline where both of the following conditions are met:

- a. it is difficult for the party who disposed waste to take the appropriate measures to cure the situation due to its financial condition, etc.; and
- b. the business entity that produced the waste did not fairly pay for the disposal of waste, or knew or could have known about the inadequate disposal.

3.4 To what extent do waste producers have obligations regarding the take-back and recovery of their waste?

The basic policies of recycling statutes are the waste generator responsibility principle and the extended producer responsibility principle. However, they are not necessarily pursued completely in each statute. Namely, the kind of waste that business entities collect and recycle, and the party that must bear the expenses for the processes in relation to collection and recycling, depend on individual laws as shown below.

According to the Law for the Promotion of Sorted Collection and Recycling of Containers and Packaging, (i) consumers must separate and empty containers and packaging waste; (ii) municipalities must sort and collect containers and packaging waste at their own expense; and (iii) business entities (containers and packaging manufacturers or contents producers) must recycle containers and packaging waste by their own means or by using a designated corporation or recycling business entity.

According to the Law for the Recycling of Specified Kinds of Home Appliances, (i) consumers must deliver used appliances to retail distributors (where the collection, transport and recycling costs are borne by the consumers); (ii) the retail distributors must surrender them to appliance manufacturers; and (iii) the appliance manufacturers must recycle them.

4 Liabilities

4.1 What types of liabilities can arise where there is a breach of environmental laws and/or permits, and what defences are typically available?

Administrative directions are outlined in the answer to question 2.4 above. Objections to administrative directions are outlined in the answer to question 2.2 above.

When there is a breach of environmental law, the violator can be liable for the damage they caused under tort law. There are three types of torts, namely an intentional tort, a negligent tort and a strictly liable tort. A person (tortfeasor) who causes damage to another person (victim) intentionally or negligently is liable to compensate for the resulting damage. If the damage was foreseeable at the time of the conduct, the negligence is established. Courts have a tendency to recognise negligence relatively easily to save victims if the damage is serious. Because it is difficult to establish negligence for certain results, some environmental statutes introduced torts with strict liability (see the Air Pollution Control Law, The Water Pollution Prevention Law, etc.). Causation can be an important issue when establishing tortious liability. According to case law, causation is strongly presumed if there is proof of epidemiological causation. If there are two or more tortfeasors who jointly cause one damage, the tortfeasors are jointly and severally liable for the damage. A remedy of suspension is also allowed under tort if such a suspension may prevent further damage.

There are penalties with respect to violations of various

environmental laws.

4.2 Can an operator be liable for environmental damage notwithstanding that the polluting activity is operated within permit limits?

Tortious liability is determined by checking whether the conduct constitutes a tort or not, even if the person has observed the environmental regulatory requirements.

4.3 Can directors and officers of corporations attract personal liabilities for environmental wrongdoing, and to what extent may they get insurance or rely on other indemnity protection in respect of such liabilities?

Directors and officers of corporations undertake joint and several liability for damage to third parties if they failed to perform their duties intentionally or with gross negligence.

Directors and officers undertake joint and several liability for damages claims where the environmental wrongdoing causes damage to the corporation. As a general rule, approval by all stockholders may discharge them from liability, but when they have performed their duties in good faith and without gross negligence, an extraordinary resolution in a stockholders' meeting or a board meeting, or a contract between the company and directors or officers based on the articles of incorporation thereof, may partly discharge them.

Directors' and officers' liability insurance was authorised in 1993. A general insurance condition covers directors and officers against legal damages to third parties, dispute costs, including court costs, attorney fees, etc., and the dispute costs for winning in the case of stockholder litigation. A stockholder's litigation guarantee special contract covers directors and officers against liabilities and dispute costs for losing in the case of stockholder litigation. However, this contract does not cover directors and officers against liabilities that result from the pursuit of their own interests or from criminal acts.

4.4 What are the different implications from an environmental liability perspective of a share sale on the one hand and an asset purchase on the other?

When a company owns contaminated property, there are different implications from an environmental liability perspective, depending on whether a purchaser purchases the stock of that company or purchases the property itself. In the case of purchasing the stock of the company, environmental liability in relation to that property remains with the company, and the purchaser of the stock will not be liable for the company's act of contamination. However, the value of the company's stock will likely be affected by any liability arising from such act, notwithstanding whether the liability accrues before or after the sale.

On the other hand, when a purchaser buys the property itself, as a general rule, such purchaser will not inherit the environmental liability of the seller. However in certain exceptional cases, the purchaser might owe an obligation with respect to the contaminated property even if such obligation arose before the sale. This is because, as stated in question 5.1 below, the Soil Contamination Countermeasures Law provides that in certain cases a landowner may be ordered to remove pollutants irrespective of who caused the pollution, including in cases where the polluter cannot be identified.

A purchaser will assume the obligations or liabilities owed by the seller if the property is a part of a sale of the seller's business and

the purchaser continues to use the business name of the seller.

4.5 To what extent may lenders be liable for environmental wrongdoing and/or remediation costs?

There are no environmental laws with respect to, and there is no case law finding, lender liability. However, a lender might become liable under tort in cases where the lender participated in the financing of a borrower if such lender effected the disposal of hazardous waste by the borrower and such disposal caused damage to a third party.

5 Contaminated Land

5.1 What is the approach to liability for contamination (including historic contamination) of soil or groundwater?

In 1970, the government introduced regulation on soil contamination of farms by enacting the Anti-Farm Soil Pollution Law. In 1996, the Water Pollution Prevention Law was revised to control the pollution of groundwater. This was followed by the enactment of the Law Concerning Special Measures Against Dioxins in 2000.

In 2002, the Soil Contamination Countermeasures Law was enacted as general law with regard to soil contamination. Under this law, an owner, manager, or occupant (together, the "landholders") of land may assume the obligation to investigate the land to determine whether there is any contamination from the operation of a facility used in the process of making, using or disposing of a certain number of harmful materials. If there is a possibility that there may be a certain amount of pollution that is hazardous to people's health, the governor may order a landholder to investigate the contamination of the land. If the land is found to be contaminated and is to be cleaned up to protect the local residents, the governor may order the polluter to clean up the contamination, and if it is not appropriate to do so (e.g., in a case where the polluter cannot be identified), the governor may order the landholder to clean up the contamination even if the landholder was not the one who caused the contamination.

Thus, parties involved in land transactions are compelled to take a great interest in the existence or non-existence of soil contamination on the land.

5.2 How is liability allocated where more than one person is responsible for the contamination?

Under the Soil Contamination Countermeasures Law, an order may be issued to a person who is responsible for contamination to clean up the resulting pollution. When there is more than one person responsible for contamination, the order must make clear that the clean up shall be performed by the polluters in a manner that is proportionate to their responsibility for the contamination.

However, in cases of two or more polluters, an order to specify the clean up area for each person may sometimes seem absurd. Hence, if there is an agreement between the polluters to perform the clean up together, the order should be made so that the polluters jointly perform the clean up and incur the costs for such work at a rate that is proportionate to their responsibility.

Under the Civil Code of Japan, when a person is injured as a result of contamination caused by more than one person, such injured person can claim compensation from the polluters as a joint

tortfeasor. The polluters would therefore be jointly and severally liable; however, between the polluters themselves, each polluter would owe compensation at a rate which is proportional to its respective individual responsibility.

5.3 If a programme of environmental remediation is 'agreed' with an environmental regulator can the regulator come back and require additional works or can a third party challenge the agreement?

There is no law that addresses this kind of programme, but there is a city ordinance in Tokyo. In this ordinance, an owner of contaminated land is in certain cases required to prepare a programme to clean up the land in accordance with the regulations of the ordinance.

A regulator can require additional work if it finds that the submitted programme does not comply with the regulations.

An objection and a request for a change to this programme by an outside party on the basis that the programme is insufficient is unacknowledged. However, since the local government is responsible for public health, the local government is always interested in the programme and provides advice to landowners on preparing the programme.

It should be noted that even in the case where a landowner is not legally required to clean up soil contamination, the landowner often consults local governments about the measures to be taken for cleaning up such contamination.

5.4 Does a person have a private right of action to seek contribution from a previous owner or occupier of contaminated land when that owner caused, in whole or in part, contamination; and to what extent is it possible for a polluter to transfer the risk of contaminated land liability to a purchaser?

In the first scenario, when company B buys contaminated land from company A, which is the polluter, and company B takes de-pollution measures, company B may seek the contribution of company A (i) based on the charge under the Soil Contamination Countermeasures Law (but only in the case where the order for the clean up is issued by the governor against company B); (ii) under liability for defect warranty of the Civil Code; or (iii) under the tortious liability of the Civil Code. There could be a dispute as to whether the pollution by company A constitutes a tort, as it is only ruining its own property. However, if company A polluted the land and left this polluted land on the market without taking any appropriate measures for clean up or the equivalent to protect public health, the release of the land might constitute a tort (but there is no citable judicial precedent).

In the second scenario, after company B buys the polluted land from company A, which is the polluter, and company B re-sells such land to company C, company C can claim against company B on the grounds of defect warranty. But since company C was not in direct contract with company A, company C can only ask company A for a charge under the Soil Contamination Countermeasures Law, or on the grounds of tort.

In the third scenario, after company A sells the polluted land to company B with disclosure of the pollution and agrees to reduce the purchase price of the land on account of the pollution, company B sells such land to company C without taking clean up measures and without notifying company C of the pollution, and company C takes the clean up measures. In this case, whether company C can seek a monetary contribution from company A poses a significant question. Although there is no citable judicial precedent, it is

reasonable to assume that the outcome would be the same as that stated in the second scenario above.

5.5 Does the government have authority to obtain from a polluter monetary damages for aesthetic harms to public assets, e.g., rivers?

The Law of Landscapes, under which a landscape programme and other measures regarding landscapes are provided, was enacted in 2004 for the purpose of advancing the creation or preservation of good landscapes. This law authorises the administrative agencies of landscapes (prefectures and certain cities) to establish a programme of creation or preservation of good landscapes (a "landscape programme"). In areas to which this landscape programme applies, certain constructions and development actions are subject to a notification procedure. Failure to follow the procedure may incur penalties.

As the Law of Landscapes delegates authority to the administrative agencies of landscapes, their ordinances can provide various regulations and penal provisions.

Whilst they are aimed at creating or preserving good landscapes mainly by regulating the development of land or the construction of buildings pursuant to the Law of Landscapes and local ordinances, some local ordinances regarding landscapes provide penal provisions for dumping waste or vandalising an area with graffiti.

6 Powers of Regulators

6.1 What powers do environmental regulators have to require production of documents, take samples, conduct site inspections, interview employees, etc?

An administrative agency has the power to gather information to fulfil its duties. As a part of its administrative authority, the Ministry of the Environment has the power to gather information regarding environmental pollution, which includes the production of documents, the taking of samples, site inspections, the interviewing of employees, etc. The laws and regulations regarding environmental pollution provide the terms and conditions under which the Minister of the Environment can collect information regarding environmental pollution, and penal codes are also provided to make the terms effective.

7 Reporting / Disclosure Obligations

7.1 If pollution is found on a site, or discovered to be migrating off-site, must it be disclosed to an environmental regulator or potentially affected third parties?

Under the Soil Contamination Countermeasures Law, landowners are under an obligation to report the fact of pollution to the governor only when soil contamination is found as a result of a legally compulsory investigation (the legal obligation to investigate is discussed further in question 7.2 below). Under this law, there is no obligation to report, except as stated above.

However, when pollution spreads to the neighbouring lands as a result of the landowner having created and left the pollution, and the landowner does not report this fact to the governor, compensation may be claimed against the polluter under the doctrine of tort by the neighbours whose land was polluted as a result of the discharge of pollution. Therefore, such landowners are often forced to dispose

of the pollution even though they have no legal obligation to report. Because it is not easy to decide what kind of disposal is appropriate, it will often be advantageous for the landowners to report the pollution and follow the instructions of the local authority.

On the other hand, even if one is not a polluter, one may still be subject to a claim for compensation from victims, under the doctrine of tort, for an omission, for example in the case where the pollution spreads to the neighbouring lands, and it is assumed that the neighbours suffer from health problems as a consequence, and one does not report the pollution to the governor.

The landowner of the contaminated site, therefore, regardless of whether it is the polluter or not, is often forced to report the fact of pollution to the local authority.

7.2 When and under what circumstances does a person have an affirmative obligation to investigate land for contamination?

Under the Soil Contamination Countermeasures Law, the legal obligation to investigate soil contamination is provided only in Articles 3 and 4. Article 3 concerns the investigation of the land when a factory using specific harmful matters ceases its operation, and Article 4 concerns the investigation of land with potential soil contamination that could damage people's health. However, actions to order investigation under Article 4 are strictly limited.

The risk of health problems from soil contamination is classified in two groups. The first is the risk of contamination of drinking water through underground water pollution. The second is the risk of polluted soil through earth being ingested or touched directly. The former risk only targets soil contamination that might cause the pollution of drinking water, and the latter risk only targets places where people may enter. Other risks that might result from soil contamination are not considered risks for the purpose of investigation, and so the situations in which the investigation under Article 4 will be exercised are limited.

7.3 To what extent is it necessary to disclose environmental problems, e.g. by a seller to a prospective purchaser in the context of merger and/or takeover transactions?

In Japan, when the property for sale does not have the quality, function or safety which can be reasonably expected for such kind of property, the purchaser can claim that the seller is liable for such a defect, based on the defect warranty doctrine in the Civil Code. An agreement that the seller will not bear any liability for a defect can be made, provided, however, that such agreement is ineffective if the seller does not disclose previous knowledge of a defect to the purchaser. Liability does not accrue when the purchaser knew about the defect at the time of the agreement, and therefore a disclosure of the defect to the purchaser will protect the seller from this liability. In recent land transactions, there has generally been a tendency for sellers to disclose their awareness of any contamination of the land. In addition, liability for a defect can occur not only in transactions of land but also in transactions of stocks of the company holding the land. Therefore, in a case where the value of the company depends on the value of such land, the stock transaction can also require the careful review of any defects in the land.

8 General

8.1 Is it possible to use an environmental indemnity to limit exposure for actual or potential environment-related liabilities, and does making a payment to another person under an indemnity in respect of a matter (e.g. remediation) discharge the indemnifier's potential liability for that matter?

It is possible to use environmental indemnities via contract to limit the risk of actual or potential environmentally-related liabilities. However, it is impossible to discharge the indemnifier's potential liabilities with respect to third parties by using an environmental indemnity, because an environmental indemnity via contract between the parties is inoperative against third parties.

8.2 Is it possible to shelter environmental liabilities off balance sheet, and can a company be dissolved in order to escape environmental liabilities?

If there is a possibility that a company will assume environmental liability, the company must list such liability as a footnote on the balance sheet. In other words, if the environmental liability corresponds to contingency liability (which is not yet an actual liability, but which becomes an actual liability upon fulfilling certain conditions), the content and amount of money must be listed as a footnote to the balance sheet.

Further, it should be noted that, for example, if company A which is an owner of land with contaminated soil and is faced with the risk of assuming an environmental liability, transfers the land to company B, company A is not necessarily released from its liability. If company A caused the contamination, it is not released from liability arising from the fact that it caused the contamination. Even if company A did not cause the contamination, if company A controls company B and if it seems unlikely that the transfer between company A and company B is an arm's length transaction in the market, then company A can be liable as a manager of the land under the Soil Contamination Countermeasures Law.

A company can dissolve voluntarily by a majority vote at the shareholders' meeting. However, the dissolution does not necessarily mean that the company is released from its liability. If company A already assumed such liability for a third party at the time of dissolution, even after the liquidation there exists a risk that the third party would try and get its shareholders, such as its parent company, company C, to surrender the wealth obtained as a result of the liquidation of company A. Furthermore, if company A's environmental problems are deemed to have been caused while it was under the control of company C, there is a possibility that company C would assume liability for a third party as a joint tortfeasor with company A.

8.3 Can a person who holds shares in a company be held liable for breaches of environmental law and/or pollution caused by the company, and can a parent company be sued in its national court for pollution caused by a foreign subsidiary/affiliate?

In principle, a parent company cannot be held liable for pollution caused by a subsidiary company. However, if for example a subsidiary company violates an environmental law and the company assumes tortious liability, and the violation is caused by the control of the parent company, the parent company might assume the same liability with the subsidiary company, as joint

tortfeasors. If the subsidiary is just a sham or if it is deemed that the parent company has misused the subsidiary in order to violate an environmental law, the violation of the subsidiary company is deemed to be the violation of the parent company due to the theory of piercing the corporate veil, and the parent company can be held liable for pollution.

A victim of pollution caused by a foreign company in a foreign country can file litigation against its parent company in Japan. Whether a parent company in Japan can be held liable for pollution caused by a foreign subsidiary company in a foreign country would be judged in accordance with the corresponding foreign law in a Japanese court.

8.4 Are there any laws to protect "whistle-blowers" who report environmental violations/matters?

The Whistleblower Protection Act (the "WPA") became effective on 1 April 2006. Under the WPA, if a worker discloses information which is in the public interest about a violation of the law to persons within a company, to an administrative agency, or to persons outside the company, under certain conditions the dismissal of the whistle-blower will be invalidated and deemed unfair treatment on the grounds that disclosure was made in the public interest. Laws subject to the WPA are those that safeguard the lives, bodies and property of citizens, including any law which protects the environment.

8.5 Are group or "class" actions available for pursuing environmental claims, and are penal or exemplary damages available?

Under the Japanese Civil Procedure Code, lawsuits via class action are not allowed, and are therefore not pursuable.

Additionally, under the Japanese legal system, penal or exemplary damages are not allowed and therefore not pursuable, even though the judgment about monetary evaluation of non-economic damage is to a certain extent at the court's discretion.

9 Emissions Trading and Climate Change

9.1 What emissions trading schemes are in operation in Japan and how is the emissions trading market developing there?

In 2005, the Environment Ministry started Japan's Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme. The Ministry offered subsidies for the installation of new facilities which lead to a reduction in global greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions, in exchange for the voluntary setting of emissions reduction levels by the participants (34 companies in the first stage (the operational period of which is fiscal year 2006) and 23 companies in the second stage (the operational period of which is fiscal year 2007), which were chosen with a view to cost efficiency). The participants can trade their allowances with other participants depending on their emissions levels. At the end of fiscal year 2006 or 2007 (March 2007 or 2008), the participants will need to calculate and verify their actual GHG emissions for the fiscal year 2006. After the final trading period, if a participant cannot reduce the actual GHG emissions to, or below, the total amount of emissions allowances allocated to such a participant plus any amount acquired by trading, the subsidies to such participant will be revoked.

10 Asbestos

10.1 Is Japan likely to follow the experience of the US in terms of asbestos litigation?

Japan is not likely to follow the experience in the US in terms of asbestos litigation for several reasons. First, the period during which workers were exposed to asbestos without adequate protection and, correspondingly, were more likely to become ill seems to be shorter than that of the US. Second, the public workers' compensation system is well established in Japan. Furthermore, large companies often compensate their workers in addition to the compensation that workers may obtain under the workers' compensation system. Thirdly, punitive damages are not allowed in Japan. Therefore, it is not likely that people who were exposed to asbestos but have not become ill will take legal action and seek damages. Fourthly, an act that enables asbestos-affected patients to recover certain expenses, including medical expenses, was enacted in 2006. A new fund for the implementation of this act will be created, and will require contributions from all business entities. Certain companies that used a large amount of asbestos in the past will be required to contribute a certain additional amount.

10.2 What are the duties of owners/occupiers of premises in relation to asbestos on site?

If a building is in such a condition that persons are threatened to be exposed as a result of asbestos blowing from the building, the owner is obligated under the Civil Code to take appropriate measures (including the removal of the asbestos) to prevent the asbestos from being blown from the building, if the owner is a landlord. Furthermore, under the Civil Code, if the building is used by a third party, such as guests of a shopping centre, the occupier or the owner of the building is liable for the damage incurred by the third party due to any defects of the building (the owner becomes liable if the occupier took the necessary care to prevent the damage). Accordingly, it is necessary for the occupier or the owner

to take the above-mentioned measures to prevent harm to a third party caused by asbestos in the building. Finally, if the building contains sprayed asbestos, and if there is a threat that such sprayed asbestos may be blown from the building, a failure to take appropriate preventative measures may be subject to criminal punishment.

11 Environmental Insurance Liabilities

11.1 What types of environmental insurance are available in the market, and how big a role does environmental risks insurance play in Japan?

There are several types of environmental insurance, such as "Environmental Impairment Liability Insurance", "Ground Pollution Cleaning Cost Insurance", "Ecology Countermeasures Cost Insurance", "Industrial Waste Disposal Generator Liability Insurance", and "Electric Appliance Recycling Insurance".

It is important that companies collect information about various sorts of environmental laws, and establish compliance in order to observe such laws. But it is not necessarily the case that it is easy to eliminate all environmental risk. Therefore, whilst the role of insurance as compensation for environmental liability is small at the moment, it can be expected to grow considerably.

11.2 What is the environmental insurance claims experience in Japan?

The number of court judgments holding companies liable for damage in pollution litigation is not insignificant. However, few Japanese insurance companies sell insurance goods that can offset such risks, and few companies buy them. It follows that it is a rare case indeed in which a company claims or files a claim against insurance companies to cover such damage. We have little or no experience of such litigation, and we have not encountered it in our research.

**Hideaki Ozawa**

Nishimura & Partners
Ark Mori Building
1-12-32 Akasaka, Minato-Ku
Tokyo 107-6029
Japan

Tel: +81 3 5562 8500
Fax: +81 3 5561 9711 / 9714
Email: info@jurists.co.jp
URL: www.jurists.co.jp

Admitted

Japan 1980; New York 1992

Education

The University of Tokyo (LL.B., 1978; Master of Engineering, 1985); Legal Training and Research Institute of the Supreme Court of Japan; Columbia University School of Law (LL.M., 1991).

Professional Experience

Dewey Ballantine, New York, 1991-1992.

Practice Areas

Real Estate, Environmental Law, Construction Law.

Papers/Publications

Author: Asbestos in Buildings and the Law, Hakuyosha, 2006; Soil Contamination Countermeasures Law, Hakuyosha, 2003; U.S. Condominium Laws, Hanrei Times, Vols. 997, 999, 1999; Very Deep Underground Use System as a Bypass, Jichi-Kenkyu, Vol. 74, No. 9, 1998.

Co-Author: Corpus Juris Finance Update, Shojihomu, 2006; Corpus Juris Finance, Shojihomu, 2003; Memories of Cities, Hakuyosha, 2002; Fixed Term Building Leases, Jyutaku-shimpo-sha, 2000.

**Kanki Hirata**

Nishimura & Partners
Ark Mori Building
1-12-32 Akasaka, Minato-Ku
Tokyo 107-6029
Japan

Tel: +81 3 5562 8500
Fax: +81 3 5561 9711 / 9714
Email: info@jurists.co.jp
URL: www.jurists.co.jp

Admitted

Japan 2005

Education

Waseda University (LL.B., 2001); Legal Training and Research Institute of the Supreme Court of Japan; Kyoto University (LL.M., 2004).

Practice Areas

Finance, Environmental Law, General Corporate, etc.

NISHIMURA & PARTNERS

The ever-evolving heritage of Nishimura & Partners results primarily from its experts continually responding to the complexity of its clients' needs in sophisticated ways. Since its founding in 1966, Nishimura & Partners has developed as one of the largest international comprehensive law firms in Japan that, as an ensemble of professionals, responds to increasingly large and complex cases with comprehensive, goal-driven approaches.

Key areas of practice:

Acquisitions, Administrative Proceedings, Alternative Dispute Resolution, Antitrust, Asset Management, Banking & Finance, Capital Markets, Civil Rehabilitation, Corporate Governance and Risk Management, Corporate Mergers, Environmental Issues, Insolvency/Reorganization, Insurance, Intellectual Property, International Finance, International Trade Disputes, Investment Trusts, Joint Ventures and Strategic Alliances, Lease/Asset-Finance, Litigation/Arbitration, Legal Liquidation, Media and Technology, PFI/Project Finance, Real Estate, Restructuring and Reorganization, Securities Transactions, Start-up Businesses, Structured Finance/Securitization, Tax, Telecommunications, Venture Capital

Contact Person: Mr. Akira Kosugi (Managing Partner)

Languages Spoken: Japanese, English, Chinese (Mandarin), French

Total Number of Lawyers (Including Partners): 247

E-mail: info@jurists.co.jp