

# All presentations from the Arctic Council's Senior Arctic Official's meeting in Luleå, Sweden, November 8-9 2011.

2011

## Arctic Council

### Arctic Council Secretariat

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/11374/1543>

*Disclaimer: This document may not be the final or approved version. It may be a working or draft version, as submitted to one of our Senior Arctic Officials meetings. Drafts are available in order to provide historical perspective on the work of the Arctic Council and the development of our scientific reports and assessments. To find final, approved versions of our reports and assessments, please make note of the title and visit the appropriate collection in our archive. Each collection listed below contains final documents from one of the six Working Groups. <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/1>, <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/617>, <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/126>, <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/3>, <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/52>, <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/4> Any citation of an Arctic Council document must include reference to the author. If no author of a particular document is identified, the document may still be cited; in these cases, the Arctic Council should be listed as the author. Downloaded from the Arctic Council Open Access Repository. <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/>*



**Report**  
**ACAP Chair on Arctic Council SAO Meeting**  
**8 November 2011**

p. 3.6 of Timed Agenda

Dear Chairman,  
dear SAOs, PPs, WGs  
participants of the meeting

Arctic Contaminants Action Programme (ACAP) has the mandate on elimination of contaminants in the Arctic and in 8 years since WG establishment the significant work has been done in the areas approved by Senior Arctic Officials (SAO).

The conducted work has shown a number of fundamental points without which the effective pollution elimination in the Arctic and WG functioning is impossible.

I will briefly focus on the main WG activities and threats.

ACAP has completed a number of projects approved by AC in the volume of 1st and 2nd phases - identification and collection of pollutants in the Russian Arctic, which are pesticides, PCBs, dioxins / furans, mercury containing waste and emissions.

In 2011 PSG OP has finished pesticides inventory and repackaging in 21 districts of Krasnoyarsk region, totally such work has been done in 11 Russian regions from Kamchatka to Murmansk; the part of pesticides from Karelia - "hotspot" K10 – has been destroyed in Finland within ACAP project (on the November 1<sup>st</sup>, BEAC Working Group on Environment decided to submit the first HS for exclusion from NEFCO/AMAP BEAC list to the Ministers), but works on the third project' phase do not start due to the lack of funding and absence of appropriate technologies and equipment in the Russian Federation. In 2011 Russia together with the USA, NEFCO and UNEP has conducted works on search and selection of such technologies and equipment as well as their work legalization in Russia, so now it's a matter of equipment purchase financing for implementation of the 3rd final project phase –contaminants destruction;



The similar situation is with PCBs – the 1st and 2nd project phases were finished, in 2011 full inventory of PCBs sources in the whole Russian Federation was finished, the 3rd project phase implementation depends on the same factors as in the OP project.

Much work has been done to significantly reduce emissions of dioxins, especially in the Vorkuta cement plant – the technical equipment reconstruction for more than 5 million Euros is carried out, corresponding HS is preparing for exclusion from the BEAC list.

The analysis of ACAP projects activities, conducted at the WG meeting 5-6 September 2011, showed that the time has come for a qualitative change in the ACAP projects format - the third project phase implementation require substantially more funding and consolidating of the countries-participants efforts. The optimal solutions is to connect the PSI mechanism to fund the 3rd phase pilot projects and for their official launch **SAO should/may indicate whether their previous Arctic Council approval of ACAP Working Group' projects is enough for implementation within the PSI framework or not.**

**The second issue for SAOs attention - how to change or close the previously approved projects (PSG) of the Arctic Council.**

The operation of PSG BFR formally requires the SAO decision to change the project status due to its association with another project or closing.

The BFR PSG is in an information exchange status now. As result of discussion ACAP WG decided:

- ACAP should update SAOs on what was accomplished in this PSG and note ACAP agreement that it should be changed/closed for now due to lack of appropriate experts with resources to undertake further activities;
- In the report to SAOs, ACAP wish to show increasing trends on BFR contamination in the Arctic, note to SAOs and raise the possibility of ACAP undertaking an update on the status of BFRs in the Arctic;
- ACAP also recognizes that much of problem stems from use of products containing BFRs and that to eliminate BFRs in Arctic would require more comprehensive legislative frameworks;
- the ability of ACAP to eliminate BFRs is minimal without additional support (from PSI and governmental level);



- pilot projects and awareness raising activities could be undertaken by ACAP but there has been no support both in terms of available experts and finances provided by countries to ACAP to develop such a project.
- expert(s) with the support to initiate projects is necessary and the SAOs may wish to consider the relative priority of continued work on BFRs.
- ACAP agrees that it should be closed or adjoin with IHWMS for now because there is no country able to lead this PSG.

The issue with this project, submitted by the WG for SAO decision, is **precedential in nature, since the projects establishment has been worked out and is regulated by the Arctic Council; the reverse procedure is not developed and require the SAO decision.** The optimal solution is to combine the project with the IHWMS, in which it is possible to implement the BFR project's tasks. In principle, the responsibility for the project implementation bears the country which was willing to become a project leader and other countries-participant should actively take part in the Arctic Council common projects implementation.

In addition, the launch of **three new ACAP projects also needs SAO support and procedures adjustment.**

The new ACAP SLCF PSG held its meetings in March and October 2011 where the PSG agreed to consider a number of activities.

The PSG also discussed an initial coordination meeting on a US led project on Reduction of Black Carbon from Diesel Sources in the Russian Arctic. This US coordinated project will work to reduce black carbon emissions in the Russian Arctic and will work to:

- assess primary sources of black carbon in the Russian Arctic,
- develop a baseline emission inventory for black carbon from diesel sources,
- implement targeted, on-the-ground demonstration projects for reducing black carbon from diesel and
- establish policy recommendations and financing options for reducing black carbon diesel sources.

While the project will be focused in the Russian Arctic, the project will collaborate more broadly to leverage resources and expertise from across arctic countries.



Russian Federation expressed interest to support the program but stressed the importance to include the indigenous people (RAIPON) into the project. RAIPON has to develop a link to BC program in Russia. Some countries and organizations reported on the readiness to send and circulate project proposals, contributing to the black carbon solutions in Arctic: on improving residential heating (Norway), on reduction of fuel combustion, use of end-of-life equipment etc. (NEFCO), green pottery (Sweden) and evaluation of combined heat and power systems (CHP) to reduce the fuel consumption (Finland).

At the SAO level it's necessary to coordinate already three groups (AMAP and TF) which are engaged in SLCF, first of all to avoid duplication and competition on similar directions, to consider this experience at AC decision-making further.

And finally, on the behalf of ACAP Working Group I would like to once again **invite the Iceland representatives to participate in the ACAP** activities and projects.