

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/>



Summary of Progress Report of the ACAP Working Group, November 2011

The ACAP Working Group meeting took place 5-6 October 2011 in Helsinki, Finland. In attendance were representatives from: Denmark, Finland, Norway, Russian Federation, Sweden, United States and NEFCO.

Below is a summary of developments and main decisions from the last ACAP meeting which may be of potential interest to SAOs:

1. ACAP PSGs activities

1.1. PSG “Short lived climate forcers/Black Carbon Contaminants (BCC)” (USA, Russia).

The 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 and USEPA issued the RFA in September, 2011. 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 her 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. Other countries and organizations reported on the readiness to send and circulate project proposals, contributing to the black carbon issue 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).

1.2. PSG “Reduction of Mercury Emissions in Environment in Arctic States” (USA, Russia and Norway)

The PSG met in March 2011, PSG Terms of Reference were developed. PSG members are currently developing project proposals in the following areas: non-ferrous metals production, industrial gold mining, artisanal gold mining, as well as a possible follow-on to the ongoing U.S. - Russia coal-fired power plant mercury control project. The PSG chair recently received a draft project proposal from NEFCO for a pilot installation of mercury and multi-pollutant control equipment at a large zinc smelter in the Russian Federation. PSG continue to follow related national, bilateral and



multilateral efforts to support the mercury release reduction objective of the PSG: The highlights of PSG activities are as follows:

- Completion of a project on the Mercury Containing Waste in NW Russia, which aimed to demonstrate ways to improve the system for collection, transport, storage, and treatment of mercury containing waste in NW Russia.
- Completion of a project in the Russian chlor-alkali industry to reduce mercury releases to wastewater and improve mercury monitoring systems in several Russian chlor-alkali facilities. These ongoing efforts have reduced mercury releases to the environment by about 1 ton per year.
- Development of the proposal for ACAP consideration for collaboration with several Russian research institutes to demonstrate the effectiveness of sorbents for reducing mercury emissions in the coal sector at a coal-fired power plant in the Russian Federation.

1.3. PSG “Reduction/Elimination of releases of Dioxins/Furans in the Russian Federation with focus on the Arctic and Northern Regions” (Sweden)

The principal activities of the PSG included the business trip of the new PSG Chair for assessment of activities of Vorkuta cement plant, which is heavily polluting the environment by dust and is considered to be one of the Barents hotspots. The new equipment was bought by the plant but installation in the process. The installation may help in reduction of dioxin emissions.

1.4. PSG “Environmentally Safe Management of stocks of obsolete and prohibited pesticides in the Russian Federation”(Finland)

PSG Chair reported on the obsolete pesticides inventory continuation in 2011, when 4 more remote districts of Krasnoyarsky Krai were inventoried. The PSG final report will be issued and a draft outline for the final report was presented to ACAP WG participants. ACAP Chair pointed out that one of the hotspots which is ready for exclusion from the list is the storage of pesticides in Karelia, which were destructed in Finland. Currently there are no possibilities to destroy obsolete pesticide stocks in Russia in an environmentally sound manner.

1.5. PSG “Reduction/Elimination of Sources and Releases of Brominated Flame Retardants”(Ex-chair - Norway)

The BFR PSG is in an information exchange status now. As result of discussion it was 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 include specific numeric information readily available on 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 ESM of products containing wastes 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. Having a suitable 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.

1.6. PSG “Phase-out of PCB`s in the Russian Federation” (Russia, USA, NEFCO).

At the moment Phases 1 and 2 of PSG workplan (inventories) are completed and RF is waiting for a new equipment for POPs destruction. The destruction Phase will start at the 2012.

In 2011 RF completed the project on the review of destruction facilities in Arctic, with the conclusion that mobile units will be the best solution.

It was decided to include the Norwegian expert in the PSG and to identify local partners in the regions. The pilot projects can be implemented in regional technoparks. Some regional authorities are ready to provide co-funding from the regional budgets.

1.7. PSG “Integrated Hazardous Waste Management Strategy in the Northern Regions of Russian Federation (IHWMS)”(Russia, USA, Norway)

IHWMS PSG meeting took place in Moscow in June, 2011. The project proposal called “The Integrated Hazardous Waste Management in the Northern Regions of the Russian Federation” was developed by NEFCO and circulated to ACAP members.

1.8. PSG “Indigenous Peoples Contaminants Action Plan (IPCAP)” (Russia, USA, Norway, RAIPON)

IPCAP PSG had a meeting in Luleo, at November 7, 2011. The decisions are circulated to ACAP members.

2. ACAP administrative issues.

2.1. Permanent Secretariat



ACAP does not currently have a permanent Secretariat instead favoring an informal arrangement where administrative functions are performed by the government chairing ACAP. As the Arctic Council itself becomes a more formal entity, some within ACAP thought it would be appropriate to examine secretariat arrangements that provide for greater continuity.

The AC task force will focus on setting up the secretariat and ACAP as a WG should provide some views on what type of secretariat support we would find useful for their consideration. The ACAP volunteered to develop a paper on what activities or responsibilities could be undertaken by a permanent AC secretariat on behalf of ACAP. In addition, as useful information for ACAP, Russia will specify the costs of Secretariat based on her experience. At a future meeting, ACAP may wish to explore the possibility of adding 1 more person to the new AC Secretariat. ACAP will explore the possibility to have the permanent ACAP Secretariat.

2.2. ACAP/PSG Membership

- The ACAP Secretariat in co-operation with ACAP country representatives will develop a list with contact information of official representatives to ACAP (country representatives, PPs and Observers), e-mail distribution lists, list of PSG members, and make that list available to ACAP.
- In addition, the ACAP Chair/Vice Chair will send a request to each PSG Chair asking for their current membership list and distribute such information to ACAP country representative to verify the accuracy of country representation on each PSG.
- ACAP will again, invite Iceland to nominate someone to ACAP

2.3. Participation of Non-Members

ACAP reviewed its policies for participation of non-members and the members agreed on the following:

- that non-members “that can directly contribute” to our work can be invited to ACAP meetings or PSGs,
- for ACAP meetings, before an invite is issued, ACAP should discuss the invitation (can happen inter-sessionally via email, no objection is agreement) and then the Chair can issue the invite,
- For specific projects PSG chairs would issue the invite,.
- ACAP should initiate higher level discussion with EU Agencies (e.g. EEA) and other potential participants and agreed to discuss how to do so at a future meeting.



2.4. Optimization of the work of ACAP

ACAP now has 6-8 PSGs with limited resources. Some PSGs are "sleeping" (no activities due lack of participating and lead countries activities), the structure of PSGs need optimization of their role and responsibilities in some instances.

It was agreed that:

- there can be multiple projects within a PSG and it is the job of the Chair to synthesize information on all activities and report to ACAP WG.
- US and Finland to work on paper (guidelines to PSG): what constitutes an AC approved project when mandate is broad; what do the PSGs need from ACAP; and what type of information should be reported on non ACAP projects.
- Chair/Vice Chair will reflect the role of PSG chairs to synthesize activities of the multiple projects of the PSG. One PSG can have many projects led by different actors.

The issue of joining several PSGs in one (BFR and PCB my join IHWMS) will continue to be explored

3. Project Support Instrument (PSI) was presented by NEFCO.

NEFCO reiterated that concrete projects (PCB, SLCF etc.) have to be Arctic Council Projects (according to routines and rules established by AC) and developed in line with the NEFCO guidelines to be eligible for PSI funding.

The decision for funding is based on a consensus between PSI Committee members (1 competent person from 1 donor entity (can be PP or others, according to the PSI Guidelines established by the Arctic Council SAO dated 7 April 2005 and according to the PSI Rules of Procedure established by the SAO at the Kautokeino SAO Meeting 19-20 Nov. 2008) while all of them have an equal vote. In the ensuing ACAP exchange of views the following was touched upon:

- The need for ACAP to ensure its project development guidelines work smoothly with the procedures for bringing forward projects to the PSI;
- That since only "approved Arctic Council" projects are eligible for PSI funding, that ACAP needed to facilitate how the ACAP Project criteria applied to projects developed by the working group.

4. Initiation of procedure of ACAP Chairmanship transfer from Russian Federation to Finland



The procedure of transfer of the ACAP WG chairmanship duties from Russia to Finland has started. The procedure will be completed at the next ACAP WG meeting – at March, 2012.

5. Update of work with AC WGs and BEAC

Finland reported that there is a close interaction between the different groups responding to common items, like obsolete pesticides. Karelia hotspot K10 will be excluded from the HS Barents List at November Ministerial Conference as a result of BEAC and ACAP common efforts. ACAP will facilitate info exchange (between ACAP and AMAP, ACAP and BEAC WGE), common w/shops and facilitate coordination of common projects.