

# Presentations from SAO-meeting

2015-10-22

Arctic Council

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/11374/1656>

*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/>*



## 3.7 Treatment of Potential Working Group Deliverables

The purpose of this agenda item is to have a principled discussion among SAOs regarding the treatment of WG products from projects listed in the work plans that are completed early in a Chairmanship including:

- What rules should be applied to products WGs wish to be considered Ministerial Deliverables?
- How should these deliverables be published and when can they bear the AC logo?



## A case study from ACAP...

- At the ACAP WG meeting in September, an EG reported that they had completed two projects listed in the 2015-2017 workplan
- The EG informed ACAP that as the results were time sensitive and included practical recommendations the results would be published in peer reviewed journals rather and not conveyed to ACAP for approval for onward submission to SAOs as Ministerial deliverables.
- The results will not be reported in another format or bear the ACAP or AC logo.
- The rationale for this decision was that the EG did not want this important work to be shelved until 2017 under an embargo for Ministerial deliverables.



This triggered a number of questions for SAOs to consider:

- How do we define an Arctic Council Ministerial Deliverable?
- Should all potential deliverables be embargoed until the Ministerial?
- Is this a practical solution for those products completed early?
- How do other WGs deal with time sensitive results? Are they released and then re-packaged as deliverables?
- If published in peer reviewed journals, what kinds of arrangements need to be in place to ensure that the work done receives the correct AC branding and recognition?



Further guidance from SAOs would be appreciated to clarify how WGs proceed in advance of the 2017 Ministerial meeting.

**Thank you!**



## EG Articles Published

- *Black carbon emissions from Russian diesel sources: Case study of Murmansk*, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, July 2015 (<http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/15/8349/2015/acp-15-8349-2015.html> ).
- Another Emissions Inventory (EI) article focusing on on-road transport will be out in an international journal in late 2015.
- Guidelines for mines on off-road vehicles published as an article in the Russian Journal, Mining Industry, in August 2015.