

**Arctic Council Task Force for Action on Black Carbon and Methane  
4<sup>th</sup> Meeting, Helsinki, May 21-22, 2014**

**Summary report**

**Introduction**

The fourth meeting of the Task Force for Action on Black Carbon and Methane (TFBCM) was chaired by France Jacovella, (Canada), and Jon Kahn, (Sweden). The key items on the agenda were: 1) presentation and discussion of intersessional work; 2) discussion of the co-chairs' draft Framework document; 3) feedback from observers on the draft Framework and 4) reaching an agreement on the path forward. For the first time since the task force was established, all eight Arctic states were represented at the meeting. Two out of six Permanent Participants (AAC and ICC) were present. Two Arctic Council (AC) working groups – AMAP and ACAP – attended the meeting. There were three AC observers: Japan, NEFCO and the EU.

**Presentation of intersessional work**

The intersessional work section was opened with short reports from the Arctic states on their plans regarding submitting comprehensive national inventories on black carbon. Finland and the U.S. reported that they have already voluntarily submitted a black carbon emissions inventory to CLRTAP and plan to continue to do so on an annual basis. Three additional states informed that they will be able to submit complete black carbon inventories by February 2015, in line with the timeline discussed by the Arctic Environment Ministers when they met in Jukkasjärvi in February 2013. Three states indicated that they could submit an updated information product on black carbon emissions (which may not be a comprehensive inventory) by the same date, namely February 2015.

Sweden and the U.S. presented a discussion paper on peer review/peer learning. This paper reflected discussions and comments from a small intersessional group, including the U.S., Sweden, AAC, and Canada. It contained a set of options to be considered by the task force. Delegates expressed their common opinion that the process for peer learning should aim at sharing experiences, be as streamlined as possible, without unnecessary reporting and to the greatest extent possible involving existing groups and bodies.

Another discussion paper, on objectives and commitments, was presented by Norway, jointly with Sweden and the U.S. Objectives on three levels were discussed: Arctic Council-wide, national and project level. Some states/PPs expressed an interest in a quantitative or “soft” quantitative black carbon emissions objective, while other states indicated that this would be difficult given there are currently no common or firmly established baselines. There was general agreement on the need for an ambitious objective that demonstrates a will to take action to reduce black carbon and methane emissions in a way that goes beyond the “business as usual scenario”. As part of the discussion on objectives, the importance of monitoring was highlighted by many, with some noting that it can also be used as an additional tool to measure progress. In terms of the extent of monitoring, some argued the focus should be on ensuring we can sustain existing monitoring capability, and others indicated the need for improved capability as recommended by AMAP, among others.

Prior to the meeting, Finland submitted the 3<sup>rd</sup> updated version of a template for national reporting on black carbon emissions. There is agreement that national reporting on black carbon and methane is an important element of the arrangement. Many states also highlighted the need to avoid duplication with other reporting processes (e.g. CLRTAP and UNFCCC), being aware that not all are party to these instruments. There remain some unresolved issues about the extent

to which methane emissions and actions should be reported in parallel with those of black carbon.

The United States presented a paper on observer and stakeholder engagement. All agreed that it is important to engage observers in the work of the task force and in future actions under the arrangement given that a substantial part of emissions originate from outside the Arctic region. Many also supported the idea that observers be encouraged or requested to take on similar actions as Arctic states (e.g., submitting the same kind of periodic reports that will be requested of Arctic states).

While there was limited discussion of community and private sector engagement at the meeting, all agreed that these topics need more attention and discussion to formulate related language in the Framework document. ACAP gave a brief overview of plans for an ACAP-AIA project called “Community based assessment tools for black carbon”.

### **Discussion of the Co-Chairs’ framework document**

The major part of the meeting was dedicated to discussions on the structure and specific wording of the latest version of the Framework document that had been revised to reflect the outcome of the third meeting and comments subsequently received. All delegations agreed that it should be a focused and concise document, organized with a short preambular section, objectives, and an action section structured along the lines of national actions, collective work as Arctic Council, and engagement of others. This outline for a new structure was generally agreed upon. A proposal was also developed and discussed during the meeting regarding how to organize the reporting process during a two year chairmanship cycle, with the objective to provide ministers with information on the progress achieved. Intersessional work will need to take place to advance this proposal on the reporting and progress review, with final discussion of the details to continue at the next meeting.

Participants also discussed the comparative advantage of the Arctic Council in addressing black carbon and methane, recognizing that black carbon and methane act and impact differently. There was agreement that in accordance with the mandate of the task force, the Framework document also needs to address the two issues, although not necessarily in the same manner. Observers had been invited to prepare presentations for this meeting, focusing on their perspectives on the Framework document. Japan, the EU and NEFCO provided their visions of their possible engagement and outlined some of their activities related to SLCPs.

### **Next Steps**

The co-chairs identified a need for two more meetings this year and some intersessional work, namely:

- 1) Update reporting template for methane emissions (**Finland**)
- 2) Engagement of the private sector (**AIA**)
- 3) Improved monitoring capabilities in the Arctic (**USA, Finland, AMAP, Norway and Russia**)
- 4) Guidelines and timelines for the 2-year reporting and review “cycle” (**Sweden, Canada, USA, Finland and AAC**).

A revised draft of the Framework document will be circulated by the co-chairs by early July for comments. A subsequent version of the Framework document, to be circulated ahead of the next meeting, will form the basis of negotiations and be the starting point for text negotiations.

The Canadian delegation offered to host the next (5<sup>th</sup>) meeting, which will take place 29 September-1 October 2014 in Iqaluit.

The Norwegian delegation offered to host the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting in Tromsø in mid-November.

**TFBCM IV; Helsinki  
21-22 May, 2014  
List of Participants**

<b>1</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>Jacovella</b>	<b>Co-chair, Canada</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Jon</b>	<b>Kahn</b>	<b>Co-chair, Sweden</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Rita</b>	<b>Cerutti</b>	<b>Canada</b>
<b>4</b>	Rebecca	Plumadore	Canada
<b>5</b>	Michelle	Campbell	Canada
<b>6</b>	<b>Carsten Moberg</b>	<b>Larsen</b>	<b>Denmark</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Elina</b>	<b>Rautalahti</b>	<b>Finland</b>
<b>8</b>	Kaarle	Kupiainen	Finland
<b>9</b>	<b>Päivi</b>	<b>Kumpulainen</b>	<b>Iceland</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Håvard</b>	<b>Toresen</b>	<b>Norway</b>
<b>11</b>	Anne Marie	Ravik	Norway
<b>12</b>	<b>Vladimir</b>	<b>Kattsov</b>	<b>Russian Federation</b>
<b>13</b>	Fredrik	Hannerz	Sweden
<b>14</b>	Anna	Forsgren	Sweden
<b>15</b>	<b>Dave</b>	<b>Turk</b>	<b>USA</b>
<b>16</b>	Benjamin	DeAngelo	USA
<b>17</b>	Julie	Cerqueira	USA
<b>18</b>	Laura	Sauls	USA
<b>19</b>	<b>Erika</b>	<b>Rosenthal</b>	<b>AAC</b>
<b>20</b>	Chief Gary	Harrison	AAC
<b>21</b>	<b>Parnuna</b>	<b>Egede</b>	<b>ICC</b>
<b>22</b>	<b>Ann-Sofi</b>	<b>Israelson</b>	<b>ACAP</b>
<b>23</b>	<b>Jan Rene</b>	<b>Larsen</b>	<b>AMAP</b>
<b>24</b>	<b>Ayaka</b>	<b>Hosokawa</b>	<b>Japan</b>
<b>25</b>	<b>Amund</b>	<b>Beitnes</b>	<b>NEFCO</b>
<b>26</b>	<b>Elisabetta</b>	<b>Vignati</b>	<b>EU</b>
<b>27</b>	<b>Nina</b>	<b>Vaaja</b>	<b>Staff</b>
<b>28</b>	Kseniia	Iartceva	Staff