

## **PAME WORKING GROUP MEETING REPORT**

### **November 1-4, 1999**

#### **I. Introduction**

The PAME Working Group met in Akureyri, Iceland, November 1-4, 1999. Participants attending the meeting are shown in Appendix I.

The meeting was chaired by John Karau (Canada) and a list of documents submitted for consideration at the meeting is shown in Appendix II.

Regarding participants, the Chairman noted that the Russian delegate had written to express his regrets that he was unable to attend the meeting due to illness. The Chairman also welcomed Sweden's renewed participation in PAME. In addition, he introduced Ms. Soffia Gudmundsdottir (Executive Secretary for PAME) and the opening of the PAME Secretariat in Akureyri.

#### **II. Agenda and Operating Guidelines**

The meeting adopted the agenda as shown in Appendix III.

In reviewing the Operating Guidelines for PAME, the meeting noted the desire to ensure complimentary guidance and to avoid needless duplication with the Arctic Council Rules of Procedure. Different opinions were expressed on whether the Operating Guidelines should be formulated in such a way that they were comprehensive enough to be read as a free standing document, or whether they should be read together with the Arctic Council Rules of Procedure. In light of these discussions, verbatim quotations from the Arctic Council Rules of Procedure were put in square brackets along with the notation that there was no disagreement on the content but some questions regarding the appropriateness of the placement of these paragraphs within the guidelines.

PAME asked the chairman to discuss the format of the Operating Guidelines at the forthcoming meeting of working group chairs with a view to facilitating consistency concerning the various Operating Guidelines. The draft Operating Guidelines for PAME is shown in Appendix IV.

#### **III. Offshore Oil and Gas Guidelines**

Denmark/Greenland presented a summary of their comments on the draft IUCN/OGP Guidelines for "Oil and Gas Exploration and Production in Arctic and Sub-Arctic Offshore Regions", which was submitted to OGP on May 10, 1999.

Denmark/Greenland observed that the draft guidelines did not meet the stated objectives or intended users. It was suggested that the guidelines should be more focused and would provide better value by incorporating Best Available Technology and Best Environmental Practice. A shorter version could also be developed, if

needed, to address the general public.

Norway presented a summary of their comments on the draft IUCN/OGP guidelines, which was submitted to OGP on June 30, 1999. Norway appreciated the draft guidelines and provided the following comments:

1. the content of the guidelines is too general;
2. the guidelines should be shorter and more focused (the general descriptions of the various activities and environmental conditions should be taken out); and
3. the focus should be on the main issues (i.e. objectives, principles, practices, environmental conditions etc.) that need to be included in planning and assessing a specific project. A document that is too comprehensive may give the impression of being all-inclusive, and become too large, resulting in people not reading it.

World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) presented their Review and Evaluation of the Arctic Offshore Oil and Gas Guidelines (see Appendix V). They compared the IUCN/OGP Guidelines with the essential features contained in the PAME Guidelines and concluded that the draft IUCN/OGP Guidelines do not complement the PAME Guidelines or incorporate information, goals and principles developed through the CAFF or AMAP Programs.

WWF also presented their draft criteria for evaluating the PAME Offshore Guidelines, which will address key questions such as: are the PAME Guidelines being implemented? If so, to what extent are they followed and working to meet the original objectives? If aspects of the projects meet the guidelines, do they adequately protect the environment? Their basic evaluation definitions are based on U.S. National Research Council criteria (1994) for adequacy of environmental information and the goals and principles of the PAME Guidelines.

WWF requested comments on their draft evaluation criteria for the offshore guidelines (see Appendix V) by January 1, 2000. The meeting agreed to provide comments to WWF in early January 2000 and noted its interest in WWF progress reports on their project.

The meeting noted that the PAME guidelines address regulatory application. As such, complimentary guidance for public use and a technical version on Best Environmental Practice and Best Available Technology for operators would be beneficial and a separate document appeared to be advisable.

IUCN/OGP expressed in writing their appreciation for the comments received. They are currently using this advice in developing a revised document, which will be prepared over the next three months and submitted to PAME.

United States submitted a progress report on the current state of USA, Norway and Russian cooperation in the development of a national regulatory system for offshore oil and gas within the Russian Federation.

#### IV. **Circumpolar Marine Workshop (CMW)**

Members of the project group for the Marine Workshop (Iceland and CAFF Secretary) briefed the meeting on preparations for the marine workshop to be held in Montreal, Canada, November 28 – December 2, 1999.

The rationale for IUCN/CAFF/PAME co-sponsoring the meeting is as follows:

IUCN:

1993 policy on marine protection; 1996 Resolution calling for increased emphasis on an Arctic and Ant-Arctic strategy; establishment of an Arctic function within the WCPA (World Commission on Protected Areas); implementing the Global Representative System of Marine Protected Areas in the Arctic; applying a revised approach to protected areas stemming from the 1997 WCPA planning meeting in Albany, Australia; enhancing domestic efforts and linking them at the circumpolar level.

CAFF

: implementing the marine component of the Circumpolar Protected Area Network (CPAN), Ministerial direction to focus additional effort on the marine environment; recommendations from CAFF's draft Status Report on Marine Protection; interest in harmonisation between conservation and development.

PAME:

implementing the PAME Regional Program of Action (RPA), including the habitat component; clarifying the applicability of coastal zone management in the Arctic; promoting an integrated approach to marine and coastal management.

It was noted that the goals of the workshop are to develop and recommend practical measures to protect the Arctic marine environment, conserve its biological diversity, and facilitate improved collaboration among Arctic countries, indigenous inhabitants, and other stakeholders and organisations.

It was further noted that the workshop objectives include:

- develop common tools, mechanisms, processes and best management practices;
- identify barriers to and opportunities for enhanced conservation and protection of the marine environment and to help design an integrated approach to marine and coastal management;
- identify major gaps in the knowledge and determine ways to address these needs;
- integrate traditional and other ecological knowledge; and
- assist Arctic Council, IUCN and other organisations to further their marine conservation and protection agendas.

The draft workshop agenda is included in Appendix VI.

The meeting considered key questions and issues to be addressed at the workshop and

offered comments to help strengthened the workshop programme.

Results of the Workshop will be forwarded to all the Arctic Council working groups. As co-sponsors of the workshop, both PAME and CAFF will review the workshop results and offer recommendations to SAOs.

The meeting also recognized that IUCN may wish to forward the workshop proceedings to the Arctic Council and other IUCN programmes.

V. **Regional Programme of Action**

. **Russian NPA Arctic and the Partnership Conference**

ACOPS provided a progress report on the implementation of the GEF PDF-B Project "Support to the National Plan of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment from Anthropogenic Pollution in the Russian Federation (NPA-Arctic)". Executing agency for the project is ACOPS, in collaboration with the Inter-Agency Working Group of the Russian Federation. The first meeting of the Steering Group for the project was held in London (18-19 Oct. 1999) and PAME was represented as an observer by its chairman.

The PDF-B project contains four substantial activities:

1. review and evaluation of relevant legislation, policy and administrative capacity at Federal and regional levels;
2. analysis of pollutant transport mechanisms and zones of impact;
3. analysis of existing practice in preparation of pre-investment studies in the Russian Federation and development of guidelines for their future preparation; and
4. identification, characterisation and prioritisation of hot-spots.

The following issues were highlighted:

5. overview of partners in the implementation of the GEF PDF-B Project and the NPA-Arctic;
6. terms of reference for workshops and working groups, and the work to be done in the inter-sessional period;
7. overview of meetings;
8. overview of consultants;
9. current policy in Russian Federation regarding the implementation of NPA-Arctic;
10. members of the Inter-Agency Working Group;
11. members of the International Task Team;
12. Russian officials associated with the implementation of the NPA-Arctic; and
13. detailed workplan and timetable for the implementation of the PDF-B Project activities.

The meeting agreed that PAME's role should include:

14. participating in the working groups of the PDF-B Project dealing with

- review of legislation and policy; analysis of pre-investment studies; and identification, characterisation and prioritisation of hot-spots;
15. providing relevant materials, particularly existing (or in preparation) reviews of legislation; information on relevant pre-investment studies; and provision of existing information on the methodology of identification, characterisation and prioritisation of hot-spots;
  16. encouraging Arctic countries to support the NPA-Arctic;
  17. encouraging IFIs to take part in the design and implementation of pre-investment studies and the identification, characterisation and prioritisation of hot-spots; and
  18. facilitating preparation of the Partnership Conference and implementation of the NPA-Arctic.

Secretariat will provide 1996 PAME Report to ACOPS and will solicit comments from PAME on criteria for selecting hot spots as well as guidelines for pre-investment studies. This information should be forwarded to the Secretariat and collated for ACOPS as soon as possible keeping in mind that the workshops are scheduled for early December 1999 and January 2000.

Regarding implementation of the NPA-Arctic, ACOPS reported that some actions have been implemented but others had to be postponed due to the slow process of fund-raising. Despite this drawback, the prognosis is good that the Partnership Conference will be organised in the first half of 2001 due to the fact that the activities, which are most important for the preparation of the Partnership Conference are already being implemented.

The meeting expressed its appreciation to ACOPS and noted that Steering Group participation in the workshops was advisable. The GEF project was noted as a priority for reporting to SAOs. In this regard the Chair requested ACOPS to prepare a Progress Report on Implementation of a Russian NPA-Arctic, which is shown in Appendix VII.

a. **PCB Project**

Vice-chairman of AMAP presented a progress report on the PCB project. The project was initiated in 1998 as a follow-up to the conclusions and recommendations of the AMAP Assessment Report, and has been supported by the First Ministerial Meeting of the Arctic Council (Iqaluit, Canada, September 17-18, 1998). The project consists of three phases:

1. evaluation of the current status of the problem with respect to environmental impact, and development of proposals for priority remedial actions;
2. feasibility study; and
3. implementation of demonstration projects.

The first phase of this project, which has been endorsed by the Arctic Council, is currently being implemented with the financial and technical support of all Arctic States and the Netherlands. The Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO) has recently made a decision to finance implementation

of a (given number of) project(s) within a limited geographical area in Northwest Russia. This would cover all three phases in a Multilateral project and can be considered as a NEFCO contribution to this project.

General management of the project organization and implementation is conducted by the steering group, which consists of one representative from each of the countries and NEFCO. According to the decision of the participating countries and supported by the Arctic Council, the first phase of the project is being conducted under the State Committee of the Russian Federation for Environmental Protection in coordination with the AMAP Secretariat.

The first phase started May 1, 1999. In August, the Steering Group adopted the Interim Report for Tasks 1 "PCB production term characterization" and 2 "PCB use term characterization", and noted the high quality and uniqueness. At present, the draft Interim Report for Task 3 "PCB-containing equipment use characterization" has been distributed among designated experts from the participating countries for comments, and it is planned that the Steering Group meeting will consider it in December 1999. The Steering Group Meeting will also consider detailed proposals and preliminary cost estimates for the phase 2 "Feasibility Study".

The meeting noted several important parallels between PAME involvement with the Russian NPA-Arctic and AMAP involvement with the PCB project. Both involve Steering Groups, donors, and secretariat support for managing large-scale projects. It was noted that the PCB project could also be considered a candidate project for the Partnership Conference. As such the need for effective communication between AMAP and PAME on these two projects and the importance of coordinated applications to GEF and relations with donors were emphasized as priorities for SAOs consideration.

#### **b. ACAP**

Norway provided a revised version of ACAP to PAME and explained that:

the revised strategy has progressed to the point where it is proposed to serve as a basis for formal discussions;  
the operative part of ACAP (action proposals) needs further development. It will be important that countries devote time and effort to develop proposals;  
a new format for project descriptions and an analysis of implementing options are in preparation and will be available shortly; and  
the discussion on the implementation of ACAP is on-going.

The meeting agreed on two major recommendations for ACAP:

1. Inclusion of EPPRs and PAMEs role in risk analysis, and pollution prevention and control measures within Section 3 of ACAP on identifying Actions; and
2. to recognize the importance of the RPA as a building block, particularly in relation to individual treatment of regional and global

approaches in Section 4 of ACAP.

c. **Mining Guidelines**

Canada presented their revised proposal on mining guidelines, which is shown in Appendix VIII. Canada noted the background and rationale for the proposed guidelines, emphasizing that mining is an important economic activity and a common environmental concern for several countries. The RPA further requires that guidelines be developed as a tier II activity. Canada explained how the proposal had been revised to respond to questions from the last PAME meeting including clarification that target users are both operators and regulators, the guidelines would be voluntary and would focus on best practices.

PAME members noted concerns about the timing, workload, status of the guidelines and implications for expanding the project coverage beyond PAME's Terms of Reference. RAIPON offered their support for developing such guidelines and noted RAIPON/ICC collaboration on mining initiatives.

Taking into consideration the concerns raised; Canada proposed that the Working Group approve the project in principle and agree to proceed with phase one which would determine what guidelines already exist and provide a comprehensive project description with appropriate linkages to RAIPON/ICC, CAFF, EPPR and ACAP. After further discussion on the need for better clarification between guidelines and codes of practice, as well as additional time needed to engage country experts, Canada withdrew their project proposal. The Chairman noted that mining guidelines proposal remains on the RPA and ACAP project lists and that PAME could in future reconsider the proposal.

Regarding the distribution between guidelines and codes of practice, Canada offered to provide further clarification on this topic for the next PAME meeting.

d. **Hazardous Chemicals**

Denmark/Greenland, presented a Nordic Proposal on phasing out of hazardous chemicals which is based on the OSPAR strategy. The proposal is presented in Appendix IX.

Both Canada and USA noted that the proposal would require amendment to make it consistent with other regional and global approaches. Although the overall goals could be supported in principle, the detailed aspects lacked consensus.

Finland noted that HELCOM has adopted a strategy on hazardous substances that is similar to the OSPAR strategy.

VI. **Shipping**

Both the Chairman and Norway, as lead country on shipping, noted the previous work

undertaken on shipping and recommended completing an evaluation of the shipping problems related to current and potential shipping activities in the Arctic prior to the next Ministerial Meeting in October 2000. To achieve this Norway offered to establish a correspondence group as soon as possible and to distribute a draft snapshot analysis of shipping activities (current and potential) within the next few months. This would take into account the results of the Northern Sea Route User Conference that will be held in Oslo, Norway from 18-20 November 1999.

The meeting agreed that Arctic States would be asked to comment on the draft snapshot analysis and offer national perspectives on possible concrete problems that are considered worthy of further consideration. The meeting also agreed that shipping experts would be invited to the next PAME meeting and asked to consider the snapshot analysis and shipping activities that could be recommended for further action. It was noted that EPPR should be invited to collaborate in this exercise.

Canada gave an update on the progress of the Polar Code. It was noted that the IMO correspondence group (CG) continues its deliberations on the Polar Code. The CG was set up by the Design & Equipment Sub-committee (DE) at IMO in March '98 and will report to DE in April 2000, as scheduled. The Maritime Safety Committee (MSC) in May '99 issued new directions to DE and the most significant change is to remove application to Antarctic waters. Subsequently, the Antarctic Treaty nations have informed IMO of the development of new guidelines for shipping south of 60° which will be submitted to IMO for consideration. Another change is that the document (now Polar Guidelines) will now be part of an Assembly resolution, however the manner of publication is yet to be determined by DE. The new mandate confirms that other sub-committees are to continue their review and reporting, and that the document is non-mandatory as per the original direction by MSC in May 1997. Discussion and related material of the correspondence group can be accessed at <http://www.tc.gc.ca/polarcode>

The Icelandic Coast Guard introduced an automated computerized Vessel Monitoring System that is being adopted by NEAFC (North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission). The system is based on automatic tracking through satellites and electronic exchange of and increases the possibilities of locating and tracking vessels, both for security reasons and to control vessel traffic within the jurisdictions of contracting parties.

## VII. **Analysis of International Agreement and Arrangements**

CAFF provided a status report on their Reporting and Evaluation Guidelines (no change) and review of legislative mechanisms. CAFF will provide copies of these to PAME.

The Chairman presented the Final Report of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Global Meeting of Regional Seas Convention and Action Plans (The Hague, 5-8 July, 1999). Attention was drawn to the various recommendations in the report which are worthy of PAME's further consideration in relation to this agenda. The importance of co-operation between and among the regional seas conventions and action plans and the interested organizations was also highlighted. The meeting noted the important recognition given to PAME activities in the report and further noted the ongoing request for PAME to participate in this process. PAME is invited to comment on the report recommendations to the



Secretariat who will then collect comments for consideration at the next PAME meeting.

The meeting agreed to invite Arctic States to provide factual updates on the 1996 PAME report to the Secretariat by mid-March 2000. Secretariat would then prepare a preliminary update for review at the next PAME Meeting. Secretariat was also requested to update the status of the 1996 PAME report recommendations and provide this information to the next PAME meeting. PAME members were further invited to provide the Secretariat with suggestions for improved reporting to SAOs and Ministers. These responses will also be considered at the next PAME meeting.

It was agreed that coordinated efforts between working groups on legal analysis would be beneficial and that PAME's update on international conventions and agreements could be seen as a helpful basis for coordinated efforts. It was further agreed that this issue should be raised during the working group chair discussions at the upcoming SAO meeting in Washington D.C.

Denmark/Greenland provided an information report on Arctic Marine Pollution, which contains a number of ideas for possible Nordic Initiatives.

### **III. Relations with other Organisations and Working Groups**

PAME recognizes the importance of effective communication between working groups and other organisations, the value of sharing work-plans and the benefit of identifying collaborative issues, which may result in joint work. The meeting agreed that the working group chairs should address the following coordination issues at the SAO meeting in Washington D.C.:

0. Legal Analysis.
1. Consideration of reporting.
2. Operating Guidelines.
3. Applications to GEF and Relations with Donors.

CAFF Executive Secretary informed the meeting about another GEF initiative. The CAFF Chair and Secretariat, the Russian Federation State Committee For Environmental Protection and UNEP-GRID-Arendal have submitted a project proposal to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to enhance implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in the Russian Arctic. A project concept paper has been submitted, and a request is being finalised for funds for project preparations (PDF-A) to UNEP/GEF. This will be a forerunner for a more comprehensive project preparation proposal (PDF-B) to be submitted in early 2000 and eventually a full GEF project. This initiative is in response to a window of opportunity, suggested by UNEP, in terms of gaps in GEF activities in relation to biodiversity conservation in the Russian Arctic. The goal of the main project, which will be running for 5 years, is to safeguard large tracts of undisturbed ecosystems and ensure conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in the Russian Arctic.

In response to a letter from EPPR regarding pollution preventions, it was agreed that there was some overlap with respect to shipping and legal analysis but that possible

duplication of effort could be avoided through collaborative arrangements. Chairs of PAME and EPPR will further discuss these issues including the particular need for collaboration on the shipping analysis.

The meeting welcomed the increased collaboration between AMAP and ACOPS. Regarding a possible ACOPS/AMAP MOU that will be considered at AMAP's next meeting, PAME agreed that should AMAP decide to pursue such an arrangement it would benefit from further WG Chair and SAO consideration. Several delegations expressed reservations about the appropriateness of using a MOU.

With respect to the GPA Clearing House and the linkages to the RPA, it was agreed that:

4. Secretariat would invite the GPA office to present the global Clearing House at the next PAME meeting and would circulate background information on the GPA Clearing House in advance;
5. Canada would provide its analysis of most frequently asked questions within a national Clearing House;
6. PAME supported ACOPS proposal to consult with the GPA office in the development of a Russian NPA-Arctic Clearing House; and
7. PAME would inform the Secretariat on potential user needs and information provided for consideration at the next PAME meeting.

Vice-chairman reported on a Seminar on the Environmental Aspects of the Northern Dimension that was in Brussels, 11 October 1999.

#### IX. **PAME Workplans**

The PAME Workplans are summarized in Appendix X. Denmark/Greenland has offered to host upcoming PAME meeting, which is tentatively scheduled for June 5-9, 2000.

#### X. **Other Business**

The Secretary provided background information on voluntary contribution in support of the PAME Secretariat. The meeting agreed to include budget reporting as a standing item on its agenda.

Recognizing the importance of effective communication, the Secretariat was requested to prepare an information piece on PAME (e.g. what it is, what it does and the future challenges) for consideration at the next PAME meeting.