

Approved by ACAP WG in September 11, 2013

ACAP Working Group Meeting Summary

St Petersburg 12-13 February, 2013

Arctic Contaminants Action Program (ACAP) Working Group met in the Finnish Consulate General premises in St Petersburg 12-13 February, 2013. Representatives from Denmark, Finland, Norway, Russian Federation, Sweden, USA, IPS, Sami Council, NEFCO, Nordic Council of Ministers, UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and VTB Capital participated in the meeting.

1. Welcome address and adoption of the agenda

The Consul General of Finland, Ms Pirjo Tulokas welcomed the participants. She noted in her opening address the vulnerability of the Arctic, the pressures due rapid changes and the need to ensure sustainability in the Arctic development. She noted the high appreciation to the work of the Arctic Council and the successful work of ACAP in retaining the contaminants in the hot spots in the Arctic. The Chairman of ACAP, Mr Jaakko Henttonen opened the meeting.

The agenda was adopted with amendments. NEFCO informed the participants that they will be attending the meeting as the PSI Fund Manager.

2. Minutes of the previous meetings

Secretariat presented the minutes of the previous Copenhagen meeting. The WG adopted the minutes.

In the ensuing discussion Norway proposed that the minutes of the meeting could be approved intersessionally. The US noted the idea of intersessional approval was interesting and would help us to be more efficient and to distribute the minutes outside working groups. The Chair will find out how other working groups adopt their meeting minutes and the WG will see if intersessional adoption is possible in the future.

3. Review of intersessional development

The secretariat reported on the outcome of the meetings of SAO in Haparanda November 2012 and Tromsø, January 2013,

ACAP welcomed the establishment of the AC permanent secretariat, finalizing the observer manual, noted the environment ministers support to the work on the contaminants.

It was noted that there had also been intersessional decisions made on process for project approval, lifting the brackets from Para 7 of the operating guidelines, and approval of the Norway-Finland led project on SLCFC.

Norway was very pleased with the current practice on project approval and proposed that there be a review after this trial period of one year and if it will prove successful. **The WG decided to take the discussion on experiences on the use of process for ACAP project approval at the next meeting.**

Sweden informed the meeting about the Arctic funding options from the Nordic Council of Ministers. The WGs of the Arctic Council are not using 9 million Danish Crown which is available for the Arctic work. Secretariat will follow up the possibilities

4. Deliverables to the ministerial meeting

The WG reviewed the status and expectations for the ACAP deliverables to the Ministerial meeting.

Norway noted that the ACAP work plan 2013-2015 contains a mix of approved and not yet approved project proposals and ideas, and the WG agreed to include text to inform about this. WG also discussed the nature of deliverables to the ministers and noted that regular 2-year reporting was not to be considered as a deliverable specifically anticipated in the work plan. In addition, regular technical reports that will be adopted by ACAP to be posted on the website may not always be considered as deliverables to the Ministers.

Dioxin and furan project

Sweden presented the status of the dioxin group deliverables, and briefly introduced their contents. The publications have been recently adopted by the PSG, and they are relatively old. PSG on PCDD/F has met in Moscow in autumn and will continue discussions on project implementation with the Vorkutinsky cement plant with the aim of reducing PCDD/F emissions. The main idea is to introduce some adjustments to the cooling process, the factory is installing filters anyway.

Denmark proposed to include a disclaimer saying the reports have been prepared under ACAP and promised to provide text intersessionally. DK also noted the technical nature of the reports and hence they were not appropriate material for the Ministerial meeting. Russian Federation supported the approach saying that the best solution was to make the reports public and have them as an official information on the Arctic Council website.

The WG decided to adopt the PCDD/F group Phase I and Phase II reports and place the reports in the ACAP website noting in the two-year report that these reports contribute to the Russian efforts to implement the Stockholm Convention and therefore should be made public.

It was noted that ACAP has been working on creating emission inventories in the past, but now several AC groups are working on creating emission inventories. ACAP discussed its role in creating emission inventories and noticed there would be a need clarify the division of labor between the different AC groups working on SLCF. It was also noted that ACAP is not in a position to define the guidelines for inventories, but should follow closely whatever action will be taken by the Ministers on inventories.

Obsolete pesticides

The OP PSG lead presented the draft deliverables to the Ministerial meeting. The PSG had decided to endeavor to adopt the Phase I and II final report as well as the Fact Sheet on time for submission to the next SAO meeting 19-21 March.

The WG noted that although progress was made in management of pesticides stocks, it was up to Russian Federation to make the obsolete pesticides project results sustainable.

5. Updating ACAP Operating Guidelines

The meeting took note of the decisions made at the previous meeting and intersessionally and decided to get back to the issue later (Spring 2014), and discuss this in light of the experience in use of the interim ACAP process for intercessional approval of ACAP projects.

6. Project Support Instrument (PSI)

The PSI Fund Manager (NEFCO) reported the state of play in PSI preparations and identified joint project areas between BEAC and ACAP concrete project proposals from the funding perspective and noted that the local authorities may not always have all the same priorities as the donors in cleaning the hotspots. Currently the PSI pledges are 15.9 MEUR. A tentative resource allocation for the period until 2015 has been prepared identifying the foreseen allocations of PSI funds to project areas. Fund manager also noted that VTB has been selected as the Russian Executing agency in November 2012.

It was stressed that all PSI project need address pollution prevention or mitigation and follow the PSI guidelines and the Rules of Procedure established by the Arctic Council. Fund manager also noted that the fall meeting of the SAO in Haparanda 2012 requested the PSI fund manager to proceed assessment of project for PSI approval.

The representative of REA (Vladimir Litvak, VTB Capital) presented their organization and expressed their interested and gratitude and looked forward to contributing to the work of ACAP. VTB is working on developing their own pipeline of project in this area and he thought they would complement the activities of PSI. They will, among other activities, work on renewable energy production in NW Russia. The REA look forward to contribute to the objectives of ACAP and are working to finalize the set of documentation as soon as possible. March 2013 was seen as a possible time of completion.

PSI Fund Manager invited ACAP to also have a look at GEF funded PAME hot spot work with a view to contributing to solutions to those problems.

7. Progress reports from the project steering groups

The WG received and discussed the reports from the Project Steering Groups.

US presented the report from **SLCFC PSG**. One project on residential wood stoves is on-going. There will be a work shop in Oslo in June, 2013.

The US also presented their diesel project proposal. Russian Federation supported the proposal highlighting the need to engage a Russian entity. RF can help identifying an expert from Roshydromet. The US diesel BC project proposal was approved by ACAP WG.

Sweden presented the status of **PCDD/F PSG**, including a work plan for Phase III. RF addressed the issue of Russian partners. In Phase I and II the Russian partner was CIP but now the partners should be considered carefully. RF supported inclusion of Roshydromet. SE was of the opinion that Rosprirodnadzor has to be in the PSG because they are the organization with authority over the control and regulations.

The **ACAP Mercury PSG** held a November teleconference (held on two separate days to accommodate the availability of all participants). During the teleconference, the PSG agreed with recommendations following the September ACAP meeting that the PSG is not required to develop a strategy document. The PSG continues to discuss next steps for advancing the proposed projects and possibilities for a face-to-face meeting. The PSG appreciates the efforts of ACAP to clarify our membership list and to encourage full participation.

Obsolete pesticides group reported they have finalized inventory activities and preparing the deliverable for the ministerial meeting. In addition, the group is studying whether co-operation with FAO regional project on OPs would be helpful in implementing the project Phase III.

IPS presented the draft **IPCAP PSG** "Strategy Document 2013", noting that the Permanent Participants are in a position to contribute to the Arctic Council work in many ways that the country participants cannot. The key question was to address how the PSG could contribute to AC work. Sweden announced they would like to co-chair the group. The PSG will then be co-chaired by AIA and Sweden.

Russia informed that the work on **IHWMS** is under consideration in Russia.

The Arctic Council NEFCO PCB Project is currently on hold due to inability to obtain an operational permit in the Russian Federation. The work plan and updating the associated tasks shall be updated once the PSI is operational in 2013.

8. Project management

The WG discussed the responsibilities and whether the projects need a country lead. PSI Fund manager referred to the established rules of the Arctic Council with regards to project lead and expressed the need to apply them in a flexible manner to be operational.

Norway underlined the importance of adherence to the Arctic Council Rules of Procedure and referred to the AC RoP no 26 regarding proposals for cooperative activities (in ACAP called projects). The WG recognized that the AC RoP no 26 should be followed. This implies that all project proposals are formally to be proposed to the ACAP WG by one or several Arctic States or PPs. The project co-leads and partners should decide between themselves how to organize the implementation of the project.

9. ACAP project development and discussion on criteria for an Arctic Council project

The PSI Fund manager, NEFCO, has requested that ACAP prepare an update on the status of ACAP projects, especially with regards to their eligibility as an “AC approved project”. The WG discussed the ACAP projects status. Several comments were made on the contents of the table. The meeting discussed the Arctic Council approval for the projects and noted that the mandate for the PSG and the work plan indicate the Arctic Council approval for any project.

WG requested the secretariat to finalize the table in cooperation with the PSGs and circulate it for approval of the Working Group on 28 February with view to submit the input to PSI Fund Manager by 10 March, 2013.

10. The Project Steering Group Composition

WG updated the list of PSG members and decided to include the email addresses in the table.

11. Cooperation with BEAC

Finland as the chairman of the BEAC Environment group presented the ACAP related work of the Barents Council in NW Russia. She noted that there were possibilities to achieve synergies in cooperation between the working groups by i.a. exchanging fact sheet, participating in each others' meetings.

RF noted the work is very commendable and important for Russia and asked about the NEFCO role as a fund manager. Finland explained that NEFCO has participated in many prefeasibility studies, pilot projects and co-funded projects. In the ensuing discussion the WG discussed the possibilities of ACAP to be involved in the work of the BEAC. Sweden highlighted that it is not donor countries, ACAP or NEFCO who is developing the hot spot projects but the Russian regions.

ACAP members welcomed the information and noted the scope for synergies between ACAP projects and BEAC work on hot spots.

12. FAO activities on obsolete pesticides

Kevin Helps, the manager of natural resources team in the regional Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) office, presented the FAO work on obsolete pesticides. He highlighted that the reason why FAO is involved in the work of obsolete pesticides are first and foremost centralised government purchases of stocks and mismanagement of migratory pests. FAO started work on OPs in 1992.

Kevin Helps presented the current 7.5 Million Euro project on 12 former Soviet Union countries, which focuses on obsolete stocks management, life cycle management, and cross cutting activities. The project aims to stimulate linkages between donors, agencies, and countries – synergies.

He identified the following challenges in the destruction of pesticides:
- lack of permitting process

- public opposition due to lack of awareness
- debate on transboundary movements of waste
- requirements under international obligations
- technological challenges: old established options, technology selection, management capacities

Russian Federation noted that the chemical weapons destruction facilities are operated by the Ministry of Industry and they are supposed to be used for that purpose only.

13. Russian Federation clean-up activities in the Arctic

Russian Federation presented a video and results of old military base clean up in Naryan-Mar, Amderma. Almost 3000 tonnes of metal scrap was removed, 1902 tonnes of soil was cleaned up, soil transported and filled 14 460 tonnes and waste oils destroyed (20 t).

NEFCO informed that a video has been put in youtube on the FJL clean up operations by UNEP and Russian Federation.

14. Next meeting

The next meeting will take place in September 9-12, 2013 tentatively in Iceland.



Annex 1: Record of Decisions

ACAP WG meeting in St. Petersburg 12-13 February, 2013

1. The WG adopted the minutes of the previous meeting in Copenhagen. Secretariat will circulate the adopted minutes to the Arctic Council, other Working Groups and Project Steering Groups. Secretariat will place the minutes on the ACAP website.
2. WG requested the Chair to find out the practices of other working groups in preparation of minutes and whether they publish their adopted meeting minutes on their websites.
3. WG decided to see if it was possible to adopt the meeting minutes intersessionally to facilitate faster information exchange with the PSGs and other Working Groups of the Arctic Council.
4. Decided to follow the interim project approval process until the Spring 2014 meeting and include discussion on experiences on the use of process for ACAP project approval in the agenda of the Spring meeting 2014.
5. ACAP discussed its role in the work on emission inventories and noted there would be a need to highlight ACAP's expertise in this area with respect to future work between the different AC groups working on SLCF to avoid overlapping activities.
6. Discussed and adopted the ACAP report 2011-2013 to the Ministers and the Work Plan 2013-2015 to be submitted to the SAO.
7. Adopted the reports of the Dioxin PSG activities Phase I and II to be placed on the ACAP website, including a disclaimer (text to be provided by Denmark). The WG decided to not submit these reports as a deliverable to the Ministerial Meeting due to their technical nature.
8. Decided to comment the Obsolete pesticides report and fact sheet by 15 February in order to adopt the documents by 19 February for submission to the next SAO meeting (19-21 March).
9. Decided to request OP PSG to consider preparing a poster on the outcomes of the project to the Ministerial meeting for display.
10. The WG decided to postpone the discussion on Operating Guidelines until the Spring 2014 meeting.
11. Agreed in principle on the elements in the response to the PSI Fund manager's request on status of ACAP projects. The WG requested the secretariat to finalize the table by 28 February in order to submit it to the PSI Fund Manager by 10 March, 2013.
12. Welcomed the reports from the Project Steering Groups and commended the progress.
13. Decided to approve the proposal from SLCFC PSG "Reduction of Black Carbon from Diesel Sources in the Russian Arctic".
14. Welcomed the draft proposal on SLCFC inventories prepared by INSTITUTE and deferred it to the SLCFC PSG for further elaboration.
15. Decided to approve the Mercury PSG report "Feasibility Study on Mercury Containing Waste in the northwest Region of the Russian Federation Baseline Report - Final Draft January 2008" by Ecobezopasnost/COWI to be placed on the ACAP website.
16. Welcomed the draft strategy paper on IPCAP prepared by IPS and AIA and deferred it to the IPCAP PSG for further elaboration.

17. WG updated the list of PSG members and decided to include the email addresses in the table.
18. WG took note of the report by Russian federation on clean-up activities in Amderma.
19. The WG requested Russian Federation to identify relevant Russian partners for new ACAP projects on Mercury and SLCF, and other projects on the request of the PSG Chair.
20. Welcomed the presentation of Chair of BEAC group on environment on hot spots in the Barents Region and the on-going activities with NEFCO.
21. Welcomed the presentation by FAO on their efforts on destruction of obsolete pesticides in Russian Federation.
22. Welcomed the information exchange by PSI Fund Manager on the status of the PSI.
23. Decided to have the next meeting tentatively 9-12 September, 2013, in Iceland.

Annex 2: list of participants

