

ACAP Steering Committee Meeting Report

*March 15th – 16th, 2005
Stockholm, Sweden*

*Arctic Council Action Plan to Eliminate Pollution of the
Arctic (ACAP)*

Table of Contents

1. Welcome and Introduction
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Annex A - Project Progress Reports
 - 3 a. Multilateral Cooperative Project for Phase-out of PCB Use and Management of PCB-contaminated Wastes in the Russian Federation
 - 3 b. Reduction/Elimination of Emissions of Dioxins and Furans in the Russian Federation
 - 3 c. Reduction of Atmospheric Mercury Releases from the Arctic States
 - 3 d. Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles in the Russian Federation
 - 3 e. Brominated Flame Retardants
4. Annex B - Project Progress Reports
 - 4 a. Russian-Norwegian Cleaner Production Centre
 - 4 b. AMAP/ACAP Fact Sheets on PCBs, Dioxins/Furans, Mercury, and Cleaner Production
5. Financial Issues
 - 5 a. Project Support Instrument (PSI)
 - 6 b. Other Issues
6. New Project Proposals
 - 6 a. Permanent Participants
 - 6 b. NGOs/Observers
7. Cooperation/Outreach
 - 7 a. ACAP/ Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation (AMEC) Cooperation
 - 7 b. ACAP/ Barents Euro-Arctic Council/Working Group on Environment (BEAC/WGE) Cooperation
8. Guidelines for Developing ACAP projects
9. Draft Report to SAOs/Ministerial Meeting
10. ACAP Webpage
11. Other Business

Table of Contents continued

APPENDICES

Appendix A: ACAP Steering Committee Meeting Agenda

Appendix B: List of Participants

Appendix C: PCBs (Polychlorinated Biphenyls)

C.1: Progress Report on ACAP PCB Project (NEFCO)

C.2: Progress Report: Collection and Storage of PCB Containing Equipment
in the Region of St. Petersburg

Appendix D: Status Report: Reduction/Elimination of Emissions of Dioxins and Furans in
the Russian Federation with Focus on the Arctic and Northern Regions
Impacting the Arctic

Appendix E: Progress Report: Reduction of Atmospheric Mercury Releases from the
Arctic Countries

Appendix F: Obsolete Pesticides

F.1: Status Report: Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete
Pesticides Stockpiles in the Russian Federation

F.2: Status Report: Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete
Pesticides Stockpiles in Republic of Karelia, RF

F.3: Progress Report: Obsolete Pesticide Project in Vologda & Pskov

Appendix G: Progress Report: Reduction or Elimination of Sources and Releases of
Brominated Flame Retardants, with enclosed Project Description

ACAP Steering Committee Meeting Report

March 15-16, 2005

Stockholm, Sweden

1. Welcome

Report from the Chairman and Secretariat

Opening remarks began with ACAP Chairman Bob Dyer thanking the Swedish EPA for hosting the March 2005 ACAP Steering Committee Meeting in Stockholm, Sweden, and gratefully acknowledging the presence of the Swedish Senior Arctic Official, Helena Odmark. The chair then introduced SAO Odmark and gave her the floor.

Swedish SAO Odmark welcomed everyone to Stockholm, recognized the importance of ACAP to Sweden, and stated that ACAP should be recognized not only as a regular Working Group, but as an Action Group within the Arctic Council. SAO Odmark also informed the Steering Committee that Zofia Tucinska of the Swedish EPA is the new permanent representative for Sweden, and will work with the former representative, Niklas Johansson. She also noted the importance of completing the Guidelines for the Project Support Instrument for consideration at the next SAO meeting in Yakutsk in April 2005.

ACAP Chair Bob Dyer discussed activities the ACAP Steering Committee has undertaken since the last meeting, highlighting continuing efforts of AMAP and ACAP on brominated flame retardants (BRFs), and increased cooperation with the Barents Euro-Arctic Council's Working Group on Environment and their "Hot Spots" report. The Chairman noted particular objectives that are foremost for the ACAP Steering Committee: completion of projects, outreach to other Arctic-focused organizations, and emerging chemicals issues. He emphasized that AMAP identifies problems within the Arctic and ACAP initiates action projects to address these problems, working closely with AMAP. He also noted that the initial focus of the ACAP Projects has been on the priority pollutants under the Stockholm Convention on Elimination of POPs, and the Heavy Metals Protocol of the LRTAP Convention with a focus on mercury compounds.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The Steering Committee adopted the agenda unanimously. The final agenda and list of participants are provided in Appendices A & B, respectively.

3. Project Progress Reports – Annex A Projects

A. PCBs (Lars-Otto Reiersen, AMAP)

Lars-Otto Reiersen, representing the AMAP Secretariat, provided an overview of progress to date on PCB issues. Mr. Reiersen informed the ACAP Steering Committee that the PCB meeting was held on March 14th, the day before the ACAP Steering Committee meeting. The record of the meeting was expected to be available in the near future.

Husamuddin Ahmadzai, representing NEFCO, gave an update on their PCB project. Three key problems NEFCO is facing with their PCB Project are: 1) Local Governments must be more supportive of PCB cleanup projects; 2) timelines of cleanup implementation are too long – some are over 10 years, thus many local governments do not feel that it is necessary to act quickly; and 3) NEFCO was facing delays awaiting Russian ratification of the Stockholm Convention. Mr. Ahmadzai then focused on lessons learned from the PCB project and informed the Steering Committee that two sites were in the final stages of evaluation: St. Petersburg and the Rostov Region. NEFCO will provide a progress report in the near future with lessons learned. See Appendix C.1 for the Progress Report dated 4.03.2005.

The Danish PCB collection and storage project was also noted as a project that will complement the NEFCO project. It will also address obsolete pesticides. Mikala Klint, representing the Danish EPA, made a short report on this topic and noted that a new status report will be made available very soon. This report is provided in Appendix C.2.

Ella Barnes of the US EPA presented a status report on the plasma arc project, which is designed to destroy PCB-containing capacitors. Two sites were identified as candidates for siting of the plasma arc technology. The primary objective of this project is the destruction and cleanup of 12,000 capacitors containing approximately 200 tonnes of PCBs. This project will require approvals and support of Rostekhnadzor (the Federal Environmental, Technological, and Nuclear Supervision Service of the Russian Federation) for licenses and permits, and from the Ministry of Industry for implementation of the project. Sweden expressed concerns about the plasma arc technology, including possible emissions of dioxins and how fly ash will be handled during the process. Loren Habegger of Argonne National Laboratory addressed these concerns as follows: A gas cleaning system would be used in the PCB cleanup process to rapidly cool emissions, preventing dioxin formation. Fabric filters with activated carbon can also be used to remove ash, eliminating residual dioxins and furans. Swedish participation in monitoring was welcomed for this project.

The U.S. will contribute an additional 60,000 US dollars for this project. AMAP reported that 90,000 euros were also available for this project. With respect to dioxins emissions, Mr. Ahmadzai of NEFCO will follow up with the United Nations and the European Union for advice on air filters that minimize risk of dioxin emissions. AMAP requested the Russian standards for PCB cleanup.

Action Item: *For the capacitor destruction project, complete Business Plans for final site selection and begin shipment of plasma arc equipment.*

Continue implementation of Danish collection and storage project in support of NEFCO PCB Project and provide copy of updated status report.

B. Dioxins and Furans (Niklas Johansson, Sweden)

Niklas Johansson of the Swedish EPA provided a status report on the reduction/elimination of emissions of dioxins and furans impacting the Arctic (Appendix D). Phase I of this project collected and compiled information on sources of dioxins and furans in Russia, to provide support to the development of Russia's National Implementation Plan under the Stockholm Convention. Phase I of this project also included translation of the UNEP Chemicals Toolkit from English to Russian, development of a dioxin emission inventory, and identification of current regulations and standards, including approved analytical methods. A final report of this project is available from the Swedish EPA.

Phase II of this project will focus on new initiatives such as an effort by Russian experts from the Russian Norwegian Cleaner Production Center (RNCPC) to provide cleaner production training. This will focus on reduction of dioxin and furan emissions from Novodvinsky pulp and paper facilities in the Arkhangelsk Oblast. This training is scheduled for completion in the first half of this year. Wood treatment facilities will be engaged in negotiations for cleaner production training in the future. Much of the problem faced in this project is getting support from local authorities and local governments. Norway was welcomed as a new member of this Working Group.

Action item: *Contributions to this project from Norway will be provided when a more detailed work plan is available, and when estimates of cost and funds available have been made.*

Note: In response to a Danish EPA request, the Russian Delegation made a presentation on the status of the Russian Federation's National Implementation Plan (NIP) for the Stockholm Convention. This will include—within the next two years—a schedule for development of the NIP and detailed documentation of the scope and content of the NIP, with support for this work provided by the Global Environment Facility. The Russian Ministry of Natural Resources has submitted an application to UNEP Chemicals for a PDF-A grant (Project Preparation and Development Facility, Block A) to initiate project/program identification to support NIP development. PDF-A funds have been allocated but not received. Russia is preparing the necessary documentation to ratify the Stockholm Convention, and in November 2004, the Duma held hearings to speed ratification. However, reorganization of key Federal authorities such as the Ministry of Natural Resources and Rostekhnadzor has delayed final review and approval of the National Implementation Plan.

C. Mercury (Mikala Klint, Denmark)

Mikala Klint, Danish EPA, made a presentation on the assessment of sources of mercury in the Arctic. In the near future, the Mercury Fact Sheet will be updated and the Mercury Background Document will be discussed at the Mercury Working Group meeting in September. Russian translations of these documents, including the updated Mercury Fact Sheet, will be made. The Danish EPA is currently evaluating the power generation sector, and assessments will be made on how to proceed with supporting a project in Russia. In addition, 250,000 Danish Kroner will be provided for mercury projects. The most current mercury inventory documents are posted on the ACAP Website. This includes *Arctic Mercury Releases Inventory and Assessment of Mercury Releases from the Russian Federation*.

The Russian representatives requested that Denmark consider undertaking mercury projects in conjunction with the obsolete pesticides project where common goals such as mercury waste management exist. Russia has large sources of mercury and mercury waste, with more than 1000 tons entering arctic oceans and rivers. "Hotspots" contamination will be considered in the near future, taking into consideration the inventory report prepared by AMAP and NEFCO for the Barents Council.

It was noted that the ACAP Mercury Project directly supports UNEP's GC23 resolution to form partnerships to reduce and eliminate mercury releases from key sectors such as combustion, products, artisanal mining, and chlorine (chlor-alkali) production. Denmark, as the Chair of PAME, has indicated a willingness to work with ACAP to coordinate mercury projects within the Russian Federation.

See Appendix E for the Progress Report.

Action Items: *Develop two reports (Action Plan for Mercury Release Reduction in the Russian Federation and Assessment of Existing Agreements on Mercury Release Sources in Arctic Countries).*

Provide updated Mercury Fact Sheet (Russian and English).

Evaluate how objectives of the Barents Council Hot Spots Report could be coordinated with the ACAP Mercury Working Group objectives.

ACAP Chair should discuss with PAME Chair opportunities to coordinate work on reduction of mercury emissions, inventories, and releases.

D. Obsolete Pesticides (Timo Seppala, Finland)

Timo Seppala of the Finnish Environment Institute provided a progress report on the project for management of obsolete and prohibited pesticides stockpiles in the Russian Federation. The Obsolete Pesticides Project consists of three phases: Phase I:

Development of inventories in eleven priority Regions of the Russian Federation; Phase II: Implementation of measures for improvement of storage conditions and movement/integration of stocks of obsolete pesticides, identification of unknown stocks, and assessment and selection of existing technologies and methods of stock destruction/disposal/storage; Phase III: Implementation of environmentally sound demonstration project for the destruction or disposal of obsolete pesticides.

Much of the river and soil pollution from obsolete pesticides comes from flooding where the pesticides are stored. Most warehouses have stocks of pesticides in degrading containers, and many of these warehouses are in areas prone to flooding, such as Altai Republic. There is a need to repackage the stocks to prevent leaking, and to perform screening analysis for mercury-containing and chlorinated compounds. The containers then need to be relabeled for easy identification. Repackaging of pesticides in hazardous waste containers will also facilitate transporting them to treatment facilities. However, many containers are mixtures of pesticides in which nothing is identified. Since the previous Steering Committee meeting in September 2004, the donor countries have allocated approximately 145,000 US\$ for the implementation of the project. The status report is provided in Appendix F.1.

Action item: *Complete inventories for three priority Regions: Tyumen, Altai Republic, and Omsk.*

The goal of the Karelia Obsolete Pesticides Project, being implemented by Finland, is to eliminate all obsolete pesticides in the Republic of Karelia. Over 20,000 kilograms of obsolete pesticides are stored in 23 warehouses throughout the Republic. One of the project's goals is to store them in environmentally sound areas. Finland reported that this project is at a standstill because Finland needs the approval of the regional representative of the Ministry of Natural Resources to continue the work in Russia. The Russian representative at the meeting replied to ACAP that no approval is needed from the Russian Federal government for this project. The status report for this project is provided in Appendix F.2.

Mikala Klint, Danish EPA, reported on the status of the Pskov and Vologda Pesticides Projects in Russia, where about 800 tonnes of pesticides are registered. Much of the pesticides inventory is in severely damaged packaging. Progress on an Action Plan will be presented at the next ACAP Steering Committee meeting. The progress report for this project is provided in Appendix F.3.

Action Item: *Present progress on an Action Plan for the Regions of Pskov and Vologda at the next ACAP Steering Committee meeting.*

E. Brominated Flame Retardants (BFRs) (Solvar Hardeng, Norway)

Solvar Hardeng of the Norwegian Pollution Control Authority made a presentation on the project for reduction/elimination of sources and releases of brominated flame retardants (BFRs). Phase I of this project is to identify sources and releases of BFRs found in the Arctic, to include collection and compilation of information from Arctic countries on: production of BFRs (including import/export); production of products containing BFRs (including import/export); waste management practices (including disposal, reuse/recycling, and incineration); and BFR releases associated with wastewater. Involvement of non-governmental organizations is important to the success of this project. Other objectives of this BFR project are to improve risk management, identify best management practices, and identify alternatives to BFRs.

The results of Phase I will be a report summarizing findings and recommendations for Phase II, and a project Fact Sheet. Norway plans to have a first draft of the report in early 2006 and hopes to include data from Russia. Currently, 50,000 USD is available for Phase I of the BFR Project. Additional funding may be provided by Norway and the United States. Funding in the amount of 125,000 US dollars is required to completely fund Phase I project and meeting expenses, including Russian participation.

A Progress Report, including a Project Description, is provided in Appendix G.

Action Item: *Develop a draft Project Fact Sheet summarizing findings for Phase I, for review by Steering Committee.*

Distribute questionnaire to relevant parties for response by 1 August 2005.

Provide progress on draft report, due in 2006, at the next ACAP Steering Committee meeting.

4. Project Progress Reports – Annex B Projects

A. Cleaner Production (Alexander Tsygankov, Russian Federation)

Alexander Tsygankov, Director of the Russian Norwegian Cleaner Production Centre, provided further information on implementation of the Cleaner Production program at Norilsk Nickel. This Project includes three cities in industrial areas where palladium, copper, and nickel are mined. Norilsk Nickel is an enterprise built before World War II, and although living conditions have dramatically improved in the past years, environmental effects linger. Russia intends to invite representatives from Norway's Teckna to participate in the work with Norilsk Nickel. Preparations for this activity are underway. Representatives from Norway and Russia have requested 1 million euro from NEFCO and the Russian Federation to support further work with Norilsk Nickel. Local management supports this program. One problem facing the cleaner production work is the potentially expensive disposal of sulfur produced as a mining byproduct. The Russian

Federation will approach the Sulfur Institute of the United States for help with this problem.

The Russian Norwegian Cleaner Production Center has recently held seminars in Tomsk in central Russia, and plans to hold similar seminars on cleaner production for the Far East.

ACAP Chairman Bob Dyer suggested that this work become part of Russia's National Action Plan on Cleaner Production. A National Cleaner Production Action Plan for the Russian Federation is being developed under the supervision of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Rostekhnadzor for proposed demonstration projects. This work was started last January and should be completed in the Summer of 2006. The Russian Ministry of Natural Resources is currently focusing on the National Action Plan for Cleaner Production in Northwest Russia and producing a cleaner production guidance document to accompany the National Action Plan.

Cleaner Production was debated as a possible permanent Project Working Group. Canada felt it was not appropriate as an ACAP Project Working Group. The rationale was that whereas the intent of Cleaner Production is to prevent pollution, ACAP was created not only to prevent pollution, but also to rehabilitate the Arctic environment. In addition, the Barents Euro-Arctic Council's Working Group on Environment is also pursuing cleaner production efforts, and has a Cleaner Production Task Force that includes Sweden, Norway, Russia, and Finland. The Steering Committee was of the opinion that Cleaner Production could remain as an ad hoc—rather than formal—Project Working Group.

Action Items: *Report on the development of the National Action Plan for Cleaner Production in Northwest Russia at the next Steering Committee meeting.*

Make a further determination, as necessary, on the possibility of Cleaner Production becoming the focus of a separate Working Group.

B. Fact Sheets (Lars-Otto Reiersen, AMAP)

The ACAP Steering Committee was provided with Fact Sheets on BFRs, obsolete pesticides, PCBs, and mercury projects. ACAP Chairman Bob Dyer stated that the most recent copies of the Fact Sheets are needed and requested that they be provided for the Senior Arctic Officials meeting in April. Delays have taken place in revision and update of the Fact Sheets because Vitaly Kimstach, a crucial member of the AMAP Secretariat, passed away, and the graphics specialist was not available. Currently, the BFRs Fact Sheet is in review, no changes were planned for the PCBs Fact Sheet, the most updated Obsolete Pesticides Fact Sheet is available, and the Mercury Fact Sheets will be updated in 2005 to reflect the development of new information. New versions of these Fact Sheets should be available before the next Steering Committee meeting. A Dioxin/Furans Fact Sheet is available, but only in Russian. Translation of this Fact Sheet will be considered in the near future. A Cleaner Production Fact Sheet is under development and will be

provided in the near future.

Action Items: Complete the updated AMAP/ACAP Fact Sheets on BFRs and mercury, and develop the Fact Sheet on Cleaner Production.

Translate the Fact Sheet on dioxins/furans into English.

5. Financial Issues

A. Project Support Instrument (PSI)

Harro Pitkanen of NEFCO made a presentation on a possible Arctic Council Project Support Instrument (PSI). It was stressed that a PSI should: a) focus solely on Arctic Council projects; b) work only with specific projects, not support administrative activities of the Arctic Council; and c) favor project preparation rather than project demonstration and implementation. NEFCO was confident that a PSI would not alter existing decision-making processes within the Arctic Council. After some discussion, NEFCO estimated that at least 3,000,000 euros would be needed for a workable PSI. A fund manager would be needed to administer the PSI. Some Steering Committee members questioned whether the PSI would be limited to just ACAP projects.

B. Other Issues

Chairman Bob Dyer asked if any projects have been put on hold because of lack of funding. Finland spoke on behalf of the Obsolete Pesticides Project and noted that available funding could only support completion of work in six or seven of the eleven targeted oblasts in Russia. Delay in completing work in the other oblasts could be risky, as some regions might undertake unsound solutions to the obsolete pesticides problem. Additional funding would also facilitate ACAP's ability to influence formulation of a Russian National Obsolete Pesticide Management Program. The Chair will report to the Ministers that the Obsolete Pesticides Project work will likely be completed in six or seven of the eleven priority regions in Russia, but that additional efforts will depend on supplementary funding.

Action Item: Present the proposed PSI Guidelines to the SAOs for approval in April 2005.

6. New Project Proposals

A. Permanent Participants

Larisa Abryutina of RAIPON (Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North) and Ella Barnes of the United States made a joint presentation on dioxin/furan assessment and education for indigenous peoples of the Russian Arctic. The goal of this project is to use education to limit pollution and to make older generations aware of the problems associated with everyday activities such as barrel burning. A parallel initiative is

to inventory unaccounted sources of obsolete pesticides and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in the Russian north, in areas inhabited by Indigenous Peoples. As an initial step, RAIPON and the US EPA are planning a joint effort with Russian health authorities to develop methods of training the local Indigenous Peoples in four villages (two in Nenets and two in Chukotka Autonomous Regions) to identify the PCBs from obsolete electrical equipment such as transformers and capacitors, collect samples for analysis, develop an inventory of local obsolete pesticide sources, and outline potential methods of safe storage or disposal. The intention is to share information and lessons learned to allow replication of these activities at other sites. It was noted that the work on PCBs and obsolete pesticides should be done simultaneously, when roads in the Regions are open.

Action Item: *It was requested that the ACAP Steering Committee consider these project proposals as additional Annex A projects related to dioxins/furans, PCBs, and obsolete pesticides management.*

Bryan Neubert from Gwich'in Council International (GCI) presented two project proposals to the Steering Committee: 1) Community-Based Models for PCB Mitigation in the Arctic and; 2) Community-Based Model for Dioxin and Furan Reduction in the Arctic. The PCB mitigation proposal targets the location, analysis, and removal of decommissioned PCB-laden equipment and development of a place-based model that can be replicated in other remote indigenous communities in the Arctic. Two RAIPON communities would be selected for inclusion in this project. The second proposal aims to coordinate a dioxin/furan source assessment, and a community education program to clarify the hazards of backyard burning and the merits of recycling and reducing the amount of trash produced.

Action items: *Do these projects represent new projects requiring SAO and Minister approval or are they part of an existing, approved program of work?*

What is the most appropriate organizational framework for conducting these projects?

B. NGOs/Observers

Brettania Walker of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) discussed possible project activities resulting from the PTS (Persistent Toxic Substances) study sponsored by the Global Environment Facility. It was suggested that further discussions of PTS follow-on activities should occur after consultation (April – September 2005) with the relevant Regions considered in this study. All the current proposals are in Phase 1, the feasibility evaluation phase. There are good indications that these proposed activities will receive funding. A primary objective for these projects is to address and resolve toxic waste issues at the local and community level. For the next ACAP meeting there could be status updates available for some of these Phase I activities. It is anticipated that some Phase I project activities could begin in the Summer.

Action Item: *Approve proposed projects with Permanent Participants at next Steering Committee meeting.*

Obtain status reports, including recommended follow-on activities, from PTS consultations with selected Russian Regions.

7. Cooperation/Outreach (Bob Dyer, ACAP Chairman)

A. ACAP/ Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation (AMEC)

The ACAP Chair brought to the attention of the Steering Committee the outreach efforts of ACAP with AMEC (Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation), a four-country (Norway, RF, UK, US) cooperative effort to address radioactivity and toxic and hazardous waste problems in the Russian north. A specific area of cooperation between ACAP and AMEC could be the removal/safe storage of toxic wastes situated on the islands comprising Franz Josef Land (FJL) in the Barents Sea. FJL contains thousands of drums, tanks, and other containers of PCB-containing oils and other chlorinated compounds abandoned at former military sites on these islands. The FJL sites have not been officially transferred from the military to civilian authorities. They are considered inactive, not abandoned, sites. Many of the containers are now leaking after more than 20 years' storage on the islands. A first step would be to inventory this material and develop a demonstration project to remove or stabilize these hazardous liquids. The Russian representatives agreed that much work could be done at Franz Josef Land, but felt that it is necessary to consult with the Ministry of Defense on this topic and determine whether work there is feasible. The United Kingdom (UK) also expressed interest in Franz Josef Land to evaluate bioremediation techniques for released oils.

Action Items: *The Ministry of Natural Resources (RF) will establish contact with the RF Ministry of Defence to determine possibilities of participation by foreign countries at Franz Josef Land.*

The Ministry of Natural Resources will determine if there is a formal procedure for transferring sites from military to civilian use.

B. ACAP/ Barents Euro-Arctic Council's Working Group on Environment (BEAC/WGE)

The ACAP Chair, Bob Dyer, noted that he has been an active participant for the past year in the meetings of the Barents Euro-Arctic Council's (BEAC) Working Group on Environment (WGE). A particular focus has been on opportunities for joint cooperation. One specific area for joint cooperation relates to the report prepared for the BEAC by AMAP and NEFCO in August 2003 titled "*Updating of Environmental 'Hot Spots' List in the Russian Part of the Barents Region: Proposal for Environmentally Sound Investment Projects*". Thirteen "hot spot" projects in that report were further identified as possible candidates for joint cooperation between ACAP and the BEAC/WGE. This list of "hot spot" projects was provided to the ACAP Steering Committee for information. Three of these "hot spots" were particularly highlighted in the joint meetings between the ACAP and BEAC/WGE Chairs:

- removal /safe storage of toxic wastes on Franz Josef Land,
- Cleaner Production training at a pulp and paper facility in Arkhangelsk with a follow-on demonstration project on dioxins/furans reduction, and
- treatment and storage of mercury-containing luminescent lamps in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug.

It was noted that the ACAP Obsolete Pesticides project had already successfully addressed one of the “hot spots”, the inventories of obsolete pesticides in the Arkhangelsk Oblast.

Action item: *ACAP Chair will continue coordination/cooperation with the BEAC/WGE and report to ACAP Steering Committee on progress and recommendations with respect to project areas of potential mutual interest.*

8. Guidelines for Developing New Proposals

Norway has developed a draft document, *Guidelines for Developing ACAP Projects*. Canada suggested that more attention be paid to “project ownership” vs. “problem ownership”. Norway noted that the draft guidelines were meant for Steering Committee use, not for presentation to SAOs, and asked for comments on the draft.

Action Item: *Norway will present the proposed Guidelines for Developing ACAP Projects at the next ACAP Steering Committee meeting for approval and adoption.*

9. Draft Report to SAO/Ministerial Meeting

The ACAP Steering Committee agreed that the Chair should circulate a draft report for comment shortly after the meeting in preparation for the SAO meeting to be held in Yakutsk, Russia, on 6-7 April 2005.

10. ACAP Web page

Chih-Yung Wu of the US EPA provided background information on development of the ACAP webpage. The webpage was made available to the ACAP Steering Committee the week prior to the meeting along with a request to report any problems. The U.S. has set aside \$6,000 to help establish the webpage, and Norway indicated that it would provide the additional \$1,500 needed for maintenance and software. The contents of the briefing book for the current ACAP Steering Committee were available online. Many of the pages of the ACAP website were updated since the last Steering Committee meeting. The homepage now includes links to all the background information of ACAP. The “Organization Structure” page was updated to include links to information about all Member Countries, Permanent Participants, and NGOs. A new organization chart was also available with links to all Working Groups of the Arctic Council. The “Projects” page on the ACAP website has been updated to include all documents for the current meeting.

The “Reports and Documents” page was updated to include the latest versions of the ACAP reports. The “Links” and “Contacts” pages were updated. It was noted that digital photos from activities of the Working Groups can be added to the website by the webmaster.

Action Item: *Add links to Indigenous Peoples Secretariat (IPS), BEAC/WGE, and ACIA.*

Update “Observers” and “National Heads of Delegation” list.

Add ACAP mandate to the homepage.

Add photographs from Working Group activities, as submitted.

11. Other Business

The Steering Committee tentatively agreed to hold its next meeting in Moscow, Russia in early September 2005.

The Chair asked each of the eight Member Countries of the Steering Committee to contact their SAOs regarding support to change ACAP’s status to a permanent Arctic Council Working Group.

Agenda
ACAP Steering Committee Meeting
Stockholm, Sweden
March 15-16, 2005

Day 1 (March 15, 2005)

- | | | |
|----|--------------------|---|
| 1. | 9:00-9:25 | Welcome
Swedish EPA
Report from the Chairman and Secretariat
Announcements (ACAP and Sweden) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Actions from Nov. '04 Ministerial Meeting- Intersessional Activities of Chair |
| 2. | 9:25-9:30 | Approval of the Agenda |
| 3. | | Project Progress Reports – Annex A Projects
(Including Funding Status) |
| | 9:30-10:10 | a. PCB's (AMAP Secretariat, NEFCO) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Bilateral Danish/Russian PCB Project Status |
| | 10:10-10:40 | b. Dioxins/Furans (Sweden) |
| | 10:40-11:10 | Break |
| | 11:10-11:50 | c. Mercury (Denmark) |
| | 11:50-12:30 | d. Obsolete Pesticides (Finland) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- DDT removal project in Karelia- Pskov and Vologda Pesticides Project (Denmark) |
| | 12:30-1:45 | Lunch hosted by Sweden |
| | 1:45-2:25 | e. BFRs Update (Norway) |
| | 2:25-3:00 | f. Cleaner Production Update (Russia) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Norilsk Nickel Update |
| 4. | 3:00-3:30 | g. AMAP/ACAP Fact Sheets <ul style="list-style-type: none">- PCBs, BFRs, Mercury, Dioxins/Furans |
| 5. | 3:30-4:10 | Finance Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Project Support Instrument (NEFCO)<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Project Guidelines- SC Approval of Guidelines |

- | | | |
|------------|--------------------|---|
| | 4:10-4:30 | Break |
| | 4:30-5:10 | New Project Proposals – Annex B
a. Barents Euro Arctic Council/Working Group on Environment (BEAC/WGE)/ACAP Cooperation on "Hot Spots" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report from Chairman of BEAC/WGE - Barents Hot Spots Facility - Joint ACAP-BEAC/WGE Hot Spots list |
| | 5:10-6:10 | Permanent Participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gwich'in Council International - RAIPON NGOs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - World Wide Fund for Nature |
| | 6:10 | Adjourn |
| | 7:00 | Dinner (hosted by ACAP Chair) |
| | | <u>Day 2 (March 16, 2005)</u> |
| 6. | 9:00-9:40 | Finance Issues (continued)
b. Project Funding Requirements (Project Steering Group Chairs) |
| | 9:40-10:00 | ACAP Outreach Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ACAP Outreach with AMEC (Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation) - ACAP Outreach with SDWG |
| 7. | 10:00-10:30 | Guidelines for Developing ACAP Projects (Norway) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed Guidelines - SC Approval of Guidelines |
| | 10:30-10:45 | Break |
| 8. | 10:45-11:00 | ACAP Webpage (ACAP Secretariat, USA) |
| 9. | 11:00-11:30 | Draft Report for the April SAO Meeting |
| 10. | 11:15-12:00 | Other Business and Wrap-up |

Appendix B: List of Participants

PARTICIPANTS

Canada

Bill Ernst,
Environment Canada, Atlantic Region
E-mail: bill.ernst@ec.gc.ca
Tel: 902-426-5048
Fax: 902-426-8373

Denmark

Morten Skovagaard Olsen
Chief Programme Coordinator
Danish EPA
Email: mso@mst.dk
Tel: 45 32 66 0245
Fax: 45 32 66 0131

Mikala Klint
Danish EPA
Email: mkl@mst.dk
Tel: (45) 3266 0233

Finland

Henna Haapala
Ministry of the Environment of Finland
International Affairs Unit
Henna.haapala@ymparisto.fi
Tel: 358 9 1603 9739

Esko Seppala
Ministry of the Environment
E-mail: esko.seppala@ymparisto.fi
Tel: 358 9 160 39505
Fax: 358 9 1603 9515

Timo Seppala
Finnish Environment Institute
Timo.seppala@ymparisto.fi

Norway

Marit Nyborg
Advisor
Section for International Affairs
Norwegian Pollution Control Authority (SFT)
Tel: 47 22 57 36 50
Fax: 47 22 67 67 06

Solvar Hardeng
Project Leader/Senior Advisor
Norwegian Pollution Control Authority (SFT)
Phone: 47 22 57 34 64
Fax: 47 22 67 67 06
Email: solvar.hardeng@sft.no

Bente Sleire
Senior Advisor
Norwegian Pollution Control Authority
Tel: 47 22 57 35 59
Fax: 47 22 67 67 06
bente.sleire@sft.no

Russia

Alexander Tsygankov
Russian Norwegian Cleaner Production
Center, Moscow
Tel: 7 095 7874 270
Fax: 7 095 7874 270
Email: edcentcp@deol.ru

Andrei Pechkorov
Federal Service for Environmental Industrial
and Nuclear Supervision
Tel: 7 095 125 56 89
Fax: 7 095 124 51 51
Email: pechkurov@mail.ru

Yury Aleksandrovskiy
Ministry of Natural Resources
Tel: 7 095 254 56 61
Fax: 7 095 254 43 10
7 095 254 82 83

Appendix B: List of Participants

Sweden

Helena Odmark
Senior Arctic Official
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Email: Helena.odmark@foreign.ministry.se
Tel: 46 8 405 37 94
Fax: 46 8 723 11 76

Niklas Johansson
Senior Scientific Advisor
Swedish EPA
Email:
niklas.johansson@naturvardsverket.se
Tel: 46 8 698 14 38
Fax: 46 8 698 15 85

Ann-Sofi Israelson
Swedish EPA
Tel: 46 8 698 1270
Fax: 46 8 698 1504
Email:
Ann-Sofi.Israelson@naturvardsverket.se

Zofia Tucinska
Head of International Projects
Swedish EPA
Tel: 46 8 698 1137
Fax: 46 8 689 1504
Email:
Zofia.Tucinska@naturvardsverket.se

USA

Bob Dyer
ACAP Chair, US EPA
Email: dyer.bob@epa.gov
Tel: 202-564-6113
Fax: 202-565-2411

Carolyn Barley
ACAP Secretariat, USEPA
Email: barley.Carolyn@epa.gov
Tel: 202-564-6438
Fax: 202-565-2411

Eleonora Barnes
Project Manager, USEPA
Email: barnes.eleonora@epa.gov
Tel: 202-564-6473
Fax: 202-565-2411

Chih-Yung Wu
USEPA
Email: Wu.Chih-Yung@epa.gov
Tel: 202-564-0119
Fax: 202-565-2411

Permanent Participants

Larisa Abryutina
Vice President - RAIPON
Email: abryt@mars.rags.ru
Tel: 7 095 780 87 27
Fax: 7 095 780 87 97

Bryan Neubert
Gwich'in Council International
Email: bneubert@catg.org
Tel: (907) 662-2667

Alona Yefimenko
Indigenous Peoples Secretariat (IPS)
Email: ay@ghsdk.dk
Tel: (45) 3283 3796

Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO)

Husamuddin Ahmadzai
Email: husamuddin.ahmadzai@nefco.fi
Tel: 358-9-18001 344
Fax: 358-9-630-976

Harro Pitkanen
Email: harro.pitkanen@nefco.fi
Tel: 358 9 18001 340
Fax: 358-9-630-976

World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)

Brettania Walker
Toxics Officer
International Arctic Programme
bwalker@wwf.no
(47) 2203 6519

AMAP

Lars-Otto Reiersen
AMAP Secretariat
Email: Lars-otto.reiersen@amap.no
Tel: 47 23 24 16 32

Argonne National Laboratory

Loren Habegger
Argonne National Laboratory
Email: lhabetger@anl.gov
Tel: 630-252-3761
Fax: 630-252-5880

**Barents Euro-Arctic Council/ Working
Group on Environment**

Henna Haapala
Ministry of the Environment of Finland
International Affairs Unit
Henna.haapala@ymparisto.fi
Tel: 358 9 1603 9739

PROGRESS REPORT

Project: ACAP PCB Project
SUB-PROJECT: NEFCO FUNDED PROJECTS:

Project name	Objective	Activities	Completion	Funding
Cleaning of transformers	250 tonnes of PCB	Emptying, cleaning and, if possible, recycling of transformers in NW and Arctic regions	200[6]	NEFCO
Destruction of liquid PCB	250 tonnes of PCB	Collection, draining and destruction of PCB fluids from transformers in NW and Arctic regions	200[6]	NEFCO

DATE: 4.03.2005

PREPARED BY: HUSAMUDDIN AHMADZAI (NEFCO)
MAGNUS RYSTEDT (NEFCO)

Project Description

The ACAP PCB Project funded by Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO) addresses mitigation of the PCB problem in the Northwest Region of Russia in lieu with the requirements of the Stockholm Convention on POPs. The goal is to destroy 250 tons of PCB based on two sub-projects, namely:

1. Implementation of an environmentally sound technique for emptying and cleaning contaminated PCB containing transformers,
2. Use of environmentally sound technique for destruction of PCB containing liquids. The technique can also be used to destroy other hazardous pollutants such as pesticides.

Logistics for the Project is dimensioned upon a transformer inventory initially prepared by AMAP and subsequently refined by NEFCO. The inventory identified existence of about 540 transformers in NW Russia containing about 1140 tons of PCB. The transformers are reported to be mainly located in Karelia, Murmansk Oblast, Vologda Oblast, Leningrad Oblast and St. Petersburg area. Process selection is based on an assessment of two cleaning and three destruction technologies including the Plasma Process, the Cyclone Reactor Process and the Rocket Engine Process. The ACAP PCB Project will utilise vapour phase solvent cleaning technique to clean and recover the PCB in the transformers and the high temperature Cyclone Reactor process to destroy the recovered PCB. Implementation of the project includes securing necessary infrastructure and ancillary facilities, permits, design, construction and operating phases. Activities of the project cover

- Safe transportation and delivery of transformers as well as other containers holding PCB
- Recovery of PCB from transformers/containers and transfer to storage tank(s)
- Recovery of organic solvent containing PCB
- Cleaning of transformers and containers to a level whereby materials can be recycled. The cleanliness level shall be monitored to ensure decontamination
- Dismantling the transformers and sorting the components
- Disposal of waste (wood, paperboard, etc.) in an environmentally acceptable manner
- Destruction of PCB, PCB containing fluids and other toxic organic substances

- Monitor & control of environmental performance (release to air, water, soil, noise etc.) and occupational health and safety. Russian standards regulating environmental, health and safety issues shall be complied with during implementation, construction and operation of the facilities. In addition, EU Directive 2000/76/EU shall be followed with respect to dioxins and key monitoring parameters.
- Tentatively the plant is expected to be located in the vicinity of St. Petersburg subject to contractual negotiations. Additional information will be forthcoming once the negotiations have been completed by NEFCO with the Contractors and the contract has been signed.

Status

The project has suffered additional delay due to refusal by local government (Committee of Natural resources and Environmental Protection in the Government of Leningrad Oblast, “CNR”) in issuing one of the approvals necessary to start construction. Despite the fact that one of the most important Federal approvals obtained in August 2004 from the Federal Commission for Environmental Examination, a local permission from October 2003 to proceed with the project has been revoked, see Annex 1 for details.

The key justifications, from CNR, for refusing the local permit may be summarised as follows:

- Safety guarantees of the experimental Site RSC “Applied Chemistry” at Kapitlova do not satisfy the requirements of the Federal Normative Act— governing the norms and regulations in the field of the nuclear energy;
- Absence of the PCB-containing electrical equipment in Leningrad Oblast
- Planned import of the “toxic fire-threatening wastes of the 1st hazard class from other regions of Russian Federation
- A facility for decontamination of the toxic wastes is being created at the polygon “Krasny Bor”.

Following the above complication, NEFCO has requested the Project owner, EnergoChemTech (ECT) to study alternative sites. Two of the sites are in the St. Petersburg area (Krasny Bor & Sue Ecostroy). One of the sites is in the Rostov Oblast area. The study has now been narrowed to two sites, Sue Ecostroy and Rostov for further development. See Annex 1 for details and lessons learnt.

Further delays can be expected and the Work Plan below is currently on hold shall be updated when a new site is approved.

Work Plan

Decision by NEFCO Board to proceed with the Project was for the feasibility study taken in March 2000 and for the investment March 2002.

Task	Completion date	Status
Feasibility Study Objective: to assess the feasibility for cleaning and destruction of PCB from transformers in Russia. This included technical, operational, economical and environmental assessments.	Feb 2002	Completed
Tendering Based on the Feasibility Study the viability of operations was determined and various options for cleaning and destruction of PCB from transformers were identified. Tender Documents were prepared based on these findings.	Sept 2002	Completed

Appendix C.1

Business Planning The preferred bidder is asked to demonstrate the sustainability of the investment and operations in a Business Plan. NEFCO provided preliminary Terms of Reference for the Scope of the Business Plan.	March 2003	Completed
Contract/Agreement Based on final review by NEFCO of the Business Plan contract has been undersigned between NEFCO and the preferred bidder (the Contractor).	April 2003	Completed
Approval of Site at Kapitolova Approval of plant location by Relevant authorities.	Oct. 2003 Dec 2004	Completed REVOKED
Approval of Alternative Site Approval of plant location by Relevant authorities	Underway (January 2005)	Preliminary
Approval of Conceptual design Approval of the conceptual design by State authorities.	Dec. 2003	Completed
Environmental Approval Approval by Federal Commission for Environmental Examination. Deputy Minister of the MNR shall issue an order of formal approval early September.	Aug. 2004	Completed
Approval of Detailed Design Acceptance of design by relevant parties and NEFCO.	Delayed	Preliminary
Construction Procurement. Renovation/construction of buildings. Manufacture of equipment, installation and erection works.	Delayed	Preliminary
Commissioning Certificates A number of certificates have to be approved by NEFCO and different authorities covering site works, functional testing, defect elimination, final testing and commissioning.	End 200[6] / Delayed	Preliminary
Cleaning and destruction of 250 tonnes of PCB Monthly capacity is to be approximately 20 tonnes of PCB	End 200[6] / Delayed	Preliminary

Progress report

For ACAP SG meeting on PCB

14 March 2005, Stockholm

Collection and storage of PCB containing equipment in the region of St. Petersburg

The collection and storage sub-project focuses on PCB in general, and not only on transformers. In Leningrad oblast there exist two inventories, one prepared under phase 1 of the PCB project and one by the oblast in 1999, and the project will look at both and update the inventory for the oblast.

The project has been resumed in 2005. The project was stalled during the last year due to ongoing changes in regional administration of St. Petersburg and due to the fact that the Danish project relied on the progress of the NEFCO project.

Primo September 2004 Danish EPA was informed by NEFCO that their project received the final approval of the technology but that the Leningrad Oblast did not approve the intended site proposed for the incineration plant (Kapitolovo).

Based on the information given on the NEFCO project Danish EPA decided to continue the project by preparing an update of the inventories and carry out necessary capacity building with regards to PCB and obsolete pesticides.

Renewed kick off meetings were initiated in January 2005 with:

1. Deputy Chairman Oleg R. Krupnov "Government of St. Petersburg. Committee of Nature Use, Environmental Protection and Ecological Safety"
2. The First Deputy of the Committee, Dr. Boris V Prokhorov "Administration of the Leningrad Region. Committee of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection:"
3. Head of the Department, professor Veronica M. Tarbaeva "Russian Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR). Administration of State Control of Natural resources (Rosprirodnadzor) for Saint-Petersburg and Leningrad Region. Department of Protected Areas and International Cooperation"
4. Head of Department in Rostekhnadzor Federal Service for Environmental, Technological and Atomic Supervision (FSETAS) for **St. Petersburg City** Mr. Boris.B. Lednev
5. Head of department in Rostekhnadzor Federal Service for Environmental, Technological and Atomic Supervision (FSETAS) for **Leningrad Oblast** Mr. Kiriy

As no treatment facility is yet in place the final decision about any transport of PCB containing transformers has been postponed.

There was a specific wish from the "Oblast" also to perform an inventory of obsolete pesticides. Both types of inventory will be made based on visits, photos and control of that proper labelling and storage are being applied. Furthermore it was agreed that a recommendation for a future legislation on PCB regulation should be worked out in cooperation with Rosprirodnadzor (MNR). The work has been agreed to start in April 2005. The Beneficiary is St. Petersburg City and Leningrad Oblast.

STATUS REPORT

Reduction/Elimination of Emissions of Dioxins and Furans in the Russian Federation with focus on the Arctic and northern regions impacting the Arctic Stockholm march 2005.

ACAP Project title:

Multilateral Cooperative Project Reduction/Elimination of Emissions of Dioxins and Furans in the Russian Federation with focus on the Arctic and northern regions impacting the Arctic

Lead Country: Sweden

Steering Group Chairman: Niklas Johansson Swedish EPA

Project initiation and support:

The first Steering Group Meeting was held on 11 – 12 March 2002.

The second was held in February 2003, a third in March 2004 and the fourth in December 2004.

Three Russian Ministries: Ministry of Natural Resources, Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology and Ministry of Health participate in the project

The Steering Group consists so far of Russia, Sweden, USA and AMAP. Denmark and UNEP Chemicals took part in the initial meetings.

Description of the Project:

The Project consists of twelve and three activities respectively in its first and second phase.

Phase I

Phase Ia

- 1:1 Translation of UNEP Toolkit from English to Russian
- 1:2 Development of dioxin/furan Fact Sheet
- 1:3 Translation, evaluation and recommendations for use of the EN sampling standard 1948: 1 in Russia
- 1:5 Compilation of existing data
- 1:6 Develop dioxin emission inventory
- 1:7 Priority selection setting of targeted plants/sites, pre-inspection etc.
- 1:8 Workshop on sampling and analysis
- 1:9 Identify regulations and standards relevant to measurement and control of dioxin releases

Phase Ib

- 1:10 Emission measurements on selected source types
- 1:11 QA/QC for parallel sampling and analysis
- 1:12 Final report from Phase I

Phase II: Feasibility Study

- 1: Consolidate the results of the PCDD/F release inventory in view of the results from the sampling and analysis project;
- 2: Explore options for implementation of BAT and BEP requirements, *e.g.*, legislation with prescribing technical reduction measures, setting of limit values, self-commitments by industries, *etc.*
- 3: Write a proposal to implement the recommendations from (2) in Russia towards compliance with international conventions and sustainable process and chemicals' management, including workshop on the UNEP Chemicals Toolkit

Phase III

Implementation of upgrade/retrofitting for source reduction/source elimination of one or more important PCDD/F sources.

Timetable (tentative)

Phase I: *March 2002 – April 2005*

Phase II: *March 2005 – October 2005*

Phase III: *October 2005 – End 2006*

Status

Items 1:1 – 1:3 and 1:8 (Translation of UNEP Toolkit from English to Russian, Development of dioxin/furan Fact Sheet, Translation, evaluation and recommendations for use of the EN sampling standard 1948: 1 in Russia and Workshop on sampling and analysis) were finished during the first year.

In connection to the workshop, where eight Russian analytical chemists were trained in standardised sampling and analysis of dioxins and furans in flue gas, material for standardised sampling has been transferred to four Russian analytical laboratories.

Three Priority regions were selected to include: Murmansk, Arkhangelsk and Komi.

In February 2003 it was decided to start Phase II activities incorporating Russian – Norwegian Cleaner Production Centre for evaluation of incineration technologies at Murmansk Shipping Company. First sub-task – Cleaner Production Training, with participation of Umeå University, was intended to start in April 2003. However, it later turned out to be impossible to find a date suitable for the Cleaner production Training and the expert(s) at Umeå University. A new initiative has recently been taken in connection to pulp and paper industries in Arkhangelsk.

At the Steering Group Meeting in December 2004 in Moscow a draft report “Estimation and Assessment of Dioxins and Furan Releases from the Major Sources in Arkhangelsk and

Murmansk Regions and in the Republic of Komi” was presented by CIP and the Russian experts. SG found that the technical content of the report was accepted. However, the Project Steering Group identified the need for some restructuring and editing of the report. After that Phase 1 will be formally finalised.

At the same meeting, Phase 2 proposals were received from CIP, Russian experts (Institute Syntez) and the Russian-Norwegian Cleaner Production Centre, It was agreed that the initial focus of Phase 2 would be on achieving reduction of formation and emission of dioxins at Arkhangelsk pulp and paper facilities and possibly also at a timber treatment facility within the framework of Cleaner Production Training. CIP will coordinate the development of the detailed phase 2 work plan.

Norway has declared its interest to participate in the project. They have selected Christel Benestad as their representative.

Next Steps

To finalise the work plan for Phase 2 and initiate its sub projects. Next Steering Group Meeting is planned to take place in late spring 2005.

Funding

Funding within Phase 1 (completed):	US\$ 185 000 (US + SE)
Funding within Phase 2 (tentative)	US\$ 30 000 (US) + 50 000 (SE). Norwegian contribution yet to be decided.

Other observations

- The awareness of environmental and health problems caused by dioxins and furans is growing in Russia;
- Russia has signed the Stockholm Convention. This is a promising sign and a positive signal of its intention to reduce the emission of dioxins and other pollutants to the environment.
- The project will be strengthened by the participation from Norway. Of course, further countries are welcomed.

PROGRESS REPORT

Reduction of Atmospheric Mercury Releases from the Arctic Countries For the 7th meeting of the ACAP SC

Stockholm 15-16 March 2005

1. *Project title:*

Reduction of Atmospheric Mercury Releases from the Arctic Countries

2. *Project Co-ordinator:*

Mikala Klint
Consultant, Danish EPA.

3. *Description of the Project:*

The project includes three phases:

Phase I: Assessment and prioritisation

Phase II: Site specific prioritisation and selection of pilot project(s).

Phase III: Implementation of pilot project(s).

5. *Project progress October 2004 - February 2005:*

Phase I

Regional Mercury Assessment

The final report "*Arctic Mercury Releases Inventory*" was published in English and Russian at the web-site of the Danish EPA, January 2005. The report is currently in press and printed copies in English (200 copies) will be available during spring 2005. Link:
http://www.mst.dk/udgiv/publications/2005/87-7614-515-8/html/default_eng.htm

Russian Mercury Assessment

The final report "*Assessment of Mercury Releases from the Russian Federation*" was published in English and Russian at the web-site of the Danish EPA, January 2005. The report is currently in press and printed copies in English (200 copies) and Russian (200 copies) will be available during spring 2005. Link:

AMAP/ACAP fact sheet

An AMAP/ACAP fact sheet: "*Mercury - a priority pollutant*" was published in Russian and English at the web-site of the Danish EPA, January 2005.

The fact sheet has been prepared in co-operation between AMAP and the ACAP mercury project and will be updated during 2005 to reflect the development of new information/initiatives. Link:

http://www.mst.dk/udgiv/publications/2005/87-7614-515-8/html/default_eng.htm

"Framework Regional Action Plan"

The ACAP SC has pointed out the need for an assessment of possible actions and an assessment of to what extent these actions are already covered by existing binding and non-binding instruments. A first draft of this assessment was discussed at the November 2004 Helsinki Steering Group meeting, and based on comments from the members, a revised draft has been prepared and will be circulated for a further comments from the SG members. The aim of preparing the report is to provide background information for the ACAP activities as well as other national and international initiatives on mercury release reductions.

Russian Mercury Action Plan Elements

During 2004 the Russian Federal environmental administration, including the Russian representative in the mercury working SG, was moved from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) to the new institution: Federal Service for Environmental, Technical and Nuclear Supervision.

A document listing possible actions reflecting the needs as regards major mercury release sources in the Russian Federation has been outlined and will be finalised in the near future. The Federal Service prepared for a planned federal Interagency Safety Council in March 2004 a document including a review of the present situation regarding mercury in Russia and some proposed actions. The document included, among other aspects, information extracted from the mercury inventory and the action plan elements draft document prepared within the ACAP Hg project. The Safety Council has not yet been held and the discussion about future actions is pending.

Phase II

Site Specific Prioritization

The choice of potential demonstration projects to be evaluated was discussed at the November 2004 project SG meeting. NEFCO volunteered to evaluate and proceed with a reduction project at the Cheleyabinsk zinc smelter. The SG chose 1) a coal power plant project proposed by the USA, and 2) a mercury waste project involving a mercury recycling plant proposed by Russia, for evaluation. A third project for evaluation remains to be chosen (see below).

6. Planned further work:

Russian Mercury Assessment and Arctic Mercury Releases Inventory

The reports are currently in press and will be printed during spring 2005

Action Plan elements for the Russian Federation

The preparation of the elements for an action plan for mercury release reduction for the Russian Federation will be finalised in the near future as agreed on a meeting between the consultant and the Federal Service in Feb. 2005.

Assessment of coverage of existing agreements of major mercury release sources in the Arctic countries

A revised draft of the document has been prepared and will be circulated for further comments from the SG members.

Priortisation

Besides the two projects already selected for evaluation, a third project remains to be chosen for evaluation. Possible candidates are

- A project on mercury reductions in extraction of gold from old mining tailings
- Two projects on treatment of spent luminescent lamps (AMAP hot spot projects)

A back-up project in the non-ferrous metal sector, in case the Chelyabinsk zinc smelter company is not interested in participating; optional projects could involve another non-ferrous smelter (candidates are being identified), or assistance to the Russian Federal Service in preparatory work needed for a planned revision of the regulation of the non-ferrous sector.

The SG is expected to make their decision end of March 2005 based on a pre-screening memo prepared by the consultants presenting a summary of updated information on the candidate project. After approval of the specific sites by the SG, the project implementation plan is revised, the sites will be evaluated and potential demonstration project(s) for a Phase III of the project will be proposed. The evaluation is planned to be ready by autumn 2005.

7. Lessons learned

- The project has been prolonged twice. It is more time and man power consuming than originally estimated
- It is an advantage that the Russian members of the mercury working group remains the same
- The need for a ACAP Web page and ACAP promotion of projects

8. *Financial status by March 5, 2005:*

	Revised budget of Nov 2004	Spent 3 Mar 2005*	Remaining
Funds from USA, Canada and Norway			
PHASE I			
Fees			
Russian experts, inventory	455,550	455,550	0
Russian experts, questionnaire and action plan	46,872	15,816	31,056
Reimbursables			
Steering Group and Int. Expert Group meetings, Russian (including meetings during Phase II)	40,132	7,824	32,308
Other reimbursables, Russian experts	74,563	73,563	1,000
Total PHASE I	617,117	552,753	64,364
Total PHASE II (fees + reimbursable)	214,000	0	214,000
Grand total	831,117	552,753	278,364
Funds from Denmark			
PHASE I			
Fees			
Danish experts	1,280,635	1,258,176	22,459
Russian assistance to Danish experts (management, translation)	242,200	241,906	294
Reimbursables	128,570	120,915	7,655
Total PHASE I	1,651,405	1,620,997	30,408
PHASE II			
Fees			
Danish experts	356,250	161,434	194,816
Russian assistance to Danish experts (management, translation)	30,000	6,800	23,200
Reimbursables	200,000	12,000	188,000
Total PHASE II	586,250	180,234	406,016
Contingencies	10,539	0	10,539
Action plan framework	228,000	158,840	69,160
Grand total	2,476,194	1,960,071	446,963
Grand grand total	3,307,311	2,512,825	725,327

9. *Needs*

No financing is yet in place for Phase III. Funds may be needed for the preparation of a full feasibility study/studies including financing plan and business plan for a selected demonstration project in Russia. Only financing of one pre-feasibility study is allocated under phase II.

STATUS REPORT
Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles
in the Russian Federation
Stockholm March 2005.

ACAP Project title:

Multilateral Cooperative Project on Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles in the Russian Federation

Lead Country: **FINLAND**

Steering Group Chairman: Jaakko Henttonen, Consulate General of Finland in St Petersburg
 Secretariat: Timo Seppälä, Finnish Environment Institute

Project initiation and support:

The first Steering Group Meeting was held on 26 October 2001 in Moscow. Four Russian Ministries participate in this project: Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Natural Resources, Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology, and Ministry of Health.

The Steering Group consists of Canada, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, USA, UNEP Chemicals, AMAP, and NEFCO.

Description of the Project:

The Project consists of seven activities implemented in three phases.

Phase 1

1. Development of Selection Criteria for identifying priority regions for inventory development.
2. Preparation of General Guidance for development of regional inventories to include existing regulatory requirements.
3. Inventory Development. The scope of the inventory will include: animal husbandry forestry management, insect and rodent control, as well as agricultural uses
 - Prepare inventory for 11 priority Arctic and Sub-Arctic Regions
 - Complete the inventory for an additional 5 to 6 Regions
 - Identify a Demonstration Region for the Process of Inventory Development
 - Perform selected sampling and analysis for unidentified pesticides stocks

Phase 2

4. Identify cost-effective preparatory/preventive measures for improving collection, storage and packaging of the obsolete pesticides
5. Implement these measures in a prototype demonstration
6. Identify destruction technologies and determine whether the technology and lessons learned from the PCB Project can be applied to pesticides destruction

Phase 3

7. Implement a prototype demonstration project to destroy 100 Tonnes of obsolete pesticides stocks. Use technology developed and tested in the PCB Project, if applicable.

Timetable

Three years to completion, depending on the availability of environmentally sound destruction technology in the Russian Federation.

Status in March 2005

Meetings

The Steering Group held its 11th meeting in March 2005 in Altai Republic, and visited four storage facilities.

Inventories & repackaging

Obsolete stocks inventories, analyses of unidentified stockpiles and repackaging activities have been completed in Archangelsk Region, Komi Republic, and Magadan Region.

Activities in Omsk and Tyumen Region have advanced well and are expected to finish by September 2005. Altai Republic was fully funded in December 2005 and activities have started. Kurgan was 75% funded in March 2005 and activities can start.

Cost estimate for activities on 5 most threatening priority districts of Altai Krai will be available for the Steering Group soon.

Due to lack of resources, Murmansk Region has not been able to commence the project implementation. Steering Group also is yet to study the possibilities to work in Nenets, Jamalo Nentski and Chukchi Autonomous Districts, which were not covered by Archangelsk, Tyumen, and Magadan inventories.

Environmentally sound management

The Steering Group has during the project expressed concern over the disposal of pesticides. The donor countries have emphasized that they will continue to support the project only if they are assured that storage and destruction of the stocks will be performed in an environmentally sound manner according to internationally accepted practices and the national legislation of the Russian Federation. Therefore, no obsolete pesticides will be deposited into the landfills under this project. Safe temporary storage will be ensured by Russian authorities (e.g. Tomsk Polygon).

Next Steps

- Centralized storage facility priority improvements in Komi Republic (funded)
- Cleanup of the hotspot at Vorogushino village in Tyumen and safe storage of the repackaged stockpiles (funded)

- Provide complete inventory and screening analysis results (for unidentified stockpiles) for Republic of Altai, Kurgan, Tyumen and Omsk regions including repackaging of stocks in poor condition and safe storage
- Improve storage conditions in 5 priority districts in Altai Krai Region
- Acquire resources to complete activities in Kurgan (75% already funded), Altai Krai Region, and Republic of Sakha
- Preparation of project implementation, including financial resources, in Kamchatka and Krasnoyarsk regions

Funding

Since the previous Steering Group meeting in September 2004, the donor countries have allocated approximately 145,000 US\$ for the implementation of the project.

With the currently available funds inventory, sampling, analysis, and repackaging activities (Phase 1 and partially Phase 2) in the currently ongoing regions (Tyumen, Omsk, Altai Republic) can be completed. In addition the available funds can be expected to cover activities in the 5 priority regions in Altai Krai, if the SG decides to fund it after receipt of cost estimate.

Estimated funds needed to initiate and complete Phase 1 and repackaging in the remaining regions: 300 000 USD¹. This estimate is based on original priority districts.

Funds needed to implement Phase 3: can not be estimated until more information on the destruction facility is available.

Observations to date

- The project has succeeded in getting information from forestry and sanitary related stocks in addition to agricultural pesticides
- All regions indicate active contributions of the regional authorities leading to successful completion of Phases I and II
- Repackaging reduces environmental threat caused by obsolete pesticides. However, this is temporary unless storage conditions are improved. Though many regions work actively in improving the storage facilities and reduce the number of storages, work with developing storage conditions is necessary to initiate
- Active participation of Ministry of Agriculture in all phases of the project would be essential
- Regions that have provided the cost estimates are ready to implement the project and have also usually reserved own resources for it
- It is important to secure full financing before initiating Steering Group approved activities in regions
- It has appeared that some of the obsolete stockpiles in Altai Krai, Altai Republic and Kurgan are threatened by seasonal floods and are in very poor state.

¹ Sakha cost estimate not ready (previous cost estimate \$35 000); Altay Kray total cost estimate approximately \$120,000; Krasnoyarsk and Kamchatka, Nenets, Jamalo Nenets and Chukchi Autonomous Districts no information available: estimate \$120 000
Steering Group meetings in the regions 3 x \$10 000

STATUS REPORT
Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles
in Republic of Karelia, RF
Stockholm March 2005.

Background

One of the Barents region environmental hot spots in the Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO) project *"Updating of Environmental "Hot Spots" List in the Russian Part of the Barents Region: Proposal for Environmentally Sound Investment Projects"* is stocks of obsolete pesticides in the Republic of Karelia. The project (K10) proposed is elimination of obsolete DDT (2500 kg) in "Sortavala Agroservice" storage. In addition it was stated that there are 4100 kg of unidentified stocks and the general situation in the region raised concerns.

Recognizing the benefits of the existing international cooperation between the Arctic countries in the field of obsolete pesticides, Finland started seeking possibilities to improve the situation in Karelia in collaboration with the regional representatives of the Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation in Republic of Karelia. Republic of Karelia is not included among the priority regions of ACAP project "Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles in the Russian Federation". However, after provisional consent of the representative of the Ministry of Natural Resources in Karelia to work on the issue, the Karelia obsolete pesticides project was included as part of the ACAP project.

Contents of obsolete stocks in Karelia

The total amount of obsolete pesticides in Karelia is approximately 20 000 kg in 23 warehouses. The amount of DDT is 4 100 kg and an equal amount is unidentified. In addition, there are 6 000 kg of other highly chlorinated pesticides. The storage conditions are poor.

Project

The aim of the project is to identify, repackage and provide safe storage for the obsolete pesticide stockpiles in the Republic of Karelia in accordance with the ACAP project in the Arctic regions. Final destruction will be decided in due course.

Status

Cost estimate for identification of unknown pesticides, repackaging and improving storage conditions is being discussed. Contact has been established between Rostekhnadzor, Ministry of Natural Resources in the Republic of Karelia, and Ministry of Environment of Finland.

Future

Mission to Petrozavodsk will take place in April-May 2005 to approve work plan and agree on financing. Finnish government is prepared to support and co-finance project implementation to complete the removal of hot spot by the end of 2005.

**Progress report
on
Obsolete Pesticide Project in Vologda & Pskov
ACAP SC meeting 15-16 March 2005, Stockholm**

Project name: Environmental Sound Management of Stocks of Obsolete Pesticides in the North West Region of Russia

Objective: Obsolete Pesticides (OPs), including POPs pesticides, stored in the Pskov and Vologda Oblast in the past have been identified, and plans for their future sound management have been developed. Part of the OPs stocks have been stored in a safe and environmentally sound manner to serve as demonstration of such practices.

Activities: The present project provides assistance to:

- preparation of inventories of OPs;
- development of an action plan for future management and disposal of OPs;
- demonstration of safe and environmentally sound management of obsolete pesticide stockpiles with focus on the Pskov and Vologda Oblast

Completion: 31.12.2005

Funding: Denmark (Danish EPA) and Russia (Pskov and Vologda Oblast)

Progress March 2005

Steering Committee Meeting has been held in beginning of November 2004, late due to the restructuring in the Russian administration.

The registration for the inventory has been completed by end of November. The inventory estimates that there is about 220 tonnes of OP in Vologda while in Pskov 580 tonnes of OP have been registered.

The Action Plan work has started, and the first draft version has been distributed for proof reading in February 2005. A workshop has been held in first week of March. The film is under preparation. An economic model is being developed, all according to the plan.

Storage facilities have been erected in Vologda, and final construction of floors, special room etc. will be concluded when the frost is of the ground.

A storage facility had been identified early in Pskov and it was anticipated that agreements with the owners would only be a matter of form so contracts have been made with construction companies and with design companies. It was anticipated that the reconstruction of the storage would be completed by the end of February 2005, allowing the collection and repackaging phase to start-up in March. However, the negotiations with the owners did not go as anticipated. In late February 2005 the chosen 600 m² storage building was demolished with a bulldozer by the owners. They did not want obsolete pesticides on their premises. Therefore a site for new storage facilities is being investigated.

“Reduction or Elimination of Sources and Releases of Brominated Flame Retardants”

PROGRESS REPORT To the ACAP Steering Committee Meeting, Stockholm, 15-16 March 2005.

1. Status of work.

The Brominated Flame Retardants (BFR) Project was officially approved at the Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting on 24 November 2004.

The objectives are to:

- a. reduce or eliminate sources and releases of BFRs that are found in the Arctic environment;
- b. identify and develop safe waste-handling and recycling practices for BFR-containing products;
- c. identify alternative flame retardant chemicals and technologies and promote safe alternatives.

A Project Steering Group (PSG) was established on the 8 February 2005, at their first meeting in Oslo. The PSG has members from Canada, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Russia, Sweden and the USA. Representatives from WWF and AMAP attended the meeting as observers. Norway, as lead country for the BFR project will chair the group, and the AMAP Secretariat will act as the Secretariat for the project. In cooperation with the Russian representatives on the PSG, the AMAP Secretariat will assist the Russian Federation in coordinating and preparing the Russian contribution to the work, and the compilation and production of the report on BFRs in the Russian Federation. In addition the AMAP Secretariat will coordinate the work to produce the report of Phase 1 of the BFR project.

At the meeting the questionnaire for the Phase I activities (2005-2006) ‘Inventory of sources and identification of alternatives and management strategies’ was discussed and finalised. The purpose of the inventory is to identify major sources/source categories and ‘flows’ of BFRs including waste management, as a basis for developing recommendation for actions, and that this did not require exact numbers. After the meeting the questionnaire with enclosure was sent out for a final approval by the members before the 1st of March. No comments for changes have been received.

The project plan for Phase I was adjusted according to the discussion at the PSG meeting, see Enclosure 1.

2. Plans for future work.

AMAP Secretariat will distribute the questionnaire to relevant parties in early-March 2005, It was agreed that countries should submit their responses to the questionnaire by 1 August in order

to prepare a first draft report on the information obtained by the time of the next PSG meeting in September. The USA and Norway volunteered to provide their responses earlier if possible (provisionally by 1 June) to allow work to compile the data to begin earlier and to identify possible problems and issues that might need to be addressed. The response from Russia is likely to take longer, but is expected between 1 September and end-2005.

The 2nd PSG meeting is scheduled for the 27 - 28 September 2005.

The preliminary work plan for the project is enclosed as Enclosure 2.

3. Financial status.

During the 1st PSG meeting the AMAP Secretariat reported that the BFR project had received financial support from USA (25.000 USD) and Canada (25.000 CAD=17.500 USD), although some questions regarding the USA contribution still need to be clarified.

Representatives from Denmark and Sweden indicated that their countries were intending to provide 40-45.000 USD and 17-18.000 USD, respectively. Norway is in the process of raising funds to support the project.

On this basis, total contribution of 100.000 – 105.000 USD have been received or are expected. The revised budget for project work during 2005-6 was agreed at the PSG meeting to be ca. 125.000 USD, excluding in-kind contribution, see Enclosure 3. **This implies that there is an outstanding need for ca. 25.000 USD within the next year (or up to 50.000 USD depending on the status of the contribution from the USA).** The PSG will continue to try to identify additional sources of funding prior to the next PSG meeting in September 2005.

Enclosure 1: Updated Project Description: ACAP Project; “Reduction or Elimination of Sources and Releases of Brominated Flame Retardants”

Background Information

In the AMAP report “Arctic Pollution 2002” it is stated that “there is evidence that POPs substances other than those included in the LRTAP Protocol and Stockholm Convention may be at or approaching levels in the Arctic that could justify regional and global action.” Levels of brominated flame retardants such as polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) were found in Arctic air and biota, and levels of PBDEs are increasing in the Canadian Arctic. The report states that “If nothing is done to reduce emissions and current trends continue, PBDEs may reach the same levels as PCBs in a few decades. In the “AMAP Assessment 2002: Persistent Organic Pollutants in the Arctic” and in the AMAP fact sheet “Brominated Flame Retardants in the Arctic”, 2004, other BFRs are also reported to be found in the Arctic.

Following up AMAPs concern regarding Brominated flame retardants as an emerging issue of concern for the Arctic, ACAP agreed to initiate a new project on these substances. The Senior Arctic Officials supported the idea of launching a new project on BFRs at their meeting in Reykjavik in April, 2003.

Brominated flame retardants (BFRs) have been in use in most parts of the world for more than 25 years. Concern is now increasing because of the rapid upward trend in the levels of some BFRs, observed in humans and the environment since the early 1990’s. Because the BFRs are extremely stable, they can persist in the environment and accumulate in the food chain, soil and sediments. Many BFRs have undesirable health and environmental effects.

With no known Arctic sources, the BFRs found in the Arctic appear to be transported from distant sources, primarily through long range atmospheric transport. The elevated levels of certain BFRs in human tissue and the Arctic environment have highlighted the potential for long term health effects for inhabitants of the Arctic regions.

In more populated areas outside the Arctic, the levels of some BFRs are also increasing rapidly in human fat tissue and breast milk, fish, and sewage sludge. In many instances the concentrations are significantly higher than the levels in the Arctic. The principal sources of BFRs include consumer products such as foam for furniture, textiles, plastics in electrical and electronic equipment, and structural materials, as well as releases from the manufacture, disposal, and combustion of these products. Some BFRs have the potential to cause effects from direct human exposure as well as through exposure to BFRs traveling via indirect pathways to the Arctic. Actions to reduce or eliminate BFRs of concern in the Arctic region will require measures to control the sources of these BFRs, see AMAP’s Fact Sheet on BFRs in the Arctic.

Status of regulatory measures and assessment efforts

Denmark, Finland and Sweden have adopted restrictions on the marketing and use of penta- and octabromodiphenylethers (penta- and octa-BDEs) from August, 2004 due to an adopted European Union (EU) directive. Norway and Iceland also implement the EU directives in this field due to the agreement creating the European Economic Area (EEA).

The EU risk assessment program has provisionally finalized the risk assessment for deca-BDE, proposing that there is no further need for additional risk reduction measures at this time. It did however identify the need for further studies on neurotoxicity, additional human and environmental monitoring and possible risk reduction measures. In addition the risk assessments and further testing of hexabromocyclododecane (HBCD) and tetrabromobisphenol A (TBBPA) are being carried out as part of the same program.

According to the EU Directive on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment (RoHS Directive) the manufacturers are required after July 2006 to substitute certain heavy metals and the BFRs polybrominated biphenyls (PBB) and polybrominateddiphenylethers (PBDE) in new electrical and electronic equipment in order to prevent problems during the waste management phase. Further discussion concerning possible exemptions of deca-BDE might come up in the Commission.

The Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE Directive) was adopted by the European Commission in January 2003 and will be implemented gradually until 2007. One of the elements of the directive is that flame retardant plastic has to be separated from other waste and that this plastic has to be recycled, incinerated or deposited at approved facilities.

In the US, efforts are underway to facilitate an orderly transition into safer substitutes for penta-BDE and octa-BDE, after the announcement by the only U.S. manufacturer of these chemicals, of a voluntary phase out of both chemicals by the end of 2004.

The United States has successfully used voluntary approaches to collect information and phase out production of specific BFRs. As part of the Voluntary Children's Chemical Evaluation Program (VCEEP), industry is filling information gaps on penta-, octa-, and deca-BDEs. The only U.S. manufacturer of penta-BDE and octa-BDE has voluntarily agreed to phase out of both chemicals by the end of 2004. The U.S. furniture manufacturing industry, flame retardant manufacturers, and US EPA have initiated a voluntary partnership to conduct an assessment of chemical and material alternatives to penta-BDE used in polyurethane foam.

Additionally, to follow-up on industry's voluntary phase out of penta-BDE and octa-BDE, U.S. EPA is developing a rule to require notification to EPA prior to their manufacture or import, for any use, after January 1, 2005. EPA is also developing a rule to require notification to the Agency prior to the manufacture, import, or processing of certain other flame retardant chemicals (including the BFRs decaBDE and HBCD) for use in residential upholstered furniture. Further, some U.S. State legislatures have banned sale and use of penta-BDE and octa-BDE, and other states are considering legislation for decaBDE as well.

Canada published a draft scientific screening assessment on PBDEs on May 8, 2004. The report recommends that PBDEs be added to the List of Toxic Substances in Schedule 1 of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999 (CEPA 99), and proposes the implementation of virtual elimination of tetra, penta and hexa brominated chemical forms which were found to be persistent, bio-accumulative and toxic. When stakeholder comments have been reviewed an assessment report will be prepared for final publication.

In addition, work has begun on a strategy for managing the concerns identified in the assessment report, as well as the preparations for consultations with industry and other stakeholders.

Objectives

The objectives are to:

- a. reduce or eliminate sources and releases of BFRs that are found in the Arctic environment;
- b. identify and develop safe waste-handling and recycling practices for BFR-containing products;
- c. identify alternative flame retardant chemicals and technologies and promote safe alternatives.

Phase I activities (2005-2006) – Inventory of sources and identification of alternatives and management strategies

1. Identify sources and releases of BFRs that are found in the Arctic environment. This work will include collection, compilation and quantification of information from the Arctic countries on:
 - a. Production of BFRs (including import/export of BFRs)
 - b. Production of products containing BFRs (including import/export of these products)
 - c. Waste management practices, including disposal, reuse, recycling, and incineration
 - d. Provide information of BFR releases from production, products, waste management practices and wastewater treatment
2. Identify further knowledge needed to improve or enable risk management of BFRs;
3. Identify and collect existing information on alternative flame retardant chemicals and technologies
4. Identify existing or planned management practices and strategies to reduce or eliminate sources and releases of BFRs to the environment. Identify stakeholders for collaboration.
5. Develop a fact sheet and a report summarizing Phase I findings and recommendations for Phase II

Estimated budget: 125.000 USD covering project administration, meetings, compiling of information from the countries, reporting, Russian experts and Russian participation in meetings. The budget does not include in-kind contribution such as collection and reporting of country-specific data.

Phase II activities (2007-2008) – Actions to reduce or eliminate priority sources and releases

1. Review management strategies and actions to reduce or eliminate sources and releases of BFRs to the environment, including identification of stakeholders in Arctic countries;
2. Evaluate alternative flame retardant chemicals and alternative technologies;
3. Evaluate need for inclusion of new hazardous BFRs, as appropriate, in addition to those identified in Phase I.
4. Develop proposals for actions, cooperative activities and/or pilot projects to reduce or eliminate priority sources and releases of BFRs (e.g. restrictions, use of alternative flame retardant chemicals, alternative technologies, guideline on Environmentally friendly (green) procurement, guidelines on safe waste handling and recycling practises);
5. Develop a report summarizing phase II findings and recommendations for Phase III. Update the fact sheet and other outreach initiatives.

Estimated budget: 210.000 USD covering project administration, meetings, compiling of information from the countries, reporting, Russian experts and Russian participation in meetings. The budget does not include in-kind contribution such as collection and reporting of country-specific data.

Phase III activities (2009-2010) – Pilot projects

1. Implementation of pilot projects - to be decided on the basis of results from phases I and II.
2. Report on progress of actions/activities to reduce and eliminate sources and releases of BFRs and evaluate their success;

Organisation

A project steering group will be established with one participant from each of the Arctic countries and with representatives from Permanent Participants and Observers. The project will be carried out in cooperation with relevant Arctic Council working groups. Cooperation with producers, importers, users and other stakeholders will be sought.

Norway will be the project coordinator.

Enclosure 2:

Revised Work plan for BFR Project Phase 1 activities (2005-2006). Inventory of sources and identification of alternatives and management strategies.

When	Task (number from the project plan)	Who is responsible?
1 March 2005	Deliver comments on revised draft of questionnaire.	PSG and AMAP
As soon as possible	Finalise layout of the technical fact sheet on BFRs in the Arctic; produce electronic version and post on websites; investigate production and printing of Russian translation	AMAP
As soon as possible	Confirm and transfer funding to support the ACAP BFR project	PSG, all Arctic countries
Early-March 2005	Finalise and distribute questionnaire (to all Arctic countries, relevant NGOs and organizations representing industry).	AMAP
Between 1 June and 1 August 2005	Delivery of responses to the questionnaire: 1.a. Production of BFRs (including import/export of BFRs) 1.b. Production of products containing BFRs (including import/export of these products) 1.c. Waste handling and recycling 2. Identify the status of waste handling and recycling strategies/methods, including identification of knowledge gaps.	All Arctic countries excluding Russia
Between 1 September 2005 and 1 January 2006	Delivery of responses to the questionnaire: 1.a. Production of BFRs (including import/export of BFRs) 1.b. Production of products containing BFRs (including import/export of these products) 1.c. Waste handling and recycling 2. Identify the status of waste handling and recycling strategies/methods, including identification of knowledge gaps.	Russia
March to December 2005	Preparation of Russian report	AMAP, Russian PSG member, Russian experts assisted by western experts
1 June 2005	3. Identify and collect existing information on alternative flame retardant chemicals and alternative technologies.	PSG, USA has volunteered to take the lead on this activity
Between 1 June and 1 August 2005	Delivery of responses to the questionnaire: 4. Identify existing management strategies/actions to reduce or eliminate sources and releases of BFRs to the environment including identification of stakeholders.	All Arctic countries excluding Russia
Between 1	Delivery of responses to the questionnaire:	Russia

September 2005 and 1 January 2006	4. Identify existing management strategies/actions to reduce or eliminate sources and releases of BFRs to the environment including identification of stakeholders.	
1 August 2005 (for a first discussion at the 2 nd PSG meeting, 27-28 September)	5.1. Compile and circulate responses from the questionnaire to all PSG members (to prepare for the discussion at the PSG meeting). At the 2 nd PSG meeting: Discussion of questionnaire responses and information obtained. Identify missing data and data which needs clarification	AMAP PSG meeting
October 2005 – January 2006	Continue collection of information and start drafting the report summarizing Phase I findings	AMAP
3 rd meeting of PSG February 2006	5.2. Develop draft recommendations for Phase II by discussion at the meeting 5.1 Discuss the first draft of the report summarizing Phase I findings	PSG
February – August 2006	Present recommendations for Phase II to the SAO meeting 5.3 Develop a new fact sheet/flyer on ACAPBFR project and phase I findings 5.4 Update the technical fact sheet on BFRs in the Arctic	Project lead PSG AMAP
4 th meeting of the PSG June/August 2006	Finalise and produce project reports, the recommendations concerning Phase 2 of the project, and the ACAP fact sheet/flyer	AMAP and PSG
October 2006	Delivery to SAOs and Ministers of the Phase 1 reports and the recommendations for Phase 2 of the BFR project	

Enclosure 3: Revised Budget for BFR Project Phase 1 Activities (2005-2006).

Cost estimate 2004-2006	NOK	6.3	USD
Administration & expert meetings			
AMAP	70.000		
Russian participation at meetings	40.000		
Interpreter	40.000		
<u>Hospitality</u>	<u>40.000</u>		
	190.000	30.000	
Preparation of Reports:			
Russian report			
Assistance to Russians inventory	200.000		
Compilation of Russian report	20.000		
Translations Russian/English	20.000		
<u>Printing of report in English</u>	<u>20.000</u>		
Russian report	260.000	41.000	
Arctic report			
Questionnaire compilation	5.000		
Follow up	5.000		
Compilation of data	10.000		
Drafting of report	150.000		
<u>Printing of report</u>	<u>30.000</u>		
Total for the report	200.000	32.000	
AMAP BFR Fact Sheet status 2005:			
Drafting, editing	24.000		
Lay out, printing 1.000 copies,	15.000*		
<u>Shipment</u>	<u>2.000</u>		
Total	41.000	6.500	
BRF Fact Sheet Project phase I	30.000	4.800	
Travelling			
Expert meetings and field work	40.000	6.400	
Miscellaneous	30.000	4.800	
Totally	791.000	125.500**	

*1.000 pr extra 1.000

Estimated budget; 125.000 USD (= 791.000 NOK) covering project administration, meetings, compiling of information from the countries, reporting, Russian experts and Russian participation in meetings. The budget does not include in-kind contribution such as collection and reporting of country-specific data.