

ACAP Steering Committee Meeting Report

29-30 March 2006

Copenhagen, Denmark

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

Table of Contents

1. Welcome and Introduction
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Project Progress Reports – Annex Projects
 - 3a. Phase-out of PCBs in the Russian Federation
 - 3b. Reduction of Dioxin/Furan Emissions in the Russian Federation
 - 3c. Mercury
 - 3d. Obsolete Pesticides in the Russian Federation
 - 3e. Brominated Flame Retardants
 - 3f. PCB & Pesticide projects in Indigenous Communities
 - 3g. Status of Fact Sheets
4. New Cooperative Project Proposals
 - 4a. Proposed Indigenous Peoples Community Action Initiative
 - 4b. Franz Josef Land
 - 4c. Cooperative Development of an Integrated Hazardous Waste Management Plan in the Russian Federation

- 4d. Pre-proposal discussion - Electronic Waste
5. Cooperation with International Fora and Organizations
 - 5a. ACAP presentation at 5th Session of UN Permanent Forum of Indigenous Peoples May 2006 New York
 - 5b. Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM) Arctic Cooperation Programme 2006 – 2008
 - 5c. UNDP Activities Relevant to the Arctic
6. Status of Maternal Cord Blood Monitoring
7. Information on Status of Stockholm Convention including new chemicals under review, UNEP Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), and Convention on LRTAP
8. Status of Project Support Instrument (PSI) and Guidelines
9. ACAP-BEAC/WGE Cooperation to Address “Hot Spots” in the Russian Federation
 - 9a. BEAC Ministerial Meeting Rovaneimi on 18 – 19 October 2005
 - 9b. Barents “Hot Spots” Facility
 - 9c. Listing and Delisting of “Hot Spots” from BEAC “Hot Spots’ List
10. Revised Guidelines for Developing ACAP Projects
11. ACAP as Permanent Arctic Council Working Group
12. ACAP Web Page
13. Draft Report for Senior Arctic Officials (SAOs) Meeting, Syktyvkar, April 2006
14. Other Business – Next Meeting
 - Appendices –

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| Appendix A: | List of Participants |
| Appendix B: | ACAP Steering Committee Meeting Agenda |
| Appendix C: | Progress Report from the PCB PEG |
| Appendix D-1: | Progress Report from the Dioxins/Furans PSG |
| Appendix D-2: | Progress Report on Phase II Dioxins/Furans Project |
| Appendix E: | Progress Report from the Mercury PSG |
| Appendix F-1: | Progress Report from the Obsolete Pesticides PEG |
| Appendix F-2: | Progress Report from the Obsolete Pesticides PEG (Karalla) |
| Appendix F-3: | Progress Report on Denmark’s Bi-lateral Obsolete |

Pesticides Project in Pskov and Vologda

Appendix G: Progress Report from the BFR PSG

Appendix H: Report on U.S. Project to Remove PCB-containing Transformers in Indigenous Communities

Appendix I: Indigenous Peoples Community Action Initiative Proposal

Appendix J: ACAP as a Permanent Working Group Discussion Paper

ACAP Steering Committee Meeting Report

29 - 30 March 2006

Copenhagen, Denmark

1. Welcome and Introduction

The ACAP Chair, Mr. Bob Dyer opened the meeting by thanking the Danish EPA for hosting the Arctic Council Action Plan (ACAP) Steering Committee meeting and for chairing the Mercury Steering Group. He also thanked the Danish Polar Center for providing an excellent meeting location and provisions. Mr. Dyer then introduced Ms. Mikaela Engell, the Danish Senior Arctic Official to the Arctic Council, who provided opening remarks.

Ms. Engell began by welcoming the ACAP Steering Committee to Copenhagen. She expressed her personal appreciation for ACAP's work as she spent much of her adult life in Greenland and has observed the influx of high levels of pollutants into areas of the Arctic not responsible for generating such contamination. She therefore noted that it is natural for Arctic countries to establish multi-lateral projects such as those undertaken by ACAP and to put these important issues on the international agenda. Ms. Engell stressed ACAP's influence in international fora such as the Stockholm Convention and the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP). Denmark has been chairing the ACAP Mercury Project Steering Group which is now entering the second phase of the mercury emissions project. Denmark is looking forward to making progress with the partners. A look at the agenda reveals the longevity of some projects which she recognizes is essential in some cases. However, in some instances progress would be expedited with increased financial support and cooperation from member states.

Ms. Engell recommended that ACAP (1) focus on pollutants of particular concern identified by the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), (2) keep the circumpolar approach, (3) continue to point to ways in which the Arctic states can reduce pollution, and (4) although establishing and implementing pilot projects is important, it is critical for ACAP to go further and gain political support necessary to sustain these efforts. One of the greatest challenges for the Arctic Council which operates in a very civilized and silent manner is the clash between science and politics. Science does not have much value, in this specific context, without political support. The Chair thanked Ms. Engell for her thoughtful remarks. He recalled that ACAP has historically focused on techniques to reduce existing pollutants, but has recently begun to look at more proactive ways to reduce them, the BFR project being one example. Mr. Dyer brought a couple of items to the attention of the SC beginning with recognition of the excellent work accomplished by the Russian Norwegian Cleaner Production (RNCP) Center and their recent award for the Norilsk Nickel project.

The Chair also noted that the Danish Environmental Minister is meeting with USEPA Administrator Johnson this week and is expected to specifically mention the good work of ACAP. Additionally,

the U.S. Ambassador to Finland Marilyn Ware met with Foreign Minister Erkki Tuomioja in Helsinki earlier in March during which FM Tuomioja expressly stated strong support for continued U.S. presence and proactive participation in the Arctic Council.

Finally, it was noted by the Chair that in anticipation of a likely transition from an “ad hoc” group to a “permanent” working group which will be addressed later in the agenda, it will be helpful to adopt a logo. Ideas were welcomed.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The Steering Committee discussed rearranging the agenda to accommodate the ambitious number of items. It was decided to move the BFR report to day two, to allow RAIPON to combine two topics related to indigenous communities, to keep Obsolete Pesticides on day one, and to evaluate the ability to add Denmark’s request to present results from a report on PCBs and Mercury in polar bears and sled dogs in Greenland based on progress of the meeting.

In the future, Denmark suggested that (1) the proposed agenda be distributed for review and comment one month prior to the meeting and (2) the host country be invited to provide presentations relevant to ASCAP.

The list of participants and final agenda are provided in Appendices A & B, respectively.

Action items:

Secretariat will prepare a draft agenda one month prior to the next SCM.

Presentations relevant to ACAP by host country will be considered for inclusion on agenda.

3. Project Progress Reports – Annex a Projects

PCBs (Yury Sychev, AMAP)

Mr. Yury Sychev, representing AMAP, reported on the status of PCB projects in the Russian Federation. A number of issues have presented a challenging situation. First, there have been problems with lack of progress in the Danish-funded project to collect, label, and transfer PCB waste in the Leningrad region. Support for information on PCB quantities and transportation of transformers containing PCB to the NEFCO facility, when constructed, has been requested from the Leningrad Oblast to no avail. Data and a commitment to assist with transportation will predicate continued implementation.

NEFCO reported progress to site and construct a storage facility was well underway until a recent site visit revealed local resistance to placing the facility in Rostov. This is becoming a recurring problem that is impacting the project financially as several thousand dollars in permit fees and public hearings are incurred for each new location. NEFCO reported that the “NIMBY” (Not-In-My-Backyard) syndrome is as prevalent in Russia as it is elsewhere. Assistance from the Leningrad Oblast has been sought, although a response is still forthcoming. NEFCO expects that with help from the Oblast, a new site will be selected. They plan to partner with local authorities and work out issues prior to the next SCM in September/October 2006.

The U.S. reported good progress with the plasma arc project which will provide technology designed to destroy PCB-containing capacitors. The next step is to allocate \$5,000 USD to the Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Center to develop a business plan by July 2006. Volgograd Chimprom has confirmed interest in this technology and in implementation of it and has asserted that they hold all necessary Russian Federation (RF) licenses and certifications to manage Class 1 hazardous waste. Therefore, it has been decided to allocate \$25,000 to Volgograd Chimprom. Canada requested a timeline along with a report on financial status and balance. The timeline and financial status will be determined in conjunction with the business plan which will be developed by Volgograd Chimprom and shall include shipment of the plasma arc system to Russia.

The Chair indicated that after presentation by Mr. Lars-Otto Reiersen, AMAP Chair, last January, there should have been a balance of \$50,000 (USD).

NEFCO, Norway, Finland, and Denmark thanked Mr. Sychev for his presentation but expressed serious concern with lack of progress which may jeopardize the future of ACAP projects; Russia is unable to access all available funding sources until a number of issues with the Russian Federation are resolved satisfactorily. The key problems raised were the RF's (1) insufficient commitment and support from the Russian Federation, (2) failure to ratify the Stockholm Convention, (3) failure to elect a co-chair for the PCB PSG, (4) failure to draft a National Implementation Plan (NIP) despite offers of assistance from UNDP, and (5) lack of coordination between various levels of government, (6) inadequate public outreach by local and regional authorities, (7) lack of hazardous waste regulations, (8) failure to provide complete data from Leningrad Oblast about PCB quantities and (9) failure to construct a single destruction facility throughout RF to handle pollutants addressed by ACAP. Canada noted that they also share these concerns but reminded everyone that some projects have had significant support and ACAP should not lose sight of those accomplishments.

Mr. Yuri Aleksandrovskiy, representing the Russian Federation, passed out a Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) brochure and briefly reminded the participants about the changes in the Russian federal and regional environmental bodies system which have been occurring for the past two years within the framework of common administrative reform in Russia. In particular, MNR, like all other Russian ministries has been authorized to be responsible only for making the state policy and legal regulation in the sphere of environmental protection (with the exception of supervising functions) and nature use management. The law enforcement duties and supervisory functions in the above fields have been delegated to the several new federal bodies created under the MNR, namely: the federal agencies of water resources (Rosvodresursy), mineral resources (Rosnedra) and forestry (Rosleshoz) as well as the federal service of nature use supervision (Rospirodnadzor), correspondingly. One more new federal body has also been established under the Russian Federation Government, namely: the Federal Service on Ecological, Technical and Nuclear Supervision (Rostekhnadzor), which is responsible for the state ecological control and the state ecological expertise of any kind of ongoing and planned economical activity, correspondingly, to prevent human-caused environmental impacts. The present head of Rostekhnadzor is a very influential person (former Representative Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation President to the Far Eastern Federal District Mr. Konstantin B. Pulikovskiy). The MNR, where Mr. Aleksandrovskiy works, is not presently responsible for the issues related with prevention of environment pollution with the chemicals, wastes and other hazardous contaminants (i.e. for the issues which are currently the main sphere of ACAP's activity). He stated that Rostekhnadzor is presently the main federal body under the Russian Federation Government dealing with industrial pollution control and supervision. There are also some other Russian ministries and agencies whose participation in ACAP's activity are very important. They are: the Ministry of Agriculture (Minsel'hoz), the Ministry of Industry and Energy (Minpromenergo), the Ministry of Regional Policy (Minregion) and the Federal Agency on Construction and Housing and Communal Services within the jurisdiction of the Minregion, the Federal Service f

for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Monitoring (Roshydromet). At the same time, as it was emphasized by Mr. Aleksandrovskiy, in accordance with the Russian Federation Government's

Resolution of October 1, 2003 No. 1430-p the MNR was authorized to be responsible for the Russian participation in the ACAP's activity. That is why there are presently some

difficulties in coordinating the above Russian ministries' and agencies' participation in ACAP projects. He also has informed that Mr. Andrey Pechkov of Rostekhnadzor was appointed as co-

chair of the PCB Project Steering Group (PSG). However, Mr. Aleksandrovskiy apologized that Mr. Peckham was unable to attend this ACAP Steering Committee Meeting (SCM) and stated that a

relevant letter was sent to the ACAP Chair to that effect. Chair confirmed receipt of such letter. Mr. Aleksandrovskiy confirmed that in some cases it is very difficult for ACAP's project experts to receive at the local level the permissions required for the project implementing. Sometimes the permission from both Rostekhnadzor and Rospirodnadzor or their relevant regional bodies are needed. In many cases it is also necessary to have permission from the relevant regional and/or local administrations. In this connection it is important for the project coordinators and executers to clearly understand in each separate case is it regulatory requirement (procedure) or illegal artificial barrier. In such cases Mr. Aleksandrovskiy asked ACAP colleagues to inform him in due time as the official Russian representative to the SC ACAP or go through the MNR leadership for assistance to overcome the above problems.

Mr. Aleksandrovskiy also said he has generally heard of problems mentioned-above by the other arctic countries representatives before but he did not interpret the situation as serious as it was now being inferred. He was not aware of any past correspondence from UNDP or any other entities that have gone unanswered by the Russian experts involved (mainly from Rostekhnadzor) as stated by NEFCO. He suggested that in the future copies of all correspondence go to him at the MNR because the Rostekhnadzor's specialists which actually participate in the work of some PSGs often operates independently of him and the MNR and rarely communicate on these issues.

He continued to say that ratification of the Stockholm Convention is imminent and that once accomplished, he anticipates implementation of all related work by all Federal and Regional bodies concerned. Even though Russia signed the Stockholm Convention in 2002, they have been slow to fund necessary projects, which underscore the importance of the Arctic Council and the critical need for an official body to ensure that all countries contribute. However, as to the financial aspect, it is necessary to note once again that very strong procedures on the matter exist now in Russia because in accordance with the Russian budgetary and financial legislation all funding from the Russian state budget may be received only if the special Governmental resolutions on the relevant matters have been issued and the expenses required have been envisaged in the Law on the Federal Budget for the relevant year. This is why most of Russia's contributions to the Arctic Council and some other international organisations and fora are mostly "in-kind" (i.e. providing the scientists and experts work, the technical means and equipment etc.) Financial questions must be negotiated carefully at the local, regional, and federal levels which makes it very complicated. The Russian Federation Federal Ecological Fund which in some specific cases might be used for providing the Russian share of co-financing was closed in 2001 and the federal budget now consolidates all taxes and payments which precludes funding of a specific organization or project. However, some ecological funds still officially exist at the local and regional levels which may be used in order to finance the most important ACAP projects in the relevant Russian regions. Mr. Aleksandrovskiy stated that he received in the working order information from the Russian SAO Mr. Sergey Krutikov prior to coming to the meeting that the situation is improving and the Russian Minister of Finance (Minim) is more likely ready to positively decide the question of the Russian voluntary financial contribution to the Arctic Council Instrument (Fund) of Projects Support, provided the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs submits them all necessary information, documents and figures on the Russia's contribution rate. Norway and the ACAP Chair responded that specific requests have already been communicated on numerous occasions in past Ministerial and SAO meetings and most recently at the SAO meeting in October 2005 in Khanty-Mansiysk. The Chair reported that he will be meeting with the Arctic Council Chairman, Ambassador Vitaly Churkin, and the Russian SAO, Mr. Sergey Krutikov, the next week (3-7 April 2006) at which time he will clearly articulate these and other issues.

Mr. Pavel Suliandziga, representing RAIPON, thanked the Arctic Council member states for their patience and persistence in providing assistance to Russia. Although there are significant currency reserves, he is not as optimistic about their increased contribution to ACAP as Mr. Aleksandrovskiy

is. He urges countries to continue support through the Arctic Council, which serves as a good example of Arctic cooperation.

Mr. Yury Sychev, of AMAP, announced that Russia is directing some funds to the International Polar Year and suggested that ACAP projects may be eligible. Although IPY deadlines for general submission as official IPY projects have passed, an organizing office in Russia is being set up and is coordinating with the IPY International Programme Office.

Ms. Ella Barnes, representing the U.S., reminded everyone that the reason ACAP is focusing efforts in the Russian Federation is because Russian sources of contaminants are amongst those most seriously affecting the Arctic. Although it can be very difficult to work with Russian Federal authorities, ACAP member states should understand that for the past two years they have been undergoing constant reform, a “bureaucratic revolution” of sorts. Even though Rostekhnadzor may have overlapping jurisdiction, they are an independent body and do not keep the MNR informed of all issues. Therefore, Ms. Barnes suggested that the MNR provide an official representative to every ACAP PSG. Mr. Bill Ernst, representing Canada, supported this suggestion, stating that their participation in and commitment to the PSGs may do more than money to move projects forward. He further stipulated that if a Hazardous Waste Strategy was adopted, it would also greatly facilitate progress.

Mr. Aleksandrovskiy concurred with the value of more active RF participation but countered that their staff in the MNR is being severely cut and they do not have sufficient resources to participate in all groups. However, they will try to provide the MNR participation in at least two steering groups. As to Rostekhnadzor it would be very desirable if their competent representatives could participate in the work of all ACAP Pegs. The Chair thanked Mr. Aleksandrovskiy and concluded that the representation on the PCB and Obsolete Pesticides steering groups would be of utmost value and he will communicate that next week with the AC Chair and Russian SAO.

A “Record of the Steering Group Meeting for the PCB Project Phase III” is provided in Appendix C.

Action items:

Denmark will continue to seek information and assistance from the Leningrad Oblast on PCB quantities to aid in removal of PCB waste.

NEFCO will identify a new site, work with local authorities, and obtain permitting for storage facility for PCB waste.

ACAP Chair to communicate specific issues and requests of the Russian Federation to Arctic Council Chair and Russian SAO during meeting next week, 3-7 April 2006, in Moscow:

Formalize arrangement of Russian co-chairs for the PCB and Obsolete Pesticides Project Steering Groups.

Seek official response to UNDP offer to assist with National Implementation Plan.

Obtain status on ratification of Stockholm Convention.

Request status of development and adoption of Hazardous Waste Management Strategy.

PCB inventory data from the Leningrad Oblast.

Need to build capacity in Russian Federation to complete the full cycle of hazardous waste disposal in proper destruction facilities.

b. Dioxins and Furans (Ann-Sofi Israelson, Sweden)

Ms. Ann-Sofi Israelson, of Sweden, provided a status of the Dioxins/Furans project. She stated that the first of three phases was completed in 2005 which resulted in a report on the major

sources of dioxins and furans, based on an evaluation of approximately 60 enterprises in Arkhangelsk and Murmansk regions as well as the Republic of Komi. The UNEP methodology is being employed and the UNEP Chemicals Toolkit has been translated into Russian, a dioxin/furan fact sheet developed, and a workshop held on sampling and analysis.

Phase II includes 5 tasks and will run from April 2006 through January 2007. One outcome of Phase II will be a feasibility study based on a technical and economic evaluation of the various measures to reduce/eliminate dioxins and furans from major sources. Site specific recommendations will inform Phase III which will implement pilot demonstration projects to reduce dioxin/furan releases.

The U.S., responding to the Chair's question about Cleaner Production (CP) training, stated that CP training has already been completed at the Arkhangelsk pulp and paper mill in the city of Novodvinsk in the Arkhangelsk region and is planning to provide the CP training program at the Kotlas pulp and paper mill and other pulp and paper facilities. Sweden reported that the Russian Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Centre suggested adding the Syktyvkar Timber Mill to the plan for CP training. The PSG approved this and Sweden will contribute extra funding to support this project.

The Chair requested that the anticipated dioxin/furan reduction be calculated and added to the COD, BOD, and solid waste reductions in the environmental results related to the dioxin/furan project before the April 2006 meeting with the SAOs. Norway concurred and Sweden agreed to provide the calculations.

A Progress Report from the Dioxins/Furans PEG and Phase II Project are provided in Appendices D-1 and D-2, respectively.

Action items:

Sweden to develop estimates of dioxin/furan emission reductions resulting from Cleaner Production training to date.

c. Mercury (Morten Olsen, Danish EPA, and Mikala Klint, Denmark)

Ms. Mikala Klint, of Denmark, distributed copies of the recently released Mercury Fact Sheet, completed in collaboration with AMAP, and copies of the "Arctic Mercury Releases Inventory" and "Assessment of Mercury Releases from the Russian Federation." The latter now available in English and Russian. The PSG is close to completion of Phase I, assessment and prioritization of atmospheric mercury releases.

The "Assessment of Existing and Planned Initiatives Addressing Mercury Sources in the Arctic States and Identification of Possible Measures for Follow-up" is in the process of being finalized by the PSG; the objective of which is to identify possible reduction measures based on gaps in existing agreements.

Mr. Jakob Maag, of COWI, provided an overview of the Mercury Releases Inventory which assessed major source categories of mercury in the eight Arctic countries and identified possible reduction measures for follow-up. Several existing agreements that address mercury were reviewed for a comparative analysis of mercury coverage. They included the Heavy Metals protocol of the LRTAP Convention, the North American Regional Action Plan on Mercury (NARAP-Hg), The Helsinki Convention, The OSPAR Convention, and others. Possible reduction measures were suggested in the categories of coal combustion, non-ferrous metal production, waste treatment, oil and gas extraction and refining, and chlor-alkali production. Mercury emissions from landfilled waste is an emerging issue; U.S. studies may provide solutions which may be considered. Oil and Gas emissions in the Arctic are poorly described; there is a lack of international data. There was ensuing discussion about the significance of mercury releases from non-Arctic countries, such as

China.

Ms. Klint then presented details of the Phase II Mercury-release reduction demonstration project which is in the pre-feasibility stage. At the September 2005 meeting of the Mercury Project Steering Group, it was decided to focus on mercury-containing lamps because it included collection, storage, transport, and treatment throughout the NW RF and thus, has potential to improve this complicated multi-step process. A large number of mercury-containing lamps and other devices are used in the Arctic and are associated with improper collection and disposal.

The next step will consist of a Feasibility Study to improve the management and handling of mercury-containing waste (MCW) in NW Russia. Terms of Reference (ToR) have been drafted and are to be tendered in April 2006. Finland asked for assurance that consultants from Finland will be eligible. Mr. Olsen, of DEPA, confirmed that they will.

A fact-finding mission to NEFCO-AMAP "Hot Spots" in Murmansk, Arkhangelsk, and Nenets by DEPA, with full support of Rostekhnadzor, was accomplished in early 2006. Visits to St. Petersburg and the Leningrad Oblast have already been conducted leaving only the Republic of Komi and Karelia to visit, neither of which are known to have enterprises to collect and treat MCW.

One facility, Ecord Ltd. In Murmansk, was recommended by DEPA for removal from the "Hot Spots" list. It was discovered to be an old but well-run facility with well-maintained equipment that only operates 120 days per year. On a similar note, Russia added that they would also like to discuss process for removal of sites, in particular they'd like to remove "M8." NEFCO said that there is no specific criteria to de-list "Hot Spots." They evaluate each on a case-by-case basis with site-specific justification provided to them.

Mr. Husammudin Ahmadzi, of NEFCO, underscored the importance of building synergy with ACAP's PCB and Obsolete Pesticides projects as well as the Barents "Hot Spots" facilities. He also reiterated the need to adhere to ToR that had been agreed upon earlier. Some changes need to be resolved in order to ensure NEFCO's continued participation.

This phase will also result in a seminar on MCW management with broad stakeholder participation in St. Petersburg in September 2006 and will culminate with submission of the Feasibility Study to the PSG in January 2007.

The Mercury PSG is also closely monitoring the progress of the Mercury Global Partnership to address chlor-alkali facilities in Russia, part of a larger global effort of UNEP. Three mercury audits were conducted at chlor-alkali facilities in Russia and a workshop was held in November 2005 in Volgograd coordinated by partners RusChlor, Volgograd "Caustic" Facility, EuroChlor, and the Russian Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Centre. Funding partners include Canada, Norway, U.S. Chlorine Chemistry Council and USEPA. Cleaner Production training was initiated at Volgograd "Caustic" in February 2006 and proposals to reduce use and releases are forthcoming in May with implementation of at least two projects scheduled to begin in June 2006. Additionally, six Russian technical experts participated in technical exchange visits to facilities in Germany, Spain, Italy. There will be a presentation of this project at the World Council meeting in Nairobi in February 2007.

The PSG is also considering support of a research project to determine the effectiveness of sorbent technology to reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants proposed by the U.S. and Canada and a mercury release reduction project at the Cheleyabinsk zinc smelter proposed by NEFCO.

A progress report from the Mercury PSG is provided in Appendix E.

d. Obsolete Pesticides (Jaakko Henttonen, Consulate General of Finland)

Mr. Jaakko Henttonen, Advisor on Environmental Affairs for Consulate General of Finland

and chair of this PSG, gave a progress report on the ACAP Multi-lateral Cooperative Project on Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stocks in the Russian Federation which was prepared by Mr. Timo Seppälä, of the Finnish Environment Institute. He opened by highlighting the current emphasis on resource exploitation in the Russian north. Although legislation prohibits pollution, enforcement is not in place. Phase I of the obsolete pesticides project to identify, inventory, analyze, and move stocks of obsolete pesticides to safe storage has been completed in 6 regions: Arkhangelsk, Komi Republic, Magadan, Omsk, Tyumen, and the Altai Republic. Work continues in Altai Krai and has begun in the Republic of Sakha. Phase I is yet to commence in Krasnoyarsk, Murmansk, and Kamchatka.

Despite commitment of \$15,000 USD by the PSG, Phase I has not yet commenced in the Murmansk Region due to insufficient Regional support. The PSG is considering work in the Autonomous Districts of Nenets, Jamalo, Nenetski, and Chukchi however, they also lack Regional support. Cost estimates are not available for Krasnoyarsk and Kamchatka.

Inventories in the five priority regions of Altai Krai revealed twice the amount of pesticide (2,890 tons) as originally estimated (1,490 tons). Since this was also the case in other regions, it was determined that doubling the original stock estimates should serve as a general rule of thumb for planning purposes.

Safe storage of obsolete pesticides awaiting destruction was discussed and such facilities have been founded in the Komi Republic, Tyumen, Omsk, Altai Republic, and Altai Krai. Of particular concern, however, were issues related to the Tomsk hazardous waste facility which received 23 tons of repackaged stock from Magadan and the Krasny-Bor landfill which received 39 of the 57 tons shipped out of the Arkhangelsk region. Though the Tomsk Polygon has adequate potential for long term storage capacity, it is questionable that pesticides moved there were placed in safe storage. Steering Group concerns over disposal in landfills has also been emphasized repeatedly. Despite understandings with Rostekhnadzor that transport to Krasny-Bor was forbidden, 39 tons were shipped in steel drums, nonetheless. An explanation from Rostekhnadzor is requested because this conflicted with the condition from donor countries that they will continue to support the project only if storage and disposal are performed in an environmentally sound manner according to internationally accepted practices and national legislation of the Russian Federation.

It was reported that it will take approximately \$410,000 USD to complete Phase I in the remaining regions. Mr. Henttonen acknowledged good participation from Rostekhnadzor, but not as much involvement as necessary from the Ministry of Agriculture. Successful completion of Phases I and II has been achieved in those areas which have received significant regional funding.

Mr. Henttonen then shared observations of the PSG which included (1) costs have been underestimated and should be twice the estimates due to unexpectedly high amounts of pesticides (+50%), (2) regional funds are sometimes available and can expedite the projects, (3) swift action is important as packaging materials degrade, local authorities get anxious and dispose in unsafe manners, storage facilities are subject to fire and other disasters, and (4) costs for meetings are increasing.

Projects for 2006 include (1) completion of project in Altai Krai due to concerns with high risk associated with the potential impact to 17,085 rivers which flow through 51,000 kilometers in the region (Altai Krai contains about 70% of all pesticides in the priority regions), (2) completion of Phases I and II in the Republic of Sakha, (3) cost estimations for remaining regions especially Krasnoyarsk and Murmansk, and (4) two meetings: one in Krasnoyarsk in June to promote activities and another in Barnaul in Sept./Oct. to monitor Altai Krai activities.

The Exit Strategy consists of (1) inventory, repackaging, and safe storage of stock in all 12 priority regions in 2007 (pending funding and support in remaining regions), (2) demonstration of environmentally sound destruction of 100 tons in 2007/2008. Approximately \$200,000 USD has been estimated for technology and construction of a facility for high temperature incineration of 100

tons of obsolete pesticides. Mr. Henttonen stated that there are currently no destruction facilities at all in the RF and it is unreasonable to expect construction of a destruction facility in the next 5 years. Mr. Bill Ernst, representing Canada, suggested that the PSG rework the Exit Strategy because it is not realistic; the timeline doesn't reflect the difficulties inherent in construction of a destruction facility in Russia.

The project in the Republic of Karelia is to collect approximately 12,000 kg of obsolete pesticides in 23 warehouses (quantities according to the latest data), package, and transport them across the border to Finland for final destruction at the Ekokem facility with high temperature incineration. The stock of obsolete pesticide in Karelia has been identified by NEFCO as one of the Barents region environmental "Hot Spots" and is now included in the ACAP project. Preliminary agreement on details and financing has been reached as a result of two meetings since the last SCM between the Karelian Ministry of Agriculture, Rostekhnadzor, the Finnish Ministry of Environment, the Finnish Environment Institute, and Ekokem.

The costs for ecologically safe destruction at Ekokem are approximately \$1,500 USD per ton; in contrast with a minimum of \$3,000 USD per ton to transport and place in temporary storage in the RF. October 2006 is the anticipated completion date for this project. The outcome of this project will inform the possibilities regarding export.

The ACAP Chair initiated discussion on the viability and implications of destroying stocks in Finland which would result in cost savings, short turn around, and final destruction by shipping obsolete pesticides from NW Russia across the border to Finland. He stressed the fact that the good work of the PSG was undermined by the inability of Rostekhnadzor to maintain control throughout the process. Mr. Jaako Henttonen restated the need to follow regulations of the RF, although Finland does offer them the option for destruction. Denmark and Norway both expressed deep regret over the shipment to Krasny-Bor because it was not in adherence to clearly stated agreements that all pesticides were to be handled in accordance with international standards and added that this could jeopardize the future of the project. Mr. Husamuddin Ahmadzai, of NEFCO, pointed out that while the offer to destroy certain hazardous substances elsewhere is attractive, it is nonetheless the responsibility of Russia to take care of their own wastes within their borders. There is a global overcapacity of destruction facilities underscoring the need to address cost effective measures in Russia.

Mr. Bill Ernst, of Canada, inquired as to the financial status which they believe may be diminishing and near zero. He further stated that if ACAP does consider exporting pesticides out of Russia, they should prioritize them and address the highly chlorinated substances first. NEFCO agreed with the need to target high risk chemicals and added the importance prioritizing mercury based pesticides. Finland stated that Ekokem cannot handle pesticides containing mercury.

Mr. Morten Olsen, representing Denmark, reported that they have visited Krasny-Bor and they believe that ALL 57 tons of pesticides shipped from Arkhangelsk were transported there which is very disturbing. The Krasny-Bor landfill is not ecologically sound, it has been purported to be under reconstruction as well as the location of a recent fire. Mr. Olsen strongly stated the need to address the ultimate disposition of these pesticides after they are collected, packaged, and stored. He added that it is ultimately up to the donor countries to determine whether storage facilities are safe.

The ACAP Chair requested the PSG to make a final determination as to whether ALL of the inventory has been shipped from Arkhangelsk or not and provide guidance as to the next steps so he can give a clear explanation and recommendations to the SAOs.

Mr. Aleksandrovskiy, of Russia, said that to improve coordination between various bodies in Russia, it would be valuable to involve representatives from the Minsel'hoz, MNR, Rostekhnadzor, Roshydromet and all regions who participate in the ACAP projects to the ACAP Chair's meeting the next week with the SAO Chair, Ambassador Vitaly Churkin, and the Russian SAO, Mr. Sergeyi

Krutikov.

Action items:

Project Steering Group will submit an accurate accounting of the exact quantities and current location of obsolete pesticide stocks shipped from and remaining in Arkhangelsk prior to 25 – 26 April SAO Meeting in Syktyvkar.

Project Steering Group will submit recommendations for next steps prior to 25 – 26 April SAO Meeting in Syktyvkar.

Project Steering Group will revise the timeline to reflect more reasonable expectations for siting and construction of a demonstration destruction facility.

Rostekhnadzor will provide explanation of their oversight of the transport and control over final destination of obsolete pesticides to storage facilities.

Ms. Mikala Klint, representing the Danish EPA, then reported on a bilateral obsolete pesticides project in NW Russia between Denmark and Russia. This project was initiated in 2004 in the Vologda and Pskov Oblasts and attempts to build synergy with ACAP project. To date they have removed 180 and 500 tons of obsolete pesticides in Vologda and Pskov, respectively, in accordance with 1996 FAO-UNEP-WHO guidelines. Though this project is designed to improve storage of obsolete pesticides, Ms. Klint acknowledges that it would be more desirable to destroy them. A film to document the project has been completed and a final meeting is scheduled to be held in Vologda in May or June 2006.

As was the case with the ACAP project, more inventory was discovered than estimated. The action plan and economic models are 90% complete. Between 200 and 400 tons of obsolete pesticides remain in Pskov to be repackaged and transferred to storage. Ms. Klint showed photos of the interiors of storage facilities Pskov I and II depicting clear and visible labeling, careful stacking of pallets designed to optimally distribute weight, and drive space along the length of the corridors. It was unfortunate that one of the two warehouses in Pskov (Pskov II) constructed to safely house hazardous waste caught fire on 25 December 2005. The authorities did not have personal protective gear on hand, despite the fact that it had been provided to all workers, nor were they conducting daily inspections as agreed. No action to assess consequences has transpired as of this date; the local authorities felt it best to close all doors and windows of the facility to limit oxygen and thereby extinguish the fire. NEFCO and Canada inquired about the anticipated remediation costs and responsible party. Russia asked about insurance coverage. Denmark indicated that it the city of Pskov owns the facility, therefore they are responsible and there exists a letter from the territorial authorities to Rostekhnadzor which documents that they have received funds. UNDP would like to see lessons learned to avoid this in future UNDP, UNEP, and UNIDO projects. The Chair pointed out that these pesticides which burned were packaged in polyethylene containers which may not have held up well in the fire. Anywhere between 3 and 6 tons of mercury may have been released as a result.

Ms. Klint also added that 22 tons of obsolete pesticides have been reported in the Leningrad Oblast. Because of the proximity to Krasny-Bor and tendency to ship to this unsafe landfill, Denmark is not willing to expand their involvement.

Action item:

Denmark will provide summary of lessons learned to avert disasters and/or accidental situations at

project sites.

Progress reports from the Obsolete Pesticides PSG, the Karelia Project, and the Danish Bi-lateral Project in Pskov and Vologda are provided in Appendices, F-1, F-2, and F-3, respectively.

Brominated Flame Retardants (Gunnar Futsjeter)

Mr. Gunnar Futsjeter, of Norway, reported that the goal of the BFR PSG is to identify sources and releases of BFRs as well as alternatives to them. There is a lot of uncertainty about transport across countries and about how much of these chemicals are contained in products. AMAP will soon release the latest information published on BFRs and this contribution should be sufficient to finalize Phase I. A detailed BFR Fact Sheet has been developed by AMAP and ACAP and has been posted to both websites.

Phase II will include an evaluation of the alternatives, management practices, and reduction strategies, a budget for which will be developed by the next SCM in September 2006. The ACAP Chair stated that Iceland had not contributed information and inquired as to whether it would be forthcoming. Ms. Israelson, of Iceland, replied affirmatively. It was also noted that Finland cannot release data due to confidentiality concerns. A request from the ACAP Steering Committee might assist. This may also be a problem in the U.S. The Chair inquired as to whether the PSG will have sufficient information to make recommendations prior to the next SCM for the SC to bring forward to the SAOs prior to the Ministerial in October.

A progress report from the BFR PSG is provided in Appendix G.

PCB & Pesticide Projects in Indigenous Communities

Mr. Pavel Suliandziga, of RAIPON, expressed appreciation for the work of ACAP member states and Gwich'in Council International. He reiterated the importance of sustained cooperation in the ever-changing political environment of the Russian Federation.

Mr. Bryan Neubert, representing Gwich'in Council International (GCI), presented the latest facts of their pilot project to remove PCB-containing transformers from remote villages in Alaska. An inventory was conducted in three Alaska Native villages which yielded a total of five transformers in the communities visited. Samples of oil were collected and analyzed. All transformers tested under 50 ppm PCBs, two of which were under 2ppm. Plans are underway to package and transport them out of the villages for disposal in accordance with USEPA regulations during the spring/summer of 2006. There are reports of at least another 15 transformers in other villages. GCI is interested in hearing from other countries with similar transportation challenges in remote communities and solutions they've employed.

Status of Fact Sheets

The most current fact sheets on Mercury and BFRs were distributed earlier during the PSG reports. The Dioxin/Furan fact sheet will be revised after Phase II is underway as it will be needed for training purposes. The Chair asked if it will be ready before the Ministerial meeting in October. Ms. Israelson, of Sweden, Chair of the D/F PSG, will check with the steering group. Mr. Timo Sepaala, of Finland, Chair of the Obsolete Pesticide PSG, reported that OP fact sheet is available as draft.

The PSG leads requested clarification of target audience for fact sheets as they now relate to general dangers associated with the pollutants and ACAP projects. The Chair stated that oftentimes the fact sheets are reviewed by the SAOs and Ministers who likely don't have time to review reports and should therefore reflect the positive environmental results of ACAP. Norway added that they have received reports that the mercury fact sheet has been found very useful in the international arena.

The Steering Committee concurred with the Chair's suggestion to develop a fact sheet for the Indigenous Peoples Community Action Initiative. The Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat will draft one for submittal to the Steering Committee.

Action item:

IPS will prepare a fact sheet for review by Steering Committee.

4. New Cooperative Project Proposals

a. Proposed Indigenous Peoples Community Action Initiative

Discussion was taken up regarding the proposal to create an Indigenous Peoples Community Action Initiative; a paper outlining this initiative was distributed to the SC. RAIPON reported that they would be partnering with the Petersburg Institute of Occupational Health. All Permanent Participants of the Arctic Council are purported to be supportive of the initiative. It is planned to go before the IPS Board for approval prior to the next SAO meeting. It was mentioned that the Permanent Participants to the AC are responsible for, and frequently called upon, to explain the benefits of ACAP projects to the Indigenous Peoples. Ms. Ella Barnes, of the U.S., and Mr. Bryan Neubert, representing Gwich'in Council International, gave examples of specific activities that have improved the situation in Indigenous communities.

Mr. Bill Ernst, of Canada, sought clarification as to whether the proposed initiative would involve financial support for participation in projects or for attending meetings. He further stated that Canada is supportive of the initiative and is seeking funding though they do not have any now. Mr. Esko Sepaala, of Finland, stated their understanding for the need for the coordination group and questioned whether Russia will be a member since projects are in Russia. Mr. Gunnar Futsjeter, representing Norway, agreed with the need for such an initiative but hopes that it doesn't call for additional meetings. He recommended that meetings of the coordination group be held immediately before or after the ACAP SCMs. It is their hope that the countries represented on the coordination group will be left open for voluntary members and donors. Ms. Barnes reported that the U.S. supports the initiative and is willing to serve on the coordinating committee. The Chair asked Russia about their participation; RAIPON will participate on the coordination committee. Mr. Aleksandrovskiy said that the Russian Federation is supportive of the initiative but is not aware whether the Ministry of Natural Resources or Rostekhnadzor will participate. He requested that the proposal be forwarded to both authorities with specific proposals for Russian participation. Denmark, Sweden, and Iceland also added their support for the initiative. The SC requested the Chair to revise the proposal as submitted by removal of the word "draft" and the question/answer section and then circulate to the group and submit it to the SAOs.

b. Franz Josef Land (Mr. Yury Sychev, AMAP)

Mr. Yury Sychev, of AMAP, presented a proposal to conduct a demonstration project to address contamination left behind from former military operations on Franz Josef Land's main priority areas of Graham Bell Island, Gofman Island, Heiss Island, and Alexandra Land.

A 2004 survey by AMAP yielded base information describing the general scope of contaminants and their state of containment on FJLs. Pollutants on Graham Bell Island are concentrated in five stations on the Kholmisty Peninsula and include approximately 18,000 tons of oil (waste and other) products contained in nearly 90,000 drums in addition to over 2,000 tons of aviation fuel in tanks at the airbase. Due to the discovery of PCBs in soil in excess of Arctic Council standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive survey of high PCB areas be conducted and project proposals be developed to address surface clean-up and rehabilitation of the areas with the highest

concentrations.

Over 20,000 tons of oil products on Gofman Island are located in about 100,000 drums which are partially frozen in the ice and are also anticipated to contain PCBs. Several thousand tons of oil products and waste have also been left behind on Alexandra Land.

Mr. Sychev presented a three phase project which included a multi-faceted approach. The first phase would consist of comprehensive surveys of storage facilities, drums, and other containers, analyses of chemical content (including POPs concentrations), and development of a phased project for storage facility decommissioning and disposal and rehabilitation of contaminated soils at two model areas on Graham Bell and Gofman Islands. In the second phase, implementation of the phased project would commence followed by a pilot project in the third phase which would include removal of several storage facilities on Graham Bell, Gofman, and Alexandra islands and remediation of adjacent lands. In addition to the removal of potentially hazardous substances from FJLs, this project would help define methods of rehabilitation of abandoned settlements and facilities on remote arctic islands.

This proposal was presented to the State Duma in January 2006 at which a decision was made to seek involvement and funding from the BEAC, the Arctic Council, AMEC, and UNEP/GEF NAP "Arctic" because of the scale and expense of a project of this magnitude. They would like to begin the first phase this year.

The specific elements which Mr. Sychev submitted to ACAP involved analysis and disposal of oil from 500 drums on Heiss or Alexandra Land Islands, cleaning of polluted territory, and inventory (survey and sampling) of pollution sources on Graham Bell Island, and development of a staged technical project for removal and remediation on one of the FJL Islands.

Discussion followed in which NEFCO pointed out that since this is a priority BEAC project, there should be an expedition this September in order to make a more concrete project proposal. Mr. Futsæter, of Norway, highlighted the enormity of the fuel oil that may be able to be utilized and would like to see that reflected in the proposal. He mentioned the National Programme of the Arctic (NPA) may be a viable source of funding and further stated that if a proposal is to go before the SAOs, it must first go to the country experts in the Arctic Council Working Groups. Finland stated that it would be hard for the Finnish government to support because the liability for environmental damage dates back to the Soviet military. Denmark suggested that the Russian Federation should consider taking out loans to address the problem and questioned the rationale behind starting any new projects in Russia given the lack of support and financing from the RF standing in the way of progress of existing projects. Canada stated that the Arctic Council may have provided earlier direction not to address contaminated sites. The Chair responded that this was specific to a PCB project. Russia reminded the SC that FJL is a "Hot Spot" with the potential to affect the entire circumpolar region. The Ministry of Natural Resources does take responsibility for the 40,000 hectares of the special natural protected area (Federal Reserve) located on the FJL, but hopes they can attract funding from PSI and other sources. The Chair pointed out that there is already an initial survey on FJL and now needs to ascertain what AMAP is asking of ACAP at this time. Mr. Sychev indicated that a proposal is ready and will circulate it electronically to the SC.

c. Cooperative Development of an Integrated Hazardous Waste Management Plan in the Russian Federation

This agenda topic was tabled until the next SCM.

d. Electronic Waste – Preproposal Discussion

Jacqueline Poston, ACAP Secretariat, presented an overview of contaminant issues associated with electronic waste (E-Waste). E-Waste is rapidly becoming an increasing problem globally and this discussion was intended for the Steering Committee to consider whether or not the

Arctic Nations have adequate measures in place to avert future contamination and, if not, whether or not ACAP is interested in addressing E-Waste in some fashion.

Various electronic devices have been shown to contain contaminants which can include lead, mercury, BFRs, cadmium, and PVC. Insufficient oversight and regulation has been documented which has led to potential release of these contaminants upon disposal. Statistics show that approximately 2.5 million tons of E-Waste is discarded annually in the U.S. and is on the rise. "Discarded" units include those which may be stored, reused, refurbished & resold, or disposed in landfills or incinerators.

Global challenges with E-Waste are prevalent in rural and urban communities including those in the circumpolar north. Issues can range from transportation challenges, to disposal in inadequate landfills, inconsistent regulations and voluntary programs, "sham" recycling, toxic by-products from incineration, and changes in design, materials, and upgradeability of emerging products. There is a shortage of reliable information as to the quantities of E-Waste that end up stored, reused, recycled, refurbished, incinerated, landfilled, or otherwise disposed of. On the up-side, changes in design are likely to reduce the number of units discarded as smaller, multi-function devices are replacing larger, single-purpose products. Accordingly, as flat panels replace CRT monitors, there should be a reduction in leaded glass, reducing the influx of leaded glass to the waste and/or recycle streams. Each of the Arctic Nations agreed to provide an overview of the estimated quantities generated along with relevant regulations and/or management strategies in place to responsibly address E-Waste. This information will serve as a precursor to continuing discussion of possible measures for ACAP consideration by the SC.

Action Item:

Each country will submit information on quantities of E-Waste generated along with regulations and/or management strategies to responsibly address E-Waste.

5. Cooperation with International Fora and Organizations

a. ACAP presentation at 5th Session of UN Permanent Forum of Indigenous Peoples, May 2006 New York

The ACAP Chair will present an overview of ACAP at the 5th Session of the UN Permanent Forum of Indigenous Peoples, May 2006, in New York. The Arctic Council was hailed as a model partnership between Indigenous Peoples and States at the Johannesburg Summit which the United Nations Permanent Forum is now fashioned after.

b. Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM) Arctic Cooperation Programme 2006 – 2008

Ms. Danfrþur Skarphþinsdyttir, of Iceland, gave a brief overview of the Nordic Council of Ministers Arctic Programme which may be a viable source of funding for ACAP-type projects, \$11M DKK is available annually for cross-sector work. Ms. Skarphþinsdyttir followed up with an email which provided email links to webpages with more detailed information on the available programs. There is a special accord for funding projects in Russia which requires that at least three Nordic countries must be involved and the project must be of added value to Nordic countries. It was pointed out that an eligible project proponent can apply to both the arctic program and the environmental sector which is what AMAP has done through the years. It is common for projects to receive funding from both programs. Mr. Dyer stated that the Arctic Environmental Strategy is neatly tailored to ACAP work and that ACAP proposals should go through the environmental sector and then to the Arctic Programme. Denmark concurred that pursuing this funding is a wise idea after first establishing is a good project.

c. UNDP Activities Relevant to the Arctic

Mr. Jacques Van Engel, representing the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), reported on the UNDP/GEF (Global Environment Facility) for POPs and the eligibility criteria for

mobilizing these funds for POPs projects in Russia. Two critical steps necessary for eligibility are (1) ratification of the Stockholm Convention and (2) development of a National Implementation Plan (NIP).

Mr. Van Engel explained that Russia can obtain assistance in developing their National Implementation Plan (NIP) on Stockholm Convention from UNDP/GEF once they receive government endorsement. Mr. Alexandrovskiy, representing Russia, said that very serious difficulties have presently arisen with regard to the Russian share (70,000 USED) of co-financing the GAFF PDF-B project on the development of the NIP on Stockholm Convention. It was supposed that the above contribution will be made as usually "in-kind." However, the Russian National GEF Focal Point, Deputy Minister of Natural Resources Mr. Valentin G. Stepankov has refused to applied in-kind contribution mechanism for the Russian co-financing which had been successfully used for the GEF's project in Russia for many years. From his point of view even in-kind contributions of the Russian Side must be calculated as debits from the state budget and in this connection the above money must be envisaged in the state budget either at the federal or regional (local) levels. Deputy Minister Stepankov said that he will sign the application on the mentioned-above GEF project only when the money required is found. Finally Mr. Aleksandrovskiy noted that all the above difficulties are seriously delayed the project preparation and implementation.

Absent ratification and a NIP, however, Mr. Van Engel said it is still possible to submit projects for conditional approval in view of the size of the problem, if interest is expressed by the government, supported by stakeholders, and some seed funding is obtained. UNDP/GEF simply needs Russia to submit a letter of interest to begin working with them. It has been requested previously but never received. Since GEF 4 is still not finalized it is suggested that Russia act swiftly. Progress may be imminent in light of subsequent meetings between the ACAP Chair and appropriate representatives of the Russian Federation and the upcoming SAO meeting.

Projects may address PCBs, pesticides, Indigenous Peoples, and "Hot Spots" such as Franz Josef Land. The approval process for projects costing \$1M USD and greater is more rigorous and takes much longer than smaller projects. NEFCO pointed out, and the U.S. agreed, that the lack of destruction facilities and overcapacity of existing facilities should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Van Engel also mentioned is the mandate of the UNDP to work with Indigenous People in countries in Economic Transition (CIET). Indigenous Peoples residing in countries who have not ratified the Stockholm Convention are not eligible for assistance.

6. Status of Maternal Cord Blood Monitoring

Dr. Jim Berner, representing the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium (ANTHC) and the Aleut International Association (AIA), presented the latest results from the study entitled "Human Tissue Levels of POPs and Heavy Metals in Indigenous residents of the Aleutian Islands and the Bering Strait: Implications for Canada, Greenland, and the Russian and European Arctic." ANTHC and AIA partnered with the Aleutian/Pribilof Islands Association (A/PIA) to conduct this study to determine the role of the North Pacific/Bering Sea in contaminants burdens and levels of contaminants in subsistence dependent Indigenous residents. Coordination with Valery Chachsin, of the Northwest Public Health Research Center in St. Petersburg, Russia, was an important element of the study.

Relying on current flow and contaminant data from AMAP and ACIA, it was shown that contaminants are introduced to Alaska and the Canadian and Russian Arctic primarily via the Bering Strait which carries a volume equivalent to eight times the cumulative volume of all rivers flowing into the Arctic Ocean. Asian outflow carrying industrial and agricultural contaminants to the Japanese current, itself emptying into the Bering Sea, adds to the contaminant load which eventually leads to the Arctic Ocean. The West Spitzbergen current is the most voluminous source of water and an important contaminant source carrying the highest load of HCH in to the Arctic Ocean. Dr.

Berner demonstrated that these flow patterns first bring contaminants through the Bering Strait to Alaskans then northern Canada and Russia as they continue the course of the ocean surface trajectories.

Levels of mercury, DDE, PCBs, Toxaphene, and PBDEs were analyzed in tissue of women of child-bearing age residing in the U.S. Aleutian Islands and Bering Sea regions and in the Russian Commander Islands and Chukotka. Observations included highest levels of mercury in Russian Bering Sea women followed by cohorts in the U.S. Bering Sea study area. DDE, a breakdown product of DDT, was highest in Aleut women in the U.S. It was concluded that abandoned coastal and island sites may pose localized contaminant threats to water passing through the Bering Sea due to elevated levels of low-congener PCBs found in women residing in Chukotka. Since these congeners with low numbers of chlorine atoms are easily broken down by humans but not fish, this data suggests a fresh source which may be an abandoned ship and/or radar station, both examples of potential sources of local contaminants.

Because subsistence fish and animals in the Bering Strait region take up and transfer a very significant quantity of contaminants to the indigenous residents of the region, the Indigenous women in the region are among the most highly exposed to PCB, mercury, toxaphene and PBDEs. It was also asserted that the levels of toxaphene and PBDEs are rising, reflecting water content, and Bering Sea inflow will distribute these POPs to the rest of the Arctic, affecting the Canadian Arctic first, then the Russian and European Arctic. Dr. Berner concluded his presentation by suggesting that Bering Sea Indigenous people are good candidates to collect data to support new international efforts to reduce/eliminate release of “new” POPs, and Asian mercury.

The ACAP Chair underscored the importance of pollutant sources other than Russia such as those introduced from China, Japan, and other regions in the Far East. This should be a factor when considering support for the Indigenous Peoples Community Action Initiative. Additionally, the correlation of elevated contaminant levels in humans to local sources demonstrates a short and clear link between some sources and reduction of risk. The Chair suggested that RAIPON pursue support to address and remedy these point sources.

Canada asked for source of increasing toxaphene trend data and an explanation on the marine pathway compared to the atmospheric. Mr. Bill Ernst said that Canada has a lot of data on toxaphene. Dr. Berner responded that he did not locate any airborne trend data and that toxaphene is easily absorbed and carried in waterways. He examined 30 years of tissue data and detected a difference in the slope between toxaphene and PBDE. Finland is also interested in the pathways via water and would like to know more about the relationship between toxaphene in air and water. Finland also mentioned that WHO recently published data on PBDEs in maternal milk from four countries indicating that U.S. levels were up to 250 times higher than elsewhere showing regular exposure. Following Dr. Berner’s statement that ACAP should be more actively involved, he was asked for more specifics on what he thought ACAP should do. It was reported that the Secretariat for the Stockholm Convention published a paper just the week prior documenting existing human health monitoring data studies.

It was suggested by Denmark that AMAP human health working group synthesize this study with others to determine role and appropriate actions for ACAP follow up.

7. Information on Status of Stockholm Convention including new chemicals under review, UNEP Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), and Convention on LRTAP Mr. Kaj Madsen, representing the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), presented information on the Stockholm Convention beginning with a map displaying the current ratification status of the Convention by country. Five new chemicals which have fulfilled the screening criteria (as specified in Annex D) and are under consideration for inclusion are pentabromodiphenyl ether - PBDE (proposed by Norway), chlordecone (EU), hexabromobiphenyl – HBB (EU), Lindane,

(Mexico), and perfluorooctane sulfonate – PFOS, (Sweden). The POPs review committee (POPRC) will meet 1- 5 May, 2006. Draft risk profiles are under preparation, review, and redraft for release in several languages on 25 September 2006 by the Secretariat prior to the POPRC-2 meeting 6 – 10 November 2006. If in agreement, another risk management profile will be established. Parties to the Conference may decide whether or not to include the new chemicals. Four of the eight Arctic countries have ratified all of eight protocols of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP).

The overall objective of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) is to achieve sound management of chemicals so that, by 2020, chemicals are used and produced in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the environment. SAICM was adopted at the International Conference on Chemical Management in Dubai 6 – 8 February 2006 and subsequently endorsed by the Governing Council of UNEP at the 9th special session in Dubai 9 – 11 February 2006. SAICM is voluntary and not legally binding; it operates with complete transparency. Strategies may include enhanced governance and capacity building in developing countries (countries with economies in transition).

A “Quick Start Programme” was established to ensure short term success. Russia is eligible to apply for funding. SAICM provides for a multisectoral approach (worker protection, agricultural, industry, etc.) with broad stakeholder participation (Indigenous Peoples, industry, government, etc.). The plan for the Quick Start Programme is to fund \$3 – 5 M USD per year for about five years before it terminates.

Since governance across international borders is uneven, it is important that countries involved in SAICM apply conventions/agreements when collaborating. Coordination of implementation and evaluation of progress will commence in 2009, 2012, and 2015 at the International Conference of Chemicals Management (ICCM) meetings. The SAICM Global Plan of Action describes the priorities and provides a summary of the 36 work areas and 273 associated activities. A comprehensive list of actors, targets, timeframes, indicators of progress, and implementation aspects will be completed in conjunction with the next ICCM. UNEP’s implementation activities include establishment of a Secretariat; functions of the Secretariat include organization of interim Regional meetings initiation of the Quick Start Programme. UNEP anticipates close coordination with other UN programmes.

Mr. Madsen stated that he would like to invite discussion as to how ACAP & SAICM can work together in future to achieve common goals. Mr. Aleksandrovskiy stated that UNEP is very important for Russian issues. They concurred that it would be fruitful to further discuss the UNEP Global Program of Action (GPA) related to Russian needs and to develop proposals for consideration.

Status of Project Support Instrument (PSI) and Guidelines

Mr. Husamuddin Ahmadzi, representing the Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO), provided an update on the status of the Project Support Instrument (PSI), a funding vehicle for ACAP projects and initiatives approved by the Ministers, the SAOs, and the ACAP process. The PSI was established at the behest of the 2004 Ministerial meeting of the Arctic Council at which the SAO’s requested NEFCO and ACAP to collaborate with each other in drafting guidelines and in development of a pilot phase. The SAOs established a three year pilot phase and approved the

guidelines in Yakutsk in April 2005. NEFCO was then appointed fund manager and is now in process of raising a modest “ million target while seeking opportunities to leverage their resources.

NEFCO administers a variety of funds which include the NEFCO 投资发展基金

Investment fund, the Nordic Environment Development Fund, the Test Ground Facility, the Cleaner

Production Revolving Facility. Additional external funds administered by NEFCO include the PSI, the Barents Hot Spots Facility, the Sillamde Trust Fund, Nuclear Environment Programme in the RF; NPA-Arctic, and the Bilateral Trust Funds. To date, Iceland, and the Saami Council have contributed 85,000 Euros to the PSI; Norway has pledged an additional 50,000 which they are prepared to submit. Russia indicated that they plan to contribute shortly after the April 2006 SAO meeting. Key stakeholders defined by the PSI include project owners, contributors, and the fund manager. The “PSI Committee” will be comprised of the assembly of contributors. The fund manager may make recommendations but final decisions rest with the “PSI Committee.”

NEFCO is receptive to funding projects in Russia provided that member states that confirm positive Russian participation. NEFCO has contacted the Russian Ministry for a list of potential projects but has not yet received a response.

One of NEFCO’s goals is environmental sustainability, which is one of the eight Millennium Development Goals. NEFCO is project-oriented and concerned with a range of issues, some of which are related to climate change, ozone depletion, heavy metals, POPs and other persistent toxic substances. NEFCO’s focus in the Arctic is on industrial activity associated with resource development. Mr. Ahmadzi presented an overview of industrial activity in the Arctic, connections to regional and global sources, CO2 emissions and impacts, effects of climate change on Arctic Ocean Ice, shipping and transportation, polar ozone depletion, and pathways of contaminant entry into the Arctic.

ACAP-BEAC/WGE Cooperation to Address “Hot Spots” in the Russian Federation

a. BEAC Ministerial Meeting Rovaniemi on 18 – 19 October 2005

b. Barents “Hot Spots” Facility

Although the PSI is still in its inception phase, there is already a Barents Council Hot Spots Facility (BHSF) in place and being administered by NEFCO. A call for expressions of interest yielded 33 proposals from Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, and their partners in the Russian Federation. Three sector studies will be completed in June 2006 and will address (1) the pulp and paper industry, (2) mining, minerals, and the metallurgical industry, and (3) joint implementation. NEFCO and the BHSF are cooperating with the Danish EPA on mercury projects in Murmansk (M-8) and Narjan-Mar (N-4). A parallel project in Narjan-Mar (N-2) to recover mercury from lighting sources is underway and has received full co-financing from the Norwegian Barents’ Secretariat, the town of Narjan-Mar, and the NEFCO revolving Energy Saving Programme.

Work has also been initiated on Terms of Reference (ToR) for listed projects in Karelia, kicking off with a district heating conversion project (K-1). Mr. Ahmadzi also announced another project on Franz Josef Land commencing with an expedition in September 20

06 followed by a project in 2007. In total, 60,000 has been allocated for up to 15 activities in place.

c. Listing and Delisting of

06 followed by a project in 2007. In total, €860,000 has been allocated for up to 15 activities in place.

c. Listing and Delisting of “Hot Spots” from BEAC “Hot Spots” List

Mr. Ahmadzi stated that about 40 – 50 “Hot Spots” may be “delisted” on a case-by-case basis. He said that there are no standard criteria by which to determine “delisting” of “Hot

Spots.” It is the responsibility of the project administrator to submit site-specific justification to support delisting.

10. Revised Guidelines for Developing ACAP Projects

This agenda topic was tabled until the next SCM.

ACAP as permanent Arctic Council Working Group

A draft discussion paper to submit to the SAOs at the upcoming SAO meeting in Syktyvkar in April 2006 to support the recognition of ACAP as a permanent working group was circulated prior to the SC meeting. In this SC review, a number of factors were taken into consideration.

Mr. Olsen, of Denmark, raised points which stimulated discussion on issues regarding the timing, Russian commitment and participation, potential redundancy, wording of the ACAP mandate, and ACAP funding. Mr. Sepaala, of Finland, inquired about funding requirements for permanent working groups. Norway, Iceland, and Canada all agreed that issues raised by Denmark were valid and they would need more time to allow SAOs to look at it thoroughly. They felt an important precursor to becoming a permanent working group is increased commitment from Russian Federation and evidence that they have adequately addressed ongoing concerns (see Section 3.A.). The U.S. pointed out that existing working groups do not have dedicated funding, but rely on donations from member countries. Russia asserted strong support for making ACAP a permanent working group.

Mr. Dyer, ACAP Chair, responded to each point as follows. Timing: This paper was prepared in response to a request by the SAOs at the last SAO meeting in Khanty-Mansiysk. Since a decision should be made at the next Ministerial meeting in October 2006, waiting until the fall SAO meeting would not give them sufficient lead time to review, consult, discuss, and reach a decision on the issue. Redundancy: He felt that there was a place of value for ACAP and, in fact that it complements other efforts. Mandate: The Chair did not recollect ever seeing an actual written mandate to ACAP so he utilized language derived from relevant AC declarations and other appropriate sources. Funding: Donor countries have been contributing financial support for projects. It has been advantageous not to attribute funding and thereby, eliminate confusing messages and focus on moving projects forward.

Mr. Dyer noted the SAOs positive outlook on ACAP and directed attention to Section 6.1 from the last SAO meeting in Khanty-Mansiysk in October 2006 which stated, “...Mr. Dyer requested the meeting to consider changing the status of ACAP into a permanent Working group “Arctic Council Action Program”, since its provisional status of “Action Plan” expires at the AC Ministerial meeting in October 2006. The SAOs expressed their positive attitude to changing the status into the permanent WG. High appreciation of ACAP’s work was given by the SAOs and the PPs.” At the conclusion, the country representatives agreed to consult with their SAOs and submit any comments or proposed changes to the Working Group white paper within one week.

12. ACAP Web Page

Arrangements have been made to have Mr. Nigel Allen provide assistance with the ACAP website. The ACAP Secretariat, Ms. Jackie Poston, has posted some pertinent documents to the site and will review the website for any additional materials that should be added or updated.

13. Draft Report for Senior Arctic Officials (SAOs) Meeting, Syktyvkar, April 2006

Other Business – Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting will be held in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, 12 – 13 September

2006. The SC requested an annotated agenda one month prior to subsequent meetings with indications as to whether topics are up for discussion or decision. The SC also agreed that it is critical to have the appropriate representative from the Russian Federation and Rostechnadzor in attendance. Everyone will submit position points to Chair in due time prior to the meeting and all items requiring decision should be submitted one month in advance and posted to the website. Norway suggested the SC consider templates for PSG reports. Finally, it was unanimously agreed NOT to provide books for SC members; rather each member will print the documents from their home office in advance.

APPENDIX A: List of Participants

Canada
Bill Ernst
Head, Air and Toxics Issues Section
Environment Canada
Email:
HYPERLINK "mailto:bill.Ernst@ec.gc.ca"
bill.Ernst@ec.gc.ca
Tel: 902-426-5048
Fax: 902-426-8373

Denmark
Morten Skovgerd Olsen
Skovgerd
Chief Programme Coordinator
Danish EPA
Email:
HYPERLINK "mailto:mso@mst.dk"
mso@mst.dk
Tel: 45 32 66 0245
Fax: 45 32 66 0131

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

Mikaela Engell
Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
HYPERLINK "mailto:mikeng@um.dk"
mikeng@um.dk
Rikke Holmberg
Pesticides Division
Danish Environmental Protection Agency
Strandgade 29
DK-1401 København K
Tel: (+45) 32 66 01 00

Tel: (+45) 32 66 04 14 (direct)
Fax: (+45) 32 66 04 79
HYPERLINK "mailto:rdh@mst.dk"
rdh@mst.dk
Finland
Esko Seppälä
Senior Advisor
Ministry of the Environment
Email:
HYPERLINK "mailto:esko.seppala@ymparisto.fi"
esko.seppala@ymparisto.fi
Tel: +358 9 160 39505
Fax: +358 9 1603 9515

Timo Seppälä
Ylitarkastaja / Senior adviser
SYKE / Finnish Environment Institute
KEM /Chemicals division

Mechelininkatu 34a, P.O.box 140
FIN-00251 Helsinki, Finland
Mob + 358 400 148 643
Tel + 358 204 902 544
Fax + 358 940 300 591
Timo.Seppala@ymparisto.fi
Senior Advisor
Finnish Environment Institute
Tel: +358 9 4030 0544
Fax: +358 9 4030 0591

Henttonen Jaakko
Consul, Adviser on Environmental Affairs
Consulate General of Finland, Preobrazhenskaya Ploschad, 4, St Petersburg 191028, Russia
Tel: +7-812-3317600
Email:
HYPERLINK "mailto:Jaakko.Henttonen@formin.fi"
Jaakko.Henttonen@formin.fi
Iceland

Danfrídur Skarphédinsdóttir
Expert
Ministry for the Environment
Office of Sustainable Development and
International Affairs
Skuggasund 1, 150 Reykjavík, Iceland
Sími 545-8600,
Email:
HYPERLINK "mailto:danfridur.k.skarphedinsdottir@umh.stjr.is"

danfridur.k.skarphedinsdottir@umh.stjr.is
Tel: +354-545-8600
Fax +354-562-4566
www.raduneyti.is /
HYPERLINK "http://www.government.is"
www.government.is

Norway
Gunnar Futsater
Senior Advisor
Norwegian Pollution Control Authority
Email:
HYPERLINK "mailto:gunnar.futsater@sft.no"
gunnar.futsater@sft.no
Phone: +47-22 57 34 49
Fax: +47-22 67 67 06

Russia
Yury Aleksandrovskiy
Director of Division
Ministry of Natural Resources
Email:
HYPERLINK "mailto:yualex@mnr.gov.ru"
yualex@mnr.gov.ru
Tel: 7 095 254 56 61
Fax: 7 095 254 43 10
7 095 254 82 83

Alexander Tsygankov,
Jan Tsygankov
Russian Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Center, Moscow
Email:
HYPERLINK "mailto:edcentcp@deol.ru"
edcentcp@deol.ru
Tel: 7 095 363-3570
Fax: 7 095 7874 270

Yan Tsygankov
Russian Norwegian Cleaner Production Center, Moscow
Email:
HYPERLINK "mailto:edcentcp@deol.ru"
edcentcp@deol.ru
Tel: 7 095 363-3570
Fax: 7 095 741-4811

Sweden
Ann-Sofi Israelson
Senior Advisor
Swedish EPA

Email:

HYPERLINK "mailto:Ann-Sofi.Israelson@naturvardsverket.se"

Ann-Sofi.Israelson@naturvardsverket.se

Tel: 46 8 698 1270

Fax: 46 8 698 1504

USA

Bob Dyer

ACAP Chair, US EPA

Email:

HYPERLINK "mailto:dyer.bob@epa.gov"

dyer.bob@epa.gov

Tel: 202-564-6113

Fax: 202-565-2411

Jacqueline (Jackie) Poston

Secretariat, US EPA

Email:

HYPERLINK "mailto:poston.jacqueline@epa.gov"

poston.jacqueline@epa.gov

Tel: 907-271-3541

Fax: 907-271-3424

Eleonora Barnes

Project Manager, US EPA

Email:

HYPERLINK "mailto:barnes.eleonora@epa.gov"

barnes.eleonora@epa.gov

Tel: 202-564-6473

Fax: 202-565-2411

PERMANENT PARTICIPANTS

Indigenous Peoples Secretariat (IPS)

Rune Fjellheim

Executive Secretary

Strandgade 91, 4th floor

P.O. Box 2151

1016 Copenhagen K

Denmark

Phone +45 32833794

E-mail:

HYPERLINK "mailto:rf@ghsdk.dk"

rf@ghsdk.dk

Alona Yefimenko

Technical Advisor

Email:

[HYPERLINK "mailto:ay@ghsdk.dk"](mailto:ay@ghsdk.dk)

ay@ghsdk.dk

Tel: (45) 3283 3796

RAIPON

Larissa Abrutina

RAIPON Executive Council

Email:

[HYPERLINK "mailto:abryt@mars.rags.ru"](mailto:abryt@mars.rags.ru)

abryt@mars.rags.ru

[HYPERLINK "mailto:raipon@raipon.org"](mailto:raipon@raipon.org)

raipon@raipon.org

[HYPERLINK "mailto:ritc@mail.ru"](mailto:ritc@mail.ru)

ritc@mail.ru

Tel: 7 095 780 87 27

Fax: 7 095 780 87 97

Gwich'in Council International

Bryan Neubert

Council of Athabascan Tribal Governments

Fort Yukon, Alaska

Email:

[HYPERLINK "mailto:bneubert@catg.org"](mailto:bneubert@catg.org)

bneubert@catg.org

Tel: (907) 662-2667

OBSERVERS

Husamuddin Ahmadzai

Special Advisor

Email:

[HYPERLINK "mailto:husamuddin.ahmadzai@nefco.fi"](mailto:husamuddin.ahmadzai@nefco.fi)

husamuddin.ahmadzai@nefco.fi

Tel: +358-9-180 01

Fax: +358-9-63 09 76

AMAP

Yury Sychev

Executive Director

Polar Foundation

Email:

[HYPERLINK "mailto:sychev@polarf.ru"](mailto:sychev@polarf.ru)

sychev@polarf.ru

Tel: 7 (095) 292 7143

Fax: (095) 292 7650

Alaska Native Medical Center

Jim Berner

Alaska Native Medical Center

Email:

HYPERLINK "mailto:jberner@anmc.org"
jberner@anmc.org
Tel: 907-729-3640

US Embassy

Lori Peterson Dando
Nordic/Baltic Regional Office of Environment, Science, Technology, & Health
U.S. Embassy
Copenhagen, Denmark

Email:
HYPERLINK "mailto:DandoLP@state.gov"

DandoLP@state.gov

Tel: 45 3341 7383

Fax: 45 3542 7034

US EPA

Marcia Combes
AK Office Director

USEPA

Email:
HYPERLINK "mailto:poston.jacqueline@epa.gov"

combes.marcia@epa.gov

Tel: 907-271-6555

UNEP

Kaj Juhl Madsen
Senior Programme Manager
UNEP Chemicals
11-13 chemin des Anémones
CH-1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Telephone (41 22) 917 8258
Fax (41 22) 797 3460
Kaj.Madsen@chemicals.unep.ch

APPENDIX B

Agenda: ACAP Steering Committee Meeting
Danish Environmental Protection Agency
Copenhagen, Denmark
29-30 March 2006

*** Day 1 ***

9:00 Registration

9:30 - 9:55 Welcome

Danish SAO (Mikaela Engell)

Chairman and Secretariat Announcements (ACAP, USA)

9:55 - 10:00 Approval of Agenda [1]

Project Progress Reports

10:00 – 10:30 Phase-out of PCBs in the Russian Federation [3]
(AMAP Secretariat, USA, Denmark, NEFCO)

10:30 – 10:50 Reduction of Dioxins/Furans Emissions in the Russian
Federation (Sweden)

10:50-11:20 Coffee Break

11:20 – 11:50 Obsolete Pesticides in the Russian Federation [5] (Finland, Denmark)

11:50 – 12:30 Mercury [6] (Denmark)

12:30 - 1:00 Brominated Flame Retardants [7] (Norway)

1:00 - 2:30 Lunch

2:30 - 3:00 PCB and Pesticides Projects in Indigenous Communities [8] (
US, Russia)

3:00 – 3:15 Status of Fact Sheets (Project Steering Group Chairs)

PCBs, Mercury, Dioxins/Furans, Obsolete Pesticides, BFRs

3:15 – 3:45 Information: Status of Stockholm Convention (including new
chemicals under review), UNEP Strategic Approach to
International Chemicals Management (SAICM), & Long Range Transport
of Air Pollutants (LRTAP) Convention (UNEP)

3:45 – 4:15 ACAP SC Guidance regarding policy issues addressed
by PSGs (Chair)

4:15 – 4:30 Status of Project Support Instrument (NEFCO)

4:30-5:00 Coffee Break
New Cooperative Project Proposals

5:00 – 5:30 Approval of Proposed Indigenous Peoples Community Action Initiative [10]
(GCI, RAIPON)

5:30 – 6:00 Franz Josef Land [11] (AMAP)

6:15 Adjourn for day

7:00 Dinner – Ferry Boat (Hosted by US)

Agenda: ACAP Steering Committee Meeting

Danish Environmental Protection Agency

Copenhagen, Denmark

29-30 March 2006

*** Day 2 ***

9:30 – 9:45 Status of Maternal Cord Blood Monitoring (ANTHC/AIA)

9:45 – 10:00 Review of Potential Measures for Reduction of Releases of
Hazardous Substances [12] (Denmark)

New Cooperative Project Proposals – continued from Day 1

10:00 – 11:00 Cooperative Development of an Integrated Hazardous Waste
Management Plan in the Russian Federation (Denmark)

11:00 – 11:30 Electronic Waste – Pre-proposal discussion [13] (Secretariat)

11:30 – 12:00 Coffee Break

Cooperation with International Fora and Organizations

12:00 – 12:15 ACAP presentation at 5th Session of the UN Permanent Forum of Indigenous Peoples May 2006 UN New York (RAIPON)

12:15 – 12:30 Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM) Arctic Cooperation Programme 2006-08 [14] (Denmark)

12:30 – 12:45 UNDP Activities Relevant to contaminants (UNDP)

12:45 -1:00 ACAP Web Page (Secretariat)

1:00 – 2:00 Lunch

2:00 – 2:30 ACAP-BEAC/WGE Cooperation to Address “Hot Spots” in Russian Federation [15] (BEAC/WGE) the

BEAC Ministerial Meeting Rovaneimi on 18-19 October 2005 (Chair)

Barents “Hot Spots” Facility (NEFCO)

Listing and Delisting “Hot Spots” from BEAC “Hot Spots” List (NEFCO)

2:30 – 3:00 Revised Guidelines for Developing ACAP Projects [16] (Norway)

Links to PSI

Other Items

3:00 – 3:30 ACAP as Permanent Working Group [17] (Discussion paper, Chair)

3:30 - 3:45 Draft Report for Senior Arctic Officials [previous report - 18] (SAOs) Meeting Syktyvkar, 26-27 April 2006

3:45 – 4:00 Next Meeting - Date and Location

4:00 Adjourn Meeting

APPENDIX C: Progress report from the PCB SG
Record of the Steering Group Meeting for the PCB project
Phase III
Moscow January 26, 2006

The NEFCO project has made good progress with the plan to implement the project at the Rostov site. The local administration supports the project. An updated Business Plan (BP) has been prepared and submitted to NEFCO. Some adjustments to address the local scope and infrastructure are needed. Local infrastructure costs are to be covered by the local parties including the Oblast administration. At present there are several parties that are involved in the design of the project. A partnership company is envisaged to be the owner of the facility (project). It is the intention to transport and handle PCB from the North West Region (NWR) as originally planned, but PCB from local and other regions will also be of interest. There has been expressed an interest to use the plant also for pesticides and medical waste. The St. Petersburg area is no longer possible for implementation of this project. Denmark stated that the main focus for the Danish project is still in NWR, but repeated the expressed interest to work together with NEFCO on the implementation of the collection, labeling and transport part of the project. There is sufficient inventory of PCBs in the Rostov Region to support the demonstration project.

The SG requested RF to prepare an overall plan of management of priority persistent organic pollutants identified by the Stockholm Convention.

The Danish-funded project on collection, labeling and transportation reported the lack of progress since the last PCB SG meeting. At the SAO meeting in October it was called for support to assist the implementation in the Leningrad Oblast. Unfortunately, no response has been seen since then. Denmark expressed interest in supporting transportation for a certain amount of transformers to the NEFCO facility whenever ready for receiving PCB waste. This activity will be discussed, as part of the overall PCB collection project, with the Leningrad Oblast (LO) and implementation will depend on their interest. NEFCO appreciated the proposal from DK on supporting pilot transportation from Leningrad region.

The status on the U.S.-lead Project on destruction of the PCB-containing capacitors with the U.S. plasma arc technology was presented. The director for Chimprom has confirmed interest of the facility to continue the implementation of the project. Volgograd Chimprom reiterated that the facility holds all necessary RF licenses and certifications to manage the Class1 hazardous waste. The next step will be to develop a Business Plan. It was decided to allocate \$25,000 (increased from \$12,000) to Volgograd Chimprom and \$5,000 for the Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Center for preparation of Business Plan. Business Plan is expected to be completed by 1 July 2006. An environmental impact assessment is planned to be implemented by a company which will assist Rostekhnadzor in environmental evaluations.

The SG discussed the administrative and financial situation at Chimprom and in Russia related to the implementation of the Stockholm Convention. Concerns were expressed regarding the situation at both levels. The Chair will continue to bring to the attention of the Ministry of Natural Resources the need for nomination of a co-chair.

Norway and Finland informed the Project Steering Group that after discussions regarding the project on PCB remediation at Serpuchov with the Russian counterparts that it was agreed to discontinue this project.

Mikala Klint
Denmark

Markku Kukkamäki
Finland

Bente Sleire
Norway

Ella Barnes
USA

Oxana Tsitser
Russia

Yuri Treger
Russia

Husamuddin Ahmadzai

Lars-Otto Reiersen

APPENDIX D-1: PSG Status Report on Dioxins/Furans

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
Copenhagen, March 2006

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 leader/secretary: Malin Gunnarsson, Swedish EPA

Project initiation and support:

The first Steering Group Meeting was held on 11 – 12 March 2002 in Moscow.
Three Russian Ministries: Ministry of Natural Resources, Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology and Ministry of Health participate in the project
The second meeting was held in February 2003 and a third and fourth in March and December 2004.
A fifth meeting was held in November 2005 in Moscow.
The Steering Group consists of Norway (donor), Russia, Sweden (donor), USA (donor) and AMAP.
Denmark and UNEP Chemicals took part in the initial meetings.

Description of the Project:

The Project consists of three phases, the first phase was completed in August 2005. The second phase is now ongoing. The third phase is planned to start late 2006/early 2007.

Phase I

In the first phase the UNEP Toolkit was translated into Russian, a dioxin/furan fact sheet was produced and data collected. A workshop on sampling and analysis was done. After a dioxin emission inventory a priority list of enterprises was produced. Emission inventory (UNEP Toolkit and a few analyses) was carried out at some 60 enterprises (21 in Arkhangelsk, 19 in Komi and 21 in Murmansk).

Phase II Feasibility Study

In the second phase the goal is to consolidate the results of the PCDD/F release inventory in view of the results from the sampling and analysis project. The project will also 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.

The result will sum up in a written proposal to implement the recommendations from phase II in

Russia, towards compliance with international conventions and sustainable process and chemicals' management. To be implemented in phase III. The work shall be coordinated by CIP, Centre for International Projects.

The selected facilities are:

Murmansk municipal solid waste incineration plant (Murmansk oblast)

Kotlas pulp and paper facility, Koryazhma (Arkhangelsk oblast)

Vorkutinskiy cement plant (Komi republic)

Preliminary Syktyvkar Timber Mill (Komi republic) (only CP training program)

The plan for phase II is outlined in the five following tasks:

Task 1: Determination and assessment of various factors impacting the formation of dioxins/furans at the Murmansk plant on heat treatment of solid wastes and Vorkutinskiy cement plant

Executors: Research Engineering Center "Syntez", Centre for International Projects

Task 2: In-depth study of dioxin emissions through implementation of analytical measurements of concentration of dioxins in gas, liquid and solid wastes at selected subjects before implementation of complex of measures on reduction of dioxin emissions from research subjects

Executors: Research Center of Emergencies of Ministry of Social Development of the Russian Federation, Research Engineering Center "Syntez"

Task 3: Selection of the most efficient technological solutions and development of recommendations on complex of measures aimed to reduction/elimination of dioxin/furan emissions at the selected enterprises (Murmansk plant on heat treatment of solid wastes and Vorkutinskiy cement plant)

Executors: Research Engineering Center "Syntez", Centre for International Projects

Task 4: Implementation of training programmes by Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Centre at the Kotlas pulp-and-paper plant followed by selection of the most economically and environmentally efficient projects for their further financing and introduction.

Executor: Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Centre

Task 5: Assessment of dioxin emissions through implementation of analytical measurements of concentration of dioxins in gas, liquid and solid wastes at the selected enterprises after implementation of complex of measures on reduction of dioxin emissions from research subjects, preparation of the report

Executors: Research Center of Emergencies of Ministry of Social Development of the Russian Federation, Centre for International Projects, Research Engineering Center "Syntez" and Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Centre.

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: November 2005 – February 2007

Phase III: February 2007 – ??? 2007

Status

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. Due to unforeseen logistical problems a new initiative has recently been taken in connection to pulp and paper industries in Arkhangelsk within the framework of Russian – Norwegian Cleaner Production.

In February 2003 it was concluded to narrow the focus on sampling to the three priority regions, Murmansk, Arkhangelsk and Komi. In addition the workshop activity on the UNEP Toolkit that previously was a part of Phase I was decided to be postponed.

As to the selection of objects, the inventory shall focus on important sources, with respect to their magnitude, but also sources that are most representative for other processes present in the area or elsewhere. Further, the future possibilities to take actions in order to reduce these emissions (according to BAT and BEP) should be taken into consideration.

CIP was requested to coordinate the work on developing a detailed work plan under the leadership of Mr Filatov, for the remaining activities. The budget for these remaining activities was estimated to 95 000 USD.

The Work Plan, to include budget and schedule, was to be provided to the Steering Committee for approval by 15 March 2003. The proposed work plan was not delivered by this date. The task was further delayed as the proposed work plan later delivered was not accepted by the Steering Committee. A new plan was discussed and decided upon in February 2004.

In December 2004 all activities within phase 1 were finalised and a report was presented at the SGM. Since SG had a couple of remarks to the report its final acceptance (of a revised version) came in late spring 2005 and a full printed version in English was available in August 2005.

In November 2005 there was a fifth SCG meeting in Moscow. At the meeting it was decided about the tasks and what enterprises to focus on. It was agreed that a project plan was to be delivered to the SCG before Christmas (from the coordinators). After delivery the project plan needed some additional work and clarifications so the final agreement was therefore delayed.

In March 2006 it was agreed to add the Syktyvkar Timber Mill (Pulp & Paper) to the plan, after a suggestion from the Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Centre. Sweden has been appointed extra funding for this project (17 March 2006) from the government and believe that it can be worthwhile to add a CP training programme at the Syktyvkar Timber Mill.

An information workshop for dioxin and furan emissions will be organized for pulp and paper enterprises in the North-West of Russia based on the findings of the Project Phase I.

Next Steps

Start the work at the enterprises and implement the project plan in order to make suggestions for phase III.

Funding

Total funding from all donors within Phase I (complete): US\$ 185 000

Total funding from all donors within Phase II: US\$ 220 000 (possibly more from Swe EPA)

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 including the arctic.

The project would be strengthened considerably by participation from further donor countries;
Annex 1

Preliminary Progress schedule on the Phase II ACAP Dioxin/Furan Project for 2006

To be updated from the final project plan

Task

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Subtask

- 1.1
- 1.2
- 2.1
- 2.2
- 3.1
- 3.2
- 3.3
- 3.4

- 5.1
- 5.3
- 5.4

Executor

REC «Syntez», CIP
RRCE,
REC «Syntez»
REC «Syntez», CIP
Centre CP
RRCE, Center CP
REC «Syntez», CIP

Time frame

March-April 2006
April-June 2006
May - June 2006
July
2006
March -April 2006
March -April 2006
May -August 2006
September - November 2006
April 2006 -

October 2006
Nov - Dec
2006
Dec
2006
Jan 2007

Proposed expenses

12 000 \$
18 000 \$
12 500 \$
5 000 \$
5 000 \$
5 000 \$
10 000 \$
25 000 \$
35 000 \$ (to be extended)
12 500 \$
5 000 \$
5 000 \$

Expected results

Data on factors impacting the formation of dioxins/furans at the research enterprises and their assessment

Data on emissions of dioxins at the selected enterprises before implementation of complex of measures, practical recommendations on change of some technological parameters with the purpose of considerable reduction of dioxin emissions.

Recommendations on complex of measures aimed to reduction of dioxin emissions

Acquisition of attains on systems study by listeners, thesis and antidioxin programme of the Cleaner Production Centre

Data on emissions of dioxins at the selected enterprises after implementation of complex of suggested measures.

Basis for completion

Report
Report
Report
Report
Final Report

CIP – Centre for International Projects

REC «Syntez» - Research Engineering Center “Syntez”

RRCE – Russian Research Center of Emergencies of Ministry of Social Development of the Russian Federation

Centre CP – Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Centre

APPENDIX D-2: Report on Phase II Dioxins/Furans Project

BIP no (assigned by Swedish EPA):

IP no (assigned by Swedish EPA):

swedish environmental protection agency
INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS SECTION
Project description

Date: 2006-03-23

ACAP Project

“Reduction/Elimination of Emissions of Dioxins and Furans in the Russian Federation with focus on the Arctic and northern regions impacting the Arctic”

Phase 2: Technical-and-economic assessment of different activities on Reduction/Elimination of Emissions of Dioxins and Furans from major sources

PROJECT SUMMARY:

The Project is directed to realization of the programme on identification and quantification of emissions of dioxins and furans for the purpose of reduction of development and environmental emission of these pollutants.

The estimated assessment of environmental emissions of dioxins and furans from the major sources of Archangelsk and Murmansk regions and Republic of Komi was made in the framework of the Project Phase 1, results of which is the basis for realization of the Phase 2. Emissions per every source were determined on the basis of quantity of output or consumable crude materials and so-called emission factor of dioxins/furans per unit of this output or crude materials.

Amongst the largest sources of Dioxin and furans in the region were the Murmansk MSW, Kotlas P & P and Vorkutinskiy cement plant. These objects are chosen for further work in phase II.

For these objects we will

- Determine and assess Site specific factors impacting formation of dioxins and furans.
 - Implement Cleaner Production-training and develop technical projects.
 - Develop site specific recommendations & reductions and recommendations on BAT
 - Make technological and economic assessment on the recommendations.
- All of the above formulated as project proposals for the three sites, as a base for phase III.

Recipient country: Russia

Project period (start and end): April 2006 – January 2007

PLAN OF FINANCING

Sources of financing

Amount (USD)

%

Swedish EPA contribution

150 000

Norwegian contribution
90 000

USA EPA contribution
30 000

Other financing
??

Total
270 000 + ??
100

PROJECT PARTNERS

Project manager at Swedish EPA or other agency/organisation: Niklas Johansson

Operative project leader (if applicable): Malin Gunnarsson

Counterpart(-s) in recipient country:

Contact person at Swedish EPA International Projects Section: Eke Mikaelsson

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT DESCRIPTION

The Project “Reduction/Elimination of Emissions of Dioxins and Furans in the Russian Federation with focus on the Arctic and northern regions impacting the Arctic” was implemented in the framework of Arctic Council Action Plan (ACAP) per Centre for International Projects in the Russian Federation at the turn of the 2003 and in 2004. The Project is directed to realization of the programme on identification and quantification of emissions of dioxins and furans for the purpose of reduction of development and environmental emission of these pollutants.

The estimated assessment of environmental emissions of dioxins and furans from the major sources of Archangelsk and Murmansk regions and Republic of Komi was made in the framework of the Project Phase 1, results of which is the basis for realization of the Phase 2. Emissions per every source were determined on the basis of quantity of output or consumable crude materials and so-called emission factor of dioxins/furans per unit of this output or crude materials.

Experimental determination of environmental emissions of dioxins/furans implemented among the most significant subjects essentially indicated correspondence between specified and actual factors of emissions of dioxins/furans. Values of emissions of dioxins/furans from different categories of sources in Murmansk and Archangelsk regions and Republic of Komi as well as summary emissions of dioxins/ furans in these regions were itemized on the basis of received experimental data. The report: “Assessment of some major sources of dioxins/furans in Archangelsk and Murmansk regions and Republic of Komi” on results of the activities implemented in the framework of the Phase 1 was made.

Research results achieved during the implementation of the ACAP Project allowed educing the following specifics of dioxin emissions in research regions.

In total emissions of dioxins for three regions the incineration of urban ore occupies the first place on importance – 24,8 %, incineration in industry occupies second place – 20,4 %.

Herewith regard must be paid to the fact that dioxin emissions from incineration of urban ore in Murmansk region amount to 60 % of total dioxin emissions in the region. Emissions from paper-and-pulp industry are the most considerable in Arkhangelsk region (46% of total dioxin emissions in the region). The most important emissions into air in Republic of Komi were detected in electro and heat power industry, from forest fires and in cement industry.

2. OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED RESULTS

The main objective of the activity suggested in the framework of the Project Phase II is determination and technical and economic assessment of various measures on reduction/elimination of emissions of dioxins and furans from major sources and preparation of proposals providing reduction of emissions of dioxins and furans from the most hazardous industries of the region.

OVERALL OBJECTIVE

To make measurable reductions on formation of dioxins and furans in the regions of Arkhangelsk, Murmansk and Komi.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE (S)

To make a feasibility study: To determine the site specific factors to reduce the formation of dioxins and make recommendations, on selected objects, with technical and economical assessments to it and make project proposals for phase III. A second objective is to implement Cleaner production training session.

EXPECTED RESULTS

Reports on the work. Educated staff at the objects (on Cleaner production). Project proposals for the implementation of the proposed recommendations in Phase III.

The research on identification of list of environmental “hot spots” in the Russian part of Barents region carried out by NEFKO in 2003 showed a range of environmentally significant investment projects on which the financial support in improvement of ecological situation should be given to the Russian Federation.

The List of environmental “hot spots” updated in 2003 showed a number of industrial facilities which were also surveyed within the framework of 1-st Phase of ACAP Project and which in our opinion deserve a special attention and more detailed research in the framework of 2-nd phase of the Project:

1) In Murmansk region it is suggested to conduct an in-depth study of the condition of the Murmansk “Plant on heat treatment of urban ore” (MSW) and prepare range of proposals aimed to reduction of dioxin emissions by this plant.

This is connected with the fact that the Murmansk plant on heat treatment of urban ore already had the financial support for modernization within the framework of the NEFKO Project M 51 (the First phase of the NEFKO Program of 1995), however research results of the ACAP Project give the basis to speak that efficiency of the actions conducted before at the plant were obviously insufficient.

2) An additional research of the condition of the pulp and paper industry in terms of dioxin emissions in the form of solid and liquid wastes of production and preparation of proposals on reduction of dioxin emissions from the Kotlas pulp-and-paper plant in Koriashma (NEFKO Project A 5) is required in Arkhangelsk region.

3) Solution of the problem connected with reduction of emissions of dioxins first of all from wood enterprises and Vorkutinskiy cement plant is topical in Republic Komi. In this connection the complex of the measures directed on estimation of factors determining formation of dioxins, measures of dioxin emissions and releases and on development of recommendations and proposals on reduction of dioxin emissions is necessary at the above mentioned plant.

In the framework of the Project activity it is planned to implement:

Analysis of technical, economical, administrative and other decisions presently being applied at the research enterprises;

Analysis of international experience in this sphere;

Preparation of alternative project decisions and selection of the most prospective and efficient decision;

Training program providing transfer of international and native experience on this problem in the framework of "Cleaner Production";

Additional analytical research of concentration of dioxins in emissions from research enterprises and sediments of neighboring water objects.

Highly knowledgeable specialists from the Russian scientific institutes and project organizations of the relevant profile as well as foreign experts will be involved in implementation of the activity connected with realization of the Project.

Wide use of national and international experience within the framework of the project will allow formulating recommendations providing the effective solution of tasks facing to the Project.

Training program on cleaner production directed to neutralization of dioxins and prevention of their formation according to the List of environmental hot spots of NEFKO/AMAP was realized at the Kotlas pulp-and-paper plant in the Arkhangelsk region.

According to methodology the training program is carried out during 6 months in line with developed system: three training sessions at three days for everyone with an interval at the extent of 6-8 weeks between them and two-day degree session. As provided by results of review of graduation works listeners successful reviewed their projects receive International Certificates, and most economically efficient environmental projects as agreed with enterprise administration will be presented to Financial Corporation of Northlands on financing of environmental projects (NEFKO) for providing investments for application. Program realization is carried out by Cleaner Production & Sustainable Development Center with involvement of Russian and Norwegian teachers – advisors.

3. PLAN OF ACTIVITIES (APPENDIX 1, 2)

The selected facilities are:

Murmansk municipal solid waste incineration plant

Kotlas pulp and paper facility, Koryazhma

Vorkutinskiy cement plant

Syktyvkar Timber Mill (only CP training program)

Task 1: Determination and assessment of various factors impacting the formation of dioxins/furans at the Murmansk plant on heat treatment of solid wastes and Vorkutinskiy cement plant

- 1.1 Selection and analysis of additional technical and other information on research enterprises (production performance, applying technologies, producing products, using raw materials, data on emissions and releases of pollutants etc.)
- 1.2. Analysis and assessment of controlled factors which are determinative for formation of dioxins at the Murmansk plant on heat treatment of solid wastes and Vorkutinskiy cement plant.

Executors: Research Engineering Center “Syntez”, Centre for International Projects

Task 2: In-depth study of dioxin emissions through implementation of analytical measurements of concentration of dioxins in gas, liquid and solid wastes at selected subjects before implementation of complex of measures on reduction of dioxin emissions from research subjects

- 2.1. Implementation of measurements of content of gas emissions of the Murmansk plant on heat treatment of solid wastes (3-4 measurements) and Vorkutinskiy cement plant (2-3 measurements), Kotlas pulp-and-paper plant (3-4 measurements) (. Also it is suggested to conduct analysis of solid wastes of incineration at the Murmansk plant on heat treatment of solid wastes (2-3 measurements), liquid discharge (Kotlas pulp-and-paper plant (3-4 measurements). Development of practical recommendations on change of some technological parameters with the purpose of considerable reduction of dioxin emissions.
- 2.2. Calculation and assessment of dioxin emissions before implementation of complex of measures on reduction of dioxin emissions from research subjects including calculation made using UNEP Guidelines.

Executors: Research Center of Emergencies of Ministry of Social Development of the Russian Federation, Research Engineering Center “Syntez”

Task 3: Selection of the most efficient technological solutions and development of recommendations on complex of measures aimed to reduction/elimination of dioxin/furan emissions at the selected enterprises (Murmansk plant on heat treatment of solid wastes and Vorkutinskiy cement plant)

- 3.1. Assessment of technologies applying at the research enterprises.
- 3.2. Selection of the most environmentally efficient technologies and measures directed to reduce dioxin emissions at the selected subjects.
- 3.3. Development of recommendations aimed to reduction/elimination of emissions of dioxins and furans at the subjects in Murmansk region and Republic of Komi taking into account recommendations of BAT.
- 3.4. Technical and economic assessment of measures on reduction/elimination of emissions of dioxins and furans at the Murmansk plant on heat treatment of solid wastes and Vorkutinskiy cement plant.

Executors: Research Engineering Center “Syntez”, Centre for International Projects

Task 4: Implementation of training programmes by Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Centre at the Kotlas pulp-and-paper plant and at the Syktyvkar Timber Mill followed by selection of the most economically and environmentally efficient projects for their further financing and introduction, Implementation of the information seminar

Executor: Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Centre

Task 5: Assessment of dioxin emissions through implementation of analytical measurements of concentration of dioxins in gas, liquid and solid wastes at the selected enterprises after implementation of complex of measures on reduction of dioxin emissions from research subjects, preparation of the report

5.1. Implementation of measurements of dioxin content in gas emissions of the Murmansk plant on heat treatment of solid wastes (3-4 measurements) and Vorkutinskiy cement plant (2-3 measurements). Conducting of analysis of solid incineration wastes at the Murmansk plant on heat treatment of solid wastes (2-3 measurements).

5.2. Calculation and assessment of dioxin emissions after implementation of complex of measures on reduction of dioxin emissions on research subjects on the basis of the data of analytical measurements and through calculations using UNEP Guidelines.

5.3. Preparation of the Report on results of implementation of the Project Phase II. aiming at the formulation of project proposals for the three selected facilities, that are enough well developed to serve as a base for investments and implementation under Phase III. Translation of the results (extended summary and project proposals for phase III).

Executors: Research Center of Emergencies of Ministry of Social Development of the Russian Federation, Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Centre Centre for International Projects, Research Engineering Center “Syntez”

4. BUDGET SUMMARY : (APPENDIX 3)

5. PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

The main stages of the activity under the Project will be carried out by the Research Engineering Center “Syntez”, the Centre for International Projects (CIP), the Research Center of Emergencies of Ministry of Social Development of Russia and Russian Cleaner Production & Sustainable Development Center. The overall coordination of activity under the Project is provided by the Center for International Projects.

6. RISK ANALYSIS AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Need for successful implementation of the Phase 2 is:

Involvement of experts on dioxins/furans problems in the activity;

Accumulated experience on estimated and experimental assessment of emissions of dioxins/furans in different industries;

Existing experience of environmental pollution prevention received during the realization of programs of cleaner production;

Accumulated Russian and World experience on identification of conditions for reduction/elimination of emissions of dioxins/furans from various processes first of all related to high-temperature burning and use of chlorine-containing substances for disinfecting of water and bleaching of cellulose.

7. COMMUNICATION AND DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS

The Final Project Report on CD will be widely disseminated in some Ministries, Regional Administrations, some industrial enterprises, public organizations and among specialists in the Russian Federation and abroad.

Dissemination is the communication with parties outside the project, such as other authorities, other comparable industries and how to reach them e.g. production of posters, brochures, reporting on local television, etc. We want to share the gained knowledge with as many as possible and there are different ways to do that.

8. REPORTING AND EVALUATION

Report on Tasks 1,2,3 will be prepared by the group of experts and transferred to CIP for further handling and presentation to the Project Steering Group in 8 months after work commencement.

Report on Task 4 will be prepared by Cleaner Production & Sustainable Development Centre and transferred to CIP for further handling and presentation to the Project Steering Group in 8 months from beginning to Phase II.

Draft of the Final report on Task 5 will be prepared and presented by CIP to the Project Steering Group in 10 months after work commencement.

On the basis of remarks the Final report will be presented by CIP at the Steering Group Meeting for the purpose of final approval in 1 month after receiving of all remarks.

Generally as a result of the Project realization background will be created as well as proposals and recommendations providing reduction of dioxin/furan emissions from the most hazardous enterprises of the region will be prepared.

Results received during implementation of the Project can give occasion to solution of problems connected with dioxin emissions and discharges from similar enterprises in other regions of Russia and will be used during development National Implementation Plan of Stockholm Convention on POPs.

APPENDIX 1 : Progress schedule on the Phase II

Task

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Subtask

1.1
1.2
2.1
2.2
3.1
3.2
3.3
3.4

5.1
5.3
5.4

Executor

REC «Syntez», CIP
RRCE,
REC «Syntez»
REC «Syntez», CIP
Centre CP
RRCE, , Center CP,
REC «Syntez», CIP

Time frame

April –June 2006
April-June 2006
May-July 2006
August 2006
March -April 2006
March -April 2006
May -August 2006
September - November 2006
April 2006 -
October 2007
Nov - Dec
2006
Dec
2006
Jan 2007

Proposed expenses

12 000 \$
18 000 \$
19 000 \$
7 500 \$
5 000 \$
5 000 \$
10 000 \$

25 000 \$
68 100 \$
12 500 \$
5 000 \$
5 000 \$

Expected results

Data on factors impacting the formation of dioxins/furans at the research enterprises and their assessment

Data on emissions of dioxins at the selected enterprises before implementation of complex of measures, practical recommendations on change of some technological parameters with the purpose of considerable reduction of dioxin emissions.

Recommendations on complex of measures aimed to reduction of dioxin emissions

Acquisition of attains on systems study by listeners, thesis and antidioxin programme of the Cleaner Production Centre

Data on emissions of dioxins at the selected enterprises after implementation of complex of suggested measures.

Basis for completion

Report

Report

Report

Report

Final Report

CIP – Centre for International Projects

REC «Syntez» - Research Engineering Center “Syntez”

RRCE – Russian Research Center of Emergencies of Ministry of Social Development of the Russian Federation

Centre CP – Cleaner Production and Sustainable Development Centre

APPENDIX 2: TIME-TABLE

Year

2006

2007

Month

IV

V

V1

V11

V111

IX

X

X1

X11
1
11
111
1V
V
V1

Activity 1

x
x
x
r

Activity 2

x
x
x
r

Activity 3

x
x
x

x
x
x
x
x
r

Activity 4

x
x
x
x
x
x
r

Activity 5

x
x
r

X - marks when activities take place

r - marks reporting occasion

APPENDIX 4: PROJECT PARTNERS - contact inform.

Project manager at Swedish EPA or other agency

Name: Niklas Johansson

Institution: Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

Adress: S-106 48 Stockholm, Sweden

Tel: + 46 8 6981438

Fax:

E-mail: niklas.johansson@naturvardsverket.se

Operative project leader (if applicable):

Name:

Institution:

Adress:

Tel:

Fax:

E-mail:

Counterpart in recipient country (-ies):

Name:

Institution:

Adress:

Tel:

Fax:

E-mail:

Contact person at the Swedish EPA International Projects Section

Name: Eke Mikaelsson

Institution: Swedish Environmental Protection Agency/ International Projects Section

Adress: S-106 48 Stockholm, Sweden

Tel:+ 46 8 6981679

Fax: +46-8-6981504

E-mail:ake.mikaelsson@natuvarvsverket.se

APPENDIX E: Progress Report from Mercury PSG

Appendix F-1: Progress Report from the Obsolete Pesticides PSG

STATUS REPORT

Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles

in the Russian Federation

Copenhagen March 2006

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, Federal Service for Ecological, Technological and Atomic Surveillance of RF (Rostekhnadzor), Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology, and Ministry of Health. The Centre for International Projects (CIP) has been the primary coordinator and organizer for activities in Russia.

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

Development of Selection Criteria for identifying priority regions for inventory development (completed)

Preparation of General Guidance for development of regional inventories to include existing regulatory requirements (completed)

Inventory Development. The scope of the inventory will include: animal husbandry forestry management, insect and rodent control, as well as agricultural uses

Preparation of inventory for 11 priority Arctic and Sub-Arctic Regions

Completion of the inventory for an additional 5 to 6 Regions

Identification of a Demonstration Region for the Process of Inventory Development

Performance of selected sampling and analysis for unidentified pesticides stocks

Phase 2

Identify cost-effective preparatory/preventive measures for improving collection, storage and packaging of the obsolete pesticides

Implement these measures in a prototype demonstration

Identify disposal technologies and determine whether the technology and lessons learned from the PCB Project can be applied to pesticides disposal

Phase 3

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

Timetable

Expected completion in 2008.

Status in March 2006

Meetings

No meetings since the last ACAP Steering Committee meeting in September 2005.

Inventories & repackaging

Project activities have been extended to 9 priority regions, of which 6 have completed their detailed pesticide inventories, analyses and safe storage phase.

Estimated stocks before project (t)
After detailed inventories (t)
Amount analyzed (t)
Amount repackaged (t)/ safely stored

Arkhangelsk

41
62
14
57

Komi Republic

14
19
6
13

Magadan

16
23
8
23

Omsk

464
540
77
390

Tyumen

40
314
77
270

Altai Rep.

23
97
12
24

Altai Krai

1490
(2890*)
251**
[41]
245**

Sakha Rep.

30
[100]***

Kurgan
646

Krasnoyarsk
38

Kamchatka
9

Murmansk
3

TOTAL
2814 (4214)
1306
235
1022

* After detailed inventories on five priority regions.

** Completion of five priority regions.

*** Before repackaging.

In late 2005, activities were initiated in five priority regions of Altai Krai. After the work started, the total estimate of the amount of pesticides in Altai Krai was increased to 2890 tonnes (70 % of the stocks in the priority regions).

The Kurgan Region has been 75% funded (\$35,000) in March 2005. However, due to organizational changes in the Ministry of Agriculture, the project is apparently not currently active. The SG is still investigating the situation and decide on further activities. Activities in Republic of Sakha have been funded, yet not started.

Although the SG committed funds to the Murmansk Region, the project has not yet commenced

because additional Regional support has not yet been found. In addition, the SG is still seeking possibilities to work in Nenets, Jamalo Nenetski, and Chukchi Autonomous Districts, which were not covered by Archangelsk, Tyumen, and Magadan inventories. A cost estimate is not available for Krasnoyarsk (including Taymur Autonomous District) and Kamchatka (including Koryak Autonomous District).

Environmentally sound management

Possibilities to create centralized storage facilities for long-term storage vary between regions. In Komi Republic, Tyumen, Omsk, Altai Republic, and Altai Krai such facilities have been founded. Magadan has transported their repackaged stocks to Tomsk hazardous waste facility (Public corporation Poligon) using regional funds. Arkhangelsk has transported 39 t to Krasnyi Bor for disposal.

The SG 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 disposal 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. The SG observed that the Tomsk Polygon has the potential for long term storage, but is concerned that adequate measures may not have been in place to ensure that all of the pesticides taken to the Tomsk Polygon were placed in safe storage.

Next Steps

Phase 1 and 2 activities in the remaining 55 regions of Altai Krai and Republic of Sakha – funding not available

Acquire cost estimate to finalize inventory, repackaging and storage activities in Krasnoyarsk
Preparation of project initiation, including financial resources, in Murmansk, Kamchatka and Krasnoyarsk regions

2 meetings in 2006: Krasnoyarsk (June) and Altai Krai (September)

Preparing an exit strategy: planning final disposal demonstration – either in the Russian Federation or abroad

Funding

Project funding (\$USD)

Regional Funding (RUR)

Arkhangelsk

29,180

1,171,000

Komi Republic

25,183

not available

Magadan

6,600

1,310,900

Omsk

38,080

20,000,000

Tyumen

43,360

5,700,000

Altai Rep.

43,272

not available

Altai Krai

50,000+

1,000,000

Sakha Rep.

32,545

Kurgan

15,000

Krasnoyarsk

Kamchatka

Murmansk

[5,505]

283,220 \$USD

29,182,000 RUR

1,042,000 \$USD

Please note that the table above only contains funds transferred to regions. The total donor allocations since 2001 are approximately \$550,000 USD.

Estimated funds needed to initiate and complete Phase 1 and repackaging in the remaining regions:
410,000 USD

. This estimate is based on original priority districts.

Funds needed to implement Phase 3: depending on the technology and facility. Estimate based on high temperature incineration 100 tons of obsolete pesticides according to the international standards: \$200,000 US\$.

Observations to date

The project has succeeded in getting information from forestry and sanitary related stocks in addition to agricultural pesticides

Contributions of the regional authorities are significant leading to successful completion of Phases I and II

Regions that have provided the cost estimates are ready to implement the project and have also usually reserved their own resources to contribute to the project. The SG works closely with the regions

Autonomous regions are challenging because they do not always have plant protection authority representation in the region

It appears that some of the obsolete stockpiles in Altai Krai (17 000 rivers, 51 000 km) and Kurgan are threatened by seasonal floods and are in very poor state requiring immediate action

Active participation of Ministry of Agriculture in all phases of the project is necessary

It is important to secure full financing before initiating Steering Group-approved activities in regions
Regions are concerned about the stocks of obsolete pesticides and do not necessarily wait for ACAP activities

Repackaging reduces the environmental threat caused by obsolete pesticides, however, long term disposal will be necessary until destruction capacity is developed. The most common repackaging material used in the regions (polyethylene) degrades eventually creating pressure to seek destruction in the near future.

Successful completion of the project depends on the availability of the environmentally sound management technology. As this technology continues to be unavailable in Russia, exporting the waste abroad to a dedicated hazardous waste destruction facility may become an option to prevent inappropriate disposal.

APPENDIX F-2: Progress Report on Obsolete Pesticide Project in Karelia

Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles
in Republic of Karelia, RF
Copenhagen - March 2006.

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, Ministry of Agriculture, Fishery and Food, and Rostekhnadzor. Republic of Karelia is not included among the priority regions of ACAP project "Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles in the Russian Federation".

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, however, included as part of the ACAP project.

Contents of obsolete stocks in Karelia

According to the latest data, the total amount of obsolete pesticides in Karelia is approximately 12 000 kg in 23 warehouses. The amount of DDT is 1 900 kg. The storage conditions are poor. The data is not based on detailed inventory in the whole region, but a desk study.

Project

Karelian Republic will collect and repack the obsolete pesticides in the region according to the ACAP guidelines (Activity II). The pesticides will be transported to one location in the Republic. Karelian authorities will acquire necessary permits to export the pesticide waste to Finland. The aim is to destroy the obsolete pesticides of Karelian Republic at Ekokem facility in Finland by high temperature incineration.

Status

Since the last ACAP SC meeting, two meetings between the Karelian ministry of Agriculture, Rostekhnadzor and the Finnish Ministry of Environment, Finnish Environment Institute and Ekokem were held. Preliminary agreement on the details and financial arrangements has been achieved.

Budget

Direct costs estimated at 25,000 EUR. However, the costs depend largely on the amount of pesticides (high temperature destruction costs approximately 1400 EUR/t).

Timeline

It is anticipated that the pesticides will be repackaged, transported and destroyed by October 2006.

Appendix F-3: Denmark's Bi-lateral Obsolete Pesticides Project in Pskov and Vologda

Environmental Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles in the Russian Federation
ACAP Steering Committee Meeting
29-30 March, Copenhagen

1. Project title:

Environmentally Sound Management of Stocks of Obsolete Pesticides in the North West Region of Russia

2. Project set up:

Bilateral ACAP project with Pskov and Vologda Oblast in the framework of the North West Russian-Danish Co-operation Agreement.

Project coordinators: Morten Skovgaard Olsen, Mikala Klint with support from Cowi A/S

3. Description of the Project:

Obsolete Pesticides (OPs), including POPs pesticides, stored in the past in the Pskov region

and the Vologda region have been identified, and plans for their future sound management have been developed. Part of the OPs stocks shall be stored in a safe and environmentally sound manner to serve as demonstration of such practices.

The project provides assistance to:

- ◆ Preparation of inventories of OPs;
- ◆ Development of action plans for future management and disposal of OPs;
- ◆ Preparation of information campaign and awareness raising
- ◆ Development of an economic model for sound management of OPs
- ◆ Demonstration of safe and environmentally sound management of obsolete pesti-cide stockpiles with focus on the Pskov and Vologda regions, respectively

4 插撈挽

. Project progress September 2005 - December 2005:

By end of December Vologda has completed collection of OP and in total 182 tonnes have been stored at the new central storage facilities in Pasyukovo.

In Pskov, the reconstruction of 3 storage facilities was completed in October. The re-packing teams have managed to collect 492 tonnes of OP which has been stored on 3 old military storage facilities in Ostrovsky Rayon. 220 tonnes of OP are still left in the region and DEPA may consider further collection and temporary storage. Unfortunately Pskov has been hit by a fire incident. On 25 December a fire was discovered in storage facility No. 2 where approximately 280 tonnes of OP was stored. The fire was extinguished by covering the gates with sand. DEPA is waiting for an official report from the Oblast which may be presented at the ACAP meeting.

5. Planned further work:

The repackaging may be completed in Pskov based on further agreements with the oblast. Remaining contingency may be allocated for this activity. Furthermore the film is nearly completed while the economic model and the action plans remains for completion during spring. The final workshop to be held in Vologda has been postponed for May/June. Interested ACAP members are welcome to join the seminar.

Danish Environmental Protection Agency

Strandgade 29 · DK-1401 Copenhagen K Phone +45 32 66 01 00 · Fax +45 32 66 04 79 · Telex 31 209 miljoe dk · CVR 25 79 83 76 · mst@mst.dk · www.mst.dk/homepage 2

APPENDIX G: Progress Report from the BFR PSG

APPENDIX G: Progress Report from the BFR PSG

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

To the ASCAP Steering Committee Meeting

Copenhagen, 29-30 March 2006

1. Status of work

The Brominated Flame Retardants (BFR) Project was approved at the Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting on 24. November, 2004. The Project Steering Group (PSG) was established at the 8. February, 2005. The PSG has members from Canada, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Russia, Sweden and USA. Norway is the project coordinator. The AMAP Secretariat is providing consultant and secretariat support to the project, with tasks including assisting Russia in preparing their

contribution to the project, preparing the overall compilation of data from all the countries, and assisting in the finalisation of the Phase I project report.

A questionnaire for the Inventory of sources and identification of alternatives and management strategies (Phase I) was distributed to the Arctic countries on 29. March, 2005, with a deadline for response of 1 August 2005 (and 1 January 2006 for Russia). Responses were received from Canada, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Russia, Sweden and USA. There has not been any Icelandic response.

On the basis of the information received, a draft of the Phase I report has been prepared.

The purpose of the Phase I Report is to:

Describe what BFRs are and how they are used.

Summarize why BFRs are a potential threat to human health and the environment.

Summarize the monitoring data on BFRs in the Arctic environment.

Identify sources and releases of BFRs that are found in the Arctic environment:

Production of BFRs;

Production of products with BFRs;

Use of products with BFRs;

Waste management and disposal of products with BFRs.

Identify further knowledge needed to improve management of BFRs and products with BFRs.

Identify and collect existing information on alternative flame retardant chemicals and technologies.

Identify existing or planned management practices and strategies to reduce or eliminate BFR releases of to the Arctic environment.

Much of the available data are uncertain and there are significant gaps in the inventory of BFRs in the Arctic countries, due to factors including confidentiality of information and lack of basic data on amounts of BFRs in, in particular, imported products. A first draft of the report was considered during the 3rd PSG meeting (27-28 March 2006) and it will be further developed over the next few months.

A separate report from Russia has been delivered to the PSG in February 2006, prepared by a specially established Russian BFR project group.

An AMAP Fact sheet presenting background information on the issue of BFRs in the Arctic has been produced and translated into Russian. This fact sheet is available electronically in English, and has been printed in Russian.

2. Plans for future work

Final versions of both the Phase I report and the Russian report, together with recommendations for the Phase II of the project are expected to be approved by the PSG at the 4th PSG meeting, provisionally scheduled for June 2006.

A proposal for an ACAP BFR-project flyer will be developed by the PSG at the 4th PSG meeting.

3. Financial status

The total contributions to the project received from Canada, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and USA between 2003-2005 amount to approximately 118.000 Euro (940.000 NOK).

The PSG discussed the financial status at their 3rd PSG meeting and agreed to increase the original

project budget with 8.800 Euro (70.000 NOK) to take account of the fact that the an additional PSG meeting has been scheduled in addition to the 4 meetings originally planned for Phase I of the project. The total Phase I project budget is now estimated to be approximately 108.000 Euro (860.000 NOK). This implies that there is no need for further funding for the phase I of the project, however there is a need to start identifying funding for Phase II of the project.

APPENDIX H: Report on U.S. Project to Remove PCB-containing Transformers in Indigenous Communities

Report on Obsolete Transformers in the Yukon Flats February 15, 2006

In 2005, the Council of Athabascan Tribal Governments (CATG) assisted five communities to search for obsolete transformers. Fort Yukon, Venetie, Beaver, Chalkyitsik, and Venetie were all inspected for obsolete transformers. Future plans include inspecting Circle, Birch Creek, Arctic Village, and Stevens Village for obsolete transformers.

A total of five transformers were identified during the initial inspections. Three are in Beaver, AK and two are in Venetie, AK. In the village of Venetie we had identified two obsolete transformers and we collected one sample from each transformer in October 2005. In the village of Beaver we identified three obsolete transformers. We were only able to collect samples from two of those transformers in November 2005. The weather was cold and the top of the transformer was frozen on.

Sample results were as follows:

Beaver, Alaska

Sample 0959LY, Total PCB = < 2 ppm

Sample 0961LY, Total PCB = <2 ppm

Venetie, Alaska

Sample 0962LY, Total PCB = 17 ppm

Sample 0963LY, Total PCB = 9 ppm

We are currently in the process of planning to remove these transformers this coming spring or summer. Listed below is a detailed transportation and disposal plan for the above referenced transformers.

Transportation and Disposal Options

Packaging

Transformers will be over packed into 55-gallon polyethylene drums. Each drum will be properly marked and labeled.

Transport

Transformers will be transported from Beaver, AK and Venetie, AK to Anchorage, AK via Everts Air Cargo (EPA ID number AKO 000 446 195).

Emerald Services (EPA ID WAD 058 364 647) will transport the transformers from Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport to the Emerald Alaska Viking Drive facility (EPA ID number AKR 000 004 186). Each transformer will be shipped on the appropriate manifest form that will be signed by an authorized representative of the generator and each transporter until it reaches the final TSDF.

Disposal

Non-detect mineral oil transformers

These units can be disposed of at the Emerald Alaska facility in Anchorage. The transformers will be drained and the liquids will be blended with other non regulated fuels and used as a fuel on site at the Emerald Alaska facility. The carcass will have all identifying marks removed or painted out and will be sent to a metals recycler in Anchorage for recycling. Analysis designating the serial number of the transformer and the “non-detect” results must accompany the carcass to the recycler. The original manifest will be sent back to the generator. A Certificate of Disposal will be issued upon completion of the disposal process.

PCB concentration less than 50 ppm

The transformers will be drained and the liquids will be blended with other non regulated fuels and used as a fuel on site at the Emerald Alaska facility. The carcass will be transported by Emerald Services to Transformer Technologies, 2233 South Garfield Road, Airway Heights, WA. (EPA ID: WAD 988 471 181) for metals recycling. The original manifest will be sent back to the generator. A Certificate of Disposal will be issued upon completion of the disposal process.

PCB concentration greater than 50 ppm

These units must be disposed of at a TSCA permitted facility in the lower 48. One of the two following disposal facilities will be selected based on the current disposal pricing offered. The units are drained and rinsed and the liquids are sent for incineration. The carcass is then land filled. The original manifest will be sent back to the generator. A Certificate of Disposal will be issued upon completion of the disposal process. An “out-of-service” date must be provided for each unit.

US Ecology, Idaho, Inc., 20400 Lumley Road / PO Box 400, Grand View, ID 83624, telephone 800-274-1516, EPA ID: IDD 073 114 654.

Onyx Environmental Services -Electronics Recycling Division, 5736 West Jefferson Street, Phoenix, AZ 85043, Phone 602-233-2955, EPA ID: AZO 000 337 360.

APPENDIX I: Indigenous Peoples Community Action Initiative Proposal
29 March 2006

BACKGROUND

In December 2004, the United Nations announced the “Second International Decade of Indigenous Peoples of the World.” The Arctic Council (AC) Ministers responded to this declaration by

increased efforts to expand the participation of Permanent Participants (PP's) in the work of the Arctic Council projects. Furthermore, the AC plans to address the United Nations in New York during the May 14 – 25 2006 event highlighting the UN “Year of Indigenous Peoples.”

At the September 22 -23, 2005 Arctic Council Action Plan (ACAP) Steering Committee (SC) meeting in Moscow, the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON) presented a project idea, with support from Gwich'in Council International (GCI), to create an initiative under ACAP that will focus on community action projects by Indigenous Communities. This initiative evolved from the grassroots projects that RAIPON and GCI are working on cooperatively within ACAP. This Initiative is recommended because at the present time, in the framework of ACAP, there are several projects which are focused on large RF regions and territories, but not on small communities and villages of indigenous peoples.

MISSION

This Indigenous Peoples Community Action Initiative is designed to build grassroots capacity using a holistic culturally-relevant approach to address pollution issues in Arctic Indigenous Communities.

APPROACH

ACAP can enhance its efforts to reduce pollution in the Arctic by recognizing the value of local communities and bridging the gap between ACAP experts and community advocates to address environmental issues that pose an immediate threat to the health and culture of Indigenous Communities.

The Initiative will provide an exchange forum where Peps, ASCAP delegates, and community advocates can collaborate on projects and exchange knowledge based on each other's experiences.

The Initiative will compile information from all projects which are being implemented in the territories where Russian Indigenous Peoples are living.

The Initiative will ensure continuing interaction with Indigenous communities for generating information concerning local environmental problems.

Initiative participants will help to identify and prioritize the most serious environmental problems and develop new projects, in line with ACAP priorities, to address these problems in the Indigenous communities.

This approach is suggested because existing project initiatives created within the ACAP program address contaminants on a large scale but not at the community level.

ORGANIZATION

This Initiative will be managed by a Coordination Group consisting of Arctic Council Permanent Participant (Peps) and donors. The actual community-level projects will be managed by RAIPON and a Russian technical entity, such as North-West Public Health Institute in St. Petersburg.

The Coordination Group will meet back to back prior to SC, IPS Board meetings, or relevant ACAP Project Steering Groups. After approval, the Initiative's Coordination Group will provide information to the IPS Board and ACAP Steering Committee on a periodic basis.

IPS may provide future project ideas through RAIPON to the Coordination Group of the ACAP Initiative.

New project proposals will be concurred by the ACAP Steering Committee and IPS Board.

The Initiative's Coordination Group will report on its activities directly to the ACAP Steering Committee, and will coordinate specific project activities with the relevant ACAP Project Steering

Groups to ensure information exchange and to avoid duplication of efforts.

The Initiative's Coordination Group will be formed to coordinate and prioritize activities of the Initiative.

The Coordination Group will provide periodic status reports to the IPS for dissemination to Peps.

The Coordination Group will provide periodic status reports to the ACAP SC.

POTENTIAL PROJECTS

Pubs, Dioxins/Furans, Obsolete Pesticides and Mercury mitigation in the Arctic Indigenous Communities.

Environmental Education, to include educating communities and setting priorities on local environmental issues.

APPENDIX J

Recognize ACAP as a Permanent Working Group of the Arctic Council

Discussion Paper

The Arctic Council Action Plan to Eliminate Pollution of the Arctic (ACAP) was created in response to the 1997 AMAP Report "Arctic Pollution Issues: A State of the Arctic Environment Report" which was produced under the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy.

The Alta and Iqaluit Declarations of 1997 and 1998, respectively, affirmed and reaffirmed the commitment of the Ministers and Senior Arctic Officials (SAOs) to increase efforts to limit and reduce releases of contaminants into the environment and to develop an Arctic Council Action Plan to Eliminate Pollution of the Arctic. Norway was asked to take the lead in developing this Action Plan.

It was particularly noted in the 1998 SAO Report to Ministers, that:

"Remediation of environmental risks that threaten the Arctic environment and the health of the local, particularly indigenous inhabitants need cooperative action by all the Arctic States at the global, regional and national level.

Because of the wide range of pollution issues, including health risks, the process of identifying and initiating appropriate actions should be a continuous activity under the Arctic Council, and be carried out in a phased process. It will be important to prioritize between the various issues of concern and be selective on the actions initiated in order to develop an operative document."

In the 2000 SAO Report to Ministers at Barrow, the strategy for the Arctic Council Action Plan to Eliminate Pollution in the Arctic was endorsed by the Ministers. The strategy calls for action at the national, regional and global levels.

It was recommended that an ad hoc Steering Committee (the Committee) should be established on an interim basis for two years "awaiting a review of the structure of the Arctic Council organization". The Barrow Ministerial approved the ACAP strategy and recommendations. Norway was asked to chair the Committee.

The terms of reference for the Committee included pollution prevention, source control and reduction, environmental remediation, and technical assistance. The Committee was tasked to develop and evaluate proposals for approval by Ministers and develop a project management regime

that could include project steering groups. Since 2000, ACAP has been developing practical solutions to environmental problems and achieving measurable environmental results. ACAP manages its program through a Steering Committee and its work is accomplished by Project Steering Groups.

Since 2000, seven projects have been developed by ACAP and approved by the SAOs and Ministers. These projects primarily focus on the priority pollutants under the Stockholm Convention and the Heavy Metals Protocol of the LRTAP Convention, and include:

Multilateral Cooperative Project for Phase-out of PCB Use and Management of PCB-containing Wastes in the Russian Federation
Reduction/Elimination of Emissions of Dioxins and Furans in the Russian Federation with Focus on the Arctic and Northern Regions Impacting the Arctic
Development of Fact Sheets on Arctic Contaminants
Environmentally-sound Management of Stocks of Obsolete Pesticides in the Russian Federation
Reduction of Atmospheric Mercury Releases from Arctic States
Implementation of the Cleaner Production, Eco-efficiency and Environmental Management Systems at the Norilsk Mining and Metallurgical Company in the City of Norilsk, Russian Federation.
(Note: This project has been completed)
Reduction/elimination of Sources and Releases of Brominated Flame Retardants

At the Ministerial meeting in Inari in 2002, the Ministers “reconfirmed their readiness and will to continue, further develop and implement ACAP and noted with appreciation the initiation and successful implementation of several priority projects as concrete actions toward reducing pollution of the Arctic.”

The Ministers decided to continue implementation of the ACAP, as described in the Barrow Declaration, until the Ministerial Meeting in 2006.

Some examples of measurable environmental results achieved to date include:

Project: Environmentally-Safe Management of Obsolete and Prohibited Pesticides
Over 1,697 tons of obsolete pesticides have been inventoried, repackaged and placed into safe storage
Of this amount, over 566 additional tons of obsolete and prohibited pesticides were discovered during the inventory development
235 tons of unidentified pesticides have been analyzed for mercury and chlorinated compounds
Two new regional storage facilities have been constructed

Project: Implementation of the Cleaner Production, Eco-efficiency and Environmental Management Systems at the Norilsk Mining and Metallurgical Company in the City of Norilsk, Russian Federation.

Three Cleaner Production training programs have been completed under this ACAP Project:
74 employees have been trained and certified as Cleaner Production Advisors
274 environmental technical projects have been developed
87 environmental technical projects have been implemented

Examples of environmental results include:

~kZL:(: