

***EPPR Working Group
Meeting***

20 – 22 April 2003

Inuvik, Canada

- Meeting Report -

June 29, 2004

(amended August 2004)

EPPR Emergency Prevention,
Preparedness and Response



***EPPR WORKING GROUP MEETING
INUVIK, CANADA, 20 - 22 APRIL 2004
–MEETING REPORT –***

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	i
Introduction	1
1. Opening of the Meeting	1
2. Adoption of the Agenda.....	2
3. Chair and Secretariat Reports, including Arctic Council Activities	2
3.1 Work of the Arctic Council and the SAOs	2
3.2 Activities of Other Working Groups/Projects.....	3
ACAP	3
ACIA	3
AMAP.....	3
CAFF	3
PAME.....	3
SDWG.....	3
3.3 Co-operation with Other Agencies	4
3.4 Activities of the EPPR Secretariat	5
4. Information Exchange and Project Updates – By Area of Focus	5
4.1 Oil and Gas.....	5
Oil and Gas - Reports on EPPR Ongoing Projects.....	5
Oil and Gas - Presentation of Possible New Projects	6
Oil and Gas - Country Reports	11
4.2 Radiological/Other Hazards	14
Radiological/Other Hazards – Reports on EPPR Ongoing Projects.....	14
Radiological/Other Hazards – Presentation of Possible New Projects.....	16

5.	Natural Disasters	20
	Survey of Past Natural Disasters	20
	Recommendation to SAOs on Expansion of EPPR Mandate to Include Major Natural Disasters	21
	Cooperation with the Northern Forum	22
6.	Cross-Cutting Issues	22
	Presentation on the Northern View	22
	Arctic Marine Strategic Plan.....	22
	International Polar Year	23
	SDWG’s Capacity Building Overview	23
7.	EPPR Web Site	24
8.	Work Plan and Strategic Plan	25
9.	Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for Period 2004 – 2006.....	25
10.	EPPR Deliverables to the Ministerial Meeting, November 2004.....	26
11.	Other Business.....	26
12.	Next Meeting	26
13.	Record of Decisions.....	26
	Appendix 1: Agenda for the 2004 EPPR Meeting.....	1-1
	Appendix 2: Participants – Working Group Meeting – Inuvik 20 - 22 April 2004 ...	2-1
	Appendix 3: Work Plan Projects 2004 – 2006: Participation by Countries	3-1

EPPR WORKING GROUP MEETING
INUVIK, CANADA, 20 - 22 APRIL 2004
–MEETING REPORT –

Introduction

The EPPR Working Group meeting was held in Inuvik, Canada, 20 -22 June 2004. The meeting was attended by country delegations from Canada, Finland, Norway, the Russian Federation, Sweden and the US. Representatives from the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON), the Sami Council, and the Indigenous Peoples Secretariat also attended.

Ms. Laura Johnston of Canada was Chair for the meeting and Mr. Kjell Kolstad of Norway was Vice Chair. Ms. Vicki McCulloch was the Secretary.

The host country arranged several events during the meeting, including a visit to the research ice-breaker 'Amundsen', and a drive on the ice-road to the local community of Aklavik.

A number of presentations were made on the ongoing projects, proposals for future work, and on other related topics. Copies of the presentations are available on the EPPR web site (http://eppr.arctic-council.org/pwpa/canada/inuvik_presentations.html).

The meeting report has been organized according to the agenda items. A copy of the meeting agenda is included as Appendix 1. The final record of decisions from the meeting was distributed 26 April 2004: the actions and decision from that record are reflected in this meeting report.

1. Opening of the Meeting

Peter Clarkson, Mayor of Inuvik; Richard Binder, Inuvialuit Game Council; Andrew Applejohn, Aurora Research Institute; and Norm Snow, Inuvialuit Joint Secretariat provided words of welcome to the delegations and other participants during the evening 'meet and greet' session.

The Chair opened the meeting and requested that the delegations be introduced. A list of meeting participants is included as Appendix 2.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The meeting agenda and timetable were reviewed. The dates of November 22-23 for the SAO meeting, and November 24th for the Ministerial meeting in Iceland had been confirmed. Item 10, 'Proposal for EPPR Secretariat in Moscow' was withdrawn: the Secretariat will be discussed in conjunction with the election of the Chair and Vice-Chair. Sweden noted that a presentation on Barents Rescue 2001 would be made as part of Agenda Item 4.2.3.

- 2.1 The agenda was adopted with two amendments. In particular, Item 10 'Proposal for EPPR Secretariat in Moscow' was withdrawn.**

3. Chair and Secretariat Reports, including Arctic Council Activities

3.1 *Work of the Arctic Council and the SAOs*

Under the Icelandic Chair, the Arctic Council continues to hold meetings of the Working Group chairs in conjunction with the SAO meetings. This is intended to increase cooperation amongst the working groups. Recently, there have been a number of requests for cooperation between working groups that place increased demands on the time of the various groups. This will be an issue for discussion.

The draft notes of the October 2003 Senior Arctic Officials (SAO) meeting held in Svartsengi Iceland were distributed to the EPPR Working Group. In addition, the Chair prepared a report to the SAOs (September 2003) and a report from the SAO meeting (November 2003). The eleven key items from the reports were quickly reviewed: all were addressed in additional detail elsewhere on the agenda.

As the next SAO meeting is May 4 – 5 in Iceland, two weeks after this meeting, the Chair noted the importance of leaving this meeting with a clear record of decision. This will facilitate preparation of a short report to the SAOs prior to their meeting.

The next Ministerial meeting is November 24 in Iceland; the Chair and EPPR Executive Secretary will be attending to provide a report on the last two years of work by the EPPR Working Group.

3.2 Activities of Other Working Groups/Projects

ACAP

To date, EPPR has not been directly involved with the Arctic Council Action Plan (ACAP). Members were invited to identify any opportunities for involvement.

ACIA

The Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) is progressing; a meeting to discuss the scientific documents took place recently. The preparation of the policy document is currently 'on hold', and will likely be a topic for discussion at the upcoming SAO meeting.

AMAP

The Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program (AMAP) will be preparing an Assessment of Potential Impacts of Oil and Gas Activities in the Arctic in 2006 (see Agenda Item 4.1). EPPR has been requested to work jointly with AMAP to prepare an international oil and gas symposium to be held in 2005. The SAOs have indicated that EPPR should be involved in the assessment and in the symposium.

CAFF

Currently, there are no joint projects with the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) Working Group.

PAME

The Arctic Marine Strategic Plan (AMSP) is led by the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME) Working Group. Input will be provided on a country-by-country basis. A meeting on the AMSP is to be held immediately following the SAO meeting in May. EPPR noted the importance of having emergencies aspects included in the Plan.

Discussion of the Oil Transfer Guidelines was deferred to Agenda Item 4.1.

SDWG

The Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG) is undertaking a number of major projects (see Agenda Item 6).

The US provided an update on the 'Circumpolar Infrastructure Task Force' (CITF).

- The CITF continues to work toward improving North American/Russian Far East aviation connections. The FAA's CAPStone program is progressing; a meeting last May in Anchorage was well attended. A number of aircraft in Alaska are now equipped with capstone equipment, representing a major advance in small aircraft technology.

- At a meeting in Akureyri, the University of Alaska, NASA and others met to review ways to advance wireless communications throughout the Arctic. A number of different firms are involved to ensure the availability of band width for applications such as telemedicine and University of the Arctic. An experts meeting was held September 2003, with a World Summit in December 2003. No meetings are scheduled for 2004. It is hoped that a demonstration project will be presented to the Arctic Council in late 2004 or early 2005; however, it will not be ready for the November Ministerial meeting.
- The Green Transportation initiative held a meeting in September 2004. An experts meeting will be held in Cambridge, with a major workshop in the summer of 2005. The CITF is working with ACIA and others on this project.

The EPPR Working Group had not identified any specific projects for consideration as part of the Sustainable Development Action Plan (SDAP). Member countries were asked to provide any suggestions in this regard.

3.3 Co-operation with Other Agencies

The US provided an update on behalf of the Northern Forum. As follow-up to the Northern Forum workshop in Anchorage in April 2002, a flooding workshop will be held in Khanty-Mansiysk, Russian Federation May 28-29 in conjunction with a Northern Forum meeting. It is anticipated that there will be strong Russian and US participation; EPPR is encouraged to participate. It was noted that several Northern Forum members have experienced severe flooding in recent years. The EPPR Working Group's response to the Northern Forum's recommendations from the Severe Cold Climate Emergency Response Workshop will be discussed under Agenda Items 4.1.2 and 5.3.

It was noted that the Russian American Pacific Partnership (RAPP) covers a slightly different area than the Arctic Council or the Northern Forum. This non-government organization, operated by the Forum for Russian American Economic Cooperation, brings together government, NGOs and industry from the western US and Russian Far East. Oil development on Sakhalin is a key topic, as is oil spill response; as such, the RAPP has an interest in EPPR's work.

The US provided an update on the University of the Arctic. With the participation of the University of Alaska, the University of the Arctic continues to advance telehealth in Alaska at the community level by developing general courses in management. The EPPR's contact persons with the University of the Arctic provided a one-page report to the Working Group for distribution at the meeting; several points were noted:

- The University of the Arctic serves indigenous communities
- The University of the Arctic is a leader in circumpolar studies
- Norway has made a generous contribution to the University in 2004
- Approximately 50 students are currently enrolled
- A course on radiation is being considered and may be proposed for development

The report from the Chair of the Arctic Council on the United Nations Report on Oceans and the Law of the Sea was noted. The US congress is ratifying the UN Convention on Oceans and the Law of the Sea, and the US further noted that the Russian Federation is becoming more involved in marine transportation issues.

The Barents Euro-Arctic Council (BEAC) Working Group on Environment was discussed under Agenda Items 4.1 and 4.2. Finland has established priorities for its chairmanship of BEAC during 2003 - 2005, as noted on their web site:

<http://www.beac.st/default.asp?id=129> .

3.4 Activities of the EPPR Secretariat

The Executive Secretary reported on the Secretariat activities since June 2003, based on the report distributed to the Working Group earlier in April. Key activities include:

- Distribution of information to, and liaison with, EPPR members other Arctic Council Working Groups, permanent participants, and observers
- Assisting the EPPR Chair in her duties (e.g., preparation of reports to SAO meetings; review of documents provided by other Working Groups)
- Responding to information requests (e.g., Field Guide)
- Managing/updating the EPPR website
- Attendance at the October 2003 Senior Arctic Officials meeting in Iceland
- Preparations for the EPPR Meeting in Inuvik (e.g., logistics, preparation of background materials)

With the confirmation of a new Chair whose term will begin after the 2004 Ministerial, the Secretariat hosted by Canada will complete its term. It is anticipated that the transition to a new Secretariat team should be completed by the end of 2004.

4. Information Exchange and Project Updates – By Area of Focus

4.1 Oil and Gas

Oil and Gas - Reports on EPPR Ongoing Projects

Shoreline Cleanup Assessment Technology (SCAT) Manual

Canada made a presentation and provided the final draft of the Shoreline Cleanup Assessment Technology (SCAT) manual. Other SCAT manuals have not addressed conditions in the Arctic, and new information is reflected in the new manual. Countries congratulated Canada on the project.

- 4.1.1 The Working Group thanked Canada for its presentation on the SCAT manual. The Working Group adopted the SCAT manual. The next steps are to: print the manual; provide translation into Russian, Inuktitut, and possibly other languages; and prepare and deliver training courses on use of the manual.**

Oil and Gas - Presentation of Possible New Projects

Interactive Web-based Maps of Environmental Information from Arctic Council Programmes

Norway presented a proposal by the AMAP Secretariat and the lead EPPR country to develop interactive web-based maps of environmental information developed by Arctic Council programmes. An informal meeting was held prior to the AMAP/CAFF meeting in Oslo in April to discuss a possible technical workshop. At the 2003 EPPR meeting, Norway was asked to investigate possible ways forward with respect to cooperation with other working groups and avoiding potential duplication with other databases. In 2003, it was also agreed to keep the 'Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk from Oil Spills' server closed.

In order to reduce duplication and data management costs, and to facilitate the dissemination of information, information from Arctic Council working groups could be placed into a common web-based map server. It was noted that the Circumpolar Map consists of static maps available on CD or the web site – it is not interactive. There was more data collected by EPPR during preparation of the map that is not processed or available in the Map. It was noted that the US mapping proposal under Agenda Item 4.2.2 would also use data from AMAP's radioactive database. The advantages of a common strategy for EPPR and AMAP were outlined in the proposal document.

The proposal involves a shared Arctic Council web server. It would then be possible for each group to have its own web site but still use the data of other groups. It was suggested that a pilot study be done. EPPR shape files would be provided to GRID Arendal to be turned into an interactive map. The AMAP radiological data would also be added. If countries desire, access to external parties could be denied. Following the pilot project, a workshop could be held. The EPPR Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk would remain 'intact'.

Sweden noted support for the project but cautioned that this would be a long-term project that may need to be implemented in steps. Sweden requested that the Circumpolar map be completed before a new project begins. Sweden can make a small financial contribution to the work of a small working group on a pilot project.

The Russian Federation noted that the proposal was very interesting and relevant to the 'Arctic Rescue' proposal, and that if such an interactive database was feasible, the Russian Federation would participate in it.

Canada noted its support and that it could provide modest financial support to the proposed pilot project/small working group approach. The types of information to be included, and the possible project leads, costs and timelines need to be determined.

Finland stated its support, noting that this phase should focus on completing the Circumpolar Map; the next phase should look at providing information for rescue operations.

The US noted its support for a focus/working group, and its agreement with Sweden's comment about the need to complete the Circumpolar Map. The focus/working group should include AMAP and CAFF, as they have useful information. The US noted its support for the pilot project and a small working group. The US also noted that radiation information is important to responders and to the public, and the needed information might be provided through this type of map, or the radiological map proposal (Agenda Item 4.2.7).

RAIPON indicated that the proposal is an excellent one, and that some of the indigenous people's organizations need to be involved.

Norway clarified that the Circumpolar Map project is in fact complete, and has been provided to the SAOs and Ministers. The next phase of the work needs to start with something tangible such as the proposed pilot study (re interactive and radiological). A workshop in the absence of a pilot study would not be worth doing. It would be unlikely that EPPR would lead such a project in the longer term. AMAP or CAFF with a permanent secretariat would be in a better position to take the lead.

Sweden asked how the interactive map proposal relates to the second one for updating and extending the current Circumpolar Map. Norway responded that if the interactive maps are made first, the updating of the Circumpolar Map would be much less expensive. The US raised the question of timelines for the workshop and the lead country. GRID-Arendal has estimated that it would take approximately two weeks to create an interactive map and a month to obtain the AMAP data. The workshop is relatively expensive, and it is hard to predict a date, but it would be approximately 6 months from now, tied into another meeting. It was agreed that Norway would continue as lead EPPR country for now.

4.1.2 The Working Group agreed to move forward on a pilot study with GRID Arendal using EPPR shape files to develop an interactive web-based map series. The pilot project will include radiological source data developed by GRID Arendal, the Norwegian Radiation Protection Agency, and AMAP. Based on the results of this pilot study, a workshop will be the next step in the Arctic Council mapping project. The AMAP Secretariat and the EPPR lead country will seek financial support for the ongoing mapping work. Recommendations will be made at the next EPPR meeting.

4.1.3 A second proposal on 'Updating and Extending EPPR data sets' was withdrawn, pending the outcome of the pilot study and workshop.

Workshop on Advancing Oil Spill Response in Ice-Covered Waters

The US presented the results of the workshop on Advancing Oil Spill Response in Ice-Covered Waters sponsored by the Oil Spill Recovery Institute and the US Arctic Research Commission, held last fall in Alaska. The US, Canada, Norway and Finland participated. Results from the Oil in Ice (MOREICE) project indicated that recovery would not be effective and that in situ burning was the answer. Any use of dispersants will require new research for response to oil in ice, as there was no real experience (full

scale field tests) to date. A number of priority program areas were identified at the workshop and are described in Section 4 of the March 2004 workshop report. The US noted its interest in hearing the Working Group's response to the identified priorities.

Sweden noted its recent experience in the Baltic Sea, which was consistent with the results described in the workshop report. Mechanical recovery was poor (5 tons out of 70 tons lost); there was difficulty finding the oil in ice and under snow. There is a need to improve knowledge, for example with respect to the properties of oil in ice.

Norway reported that a workshop on similar subjects would be held in Oslo, April 2004, with Norwegian, US, Canadian, and Russian participation. Much of the information presented by the US would be of benefit at that workshop. The workshop will be considering similar projects in the Barents Sea, and the possibility of joint projects of mutual interest could be explored. It was noted that the Oslo workshop will focus on 'equipment development', rather than 'research', but that there will be common areas of interest.

RAIPON noted recent meetings dealing with oil and gas and Aboriginal people of the north, and the effects of oil spills on tundra environments. Aboriginal people are concerned about the effects of oil and gas activities on the environment, including reindeer health and salmon spawning. Norway asked RAIPON if they could provide any further information on a recent 'ship-to-ship' transfer incident in the White Sea. RAIPON noted that nothing official was said about the incident, although there were rumours amongst Aboriginal people. In the Russian context, it was not a large incident.

4.1.4 Countries agreed that the report from the workshop on Advancing Oil Spill Response in Ice-Covered Waters would be useful in their ongoing work on developing response to oil in ice

Response to the Northern Forum's April 2002 Severe Cold Climate Workshop Recommendations

The Chair invited feedback on the March 2 2004 revised response to the Northern Forum's April 2002 Severe Cold Climate Workshop recommendations. The US noted that the Northern Forum had indicated that recommendations # 4, #5, #6 and #7 were of greatest priority to them. It was further noted that there is potential for synergy with the Northern Forum as EPPR becomes more familiar with the organization. The Northern Forum can be helpful to EPPR in setting its own agenda. The limited resources of EPPR will need to be kept in mind when working cooperatively with the Northern Forum. The Northern Forum has also done recent work on natural disasters. The Chair noted that Appendix 1 of the March 2 2004 revised response is currently blank in anticipation of a decision regarding EPPR's future mandate.

4.1.5 The Working Group noted the Chair's report on potential cooperation with Northern Forum, specifically the response to the April 2002 Severe Cold Climate Workshop recommendations. The Northern Forum confirmed their interest and support to undertake work on 4 of the 8 recommendations with

respect to oil spills. EPPR will work to strengthen cooperation with the Northern Forum.

Petroleum Hydrocarbon Assessment

The Chair noted that a Prospectus for the 2006 Arctic Council Assessment of Potential Impacts of Oil and Gas Activities in the Arctic had been distributed to the Working Group in March. A response to the SAOs and AMAP on EPPR's role is required. The US noted that countries and working groups have been asked to self-nominate experts to write parts of the assessment. The discussion is ongoing as to the geographic scope of the assessment. Norway and the US are leading the assessment. It would be desirable for EPPR to be involved, on a country-by-country basis, perhaps by EPPR providing co-authors and/or participating in the 2005 workshop. Expert nominations need to be provided to AMAP by May 24th. Nominations need to be accompanied by an undertaking that organizations will support the authors' participation.

The Chair noted that two chapters are of particular interest to EPPR: 'Oil and Gas Activities in the Arctic' and 'Sources and Inputs of Petroleum Hydrocarbons, PAHs and other relevant contaminants in the Arctic'. At a minimum, EPPR could provide information; it is important for EPPR to give this consideration, otherwise who will provide the emergencies information? Norway added that much of the needed information is already available on web sites and in documents; it is simply a matter of pulling it together. It was suggested that perhaps countries that are not presently leading projects within EPPR currently could take on this role. Sweden noted that it could participate in a reviewer capacity, rather than as a developer of a paper. Canada noted its interest in participating in at least a review capacity.

4.1.6 The Working Group thanked Norway and the US for the report on the Petroleum Hydrocarbon Assessment project under AMAP. Two chapters are of particular interest to EPPR: 'Oil and Gas Activities in the Arctic' and 'Sources and Inputs of Petroleum Hydrocarbons, PAHs...' In response to the request from the AMAP Secretariat, members are to provide nominations for key or contributing experts to the EPPR Chair by May 17, 2004.

The Chair noted the tentative date for the 2005 symposium as June or July. The prospectus indicates that the workshop will address emergency and contingency planning, environmental impacts, and risk assessment. Norway noted that AMAP had indicated that it would be desirable to have an EPPR representative at the workshop.

Finding a representative(s) to attend the workshop may be more feasible than assisting with the organization of the workshop. The US noted that EPPR has more experience with tanker transport and shipping than other working groups, and, as such, EPPR needs to keep a close eye on the assessment. In response to a question from RAIPON, it was noted that while the assessment is being led by the Russian Federation, there is a call for contributing authors from other countries. Norway added that the upcoming assessment is a follow-up to an earlier one completed 5 or 6 years ago.

4.1.7 The Working Group also noted the upcoming Oil and Gas Symposium (2005). Countries were asked to nominate participants to represent EPPR.

Arctic Rescue

The Russian Federation presented the 'Arctic Rescue' proposal. Arctic Rescue is a mechanism for the prevention and response to emergencies in the Arctic. Over the past year, ideas have been gathered for this project. The first step would be to establish a coordination centre in Moscow and a network of points with suitable infrastructure (airport, seaport, roads, medical services, etc.). Three stations are proposed for the Russian Federation (Murmansk, Dikson, and Chukotka). The Russian Federation asked if other countries were interested in identifying sites for such a network. The next steps would be the development of international agreements and preparation of legislation within individual countries. It was noted that EPPR working group members may have expertise to contribute in the development of legislation documents between countries.

The US noted that the Russian Federation should be applauded for this broad and ambitious proposal; the proposed project to develop international response capabilities for radiological incidents (Agenda Item 4.2.7) could be seen as a building block for Arctic Rescue. Sweden thanked the Russian Federation for the initiative, which is important for improving response capability and humanitarian aid, noting that additional consideration is needed. Finland stated that it had been considering the proposal over the past year, and had questions with respect to the costs and resources needed for the three stations and any others that may be developed. Finland suggested a small working group be established to pursue the matter. Canada indicated that it would review the proposal with other Canadian organizations with related responsibilities in the Arctic.

The US asked the Chair if the SAOs had indicated any views on the Arctic Rescue proposal, or any sense of urgency. The Chair indicated that she was unclear what the level of discussion might be at the May meeting. The US reiterated that it saw the National Assistance Capability project as a building block. It asked the Russian Federation to clarify what types of legislation might be envisioned. The Russian Federation responded that it anticipated official conclusions between countries to take part in this project on a bilateral basis.

4.1.8 The Russian Federation invited other interested countries to identify potential sites for inclusion in a network. Countries expressed interest and support for this project. The US indicated that the project to develop international nuclear emergency response capabilities could be presented to the SAOs as an example of a building block for the Arctic Rescue initiative (see 4.2.7, below).

Oil Transfer Guidelines

Norway noted that the Guidelines fill a gap left by other similar guidelines (e.g., MARPOL) that do not address special circumstances in the Arctic (e.g., 24-hour

darkness, distance, temperature etc.). A distinction could be made between oil transfer to communities, and commercial ship-to-ship transfers. In response to a question from Sweden, the US noted that the oil transfer guidelines would be published as a PAME guideline on their web site; it was not anticipated that there would be further work to develop them into an International Maritime Organization regulation. The guidelines have been designed for use by small or medium-sized communities.

It was suggested that the guidelines could be distributed to communities for a 'test drive' of the 'ship-to-shore' component. The IPS noted that electronic documents have limited distribution at the community level; distribution of paper products is possible, but financial support is needed to do so. The Sami Council noted that Canada's proposal to the SAOs for core funding for the IPS and Permanent Participants could assist in this regard. Canada stated that it could ensure that the guidelines are distributed to its northern residents. Sweden noted that the guidelines are excellent, and ready for distribution, but appreciate Canada's and Norway's comments. If the guidelines are put into international standards, there is an obligation to use them, otherwise they sit on the shelf. Discussion followed regarding some suggested changes to the text.

4.1.9 Draft text of recommended changes was transmitted to PAME following the meeting (note: the changes were accepted with one modification). The Working Group discussed potential means for distributing the completed guide to communities in order to test their effectiveness in the field. PAME will be consulted to determine if this would be a useful approach from their perspective.

Oil and Gas - Country Reports

New Activities in the Arctic Areas

Canada provided a brief overview of possible future oil and gas activity in the Canadian Arctic. Norway indicated there was a potential for increased activity in the Davis Strait.

Oil and Gas – Related Items of Interest

Sweden informed the Working Group about the 2005 Barents Rescue exercise in northern Norway. Denmark, Finland, Norway, the Russian Federation and Sweden will co-operate in large-scale search and rescue, medical care and oil response. The scenario will likely be a collision between a cruise ship and an oil tanker caused by terrorist actions.

4.1.10 Norway invited EPPR member countries outside the Euro- Barents Council to participate as observers in the Barents Rescue 2005 exercise. Information on the exercise can be accessed at the web site (<http://www.beac.st/default.asp?id=376>).

Norway noted that every other year it conducts an oil exercise with the Russian Federation. EPPR countries are invited to participate as observers. Information on the exercise (e.g., web site address) will be conveyed to the Working Group through the Secretariat.

Sweden, as Chair of HELCOM Response, informed about ongoing work among the HELCOM states regarding impact assessment, emergency capacity, and other operational co-operation in order to ascertain a high and effective response readiness. The Baltic Sea is an area with 50 million people with 2000 ships per day in transit. Traffic is expected to increase by 50% in the period 2000 – 2015 and measures are required to prepare for environmental emergencies in light of the increase in traffic and ship size. Capacity to respond is being increased, particularly in high risk areas. Information is available on the HELCOM web site: www.helcom.fi. Sweden noted no major organizational changes in the past year.

Finland noted that it has mutual agreements with other countries, as in the north resources may be far from an incident. Systems are arranged whereby the nearest practical/available resources are dispatched, regardless of the country of origin. A project being led by Sweden 'Emergency and Rescue Services' under the Barents Council involves training, mutual cooperation and exercises, and legal agreements.

Norway noted that there have been no significant organizational changes in their country in the past year. Development in the Barents Sea, such as the Snow White gas field, has been controversial and resulted in a 3-year moratorium while a damage assessment was completed. Five new wells be soon be drilled in ice-free areas. There is also concern about the shipment of oil from the Russian Federation along the Norwegian coast. It was noted that shipments destined to the US will face a higher standard of regulation than some other jurisdictions. A pipeline to Murmansk has been proposed, which would result in a number of large tankers (100,000 tons) leaving the port each day, taking approximately 3 days to pass through Norwegian waters en route. Norway's national waters have been extended to 12 km from 4 km; 3 new tugboats have been added to the fleet. Cooperation with the Russian Federation has been good with respect to activities such as exercises and notification systems.

The US reported on the ongoing reorganization of the Department of Homeland Security. As a result, marine environmental protection is now reporting to a part of the organization with a military (not environmental emergency) background. The US concluded and tested its joint contingency plan with the Russian Federation. The need to have a full understanding of the plan and the systems in two different languages is apparent, as is the need for common command and control systems. The Russian Federation has adopted the US Incident Command System (ICS) and the annexes have been colour coded for ease of use.

The geographical annexes for shared areas (e.g., Beaufort Sea) in the joint contingency plan with Canada were addressed at a meeting in Cleveland in March 2004. Canada is hesitant to replace its own Response Management System with the US Incident Command System. A memorandum of agreement with Canada on the joint contingency plans is being pursued.

The US noted that a 'Spill of National Significance' (SNS) exercise with Mexico was completed in April 2004. The Russian Federation and Canada will be invited to participate in the next SNS exercise.

4.1.11 The Working Group noted that the US plans for the next biennial ‘Spill of National Significance’ exercise will begin after the current one is complete in April of 2004. The US will invite EPPR countries to observe. If the next scenario involves the EPPR region, an invitation to participate will be extended.

The US compared Alaskan hydrocarbon production at 13,000 tons/day with the levels in Norway and Sweden. Because tankers have been upgraded, the pipeline probably presents the greatest risk. At this time, the construction of a gas pipeline from Alaska is not economical without significant subsidies. There is very little activity onshore; and little industry interest in, and lots of public concern about, offshore activity. The emphasis has been on overseas oil exploration and development.

Canada noted major organizational changes in the past year, with the changing responsibilities between Transport Canada and the Canadian Coast Guard. Responsibility for policy and regulatory issues, program and administrative functions for environmental response now reside within Transport Canada. Coast Guard remains responsible for responding to spills and will fulfill the federal monitoring and/or on-scene command roles for the Government of Canada. These changes within the two departments will provide mariners with a single point of contact for marine policy matters within Transport Canada and will allow the Coast Guard to focus on provision of services to mariners in Canadian waters.

The Russian Federation noted that the US and Norway had described several mutual activities. Recently there have been significant shifts as a result of the new government. EMERCOM has remained unchanged, and EPPR is expected to remain as its responsibility; however, it is not clear if there will be other changes in relationships with the Arctic Council as a result of the changes. Several relevant activities from the past year were noted: special exercise in the Caucasus and Ural mountain regions; a conference on oil spills in San Diego; an international exercise in the Baltic Sea near Kaliningrad dealing with oil spills from exploration; and an international seminar in St. Petersburg on provision of psychological assistance to people – both rescuers and victims – involved in disasters. The US complimented the Russian Federation on the latter workshop; noting that, after the Exxon Valdez, years later rescue workers and fishing families started to come forward with complaints.

The Sami Council stated their concern with the increasing oil exploration in the Russian Federation given the reluctance to sign the Kyoto Protocol. The increased use of fossil fuels has resulted in more ice melting.

RAIPON thanked the countries for their presentations. RAIPON is concerned about the lack of legislation in the Russian Federation with respect to the use of resources. The issues have been studied for 20 years; some legislation has been approved by the upper and lower chambers and signed by the president, but implementation has not occurred. RAIPON has submitted proposals in order to better understand environmental effects. Aboriginal people receive no benefits from resource development in the north, and we

need to improve our situation; however, RAIPON understands that the Russian Federation itself is in a difficult situation.

4.2 Radiological/Other Hazards

Radiological/Other Hazards – Reports on EPPR Ongoing Projects

Source Control Management Phase I – Refined Risk Assessment Methodology

The US made a series of presentations on pilot projects undertaken to develop a refined risk assessment methodology. The 'working draft' of the Risk Assessment Methodology document will be distributed to those who are interested for review and comment. In addition, some countries may be interested in participating in future projects.

4.2.1a The Working Group thanked the US for its presentation on the most recent 'working draft' of the 'Refined Risk Assessment Methodology' document. . The US and the Russian Federation indicated that the working draft will be distributed on request for review and comment.

4.2.1b The Working Group thanked the U.S. for the report on the second Source Control Management (Phase II) pilot project conducted at the NIAR Fuel Research Department in Russia.

ISO 14001 Training Programs

Initial training, 'Implementing ISO 14001: the International Voluntary Environmental Management Systems Specification for the Federal Agency for Atomic Energy' was conducted in December 2003. A second three day course, 'Understanding ISO 14001', is planned for September/October in the Russian Federation. Additional detail is available from the US.

4.2.2 The Working Group noted the report on the ISO 14001 training programs. The Working Group complemented the US and the Russian Federation on their ongoing efforts in these fields. Countries were asked to indicate potential interest in participation with the Russian Federation and the US in future projects of this type.

RAIPON asked if the US has burial sites for radioactive materials, and if so, what was the public's opinion on the sites. The US responded that there are such sites, which will take back spent fuel from foreign reactors if the fuel originated in the US.

Norway complimented the US on the work from these projects. Norway requested information on the number of reprocessing facilities in Russia and how the work would be used at other facilities. The US clarified that the reference was to the entire fuel cycle, not just processing facilities. The risk assessment methodology does not address operational discharges: it deals with accidents and emergency prevention. However, the

ISO14001 part of the project does deal with that aspect. There is high interest within the Ministries of the Russian Federation, and much public interest.

Sweden asked why the work was concentrated on the nuclear industry, was it more receptive to ISO14001 than other facilities? The US responded that ISO standards are new to the nuclear industry and are just now being incorporated. . This project is a cooperative, mutual exchange process. It was harder to compare nuclear and chemical priorities between the two countries. However, the first source control project dealt with chlorine at a water works and substantial amounts of chlorine are also used at nuclear facilities. While the US Department of Energy (DOE) mandate is focused on nuclear matters, the Russian partners have a broader interest. The Russian Federation noted that the public is generally more concerned about radiation as it is perceived to be more dangerous, and therefore a priority.

RAIPON referred to ____17 nuclear power station, which is not inspiring public confidence. The nuclear waste there has resulted in leukosis. Protests against new nuclear facilities have been to no avail; nuclear technology is not easily managed, not 100% safe. While there is a need for energy for society, there is also a need for safety. We need to learn more, and the question remains open.

The US noted that risk evaluation can be a very subtle thing. For the Alaska pipeline, the two failures to date related to sewage lagoons and welding (training failures). Therefore, it is necessary to look at the right things when assessing risk.

Norway noted that in event of an accident, notification is important and asked whether ISO14001 involved the chain of information communication – getting timely information? The US responded that the Russian Federation is active with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and there are two conventions regarding assistance and notification. Both the Bilibino and Dimitrovgrad exercises demonstrated that notifications are carried out well. The Russian Federation added that a special map of radioactive sites is being prepared for public use. Notification is also part of the Arctic Rescue proposal. The US noted that one precept of ISO14001 is pollution/emergency prevention – must conduct regular training/exercises, must look at public participation and public awareness, and must track legal and other requirements. The US was asked if intentional releases are part of the analysis, for example loss of materials due to worker disaffectedness. The US responded that the answer is ‘yes and no’; security is handled separately through a different program, although breach of security can be part of the scenario. There is no specific ISO 14001 requirement in that regard.

Community Radiation Information Project

The US reported on the Community Radiation Information project. While Phase I of this project has been completed, there is a new proposal (see 4.2. 9, below). RAIPON restated its lack of confidence in the safety of nuclear technology, while recognizing its potential contribution to society. The implementation of ISO14001 is new to RAIPON; the construction of new power stations does not involve the use of R16 technology – which is an improvement. While nuclear energy is reliable and efficient, the technology needs to be improved. However, the public need to be convinced of this. Norway noted that information is important, but it must be true and balanced. The US responded that it

feels the information is fair and balanced, is trying to provide an understanding of nuclear activities that have been around some communities since the 1940s.

4.2.3 The Working Group noted the completion of the materials for the Community Radiation Information project for the Kola area. The booklets are currently available in Russian and the English version is anticipated shortly. Printed booklets will be distributed and a copy placed on the EPPR web site.

4.2.4 The Chair and country representatives thanked the US and the Russian Federation for their efforts in conducting these projects, and for the continued invitation to participate in the ongoing work.

Radiological/Other Hazards – Presentation of Possible New Projects

Proposal for a Table Top Emergency Exercise Conducted by Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation (AMEC) Partners in Conjunction with EPPR

The US provided information on an upcoming tabletop emergency exercise to be conducted by the Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation (AMEC) partners. The exercise will occur in the Murmansk region later in 2004 or early 2005, but the scenario has not yet been finalized, and is being developed by IBRAE. The 'Picasso system', a suite of monitoring equipment developed by Norway and installed in Murmansk, will be exercised. The use of the term 'table-top' was clarified – in the US, the term is used to describe an exercise conducted within a room; however in the Russian Federation, the term generally refers to an exercise on a site in which a moderate amount of players, participants, and equipment is involved.

Sweden noted that they would like to participate and that 2005 would be better for planning purposes. The exercise could also serve as a test of a new agreement. It was asked if all AMEC countries are on the list of participants, and if the scenario was an 'accident', or the result of antagonistic acts. The US responded that at this time it is mostly Russian participants, with some from the US, Norway and possibly Great Britain. The scenario is an accident, rather than terrorism. Sweden noted that it would like to see regional organizations from the Russian Federation, Sweden and Norway involved. Norway asked who would present the scenario to the table. The US noted that while the scenario would be jointly developed by the US and the Russian Federation, the exercise will be conducted in Murmansk by Russian Federation participants.

Norway enquired whether the Russian navy would be involved in the table top exercise. The US responded that the Ministry of Defence would be very involved and that the interface on on-site and off-site elements was very exciting.

4.2.5 The Working Group members were invited to participate and several countries noted their interest in participating in an upcoming tabletop emergency exercise to be conducted by the Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation (AMEC) partners.

Source Control/ Emergency Prevention Project (Continuation of EPPR Program of Work: Development of Emergency Source Control Management and Spill Prevention Strategies for High Risk Activities in the Arctic)

The US provided a presentation on the third pilot project being conducted as part of the source control management project. The risk assessment methodology will be applied at a facility in the Arctic handling radioactive/nuclear materials. The project will also focus on public information, capacity building, and training.

4.2.6 The Working Group thanked the US for its presentation on a new source control management project in the Murmansk Region: the third pilot project on risk assessment. The EPPR member countries are invited to participate in development and implementation. Once the facility is identified, additional information will be provided to EPPR.

Developing International Nuclear Emergency Response Capabilities

The US provided information on an International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) initiative to develop international response capabilities to address 'nuclear events' including small radiological incidents. The US noted that this project is quite exciting, as it has global, not just Arctic, application. The response to 'major' nuclear incidents is relatively well planned for and relatively rare, the last one occurring in 1984. For smaller incidents which occur more often, there are fewer resources identified. The IAEA tended to turn to major countries for resources for these smaller events, rather than the smaller countries that may have been more accessible and had the needed resources. This project is seen as a building block for the Arctic Rescue initiative, addressing training, additional equipment, and joint exercises. While this project is underway, the countries could continue to consider and better understand the Arctic Rescue proposal. With regionally located response capabilities, a faster response is possible. The EPPR role would be to help shape the Arctic component, to reflect specific Arctic demands, e.g., identifying specialized equipment. The EPPR countries are all members of IAEA. While the proposal refers to the US and the Russian Federation working together, other countries are invited to participate.

Sweden expressed interest in the project and asked how far along the ongoing IAEA response capability project has progressed. The US responded that the process is not far along, the US, Russian Federation and others met in Brussels in mid-April, and also at the IAEA meeting in March 2004.

RAIPON asked if it was possible to develop medical assistance programs to examine things like leukosis in the tundra environments developing from exposure to radioactivity. At this time, only the Japanese are dealing with it in terms of survivors from Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Those who are suffering do not have the means to take care of the disease. The US responded that in this project medical assistance would be emergency medical assistance at an incident, rather than chronic medical care. While there are types of incidents that won't be addressed by this project, the capability from the project can also be applied to other man-made and natural disasters.

4.2.7 The EPPR member countries are invited to help shape the Arctic component of this ongoing IAEA project initiative to develop international response capabilities to address 'nuclear events' including small radiological incidents via the development of the nuclear response component of the Arctic Rescue initiative.

Radioactivity in the Arctic – Map and Information

The US presented its proposal to develop a map to provide a full picture of the information on radioactive sites in the arctic. The map would require a collective decision about the information to be included on the maps, with each country providing information on radioactive sites, and links to additional information. AMAP will be consulted on the information available in their database. This project is one way to move forward with the map project discussed earlier in the meeting.

The Russian Federation agreed this was a way to move forward; would radioactive transport be considered in the future? Sweden thanked the US for the proposal, noting it would provide important and useful information for responders. Sweden will participate in the project and noted that if this map is on the EPPR web site, it could become part of the Circumpolar Map.

Norway noted that the project fits well with the Circumpolar Map and the plan for the pilot study discussed earlier in the meeting. It would be possible to have password-protected access to the maps in order to facilitate a comment period. AMAP may have useful information on their web site. Norway would like to be kept informed of the progress, and is willing to work with the US and the Russian Federation on the project. If the information is managed centrally, can make corrections once rather than many times – the process is more efficient. The US noted that they were not familiar with the content of AMAP's site, which they understood to be ecological, rather than emergency response oriented. In any event, the AMAP information would not likely include facility information. The project is not just document points on a map, but also the information behind the points, in a common format.

Sweden asked if the AMAP information would be sufficient for these purposes. It was suggested that thresholds or criteria for the information to be included need to be developed, and then the AMAP information should be evaluated with respect to those needs. It would be helpful if the AMAP data could be used, but don't want to have to maintain or update several sources of information. In noting its support for this project, Norway added that the quality of AMAP's information may be underestimated and suggested that it be reviewed first, before making a decision.

Canada noted that it supported the project in theory, but needed to look into in more detail before making a financial commitment. Finland noted its support of the proposal. The Russian Federation also noted their support and intention to participate.

4.2.8 The Working Group agreed to develop a map of known locations of radioactivity in the Arctic. The Working Group requested that the EPPR lead (Norway) for the circumpolar map and the AMAP Secretariat conduct a

pilot project to make an interactive web-based map that will include the AMAP data on radioactivity sources. The results of the pilot project will be placed on a password-protected area of the EPPR web site with a request to provide feedback on the suitability of the information and the adequacy of supporting data on the facilities identified. Based on comments received on the pilot project, the path forward will be determined.

Community Information Booklet

The US described the preparation of a Community Information booklet to provide radiological response information for government officials (second level responders). EPPR countries are welcome to participate in the development of this project. The booklet will be approximately 100 pages in length, and provide information on the responsibilities of organizations on and off-site, expertise, lessons learned, and public perceptions. A shorter brochure document will also be prepared as a follow-up. It will be targeted at middle-school level, describing radiation sources, what happens when sources are out of control, how to know if one is exposed, and who to call. The booklet will be developed with the IAEA. Some English, Russian and Spanish versions were available at the meeting. The Russian Federation noted they are pleased with the project and will support it. Canada indicated that the booklet is a great idea, and will consider it further.

4.2.9 The final Community Information booklet will be posted on the EPPR web site, and countries are invited to use the booklet as a template for the preparation of national information documents.

Radiological/Other Hazards - Country Reports

The US made a presentation on the Independent Assessment Science Plan for Amchitka Island, Alaska. The island was the site of nuclear testing from 1965 to 1971: the assessment will involve sampling of the environment in the summer of 2004 with the involvement of students from local native villages. The US reported on the opening of the MIPK Centre in Russia which will instruct 300 students (middle and senior manager) per year. The Nuclear Energy Agency conducted the INEX3 international exercise and some arctic countries (Norway, Finland and Sweden) are heavily involved. The US also reported on the NIIAR exercise which took place in Dimitrovgrad in December 2003 and involved local, regional, federal and IAEA personnel.

Finland reported that they had participated in the Bilibino nuclear exercise, which was very useful. They look forward to upcoming exercises.

Norway noted that resources had been applied to the clean up of old nuclear test sites and storage sites. Norway also noted that in the Murmansk area a few weeks ago, there was a report that the warship Peter the Great was about to blow up, and that people should leave the area.

In response, the Russian Federation noted that it was difficult to comment on that particular situation. However, there are several items that can be reported following last years meeting. With respect to the monitoring and forecasting of natural and technical

emergencies, a special exercise is to be held in late April and it may provide a base for the Arctic Rescue project. A recent decision of the government will require local administrations (governors and vice-governors) to have training in emergency response following their election. Every year, a scientific conference is held on the monitoring and forecasting of natural disasters. The event will be in Lake Baikal next year and it will focus on natural fires.

Sweden noted that an agreement had been signed between Sweden, Norway, Finland and Russian Federation agencies concerning protection, information exchange on emergency rescues, and a commitment to take part in national exercises and the implementation of IAEA standards. Sweden also presented a report on the Barents Rescue 2001 exercise (see 4.1.10, above). Over 1,500 people from 24 countries were involved. It was suggested that there may be opportunities to coordinate some of the exercises that Sweden / Russian Federation are working on with those being planned by the US/Russian Federation. The Barents Rescue 2005 exercise may or may not have a nuclear incident as part of the scenario. It was also noted that Sweden has been working with the Russian Federation to translate some materials into Russian.

The Sami Council noted the importance of having information in a way which they can access, such as paper copies in different languages. The use of web sites is one approach, but many locations in the world do not have access to them. The Sami Council further noted Norway's earlier comment about the recent incident with Peter the Great. This may be a sign to the Arctic Council because when it was established, military information was not within its mandate and this has limited discussions. If military issues were within the mandate of the Arctic Council, perhaps it could advance peace. The Sami Council also noted that radioactivity is an important concern to all, and is of special concern in Russia. The impact of climate change on nuclear storage facilities, e.g., permafrost melting, has resulted in the melting of the ground under the facilities and the removal of materials to new areas.

5. Natural Disasters

Survey of Past Natural Disasters

Finland presented the results of the survey of past natural disasters and a discussion of the implications for EPPR. It was noted that the topic was discussed in Murmansk and at previous EPPR meetings, as well as at SAO meetings in 2002 and 2003. It was noted that the mandate of the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy was more limited, but with the advent of the wider mandate of the Arctic Council it would be possible to include natural disasters in our mandate. Finland noted the difficulty in completing the survey. The results of the survey were not comprehensive or complete, but were slightly in favour of adding natural disasters to the EPPR mandate. The addition of natural disasters to the mandate has work load implications.

The Chair noted that the Working Group needed to come to a decision as a recommendation must be made to the SAOs at their meeting in two weeks. The Russian Federation stated that it is in favour of the expanded mandate. EMERCOM deals with all kinds of incidents. In the Arctic, floods are an issue on rivers flowing north. There are some problems that are rather specific, and there could be increased cooperation on climate change, and changes in permafrost and how that affects towns, the construction of pipelines, etc.

The Swedish Rescue Agency is involved in natural disasters; similar problems to those described by Russia occur in northern Sweden – floods, erosion, etc. There is room for information sharing.

Canada thanked Finland for its presentation. Canada is a very large country with many different organizations having responsibilities for natural disasters which would need to be included. It was suggested that if natural disasters were added to the EPPR mandate, the number of projects should be limited.

Finland agreed with Canada's approach and suggested that future projects could examine the fire risk associated with different types of forest and humidity conditions, or satellite forecasting of floods.

Norway agreed that efforts should begin slowly.

Sweden agreed that the matter should be put on the agenda, and that EPPR should move slowly to implement projects, and start with information exchange.

The US supported Canada's approach. If EPPR is to take a recommendation to the SAOs that we want to include natural disasters in our mandate, we also need a statement of our goals and the kinds of benefits anticipated. The US noted that it would be willing to assist with the drafting of this material. In Alaska, there are many forest fires, floods, and coastal erosion. There is a need for information exchange, and this will be facilitated by today's decision.

Recommendation to SAOs on Expansion of EPPR Mandate to Include Major Natural Disasters

- 5.1 It was the consensus of those countries present to recommend to the SAOs that natural disasters be added to the mandate of the EPPR Working Group. If this recommendation is accepted, the first steps will include: clarification of the specific goals; exchange of information; and the addition of natural disasters to the risk assessment matrix.**

The Chair indicated that it would be necessary to confer with Denmark/Greenland and Iceland, regarding the decision.

Cooperation with the Northern Forum

The Chair noted that it would not likely be possible to address the Northern Forum's nine recommendations from the Severe Cold Climate Emergency Response Workshop (April 2002) related to natural disasters in any detail during this meeting. The US noted that the Northern Forum had expressed a strong desire for EPPR to attend their upcoming May flooding workshop in the Russian Federation to further cement the relationship. The US was unable to attend due to other commitments. Finland indicated that they may attend. The Russian Federation indicated that they will be participating and EMERCOM will be represented.

- 5.2 The Working Group agreed to pursue cooperation with the Northern Forum in the field of natural disasters. EPPR will review the recommendations on flooding from Northern Forum's Severe Cold Climate Emergency Response Workshop (April 2002) for areas of potential cooperation. Finland and the Russian Federation will agree on how to represent the EPPR Working Group at the upcoming Northern Forum workshop on flooding to be held May 28-29 in Khanty-Mansiysk, Russian Federation.**

6. Cross-Cutting Issues

Canada made a presentation on the Northwest Territories Cumulative Effects Assessment and Management (CEAM) Strategy and Framework. Questions followed about the nature of diamond mining in the Northwest Territories, and oil and gas exploration in the Beaufort Sea-Mackenzie Delta. The US noted that in Alaska, there has been 60 years of development and considerable research into cumulative effects on the North Slope. The common elements between the two regions were noted.

Presentation on the Northern View

A presentation on the 'Northern View' earth observation satellite services was provided. Questions following the presentation related to its potential application in situations involving oil in ice; the availability of a large number of other satellite imaging services; and the difficulties inherent in using satellite imaging for oil response. It was suggested that service providers need to work with potential users early on in the planning phases to ensure that their needs can be met.

Arctic Marine Strategic Plan

The second draft of the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan (AMSP) was distributed in March; no comments were received from EPPR members. The EPPR Chair and Secretariat did provide some feedback to PAME on the 'ecosystem approach', and the US contributed a paper on the topic. A meeting on the AMSP will be held May 6 immediately following the

SAO meeting but the Chair will not be able to attend. EPPR members from Canada and the US will be participating but will not officially represent EPPR. The AMSP does discuss emergency response.

The US noted that the 'ecosystem approach' is a major topic of discussion for the AMSP and the Oil Spill Recovery Institute has spent a fair bit of effort on this. An ecosystem-based database for some of the Beaufort Sea/ Chukchi Sea is available for on-scene coordinators. The US further clarified that the original paper on the 'ecosystem approach' was written because the term was being used in a variety of ways. The paper provides a US government perspective, identifying ways the term might be used. This has also been done for the precautionary principle.

Sweden noted that the draft AMSP does not reflect the issue of emergency response. The Chair noted that she would provide EPPR's input at the upcoming meeting of the Working Group chairs; the EPPR members participating in the AMSP meeting can convey the comments to that venue.

- 6.1 The Working Group discussed the March 2004 draft of the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan. Countries noted the need to strengthen the emergencies preparedness and response component of the current draft. Note: PAME accepted these comments during their recent meeting**

International Polar Year

The Chair noted that no specific suggestions had been received from EPPR regarding the International Polar Year (IPY - 2007) in response to a request from the Chair of the SAOs. The US noted that there had been a meeting in St. Petersburg, attended by very few Arctic researchers, Permanent Participants, Northern Forum, or others. There was a strong Antarctic contingent. Discussion centred on the question of whether the focus is on the Arctic and its residents, or just on purely scientific issues. Sweden noted the importance of having research on the agenda for the IPY, mainly applied research, to demonstrate its value to the people in the regions with concrete examples of what research can do for us.

- 6.2 The Working Group agreed to provide information on any activities or concrete projects of relevance to the International Polar Year to the Chair, for inclusion in the EPPR response to the Chair of the Arctic Council.**

SDWG's Capacity Building Overview

The Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG) prepared a draft document that included several EPPR products and activities, such as the Arctic Guide, the Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk, and Source Control Management Projects. The Working Group was asked to identify anything that was missing, or any inaccuracies that

need to be addressed. After confirming the intended audience, the US noted that e-mail addresses should be removed for the individual contacts; for some projects, a generic reference to the EPPR Secretariat/web site address would be more appropriate than a specific individual for some of the more dated projects. Dates should be added for all projects.

- 6.3 The Working Group reviewed the current draft of the Sustainable Development Working Group's Capacity Building Overview, and found that all relevant EPPR projects were included. The EPPR Secretariat and Chair will revise the EPPR portion of the document based on the comments received from the Working Group.**

7. EPPR Web Site

The Secretariat summarized the changes to the web site since the last meeting and the questions outlined in the previously distributed report on the web site. In addition, hard copies of the Arctic Guide were distributed for the delegations to review and update as necessary.

Sweden noted the value of the web site, and the need to maintain a linkage to the Arctic Council site, should it be moved. Sweden requested that all of the meeting documents distributed and posted on the web site be clearly marked with the agenda item reference number for easier organization of materials. With respect to the provision of e-mail addresses, the Indigenous Peoples Secretariat noted that there should be no problems if the information is posted in the password-protected area. The US noted that any public access to an e-mail address results in a number of requests from the public, in addition to the threat of 'spam'. Sweden noted that requests from the public are not a large problem, although spam is an issue. The European Union is banning spam.

- 7.1 The EPPR Working Group gratefully accepted Sweden's offer to host the EPPR web site for a period of five years.**
- 7.2 The EPPR project information on the Arctic Council web site will be updated by the Secretariat, in consultation with the project leads. The corresponding sections of the EPPR web site will also be updated. In the future, lead countries for projects will be asked to provide updates to the Secretariat on projects for inclusion on the web site when submitting reports prior to the annual EPPR meeting.**
- 7.3 E-mail addresses for EPPR members will be provided to the Arctic Council Secretariat for inclusion in the password-protected section of the Arctic Council web site. This information will also be available on the password-protected portion of the EPPR web site.**

- 7.4 Countries were asked to provide updates to the relevant sections of the on-line 'Arctic Guide' to the Secretariat within 30 days of the meeting.
- 7.5 Working Group members are invited to provide suggestions for the web site to the Secretariat at any time.

8. Work Plan and Strategic Plan

The draft work plan tables distributed in advance of the meeting were updated to reflect the discussions at the meeting. The Chair noted that the Strategic Plan is not an immediate priority, but will need to be reviewed in light of the recommendation to expand the mandate to include natural disasters.

- 8.1 The updated work plan tables are included were included in the record of decision for the meeting, and as Appendix 3 of this meeting report.
- 8.2 The Strategic Plan will be reviewed and revised as appropriate following the decision of the SAO's regarding EPPR's recommendation on expansion of the mandate to include natural disasters.

9. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for Period 2004 – 2006

EMERCOM indicated that if the Russian Federation takes the Chair of the Arctic Council, EMERCOM is willing to assume the Chair of EPPR. However, there is an element of uncertainty with the recent government change in the Russian Federation. It is important to send the message to the SAOs that EPPR needs to continue, and that there may be creative ways to address the chairmanship of EPPR. The question of Vice-chair must also be addressed. Canada noted that it is difficult to find a Vice-chair if there is no Chair in place. Sweden asked about the future Secretariat services.

The Chair noted that if the Russian Federation assumes the Chair, they would also provide the Secretariat. If that situation fails to materialize, all three roles – Chair, Vice-chair, and Secretariat – are open for discussion, and must be resolved before the November Ministerial meeting.

- 9.1 The election of the new Chair and Vice-Chair was deferred pending clarification of the chairmanship of the Arctic Council for 2004 - 2006. If the Russian Federation is the next chair of the Arctic Council, it is anticipated that the Russian Federation will also chair the EPPR Working Group and provide the Secretariat.

10. EPPR Deliverables to the Ministerial Meeting, November 2004

10.1 The Working Group proposed the following deliverables for the upcoming Ministerial meeting:

- Recommendation re: inclusion of natural disasters in the mandate
- SCAT Manual
- Community Radiation Information Project
- Risk Assessment Methodology document (working draft)
- Information booklets
- Reports on exercises, e.g., Bilibino

11. Other Business

11.1 The draft report on the 2004 EPPR meeting in Inuvik Canada will be provided within 30 days. Countries are to provide comments within 30 days of receipt of the report.

12. Next Meeting

12.1 The Chair advised that the date and location for the next meeting, anticipated to be in Denmark/ Greenland, would be forthcoming. Finland has agreed to host the 2005 meeting in the event that Denmark/ Greenland is unable to do so.

13. Record of Decisions

A draft record of decision document was reviewed by the Working Group. It was noted that a full meeting report (this document), and a short report from the May SAO meeting, would also be prepared.

13.1 The Secretariat is to distribute the final record of decision for the meeting to the Working Group within 30 days of this meeting (distributed April 26).

Appendix 1: Agenda for the 2004 EPPR Meeting

0. Registration

1. Opening of the Meeting

2. Adoption of the Agenda

3. Chair's and Secretariat Report, including Arctic Council Activities

3.1 Work of the Arctic Council and the SAOs

Information and discussion on recent and coming meetings/developments:

- AC Working Group Chairs Meeting – Reykjavik October 2003
- SAO meeting – Svartsengi Iceland, October 2003
- Upcoming SAO meeting – Iceland May 2004
- Upcoming SAO and Ministerial meetings – Iceland Fall 2004

3.2 Other Working Groups/Projects

- ACAP
- ACIA – Scientific and Overview reports
- □AMAP – Petroleum Hydrocarbons Assessment (2006), Oil and Gas Conference (2005)
- CAFF
- PAME - Arctic Marine Strategic Plan, Oil Transfer Guidelines
- SDWG - Circumpolar Infrastructure Task Force, Sustainable Development Action Plan

3.3 Co-operation with Other Agencies

- Northern Forum (April 2002 Severe Cold Climate Emergency Response Workshop recommendations)
- University of the Arctic (in conjunction with the EPPR Contact Persons)
- UN report on Oceans and Law of the Sea (note from AC Chair)

3.4 Activities of the EPPR Secretariat

4. *Project Updates and Information Exchange – By Area of Focus*

The delegations are invited to provide the meeting with information on:

4.1 Oil and Gas

4.1.1 Reports on EPPR *ongoing projects* (by lead country):

- Shoreline Cleanup Assessment Technology (SCAT) Manual (Canada)

4.1.2 Presentation of possible *new projects*:

- Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk - Updating and Extending EPPR datasets (Norway)
- Interactive Maps and Environmental Information from Arctic Council Programmes on the Web – Proposal developed by EPPR and AMAP Secretariats (Norway)
- R&D – Response for oil in ice
- Cooperation with Northern Forum
- Transboundary cooperation
- Petroleum Hydrocarbons Assessment 2006 (AMAP)
- Oil and Gas Conference 2005 (AMAP)
- Arctic Rescue

4.1.3 Country Reports

- New activities in the Arctic areas (transportation, production)
- Major organisational changes in the Arctic countries
- Update on bilateral and multi-lateral agreements/plans
- Related activities of interest – other regional organizations (E.g., Barents Euro-Arctic Regional Council, Nordic Council of Ministers, Council of Baltic Sea States)
 - Presentation by Swedish Coast Guard – Sub-Regional Arrangements to Combat Marine Pollution
- Other items of interest
 - Research and development in the Arctic countries (invited/offered presentations)
 - 'Lessons learned' (invited/offered presentations)

4.2 Radiological/Other Hazards

4.2.1 Reports on EPPR *ongoing projects* (by lead country):

- Source Control Management Phase I – Refined Risk Assessment Methodology (working draft) (US and Russian Federation)
- Source Control Management Phase II – NIIAR Fuel Research Department (US and Russian Federation)
- Community Radiation Information Project
- ISO 14001 Training Programs

4.2.2 Presentation of possible *new projects*:

- Source Control/ Emergency Prevention Project (Continuation of EPPR Program of Work: Development of Emergency Source Control Management and Spill Prevention Strategies for High Risk Activities in the Arctic) (US and Russian Federation)
- Proposal for a Table Top Emergency Exercise Conducted by Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation (AMEC) Partners in Conjunction with EPPR (US)
- Developing International Nuclear Emergency Response Capabilities (US and Russian Federation)
- Radioactivity in the Arctic – Map and Information (US)

4.2.3 Country Reports

- New activities in the Arctic areas
- Major organisational changes in the Arctic countries
- Bilateral and multi-lateral agreements/plans
- Related activities of interest – other regional organizations (E.g., Barents Euro-Arctic Regional Council, Nordic Council of Ministers, Council of Baltic Sea States)
 - Presentation by Swedish Radiation Protection Authority – Barents Rescue 2001
- Other items of interest
- Research and development in the Arctic countries (invited/offered presentations)
- ‘Lessons learned’ (invited/offered presentations)

5. *Natural Disasters*

5.1 Survey of Past Natural Disasters (Finland)

5.2 Develop recommendation to SAO’s (May meeting) on the expansion of the EPPR Working Group mandate to include major natural disasters

5.3 Cooperation with Northern Forum (if recommendation is to expand mandate)

6. *Cross-Cutting Issues*

**6.1 Presentation on Northern View (David Arthurs
<http://www.northernview.org/>)**

6.2 Arctic Marine Strategic Plan - ‘approval’ of EPPR section

6.3 International Polar Year

6.4 Capacity-building (SDWG)

7. *EPPR Web Site (Secretariat)*

- Discussions on updating needs and on the contents/structure of the web site
- Updates to the Arctic Guide

8. *Work Plan and Strategic Plan (Chair)*

- Discussion and adoption of the updated work plan
- Discussion on updating strategic plan (particularly based on decisions re: expanded mandate – would be done by correspondence following meeting)

9. *Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for Period 2004 - 2006*

- Paragraph 2.1 of the Operating Guidelines for EPPR states: "*The chairperson and the vice-chairperson shall each serve terms of two years. These terms may be extended by the Working Group. The terms of the chairperson and vice-chairperson shall normally begin after the Ministerial Meeting of the Arctic Council that follows their election.*" Paragraph 2.5 further states: "*The home country of the chairperson normally provides secretariat support, or the Working Group may agree on other arrangements.*"
- Decision regarding future location of EPPR Secretariat

10. *EPPR Deliverables to the SAO Meeting, May 2004*

11. *Other Business*

12. *Next Meeting*

13. *Record of Decisions – finalize*

14. *Adjournment*

Appendix 2: Participants – Working Group Meeting – Inuvik 20 - 22 April 2004

<i>Country / Organization</i>	<i>Head of Delegation* / Other Representatives</i>	<i>Title/Organization/Mailing Address</i>	<i>Tel/Fax/E-Mail/Website</i>
EPPR Chair	Ms Laura Johnston	EPPR Working Group Chair Manager Northern Division Environmental Protection Branch Environment Canada Suite 301, 5204 – 50th Avenue Yellowknife, Northwest Territories CANADA X1A 1E2	Tel: +1 867 669 4782 Fax: +1 867 873 8185 E-mail: laura.johnston@ec.gc.ca
EPPR Secretariat	Ms. Vicki McCulloch	EPPR Executive Secretary c/o P.O. Box 2335 5020 – 47th St. Yellowknife, NWT Canada X1A 2P7	Tel: +1 613 478 2020 Fax: +1 613 478 3162 E-mail: vmcculloch@bellnet.ca http://eppr.arctic-council.org
Canada	Ms. Bonnie Leonard*	Policy and Planning Advisor Marine Safety Transport Canada Centennial Towers 200 Kent Street, 5th Floor Ottawa, ON CANADA K1A 0E6	Tel: +1 613 990 3381 Fax: +1 613 996 8902 E-mail: leonardbo@dfo-mpo- gc.ca
	Dr. Norm Snow	Executive Director Joint Secretariat, Inuvialuit Renewable Resource Committees Box 2120 Inuvik, Northwest Territories Canada X0E 0T0	Tel: +1 867 777 2828 Fax: +1 867 777 2610 E-mail: execdir@jointsec.nt.ca
	Mr. Frank Pokiak	Chair Inuvialuit Game Council Box 2120 Inuvik, Northwest Territories Canada X0E 0T0	Tel: +1 867 777 2828 Fax: +1 867 777 2610 E-mail: igc-js@jointsec.nt.ca
	Mr. Richard Binder	Inuvialuit Game Council Box 2120 Inuvik, Northwest Territories, Canada X0E 0T0	Phone +1 867 777-2828 Fax +1 867 777-2610 E-mail: igc-js@jointsec.nt.ca

**EPPR Working Group Meeting
Inuvik, Canada, 20 – 22 April, 2004
Meeting Report – Appendix 2: Meeting Participants**

June 29, 2004

<i>Country / Organization</i>	<i>Head of Delegation* / Other Representatives</i>	<i>Title/Organization/Mailing Address</i>	<i>Tel/Fax/E-Mail/Website</i>
	Mr. Boogie Pokiak	Inuvialuit Game Council Box 2120 Inuvik, Northwest Territories, Canada X0E 0T0	Phone +1 867 777-2828 Fax +1 867 777-2610 E-mail: igc-js@jointsec.nt.ca
	Mr. Chuck Brumwell	Director Northern Corporate Affairs Branch Environment Canada Suite 301, 5204 – 50th Avenue Yellowknife, Northwest Territories CANADA X1A 1E2	Tel: +1 867 669 4725 Fax: +1 867 873 8185 E-mail: chuck.brumwell@ec.gc.ca
	Mr. Ed Collins	Chief, Engineering and Emergency Science Environment Canada Suite 301, 5204 – 50th Avenue Yellowknife, Northwest Territories CANADA X1A 1E2	Tel: +1 867 669 4726 Fax: +1 867 873 8185 E-mail: ed.collins@ec.gc.ca
	Mr. John Korec	Environmental Assessment Officer National Energy Board 444 Seventh Ave. SW Calgary, Alberta Canada T2P 0X8	Tel: +1 403 292 6614 Fax: +1 403 292 5875 E-mail: jkorec@neb-one.gc.ca
	Mr. J.J. Brickett	Regional Operations Officer Environmental Response Canadian Coast Guard Central and Arctic Region 201 Front Street North Suite 703 Sarnia, Ontario Canada N7T 8B1	Tel: +1 519 383-1956 Fax: +1 519 383-1991 E-mail: BrickettJJ@DFO-MPO.GC.CA
	Mr. David Livingstone	Director, Renewable Resources and Environment Indian and Northern Affairs Canada Renewable Resources and Environment Directorate Bellanca Building P.O. box 1500 Yellowknife, Northwest Territories Canada X1A 2R3	Tel: +1 867 669-2647 Fax: +1 867 669-2707 E-mail: livingstoned@inac.gc.ca
	Mr. Andrew Applejohn	Director Aurora Research Institute 191 Mackenzie Road Box 1450 Inuvik, Northwest Territories Canada X0E 0T0	Tel: +1 867 777-3298 Fax: +1 867 777-4264 E-mail: Andrew_applejohn@gov.nt.ca

<i>Country / Organization</i>	<i>Head of Delegation* / Other Representatives</i>	<i>Title/Organization/Mailing Address</i>	<i>Tel/Fax/E-Mail/Website</i>
Denmark / Greenland			
Finland	Mr. Timo Viitanen*	Ministerial Adviser Ministry of the Interior Kirkkokatu 12 PO Box 26 Helsinki Finland FIN-00023 GOVERNMENT	Tel: +358 9 160 44575 Fax: +358 9 160 44672 E-mail: timo.viitanen@intermin.fi
	Mr. Seppo Lehto	Deputy Chief of Rescue Department State Provincial Office of Lapland P.O. Box 8002 Valtakatu 2 96101 Rovaniemi Finland	Tel: +358 2051 77677 Fax: +358 2051 77643 E-mail: seppo.lehto@lh.intermin.fi
Iceland			
Norway	Mr. Kjell Kolstad* (Vice-chair)	Head of Station for Emergency Response Norwegian Coastal Administration The Polar Environmental Centre 9296 Tromso Norway	Tel: +47 7775 0480 Fax: +47 7775 0481 E-mail: kjell.kolstad@kystverket.no
Russian Federation	Mr. Igor Veselov*	Deputy of the Chief Department of Warning of Extraordinary Situations and Scientific-technical Policy EMERCOM of Russia Teatralnyi proezd, 3 Moscow 103012 Russia	Tel: +7 095 449 3785 or +7 095 443 4575 Fax: +7 095 144 5948 or +7 095 449 9773 E-mail: veselov@mchs.gov.ru
Sweden	Mr. Anders Hermansson*	Desk Officer Ministry of Defence Jakobsgatan 9 SE-103 33 Stockholm Sweden	Tel: + 46 8 405 39 51 Fax: + 46 8 20 44 83 E-mail: anders.hermansson@defence.ministry.se Mobile Tel: 070-3299974
	Mr. Thomas Fagö	Commodore Swedish Coast Guard Stumholmen, Box 536 Karlskrona Sweden SE-37123	Tel: + 46 455 35 34 55 Fax: + 46 455 105 21 E-mail: thomas.fago@coastguard.se
	Mr. Karl-Erik Kulander	Swedish Rescue Services Agency Karolinen Karlstad, Sweden S-651-80	Tel: + 46 54 135072 Fax: + 46 54 135615 E-mail: karl-erik.kulander@srv.se

EPPR Working Group Meeting
Inuvik, Canada, 20 – 22 April, 2004
Meeting Report – Appendix 2: Meeting Participants

June 29, 2004

<i>Country / Organization</i>	<i>Head of Delegation* / Other Representatives</i>	<i>Title/Organization/Mailing Address</i>	<i>Tel/Fax/E-Mail/Website</i>
	Dr. Jonas Lindgren	Programme Coordinator Emergency Management Swedish Radiation Protection Authority Stockholm, Sweden S-171 16	Tel: + 46 8 7297240 Cell: + 46 703 985706 Fax: + 46 8 7297108 Cell: + 46 706 103485 Iridium: +88 1621 419087 E-mail: Jonas.Lindgren@ssi.se
USA	Ms. Ann Heinrich*	Deputy Director Office of International Emergency Management and Cooperation National Nuclear Security Administration US Department of Energy 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W. Washington, D.C. USA 20585	Tel: +1 202 586 8165 Fax: +1 202 586 8272 E-mail: Ann.heinrich@nnsa.doe.gov
	Mr. Walter B. Parker	Board Member Oil Spill Recovery Institute 3724 Campbell Airstrip Road Anchorage, Alaska USA 99504	Phone: +1 907 333 5189 Fax: +1 907 333 5153 E-mail: wbparker@gci.net
	Mr. Bruce Russell	JS & A Environmental Services Inc. Pacific Northwest National Laboratories 7107 Oakridge Ave. Chevy Chase, Maryland USA 20815	Tel: +1 301 656 1751 Fax: +1 301 656 0436 E-mail: barussell@verizon.net
	Mr. Mark Meza	Deputy, Office of Response US Coast Guard 2100 2nd Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. USA 20593-0001	Tel: +1 202 267 2466 Fax: +1 202 267 4085 E-mail: mmeza@comdt.uscg.mil
	Dr. Dave Barnes	Professor University of Alaska Fairbanks P.O. Box 755900 Fairbanks, AK USA 99775	Tel: +1 907 474 6126 Fax: +1 907 474 6087 E-mail: ffdib@uaf.edu
Indigenous Peoples Secretariat	Ms. Laila Chemnitz	Administrative Secretary IPS Strandgade 91, 4 P.O. Box 2151 1401 Copenhagen K Denmark	Tel: +45 32 83 37 92 Fax: +45 32 83 37 91 E-mail: lch@ghs.dk

EPPR Working Group Meeting
Inuvik, Canada, 20 – 22 April, 2004
Meeting Report – Appendix 2: Meeting Participants

June 29, 2004

<i>Country / Organization</i>	<i>Head of Delegation* / Other Representatives</i>	<i>Title/Organization/Mailing Address</i>	<i>Tel/Fax/E-Mail/Website</i>
Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON)	Mr. Yuriy Samar*	Senior Counsellor Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON) 37, Prospect Vernadskogo, Block 2 P.O. Box 110 119415 Moscow Russian Federation	Tel: + 7 095 165 0754 Fax: + 7 095 164 6939 E-mail: raipon@online.ru
Sami Council	Mr. Stefan Mikaelsson*	Vice-President Sami Council P.O. Box 90 SE-960-24 Harads Sweden`	Tel: + 46 928 107 95 Fax: + 358 16 677 353 E-mail: Stefan.Mikaelsson@telia.com
Other Participants	Mr. David Arthurs	President Hickling Arthurs Low (HAL) Corporation 150 Isabella Street, Penthouse Floor Ottawa, K1S 1V7	Phone: 613 237 2220 Fax: 613 237 7347 Email: darthurs@hal.ca Web: www.hal.ca

Appendix 3: Work Plan Projects 2004 – 2006: Participation by Countries

The following tables summarize the involvement of countries in the EPPR Working Group's projects for oil pollution, radiological and other hazards, and natural disasters – based on discussions at the April 2004 meeting.

OIL POLLUTION: L - LEAD, P - PARTICIPANT

PROJECTS	Canada	Denmark/ Greenland	Finland	Iceland	Norway	Russian Federation	Sweden	USA
<i>Ongoing</i>								
Host EPPR web site							L	
<i>Proposed Projects</i>								
Interactive Maps and Environmental Information from Arctic Council Programmes on the Web	P		P		L	P	P	P
Cooperation with Northern Forum	P		P					L
Petroleum Hydrocarbon Assessment 2006 (AMAP)	P							
Oil and Gas Symposium 2005 (AMAP)								
Arctic Rescue						L		

RADIOLOGICAL & OTHER HAZARDS: L - LEAD, P - PARTICIPANT

PROJECTS	Canada	Denmark/ Greenland	Finland	Iceland	Norway	Russian Federation	Sweden	USA
Ongoing								
Source Control Management Phase I – Refined Risk Assessment Methodology (working draft)			P			L		L
Source Control Management Phase II – NIIAR Fuel Research Department						L		L
ISO 14001 Training Programs						L		L
Host EPPR Website							L	
Proposed Projects								
Source Control/Emergency Prevention Project						L		L
Proposal for a Table Top Emergency Exercise – AMEC in cooperation with EPPR			P			L	P	L
Developing International Nuclear Emergency Response Capabilities						L	P	L
Radioactivity in the Arctic – Map and Information							P	L
Community Information Project						L		L
Arctic Rescue						L		

NATURAL DISASTERS: L - LEAD, P - PARTICIPANT

PROJECTS	Canada	Denmark/ Greenland	Finland	Iceland	Norway	Russian Federation	Sweden	USA
Ongoing								
Proposed Projects								
Clarify Goals/Update Risk Assessment								
Cooperation with Northern Forum			P			P		