

***EPPR Working Group  
Meeting***

***3 – 5 June 2003***

***Murmansk, Russian  
Federation***

***-Meeting Report-***

***(August, 2003)***

***EPPR WORKING GROUP MEETING  
MURMANSK, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 3 – 5 JUNE 2003  
–MEETING REPORT–***

**Table of Contents**

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1. OPENING OF THE MEETING</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>3. CHAIR’S AND SECRETARIAT REPORTS, INCLUDING ARCTIC COUNCIL ACTIVITIES</b> 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
PAME.....	3
SDWG .....	3
3.3 CO-OPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.....	4
3.4 ACTIVITIES OF THE EPPR SECRETARIAT .....	6
<b>4. INFORMATION EXCHANGE AND PROJECT UPDATES – BY AREA OF FOCUS</b> .....	<b>6</b>
4.1 OIL AND GAS.....	6
<i>Lessons Learned/New Activities/Major Organizational Changes/Research and</i> <i>Development</i> .....	6
<i>Ongoing Projects – Oil and Gas</i> .....	8
<i>Northern Forum Severe Cold Climate Workshop Recommendations</i> .....	11
<i>Russian Expert Presentations – Oil and Gas</i> .....	12
4.2 RADIOLOGICAL/OTHER HAZARDS .....	12
<i>Lessons Learned/New Activities/Major Organizational Changes/Research and</i> <i>Development</i> .....	12
<i>Ongoing Projects – Radiological and Other Hazards</i> .....	13
<i>Russian Expert Presentation – Radiological and Other Hazards</i> .....	15
4.3 NATURAL DISASTERS .....	15
4.4 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES .....	17
<b>5. DISCUSSION PAPER: MANDATE AND OPERATIONAL OPTIONS FOR THE EPPR</b> <b>WORKING GROUP</b> .....	<b>17</b>

<b>6. OTHER EPPR WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES.....</b>	<b>18</b>
6.1 ARCTIC MARINE STRATEGIC PLAN .....	18
6.2 ACIA POLICY PAPER.....	18
6.3 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES (NEW) .....	19
6.4 UPDATING THE EPPR WEB SITE .....	20
6.5 UPDATE OF THE WORK PLAN AND STRATEGIC PLAN .....	20
<b>7. EPPR DELIVERABLES TO THE SAO MEETING, OCTOBER 2003.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>8. OTHER BUSINESS.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>9. NEXT MEETING.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1: AGENDA FOR THE EPPR WORKING GROUP MEETING .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2: PARTICIPANTS - WORKING GROUP MEETING – MURMANSK 3-5 JUNE 2003 2-1</b>	
<b>APPENDIX 3: WORK PLAN PROJECTS 2002-2004 - PARTICIPATION BY COUNTRY .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>

***EPPR WORKING GROUP MEETING***  
***MURMANSK, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 3 – 5 JUNE 2003***  
***–MEETING REPORT–***

## **Introduction**

The EPPR Working Group meeting was held in Murmansk, Russian Federation, 3 – 5 June 2003. The meeting was attended by delegations from Canada, Finland, Norway, the Russian Federation, Sweden and the US.

Ms. Laura Johnston of Canada was Chair for the meeting and Ms. Vicki McCulloch was the Secretary.

The host country arranged several tours during the meeting, including a visit to a nuclear-powered icebreaker owned by the Murmansk Shipping Company.

A number of presentations were made on the projects or proposals being discussed at the meeting, and also on other related topics by Russian experts; while the latter are noted in this meeting report, the substantive details have not been included. Copies of the presentations are available on the EPPR web site (<http://eppr.arctic-council.org/>).

The meeting report has been organized according to the agenda items, although at the meeting adjustments were made to the order of agenda items to accommodate the circumstances. A copy of the meeting agenda is included as Appendix 1.

## **1. Opening of the Meeting**

The Chair opened the meeting. Mr. Gennady Gurianov, Vice- Governor of Murmansk oblast, provided words of welcome to the delegations and other participants in the meeting.

Dr. Vladimir Novikov, EMERCOM of Russia also welcomed the participants and made a presentation on the 'Arctic Rescue' initiative, a mechanism for coordination of international activities on prevention and liquidation of the consequences of the emergency situations in the Arctic. The rationale for the creation of this international structure was reviewed, and an overview of its possible structure, sources of funding, and potential results/benefits provided. Additional information is provided in Section 4.4.

At the Chair's request, the delegations were introduced. A list of meeting participants is included as Appendix 2.

The Chair noted with appreciation the invitation from Murmansk oblast to meet in Murmansk, and the kind words of welcome from the Vice-Governor. EMERCOM of Russia was thanked for their presentation on the Arctic Rescue initiative and their suggestions on the direction that the

work of EPPR might take.

## **2. Adoption of the Agenda**

The meeting agenda and timetable were reviewed. The Chair noted that the approach to the agenda had been slightly modified from previous years, grouping discussions by area of interest; however the intent – to exchange information on ‘lessons learned’, organizational changes, projects, and research and development initiatives – remains the same. It was noted that a number of presentations by Russian experts of relevance to the various areas of interest would be made.

### **2.1 The agenda was adopted with amendment that Item 4.2 ‘Radiological / Other Hazards’ would precede 4.1 ‘Oil and Gas’.**

Dr. Vladimir Novikov, EMERCOM of Russia, Mr. Gennady Gurianov, Vice- Governor of Murmansk, and the EPPR Chair participated in a press conference conducted with print, radio, and television media.

## **3. Chair’s and Secretariat Reports, including Arctic Council Activities**

### **3.1 Work of the Arctic Council and the SAOs**

The Chair outlined activities of the Arctic Council since the last EPPR meeting in Cordova in April 2002, particularly since Canada assumed the Chair after the Ministerial meeting in Inari. It was noted that the EPPR work plan contained in the Inari meeting report formed the basis for this meeting; its main elements were reviewed. The Arctic Council has also been considering the mandate of the EPPR Working Group. The traditional focus has been on oil and gas; EPPR has been requested to give more emphasis to radiological and other hazards, and to examine the possibility of expanding the mandate to include natural disasters. The Senior Arctic Officials (SAOs) have also asked that EPPR increase cooperation with other Arctic Council working groups, in particular the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program (AMAP) and Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME).

In January of 2003, Iceland, as Chair of the Arctic Council, convened a meeting of the Working Group Chairs and the Chairman of the Governing Board of the Indigenous Peoples Secretariat. The meeting included information-sharing, discussion of opportunities for coordination and cross-cutting themes.

The Chair noted that a report on EPPR's activities was submitted to the SAO's prior to their April 2003 meeting; the report was also distributed to EPPR heads of delegation, other country representatives, and the Indigenous Peoples Secretariat. At the SAO meeting, feedback was received on a number of matters. Canada and others expressed concern as to whether adequate resources were available, should EPPR's mandate be expanded to include natural disasters. Many exciting opportunities, particularly with respect to offshore oil and gas, were noted. The SAOs expressed their pleasure with the successful tabletop exercise at Bilbino. EPPR was requested to work with AMAP to clarify their respective roles with respect to the assessment of petroleum hydrocarbons in terms of emergency prevention and response. Finally, the SAOs requested that EPPR take a role in the PAME-led Arctic Marine Strategic Plan (AMSP). A workshop on the AMSP will be held immediately prior to the October 2003 SAO meeting in Iceland (see Agenda Item 6.1).

### **3.2 *Activities of Other Working Groups/Projects***

The Chair provided highlights of the activities of other Arctic Council Working Groups and projects of relevance to EPPR.

#### **ACAP**

It was noted that the Arctic Council Action Plan to Eliminate Pollution (ACAP) has been undertaking a number of major projects, such as management of PCBs and obsolete pesticides. To date, there has not been much interaction with EPPR, but this is an opportunity the working group may wish to consider.

#### **ACIA**

The Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) is being led by the AMAP and Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) working groups. Three reports are under preparation: a 'science' report (approximately 1000 pages), a synthesis of the science document (approximately 100 pages), and a policy document (approximately 30 pages). The findings of the science report on change in the Arctic, as well as the policy document may be of relevance to EPPR's work.

#### **AMAP**

AMAP will be producing an assessment of petroleum hydrocarbons in the Arctic in 2006. EPPR has been requested to work jointly with AMAP on an international hydrocarbon conference to be held in 2005. In addition, discussions need to be held on the use, as part of the AMAP assessment, of the circumpolar map of resources at risk from oil spills.

#### **PAME**

Discussed under agenda item 6.

#### **SDWG**

The Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG) is undertaking seven major projects. Of

main interest to EPPR are the 'Circumpolar Infrastructure Task Force' and the 'Information and Communication Technology in the Arctic Conference' to be held in the fall of this year. (Additional discussion was held as part of Agenda Item 6)

The Chair called upon those present to speak to the various initiatives of the other Working Groups, particularly those who are members or involved in projects:

- Sweden noted that their representatives present at the meeting are not directly involved, and as such have no comment. They would however speak to the work of the Helsinki Commission later in the meeting.
- The US indicated that it would be speaking to both the 'Circumpolar Infrastructure Task Force' and the 'Information and Communication Technology in the Arctic Conference' under agenda item 6.2.
- The Russian Federation noted that their involvement would come up in the discussions of EPPR activities later in the meeting, particularly cooperation with Sweden, the US and Norway on cooperation with respect to the northwestern oil fields.
- Norway noted that those present at the meeting are not directly involved with the other working groups or their activities. However, discussions have been underway with other working groups, for example AMAP, with respect to the importance of monitoring oil and gas exploration and activity in the north. Indigenous people are very concerned and want to make sure that any development is done in a safe way.
- Finland noted that although the country does not have any Arctic waters, similar issues are being encountered in the south of Finland and the Baltic Sea with respect to oil transportation.
- Canada added that their representatives present at the meeting are not directly involved with the other working groups or their activities
- The Sami Council noted that the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan (AMSP) is to involve indigenous peoples, particularly with respect to the use of traditional knowledge. The Sami Council is participating in the development of the AMSP, and will be attending the workshop this fall. The Council is also involved in some of the SDWG projects. It was also noted that the budget for Arctic Council projects often does not include a specific component relating to the costs of Permanent Participants involvement, and that financial constraints often limit their participation.

### **3.3 Co-operation with Other Agencies**

The Chair initiated the discussion with an overview, and invited countries to contribute to the discussion based on their involvement and activities. It was noted that the SAOs had directed EPPR to increase cooperation with other organizations, and it was recognized that this has many mutual benefits. These organizations include the Barents Euro-Arctic Council (BEAC), the Nordic Council / Nordic Council of Ministers, the Northern Forum, and the Council of Baltic Sea States.

The Swedish delegation recommended that, besides cooperation with the Council of Baltic Sea States, EPPR should also cooperate with the Helsinki Commission, which has groups working on issues related to emergency prevention, preparedness and response.

The US provided the following recommendations for additional cooperation with the Northern Forum:

- Formal mutual notification of meetings and events
- The EPPR Chair should communicate with the Northern Forum regarding an exchange of experts, if only to list experts to ensure no duplication of effort
- Sharing the roster of issues in cold climate emergency prevention, preparedness and response
- Maintain flexibility to engage in joint projects, not just with Arctic Council working groups, but also with the Northern Forum

The 6<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the Northern was held in St Petersburg, Russia April 23-25<sup>th</sup> 2003. It was noted that the report on the Severe Cold Climate Workshop held in Alaska in April 2002 was now available. The report contains a range of recommendations intended to be transmitted to the EPPR and the Arctic Council SAO and Ministerial meetings. The Chair noted that the recommendations in the report were too detailed for discussion at this meeting, but need to be considered by the Working Group after the meeting. (Additional discussion occurred under Agenda Item 4.1) The Chair noted her recent correspondence with the Executive Director of the Northern Forum regarding increased coordination and cooperation.

The Sami Council noted their ongoing involvement for more than ten years with the BEAC, and in particular the recent commitments by Norway and Sweden to provide funding for the Sami Cultural Centre in Lovozero, Russia.

The Russian Federation noted their interest in cooperation with BEAC and the CBSS. There are increasing levels of cooperation with Sweden, Norway and Finland in particular. A forthcoming meeting of the directors general responsible for civil protection in the Baltic Region will be held in St Petersburg on the 10 -11 of September. The Arctic Rescue initiative tabled at the outset of the EPPR Working Group meeting was cited as a way to increase cooperation and coordination.

Norway provided an overview of regional cooperation. Russia and Norway have had an agreement since 1992 for fighting oil spills in the Barents Sea. Meetings are held every year, alternating between the two countries. This year the meeting will be in the Murmansk area. Funding was made available for a contingency plan for the Barents Sea, which was completed in 2002. Norway has also been working with the local staff of EMERCOM of Russia on the preparation of a beach cleaning operation plan for Murmansk oblast. A similar plan is expected to be prepared for Arkhangelskaya oblast this year or next. Gennady Semanov of the Ship Research Institute in St Petersburg thanked Norway for their interest and assistance with these projects. It was noted that the International Maritime Organization (IMO) Level I and Level II training on oil spill control would be offered in Norway and Murmansk.

The US requested that Norway send notification of exercises to the US, as they have a joint contingency plan for Chukchi and the Bering Strait, and will be conducting similar activities in Sakhalin and Vladivostock.

Finland noted that the Barents Euro-Arctic Regional Council (BEARC), originally focused on economic and culture, is now extending into rescue services. Task forces have been formed to improve the coordination of rescue services in the region. A study of existing international agreements and possible needs for amendment is to be undertaken. The CBSS has developed Guidelines for a New Action Plan (i.e. a 2nd Northern Dimension Action Plan) that apply to Norway, Finland, Sweden and other Baltic countries. The CBSS provides Secretariat services for the Northern Dimension. It was suggested that EPPR could provide input to that regional process through the Arctic Council.

### **3.4 Activities of the EPPR Secretariat**

The EPPR Executive Secretary provided a brief summary of the Secretariat's activities relating to:

- Transfer of Secretariat from Finland to Canada
- Distribution of information to EPPR members and to other Arctic Council Working Groups, permanent participants, observers
- Liaison with other Arctic Council Working Groups and Secretariats
- Assisting the EPPR Chair in support of her duties
- Responding to information requests (e.g., Field Guide)
- Managing/updating the EPPR website (further discussion under agenda item 6.3)
- Attendance at the Working Group Chairs meeting in Iceland (January 2003)
- Preparations for the EPPR Meeting in Murmansk

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

### **4.1 Oil and Gas**

#### **Lessons Learned/New Activities/Major Organizational Changes/Research and Development**

##### *New Activities*

The US reported interest by their federal administration for moving into offshore oil and gas development, with movement of on-shore development to the west. In spite of government interest, industry is more enthusiastic about prospects in Russia. Major oil fields to the east in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) still lack sufficient support in the US Congress.

Norway noted the ongoing construction of a project in the Norwegian Arctic near Hammerfest to bring liquefied natural gas inshore. A 160-km pipeline in water depths of 250 to 350 m, as well as ships up to 80,000 tonnes will be used to transport the gas. Construction began in 2002 and is expected to be complete in 2006. Government is conducting a consequence analysis for the Barents Sea and further development is banned until it is completed.

Canada reported that the US Coast Guard and the Canadian Coast Guard just updated their joint environmental response contingency plan; annexes should be complete in October of this year. All Arctic oil and gas activities in Canada are in the Western Canadian Arctic, including a proposed gas pipeline for the Mackenzie Valley. There have been two commercial discoveries in the past two years, with another 10-12 wells on land in the next four years. Offshore drilling activity is planned for the first time in 16 years, primarily gas, but possibly oil. Thus there is a rebuilding of oil spill response capability, which has been deteriorating in recent years.

#### *Organizational Changes*

The US has reorganized federal emergency and security agencies into the Department of Homeland Security. This agency has broad responsibilities in the crisis management and consequence management areas, and incorporates a number of formerly independent organizations, including the Coast Guard and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). This reorganization will not affect the work continuing under the 'Cooperation in the Field of Natural and Technological Disaster Prevention and Response', a bilateral agreement chaired on the US side by FEMA and on the Russian side by EMERCOM. Workplans for the next meeting, to take place in the US, are being developed.

Norway reported that reorganization has resulted in the response unit for pollution control being transferred from the Ministry of Environment/Norwegian Pollution Control Authority to the Ministry of Fisheries/Norwegian Coastal Administration.

Finland noted that a reorganization of rescue services is underway, and by next year a single Rescue Services District will cover all of Finland.

#### *Research and Development*

Mr. Gennady Semanov of the Ship Research Institute in St Petersburg noted Russia's ongoing concern about its ability to respond to oil pollution incidents. A proposal has been submitted to the IMO to develop an international approach for risk assessment and minimal standards for responding to oil spills. He noted that other countries are also interested in this problem; perhaps EPPR could consider this project, or countries may wish to participate as part of a technical working group.

The US Coast Guard reported on a number of products related to response in oil and ice that the Working Group may be interested in. Materials have been produced and can be distributed to members. These include:

- A US library of research on in situ burning (e.g., basic principles, operational procedures, review of products)
- Reference book on fast-water booming
- Detailed work by US Coast Guard on the use of dispersants

It was noted that these products completed a phase of research at the US Coast Guard. A change in focus to intentional rather than accidental events following the events of September 11 2001, and the shift in research activities from oil pollution to intentional chemical releases, and converting dispersion models for use with intentional rather than accidental releases.

The US also reported that the Oil Spill Recovery Institute (OSRI) is in the first steps of reviving its oil and ice research program in response to renewed interest in Arctic oil and gas. OSRI has a mandate in US legislation to ensure research into oil spill recovery in the Arctic and sub-Arctic waters of the North Pacific, Bering Sea and Arctic Ocean. A project looking into mechanical means of recovering oil in ice (Norway, Germany, Canada and the US) is nearing completion. The Coast Guard study on in situ burning is available. Gaps relate to the use of dispersants, which have not really been tested. A US/Canada working group has been formed, and will be developing proposals for how to proceed with oil and ice research; funding is being sought. In the absence of workable solutions, it will be very difficult to proceed with offshore production in ice-impacted areas. It is expected that funding for a fairly extensive program over the next 5 or 6 years will be available. EPPR will be kept informed, and participation and ideas from all parties is welcome.

Mr. Gennady Semanov reported that Russia is in a similar position to the US with respect to in situ burning. A different approach is being taken with respect to use of dispersants. The use of dispersants in Arctic waters is not allowed in resource-rich areas such as the Barents Sea due to concern about potential effects on fisheries. Mechanical techniques are available for broken ice, but not fast ice. Finnish equipment has been purchased by an oil company, and has worked well in broken ice in the Baltic Sea. Research into the use of lasers has been conducted by the Department of Transport, many questions remain but it appears positive. A model for forecasting the movement of oil in ice under Arctic conditions should be completed by the end of this year, and will be tested in 2004.

The US thanked Russia for the information. They indicated agreement that there is adequate equipment for land fast ice and that the problem is with broken ice. The US would like more information on the Finnish solution.

**4.1.4 Response in Oil and Ice – US and Russia provided information on ongoing and planned research projects, and member countries are invited to participate as appropriate.**

## **Ongoing Projects – Oil and Gas**

### *Shoreline Cleanup Assessment Technology (SCAT) Manual*

Canada reported on the work undertaken in the past year. New material specific to Arctic regions was prepared, and refined to reflect more representative local conditions of Canada and Alaska; the new material was then integrated, with a revision and adaptation process. Comments have been received from the US (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and Coast Guard) and a review of comments on Environment Canada's second edition of its SCAT manual is underway. There is a new chapter on physical shoreline characteristics and processes that characterize Canadian and Alaskan shoreline, illustrated with color photos,

and a glossary of arctic shoreline types and written descriptions of them. A one-page guide for non-technical responders is currently being prepared, and will be included in the manual. The new material has undergone internal review in the US and Canada. A final draft of the whole manual should be available in mid to late July; if needed, an experts meeting could be convened about that time. A topic remaining to be addressed is standardization of the end-point criteria at which point a cleanup is considered 'complete'. Environment Canada has prepared a piece on this; it would be desirable to include it in the SCAT manual.

A remaining piece of work is disposal of oily wastes under Arctic conditions. This project has been suggested before to EPPR. Canada asked if there is interest in pursuing the standardization of steps in dealing with this material in the future.

**4.1.1 The Working Group noted a presentation by Canada on the SCAT manual, and a possible experts group meeting to review the draft manual tentatively scheduled for July/August. Countries are invited to participate in the review of the draft manual at the meeting or by correspondence. The SCAT manual meeting may also provide an opportunity to further discuss approaches to dealing with disposal of oily wastes.**

*Oil Transfer Guidelines (PAME)*

The Chair noted that the Guidelines are fairly well advanced, and a draft for review is expected from PAME in late June. The US noted that the final guidelines are much simpler than those originally envisioned. This product will be most appropriate to small indigenous communities doing seasonal transfers of diesel and heating oil. The guidelines address pre-transfer preparation, transfer operations, contingency planning, and post-transfer. Seamanship is addressed in addition to spill prevention.

**4.1.2 EPPR will cooperate with PAME on the preparation of the Oil Transfer Guidelines, and provide comments on the contingency planning chapter as requested by PAME. Countries can comment through EPPR or through their individual country. Countries are asked to distribute the draft guideline for 'on the ground' testing in at least one community in their country.**

*Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk from Oil Spills in the Arctic*

The Chair noted that the Ministers and SAOs have accepted the Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk from Oil Spills in the Arctic, and have spoken very positively of it. Norway has sent CD copies to all countries (the map is also posted on the Internet, and is accessible via the EPPR website at <http://www.akvaplan.niva.no/eppr/>). The SAOs have encouraged EPPR to look at possible expansion of the maps, for example to consider other types of hazards, in conjunction with other working groups.

Norway noted that it has developed a short discussion paper for the Working Group's consideration in this regard. The project has been ongoing for some time, and is complete as originally envisioned, addressing the needs of different audiences. The map is at a large scale, the data is not intended to be exhaustive at the local level. Gratitude was expressed for the financial support from countries in EPPR, and for provision of special data. Over 100 copies of the CD have been distributed, and discussions are underway about ideas as to how to proceed with any follow-up. The future of the Circumpolar Map will have to be addressed at the next SAO meeting in Iceland. AMAP has some ideas, and the Circumpolar Map was on the agenda of their last meeting. In 2005 a new database will be developed in conjunction with the oil assessment report being prepared for the Ministerial meeting. There are a number of options for proceeding, with associated costs, as outlined in the discussion paper. Norway can provide some funding, but needs partners to proceed.

Sweden noted that when EPPR decided to do the Map, it was implicit that there would be revision and updating, but this involves workload and financial resources. Perhaps industry is one possible source of funding, as they would be interested in the information. Last time, countries shared the costs one way or another. Sweden does not have funds available for this year, perhaps next. Sweden proposed that in the next year, Norway pursue funds from various sources, and come back next year with a proposal to continue the work. It is not necessary to do all of the work in a single year.

The US noted that the Circumpolar Map is a good product currently in use by a number of organizations. Evaluating whether to continue is an important decision not to be taken lightly. >From the US perspective, a significant workload and financial commitment is involved, and there will be a workload for all countries. There are a number of other ongoing mapping projects that may parallel or duplicate the Circumpolar Map. For example, the International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA) has a joint project with IMO to map environmentally sensitive species and areas, targeting areas of existing and future oil transport and development. From a radiological point of view, there is interest in expanding the map, but no specific proposal. In the US view, it is somewhat premature to update information before a decision is made about adding new aspects. The project goal needs to be kept in mind; it was not intended to have a high level of detail at the local level.

Canada also questioned what industry might be doing internationally. In principle, Canada supports continuation of the project, and will pursue possible avenues of resources both financial and through provision of expertise.

RAIPON noted the importance of the Circumpolar Map project, and the need to have indigenous people participate and provide their knowledge to any future work on it.

Finland indicated agreement in principle with proceeding with updating of information and expanding to include other hazards. However, all of the information needed for the maps exists elsewhere, and there is a need to coordinate.

Norway acknowledged the additional workload for Norway and other countries, and thanked all participants for their efforts and information. It was agreed that it is late to obtain funds from elsewhere for this year. Norway has some available, but it will be difficult to obtain support if

other countries / partners are not also participating. Norway recommended taking the next year to raise funds, and to come to the next meeting with a proposal. It was agreed that the involvement of indigenous people was necessary and that more effort is needed. AMAP's interest in developing a map for the upcoming oil assessment was noted.

The US expressed concern about access to the database by external parties, as the information had been produced for a specific purpose. A definitive response from the US requires further discussion, and so the question of allowing for an interactive database is not resolved in their view. If some information in the database needs to be corrected, the US would prefer that this be done directly by the countries, rather than by others on their behalf. With respect to other working groups, they are welcome to use the maps, and the US would welcome any proposals from them on future activities.

The Chair noted the variety of opinions on the future direction for the Map. The importance of not duplicating other efforts was noted, but more information is needed on other similar projects. There seemed to be general agreement to look at the possibility of including radiological hazards, but the questions of access to the underlying databases and the desirability of an interactive database were not resolved. These questions need to be resolved quickly. The US noted that it could be possible to come with a proposal for adding radiological hazards for the next meeting, but not sooner. Norway suggested working in the coming year with the AMAP Secretariat to address radiological data they may have and the relationship with the upcoming oil assessment.

**4.1.3 The Working Group agreed to proceed with further discussion on the Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk. The database will remain closed while countries consider the need for access to the database and for interactive capability. Norway will lead an effort to look at potential partners (e.g., AMAP, ACAP, IPIECA, industry) and funding opportunities, and report back to the Working Group so that decisions can be made at the next EPPR meeting. Countries can consider the relationship to other mapping projects. The US will furnish information on IPIECA and their mapping project to the Working Group.**

## **Northern Forum Severe Cold Climate Workshop Recommendations**

Following up to the initial discussion under Agenda Item 3.3, the Working Group discussed ways to proceed with respect to working more closely with the Northern Forum on areas of common interest. It was noted that the April 2002 Severe Cold Climate Workshop recommendations also deal with natural disasters, in addition to oil and gas response.

- 4.1.5 The Working Group requested the US to develop a process for EPPR to review the April 2002 Severe Cold Climate Workshop recommendations, with a view to strengthening our cooperation with the Northern Forum. The Working Group is to invite the Northern Forum to the next EPPR meeting to have more in-depth discussion of opportunities for coordination and cooperation.**

## **Russian Expert Presentations – Oil and Gas**

During a trip to the Knipovich Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (PINRO), Russian experts made two presentations:

- Investigations of Chemical Contamination of the Barents Sea Environment and Marine Organisms – Ms. N.F. Plotitsyna
- Experience in aircraft using for inspection of the open part of the Barents Sea and its riverside contamination – Mr. V. Zabavnikov / I. Sharikov

Two additional presentations were made on June 5 at the meeting:

- Development of Sorbents for Environmental Oil Pollution Control – Ms. Svetlana Mesyaz, Mining Institute of the Kola Science Centre, Russian Academy of Sciences
- Foundation of the Center for combating of accident oil spills in Euro-Arctic region in Murmansk oblast – Mr. N. Melnikov, Kola Peninsula Research Center of the Russian Academy of Science

## **4.2 Radiological/Other Hazards**

### **Lessons Learned/New Activities/Major Organizational Changes/Research and Development**

#### *New Activities*

The US reported on new collaborative activities between the US Department of Energy and the Russian Federation with respect to nuclear safety training. A 3-day session was held in January in Moscow to address the Russian emergency management system, communications, procedures, roles and responsibilities, and crisis centre management. This involved 24 emergency management officials from six different agencies. The course was the first in a series; the second – dealing with protective actions and decision-making - is being conducted right now in Moscow. A copy of the US input to the course was available for review at the meeting; and is available by e-mail from Ann Heinrich. The Russian version can also be obtained. The third course, on ISO 14001, will be held in the fall of this year. It was noted that the training has been very productive.

The US also noted that cooperation with EMERCOM of Russia's crisis centre regarding the provision of equipment was moving ahead. In addition, since 1996 there has been cooperation between the militaries of Norway, Russia and the US regarding the cleanup of military installations. An exercise may be conducted in the Murmansk oblast. A new sub-agency called

the Office of International Emergency Management and Cooperation has been created within the Department of Energy; Head of Delegation Ann Heinrich is situated in that agency.

## **Ongoing Projects – Radiological and Other Hazards**

### *Source Control Management – Phases I and II*

Presentations were made by Russia and the US on Phase I of the Source Control Management Project. Current and proposed activities for Phase II of the Source Control Management Project were also presented. It was noted that the extensive cooperation between the two countries has contributed to the success to date.

Phase 1: the Apatityvodokanal (Apatity Water Utility) Pilot Project was summarized. The development of the 'Risk Assessment Methodology at Hazardous Industrial Facilities' was presented. It was noted that the report is being referred to as a 'working draft'. It is to be reorganized to contain separate annexes for non-radiological/non-nuclear materials and radiological/nuclear materials.

During Phase II, a risk assessment will be conducted for the State Scientific Center of Russian Federation - Research Institute of Atomic Reactors (NIIAR) fuel research department; the final report and a revised Working Draft of the Risk Assessment Methodology are to be completed by December 2004.

A series of ISO 14001 training will be offered beginning in the fall of 2003. A one-day session for top management will be open to EPPR members, EMERCOM staff, and other agencies. This will be followed by a 2-1/2 day course on implementing ISO 14001. The final course will deal with ISO 14001 audits.

Norway offered congratulations for the successful nature of these projects and asked if it was possible to obtain information about the resources needed for these projects (manpower and financial). The US noted that it would take some time to estimate this, as the projects have been ongoing over several years.

#### **4.2.1 The meeting noted acceptance of the report on source control management and prevention strategies for chlorine handling at the Apatity waterworks – Phase I (US and Russian Federation) - 'Analysis of Risks of Emergencies to Population and Territory, and Development of Measures to Reduce the Risks as Applied to the Apatityvodokanal Utility' 2002.**

- 4.2.2 The meeting noted acceptance of the ‘working draft’ of the Phase I ‘Risk Assessment Methodology at Hazardous Industrial Facilities’ Report, January 2002.**
- 4.2.3 Countries were asked to indicate potential interest in participation with the Russian Federation and the US on Phase II of the emergency prevention/source control project - preparation of a refined risk assessment methodology document.**
- 4.2.4 Countries were asked to indicate potential interest in participation with the Russian Federation and the US on Phase II of the emergency prevention/ source control project - NIIAR Fuel Research Department risk assessment.**
- 4.2.5 Countries were asked to indicate potential interest in participation with the Russian Federation and the US on a series of ISO 14001 training programs (first one-day session in Fall of 2003).**

*Bilibino Tabletop Exercise (US and Russia)*

The US provided an overview of the very successful emergency exercise at Bilibino Nuclear Power Plant. While billed as a ‘tabletop’ exercise, it was in fact much larger, with participation by Russian government and agencies, the US, Finland, Norway, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the local town. A scenario was developed; plans and procedures were exercised; communications channels tested. All objectives were successfully met. A similar exercise is planned for the Dimitrovgrad facility in the fall of 2003, although this may be of less interest to EPPR due to its geographical location. The Bilibino exercise did demonstrate the potential for use of the Internet for communicating during and emergency, disseminating information, and making contacts. Current methods are not robust enough to rely on this mode of communication; however, this should be tested for future changes and possible use.

Sweden noted another exercise for the Working Group’s information, referred to by Russia in the presentation on the Arctic Rescue initiative, that being the Barents Rescue 2001, a radiological exercise involving Finland, Russia and Sweden. Over 1500 representatives from 22 countries participated, with cooperation between civil and military authorities.

- 4.2.6 The Working Group noted the completion of the exercise described in the ‘Final Report on Preparation and Organization of the Tabletop Exercise at the Bilibino NPP’, October 2002.**

*Community Radiation Protection Information*

‘Communicating Radiation Safety Issues to the Community’ was presented by Dr. Elena Melikova, Institute for Safe Development of Nuclear Energy (IBRAE). The joint US/Russia ‘Community Radiation Protection Information’ project is a new project being offered to EPPR. The US Department of Energy is working with IBRAE and EMECOM of Russia to study public information needs, develop a brochure and informational CD, and distribute the information once it has been prepared. The focus is on the Murmansk and Arkhangelskaya regions of Russia. EPPR members may wish to participate in the project, or to receive the information for adaptation in different countries.

- 4.2.7 The Working Group confirmed that the Russian Federation and the US will proceed with the Community Radiation Protection Information project, and that countries and Permanent Participants are invited to participate in the project or to receive the products for use and adaptation following completion.**
- 4.2.8 Currently the Russian Federation is working on draft new projects, which are to be distributed among all countries and Permanent Participants through the EPPR Secretariat.**

### **Russian Expert Presentation – Radiological and Other Hazards**

Dr. Vladimir Kiselev of the Russian Academy of Sciences Nuclear Safety Institute (IBRAE) provided a presentation entitled 'Comparing of Radiation and Chemical Risks in the Russian Arctic Region'.

### **4.3 *Natural Disasters***

Finland noted that they had done a survey of past major accidents for the last EPPR meeting. Although substantial information was provided by the US, the survey as a whole was not particularly successful. Based on the direction provided at the SAO meetings to examine the possibility of expanding the mandate to include natural disasters, Finland is now proposing to lead an 'Inventory of Past Natural Disasters'. Such an inventory may contribute to making a decision on that question. Finland's view is that such an inventory would only address 'natural phenomena' rather than disasters resulting from human activity, and the consequences to nature and infrastructure. Finland has drafted a matrix / form that could be used; a more focused approach should improve the outcomes relative to the initial survey. Finland provided an outline of the proposed approach.

The Chair opened the floor to discussions of two aspects: 1) the merit of conducting such a survey, and ii) comments on possible expansion of EPPR's mandate.

Sweden noted that for a small country, participating in the inventory is not a large task. However, there are questions about the level of effort that can be put to international work. If the mandate is expanded, the number of people that will need to be involved in the Working Group, number and length of meetings etc. will also expand. All of this has costs. This needs to be highlighted to the SAOs, as some countries may be hesitant for these reasons. The Chair confirmed that the SAOs are also concerned about the financial consequences of expanding the mandate.

The US noted that although it has concerns about expanding the mandate, this change could be accommodated. There are two key questions that need to be considered:

- What is the gap we are trying to fill? What is the need of the eight Arctic nations that is not currently being met?
- What is the value that EPPR can add?

It was noted that with the exception of the Russian Federation/EMERCOM, other countries would need to involve other organizations to meet an expanded mandate. In the US, the involvement of natural disasters infrastructure would be a challenge, as this responsibility has a more local focus, presenting difficulties for participation in an international forum. However, if there is a real value from EPPR in this regard, the hurdles can be overcome.

Russia noted that the expansion of the mandate would be useful from their perspective. EMERCOM's responsibilities include natural disasters. Every year in the Arctic there are several examples of casualties caused by floods. Because rivers flow from the south to the north, they jam with ice each spring. Therefore a widespread disaster mandate is of interest.

Norway noted that as a small country, its perspective is similar to that of Sweden. Reference was made to the issues surrounding the proposed PAME/EPPR merger of a few years ago. The SAOs directed that the groups not merge, and that EPPR be revitalized, for example putting more emphasis on radiological and other hazards. In response to the US question regarding 'what is the gap', Norway noted the potential benefit of having new people at the table, and improved communications if there is an incident. Expanding the mandate to include natural disasters is a positive thing.

Canada agreed that in general, expanding the mandate could have benefits. However, like the US, Canada would face a challenge due to the vast geographic area and the large number of organizations responsible for natural disasters. Expanding the mandate would be difficult to pursue unless there is clear benefit from doing so.

The Chair reiterated that the SAOs have directed EPPR to look into the matter, and that there is need to give it serious consideration. The Working Group must be mindful of the questions 'what is the gap to be filled?' and 'what is the value EPPR can add?'. Conducting a focused survey could assist in answering these questions. The consequences in terms of human and financial resources need to be explored to provide the information needed to help the EPPR Working Group make a recommendation for the subsequent decision by the SAOs/Ministers. The survey would also contribute to an updating of the risk assessment of 1998, as well as answering the questions posed by the SAOs with respect to EPPR's mandate.

**4.3.1 Based on a proposal presented by Finland, the Working Group agreed to undertake a Survey of Past Natural Disasters. Finland, as lead, will prepare a proposal regarding the content of the survey. The survey will also address the following questions:**

- **What gaps would be filled by expanding the mandate?**
- **What is the 'value added' of EPPR expanding its mandate?**

- **What would the consequences (workload, financial) be if the mandate was expanded?**

#### **4.4 Cross-Cutting Issues**

The meeting discussions also resulted in actions and decisions related to other cross-cutting themes:

- 4.4.1 Countries were asked to provide updates to the relevant sections of the on-line 'Arctic Guide' to the Secretariat within 30 days. Secretariat to subsequently update the web site.**

At the opening of the meeting, Dr. Vladimir Novikov, EMERCOM of Russia made a presentation on the 'Arctic Rescue' initiative, a mechanism for coordination of international activities on prevention and liquidation of the consequences of the emergency situations in the Arctic. The rationale for the creation of this international structure was reviewed, and an overview of its possible structure, sources of funding, and potential results/benefits provided.

- 4.4.2 The Working Group is asked to take into consideration the 'Arctic Rescue' initiative tabled by the Russian delegation. The Secretariat is to forward the related presentation to all countries for their further review. All countries are kindly requested to inform the EMERCOM of Russia of their opinion of the 'Arctic Rescue' initiative.**

### **5. Discussion Paper: Mandate and Operational Options for the EPPR Working Group**

The Working Group's discussion of the expanded mandate was conducted in conjunction with the discussion of the survey of past natural disasters (see Section 4.3 of this report, above).

- 5.1 The Working Group agreed it was premature to make a decision on expanding the EPPR Working Group mandate to include natural disasters until the Survey of Past Natural Disasters is completed.**

The Working Group also discussed potential changes to the way it conducts its business. The discussion paper distributed in advance of the meeting provided some ideas in this regard. As the work expands into different areas there is a need to look at how to work most efficiently.

The US stated satisfaction with the organization of this meeting into 'areas of interest', although this approach may not work in the future. When the work load changes, it may be necessary to have concurrent and/or separate meetings. Such a precedent already exists with the separate meetings held to develop the Field Guide.

Sweden agreed with the US' comments. Many of the comments resulting from a review of the

discussion paper have been addressed earlier in the meeting. The possibility of extra meetings, similar to those held for the Field Guide, could be an option, but does have cost implications.

## **6. Other EPPR Working Group Activities**

### **6.1 Arctic Marine Strategic Plan**

The Chair noted that this Arctic Council project is being led by PAME, but will involve all Working Groups. A workshop is to be held in October immediately preceding the SAO meeting in Iceland. PAME has requested the preparation of background papers to assist in discussions at the workshop, and EPPR will have the lead on a paper 'Environmental Emergency and Risk Assessment'. The intent of the paper is to provide technical information, rather than to outline positions, for the purpose of exchanging ideas at the workshop. The Chair expects to receive a request for a background paper shortly, and EPPR can decide if it is willing to prepare the document. Members of the EPPR Working Group may be invited as experts to the workshop, and all working group Chairs will receive invitations. After the workshop, Iceland / Canada as lead countries will prepare a draft strategy for the Working Groups and Permanent Participants. EPPR can comment on relevant sections. The Chair sought direction from the Working Group as to whether EPPR would participate in the preparation of a background paper, or whether individual countries could assist in that regard.

**6.1 The meeting agreed that the Chair would participate in the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan workshop in October 2003, and that countries would provide their input to the process through their PAME country contact or the EPPR Chair, as appropriate.**

### **6.2 ACIA Policy Paper**

Further to the discussion of the ACIA policy paper (Agenda Item 3.2), the Chair noted that it was important that EPPR be comfortable with the recommendations that may impact their work. The Chair made an undertaking to provide information on the ACIA policy paper to the Working Group, but it was agreed that comments would be provided through individual country processes.

**6.2 The EPPR Working Group is to comment on the ACIA draft policy paper through their individual country processes.**

### **6.3 Sustainable Development Working Group Activities (new)**

#### *Circumpolar Infrastructure Task Force (CITF)/ Information and Communication Technology in the Arctic Conference (ICT)*

Chaired by Walter Parker, the CITF is intended to develop expert groups with respect to aviation, telecommunications, and marine transportation, as well as to coordinate and cooperate with the Northern Forum. The focus is primarily on infrastructure to support small communities, research and development, and resource development in the north. The first report of the aviation group is available on the website, and an experts group meeting was held last year in Anchorage.

The telecommunications group is being formed to address issues faced by 1500 small communities in the Arctic that are not linked to surface transportation systems, thus facing greater reliance on telecommunications and aviation than other communities. The goal is to ensure access to the Internet, satellite systems (low-earth orbit and geo-stationary) and wireless distribution. One of the sessions at the ICT conference October 18 - 19 in Akureyri Iceland will be on distant delivery of health and social services, and the University of the Arctic has been asked to develop a white paper that will be finalized at a workshop this August.

The marine transportation group will be meeting July 14 - 17 in Sakhalin, although they are dealing with basic transportation and communication issues more so than emergency prevention, preparedness and response. There was discussion at the April Northern Forum meeting with Russian colleagues, particularly with respect to the Northern Sea Route process. Close contact is maintained with ACIA due to the implications of climate change on shipping activities throughout the Arctic. The relationship with EPPR is relevant with respect to transportation and communications, and therefore the groups should work together closely, particularly with Permanent Participants.

The Chair noted that she had been in communication with the Northern Forum about their possible participation at the EPPR Working Group meeting, and it was felt that some work was needed within EPPR to develop more concrete ideas of how to best work together.

**6.3 With respect to the Sustainable Development Working Group's 'Information and Communication Technology in the Arctic Conference' and the 'Circumpolar Infrastructure Task Force', it was requested that the US keep the Working Group informed of the processes and possible opportunities for coordination with EPPR.**

## **6.4 Updating the EPPR Web Site**

The Secretariat has been working on updating the web site and making it more 'user-friendly'. The Working Group was asked for comments and suggestions. The US and Sweden noted that the provision of meeting materials on the site was convenient; however working drafts like the papers for the meeting should be in a password-protected area. Links to sites of other organizations such as the Helsinki Commission would be useful. The Sami Council suggested that the Russian pages of the website need to correspond to the English version, and asked if Canada can arrange for this, as the need for information is perhaps even greater in the Russian Federation.

**6.4.1 EPPR Secretariat to continue work to refine the web site. Draft reports and other such documents will in future be password-protected.**

**6.4.2 Updating of the Russian portion of the web site will be undertaken as soon as practicable.**

## **6.5 Update of the Work Plan and Strategic Plan**

The Working Group reviewed the EPPR work plan tables distributed in advance of the meeting and provided input on the status of various projects.

**6.5 The Secretariat is to update the work plan tables as discussed by the Working Group. Revised tables will be distributed to the Working Group and any comments are to be provided to the Secretariat within 30 days of distribution.**

A copy of revised work plan tables is included as Appendix 3.

## **7. EPPR Deliverables to the SAO Meeting, October 2003**

The Chair will prepare a short report and forward the record of decision and meeting report to the SAOs for their consideration.

## **8. Other Business**

The Working Group reviewed a draft 'record of decision'. Comments were noted and incorporated into a revised draft to be circulated following the meeting.

**8.1 The Secretariat is to distribute a revised draft record of decision for the meeting to the Working Group. Comments are to be provided to the Secretariat within 30 days of distribution. (Note: the Secretariat distributed a revised draft, with comments to be submitted by July 15, 2003; subsequently, the record of decision was finalized in August)**

The Sami Council noted that it would be preparing a report to the Permanent Participants /

Indigenous Peoples Secretariat on the EPPR Working Group meeting. A matter that needs to be addressed is how to increase the participation of the Permanent Participants on all of the Working Groups, particularly EPPR. This can be addressed in part by increasing funding and should be taken into account in the budget for specific projects. One option would be to have a better structure in place for Permanent Participants to participate in Working Group meetings, with some continuity rather than a different person every time. The Sami Council also feels that it should be easier for Permanent Participants to travel to and from the Russian Federation in the east and the west.

## **9. Next Meeting**

**9.1 Canada advised that the date (tentatively in March/April) and location for the next meeting in Canada would be forthcoming. Countries are asked to advise the EPPR Secretariat of any meetings or events that may conflict with an EPPR Working Group meeting during that time period. *(Note: subsequently, Canada has advised that the 2004 EPPR meeting will take place in Inuvik. The meeting will be held the week of April 20, barring a conflict with the spring SAO meeting.)***

## **Appendix 1: Agenda for the EPPR Working Group Meeting**

*Murmansk, Russian Federation  
3 – 5 June 2003*

- 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:

- SAO and Ministerial meetings - Inari October 2002
- AC Working Group Chairs Meeting – Reykjavik January 2003
- SAO meeting – Iceland, April 2003
- Upcoming SAO meeting – Iceland October 2003

### **3.2 Activities of Other Working Groups/Projects**

- ACAP
- ACIA - Policy Paper
- AMAP - Oil and Hydrocarbon Assessment, Oil and Gas Conference (2005)
- CAFF
- PAME - Arctic Marine Strategic Plan, Oil and Gas Guidelines, Oil Transfer Guidelines
- SDWG - Circumpolar Infrastructure Task Force, ICT Conference, Capacity Building

### **3.3 Co-operation with Other Agencies**

- Barents Euro-Arctic Council (Working Group on Emergency & Rescue Services, Northern Sea Route Working Group)
- Barents Euro-Arctic Regional Council
- Nordic Council of Ministers (Arctic Co-operation Programme)
- Northern Forum (Workshop recommendations)
- Council of Baltic Sea States

### **3.4 Activities of the EPPR Secretariat**

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

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

#### **4.1 Oil and Gas**

- 'Lessons learned'
- New activities in the Arctic areas (transportation, production)
- Major organisational changes in the Arctic countries
- Research and development in the Arctic countries
- Reports on EPPR **ongoing projects** (by lead country):
  - Circumpolar map of resources at risk from oil spills in the Arctic (Norway)
    - Presentation of the final product.
    - Discussion and decision on maintenance, updating, and possible connection to other Working Groups
  - SCAT Manual (Canada)
  - Oil Transfer Guidelines (PAME)
- Presentation by **Russian specialists**:
  - Experience in aircraft using for inspection of the open part of the Barents Sea and its riverside contamination (presentation at PINRO)
  - Foundation of the Center for combating of accident oil spills in Euro-Arctic region in Murmansk oblast
- Presentation of possible **new projects**:
  - Inventory of response stockpiles
  - R&D – Response for oil in ice
  - Cooperation with Northern Forum
  - Transboundary cooperation
  - Oily waste disposal (Canada)
  - Update of environmental risk analysis (Chair)
- Updates to the Arctic Guide
- Update on bilateral and multi-lateral agreements/plans
- Other items of interest

#### **4.2 Radiological/Other Hazards**

- 'Lessons learned'
- New activities in the Arctic areas
- Major organisational changes in the Arctic countries
- Research and development in the Arctic countries
- Reports on EPPR **ongoing projects** (by lead country):
  - Source control management and prevention strategies for chlorine handling at the Apatity waterworks – Phase I (US and Russia) - 'Analysis of Risks of Emergencies to Population and Territory, and Development of Measures to Reduce the Risks as applied to the Apatityvodokanal Utility' Report 2002 -confirm report acceptance
  - Phase I 'Risk Assessment Methodology at Hazardous Industrial Facilities' Report January 2002 - confirm report acceptance

- Bilibino Table-top exercise (US and Russia) – ‘Final Report on Preparation and Organization of the Tabletop Exercise at the Bilibino NPP’ (October 2002) - confirm report acceptance
- Presentation by **Russian specialists**:
  - Sampling comparative analysis on radiation and chemical risks in arctic region
  - Development of inquiry-informative system on ecological and nuclear safety on Kola peninsula
  - Research of PINRO in the field of chemical pollution of sea environment as regards the Barents Sea (presentation at PINRO)
- Presentation of possible **new projects**:
  - Source control management (Phase II) (US and Russia)
  - Circumpolar map expansion
  - Community Radiation Protection
  - Response stockpiles – radiological
  - Cooperation with Northern Forum
  - Best practices – nuclear/radioactive
  - Transboundary cooperation
  - Update of environmental risk analysis (Chair)
- Updates to the Arctic Guide
- Bilateral and multi-lateral agreements/plans
- Other items of interest

#### **4.3 Natural Disasters**

- ‘Lessons learned’
- New activities in the Arctic areas
- Major organisational changes in the Arctic countries
- Research and development in the Arctic countries
- Reports on EPPR **ongoing projects** (by lead country):
  - Inventory of Past Natural Disasters (Finland)
- Transboundary cooperation
- Discussion of possible **new direction** (see item 5)

**5. *Discussion Paper: Mandate and Operational Options for the EPPR Working Group***

Discussion by Working Group members on:

- The implications of expanding the EPPR Working Group mandate to include major natural disasters
- Possible changes in the approaches to EPPR Working Group operations.

**6. *Other EPPR Working Group Activities***

**6.1 Arctic Marine Strategic Plan (PAME)**

**6.2 ACIA Policy Paper (Chair)**

**6.3 Sustainable Development Working Group Activities (*new*)**

**6.4 Updating the EPPR Web Site (Secretariat)**

- Discussions on updating needs and on the contents/structure of the web site.

**6.5 Update of the Work Plan and Strategic Plan (Chair)**

- Discussion and adoption of the updated work plan
- Discussion and adoption of the updated strategic plan (particularly based on decisions re: expanded mandate)

**7. *EPPR Deliverables to the SAO Meeting, October 2003***

**8. *Other Business***

**9. *Next Meeting***

**10. *Record of Decisions and Adjournment***

## Appendix 2: Participants - Working Group Meeting – Murmansk 3-5 June 2003

<i>Country / Organization</i>	<i>Name: Head Delegation*/ Other Representatives</i>	<i>Title/Organization/Mailing Address</i>	<i>Tel/Fax/E-Mail/Website</i>
<b>EPPR Chair</b>	Ms Laura Johnston	EPPR Working Group Chair Manager Northern Division Environmental Protection Branch Environment Canada Suite 301, 5204 – 50 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Yellowknife, Northwest Territories CANADA X1A 1E2	Tel: +1 867 669 4725 Fax: +1 867 873 8185 E-mail: <a href="mailto:laura.johnston@ec.gc.ca">laura.johnston@ec.gc.ca</a>
<b>EPPR Secretariat</b>	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: <a href="mailto:vicki@reach.net">vicki@reach.net</a> <a href="http://eppr.arctic-council.org">http://eppr.arctic-council.org</a>
<b>Canada</b>	<b>Ms. Bonnie Leonard*</b>	Policy and Planning Advisor Canadian Coast Guard Department of Fisheries and Oceans Centennial Towers 200 Kent Street, 5 <sup>th</sup> Floor Ottawa, ON CANADA K1A 0E6	Tel: +1 613 990 3381 Fax: +1 613 996 8902 E-mail: <a href="mailto:leonardbo@dfo-mpo-gc.ca">leonardbo@dfo-mpo-gc.ca</a>
	Mr. 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: <a href="mailto:execdir@jointsec.nt.ca">execdir@jointsec.nt.ca</a>
<b>Finland</b>	<b>Mr. Timo Viitanen*</b>	Director of Rescue Services Unit Ministry of the Interior Kirkkokatu 12 Helsinki Finland FIN-00023 GOVERNMENT	Tel: +358 9 160 44575 Fax: +358 9 160 44672 E-mail: <a href="mailto:timo.viitanen@sm.intermin.fi">timo.viitanen@sm.intermin.fi</a>

<b>Country / Organization</b>	<b>Name: Head Delegation*/ Other Representatives</b>	<b>Title/Organization/Mailing Address</b>	<b>Tel/Fax/E-Mail/Website</b>
<b>Norway</b>	<b>Mr. Kjell Kolstad*</b> (Vice-chair)	Head of Station Norwegian Coastal Administration 9143 Skibotn Tromso Norway 9143	Tel: +47 7775 0480 Fax: +47 7775 0481 E-mail: <a href="mailto:kjell.kolstad@kystverket.no">kjell.kolstad@kystverket.no</a>
	Mr. William Standring	Scientist Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority P.O. Box 55 Grini Naeringspark 13 1332 Oesteraas Norway	Tel: +47 6716 2646 Fax: +47 6714 7407 E-mail: <a href="mailto:william.standring@nrpa.no">william.standring@nrpa.no</a>
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<b>Dr. Vladimir Novikov*</b>	Chief Department of Warning of Extraordinary Situations and Scientifically-technical Policy EMERCOM of Russia Teatralnyi proezd, 3 Moscow 103012 Russia	
	Mr. Igor Veselov	Deputy of the Chief Department of Warning of Extraordinary Situations and Scientifically-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: <a href="mailto:veselov@emercom.gov.ru">veselov@emercom.gov.ru</a>
	Mr. Dimitriy Lobanov	Head of Division Department of International Co-operation EMERCOM of Russia Teatralnyi proezd, 3 Moscow 103012 Russia	Tel: + 7-095-449-99-13 Fax: + 7-095-445-50-46
	Mr. Viktor Rolin	Main Expert Department of International Co-operation EMERCOM of Russia	
	Ms. Tatiana Korneeva	Main Expert Department of International Co-operation EMERCOM of Russia	

<b>Country / Organization</b>	<b>Name: Head Delegation*/ Other Representatives</b>	<b>Title/Organization/Mailing Address</b>	<b>Tel/Fax/E-Mail/Website</b>
	Ms. Svetlana Stephanskaya	Main Expert Department of Warning of Extraordinary Situations and Scientifically-technical Policy EMERCOM of Russia	
	Mr. Yuri Yuriev	High Officer Department of Operating Information Interplay with Foreign Countries and Organizations EMERCOM of Russia	
	Mr. Evgueny Dukov	Chief Department of Warning and Liquidation of Extraordinary Situations by the Sea and Water Basins of the Northwest Regional Center EMERCOM of Russia	
	General Valeriy Lishik	EMERCOM of Murmansk Region	
	Mr. Vladimir Gusev	EMERCOM of Murmansk Region	
	Mr. Anatoliy Sivaikin	EMERCOM of Murmansk Region	
	Dr. Vladimir Kiselev	Head of Department Nuclear Safety Institute Russian Academy of Sciences (IBRAE) 52, B. Tuls kaya Moscow 115191 Russia	Tel: +7 095 955-2296 or 955-2236 Fax: +7 095 958-1151 E-mail: <a href="mailto:kis@ibrae.ac.ru">kis@ibrae.ac.ru</a>
	Mr. Igor Linge	Nuclear Safety Institute Russian Academy of Sciences (IBRAE)	
	Dr. Elena Melikhova	Head of Laboratory Nuclear Safety Institute Russian Academy of Sciences (IBRAE) 52, B. Tuls kaya Moscow 115191 Russia	Tel: +7 095 955-2241 Fax: +7 095 955-2241 E-mail: <a href="mailto:mem@ibrae.ac.ru">mem@ibrae.ac.ru</a>
	Mr. Gennady Gurianov	Deputy Governor of Murmansk oblast	
	Mr. Alexander Medvedev	Murmansk Shipping Company	

<b>Country / Organization</b>	<b>Name: Head Delegation*/ Other Representatives</b>	<b>Title/Organization/Mailing Address</b>	<b>Tel/Fax/E-Mail/Website</b>
	Mr. Alexander Boltnev	Knipovich Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (PINRO)	
	Mr. Oleg Mnatsakanyan	Federal State Unitary Enterprise <Arcticmorneftegasrazvedka >	
	Mr. Alexey Zuev	Murmansk Marine Biological Institute Kola Scientific Centre Russian Academy of Sciences (KNC of RAN)	
	Mr. Nikolai Melnikov	Mining Institute Kola Scientific Centre Russian Academy of Sciences	
<b>Sweden</b>	<b>Mr. Thomas Fagö*</b>	Commodore Swedish Coast Guard Stumholmen, Box 536 Karlskrona Sweden SE-37123	Tel: + 46 455 35 34 55 Fax: + 46 455 105 21 E-mail: <a href="mailto:thomas.fago@coastguard.se">thomas.fago@coastguard.se</a>
	Mr. Thord Tärnbrant	Senior Administrative Officer Swedish Rescue Services Agency Norra Klaragatan 18 Karlstad Sweden SE-651-80	Tel: + 46 54 13 5328 Fax: + 46 54 13 5620 E-mail: <a href="mailto:thord.tarnbrant@srv.se">thord.tarnbrant@srv.se</a>
	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: <a href="mailto:anders.hermansson@defence.mil.se">anders.hermansson@defence.mil.se</a> Mobile Tel: 070-3299974
<b>USA</b>	<b>Ms. Ann Heinrich*</b>	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: <a href="mailto:Ann.heinrich@nnsa.doe.gov">Ann.heinrich@nnsa.doe.gov</a>

<b>Country / Organization</b>	<b>Name: Head Delegation*/ Other Representatives</b>	<b>Title/Organization/Mailing Address</b>	<b>Tel/Fax/E-Mail/Website</b>
	Mr. Bruce Russell	Pacific Northwest National Laboratories 7107 Oakridge Ave. Chevy Chase, Maryland USA 20815	Tel: +1 301 656 1751 Fax: +1 301 656 0436 E-mail: <a href="mailto:barussell@erols.com">barussell@erols.com</a>
	Mr. Mark Meza	Deputy, Office of Response US Coast Guard 2100 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. USA 20593-0001	Tel: +1 202 267 2466 Fax: +1 202 267 4085 E-mail: <a href="mailto:mmeza@comdt.uscg.mil">mmeza@comdt.uscg.mil</a>
	Dr. Karen Erickson	Professor University of Alaska Fairbanks P.O. Box 750138 Fairbanks, AK USA 99775	Tel: +1 907 474 6503 Fax: +1 907 474 7244 E-mail: <a href="mailto:ffkje@uaf.edu">ffkje@uaf.edu</a>
	Mr. Walter B. Parker	Board Member Oil Spill Recovery Institute 3724 Campbell Airstrip Road Anchorage, Alaska USA 99504	Tel: +1 907 333 5189 Fax: +1 907 333 5153 E-mail: <a href="mailto:wbparker@gci.net">wbparker@gci.net</a>
<b>RAIPON</b>	<b>Mr. Anatoly Mikhailov*</b>	Office Manager Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON) 119415 Moscow Russian Federation P.O. Box 110	Tel: + 7 095 165 0754 Fax: + 7 095 164 6939 E-mail: <a href="mailto:raipon@online.ru">raipon@online.ru</a>
<b>Sami Council</b>	<b>Mr. Stefan Mikaelsson*</b>	Vice-President Sami Council P.O. Box 90 Harads Sweden SE-960-24	Tel: + 46 928 107 95 Fax: + 358 16 677 353 E-mail: <a href="mailto:Stefan.Mikaelsson@telia.com">Stefan.Mikaelsson@telia.com</a>
	Mr. Aleksander Kobelev	Vice-Chairperson Sami Council Lovozero, Russian Federation  Saami Council Headquarters: Office - Sekretariat - Sihteeristö FIN-99980 Utsjoki/Ohcejohka, FINLAND	Tel: Fax: +7 815 38 31 298 E-mail: <a href="mailto:aleksander.kobelev@saamicouncil.net">aleksander.kobelev@saamicouncil.net</a>  Saami Council Headquarters: Tel: + 358 16 677 351 Fax: + 358 16 677 353 Web: <a href="http://www.saamicouncil.net">www.saamicouncil.net</a> Email: <a href="mailto:saamicouncil@saamicouncil.net">saamicouncil@saamicouncil.net</a>

<b><i>Country / Organization</i></b>	<b><i>Name: Head Delegation*/ Other Representatives</i></b>	<b><i>Title/Organization/Mailing Address</i></b>	<b><i>Tel/Fax/E-Mail/Website</i></b>
<b>Other Participants</b>	Mr. Gennady Semanov	Ship Research Institute Department of Transport St Petersburg Russian Federation	Tel: Fax: E-mail: <a href="mailto:semanov@spb.cityline.ru">semanov@spb.cityline.ru</a>

## Appendix 3: Work Plan Projects 2002-2004 - Participation by Country

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.

### OIL POLLUTION: L - LEAD, P - PARTICIPANT, S – SECRETARIAT

PROJECTS	Canada	Denmark/ Greenland	Finland	Iceland	Norway	Russian Federation	Sweden	USA
<b>Ongoing</b>								
Shoreline Cleanup Assessment Technology (SCAT) Manual	L							P
Oil Transfer Guidelines (PAME)	P							P
Update web site and Arctic Guide	S							
Cooperation with Northern Forum	P							L
Maintain Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk from Oil Spills					L			
<b>Future possibilities</b>								
Update/expand Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk from Oil Spills	P		P		L	P	P	P
R&D - Response for Oil in Ice	P							L
Transboundary Cooperation						L		
Oil and Gas Conference (AMAP)	P							P

**RADIOLOGICAL & OTHER HAZARDS: L - LEAD, P - PARTICIPANT, S - SECRETARIAT**

PROJECTS	Canada	Denmark/ Greenland	Finland	Iceland	Norway	Russian Federation	Sweden	USA
<b>Ongoing</b>								
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
Community Radiation Information Project						L		L
ISO 14001 Training Programs						L		L
Update Website and Arctic Guide	S							
<b>Future possibilities</b>								
Expand Circumpolar Map to Include Radiological Hazards					L			P

**NATURAL DISASTERS: L - LEAD, P - PARTICIPANT, S - SECRETARIAT**

PROJECTS	Canada	Denmark/ Greenland	Finland	Iceland	Norway	Russian Federation	Sweden	USA
<b>Ongoing</b>								
Survey of Past Natural Disasters			L					
Cooperation with Northern Forum			L					L
<b>Future possibilities</b>								