



**PROGRAM FOR THE  
PROTECTION OF THE ARCTIC MARINE ENVIRONMENT**

**PAME**

**Working Group Meeting Report  
No: I-2005**

**FEBRUARY 22-23, 2005  
Copenhagen, Denmark**

## TABLE OF CONTENT

<b>SESSION I: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
SESSION I (1): ADOPTION OF AGENDA .....	1
SESSION I (2): REPORT FROM THE CHAIR AND THE SECRETARIAT .....	1
SESSION I (3): REPORT FROM SAO/MINISTERIAL MEETING .....	2
<b>SESSION II: REPORT FROM LEADS ON PAME-RELATED ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>2</b>
SESSION II (1): CONTRIBUTION TO THE AMAP OIL AND GAS ASSESSMENT .....	2
SESSION II (2): ADVANCE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RPA .....	2
SESSION II (3): UPDATE STATUS OF THE GEF/RUSSIAN NPA-ARCTIC .....	4
<b>SESSION III: PORT RECEPTION FACILITIES.....</b>	<b>6</b>
COOPERATION AND SYNERGIES WITH EPPR .....	7
<b>SESSION IV: ARCTIC MARINE SHIPPING ASSESSMENT.....</b>	<b>7</b>
BREAKOUT SESSION.....	8
<b>SESSION V: ECOSYSTEM APPROACH.....</b>	<b>10</b>
BREAKOUT SESSION.....	12
<b>SESSION VI: OTHER PAME RELATED ACTIVITIES AND FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME .....</b>	<b>13</b>
SESSION VI(1): OTHER ACTIVITIES .....	13
<i>Proposed Internet Portal for PAME</i> .....	13
<i>Introduction of a draft proposal on “ACIA beyond 2004”</i> .....	14
SESSION VI (3): THE NEXT PAME WORKING GROUP MEETING .....	15
SESSION VI (4): REPORTING TO THE NEXT SAO MEETING .....	15

## **LIST OF APPENDICIES**

### **APPENDIX I**

List of Participants

### **APPENDIX II**

List of Documents

### **APPENDIX III**

Agenda

### **APPENDIX IV**

Voluntary Contributions and Expenditures

### **APPENDIX V**

ACOPS position on Session II.3 “Update status of the GEF/Russian NPA- Arctic”

### **APPENDIX VI**

Summary Paper on Port Reception Facilities, submitted by Norway

### **APPENDIX VII**

Locations of previous PAME meetings since 1999

## **Session I: Welcome and Introduction**

### **Session I (1): Adoption of Agenda**

The Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME) Working Group met 22-23 February 2005 in Copenhagen, Denmark. The list of participants attending the Meeting is in Appendix I.

The Meeting was opened with a warm welcome by Mr. Jørgen Magner, on behalf of the Danish EPA.

The meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Frank Sonne from the Danish EPA in his capacity as the incoming chair of PAME and Mr. David Egilson, Director of the Environment and Food Agency in Iceland, the outgoing chair of PAME. The co-Chairs expressed their gratitude to the Danish EPA in arranging the Meeting.

A list of documents submitted for consideration at the Meeting is in Appendix II. All powerpoint presentations will be sent out separately and are available on the password protected PAME homepage.

*The Meeting adopted the agenda as presented in Appendix III.*

### **Session I (2): Report from the Chair and the Secretariat**

Mr. David Egilson, referred to a letter sent out prior to the meeting on the issue of PAME considering having two vice-chairs for PAME over the next 2 years. He reiterated that this arrangement would serve the purpose of obtaining the geographical coverage, participation and support to the new chair in forwarding the PAME work plan. The Chair, Frank Sonne, welcomed the proposal and noted the importance and value in having such support. Due to the unfortunate absence of Mr. Yuri Yu Aleksandrovskiy from the Ministry of Natural Resources in Russia, the Chair informed the meeting of his attention to discuss with Mr. Aleksandrovskiy, at the upcoming SAO meeting, the vice-chair position of PAME. The status of the Russian vice-chairmanship within PAME is pending the outcome of this discussion.

*The Meeting welcomed Dr. Lawson Brigham from USA as the vice-chair for PAME over the next 2 years and requested the Chair, Mr. Frank Sonne to contact Ambassador Vitaly Churkin, Chair of the Arctic Council SAOs to inform him on the absence of Russian representation at this Meeting and to seek his guidance on the status of the Russian vice-chair position within PAME.*

The PAME Secretariat distributed an information package on the finances of the PAME International Secretariat highlighting that the funding of the PAME Secretariat had been undersupplied resulting in a negative annual balance over the last 3 years. This was not discussed in plenary but at a lunch meeting of the national representatives. The Chair has after the meeting informed the Executive Secretary that he express the view that in his capacity as the Chair of PAME he encouraged countries to contribute to the Secretariat in accordance with the proposed increases.

A summary of the activities and a budget statement for the period of January 1, 2004 – December 31, 2004 as well as the expected operational expenditures for the calendar year 2005 and total voluntary contributions and expenditures for the period of 1999-2005 are presented in Appendix IV.

### **Session I (3): Report from SAO/Ministerial Meeting**

The Chair informed the Meeting on the main outcomes of the Arctic Council SAO and Ministerial meetings held 23-24 November in Reykjavik, Iceland and referred to the PAME-related sections within the SAO report and the Reykjavik Declaration which provide the building blocks for the PAME 2004-2006 Work Plan. He emphasised that particular focus be placed on the issues highlighted in the Reykjavik Declaration i.e. the port reception facilities assessment, the Arctic marine shipping assessment and the application of ecosystem approach.

The Chair noted that all participants should have received the SAO Report to the Ministers and the Reykjavik Declaration. These documents are also available on the PAME password protected homepage.

### **Session II: Report from leads on PAME-related activities**

#### **Session II (1): Contribution to the AMAP Oil and Gas Assessment**

Mr. Frank Sonne attended parts of the AMAP expert meeting on the Oil and Gas Assessment held in Helsinki, Finland 16-18 February 2005. He gave a short summary of the discussion at this meeting and noted that there could possibly exist an opportunity for PAME to contribute to this assessment if an update/summary of the Arctic nations regulatory systems is to be prepared. Recalling that the assessment was an AMAP-task he reiterated that the role of PAME, as mentioned in the work plan, would be a PAME-review to secure that possible PAME-related issues were adequately addressed in the assessment. He noted that there were however clear linkages between the AMAP Oil and Gas Assessment and the upcoming shipping assessment which should be kept in mind as the shipping assessment proceeds.

Mr. Dennis Thurston/USA provided a written update and identified possible opportunities for PAME to participate in the oil and gas assessment which was distributed prior to this meeting. He could not attend this meeting but agreed to provide a summary on the outcome of the oil and gas meeting which the PAME Secretariat will then distribute to the participants of this Meeting.

*The Meeting agreed that opportunities for PAME in this assessment should be further explored, both through a follow-up and reporting on status of this assessment. The Meeting noted connection to the Arctic shipping assessment and further agreed to include this issue on the agenda for the next PAME meeting.*

#### **Session II (2): Advance the implementation of the RPA**

Canada as the lead-country on advancing the implementation of the Regional Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment from Land-based Activities

(RPA) suggested that the follow-up and update over the next 2 years be as follows (distributed at the Meeting):

**Project title:** Advance the implementation of the RPA. Consider possible expansion to address additional priority source categories not already covered.

**Rationale:** The RPA was developed from 1996-1997 and adopted by Arctic Ministers in 1998. Since then, considerable new information has become available including:

- Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA)
- Arctic Human Development Report (AHDR)
- Arctic Council Sustainable Development Action Plan
- New information on hotspots in Russia (ACAP)
- The ACAP report: Reduction of Atmospheric Mercury Releases from Arctic States (Jan. 2005).
- GESAMP Report: Protecting the Oceans from Land-based Activities (2001)
- IUCN legal regime for the Arctic
- New legal agreements including: Stockholm Convention (POP's) + UNECE LRTAP Protocols in POP's and Heavy Metals
- Others?

The RPA could be updated to take this information into consideration particularly in section 4.0- Identification and Assessment of Problems, 5.0- Priorities, 6.0- Setting Management Objectives, Strategies and Measures. Consideration will be given to the possible expansion of the scope of the RPA to address additional priority source categories.

This report on updating the RPA could be brought forward by PAME as a contribution to the 2006 GPA Intergovernmental Review Meeting (IGR-2) and the next Arctic Council Meeting.

**Project Design:** To undertake a qualitative assessment and review of the RPA, to prepare a report on updating the document using new information available since 1997 (e.g. from sources listed above). To consider possible expansion of the scope of the RPA to address additional priority source categories beyond POP's and heavy metals to cover Medium priority issues: radio nuclides, petroleum hydrocarbons, and physical degradation of habitat.

**Schedule:** A report on the review and update of the RPA should be completed in time for 2006 GPA Intergovernmental Review Meeting (likely November 2006). This project should be initiated in early 2005, such that an updated RPA can be presented to SAO's and Ministers for endorsement in advance of the GPA Meeting.

**Country Leads / Resource Requirements / Budget:** This RPA update could be lead by Canada (as lead country) but would have to be supported with information/input by all PAME members. It is anticipated that the lead country will provide necessary resources to prepare the update.

The GPA representative reiterated the importance on having the updated RPA ready for the 2006 IGR meeting.

*The Meeting agreed to the proposed way forward with the updating of the RPA and noted that this update should not constitute a new RPA but rather be presented as a separate report/document.*

### **Session II (3): Update status of the GEF/Russian NPA-Arctic**

Mr. Vitaly Lystsov of the Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS) provided an updated status of the GEF Project “Russian Federation – Support to the National Program of Action for Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment” from ACOPS perspective (presentation provided in Appendix V).

He informed the Meeting that from the February of this year the Project starts its actual execution. He provided a summary of the four main conceptual components of the project and noted that in the current version of Project Document (January 2005) a fifth component had been added to include some additional demonstration and pilot projects for the purpose of possible expansion of donor base for the Project.

In closing he informed the meeting of changes in the execution modality of the Project i.e. now the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of the Russian Federation have been made the sole executing agency for Russian and GEF funds. The modality of execution of bilateral donors funds will be defined at Donors Meeting in London 16-17 March and a subsequent Steering Committee Meeting. In the new Project Document ACOPS (as well as NEFCO) received the status of “Partner Agency”, which could implement specific work on new projects and components adopted in the framework of the Project donor’s funds specially allocated for these purposes.

*The Meeting agreed that the PAME Secretariat participate at the upcoming meeting as a means of liaising and exploring possible synergies between the Project and the AMSP and PAME Work Plan.*

### **Session II (4): AMSP Communication Plan**

Canada and Iceland as the co-leads on the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan (AMSP), provided the following proposed way forward in developing the AMSP Communication Plan (distributed at the Meeting):

**Project Title:** Communications Plan for the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan.

**Rationale:** The AMSP, as approved by the Arctic Council on November 24, 2004 requires the development of a communications plan within two years for

consideration by the SAO's and Arctic Council. The PAME 2004-06 Work Plan indicates that Canada and Iceland will lead this PAME activity.

The need to develop a communications plan was included in the AMSP as a specific task to help address concerns expressed in the October 2003 AMSP Reykjavik Workshop and other forums that to be effective the AMSP must be communicated to and engage people with interest in the protection and sustainable utilization of arctic seas and coasts. The AMSP sees the need for a communications plan to support understanding and involvement in implementation.

**Project Design:** (scope, method, etc to be discussed in the PAME Meeting)

The PAME meeting may wish to consider the following:

1. The scope of the Plan should include communications activities aimed at global circumpolar, sub-regional and/or national audiences and identify who is responsible for communications and promotion of the AMSP to each of these audiences.
2. The term of the Plan should be the time frame for the Plan – one two or 3 Arctic Council Chairmanship terms
3. The Plan will set out key messages for each of the main target audiences.
4. The Plan will identify the main communications activities and initiatives for the next AC term

**Relevance to Indigenous Peoples:** Permanent Participants and IPS to indicate how they wish to be involved in this project

**Relationship to other Projects:** PAME has a communications plan, which covers all the PAME activities. As the lead working group for the AMSP, the AMSP Communications Plan should be closely aligned with the PAME communications plan. However, the AMSP Communications Plan should also include the work of other working groups in the AMSP.

**Schedule:** The Communications Plan is to be completed for the 2006 Arctic Council Meeting.

**Country Leads/Resource Requirements /Budgets:** Canada and Iceland have been identified in the PAME Work Plans as the lead country. It is anticipated that the two lead countries will provide the necessary resources to develop the Plan. However, implementation of communications activities related the AMSP are likely to require resources for most arctic countries.

*The Meeting agreed to the overall proposed framework. Canada and Iceland as the leads will prepare the 1<sup>st</sup> draft of the Communication Plan for distribution and comments prior to the next PAME meeting.*

### Session III: Port Reception Facilities

Norway as the lead country on the assessment of existing measures for port reception facilities for ship-generated waste and cargo residues presented their background paper on this issue as provided prior to the meeting (in Appendix VI).

Denmark informed the Meeting on their GIS development within the HELCOM region for port reception facilities to be used by ships and ports. The information system provides information about reception facilities which enables the ports to promote their services and enables ships to identify adequate reception facilities meeting their demands. Information can be retrieved either for a specific port or for a specific type of ship waste. In case a port is to be called on, the waste management capabilities for that particular port can be checked including information on handling fees, opening hours, notification terms and conditions and a direct link to mail address and home page of the port can be established. Discussions are underway on harmonized guidelines within the HELCOM region.

Denmark further noted that a "no-special-fee" system has been designed to encourage the use of port reception facilities. This means that fees covering the cost of the reception, handling and final disposal of ship-generated wastes are included in the harbour fee or otherwise charged to the ship, irrespective of whether any wastes are actually delivered. Further information can be found on the HELCOM homepage: [www.helcom.fi](http://www.helcom.fi)

Some participants noted that IMO had already prepared Guidelines For Ensuring The Adequacy of Port Waste Reception Facilities (adopted in 2000) which could also be used in this work. The IMO Guidelines provide guidance on the determination of adequacy of reception facilities for ship-generated waste as part of the implementation of MARPOL 73/78.

The Meeting noted the importance of good and accessible information systems on existing port reception facilities and asked the lead country to consider the "lessons learned" from e.g. the Baltic Sea Area.

*The meeting agreed that the actions be divided into phases with phase I to include the following:*

- *Immediately establish a correspondence group (email group).*
- *To assess availability of and measures for port reception facilities for ship-generated wastes and cargo residues in the PAME region (point 1 as proposed by Norway).*
- *To identify gaps in existing coverage taking into account existing applicable criteria such as the IMO's for the identification of these gaps (amendments to point 2 as proposed by Norway).*
- *In general, taking into account the possible outcome of the work focusing on improved information systems (e.g. Danish GIS system).*

- *The lead (Norway) to provide a timeframe of critical steps/milestones for approval by a written procedure as soon as possible.*

*The modalities of Phase II will depend on the outcome of Phase I. Original item no. 3 in Norway's background paper on harmonized guidelines will be further explored within Phase II.*

*The Meeting noted the importance of active involvement of Russia and the Russian port administrations in particular in this work.*

### **Cooperation and synergies with EPPR**

Mr. Mark Meza informed the meeting on the work of the EPPR Working Group and emphasized that synergies and opportunities for collaboration exist with PAME on a number of issues.

### **Session IV: Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment**

Dr. Lawson Brigham/United States as one of the leads on the Arctic marine shipping assessment (the other leads are Canada/Ross McDonald and Finland/Kimmo Juurmaa from Aker Finnyards Inc.) presented the background, rationale and need for this assessment and noted in particular its direct follow-on to the ACIA findings and the AMSP (presentation as a separate file). He further noted the numerous selected resources that would feed into this work such as:

- The Reykjavik Declaration – the 4<sup>th</sup> Arctic Council Ministerial (Nov 2004).
- Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) (Highlights, Overview Report, Science Report, & Policy Document). Key Finding #6 in the ACIA Overview Report "*Reduced sea ice is likely to increase marine transport and access to resources*". These documents are also available in its entirety at: <http://amap.no/acia/>
- The Arctic Marine Strategic Plan (AMSP) and how it relates to shipping. This document is available on the PAME homepage: <http://www.pame.is>
- The background paper on shipping as prepared for the AMSP workshop held 20-22 of October 2003.
- Draft workshop report from the Arctic Marine Transport Workshop held at the Scott Polar Research Institute in Cambridge September 28-30, 2004: Arctic Marine Transport Workshop, Scott Polar Research Institute. Further information are available at: <http://www.institutenorth.org>
- INSORP (International Northern Sea Route Programme) at <http://www.fni.no/insrop>
- The Snap Shot Analysis of Maritime Activities in the Arctic, Report No. 2000-3220, the Norwegian Maritime Directorate. Prepared for PAME.
- ARCOP (Arctic Operational Platform) a project co-funded by EU-DGTREN at [www.arcop.fi](http://www.arcop.fi)

Mr. Ross McDonald/Canada pointed out that PAME should consider some type of a conceptual framework paper for upcoming SAO meeting and detail this paper by fall of 2005 based on SAO guidance. Issues to be included in such a paper could for example include: geographical scope; the size of ships; transit shipping and local shipping/fishing fleets; scenarios (e.g. ACIA and general development); human impacts and impacts on local economies; and ecosystem impacts. This paper should also address the organisational and management structure of this work including collaboration with other working groups, in particular EEPR and SDWG and the financial aspects of this work.

Mr. Kimmo Juurmaa/Finland gave an update on the ARCOP Project and how its outcome and findings can feed into the shipping assessment as it relates to mainly predictions of transport volumes in 2020, emissions and assessment of risks.

The Meeting emphasised that the scope of the assessment should be fully comprehensive and integrated in nature and that direct participation of the entire Arctic Council, its Member Nations, Permanent Participants, Working Groups and Observers is crucial in this work to ensure a truly circumpolar participation. Further, a broad involvement of the circumpolar and maritime communities (e.g. selection of ‘experts’) needs to be ensured. It was mentioned that the coastal zones are essential for many Indigenous Peoples and local communities and concern for the influence on local fisheries and hunting due to increased shipping were mentioned.

Outreach will play an integral part in this work including the convening of a stakeholder workshop and/or conference; regional and Arctic community visits. Also, the need for early communication in the form of a Context Paper and a Brochure was noted.

Iceland informed the Meeting of a new report prepared by a working group set up under the auspices of the Icelandic Ministry for Foreign Affairs to study opportunities connected to the opening of the Northeastern sea route. This report is currently only available in Icelandic but a summary will shortly be provided in English and distributed to the participants.

### **Breakout Session**

A breakout/working session was provided in the agenda as an opportunity for designated experts to further work with the leads on overall scope of the assessment and decide on next steps.

The following six points summarize the main outcome of this session:

#### **1. Scope of the Work**

##### Activities:

- Initially covers all possible ship activities and ship types (tankers, fisheries, drilling vessels, cruise liners)
- Decision to keep the activities on the list to be based on importance and data availability

##### Geographic Area:

- As defined by the member States

- LME approach (regional transits through the LMEs)

Environmental impact assessment – to be performed based on the results from this study in another context

Social impact assessment – to be performed based on the results from this study in another context

Regulatory framework

## **2. Study Timeline**

Interim report in autumn 2006 (Ministerial meeting)

Final report in 2008 (Ministerial meeting)

## **3. Future Projections**

Economic projections to 2020

Climate change projections 2050

Other projections?

## **4. Management Structure**

Steering group – 10-12 persons

Points of contact to be provided immediately

Communication with the member states

Importance of Russian participation

## **5. Communication**

Early Communication

- Brochure
- Web-site

Field visits to Northern communities

Stakeholder workshop

## **6. Costs/Funding**

Between AMSP and ACIA

- ARCOP 5 million
- INSORP 5 million
- ACIA 9 million

Cost estimates and funding opportunities and sources will be explored by the lead countries and PAME.

The Meeting noted the importance of ensuring links and synergies between PAME and other relevant groups such as the Circumpolar Infrastructure Task Force (CITF), EPPR and others in this assessment. The interactions and connection with e.g. the AMAP Oil and Gas Assessment and ACOPS Ocean Security Initiative was also noted.

The importance of Permanent Participants participating early on in this process and their funding needs was discussed. Also, the unfortunate absence of Russian representatives at this

1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the shipping assessment was noted. The Chair was asked to seek guidance from the Russian Arctic Council Chairmanship in an effort to have designated marine transport experts from Russia on board to ensure a shipping assessment that is truly circumpolar in coverage and participation.

The Chair noted that he was of the understanding that lead-parties on respective items of the PAME Work Plan are responsible for anticipated costs and to secure additional funding if needed. The US informed the Meeting that it would attempt to secure some funding to support its role in the assessment as one of the three lead countries and encouraged others to consider financial contributions to specific tasks of this assessment.

*The lead countries will develop a detailed outline of the assessment, form a steering committee, and initially request from the Member States official information on current Arctic marine traffic in their respective regions. An early communications strategy will be developed and a potential international conference or workshop will be planned for 2006.*

### **Session V: Ecosystem Approach**

Dr. Kenneth Sherman of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) presented the Large Marine Ecosystem Approach (LME) on behalf of the lead country, with reference to the background paper on LME Approach to Assessment and Management as sent out prior to the meeting (presentation as a separate file).

Dr. Sherman noted that the World Summit on Sustainable Development called for the application of the ecosystem approach by 2010. He noted that the LME approach is applied within geographical management areas which are based on distinctive ecosystems rather than political boundaries. LMEs are regions of ocean space encompassing coastal areas from river basins and estuaries to the seaward boundaries of continental shelves and the outer margins of the major coastal currents. They are relatively large regions, on the order of 200,000 km<sup>2</sup> or greater, based on four ecological criteria: (1) bathymetry, (2) hydrography, (3) productivity, and (4) trophic relationships.

A five-module indicator approach to the assessment and management of LMEs consist of 3 science-based indicators focused on: (1) productivity, (2) fish and fisheries, (3) pollution/ecosystem health. The other two are (4) socio-economic conditions, and (5) governance.

The GEF Council has included the concept of LMEs in its GEF Operational Strategy as a vehicle for promoting ecosystem-based management of coastal and marine resources in the international waters focal area within the framework of sustainable development. The five-module approach is customized to fit the situation within the context of a transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA) (i.e. the first four modules) process and a strategic action plan (SAP) (i.e. the governance module) development process for the groups of nations or states sharing an LME.

### Ecosystem Management: A Paradigm Shift

FROM 	TO
Individual species	Ecosystems
Small spatial scale	Multiple scales
Short-term perspective	Long-term perspective
Humans: independent of ecosystems	Humans: integral part of ecosystems
Management divorced from research	Adaptive management
Managing commodities	Sustaining production potential for goods and services

Following presentations were made within this session as a means of providing a general background on the concept of an ecosystem approach both for information purposes and as an input to the breakout session.

Presentation was made by the Executive Director of the European Environment Agency, Dr. Jacqueline McGlade. "Supporting the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment through the Shared Spatial Information Service, the contribution of environmental informatics and spatial data to ecosystem analysis." She summarizes the various data and information collection processes and methods for the purpose of the five-module LME analysis and noted that low density of in-situ monitoring programmes exist in the Arctic region and that mapping for the marine environment is currently lacking. She noted that studies are underway to use the LME approach for the purpose of decision-making within the policy and management fields.

Presentation was made by Mr. Ben van de Wetering from the European Commission, DG Environment Unit Protection of Water & Marine Environment, on the status of the European Marine Strategy.

His presentation reflected the preparatory material for the eventual proposals of the European Commission regarding the Thematic Strategy for the Protection and Conservation of the European Marine Environment and did not necessarily reflect the view of the European Commission and in no way anticipated the Commission's future policy in this respect.

He summarised the main goals and objectives in preparing the European Marine Strategy and the principles of an ecosystem approach in this work. He noted that the implementation of the Strategy would be accomplished through the development of "Implementation Plans" at regional scale following ecosystem approach and involving all stakeholders. He further noted that the identification of 'eco-regions' within European seas would be finalised in April 2005 on the basis of proposal made by ICES. In closing he informed the meeting that the status of the final Strategy had not yet been finalized but noted the need to propose to Council and Parliament a legal instrument/framework. The Strategy will be finalized by June/July this year for submission to the Commission which will be followed by the EU political process.

## **Breakout Session**

A breakout/working session was provided in the agenda as an opportunity for designated experts to further work with the leads on overall scope of the ecosystem approach and collectively agree on next steps.

Dr. Sherman provided a presentation on LME Assessment and Management Partnering in UNEPs Regional Seas. He noted that recently UNEP and NOAA had extended their partnership to include the promotion of GEF supported LME projects as assessment and management units for UNEP's Regional Seas Program. At present, 121 countries are either planning or implementing GEF-LME ecosystem-based projects that are relevant to the Regional Seas Program.

It was suggested that national experts be invited to a special meeting to consider the LME and other pertinent assessment strategies for assessing and improving ecosystem conditions within the PAME area. The meeting would include presentations by experts on the Norwegian and Canadian approaches to Ecosystem Based Management.

With regard to the PAME area, Dr. Sherman described the methodology used in the delineation of 17 Arctic LMEs. It was proposed that the boundaries of 15 of the 17 Arctic LMEs be reviewed and the Gulf of Alaska and North Sea LMEs be removed from the Arctic LME list. It was further proposed that during the 7<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of the IOC, IUCN, NOAA Large Marine Ecosystem Consultative Committee scheduled for 5-6 July, the Arctic LME boundaries would be reviewed. Academician Gennady Matishov, Director of the Murmansk Marine Biological Institute will provide results to the Consultative Committee of the findings of a UNEP sponsored project for taking into consideration new information on 4 criteria, bathymetry, hydrography, productivity, and trophic linkages, used to delineate LME boundaries.

It was noted that opportunity to extending the GEF-LME project network to the Arctic was good and the meeting discussed the possibility of developing and implementing a GEF supported LME assessment and management projects for the West Bering Sea and the Barents Sea. A dialogue on this issue is expected to continue among the interested parties including the USA and Russian Federation.

In this regard, ACOPS representative emphasised possible synergies that could be explored with the possible GEF supported LME projects for the West Bearing Sea and Barents Sea within the framework of the GEF/Russian NPA-Arctic.

Norway informed the Meeting on the status and proposed methodology on the development of an integrated management plan for the Norwegian Barents Sea. Norway noted that this effort seeks to apply an integrated ecosystem approach which is similar to the LME approach. This integrated management plan will be presented as a White Paper to the Norwegian Government.

Prof. Torkel Gissel Nielsen/Denmark provided an update on a project on ecosystem approach in Greenland (ECOGREEN project).

Following is a summary of the main outcome of this session:

*The Meeting agreed on the following next steps to further develop the ecosystem approach:*

1. *Establish a steering committee with 10-12 representatives.*
2. *Convene a special meeting of PAME ecosystem assessment, management, and policy experts in late spring or early summer at a venue to be decided through deliberations with the PAME Secretariat to explore the following:*
  - *LMEs within the Arctic and nested ecosystems at other scales*
  - *Other pertinent assessment strategies for assessing and improving ecosystem conditions, and*
  - *Opportunities for pilot studies*
3. *Support the scheduling, with a PAME Steering Committee, a Symposium on the "Assessment and Management of Arctic Large Marine Ecosystems During Climate Change," to be held during the 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)*

In addition, a consideration was given to convening an LME Symposium on the "Assessment and Management of Arctic Large Marine Ecosystems During Climate Change," topic for late 2006, wherein the outcome of the deliberations could be an Arctic LME volume to be published in the LME Series by Elsevier Science in 2007 under the guidance of a PAME Steering Committee.

The synthesis of available scientific and management information would be encouraged during 2007, in preparation for the completion of a final report on an ecosystem-based approach to the assessment and management of the PAME area in 2008, based on guidance received from PAME.

## **Session VI: Other PAME Related Activities and Future Work Programme**

### **Session VI(1): Other Activities**

The Chair informed the meeting of the recently released ACAP report: Reduction of Atmospheric Mercury Releases from Arctic States (Jan. 2005) which is available at homepages of AMAP ([www.amap.no](http://www.amap.no)) and the Danish Environmental Protection Agency ([www.mst.dk](http://www.mst.dk)).

### **Proposed Internet Portal for PAME**

The PAME Secretary, in collaboration with the CAFF Secretary, introduced a proposal for an advanced new internet portal for CAFF and PAME which has been developed in cooperation with a local software company, Teikn a Lofti. The aim is to increase co-operation with other organizations and professionals and sharing of resources, provide a better service and up-to-

date information to different Arctic groups, provide a better data management, strengthen circumpolar networks and increase public awareness and exposure.

This new portal provides the opportunity to provide an access to a central, inter-active, communication and information gateway serving e.g. specific PAME projects such as the port reception facilities assessment, the Arctic marine shipping assessment and the application of ecosystem approach.

The CAFF Secretariat, in collaboration with the software company, is exploring funding for this work and the response has so far been positive.

*The Meeting welcomed this initiative and agreed that the PAME Secretariat, in collaboration with the CAFF Secretariat, should continue this work and noted the importance of exploring external funding as countries are not in a position to fund such an initiative and further stressed the importance that the new proposed internet portal does not lead to additional operational costs of the PAME Secretariat. The Meeting emphasized that the current PAME homepage be kept up and running during this updating process. The PAME Secretary will report on progress at the next PAME meeting.*

#### Introduction of a draft proposal on “ACIA beyond 2004”

The Executive Secretary of CAFF, Maria Gunnarsdottir informed the Meeting of an initiative taken by AMAP and CAFF to draft a paper on “ACIA Beyond 2004” as an answer to the request from the 2004 ministerial meeting to establish a focal point for the follow-up to the ACIA. This issue had been discussed at the extended AMAP board meeting which had been convened a one-week prior to the PAME meeting. The Chair of PAME attended this meeting in his capacity as the national AMAP representative and as the incoming Chair of PAME.

The Meeting noted that ACIA was an assessment like others of the Arctic Council and that the ad-hoc organisational status of ACIA had formally ended. The 2004 ministerial meeting asked the Arctic Council working groups to secure the necessary follow-up, and the SAOs to secure a focal-point for the follow up. The Meeting further expressed the view that the ownership and the decision for an ACIA-follow-up should be within the existing structure of Arctic Council, and not through the creation of a new group. The Chair informed the Meeting that his interventions at the AMAP board meeting were in accordance with the view as expressed by PAME representatives.

The Chair further noted that any decision on possible creation of new structure within the Arctic Council was, as clearly wished by some of the stakeholders of ACIA, a matter for SAO decision. He also mentioned that in his capacity as the Chair of PAME he assumes, until further guidance from SAOs on the ACIA follow-up, that the activities of the Arctic Council are carried forward within the Working Groups in accordance with their respective mandates. He emphasised that in his view the Working Group Chairs and Secretariats should coordinate their respective work accordingly.

*The Meeting agreed with the Chair’s view on the procedures of the ACIA follow-up and emphasized that the creation of a new group to address the ACIA follow-up within the Arctic Council should be avoided.*

### **Session VI (3): The next PAME Working Group meeting**

*The Meeting agreed that the next PAME meeting should preferably take place back-to-back with other relevant meetings such as possible meetings in Alaska and/or in St. Petersburg on the shipping assessment. Exact time and place to be further explored and opportunities identified for the next PAME meeting to be convened in the fall of 2005.*

Norway indicated that they will explore the possibility of hosting the next PAME meeting and will inform participants in due time.

A list of locations of previous PAME meetings is provided in Appendix VII.

### **Session VI (4): Reporting to the next SAO Meeting**

The Chair will report on the outcome of the PAME meeting at the next SAO meeting that will be held in Yakutsk, Russian Federation, 6-7 April 2005.

## APPENDIX I – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<i>PAME Secretariat</i>	
<p><b><u>David Egilson</u></b>            Chair (outgoing)            Director            The Environment and Food Agency            Sudurlandsbraut 28            128 Reykjavik            Iceland</p> <p>Tel: +354 591 2000            Fax: +354 591 2020            Email: <a href="mailto:david@ust.is">david@ust.is</a></p>	<p><b><u>Soffia Gudmundsdottir</u></b>            Executive Secretary            PAME International Secretariat            Borgir            Nordurslod            600 Akureyri            Iceland</p> <p>Tel: +354 461 1355            Fax: +354 462 3390            Email: <a href="mailto:pame@pame.is">pame@pame.is</a></p>
<p><b><u>Frank Sonne</u></b>            Chair (incoming)            Ministry of the Environment            Danish Environmental Protection Agency            Strandgade 29            DK-1401 Copenhagen K</p> <p>Tel: + 45 3266 0330            Fax: + 45 3266 0201            Email: <a href="mailto:fms@mst.dk">fms@mst.dk</a></p>	<p><b><u>Olga Pálsdóttir</u></b>            PAME International Secretariat            Borgir            Nordurslod            600 Akureyri            Iceland</p> <p>Tel: +354 461 1355            Fax: +354 462 3390            Email: <a href="mailto:olga@caff.is">olga@caff.is</a></p>
<i>CANADA</i>	
<p><b><u>Chris Cuddy</u></b>            Chief            Land and Water Management Division            Indian and Northern Affairs Canada            10 Wellington St., Room 648            Gatineau, Quebec, K1A 0H4</p> <p>Tel: +1 819 994-7483            Fax: +1 819 997-9623            Email: <a href="mailto:cuddyc@ainc-inac.gc.ca">cuddyc@ainc-inac.gc.ca</a></p>	<p><b><u>Renée Sauvé</u></b>            Ocean Advisor            Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada            Oceans Stewardship Branch            200 Kent Street            Mail Stop: 12234            Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6</p> <p>Tel: +1 613 447 3862            Email: <a href="mailto:sauver@dfo-mpo.gc.ca">sauver@dfo-mpo.gc.ca</a></p>

<p><b><u>Maureen Copley</u></b>  Head, Land-based Activities Division  Marine Environment Branch  National Programs Directorate  Environment Canada  351 St. Joseph Blvd., 12th floor  Gatineau, Quebec Canada K1A 0H3</p> <p>Tel. (819) 953-6949  Fax. (819) 953-0913  Email: <a href="mailto:maureen.copley@ec.gc.ca">maureen.copley@ec.gc.ca</a></p>	<p><b><u>Ross MacDonald</u></b>  Manager, Special Projects and Arctic Shipping  Transport Canada  Tower C, Place de Ville, 330 Sparks St.  Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0N5</p> <p>Tel: +1 613 991 3145  Email: <a href="mailto:MACDORA@tc.gc.ca">MACDORA@tc.gc.ca</a></p>
<p><b><u>Jack Mathias</u></b>  Senior Policy Advisor  Oceans Directorate  Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada  Suite 200 - 401 Burrard Street  Vancouver, BC V6C 3S4</p> <p>Tel. (250) 758 8824  Fax. (250) 756 7349  Email: <a href="mailto:mathias@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca">mathias@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca</a></p>	
<b><i>DENMARK/GREENLAND/FAROE ISLANDS</i></b>	
<p><b><u>Kjeld F. Jørgensen</u></b>  Danish EPA Water  Strandgade 29  DK-1401 København K</p> <p>Tel: +45 32 66 04 42  Fax: +45 32 66 05 00  Email: <a href="mailto:kfj@mst.dk">kfj@mst.dk</a></p>	<p><b><u>Jørgen Magner</u></b>  Danish EPA Water  Head of Division  Strandgade 29  DK-1401 København K</p> <p>Tel: +45 32 66 01 00  Fax: +45 32 66 04 79  Email: <a href="mailto:jm@mst.dk">jm@mst.dk</a></p>
<p><b><u>Ivan Andersen</u></b>  Danish EPA Water  Head of Section  Strandgade 29  DK-1401 København K</p> <p>Tel: +45 32 66 01 00  Fax: +45 32 66 04 79  Email: <a href="mailto:ia@mst.dk">ia@mst.dk</a></p>	<p><b><u>Heidi Nexø</u></b>  Bureau of Minerals and Petroleum  Government of Greenland  P.O. Box 930  DK-3900 Nuuk  Greenland</p> <p>Tel. +299 34 68 00  Fax: +299 32 43 02  Email: <a href="mailto:HENE@gh.gl">HENE@gh.gl</a></p>
<p><b><u>Suni Petersen</u></b>  Food-, Veterinary- and Environmental Agency  Falkavegur 6  FO-100 Tórshavn  Faroe Islands</p> <p>Tel. +298 356400  Fax: +298 356401  Email: <a href="mailto:sunip@hfs.fo">sunip@hfs.fo</a></p>	<p><b><u>Andreas Vedel</u></b>  The Ministry of Environment and Nature  Government of Greenland  P.O. Box 1614  DK-3900 Nuuk  Greenland</p> <p>Tel: +299 34 67 07  Fax: +299 32 52 86  Email: <a href="mailto:ave@gh.gl">ave@gh.gl</a></p>

<p><b><u>Prof.Torkel Gissel Nielsen</u></b> National Environmental Research Institute Dept of Marine Ecology Frederiksborgvej 399 DK-4000 Roskilde</p> <p>Tel: +45 46 30 12 57 Email: <a href="mailto:agn@dmu.dk">agn@dmu.dk</a></p>	<p><b><u>Frank Riget</u></b> Senior Scientist National Environmental Research Institute Dept of Marine Ecology Frederiksborgvej 399 DK-4000 Roskilde</p> <p>Email: <a href="mailto:ffr@dmu.dk">ffr@dmu.dk</a></p>
<b>FINLAND</b>	
<p><b><u>Outi Väkevä</u></b> Senior Advisor Ministry of the Environment Kasarmikatu 25, Helsinki P.O.Box 35, 00023 Valtioneuvosto</p> <p>Tel: +358 9 1603 9736 Fax: +358 9 1603 9717 Email: <a href="mailto:outi.vakeva@ymparisto.fi">outi.vakeva@ymparisto.fi</a></p>	<p><b><u>Kimmo Juurmaa</u></b> Aker Finnyards P.O. Box 132 FI-00151 Helsinki</p> <p>Tel. +358 10 670 2247 Fax +358 10 670 2527 Email: <a href="mailto:kimmo.juurmaa@masa-yards.fi">kimmo.juurmaa@masa-yards.fi</a></p>
<b>ICELAND</b>	
<p><b><u>Óttar Freyr Gíslason</u></b> Ministry for the Environment Skuggasund 1 IS- 150 Reykjavik</p> <p>Tel: +354 545 8600 Fax: + 354 562 4566 Email: <a href="mailto:ottar.gislason@umhverfisraduneyti.is">ottar.gislason@umhverfisraduneyti.is</a></p>	<p><b><u>Stefan Asmundsson</u></b> Director of International Affairs Ministry of Fisheries Skulagata 4 IS 150 Reykjavik</p> <p>Tel. +354 545 8300 Fax. +1 354 562 1853 Email: <a href="mailto:stefan.asmundsson@sjr.stjr.is">stefan.asmundsson@sjr.stjr.is</a></p>
<b>NORWAY</b>	
<p><b><u>Marit Nyborg</u></b> Norwegian Pollution Control Authority (SFT) P.O. Box 8100 Dep. 0032 Oslo Norway</p> <p>Tel: +47 22 57 36 50 Email: <a href="mailto:marit.nyborg@sft.no">marit.nyborg@sft.no</a></p>	<p><b><u>Jens Koefoed</u></b> Norwegian Maritime Directorate P.O. Box 8123 Dep 0032 Oslo Norway</p> <p>Tel: +47 22 45 45 00 Fax: +47 22 45 45 01 Email: <a href="mailto:jens.koefoed@sjofartsdir.dep.no">jens.koefoed@sjofartsdir.dep.no</a></p>
<p><b><u>Eivind Vagslid</u></b> Norwegian Maritime Directorate P.O. Box 8123 Dep 0032 Oslo Norway</p> <p>Tel: +47 22 45 45 00 Fax: +47 22 45 45 01 Email: <a href="mailto:eivind.vagslid@sjofartsdir.dep.no">eivind.vagslid@sjofartsdir.dep.no</a></p>	<p><b><u>Inger Winsnes</u></b> Ministry of the Environment P.O. Box 8013 Dep, 0030 Oslo</p> <p>Tel: +47 22 24 90 90 Fax: +47 22 24 95 60 Email: <a href="mailto:Inger.Winsnes@md.dep.no">Inger.Winsnes@md.dep.no</a></p>

<i><b>SWEDEN</b></i>	
<p><b><u>Husamuddin Ahmadzai</u></b> Principal Executive Officer Dept. of Enforcement &amp; Implementation Swedish Environmental Protection Agency SE-106 48 Stockholm, SWEDEN</p> <p>Tel: +46-8-698 1145 Fax: +46-8-698 1602 / +46-8-698 1345 Email: <a href="mailto:husamuddin.ahmadzai@naturvardsverket.se">husamuddin.ahmadzai@naturvardsverket.se</a></p>	
<i><b>UNITED STATES</b></i>	
<p><b><u>Tom Laughlin</u></b> Office of International Affairs/NOAA U.S. Department of Commerce 14th and Constitution, N.W., Room 5230 20230 Washington DC</p> <p>Tel: +1 202 482 6196 Fax: +1 202 461 4307 Email: <a href="mailto:tom.laughlin@noaa.gov">tom.laughlin@noaa.gov</a></p>	<p><b><u>Kenneth Sherman</u></b> Director USDOC/NOAA/NMFS Narragansett Laboratory 28 Tarzwell Drive Narragansett, RI 02882 United States</p> <p>Tel: +1 401 782 3211 Email: <a href="mailto:ksherman@mola.na.nmfs.gov">ksherman@mola.na.nmfs.gov</a></p>
<p><b><u>Mark Meza</u></b> Deputy, Office of Response Assistant Commandant for Science, Safety, Security and Environmental Protection US Coast Guard 2100 Second Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20593-0001 United States</p> <p>Tel: +1-202-267-2466 Fax: +1-202-267-4085 Email: <a href="mailto:MMeza@comdt.uscg.mil">MMeza@comdt.uscg.mil</a></p>	<p><b><u>Dr. Lawson W. Brigham</u></b> Deputy Director U.S. Arctic Research Commission 420 L Street, Suite 315 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 USA</p> <p>Tel: +1-907-271-4577 Fax: 1-907-271-4578 E-mail: <a href="mailto:usarc@acsalaska.net">usarc@acsalaska.net</a></p>
<i><b>CAFF</b></i>	<i><b>RAIPON</b></i>
<p><b><u>María Victoria Gunnarsdóttir</u></b> CAFF Executive Secretary Borgir Nordurslod 600 Akureyri Iceland</p> <p>Tel: +354 462 3350 Cell: +354 895 1357 Fax: +354 462 3390 Email: <a href="mailto:maria@caff.is">maria@caff.is</a></p>	<p><b><u>Anatoly Mikhailov</u></b> Chief of RAIPON Staff 260 office, 92 Vernadskogo Prospect 119571 Moscow Russia</p> <p>Tel: + 7 (095) 780-8727 Fax: 7 (095) 780-8727 Email: <a href="mailto:raipon@online.ru">raipon@online.ru</a></p>

<i>IPS</i>	
<p><b><u>Laila Chemnitz</u></b>  Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat  Strangader 91, 4.  P.O.Box 2151  1016 Copenhagen K</p> <p>Tel: +45 32 83 37 90  Fax: +45 32 83 37 91  Email: <a href="mailto:lch@ghsdk.dk">lch@ghsdk.dk</a></p>	<p><b><u>Mette Uldall Naver</u></b>  Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat  Strangader 91, 4.  P.O.Box 2151  1016 Copenhagen K</p> <p>Tel: +45 32 83 37 90  Fax: +45 32 83 37 91  Email: <a href="mailto:mu@ghsdk.dk">mu@ghsdk.dk</a> or <a href="mailto:ips@ghsdk.dk">ips@ghsdk.dk</a></p>
<i>UNEP/GPA Coordination Office</i>	<i>European Environment Agency</i>
<p><b><u>Annie Muchai</u></b>  Associate Liaison Officer  United Nations Environment Programme  GPA Coordination Office/Regional Seas  P O Box 16227, 2500 BE The Hague  The Netherlands</p> <p>Tel: +31703114479/60  Fax: +31703456648  Email: <a href="mailto:a.muchai@unep.nl">a.muchai@unep.nl</a></p>	<p><b><u>Dr. Jacqueline McGlade</u></b>  Executive Director  European Environment Agency  Kgs. Nytorv 6  DK-1050 Copenhagen K  Denmark</p> <p>Tel: +45 3336 7100  Email: <a href="mailto:Jacqueline.Mcglade@eea.eu.int">Jacqueline.Mcglade@eea.eu.int</a></p>
<i>EU Commission</i>	<i>ACOPS</i>
<p><b><u>Ben van de Wetering</u></b>  DG Environment  Unit Protection of Water &amp; Marine Environment  Environment Directorate-General  European Commission  B-1049 Brussels  Belgium</p> <p>Email: <a href="mailto:Ben.VAN-DE-WETERING@cec.eu.int">Ben.VAN-DE-WETERING@cec.eu.int</a></p>	<p><b><u>Prof. Vitaly Lystsov</u></b>  Representative in the Russian Federation of the  Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea  (ACOPS)  RRC "Kurchatov Institute"  Kurchatov Sq.1  123182 Moscow, Russia</p> <p>Tel: +7 095 196 6328  Fax: +7 095 196 8679  Email: <a href="mailto:vitalil@pike.pike.ru">vitalil@pike.pike.ru</a></p>

## APPENDIX II – LIST OF DOCUMENTS

AGENDA ITEMS	DOCUMENTS
<b>Agenda Item I:</b> Welcome and Introduction	(1) Agenda (1) Annotation to the agenda (2) Report from the Secretariat Letter from Mr. David Egilson sent out 29 December 2004
<b>Agenda Item II:</b> Reports from leads on PAME-related activities	(1) Watch Brief ISO Arctic Structures Standards (2) Update on the status of the Russian NPA-Arctic
<b>Agenda Item III:</b> Port Reception Facilities	- Summary Paper on Port Reception Facilities (Norway)
<b>Agenda Item IV:</b> Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment	Recommended background material on the shipping assessment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ACIA Overview Report, <u>Key Finding #6 "Reduced sea ice is likely to increase marine transport and access to resources"</u> and the ACIA Policy Document. These documents are also available in its entirety at: <a href="http://amap.no/acia/">http://amap.no/acia/</a></li> <li>2. <u>The Arctic Marine Strategic Plan (AMSP)</u> and how it relates to shipping. This document is available on the PAME homepage: <a href="http://www.pame.is">http://www.pame.is</a></li> <li>3. <u>The background paper on shipping</u> as prepared for the AMSP workshop held 20-22 of October 2003. This paper is attached but the document with all background paper is available on the PAME homepage (front page).</li> <li>4. <u>Draft workshop report from the Arctic Marine Transport Workshop</u> held at the Scott Polar Research Institute in Cambridge September 28-30, 2004: Arctic Marine Transport Workshop, Scott Polar Research Institute. Further information are available at: <a href="http://www.institutenorth.org">http://www.institutenorth.org</a></li> <li>5. <u>INSORP (International Northern Sea Route Programme)</u> at <a href="http://www.fni.no/insrop">http://www.fni.no/insrop</a></li> <li>6. <u>The Snap Shot Analysis of Maritime Activities in the Arctic</u>, Report No. 2000-3220, the Norwegian Maritime Directorate. Prepared for PAME.</li> <li>7. ARCOP (Arctic Operational Platform) a project co-funded by EU-DGTREN at <a href="http://www.arcop.fi">www.arcop.fi</a></li> </ol>
<b>Agenda Item V:</b> Ecosystem Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Background paper: LME approach to Assessment and Management</li> <li>- Background paper on LME: Draft meeting report from IOC-IUCN-NOAA 6th consultative meeting, 29-30 March 2004. A Prospectus for an Arctic Pilot Project, The West Bearing Sea Large Marine Ecosystem</li> <li>- Background paper: Advice on eco-region for the implementation of an ecosystem approach in European waters (prepared by ICES) accompanied with an email</li> </ul>
<b>General Documents</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PAME Work Plan 2004-2006</li> <li>- 2004 Reykjavik Declaration</li> <li>- SAO Report to Ministers Nov 2004</li> </ul>

## **APPENDIX III – AGENDA**

**The Meeting will be co-chaired by Mr. David Egilson and Mr. Frank Sonne**

**TUESDAY, February 22**

**09:00-09:30 Registration and Coffee**

**09:30-10:00, Session I: Welcome and Introduction (Chair)**

1. Adoption of agenda
2. Report from the Chair and the Secretariat

**10:00-11:00, Session II: Report from leads on PAME-related activities**

1. Contribute to the AMAP Oil and Gas Assessment (Denmark/ Greenland/ Faroe Islands, USA and others)
2. Advance the implementation of the RPA (Canada)
3. Update status of the GEF/Russian NPA-Arctic (Russia)
4. AMSP Communication Plan (Canada/Iceland)

**11:00-12:00, Session III: Port Reception Facilities**

1. Introduction by the lead country (Norway)
2. Discussion and an agreement on next steps

**13:00-14:00, Session IV: Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment**

1. Introduction by lead-countries (Canada/Finland/USA)
2. Tour de table

**14:00-16:30, Breakout/working session for the Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment**

**16:30-17:00, Session V: Ecosystem Approach**

1. Presentation by the Executive Director of the European Environment Agency, Dr. Jacqueline McGlade

**Reception hosted by The Faroe Islands and Greenland**

## **WEDNESDAY, February 23**

### **09:00-10:30, Session IV: Shipping – Cont.**

1. Report back to the plenary
2. Discussion and an agreement on next steps

### **11:00-12:00, Session V: Ecosystem Approach**

1. Introduction by the lead country (USA)
2. LME presentation (Kenneth Sherman/USA)
3. Presentation on the EU perspective (Ben van de Wetering)
4. Tour de table

### **13:00-15:00, Breakout/working session for the Ecosystem Approach**

### **15:30-16:30, Session V: Ecosystem Approach – Cont.**

1. Report back to the plenary
2. Discussion and an agreement on next steps

### **16:30-17:30, Session VI: Other PAME Related Activities and Future Work Programme**

1. Other activities
2. Review draft meeting report
3. The next PAME Working Group meeting (timing and place)
4. Reporting to the next SAO Meeting

PAME Meeting Concludes

## **APPENDIX IV - Voluntary Contributions and Expenditures**

Provided below are operational expenditures and voluntary contributions in support of the PAME Secretariat as follows:

- Country contributions and financial statements for the years 1999-2004
- Financial Statement for the year 2004
- Proposed budget for 2005 at the exchange rate of 63 ISK/USD and 70 ISK/USD, respectively

Country Contributions for the years 1999 - 2005 (in USD)								
							SUGGESTED	
Country	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Canada		\$20.000	\$12.800	\$13.600	\$13.523	\$20.000	\$18.700	
Denmark		\$11.000	\$11.000	\$11.000	\$11.000	\$15.200	\$15.200	
Finland		\$9.700	\$12.600	\$6.900	\$7.299	\$8.000	\$16.400 <sup>4)</sup>	
Iceland	\$142.248 <sup>1)</sup>	\$68.194	\$59.866	\$55.341	\$81.926	\$108.000	\$117.143	
Norway		in-kind	in-kind	in-kind	in-kind	in-kind	\$17.600 <sup>4)</sup>	
Russia		in-kind	in-kind	in-kind	in-kind	in-kind	in-kind	
Sweden		\$17.600	\$17.600	\$17.600	\$17.600	\$17.600	\$17.600	
United States		\$30.000	\$30.000	in-kind	\$20.000	\$20.000	\$20.000	
<b>Total Contributions/year:</b>	<b>\$142.248</b>	<b>\$156.494</b>	<b>\$143.866</b>	<b>\$104.441</b>	<b>\$151.348</b>	<b>\$188.800</b>	<b>\$222.643</b>	
						\$744.950		
Financial Statment for the years 1999-2005 (in ISK)								
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	70 ISK/USD 2005	63 ISK/USD 2005 <sup>2)</sup>
<b>REVENUE</b>								
Contributions <sup>3)</sup>	10.000.000 kr.	12.892.497 kr.	11.605.750 kr.	10.771.473 kr.	12.669.258 kr.	13.666.111 kr.	15.585.000 kr.	14.846.500 kr.
Misc revenue	6.000 kr.	250.635 kr.	85.135 kr.	146.952 kr.	200.000 kr.	50.000 kr.	100.000 kr.	100.000 kr.
<b>Sub-total Revenue/year:</b>	<b>10.006.000 kr.</b>	<b>13.143.132 kr.</b>	<b>11.690.885 kr.</b>	<b>10.918.425 kr.</b>	<b>12.869.258 kr.</b>	<b>13.716.111 kr.</b>	<b>15.685.000 kr.</b>	<b>\$14.946.500</b>
Carryforward from previous year:		6.382.201 kr.	6.377.357 kr.	2.080.905 kr.	-1.285.768 kr.	-1.023.903 kr.	-782.251 kr.	-782.251 kr.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10.006.000 kr.</b>	<b>19.525.333 kr.</b>	<b>18.068.242 kr.</b>	<b>12.999.330 kr.</b>	<b>11.583.490 kr.</b>	<b>12.692.208 kr.</b>	<b>14.902.749 kr.</b>	<b>14.164.249 kr.</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES:</b>								
Staff	1.103.880 kr.	6.772.930 kr.	7.724.721 kr.	7.696.689 kr.	7.379.010 kr.	6.918.345 kr.	7.500.000 kr.	7.500.000 kr.
Office	1.859.991 kr.	3.023.210 kr.	3.773.092 kr.	3.150.843 kr.	3.498.688 kr.	5.010.086 kr.	5.095.000 kr.	5.095.000 kr.
Travel/Meetings	659.928 kr.	3.351.836 kr.	4.489.524 kr.	3.437.566 kr.	1.729.695 kr.	1.546.028 kr.	2.350.000 kr.	2.350.000 kr.
<b>Total Expenditure/year:</b>	<b>3.623.799 kr.</b>	<b>13.147.976 kr.</b>	<b>15.987.337 kr.</b>	<b>14.285.098 kr.</b>	<b>12.607.393 kr.</b>	<b>13.474.459 kr.</b>	<b>14.945.000 kr.</b>	<b>14.945.000 kr.</b>
<b>Balance per year:</b>	<b>6.382.201 kr.</b>	<b>-4.844 kr.</b>	<b>-4.296.452 kr.</b>	<b>-3.366.673 kr.</b>	<b>261.865 kr.</b>	<b>241.652 kr.</b>	<b>740.000 kr.</b>	<b>1.500 kr.</b>
<b>Closing balance/year:</b>	<b>6.382.201 kr.</b>	<b>6.377.357 kr.</b>	<b>2.080.905 kr.</b>	<b>-1.285.768 kr.</b>	<b>-1.023.903 kr.</b>	<b>-782.251 kr.</b>	<b>-42.251 kr.</b>	<b>-780.751 kr.</b>
<b>Exchange Rate ISK/USD:</b>								
<b>Daily min.</b>		72 kr.	84 kr.	81 kr.	70 kr.	61 kr.		
<b>Daily max.</b>		90 kr.	110 kr.	103 kr.	82 kr.	75 kr.	62,5 kr. <sup>5)</sup>	
<b>Annual Avg.</b>		79 kr.	98 kr.	92 kr.	77 kr.	70 kr.		
<b>Notes:</b>	1) Icelandic contribution towards the start-up and operation of the PAME Secretariat in 1999 2) Refer to a separate sheet for more details on the expected expenditure for 2005 3) Contributions based on the ISK/USD exchange rate at time of deposit 4) Suggested increase in country contributions based on contributions to the CAFF Secretariat 5) Average exchange rate ISK/USD for January 2005							

## PAME INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT

Received contributions for 2004:			
Contributions per country:		IKR	USD
	Canada	1.260.000	20.000
	Denmark	1.152.920	15.200
	Finland	584.039	8.000
	Iceland	8.100.000	108.000
	Norway	in-kind	in-kind
	Russia	in-kind	in-kind
	Sweden	1.109.152	17.600
	United States	1.460.000	20.000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>13.666.111</b>	<b>188.800</b>
Total Revenue for 2004:			
	Received contributions:	13.666.111	188.800
1)	Misc Revenue (estimated):	50.000	714
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>13.716.111</b>	<b>189.514</b>
	Carryforward from 2003:	-1.023.903	-14.627
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12.692.208</b>	<b>174.887</b>
<b>End-of-year balance 2004:</b>		241.652	3.452
<b>carryforward to 2005:</b>		-782.251	-11.175

### OVERVIEW:

TYPE OF EXPENDITURE		IKR	USD
	Staff	6.918.345	98.834
	Operating costs - office	5.010.086	71.573
	Operating costs - travel	1.546.028	22.086
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13.474.459</b>	<b>192.492</b>

### BREAKDOWN:

TYPE OF EXPENDITURE:		IKR	USD
<b>STAFF</b>	Salary, benefits,taxes,insurance,pension (1 person full time and 1 person 40%)	6.918.345	98.834
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>6.918.345</b>	<b>98.834</b>
<b>OFFICE</b>	Service (telephone, fax, e-mail, internet)	1.603.715	22.910
	Office supplies	316.861	4.527
	Housing (rent, heat, electricity, cleaning)	1.712.907	24.470
	Shipping/Postage/Bank Services	182.293	2.604
	Printing	1.194.310	17.062
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>5.010.086</b>	<b>71.573</b>
<b>TRAVEL</b>	Domestic - airline tickets, taxis,rental cars	391.776	5.597
	International - airline tickets, hotel, per diem, etc.	1.154.252	16.489
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>1.546.028</b>	<b>22.086</b>
<i>Notes: 1)</i>	Interest rates, expected exchange rates etc Calculations are based on the annual average ISK/USD exchange rate for 2004: 70kr		

# PAME INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT

**63 ISK / USD**

## Suggested contributions for 2005:

Suggested revenue from fixed contributions:		IKR	USD
	Canada	1.178.100	18.700
	Denmark	957.600	15.200
	Finland	1.033.200	16.400 <sup>1)</sup>
	Iceland	8.200.000	130.159
	Norway	1.108.800	17.600 <sup>1)</sup>
	Russia	in-kind	in-kind
	Sweden	1.108.800	17.600
	United States	1.260.000	20.000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>14.846.500</b>	<b>235.659</b>
<b>Total Expected Revenue for 2005:</b>			
	Suggested Contributions 2005:	14.846.500	235.659
2)	Misc Revenue (estimated):	100.000	1.220
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>14.946.500</b>	<b>236.878</b>
	Carryforward from 2004:	-782.251	-12.417
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14.164.249</b>	<b>224.462</b>
<b>Projected closing balance for 2005 (carryforward 2006):</b>		519.249	8.242

## Projected Operational Expenditures for 2005

January - December 2005

### OVERVIEW:

	TYPE OF EXPENDITURE	IKR	USD
	Staff	7.500.000	119.048
	Operating costs - office	3.795.000	60.238
	Operating costs - travel	2.350.000	37.302
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13.645.000</b>	<b>216.587</b>

### BREAKDOWN:

	TYPE OF EXPENDITURE:	IKR	USD
<b>STAFF</b>	Salary, benefits,taxes,insurance,pension (1 person full time and 1 person 40%)	7.500.000	119.048
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>7.500.000</b>	<b>119.048</b>
<b>OFFICE</b>	Service (telephone, fax, e-mail, internet, homepage)	100.000	1.587
	Office supplies	500.000	7.937
	Housing (rent, heat, electricity, cleaning)	1.800.000	28.571
	Shipping/Postage/Bank Services	300.000	4.762
	Equipments	200.000	3.175
	Hospitality	100.000	1.587
	Update the homepage	250.000	3.968
	Bank Service	45.000	714
	Printing	500.000	7.937
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>3.795.000</b>	<b>60.238</b>
<b>TRAVEL</b>	Domestic - airline tickets, taxis	600.000	9.524
3)	International - airline tickets, hotel, per diem, etc.	1.750.000	27.778
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>2.350.000</b>	<b>37.302</b>

*Notes:* 1) Suggested increase in country contributions are based on contributions to the CAFF Secretariat

2) Interest rates, expected exchange rates etc.

3) PAME meeting x 2, SAO meeting x 2, other meetings x 3 (each at 250.000 IKR)

All calculations are based on the average ISK/USD exchange rate for 2004:

63 kr.

# PAME INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT

70 ISK / USD

Suggested contributions for 2005:			
	<b>Suggested revenue from fixed contributions:</b>	<b>IKR</b>	<b>USD</b>
	Canada	1.309.000	18.700
	Denmark	1.064.000	15.200
	Finland	1.148.000	16.400 <sup>1)</sup>
	Iceland	8.200.000	117.143
	Norway	1.232.000	17.600 <sup>1)</sup>
	Russia	in-kind	in-kind
	Sweden	1.232.000	17.600
	United States	1.400.000	20.000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>15.585.000</b>	<b>222.643</b>
<b>Total Expected Revenue for 2005:</b>			
	Suggested Contributions 2005:	15.585.000	222.643
2)	Misc Revenue (estimated):	100.000	1.220
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>15.685.000</b>	<b>223.862</b>
	Carryforward from 2004:	0	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15.685.000</b>	<b>223.862</b>
<b>Projected closing balance for 2005 (carryforward 2006):</b>		740.000	10.571
<b>Projected Operational Expenditures for 2005</b>			
<b>January - December 2005</b>			
<b>OVERVIEW:</b>			
	<b>TYPE OF EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>IKR</b>	<b>USD</b>
	Staff	7.500.000	107.143
	Operating costs - office	5.095.000	72.786
	Operating costs - travel	2.350.000	33.571
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14.945.000</b>	<b>213.500</b>
<b>BREAKDOWN:</b>			
	<b>TYPE OF EXPENDITURE:</b>	<b>IKR</b>	<b>USD</b>
<b>STAFF</b>	Salary, benefits,taxes,insurance,pension (1 person full time and 1 person 40%)	7.500.000	107.143
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>7.500.000</b>	<b>107.143</b>
<b>OFFICE</b>	Service (telephone, fax, e-mail, internet, homepage)	1.400.000	20.000
	Office supplies	500.000	7.143
	Housing (rent, heat, electricity, cleaning)	1.800.000	25.714
	Shipping/Postage/Bank Services	300.000	4.286
	Equipments	200.000	2.857
	Hospitality	100.000	1.429
	Update the homepage	250.000	3.571
	Bank Service	45.000	643
	Printing	500.000	7.143
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>5.095.000</b>	<b>72.786</b>
<b>TRAVEL</b>	Domestic - airline tickets, taxis	600.000	8.571
3)	International - airline tickets, hotel, per diem, etc.	1.750.000	25.000
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>2.350.000</b>	<b>33.571</b>
<p><i>Notes:</i> 1) Suggested increase in country contributions are based on contributions to the CAFF Secretariat</p> <p>2) Interest rates, expected exchange rates etc.</p> <p>3) PAME meeting x 2, SAO meeting x 2, other meetings x 3 (each at 250.000 IKR)</p> <p>All calculations are based on the average ISK/USD exchange rate for 2004: 70 kr.</p>			

## **APPENDIX V**

### **ACOPS position on Session II.3 “Update status of the GEF/Russian NPA- Arctic”**

Presentation by V. Lystsov on GEF Project “Russian Federation – Support to the National Program of Action for Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment”

Dear colleagues,

I will not stay on pre-history of this Project, which was unfortunately rather long and could be interpreted from quite different points of view. Instead I will stress that just from the February of this year the Project starts its actual execution. Let me remind you main conceptual components of the project:

The first is common for all GEF projects in focal area “International Waters” and includes fulfillment of transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA) and elaboration of strategic action program (SAP), which could provide for resolution of priority environmental issues in the Arctic with target dates and expected costs. Some of the issues covered by the SAP will be of primary importance to the Russian Federation alone and these will be addressed as priority issues using national resources. Other issues, however, involve serious consequences for the international waters of the Arctic and will properly accounted for in the Project. New aspect of these activities could be application of LME approach to the seas of the Russian Arctic. First candidates for international cooperation in this direction are LME of Barents sea, Chukchi and Bering sea.

Second component of the Project should bring the improvement in legislative, administrative and institutional conditions, what would help to implement the SAP. It should also harmonize and rationalize the procedures of the federal and regional executing agencies in the field of environmental protection in the Arctic.

The third component – pre-investment studies – will address problems of hot-spots in Russian Arctic identified as the result of the PDF-B Project executed by ACOPS. About 147 hot spots both marine and terrestrial, including freshwater, that seriously threaten the health of the arctic population, its resources and amenities were determined and characterized. By specially developed in PDF-B Project methodology 21 priority hot spots were selected. The pre-investment component of the Project will allow to define the optimal set of environmental projects requiring significant investments. These investments for remediation actions could be attracted from Russian institutions, partner countries and private sector through the mechanisms of the Partnership conferences and round tables.

Fourth component includes 3 demonstration projects, which could be further replicated within Russia as well as Arctic and non-Arctic States. One of them will develop the potential of the brown algae to act as a cleanup agent in marine areas. Another includes environmental remediation of the areas of decommissioned military bases and their transfer to civil administration and public use. The third project is aimed at setting the conditions for co-management of the environment by executing agencies, resource developing companies and indigenous peoples of the North.

In the current version of Project Document (January 2005) the fifth component has appeared. Here corresponding paragraph will be quoted as the whole:

*“For possible expansion of donor base for the Project, some additional demonstration and pilot projects will be considered, particularly in the following areas:*

- *Ecological rehabilitation of the Arctic territories contaminated by radio nuclides; Enhance preparedness to deal with consequences of radiation accidents in the Arctic region;*
- *Ecologically safe utilization of obsolete techniques and ammunition in the Arctic;*
- *Utilization of the old stocks of toxic chemicals for agricultural and other purpose in the Arctic region;*
- *Assessment of the consequences of global warming for the Arctic territories polluted by toxic chemicals, oil products and radio nuclides;*
- *Conservation of habitat and biodiversity at the Arctic territories under impacts of toxic chemicals and radio nuclides;*
- *Ecologically safe utilization of obsolete radio isotopic thermo electrical generators in the Arctic region”*

In accordance with this recommendations ACOPS now in coordination with donors leads the work on identification of most interesting pilot projects, which may be successfully replicated in Russian Arctic.

Execution modality of the Project now has changed in comparison with previous Project Document. Now the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of the Russian Federation have been made the sole executing agency for Russian and GEF funds. The modality of execution of bi-lateral donors funds has to be defined at Donors Meeting in London 16-17 March and subsequent Steering Committee Meeting. In new Project Document ACOPS (as well as NEFCO) received the status of “Partner Agency”, which could implement specific work on new projects and components adopted in the framework of the Project donor’s funds specially allocated for these purposes.

## APPENDIX VI

### SUMMARY PAPER ON PORT RECEPTION FACILITIES

Submitted by Norway

#### **Introduction:**

The Pame Strategic Work Program 2004-2006 states under Objective I:

Action(s)	Activities	Lead
Assess existing measures for port reception facilities for ship-generated waste and cargo residues and develop harmonized guidelines for consideration by States. <i>(From sections 7.2.4 and 7.2.6 in the AMSP)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Availability and measures for existing port reception facilities for ship-generated waste and cargo residues in the PAME region, based on a survey of existing information.</li><li>➤ Identify gaps in existing coverage and possible improvements in the availability and incentives for delivery.</li><li>➤ Develop recommendations for harmonized guidelines for consideration by States.</li></ul>	NORWAY

Norway has asked Det Norske Veritas to develop a proposal taking into account the first 2 activities above, and the substantive part of this proposal is attached (Annex I).

Further appropriate references to the IMO Circulars on reception facilities regarding cargoes in Annexes I and II to MARPOL 73/78 are listed (Annex II).

The remaining activity, to develop further recommendations for harmonized guidelines, needs some further clarification:

In the area covered by these guidelines there will be substantially different natural conditions regarding urbanization, vegetation, soil etc. In the high arctic there will be permafrost, whilst further south permafrost does not constitute a major problem. Parts of the Arctic will be ice covered for a substantial part of the year, whilst others are ice free.

The legal conditions also vary substantially throughout the area. The European Union have developed a directive on port reception facilities and Denmark, Sweden, Finland and Iceland (and probably Greenland), as well as Norway and Iceland (as members of the European Economic Area would have to implement that directive in national legislation (see for reference Annex III).

In Norway's opinion the direction of such common guidelines should be sought before actual guidelines are developed, and some basic principles should be identified, i.e. regarding the relation to the EU legislation.

#### **Proposed actions:**

PAME should undertake:

1. to assess availability of and measures for port reception facilities for ship-generated wastes and cargo residues in the PAME region;
2. to identify gaps in existing coverage and possible improvements in availability and incentives for delivery; through a project jointly sponsored by the Arctic States and;
3. to consider and give further guidance before developing recommendations for harmonized guidelines in any detail.

## **APPENDIX VII – LOCATION OF PAME MEETINGS SINCE 1999**

- Feb 1999 – Canada
- Nov 1999 – Akureyri, Iceland
- Jun 2000 – Copenhagen, Denmark
- Jan 2001 – Washington D.C., United States
- Oct 2001 – Moscow, Russia
- Apr 2002 – Reykjavik, Iceland
- Feb 2003 – Stockholm, Sweden
- Feb 2004 – Helsinki, Finland
- May 2004 – Reykjavik, Iceland
- Feb 2005 – Copenhagen, Denmark