

AMAP Report 2000:7

This report can also be found on the AMAP website: <http://www.amap.no/>

**Minutes from the Fourteenth Meeting of
Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group
Trondheim, Norway, September 5-6, 2000**

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. Opening of the Meeting	3
2. Adoption of the Agenda	3
3. Report from the Chair and Secretariat	3
4. AMAP Report to the Ministerial meeting in Barrow, and comments to the Draft Ministerial Declaration and SAO Report	4
5. The AMAP Programme for Monitoring of Trends and Effects	6
6. National Implementation Plans (NIPs) and the AMAP Project Directory (PD)	7
7. The AMAP Operating Guidelines	8
8. The AMAP Assessment Guidelines for 1998 – 2003	8
9. The AMAP Inventory of Sources	9
10. The AMAP Thematic Data Centres (TDCs)	9
11. List of actions to follow up decisions made at this meeting	10
12. AMAP participation in other activities	10
13. Election of the AMAP Chair	12
14. Any other business	12
15. End of the Meeting	13

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. List of Participants to the 14 th AMAP Working Group Meeting	14
Appendix 2. Draft annotated agenda for the 14 th AMAP Working Group Meeting	18
Appendix 3. Final List of Documents for the 14 th AMAP Working Group Meeting	21
Appendix 4. List of Actions arising from the 14 th AMAP Working Group Meeting, and proposed timetable for their implementation	23

MINUTES FROM THE 14TH AMAP WORKING GROUP MEETING TRONDHEIM, NORWAY, SEPTEMBER 5-6, 2000 *

1. Opening of the Meeting

- 1.1. The Chair of the AMAP Working Group, Hanne Petersen, opened the meeting, and thanked the delegations and observers for their participation in the rescheduled meeting, in spite of its short notice. A list of participants is attached as Appendix 1.
- 1.2. The Head of the Norwegian Delegation, Gunnar Futsæter, welcomed the meeting participants on behalf of the Norwegian Pollution Control Authority and the Directorate for Nature Management. He expressed their high appreciation of AMAP activities, and wished success to the meeting.

2. Adoption of the Agenda.

- 2.1. Hanne Petersen pointed out that, under agenda item 4, in addition to the AMAP Report to the Ministerial meeting it would be appropriate to consider the drafts of the Ministerial Declaration and the SAO report to the Ministers that had been circulated by the Arctic Council Secretariat prior to the meeting.
- 2.2. The AMAP Executive Secretary, Lars-Otto Reiersen, suggested discussing the AMAP role in preparation of the "RIO+10" process under agenda item 14.
- 2.3. The draft agenda (Appendix 2) was adopted with the proposed changes.
- 2.4. The list of documents distributed prior to and during the 14th AMAP WG meeting is attached as Appendix 3.

3. Report from the Chair and Secretariat.

- 3.1. At the beginning of her presentation, Hanne Petersen pointed out that agenda items 3 and 4 were closely related, and suggested therefore that overlapping parts be considered together.
- 3.2. Lars-Otto Reiersen informed the meeting participants that all major activities that would normally be presented in the Progress Report to the AMAP WG are included into the AMAP Report to the Arctic Council Ministerial meeting (WG14/4/2). Main activities since the last WG meeting have been based on the List of Actions from the 13th WG meeting in Toronto. He also informed that no additional information had been received from GIWA concerning their plans for conducting assessment of the Arctic region, and that consequently no practical developments had taken place concerning possible AMAP involvement in this project.

** The Minutes from the Joint AMAP/CAFF Meeting on the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA), 4 September, 2000, will be circulated as a separate document.*

3.3. The Head of the Canadian Delegation, David Stone, suggested that the discussion should focus on the issues to be handled under agenda item 4. This suggestion was supported by other participants.

4. AMAP Report to the Ministerial meeting in Barrow, and comments to the Draft Ministerial Declaration and SAO Report.

4.1. Hanne Petersen reminded the meeting participants that the draft report, consisting of three parts, was distributed prior to the meeting:

- Part A - Key Scientific Findings and Recommendations for Actions (WG14/4/1);
- Part B - Progress Report, covering organizational and financial issues (WG14/4/2);
- Part C - Scientific Interim Update Reports on Human Health (WG14/4/1-C1, POPs (WG14/4/1-C2), Radioactivity (WG14/4/1-C3) and Heavy Metals (WG14/4/1-C4).

The WG were requested to consider whether this structure should be retained in the material to be delivered to the Barrow Ministerial meeting.

4.2. In general, the meeting participants supported the structure presented. However the Head of the US Delegation, John Calder, expressed concern that the recommendations in the summary were not adequately supported by evidence presented in the pollution effects updates.

4.3. The Canadian and Norwegian Delegations supported the opinion of the Head of the US Delegation. It was therefore agreed that the recommendations should be included in Part A of the report, and Part A itself should be redrafted to make it shorter and more consistent with the new findings reported since the publication of the AMAP Assessment Report.

4.4. It was also noted by the Canadian Delegation that climate and UV-B issues and work relating to ACIA should be introduced into the "Key Scientific Findings" if possible. However, the available supporting documentation mainly covered organizational issues only (i.e. progress in the development of ACIA) rather than an update on new findings.

4.5. The meeting participants presented their comments concerning the draft texts of 'Part A - Key Scientific Findings' of the AMAP Report to Ministers and SAOs and agreed that a small *ad hoc* editorial group should be formed with the request that they prepare a new draft of 'Part A - Key Scientific Findings and Recommendations for Actions' before the end of the meeting.

4.6. Since most comments to Section B were of a factual and non-contentious nature, it was agreed that the meeting participants would communicate their comments to the Secretariat during the meeting for later incorporation into the final document.

4.7. Taking into account the fact that that most of the lead experts responsible for preparing the Interim Update Reports on Human Health, POPs, Radioactivity and Heavy Metals were not participants in the WG meeting, Hanne Petersen suggested that the WG

consider the content of Part C on a page-by-page basis. The meeting participants agreed to this proposal.

- 4.8. The lead expert on radioactivity, Per Strand (Norway), informed the meeting that, in response to a number of comments received in connection with the initial circulation of Part A, a paragraph for inclusion in the Radioactivity Interim Report concerning technetium releases from the Sellafield re-processing plant in UK, with corresponding recommendations, had been drafted by the radioactivity expert group at their recent meeting. Lars-Otto Reiersen reminded the meeting participants of the comments received on this matter from some of the participating countries and asked whether the proposed inclusion now provided the necessary supporting documentation. After discussion, the Working Group agreed to keep this issue in the Report. The Secretariat also informed that new material had also been received from one of the experts responsible for the Heavy Metals report to update parts of the report concerning anthropogenic emissions of metals. The WG agreed that this, together with other material brought to the meeting by several delegations, should be incorporated wherever appropriate.
- 4.9. The meeting participants reviewed draft texts of interim reports on different issues of concern (Part C). Several comments were of a generic nature, for example the view expressed that certain parts of the documents (e.g., material reporting on progress in organizational matters and listing ongoing activities) could be eliminated, and the documents revised where necessary to better emphasise the new findings and emerging results. In the case of the heavy metals update, it was considered that the main emphasis should be given to mercury since this was the subject of most of the new findings. It was therefore agreed that the heavy metals report should be restricted to cover only mercury in its update of information for the Ministerial meeting in Barrow. The AMAP Secretariat was therefore requested, in collaboration with lead experts, to update these texts according to the comments received.
- 4.10. The editorial group presented a new draft text of 'Part A - Key Scientific Findings and Recommendations' to the meeting participants. The Chair thanked the editorial group for their excellent work and the WG accepted this new draft, and requested the Secretariat to finalize this document and submit it to the Arctic Council (AC) Secretariat together with Part B, also revised as agreed.
- 4.11. The WG presented their comments to the draft texts of the Ministerial Declaration and the SAO Report. They further requested the AMAP Board to prepare proposals for revisions to these documents, based on the new agreed draft text of 'Part A - Key Scientific Findings', and to submit these proposals to the AC Secretariat for their consideration (with copies to AMAP Heads of Delegation).
- 4.12. The WG requested the AMAP Secretariat to circulate to all Heads of Delegation the revised versions of Parts A and B for final confirmation as soon as they were available after the meeting, and also to prepare in a separate document the revised Update Reports on Special Issues (Part C) and circulate this for final confirmation as soon as it was available.
- 4.13. Lars-Otto Reiersen informed the WG that Phase 1 of "Multilateral Cooperative project on Phase-out of PCB Use, and management of PCB-contaminated wastes in the

Russian Federation" had been completed on 30 June, 2000. Formal presentation of the results of this work would take place at a meeting in Moscow on 12 September. The Executive Summary (parts of which had been circulated to the WG) and a pre-print of full report on Phase 1 of the project would be ready by this time. He also presented the Interim Implementation Plan for Phase 2, which would be presented to the Arctic Council at the Barrow Ministerial Conference for endorsement by the Ministers.

- 4.14. The WG supported the conclusions and recommendations from Phase 1 of the PCB project, and the proposals for Phase 2 of the project that had been developed by the Project Steering Group, and agreed that AMAP should continue its involvement in the project implementation during Phase 2.
- 4.15. Lars-Otto Reiersen informed the WG about progress regarding preparation of the RAIPON/AMAP Project "Persistent Toxic Substances, Food Security and Indigenous Peoples of the Russian North". The project had been approved for funding by GEF in February 2000. However, the AMAP Secretariat had subsequently been informed that GEF funds would only be released after all matching funding is ensured. In this connection, AMAP National Delegations were requested to initiate efforts within their countries to raise co-financing funding. He also informed the WG that, in order not to miss the 2000 field season, a decision had been taken to undertake environmental sampling during September - October in all 4 regions selected for the project implementation, based on already available funding.
- 4.16. John Calder requested further information on the field sampling that is planned to be performed within the framework of the above GEF project.
- 4.17. AMAP Deputy Executive Secretary, Vitaly Kimstach, informed the meeting that the general principles of the field sampling are those described in the project Brief distributed previously to the WG. Specific details concerning the field work to be conducted during the summer-autumn 2000 were also available, and could be provided to the meeting participants. The AMAP Secretariat was requested to distribute the relevant documentation to the WG.

5. The AMAP Programme for Monitoring of Trends and Effects.

- 5.1. AMAP Deputy Executive Secretary, Simon Wilson, reminded the meeting participants that sections A (Background Information), B (AMAP Trend Monitoring Programme) and F (Data Reporting and AMAP Data Policy) of the Programme documentation had been approved (subject to revisions agreed by the WG) at its previous meeting. As agreed at that meeting, sections A, B and F had been posted initially on the restricted part of the AMAP website for final review, and thereafter made publically available. He further informed the WG that Sections C (AMAP Effects Monitoring Programme) and G (Appendices on Methodology) of the documentation had been updated as agreed and placed on the restricted part of the AMAP website for final review. In response to comments received, Section G had been finalised and all specific comments to Section C had been introduced prior to the WG 14 meeting (as described in WG14/5/1). Section G could now be placed on the public part of the web if approved by the WG. Outstanding issues concerning Section C would be addressed at

the ASG meeting in November, where Sections D (Supporting Studies) and E (Quality Assurance and Quality Control) would also be discussed.

- 5.2. Gunnar Futsæter stated that although the presented version of Section C could not be considered as completely final, the Norwegian delegation were now satisfied that finalization could be accomplished by experts and Secretariat, and suggested that the WG authorize ASG to approve the remaining sections during their forthcoming meeting in Reykjavik in November.
- 5.3. The WG agreed that the Secretariat and ASG could finalise the remaining parts of the documentation at the ASG meeting, post them on the restricted part of the AMAP website for a short period for final review (as previously done with other sections) and then release them to the public as soon as possible after the November ASG meeting. Lars-Otto Reiersen reminded the WG that, even after it had been finalised and released to the public, the Programme was intended to be a living document. It is already in use within the countries and will be further modified as appropriate and when necessary.

6. National Implementation Plans (NIPs) and the AMAP Project Directory (PD).

- 6.1. Simon Wilson presented a progress report on AMAP Project Directory (WG14/6/1), and thanked the University of Groningen and GRID-Arendal for their contributions to this work. He informed that most countries had begun registration of projects and programmes, particularly NIP projects, and that so far over 100 projects/programmes were registered. The Norwegian Delegation expressed its regret concerning delays in making relevant PD registrations and would try to accomplish this work before the ASG meeting.
- 6.2. The Russian Delegation presented an updated version of their NIP (WG14/6/3). Simon Wilson offered to enter this information into the AMAP PD, sending the resulting registrations to the Russian Delegation for confirmation.
- 6.3. The Swedish Delegation informed the meeting that almost all Swedish NIP projects had now been registered in the AMAP PD.
- 6.4. The Finnish Delegation informed that they had notified the Secretariat concerning delays in registering relevant Finnish projects in the PD, and indicated that they would attempt to ensure that the work would be completed before the ASG meeting in November. They further informed that there were no additions to the Finnish NIP since the Toronto WG Meeting. The document describing the Finnish NIP had been published as part of an effort to communicate information about AMAP within Finland and internationally. The WG commended Finland on this initiative and suggested that other countries might consider doing the same. Simon Wilson reminded the WG that all NIP documents that they provided in electronic format were being placed on the public access part of the AMAP website.
- 6.5. The Danish Delegation informed the meeting that there were no changes in its NIP since the previous report, and that all relevant projects should have been registered in the AMAP PD. However, they also noted that some expansion in the Danish NIP could be expected to result from involvement of Denmark in ACIA.

- 6.6. The Icelandic Delegation presented its NIP (WG14/6/2).
- 6.7. All participating countries were requested to complete their NIPs and to ensure that they are fully represented in the AMAP PD before the ASG meeting in Reykjavik.

7. The AMAP Operating Guidelines.

- 7.1. Lars-Otto Reiersen presented the draft Operational Guidelines for the AMAP WG (WG14/7/1) and informed the meeting participants that the draft had been prepared by the Board on the basis of the SAO directives and the existing AMAP Rules of Procedure that had been approved at the 5th AMAP WG Meeting (Tromsø, Norway, March 3-4, 1994).
- 7.2. After discussion, the Working Group approved the draft Operational Guidelines and requested the Secretariat to send them to the Arctic Council Secretariat for consideration by SAOs.

8. The AMAP Assessment Guidelines for 1998 - 2003.

- 8.1. Lars-Otto Reiersen informed the WG that draft Guidelines for the AMAP Phase 2 Assessment had been prepared (WG14/8/1). These Guidelines were based on the previously issued document "Guidelines for the AMAP Assessment" (AMAP Report 95:1), parts of which had been updated or deleted as appropriate. The draft was distributed prior to the meeting, and comments from some of the countries obtained. It was noted that detailed contents of the various 2002-2004 assessments are not yet finalised, but that these would be presented for several of the assessments at the ASG meeting in November. Consequently it is envisaged that the Assessment Guidelines will be finalized at the ASG meeting. The participating countries and observers were however requested to provide information on and additional material that they would like to see included in the Guidelines.
- 8.2. Since some of the meeting participants were not involved in the previous AMAP assessment process, Lars-Otto Reiersen provided a brief explanation of the objectives of the Assessment Guidelines as a guiding document for lead authors and other experts involved in the AMAP assessment process.
- 8.3. It was noted during the presentation that UV-B and climate parts are still missing in the draft, and Delegations were requested to pay special attention to these issues in their further comments.
- 8.4. Delegations were also requested to provide any additional names or corrections to the lists of Experts and national data managers included in the Guidelines, and to inform the Secretariat of any necessary changes before the Reykjavik ASG meeting.

9. The AMAP Inventory of Sources.

- 9.1. Lars-Otto Reiersen reminded the WG of a decision taken during the Toronto WG meeting concerning reporting of information on sources. Participating countries had agreed to inform AMAP about source information they they reported to other fora and, where possible, to provide this information to AMAP as well.
- 9.2. Gunnar Futsæter circulated a Norwegian proposal for a table which could give an overview of national reports to international fora on emission and discharges, and asked for comments on the format of the table.
- 9.3. The Head of the Russian Delegation, Yuri Tsaturov, informed the meeting participants that Russia has completed source inventories for radioactivity and PCB, and these inventories are available to AMAP. In general, however, inventories and monitoring of pollution sources in the Russian Federation fell under the responsibility of the State Committee for Environmental Pollution that had been abolished in May 2000. The functions of the State Committee for Environmental Pollution had been transferred to the Ministry of Natural Resources. Work on source inventories within the Russian Federation will be continued after finalization of the re-organization of the appropriate federal executive bodies.

10. The AMAP Thematic Data Centres (TDCs).

- 10.1. Simon Wilson informed the WG that the atmospheric, marine, and radioactivity TDCs were operational and were funded for 2000; the human health TDC is in the final stages of being established, and is also funded. He also updated the WG concerning three matters relating to TDCs that were raised at the WG13 meeting, as follows:
 - 1) Following WG13, a decision was taken to transfer the AMAP freshwater TDC from its location at the Freshwater Institute in Canada to another location. Three institutes notified their interest in taking on the AMAP freshwater TDC: the Polar Research Centre in Tromsø; the GEMS/Water Collaborating Centre - National Water Research Institute in Burlington, Canada (GWCC-NWRI); and the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF). Detailed discussions had been held between the Secretariat and each of these institutes, including delivery of test data sets for evaluation purposes, etc. Two of the institutes (GWCC-NWRI and UAF) had subsequently delivered proposals for establishing the AMAP freshwater TDC at their institutes. In general, both institutes were considered very capable of operating the AMAP TDC and of providing the necessary services in support of the AMAP 2002 assessments. Following discussions within a consultation group to consider the available options, the group recommended to accept the offer of UAF to operate the AMAP freshwater TDC. This decision in part reflected the prevailing financial circumstances for funding TDC operations, and also the perceived advantages of operating a combined freshwater/terrestrial TDC (see comments below). The AMAP WG agreed to adopt the recommendation that UAF become the new AMAP freshwater TDC and at the same time thanked all the institutes, and in particular UAF and GWCC-NWRI, for the work they had done in preparing excellent proposals for the TDC relocation.

2) Proposals to establish an AMAP terrestrial TDC at the University of Alaska (UAF) had been further developed over the preceeding year, to the extent that a firm offer had been received from UAF to undertake this task, and optionally to also operate a combined freshwater/terrestrial TDC. This offer was seen to have a number of advantages with respect to administration of the AMAP TDC network and the WG decided to accept the offer from UAF with appreciation.

3) The general lack of funding to support some AMAP TDC operations during 2001-2002 and the need for increasing funding of the TDCs to accommodate assessment needs was raised at WG13, and in documents circulated prior to the WG14 meeting (WG14/10/1). At WG14, no countries were in a position to offer additional funding to support TDC operations and it was therefore decided to once again raise the issue of lack of funding for core AMAP activities at the SAO level. As a part of the discussions on this point, it was noted that the UAF offer to operate the AMAP freshwater/terrestrial TDC included supporting this work from their internal institutional budgets, through provision of the manpower to support the work and use of in-house available database developments, at least for the period to 2002, covering AMAPs immediate assessment activities. This generous offer was again received with appreciation by the WG.

11. List of actions to follow up decisions made at this meeting.

- 11.1. Lars-Otto Reiersen presented an overview of decisions made during the meeting, and proposed a timetable for their implementation (Appendix 4).

12. AMAP participation in other activities.

- 12.1. Hanne Petersen reported to the meeting participants that she has received a number of documents from PAME related to AMAP contributions to PAME activities, a review of their products, and other matters concerning AMAP/PAME cooperation. Appropriate responses to some of these contributions would necessitate considerable effort and allocation of manpower and financial resources on the part of AMAP. In this connection, she requested the advice of the AMAP WG on how to proceed with such requests.
- 12.2. Lars-Otto Reiersen added to the presentation by the AMAP Chair that AMAP, as an observer, faces similar problems in relation to requests in relation to the ACOPS GEF-funded project on support of the Russian National Plan of Actions for the protection of Arctic marine environment from land-based sources. He pointed out that, if AMAP should provide detailed responses to such requests, it would not only require significant resources, but also that AMAP had no established mechanisms or procedures to run such activities or include WG review of the products, etc. AMAP's capacity to do this type of work is based largely on the professional expertise available within the AMAP Secretariat. In some cases AMAP associated national experts have been requested to assist in such tasks, however, in general it is not appropriate for the Secretariat to use these experts for activities beyond the scope of AMAP's main responsibilities without the agreement of the corresponding countries and their financial support. Financial contributions to the Secretariat from Norway,

occasionally supplemented by *ad hoc* contributions from other countries, are intended for running Secretariat support of AMAP activities. He informed the meeting participants that he had applied to ACOPS, following prior consultation with Norway, about possibility to use Norwegian contribution to the ACOPS/GEF project to support the activities requested of AMAP by ACOPS, but received no positive response.

- 12.3. The Danish Delegation, commenting on the statement by the Executive Secretary, expressed their opinion that AMAP should be requested by the Arctic Council to undertake this work referred to. Under these circumstances it would be easier for AMAP to involve national experts in activities that otherwise go beyond the AMAP mandate.
- 12.4. Hanne Petersen further requested the WG's advice on how to respond to a paper prepared by the PAME Chair, John Karau, in consultation with ACOPS "Comparative analysis of contaminant programmes and projects related to the Arctic Council RPA for the protection of the Arctic marine environment from land-based activities" that had been received prior to the meeting.
- 12.5. Several Delegations indicated their confusion about the origin of this request, i.e. whether it was a PAME request, an ACOPS request, or an individual request from John Karau. The Danish Delegation expressed its opinion that, since the document is not a formal PAME WG document, but rather a discussion paper addressed to the Chair of the AMAP WG from John Karau, it should not be considered by the AMAP Working Group. Gunnar Futsæter confirmed that, at the PAME WG meeting where this matter had also been raised, the PAME WG had also decided that this document should be considered as a letter from the PAME Chair but not as a formal document backed by the Working Group.
- 12.6. Considering the content of the document, Yuri Tsaturov expressed his concern that PAME and ACOPS activities in Russia duplicate to a large extent what has been done or is currently being done within the framework of other activities. He, and a number of other meeting participants, also expressed their personal disagreement with a number of issues presented in the document. In particular, as a Member of the Inter-Agency Commission of the Russian Federation on Arctic and Antarctic, Yuri Tsaturov emphasized that this Commission has never considered the ACOPS/GEF project, and cannot be presented in this document as the "Host mechanism" for the ACOPS/GEF project.
- 12.7. David Stone, commenting on the intervention of Yuri Tsaturov, stated that he is not the first person in Russia who expresses such a concern. In this connection, he recommended that Russia should present this opinion to the Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting and to SAOs in the form of an official statement of the Russian delegation.
- 12.8. A number of meeting participants pointed out inaccuracies in the document prepared by the PAME Chair, in particular in its review and comparison of AMAP activities and other projects. It was noted that the projects included in the comparison represented a far-from-complete selection of relevant activities, both with respect to AMAP and also other Arctic Council Groups such as CAFF. Lars-Otto Reiersen reminded the meeting that, prior to the SAO meeting in May 2000, the Arctic Council

Secretariat had requested CAFF to compile a list of their activities related to the Arctic environment.

- 12.9. The AMAP Vice-Chair, Helgi Jensson, pointed out that serious analysis of issues raised in the letter would need considerably more time. At the same time, he emphasized that this document is actually addressed from one Chair to another, and that the Working Group need not formally respond to this document.
- 12.10. The meeting participants came to general conclusion that, whilst a thorough review of activities relevant to the Arctic Council might prove a useful exercise, such an activity should be conducted by the Arctic Council Secretariat, with involvement of all WGs. Hanne Petersen agreed to communicate the views of the WG in her response to the PAME Chair.

13. Election of the AMAP Chair.

- 13.1. Helgi Jensson reported to the meeting participants that Hanne Petersen was elected as the AMAP Chair in 1998 at the 12th AMAP WG Meeting, and that her term of office was due to expire in December. John Calder the Head of the US delegation, proposed to the Working Group that Hanne Petersen be re-elected as the AMAP Chair for a second period. This proposal was seconded by the Finnish Delegation. Hanne Petersen was unanimously elected as the AMAP Chair for a further two-year period.
- 13.2. Hanne Petersen thanked the WG for their expression of confidence and support and accepted the AMAP Chair for a second period.

14. Any other business.

- 14.1. Lars-Otto Reiersen reported to the meeting participants that, due to a large number of documents distributed by AMAP, the US Delegation had suggested using only e-mail for such purposes in future. After discussion, the meeting participants agreed to use e-mail as the main source of communication, particularly for distribution of large documents. In order to ensure distribution of documents prior to meetings, other delegates could also receive meeting information in addition to the Heads of Delegations. However e-mail distribution should be accompanied by a fax message announcing the document distribution, including information on the number and titles of the documents distributed so that their receipt could be checked.
- 14.2. Lars-Otto Reiersen reminded the meeting participants that the 10th anniversary of the Rio-de-Janeiro UN Conference on environment and development is planned to be held in 2002. He informed that it is not yet clear whether some joint actions will be undertaken by the Arctic Council in connection with this event. The Head of the Finnish Delegation, Outi Mähänen, presented information that a special event is planned for summer 2002 in South Africa. In this connection, the UNEP representative, Lars Kullerud, informed the meeting participants that UNEP has 4 options for celebration of "RIO+10", however no final decision has yet been made on these options.

- 14.3. Hanne Petersen reminded the WG that it had been suggested at the Joint AMAP/CAFF meeting held immediately prior to the AMAP WG meeting that ways of increasing coordination of monitoring activities between the AMAP and CAFF should be further discussed. She informed that some countries had already taken steps in this direction by establishing joint monitoring systems. During a brief discussion, the meeting participants shared their experience concerning practical measures adopted within their countries along these lines. It was agreed that special focus should be taken at the national monitoring level to enhance coordination of AMAP and CAFF related monitoring work.
- 14.4. The Danish Delegation offered to host the next AMAP Working Group meeting on the Faroe Islands, tentatively in September 2001. This invitation was accepted with appreciation.
- 14.5. Lars-Otto Reiersen reminded the WG that initiation of the ASG work in connection with the assessments due in 2002-2006 would be the main task for AMAP over the coming period. He suggested that cross-fertilization work between the various assessment groups should start during spring-early summer of 2001. In this connection, it is likely that AMAP will need to convene two ASG and several drafting group meetings in 2001.
- 14.6. The Norwegian Delegation requested that ASG be asked to pay particular attention to new information about the distribution of contaminants within the Arctic.
- 14.7. John Calder, referring to the results of the Joint AMAP/CAFF meeting suggested that it might be useful to convene such a joint meeting at some point in 2002, with a special focus on ACIA. This proposal was supported by the AMAP Chair.

15. End of the Meeting.

- 15.1. The AMAP Chair, Hanne Petersen, closed the 14th AMAP Working Group meeting.

Appendix 1: List of Participants to the 14th AMAP Working Group Meeting, 5 – 6 September, 2000, Trondheim, Norway

Country	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Direct phone	Direct fax	e-mail	Institute phone	Institute fax
Canada	David	Stone	Indian and Northern Affairs	Les Terrasses de la Chaudiere North Tower Ottawa K1A 0H4 Ontario	+1 819 997 0045	+1 819 953 9066	stoned@inac .gc.ca	+1 819997 0045	+1 819 953 9066
Denmark Chair	Hanne	Petersen	Department of Arctic Environment National Environmental Research Institute	Frederiksborgej 399 P.O. Box 358 DK-4000 Roskilde	+45 46 30 19 40	+45 46 30 19 14	hkp@dmu.d k	+45 46 30 12 00	+45 46 30 19 14
Denmark	Birte	Rindom	Danish Environmental Protection Agency Ministry of Environment and Energy	Strandgade 29 DK-1401 Copenhagen K	+45 32 66 01 66	+45 32 66 04 11	BR@MST.D K	+45 32 66 01 00	+45 32 66 04 79
Denmark	Henrik	Elling	Arctic Environmental Secretariat	Dansih Polarcentre Strandgade 100 H DK-1401 Copenhagen	+45 32 88 01 19	+45 32 96 07 03	he@dpc.dk	+45 32 88 01 01	+45 32 96 07 03
Faroe Islands	Maria	Dam	Food and Environmental Agency	Debesartrød FR - 100 Torshavn	+298 31 53 00	+298 31 05 08	MARIADA M@hfs.fo	+298 31 53 00	+298 310 508
Finland	Pasi	Iivonen	Ministry of the Environment	P.O.Box 399 FIN-00121 Helsinki	+358 9 1991 94 91	+358 1991 94 33	pasi.iivonen @vyh.fi	+358 9 199 11	+358 9 1991 94 33
Finland	Petteri	Taalas	Finnish Meteorological Institute	P.O. Box 503 FIN-00101 Helsinki	+358 9 1929 4150	+358 9 1929 3146	petteri.taalas @fmi.fi	+358 9 19291	+358 9 1929 3146
Finland	Outi	Mähönen	Ministry of the Environment	Lapland Regional Environment Centre P.O. Box 8060 FIN-96101 Rovaniemi	+358 16 329 4444	+358 16 310 340	outi.mahone n@vyh.fi	+358 16 329 4111	+358 16 310 340
Iceland Vice Chair	Helgi	Jensson	Environmental and Food Agency of Iceland	P.O. Box 8080 IS-128 Reykjavik	+354 585 10 23	+354 585 1020	helgij@hollv er.is	+354 585 1000	+354 585 1010

Country	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Direct phone	Direct fax	e-mail	Institute phone	Institute fax
Norway	Cecilie	von Quillfeldt	The Norwegian Polar Institute	Polarmiljøseneteret N-9296 Tromsø	+47 77 75 06 32	+47 77 75 05 01	cecilie.quillfeldt@npolar.no	+47 77 75 05 00	+47 77 75 05 01
Norway	Gunnar	Futsæter	Norwegian Pollution Control Authority	P.O.Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	+47 22 57 34 49	+47 22 67 67 06	gunnar.futsaeter@sft.telemax.no	+47 22 57 34 00	+47 22 67 67 06
Norway	Per	Strand	Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority	P.O.Box 55 N-1345 Østerås	+47 67 16 25 64	+47 67 14 74 07	per.strand@nrpa.no	+47 67 16 25 00	+47 67 14 54 44
Norway	Jon	Barikmo	Directorate for Nature Management	Tungslletta 2 N-7485 Trondheim	+47 73 58 05 00	+47 73 91 54 33	jon.barikmo@dirnat.no	+47 73 58 05 00	+47 73 58 05 01
Norway	Harald	Loeng	Institute of Marine Research	P.O.Box 1870 Nordnes N-5817 Bergen	+47 55 23 84 66	+47 55 23 85 84	harald.loeng@imr.no	+47 55 23 85 00	+47 55 23 85 31
Norway	Ivar	Myklebust	Directorate for Nature Management	Tungslletta 2 N-7485 Trondheim	+47 73 58 06 35	+47 73 58 05 01	ivar.myklebust@dirnat.no	+47 73 58 05 00	+47 73 58 05 01
Russia	Yuri S.	Tsaturov	Russian Federal Service for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Monitoring	Novovagankovsky Street 12 123242 Moscow	+ 7 095 252 07 28	+ 7 095 255 24 00	tsaturov@mecom.ru	+7 095 252 24 29	+7 095 255 24 00
Russia	Aleksandr	Kutsuruba	Russian Federal Service for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Monitoring	Novovagankovsky Street 12 123242 Moscow	+7 095 255 24 88	+7 095 255 24 00	umc@mecom.ru	+7 095 252 24 29	+7 095 255 24 00
Sweden	Carina	Westerberg	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	Blekhholmsterrassen 36 S-106 48 Stockholm	+46 8 698 16 13	+46 8 698 15 85	carina.westerberg@environment.se	+46 8 698 1000	+46 8 698 1042
USA	Walter B.	Parker	U.S. Arctic Research Commission	3724 Campbell Airstrip Road Anchorage, AK 99504	+1 907 333 5189	+1 907 333 51 53	wbparker@alaska.net	+1 907 333 5189	+1 907 333 5153
USA	John	Calder	National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration Arctic Research Office	SSMC3, Mail Code R/ARC 1315 East-West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910	+1 301 713 2518 ext.114	+1 301 713 1967	john.calder@noaa.gov	+1 301 713 2518 ext.114	+1 301 713 1967

Country	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Direct phone	Direct fax	e-mail	Institute phone	Institute fax
USA	Kara	Nance	University of Alaska, Fairbanks	P.O. Box 756 660 Fairbanks, AK 99775 6660	+1 907 474 6104	+1 907 474 5110	ffkln@uaf.edu	+1 907 474 7314	+1 907 474 1836
USA	Brian	Hay	University of Alaska, Fairbanks	P.O. Box 756 660 Fairbanks, AK 99775 6660	+1 907 474 5110	+1 907 474 5110	fsbh1@uaf.edu	+1 907 474 7314	+1 907 474 1836
USA	Henry	Huntington	Marine Mammal Commission	P.O. Box 773 564 Eagle River, AK 99577	+ 1 907 696 3564	+ 1 907 696 3565	hph@alaska.net	+ 1 907 696 35 64	+ 907 696 35 65
Permanent Participants	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Direct phone	Direct fax	e-mail	Institute phone	Institute fax
RAIPON	Tamara	Semenova	Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON)	Korp 2, Office 527 Prospekt Vernadskogo 37 117415 Moscow	+7 095 938 9597	+7 095 930 4468/938 9527	udege@glasnet.ru	+7 095 938 9597	+7 095 930 4468/938 9527
Saami Council	Jan Idar	Solbakken	Saami Council	Saami College N-9520 Guovdageaidnu	+47 78 48 77 29	+47 78 48 77 02	jan- idar.solbakk en@samiskh s.no	+47 78 48 77 00	+47 78 48 77 02
Observing Organizations	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Direct phone	Direct fax	e-mail	Institute phone	Institute fax
UNEP GRID- Arendal	Lars	Kullerud	UNEP GRID-Arendal	P.O.Box 1602 Longum Park N-4801 Arendal	+47 370 35 705		kullerud@grida.no	+47 370 35650	+47 370 35050
WWF	Samantha	Smith	World Wide Fund for Nature International Arctic Program	P.O. Box 6784 St. Olavs pls. N-0130 Oslo	+47 22 03 65 17	+47 22 20 06 66	smith@wwf.no	+47 22 03 65 17	+47 22 20 06 66
Observing Countries	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Direct phone	Direct fax	e-mail	Institute phone	Institute fax
The Netherlands	Frits	Steenhuisen	Arctic Centre University of Groningen	P.O.Box 716 NL-9700 AS Groningen	+31 503 63 60 56	+31 503 63 49 00	frits@let.rug.nl	+31 503 63 68 34	+31 503 63 49 00

AMAP Secretariat	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Direct phone	Direct fax	e-mail	Institute phone	Institute fax
AMAP Secretariat	Lars-Otto	Reiersen	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat	P.O. Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	+47 23 24 16 32	+47 22 67 67 06	lars-otto.reiersen@amap.telemax.no	+47 23 24 16 30	+47 22 67 67 06
AMAP Secretariat	Vitaly A.	Kimstach	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat	P.O. Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	+47 23 24 16 34	+47 22 67 67 06	vitaly.kimstach@amap.telemax.no	+47 23 24 16 30	+47 22 67 67 06
AMAP Secretariat	Simon	Wilson	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat	P.O. Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	+47 23 24 16 35/+31 10 4662989	+47 22 67 67 06/+31 10 4662989	s.wilson@inter.nl.net	+47 23 24 16 30	+47 22 67 67 06
AMAP Secretariat	Inger	Utne	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat	P.O. Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	+ 47 23 24 16 35	+ 47 22 67 67 06	inger.utne@amap.telemax.no	+47 23 24 16 30	+47 22 67 67 06

Appendix 2: Draft annotated agenda for the 14th AMAP Working Group Meeting, September 5-6, 2000, Trondheim, Norway.

1 Opening of the meeting

The AMAP Chair and a representative from Norway will open the meeting.

2 Approval of the agenda

A draft annotated agenda has been circulated; the WG are invited to approve the agenda.

3 Report from the Chair and Secretariat

The Chair and Secretariat will report on important issues and events and follow-up of actions since the last WG meeting.

4 AMAP reports to the Ministerial meeting in Point Barrow

The draft AMAP report to the Ministerial meeting, including recommendation for actions, has been circulated during the spring. The latest (August) version of the material concerning Key Findings, and related Appendixes, is document AMAP WG 14/4/1. The draft Progress report from AMAP is document AMAP WG 14/4/2. The WG is asked to approve the report.

The report from phase 1 of the PCB project is now finalised and will most probably be presented at an international meeting in Moscow, September 11-12, 2000. The Executive Summary (AMAP WG 14/4/3) including the recommendation for phase 2 will be provided to the WG for their consideration.

The SAOs have requested a report from the WG's regarding activities and projects they are involved in that have a component of Capacity building. The WG is asked to discuss and improve the circulated draft report, AMAP WG 14/4/4.

The joint RAIPON/AMAP/GEF project: PTS Food Security and Indigenous Peoples of the Russian North, is important for AMAPs work. A progress report will be presented to the WG regarding both the financial support from Arctic countries and the implementation status.

5 The AMAP Programme for monitoring of Trends and Effects

The WG is asked to comment and endorse/approve the circulated drafts that have not been approved at previous meetings (Sections C, F and G).

6 National Implementation Plans (NIPs) and the AMAP Project Directory (PD)

The countries are requested to present their updated NIPs for 2000-2003. The AMAP Secretariat will present an overview of the AMAP PD and it present content regarding projects covering contaminants, climate and UV and human health.

7 The AMAP Operating Guidelines

The AMAP Secretariat has been requested to prepare a set of Operating Guidelines to replace the old AMAP Rules of Procedure; a draft Operating Guidelines will be presented for discussion and endorsement. Final approval will be by the SAOs.

- 8 The AMAP Assessment Guidelines for 1998 - 2003**
The AMAP Secretariat is updating the Assessment Guideline. The material available to date will be presented to the WG for their comments and approval. The Guidelines will be updated based on input from countries and Lead Country Experts (LCEs). The WG is also requested to present the status of their contribution to the assessment work (2000 - 2003) and to present any wishes to the ASG meeting to be held in Reykjavik, November 1-3, 2000.
- 9 The AMAP Inventory on sources**
Countries are requested to present national inventories regarding discharges and emissions in accordance with an Action agreed at AMAP WG13.
- 10 The AMAP Thematic Data Centres (TDCs)**
The AMAP Secretariat will present the situation regarding the data centres, and a proposal for the freshwater and terrestrial centres.
- 11 List of Actions to follow up decisions made at this meeting**
The Chair will summarise the Actions decided upon during the meeting, time schedules, etc.
- 12 AMAPs participation in other activities**
During past years, the AMAP Secretariat and Chair have received several requests to participate in working groups, evaluate reports, etc. Some of these requests are of great interest for AMAPs work and AMAP could gain from a participation. Some requests are easy to handle and are not time consuming, while others might be time consuming, have cost implications (e.g. involving consultation with experts) and might be additional to the workplan decided by the Ministers and SAOs. The WG is asked to discuss which policy should be applied as a basis for responding to such requests.
- 13 Election of AMAP Chair**
The AMAP Chair and Vice Chair have held their positions for 2 years. The Chair was elected at the AMAP WG meeting in December 1998. According to the draft "Operating Guidelines", the WG is required at this point to elect/re-elect the AMAP Chair. The AMAP Chair and Vice Chair can be re-elected for a second period.
- 14 Any other business**
The WG participants are requested to present any information that might be of interest for the WG and its work.
- 15 End of the meeting**

Draft time schedule for the 1st joint AMAP /CAFF WG and the 14th AMAP Working Group Meeting:

Monday 4th: Joint AMAP/CAFF meeting (see separate agenda)

0900 Opening	Item 1
0930 - 1800	Items 2 - 8
1800	Item 9, Close of joint AMAP/CAFFmeeting
1900 - 2030	Reception

Tuesday 5th 14th AMAP WG

0830 - 1000	Items 1-3
1000 - 1015	Coffee
1015 - 1200	Item 4
1200 - 1300	Lunch
1300 - 1500	Item 4 cont.
1500 - 1515	Coffee
1515 - 1800	Items 5 & 6
1900 - 2200	Joint AMAP & CAFF dinner

Wednesday 6th

0830 - 1100	Items 7 - 9
1100 - 1115	Coffee
1115 - 1300	Items 10 - 12
1300 - 1400	Items 13 - 15
1400	End of the meeting

Appendix 3:

WG14/1/2 (Final version 6/9/00)

Final List of Documents for the 14th AMAP Working Group Meeting

WG14/1/1: List of Participants to the AMAP WG14 meeting.
WG14/1/2: List of Documents for the AMAP WG14 meeting.
WG14/2/1: Draft annotated agenda of the AMAP WG14 meeting.
WG14/4/1: Draft AMAP report to Ministers - Part A: Key Findings, Recommendations.
Unnumbered: Distributed during the WG meeting: A: Key Scientific Findings since the AMAP 1998 Report and Recommendations for Actions.
WG14/4/1-C1: Draft AMAP report to Ministers - Part C1: Appendix Human health.
WG 14/4/1-C1 Add.1: Item 9.7. Sweden of the Draft AMAP report to Ministers - Part C1: Appendix Human health.
WG 14/4/1-C1 Add. 2: Item 9.5. Iceland of the Draft AMAP report to Ministers - Part C1: Appendix Human health.
WG14/4/1-C2: Draft AMAP report to Ministers - Part C2: Appendix POPs.
WG14/4/1-C3: Draft AMAP report to Ministers - Part C3: Appendix Radioactivity.
WG14/4/1-C4: Draft AMAP report to Ministers - Part C4: Appendix Heavy metals.
WG 14/4/1 Add. 1: Item 2.3. Loss of the Russian Nuclear Submarine Kursk in the Barents Sea of the Draft AMAP report to Ministers - Part C3: Appendix Radioactivity.
WG14/4/2: Draft AMAP report to Ministers - Part B: Progress Report from AMAP.
WG14/4/3: PCB project phase 1. Executive Summary – Extract.
WG14/4/3-Add.1: PCB project phase 2 Implementation Proposal.
WG14/4/5: Danish comments to second draft AMAP report to Ministers.
WG14/4/6: Canadian comments to updated draft of AMAP report to Ministers.
Unnumbered: Additional material concerning the Barrow Ministerial meeting: - Draft agenda of Ministerial meeting. - Draft table of contents of SAO report to the Arctic Council. - Draft Barrow Arctic Council Ministerial Declaration.
WG14/5/1: Notes on handling of comments received to Sections C and G of the AMAP Trends and Effects Programme documentation.
WG14/5/2: Updated Draft Section C of the AMAP Trends and Effects Programme documentation.
WG14/5/3: Updated Draft Section G of the AMAP Trends and Effects Programme documentation.
WG14/6/1: AMAP Data handling issues 1 - AMAP Project Directory.
WG 14/6/2: Icelandic Implementation Plan.

WG 14/6/3: Russian Federal Service for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Monitoring: On the Progress of Implementation of the Russian National AMAP Plan Projects (II Stage) by Roshydromet in 2000.

WG14/7/1: Draft Operating Guidelines for the AMAP WG.

WG14/8/1: Draft Guidelines for the AMAP Phase 2 Assessments.

WG 14/8/1 Add.1: Comments from NRPA on the Guidelines for the AMAP Phase 2 Assessments.

Unnumbered.

AMAP Inventory of sources. Norwegian Discussion Paper on Source Information.

WG14/10/1: AMAP Data handling issues 2 - AMAP Thematic Data Centres.

Unnumbered. Distributed during the WG Meeting:

Information on monitoring of radioactive contamination of environment, conducted by Federal Service of Russia on Hydrometeorology and Environmental Monitoring (ROSHYDROMET) in connection with "Kursk" nuclear submarine accident.

Unnumbered. Distributed during the WG Meeting:

Comparative Analysis of Contaminant Programmes and Projects Related to the Arctic Council Regional Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities. PAME Chairman in consultation with ACOPS, August 2000.

Appendix 4. List of Actions arising from the 14th AMAP Working Group Meeting, and proposed timetable for their implementation.

Action	Responsibility	Deadline	Minutes item No
1. Updating Parts A and B of the AMAP Report to the AC Ministerial Conference, and circulation of the draft to AMAP Heads of Delegation for final approval.	AMAP Secretariat	a.s.a.p.	4.12
2. Updating texts of Interim Update Reports (previously Part C), and their compilation in a separate document, and circulation of the draft to AMAP Heads of Delegation for final approval.	AMAP Secretariat in consultation with LCEs	a.s.a.p.	4.12
3. Confirmation of approval of AMAP Report to AC Ministerial Conference and the Interim Update reports on human health, POPs, mercury and radioactivity.	All AMAP Delegations	a.s.a.p.	4.12
4. Development of proposed texts concerning AMAP for inclusion in the draft Ministerial Declaration (AMAP Board). Communication of proposed texts to AC Secretariat and to AMAP Heads of Delegation (AMAP Secretariat). Follow-up at national level with SAOs (AMAP Delegations).	AMAP Board, Secretariat, Delegations		4.11
5. Development of proposed texts concerning AMAP for inclusion in the draft SAO Report (AMAP Board). Communication of proposed texts to AC Secretariat and to AMAP Heads of Delegation (AMAP Secretariat). Follow-up at national level with SAOs (AMAP Delegations).	AMAP Board, Secretariat, Delegations		4.11
6. Distribution of the field sampling strategy for the RAPON/AMAP Project (season 2000)	AMAP Secretariat	October 2000	4.17
7. Finalisation of AMAP Trends and Effects Programme documentation. Finalisation and publication of Sections F on AMAP website. Finalisation of Sections C and G for review by ASG, and subsequent publication following approval by AMAP WG. Drafting of Sections D and E for review by ASG, and subsequent publication following approval by AMAP WG.	AMAP Secretariat, ASG, AMAP Delegations	October - November 2000	5.1 / 5.3.
8. Completion of NIPs and ensuring that they are fully represented in the AMAP PD prior to November ASG meeting.	AMAP Delegations	October 2000	6.7
9. Presentation of the AMAP Operational Guidelines to the AC Secretariat	AMAP Secretariat	a.s.a.p.	7.2.
10. AMAP Assessment Guidelines. Provision of additional names of experts and confirmation of existing list of experts and NDMs to the AMAP Secretariat. Provision of information on desired content of Assessment Guidelines. Distribution and review of present draft of Assessment Guidelines and delivery of comments to the AMAP Secretariat prior to ASG	AMAP Delegations	October 2000	8.2 / 8.4

10. Distribution of the proposed source reporting form (Norway) and consideration for use (all countries). Comments to AMAP Secretariat prior to ASG if possible.	Norway, AMAP Delegations	October 2000 if possible	9.2
11. Raise issue of lack of secure funding for some TDC operations beyond 2000 with SAOs.	AMAP Secretariat, Board, AMAP Delegations	October 2000	10.1
12. Communicate AMAP WG views on review of AMAP/ACOPS and AC group activities in general to PAME Chair and SAOs.	AMAP Chair	October 2000	12.10
13. Promote coordination of AMAP and CAFF monitoring activities at the national level.	AMAP Delegations		14.3
14. Arrangement of 15 th AMAP WG Meeting, tentatively in September 2001.	Denmark/Faroe Islands AMAP Board, AMAP Secretariat	Spring-summer 2001 (preparation)	14.4
15. Investigation of need for joint AMAP/CAFF WG meeting in 2002.	AMAP Chair		14.7

List of AMAP Publications:

NEFCO/AMAP Report 1995	Barents Region Environmental Programme: Proposals for environmentally sound Investment Projects in the Russian Part of the Barents Region: Volume one: Non-radioactive Contamination Volume two: Radioactive Contamination
AMAP Report 1997	Arctic Pollution Issues: A State of the Arctic Environment Report
AMAP Report 98:3	AMAP/CAFF Workshop on Climate Change, Rovaniemi, 24 – 25 March, 1998. Summary Report
AMAP Report 98:4	Brief Synopsis of the State of the Arctic Marine Environment in the Context of the Development of a Regional Plan of Action to Protect the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (RPA). June, 1998.
AMAP Report 1998	AMAP Assessment Report: Arctic Pollution Issues
AMAP Report 99:1	Report of the Workshop on Combined Effects in the Marine Environment, Copenhagen, 16 – 17 November, 1998
AMAP Report 99:3	Synopsis of the State of the Arctic Environment in the Context of the Development of an Arctic Council Action Plan for the Elimination of Pollution in the Arctic (ACAP). Prepared by AMAP.
AMAP Report 99:4	Modelling and Sources: A Workshop on Techniques and Associated Uncertainties in Quantifying the Origin and Long-Range Transport of Contaminants to the Arctic, Bergen, Norway
AMAP Report 99:6	The AMAP Strategic Plan: 1998 – 2003
AMAP Report 99:7	The AMAP Trends and Effects Programme
AMAP Report 99:8	"Heavy Metals in the Arctic." Anchorage, Alaska, September 7 – 10, 1999. Proceedings.
AMAP Report 2000:1	International Workshop on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the Arctic: Human Health and Environmental Concerns, Rovaniemi, Finland, 18 – 20 January, 2000. Proceedings.
AMAP Report 2000:2	CAFF/AMAP Workshop on a Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program, Reykjavik, 7 – 9 February 2000. Summary Report
AMAP Report 2000:3	PCB in the Russian Federation: Inventory and proposals for priority remedial actions (Executive Summary).
AMAP Report 2000:4	AMAP Report on Issues of Concern: Updated Information on Human Health, Persistent Organic Pollutants, Radioactivity, and Mercury in the Arctic.
AMAP Report 2000:5	AMAP Report to the Second Ministerial Meeting of the Arctic Council, Barrow, Alaska, U.S.A., October 12 – 13, 2000.
AMAP Report 2000:6	Report of the Expert Meeting on Sampling and Analysis of Persistent Toxic Substances (PTS), St. Petersburg on May 28 to June 1, 2000

(Minutes of AMAP Working Group Meetings are also published in the AMAP Report series)