

Minutes from the Sixteenth Meeting of

Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group

Tórshavn, Faroe Islands, 30 April – 3 May, 2002

Table of Content

1.	Opening.	3
2.	Approval of the Agenda.	3
3.	Progress report from the Chair and Secretariat, including the special projects such as the PCB and PTS projects.	4
4.	Statements from Observers.	4
5.	Production and funding of the AMAP 2002 reports.	5
6.	Approval of the 2002 Arctic Pollution Issues; A State of the Arctic Environment Report, including recommendations in the Executive Summary.	8
7.	The SAO meeting in May: Progress report from AMAP, reorganization of AC and its potential effects for AMAP, coordination of work with other AC Working Groups, etc.	10
8.	Arctic Council Capacity Building Strategy – a request for information from Canada.	11
9.	The Ministerial meeting in October; Progress report from AMAP; AMAP Strategic Plan for 2003 – 2008: Priorities for monitoring and assessments to be performed, work on sources, new issues of concern, national plans etc.	11
10.	The 2 nd International AMAP Symposium, October 2002; Program and financial situation.	13
11.	Communication of the AMAP results to a wider audience, people of the North, Rio + 10, etc., use of international press, TV-films, etc.	13
12.	ACIA progress and issues to be solved.	14
13.	International cooperation: EU & EEA, UNEP Chemicals, OSPARCOM, WMO etc. Progress and issues to be solved.	15
14.	The financial situation for the AMAP Secretariat and the special projects.	16
15.	AMAP Workplan for 2002 - 2004.	17
16.	The next AMAP Working Group meeting.	18
17.	Any other business.	18
18.	End of the meeting.	18

List of Annexes

- Annex 1. Opening address by Jacob Pauli Joensen
- Annex 2. List of Participants at the 16th Working Group Meeting of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands, 30 April – 3 May, 2002
- Annex 3. Updated draft agenda for the 16th AMAP WG meeting, April 30 – May 3, 2002. Tórshavn, Faroe Island.
- Annex 4. List of Documents: AMAP Working Group 16, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands, 30 April – 3 May, 2002
- Annex 5. List of Actions Arising from the 16th AMAP Working Group meeting, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands, 30 April – 3 May, 2002
- Annex 6. Strategy for the preparation of the ACIA Policy Document (AMAP WG16/12/1: Revised)
- Annex 7. Draft AMAP Workplan for 2003 and 2004

Minutes of the 16th AMAP WG meeting, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands, April 30 – May 3, 2002.

1. Opening.

The AMAP WG Chair, Helgi Jensson (Iceland), opened the meeting.

Jacob Pauli Joensen (Faroe Islands) welcomed participants to Tórshavn, Annex 1. He informed that the work of AMAP had considerable relevance to the Faeroes people, in particular in relation to the threats to human health from mercury in the traditional diet. Whereas the Faroe Islands had only played a small role in AMAP Phase 1, the participation of the Faroe Islands in AMAP Phase 2 had been greatly strengthened. He thanked the Danish government for their financial support that had increased this participation in AMAP and wished the meeting success.

A list of participants at the WG meeting is attached as Annex 2.

2. Approval of the Agenda.

Helgi Jensson introduced the draft agenda for the meeting and invited comments. The draft agenda (Annex 3, WG16/2/1) was adopted without changes.

A list of documents to the meeting is attached as Annex 4.

A list of Actions arising from the meeting is attached as Annex 5.

The Danish delegation stated its view that the meeting had two clear priorities: extracting clear recommendations from the AMAP Phase 2 assessment for Ministers to consider at the Arctic Council meeting in October, and planning the AMAP Strategy for the period after 2002. Helgi Jensson agreed that these were the main goals for the meeting, however in relation to the planning of the future AMAP Strategy he reminded the WG that this would also depend on the outcome of the October Ministerial meeting and any requests that might be made on AMAP following that meeting.

It was agreed that a degree of flexibility would be necessary in handling the various agenda items in relation to the running of parallel working sessions to complete tasks necessary to allow the AMAP 2002 State of the Arctic Environment Report to be adopted by the end of the meeting.

Maria Dam (Faroe Islands) provided practical information concerning the meeting arrangements.

3. Progress report from the Chair and Secretariat, including the special projects such as the PCB and PTS projects.

Lars-Otto Reiersen (AMAP Executive Secretary) reported on progress since the last AMAP WG meeting. Reviewing the list of Actions from the WG15 meeting, he informed that all actions had essentially been fulfilled.

PCB Project: Vitaly Kimstach informed the meeting participants about progress in implementation of Phase 2 of the PCB project. Phase 2 is planned to be finalized in October. A report will be produced and its Executive Summary will be provided to the Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting. The Project Steering Group has developed a Discussion Paper on preparations for Phase 3 of the project, including its organizational, managerial and financial aspects. He emphasized that the perspectives for execution of Phase 3 would depend, to a great extent, on the position of the Russian Federation in relation to POPs policy initiatives, in particular, signature of the Stockholm POPs Convention.

Lars-Otto Reiersen noted that the Steering Group for the PCB project had met the previous week in Copenhagen, and informed about their decisions.

PTS Project: Vitaly Kimstach informed on the progress in implementation of the RAIPON/AMAP/GEF project "PTS, Food Security and Indigenous Peoples of the Russian North". The PTS project activities are being implemented according to the work plan, and data obtained within the framework of the project provide a significant part of Russian contribution to the AMAP Assessment. He noted that an information flyer on this project has been published in English and in Russian, and the flyer was distributed to the meeting participants. He noted that this project provides a good example of close and fruitful collaboration between AMAP and IPOs.

Lars-Otto Reiersen provided an overview of the financial situation for the PTS project. He informed that the project was still not completely financed. In this connection he welcomed the fact that Finland was considering contributing additional funds to the project. This development was highly appreciated. Other Arctic Council members were invited to follow this example.

The Russian head of delegation and AMAP Vice-Chair, Yuri Tsaturov, informed the meeting that the signing of the Stockholm Convention by Russian was currently blocked due to financial considerations, however preparatory work was underway in connection with the Johannesburg Summit that would hopefully clear these obstacles¹.

4. Statements from Observers.

None of the observers present at the meeting wished to present a statement.

¹ Supplementary note: Russia signed Stockholm Convention on May 22nd 2002.

5. Production and funding of the AMAP 2002 reports.

Lars-Otto Reiersen informed the WG that the total estimated production costs for the 2002 SOAER and five scientific assessment reports amounted to some 450 000 USD (of which ca. 100 000 USD would be covered by work by the Secretariat). Currently, 440 000 USD had been secured to finance the report production work, and thus the required funding need is essentially covered.

However, Lars-Otto also noted that there were a number of discrepancies between the funding provisions by the different countries and their national orders for copies of the reports. Due in part to grants provided specifically to produce copies of the reports for external distribution, there exists some scope in the budget for increasing production above the minimum numbers of copies of the reports ordered by the countries. It is now necessary to make final decisions on exactly how many copies of each of the reports should be produced. It was therefore agreed that, over the course of the meeting, Lars-Otto Reiersen would consult with individual Heads of Delegations to resolve outstanding questions regarding national report requirements and provision of funding for this.

Simon Wilson, AMAP Deputy Executive Secretary, then provided updated information regarding the timetables for production of the various reports. He informed that, with the exception of the SOAER journalists and the group responsible for the human health assessment, all other drafting groups had incurred major delays with respect to meeting the challenging timetables that had been agreed at the WG15 meeting in Stockholm. The status of the various reports was summarised as follows:

2002 SOAER: assuming that the main report could be approved by the WG during the meeting, as planned, the report was on schedule to be completed and delivered by the time of the October AMAP Symposium and Arctic Council Ministerial meeting.

Human health assessment report: the second draft of most of the human health assessment was circulated for review just before Christmas, and the third draft in mid-March; peer review comments had also been received. Thus, although delayed by a few weeks relative to the timetable, the final manuscript of the report was expected to be ready by 1 May. Graphical production work was complete apart from one chapter. Canada and Denmark had jointly agreed to fund a technical editor to work on the report through May, with the prospect of delivery of the final manuscript to the publisher by 1 June – for final production and printing in time for the ministerial meeting in October.

POPs assessment report: The second draft of the POPs assessment was circulated for general review end-December/early-January, and parts of the third draft during the second half of March. The accumulated delay of some 6 weeks relative to the timetable was partly connected with attempts to incorporate late data, including PTS project data. Although peer review of the available sections of the third draft had been completed, work was still ongoing to complete the remaining parts of the third draft. Graphical production work on the part of the publisher had also barely begun. Current plans were to finalise outstanding parts of the third draft by mid-May, for review by end-May. During June, final re-drafting would be completed and technical editing initiated with the idea of delivering a final manuscript to the publisher by mid/late July. These plans should allow the report to be published by the end of the year, but not in time for the October Ministerial meeting.

Heavy metals assessment report: The second draft of the heavy metals assessment was circulated end-December for general review, with an updated second draft circulated in mid-January. The third draft of the assessment was circulated end-March. The drafting group currently plans to produce an updated third draft by the end of May for final editing during June with delivery of the manuscript to the publisher by early-July. However, full peer review on the third draft (or updated third draft) has still to be completed. Under these circumstances, it is expected that the report will be published by the end of the year, but not in time for the October Ministerial meeting.

Radioactivity assessment report: The second draft of the radioactivity assessment was circulated for general review in early-January. However, due to a number of issues, no third draft had been produced. At a meeting of the radioactivity expert group, held immediately prior to the WG meeting, a number of principle matters that had been holding up the assessment production were resolved, such that the finalisation and approval of the SOAER during the WG meeting would not be affected by the delays to the scientific report. It was anticipated that production of the third draft of the scientific assessment report, and its peer review, would now not be completed before end-July at the earliest. Taking this into account, together with the need for final editorial work, the summer vacation period, and the final report publication work the report production is now significantly delayed. If no further delays occur, it is still hoped that the printed report can be delivered before the end of the year.

Pathways and Climate Change assessment report: following discussions during the AMAP Conference in Tromsø in January, Heads of Delegation had received written notification of, and accepted, a proposal regarding production of a separate (fifth) scientific assessment report on Pathways and Climate Change. Drafting of this report was well advanced and several peer reviewers had provided comments. Present plans were to produce a final draft manuscript if possible by mid-June, to complete technical editing of this (relatively short) report by the end of June (possibly through involvement of the AMAP Secretariat). Again, the intention is, if at all possible, to produce the report in time for the October Ministerial meeting.

Concluding Simon Wilson informed the WG that the Secretariat, therefore, currently anticipated that the 2002 SOAER, the Human health assessment report, and possibly the Pathways and Climate Change assessment report would be available by the time of the Ministerial meeting. The final versions of the other three reports should also be available at that time, but only in the form of advanced or final proofs of the reports.

Helgi Jensson reiterated for the WG that, as far as the scientific reports were concerned, it was the scientists responsible for drafting the reports rather than the WG that were responsible for approving the final content of the reports. The WG were responsible only for approving the 2002 SOAER.

He further noted that the 2002 SOAER would be finalised and approved during the meeting, but that delays in drafting of the scientific reports meant that these were still being revised, and in some cases new information was still being added. The basis of the AMAP assessments is that the scientific assessments provide the foundation for the content of the SOAER, and in particular for its conclusions and recommendations. Under these circumstances, further revisions to the scientific reports, after approval of the SOAER, could only be made such that:

- further changes are aimed at improving the readability or accuracy of the reports;
- the changes do not introduce any discrepancies or major inconsistencies with respect to the material presented in the SOAER;
- the changes do not alter the conclusions and recommendations with respect to those that had been taken over into the SOAER
- new data and information could be added to further support existing conclusions or further elaborate the scientific basis, etc.,
- in the unlikely event that any new information radically changed or directly contradicted messages conveyed in the SOAER, this should not be incorporated in the scientific reports, but instead should become the subject of a briefing note that would be communicated as supplementary information when SAOs and Ministers were taking the SOAER into consideration.

Suzanne Marcy (USA, heavy metals lead) asked for clarification on the procedures for peer review of the scientific reports, i.e. review by individuals external to the process of producing/authoring the assessments. She had understood that each of the countries would be responsible for identifying peer reviewers to review the third draft of the report that had been circulated in March, and that national Heads of Delegations would make the necessary arrangements for this work. However, so far only external reviewers from Canada and the USA had provided comments to the third draft.

The Secretariat noted that most of the other assessment groups had identified a few (3-5) individuals and arranged with these individuals to conduct a peer review of the assessments; any other comments received from national experts (either internal or external to the process) were additional to these reviews.

The WG accepted that it was desirable for additional external reviewers, from countries other than Canada and the USA, to comment on the heavy metals assessment, and agreed to try to involve further national experts in this process. At the same time, it was also noted that those Canadian and US experts who had delivered comments to date should be highly commended for their very thorough reviews and useful input. It was not anticipated that additional peer review comments would raise any major new issues. Under these circumstances the existing heavy metals assessment was considered to provide a sound basis for the discussion of heavy metals that had been drafted for inclusion in the SOAER, and for its associated conclusions and recommendations with respect to heavy metals. The same was considered to apply in the case of the radioactivity assessment.

With respect to the delays in producing the scientific assessments due to the continuing efforts to include important new data, such as that coming out of the PTS project, the WG accepted that this had been a recognized risk. A major new contribution of PTS data had been delivered to the WG meeting (ahead of the contractual deadlines, thanks to a special effort on the part of the contractors). The WG agreed that every effort should be made to take into account data made available by the time of the meeting. A preliminary examination of the new PTS data by relevant experts present at the meeting would allow any necessary adjustments to be made in the SOAER as part of its final acceptance process. However, the WG agreed that, after the end of the meeting, no new data would be accepted for introduction into the assessments.

Yuri Tsaturov informed the WG that, as an in-kind contribution, ROSHYDROMET would undertake the work of translating the 2002 SOAER into Russian. Norway will also support publication of the Russian version of SOAER.

Lars-Otto Reiersen further informed that Denmark had undertaken to produce Danish and Greenlandic versions of the 2002 SOAER. No information had yet been received regarding possible production of a Saami language version.

The Finnish and Norwegian delegations, together with the representative from the Saami Council agreed to consult on this matter during the course of the meeting.

6. Approval of the 2002 Arctic Pollution Issues; A State of the Arctic Environment Report, including recommendations in the Executive Summary.

The AMAP WG Chair introduced this agenda item, noting that the approval of the AMAP 2002 SOAER report and its Executive Summary was the main item of business to be completed during the meeting. Before going into further detail, he asked Heads of Delegations whether they would like to make any general comments or observations concerning the SOAER or procedures for its approval.

Cindy de Wit (Sweden) noted that the most recent version of the radioactivity chapter had only been made available just prior to the meeting, and that some delegations had only received it on arrival at the meeting. Consequently they had had little or no chance to properly review it or compare it with the previous version. Lars-Otto Reiersen informed that a new copy of the chapter clearly identifying revisions relative to the previous version would be provided to the meeting shortly. Since this chapter would not be discussed before later in the meeting, when the radioactivity assessment lead was present, he asked all delegations to review the latest changes as a matter of highest priority, and if necessary consult with their experts at home in advance of any discussions on this chapter.

Annika Nilsson (SOAER author) stated that she would like to check that all comments to the draft of the SOAER that had been circulated 15 April had been taken into account. If any participants considered that comments from their national experts had not been properly addressed she requested that they take contact with her or Henry Huntington (SOAER co-author) as soon as possible during the meeting.

Helgi Jensson asked that any corrections of an editorial or factual nature be passed directly to Annika Nilsson and Henry Huntington. Any other proposed changes, including any potentially contentious issues should be raised and discussed by the WG in plenary.

Simon Wilson asked whether it was still the intention for the 'Setting the Stage' chapter to be included in all the scientific assessment reports, as a form of introductory preamble. The WG confirmed that this was the case, but that the last two sections dealing with 'Data interpretation issues' and 'The structure of the volume' would need to be appropriately altered or omitted depending on existing introductory material that had been drafted for the scientific reports. Also, other parts of the text might need to be adapted to emphasise the introduction with respect to the pollution issues being discussed in each of the respective scientific reports.

Gunnar Futsæter (Norway) considered the 'Setting the Stage' chapter in its current form to be too general and repetitive of material contained in the 1997 SOAER. The Secretariat responded that this was intentional, since the readers of the 2002 SOAER could not necessarily be expected to be familiar with the 1997. Several of the more introductory chapters in the 1997 report (e.g. those presenting the Geography of the Arctic, its Ecosystems and Peoples, and main characteristics of contaminant pathways) would not be repeated in the 2002 report. Sweden supported the view that the 2002 SOAER should be able to be read in its own right, without the need for access to the 1997 SOAER, and that the small amount of repetition of 1997 material currently present in the 'Setting the Stage' was therefore justified.

Helgi Jensson noted that one purpose of the 'Setting the Stage' chapter had been to put an appropriate perspective on the relationship between the contaminant issues and indigenous populations in the Arctic. Annika Nilsson agreed, but supported the view of Norway that this should not take on the appearance of a 'self-congratulatory' note from AMAP.

The Secretariat reminded the WG that the original idea had been that representatives of the indigenous peoples should draft this material, and that to some extent the indigenous perspective was still missing in the current draft.

Following these discussions, the WG the following working procedures for the meeting:

- The meeting participants would divide between groups that would work independently on Human Health, Pathways, Metals, Radioactivity and POPs.
- The SOAER authors would consult with each of these groups to resolve any outstanding questions or issues relating to comments to the final drafts of the SOAER. The groups could at the same time continue with other work tasks such as work on the scientific assessment reports, discussion of graphical production issues, and incorporation of new data and information (e.g. the newly received PTS project data. Work within the groups would concentrate on addressing matters relevant to the SOAER; in particular resolving any outstanding issues concerning Conclusions and Recommendations.
- Indigenous peoples representatives would consult with Henry to revise the 'Setting the Stage' chapter, including introducing the indigenous peoples perspectives in an appropriate manner.

These groups worked in parallel during the afternoon of the first day of the meeting and during the second day of the meeting, reporting to plenary sessions on their progress.

A small group comprising David Stone, Henry Huntington and Simon Wilson was convened on the third day of the meeting to work on the Executive Summary.

Over the course of the third day of the meeting, the WG met in plenary to review the complete 2002 SOAER draft, including the Executive Summary. All amendments proposed following work in the various sub-groups any other points raised by delegations were discussed. These discussions resulted in consensus agreement on the content of the SOAER and its Executive Summary. The 2002 SOAER was therefore formally approved by the WG at the meeting.

The AMAP WG Chair concluded that, in principle, no further changes to the 2002 SOAER report would now be accepted. If further comments regarding corrections of, for example an editorial or factual nature were received, he as the Chair of the WG would review each of these to ensure that they did not have any implications with respect to the agreed content of the SOAER. In the event that any proposed 'final editorial changes' were considered potentially contentious, these would be circulated to all Heads of Delegation for their views, and only introduced if no objections were received.

The SOAER authors, Annika Nilsson and Henry Huntington, undertook to provide the agreed texts to the publisher of the report by 1 June so that the 2002 SOAER report could be produced in time for the Ministerial meeting in October. The Indigenous Peoples representatives undertook to present their 'Indigenous Peoples Perspective Preface' drafted during the meeting to the Presidents of the IPOs for their consideration/signing.

Both the SOAER and AARs will include Annexes with lists of acronyms, places, species, etc.

7. The SAO meeting in May: Progress report from AMAP, reorganization of AC and its potential effects for AMAP, coordination of work with other AC Working Groups, etc.

The AMAP Chair reported on several matters relating to SAO consideration of AMAP activities and the coordination of AMAP work with that under other Arctic Council groups.

The AMAP Executive Secretary then outlined the plans for the preparation of the AMAP progress report to the SAOs meeting in Oulu in May.

The original idea was to deliver only a very short progress report referring to reports that would be delivered in October. However, the AC Secretariat had requested a detailed report according to a prescribed format – with a deadline of 1 May. Given the lack of available time, a draft list of headings had been prepared by the Secretariat and this was circulated at the meeting. It was agreed that, following the WG meeting, the AMAP Board would draft the progress report and circulate it for information to HoDs. Since there was no time available for countries to formally comment and agree this report, it would be submitted to AC Secretariat as a progress report from AMAP Board, together with 2002 SOAER Executive Summary and the updated paper on the ACIA policy document – as input to SAO meeting in Oulu May 15-16.

Yuri Tsaturov presented a progress report prepared by Roshydromet on the implementation of the Russian National AMAP plan. The WG requested the Secretariat to prepare a simple reporting format that could be circulated to the member countries and observing countries to allow them to deliver updated information on progress made on Arctic monitoring and research during the last year and describe plans for 2002/2003.

8. Arctic Council Capacity Building Strategy – a request for information from Canada.

David Stone informed WG about the Canadian initiative to develop the Arctic Council Capacity Building Strategy and Action Plan, as a key theme for the Sustainable Development Working Group. He pointed out that Sustainable Development Framework Document encourages Arctic Council Programmes to increase capacity at all levels of society. In this context, AMAP, as well as the other AC WGs, had been requested to provide information and contributions needed for further development of this initiative.

The WG considered that the term ‘capacity building’ is presently employed too generally, and means different things to different people. This result in a degree of confusion that is currently an obstacle to achieving progress on ‘capacity building’ issues. A more specific definition of the term capacity building should be developed and adopted by the Arctic Council.

In relation to the discussion on the proposal to include a ‘communications strategy project’ under the capacity building heading, it was similarly not clear whether this was aimed at a communication strategy for the Arctic Council as a whole, for the WGs (and if so which WGs), for a specific project (e.g. ACIA), or for the countries. Discussions within the AMAP WG clearly indicated the need to have this basic question answered. Both AMAP and the countries have developed various aspects of a strategy for communicating results of AMAP assessments. Several countries have put considerable effort into development of communication strategies that suit the particular circumstances and needs of their communities, etc., and a new initiative that might interfere with this would not be welcomed.

Commenting on the concrete proposals of the WGSD regarding using AMAP, CAFF or ACIA as possible ‘test cases’ for looking into communication strategies, the WG concluded that, if AMAP is selected, a review of the AMAP experiences and communication strategy developed under AMAP phase 1 would provide a more useful and informative exercise than studying the ongoing phase 2 activities. Information on the practises adopted (report production and distribution, translations of reports, fact sheets, web dissemination of information, national communication activities, etc.) is readily available, and the effectiveness of this could be evaluated. The associated work could largely be dealt with by the AMAP Secretariat, but preferably after October when the other priority tasks have been completed.

However, Norway and several other countries noted that they would require further documentation detailing any specific requests to AMAP before they would be able to support such an activity.

9. The Ministerial meeting in October; Progress report from AMAP; AMAP Strategic Plan for 2003 – 2008: Priorities for monitoring and assessments to be performed, work on sources, new issues of concern, national plans etc.

Outi Mähönen informed the WG about preparations for the SAO and Ministerial meetings. In particular, she drew the attention of the WG to the availability on the Internet of an initial draft Ministerial Declaration and draft of the SAO report to Ministers. She requested that the

WG members consider these draft materials and provide further input for these documents, bearing in mind that the basis for their preparation should be scientifically based decision making.

Helgi Jensson reviewed the outline content of the AMAP Progress Report that has to be prepared prior to the ministerial meeting. He focused in particular on reporting of the basic components from the AMAP 2002-2004 work plan and the strategic plan for the period beyond 2004. In the ensuing discussion, Canada noted that a comprehensive review and discussion of AMAP's future activities should be a priority item for the next WG meeting. In this connection, it would be appropriate to reflect on the experiences gained during both AMAP phases 1 and 2, and to discuss options for redirecting/reorganizing the activities under AMAP in the coming years to be able to address new demands in a more flexible manner within constraints imposed by practical and financial circumstances, etc. Norway and Denmark supported this opinion. Lars Moseholm (Denmark) stated that, in his view, it was very important that activities proposed for inclusion in the future strategic plan of AMAP should be prioritised. Summarising the discussion, Helgi Jensson reiterated that the main work of preparing the long-term strategic plan would be done in 2003, and that the progress report to the October Ministerial meeting would mainly address those items that had already been agreed as priorities for the period until 2006 (ACIA, Petroleum Hydrocarbons assessment, Acidification assessment, etc.).

Denmark proposed that AMAP, in the future, may need to become more of a fund-raising body. Lars-Otto Reiersen, commenting on this intervention, pointed out that fund-raising is already an important activity, not only from the point of supporting different activities, but also to cover the normal operational costs of the AMAP Secretariat, to support the basic AMAP activities as directed by the WG. He illustrated the situation by informing that Norway is currently covering only 2/3 of actual basic costs of the Secretariat, and the rest of the necessary funds are currently coming from ad hoc contributions of other countries and from overheads on other project work co-ordinated and managed by the Secretariat.

New issues of concern:

Lars-Otto Reiersen reminded the WG of an ongoing requirement to keep under review possible new issues of concern that might need to be drawn to the attention of the Ministers. New issues of concern raised by the WG may become basic elements of any future AMAP strategic plan. In this connection, he reminded the WG that underwater noise had been an issue of concern during the initial stage of development of the AEPS (1989-1991). However, at the Ministerial meeting in 1991, other environmental issues were given a higher priority. Recently, underwater noise issues have been the subjects of increased attention in the international media and the scientific literature, and as a focus of work under non-governmental environmental organizations. He noted that during the AMAP Conference in Tromsø (January 2002) this issue had been raised with scientists from NOAA, who had informed about recent work under NOAA in relation to problems, associated with underwater noise. During the discussion, John Calder, Head of the US Delegation, indicated that there is currently not enough information on environmental impacts of noise in the Arctic to conduct an assessment of this issue. To date, no delegation had notified of a present priority for noise monitoring. It was therefore decided that, in the event that this situation changes, i.e. the issue is raised by one or more delegations, the topic could be discussed when considering the AMAP strategic plan for the next period.

The WG noted that, during the second phase of AMAP, a number of new initiatives had been developed to try to improve the availability of information on sources of pollution (both their identification and quantification). Examples included AMAP organized workshops on source-related issues, and source related components of the PCB and PTS projects, etc. Adequate information on sources had been identified in 1997 as a major deficiency, and despite the continuing efforts, this situation was still far below the level that was considered necessary for the conduct of the desired AMAP assessments. In part, the problems relate to restrictions on access to vital information. It was further noted that source related assessment work is likely to gain increased importance in the future, for example in relation to assessing the effectiveness of new agreements in reducing emissions and discharges of pollutants. In this connection, the WG agreed that source related work should be given an increased focus, including the possible need to direct attention of Ministers to the continuing problems with access to data required for assessment purposes. The WG agreed that these issues should be taken up when the future strategic plan for AMAP is being discussed.

10. The 2nd International AMAP Symposium, October 2002; Program and financial situation.

John Derome presented the plans for the 2nd International AMAP Symposium. The Final Announcement will be circulated by June 1 together with the provisional programme of main oral presentation. This information will also be made available on the AMAP website.

The situation regarding financing of the Symposium appears to be satisfactory. To date, sponsors have provided ca. 100.000 USD. An additional income of 40.000 USD is expected from the Symposium fee. Together, this funding should cover all the main anticipated costs.

As a mark of appreciation to the independent external (peer) reviewers for the work they had done in reviewing (for free) the various AMAP assessment reports, it was agreed that these ca. 12-15 individuals would be invited to participate at the Symposium without having to paying the conference fee. The Secretariat will contact these individuals concerning this offer.

11. Communication of the AMAP results to a wider audience, people of the North, Rio + 10, etc., use of international press, TV-films, etc.

The English language version of the 2002 SOAER will be published in October and released during the AMAP Symposium/Arctic Council Ministerial meeting. Following this publication, the 2002 SOAER will also be produced in Danish, Greenlandic and Russian language versions.

Concerning the possible publication of a Saami language translation (see also agenda item 5), Jan Idar Solbakken informed that WG that the president of the Saami Council had agreed to send a letter to the SAO meeting to be held in Oulu in May regarding this issue.

John Calder informed the WG about plans for highlighting the ACIA assessment at the Rio+10 WSSD meeting in Johannesburg.

Outi Mähönen (Finland) drew the attention of the WG to the *Arctic Information Package to the Johannesburg Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) 2002*, that had been prepared by Finland as Chair of the Arctic Council in close collaboration with other member states and permanent participants. The information package contains the Rovaniemi Conclusions of the Chair (June 2001) and two fact sheets. The folder containing the fact sheet was also distributed at the preparatory meetings of the WSSD. The Rovaniemi Conclusions as well as the fact sheets are available on the Arctic Council website, in both English and Russian.

The representative from UNEP/GRID-Arendal, Kathrine Johnsen, presented information on GRID-Arendal's plans regarding communication of information on Arctic issues to the Rio+10 summit. Amongst other things GRID-Arendal will, in cooperation with partners, produce a map showing the Arctic exhibitions, booths and events in Johannesburg. Also, they will prepare an Arctic newspaper based on the GEO-3 report and contributions from institutions working on Arctic issues.

Lars-Otto Reiersen reported to the meeting about an activity that had been initiated by Denmark earlier in the year to see if there was any interest in jointly producing and funding a film/video to communicate the AMAP phase 2 results. Two companies had responded with letters expressing their interest in producing such a film/video. The Secretariat had subsequently circulated information about this initiative to some SAOs to hear their reactions to this proposal. The response in general had been 'positive with reservations'. In the meeting, both Denmark and USA indicated their interest in co-sponsoring a short video/film production (10-15 min.). Denmark informed that they were currently considering production of an updated version of the "The Arctic Dilemma" video that had been prepared in 1998 to communicate AMAP phase 1 results in Greenland. Any interest from other countries in a joint production would be most welcome. The USA informed that they would look into the possibility to involve National Geographic in a possible film/video production. Other countries were invited to join as co-sponsors in this activity. The Secretariat was requested by the WG to clarify in more detail the costs, time schedule, and practical arrangements, etc. required for a production that hopefully could deliver some product by the first week of October.

12. ACIA progress and issues to be solved.

Lars-Otto Reiersen informed that a draft paper on the strategy for producing the ACIA Policy Paper had been distributed earlier, and reminded the WG of the general approach, as outlined in this paper. He informed that it had not yet been decided whether the policy paper should be distributed for public review. He again raised the question of how to involve the other AC WGs in preparation of the ACIA Policy document, including the need for WGs to nominate their experts to be involved in this process. An in-depth discussion with CAFF on how the policy document will be produced is an urgent priority. The WG was informed that some of these issues would be discussed at an ACIA ASC meeting that would be held in Oslo at the beginning of June. It was the intention that initial drafts of all chapters of the ACIA assessment would be ready by the time of this meeting.

Lars-Otto Reiersen also provided information about US proposals regarding production of the ACIA assessment reports, including graphical production work and the proposal to hire a professional writer to redraft the scientific report on the basis of the contributions from the

lead authors. This is a somewhat different approach than that adopted for the production of the AMAP assessments (where the scientific report is subject to technical editing but not substantially rewritten, and only the 'synopsis report' is written by a professional journalist), although it had been discussed within the ACIA steering body (Board) it had not yet been discussed by the ASC as a whole. He expressed his concern that the size of the chapters is expanding, and that if the scientific report is to be kept within the 400-page limit implied in the production proposal, it will be necessary to apply strict limitations.

Harald Loeng pointed out that AMAP work is rather well structured, but that is currently not the case in ACIA. He expressed his concern that, from his perspective as a lead author for parts of the ACIA assessment 'the rules of game were changing every day'. He further stated that, in the event that the scientific report is to be significantly rewritten by others, his expert group would probably not be able to stand behind the product. His expert group has drafted a chapter of 75 pages, and that it would not be possible to reduce this to 25 pages whilst retaining the essential information.

Responding to this comment, John Calder noted that, in his view, any professional writer engaged should assist in writing process, and in particular the writing of the synopsis report, but not rewrite the scientists assessments. The final chapters should be sent to the scientists for review. He also expressed his agreement that a 25-page limit for the chapters was inappropriate.

The USA and Norway raised issues relating to the strategy document for producing the ACIA Policy Document, in particular the role of scientists involved in preparing the ACIA scientific assessment was discussed. As a result of these discussions, a revised version of the strategy document for producing the ACIA Policy Document was agreed. This was subsequently discussed and agreed by CAFF and presented to the SAOs at their meeting in Oulu (see Annex 6).

Concluding, Lars-Otto Reiersen said that the planning of the dissemination of ACIA results should be conducted without delay. This was supported by Gunnar Futsæter, Norway, who suggested that SAOs be invited to discuss the ACIA communication strategy.

13. International cooperation: EU & EEA, UNEP Chemicals, OSPARCOM, WMO etc. Progress and issues to be solved.

UNEP-Chemicals: Lars-Otto Reiersen informed the WG about progress in the development of cooperations with UNEP-Chemicals regarding POPs issues. He reported that UNEP-Chemicals has decided to provide financial support to the PCB and PTS projects, and invited AMAP to participate in development of the Global POPs monitoring network. Strategic issues relating to this network will be developed at an Advisory Board meeting in Geneva 13-14 May, in which AMAP has been invited to participate. The WG were invited to express their opinions with respect to these developments.

In general, the WG supported AMAP participation in the development of the Global POPs monitoring network. However, any decisions on how the global monitoring may be implemented in the Arctic will be made by the International Negotiating Committee (INC) under the Stockholm Convention. As a first step, it is most important that the AMAP WG

fully inform their (INC) national delegations on the potential of AMAP for this purpose when the INC next meets in the week of 17th June, 2002.

WMO: Vitaly Kimstach informed the WG that, following an ACSYS request on contributing to climate related hydrological information for the Arctic region, the WMO Department of Hydrology and Water Resources had taken an initiative to develop the Arctic-HYCOS (Arctic Hydrological Cycle Observing System), as an integrated part of the World-HYCOS. Taking into account that AMAP may be interested in improvement of climate-related monitoring systems in the region, the AMAP Secretariat had played an active role in the development of this project proposal. The WG were invited to support this initiative.

While expressing its general support, the WG emphasised that the development of this monitoring system may have significant financial implications. It was recommended that more detailed consultations be concluded within the respective countries before and definite support to this initiative could be elaborated.

World Water Forum and DWC: Vitaly Kimstach reminded the WG about the successful “Polar Regions” Session at the 2nd World Water Forum (The Netherlands, March 2000), which had been co-ordinated by AMAP. He informed the WG that the Organising Committee of the 3rd World Water Forum (Japan, 2003) had invited AMAP to organize a similar session at this Forum. The main objective of the previous forum had been the development of a vision, whereas the forthcoming forum would mainly be directed at consideration of possible actions. Vitaly Kimstach also noted that climate related issues will be one of the priorities on the Forum agenda. In this connection, the Global Dialogue on Water and Climate (DWC), with an International Secretariat and a targeted budget, has been organized. Taking into account the fact that climate issues are a priority within the Arctic Council, the Secretariat had taken the opportunity to propose a special project “Dialogue on Climate Change Adaptation Strategy in Water Management and Flood Preparedness at the Lena Basin”, which has been supported by relevant Russian authorities. This project proposal had subsequently been adopted by the DWC Steering Committee, with allocation of 180,000 \$ US from the DWC budget for financial support of this project.

Yuri Tsaturov commented that the Russian Federation is keenly interested in this project on the Lena Basin, and intends to allocate significant resources for its implementation in the form of in-kind contributions.

The WG agreed that the Secretariat should take part in the WWF3 and DCW initiatives described above, on the understanding that they do not detract from the work of the Secretariat and do not draw upon the core funding of the Secretariat.

14. The financial situation for the AMAP Secretariat and the special projects.

Lars-Otto Reiersen presented a short overview of the financial situation for the AMAP Secretariat. The AMAP Secretariat receives core funding from Norway that covers approximately 67% of the operational costs of the Secretariat. The remainder has been covered by voluntarily contribution from Canada and Finland, and through administration of projects such as the PTS and PCB project.

The production of the AMAP 2002 Assessment Reports is funded partly through in-kind contributions, whereby all lead countries support participation of their National Key experts in the assessment work. Report production work, including authoring of the SOAER, graphical production work, report layout and printing, etc., is covered partly by grants from some countries, including Canada, Denmark, Finland, Norway, and USA, and the Nordic Council of Ministers. The remainder is covered at cost through national orders for copies of the reports.

The production and translation of the Fact Sheets for ACAP was funded by Denmark, Finland and Norway.

Phase two of the PCB project has been funded by all eight Arctic countries and UNEP-Chemicals. Approximately 60.000 USD was still lacking to fully finance phase 2 of the PCB project².

The AMAP/RAIPON/GEF PTS project has been funded by all eight Arctic countries, GEF, the Salamander Foundation, WWF, the Nordic Council of Ministers, and UNEP-Chemicals. The total budget is 3.750.000 USD, of which an amount of approximately 230.000 USD is still being sought. Finland announced that they might contribute a further 40.000 USD³.

A special application has been sent to GEF concerning an ACIA project in Russia. This received PDF-A support. A MSP (medium sized project) proposal has been prepared and sent to the GEF secretariat for evaluation and hopefully support.

Lars-Otto Reiersen informed the WG that, in order to secure funding for AMAP Phase 3 activities it would be necessary to use opportunities that exist, such as the research funding opportunities under the European 6 Framework Programme and the equivalent North American funding by NSF, etc. In this respect it was important to try to influence on priorities for funding under these bodies, to ensure that they reflected the research needs identified in the AMAP phase 2 assessments, etc. The WG supported this view and agreed that this should be followed up both nationally and through AMAP.

15. AMAP Workplan for 2002 - 2004.

A draft workplan was circulated at the meeting. The WG decided to request the SAOs to accept a new timetable for delivery of the petroleum hydrocarbons assessment. Under this revised proposal, AMAP would like to invite the other AC WGs to work jointly prepare that assessment. The draft workplan (Annex 7) will be further updated based on the discussion and decisions made by SAOs and Ministers.

² During the ACAP meeting, May 14, this was covered by new national contributions.

³ At the SAO meeting in Oulu, Sweden also announced that they will increase their contribution, and Nordic Council of Ministers informed that they would look positively on a new application from the AMAP Secretariat.

16. The next AMAP Working Group meeting.

The WG Chair introduced the proposal to hold WG meetings in spring 2003 and spring 2004, in the United States and Russia, respectively. The 2003 meeting would focus on the new AMAP strategic plan, and also include a joint meeting with CAFF to focus on development of the ACIA policy document.

Pending on the situation there might also be a need to hold an AMAP meeting during autumn 2003. Iceland would clarify the possibility to host such a meeting.

17. Any other business.

On behalf of all of the WG, Helgi Jensson expressed thanks to Birte Rindom for her many valuable contributions to work of AMAP over the past years.

18. End of the meeting.

Helgi Jensson thanked all participants for their endurance and efforts to complete the agenda, and in particular complete the work necessary to allow WG approval of the 2002 SOAER during the meeting.

He also thanked the hosts from the Faroe Islands for their excellent arrangements and support for the WG meeting.

Finally, he wished all participants a good and safe return journey.

The meeting was closed at 00:30 on 3 May.

Annex 1. Opening address by Jacob Pauli Joensen

Good morning Ladies and Gentlemen!

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome you to the Faroes. I know you have had a long journey to get here. You can be grateful that the weather was calm for your landing at the airport yesterday. But you may already have experienced some other kinds of turbulence since you got here. Hopefully the ferry strike didn't make it too difficult for you to cross the fjord to Vestmanna. You have probably also noticed all the posters around town. Today is our national election to elect the around 30 members of the Faroese parliament for the next 4 years. Our elections are not only about left - right politics, but also about different views on independence, ranging from autonomy under the Kingdom of Denmark to becoming a fully independent state.

The importance of AMAP's work has long been recognised in many countries, including the Faroes. As you know we have been very concerned about the level of pollutants in a very important part of our traditional food resource: the pilot whales. The first dietary recommendation was issued in 1977 to limit the intake of whale meat and telling people to abstain completely from eating pilot whale liver, due to mercury levels. These recommendations have been revised twice since, limiting consumption even more. The latest recommendation from 1998 advises girls and childbearing women not to eat blubber at all. Although these recommendations were strongly worded and gave very specific advice, it is up to families themselves to adjust their eating habits. There are of course many people who doubt the value of the recommendation referring to the positive health aspects of our traditional food. Small portions of blubber have traditionally been eaten on a daily basis in the same way as people take a spoonful of cod-liver oil or olive oil in other parts of Europe. For many it is also difficult to believe that it is less healthy to eat wild animals compared with industrially produced and farmed food, often with fewer natural compounds and higher levels of medicine residues. We don't know whether Faroese people have adjusted their eating habits on the basis of the dietary recommendations or because of a general awareness of nutrition, but we do have reasons to believe that food habits are changing, as we have seen a significant reduction in mercury levels in pregnant women in recent years.

Knowledge of nature is the backbone of life, especially here in the middle of the North Atlantic. But advances in modern technology have made exploitation of living resources less dependent on traditional knowledge. Along with the global market the knowledge needed today is more about the quality of those resources which our life and welfare are based upon. The first analyses at the laboratory of Food and Environmental Agency, back 30 years ago, were on mercury in fish stocks. During the years we have participated in AMAP, we have expanded our monitoring to include a lot of other species and other analyses, such as on POPs. In this work it has been important to see the work carried out in other countries and I will thank you all for having created a forum like AMAP to cooperate on monitoring and assessment. Also, I would like to thank Denmark for their financial support for AMAP related projects in the Faroes.

This meeting of AMAP is of great importance. It may show the way forward as well as provide results with regard to those regulations, which have already been adopted. There have been great achievements in some areas. We now have a Stockholm-convention for reduction and elimination of the most dangerous POPs and we also have an IMO convention

on TBTs. Concentrations of pollutants in wildlife species may only represent a small proportion of the overall intake of pollutants in the diet, but a world in which the only acceptable foodstuff is that produced in modern facilities is unacceptable – it would be a much poorer world to live in. Knowledge about the danger of mercury needs to be translated into restrictions on the use and emissions of Mercury. We hope that an international convention can soon be achieved also on Mercury.

Although there are many important issues on our agenda for the next 3 days I hope you can find the time to explore our capital. There are plenty of good areas to walk, especially here around the hotel, which is the old part of Tórshavn. Should you have any questions during your stay here, please don't hesitate to ask.

Finally I would like to inform you that we have arranged a tour with an old boat – a sloop - late this afternoon. Maria will tell you more at the end of the meeting today. Tomorrow night we also have the pleasure of inviting you to a dinner at Hotel Føroyar. This is a hotel situated up on the side of the hill overlooking Tórshavn. The bus from this hotel to Hotel Føroyar is scheduled to leave at 7.15 p.m. tomorrow.

We won't disturb the meeting with these events, but hopefully they can help you to reach all the agreements you are hoping for.

Thank you

Annex 2. List of Participants at the 16th Working Group Meeting of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands, 30 April – 3 May, 2002

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	+1 819 997 0045	+1 819 953 9066
Canada	Keith	Puckett	Meteorological Service of Canada Environment Canada	4905 Dufferin Street Toronto Ontario, M3H 5T4	+1 416 739 4836	+1 416 739 5708	keith.puckett@ec.gc.ca	+1 416 739 4841	+1 416 739 4224
Denmark	Henrik	Elling	Arctic Environmental Secretariat	Danish Polar Centre Strandgade 100 H DK-1401 Copenhagen	+45 32 88 01 19	+45 32 96 07 03	he@dpc.dk	+45 32 88 01 00	+45 32 88 01 01
Denmark	Jens C.	Hansen	University of Aarhus Dep. of Environmental and Occupational Medicine	Bldg. 260 Vennelystboulevard 6 DK-8000 Århus	+45 89 42 61 60	+45 89 42 61 99	jch@mil.au.dk	+45 89 42 61 57	+45 89 42 61 99
Denmark	Lars	Moseholm	Danish Environmental Protection Agency	Strandgade 29 DK-1401 Copenhagen K	+45 32 66 03 35	+45 32 66 04 11	lmo@mst.dk	+45 32 66 01 00	+45 32 66 04 79
Denmark	Birte	Rindom	Danish Environmental Protection Agency	Strandgade 29 DK-1401 Copenhagen K	+45 32 66 01 66	+45 32 66 04 11	BR@MST.DK	+45 32 66 01 00	+45 32 66 04 79
Faroe Islands	Maria	Dam	Food and Environmental Agency	Falkarvegur 6, 2 FO - 100 Torshavn	+298 35 64 75	+298 35 64 51	MARIADAM@hfs.fo	+298 35 64 00	+298 35 64 01
Faroe Islands	Maria Gunnleivs-dottir	Hansen	Food and Environmental Agency	Falkarvegur 6, 2 FO - 100 Torshavn	+298 35 64 23	+298 35 64 01	Mariagh@hfs.fo	+298 35 64 00	+298 35 64 01
Faroe Islands	Jacob Pauli	Joensen	Food and Environmental Agency	Debesartrød FO - 100 Torshavn	+298 35 64 21	+298 35 64 01	Jakupppj@hfs.fo	+298 35 64 00	+298 35 64 01
Finland	John	Derome	Finnish Forest Research Institute	P.O.Box 16 FIN-96301 Rovaniemi	+358 16 336 4345	+358 16 336 41 11	john.derome@metla.fi	+358 16 336 4640	+358 16 336 4640
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.mahonen@ymparisto.fi	+358 16 329 4111	+358 16 310 340

Iceland	Helgi	Jensson	Environmental and Food Agency of Iceland	P.O. Box 8080 IS-128 Reykjavik	+354 585 10 23	+354 585 1010	helgij@hollver.is	+354 585 1000	+354 585 1010
Norway	Linn Bryhn	Jacobsen	Norwegian Pollution Control Authority	P.O. Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	+22 57 36 85	+47 22 67 67 06	Linn.bryhn-jacobsen@sft.no	+47 22 57 34 00	+47 22 67 67 06
Norway	Gunnar	Futsæter	Norwegian Pollution Control Authority	P.O. Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	+22 57 34 49	+47 22 67 67 06	Gunnar.futsater@sft.no	+47 22 57 34 00	+47 22 67 67 06
Norway	Geir Wing	Gabrielsen	Norwegian Polar Institute	Polarmiljøseneteret N-9296 Tromsø	+47 77 75 05 29	+47 77 75 05 01	geir.gabrielsen@npolar.no	+47 77 75 05 29	+47 77 75 05 01
Norway	Haral	Loeng	Institute for Marine Reserach	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	Per	Strand	Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority	P.O.Box 55 N-1345 Østerås	+47 67 16 25 64	+47 67 16 25 00	per.strand@nrpa.no	+47 67 14 74 07	+47 67 14 54 44
Russia	Alexander	Klepikov	Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute	Bering Str. 38 199397 St. Petersburg	+7 812 352 0226	+7 812 352 15 57	Klep@aari.nw.ru	+7 812 352 33 52	+7 812 352 0096
Russia	Yuri S.	Tsurov	Russian Federal Service for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Monitoring	Novovagankovsky Street 12 123242 Moscow	+7 095 252 2429	+7 095 255 24 00	tsurov@mecom.ru	+7 095 252 24 29	+7 095 255 24 00
Sweden	Cynthia	de Wit	Institute of Applied Environmental Research (ITM)	S-106 91 Stockholm	+46 8 674 7180	+46 8 6747636	cynthia.de.wit@itm.su.se	+46 8 16 20 00	+46 8 674 76 36
Sweden	Britta	Hedlund	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	S-106 48 Stockholm	+46 8 698 12 08	+46 8 698 1585	britta.hedlund@naturvardsverket.se	+46 8 698 1000	
Sweden	Niklas	Johansson	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	S-106 48 Stockholm	+46 8 698 1438	+46 8 698 1585	Niklas.johansson@naturvardsverket.se	+46 8 698 1000	
USA	John	Calder	National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration Oceanic and Atmospheric Research R/AR	SSMC1, Mail Code R/ARC 1315 East-West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910	+1 301 713 2518 ext.146	+1 301 713 2519	john.calder@noaa.gov	+1 301 713 2518 ext. 146	+1 301 713 2519

USA	Suzanne	Marcy	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Arctic Programme Office	222 W. 7th Ave. # 19 Anchorage, AK 99513	+1 907 271 2895	+1 907 271 34 24	marcy.suzanne@epa.gov	+1 907 271 50 83	+1 907 271 34 24
USA	Hale	VanKoughnett	U.S. State Department	2201 C St., NW Washington, DC 20520	+1 202 647 4972	+1 202 647 4353	vankoughnetthc@state.gov	+1 202 647 32 62	+1 202 647 4353
Permanent Participants									
Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat	John	Crump	Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat	Pilestræde 52 P.O. Box 2151 DK - 1016 Copenhagen K	+45 33 69 34 62	+45 33 69 34 99	jpc@ghsdk.dk	+45 33 69 34 98	+45 33 69 34 99
Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat	Alona	Yefimenko	Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat	Pilestræde 52 P.O. Box 2151 DK - 1016 Copenhagen K	+45 33 69 34 98	+45 33 69 34 99	ay@ghsdk.dk	+45 33 69 34 98	+45 33 69 34 99
Saami Council	Jan Idar	Solbakken	Saami Council	Saami College N-9520 Guovdageaidnu	+47 78 48 77 29	+47 78 48 77 02	jan-idar.solbakken@samiskhs.no	+47 78 48 77 00	+47 78 48 77 02
Observers									
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
UNEP/GRID ID	Kathrine	Johnsen	UNEP/GRID Arendal	P.O. Box 706 N-4801	+47 37 03 57 46	+47 37 03 50 50	Kathrine@grida.no	+47 37 03 56 50	+47 37 03 50 50
SOAER Journalist									
SOAER Journalist	Annika	Nilsson		Atlestigen 7 S-141 41 HUDDINGE	+46 8 746 61 83	+46 8 746 08 13	annika.nilsson@vetani.se	+46 8 746 61 83	+46 8 746 08 13
USA/SOAER Journalist	Henry	Huntington	Huntington Consulting	23834 The Clearing Dr. Eagle River, AK 99577	+ 1 907 696 3564	+ 1 907 696 3565	hph@alaska.net	+ 1 907 696 35 64	+ 907 696 35 65

AMAP Secretariat									
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.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.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	+31 10 466 2989	+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.no	+47 23 24 16 30	+47 22 67 67 06

Annex 3. Updated draft agenda for the 16th AMAP WG meeting, April 30 – May 3, 2002. Tórshavn, Faroe Island.

1. Opening.
2. Approval of the Agenda.
3. Progress report from the Chair and Secretariat, including the special projects such as the PCB and PTS projects.
4. Statements from Observers.
5. Production and funding of the AMAP 2002 reports.
6. Approval of The 2002 Arctic Pollution Issues; A State of the Arctic Environment Report, including recommendations in the Executive Summary.
7. The SAO meeting in May; Progress report from AMAP, reorganization of AC and its potential effects for AMAP, coordination of work with other AC Working Groups, etc.
8. Arctic Council Capacity Building Strategy – a request for information from Canada.
9. The Ministerial meeting in October; Progress report from AMAP; AMAP Strategic Plan for 2003 – 2008: Priorities for monitoring and assessments to be performed, work on sources, new issues of concern, national plans etc.
10. The 2nd International AMAP Symposium, October 2002; Program and financial situation.
11. Communication of the AMAP results to a wider audience, people of the North, Rio + 10, etc., use of international press, TV-films, etc.
12. ACIA progress and issues to be solved.
13. International cooperation: EU & EEA, UNEP Chemicals, OSPARCOM, WMO etc. Progress and issues to be solved.
14. The financial situation for the AMAP Secretariat and the special projects.
15. AMAP Workplan for 2002 - 2003.
16. The next AMAP Working Group meeting.
17. Any other business.
18. End of the meeting.

Annex 4. List of Documents: AMAP Working Group 16, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands, 30 April – 3 May, 2002

Document No.	Document Title:
AMAP WG 16/2/1	Updated Draft Agenda
AMAP WG 16/2/2	Draft List of Participants
AMAP WG 16/2/3	Draft List of Documents
AMAP WG 16/3/1	Discussion Paper on Preparation of Phase 3 of the Multilateral Cooperative Project on Phase-out of PCB Use, and Management of PCB Contaminated Wastes in the Russian Federation
AMAP WG 16/5/1	Assessment Production Funding April 2002
AMAP WG 16/7/1	Progress Report from AMAP to the SAO Meeting in Oulu, 15 – 16 May, 2002
AMAP WG 16/8/1	Arctic Council Capacity Building Strategy and Pilot Project – Draft March 28, 2002
AMAP WG 16/8/2	Arctic Council Capacity Building Strategy and Action Plan. Draft for Discussion 28 March, 2002. CAFF Board Meeting, 9 – 11 April 2002
AMAP WG 16/9/1 Info.	Arctic Human Development Report (AHDR). A Project Proposal for the Arctic Council – Summary
AMAP WG 16/9/1	Draft Priorities for the AMAP Phase 3, 2003 - 2015
AMAP WG 16/9/1-1	INARI Declaration
AMAP WG 16/9/1-2	Report of Senior Arctic Officials to Arctic Council Ministers – Draft Disposition
AMAP WG 16/9/1-3	Arctic Council SAO & 3 rd Ministerial Meeting, Saariselka, Inari, October, 7 – 10 , 2002. Draft for the Schedule of the Inari meetings and the Agenda for the Ministerial Meeting.
AMAP WG 16/9/2	Proposal for a Changed Time Schedule for the Preparation of Assessment of Petroleum Hydrocarbons in the Arctic Environment
AMAP WG 16/10/1	Draft Programme: Second AMAP International Symposium, Rovaniemi, 1 – 4 October, 2002

AMAP WG 16/12/1	Strategy for the Preparation of the ACIA Policy Document. Updated Draft April, 2002
AMAP WG 16/13/1	The Global Network for the Monitoring of Chemicals in the Environment
AMAP WG 16/13/2	Information Support for Climate Studies and Water Management for the Arctic Region. Development of the Arctic Hydrological Cycle Observing System (ARCTIC-HYCOS) – Draft Project Profile (Version of September 12, 2001)
AMAP WG 16/13/3	Dialogue on Water and Climate. Project Document (April 2002)
AMAP WG 16/13/4	Dialogue on Water and Climate Project Proposal
AMAP WG 16/13/5	World Water Forum 2: Polar Regions Session Report

Annex 5. List of Actions Arising from the 16th AMAP Working Group meeting, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands, 30 April – 3 May, 2002

Action (relevant agenda item)	For	Due by
Determine final national requirements for copies of 2002 assessment reports and arrangements for provision of funding for this (Agenda item 5)	AMAP Secretariat and Heads of Delegations	30 June
Identify additional external peer reviewers to comment on the heavy metals assessment and nominate names to Secretariat (Agenda item 5)	All countries (optional for Canada and USA)	7 June
Present the 'Indigenous Peoples Perspective Preface' drafted during the meeting to the Presidents of the IPOs for their consideration/signing (Agenda item 6)	Indigenous peoples representatives, IPS Secretariat	30 June
Provide the agreed SOAER texts to the publisher of the report (Agenda item 6)	Annika Nilsson and Henry Huntington	1 June
Prepare annexes with lists of acronyms, places, species, etc. for inclusion in SOAER and AAR reports (Agenda item 6)	Simon Wilson AAR lead authors SOAER authors	30 June
Draft, and present as a 'report from the AMAP Board', the AMAP Progress Report to the SAOs meeting in Oulu (Agenda item 7)	AMAP Board and Secretariat	15 May
Present to the SAOs meeting in Oulu the 2002 SOAER Executive Summary and the updated paper on the ACIA policy document (Agenda item 7)	AMAP Chair and Secretariat	15 May
Prepare a simple reporting format for use by countries in reporting updated information on NIPs and progress on Arctic monitoring and research, and to describe plans for 2002/2003 (Agenda item 7)	AMAP Secretariat	August 1
Request Arctic Council/WGSD to develop and adopt a specific definition of the term capacity building (Agenda item 8)	AMAP Chair	May 15
Request appropriate documentation detailing any specific requests addressed to AMAP in connection with WGSD capacity building initiative (Agenda item 8)	AMAP Secretariat Canadian Head of Delegation	June 30
Consider draft Ministerial Declaration and SAO report prepared by AC Secretariat/Chair and provide further input for these documents (Agenda item 9)	All countries	9 August

Consider possible new issues of concern that might be recommended to be taken up in future AMAP strategic plan (noise, sources, etc.) (Agenda item 9)	All countries	Next AMAP WG meeting
Circulate Final Announcement and Preliminary Programme for the 2 nd International AMAP Symposium, and put this information on the AMAP website (Agenda item 10)	John Derome AMAP Secretariat	1 June
Contact independent external (peer) reviewers that have contributed significantly to the AMAP assessment review process to offer them participation at the AMAP Symposium without having to pay the conference fee (Agenda item 10)	AMAP Secretariat (assessment leads to notify names and contact information for relevant individuals)	15 June
Request President of the Saami Council to prepare a letter to SAOs regarding possible production and funding of a Saami language translation of the 2002 SOAER (Agenda item 11, and 5)	Jan-Idar Solbakken	30 June
Prepare more detailed documentation of the costs, time schedule, and practical arrangements, etc. required for production of a film/video presenting the results of AMAP phase 2 (Agenda item 11)	AMAP Secretariat	30 June
Invite SAOs to discuss the ACIA communication strategy (Agenda item 12)	AMAP Chair	10 October
AMAP WG fully inform their International Negotiating Committee (INC) national delegations on the potential of AMAP for providing the Arctic components of the Global POPs monitoring network under the Stockholm Convention (Agenda item 13)	All countries	Before INC meeting the week of 17 June
Attempt to influence on funding agencies in Europe and North America to priorities research needs identified in AMAP assessments (Agenda item 14)	All countries AMAP Secretariat	June 6 (European FP6 input) and as appropriate
Contact CAFF regarding possible joint meeting in spring 2003 to develop ACIA Policy Document (Agenda item 16)	AMAP Chair	30 June

Annex 6. Strategy for the preparation of the ACIA Policy Document (AMAP WG16/12/1: Revised)

Introduction

This document, outlining the proposed strategy for preparing the ACIA Policy Document, is based on the ACIA Implementation Plan approved by the Second Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting in Barrow, 2000, discussions at the joint AMAP/CAFF working group meeting held in Stockholm, August 30, 2001, comments from the SAO meeting held in Espoo, November 6-7, 2001, and the ACIA Assessment Steering Committee meeting held in Ottawa, December 3- 5 2001. The final strategy is expected to be endorsed at the Ministerial meeting in October 2002. Note: a question to the SAOs in bold.

Purpose

The purpose of the ACIA Policy Document as stated in the ACIA Implementation Plan is to: “relate the information from the synthesis and scientific documents [of ACIA] to the policy needs of the Arctic Council and provide recommendations for follow-up measures. AMAP and CAFF will address the question of what strategies can be recommended to cope with current environmental stresses, and possibly lessen the impacts of these changes in the climate and ultraviolet radiation. These recommendations will include advice relevant to national and international policy as well as advice to inhabitants of the Arctic”.

The product

The ACIA Policy Document will be prepared in laymen’s terms and as a stand-alone document. The background for the scientific conclusions and all references to scientific literature will be in the ACIA Scientific Report, which will be presented at the same time. The ACIA Policy Document will convey information carefully in order not to alarm or confuse the reader. The size of the document is expected to be between 20-30 pages plus illustrations.

Audience

The primary audience for the ACIA Policy Document are the Arctic Council Ministers and Permanent Participants, but also Arctic residents, economic sectors and other stakeholders, non-Arctic States and international fora dealing with climate and UV/ozone questions (e.g. EU, UN/IPCC).

Approach

At Barrow (2000), the AC Ministers requested AMAP and CAFF, in cooperation with IASC, to implement ACIA. Although stated in the ACIA Implementation Plan, that AMAP and CAFF will be responsible for drafting the ACIA Policy Document, follow-up discussions at the SAO level (e.g. in Espoo, November 2001), have identified the need for other AC working groups and indigenous organizations to be intimately involved in the process. Therefore, representatives from all AC working groups and indigenous organizations should be invited to participate in the drafting of ACIA policy recommendations relevant to their work and expertise. In addition, draft chapters of the AC Policy Document should be circulated to all AC working groups for comments prior to submission to the SAOs.

The SAOs will not be directly involved in the drafting process. However, key policy questions will be brought up to the SAOs as early in the process as possible. In early 2004, the ACIA policy recommendations will be handed over to the SAOs for their consideration and preparation of recommendations to Ministers for joint adoption at the Fourth AC Ministerial meeting in the fall of 2004.

The following describes the proposed process for the preparation of the ACIA Policy Document:

1. The document will be prepared by AMAP, CAFF, other AC working groups that wish to participate, and indigenous people groups, with the assistance of a professional writer. A core drafting team will be established to prepare the first draft. The composition of the drafting team will be proposed to SAOs in October 2002 following discussion with SAOs in May 2002. It will be important to ensure that members of the drafting group has the proper competence for this task.
2. A process to ensure a clear linkage to the scientific report is essential. As a part of this process, the first draft will be reviewed by the ASC, including all lead authors, to control the validity of the science interpretations and science related recommendations.
3. The 2nd draft will be circulated to all AC WGs involved and the indigenous organizations with an invitation to comment the draft policy and science recommendations.
4. Joint meeting of AMAP and CAFF, with representatives from indigenous peoples organizations and the other AC working groups, will be arranged to negotiate the final conclusions and recommendations.
5. The 3rd draft, including all recommendations, will be presented to the SAOs for their considerations in early 2004.
6. After final editing of the report it will be sent to a publisher for printing.
7. The final report will be presented to the Fourth AC Ministerial Meeting in fall 2004.

Note: Before the Third Ministerial (fall 2002), the SAOs need to decide on whether the ACIA Policy Document, in addition to the national review process, shall be circulated for a public review.

Structure

A rough outline of the ACIA Policy Document is presented below. This outline will be regularly upgraded and developed based on information from the Scientific Report and feedbacks from the AC WGs and SAOs. The first opportunity to provide and incorporate any science-based preliminary policy questions and issues into this outline (section 4.) will be after the upcoming ASC meeting in Norway, June 2-4, 2002, where first rough drafts of all chapters of ACIA Scientific Report are expected.

Proposed structure, as of April 2002:

0. Preface.
1. Introduction.
2. The circumpolar Arctic context.
3. Summary and conclusions with respect to expected climate changes and their impacts across regions, ecosystems, societies and sectors of the circumpolar Arctic, as documented in the ACIA Scientific Report.
4. Policy recommendations addressing environmental, social, sectoral economic, and cultural issues. (Note1: due to the geographical size of some of the Arctic countries and special conditions there might be situation where some of the recommendations are country specific, but in general country specific recommendations should be avoided. Note2: decision on the grouping of the recommendations, by themes as above, or chapters of the scientific assessment, will wait further discussions).

Each recommendation will be structured in the following way:

- specific recommendation and target
 - rationale
 - discussion
 - benefits/costs
5. Unresolved issues. This chapter would highlight issues, for which there is not scientific or political consensus.
 6. Next steps.

Revised timetable for the preparation of the strategy and the ACIA Policy Document

- 1 August 2001. A small *ad hoc* group prepares a first draft strategy outline for presentation to the joint AMAP/CAFF working group meeting in August 2001.
- 2 November 2001. Based on recommendations from the working groups, the *ad hoc* group prepares an updated proposal to be presented to the SAO meeting in November 2001.
- 3 Early 2002. Based on comments from the SAO meeting and the December 2001 meeting of the ASC, the *ad hoc* group prepares and circulates an updated draft for comments from the working groups and ASC.
- 4 April 2002. An updated proposal from AMAP and CAFF is presented to the SAOs for their consideration at the May meeting in 2002.
- 5 September 2002. The final strategy for preparing the ACIA Policy Document is presented to SAOs for adoption at the Ministerial meeting in October 2002.

- 6 October-November 2002. Appointment of a drafting team, including the professional writer.
- 7 January 2003. The drafting team initiates its work. Note: 2nd draft of the ACIA scientific report and the 1st draft of the executive summary report, is expected in early 2003.
- 8 June 2003. Circulation of the 1st draft of the ACIA Policy Document to ASC.
- 9 September 2003. Comments returned to drafters.
- 10 November 2003. Circulation of the 2nd draft of the ACIA Policy Document to the Working groups and indigenous organizations.
- 11 January 2004. Comments returned to drafters.
- 12 March-April 2004. A joint AMAP/CAFF working group meeting, with representatives from indigenous peoples organizations and the other AC working groups, to approve the recommendations.
- 13 April-May 2004. The 3rd draft of the ACIA Policy Document, including all recommendations, presented to the SAOs.
- 14 June – August 2004. Proof reading, editing, printing of the report.
- 15 September 2004. The ACIA Policy Document is ready for presentation to the Ministerial meeting.

Annex 7. Draft AMAP Workplan for 2003 and 2004

- 2003
- Continue the core ongoing and long-term monitoring activities under the AMAP Trends and Effects Monitoring Programme (for temporal and spatial trends, human health and biological effect studies, also including collection of information on new contaminants, other emerging issues, etc.).
- Continue to implement ACIA in a close cooperation with CAFF and IASC.
- Assessment priority 1: The ACIA assessment, prepare the policy document, ensure that pollution aspects are covered where appropriate, etc.
- Assessment priority 2: Initiate the acidification and petroleum hydrocarbons assessment activities (assessments due in 2006).
- Consolidate programmes and activities, taking into account any implications of reorganization of the AC, requests from the AC, also including cooperation with international bodies such as UNEP and UN-ECE, e.g., follow-up of the Stockholm Convention.
- Develop a new strategic plan for AMAP, including planning a new strategy for performing assessments and reporting these.
- Continue efforts aimed at communication of results, including production and presentation of translations of the 2002 assessment report.
- Improve procedures for reporting data to AMAP TDCs, and improve accessibility to AMAP data.
- Upgrade the AMAP website.
- Prepare and deliver final PTS project report, planning related to any follow-up (e.g. possible international conference for presentation of the PTS project results)
- ACAP: Continue cooperation and support to specific projects.
- 2004
- Deliver the ACIA Assessment in cooperation with CAFF and IASC. Possible International Symposium on Arctic Climate and UV.
- Agree the AMAP monitoring programmes for the next period (long-term temporal trends and biological effects, including human health, etc.) taking into account requests from Ministers, and also possible requests relating to follow-up of UN ECE Protocols, Stockholm Convention, etc.
- Continue to implement National Implementation Programmes (NIPs) as appropriate, including those relating to assessments due in 2006, and develop NIPs in relation to future planned activities.
- Provision of data for the acidification and petroleum hydrocarbons assessments.
- Develop a new timetable for presentation of future assessments, based on decisions made by the AC regarding assessment priorities and follow-up of international bodies, and the new AMAP strategic plan, etc.
- ACAP: Continue cooperation and support to specific projects.

AMAP List of Publications:

	Minutes of the First Meeting of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Task Force (AMATF), Tromsø, 2-6 December 1991
	Minutes of the Second Meeting of the Arctic Monitoring Assessment Task Force (AMATF), Toronto, 30 November - 4 December 1992
AMAP Report 93:2	Minutes from the Third Meeting of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Task Force (AMATF), Stockholm - Helsinki, 12 - 14 May 1993
AMAP Report 93:3	The Monitoring Programme for the AMAP
AMAP Report 93:4	Report to Ministers. Update on Issues of Concern to the Arctic Environment, including Recommendations for Actions
AMAP Report 93:5	Audit Report: Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme
AMAP Report 93:6	Minutes from the Fourth Meeting of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group (AMAPWG), Reykjavik, 11 - 13 October 1993
AMAP Report 94:1	Minutes from the Fifth Meeting of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group (AMAPWG), Tromsø, 3 - 4 March 1994
AMAP Report 94:2	Minutes from the Sixth Meeting of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group (AMAPWG), Washington 26 - 28 October 1994
AMAP Report 95:1	Guidelines for the AMAP Assessment
AMAP Report 95:2	Minutes from the Seventh Meeting of Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group (AMAPWG), Moscow, September 13-15 1995
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 97:1	Minutes from the Eighth Meeting of Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group (AMAPWG), Groningen, January 27 - 31 1997
AMAP Report 97:2	Minutes from the Ninth Meeting of Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group (AMAPWG), Stockholm, 21 - 23 April, 1997
AMAP Report 1997	Arctic Pollution Issues: A State of the Arctic Environment Report
AMAP Report 98:1	Minutes from the Tenth Meeting of Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group (AMAPWG), Aarhus, 17 - 20 November, 1997
AMAP Report 98:2	Minutes from the Eleventh Meeting of Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group (AMAPWG), Girdwood, Alaska, USA April 23-24, 1998

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 99:2	Minutes from the Twelfth Meeting of Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group (AMAPWG), Helsinki, Finland December 7 – 9, 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 99:5	Minutes from the Thirteenth Meeting of Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Working Group (AMAPWG), Toronto, Canada, November 10 – 12, 1999
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, Russia, 28 May - 1 June, 2000.
AMAP Report 2000:7	Minutes from the 14th AMAP Working Group Meeting, Trondheim, Norway, 5 – 6 September, 2000.

AMAP Report 2001:1	Guidelines for the AMAP Phase 2 Assessments.
AMAP Report 2001:2	Minutes of the 15 th AMAP WG Meeting, Stockholm, Sweden, 30 August 2001.
AMAP Report 2002:1	Minutes of the 16 th AMAP WG Meeting, Thorshavn, Faroe Islands, 30 April – 3 May, 2002