

Draft Minutes

ACAP Expert Group on POPs and Mercury

Meeting#1, 18 of December 2015 (Telephone)

1. Opening of the meeting

The meeting was opened (after significant delay) and attended by

- Ms. Marianne Bailey, US
- Mr. Ruslan Butovskiy, RU
- Mr. Niklas Johansson, SE
- Mr. Åke Mikaelsson, SE + EG Chair

- Mr. Husamuddin Ahmadzai, NEFCO (Observer)

The teleconference service showed problematic and due to the related delays, the connections with Mr. Alexander Romanov, RU and Mr. Dmitriy Kuznetsov, RU failed. A lesson learned till the next meeting is for the Chair to communicate more clearly whether the participants shall EITHER WAIT FOR A CALL from the teleconference service OR DIAL IN TO THE TELECONFERENCE themselves, since the technique used does not support both variants (“dial in” resp. “dial out”) in the same telephone conference.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted under the conditions to limit the meeting to 60-80 Minutes.

3. Introduction to the start-up of the new Expert Group (Chair)

Referring to the ACAP Meeting in Tromsø on 16-18th of September, 2015, the Chair gave the background to the reorganization of the expert groups incl. the merging of EG Dioxins and Furans and the EG on Mercury into the EG on POPs and Mercury.

As key issues for the new EG in the near future, the Chair addressed on the one hand (strategically) to sort out the key projects/activities to drive further and on the other hand (operatively) both to get to know each other and assess the participants’ respective mandates, resources, availability, skills and interests etc. in order to build the most effective team.

4. Introduction of the individual Participants

a+b) In addition to the presentations given in writing prior to the meeting, the participants made brief presentations of themselves and their respective background as well as their role in the former PSG and interests in the new, merged EG. It was concluded that the presentations made in writing prior to the meeting (see Appendix #1.4ab) was a good way for everybody to get an overview of the new colleagues and the **EG members not yet having submitted their “presentations” should be encouraged to do so.**

c) Regarding the EG members’ availability for participating in the EG work it was noted that time for participating in meeting and conducting work is available (in various extent) for all the EG members attending this first EG meeting, however the means for travel are limited due to various reasons. Ms. Marianne Bailey explained that Mr. Stanley Durkee also will play

a key role in the US engagement in the group and that funding for travel for EG meetings and to advance projects is very limited. Mr. Husamuddin Ahmadzai commented that physical meetings will basically be possible to attend in connection with other ACAP meetings. For the other attendants, funds so far are available for attending project related meetings in any Arctic country when needed and justified from project point of view.

Given the limited number of EG members attending this first meeting, it was concluded that these issues (a,b,c) have to be discussed further also with other EG members.

5. Presentation of work done and planned within the former EG on Dioxins and Furans

- a) The Chair explained that the core of the work of the EG Dioxins has been devoted to the preparations of a "Phase III" pilot action project on the Vorkutinskiy Cement Plant (VCP) in the Komi Republic, selected among a large number of facilities examined in the Phase I and Phase II. The preparations on VCP comprised three assignments funded by NEFCO with support from the Swedish EPA: i) sampling and analysis of dioxins and other pollutants from the VCP, ii) feasibility study and drafting of an action plan for controlling of the emissions of dioxins, furans, black carbon and heavy metals from the VCP, iii) a Seminar on "Environmental Requirements for Using Waste as Additional Fuels in the Cement Industry", conducted in Syktyvkar in 2014. (For more details, see EG Dioxin's Status Report #23 in Appendix #1.5a.)

The assignments i) and ii) were implemented in 2014 and 2015. Currently the final reports are elaborated and expected to be completed in early 2016.

Apart from the efforts on the VCP, the EG Dioxins also prepared a Work Programme for a broad range of activities (see agenda item 5b below) also forming the base for two applications submitted to the PSI Committee (see agenda item 5c below).

- b) A Work Programme for the EG Dioxins (see Appendix #1.5b) was presented to ACAP in Rovaniemi in January 2015, comprising five key activities:
- Activity 1 – Implement emission reduction actions at Vorkutinskiy Cement Plant (Phase III)
 - Activity 2 - Up-date information on potential pilot objects identified in Phase II
 - Activity 3 - Broadened inventory of other emission sources than those inventoried in Phase II
 - Activity 4 - Promote implementation of control technologies
 - Activity 5 - Support to Russia's activities aiming at adaptation to the requirements under the International Conventions

Having completed Activity 1 within soon, the Chair together with Mr. Butovskiy and Mr. Johansson commented that it is now time to focus on the Activities 2-5.

- c) Based on the Work Programme, the EG Dioxins in March 2015 submitted two funding applications to the PSI Committee:
- P1 "Implementation of the Action Plan for Dioxins and Dust Emission Reductions at the Vorkutinskiy Cement Plant", addressing the Activity 1 of the Work Programme and
 - "P2345 – Inventory Programs, Control Technologies and other Support to Russia's Compliance with International Convention Requirements" addressing the Activities 2,3,4,5.

Both applications received principal approval (as Expression of Interest, "EoI") by the PSI Committee, but require further preparations for final approval. The further development of Project P1 depends on the results of the two assignments (see 5a above) which are expected within soon. In addition, Mr. Butovskiy explained that a refined application on the Project "P2345" is elaborated on at the Russian side, hopefully possible to discuss within soon.

6. Presentation of work done and planned within the former EG on Mercury

- a) Ms. Bailey reported that the work of the EG Mercury has been devoted to the elaboration of basically four work areas:
- Work Area 1 - Non-Ferrous Metals/Zinc Smelter Project Proposal for reduction of mercury releases from non-ferrous metals smelters in the Russian Federation”
 - Work Area 2 - Mercury Emissions Reduction Technology Workshop
 - Work Area 3 - Reduction of mercury emissions from the industrial gold mining sector in the Russian Federation
 - Work Area 4 - Mercury Waste Management, in collaboration with the Integrated Hazardous Waste Expert Group.

Out of these, the Work Areas 1 and 2 reached the most developed stage with project plans, submitted to the PSI Committee. Work Area 3 so far resulted in a Draft Working Paper based on initial information gathering. For Work Area 4 components on mercury waste management have been integrated into design of Work Areas 1 and 2, and further discussions with the EG on Integrated Hazardous Waste Management Systems (EG IHWMS) are anticipated. (For more details, see EG Mercury’s Status Report in Appendix #1.6a.)

Within the context of the Work Area 1, NEFCO and Russian partners conducted a workshop on “Technical Information Exchange on Mercury Abatement in the Metallurgical Industry” in Yekaterinburg in April 2015. Awaiting the PSI FID , the activity was co-funded from the the Swedish EPA Trust Fund with NEFCO.

The project plan for Work Area 2 was elaborated by US EPA and designed to have a complementary function to a larger, GEF funded project comprising a Mercury emission inventory and the drafting of a Minamata Action Plan. Due to lack of funding, the ACAP-part of this project has not yet been launched, whereas the GEF-funded parts are close to completion.

- b) Primarily, the Project Plans prepared by the EG Mercury and intended for PSI-funding (Work Areas 1 and 2) should be followed up. Of these, clear priority should be given to the Non-Ferrous Smelter Project.
- c) Based on the project development conducted under the Work Areas 1 and 2, two funding applications were approved by the EG and ACAP, and submitted to the PSI Fund Manager (NEFCO) for consideration of the PSI Committee:
- The Non-Ferrous Metals/Zinc Smelter Emission Reduction Project
 - The Mercury Emissions Reduction Technology Workshop.

7. Discussion on how to work within the merged Expert Group on POPs and Mercury

- a) Based on the information exchanged under item 5 and 6, the prioritised tasks and projects for the new EG on POPs and Mercury were discussed, suggesting the following prioritised tasks:
- i) Consider the need for any Action project – as well as any PSI funding – on the Vorkutinskiy Cement Plant, based on the assessment of the two assignment reports that are expected to soon be completed
 - ii) Initiate a desk top study for updated monitoring on previously (EG Dioxins Activity 2) examined emission sources as well as the project development of a broadened inventory of potential dioxin emission sources (EG Dioxins Activity 3)

- iii) Consider the elaboration of Support Activities to Emission Control Technologies (EG Dioxins Activity 4), *inter alia* in connection with the introduction of BAT in the Russian Federation
- iv) Discuss with MNRE their interest to get our support in activities related to international conventions (EG Dioxins Activity 5) - as well Stockholm/Basel/Rotterdam as Minamata conventions - and prepare project ideas only upon specific requests with “administrative context” (incl. NIP status) from the Russian side.
- v) Await the response from the PSI Committee on the funding application submitted for the Non-Ferrous Smelter Project (EG Mercury Work Area 1).
- vi) Survey and assess the situation on the project proposals/project ideas related to EG Mercury Work Areas 2 (Workshop) and 3 (Gold Mines) for possible further development and promotion
- vii) Survey the status of and if possible, promote the further development of the project proposal on “Development of mercury containing waste management system in arctic regions of Russian Federation” (EG Mercury Work Area 4) within the frames of the other merged EG on Hazardous Waste.

Given the limited number of EG members attending this first meeting, it was concluded that these issues need to be discussed also at the next EG meeting.

- b) Recognising the fact that the merging of the two expert groups was made on a test basis as well as that there are much operative issues to be solved with the elaboration and promotion of project proposals, it was suggested that no joint Working Programme should be elaborated at this first stage. For operative purposes during the test period, it was instead deemed sufficient that the work of the merged EG on POPs and Mercury be guided by the WP for the EG Dioxins and the ToR for the EG Mercury respectively.
- c) Regarding the technical prerequisites for conducting meetings, etc. it was concluded that the most common way of conducting meetings has to be via telephone conference, however the possibilities for using video-link also should be surveyed. Apart from the telephone/video meetings, it was agreed that a physical start-up meeting would be of great benefit to the work in the new, merged EG.

8. Preparations to the ACAP Meeting in Washington

- a) It was agreed that the Chair prepares a draft presentation of the merged EG, incl. draft priorities as outlined in item 7 and that Ms. Marianne Bailey make necessary completions
- b) Among the current projects it was concluded that the status of i) the Vorkutinskiy Cement Plant and ii) the Smelter project should be presented at the ACAP meeting as well as the results from iii) the Technical Information Exchange Workshop in Yekaterinburg.
- c) For the up-date of the ACAP web page it was agreed that reports from as well the VCP assignments as the Yekaterinburg workshop should be uploaded when final version of the Rapport “ Summary of Technical Information Exchange Meeting on Mercury Abatement in the Metallurgical Industry” submitted by NEFCO on 11 June 2015 to the PSG-Hg Chairs & ACAP Chair is also approved by ACAP. .

9. Summary on next steps and work distribution

- i) EG members not yet having submitted their “brief presentations” are encouraged to **update the “EG POPs Member Presentation” file**, see App #1.4ab below. (All)
- ii) Draft joint Status report and presentation slides for the ACAP meeting (Åke)

iii) Add necessary information to Åke's drafts (Marianne)

10. Time for the next meeting

It was agreed that a physical meeting should be arranged at US EPA in Washington D.C. prior to the ACAP Meeting. Indicatively meeting time was suggested to take place on **Monday the 1st of February at 14.30 EST** (Eastern Standard Time). For EG members unable to participate physically, a telephone link will be arranged.

11. Closure of the meeting

The Chair expressed his gratitude to all participants and declared the meeting closed.

Appendices:

App#1.4ab - EG POPs Member Presentation (18Dec2015).docx

App#1.5a - StatusRpt #23 PSG Dioxins (24Aug2015).docx

App#1.5b - WP PSG Dioxins v1.0 (14Jan2015).pdf

App#1.6a - ACAP Mercury PSG Status report (Sep2015).docx

App#1.6b - TOR Mercury PSG to Submit to SAO (Feb2012).docx