

Minutes of SDWG Regular Meeting Copenhagen, Denmark 10-11 November 2009

1. Opening

Approval of Agenda and Minutes of Last Meeting

Approval was given to the agenda (see attached), with the addition of a brief presentation on a Model Arctic Council project in Yukon added under item 10, "Other Business". The Minutes of the last meeting in Nuuk, Greenland (09-10 June 2009) were also approved.

2. Activity Reports and Updates

a. Arctic Human Health Experts Group (AHHEG)

The AHHEG Co-Chairs, Professors Peter Bjerregaard (Denmark/Greenland) and Kue Young (Canada), provided a status report on the new expert group. After several years of planning, the inaugural meeting was held in Ottawa in February 2009. A further meeting in July 2009 in Yellowknife was held in conjunction with the International Congress on Circumpolar Health. (AHHEG plans a similar meeting in conjunction with the ICCH in 2012).

The priority themes are set out in the AHHEG work plan, which was circulated to the SDWG in advance of this meeting and is available on the SDWG website <http://portal.sdwg.org>, include:

- mental health and suicides (marginalization, depression, youth suicide, substance abuse)
- diet and nutrition (food security, obesity, safe water, fluoridation, cardiovascular disease and diabetes)
- health care (health care to indigenous populations, culturally appropriate health care to the elderly, rapid turn-over of staff, cultural education of health staff)
- inequalities in health (reduce circumpolar inequalities, create documentation for inequalities)
- Other (monitoring health effects of climate change, infectious diseases (STD, tuberculosis), expand ICS, violence, child and youth health and wellbeing, tobacco, unintentional injuries, better health for the money allocated, cancer)

These priorities arose from careful discussions in the AHHEG. The intention is to turn these priorities into action items. The *International Circumpolar Surveillance (ICS): Prevention and Control of Emerging Infectious Diseases in the Arctic* project led by the USA is ongoing in the SDWG.

A first piece of work by AHHEG was preparation for the workshop on *Hope and Resilience in Suicide Prevention* which was held in Nuuk, Greenland on 07-08 November 2009. (The preliminary outcomes of this workshop are reported below in these minutes.)

As a second task AHHEG will commission a review of nutritional guidelines in circumpolar countries and which be discussed at the next AHHEG meeting (no date has been set but AHHEG might meet

around the dates of the next SDWG meeting). These nutritional guidelines will hopefully be completed by the end of the year.

Another activity planned by AHHEG is a comparative study of the health care systems in the circumpolar countries which would prepare profiles focusing on the north, similar to the profiles developed by the European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies. The AHHEG work plan includes a proposal to develop a Circumpolar Health Observatory (CircHOB) which will be an international collaborative health information system, involved in systematic, standardized, and consistent data collection and analysis. It is population-based, and produces data for all northern regions in all circumpolar countries. CircHOB's purpose would be to monitor trends and patterns in health status, health determinants, and health care, provides quantitative evidence for planning and evaluation of health programs and services. It will be on-going and sustainable with periodic updates.

CircHOB will extract relevant data from existing data sources managed by different groups and agencies. This activity could have connections to the *Arctic Social Indicators* project and to *ArcticStat*.

Finally, a summer institute in circumpolar health research (<http://sichr.circumpolarhealth.org>) is being developed to look at methods in nutritional assessment and disparities in health. The website outlines more details of this summer institute. The plan is to undertake this work over the coming three years at least.

There are activities planned for each of the 5 priorities outlined by AHHEG in their work plan, and some of these are already in progress. The intention is not to have endless meetings but rather to undertake concrete measures that show results.

During the discussions following the status report, in response to a question as to whether health data will it be shared with indigenous communities, Professor Young clarified that the circumpolar health observatory will be available on the web with break downs by issue, country and perhaps by indigenous group. There will also be paper-based reports. New data will be coming in so updating the online material will be important.

Professor Young encouraged representation on AHHEG from Iceland and Russia. The Saami Council advised that it had nominated an expert from Norway and this person was pleased with the work done by AHHEG to date.

In response to a suggestion that gaps in themes, participation and strategic thinking in relation to health might be included in the strategic planning exercise for SDWG, Professor Young pointed out that AHHEG did not want to get stuck in the cycle of constant planning. Their objective was to make some quick progress on tangible issues and then go back to constituencies to get further actions to address. AHHEG is open to input from the Permanent Participants on priorities.

In response to a question relating to health issues which are subject to guidelines set down by authorities in the various Arctic states, it was clarified that AHHEG does take these guidelines into account. AHHEG plans to compile these guidelines as they apply to the Arctic and to try to understand the political and cultural reasons for any significant variations. So far there is no plan to create a universal set of guidelines.

There was discussion about support from the SDWG for approval of the work plan and new projects. Professor Young indicated that AHHEG would like some recognition and approval of its work plan and then AHHEG could come back to the SDWG for guidance and approval of specific projects. As for the data collected by AHHEG, this is an area where there can be significant contribution and comparative work. AHHEG would like to work with others on these ongoing projects. The discussions were concluded by the SDWG giving its approval to the work plan and priorities presented by AHHEG.

b. Report on the Nuuk Seminar on Hope and Resilience in Suicide Prevention

The SDWG Chair introduced this item and pointed out that there was impressive representation from Arctic youth at this very successful seminar. Participants came from Alaska, Canada, Norway and Greenland - 62 participants and 32 youth attended the seminar and represented most regions in the circumpolar area. A broad range of policy makers, practitioners, politicians and researchers also participated in the seminar.

Professor Bjerregaard stressed that the seminar was held only a few days before this SDWG meeting so the findings are very raw and the recommendations are still under consideration.

The purpose of the seminar was to create new networks and to strengthen the existing relations between different sectors across the Arctic working with suicide prevention. Professor Bjerregaard noted that this was the first circumpolar meeting on this topic for a very long time and the seminar really filled a gap and helped develop lots of new, good relationships.

The seminar was the result of a partnership between the Arctic Human Health Expert Group, the Inuit Circumpolar Council and Youth Council (ICYC), and the Greenland Government (Dept. of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Health). The program included presentations from different circumpolar regions; 3 thematic workshops; a seminar for youth (aged 18 to 30); and a panel discussion between youth and policy makers. An executive summary and recommendations will be presented in a final report

Among the preliminary recommendations from the youth seminar were the following:

1. Make resources available to promote healthy living among the youth in the Arctic;
2. Establish centralized crisis networks that are easily accessible and visibly available to youth to raise awareness of the existing resources; and
3. Increase the participation of youth in policy decisions that affect them with more invitations to conferences, seminars, and workshops.

Some recommendations from the main seminar included:

1. Focus on well-being of children and youth. This means a life free from neglect, substance abuse, and sexual abuse.
2. Self determination and cultural awareness were mentioned, but their direct importance for suicides needs to be documented.
3. More work needs to be done from a gender perspective.
4. There needs to be better integration of research and practice.

A great achievement of this seminar was the creation of new networks across generations, national borders, and professional disciplines. Other key points from the seminar included:

- Young people have something to say - and they want to be heard.
- Local problems demand local solutions, but the circumpolar areas share similar challenges.

During discussions Professor Bjerregaard clarified that many of the recommendations from the seminar fit well into the mental health and suicide themes in the AHHEG plan and would be taken into account under that theme of the work plan. However, he stressed that the well-being of children is not just a health issue. It involves more. For example, consideration might be given to another children and youth project under the SDWG or perhaps adding a new theme to the AHHEG work plan. These will be questions to reflect on.

The Chair concluded the discussions by noting that she will give a short report on AHHEG and this seminar to SAOs at their meeting this week.¹

3. Project Reports and Updates

a. Arctic Social Indicators (ASI)

Dr. Joan Nymand Larsen provided a status report on ASI. The *Arctic Human Development Report* (2004) was the basis for doing this work and provided a baseline. The objective was to facilitate long term monitoring of human development in the Arctic. Approximately 35-40 participants from many backgrounds and disciplines were involved in ASI. Findings have been presented at a number of conferences (Arctic Frontiers and UNESCO in Monaco).

Six domains were chosen for selection of indicators, namely: Fate control and or the ability to guide one's own destiny; Cultural well-being; Contact with nature or interacting closely with the natural world; Education; Health and Population; and Material well-being.

The first 3 were taken from the AHDR, and the remaining 3 from the UN human development work. Indicators were chosen based on a range of criteria. The most difficulty domains to work with were the ones identified in the AHDR and these still need further research and work to generate the necessary information. The ASI team agreed that a good indicator should be generalizable and stable; easy to measure in a broadly accepted manner; suitable for use in longitudinal analyses; have a clear meaning relevant to one or more of the six domains of Arctic human development; sensitive to change over time; available at least down to a regional level; and applicable to, and reported separately for, indigenous and non-indigenous populations.

In the *Health and Population* domain the recommended indicators are

- Health: infant mortality and
- Population: net-migration

Infant mortality relates directly to quality of life and people's sense of well-being. Net-migration reflects the current local sum of various push and pull factors, integrates different forces, and tells something basic about where one place is heading, or how it compares with others.

In the *Material Well-being* domain the recommended indicators are:

- Per capita household income
- Net migration
- Subsistence harvest per capita
- Composite index (per capita household income, subsistence harvest per person, housing cost)

For example, per capita household income is an efficient, consistent and robust, direct measure. This indicator overcomes some weaknesses of GDP, but does not account for the subsistence economy.

In the *Education* domain the potential indicators are:

- The ratio of students successfully completing post-secondary education opportunities
- The proportion of students pursuing post-secondary education opportunities
- The Proportion of graduates who are still in the community 10 years later.

¹ At the SAO Meeting in Copenhagen on 13 November 2010, SAOs warmly welcomed the work of the AHHEG, congratulated on successful seminar and encouraged further SDWG-AMAP cooperation in the field of human health.

These indicators give a picture of the role of education in contributing to the well-being of Arctic communities.

In the *Cultural Well-being* domain the potential indicators are:

- Language vitality
- Cultural autonomy
- Belonging
- Composite indicator of cultural vitality (cultural autonomy, language retention, belonging)

For example, the indicator on *Language vitality* recognizes that language holds extensive cultural knowledge, and functions as a link among generations necessary to the practice and retention of cultures.

In the *Contact with Nature* domain the potential indicators are:

- Consumption and/or harvest of country food
- Number of people or households engaged in the traditional economy

Using the example of *Consumption and/or harvest of country food*, this indicator was chosen because of the centrality of food consumption, the availability of data and ability to collect those data, and generalizability of this concept across Arctic.

In the *Fate Control* domain the indicators are grouped under:

- Political Power and Political Activism & Human Rights
- Decision-making power & Human Rights
- Economic Control & Human Rights
- Knowledge Construction & Human Rights

While the ASI team acknowledges the challenges and limitations of a composite index, the intention is to use a composite index of fate control incorporating elements from each of the four categories. These components highlight key areas of collective empowerment; the components are relevant; the data are accessible; and the costs are reasonable.

The recommendations flowing from the phase I work on ASI are directed at addressing data challenges and the need for an Arctic Social Indicators monitoring system:

- Design an Arctic Social Indicator monitoring system to meet the following objectives:
 - Data are available at a regional level;
 - Data are available separately for indigenous and non-indigenous populations;
 - Data are available on at least a five-year reporting period.
- ASI indicators are based on existing published data National statistical agencies should be encouraged to participate in development of a meta database identifying ASI indicators that are already monitored by a national agency and published in hard copy or electronic form.
- For ASI indicators requiring special tabulations, it is recommended that an international task force composed of national statistical agency analysts and Arctic researchers be established to identify the special tabulations required to produce comparable ASI indicators and to recommend approaches to produce these special tabulations.
- In respect of ASI indicators requiring primary data collection, it is recommended that *ASI Phase Two* be initiated with the objective of testing ASI indicators, including those produced in collaboration with funded research primary data collection projects.

Each chapter of the final report is very comprehensive but challenges of data availability and data compatibility remain.

The final ASI report from phase 1 of the project will be released first on the web. The hard copy version is currently at the printers.

The project will now move into Phase II which involves measurement and testing of indicators. Phase II will be implemented 2009-2011 to:

- systematically identify and describe data challenges, including data availability and data quality by region for each of the final set of recommended ASI indicators as well as select other and promising Arctic social indicators considered in ASI Phase I;
- refine the ASI indicators where needed based on further research, testing, and feedback from northern communities and other arctic stakeholders;
- conduct a series of regional comparisons and analyses based on measured ASI indicators to illustrate and further test their strength and applicability;
- formulate recommendations for a long-term monitoring system; and
- present the final results in a format that targets a broad audience and which at the same time makes the report useful in educational instruction in the University of the Arctic and other northern colleges and universities.

A workshop on Phases II is scheduled for Roskilde on November 13-14, 2009.

During the discussions that followed the presentation it was noted by SDWG Vice-Chair Olsen (ICC) that ASI is an ongoing activity and a follow-up of the AHDR. The project has been welcomed and accepted by the Arctic Council at its Ministerial meeting in Tromsø in April 2009 on the basis of the draft report which was made available on the SDWG website for several months prior to the Ministerial. ASI Phase I can be anticipated to be very important for decision-making in the SDWG and the Arctic Council and the SDWG is looking forward to Phase II of the report.

In response to a question as to whether the ASI authors looked at the history of the Arctic to determine why the situation is as it is today and whether it is possible to quantify the self-determination and cultural dimensions, Dr. Larsen noted that ASI authors did indeed look backward as well as forward to get a sense of what was going on. Fate control includes control over land and some of these appeared to be a proxy for self-determination. Phase II will be to determine if these are in fact usable indicators and valuable proxies.

The Saami Council observed that often decisions are made on the basis of assumptions rather than information, so this ASI work supplies some of that information. On education, the focus is on post secondary education. An important measure is how many who have completed this education are still in the communities 10 years after. Dr. Larsen advised that these questions have been of concern in the ASI work. The ASI project is trying to find the measures that are available quite easily and without huge costs. The idea is to follow up to try to find information on the other measures indicated in the chapters.

It was also noted by the Saami Council that at *Convention on Biological Diversity* a task group on article 8(j), has discussed an indicator on linguistic diversity as one indicator for determining protection of traditional knowledge. People who are working on this have been aware of the ASI work so it is useful. ILO 169 has also taken on the task of traditional occupations work. So there may be an opportunity for the ASI project to make some connections to the outcomes of this work.

In response to a question as to whether these indicators fit all the various groups, or fit better in some areas of the Arctic than in others, Dr. Larsen advised that these questions are at the centre of phase II which will test the indicators and refine them. If their validity can be shown, then there could be

some guidance for policy-makers. Their use in all parts of the Arctic is a question already asked within the ASI team. Some of the first 3 indicators might, for example, be better suited to indigenous communities. There is a lack of data and data quality for some indicators. So it will be necessary to describe and address this gap and how this impacts issues in the Arctic.

The Chair concluded this item by noting that this good work will provide support for ongoing work within the SDWG.

b. Arctic Energy Summit (AES)

The USA reported on this item. The Institute of the North was the partner implementing this as an IPY/SDWG project. The final report is delayed because of changes in personal at the Institute. The final report is anticipated in mid-December. It was recommended that any issues flowing from the final report could be dealt with at the SDWG spring meeting in 2010. Iceland pointed out the website for the AES is no longer running but the webcasts from the conference in October 2007 are still available on the Arctic Portal (<http://arcticportal.org>). The Arctic Portal is intending to develop an energy portal which could be a place for the final report and other information on Arctic energy issues.

c. Economy of the North 2008 (ECONOR II)

Norway reported on this item and advised that the published hard copy of the report was being shipped to Copenhagen and would be available at this meeting. The project coordinator could be available to make a presentation on the final report at the next SDWG next meeting.

The Economy of the North 2008 is available online at the Statistics Norway website (http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/00/00/30/sa_economy_north/) and at SDWG website.

d. Others

i. Reindeer herding, traditional knowledge and adaptation to climate change and loss of grazing land (EALAT)

Dr. Mikhail Pogodaev (Chair), Anders Oskal, and Anna Degteva of the Association of World Reindeer Herders provided a status report on the EALAT project. Norway, the Russian Federation, the Saami Council, RAIPON and the Arctic Portal have all made contributions to the ongoing work. Climate change continues to be the issue of major concern. There have been about nine completed community-based workshops with approximately six additional workshops planned, including in Sweden and Alaska.

In accordance with the Yakutsk Declaration 2005, which supported the taiga reindeer husbandry in cooperation with the Government of the Sakha Republic, the Administration of the Aldan region and local authorities of the Khatystyr village, the EALAT team organized the second IPY EALAT workshop on 22-25 February 2009 in the Evenki village of Khatystyr in the Sakha Republic. This workshop included discussions about climate change and the loss of grazing lands resulting from industrial development of hydro, uranium, energy pipelines as well as other development activities. There is a need for continuing dialogue and sharing of information between reindeer herders, authorities and developers. Local authorities have supplied some financial backing for the establishment of a new Information Centre for Taiga Reindeer Husbandry in Khatystyr, Sakha Republic.

Anna Degteva, who is a PhD student at St.Petersburg State University, provided a report on a community-based seminar held in Khralovo, Yamal, in February 2009. This seminar took place near the most northerly railway which was built to access the gas fields in the region. Forty (40) reindeer

herders, scientists and local authorities discussed climate change, Traditional Knowledge, development pressures, and management issues.

Anders Oskal, the director of the International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry, then reported on the Reindeer Herders' Professional Day held at the 4th World Reindeer Herders Congress which took place in Kautokeino, Norway on 31 March 2009. This event included a panel on development impacts and adaptation. In addition there was discussion about:

- development of courses on impact assessments for reindeer herding youth
- further standards and guidelines for developers
- impacts of future climate change
- implementation of a "no net loss-policy" in relation to grazing land and
- development of an integrated management plan for land areas in the Barents region.

Within the University of the Arctic, a virtual institute - University of the Arctic EALÁT Institute for Circumpolar Reindeer Husbandry – has been established to contribute to knowledge of the challenges of circumpolar reindeer husbandry, including local capacity building relating to climate change and development issues. Dr. Robert W. Corell has agreed to be the first professor of this institute.

During discussions the project coordinators were congratulated for their extensive work, particularly in Russia. It was noted that there is potential for collaboration between EALAT and the Arctic Biodiversity Assessment (ABA). There are two Traditional Knowledge coordinators for the ABA and some contact has already been made.

ii. Action Arctic ICT

Sweden provided a status report on this project. The project coordinator advised that partners in Action Arctic ICT include Sweden, Norway, USA, Canada, Slovenia and some Permanent Participants.

Action Arctic ICT is a Swedish-led Initiative to develop ICT solutions for Arctic populations, especially the rural populations. Arctic Action ICT is coordinated by Luleå University of Technology, Sweden. This European project is a development of the previous nationally funded Sámi Network Connectivity project. It is part of the EU 7th Framework Program ICT project on Networking for Communications Challenged Communities, N4C.

N4C is an ICT research and development project which also contributes to policy development. N4C jointly studies the problem of making available broadband communication for areas that today lack coverage and developing Delay Tolerant Networks (DTN) for such areas. N4C develops test beds to study possible techniques and usage. Some of the aims of the N4C project are to test its use for tracking reindeer, for the use by hikers in the mountains, and to transfer meteorological and environmental data. Technical progress continues. Three field tests have been carried out in Swedish Lapland and one in the Tromsø area (about three months totally). One deliverable of particular interest is the pervasive applications intermediate report. The responsible partner for this deliverable was the Norwegian partner Norut. In July 2009 N4C organized a workshop on "User Driven Development for Communications Challenged Communities" during the *Future Internet* Research and Experimentation week in Luleå, "

An Action Arctic ICT one-day workshop will be held in Tromsø, Norway in January 2010. The exact dates are not set but it will be either Tuesday 26th - Thursday 28th January 2010. The local host will be Norut. The event is organised by Luleå University of Technology and N4C partner Tannak AB, Jokkmokk, Sweden. The workshop theme is *Test beds for Rural Communities and Arctic*

Conditions. Test beds are currently thought of as key tools for knowledge-society advancement. Both technical, community and business model topics will be covered.

Attendance is expected from the N4C project including the Technical Advisory Board (remote participation), the North Calotte Council, the Norwegian Polar Institute and Sámi representatives. SDWG participants are also welcome. The contact for this event is Maria Udén via e-mail maria.uden@ltu.se or telephone +46-(0)70-5334978. Information is also available on the website: http://www.itek.norut.no/norut_troms/om_oss/ansatte_i_norut_troms/sjursen_sigurd.

iii. ArcticStat

Canada provided a status report on this project. The first stage of ArcticStat was completed with the creation of the website (<http://www.arcticstat.org/>). The long-term sustainability of Arcticstat was an issue flagged at the outset. The integration of data collection in relation to socio-economic issues is important for the work of SDWG but also for cross-cutting issues within the Arctic Council and the overall human dimension of the Arctic.

The project coordinator recalled that when the idea of ArcticStat was first presented to the SDWG there were about 100 tables with a few indicators and a few regions. There are now more than 30 regions covered with more than 5300 tables. From the first month of its launch, there were about 1500 visits per month; however, more recently there have been about 23,000 per month. The replication of this model is often requested. What is now required is the translation into English of tables from Russia, Finland, Sweden and Greenland. This cannot be done with translation machines.

The project would like to work with new indicators in the areas of public finance, health, crime and justice. In relation to health statistics there is good potential for cooperation with AHHEG. A “tool box” will be offered on the website to make comparisons of currencies, purchasing power parities, and so on. So far, ArcticStat only has data from national statistics bureaus. Many valid tables produced by researchers need to be added so this knowledge is available (e.g. ASI, SLiCA). This will allow ArcticStat to reach one of its goals as a repository of human data and have this recognized by the SDWG.

All of these items are challenging. Working with national statistics agencies is important and will attempt to work on new indicators in cooperation with ASI. There have been some discussions with Permanent Participants about putting together a major project on the status of societies in each region. Rather than work on sectors, the intention would be to examine the global reality of each region by integrating all the factors involved in the region. In this connection, ArcticStat would like to work with SLiCA, AHHEG and ASI. The ECONOR II report provides an example of how this might look.

In conclusion it was noted that efforts will need to be made to secure the long-term financing of ArcticStat.

During the discussions, the Co-vice Chair Olsen noted that in the current program of the ABA there is a section on linguistic biodiversity, but there were some discrepancies with the UNESCO data and inquired whether this be covered in ArcticStat. The project coordinator advised that there are tables in ArcticStat on this matter but they come from national statistics bureaus. If there are problems, there might be a way to work on this to reduce them. This could be included in the ArcticStat objectives for the future.

It was also noted that linkages to other Arctic Council projects could be part of ArcticStat’s future objectives. Such a tool has to be user friendly and easily accessible. Putting some of this human

data together with nature information and climate change information would give us a contextual picture of the Arctic. The presentation of the data is important in understanding the human role in nature. The Arctic Data Project initiated by CAFF and PAME is important, as is AMAP data, so connections among projects will be a key consideration. More importantly this is very relevant to SAON.

iv. Circumpolar Information Tool Kit on Minerals, and Oils and Gas for Indigenous People and Northern Communities

Canada reported that a steering committee has been set up and there is a teleconference planned to discuss the project outline. Canada's Head of Delegation will provide an update to the next meeting of the SDWG.

v. Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic SLICA

This is a Denmark/Greenland-led project. The project coordinator reported that all data have been gathered including for the Saami areas in Norway, Sweden and the Kola peninsula. Finland is still not included but there is some progress on this front. For the first time data was presented in a conference setting for the seminar on Hope and Resilience In Suicide Prevention. Some input on methodologies was given. A joint report to the SDWG and the SAOs during the spring 2010 will be made to compare data for the Inuit, Saami and peoples of Chukotka. The Nordic Council of Ministers has given some funding as a follow-up to the IPY to facilitate making available data on human issues.

The project coordinator read the following statement for the record on behalf of RAIPON as part of the SLiCA team:

"For indigenous communities of the Russian Federation it is important to continue the work of the SLCIA project. For instance basing on the results of the research the modelling of deviant behaviours shall be developed in order to deeply understand the problem of suicide behaviours among indigenous peoples of Russia and to prevent the problem in future. There is a need to establish special medical centres which should take into consideration specifics of indigenous cultures and hold relevant medical, psychological and cultural research."

vi. International Circumpolar Surveillance: Prevention and Control of Emerging Infectious Diseases in the Arctic (ICS)

The USA advised that a written status report on this project was circulated well in advance of this meeting and this document is available on the SDWG website: <http://portal.sdwg.org>.

vii. Advancing Alcohol & Drug Abuse Treatment in the Circumpolar North

The USA advised that this USA-led project was under the management of the Northern Forum. While there had been some work with some partners in Russia, currently there are no concrete plans to continue this work.

viii. Research & Action Plan for Human Health Risk Reduction in the Arctic

This is a Russian-led project. No report was available for this item.

4. New Project proposals

a. Arctic Indigenous Languages

This item was chaired by Co-Vice Chair Carl Christian Olsen. Canada advised that it is prepared to do follow-up work to the languages symposium held in 2008 and is engaged in scoping this work in cooperation with ICC. (The recommendations from the *Arctic Indigenous Languages Symposium* are online at www.arcticlanguages.com.) The scoping study would:

- design consultation
- undertake consultation
- compile a report to SDWG on a work plan

The objective is to prepare a plan by April 2010 which would set out short, medium and longer term work on languages. To keep costs down, step one would be to use questionnaires, emails and phone communications. A full scale proposal could be the end product. Ministers supported language work within the council. This process will also obtain more information about individual initiatives such as the Aleut International Association (AIA) proposed study and how it could fit into a long term languages plan.

During discussions, ICC noted that language retention is a very important dimension of Arctic peoples, as was referenced in the ASI report. ICC expressed appreciation for the role given to the Permanent Participants to take the lead in the symposium. AIA stressed that languages are a key and in some cases urgent priority, and this needs to be taken into account in any work plan. GCI also noted that the issue is more than just languages, it is also about culture and health and other dimension of Arctic life. The Saami Council observed that this work is linked to the *Convention on Biological Diversity* and the role of languages in protecting biodiversity. Russia made reference to their proposed electronic memory project which includes sound files comprising some 2000 fragments in 30 languages.

Arctic states expressed consensus support for the approach suggested by Canada. In summarizing this agenda item, Co-vice Chair Olsen advised about some other initiatives after the Tromso Ministerial Meeting, including a Sakha initiative in September 2009 on indigenous languages which had some connections to UNESCO. An Inuit Summit in February 2010 will also discuss languages issues. Other groups are dealing with linguistic diversity and he noted that CAFF will be making a related presentation to the SDWG about this under agenda item 6. He also noted that reliable indicators and statistics are required to feed into a framework for action and suggested ArcticStat may be relevant in this regard.

b. Aleut International Association Languages Proposal

The Aleut International Association introduced this item by noting that the Aleut language is one of 14 languages with less than 100 speakers. A written project proposal circulated by the AIA prior to the SDWG meeting and is available on the SDWG website. The objective is to bring together experts from Russia and the USA, as well as indigenous peoples to discuss with the Aleut language, including the recording of languages. The project coordinator will be an expert on Aleut languages from St. Petersburg. Some recordings of the language are available on wax cylinders. The AIA is seeking endorsement for the project from the SDWG and Arctic Council. Funding is being sought from the USA National Science Foundation.

During discussions Co-Vice Chair Olsen observed that this work on language vitalization could form part of the framework being explored as a follow-up to Arctic Languages Symposium. The Saami

Council agreed that this work can contribute to wider consideration of indigenous languages and suggested that maybe one day there will be indigenous languages assessments. There is some urgency on this matter and several interventions expressed hope the Arctic Council will support this project.

There was to consensus that this is important work and there was also support for AIA to proceed with its efforts on this matter as an endorsed project.

c. BEPOMAR II

Norway introduced this item, noting that impact assessments are required in offshore petroleum development in relation to environmental and socio-economic impacts. It would be useful to study these sorts of processes around the Arctic and extract observed best practices from these processes. Some common guidelines could be developed for such activities. Norway undertook to work further on this proposal and come forward with more information at the next meeting.

During discussions a question was raised as to the connection between this project and PAME's proposed Arctic Ocean Review. Norway explained that the PAME work is more involved in environmental concerns. This BEPOMAR II project proposal would be more socio-economic in nature and could engage petroleum ministries in order to look at positive issues of socio-economics, not just negative environmental impacts.

d. Cultural Heritage

Norway introduced this item and reminder participants that the original project proposal had been brought to the SDWG during the Norwegian chairmanship (March 2008). A revised project proposal had been circulated before this SDWG meeting and had also been posted on the SDWG website. This presentation was on the objectives and approaches to the project. Some issues raised in prior discussions have not been finally concluded so Norway advised that they were "in a listening mood" and would like reactions to the current proposal. Revisions could then be made and the hope was that an intersessional process could be used to get final approval of this project.

The project coordinator advised that Indigenous peoples' participation had been clarified. An objective of the project would be to bring cultural heritage into the forefront given the changes afoot in the Arctic. There are now more visitors and more economic activity in the circumpolar region. The profile of some cultural sites in the Arctic should be raised. It was proposed that a small group of experts should get together to agree on criteria for this list. These experts would work through their own national networks. The lists of sites can then be forwarded to the Arctic Council. This would be in addition to any national sites which have been identified for special attention. It is expected that there would be a few sites with international importance; national sites should be dealt with nationally.

The intention is not to introduce these Arctic sites as world heritage sites, but rather to take into account the appropriate level of protection and recognition. Not every country necessarily needs to identify sites for the list. The hope is that the group of experts would approach this process from an international perspective rather than a national perspective. An objective is to strengthen the bonds within the Arctic. There could be an agreement on ethical principles or guidelines so that each Arctic state could use these to protect their sites.

The desire is have a relatively small group to do the work on this project but each member of this small group is expected to have an extensive group or network to draw upon. There is no preconceived idea about what sorts of sites should be included on this final list.

During the discussions there was general support for this sort of project but some outstanding questions were identified. For example, the terminology of "ethical principles" might be somewhat

problematic so it might be preferable to use the term “best practices”. If the idea is to constantly update any list, this should be clarified in the proposal. Development of criteria for creating the list will need to take into account the UNESCO world heritage site process so that conflicts are avoided. As a matter of information it would be helpful to know if there are other inhabited places that have done something like this. In addition the time frame and budget required to carry out the project should be clarified.

In response to a question as to whether unique natural formations fall into this project, Norway clarified that natural sites could be included because of their cultural value.

The Saami Council observed that while the proposal now mentions the indigenous peoples and the Permanent Participants, it would be helpful during the next stage of development of the proposal if there could be some declaration on the role of Permanent Participants in the design of project and to show how the Permanent Participants can be actively involved in the conduct of the project. In this regard some clarification of amounts available for their participation could be included in the budget for the project, as suggested in the Reykjavik Ministerial Declaration in 2004. It was also noted that Permanent Participants might have different criteria for what is considered a cultural heritage monument and it was recommended that this should also be reflected in the next iteration of the proposal. There will need to be discussions about the need to be respectful of sites that indigenous peoples do not want to be listed. It might, for example, be possible to develop guidelines for this. It was noted that CAFF and RAIPON had a joint project on sacred sites in 2004 and this might provide some useful background. The Saami Council advised that it would like to participate in this project.

ICC, GCI and AAC also expressed a desire for clarifications and further consultation on how the indigenous peoples will actually be involved, particularly in relation to funding issues.

Russia noted that this project could have linkages to their proposed Electronic Memory Project and expressed an interest in discussing this further with Norway.

e. Vulnerability and Adaptation to Climate Change in the Arctic (VACCA II)

Norway advised that for now it would be withdrawing this project. They had initially considered developing a database of activities but now there is some uncertainty about the usefulness of this approach. Norway is open to ideas that can be useful to everyone given the broad variations in circumstances across the Arctic.

The Saami Council noted that EALAT is on the agenda as an adaptation project and suggested that perhaps additional resources could be given to EALAT.

There was general consensus that the SDWG should continue to consider work in the field of adaptation because climate change will affect lives in cities and towns in the Arctic.

f. Electronic Memory of the Arctic Proposal (EMA)

The Russian Federation introduced this item. The Electronic Memory Project is intended to be a combination of electronic library, electronic archive and electronic museum in order to provide access to the history of the Arctic and its present circumstances. The project participants will include the Russian National Library in St Petersburg, an electronic publisher, RusAr, and a publishing house, Severnye Prostory. During the second stage of the project the intention is to have participation from major research institutes in Russia. During the third stage, regional information sources would be included. The project is supported in Russia by the Council of the Russian Federation, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Since the initial project proposal there have been some developments and changes in the project. The development of full specifications for the technical and technological infrastructure for project has been completed. At this stage the decision is to use

the infrastructure of NEL and NESD based in the Russian National Library (RNL) in St Petersburg and in Yamal, Salekhard. Information resources for the project will be developed by RNL and RusAr and financed within the framework of the NEL project. The development of an EMA portal was started and includes:

- 1 - electronic content and database structure
- 2 - usage of software development instrumental sets
- 3 - database protocols.

The model outlined by Russia for this project would involve “national segments” based on the national libraries or archives of the Arctic states. Each Arctic state could take responsibility for developing its own national segment. Technical discussions would be necessary to address and harmonize what, when, how and by whom, materials will be digitized.

During the discussions it was noted with appreciation that Russia is taking the initiative in making available the cultural and linguistic heritage and others can follow this example. This project might provide an example of a comprehensive tool for accessing information on languages and cultures in the Arctic. Iceland the Arctic Portal was referenced as a possible tool to make data available. In response to a question about the involvement of Permanent Participants in this project Russia advised that in the national electronic sound depository there are fragments of rare languages and there are few people who know anything about these languages, but the internet can make these accessible to others.

It was suggested that it would be very helpful if Russia could do a demonstration of this project at some point so as to foster discussions about the kind of participation might be possible from other SDWG delegations. Russia advised that a demonstration would not be possible at the next SDWG meeting (early March 2010) but Russia would appreciate support to develop a common plan. Russia estimated that in approximately 6 months it could be possible to demonstrate the proposal; stage 1 (see above) will be done by mid-2010 and there will be interesting content available by then.

The Chair concluded by encouraging Russia to consider a demonstration of the project and anticipated that this might bring along some good participation from others.

g. Others

Norway introduced a possible new project area for consideration, namely a follow-up on an informal meeting during the Norwegian chairmanship between the chair of SAOs/Working Groups and representatives of the oil and gas industry. Norway is considering whether it might be possible to have a conference or workshop with the petroleum industry to talk about the requirements for and obstacles to operations in the Arctic. This could foster interesting and open discussions on important Arctic energy issues, some of which are identified in the *SDWG Report to Ministers on Arctic Energy*, the *AMAP Arctic Oil and Gas Assessment*, the PAME work on *Arctic Marine Shipping* and new oil and gas guidelines, etc. This could lead to a short report that might suggest ways to facilitate better dialogue on these issues.

6. Work Program and Cross-cutting Activities

a. Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF)

Under this item the Chair of the CAFF Working Group made a presentation on CAFF’s work program and possible areas for cooperation with SDWG.

CAFF has five main project/ activity areas:

- Arctic Biodiversity Assessment (ABA)
- Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP)
- Flora Group
- Seabird Group
- Ecosystems in the Russian Arctic (ECORA): An Integrated Ecosystem Management Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimise Habitat Fragmentation in Three Selected Model Areas in the Russian Arctic

The ABA (see: www.caff.is/aba) is designed to synthesize and assess the status and trends of biological diversity in Arctic. The co-leads for the ABA are Greenland/Denmark, Finland and the USA. The assessment will compile up-to-date baseline data from scientific sources and Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK). In addition it will identify gaps in data records, identify main stressors and identify key mechanisms driving change. Recommendations will be included in the assessment.

A report entitled *Arctic Biodiversity Trends 2010* is currently being finalized to be published in 2010 during the UN International Biodiversity Year. This report will provide a preliminary assessment of the status and trends of Arctic biodiversity, together with selected indicators of change. It will also measure progress towards the *2010 Convention on Biological Diversity* target “to reduce the rate of biodiversity loss”. The full ABA science report is scheduled for completion in 2013, for example, with chapters on ecosystem services, genetic diversity, conservation issues and so on.

Some areas for potential cooperation with SDWG include:

- review of ABA texts (e.g. prior to finalization in 2010)
- resource management (e.g. in relation to marine mammals; seabirds; reindeer/caribou, etc.)
- data management (e.g. in relation to the CAFF/PAME ArcticData project; SDWG data; Links with SDWG projects such as ArcticStat)
- community monitoring (e.g. development of a project inventory; workshops, etc.)
- communications and outreach.

In terms of cooperation, the CAFF Chair stressed that this is an initial opportunity to exchange ideas and share impressions. In particular, the work of the SDWG on socio-economic issues and languages issues has some potential for cooperative and collaborative activities between the working groups.

The Chair of Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP) provided an overview of the program and potential linkages with SDWG work. The CBMP is the CAFF response to the *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA)* report recommendations to expand and enhance long-term Arctic biodiversity monitoring; to expand the international network to improve detection, understanding and reporting of Arctic biodiversity trends; to create a focal point for cutting-edge Arctic biodiversity information; and to find ways to streamline reporting processes and products that are useful to governments and local communities.

CBMP is led by Canada out of an office in Whitehorse, Yukon with funding several sources, including Canada, EC, Finland, Norway, Sweden and U.S.A. The program is currently in year 2 of a five-year implementation plan. There are some 600 partners and the CBMP has strategic links to the ABA; Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks (SAON); the State of Arctic Reporting; the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators partnership; and the Global Earth Observation-Biodiversity Observation Network.

The program areas include coordinating and integrating Arctic biodiversity monitoring, data management and reporting; capacity building to facilitate uptake of community-based monitoring; and communication and outreach on biodiversity.

For the coordinated monitoring component there are Expert Monitoring Groups (Marine, Coastal, Freshwater, Terrestrial Fauna and Terrestrial Flora); an ecosystem-based, network of networks; a forum for scientists and community experts (best monitoring practices); and pan-Arctic, integrated monitoring plans. In addition there are several existing monitoring frameworks (e.g. Protected Areas, Arctic Marine Mammals, Seabirds).

In relation to coordinated data management, work is based in Cambridge UK but there is a distributed network, where each node in the network has control of its own data, with different levels of permission and access.

In respect of coordinated reporting, work is ongoing to develop biodiversity indicators and indices. These indicators are based largely on the *Convention on Biological Diversity* indicators. Currently the CBMP Biodiversity Indices include:

- Arctic Species Trend Index
- Arctic Red List Index
- Arctic Trophic Level Index
- Arctic Wilderness Index
- Arctic Human well-being Index

Approximately 23 other indicators have been identified for development.

Above all, the CBMP objective is to add value by:

- making monitoring coordinated, more powerful and cost-effective
- developing and promoting best monitoring practices and new tools
- involving Arctic people in monitoring and interpretation of results; and
- making current and accurate information on Arctic biodiversity accessible to decision-makers and the public.

A few potential areas which could be considered for collaboration between CAFF and the SDWG are:

- development of indicators and indices, for example, in relation to an Arctic Human Well-being Index which measures ecosystem integrity for Arctic habitats and their ability to provide services for local communities, such as the availability of biodiversity for traditional foods and medicines; and
- community based monitoring approaches.

During the discussions the SDWG Chair thanked CAFF for these excellent presentations and commended them on their ability to mobilize so many partners to cooperate on this work. The SDWG Chair invited Heads of Delegation and SDWG project leaders to comment on the very good examples of areas for collaboration.

As a general comment it was noted that a wise approach would be to look into reviewing each other's projects and work programs before moving to possible joint projects. In respect of assistance in reviewing the ABA texts, it was stated by some SDWG representatives it would be good to know specific matters on which CAFF would like feedback.

For example, it would be helpful to know where the SDWG might contribute to CAFF work during the Danish chairmanship. One area mentioned in the CAFF presentations was the Arctic indigenous languages and their relationship to biodiversity. It was noted by the CAFF Executive Secretary that CAFF has looked briefly at language diversity and change over 75 languages. Eleven languages have apparently become extinct over the past 20 years. CAFF would like to share this text on languages and have the SDWG comment on it.

The project leader for ArcticStat observed that there are many potential opportunities for cooperation. In the Arctic the social dimension is closely connected to nature. The SDWG is doing many studies on social systems in the Arctic. Some collaboration on data sharing is already occurring across projects and Working Groups. ArcticStat has data on languages already and can add to this to help better understand human well-being in the Arctic. The project leader for SLiCA echoed this observation. A central objective of SLiCA has been the collection of comprehensive data sets relating to human well-being in the Arctic.

Another area mentioned was in connection with data management issues. It was noted that the SDWG is at a critical point in developing a strategic plan to address its own work and to assist in efforts to cooperate with other Working Groups on the human dimension. Development of an SDWG strategic plan is intended to make it possible to respond effectively to this type of request from CAFF for review and input.

In response to a question the Chair of the CBMP clarified that the work on a “Human Well-Being Index” had not yet started. It has been identified as a possibility and CAFF is looking for good ideas. CAFF reiterated that it does not have a mandate for socio-economic issues and therefore is looking more at whether people are meeting their needs in the use of species, etc. There are limited circumpolar data sets on these issues and CAFF only has a few very specific regional data bases.

It was noted that the SDWG work on Arctic Social Indicators (ASI) may be relevant for CAFF in its work on a Human Well-being Index. These indicators could also become a part of a broader set that fits into SAON. The new AHHEG group is also highly relevant to CAFF work because it is tied to biodiversity issues.

The ASI Project leader commented that there is good potential for ASI to collaborate with CAFF now that ASI is moving into the phase II testing and community studies on domains such as “Nature Issues”. There is good room here for collaboration. The Nature domain and the cultural domain both look at subsistence harvesting and languages retention. A Human Well-being Index is also of interest but ASI has moved away from this because of fears about how it might be used or misused to rank various communities or states.

The CAFF and SDWG Chairs concluded the discussions by noting that the next step is to try to develop the areas of cooperation that can be of practical use.

b. Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM)

Ms. Anna Enemark made a presentation on behalf of the Nordic Council of Ministers on the subject of the Northern Dimension Cultural Partnership. The NCM has played a role during 2009 in the preparatory process in order to establish the Northern Dimension Cultural Partnership by providing secretariat services. The process started under the Finnish presidency of the NCM (2007). A Nordic policy group was struck to report on a potential partnership. In 2009 an *ad hoc* expert group was tasked with coming up a proposal and this was done in September 2009. The four regional councils in the North are recognized in the Northern Dimension Policy Framework Document as “participants” to the ND policy.

There are now three (s) established partnerships. On 12 November 2009 the cultural partnership was to be formerly decided. It would be the 4th partnership of the Northern Dimension (ND). The partnerships would therefore be:

- The Environmental Partnership
- The Partnership in Public Health and Social Well-being
- The Partnership on Transport and Logistics
- The Partnership on Culture (NDCP)

The term “culture” is used broadly to include cultural and economic dimensions of culture and a future challenge is to identify how the partnership can create a platform for culture and creative industries within the Northern Dimension area. There is ongoing dialogue with cultural actors in the Northern Dimension area to identify potentially relevant projects for an ND Partnership on Culture. At the Helsinki Cultural Forum in 2009 there were several embassies involved so there is much interest in this political framework. An additional forum will be held in 2010 in St Petersburg.

Possible objectives for the partnership could include:

- a focal point for projects and networks;
- a forum for dialogue between cultural actors and the business community;
- a forum for possible coordination of cultural activities in the regional councils;
- an information sharing mechanism;
- a mechanism to screen the financial viability of projects;
- a way to mobilize public-private funding for collaboration;

Depending on funding arrangements, ND cultural products could be presented to international audiences in festivals, exhibitions and similar events. There could be analysis as to what different audiences in various countries and regions would like to experience in the ND area. It would also be possible to develop tools to develop tailor made cultural tourism in the ND region and to promote people to people cultural contacts.

The NCM will function as a preparatory secretariat for this work during 2010. This will be a planning year to prepare the partnership. The process is still very young and open to new ideas, and will evolve depending on levels of interest and practicalities.

Some potential areas for collaboration with the SDWG on cultural matters might include:

- safeguarding languages;
- information sharing on cultural projects; and
- cultural tourism with a primary focus on nature experiences.

During discussions the SDWG Chair observed that one immediate similarity is that the SDWG is also not a funded body. It appears that a main objective is branding and technical assistance to cultural industries but mobility and other projects might be possible. It was noted that Greenland had tried to open an “Arctic Window” in the Northern Dimension but the focus has been mainly to the east (i.e. Russia). So this new approach described in the presentation might allow a broader approach.

c. Socio-economics in Major Assessments

The Chair noted that the issue of socio-economic inputs into in major Arctic Council assessments would be dealt with during the discussions on strategic planning under agenda item 7. Therefore the Chair recommended that the SAON process and the role of the SDWG in the SAON initiative be discussed. The SDWG Chair noted that she had agreed on an interim basis to participate in the teleconference on SAON but a replacement should be nominated. Norway suggested that the project leader for ASI could be asked to participate in the SAON discussions as the SDWG representative. Ms. Joan Nymand Larsen confirmed that she was prepared to participate in SAON on behalf of the SDWG. The SDWG Executive Secretary will also continue to participate in the SAON teleconferences.

d. Approaches on a way forward

The Chair noted that this issue would also be dealt with during the discussions on strategic planning under agenda item 7.

7. Strategic Planning

a. Update on the Strategic Planning Task Force

Canada introduced this item and handed out an outline. It was noted that this exercise to develop a strategic framework and work plan was mandated during the Norwegian chairmanship. Since the SDWG regular meeting in Nuuk there have been consultations with a small Task force and an annotated terms of reference was sent to SAOs for their meeting this week. A template for project proposals has been developed from the Swedish paper. Canada expressed the view that an updated set of themes was required to guide the work of the SDWG. There are now have six themes and it will be necessary to consider whether the clusters are appropriate. In addition it will be necessary to address access to finances for SDWG work, especially to ensure the participation of the Permanent Participants.

An ongoing question will be whether or not it is appropriate to establish other expert groups, similar to AHHEG which was set up to help with health issues. Another approach might be to set up *ad hoc* round tables or other bodies, or alternatively rely on project leads to assist where appropriate. For some time the SDWG has been discussing how to respond to human dimension/socio-economic requests from other Working Groups. It is enough for project leaders to respond on behalf of the SDWG or is an in-house integrative mechanism required for this? All Arctic Council Working Groups have some type of human dimension. For the SWIPA project, AMAP simply moved forward on socio-economic issues without SDWG. SAOs and ministers are moving away from a silo approach and SDWG can expect increased demands for input in the future. Canada mentioned 9 potentially cross-cutting activities (but did not identify them). It was suggested that the SDWG needs an “early warning system” as to where the other Working Groups are going to need assistance on human dimension/socio-economic issues so that the SDWG can be prepared. This is particularly important as was reflected in the discussions with CAFF.

Canada encouraged that there be a discussion on how to develop the human development data component of the SDWG program. It was suggested that a workshop on this issue be held to talk about the existing data and anticipated requirements, in particular, to assess how the SDWG is meeting data needs and data dissemination. This could help the SDWG to develop a new slate of project and activities in the future to meet these criteria. The work of the SDWG to date has been characterized by issue specific and time specific projects. A workshop could look at our existing documentation on the human dimension and have the various project leaders in attendance to analyze best practices and

help inform the strategic plan. Other experts, representatives of statistical agencies, other Working groups, etc. could be engaged through this workshop also. Canada advised that it is prepared to host such a workshop and prepare a paper to inform the discussions for the workshop.

In terms of timelines for the workshop, it is now more challenging to make preparations before the next SDWG meeting given that the dates of the next meeting will be 03-04 March 2010. However, Canada is prepared to plan for the workshop on 01-02 March 2009. A draft plan might then be prepared for the fall of 2010. Canada requested reactions to these elements.

b. Discussions

During discussions there was general consensus that the SDWG must take steps to deal with the sorts of issues raised by Canada. Proposals for work will likely increase. There is currently a limit to the ability of the SDWG to meet these demands. Information dissemination is a key issue. It was noted that the timelines are very tight if a comprehensive integrated approach is required. Financing will also be a challenge.

There was also general agreement that the SDWG cannot simply let other Working Group take on the human dimension work and leave the SDWG to provide a review function. The SDWG has a broad mandate to fulfill. It was suggested that perhaps there is a lack of good ideas rather than a lack of will or funding. It was observed that sustainable development is a national issue and encouraging sustainable development in each Arctic country is a state responsibility. The SDWG mandate requires it to seek Arctic common issues rather than to attempt to create big projects that try to generate sustainable development everywhere. There is no other alternative except to keep on thinking about these common issues and suitable projects. Small and practical projects are still going to be helpful to Arctic communities. These might not change the world but cannot be overlooked.

As an example, ICC identified the issue of food security as a key issue and suggested it would be helpful as the SDWG proceeds with the development of a strategic plan include an analysis of the Arctic food chain. This is also an area where cooperation with the other Working Groups is possible.

The Project Leader for ArcticStat observed that a quick analysis of this challenge facing the SDWG suggests that it requires integrating a number of pieces of research of a disparate nature as well as integrating this data with other Arctic Council Working Group activities. To do this integration, a framework or model is required. It appears that few of the projects have taken the challenge of linking their research to a vision of sustainable development for the Arctic. He noted that the Rio Declaration gives us a lot of criteria. It would be possible to use a conceptual framework based on inputs-intermediation - outputs. He outlined an example based on food security: a large research program on food security was done over 5 years; it is possible to analyze this and come up with a diagnosis on food security. Similarly data from all the work of the SDWG and other Working Groups could also be incorporated into such a model. This could be analyzed on the basis of the criteria from the Rio Declaration. The consortium of people who could do this includes all researchers and Permanent Participants. This would allow the SDWG to draw a portrait of sustainable development in the Arctic and integrate it into a report or assessment that could be entitled "Sustainable Development in the Arctic". This approach could also help make it possible to assess gaps in the current work.

In response to this suggested approach, some participants commented that before doing the soliciting of projects and funds, it was necessary to first determine what the SDWG wanted to do: "Before dispatching researchers into communities, let's talk about how projects get brought to the table." The SDWG Chair observed that lack of funding has limited what the SDWG can bring to the table and has had a significant bearing on how the SDWG structures its work.

The Project leader for ASI commented that there seems to be a willingness to pool SDWG work and create synergies. IASSA could offer support to identify issues, themes and resources inside and outside of the Arctic Council that could be considered in the SDWG to address these issues. Immense resources are needed to do the socio-economic work in the circumpolar north. But some resources can be pooled and this can lead to better results.

In answer to Canada's offer to hold a workshop, there was consensus that this would be a useful exercise. It was not possible in the time given at this meeting to go through the Canadian paper and answer each of the questions posed there. Given the interesting input from project leaders and others and we need to consider how to structure this input. Should there be written submissions.

There was a divergence of views. On the one hand some participants thought the current SDWG system is working well and that the SDWG simply needs better ideas for projects. On the other hand some appear to take the view that the SDWG has too many already and that it is necessary to create more focus before identifying any new work. This raised the issue as to whether all work would stop until a strategic plan is done. It was stressed that it would be unproductive to allow "the study of our work to delay our work". It was suggested therefore that the practical work of the SDWG needed to continue. There seemed to be consensus that new work would be coming forward and it would not be possible to "put on the brakes" until a strategic plan was created. It was noted that there are already existing criteria for assessing project proposals but they seem not to have been rigorously applied. It was suggested that a project template be approved as soon as possible so that it could be used to assess and make decisions in respect of all future projects.

There was also consensus that the workshop proposed by Canada could look at integrative issues, synergies with Working Groups and so on. This workshop could be held in advance of the next SDWG meeting which will take place in Copenhagen on 03-04 March 2010.

Canada clarified that it would like comments on the paper "Sustainable Development Working Group STRATEGIC PLANNING 2011: Terms of Reference Framework" by email prior to a workshop. If there are comments on any substantive points in the paper, participants are encouraged to send them to Canada so that they can be considered by the Task Force. The general timelines in this paper appeared to be acceptable to participants.

The SDWG Chair concluded the discussions by noting that the SAOs have this Terms of Reference Framework paper and the SDWG will report to SAOs at their meeting this week.²

8. Joint meeting with AMAP

Approximately 20 participants from the AMAP working group joined the SDWG participants on the afternoon of day 2 of the regular SDWG meeting to conduct a joint AMAP/SDWG session. The AMAP Chair recalled the last joint meeting of AMAP/SDWG in May 2008. These joint sessions are an opportunity to talk about areas of common interest and how the groups can work together. Three issues were initially identified for discussions: Arctic human health, SAON and socio-economic issues in major assessments. The SDWG and AMAP chairs agreed that there is complementarity between the AMAP human health group and the AHHEG. AMAP deals mainly with contaminants. AHHEG's 5 priorities are set at a high level and the two groups could work effectively on a health risk advisory strategy, for example for contaminants. The two groups may even utilize the same secretariat based at the University of Tromsø. Given a recent meeting on Arctic human health in Oulu in which the AMAP

² At the SAO Meeting in Copenhagen on 13 November 2010, SAOs took note of the progress of the work with a strategic plan for the SDWG and encouraged that the issues attached to project approval were included in the strategic plan.

expert group and the new SDWG AHHEG participated, it was decided to only proceed with discussions on socio-economic issues and SAON.

a. Socio-Economic Issues:

The AMAP Chair noted that socio-economic issues were discussed in the joint AMAP/SDWG meeting in May 2008 in the context of SWIPA. Given the short timelines, SDWG was unable to participate so AMAP requested IASSA to supply the socio-economic data. AMAP is under increasing pressure from SAOs and Ministers to include socio-economic input in its major assessments. These pressures will likely increase in the future so it would be helpful to know what kind of activities are going on in SDWG in this regard. Adding this human dimension enriches these assessments. Human health and socio-economic components are included in SWIPA which will be delivered in 2011.

Morten Olsen provided a report on the SWIPA work. He noted that AMAP had been mandated by the Arctic Council to work on 3 components relating to the cryosphere: the Greenland ice sheet, sea ice and snow and ice. AMAP is well acquainted with working with natural science but less so on socio-economic issues and impacts. Therefore, AMAP sought input from social sciences to contribute to the SWIPA modules. In order to coordinate this work, a SWIPA IT team was developed. Lead authors and others working on the assessment have become the steering group for project.

It became apparent that it is necessary to integrated across the 3 modules. When AMAP looked at human impacts it was clear that these were happening across the cyrosphere. A cross-cutting description of the changes affecting society were needed in the assessment. Professor Birger Poppel from Greenland was involved in this work, as was IASSA. This has been a good addition to the steering team. The first draft of the SWIPA report is emerging but at this stage releasing the draft would be premature. An effort is being made to look at all relevant research and data. At the Potsdam meeting of leader authors there will be discussion of overlaps and integration of the draft. A revised draft will be sent out to other Working Groups for review and comment. The SDWG should be involved at this stage.

Preliminary results from the SWIPA, where socio- economic issues are concerned, are not as well documented as for the natural sciences. There is more grey literature and AMAP is using the same criteria as the IPCC to deal with this material. Some impacts on humans might be described but when it comes to adaptation this is a more difficult task because there is a lack of data.

The time lines for SWIPA are as follows:

- the “cross-fertilization process among lead authors will take place in January 2010 so realistically a useful draft document should be available for circulation by March 2010;
- comments on the draft would then be required by early autumn 2010.

Canada provided a brief description of the SDWG strategic planning process and stated that this would be an ongoing process, in part to help address socio-economic requirements in large assessments and cross-cutting activities. It was noted that there will be a workshop in March 2010 to take stock and suggest ways to deal with socio-economic data requirements in the future. It was observed that the SDWG is often asked to respond to requests for socio-economic input on very short notice and it would be helpful to know what is coming forward from other working groups. Chairs of Working Groups could meet more to discuss their programs and ways to cooperate.

The AMAP Chair advised that AMAP is going through similar processes given the pressures from Arctic Council regarding the socio-economic data and impacts. Natural scientists are facing the same struggles. AMAP is also talking about these data requirements internally and agrees that SDWG and AMAP need to keep the lines of communication open.

The SDWG Chair noted that it is sometimes not that easy to get funding from outside for “a corner of a project” so for the SDWG to get funds to participate in the socio-economic dimensions of a major environmental assessment can be difficult. Perhaps a “user pay” approach needs to be considered and could be built into AMAP projects. Natural science seems to be better funded than social sciences. SDWG is considering the possibility of a socio-economic expert group but could only do this if it is sustainable.

The AMAP Chair stated that funding is an ongoing problem AMAP also and AMAP often has to go back to national delegations for more money. SWIPA, for example, is not fully funded. Nonetheless, socio-economic issues will increase not decrease.

b. Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks (SAON)

The SDWG Chair advised AMAP that the new representative from SDWG who will participate in the SAON process will be Joan Nymand Larsen. The SDWG Executive Secretary will also continue to participate.

The SAON Chair, John Calder, made a presentation on the SAON process. He reminded participants that the Salekhard Declaration had requested long-term monitoring as a legacy for IPY focusing on societal needs. The SAON vision is that users should have access to free, open and high-quality data that will realize pan-Arctic and global value-added services and provide societal benefits. To attain the vision, SAON’s goal is to enhance Arctic-wide observing activities through coordination and integration and to promote sharing and synthesis of data and information.

SAON is not an observing network. It is to help the networks improve their functioning. SAON was asked not to duplicate, but rather to work with existing networks. The report in December 2008 recommended that the Arctic Council should lead the legacy work even though 13 groups were involved in the SAON Initiating Group. Arctic states need to maintain what they are now doing and work better at getting information disseminated. All working groups need to work better together on this. The final SAON-IG report was distributed in January 2009. This report went to Ministers at their Tromso Meeting in April 2009. In the Tromso Declaration, Ministers reaffirmed the work and gave AMAP and IASC the mandate to develop an institutional framework and work plan.

However, SAOs wanted more action so the steering group was set up. As defined by the Arctic Council and Senior Arctic Officials, the new SAON Steering Group (SAON-SG) consists of representatives from:

- each of the 8 Arctic Council member states
- Arctic Council Permanent Participants
- Arctic Council Working Groups
- IASC and
- WMO.

AMAP and IASC providing a co-chair and secretariat support. The SAON-SG is focused on “doing” not on “planning”. The SAON-SG retains the Vision defined by the SAON-IG, namely the SAON-SG will identify and implement steps to improve coordination and integration, and to promote sharing and synthesis of data and information. Priority activities are:

- Identify needs, gaps, and opportunities for improving data access and data sharing;
- Facilitate coordination and integration among activities supported by national agencies;
- Improve the linkage between community-based monitoring and science-based monitoring.

In terms of the work plan, 3 items are on track for the coming months:

- **Surveys of national observing networks:** A survey is being prepared of existing observing networks that are nationally supported. This is still ongoing. The focus is on long term networks.
- **Meeting of National Funding Agencies:** One of the most important steps toward realization of sustained Arctic observations is to obtain the views and support of the many funding and implementing organizations that deal with observations on the Arctic region. The SAON-SG will sponsor a workshop focused on defining benefits from and means to accomplish improved coordination and collaboration in funding and performing Arctic observations. This meeting is scheduled for 18-19 March during the State of the Arctic Conference in Miami.
- **Community Based Monitoring:** A subgroup of SAON-SG members, coordinated by CAFF, are currently compiling a list of organizations, programs, and networks implementing or making use of Traditional and Local Knowledge.
- **Data Access and Sharing:** Work in this area is to determine the current state of technology and support for discovering, accessing, and sharing Arctic data. For example, what process should be used to design and implement the optimal (minimal?) system for single entry, Arctic-wide data discovery, access, and sharing? SAON and IPY Data Management Committee have agreed on joint workshop in spring 2010. This will review current data management practices by existing Arctic observing networks and identify improvements and will also identify a useful approach for developing “union catalogue” of data sets.

The AMAP Executive Secretary noted that there has been a lot of activity on SAON and it has been a very useful exercise for the states to see what they are actually doing when they have dug into the question of their national network inventories.

9. Review of Report to SAOs

The SDWG Chair advised that there would be two items on the SAO agenda relating to the SDWG. One item comprises a brief report on AHHEG and the Nuuk seminar on Hope and Resilience in Suicide Prevention. The SDWG Chair's report will match what was said by the AHHEG co-chairs on day one of the SDWG meeting. The second item is a brief report on the strategic planning process. The draft Terms of Reference Framework prepared by the SDWG Strategic Planning Task Force has been provided to SAOs as an information item. Finally, there is an item towards the end of the SAO Agenda where SAOs can ask questions about working group activities. A copy of the report/minutes of the SDWG regular meeting in Nuuk (June 2009) has also been provided to SAO as an information item.

There was consensus on this approach to the SDWG Chair's report at the SAO meeting.

10. Other business

a. Model Arctic Council (Yukon)

Under this item, a member of the Canadian delegation from Yukon provided information about a group of youth aged 16 to 18 years who will hold “A Youth Simulation of the Arctic Council” Youth participants will play the parts of various AC participants. This model Arctic Council event will take place in Whitehorse, Yukon in May 2010. Additional information is available on the SDWG website.