

# Meeting of Senior Arctic Officials. Haparanda, Sweden. 14-15 November 2012. Final Report.

2012

Arctic Council

Arctic Council Secretariat

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/11374/1193>

*Disclaimer: This document may not be the final or approved version. It may be a working or draft version, as submitted to one of our Senior Arctic Officials meetings. Drafts are available in order to provide historical perspective on the work of the Arctic Council and the development of our scientific reports and assessments. To find final, approved versions of our reports and assessments, please make note of the title and visit the appropriate collection in our archive. Each collection listed below contains final documents from one of the six Working Groups. <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/1>, <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/617>, <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/126>, <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/3>, <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/52>, <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/4> Any citation of an Arctic Council document must include reference to the author. If no author of a particular document is identified, the document may still be cited; in these cases, the Arctic Council should be listed as the author. Downloaded from the Arctic Council Open Access Repository. <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/>*

**Meeting of Senior Arctic Officials  
Haparanda, Sweden  
14-15 November 2012  
Final Report**

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1. Opening of Meeting and Welcoming Words**

The SAO Chair, Gustaf Lind, welcomed all delegates to Haparanda and to the third SAO meeting under the Swedish chairmanship.

### **1.2. Introduction of new SAOs/ PP HoDs**

The SAO Chair welcomed **Sigrid Anna Johnson** as new and recently appointed SAO for Canada. She will also be serving as SAO under the upcoming Canadian Chairmanship.

### **1.3. Approval of the Agenda**

Decision: The draft agenda as distributed before the meeting was approved with the following amendments: Two new items 1.5.2 Guidelines for WGs regarding SAO Report to Ministers and 1.5.3 Appointment of Director for the Arctic Council Secretariat were added. In addition, under Any Other business the items 7.3 Global Mercury Negotiations and 7.4 Arctic School were added.

### **1.4. Special Mention**

### **1.5. Approval/welcoming of written reports**

#### **1.5.1 SDWG Communication Strategy**

Background: The SDWG has developed a new communication strategy, which had been presented to the SAOs as part of the documentation for this meeting

Decision: SAOs took note of the SDWG Communication Plan.

#### **1.5.2 Guidelines for WGs regarding SAO Report to Ministers**

Background: The Swedish chairmanship had presented, as part of its preparations for the Kiruna Ministerial, a document providing guidelines for working groups to follow when submitting their reports for the Kiruna "SAO report to Ministers" to the chairmanship.

Decision: SAOs adopted the document as presented.

#### **1.5.3 Appointment of Director for the Arctic Council Secretariat**

Background: The SAO chair informed that the SAOs had decided to appoint Mr. **Magnús Jóhannesson**, Secretary General of the Ministry for the Environment of Iceland, as the first

Director for the standing Arctic Council Secretariat in Tromsø. Mr Jóhannesson was congratulated and gave a short presentation of himself to the meeting. Mr Jóhannesson will commence in his new position from February 2013.

Decision: The SAOs decided to appoint Mr. **Magnús Jóhannesson** as the first Director for the standing Arctic Council Secretariat in Tromsø.

## Thematic Areas

### 2. Administrative Issues/ Effectiveness and Efficiency of the Arctic Council

#### 2.1. Overview of plans for the remaining period of the Swedish Chairmanship

Background: The SAO Chair provided an overview of the plans for the last part of the Swedish Chairmanship, including the preparations for the Ministerial Meeting in Kiruna 15 May 2013. There will be an informal SAO meeting in Tromsø in January 2013. The next formal SAO meeting will be held in Stockholm 19-21 March 2013. The SAO Chair encouraged everybody to work together to manage to finalize all the deliverables in time for the Kiruna Ministerial. Focus should be on communication, implementation and problem solving. The Chair wants to be kept well informed on progress and requested to hear about potential problems as early as possible.

Conclusion: For information and guidance for all parties involved in the Arctic Council.

#### 2.2. Task Force on Institutional Issues (TFII)

Background: The TFII Chair, Andreas von Uexküll, presented the progress to date and the further plans for the TFII work. The administrative framework of the standing Arctic Council Secretariat in Tromsø is now in place and the Host Country Agreement will be ready for signing possibly in January during the next informal SAO meeting in Tromsø. The TFII will now focus on finalizing the remaining tasks from its mandate, namely the consequential revisions of the Arctic Council Rules of Procedures, a first work plan for the Secretariat, the Observer Manual and the relocation of the IPS to Tromsø.

Conclusion: For information on progress in the TFII.

### 3. Climate, Environment and Biodiversity

#### 3.1. Adaptation Actions for a Changing Arctic (AACA)

Background: As the AACA consists of three parts, three presentations were given to inform about the current status for the project.

**Section A)** was presented by the SDWG Chair, Mikael Anzen, who informed that the SDWG is working hard to be able to finalize its report to January 2013, to meet the deadline for delivery to the Ministerial. The work is to be conducted by each Arctic Council working group and compiled and synthesized by SDWG. The working groups are reporting that they



are stretching their resources to be able to finish the tasks they have been requested to do, and so far most of the working groups have in fact not delivered to this part of the project.

**Section B)** is co-lead by Canada and Russia. Sigrid Anna Johnson, Canadian SAO, provided a short update. This part of the project involves compiling information about climate change adaptation activities relevant to the Arctic region with the aim to provide guidance on best practices, challenges and opportunities to inform the development and application of climate change adaptation tools and approaches. The Canadian SAO also noted that the scope of the project is broad, and the timelines are tight but that, despite the challenges, good progress has been made and the final product is expected to provide a good reflection of the situation in the Arctic states. She also noted that a workshop will be held in Ottawa at the beginning of February to confirm the analyses and develop the recommendations, and conveyed the importance of attendance at this workshop by representatives from all Arctic States as well as the permanent participants.

**Section C)** The AMAP chair, Russel Shearer, provided a brief outline of the work to date. An experts' workshop on Arctic climate scenarios was held in Seattle, Washington on 16-18 October. A second workshop on climate and ecosystem modelling will be held in St. Petersburg, Russia, 22-24 April 2013. Both of these workshops will provide significant input to section c) on development of future climate scenarios for the Arctic. Phase 1 will be a deliverable to Ministerial 2013, phase 2 will focus on identification of additional stressors and be delivered in 2015, while phase 3 will be concluded with an integrated summary report 2017. AMAP will focus on building on existing initiatives, and on coordinating with, and getting input from EBM, ARR, and other relevant Arctic Council projects.

Conclusion: SAOs expressed strong support for this work. Adaptation is a priority area and this project can lead to good results for the Arctic Council. The SAO Chair indicated the need for working groups and Arctic states to put this high on their agenda in order to hold to the timetable. More information is needed on section C) phase 2 and 3 in order to decide how this would move forward under the Canadian and US Chairmanships.

### 3.2. Arctic Resilience Report (ARR)

Background: A progress report was given by Annika Nilsson, Sweden. The ARR is about preparing for Arctic change, and understanding the links between the different levels, from local to global policy. A recent work shop in Kautokeino, Norway, was very successful in producing progress in the project work.

Conclusion: SAOs expressed support for the ARR, and satisfaction with the progress. Focus on adaptation is of increasing importance in the Arctic. There should be a continued, strong focus on coordination between the AACA, ARR and EBM projects to avoid overlaps and the leaders of these projects should work together on joint communication strategy that clarifies the relationship among the projects, their similarities and differences, and why they are complementary, not duplicative or overlapping. The importance of involvement of local communities and decision makers, and of integrating the ARR work in the Arctic Council structure was underlined.

### 3.3. Short-Lived Climate Forcers (SLCF)

Background: One of the three co-chairs, Ben DeAngelo (USA) presented the progress made by the SLCF task force. The task force is focusing on black carbon, methane and tropospheric ozone as outlined in the mandate from the Nuuk Ministerial. Currently the task force is preparing two documents for the Kiruna Ministerial, and cooperates with the AMAP expert group to produce the best available science as background for the policy recommendations. The recommendations from the 2011 Ministerial are still valid and worthy of SAO consideration. Reduced black carbon and methane emissions will also confer health benefits in the Arctic, but such effects are difficult to quantify. Hodayah Finman (USA) presented ACAP's main projects in the Short Lived Climate Forcers and Contaminants (SLCFC) Project Steering Group (PSG) of ACAP, while AMAP briefly underlined that the two AMAP expert groups - on black carbon, tropospheric ozone and on methane - are focusing on feeding science into the policy discussions of the task force.

Conclusion: SAOs expressed support for the work in this field. The Arctic Council has played a central role in lifting the SLCF issue on the global agenda, and the issue needs to be kept high on the agenda also after the task force has finalized its current mandate. SAOs called for close coordination of work between the task force, ACAP and AMAP. The SAO Chair hoped to be able to present more concrete ideas for policy outcomes at next SAO meeting.

### 3.4. Arctic Biodiversity Assessment

Background: The CAFF chair Evgeny Syroechkovskiy presented on the Arctic Biodiversity Assessment (ABA) which is in its final stages of preparation. The ABA was first initiated in Salekhard 2006. It will be the first ever overall assessment of status and trends of Arctic biodiversity. The ABA is led by Canada, Finland, Denmark/Greenland, Sweden and the United States. The ABA consists of four components: (1) *Arctic Biodiversity Trends 2010 – Selected Indicators of Change*, which provided a preliminary snapshot of status and trends of Arctic biodiversity (released in 2010); (2) a full scientific assessment of Arctic biodiversity, (3) Compendiums of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (4) a Summary for Policy Makers. These products will be submitted to the SAOs for review on January 4th. A film has also been produced which has been approved by the CAFF board. The film will be distributed and used at the Ministerial. CAFF is planning a symposium in 2014 to focus on implementation.

Conclusion: SAOs expressed support for the project, the progress made and the plans for finalization. The ABA has the potential to become as important as the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment and might become a reference document for biodiversity in the Arctic. Timing is essential to ensure that all deadlines are met and the report finalized in time for delivery at the Ministerial. It is important that the Arctic states are ready to start review of the full report when the draft is submitted on January 4th- 2013. SAOs will then be prepared for discussion on the ABA policy recommendations at their meeting in January 2013.

### **3.5. Arctic Ocean Acidification (AOA)**

Background: The AMAP Executive Secretary, Lars Otto Reiersen, provided an outline of the AOA work. The deliverables for the Ministerial will be one technical (science) report, one short report called summary for policy-makers which will include policy-relevant recommendations and two films (3 and 14 minutes). A scientific conference on AOA is planned to take place in Bergen, Norway on 6-8 May 2013. Reiersen explained the connections between the AOA and bodies such as the International Council for Exploration of the Seas (ICES), and the Scientific Committee on Oceanic Research (SCOR).

Conclusion: SAOs underlined the importance of this project as it produces new knowledge in an important field with possible significant effects on fisheries and livelihood in the North. SAOs also supported the plans as presented and were encouraged by the good speed the ongoing work had, suggested that more research will be needed in the future, and expressed hope that AMAP will continue its work in this area. AMAP was encouraged to focus on the timing in order to ensure enough time for review and discussions on the policy recommendations.

### **3.6. Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS)**

Background: The AMAP Executive Secretary, Lars Otto Reiersen, gave a presentation on the work in the AMAP UAS Expert Group. He explained how this work had started after a US initiative 5-6 years ago. Norway and USA are the current co-leads. Now anyone can fly drones wherever they want without seeking any permission. A report from the Expert group is about to be ready, but it will unfortunately not be possible to reach the deadlines for delivery to the Ministerial. Preliminary conclusion is that scientific use of drones is increasing rapidly, and security and safety guidelines are very much needed. There is a knowledge gap when it comes to understanding the processes in the Arctic in the winter season. More data is needed, and UAS is a good tool to achieve this, and it is increasingly available. One of the recommendations will be to consider establishing a framework for cooperation (an agreement regulating the airspace) among the Arctic States.

Conclusion: SAOs expressed many positive words of this cutting edge technology which could be so useful for many research and monitoring purposes in the Arctic. A hope and a wish for some sort of deliverable in this field for the Kiruna Ministerial were expressed.

### **3.7. Ecosystem-based Management (EBM) Expert Group**

Background: One of the three co-chairs of the EBM Expert group, Magnùs Jóhannesson (Iceland) gave a status update, explaining that the expert group had three meetings and had finalized draft documents for SAO review and possible delivery to the Ministerial. There will be 12 recommendations, which, according to the expert group, allow for follow up by the WGs and the larger Arctic Council structure. A policy commitment to the EBM principle should be included in the Kiruna declaration.

Conclusion: SAOs expressed strong support for the EBM project, the draft material presented to SAOs, and the plans for finalization as presented by the EBM co-chair, so that the report can be formally accepted by SAOs in March. Focus was also on keeping the issue of EBM on the Arctic Council agenda after the finalization of the current mandate. The Council needs to

decide how to continue this work, how to implement the recommendations and how to integrate it into the Arctic Council structures.

### **3.8. Arctic Spatial Data Infrastructure (Arctic SDI)**

Background: Inge Thaulow, Denmark/Greenland's representative to CAFF, provided a status on progress of the Arctic SDI. Within the Arctic Council/CAFF the Arctic SDI is led by Denmark/Greenland. The project is a joint cooperation between the mapping agencies in the Arctic states. At the previous SAO meeting, the SAOs recognized the importance of the Arctic SDI and its contribution to improving data integration, sharing and analysis across the Arctic. They asked CAFF and the Arctic SDI Steering Committee to consider how to formalize this cooperation through the Arctic Council, and insure a sustainable framework for this project.

The SAOs were informed that in response to this request a number of measures were underway. A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the National Mapping Organizations is being negotiated as a key step towards the successful implementation of the Arctic SDI. Text to be included in the Kiruna Declaration was suggested.

Conclusion: There were positive reactions to this project as a concrete and useful tool. There was a call for ceremony at a high profile event when the non-legally binding MoU between the mapping agencies is to be signed. CAFF was tasked to keep SAOs well informed on progress.

### **3.9. The Project Support Instrument (PSI)**

Background: Husamuddin Ahmadzai, NEFCO, presented the current status for the PSI. He informed about substantial developments since March. The USA has now joined the PSI with a contribution of \$US 1 million. The Preparatory PSI Committee (PPCOM) had its first meeting in June 2012, and very recent decisions in the Russian Federation have paved the way the final formalities which will allow the PSI to become operational. The PSI is to finance approved Arctic Council projects. The PPCOM has requested clarity on the exact definition of such projects. 10 over arching Arctic Council project areas have been identified (P1-P10).

Decision: SAOs welcomed the U.S. contribution to, and joining of, the PSI; invited other members of the Arctic Council that have not yet done so, to consider joining the PSI; noted with appreciation the NEFCO's November 2012 Update on the PSI; encouraged parties to deposit their contributions with the Fund Manager to enable the PSI to become operational during the earliest; noted that items listed in P1-P10 identified by the Fund Manager in the November 2012 Update on the PSI are approved Arctic Council project areas. Projects within these areas are thus eligible for funding consideration if they have followed the appropriate Arctic Council and subsidiary body procedures including bringing the individual projects forward to the appropriate Arctic Council subsidiary body for approval; requested the Fund Manager to proceed with an appropriate assessment and development of these projects for future consideration of the PSI Committee for financing; encouraged the Fund Manager to cooperate with relevant Arctic Council subsidiary body chair(s) to mobilize the Project Support Instrument (PSI).

### **3.10. Sustaining Arctic Observing Network (SAON)**

#### Background:

The SAON Chair, Tom Armstrong gave an update on the current status of SAON, and its primary goal to provide a diverse range of policy-relevant, timely and relevant observational data, to support better decision-making by multiple stakeholders. He noted that all eight Arctic states, and one Permanent Participant were in attendance at the last SAON board meeting in October. After a long process with discussions regarding the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for SAON, now an ‘adaptive management’ process has been adopted in which the existing ToR/RoP are to be accepted as they are now to allow for the implementation and forward movement of SAON. These “founding documents” will be open for review every two years.

Conclusion: SAOs expressed their strong support and appreciation for SAON’s operational status which now includes all Arctic states.

## **4. Oceans**

### **4.1. Recommended Practices in the Prevention of Marine Oil Pollution (RP3)**

Background: The EPPR chair, Ole Kristian Bjerkemo, informed about the current status of the RP3 project. The deliverables from this project will be a technical report which EPPR recommends that the ministers “take note of,” and a short report with policy recommendations which ministers may adopt in Kiruna. Regarding the short report, the work on which is being led by Norway and Canada, the first draft will be submitted to SAOs for their January informal meeting. EPPR cooperates also with PAME in the RP3 project. Bjerkemo presented some of the possible recommendations from the report.

Conclusion: SAOs expressed strong support to the RP3 project, the suggested way forward and the timeline towards becoming one of the main deliverables at the Kiruna Ministerial. A regional process of preadopting the IMO Polar code would not be recommended.

### **4.2. Task Force on Marine Oil Pollution Preparedness and Response**

Background: Co-chair, Anton Vasiliev (Russian SAO), presented the progress to date in the work toward an international instrument on Arctic marine oil pollution preparedness and response, which builds on the existing global conventions, but adds regional value. Vasiliev informed that after five meetings the task force has now completed the negotiations. Now there is a need to focus on the preparations for the signing ceremony in Kiruna. Norway will act as depositary of the agreement. EPPR has been tasked to develop Operational Guidelines in support to the Task Force Agreement on Marine Oil Pollution Preparedness and Response. A progress report on the status of the Operational Guidelines, was given by Ole Kristian Bjerkemo, EPPR Chair.

Conclusion: SAOs praised the process and the co-chairs for their work, which will lead to the signing of a new, legally binding agreement in Kiruna. The Arctic Council will present a Marine Oil Pollution “package” in Kiruna, covering prevention, preparedness and response. There is a need to plan how to showcase this in Kiruna, and to show special consideration

towards PP involvement in these kinds of agreements between the Arctic states. Appreciation was expressed to Canada who has offered to host the first exercise under the instrument in 2014.

### **4.3. Arctic Ocean Review (AOR)**

Background: Elizabeth Mc Lanahan, PAME Vice chair, presented status and progress to date for the Arctic Ocean Review (AOR) project. The draft AOR report had been distributed to SAOs before the meeting. There is a new chapter 2 on Indigenous Peoples and Culture , and there will be recommendations at the end of each chapter. Mc Lanahan went through the preliminary recommendations by theme, and explained that the draft report and the recommendations have yet to be negotiated. A timeline, which includes weekly telephone conferences, has been developed to ensure that the report with its recommendations will be ready in time for the Kiruna Ministerial.

Conclusion: SAOs expressed support for the AOR as one of the main deliverables for the Kiruna Ministerial, although there was some concern over the extended number of draft recommendations. It was deemed important that PAME HoDs work very closely with the SAOs and the people attending the weekly AOR teleconferences to ensure that the work moves forward. If there are any challenges these should be fed into telephone conference discussions as early as possible. The Arctic Council has no *fisheries management* role.

## **5. Human Development**

### **5.1. Corporate Social Responsibility**

Background: Mikael Anzén, SDWG Chair, gave a presentation on the ongoing Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) project. It was noted that the work builds on existing frameworks and guidelines on CSR in i.e. the UN Global Compact, OECD guidelines for Multinational enterprises and the Global Reporting Initiative. SDWG has arranged workshops and an informal business dialogue at its September meeting in Reykjavik. SDWG proposes to develop an information kit on CSR to be posted on the SDWG and possibly the Arctic Council websites. A workshop will be held in Stockholm 28-29 November 2012 to further define the content and format of this information kit.

Conclusion: SAOs expressed support for SDWG's expanded work involving more business issues and engagement, noting projects such as Corporate Social Responsibility and economic development initiatives in the manner described by the SDWG Chair.

### **5.2. SDWG Reform and Strategic Plan - Arctic Social, Economic and Cultural Expert Group**

Background: Mikael Anzén, Chair of the SDWG, presented the proposal to establish an Arctic Social Economic and Cultural Expert Group (SEC expert group). Under the auspices of the SDWG, the SEC expert group shall support and provide expertise to the Arctic. The SDWG Heads of Delegation will each nominate one representative to the interim SEC Expert Group.

Draft Terms of Reference for the group has been negotiated, the funding will be arranged on a voluntary basis, and among the first tasks of the group will be to identify emerging priorities, possible actions and scope of the expertise needed.

Conclusion: The discussion showed that there is support among the states and PPs for establishing the SEC expert group, and SAOs endorsed the Terms of Reference as proposed.

## 6. Working Group Administration

### 6.1. Working Group Progress Reports

Background: Working Group Progress Reports contain information on project progress and outcomes, including special issues for SAO consideration.

Conclusion: SAOs thanked the working groups for their progress reports, and in addition recognition was given to ACAP for its important and successful work on obsolete pesticides.

The CAFF Chair announced that Canada's lead of CBMP ends on May 2013 after which they will stay on for a period of one year to help transition the lead. Greenland/Denmark informed that they will take a co-lead role for CBMP at the 2013 ministerial. Plans for this are to be formalized for the March SAO meeting.

## 7. Any Other Business

### 7.1. Meeting of Ministers for Environment in Jukkasjärvi 5-6 February 2013

Background: Fredrik Hannerz, from the Swedish Ministry of Environment, informed about the upcoming Arctic Environment Ministers meeting, "Arctic change – global effects", which will take place in Jukkasjärvi, Sweden, 5-6 February, 2013. The meeting is planned to include a half-day in-depth dialogue about the connectivity between Arctic change processes and global environmental challenges. Invited to this session are Environment ministers from Arctic countries, Arctic Council Permanent Participants, Arctic Council working groups and leading scientists. During the second day, in a more open setting, the aim is to make concrete progress on issues on the Arctic Council agenda including in particular short-lived climate pollutants, protection of vulnerable areas, biodiversity in the Arctic and Arctic resilience.

Conclusion: The discussion showed support for the meeting and the suggested agenda items. It was proposed to add ACAP's work on pesticides to the agenda. Sweden will continue to consider carefully both the structure and outcome of the meeting and its links with the Arctic Council structure.

### 7.2. Report from the 10th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region

Background: The Secretary General of the Standing Committee of the Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (SCPAR), Bjørn Willy Robstad, gave a short report from the 10<sup>th</sup> Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, which took place in Akureyri 5-7 September 2012.

At their recent meeting in Inari, Finland it was decided that the 11th conference will be arranged in Whitehorse, Canada, September 2014. In addition a letter to the President of the Russian Federation on the RAIPON situation was adopted.

Conclusion: For information only.

### **7.3 The Global Mercury Negotiations**

Background: Sigrid Anna Johnson, Canadian SAO, said that the UNEP Global Mercury negotiations will conclude with final negotiation round (intergovernmental negotiating committee (INC-5) in January 2013. Beginning in 1997, with AMAPs first mercury assessment and with a recent AMAP updated assessment in 2011, the Arctic Council has provided significant scientific evidence for mercury's harmful effects. The Canadian SAO conveyed Canada's support for the development of a strong treaty on mercury and encouraged each SAO to contact their HoD to the negotiations to convey the importance of these negotiations for the Arctic Council, and urge that HoDs, make reference in their statements and interventions at INC-5 about the continuing rising levels of mercury in the Arctic and the importance of concluding negotiations with a strong commitment to reduce global atmospheric mercury emissions. The Canadian SAO also said that Canada invites the Arctic Council Chairmanship to deliver a statement to the negotiations on behalf of the Council.

Conclusion: For information only

### **7.4 Arctic School**

Background: Anton Vasiliev, Russian SAO, informed that Yakutia/Sakha, the largest republic in the Russian Federation has decided to establish a school for children of Arctic Indigenous Peoples. For those interested, detailed information about the school will be available in written form.

Anton Vasiliev furthermore informed about the Arctic Forum, which unfortunately had to be postponed earlier this autumn. The Russian Geographical Society has now decided that the Forum will be arranged in Salekhard on 24-25 September 2013. Vasiliev asked that Canada takes the dates into account when planning for their chairmanship.

Conclusion: For information only

## **8. Information about Next Meeting and Closing of Meeting**

The SAO Chair informed about the dates for the next informal SAO meeting, which will be held in Tromsø on January 21-23. The last formal SAO meeting of the Swedish chairmanship will be arranged March 19-22 in Stockholm. The meeting extended its sincere gratitude and best wishes to Karsten Klepšvik, Norwegian SAO, who will be leaving the Arctic Council portfolio before the next formal SAO meeting.

---

## 9. ANNEX: Documents for information purposes

Statement from the Senior Arctic Officials and Permanent Participants regarding RAIPON  
(decided at the informal session and read by the SAO Chair at the formal session)