

# Report: SAO Plenary meeting

Fairbanks, Alaska | March 2016

*Second SAO Plenary meeting during the U.S. Chairmanship*

## List of acronyms and abbreviations

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| AAC       | Arctic Athabaskan Council   |
| AACA      | Adaptation Actions for a Changing Arctic (AMAP)   |
| ABA       | Arctic Biodiversity Assessment (CAFF, 2013)   |
| AC        | Arctic Council  |
| ACAP      | Arctic Contaminants Action Program (1 of 6 Working Groups)  |
| ACGF      | Arctic Coast Guard Forum  |
| ACIA      | Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (AMAP)   |
| ACS       | Arctic Council Secretariat  |
| AEC       | Arctic Economic Council   |
| AIA       | Aleut International Association   |
| AMAP      | Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (1 of 6 Working Groups)                                |
| AMATII    | Arctic Maritime and Aviation Transportation Infrastructure Initiative (SDWG)                      |
| AMSA      | Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment (PAME)  |
| AMSP      | Arctic Marine Strategic Plan 2015-2025 (PAME)   |
| AORF      | Arctic Offshore Regulators' Forum   |
| ARR / ARA | Arctic Resilience Report / Arctic Resilience Assessment   |
| BCM       | Black carbon and methane  |
| CAFF      | Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (1 of 6 Working Groups)                                    |
| C&O group | Communications and outreach group   |
| EG        | Expert Group  |
| EGBCM     | Expert Group in support of implementation of the Framework for Action on Black Carbon and Methane |
| EPPR      | Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response (1 of 6 Working Groups)                           |
| GCI       | Gwich'in Council International  |
| ICC       | Inuit Circumpolar Council   |
| IPS       | Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat   |
| MOSPA     | Agreement on Cooperation on Marine Oil Pollution Preparedness and Response in the Arctic (2013)   |
| MPA       | Marine protected area   |
| O&G       | Oil and gas   |

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| PAME   | Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (1 of 6 Working Groups) |
| PP     | Permanent Participant   |
| PSI    | Project Support Instrument  |
| RAIPON | Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North              |
| SAO    | Senior Arctic Official  |
| SAOC   | SAO Chair (Chair of the Senior Arctic Officials)                    |
| SAON   | Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks                                |
| SAR    | Search and rescue   |
| SC     | Saami Council   |
| SCTF   | Task Force on Enhancing Scientific Cooperation in the Arctic        |
| SDWG   | Sustainable Development Working Group (1 of 6 Working Groups)       |
| SWIPA  | Snow, Water, Ice and Permafrost in the Arctic (AMAP)                |
| TFAMC  | Task Force on Arctic Marine Cooperation                             |
| TFOPP  | Task Force on Arctic Marine Oil Pollution Prevention                |
| TFTIA  | Task Force on Telecommunications Infrastructure in the Arctic       |
| TLK    | Traditional and local knowledge                                     |
| WG     | Working Group   |

## 1. Introduction

All eight Arctic States, five Permanent Participants (RAIPON not in attendance), six WG Chairs and their executive secretaries participated in the meeting. 26 Observers also attended the meeting. To see the full list of meeting participants click [here](#).

### 1.1 Welcome remarks

Dr. Poldine Carlo, an Athabaskan elder, provided a traditional welcome and an opening song.

Dr. James R. Johnsen, President of the University of Alaska, welcomed delegates to the University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Admiral (ret.) Robert Papp, U.S. Special Representative for the Arctic, also provided welcoming remarks. Admiral Papp highlighted the importance of the Arctic in President Obama's agenda, and announced the upcoming White House Arctic Science Ministerial,

which will take place in Washington D.C. approximately 1 year after the August 2015 GLACIER event.

The SAOC acknowledged the many contributions of the late Terry Fenge to the AC and all in the room observed a moment of silence for him.

## 1.2 Approval of agenda

The SAOC announced that one of the documents submitted under agenda point 4.1.1 (Circumpolar Best Practices: Policy and Financing Options for Black Carbon Emission Reductions from Diesel Sources) was actually submitted for SAOs' approval for submission to the 2017 Ministerial meeting.

The U.S. delegation noted a change in the order of sub-points for agenda item 6.3 on Resilience.

With those changes, the agenda for the meeting was approved.

## 2. Reports from other meetings

### 2.1 COP21 Arctic Council side event(s)

#### **Background and discussion**

Iceland provided a summary of a side event held during the Twenty-First Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP21) in Paris in November – December 2015 that highlighted the AC's work on BCM. The event was organized by Iceland and supported by the ACS. Panelists included experts from AMAP, ACAP, the SC and the EGBCM. Iceland recommended that the AC continue to have a presence at future COP meetings.

#### **Summary / Conclusion**

This item was for information and the SAOC recommended that the question of an AC presence at future UNFCCC COPs be discussed under item 6.1

### 2.2 Four Regional Councils of the North meeting

#### **Background and discussion**

The SAOC provided a summary of a meeting of the four regional councils of the north (Arctic Council, Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Council of the Baltic Sea States, Nordic Council of Ministers) held in Reykjavik on 11 November 2015. The SAOC noted that the four councils have both common interests (in particular, grappling with climate change and advancing sustainable development) and common challenges (for example, securing predictable financing for their project work as well as outreach to communities and youth). The SAOC also noted how the other bodies addressed observer engagement.

[Click to see the supporting document](#)

**Summary / Conclusion**

This item was for information.

## 2.3 SAO Chair meeting with Working Group Chairs

**Background and discussion**

The SAOC thanked the WG Chairs and Executive Secretaries for their hard work amidst their other significant responsibilities and reminded all that most of the progress made in the AC depends on the WGs. Most of the WGs were created before the establishment of the AC and have developed their own ways of doing business. While recognizing the individual strengths of the WGs, the SAOC noted the need for continued efforts to make all parts of the AC system a coherent whole. Much of what was discussed with the WG Chairs and Exec Secretaries in Reykjavik in 2015 was a variation on this theme: (1) improving coordination of work plans and schedules, (2) approaching engagement with PPs and TLK more consistently, (3) enhancing Observer engagement consistently, and (4) relating to external bodies with more visibility. The U.S. thanked the SAOC for giving SAOs the opportunity to suggest agenda items for the first time and suggested that this should be standard operating procedure.

[Click to see the supporting document](#)

**Summary / Conclusion**

This item was for information.

## 3. Arctic Council 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary

**Background and discussion**

The SAOC invited delegates to provide read-outs from any celebrations of the AC's 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary that have already occurred, and to offer updates on any planned events.

Norway thanked those who had attended the celebration held in January 2016 in Tromsø, and shared plans for an event in June in Oslo celebrating AMAP's contributions to the AC.

The U.S. announced that the Council's formal 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration will be held alongside the 2017 Fairbanks Ministerial.

Iceland announced a domestically-focused event to be held in the autumn, likely in September. Sweden announced an event with a similarly domestic focus, and with the participation of three ministers, to take place on 7-8 April 2016. Canada announced plans for an event to be held close to the actual 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary date (19 September), but did not provide more detailed information at this time.

ICC announced a plan for a photographic exhibition of the ["I am Inuit"](#) project alongside the Fairbanks Ministerial. GCI announced that the new PP funding mechanism will be launched as part of the AC's 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary, and invited all AC stakeholders to contribute to the

fund. AIA then unveiled a project for a 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary multimedia “storyboard” focused on the history of the PPs.

SDWG noted its plans to use its website – [sdwg.org](http://sdwg.org) – to highlight significant products completed since its establishment 16 years ago.

### **Summary / Conclusion**

This item was for information.

## 4. Working Group updates and written reports

### 4.1 Working Group showcase

#### 4.1.1 ACAP: Circumpolar Local Environmental Observer Network (CLEO)

##### **Background and discussion**

Patrick Huber, project co-lead from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, provided delegates a quick description of the “LEO reporter” mobile app (available in Android and iPhone technologies), and briefed delegates on plans for the CLEO project, which include:

- the development of guidance for new CLEO observers and for CLEO hubs;
- upcoming workshops in Inari, Finland in June 2016 and in Canada in July 2016;
- development of an expansion framework for the years ahead;
- bringing on additional partners for the project, and engaging other AC WGs; and
- efforts to establish new regional chapters and hubs.

Following the presentation on CLEO, ACAP requested SAO approval of its report entitled, “Circumpolar Best Practices: Policy and Financing Options for Black Carbon Emission Reductions from Diesel Sources.” Many delegates welcomed the report and used the opportunity to highlight the importance of implementing its recommendations voluntarily.

*Click to see the [presenter’s slides](#) and supporting documents ([1](#), [2](#))*

##### **Summary / Conclusion**

Delegates did not discuss the CLEO project extensively, but those who spoke expressed support for the project. AIA noted the importance of exploring links to other community-based monitoring initiatives, and EPPR and CAFF noted a desire to explore opportunities to coordinate with ACAP on the project.

Regarding the Diesel Best Practices report, many delegates noted the high quality of the report, but both Russia and Iceland expressed reservations about approval. Most delegates emphasized that the best practices contained in the report were not binding on the Arctic States, but that the information is useful for domestic decision-making. ACAP was asked to work with Russia and make minimal adjustments to the report to ensure that it does not include instructions to national governments. ACAP was also asked to work with Iceland to ensure that they are also able to review and approve the report. A revised version of the

report for consideration/approval will be presented no later than the SAO meeting in October 2016.

#### 4.1.2 AMAP: Arctic Freshwater Synthesis report

##### **Background and discussion**

The Chair of AMAP introduced AMAP's new report "The Arctic Freshwater System in a Changing Climate." The Chair of AMAP noted the severity of climate change impacts in the Arctic, pointing out that even a 2-degree global temperature change is likely to mean 6 degrees for the Arctic, and that even the impact of the Paris climate change agreement likely will not be enough to prevent major changes in the Arctic and its hydrologic system.

During the discussion, Sweden, Kingdom of Denmark, and Norway noted the importance of this report as "fuel" for the AC's work on climate change and resilience. CAFF highlighted the importance of freshwater for CAFF's research as well, and this example of successful coordination between the two WGs. The U.S. noted that for the update of the SWIPA report it would be important to include how a two degree Celsius temperature increase will affect the freshwater picture in the Arctic. Other delegates raised issues including the impacts of low water tables leading to forest fires, climate refugees and the potential for export of freshwater from the Arctic to southern latitudes. Norway suggested this report for early release at the White House Arctic Science Ministerial in Summer 2016.

*Click to see the [presenter's slides](#)*

##### **Summary / Conclusion**

AMAP thanked delegates for their comments and support, and noted the WG's intent to continue this work and, potentially, to expand into socio-economic issues such as forestry and health.

#### 4.1.3 CAFF: Invasive Alien Species

##### **Background and discussion**

The Chair of CAFF presented an initiative to develop an Arctic invasive alien species strategy. The Chair of CAFF made reference to collaboration with PAME on the marine component of the strategy, and noted the support for work on invasive alien species contained in the AMSA (PAME, 2009), Arctic Ocean Review (PAME, 2013), AMSP 2015-2025 (PAME, 2015), and Actions for Arctic Biodiversity 2013-2021 (CAFF, 2013). After describing the questions to be addressed in the strategy, and cataloging some of the tasks ahead for CAFF and for PAME in its development, the Chair of CAFF announced the formation of a steering group for this work. The Chair of CAFF also reminded delegates of an upcoming workshop in Akureyri, Iceland on 30 March and 1 April of this year.

During the discussion, several delegates noted this work as an excellent example of collaboration between WGs on a cross-cutting issue. Canada appreciated the presentation on invasive species while noting that it would like to see in the future a CAFF presentation to SAOs on "Arctic Traditional Knowledge and Wisdom", as was originally envisioned. Canada suggested that this presentation might be appropriate with delivery of the CAFF report

“Arctic Traditional Knowledge and Wisdom: Changes in the North American Arctic” at the upcoming SAO meeting in October 2016.

Click to see the [presenter's slides](#) and supporting documents ([1](#), [2](#))

## Summary / Conclusion

The CAFF Chair urged the Arctic States and PPs to take part in the project if possible, and acknowledged the importance of TLK to this project in particular. The CAFF Chair said that a first draft of the strategy will be discussed by CAFF in early September and projected delivery of the final version to the Ministers on time.

### 4.1.4 EPPR: Search and rescue (SAR)

#### Background and discussion

The Chair of EPPR presented delegates with an overview of the WG’s many efforts to work on SAR as an issue. These include:

- establishing a relationship with the recently-developed ACGF;
- assessing recommendations emerging from the *Arctic Zephyr* exercise that took place on the margins of the Anchorage SAO meeting (October 2015):
  - working to improve coordination and information-sharing between regional SAR centers;
  - developing a pan-Arctic database of SAR capabilities and requirements;
  - exploring and expanding cooperation with other SAR stakeholders, including the cruise industry;
- connecting SAR work to oil spill response work wherever appropriate;
- presenting a joint SAR manual that is an extension of Norwegian-Russian operational guidelines;
- working to improve “cross talk” between AC and non-AC SAR bodies and initiatives;
- focusing transitioning to “post-SAR” activities and authorities;
- a Russian project focused on SAR in small communities.

In addition, the EPPR Chair noted several upcoming SAR-related events:

- a table top exercise and workshop with the cruise industry on 6-7 April in Reykjavik;
- the conference “Challenges in Emergency Preparedness and Response in the Arctic: Safe Arctic settlement” taking place near Moscow on 6-8 April 2016;
- a U.S.-Canada cruise industry drill 13-14 April, focused on the planned cruise of the *Crystal Serenity* from Alaska through the Northwest Passage; and
- the U.S.-led *Arctic Chinook* exercise coming up in August.

During discussions, delegates were uniform in their praise for EPPR’s extensive and concrete work on improving SAR capability in the Arctic, as well as its work with the Arctic Coast Guard Forum to define roles and responsibilities more precisely. The Kingdom of Denmark also notified delegates of national Arctic exercises taking place in months ahead to which Arctic States would be invited. AIA suggested leveraging the existing AMATII database, developed by SDWG, and encouraged all PPs to participate in EPPR. Several delegates noted

the importance of EPPR's interface with the ACGF and industry. In addition, Canada and AAC drew delegates' attention to the need to recognize relevant domestic, inland SAR capacity as well as marine SAR capacity.

*Click to see the [presenter's slides](#)*

### **Summary / Conclusion**

The Chair of EPPR praised the Kingdom of Denmark for having the same individual participate in EPPR and in the ACGF, noting that this makes good coordination easier. The Chair of EPPR also noted the desire to work with SDWG to explore the possibility of using the AMATII database in EPPR's work, that the domestic specific issues were heard and encouraged PPs to participate so that they can bring those scenarios into the exercises.

#### 4.1.5 PAME: Pan-Arctic Network of Marine Protected Areas (MPA)

### **Background and discussion**

The Chair of PAME provided delegates with an overview of PAME's work to support the development of a pan-Arctic network of MPAs. The Chair of PAME noted existing targets for protection under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. PAME's work to this end is planned to include:

- mapping of existing Arctic MPAs;
- an area-based conservation toolbox compiling a range of conservation measures;
- an assessment of what areas could be protected to support connectivity between existing MPAs;
- recognized methodologies for conducting integrated ecosystem assessments; and
- objectives for supporting ecosystem health.

During the discussion, several delegates highlighted the value of PAME-CAFF collaboration in this work, and the ICC pointed out the importance of consultation with Inuit in the creation of any MPA with respect to TLK and food security. Canada drew attention to the recent U.S. Canada Joint Statement on Climate, Energy and the Arctic, which highlighted specific commitments on MPA's.

*Click to see the [presenter's slides](#)*

### **Summary / Conclusion**

The Chair of PAME noted the WG's intention to use a broad definition of MPA, including traditional use access, to allow for flexibility in response to different situations and needs. In response to an inquiry from the Kingdom of Denmark, the Chair of PAME expressed the belief that PAME's work related to heavy fuel oils does not relate to a proposal for a regional ban nor overlap with the IMO's work in this area.

#### 4.1.6 SDWG: Arctic Remote Energy Networks Academy (ARENA)

##### **Background and discussion**

The Chair of SDWG presented the ARENA project, which seeks to build technical capacity in Arctic communities for renewable-energy microgrids, which are stand-alone energy facilities for communities that otherwise have limited options. The major components of this work are (1) a series of nine online educational webinars and (2) a program of multi-week on-site sessions for 20 “fellows” – early to mid-career professionals working in target circumpolar communities, though applicants from non-Arctic States may also apply. The webinars are scheduled to begin shortly, and the first on-site session will take place in August. SDWG asked for all delegates’ help in recruiting fellows to participate and to fund their participation in the on-site sessions.

The U.S., Canada and GCI reiterated SDWG’s call for assistance in recruitment, subject-matter expertise, and funding for this program, including from Observers. Other delegations spoke strongly of the program’s value as well.

*Click to see the [presenter’s slides](#) and supporting documents ([1](#), [2](#))*

##### **Summary / Conclusion**

SDWG thanked delegates for their support and enthusiasm.

## 4.2 EPPR Strategic Plan

##### **Background and discussion**

The Chair of EPPR presented the WG’s updated strategic plan. The updates to the document reflect recent changes in the WG’s mandate regarding SAR and the Framework Plan for Cooperation on prevention of Oil Pollution from Petroleum and Maritime Activities in the Marine Areas of the Arctic (2015).

*Click to see the [supporting document](#)*

##### **Summary / Conclusion**

In order to reflect the idea that WGs’ mandates do not change often, but that work plans are regularly updated, the SAOC asked EPPR to change the word “mandate” to “work plan” in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of section 1.2 of the strategic plan as submitted. With that change, the new EPPR strategic plan was approved.

## 4.3 Written Reports

### 4.3.1 Working Group reports

##### **Background and discussion**

The six Working Groups submitted progress reports in advance of the SAO meeting. SAOs and PPs were invited to ask any clarifying questions that they might have regarding those reports.

During the discussion, the U.S. asked the WGs to provide greater visibility into the work underway in each subsidiary EG, and encouraged all WGs to follow AMAP's lead in providing a list of expected deliverables for the 2017 Ministerial meeting. More broadly, the U.S. also asked for a discussion among SAOs on criteria for products to be Ministerial deliverables; in other words, "what constitutes a 'deliverable'?" given the many types of products the Working Groups produce.

In response to a question from the U.S. about the regional synthesis in the "Adaptation Actions for a Changing Arctic" project, AMAP explained their plans to provide a short pan-Arctic summary report for the Ministerial in 2017. It will be based on the three regional reports of the AACA.

The SC drew delegates' attention to the activities surrounding CAFF's recent WG meeting in Kirkenes, noted the development of a new educational course on biodiversity and traditional knowledge and noted the importance of monitoring both freshwater and coastal areas as part of CAFF's and AMAP's work. Saami Council also appreciated efforts of the U.S. Chairmanship, Russia and Norway to achieve progress on Global Environment Facility (GEF) funding for Nomadic Herders, as an important indigenous peoples' initiative in CAFF.

Canada asked for a clearer understanding of where responsibility lies for the implementation of the recommendations on integrating TLK that are contained in the Iqaluit Declaration (2015) and the accompanying SAO Report to Ministers. In particular, Canada's interest was in the development of a lexicon for AC use when speaking or writing about TLK. SDWG noted its understanding that the SAOs decided to determine the way forward on developing a lexicon at their October 2015 meeting. The SAOC agreed and suggested that Canada chair a small group of States and PPs to determine whether consensus could be reached on a lexicon for AC use by the end of the U.S. Chairmanship. Several PPs expressed concern about investing additional time to develop a lexicon when past efforts were not successful; those voicing concerns emphasized the need for the process to be conducted with respect for PP culture and that any lexicon would need to be acceptable to the PPs.

*Click here to see the supporting documents ([ACAP](#), [AMAP](#), [CAFF](#), [EPPR](#), [PAME](#), [SDWG](#))*

### **Summary / Conclusion**

The SAOC concluded by asking that Canada take the lead in forming a small group, including PPs and any States that wish to be involved, to try to develop a document containing (1) a discrete list of terms related to TLK and (2) guidance on how the AC should use those terms. The SAOC noted that any such draft should be circulated to all for discussion and possible finalization, but acknowledged that it may not be possible to reach consensus.

### **4.3.2 Arctic Council Secretariat annual report**

#### **Background and discussion**

The Director of the ACS provided an overview of the ACS annual report for 2015, including financial statements and the external auditors' report. The Director noted a surplus of USD 249,000 mainly due to significant fluctuations in exchange rates. The Director thanked the

Canada and U.S. chairmanships, the Host Country, SAOs, PPs, WG Chairs, and executive secretaries for their cooperation and support during 2015.

*Click here to see the supporting document: [ACS annual report](#)*

### **Summary / Conclusion**

SAOs took note of the ACS annual report for 2015 and approved the 2015 accounts and auditors' report.

## 5. Strengthening the Arctic Council

### 5.1 Funding mechanisms in the Arctic Council

#### **Background and discussion**

In a discussion intended as warm-up for a deeper discussion in fall of 2016, the SAOC noted the importance of both understanding the ways in which AC work is funded and, over the longer term, identifying ways to make funding for AC work more reliable and predictable.

The Director of the ACS introduced a paper on funding, noting that it was a very general, qualitative overview without much reference to amounts of funding. The Director noted two categories of expenses, (1) operational costs and (2) project costs, and noted that support comes typically either as actual funds or as in-kind support. The latter is often received in the form of time and effort of individual researchers and other contributors. The Director noted that support is received from the Arctic States, as well as from accredited Observers and, on occasion, other entities (e.g., foundations) that support the work of the AC.

During the discussion, several delegations noted the importance of getting a clearer picture of how the AC's work is funded, emphasized SAOs' responsibility for understanding how the AC is financed, and expressed the importance of transparency in the AC's operations. The U.S. said that it would work over the summer with the ACS, WG secretariats and others to get a better handle on the financial picture.

Regarding in-kind contributions, several delegations acknowledged the difficulty of putting a value on the time that individuals from many governments and other entities contribute to the work of the AC, but noted that doing so is important for a clear understanding of the full financial picture. ICC noted that its own contributions to WG efforts are entirely in-kind, and should also be counted in any such effort to provide a complete picture. The U.S. further noted that the important thing for now is to understand the AC's monetary finances as recommended by several Arctic State audit agencies, and that there could be a second phase of studying in-kind contributions later. Canada suggested that a couple of case studies of individual projects might be a good starting point. Norway supported accounting for in-kind contributions by looking at how other entities have done so.

*[Click here to see the supporting document](#)*

## Summary / Conclusion

The SAOC summarized the discussion by pointing out general agreement that actual funds should not be difficult to track, and are in fact already cataloged in annual reports completed by WGs, the ACS and the IPS. Regarding in-kind contributions, the SAOC expressed understanding that calculating in-kind support can be nearly impossible for WGs; however, some kind of understanding of the source and magnitude of such support is important to achieve. The SAOC asked the U.S. (in cooperation with the ACS and all subsidiary body secretariats) to lead the preparation of a more detailed draft for discussion in October 2016. Such a report will catalog financial contributions over a yet-to-be determined time period, and should, if possible, include some kind of description – and possibly a rough valuation – of in-kind support. The SAOC noted as well that such a document will contribute to the States' abilities to make the case for additional resources in the future. In addition, the ACS will look into the suggestion to seek and compile information about how similar bodies handle in-kind support.

## 5.2 Arctic Council relations to outside bodies

### Background and discussion

The SAOC introduced this agenda point by pointing out that the relationships between the AC, its subsidiary bodies, and other outside bodies, are varied and vital to the ongoing work of the AC. The U.S. introduced the proposed draft guidelines. Delegates were invited to consider the draft guidelines for exchange of information when new relationships are considered or established.

During the discussion, WG delegates expressed no problems with the document as submitted. Norway requested a small change in the third paragraph, in the sentence beginning "As subsidiary bodies..." The text requested by Norway is "...or as subsidiary bodies contribute to work in outside bodies..."

[Click here to see the supporting document](#)

### Summary / Conclusion

With the change from Norway, the document was approved by SAOs.

## 5.3 Arctic Council communications guidelines and the Arctic Council Communications Strategy 2012-2016

### Background and discussion

The SAOC introduced a revised version of the draft AC communications guidelines developed during the Kingdom of Denmark's Chairmanship. The SAOC highlighted the document's assignment of roles and responsibilities, and the guidance that it provides on the use of the AC logo. The SAOC noted that the document is open to SAO review in the future, as needed.

The SAOC then opened a discussion of the communications strategy for the AC (Stockholm, 2012), which “expires” at the end of this year. The SAOC proposed that the Communications and outreach (C&O) group update the strategy and circulate it in time for consideration at the fall 2016 SAO meeting.

During the discussion, the U.S. emphasized that the WG secretariats should consistently participate in the C&O group, and that it is equally important to have communications professionals from the Arctic states involved in the process of drafting the update. Sweden followed by noting the strategic nature of a communications strategy, and stressing that the engagement of policy individuals is also critical. Regarding the “key messages” contained in the communications strategy, Sweden asked delegates to consider whether a broader deliberation on the AC’s long-term strategy should precede a review of the communications strategy.

Canada noted the importance of concrete community-outreach initiatives, highlighting an event run by CAFF in Cambridge Bay as a great example.

*Click here to see the supporting documents ([1](#), [2](#))*

### **Summary / Conclusion**

Regarding the revised AC communications guidelines, no delegations had any comments. The guidelines were approved as presented.

On the question of a review of The Communication Strategy for the Arctic Council (Stockholm, 2012), the SAOC summarized the discussions by noting an agreement to use the C&O group to assemble a draft of an updated version. The SAOC called for an inclusive process, including both communications experts and policy experts with knowledge of the AC. The SAOC asked the group to produce an updated version and circulate in time for consideration at the fall 2016 SAO meeting.

## 6. Cross-cutting theme #1 – Climate change and resilience

### 6.1 Paris agreement and its potential effect on future Arctic Council work

#### **Background and discussion**

Halldor Thorgeirsson, invited expert and Director for Strategy at the United Nations Climate Change Secretariat, presented on the climate change agreement reached in Paris in December 2015. After providing a summary of the agreement itself, Mr. Thorgeirsson highlighted the contributions that the AC could make in support of the Paris agreement: 1) continue to press for black carbon and methane mitigation; 2) focus on resilience and adaptation; 3) invest in Arctic observing systems; and 4) focus on communicating the role the Arctic plays in climate change.

During the discussion, several delegations asked how the AC can contribute in concrete ways, and whether the existing scientific assessments produced by the AC have been useful. In response, Mr. Thorgeirsson highlighted in particular (1) the contribution made to global emissions by the Arctic States, (2) the value of bilateral work between Arctic states and large industrializing economies, and (3) the extensive overlap between climate science writ large and specific Arctic climate research. In response to follow-up questions, Mr. Thorgeirsson specifically mentioned the ACIA and IPCC reports playing a role in Paris and that an input from AC work on climate monitoring and research would be highly welcomed for the next IPCC update in 2023. Mr. Thorgeirsson suggested that the AC consider an integrated approach to Arctic implementation of the Paris Agreement and the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

[Click here to see the presenter's speech.](#)

### **Summary / Conclusion**

(See summary for 6.5)

## 6.2 Black carbon and methane (BCM)

### **Background and discussion**

The EGBCM Chair spoke on the role of BCM in climate change both worldwide and in the Arctic specifically. The EGBCM Chair also provided a read-out from the first meeting of the EGBCM. The EGBCM Chair highlighted a commitment to accelerate the reduction of BCM emissions both within and, where possible, outside the Arctic region. The EGBCM Chair announced that national emissions inventories had been received from all the Arctic States and from eight accredited Observer states and the European Union, and said that participants in the first meeting of the EGBCM had addressed both potential parameters for recommending a goal for BCM emissions reductions and the possibility of developing a pan-Arctic inventory of emissions. The EGBCM Chair mentioned that teams have been assigned to consolidate information across five sectors: (1) oil and gas flaring, (2) mobile diesel sources, (3) solid waste, (4) residential biomass heating and (5) enteric fermentation as prime targets for reducing emissions of BCM.

Many delegates spoke up about the importance of this work in terms of its contributions to slowing climate change, improving air and health quality in Arctic communities, and demonstrating collaborative work among the Arctic States and accredited Observer states. AIA and SC expressed their desire to participate in the EGBCM.

[Click here to see the presenter's slides](#) and [supporting document](#)

### **Summary / Conclusion**

(See summary for 6.5)

## 6.3 Resilience

### 6.3.1 Report from resilience workshop

#### **Background and discussion**

Joel Clement, invited expert from the U.S. Department of the Interior, provided an overview on the AC resilience workshop that had taken place immediately prior to the SAO meeting. As background, Mr. Clement reviewed the extensive work on climate adaptation and resilience taking place within the AC, and suggested that efforts toward a more structured and collaborative approach would help to avoid duplication. Mr. Clement also mentioned a specific recommendation from the workshop, which was to hold a resilience forum every two years. As to the workshop itself, Mr. Clement noted great enthusiasm among participants and excellent progress made, including agreement upon a timeline, key messages, and next steps for the months ahead. Mr. Clement then asked SAOs for approval to present a draft framework at the fall 2016 SAO meeting, and asked each State, PP and WG to provide a point-of-contact to participate in the review team.

During the discussion, several delegations expressed gratitude for an explanation of the difference between resilience and adaptation, and the links between them; they also noted important links with other work going on both inside the AC (e.g., the AACA project) and outside (e.g., through the UNFCCC, or in Arctic communities). Numerous delegations agreed to provide a point-of-contact for the review team.

[Click here to see the supporting document](#)

#### **Summary / Conclusion**

(See summary for 6.5)

### 6.3.2 Update on the Arctic Resilience Assessment (ARA)

#### **Background and discussion**

Johan Kuylenstierna (Sweden) provided an update on the ARA (formerly Arctic Resilience Report, or ARR), which assesses interactions between the many drivers of change in the Arctic. Mr. Kuylenstierna noted 18 specific “regime shifts” that are currently observed to be underway in the region, and 25 case studies examining Arctic communities’ responses to ongoing change. ARA preliminary findings suggest that the AC would benefit from defining its place within a crowded and changing governance landscape in the region, and should consider ways to build its capacity to engage with many different relevant policy processes. Mr. Kuylenstierna informed delegates that the review and editing process for the ARA is currently underway. The U.S. and Sweden are co-leading the AC resilience work (including the workshop and the ARA) and the SAOs/PPs will have an opportunity to review the proposed resilience framework and policy-related components of the synthesis report.

Those delegates who spoke during the discussion were very supportive of the ARA. The U.S. emphasized that the ARA team should make an effort to distill the takeaways from the report into a short list (2-3) of policy recommendations that are practical and

implementable, rather than a lengthy list of recommendations that would likely be too difficult to implement. The U.S. also emphasized that a scientific assessment that is solely focused on the science will not require SAO review. However, a synthesis report with policy recommendations will need SAO review and approval. The report is on track to be completed during the U.S. Chairmanship and should be considered as a deliverable for the next Arctic Council ministerial.

[Click here to see the presenter's slides](#)

### **Summary / Conclusion**

(See summary for 6.5)

## 6.4 One Health: Operationalizing One Health in the Arctic

### **Background and discussion**

The Chair of SDWG introduced the WG's work on One Health, highlighting in particular (1) an ongoing survey, (2) events to gather and share knowledge from experts, (3) efforts to organize upcoming simulations or tabletop exercises, and (4) the future establishment of One Health "hubs" to assist with knowledge-sharing between communities. Regarding the survey, the Chair of SDWG asked for assistance with obtaining more responses, especially from the Nordic States and Russia. Among those who have already responded to the survey, the Chair of SDWG highlighted both (1) strong interest in further contact regarding One Health and (2) high awareness of the One Health concept.

*Click here to see the [presenter's slides](#) and supporting documents ([1](#), [2](#))*

### **Summary / Conclusion**

(See summary for 6.5)

## 6.5 Open discussion of climate change and resilience work in the Arctic Council

### **Background and discussion**

After showing a short film on climate change featured at the GLACIER conference in August 2015, the SAOC asked delegates to consider what the AC should do to address climate change issues in the next 5-10 years, beyond what it is already doing. The SAOC noted the clear need to continue with monitoring and assessment of climate change, addressing adaptation and resilience to climate change, and grappling with emissions of short-lived climate pollutants, but asked whether there is more that should be done.

The U.S. then presented its discussion paper on climate change and the future work of the AC, noting in particular the AC's potential role in educating the world about the Arctic and climate change. Sweden supported this point strongly, arguing that the AC could focus more on strategic communication and asked as well whether the AC's ongoing work on BCM could be a model for other ambitious work on further issues related to climate change. As three possibilities, Sweden suggested further work on wetlands (in addition to the biodiversity

aspect already covered by CAFF), regional implementation of [2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development](#), and reductions in flaring. Sweden also suggested that it is important to follow-up the concrete proposals and this discussion at the next SAO meeting. Finland addressed regional implementation of the UN Agenda 2030 as an important contribution the AC could make. Iceland noted the possibility of using the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary as a “hook” to draw global attention to climate change within the Arctic, and expressed a wish to see a substantive AC presence at future Climate Change COPs.

Canada wanted to see more AC work on renewables and closer cooperation with other groups and advocated an approach that would ensure the AC is working in areas in which it can add unique value and consider stopping work on those activities that are not aligned. This would free up resources for priority work, and making strides in implementation, not just sharing of best practices. Canada also addressed communications as one area in which the AC can contribute, but noted two distinct themes on (1) the Arctic generally, and (2) the work of the AC in particular. Furthermore, Canada emphasized the importance of communications to northern communities and to “the South,” and highlighted AC statements to COP meetings as one helpful effort. Russia expressed support for the points made by Canada, and added that it would be valuable to communicate about the work of regional and local governments towards adaptation and resilience; this idea in particular was supported by Norway. The Kingdom of Denmark expressed support for the idea of expanding the AC’s communications work on climate change, resilience and to work closer with AC Observers in international organizations.

ICC noted the urgency of addressing the impacts of climate change for local communities in the Arctic, many of which face imminent environmental, economic, and social challenges. ICC pointed out that many of these local-level issues “belong” to national governments to address. SC called upon states to show leadership in transforming their economies to renewable energy sources, the Arctic Council to take the lead in developing and adopting specific action plans for mitigation of carbon dioxide emissions, and states to conserve existing land-use.

The U.S. focused on the potential for impact by working through other fora (e.g., the Montréal Protocol, the Climate and Clean Air Coalition, and the International Maritime Organization) and noted that it would also be worthwhile to cooperate with industry-focused ministries to reduce the cost of new technologies. AMAP provided final remarks, noting that current commitments are insufficient, and that interventions will be needed to reach mitigation goals; AMAP suggested that the AC might explore intervention techniques.

[Click here to see the supporting document](#)

### **Summary / Conclusion**

The SAOC summarized the discussion at some length, including the following points.

- The AC should focus on those efforts in which it can truly add value.
- The AC is in a unique position to engage with peoples of the Arctic region, and should make efforts to engage local/regional organizations and governments.

- The AC has limited time, resources and capacity. Any future initiatives must take this into account. It is important not to lose what we are already doing well in the AC.
- Specific areas for work might include wetlands, implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), gas flaring, and strategic communications. The latter might include a call for attention to the consequences of climate change.
- The next five years between the 20<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> anniversaries of the AC could be a significant time to work more on renewable energy, and on engagement with stakeholders outside the AC “family”.
- The AC should work not just on big-picture issues, but also on the urgent issues facing communities in the Arctic.
- The AC – the Arctic States and Observer states, working together – could do more to push together and work as an “Arctic caucus” of sorts in other fora, such as the IMO, the UNFCCC, CCAC and the Montreal Protocol.
- The Arctic States are united in a desire to encourage Observers to work alongside them on these issues, for example by joining the CCAC, developing BC reports and working with the EGBCM.
- AMAP will present to the Arctic States on what the Paris agreement, if fully implemented, would mean for the Arctic cryosphere over the next century. Some suggested that we consider a presentation on climate change during the 2017 Ministerial meeting.

SAOs agreed to follow-up this discussion specifically with these actions:

- Delegates agreed to an enhanced presence at COP22 in Marrakech. Iceland, the U.S. and the Chairmanship will work to think more about specific proposals for AC involvement in COP22.
- The U.S., with the C&O group, was charged to work on a plan for strategic communications on climate change issues. The U.S. noted a focus on educating the COP on the Arctic writ large, and not necessarily on the AC’s work in particular. A conference call among SAOs and PPs may be needed to further discuss climate change communications in preparation for the October 2016 SAO meeting.

## 7. Cross-cutting theme #2 – Future Arctic Council work on oil and gas

### 7.1 EPPR presentation

#### **Background and discussion**

(No presentation given)

*[Click here to see the supporting documents \(1, 2\)](#)*

#### **Summary / Conclusion**

The SAOC asked that the report “Overview of Measures Specifically Designed to Prevent Oil Pollution in the Arctic Marine Environment from Offshore Petroleum Activities,” originally intended for approval at the Fairbanks meeting, be presented for approval no later than the October 2016 meeting. All delegations agreed.

### 7.2 ACAP presentation

#### **Background and discussion**

The Chair of ACAP introduced delegates to the idea of reducing gas flaring as one important channel through which to reduce BCM emissions in the Arctic; the Chair of ACAP then presented a project under development within ACAP focused on such reductions from the oil and gas sector in Russia. After pointing out both the volume of flaring that takes place, and the different reasons that gases are flared rather than used, the Chair of ACAP highlighted several techniques and technologies for reducing gas flaring. Norway noted that gas flaring is prohibited in Norway with the exception of emergency flaring.

During a brief discussion that followed, the U.S. noted the importance of harmonizing measurement methods for emissions with other entities that do related work, and Norway pointed out the importance of coordinating with other bi- and multi-lateral initiatives among the Arctic States on this issue.

*[Click here to see the presenter's slides](#)*

#### **Summary / Conclusion**

(See summary for 7.4)

### 7.3 Arctic Offshore Regulators’ Forum (AORF)

#### **Background and discussion**

Mark Fesmire, an invited expert and current Chair of the Arctic Offshore Regulators Forum, presented on the development of the AORF. Mr. Fesmire first offered a summary of the AORF as an outgrowth of the work of the TFOPP, and then presented the Forum’s terms of reference. Mr. Fesmire emphasized in particular the focus of the AORF on information exchange, as opposed to policy development, and drew delegates’ attention to two

upcoming meetings of the AORF to take place in late April 2016 (Washington, DC) and late October 2016 (to be determined).

The AORF is a forum of technical and operational offshore petroleum safety regulators whose members are dedicated to the common cause of improving offshore safety outcomes in the Arctic. The AORF's scope is the exchange of information, best practices and relevant experiences learned from regulatory efforts related to developing petroleum resources in the Arctic.

During the discussion, the U.S. pointed out the desirability of coordination between the AORF and EPPR and PAME and also highlighted AORF's requirement to keep SAOs informed of ongoing activity. Canada noted the value of the AORF as a body that might help to harmonize the regulatory environment around the Arctic. The SAOC added that the AEC also hopes to look at regulatory practices around the region.

In response to a comment from Canada, Norway noted that offshore and terrestrial O&G production are governed by two different regulatory frameworks, and that petroleum is national regulated, because of different conditions. Accordingly, Norway emphasized the importance of having Russia join the AORF. Russia said that it wishes to become a member of the AORF, but is still discussing the opportunity both internally and with the U.S. and Norway.

It was noted by EPPR that a workshop on standards for prevention of oil spills from offshore Arctic O&G will be taking place in London in April 2016, and EPPR encouraged all States, PPs and Observers to consider attending. [Note: Due to a conflict with an IMO meeting, this workshop has been moved to the margins of the EPPR I meeting, and will now take place on 14 June 2016, in Montreal, Canada.]

*Click here to see the [presenter's slides](#) and [supporting document](#)*

## **Summary / Conclusion**

(See summary for 7.4)

## 7.4 Open discussion of oil and gas work in the Arctic Council

### **Background and discussion**

The SAOC asked delegates whether there are new things that the AC should be doing, or thinking about, in the field of Arctic O&G. The U.S. then introduced a discussion paper on the AC's work in this area, drawing particular attention to the breadth of that existing body of work and to the proliferation of recommendations in this area. In addition to updating existing research and continuing with already-planned work, the U.S. encouraged WGs to consider whether work on terrestrial O&G would be beneficial.

Norway pointed to O&G in Norway as a mature industry and an important driver of regional development in northern Norway, and asked whether the AC focuses adequate attention on the value of O&G as an important driver of economic development, as opposed to merely a source of environmental risk. (SDWG responded later, noting that such an analysis will be part of "The Economy of the North" updated report that will be finalized in the fall of 2016.)

Russia supported the remarks by Norway, and the Kingdom of Denmark and Canada also offered support for the idea that O&G can be an important driver of economic development for Arctic communities. Canada, however, pointed out that other Arctic States may be very interested in the topic of offshore Arctic O&G as well, and underlined in addition the importance of engaging sub-national governments and indigenous organizations in such work. The U.S. thought that several Arctic States have a strong interest in new O&G work, and said that the AC is the expert in research on Arctic O&G. Norway responded on the latter point, pointing instead to the national authorities and research institutions in States with petroleum production as the experts.

AAC drew delegates' attention to the close tie between O&G work and fishing, pointing out CAFF's "Salmon Peoples" project as a good way for the Arctic States to meaningfully engage with PPs on these issues. The SC then raised the issue of tension between fisheries and O&G work in northern Norway emphasizing that both industries are important for regional development. Norway agreed with the SC and said that Norway successfully manages fisheries and O&G development in the same ocean areas. ICC noted that proliferation of regulation has in some cases hindered indigenous peoples' ability to develop O&G on lands for which they have that right. ICC also emphasized the deep concern that coastal peoples have in keeping their waters clean, and noted that income from the O&G industry can support critical services such as education and health in northern communities.

PAME and AIA pointed out ongoing work in PAME to update existing O&G guidelines, rather than to produce further recommendations.

[Click here to see the supporting document](#)

### **Summary / Conclusion**

The SAOC observed that points of view on this issue differ broadly among delegations, and summarized the discussion with the following points.

- Some delegations thought that the AC has spent too much time focused on environment impacts of O&G activity, and not enough time focused on potential benefits of economic development from O&G activity. Others, however, thought that there are substantial environmental consequences of O&G activity that must be addressed.
- Delegates did not agree upon new areas into which the AC could expand its activities with regard to O&G; however, ACAP's developing project on reducing BCM emissions from flaring might be one example. WGs were asked to consider which of their existing products in this area could benefit from a "refresh" or update in light of new developments in, for example, technology innovation.
- Several delegations were emphatic about the important distinction between offshore and onshore activity, in terms of jurisdiction, regulation, and environmental issues.
- In general, delegates appear to want balance between environmental protection and sustainable development, but there is not yet broad agreement about what that means in this area. Russia and Norway, and any others who wish the AC to think

more about economic and regional development, were asked to suggest concrete proposals on how the AC could focus more on the potential for O&G as a driver of economic development, in order to help the AC consider whether activities could be expanded in that direction.

## 8. Other Arctic Council projects and initiatives

### 8.1 The Task Force on Telecommunications Infrastructure in the Arctic (TFTIA)

#### **Background and discussion**

The SAO for Norway presented an update on the activities of the TFTIA and the outcomes from the second meeting, held in Tromsø in February 2016. Those outcomes included a draft work plan and table of contents. Norway also noted that the TFTIA is the first AC TF to actively try to engage the AEC in its work; the head of the AEC's working group on telecommunications virtually presented to the TFTIA meeting.

Norway then presented two questions for SAOs' input. First: What is the appropriate level and nature of engagement with the AEC? And second: should a common "vision" for the future of Arctic telecommunications infrastructure be part of the report?

During the discussion, several delegations agreed that industry will be an important partner in any future telecommunications development in the Arctic, and that as a result interaction with the AEC is well worth trying and exploring. The prospect of a workshop including representatives from the AEC working group and the TFTIA was raised. Canada noted that the interest may be challenging to generate on the AEC side, as it may not be clear to industry representatives what the value of taking part in the TFTIA will be.

Several delegations expressed skepticism that a vision statement in the TFTIA report would be useful or appropriate.

*Click here to see the [presenter's slides](#) and supporting documents ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#))*

#### **Summary / Conclusion**

The SAOC summarized by noting general support for the idea of working with the AEC in whatever capacity seems possible. Not all delegations were prepared to endorse the idea of a joint workshop at this stage. There were differing views on a possible vision statement. The SAOC concluded that in light of this, the TF should focus on developing recommendations and an analysis of existing infrastructure as described in its mandate.

## 8.2 The Task Force for Enhancing Scientific Cooperation in the Arctic (SCTF)

### Background and discussion

The Co-chair from the U.S. presented on behalf of the SCTF. The Co-chair provided a summary of the SCTF's most recent meeting in early March 2016, and thanked Canada in particular for successfully obtaining a mandate to work towards a legally binding agreement. The Co-chair informed delegates that a draft agreement is expected after the next meeting, coming up in early July in Canada, and described the different elements of the draft agreement that are currently being considered by the TF.

During the discussion, Russia expressed hope that the upcoming meeting in July will be the final one for the SCTF. The Kingdom of Denmark noted concern among accredited Observer states about potential unintended negative effects of the draft agreement on scientific collaboration with non-parties. This point was echoed later by Iceland, and the U.S. reassured delegates that the agreement would not undercut other existing arrangements that support scientific collaboration among Arctic and non-Arctic states. Russia pointed out that the paper submitted by some of the Observer States (France, Germany, UK) to the SCTF was considered and that the current draft agreement reflects deliberations over that input.

The Kingdom of Denmark also emphasized that there must be clear distinction between any statement emerging from the planned White House Arctic Science Ministerial to take place in Summer 2016 and the 2017 Fairbanks Ministerial declaration.

Canada emphasized the importance of including language on TLK in the agreement, and AIA said that there is a possibility that they may resubmit to the SCTF a draft annex with brief and carefully-worded language regarding TLK.

*Click here to see the [supporting document](#)*

### Summary / Conclusion

The SAOC noted uniform support for the work of the SCTF, and the production of an agreement as a major deliverable to the 2017 Ministerial. The SAOC encouraged the co-chairs and delegates to the SCTF to take on board concerns about any potential barriers to cooperation with non-Arctic states that might be raised by the agreement. Finally, the SAOC reiterated that another proposal on the inclusion of TLK in the agreement may be forthcoming.

## 8.3 The Task Force for Arctic Marine Cooperation (TFAMC)

### Background and discussion

The Co-chair from the U.S. provided an update on the work of the TFAMC. In its work thus far, the TFAMC has focused on (1) identifying existing strategic objectives in this area, (2) considering what opportunities to enhance cooperation are of interest to explore, preliminarily, and (3) discussing possible principles to guide the work of the TFAMC into the future. The Co-chair drew delegates' attention in particular to broad consensus that this

work should indeed take place within the Arctic Council, and that the involvement of Arctic indigenous peoples is essential. The Co-chair then provided an overview of the TFAMC's work plan between now and the 2017 Ministerial, much of which involves internal consultations by each of the Arctic States. The TFAMC expects to have recommendations available for consideration by SAOs and Ministers in early 2017. The Kingdom of Denmark, supported by Iceland and Norway, highlighted the importance of discussions of marine protected areas in the Arctic to be discussed within the Arctic Council and not in other fora.

[Click here to see the supporting document](#)

### **Summary / Conclusion**

This item was for information.

## 9. Other Business

### 9.1 Permanent Participant funding mechanism

Nils Andreassen of the Institute of the North, speaking on behalf of GCI, provided an update on the plan that has been developed for the creation of a PP funding mechanism. Mr. Andreassen identified a foundation in Sweden as the most advantageous legal entity and domicile for such a funding mechanism, and pointed out that legal and technical advice would be necessary to ensure that the fund meets all accountability and transparency principles. Mr. Andreassen described the likely management and oversight structure for the fund, and listed three separate funds that have been suggested: (1) a capacity-building endowment, (2) a holding account for short term or emergency needs, and (3) a project fund. The SAOC expressed gratitude for this work and invited delegates to approach Mr. Andreassen and GCI offline for more information.

[Click here to see the presenter's slides](#)

### 9.2 Project Support Instrument (PSI)

The SAOC informed delegates that there are uncertainties regarding the trial period for the PSI. The SAOC encouraged those involved with the PSI to review the documentation and come up with a clear understanding of the beginning and end of the PSI trial period. The PSI will under no circumstances end in 2016.

### 9.3 Remarks from accredited Observers

The SAOC offered Observers the opportunity to deliver brief remarks. Observers self-organized into three groups: IGOs, States, and NGOs.

#### 9.3.1 Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs)

Anna Maria Mikkelsen, Senior Advisor at the Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM), spoke on behalf of the IGOs among accredited AC Observers. Ms. Mikkelsen informed delegates about the work of the NCM and about its support for AC-related work, including UArctic,

reindeer husbandry, ocean acidification, BCM, the AMSP, biodiversity, and more. Ms. Mikkelsen also highlighted the work of Nordic environment and energy ministers on an ambitious program for follow-up of the Paris climate change agreement.

### 9.3.2 States

Michael Däumer, from Germany's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, spoke on behalf of the States among accredited AC Observers. Mr. Däumer highlighted the value of the AC as a forum in which Observer states can interact with SAOs, PPs, WG Chairs and others and stated that the AC is attractive to Observer states because the Arctic region, and the issue of climate change that is so visible in the Arctic, are of global interest. Mr. Däumer noted the extensive research done in the Arctic by researchers from Observer states, and drew attention to participation by such researchers in AC WGs, TFs and EGs, as well as Observer states' support for the inclusion of TLK in such research.

Regarding the work of the SCTF in particular, Mr. Däumer expressed thanks for the progress made concerning article 19, which addresses cooperation with non-Arctic states.

### 9.3.3 Non-governmental Organizations

Volker Rachold, executive secretary at the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC) secretariat, spoke on behalf of the NGOs among accredited AC Observers. Mr. Rachold emphasized that the projection of a 2-degree increase in global average temperature is very optimistic, and that any such increase will have dramatic consequences for the Arctic. Mr. Rachold asked the eight Arctic States to take a strong voice in climate negotiations and in communicating the urgent need to reduce climate emissions, and highlighted his desire for the AC to support SAON, as well as efforts to establish international funding mechanisms to monitor and combat climate change that do not yet exist. Mr. Rachold took special note of the value of both science and TLK, and of the importance of facilitating science-to-policy knowledge transfer.

## 9.4 Other items

Iceland informed delegates that IASC has decided to relocate its secretariat from Potsdam, Germany to Akureyri, Iceland as of 1 January 2017.

In anticipation of their departure, all delegates at the meeting thanked Susan Harper and Erik Vilstrup Lorenzen for their service and friendship during their tenures with the AC.

## Annex: List of documents submitted for information

Info Doc 1: Amarok: Arctic Council Tracker

Info Doc 2: Update from the ACS on the Ratification of the Agreement on Cooperation on Marine Oil Pollution Preparedness and Response in the Arctic

Info Doc 3: Update from NEFCO on the Project Support Instrument (PSI)

Info Doc 4: Response to recommendations from the Future Arctic Leaders workshop

Info Doc 5: Memo on educational kits (CAFF)

Info Doc 6: Arctic Council 20th anniversary photo slide show

Info Doc 7: Cover Note on Arctic Marine Strategic Plan (AMSP) Communication and Implementation Plans (PAME)

Info Doc 8: AMSP Communication Plan (PAME)

Info Doc 9: AMSP Implementation Plan (PAME)

Info Doc 10: Cover note on the Arctic Ship Traffic Data (ASTD) Project Plan (PAME)

Info Doc 11: ASTD Project Plan (PAME)

Info Doc 12: Report from the 3rd International Conference on Arctic Research Planning ICARP III

Info Doc 13: CBMP Coastal Biodiversity Monitoring background paper

Info Doc 14: Memo on the Arctic Migratory Bird Initiative (AMBI)

Info Doc 15: AACA and ARA primer