



Arctic Council SAO plenary meeting
13-14 March 201, Ruka, Finland
Meeting code: SAOFI204

Document Title

SDWG Suggestions on ARAF for consideration by SAOs

Agenda item number

7.1.5

Submitted by

SDWG

Document filename

SAOFI204_2019_RUKA_07-01-05_SDWG_ARAF-Suggestions

Number of pages, not including this cover sheet

3



12 February 2019

Note to Reader: SAOs requested SDWG to provide advice regarding the ARAF project and its future disposition. SDWG's "suggestions" are found in Section I below. These suggestions are to be distinguished from the "recommendations" of the ARAF Implementation Team found in the ARAF Progress Report 2017-2019, which are found in Section II below. To the extent that the SDWG suggestions vary from the ARAF recommendations, some explanation is provided in Section III below.

I. SDWG Suggestions on ARAF for consideration by SAOs

- *SDWG recognizes the efforts undertaken by the ARAF project to highlight the need for resilience- building in the Arctic and to encourage the Arctic Council and its subsidiary bodies to view their activities through a resilience lens.*
- *The Arctic Resilience Forum provided an excellent opportunity to share resilience-building actions and experiences on climate change adaptation and engage in networking.*
- *The SDWG recommends that SAOs be inspired by the four priority areas listed in ARAF when planning the future work of the Arctic Council.*
- *The SDWG takes note of Working Group actions building resilience which are extensively listed under the four priority areas of ARAF.*
- *The SDWG considers that Arctic Council Working Groups are well positioned to carry forward the work of resilience building in the Arctic and to operationalize the concept within their respective working areas in a manner which is compatible with their respective mandates.*
- *The SDWG highlights the need to focus on adaptation capacity and management of climate-related risks in the Arctic and notes that the essence of strengthening resilience and adaptive capacity is through connecting communities across the circumpolar Arctic to share knowledge, practices, and tools related to climate adaptation.*
- *The SDWG acknowledges health as an important aspect in understanding resilience and encourages future resilience work to be rooted in a holistic perspective that considers health and highlights the interconnectedness between health, social, ecological, and cultural systems.*
- *Looking ahead, the SDWG favors a mainstreaming approach to resilience building rather than having a stand-alone project work on resilience building.*
- *SDWG could revisit the matter in 2020 in a SDWG meeting with invited experts to take stock of the developments of resilience work in the Arctic region.*
- *SDWG takes note of the proposed work on indicators but would not suggest making this a target for any immediate action.*

II. Summary of ARAF Implementation Team's recommendations (section 8.2. of the ARAF Progress Report 2017-2019)

A. Identifying existing good practices, building a "community of practice"

The report recommends strengthening links among practitioners, supporting efforts to expand or scale

up successful project activities, and expanding a community of practice. Suggested activities include an online platform or a list share that displays case examples and allows users to interact in a virtual space, mini-workshops on resilience, developing an in-depth catalog of resilience funding opportunities, identifying emerging priorities not captured by the original ARAF document, and developing education/communication materials.

B. A second Resilience Forum: how might it contribute

The report recommends using a second Forum to review and share progress. It suggests making a second Forum workshop oriented with a focus on hands-on discussions and using it to show how ARAF can help demonstrate collaboration needed to encourage additional public and private investment in Arctic resilience building.

C. Mainstreaming Resilience in Arctic Council Working Groups

The report suggests that Arctic Council Working Groups develop selected projects as a test case for applying resilience principles, including a social-ecological systems perspective, knowledge integration and expanded collaboration across Working Groups.

D. Developing resilience indicators: How can results be monitored and assessed?

The report lists a number of possible activities, including updating a list of on-going indicator work in AMAP and in the EU's Joint Research Center, organizing a workshop to refine existing indicators, using a model such as INFORM (a global, open-source risk assessment for humanitarian crises and disasters) while adapting it to the Arctic context, identifying communities with an interest in developing indicators, and looking for funding for indicator work outside the Arctic Council.

III. Justification for SDWG's Suggestions to SAOs on ARAF

In relation to recommendation A by ARAF

There is a wide definition of resilience in ARAF. Resilience is already widely promoted in the work of Arctic Council. The specific recommendations proposed by ARAF under A ("*Identifying good practices*") and a proposal to establish a new "*Community of Practice*") do not fully reflect the existing resilience-related work within the Arctic Council.

However, in the context of climate change, a more narrow definition of resilience corresponds to the overall need for increasing adaptation measures in the Arctic. A specific recommendation by ARAF under "*Other potential activities*" including: "*Identification of emerging priorities that the original ARAF document does not capture*", could possibly relate to additional work related to adaptation measures specifically needed in the Arctic.

In relation to recommendation B by ARAF

The content of a possible second resilience forum is not clearly defined in ARAF's recommendation B. The usefulness and need for a potential second forum/workshop/thematic sessions, including ARAF's recommendations A on *other potential activities* and/or D on *indicators*, have not been assessed and

should not be a target for any immediate action.

In relation to recommendation C by ARAF

Mainstreaming resilience relates to most of the practical work currently taking place in Arctic Council Working Groups. The Working Groups are best placed to assess the usefulness and additional value of ARAF for their work.

In relation to recommendation D by ARAF

As described under recommendation D by ARAF, there is a wealth of indicator work available for resilience but not necessarily always analyzed in the Arctic context (In addition to AMAP for instance: Agenda 2030/SDGs, the EU/JRC, etc.). The SDWG takes note of this recommendation but suggests that this should not be a target for any immediate action.