

**EIGHTH MEETING OF THE CAFF INTERNATIONAL
WORKING GROUP**

CAFF VIII

SUMMARY REPORT

Trondheim, Norway, September 6-9, 2000

Prepared by the CAFF International Secretariat 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
SESSION I: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION	1
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1a. Opening statement	1
1b. Chairman's address	2
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	3
SESSION II: THE CAFF WORK PROGRAM	4
3. ARCTIC CLIMATE IMPACT ASSESSMENT (ACIA)	4
Progress Report	4
Report from joint AMAP/CAFF Meeting – Sept. 4, 2000	4
Plenary discussion	5
4. CIRCUMPOLAR BIODIVERSITY MONITORING NETWORK	7
Progress Report	7
Reports from networks	7
Plenary discussion	8
5. CIRCUMPOLAR PROTECTED AREAS NETWORK (CPAN)	9
Progress Report	9
Report of the CPAN Committee and Plenary discussion	10
6. CAFF OVERVIEW REPORT: STATUS OF ARCTIC FLORA, FAUNA AND HABITATS	12
Progress Report	12
Plenary Discussion	13
7. CAFF/GEF PROJECT	13
Progress Report	13
Plenary Discussion	14
8. CAFF FLORA WORK	14
Progress Report	14
Plenary discussion	15
9. CAFF SEABIRD WORK	15
Progress Report from the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group	15
The Bycatch Workshop - report and recommendations	16
Plenary discussion	17
SESSION III: RELATIONS WITH OBSERVERS	18
10. RELATIONS WITH OBSERVER ORGANISATIONS	18
Reports from Observers	18
Plenary discussion	19
11. RELATIONS WITH AC WORKING GROUPS	20
SESSION IV: PLANNING AHEAD	21
12. FUTURE INITIATIVES	21
Circumpolar Marine Workshop (CMW)	21
Plenary Discussion	21
13. THE CAFF WORK PLAN 2000-2002	21
14. REPORTING TO SAOS AND MINISTERS	22
15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	22
16. CLOSE OF MEETING	22
Appendix 1 CAFF VIII participants list	
Appendix 2 CAFF VIII Agenda	
Appendix 3 CAFF Input to Barrow Ministerial Declaration	
Appendix 4 CAFF: Input to SAO Report to Ministers, Barrow	
Appendix 5 Work Plan 2000-002	

CAFF VIII REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Arctic Council Working Group for the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) met for the eighth time in Trondheim, Norway, September 6-8, 2000, to report on progress and discuss the way ahead for the CAFF Program.

In her opening statement, Anne Sæterdal, Secretary General, Norwegian Ministry of the Environment, spoke of the global importance of the Arctic environment and the need to protect its resources against increasing external and internal pressures. She emphasised the full support of the Norwegian Government to Arctic collaboration, including CAFF, and announced a \$40 000 US support to CAFF's efforts, in collaboration with UNEP and GEF, to safeguard the extensive undisturbed ecosystems of the Russian Arctic.

Berit Lein, CAFF Chairman, provided an overview of CAFF's achievements since the last Ministerial meeting in Iqaluit and noted her general satisfaction with progress on Ministerial priorities. She also informed about the status of the new CAFF/GEF project in the Russian Arctic and called for strong support from other CAFF countries to this project.

Following the opening session, the meeting assessed the status of various CAFF Program activities and discussed the way ahead for each of them:

The development of the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) is well underway, with selection of lead authors for 14 sub-topics almost completed. An ACIA Secretariat has been established in Fairbanks, Alaska, supported by the U.S. CAFF needs to appoint a second representative for the Assessment Steering Committee. A report was given from a joint CAFF/AMAP meeting on September 4, where the two working groups agreed to work closely together on the implementation of ACIA and prepared joint documents to the Barrow Ministerial meeting. It was emphasised that CAFF needs to be proactive in providing ACIA with biodiversity information and in identifying contributing authors and resource persons for the assessment.

A CAFF/AMAP workshop was held in Reykjavik, Iceland, in February 2000, to launch the development of a Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program. As a result seven expert networks (ringed seal, Arctic char, waders/shorebirds, seabirds, reindeer/caribou, wetlands, vascular plants) have been established for key elements of Arctic biota. Another two networks (geese, polar bear) are planned. The meeting agreed to focus CAFF's efforts for the time being on supporting the work of these networks and to work for better integration of CAFF and AMAP monitoring activities.

With respect to the Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN), CAFF co-sponsored a Circumpolar Marine Workshop with the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and PAME, to explore practical ways to promote conservation, environmental protection, and sustainable development in coastal and marine ecosystems. CAFF published "Summary of Legal Instruments and National Frameworks for Arctic Marine Protection" and a "GAP Analysis for the Russian Arctic in Support of CPAN". The CPAN Standing Committee reported on their deliberations for further development of CPAN. The meeting decided to prioritise work on improving electronic and managerial linkages among Arctic protected areas, on enhancing protection of sacred sites and sanctuaries of indigenous peoples of the Russian Arctic and on assessing the full value of Arctic protected areas. The CPAN Standing Committee will further evaluate recommendations from the Circumpolar Marine Workshop and advise on CAFF's role in marine protection.

CAFF VIII REPORT

Completion of CAFF's Overview Report on Arctic conservation issues is progressing well, although the Ministerial deadline could not be reached as planned. With the assistance of Greenland, the Editorial Team prepared a preview booklet for the Ministerial meeting, which captures the theme of the overview report, entitled "Arctic Flora and Fauna: Biodiversity, Status and Conservation". The meeting decided to deliver the full report to the 10-year anniversary meeting of the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (APPS) to be held in conjugation with the meeting of the Senior Arctic Officials in Rovaniemi in June 2001. Specific recommendations will be presented by CAFF to Ministers at a later time (fall 2002). Countries agreed to do their best to provide the status and trends information requested from the Editorial Team.

With respect to the CAFF GEF Project, "Integrated Ecosystem Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimise Habitat Fragmentation in the Russian Arctic", a PDF-B development phase was approved by GEF in July 2000. The GEF has committed \$350 000 US to the PDF-B phase, which is estimated to run through 2001, provided that co-funding amounting to \$450 000 is raised from other sources. The meeting provided full support to the project and countries will do their best to raise cash and in-kind support for it.

The "Atlas of Rare Endemic Vascular Plants of the Arctic" was printed and the Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map, a circumpolar synthesis map and database, is planned for completion in 2002. A report was provided to the meeting by an ad hoc flora group, established at CAFF VII. The meeting decided to establish a permanent CAFF Flora Group. This group will identify flora conservation priorities for CAFF and link the flora work with other major projects of CAFF, such as ACIA, biodiversity monitoring and CPAN.

The CAFF Circumpolar Seabird Working Group (CSWG) reported good progress with implementation of the International Murre Conservation Strategy and Action Plan and the Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan. In support of both strategies, CAFF hosted a workshop on "Seabird Incidental Bycatch in the Waters of Arctic Countries" in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, April 2000. The workshop produced recommendations on outreach and education, monitoring and assessment, mitigation measures, and mechanisms for reducing the bycatch of seabirds in commercial marine fisheries, and emphasised the need to bring fisheries management and seabird conservation agencies together within each CAFF country.

Representatives from Observer countries and organisations, the Netherlands, United Kingdom, World Conservation Union (IUCN), UNEP GRID-Arendal, World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF), addressed the meeting and informed about projects of joint interest and cooperation opportunities. A representative from the Arctic Council Working Group on the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment spoke of opportunities for joint efforts for marine protection.

The meeting reviewed and adopted CAFF's input to the Barrow Ministerial Declaration and SAO Report to Ministers. A new CAFF Work Plan 2000-2002, listing 20 action items, was deliberated and adopted.

The meeting elected a new Chair, Sune Sohlberg, Sweden, and Vice-chair, Janet Hohn, United States, for the upcoming inter-ministerial period 2000-2002.

Session I: Welcome and Introduction

1 Introduction

The Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) Working Group of the Arctic Council (AC) met for the eight time in Trondheim, Norway, on September 6-8, 2000. The meeting gathered roughly 40 representatives from Arctic States, AC Permanent Participants and AC Observers (see Appendix 1). The following report highlights the progress reported and discussions held at the meeting. Relevant background documents are found at: <http://www.ni.is/caff1>

1a. Opening statement

Anne Sæterdal, Secretary General, Norwegian Ministry of the Environment welcomed participants to CAFF-VIII and Trondheim. She spoke of the global importance of the European Arctic where some of the world's largest relatively undisturbed areas are located with unique biological diversity and diverse cultures of indigenous peoples who still base their livelihoods on the harvesting of living resources. The rapid growth of the world's population and the global economic output place increasing pressure on the northern environment and the Arctic is increasingly being looked upon as a "resource pool" for renewable (e.g., fish) and non-renewable (e.g., oil and gas) resources for use outside the Arctic. The natural environment of the Arctic is furthermore threatened by pollution transported by winds and ocean currents from lower latitudes, as well as from local sources of pollution. The special living conditions of the circumpolar north raise several serious health problems. Besides the physiological and psychological problems of cold, darkness and deprivation, they include the health consequences of local and global pollution and the health problems of indigenous populations in transition.

Many of these problems are transboundary in nature calling for common actions to increase knowledge about and monitor the state of the environment, and to develop models and possibilities for sustainable use of natural resources. Crucial for success are conclusions and implementation of global and regional environmental conventions and programs, including those of the Arctic, Nordic and Barents Councils. Sæterdal informed about several Norwegian initiatives under these and other programs as well as national conservation initiatives on Svalbard and Bear Island.

With respect the Arctic environmental cooperation and CAFF, Mrs. Sæterdal emphasised its role in developing models for important habitat networks, monitoring and sustainable use of natural resources, environmentally-friendly tourism, understanding impacts of climate change, and in developing other premises for the global co-operation on biodiversity. She congratulated CAFF on the development of the GEF project: "Integrated Ecosystem Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimise Habitat Fragmentation in the Russian Arctic" and announced \$40 000 cash support from Norway to its PDF-B phase and challenged all the CAFF countries to contribute to realise this important project.

CAFF VIII REPORT

1b. Chairman's address

Berit Lein, CAFF Chairman, welcomed participants and thanked the Norwegian Ministry of Environment for support at the political level. She reviewed the five priority tasks that were identified for CAFF at the first Arctic Council ministerial meeting in Iqaluit in 1998 and noted that progress had been good on all tasks and furthermore CAFF had ventured into some new projects.

The task of preparing a CAFF Overview Report on the status of Arctic flora and fauna was hampered by lack of common understanding and financial commitment by CAFF before it was announced in Iqaluit. The intention to deliver a good draft to the Barrow Ministerial failed and, therefore, the Editorial Team was requested to prepare an introductory booklet "*Arctic Flora and Fauna: An Introduction to Biodiversity, Status and Conservation*" for the Ministerial meeting. The Editorial Team accomplished this with the assistance of Greenland. The Chairman asked CAFF VIII to consider and decide how and when the larger Overview Report would be completed.

In Iqaluit, the Ministers asked AMAP and CAFF to assess the impacts of climate change on Arctic ecosystems – a project that has now formally materialised in the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment. ACIA, which is a tremendous task, was discussed at length in a joint meeting with AMAP on September 4, 2000. The Chairman noted her satisfaction with the current ACIA Implementation Plan and an organisational structure that can work for CAFF.

Towards the goal of establishing a program to monitor circumpolar biodiversity, the workshop in Iceland, February 2000, launched expert networks for six of nine priority species and habitats identified. Monitoring is one of CAFF's main priorities for the next period and it is hoped that all nine networks will soon be in place.

With respect to progress on implementing CPAN, the Chairman welcomed the active involvement of RAIPON in CAFF through initiating the project on "Biological Significance of Sacred Site of Indigenous Peoples in the Arctic: A Study in Northern Russia"; she mentioned the challenge before CAFF on how to proceed co-operatively with marine conservation issues, based *inter alia* on recommendations from the Circumpolar Marine Workshop in Montreal in 1999, and; thanked the United States for leading the CPAN work and Standing Committee.

The Chairman reviewed the history behind and status of a new GEF project to enhance biodiversity conservation efforts in Northern Russia. Hard work by CAFF, UNEP and Russia had now resulted in a GEF Secretariat endorsement and funding of a large planning project, a so-called PDF-B. The generous support by the government of Norway, just announced, would give additional strength to the planning phase. Other countries were invited to provide active support to this project, which represents a unique opportunity to support Russia in the conservation and sustainable development of some of the world's last remaining intact ecosystems and wilderness areas.

On the issues of increased co-ordination and co-operation between the Arctic Council working groups, another Ministerial request, the Chairman mentioned the co-operation with AMAP on developing a circumpolar biodiversity monitoring network and the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA), and the co-operation with PAME

CAFF VIII REPORT

and IUCN on the Circumpolar Marine Workshop. These initiatives are of such a size, importance and complexity that comprehensive and joint efforts are needed to achieve good results. In addition, the Chairman expressed hopes that the good working relations CAFF has with its long-time observers, including the Netherlands, UNEP GRID Arendal, WCMC, WWF's Arctic programme and IUCN, may continue.

In closing, the Chairman pointed out that CAFF next year will have its 10-year anniversary and, although, much progress has been made, there is still a plenty of work to do, and decisions and priorities to be made based on sound resource considerations.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The Agenda (see Appendix 2) was adopted with a few changes in order of items.

Session II: The CAFF Work Program

3. Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA)

Progress Report

The Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) Steering Committee (ASC) held its 5th meeting in Copenhagen, June 15-16, 2000. The main task of the meeting was to review submitted author nominations and propose candidate lead-authors for the ACIA. Approximately 300 nominations were received. The ASC sought to identify lead-authors that combined scientific and leadership capacity to effectively organise the work of the writing teams.

Draft Terms of Reference for the ASC were adopted at the SAO-meeting in May 2000 with the reservation that it should be clear that all Arctic countries have a right to be represented on the ASC in one form or another. The ASC will consist of 13 lead authors and two representatives each from AMAP, CAFF, IASC, and IPOs. Observers will be invited from appropriate international organisations. The ASC has appointed a five-man Executive Committee for day-to-day management of the ACIA. The ACIA Secretariat will be based in Fairbanks, Alaska, and is headed by Gunter Weller.

The estimated total cost for the project is \$3.6 million USD, of which \$2.4 million has already been provided from the US over next 3-4 years. The remaining funds are expected to come from Arctic countries in *in-kind* or cash contributions.

Three products will result from the ACIA:

1. Peer reviewed Scientific Document (lead authors and their writing team)
2. Synthesis Document (ASC/journalist)
3. Policy Document to convey the scientific findings into policy-relevant recommendations for the Ministers (AMAP and CAFF working groups)

The Scientific Document will address what we know now (atmospheric, terrestrial, freshwater and marine environments); what is likely to happen (scenarios of natural and socio-economic changes), and; how will it effect socio-economic activities. The Policy Document will be started in approximately two years when the bulk of the assessment has been completed so that it can be delivered at the same time as the assessment.

Report from joint AMAP/CAFF Meeting - Sept. 4, 2000

Snorri Baldursson, CAFF Executive Secretary, presented the results of the joint AMAP/CAFF meeting on September 4, 2000. The goal of the meeting was to reach common understanding on how the two groups will work on the ACIA, how to continue to work on it, and to demonstrate this for SAOs. The expectations of CAFF from the ACIA process are:

CAFF VIII REPORT

- to gain a better understanding of current and potential effects of climate change on Arctic ecosystems and biota;
- to identify gaps in knowledge to reliably assess the impacts of climate change on Arctic ecosystems and biota; and
- to create a scientific basis for developing a research and monitoring program.

The most relevant sections of the ACIA to CAFF are those relating to terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems, oceanic and marine ecosystems, wildlife and conservation issues, and subsistence use issues.

Comments from the countries emphasised the need to speak as one, to maintain close links with the scientific community and to start thinking about the policy document. All countries stated that they are pleased to co-operate on this initiative.

The ASC has identified a number of expectations from CAFF and AMAP for the ACIA. They require approval of the ACIA Implementation Plan. It was stressed that this is a living document, i.e., it may change, if necessary. It is necessary to start national processes to ensure that relevant data are made available to ACIA and all relevant experts are included. Countries need to start seeking contributors; lead-authors are expected to commit 3-6 months per year, other contributors to commit 1-3 months per year. Finally, the working groups must clarify budgetary questions and possible funding for ACIA and keep strong links to ASC.

It was emphasised that the ACIA is not a scientific program but rather that it is scientifically based, i.e., based on existing data. At the same time, the ASC urges CAFF and AMAP to initiate new research relevant to ACIA and future assessments, and for countries to initiate any new research.

CAFF, AMAP and IASC will maintain governance of the project but the ASC Chair may be requested to provide reports to the SAOs.

There has been some confusion regarding the governance of ACIA in relation to the Arctic Council, who is responsible for reporting its progress to the SAOs and Ministers, and how to deal with socio-economic issues. The texts developed at the joint meeting for the Ministerial Declaration and Report to SAOs (Appendix X) address these issues and clearly demonstrate that ACIA is a joint CAFF – AMAP project, although the Chair or Vice-chair of ASC may be asked to report on progress. The Sustainable Development Working Group will be consulted with respect to socio-economic recommendations.

Plenary discussion

The Chairman emphasised that Arctic Council work is based on consensus, and so is the ACIA. There were long discussions on this at the joint meeting to ensure that the Barrow Ministerial Declaration reflects this. She also stated the need for better integration of programs, which could be discussed further under the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Network. CAFF and AMAP are not establishing a totally new program but mainly trying to better integrate existing programs.

Countries expressed thanks to Norway for hosting the first joint meeting between CAFF and AMAP. A number of comments were raised from plenary regarding the

CAFF VIII REPORT

ACIA. Concern was expressed because CAFF is late in starting in the ACIA process and there is much work required from CAFF. A decision must be made on how to organise the CAFF contribution to the ACIA. Specific issues to be addressed are:

- ensuring that the biological impacts of climate change are included in all aspects of the assessment;
- finding contributing authors with the appropriate biological background to assist with writing chapters; and
- including an additional CAFF person on the ASC.

The need to start national processes for identifying authors and information was stated by several countries. With respect to the drafting teams, it was suggested that these be made larger to ease the burden on all contributors. The current proposal is for one lead author and 4-5 contributors. This could be addressed by having national experts in the background to assist with information collection.

A number of countries identified potential sources of data for the report but it was also stated that it would be easier to acquire data if there were a clear understanding of specifically what is needed. Concern was expressed that there will not be time to base this assessment on new data. It was, however, emphasised that this is a baseline activity. There will be new interpretations on existing data and efforts to establish new monitoring activities to assist in future assessments.

There are already some important CAFF projects that will contribute to the ACIA in a very significant way. The seabird working group, for example, is starting to look at information compiled on the breeding success of murres from all Arctic countries under auspices of Murre Conservation Strategy and are relating this to climate change models. The preliminary findings show exactly what models expected. CAFF has also made significant progress on flora, specifically the circumpolar vegetation map, that will help provide baseline information.

It was stated that there is a need to be proactive in communications with the public. CAFF should not wait to have a final report and policy before sharing its finding with local communities. Instead, CAFF should seek to find ways to spread the information on their findings and advice on recommended actions in understandable ways to those communities (i.e., a similar approach to what is being done with POPs.) This should be done early in the process and in an on-going way.

WWF expressed its appreciation to CAFF for becoming involved in climate change issues. They also, however, cautioned CAFF that they were entering a huge field where it is often difficult to distinguish what the real issue is. It is important to be aware of whether other groups may already be doing some of this work. They are also concerned that the more CAFF gets involved with climate change, the more it will get away from other key issues for nature protection in Arctic, i.e., other human impacts. It will be necessary to keep a balance between seeking information on climate change and continuing to address other issues.

WCMC reported that they have worked on climate change research for 2 years, focussing on waterbirds, waders and geese. A report was recently released on this work. Together with GRID-Arendal under UNEP, they are prepared to continue compiling climate change data but they emphasised that they need consistent data

CAFF VIII REPORT

from all countries. They appreciate the efforts of CAFF and AMAP to co-operate on this effort.

4. Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Network

Progress Report

Aevar Petersen, Iceland, presented a report from the CAFF/AMAP Workshop on a Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program, which was held in Reykjavik, February 7-9, 2000. Thirty-five people attended the three-day workshop from the circumpolar nations. The workshop concentrated on large ecosystems – terrestrial, freshwater, and marine. Bill Heal developed discussion paper in advance of workshop and a drafting committee developed a conceptual framework for a circumpolar biodiversity monitoring program.

The main conclusions of the workshop were to focus monitoring activities initially on impacts of climate change and thus make a link to the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, and to take a pragmatic approach to the development of a circumpolar program to monitor biodiversity through the establishment of expert networks on key species and habitats of the Arctic. The workshop launched six such networks (waders/shorebirds, reindeer/caribou, vascular plants/ITEX, ringed seals, Arctic char and seabirds) and identified coordinators for them.

Aevar Petersen informed that the Terms of Reference for the network coordinators specify *inter alia* that: the networks are voluntary with no current financial obligation from CAFF; the networks should assess the need among experts to coordinate research related to climate change and contribute information a wider program; the networks should propose a pragmatic set of circumpolar research activities; the networks should consider practical issues of funding and harmonising of data, and that the network coordinators report to.

Ten main recommendations were developed:

1. establish expert networks for geese, wetlands, polar bears;
2. include protected areas in the program;
3. establish community network/volunteer programs for simple indicators;
4. establish a drafting committee to incorporate local and indigenous peoples in community-based monitoring;
5. consider monitoring harbour seals;
6. implement eider monitoring initiative;
7. scope out existence of benthic studies;
8. organise more topic-related meetings and workshops;
9. fund and revitalise existing regional and circumpolar programs; and
10. encourage IASC to develop methodologies and research directed at circumpolar monitoring of genetic diversity.

Reports from networks

Six out of nine networks identified at the workshop have begun their work. Written reports from five of them were submitted to the meeting. In addition, Elin Pierce, Norway, presented an oral report to Plenary from the wader and shorebird network.

CAFF VIII REPORT

This network of experts includes shorebird researchers that are either involved in Arctic shorebird research or have been in the past.

A circumpolar research network, Pan-Arctic Wader Research Network, was initiated in order to conduct a survey of interested wader researchers who have either ongoing Arctic wader studies or have responsibility for relevant existing databases and ongoing research programs. The work will be coordinated with the ongoing program "Arctic birds: an international breeding conditions survey" run by Mikhail Soloviev for the Wader Study Group and other scientific programs relating to one or more Arctic wader species. Of particular interest will be long-term studies which collect data that can be used to investigate the effects of climate change on population dynamics, distribution, breeding phenology, or any other aspect of wader ecology.

The goal of the network is to establish strong international collaboration between researchers and to help co-ordinate pan-Arctic monitoring network in future (there has been no pan-Arctic collaboration in the past). They will collate current and past datasets to look at potential climate change effects.

Already, significant interest has been expressed in this work. There is interest in hosting a workshop to, for example, investigate the possibilities of: 1) synthesising data collected on shorebirds during past and present long-term studies and attempt to relate these data to global climate changes; 2) implementing a common, long-term, pan-Arctic shorebird monitoring program to collect data on population and breeding biology variables and relate these to trends in climatic variability; 3) defining common future priorities in terms of research; 4) establishing strong international collaboration between Arctic shorebird researchers world-wide by creating a project web site and subscriber e-mail bulletin and to explore possibilities for international grant proposals for project funding.

Elin Pierce noted general problems in obtaining funding for research beyond 5 years and called for CAFF to assist in that regard.

Plenary discussion

The countries thanked Iceland for hosting this important workshop. It was stressed that initial focus should be on the nine identified expert monitoring networks and that these should be assisted and their work evaluated before taking on any more. The networks should focus on areas where information is available and can readily show some progress. There should also be an effort to spread the information that already exists in a format that people can access. It will also be important to look at the kind of information that is required for ACIA.

There were concerns expressed about the difficulties in harmonising methods but general agreement that there cannot be a country-by-country approach for a pan-Arctic monitoring. The need to harmonise methods has been included as an objective in the terms of reference for each network. The networks can focus on harmonising a few specific parameters and building on these. As an example, the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group has come up with a harmonised set of monitoring parameters for murre. There were also concerns expressed that there was a need for coordination of the monitoring networks.

CAFF VIII REPORT

Reaching out to volunteers will be important but they will need direction and guidance from CAFF. CAFF must reach out to both local and indigenous communities, and the scientific community. Caution, however, was expressed that CAFF should not depend solely on the good will of volunteers.

It was asked whether a new group was required within CAFF to co-ordinate monitoring. This was not deemed necessary as long as good communication and co-ordination can be ensured among the networks. There is a need for the groups to meet and co-ordinate their work in some way before the next CAFF WG meeting.

The issue of funding will need to be addressed. There are three aspects to the networks: collecting and synthesising existing data; looking at co-ordination of methodology; using and implementing monitoring. All of this requires people with time and money. There may be a need to identify someone within CAFF that can lobby for funds within each country. It was stressed, however that for the time being, the monitoring will be based on existing programs. This is intended only as a pilot phase.

The Flora Group will need to address how to monitor flora in the Arctic. Currently ITEX and wetlands are in the program but these are not meant to represent everything.

It was stressed that CAFF should continue a dialogue with AMAP focusing on integrating their monitoring activities.

With respect to the wader network specifically, it was expressed that these birds are not just of a circumpolar concern as they migrate to all continents of the world. Therefore, there is a need to look at wader conservation in a wider context, e.g. under the Bonn Convention.

5. Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN)

Progress Report

A Circumpolar Marine Workshop was co-sponsored with the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and PAME in Montreal, November 28 - December 2, 1999, to explore practical ways to promote conservation, environmental protection, and sustainable development in coastal and marine ecosystems. A Workshop Report has been published in two languages (Russian and English). At the CAFF Management meeting in Copenhagen in May 2000, Canada and Iceland offered to do an initial screening of the workshop recommendations for consideration by CAFF VIII.

Since CAFF VII in Yellowknife, two new reports have been published in the CAFF Habitat Conservation (CPAN) series:

- A “Summary of Legal Instruments and National Frameworks for Arctic Marine Protection (CAFF Habitat Report No 8)” suggests that there is already sufficient legislation to protect the Arctic marine environment and conserve its biodiversity and habitats. However, the general observation among Arctic

CAFF VIII REPORT

representatives is that the legislation is not always implemented or its provisions adequately enforced. Therefore, one suggestion is for the Arctic countries to consider reviewing implementation of the various instruments to determine how and where, as a circumpolar group, they could enhance implementation.

- A “GAP Analysis for the Russian Arctic in Support of CPAN (Habitat Conservation Report No 9)” provides in 22 maps, a wealth of data that can be useful in determining where Russia should focus its efforts to establish protected areas. The maps show noticeable gaps in protection over large tracts of Arctic territory in particular in the north of the Russian Far East, along the southern forest tundra boundary and in large sections of tundra. At the species level, important bird sites remain unprotected and there is a critical shortage of protection for marine mammals.

Since Yellowknife, RAIPON has initiated a new CAFF/CPAN project, funded by the Danish Environmental Protection Agency, on the “Biological significance [conservation value] of sacred sites and sanctuaries of Arctic indigenous peoples: A study in northern Russia.” The project aims to advance the integrated conservation of Arctic biological diversity and the cultural heritage of indigenous peoples through integration with CPAN. In the summer of 2000, fact-finding missions were conducted in the Koryak (northern Kamchatka) and Yamal-Nenets autonomous regions, two proposed model areas of the study, to explore the practicalities of implementing the project in these areas.

Report of the CPAN Committee and Plenary discussion

Leslie Kerr, USA, reported on behalf of the CPAN Standing Committee. The Committee had prepared a discussion paper for CAFF VIII titled “Advancing the Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN): A Draft Discussion Paper”.

Leslie Kerr asked the Plenary to provide the Standing Committee with priorities and overall guidance with respect to seven themes and series of related questions posed in the CPAN discussion paper. Each item would then be discussed in greater detail at the Standing Committee meeting scheduled on September 10, 2000. The questions posed and plenary discussions following each question are outlined below.

Definition of “Arctic”

- *The question posed was whether the CAFF community wishes to revisit the CAFF definition of “Arctic” (e.g., to better include marine areas and harmonise country definitions)*

Although countries recognised the ecological inconsistency among the current country definitions of the CAFF boundary, there was no interest in re-defining it at this time. Instead, it was agreed that there should be flexibility in interpreting the boundary within individual CAFF projects. It was suggested that there might be a need to develop a consistent ecological framework for CAFF activities. Such a common framework may be one way to address this need without the complications of re-defining the CAFF boundary. A harmonised ecological framework already exists for North America.

CAFF VIII REPORT

Develop linkages for sharing CPAN information electronically

- *The question posed was whether the CAFF community wishes to focus on improving electronic linkages among Arctic protected area managers, through expanded website coverage, improved infrastructures, etc.*

There was general agreement that better communication is needed between protected area managers. There were also concerns, however, that some of the actions proposed were premature relative to other objectives of the CPAN Strategy and Action Plan; all of the work undertaken by CPAN must link back to this. A number of countries stressed that the main focus for CPAN must be on the establishment of protected areas rather than building communications linkages.

There was agreement that there should be an expanded presence of CPAN on the CAFF website, including posting contact lists and possibly establishing a list server. There was less support for initiating work on communications infrastructure. Although it is understood that Russia needs assistance with telecommunications, it was felt that this could be best achieved via on-going bilateral agreements. There may also be an opportunity to interest the high-tech industry in getting involved.

A suggestion was made to hold a circumpolar protected areas managers workshop as a means to improve communications and information sharing between countries, and to assist in the managerial role of CPAN.

Address outstanding proposals related to sacred sites

- *The questions posed were whether the CAFF community wishes to: develop definitions, criteria and guidelines for protecting sacred sites within CPAN; develop an inventory methodology and conduct an inventory of sacred sites in the Russian Arctic*

There was continued support for this work. It was noted that the Permanent Participants need to be closely involved in developing and implementing this project (i.e., taking a lead role, not only participating in the study). Consideration must be given to how sacred sites can be incorporated into biodiversity conservation and for that further definitions are needed, specifically a common understanding of what a sacred site is. It was suggested that this is one issue that the Permanent Participants could address and make a recommendation to CAFF.

Update “State of Protected Areas in the Circumpolar Arctic”

- *The question posed was whether the CAFF community wishes to develop a “CPAN List” similar to the “List of Protected Areas in the Antarctic” and, if so, in what format such a list should be*

Clarification was provided on the difference between the CPAN list and the Pan Arctic Protected Areas Registry (PAPAR): PAPAR is a complete list of all designated and proposed protected areas, while CPAN contains only the designated areas within the CAFF boundary. There was support for continuing the compilation of a CPAN list, however Norway was unable to continue the work they have been doing, and no conclusion was reached on who should do it. The CPAN Standing Committee was charged with keeping this on their agenda and revisit at CAFF IX.

Continue development of Pan Arctic Protected Areas Registry

- *The question posed was whether the CAFF community wishes to establish a Pan Arctic Protected Areas Registry in cooperation with WCMC and UNEP/GRID-Arendal?*

CAFF VIII REPORT

This was addressed under the question above.

Continue gap analysis

- *The questions posed was whether the CAFF community wishes to undertake background work on a circumpolar gap analysis for CPAN at this time and what such work might include, and whether a workshop should be planned to explore this issue.*

The issue of the need for a common habitat classification system (ecological framework) was raised. There was general agreement that any gap analysis needs to have good baseline to work with and adequate resources and it may be premature to undertake this kind of an initiative at this time. It was proposed that the Standing Committee could re-examine it in time for CAFF IX.

Investigate ways of demonstrating the value of protected areas

- *The question posed was whether the CAFF community wishes to undertake a project or a review that demonstrates the value of Arctic protected areas.*

Canada agreed to produce a proposal and bring it forward for the consideration of the CAFF National Representatives for their spring 2001 meeting.

6. CAFF Overview Report: Status of Arctic Flora, Fauna and habitats

Progress Report

Paula Kankaanpää, Finland, Henry Huntington, USA, Christoph Zoeckler, UK, and Seppo Kaitala, Finland, presented a report of the Editorial Team. A revised draft of the basic text, based on expert review in the spring of 2000, is available on the project website¹ for comments. This draft numbers approximately 80 pages. More than half of the 60 intended text inserts and boxes have been prepared; a good portion of the remaining half is expected soon while some of the boxes will have to be dropped due to non-delivery. Approximately 50 maps have been prepared and are being reviewed by experts. The work on other graphics is also proceeding well. The final chapter will now only contain conclusions; recommendations will be developed by CAFF at a later date. In addition to the report, a 20-40-page booklet has been prepared for Barrow Ministerial, October 2000.

The original intention of the Overview Report was to be a comprehensive status report on Arctic species. Due to available resources this goal has been changed to provide an authoritative overview on Arctic biodiversity, its status and conservation for the lay reader. The Editorial Team noted that the current draft, in their opinion, fulfilled this goal. However, they agreed with previous comments raised by several countries that the report would benefit from more solid status and trends information on species. Hence, they had requested such information on key species and species groups from the countries. The importance of receiving this information in time was stressed.

The proposed timeline for the completion of the report is as follows:

- submission of final material - Oct. 1, 2000

¹ <http://ginkgo.pc.helsinki.fi/caff>

CAFF VIII REPORT

- completion of manuscript - Oct. 31, 2000
- country reviews – Nov/Dec. 1, 2000
- completion of revisions - Jan. 1, 2001
- printed report - May 31, 2001, ready for presentation at the 10-year anniversary of the AEPS.
- preparation of recommendations for next Ministerial - fall 2002.

Plenary Discussion

The countries were generally pleased with the progress on the report and with preparation of the booklet. Some questions arose about the timelines set down for completion of the report but it was agreed to aim for finalising it in time for the 10-year AEPS Anniversary meeting.

All countries agreed to acquire as much of the needed data as possible in the given time. However, a concern was raised firstly with difficulties in some countries in distinguishing between CAFF versus non-CAFF species and populations and secondly with the fact that even on key species such as polar bears, there is limited trends information available. It was recognised that it may not be possible to get enough information for all species in the allotted time but that it is important to get as much as possible by the October 1 deadline. CAFF may want to consider a project to undertake status and trends work to fill in the gaps, leading to a more thorough report at a later time.

With respect to the budget, there is still a lack of money for finalising and printing the report. Finland appealed to countries to help raise funds for this.

A suggestion was made that CAFF look at developing more educational material for the public, schools, etc. based on the Overview Report. Many interventions have been made to CAFF recommending they undertake more public education and it may be easier to apply for funding on this.

7. CAFF/GEF Project

Progress Report

Lars Kullerud, UNEP GRID-Arendal, presented the progress report. The project initiative was taken by the CAFF Chair, Russian Federation and UNEP/GRID-Arendal in the fall of 1999, which led to GEF funds (\$ 25 000), supplemented by Norway (\$ 45 000), for a project preparatory phase, so called PDF-A. The main activity during the PDF-A phase, was a stakeholder workshop in Moscow, February 2000, where commitments were confirmed from Russian federal and regional authorities.

A PDF-B Request was subsequently submitted to GEF and approved in July 2000. The GEF has committed \$350 000 US to the PDF-B phase, given that co-funding amounting to \$450 000 is raised from other sources. The planning team estimates that approximately \$ 170 000 in cash and \$280 000 in *in-kind* co-funding is required for successful implementation of the PDF-B phase. In-kind and cash contributions would be used for expert work on the selection of 2-3 model areas for the full project (out of

CAFF VIII REPORT

a proposed 24 identified during the PDF-A phase), establishing baseline information, and to prepare for the full project. The first Steering Committee meeting for the PDF-B is scheduled in Moscow, 23-24 October 2000.

If the PDF-B phase is successful, the GEF is willing to allocate up to \$2 500 000 US to the full Project starting in 2002 and running through 2005.

Lars Kullerud appealed to the countries to support this important project.

Plenary Discussion

The countries agreed that this is an important project for CAFF and thanked Norway for taking the lead on it. It was noted that the project is an important one not only for Russia but also for CAFF as a whole as it will create models of integrated ecosystem management. Thus it nicely fulfils the main objectives of CAFF and demonstrates its value.

Finland announced that it has committed US \$10 000 to the PDF-B as an "entrance ticket". Norway has committed US \$40 000 plus in-kind support through bilateral agreements. Other countries are pursuing different funding options. The Chair stressed that the PDF-B is due to start in October 2000 but this is not possible until the funding is in place. Clear support for this project was being sought from CAFF VIII and from the Ministerial meeting in Barrow in October 2000.

8. CAFF Flora Work

Progress Report

Janet Hohn, USA, introduced this item and noted that CAFF VII had decided to establish an *ad hoc* CAFF Flora Group, charged with preparing a discussion paper for CAFF VIII. She then introduced Stephen Talbot, USA, Chairman of the *ad hoc* Flora Group, who presented the discussion paper to the Plenary.

Stephen Talbot informed about members, proposed goal and objectives of the Flora Group. He then went on to seek the following decisions from CAFF VIII:

Short-term:

- Establishment of a permanent CAFF Flora Group
- Agreement of proposed goals and objectives of the Flora Group
- Prioritisation of future flora work
- Agreement on a CAFF Flora workshop in Scandinavia in early 2001

Long-term:

- Funding support for priority flora items
- How the Flora Group can serve the needs of CAFF

Prior to the formation of the *ad hoc* Flora Group, two major flora projects were undertaken as action items under the auspices of CAFF. The first project was the preparation of an "Atlas of Rare Endemic Vascular Plants of the Arctic" and was

CAFF VIII REPORT

published as CAFF Technical Report No. 3 in 1999. The other one is the ongoing Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Project, which is planned completed in 2002.

Plenary discussion

The US was complemented on the work they had done on leading this initiative. There was overall support for the establishment of a permanent CAFF Flora Group to develop priorities in flora conservation.

It was requested that the Flora Group prepare a more refined charter and work plan and explore links to other flora groups, such as ITEX and PAF (Pan-arctic Flora Initiative). There was a general support for holding a flora workshop and it was felt that the issue of flora priorities would be best addressed there and reported back to CAFF.

The Flora Group will need to address the issue of monitoring together with ITEX, i.e., how should flora be monitored (species, rare species, communities) within the planned Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program. This will relate back to other CAFF projects such as GEF and ACIA (e.g., through providing contributing authors). There is also a need to look at the issue of introduced and alien species.

The CAFF boundary is also an issue for the flora work of CAFF. Some CAFF countries (Finland, Iceland, Sweden) are currently not within the floristic definition of the Arctic. The Flora Group is striving for an ecological definition of Arctic to allow for meaningful comparisons. The suggestion for an ecological framework arose once again, as it appears to be crosscutting issue. CAFF should consider work on this at some time.

9. CAFF Seabird Work

Progress Report from the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group

Kenton Wohl, USA, Chair of the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group reported on the recent activities of the CSWG. CSWG was created 1993 in recognition that Arctic Countries have many seabird species in common and often share the same populations, and, therefore, a joint and equal responsibility for their conservation. Since 1994, CSWG has conducted six meetings (the most recent one in Ottawa, Canada in Dec. 1999), published two conservation Action plans (Murre and Eiders), three CAFF technical Reports, three editions of the popular Circumpolar Seabird Bulletin, three posters (CSWG, Seabirds and you, and Murre). They will soon publish a report on "Harvest of Seabirds in Circumpolar Countries."

Analysis of the country implementation of the Murre and Eider strategies indicates that out of the 217 possible murre action items (spread on 7 nations), 149, or 69%, are either being implemented or have been completed. Only 20, or 9%, of the actions are in a "not applicable" category in the seven countries and 68, or 31%, of the action items are not being implemented in 1999. Out of the 161 possible eider action items, 78, or 48%, are either being implemented or have been completed. The remaining 83 action items are either not being implemented (62 items) or are consider "not

CAFF VIII REPORT

applicable” at this time (21 items).

The proposed future activities of the CSWG are to:

- continue to implement International Murre Conservation Strategy and Action Plan
- continue with the Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan
- coordinate eider monitoring plan within the above initiative to tie in with CBMP
- Seabird Harvest Regimes in Circumpolar Nations – reviewing recommendations and reporting on priority activities
- Migratory Bird Workshop - Sept. 10-11 – to review the recommendations of the technical report and identify priority items for action by CAFF
- address the issue of establishing a migratory birds experts group
- Oct. 23-25, 2000 - next CSWG meeting in Helsinki

Kenton Wohl highlighted past and forthcoming CSWG products that linked well with other CAFF activities, e.g., the “Murre monitoring plan,” which could be a model for other circumpolar monitoring activities and ongoing work to link murre population changes to climate patterns – a tentative product for ACIA.

The Bycatch Workshop - report and recommendations

Richard Elliot, Canada, presented the report and recommendations of the Bycatch Workshop held in Halifax, Canada, April 2000. There were approximately 60 attendees from 10 countries (6 CAFF countries) and included both government and academia.

There were two priority items to be addressed by the workshop: seabird mortality in gill nets and the incidental catch of seabirds in longline fisheries. The goals were to exchange the latest information on seabird by-catch in fisheries (affected species, where, when); identification of needs for monitoring systems; methods for reducing by-catch; and reviewing existing plans of action in Arctic countries. The incidental catch of seabirds in fisheries of the Arctic was the focus of CAFF Technical Report No. 1 ~~✕~~Incidental Take of Seabirds in Commercial fisheries in Arctic Countries~~✕~~ and the recent CAFF (Canada - U.S. co-sponsor) Workshop on Seabird Incidental Catch in Waters of Arctic Countries.

The workshop recommends to educate seabird and fishery researchers and managers, fishers and non-governmental organisations in fisheries and fishery gear techniques, seabird management, and full spectrum of economic, cultural, and biological values of fisheries and seabirds to society throughout disseminating the identification guides, fact sheets, posters and videos in local languages of fishers.

The workshop noted that the trained observers in the political, economic, biological and policy ramifications of the issue of seabird incidental catch should play a useful role as direct ambassadors with vessel captains and the fisheries industry.

The workshop recommended *inter alia* to develop a list of experts and organisations that have an interest in seabird incidental catch as well as improve the dissemination and availability of regional information and different approaches, to **create a seabird incidental catch focus group** that includes the full spectrum of government and non-governmental organisations, and creating a website.

There were three decision points for CAFF VIII arising from the workshop:

CAFF VIII REPORT

1. Publishing the proceedings in time for the Barrow Ministerial meeting in October 2000 (final draft now available and will be complete by the end of September).
2. Reviewing the workshop recommendations and those from the CAFF Technical Report and reporting back to CAFF on priority activities and key action items.
3. Seeking endorsement from the SAOs to encourage collaboration between researchers and fishing industry at a national level.

Plenary discussion

There was general support for the CSWG recommendations since most of these are ongoing activities for the group. The CSWG was challenged to consider how they would contribute to marine bird chapter in ACIA (identification of lead authors and experts).

It was asked whether the CSWG and the Migratory Bird work would be integrated into one large group on birds. The reply was that this issue has arisen several times in CAFF and would again be discussed at the September 10-11 workshop on migratory birds with a recommendation to be developed for the National Representatives. Caution was expressed, however, about expanding this group to deal with all birds, at least for time being. This is a specialist group and expanding it would require changing activities.

The meeting decided to aim for publishing the Bycatch Report and deliver it to the Ministerial meeting. It was also agreed that the CSWG would review the workshop recommendations and report back to CAFF. Some discussion arose on the formal status of CAFF workshop reports, i.e., whether they represented the view of the CAFF Working Group and if so whether they needed country reviews. Instead, it was decided to put a disclaimer in such workshop reports noting that the CAFF WG is not responsible for their contents.

Session III: Relations with Observers

10. Relations with Observer Organisations

Reports from Observers

The Netherlands: presented by Gerard Boere

The Netherlands congratulated Norway on hosting the CAFF meeting and thanked them for hosting the Migratory Bird Workshop. There is a new International Program on Nature Management in the Netherlands, which will be important to the work of CAFF. 80M Dutch guilders have been committed for a period of four years. It will look at strengthening the conservation of flyways.

IUCN: presented by Julia Gorelova and Jeanne Pagnan.

The World Conservation Congress will be held in Amman, Jordan in October 2000. Peter Nielsen will be giving the first ever presentation on the Arctic. A resolution has been put forward to recognise the Arctic as a priority ecosystem and to develop an Arctic strategy. IUCN counsellors will also be approved at this time; Esko Jaakkola of Finland is one of the nominees.

The World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) of the IUCN established a task force for the Arctic. This is a first for the IUCN. The task force held a planning session in Greenland in June and has prepared recommendations and an action plan.

The IUCN co-sponsored Circumpolar Marine Workshop (CMW) in Montreal, Canada in December 1999 along with CAFF and PAME. The series of recommendations from the workshop are being dealt with separately by each of co-sponsoring organisations.

WCMC: presented by Christoph Zoeckler.

For more than seven years the World Conservation Monitoring Centre has been involved in the CAFF process. Many projects have already been undertaken jointly with GRID Arendal and UNEP-WCMC would like to increase this collaboration, in particular for the benefit of CAFF. WCMC now operates as UNEP's global agency for biodiversity related information management and early warning. UNEP GRID-Arendal has responsibility within UNEP-GRID for Arctic affairs, and WCMC would like to support that role in relation to biodiversity. A Memorandum of Understanding between WCMC and GRID Arendal, is planned to define the new form of collaboration between the two UNEP partners in supporting the CAFF process in protecting Arctic biodiversity.

WWF: presented by Peter Prokosch.

There are many present and planned activities in WWF that have connections to CAFF.

CAFF VIII REPORT

1. Work with UNEP-GRID/Arendal to identify 25 largest unfragmented ecosystems in Arctic; this information will be used to advance protection of these areas.
2. WWF is involved in establishment of new protected areas, especially in Russia; CAFF needs to visualise a complete set of protected areas within CPAN.
3. Global 200 Ecoregions (most important ecoregions with respect to species, ecosystems); they are running major projects in Barents Sea and Bering Sea
4. WWF's lobby for integrated protection for the whole of Svalbard - to make Svalbard one of the best-managed wildernesses in the world.
5. 100 most important species "hotspots" in Arctic - will also relate to climate change issue.
6. Arctic goose population and trends have been submitted to CAFF Overview Report.
7. Guidelines to make use of Arctic wild species ecologically sustainable.
8. Increase profile of Arctic in the global scene - viz. climate change.
9. Global flyways.
10. Sacred sites - contract with RAIPON to establish nature reserve system, which covers both nature and cultural areas.
11. Sustaining an environmental movement in the Arctic.
12. Tourism - award to recognise the best tourism operations.
13. Developing a report on Common Future of the Arctic; asking key experts in field on how they see future of Arctic and how it could be made better.

WWF Bering Sea project: presented by David Cline.

The Bering Sea is one of most biologically productive marine ecosystems in the world. A Biodiversity Assessment Workshop was held in Alaska in 1999 with environmental organisations, scientists, local communities, etc. They identified 20 priority areas for conservation in Bering Sea. These areas are being seriously threatened by over-fishing (especially bottom dragging), high bycatch, climate change, contaminants, and introduced species. Sea lions have been declared endangered, and harbour seals and otters are declining. The information from the workshop has been published. They are now organising an Alaskan ocean's network. The priority is to reform damaging fishing practices (e.g., no trawling zones); encourage sustainable fishing practices; and designate marine protected areas in the Bering Sea. They are also working with Russia to sign an agreement on management of polar bears and working to re-authorise fur seal agreement and migratory bird treaty.

They provided two recommendations to CAFF:

1. Greater recognition to marine ecosystems; this would give the environmental community greater leverage in their work to protect areas
2. Seek to communicate CAFF's important findings to local community in North and public at-large, and making recommendations on what actions individuals can make

Plenary discussion

Appreciation was given for the work of Observers for CAFF, especially WWF's work on the Bering Sea ecosystem and their work on the Arctic Bulletin.

11. Relations with AC Working Groups

PAME Working Group: presented by Soffia Gudmundsdottir.

The recommendations from Circumpolar Marine Workshop (CMW), which PAME co-sponsored with CAFF and IUCN, were reviewed at the last PAME meeting. There is a clear call for integrated management approaches. There are further capacity building issues for the Arctic Council, and between CAFF and PAME. Some of the recommendations could be used as guidelines for sustainable development. The PAME WG will await outcome of CAFF meeting, and then revisit the recommendations to decide on future work.

Session IV: Planning Ahead

12. Future Initiatives

Circumpolar Marine Workshop (CMW)

Kevin McCormick presented a report on the Circumpolar Marine Workshop held in Montreal, Canada in December 1999. The workshop was co-sponsored by CAFF, PAME and IUCN. The workshop report was released in April 2000, and it contained 40 recommendations in six subject areas. A preliminary review suggested at least four items, which could merit immediate attention by CAFF:

- produce circumpolar maps of marine resources, indigenous sites, ecologically sensitive sites and marine economic zones - work with EPPR?
- review existing geo/biophysical classification systems and terminology in use across the Arctic and propose a common system - work with PAME and EPPR?
- complete compendium of and establish a circumpolar network of MPA within CPAN and the IUCN's GRSMMPA that incorporates seasonal sites and migratory routes
- establish circumpolar guidelines for sensitive and culturally important marine sites and for marine user groups such as extraction industries and tourism - work with PAME?

No further issues were tabled.

Plenary Discussion

It was stated that marine protection work is important to CAFF. Some of the workshop recommendations were felt to require domestic rather than international action. Along with the four recommendations noted, there are many other good recommendations in the workshop report which touch on CAFF work and could provide opportunities for collaboration with PAME and EPPR (e.g., conservation outside of 200 nm EEZ, effect on harvest technologies on benthic communities).

Some countries felt that they required more time to review the workshop report internally and were reluctant to formalise a specific action item based in its recommendations at this time. It was agreed that the recommendations should also go to the CPAN Steering Committee for further consideration and for identification of potential work plan items. Also, since CAFF is a recommending body it can make recommendations for marine protection outside the EEZ.

13. The CAFF Work Plan 2000-2002

Leslie Kerr, USA, introduced the draft CAFF Work Plan for 2000-2002 on behalf of the Drafting Team. The draft Work Plan, which follows the format of the CAFF "Strategic Plan for the Conservation of Arctic Biological Diversity" was then reviewed item by item, amended as appropriate and finally approved by Plenary for

CAFF VIII REPORT

submission to the SAOs and Ministers at Barrow. The complete CAFF Work Plan 2000-2002 is attached as Appendix 5.

14. Reporting to SAOs and Ministers

Snorri Baldursson, CAFF Executive Secretary, introduced drafts for the CAFF bullet in the Ministerial Declaration and CAFF Section in the SAO Report to Ministers. These documents, which are attached as appendices 3 and 4 respectively, were reviewed and amended, as appropriate, and finally adopted by Plenary.

The Chair and Secretariat were charged with introducing these documents to the SAOs at their preparatory meeting in London, September 16-17, 2000.

15. Any Other Business

No other business was raised

16. Close of Meeting

Berit Lein, CAFF Chairman, thanked the Working Group, the Secretariat and her staff for a good meeting and good collaboration during her term as Chair, which would come to an end after the Ministerial meeting in Barrow. She introduced and welcomed the incoming Chair, Sune Sohlberg, from Sweden and the incoming Vice-chair, Janet Hohn, from the United States. Countries expressed their warm appreciation for Norway's chairmanship and hospitality. Sune Sohlberg noted that he is looking forward to chairing CAFF and that it would be a tough act to follow Norway. He then welcomed participants to CAFF IX in northern Sweden in 2002.

Appendix 1

CAFF VIII Participants Trondheim, 6-9 September 2000

Canadian delegation

Kevin McCormick (Head of Delegation)
Environment Canada
Northern Conservation Division
5204-50th Ave. Yellowknife, Canada X1A
1E2
+1 867 669 4760
+1 867 873 6776
kevin.mccormick@ec.gc.ca

Susan Aiken
Canadian Museum of Nature
Canadian Flora Interests
P.O.Box 3443, Station D,
Ottawa, ON K1P 6P4 Canada
+1 613 364 4073
+1 613 364 4027
SAIKEN@mus-nature.ca

Richard D.Elliot
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
17 Waterfowl Lane,
Sackville, New Brunswick
E4L 1G6 Canada
+1 506 364 5014
+1 506 364 5062
richard.elliott@ec.gc.ca

James Johnston
Parks Canada
4th Floor, 25 Eddy Street, Hull, Quebec,
Canada K1A 0M5
+1 819 994 3013
+1 819 997 5883
jim_johnston@pch.gc.ca

Tiina Kurvits
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
200 Kent Street, Ottawa,
ON Canada, K1A 0E6
+1 613 990 1575
+1 613 990 8249
kurvitst@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Greenlandic/Danish Delegation

Peter Nielsen (Head of Delegation)
Department of Environment and Nature
Boks 1614
DK-3900 Nuuk, Greenland
+299 346715
+299 325286
Pen@gh.gl

Karen Touborg
Department of Environment and Nature
Boks 1614
DK-3900 Nuuk, Greenland
+299 346717
+299 325286
Kto@gh.gl

Lisbeth Andersen
Skov- og Naturstyrelsen
Haraldsgade 53
DK-2100 København, Danmark
+45 39 47 29 19
+45 39 27 98 99
LBA@sns.dk

Bergur Olsen
Museum of natural History
FO-100 Tórshavn,
Faroe Islands
+298 31 85 88
berguro@frs.fo

Finish delegation

Esko Jaakkola (Head of Delegation)
Ministry of the Environment
P.O.Box 380
FIN-00131 Helsinki
+358 9 1991 9371
+358 9 1991 9364
esko.jaakkola@vyh.fi

Heikki Eeronheimo
Forest and Park Service
P.O.Box 8016
FIN-96101 Rovaniemi
+358 205 64 7696
+358 205 64 7670

heikki.eeronheimo@metsa.fi

Paula Kankaanpää

Arctic Centre, Univ. of Lapland
P.O.Box 122,
FIN-96101 Rovaniemi
+358 16 341 2768
+358 16 341 2777
paula.kankaanpaa@urova.fi

Anna-Lisa Sippola

Arctic Centre, Univ. of Lapland
P.O.Box 122,
FIN-96101 Rovaniemi
+358 16 341 2779
+358 16 341 2951
anna-liisa.sippola@urova.fi

Seppo Kaitala

Environmental biology, Univ. of Helsinki
P.O.Box 7
FIN-00014 Helsinki
+358 9 191 24441
+358 9 191 40048
Seppo.kaitala@helsinki.fi

Icelandic Delegation

Aevar Petersen (Head of Delegation)

Icelandic Institute of Natural History
Hlemmur 3,
IS-125 Reykjavik
+354 562 9822
+354 562 0815
aevar@ni.is

Norwegian Delegation

Berit Lein (Head of Delegation)

Directorate for Nature Management
Tungasletta 2
N-7485 Trondheim
Norway
+47 73 58 08 21
+47 73 58 05 01
berit.lein@dirnat.no

Jan-Petter Huberth Hansen

Directorate for Nature Management
Tungasletta 2,
N-7485 Trondheim
Norway
+47 73 58 08 29
+47 73 58 05 01
jan-p.huberth-hansen@dirnat.no

Finn Katerås

Directorate for Nature Management
Tungasletta 2,
N-7485 Trondheim
+47 73 58 08 30
+47 73 58 05 01
finn.kateras@dirnat.no

Ivar Myklebust

Directorate for Nature Management
Tungasletta 2
N-7005 Trondheim
+47 73 58 06 35
+47 73 58 05 01
ivar.myklebust@dirnat.no

Dag Vongraven

The Norwegian Polar Institute
Polarmiljøsentret
N-9296 Tromsø
+47 77 75 06 38
+47 77 75 05 01
dag.vongraven@npolar.no

Russian Delegation

Vladimir Pishchelev (Head of Delegation)

Ministry of Natural Resources, Dept of Env.
Protection and Ecological Security,
Kedrova 8/1, Moscow, Russia 117874
+7 095 125 61 33
+7 095 254 82 83
fax: + 095 943 00 13
ecohealth@mtu-net.ru
mikh@bdvgef.msk.ru

Stanislav Belikov

Russian Institute for Nature Protection
Znamenskoe-Sadki.
Moscow, 113628 Russia
+7 095 423 84 44
+7 095 423 23 22
arctos@glasnet.ru

Boris Yurtsev

Komarov Botanical Institute
Russian Academy of Sciences Prof. Popov Str.
2, St. Petersburg, 197376, Russia
+ 7 812 543 83 67
VolodyaR@north.bin.ras.spb.ru

Liudmila Khorosheva

Ministry of Natural Resources, Dept. of Env.
Protection and Ecological Security,
B.Gruzinskaya 4/6, Moscow, Russia 123812
+7 095 230 87 22

fax: +7 095 943 00 13
ecohealth@mtu-net.ru
mikh@bdvgef.msk.ru

Valeri Orlov

Ministry of Natural Resources, Dept. of Env.
Protection and Ecological Security,
Kedrova 8/1, Moscow, Russia 117874
+7 095 124 39 58
+7 095 125 52 09
fax: +7 095 943 00 13
ecohealth@mtu-net.ru
mikh@bdvgef.msk.ru

Swedish Delegation

Sune Sohlberg (Head of Delegation)
The Swedish Environmental Protection
Agency
S-106 48 Stockholm
+46 8 698 13 36
+46 8 698 10 42
sune.sohlberg@environ.se

United States Delegation

Janet E. Hohn (Head of Delegation)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1011 E. Tudor Road,
Anchorage, AK 99503
+1 907 786 3544
+1 907 786 3640
janet_hohn@fws.gov

David R.Cline

World Wildlife Fund
11930 Circle Drive,
Anchorage, AK 99516
+1 907 345 2939
clinerom@alaska.net

Ellen Fritts

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
P.O.Box 25526,
Juneau, AK99801
USA
+1 907 465 4107
+1 907 465 4759
ellen_fritts@fishgame.state.ak.us

Leslie Kerr

Selawik National Wildlife Refuge U.S. Fish
and Wildlife Service
P.O.Box 270, Kotzebue, AK 99752
+1 907 442 3799
+1 907 442 3124
leslie.kerr@fws.gov

Walter B. Parker

U.S. Arctic Research Commission
3724 Campbell Airstrip Road, Anchorage, AK
99504
+1 907 333 5189
+1 907 333 5153
wbparker@alaska.net

Stephen S. Talbot

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1011 East Tudor Road,
Anchorage, AK 99503
USA
+1 907 786 3381
stephen_talbot@fws.gov

Kenton D.Wohl

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1011 East Tudor Road,
Anchorage, AK 99503
USA
+1 907 786 3503
+1 907 786 3641
kent-wohl@fws.gov

Henry P. Huntington

Marine Mammal Commission
P.O.Box 773564
Eagle River, AK 99577
+1 907 696 3564
+1 907 696 3565
hph@alaska.net

Permanent Participants

Aleutian/Pribilof Islands Association

Flore Lekanof

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and APIA/AIA
2430 Chandaler Drive, Anchorage, AK 99504
+1 907 333 3576
+1 907 333 2902
floresr@chugach.net

RAIPON

Tamara Semenova

Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of
the North (RAIPON)
Korp 2, Office 527
Prospekt Vernadskogo 37
117415 Moscow
+7 095 798 3246 (mobile)
+7 095 930 4468/938 9527
Tams@online.ru

Jvg_iucn@interser.ru /
Julia@aha.ru

Observers

The Netherlands

Gerard C. Boere

Directorate for Nature management,
Postbox 20401, s-Gravenhage, 2500 EK,
The Netherlands
+ 31 70 378 55 91
+31 70 378 5007
+31 70 378 6146
g.c.boere@n.agro.nl

United Kingdom

Steve Albon

CEH Banchory Hill of Brathens
Banchory Aberdeenshire,
AB31 4BW, Scotland
U.K.
+44 1330 826303
+44 1330 823303
s.albon@ceh.ac.uk / smk@ceh.ac.uk

UNEP

Christoph Zöckler

UNEP - WCMC
219 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0DL
UK
+44 1223 277314
+44 1223 277136
christoph.zockler@unep-wcmc.org

UNEP Grid- Arendal

Lars Kullerud

UNEP Grid-Arendal
Longum Park P.O.1602 Myrene
N-4801 Arendal, Norway
+47 37 03 56 50
+47 37 03 57 08
kullerud@grida.no

The World Conservation Union (IUCN)

Julia Gorelova

IUCN office for CIS Countries
17, Martial Vasilevska Str.
Moscow, 123182, Russia
+7 095 190 70 77/16-04
+7 095 490 58 18

Jeanne L. Pagnan

IUCN/WCPA
53 Brouage, Aylmer,
Quebec
Canada-J9J 1J5
+1 819 777 1767
jpagnan@compuserve.com

World Wide Fund for Nature

Peter Prokosch

WWF International
P.O.Box 6784,
N-0130 Oslo
+47 22 03 65 18
+47 22 20 06 66
pprokosch@wwf.no

AC Working Groups

PAME

Soffia Gudmundsdottir

PAME International Secretariat
Hafnarstraeti 97,
IS-600 Akureyri
+354 462 1355
+354 263 3390
soffiag@ni.is

CAFF-Secretariat

Snorri Baldursson

Executive Secretary CAFF
Hafnarstraeti 97,
IS-600 Akureyri
+354 462 3350
+354 462 3390
snorri@ni.is

Interpreters

Stein Larsen
Michael Pouckin

Appendix 2

CAFF VIII, Trondheim, September 6-9, 2000

Revised Draft Annotated Agenda

SEPTEMBER 5

19:00 - Official CAFF/AMAP dinner. Address by Jo Stein Moen, Political Advisor, Ministry of the Environment.

SEPTEMBER 6 - DAY 1

09:00 - 10:15 (1) Welcome and introduction
Opening statement by Secretary General Anne Sæterdal, Ministry of the Environment, Norway
Chairman's address
Brief statements by Permanent Participants
(2) Adoption of the agenda

10:15 – 10:30 Coffee break

10:30 – 12:00 (3) Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA)
Status of work
Report from joint AMAP/CAFF meeting
Discussion on sustained CAFF involvement

12:00 – 13:30 Lunch

13:30 – 15:00 (4) Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Network
Workshop recommendations
Reports from networks
Links with AMAP and ACIA
Discussion on next steps

15:00 – 15:15 Coffee break

15:15 - 17:30 (5) Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN)
Report and recommendations from the CPAN Standing Committee
Circumpolar Marine Workshop – discussion on CPAN related workshop recommendations and follow-up
Sacred sites project – status and next steps
Discussion on status and further development of CPAN

SEPTEMBER 7 - DAY 2

09:00 - 10:15 (6) CAFF Overview Report : Status of Arctic Flora, Fauna and Habitats
Report from Editorial Team and presentation of the preview booklet "Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna: An Introduction to Biodiversity, Status and Conservation"
Review of current status of the Overview Report and identification of remaining gaps
Discussion on completion of the Overview Report

10:15 - 10:30 Coffee break

10:30 – 12:00 Overview Report, cont.

12:00 - 13:30 Lunch

13:30 – 15:00 (7) CAFF/GEF Project: Integrated Ecosystem Approach for Conserving Biodiversity and Minimising Habitat Fragmentation in Arctic Russia
Report from Planning Team
Discussion on CAFF involvement and follow-up

15:00 – 15:15 Coffee break

- 15:15 – 16:15 (8) CAFF Flora Work
Report and recommendations from the CAFF Flora Group
Discussion on follow-up
- 16:15 – 17:15 (9) CAFF Seabird Work
Bycatch Workshop – report and recommendations
Report of CSWG
Discussion on follow-up

SEPTEMBER 8 - DAY 3

- 09:00 - 10:00 (10) Relations with Observer organisations
Observers ((IUCN, UNEP, Wetlands International, WWF-Arctic Programme, others)
are invited to make a brief statement to the meeting on issues of joint interest
Discussion
- 10:00 - 10:15 Coffee break
- 10:15 – 12:00 (11) Relations with other Working Groups of the Arctic Council. Working Groups
are invited to make a brief statement to the meeting on issues of joint interest and on
areas for collaboration, inter alia:
ACAP – role of CAFF in ACAP
AMAP – coordination of monitoring and research activities
EPPR – Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk from Oil Spills
PAME – Circumpolar Marine Workshop follow-up
SDP – overlapping mandates/collaboration
Discussion
- 12:00-13:30 Lunch
- 13:30-14:30 (12) Future Initiatives of CAFF
Discussion on follow-up of other recommendations from CAFF VII
Discussion on ideas for new activities
- 13:30-15:00 (13) CAFF Work Plan 2000-2002
- 15:00-15:15 Coffee break
- 15:15-16:00 (14) Reporting to SAOs and Ministers
CAFF Report and Deliverables to SAOs and Ministers
Issues CAFF wants highlighted in the Ministerial Declaration
- 16:30 –17:00 (15) Any other business
- 17:00 (16) Close of meeting
- 20:00 - CAFF Chair, Berit Lein, invites participants to informal get-together

SEPTEMBER 9

- 08:00 – 19:00 Excursion to Røros World Heritage Site

Appendix 3

Conservation Of Arctic Flora and Fauna

Plenary Approved Text for the Barrow Ministerial Declaration

17:20, 8 September 2000

Receive with appreciation reports on biodiversity monitoring, legal instruments for marine protection, circumpolar marine conservation, protected area needs in the Russian Arctic, rare endemic vascular plants, seabird harvest, and seabird bycatch, and **endorse** CAFF's future activities as outlined in the CAFF Work Plan 2000-2002.

Welcome the Global Environment Facility's support to Russia, CAFF and UNEP in developing a project using an integrated ecosystem approach to enhance biodiversity conservation in the Russian Arctic, noting its focus on capacity building, stakeholder involvement, and the integration of biodiversity concerns into sustainable development in the Arctic, and **request** that Arctic States consider active support for this project.

Receive with appreciation the booklet "Arctic Flora and Fauna: Biodiversity, Status and Conservation", and **look forward** to the publication of the Overview Report on Arctic conservation issues.

Acknowledge the establishment of circumpolar monitoring networks for key elements of Arctic biodiversity, and **encourage** further work of CAFF and AMAP on towards integrating their monitoring initiatives.

Appendix 4

CONSERVATION OF ARCTIC FLORA AND FAUNA: INPUT TO SAO REPORT TO MINISTERS; BARROW

Plenary Approved text as of 17:00, 8 September 2000

B. CONSERVATION OF ARCTIC FLORA AND FAUNA (CAFF)

CAFF was established under the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) in 1991, as a "distinct forum for scientists, indigenous people and conservation managers engaged in Arctic flora, fauna and habitat related activities to exchange data and information on issues such as shared species and habitats and to collaborate as appropriate for more effective research, sustainable utilization and conservation". Currently the CAFF program work is guided by the "Strategic Plan for the Conservation of Arctic Biological Diversity", endorsed by the Arctic Ministers in 1998, as further defined through directions from the Arctic Council. At the Iqaluit Ministerial Meeting, five priority tasks for CAFF were identified:

1. to prepare an overview report on status and trends in changes to Arctic ecosystems, habitats, and species;
2. to assess, in collaboration with AMAP, the impacts of climate change on Arctic ecosystems;
3. to identify elements of a program to monitor circumpolar biodiversity;
4. to continue developing and coordinating implementation of the Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN) with focus on the marine environment;
5. to continue coordinating implementation of the Murre and Eider conservation strategies and action plans.

Progress Report

Completion of CAFF's overview report on Arctic conservation issues is progressing well. CAFF plans to deliver the report to the meeting of the Senior Arctic Officials to be held in conjunction with the meeting marking the tenth anniversary of the AEPS. Specific recommendations will be presented by CAFF in a separate report. SAOs are pleased to present to Ministers a preview booklet which captures the theme of the overview report, entitled "Arctic Flora and Fauna: Biodiversity, Status and Conservation".

CAFF has actively participated in the Assessment Steering Committee for the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) and assisted in the preparation of relevant ACIA documents submitted to the Arctic Council, including the ACIA Implementation Plan, Version 3.6. CAFF and AMAP held a joint meeting on ACIA in Trondheim, September 4, 2000 to discuss and harmonise climate change research and monitoring

work. The meeting confirmed the will of the two programs to work closely together on this important issue.

CAFF held a workshop in Reykjavik in February 2000, co-sponsored with AMAP, on identifying priority elements of a program to monitor circumpolar biodiversity. Based on the results of the workshop, CAFF has established, as the pilot phase of this monitoring initiative, nine voluntary expert monitoring networks on important elements of Arctic biota for which there are national and regional interests.

With respect to CPAN, CAFF co-sponsored a Circumpolar Marine Workshop with the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and PAME, to explore practical ways to promote conservation, environmental protection, and sustainable development in coastal and marine ecosystems. CAFF published “Summary of Legal Instruments and National Frameworks for Arctic Marine Protection” as CAFF Habitat Report No. 8, which suggests that there is already sufficient legislation to protect the Arctic marine environment and conserve its biodiversity and habitats. However, a general conclusion from the report is that the legislation is not always implemented or its provisions adequately enforced. CAFF also published a “GAP Analysis for the Russian Arctic in Support of CPAN” (Habitat Conservation Report No. 9) providing in 22 maps a wealth of data that can be useful in assisting Russia in focusing its efforts to establish protected areas.

The “Atlas of Rare Endemic Vascular Plants of the Arctic” was printed as CAFF Technical Report No. 3. The atlas describes and provides distribution maps of 96 vascular plant species endemic to the Arctic region, only 30% of which are fully protected. The completion of the Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map is progressing well. The final product, a circumpolar synthesis map and database, is planned for completion in 2002. The CAFF Circumpolar Seabird Working Group (CSWG) met in Ottawa in December 1999. National implementation of the International Murre Conservation Strategy and Action Plan and the Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan is well underway. In support of both strategies, CAFF hosted a workshop on “Seabird Incidental Bycatch in the Waters of Arctic Countries” in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, April 26-28, 2000, which produced recommendations on outreach and education, monitoring and assessment, mitigation measures, and mechanisms for reducing the bycatch of seabirds in commercial marine fisheries. The workshop proceedings emphasise the need to bring fisheries management and seabird conservation agencies together within each CAFF country to effectively address this conservation concern. Further, the report on “Seabird Harvest Regimes in the Circumpolar Nations”, which summarizes current harvests of seabirds and impacts on their populations, was published as CAFF Technical Report No. 5.

A workshop on the “Conservation of Arctic Breeding Migratory Birds Outside the Arctic” was held in Songli, Norway on 10-11 September 2000, with the support of the Netherlands. It addressed the recommendations presented in CAFF Technical Report No. 4 “Global Overview of the Conservation of Migratory Arctic Breeding Birds Outside the Arctic”, considering the need for international initiatives to protect Arctic bird species that migrate south to over-winter beyond the Circumpolar Region. [Conclusions to be added following workshop completion]

Since 1998, CAFF has initiated two new projects. The CAFF chair, Russia and UNEP developed a proposal on “Integrated Ecosystem Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimise Habitat Fragmentation in the Russian Arctic”. The project will use the

integrated ecosystem approach which will secure necessary capacity building and the involvement of all relevant sectors and stakeholders, and integrate biodiversity concerns into sustainable development. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) has awarded US\$350,000 to the project development phase to be conducted from fall 2000 through 2001. Additional country contributions have been confirmed, although further monetary and in-kind contributions are required. If the project development is successful, GEF will contribute up to US\$2.5 million to the larger project from 2002-2005, matching ongoing and planned country efforts related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in the Russian Arctic.

To address an issue of high priority to indigenous people, the project on “Biological Significance of Sacred Sites of Indigenous Peoples in the Arctic: A Study in Northern Russia” has been initiated by RAIPON, with financial support from the Danish Environmental Protection Agency. Its objective is to enhance protection and management of sacred sites through linkage with biodiversity conservation efforts under CAFF/CPAN.

Future Activities

Future activities are grouped around the five objectives of the CAFF Strategic Plan. The SAOs recommend that the Ministers endorse the following priorities for CAFF:

Monitoring of Arctic biodiversity

- continue the development and implementation of a comprehensive network to monitor biodiversity, focusing on key species and species-groups of ecological and economic value,
- play an integral role in the completion of the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA), and
- develop and implement monitoring activities in collaboration with AMAP, in support of ACIA and other assessments.

Species and habitat conservation

- support the further development of the flora group to address priority flora and vegetation issues and to support ACIA, biodiversity monitoring, and CPAN,
- finalise the Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map,
- continue coordinating the implementation of the murre and eider strategies, and
- address the recommendations from CAFF’s work on seabird bycatch and the conservation of migratory birds outside the Arctic.

Protected areas

- continue coordinating the implementation of the Circumpolar Protected Areas Network, with specific focus on the full range of values of Arctic protected areas, marine protection in collaboration with PAME, electronic linkages to facilitate communication among protected area managers, and integrating protection of indigenous sacred sites into CPAN.

Biodiversity conservation outside protected areas

- complete the project development phase of the GEF project on “An Integrated Ecosystem Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimise Habitat Fragmentation in the Russian Arctic”, including securing the necessary funds to complete the development phase and to start the larger project.

Integration and information sharing

- complete the full CAFF overview report on Arctic conservation issues,
- prepare recommendations based on the overview report, and
- use the report and recommendations to enhance awareness among the public and decision-makers about important Arctic biodiversity concerns.

The SAOs also note that Sweden will become Chair of CAFF after the Barrow meeting of the Arctic Council.

Appendix 5

CONSERVATION OF ARCTIC FLORA AND FAUNA CAFF

WORK PLAN 2000 – 2002

September 8, 2000 – Final text as approved in Plenary

I. INTRODUCTION

The CAFF Work Plan 2000-2002 specifies actions agreed upon by the eight Arctic countries to be undertaken by CAFF, under the auspices of the Arctic Council, during the period September 2000 to fall 2002.

The CAFF Work Plan 2000-2002 follows the format of and represents steps towards implementing the “Strategic Plan for the Conservation of Arctic Biological Diversity,” which was endorsed by the Arctic Ministers in 1998 as a framework for future CAFF activities.

II. WORK PLAN

Enhance efforts to monitor Arctic biological diversity, paying particular attention to species, populations, habitats and ecosystems, which are of greatest ecological, cultural and social value

- 1.1. Facilitate establishment of nine networks of experts to identify priority elements of a program to monitor biological diversity **(All)** and report progress as it relates to the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment at CAFF IX. **(Iceland)**
- 1.2. Collaborate with AMAP to harmonize biological diversity monitoring activities. **(Sweden, as CAFF Chair/CAFF Secretariat)**
- 1.3. Collaborate with AMAP and the International Arctic Science Committee to prepare the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment for delivery to the Ministers in 2004. **(Norway/Canada/CAFF Secretariat)**

2. Support and implement measures for the conservation of Arctic genetic resources, species and their habitats

Flora

- 2.1. Establish the CAFF Flora Group to address priority flora and vegetation issues in support of CAFF priorities including the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, the Circumpolar Protected Areas Network and circumpolar monitoring. A charter will be prepared for the April 2001 CAFF management meeting. **(USA/All)**

- 2.2. Review issues identified in the *ad hoc* CAFF Flora Group discussion paper tabled at CAFF VIII at a workshop to be held in Fennoscandia in 2001, and make recommendations to CAFF IX on priority action items. **(USA/All)**
- 2.3. Continue preparation of a taxonomically unified checklist of Pan-Arctic Flora, and revise the list of rare non-endemic plants of circumpolar conservation concern. Provide a status report at CAFF IX. **(Russia/CAFF countries as appropriate).**
- 2.4. Complete the Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map in 2002, and present the map at CAFF IX. **(USA)**

Fauna

- 2.5. Co-ordinate national and circumpolar implementation of the International Murre Conservation Strategy and Action Plan and report on progress to CAFF IX. **(USA/Circumpolar Seabird Working Group)**
- 2.6. Co-ordinate national and circumpolar implementation of the Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan and report on progress to CAFF IX. **(USA/Circumpolar Seabird Working Group)**
- 2.7. Review recommendations of the CAFF Seabird Bycatch Workshop and CAFF Technical Report No. 1, "Incidental Take of Seabirds in Arctic Countries," and report to the April 2001 CAFF management meeting on priority activities for implementation. **(USA/Circumpolar Seabird Working Group)**
- 2.8. Review recommendations of CAFF Technical Report No. 5 "Seabird Harvest Regimes in the Circumpolar Nations," and report to the April 2001 CAFF management meeting on priority activities for implementation. **(USA/Circumpolar Seabird Working Group)**
- 2.9. Review recommendations of the CAFF workshop on "The Conservation of Migratory Birds Outside the Arctic," and report to the April 2001 CAFF management meeting on priority activities for implementation. **(Russia/Circumpolar Seabird Working Group)**

3. Establish protected areas in the Arctic where they contribute to the conservation of ecosystems, habitats and species

- 3.1. Further develop electronic linkages to facilitate communication among protected area managers and others, by updating and expanding the CAFF web-site, and by establishing an electronic means, such as a list server, to distribute information on protected area initiatives and other CAFF activities. **(USA/CAFF Secretariat/UNEP GRID-Arendal)**

- 3.2. Analyse the conservation value of sacred sites of indigenous peoples of the Russian Arctic, their current status and ways to enhance their protection through the Circumpolar Protected Areas Network, and report findings to CAFF IX. **(RAIPON/Russia/CAFF Secretariat)**
- 3.3. Prepare by CAFF IX a discussion paper and preliminary project proposal to demonstrate the full range of values of Arctic protected areas. **(Canada)**

4. Manage activities outside protected areas in order to maintain the ecological integrity of protected areas and to ensure the conservation of biodiversity

- 4.1. Complete by December 2001, a PDF-B for a Main Global Environment Facility Project “Integrated Ecosystem Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimize Habitat Fragmentation in the Russian Arctic.” Begin implementation of the Main Project in 2002. Implementation of both phases will be dependent upon receipt of matching funds. **(Russia/Norway/CAFF Secretariat/UNEP GRID-Arendal)**

5. Enhance integration of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives into sectoral and cross-sectoral plans and policies. Identify approaches and develop strategies by which information on the conservation of Arctic biological diversity can be made available in an appropriate manner to those making socio-economic decisions

- 5.1. Complete the CAFF overview report on Arctic conservation issues, and present it to the Senior Arctic Officials in June 2001, in conjunction with the meeting marking the tenth anniversary of the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy. **(Finland/All)**
- 5.2. Develop recommendations for further actions based on the information and conclusions presented in the overview report, for presentation to the Ministers in 2002 **(Sweden, as CAFF Chair/All)**

6. Outstanding Administrative and Management Actions

- 6.1. Revise and finalize CAFF’s draft operating guidelines and submit to the Senior Arctic Officials for approval in June 2001. **(USA)**
- 6.2. Revise and finalize CAFF’s draft communication strategy and submit to the Senior Arctic Officials for approval in June 2001. **(Iceland)**