

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

**CAFF VII
SUMMARY REPORT**

YELLOWKNIFE, CANADA, 28-30 APRIL 1999

Prepared by the CAFF International Secretariat 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	iv
Section I - Opening Statements	1
1. Welcome and Opening Comments	1
2. Presentation and Adoption of Agenda	1
3. Opening Statements and Summaries	1
4. National Reports	5
Section II - CAFF Administration and Management	9
5. New CAFF Framework	9
6. CAFF Administration	10
Section III - Thematic Breakout Sessions	11
7. CAFF Overview Report: Arctic Conservation Issues: Status and Trends of Arctic Flora, Fauna and Habitats	11
8. Climate Change and UV-B	12
9. Monitoring Biodiversity	13
10. Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN)	14
11. Implementing Other Aspects of the CAFF Strategic Plan	14
Section IV – Closing	17
12. CAFF Work Plan 1999-2000	17
13. Other Business	17
14. Passing the Torch	17
Section V – Appendices	18
I. CAFF VII Participants List	18
II. Opening Address - Hon. Kakfwi	27
III. CAFF VII Agenda	30
IV. Opening Statements by Permanent Participants, Observers and Experts	33
V. Country Reports to CAFF VII	43
VI. CAFF Overview Report - Outline, Timeline	
VII. Breakout Session 1: CAFF Overview Report	61
VIII. Breakout Session 2: Climate Change and UV-B Impacts	64
IX. Breakout Session 3: Monitoring Circumpolar Biodiversity	73
X. Breakout Session 4: Circumpolar Protected Areas Network	77
XI. Breakout Session 5: Implementing Other Aspects of the CAFF Strategic Plan	84
XII. Report of the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group (CSWG)	87
XIII. CAFF Work Plan 1999-2000	88

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction and Opening: The Arctic Council (AC) Working Group for the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) met for the seventh time in Yellowknife, Canada, April 28-30, to address Arctic conservation issues. The meeting was attended by over 50 participants representing the Member States and Permanent Participants, Accredited Observers and invited Experts.

Kevin McCormick, CAFF Chair, welcomed participants and noted that the main goal of the meeting was to address the Ministerial (September 1998) charge to CAFF to prepare an overview report of the status and trends of Arctic biodiversity, design a program to monitor circumpolar biodiversity, assess, in collaboration with AMAP, the effects of climate change and UV-V on Arctic ecosystems, and continue implementing strategies and action plans for the Circumpolar Protected Area Network (CPAN), for murre, and for eiders.

The Honourable Stephen Kakfwi, Minister of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development of the Government of the Northwest Territories in an opening address emphasises the important of conservation to all northern peoples.

Opening statements were provided by the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC), the Saami Council, the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON), The Netherlands, United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), World Wildlife Fund (WWF), the Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the World Conservation Union (IUCN), the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), and the programmes for Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME) and Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response (EPPR). The Member States submitted written progress reports to the meeting.

Operational Framework of CAFF. Kevin McCormick provided a summary of the changes in the political and operational framework affecting CAFF since the last meeting in Nuuk, 1997. Main developments mentioned were:

The *CAFF Strategic Plan for the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna* (1998) provides a clear mandate for CAFF as well as a framework for establishing priorities, reporting to the Senior Arctic Officials (SAOs) and for communicating.

The *Arctic Council Rules of Procedure* (AC ROP) contain several provisions which affect the way CAFF does business - for example only Member States or Permanent Participants can formally lead CAFF projects.

CAFF is developing **Operating Guidelines** which detail organisational aspects, meeting procedures, document management and other operating procedures. Accordingly, CAFF Working Group Meetings will be held biennially, immediately after AC meetings, with smaller Management Meetings in between, and the CAFF Work Plan will be more flexible in the sense that approved and funded projects can be added to the Work Plan at any CAFF Meeting.

There is an expectation and a trend towards **increased collaboration among AC Working Groups**. Examples are a joint CAFF/AMAP assessment of the impacts of climate change and UV-B on Arctic flora and fauna, assisted by several international organisations, and a joint CAFF/PAME/IUCN Circumpolar Marine Workshop scheduled for late 1999.

The bulk of the meeting was conducted in five breakout sessions, detailed below, designed to address main projects and program areas of CAFF.

CAFF Overview Report “Arctic Conservation Issues: Status and Trends of Arctic Flora and Fauna”. The meeting commended the Overview Editorial Team for good work and adopted a revised set of goals and objectives for the project. The intention is to produce a high quality, illustrated report, in book form, which describes in lay terms the current status and trends in Arctic biodiversity. An advance draft is planned to be ready by fall 2000 necessitating a very rigorous timeline. The meeting decided that the report should include general recommendations to Arctic policy makers. The meeting accepted Finland’s offer to lead the preparation of the report.

Climate Change and UV-B Impacts: The meeting recommended that CAFF play an active role in climate change studies and assessments and supported *in principle* the joint proposal tabled by AMAP/CAFF/IASC for a broad-based scientific study of the impacts of climate change and UV-B in the Arctic region (the Arctic Climate Impact Study - ACIS). The meeting accepted Sweden’s offer to lead the climate change and UV-B work and to represent CAFF on the joint AMAP/CAFF/IASC Assessment Steering Committee.

Biodiversity Monitoring: The meeting supported the concept of a circumpolar biodiversity monitoring network and agreed to establish a Drafting Committee to advance the work initiated at CAFF VII and to prepare a draft framework for the monitoring network. This framework is to be discussed at a workshop in Iceland dedicated to this issue. The meeting accepted *in principle* project concepts/proposals on reindeer/caribou, ringed seal and seabird monitoring and agreed to incorporate these proposals into the monitoring work. The meeting also accepted Iceland’s offer to lead the CAFF monitoring effort on an interim basis.

Circumpolar Protected Area Network (CPAN): The meeting decided to establish a US-led Standing Committee on CPAN to prepare, for the next CAFF Management Meeting, a discussion paper on how to advance the CPAN program. The paper is to contain concrete recommendations for specific actions. The meeting expressed strong support for a RAIPON/CAFF project aimed at enhancing the protection of sacred sites of the indigenous peoples of the Russian Arctic.

Implementing Other Aspects of the Strategic Plan: The meeting decided to establish a US-led *ad hoc* Flora Group to evaluate circumpolar flora issues of common concern. The Group will provide a discussion paper to CAFF VIII with recommendations for future work and on how flora issues should be handled by CAFF. Countries also agreed to review and take into consideration at later meetings, recommendations provided by the breakout groups on Fauna conservation and on Integration and Information Flow. The meeting commended the work of the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group and supported its intention to organise a Seabird Bycatch Workshop in Halifax, Canada in spring 2000. The workshop will bring together seabird conservation and fisheries interests from CAFF countries to develop actions to reduce seabird bycatch in gillnet fisheries and thus complement FAO bycatch initiatives which focus on the long-line fisheries.

CAFF Work Plan: The meeting developed and adopted a draft CAFF Work Plan for 1999-2000 for presentation to the SAOs. The Work Plan includes *inter alia* five specialist CAFF-sponsored workshops during the period signifying a trend within CAFF towards more focused gatherings of specialists.

Other Business: The meeting was informed about plans for CAFF/PAME/IUCN co-sponsored Circumpolar Marine Workshop in fall 1999 aimed at furthering multi-stakeholder collaboration for better protection of the Arctic marine environment and its resources.

Closing: Kevin McCormick thanked everyone for the hard work and welcomed Norway as incoming Chair. Berit Lein, Norway, welcomed participants to Tromso in the fall 2000.

INTRODUCTION

The CAFF International Working Group of the Arctic Council gathered for the seventh time in Yellowknife, April 28-30, to address Arctic conservation issues. The meeting was attended by 56 participants (Appendix 1) representing the eight Arctic countries - Canada, Finland, Greenland/Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden and the United States; Permanent Participants of the Arctic Council - the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC), Saami Council, and the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON), accredited Observers - The Netherlands, United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), and World Wildlife Fund (WWF); invited Experts - the Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC); other Arctic Council Programs - Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program (AMAP), Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME), Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response (EPPR), and the Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat and CAFF Secretariat.

This report provides highlights of presentations, recommendations, discussions and decisions made during the meeting. It is divided into five sections: I: Opening Statements; II: Administration and Management; III: Thematic Breakout Sessions; VI: Closing: V: Appendices.

SECTION I: OPENING STATEMENTS

1. WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS

CAFF Chair

Kevin McCormick, CAFF Chair, welcomed participants including Mr. Lars-Erik Lijlelund, the new National Representative for Sweden, and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity previously not represented at CAFF meetings.

Mr. McCormick reviewed the following Iqaluit Ministerial charge to CAFF:

- to prepare an overview of the status and trends in changes to ecosystems, habitats and species in the Arctic (hereafter called the CAFF Overview);
- to design a program to monitor circumpolar biodiversity
- to assess, in collaboration with AMAP, the effects of climate change and UV-B on Arctic ecosystems; and,
- to continue ongoing work to develop the Circumpolar Protected Area Network (CPAN) and the conservation strategies for murres and eiders.

The Ministerial directives influenced the approach to the structure of the meeting with the emphasis being on sessions designed to provide an opportunity to collectively provide input and respond to these challenging tasks.

Minister Kakfwi.

The Honourable Stephen Kakfwi, Minister of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development of the government of the Northwest Territories presented the opening address to the CAFF VII participants. He emphasised the importance of conservation to all northern people and the need to engage all those who might be affected by northern environmental concerns in developing a consensus on the appropriate course to follow in addressing the challenges facing us (full text is contained in Appendix 2).

2. PRESENTATION AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The Agenda was accepted as presented (Appendix 3)

3. OPENING STATEMENTS AND SUMMARIES

Presented below are highlights from opening statements by Permanent Participants, Accredited Observers, Invited Experts, Arctic Council Working Groups and representatives of the Arctic countries. Full texts, as appropriate, are provided in Appendix 4.

A) Permanent Participants

ICC - Inuit Circumpolar Conference (Presenter: Duane Smith)

Mr. Smith introduced the six-person ICC delegation which included representatives of Greenland, Canada and Alaska and explained that the size of the delegation signals the seriousness with which ICC views CAFF and the issues being dealt with by this Arctic Council working Group. Mr. Smith noted that ICC had completed projects under the CAFF Work Plan and that peer-reviewed papers on traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) of whaling in the Bering Sea based on work for CAFF have recently been published and these were tabled. As well, ICC distributed order forms for *Inuit Whaling and Sustainability*, a book prepared for and sponsored by ICC recently published by AltaMira Press in the USA. ICC then noted the importance of the forthcoming CAFF Overview and characterised the document as CAFF's flagship publication. ICC stated it would support the project proposed by RAIPON on sacred sites, and the Saami Council's suggestion that the recently published study *Saami Potatoes* be included in the forthcoming biodiversity report. On the discussion on sustainable development, ICC would like to stress that the indigenous peoples of the Arctic are the highest part of the food chain utilising the Arctic flora and fauna for subsistence lifestyle on which our culture is based.

RAIPON - Russian Association for the Indigenous Peoples of the North (Presenter: Pavel Suliandziga)

Mr. Suliandziga informed participants of the many difficulties facing indigenous peoples in northern Russia and citing hostilities in the Balkans, that CAFF must not let international politics get in the way of co-operation. He extolled participants to continue efforts to promote co-operation between indigenous peoples and national governments. As a member of the Udege group, Mr. Suliandziga described the deteriorating situation for indigenous peoples and environmental destruction in the Russian Far East. He suggested that the traditional way of life of indigenous peoples was one important way to conserve the natural environment. In closing, he noted that RAIPON is a young agency and that it is receiving valuable help from Canada, Denmark and Norway. This assistance is evidence that the Arctic is a "common house" of the Arctic nations.

Saami Council (Presenter: Ole Gaup)

Mr. Gaup spoke of problems with the salmon fishery in northern Norway related to catch limits, fishing seasons, restricted areas, and bycatch. Traditional Saami fishing is increasingly difficult as a result of these problems. The Saami Council will be preparing studies on these issues under the rubric of the Arctic Council's sustainable development program. The concept of biodiversity conservation needs to be expanded to account for and to promote cultural diversity. African groups and the Saami council are currently discussing this idea. Finally, Mr. Gaup noted that many nations do not understand the concept of sacred sites and that CAFF should support work on this concept.

B) Accredited Observers

The Netherlands/Standing Committee of the Bonn Convention (Presenter: Gerard Boere)

Mr. Boere noted that the Netherlands remains committed to Arctic issues and continues to support concrete activities, including those of CAFF as evident by the following examples. In March 1998, the Netherlands and Russia jointly organised the “Willem Barents Memorial Arctic Conservation Symposium”. Also in 1998, a new long term research program focusing on the population dynamics of the long distance migrant Curlew Sandpiper (*Calidris ferruginea*) was established on Taimyr. Mr. Boere advised that an updated version of the overview of Dutch Arctic research is now available on the web. Of particular relevance for CAFF, the Netherlands government has offered to host a small CAFF workshop in Wageningen, spring 2000, as a follow-up to CAFF Technical Report No. 4 - *Global Overview of the Conservation of Migratory Arctic Breeding birds Outside the Arctic* (1999). The African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) under the Bonn Convention will soon come into force with the final African ratification underway. In co-operation with South Africa and the Bonn Convention, the Netherlands is preparing the first meeting of the Parties from 7-9 November 1999 in Cape town - back to back with the Conference of the Parties to the Bonn Convention. Mr. Boere invited CAFF to attend both meetings and to participate actively in the work of the AEWA and Bonn Convention.

UNEP - United Nations Environment Program (Presenter: David Henry)

Mr. Henry welcomed the fact that CAFF is moving towards a focused work program grounded in the Strategic Plan. UNEP considers the production of the CAFF Overview a crucial undertaking for CAFF and an excellent opportunity to raise awareness of the Arctic region and issues of biological conservation. UNEP offers its channels for this product to reach a wider international audience. Mr. Henry noted that currently the GEF Co-ordination Office is assisting AMAP, RAIPON, ICC and the government of the Russian Federation in the development of a proposal on contaminant studies in northern Russia. Possibilities to support relevant CAFF-related biodiversity conservation issues within the Russian Federation should be explored. At a practical program level, UNEP GRID-Arendal is currently completing, together with the World Conservation Monitoring Centre, a CPAN gap analysis in the Russian Arctic. UNEP GRID-Arendal has also worked with the Icelandic delegation to create a draft CAFF communications strategy and with the Norwegian delegation to prepare a discussion paper on a CPAN registry.

WWF - World Wildlife Fund - Arctic Program (Presenter: William Carpenter)

Mr. Carpenter expressed strong support for the CAFF Overview and offered WWF's assistance in its preparation and communication throughout the WWF global network. Mr. Carpenter mentioned other specific projects of mutual interest to CAFF and WWF including WWF's climate change project “Waterbirds on the Edge” contracted with WCMC, RAIPON's proposal to link the protection of sacred lands and valuable nature areas within the framework of CPAN, WWF's “Guidelines for the Consumptive Use of Wild Species in the Arctic”, and the project on “Linking Tourism and Conservation in the Arctic” with potential linkages to CPAN. In general, WWF is prepared to play an active role in CAFF through sharing

information, collaborating and exploring new areas of significance and in promoting the conservation of Arctic flora and fauna.

C) Invited Experts

Secretariat to the Convention on Biological Diversity (Presenter: Tony Gross)

Mr. Gross briefed the meeting on objectives and current priorities of the CBD which harmonise very well with those of CAFF. Because regional initiatives are considered fundamental to reinforcing national actions to implement the CBD, the CBD Secretariat is looking towards CAFF with great interest. CAFF's experience in developing assessments of the status and trends of circumpolar biodiversity, in developing a program of monitoring, in incorporating traditional knowledge and in co-operating among countries with different administrative, legal and political traditions will provide important pointers to other Parties to the CBD. In closing, Mr. Gross urged CAFF delegates to bring to the work of the Convention the lessons being learned by CAFF in order that other countries and regions may benefit.

IUCN - World Conservation Union (Presenter: Malcolm Mercer)

Mr. Mercer noted that the joint membership of Arctic States and some Permanent Participants in the Arctic Council and in the IUCN makes it natural to seek areas of partnership in order to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure equity and sustainability in resource use. IUCN and PAME have collaborated on the development of Arctic Offshore Oil and Gas Guidelines. With respect to CAFF, the IUCN Canada Office is looking forward to hosting the joint IUCN/CAFF/PAME Circumpolar Marine Workshop this fall. IUCN is also prepared to collaborate with CAFF in the area of climate change. IUCN's new initiative on Species as Indicators of biological Diversity is relevant to CAFF's work on biodiversity monitoring and may offer further partnership opportunities. IUCN has already offered to contribute to the CAFF Overview.

WCMC - World Conservation Monitoring Centre (Presenter: Igor Lysenko)

Mr. Lysenko noted that since 1994 WCMC has contributed to the CAFF program by producing information for several CAFF/CPAN reports and with the implementation of several projects. Currently WCMC in collaboration with GRID-Arendal is finishing the CAFF/CPAN gap analysis project in the Russian Arctic. Also relevant for CAFF is the project on Water birds at the Edge - a key component of the WCMC Climate Change Program - and continued WCMC Internet Database Service in support of the conservation efforts across the Circumpolar region. WCMC advocates an integrated approach to Arctic conservation using all available information and an acknowledgement of the uniqueness and integrity of the biological processes in the Arctic region. This Arctic View must be incorporated into the public vision of CAFF, into its conservation activities, into conservation science and into the decision making process across the circumpolar region. WCMC supports the CAFF Overview as a first and very important step along the way.

D) Arctic Council Working Groups

AMAP - Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program (Presenter: Janine Murray)

AMAP is beginning to plan its next assessments and has established an Assessment Steering Group (ASG) to oversee this process. With respect to CAFF VII, AMAP is particularly interested in the discussions to be held on climate change and UV impacts as AMAP is co-operating with CAFF on an upcoming circumpolar assessment. An Assessment Steering Committee (ASC) comprised of members of CAFF, IASC and AMAP has been formed to co-ordinate this assessment. The first meeting of the ASC was held in Washington in March and discussed monitoring programs, specific assessment work to be conducted and co-operation with other international organisations. Simultaneous to CAFF VII, AMAP was attending the Arctic Science Summit Week organised by IASC and taking part in the Workshop on Impacts of Climate Change in the Arctic. A proposal for a monitoring and research program on climate change in the Arctic would be submitted to CAFF. AMAP looked forward to continued co-operation with CAFF on climate change and UV effects in the Arctic.

PAME - Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment and EPPR - Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response (Presenter: Laura Johnston)

On behalf of PAME, Ms. Johnston brought the attention of the meeting to the recently released *Regional Program of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities*. A summary of the PAME Work Plan 1999-2000 was also provided. PAME, a cosponsor of the Circumpolar Marine Workshop, indicated its concurrence with the information provided by IUCN in this regard.

EPPR brought to the attention of the meeting the EPPR Strategic Plan of Action as confirmed by Ministers in Iqaluit. The project to prepare a "Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk from Oil Spills in the Arctic" may offer opportunities for Working Group co-operation. The goal of this project is to produce a series of circumpolar maps (likely four) that highlight the areas of highest risk of an oil spill and those areas where natural resources at risk and of importance for subsistence communities exist. In summary, both EPPR and PAME are looking forward to increased co-operation with CAFF in areas of mutual interest.

4. NATIONAL REPORTS

Highlights of written reports tabled by the Arctic countries and presented in Appendix 5 are presented below.

Canada

Canada has chaired the CAFF program since CAFF VI and during this period, CAFF's international contribution has been that it hosted CAFF VII in Yellowknife, contributed to the completion of the CAFF Strategic Plan, played an active role in CAFF's seabird projects by completing the murre colony database and the National Murre Conservation Action Plan, by editing the CAFF/CSWG report on Human Disturbance at Arctic Seabird Colonies, prepared, together with the Secretariat, draft

operating guidelines for CAFF, and prepared a draft report on *International and National Legislative Frameworks for Arctic Marine Conservation*.

Domestically, Canada took steps to reduce seabird mortality from oil at sea and hosted the May 1998 *Conference on Sustainable Development in the Arctic: The Way Ahead*, the results of which will contribute to the development of the Arctic Council's Sustainable Development Program. Other accomplishments include: the establishment of the new political territory of Nunavut on 1 April 1999; the establishment of a new national park, Tuktoyaktuk Nogait on the coast of the Beaufort Sea; and the establishment of five pilot marine protected areas under Canada's 1997 Oceans Act and under legislation passed in 1998. New research and monitoring opportunities are being provided by the Northern Ecosystem Initiative, the continental Sea Duck Joint Venture and the Climate Change Action Fund. Finally, new federal endangered species legislation is being developed in consultation with territorial and provincial governments, Aboriginal organisations and interest groups to provide a harmonised approach to the conservation of species-at-risk.

Finland

Finland prepared an internal report to CAFF titled "Arctic Biological Diversity: Concerns and Long-term Threats", arranged an AMAP/CAFF Workshop on Climate Change in Rovaniemi, March 1998, and allocated a senior expert to the CAFF Secretariat for a one year period 1998/99. After returning to Finland, the expert will continue to lead the work on the CAFF Overview. Finland organised a workshop on Sustainable Development in the Northern Timberline forests in Whitehorse, Canada in May 1998 and published the Proceedings in 1999.

Domestically, Finland has prepared a National Action Plan for Biodiversity 1997-2005 in order to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Plan calls for a network to monitor the status of biological diversity in Finland, which will also be relevant for CAFF's monitoring tasks. The Red Book of Eastern Fennoscandia was published in co-operation with Russia in autumn 1998. Finland has submitted its national proposal on protected areas to be included in the European-wide Natura 2000 network. Although the conservation status in Finnish Lapland is generally good, there are concerns with for example, overgrazing by reindeer, increased tourism, the need for detailed hunting surveys and the introduction of fish and fish-farming. The landscape planning method, adopted by the Finnish Forest and Park Service, has proved to be an important method to strengthen the co-operation between different stakeholders, including authorities and local residents.

Greenland

With the formation of the Greenland Institute of Natural Resources in 1995 and the establishment of the Department of Environment and Nature in 1997, the Greenland Home Rule government has created the institutional setting for its work on conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. After a period of consolidation of the institutions, high priority is placed on public awareness, information and involvement of local communities in both research and management programs.

Related to the CAFF Work Plan, seabirds and protected areas have been a focus. A Greenland Murre Conservation Action Plan and a Greenland eider Conservation

Action Plan are near completion. National overviews were completed for CAFF technical reports on seabirds. A public awareness program on murres in the northern part of West Greenland is now in its second year. A status report on protected areas in Greenland and the identified problems in the management of these areas was delivered to the Parliament in October 1998, and is now being followed-up by protection of several unique areas in Greenland. A gap analysis, based on an assessment of biodiversity in Greenland, is in progress.

Iceland

Work in Iceland related to CAFF has been primarily centred on seabird conservation, the Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Mapping (CAM) project, the Circumpolar Protected Area Network (CPAN), the CAFF Communications Strategy (for which Iceland had the lead), and the biodiversity monitoring project. The approach to national programs for nature conservation has been such as to build the foundation for and integrate with directions set at the international level. A significant milestone in that vein took place in early 1999 with new legislation for general nature conservation, adapting and legalising the general thrust of the CAFF program, the Convention on Biological Diversity and others. Iceland has hosted the CAFF Secretariat since 1996 and provided increasing support.

Norway

Since CAFF VI, several Norwegian initiatives have been launched of relevance to CAFF. The new Polar Environmental Centre in Tromsø was officially opened on December 1, 1998. This institute is intended to be a major force in environmental co-operation in the Barents region and polar areas. A monitoring system for Svalbard and Jan Mayen has been developed and implementation will start in summer 1999. A reorganisation of the Norwegian-Russian environmental co-operation has resulted in high activity within the different new working groups. A major project has been the development of a monitoring program for the Barents Sea and northern marine areas. The goal is to start implementation of this program in year 2000. A national plan for monitoring biological diversity has been prepared involving almost all of the relevant research institutions and management authorities. Implementation of the plan is underway. In Svalbard, a new plan to supplement the existing protected areas has been launched. It is based on a recent gap analysis showing that some nature types are underrepresented in the existing protected areas. National authorities will launch a new environmental law for Svalbard this summer and later this year, a new White Paper on Svalbard will be presented to the Parliament.

Russia

Russia is actively implementing several CAFF projects including providing input to the Pan-Arctic flora project, the Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map and other botanical activities. During the past few years, Russia has been actively establishing protected areas but wishes to be even more active in implementing the CPAN Strategy and Action Plan. CPAN and the new CAFF Overview report are considered the most important CAFF projects from Russia's perspective. Russia is pleased with recent developments within CAFF and would like to see the program continue to be an effective circumpolar forum for conservation managers and scientists and for resolving important Arctic nature conservation issues.

Domestically, dedicated government bodies and NGO's continue to implement measures aimed at improving and protecting the environment and nature. The State Committee is preparing for the All Russian Congress on Nature Conservation 1999 - a very important even for Russia. Within the framework of GEF, the "National Strategy and Action Plan on Biodiversity Conservation" is being developed. The Russian system of nature protected areas is under development and in 1998 the Red Book of Russia was revised. Russia has almost completed its strategy for the conservation of wetlands.

Sweden

No input

USA

The US reported good progress with its CAFF projects as follows: the *Atlas of Rare Endemic Vascular Plants of the Arctic* will be published in 1999 as CAFF Technical Report No 3; the US hosted the 3rd International Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map (CAVM) meeting in Anchorage, Alaska in June 1998; on seabird conservation, national overviews were prepared for CAFF Technical Reports No's 1 and 2, a "Five-year Alaska Murre Conservation Action Plan" and a "Framework for Monitoring Murres in the Circumpolar Region" were completed in 1998, an "Alaska Eider Conservation Action Plan" is nearing completion, and a CAFF Technical Report on the "Harvest of Seabirds in the Arctic" will be completed in mid-1999; the US is actively participating in the CPAN project; the USA and Canada collaborated to generate a proposal on assessing impacts of climate change using caribou and reindeer as indicators and are further collaborating on a proposal for an Arctic workshop on seabird bycatch in commercial fisheries; for CAFF VII, the US circulated discussion papers on "Incorporating ringed seals into CAFF and AMAP monitoring programs" and on CPAN and, the US secured funding for a consultant to participate on the Editorial Team in charge of drafting the CAFF Overview.

Domestic issues of interest to CAFF are, for example, a US Fish and Wildlife Service-sponsored study of plant species, communities and ecosystem diversity of the Alaska Peninsula; in 1997 the US Senate endorsed new Protocols to the two bilateral migratory bird conventions (USA-Great Britain (for Canada) 1916 and USA-Mexico 1936) paving the way for a regulatory process to ensure proper implementation of subsistence hunting; the US has continued its active participation in the USA-Russia Environmental Agreement and Trilateral USA/Canada/Mexico Agreement processes and has also re-established relationships with Japan in early 1999 for the purpose of co-operating and collaborating on the conservation of Arctic migratory species and populations shared between the two countries.

SECTION II: CAFF ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

5. NEW CAFF FRAMEWORK (KEVIN MCCORMICK)

CAFF has been undergoing a period of transition since June 1997 when it was subsumed by the Arctic Council. The main developments affecting CAFF have been: a) the CAFF Strategic Plan; b) the Arctic Council Rules of Procedure (AC ROP); c) the production of CAFF Operating Guidelines and d) evolution and co-operation with other Arctic Council Working Groups.

CAFF's *Strategic Plan for the Conservation of Arctic Biological Diversity*, endorsed by the Ministers in Iqaluit, provides a clear mandate for CAFF but also considerable scope for creativity in terms of developing new projects. It is a framework for establishing priorities, provides an effective mechanism for reporting to the SAOs, and is an effective communication tool for CAFF.

In Iqaluit, the Ministers adopted *Arctic Council Rules of Procedure (AC ROP)*. Provisions of special relevance to CAFF are *inter alia*:

- activities of the Working Groups, including Work Plans are subject to the guidance, direction and approval of the SAOs;
- only an Arctic State or Permanent Participant can be a proponent for co-operative activities (i.e. Work Plan items). However, there is no apparent restriction on the proponent's ability to develop partnerships with other organisations to deliver the work;
- proposals for co-operative activities must be received 90 days prior to any meeting at which they are to be considered;
- although the Arctic Council alone can accredit observer status to a particular organisation, Working Groups may invite experts to their meetings as they see fit.

Consistent with the AC ROP, CAFF is developing **Operating Guidelines**. Relevant decisions already made with respect to program delivery include the following:

- CAFF Working Group (WG) Meetings will be held every two years shortly after the AC Ministerial meetings;
- the term for the chairperson will be extended to two years with the chair transferred at Working Group Meetings;
- there will be a stronger technical component to the semi-annual CAFF Management Meetings (CAFF National Representatives, Permanent Participants and invited experts);
- the Work Plan will be more flexible in the sense that approved **and funded** projects can be added at any CAFF meeting.

Mr. McCormick explained that there is an expectation and trend towards **increased collaboration** including among Arctic Council Working Groups. CAFF has demonstrated this by undertaking with AMAP and IASC a joint assessment of the impacts of climate change and UV-B on Arctic flora and fauna and by co-sponsoring with PAME and the IUCN a Circumpolar Marine Workshop in the fall, 1999. Other examples of potential Working Group collaboration include EPPR's Circumpolar Map of Resources at Risk from Oil spills in the Arctic, and the *Regional Program of Action for Protection of the Marine Environment Against Land Based Activities* developed by PAME. In Iqualit, the Arctic Council created a Sustainable Development Program (SDP) and an associated Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG). The SDWG will oversee a variety of projects including ones related to fisheries management and ecotourism and since CAFF has pursued similar projects in the past, it may be asked to be involved.

6. CAFF ADMINISTRATION

CAFF Operating Guidelines: The USA tabled draft CAFF Operating Guidelines for consideration and comments by the Working Group. Based on comments received, the USA will prepare a final draft for consideration by the SAOs.

CAFF Communications Strategy: Iceland tabled a draft CAFF Communications Strategy for consideration and comments by the Working Group. Based on comments received, Iceland will prepare a final draft for consideration by the SAOs.

New CAFF Vice-Chair: Sweden, being the next in line after Norway to Chair CAFF, could not commit to chairing CAFF during 2000-2002 but agreed to Chair for the period 2002-2004. The USA offered to take the next term after Sweden (2004-2006). Iceland will consider taking on the task of CAFF Vice-Chair to the year 2000 and Chairing the Program for the 2000-20002 term.

CAFF Management and Working Group Meetings: The next CAFF Management Meeting will be in Trondheim, Norway in the fall, 1999. CAFF VIII will be hosted by Norway in Tromso, fall 2000, soon after the Second Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting.

Secretariat: The Secretariat tabled a status report noting *inter alia* that a replacement will be needed for Paula Kanpaanpaa who will be returning to Finland in summer, 1999. The Secretariat asked countries and Permanent Participants to consider seconding an experienced person on salary for a year or two with the Secretariat covering supplementary costs. The Secretariat was charged with writing a job description for participants to consider.

SECTION III: THEMATIC BREAKOUT SESSION

Participants of CAFF VII gathered into individual thematic groups to discuss and provide input on CAFF's Ministerial priorities. Highlights of the individual sessions and discussion held in Plenary are provided below. Reports from each session containing input of participants are contained in Appendices 7-11.

7. BREAKOUT SESSION I - CAFF OVERVIEW REPORT "ARCTIC CONSERVATION ISSUES: STATUS AND TRENDS OF ARCTIC FLORA, FAUNA AND HABITATS".

A) Plenary Report from the Editorial Team

Paula Kankaanpää and Henry Huntington presented a report of the Editorial Team (Appendix 6), including an annotated outline of the proposed Table of Contents. They explained that the objective of the CAFF Overview is to produce a high quality, illustrated report in book format, describing in lay terms the current status and trends in Arctic flora, fauna and habitats. The intention is to present a relatively complete draft to Ministers of the Arctic Council at their next meeting in the year 2000. This ambitious goal necessitates a very rigorous timeline. Participants were requested to comment on and confirm the purpose, theme, scope and audience for the report and to begin developing conclusions and recommendations, which are internationally relevant, practical and achievable within the time frame available.

B) Report of Breakout Groups

David Henry presented the results of the breakout sessions (Appendix 7). The Editorial Team was applauded for its good work and advised that the final product should be an overview, not an assessment, and that the Editorial Team should avoid trying to cover too much. The Overview should focus on providing pathways to solutions for issues raised. Although the Overview's main audience is Arctic decision-makers, it should also consider linkages with areas outside the Arctic and add international fora to the list of targeted audiences. Several people questioned whether the Overview should include detailed recommendations for specific by Arctic countries.

C) Report of Plenary Session

The meeting decided to forward the full report of the breakout session to the Editorial Team for its consideration in furthering the work on this project.

The meeting accepted with appreciation the generous offer of Finland to be Lead Country for preparation of the Overview Report and Canada's appointment of a member to the Editorial Team.

The timeline proposed by the Editorial Team was adopted, although some countries noted that it was extremely tight. It was decided to evaluate the status of the work in January 2000 and, in light of that evaluation, revisit the proposed timeline.

There was a consensus to include general recommendations in the Report. These will be developed through a process parallel to the writing process with the aim to have them approved by the SAOs in early summer 2000.

There is a budget of \$130,000 US to cover preparation and printing of an English version of the Report. This will be supplemented by extensive in kind contributions including salaries for the Editorial Team and expert content contributions by countries and organisations. Of the \$130,000 for preparation and printing, \$102,500 has been raised leaving \$27,500 outstanding. It was suggested that countries and Permanent Participants cover the estimated \$75,000 US printing cost through obligatory subscriptions.

Several non-English speaking countries noted that a report in English would not be very useful for their domestic audience and that a strategy for translating the report would have to be prepared before any commitments were made for subscriptions. The meeting charged the Secretariat with exploring with the Publisher additional layout costs associated with publication in several Arctic languages and decided to revisit the issue of obligatory subscriptions at the next CAFF Management Meeting. Norway raised concerns with proceeding with the project before it is fully funded.

8. BREAKOUT SESSION 2 - CLIMATE CHANGE AND UV-B

A) Report of Breakout Groups

Brian Johnston presented the summary report of the breakout groups (Appendix 8). There was, in general, good support for CAFF taking an active role in climate change studies and for the broad-based approach suggested in the joint AMAP/CAFF/IASC Arctic Climate Impact Study (ACIA) proposal (CAFFVII/7-4). Items highlighted during group discussions included lack of an overview of ongoing climate change research in the Arctic, and the importance of using traditional ecological knowledge and retrospective analyses. Key species/studies suggested were: algae, charr, lemmings, lichen, seals, caribou/reindeer, vegetation communities (e.g. northern timberline forests). The freshwater-permafrost and sea-ice ecosystems were emphasised as was the need to capture local knowledge regarding changes in animal migration, health and behaviour. The groups noted a need for a Lead country and a support group for climate change and UV-B within CAFF and suggested this be a topic for Plenary.

B) Report of Plenary Session

The meeting accepted Sweden's offer to lead the climate change and UV-B work and to represent CAFF on the joint AMAP/CAFF/IASC Assessment Steering Committee.

The meeting agreed to establish an informal group to assist Sweden with this issue and the Chair called on countries, Permanent Participants and others interested in this issue to nominate individuals for this group.

9. BREAKOUT SESSION 3 - MONITORING BIODIVERSITY

A) Report of Breakout Groups

Tiina Kurvits presented the consolidated report of the breakout groups (Appendix 9). The report endorsed the Scoping Paper “Monitoring of Biodiversity” (CAFFVII/8-1) as a basis for further development of the circumpolar monitoring network and provided further suggestions for objectives, scope and desirable linkages of a circumpolar network to other international and national projects. It was suggested that a drafting group be established in advance of the proposed workshop in Iceland to develop and distribute an ecologically-based framework for biodiversity monitoring. It was further suggested that a group should be established to advance incorporation of Traditional Environmental Knowledge (TEK) into the monitoring work. The report addressed the two concept proposals that were tabled at CAFF VII, i.e. on reindeer/caribou (CAFFVII/10-8) and ringed seal (CAFF VII/10-9) monitoring programs, and agreed that they should be further developed in tandem with the monitoring framework.

B) Report of Plenary Session

Iceland reiterated its offer to host a workshop on circumpolar biodiversity monitoring, but noted that the proposed timing (fall 1999) might need to be revisited.

The meeting agreed to establish a drafting committee to prepare a framework document for the workshop, as suggested by the breakout groups. The meeting accepted Iceland’s offer to lead the monitoring effort, as a minimum until the workshop, and Norway’s offer to aid this work through appointing a person to the drafting committee.

The meeting accepted the US offer to lead the discussions on ringed seals and to work with Canada to further develop the reindeer/caribou proposal before the Iceland workshop. The meeting also noted the Circumpolar Murre Monitoring Framework developed by the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group as an important element in the monitoring work.

10. BREAKOUT SESSION 4 – CIRCUMPOLAR PROTECTED AREAS NETWORK (CPAN)

A) Report of Breakout Groups

Robin Tuttle presented the consolidated report of the CPAN breakout groups (Appendix 10). The groups addressed the discussion paper “Furthering Implementation of the Circumpolar Protected Area Network” (CAFFVII/9-2), commented on the continuing value of CPAN and offered advice/recommendations to the CAFF Overview Editorial Team, the organisers of the Circumpolar Marine Workshop and to CAFF. The report recommended that CAFF re-establish a Standing Committee on CPAN. It commended the CPAN mapping and categorising efforts, reaffirmed the objectives established for CPAN, and indicated the need for CPAN to focus more on the cross-boundary and circumpolar relationships of national protected areas and, as its next priority, the potential for marine protected areas.

B) Report of Plenary Session

The meeting decided to establish a CPAN Standing Committee. It accepted the US’s offer to lead this Committee and the CPAN project in general. Countries will identify contact persons for the CPAN Standing Committee. Based on discussions at CAFF VII, the Committee will prepare for the next CAFF Management Meeting a focused discussion paper/recommendations on directions for CPAN.

The meeting expressed strong support for the RAIPON Proposal on “Sacred Sites and Sanctuaries: Protection of the heritage of Indigenous Peoples of Arctic Russia”. However, it was agreed to hold listing the project in the CAFF Work Plan in abeyance until funding is obtained. The CAFF Secretariat was charged with assisting RAIPON in seeking funding for the project, preferably in collaboration with the Indigenous Peoples’ Secretariat. The Nordic Council of Ministers and the Danish government were identified as potential sponsors.

11. BREAKOUT SESSION 5 - IMPLEMENTING OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAFF STRATEGIC PLAN

Within this category, there were three separate sub-breakout groups to discuss implementation of Objectives 2 and 5 of the CAFF Strategic Plan (flora conservation, fauna conservation and communication and integration.) The reports of the sub-breakout groups are contained in Appendix 11.

B) Report of Breakout Sub-Groups

Henry Huntington presented the reports of the three breakout groups on flora- and fauna conservation (objective 2 of the CAFF Strategic Plan) and communicating and integration (objective 5). A discussion paper on “Implementing the CAFF Strategic Plan” (CAFFVII/10-13) provided a basis for the discussions. The Flora group

recommended (a) that a CAFF Flora Conservation Group be established to scope the flora conservation approach of CAFF and (b) that a report be prepared listing other international flora activities. The Fauna group recommended that CAFF (a) prepare a prioritised list of potential circumpolar fauna projects in the Arctic, (b) establish a general Fauna Group, (c) prepare a communication strategy and (d) establish a CAFF working group to elaborate links and integration with indigenous peoples. The group on communication and integration recommended that CAFF, through selected case studies, develop an “Approach and Language” for presentation of the “Biodiversity Case” to decision makers.

C) Report of Plenary Session

Several countries expressed strong support for a formal CAFF Flora Group and the meeting reached consensus on establishing an *ad hoc* group to evaluate circumpolar flora issues of common concern and to provide a discussion paper to CAFF VIII with recommendations for future work on flora and on how flora issues, in general, should be handled by CAFF. Finland noted that the current geographic CAFF zone in some countries would need to be expanded to include the northern timberline zone in order to make the work more relevant to the Scandinavian countries.

The meeting accepted the US offer to lead the *ad hoc* flora group and Finland, Iceland and Russia noted their intention to participate and appoint members to the group.

The US noted its intention to review other recommendations provided by the breakout groups and suggested other countries do the same.

With reference to the work carried out in all of the breakout sessions, the Chair acknowledged the hard work of all participants and pledged to address and incorporate in future work of CAFF, as possible, the results and recommendations.

The meeting also acknowledged the good work of the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group (CSWG) as evident in their summary report (Appendix 12).

Species of Common Conservation Concern (species at risk): Participants reviewed the report on Species of Common Conservation Concern (CAFFVII/5-3) and countries agreed to provide the requested information on species at risk for the CAFF Overview Report. The CAFF Secretariat was charged with sending out a call letter to countries on this item.

Resolution on Seabird Bycatch in Longline Fisheries (CAFFVII/10-10). The report of the CAFF Circumpolar Seabird Working Group *Incidental Take of Seabirds in Commercial Fisheries in the Arctic Countries* (CAFF Technical Report No. 1 - 1998) identified commercial longline fisheries in the north Pacific and gillnet fisheries in the north Atlantic as major causes of bycatch mortality for circumpolar seabirds. In a resolution to CAFF, the CSWG also pointed out the importance of bringing seabird conservation and fisheries interests together to address the issue of seabird bycatch.

The Resolution was considered in the context of the recent decision by the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation's Committee on Fisheries (FAO/COF) to implement an *International Plan of Action to Reduce Seabird Bycatch in Longline Fisheries* through the development of National Plans of Action by member nations. CAFF welcomed the FAO/COF decision and supported the intention of the CSWG to organise a *Seabird Bycatch Workshop* in Halifax, Canada I April 2000. The workshop will bring together seabird conservation and fisheries interests from CAFF countries to assist in developing national Plans of Action and to develop similar actions to reduce seabird bycatch in gillnet fisheries.

SECTION IV: CLOSING

12. CAFF WORK PLAN 1999-2000

The Plenary reviewed the draft CAFF Work Plan 1999-2000 item by item and amended it as appropriate. The Work Plan includes *inter alia* five specialist CAFF-sponsored workshops during the period signifying a trend within CAFF towards more focused gatherings of specialists. The final draft presented to the Senior Arctic Officials is attached as Appendix 13.

13. OTHER BUSINESS

Circumpolar Marine Workshop (CMW): Peter Nielsen briefed CAFF VII on the upcoming CAFF/PAME/IUCN co-sponsored initiative. Based on an overriding theme of integrating conservation and development, the CMW will be structured into three modules on developing common circumpolar tools and mechanisms for marine management, involving local and indigenous peoples and authorities, and protecting the marine environment. Of the \$100,000 US budget, \$73,000 has been raised. It is hoped that the CMW will be the first step in a longer circumpolar process for Arctic marine conservation.

14. PASSING THE TORCH

The Chair thanked everyone for the hard work and welcomed Norway and its representative, Berit Lein, as the incoming Chair. Norway, in turn, welcomed participants to Tromso in fall 2000 and pledged to do her best to increase the profile of CAFF and conservation issues within the Arctic Council and to seek additional funding for CAFF activities and a solid financial basis for CAFF work.

SECTION V: APPENDICES

Appendix 1

CAFF VII Participants List Yellowknife, 1999

National Representatives

CHAIR

Kevin McCormick

Environment Canada
5204 50th Ave.
Yellowknife, NT
Canada X1A 1E2
Tel: + 1 867 669 4760
Fax: +1 867 873 8185
E-mail: kevin.mccormick@ec.gc.ca

CANADIAN DELEGATION

Richard D. Elliot (Head Delegation)

Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Box 6227
Sackville, NB
Canada E4L 1G6
Tel: +1 506 364 5014
Fax: +1 506 364 5062
E-mail: richard.elliott@ec.gc.ca

Sebastian Oosenbrug

Resources Wildlife & Economic Development
Government of the Northwest Territories
Suite 600
5102-50th Ave
Yellowknife, NT
Canada, X1A 3S8
Tel: +1 867 873 7760
Fax: +1 867 873 0293
E-mail: bas_oosenbrug@gov.nt.ca

Dennis Arey

Inuvialuit Game Council
P.O. Box 2120
Inuvik, NT
Canada X0E 0T0
Tel: + 867 978 2723
Fax: + 867 978 2661
E-Mail: AKL-HTC@jointsec.nt.ca

Fred McFarland

Rural Route #2
Merrickville, Ontario
Canada K0G 1N0
Tel: +1 613 269 4415
Fax: +1 613 269 4398
E-mail: mcfar@storm.ca

Eddy Carmack

Institute of Ocean Sciences
P.O. Box 6000
9860 W. Saanich Road
Sidney, B.C.
Canada V8L 4B2
Tel: +1 250 363 6585
Fax: + 1 250 363 6746
E-Mail: carmacke@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Brian Johnston

Wildlife Advisory Management Council
(NWT)
P.O. Box 2120
Inuvik, NT
Canada, X0E 0T0
Tel: +867 777 2828
Fax: +867 777 2610
E-Mail: WMACNWT@jointsec.nt.ca

Siu-Ling Han

Department of Sustainable Development
Box 1340
Government of Nunavut
Iqaluit, Nunavut
Canada X0A 0H0
Tel: +867 979 5133/5070
Fax: +867 979 6026
E-mail: shan@gov.nu.ca

James D. Reist

Research Scientist
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
501 University Crescent
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada, R3T 2N6
Tel. 204 983 5032
Fax: 204 984 2403
E-mail. ReistJ@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

John Reid

Northern Advisor
Ecosystems and Environmental Resources
Directorate
Environment Canada
Place Vincent Massey, Room 749
Hull, Quebec
Canada K1A 0H3
Tel: + 819 997 2603
Fax: + 819 997 3822
E-mail: JohnR.Reid@ec.gc.ca

Gerald McKeating

Director,
Environmental Conservation Branch
Environment Canada
4999 98 Ave
Edmonton, Alberta T6B 2X3
Tel: +780 951 8853
fax: +780 495 2615
E-mail: gerald.mckeating@ec.gc.ca

Don Russell

Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
91782 Alaska Highway
Whitehorse, Yukon
Canada, Y1A 5B7
Tel: +867 393 6700
Fax: +867 667 7962
E-mail: don.russell@ec.gc.ca

Anne Gunn

Caribou Biologist
Resources Wildlife & Economic Development
Government of the Northwest Territories Suite
600
5102-50th Ave
Yellowknife, NT
Canada, X1A 3S8
Tel: +1 867 873
Fax: +1 867 873 0293
E-mail: Anne_Gunn@gov.nt.ca

Gordon Hamre

Parks Canada
Box 1166
Yellowknife, NT
Canada X1A 2N8
Tel: +867 669 2821
Fax: + 867 669 2829
E-mail: gordon_hamre@pch.gc.ca

Tiina Kurvits

Ecosystem Conservation Advisor
Marine Ecosystems Conservation Branch
Oceans Directorate
Fisheries & Oceans
200 Kent Street
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1A 0E6
Tel: +1 613 990 1575
Fax: + 1 613 990 8249
E-Mail: Kurvitst@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

DANISH/GREENLANDIC DELEGATION

Peter Nielsen (Head of Delegation)

Head of Delegation
Greenland Homerule,
Department of Environment and Nature
P.O. Box 1614
DK 3900 Nuuk
Greenland
Tel: +299 34 6715
Fax: +299 32 52 86
E-mail: pen@gh.gl

Lisbeth Bjorndal Andersen

Skov-og Naturstyrelsen
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen
Denmark
Tel: +45 39 47 20 00
Fax: +45 39 27 98 99
E-mail: lba@sns.dk

FINNISH DELEGATION

Outi Mähönen (Head of Delegation)

Ministry of the Environment
P.O. Box 380
FIN-00131
Helsinki
Finland
Tel: +358 9 1991 9739
Fax: +358 9 1991 9603
E-mail: outi.mahonen@vyh.fi

Seppo Kaitala

University of Helsinki
Dept. of Ecology and Systematics
Division of Environmental Biology
P.O. Box 44
(Jytängöntie 2, Botanical Garden)
FIN-00014, Finland
Tel: +358 9 19140059
Fax: +358 9 19140033
E-mail: seppo.kaitala@helsinki.fi

Ulla-Maija Liukko

Nature and Land Use Division
Finnish Environment Institute
P.O. Box 140
FIN-00251
Helsinki Finland
Tel: +358 9 4030 0755
Fax: +358 9 4030 0791
E-mail: ulla-maija.liukko@vyh.fi

ICELAND DELEGATION

Aevar Petersen

Icelandic Institute of Natural History
P.O. Box 5320
IS-125 Reykjavik
Iceland
Tel: +354 562 9822
Fax: +354 562 0815
E-mail: aevar@ni.is

NORWEGIAN DELEGATION

Berit Lein (Head of Delegation)

Directorate for Nature Management
Tungsletta 2
N-7485 Trondheim
Norway
Tel: +47 73 58 05 00
Fax: +47 73 58 05 01
E-mail: berit.lein@dirnat.no

Jan-Petter Hubert Hansen

Directorate of Nature Management
Tungsletta 2
N-7485 Trondheim
Norway
Tel: +47 73 580 500
Fax: +47 73 580 501
E-mail: jan-p.hubert-hansen@dirnat.no

Dag Vongraven

Norwegian Polar Institute
Polarmiljøseneteret
N-9296 Tromsø
Norway
Tel: +47 77 75 05 00/0638
Fax: +47 77 75 05 01
E-Mail: Dag.Vongraven@npolar.no

Hallvard Strøm

Norwegian Polar Institute
Polar Environmental Centre
N-9296 Tromsø, Norway
Tel: +47 7775 0500/0548
Fax: +47 7775 0501
E-Mail: Hallvard.Strom@npolar.no

RUSSIAN DELEGATION

Vladimir A. Pischeliev (Head of Delegation)

The state Committee of the Russian
federation for Environmental Protection
Department of Nature Reserves,
8-1 Kedrova Street
Moscow 117874
Russia
Tel: +7 095 125 61 33
Fax: +7 095 254 82 83
E-mail: zapchin@glas.org

Valery A. Orlov

The state Committee of the Russian
federation for Environmental Protection
Dept. of Biological Resource Protection
4/6 Grouzinskaya Str.
123812 Moscow
Russia
Tel: +7 095 127 84 10
Fax: + 7 095 254 82 83
E-mail: zapchin@glas.org

Prof. Boris A. Yurtsev

Komarov Botanical Institute
Russian Academy of science
2 Prof. Popov Str,
197376 St. Petersburg

Tel: +7 812 543 8367
Fax: +7 812 234 4512
E-mail: carta@map.bin.ras.spb.ru

SWEDISH DELEGATION

Lars-Erik Liljelund

Director,
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Natural Resources Department
SE-106 48 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel: +46 8 698 15 08
Fax: +46 8 698 10 42
E-mail: lars-erik.liljelund@environ.se

UNITED STATES DELEGATION

Janet E. Hohn (Head of Delegation)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Head of Delegation
1011 E. Tudor Road
Anchorage Alaska, 99503
USA
Tel: +1 907 786 3544
Fax: +1 907 786 3640
E-mail: janet_hohn@fws.gov.

Kenton D. Wohl

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1011 E. Tudor Road
Anchorage, Alaska, 99503
USA
Tel: +1 907 786 3503
Fax: +1 907 786 3641
E-Mail: kent_wohl@mail.fws.gov.

Leslie Kerr

Selawik NWR
P.O. Box 270
Kozebue, Alaska 99762
Tel: +1 907 44 3799
Fax: +1 907 442 3124
E-mail: leslie_kerr@fws.gov

John Bengtson

National Marine Mammal Laboratory
National Marine Fisheries Service/NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115
USA
Tel: +1 206 526 4016
Fax: +1 206 526 6615
E-mail: john.bengtson@noaa.gov

Stephen S. Talbot

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1011 E. Tudor Road
Anchorage, Alaska, 99503
USA
Tel: +1 907 786 3381
Fax: +1 907 786 3976
E-mail: stephen_talbot@fws.gov

Robin Tuttle

National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Science and Technology
1315 East-West Highway
Silverspring, Maryland 20910
USA
Tel: +301 713 2282 ext. 199
Fax: +301 713 4057

Henry P. Huntington

Huntington Consulting/Marine Mammal
Commission
P.O. Box 773564
Eagle River, Alaska 99577
USA
Tel: +1 907 696 3564
Fax: +1 907 696 3565
E-mail: hph@alaska.net

Ellen Fritts

Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game
Habitat and Restoration Division
P.O. Box 25526
Juneau, Alaska 99802-5526
U.S.A.
Tel: +1 907 465 4105
Fax: +1 907 465 4759
E-mail: ellenf@fishgame.state.ak.us
ellen_fritts@fishgame.state.ak.us

PERMANENT PARTICIPANTS

INUIT CIRCUMPOLIAR CONFERENCE (ICC)

Duane Smith (Head of Delegation)

Inuvialuit Game Council (ICC)
P.O. Box 2120
Inuvik, NT.,
Canada X0E 0T0
Tel: +867 777 2828
Fax: + 867 777 2616
E-mail: IOC-C@jointsec.nt.ca

Frank Pokiak

Inuvialuit Game Council (ICC)
P.O. Box 2120
Inuvik, NT.,
Canada X0E 0T0
Tel: +867 777 2828
Fax: + 867 777 2616
E-Mail

Carl Chr. Olsen

Inuit Circumpolar Conference
P.O. Box 204
DK-3900 Nuuk
Greenland
Tel: +299 32 36 32
Fax: +299 32 30 01
E-mail: iccgreen@greenet.gl

RAIPON

Pavel Suliandziga

Prospect Vernadskogo 37
Korpus 2, Kom. 527
Association RAIPON
117425 Moscow
Russia
Tel: +7 095 938 9597
Fax: +7 095 930 4468
Email: udege@glasnet.ru

Michael Pederson

Natural Resources Specialist
Arctic Slope
Native Association Limited
P.O. Box 1232
Barrow, Alaska
USA 99723 123
Tel: +907 852 2762
Fax + 907 852 2763
E-mail michaelp@barrow.com

Norm Snow

The Joint Secretariat
Inuvialuit Renewable Resources Committees
P.O. Box 2120,
Inuvik, NT.,
Canada X0E 0T0
Tel: 867 777 2828
Fax 867 777 2610
E-mail: exccdir@jointsec.nt.ca

Terry Fenge

Inuit Circumpolar Conference
170 Laurier Avenue W.
Suite 504
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1P 5V5
Tel: +613 563 2642
Fax: +613 565 3089
E-mail iccenv2@istar.ca

SAAMI COUNCIL:

Nils Gaup

Saami Council
Finland, Sweden,
Norway, Russia
Ohcejohka, Finland
Fin-99989
Tel: +358 166 77 351
Fax: +358 166 77 353
E-mail: sauiradd@netti.fi

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES SECRETARIAT (IPS)

Alona Yefimenko

P.O. Box 2151, Pilestræde 52
DK 1016, Copenhagen

Denmark
Tel: +45 33 13 61 72
Fax: +45 33 13 62 45
E-mail: alona.Yefimenko@ghsdk.dk

OBSERVERS

THE NETHERLANDS

Gerard C. Boere
Directorate for Nature Management
Ministers of Foreign Affairs
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel: +31 70 378 5591
Fax: +31 70 378 6146
E-mail: g.c.boere@n.agro.nl

WWF-INTERNATIONAL

William Carpenter

Coordinator, Western NWT
Endangered Spaces Campaign
101 Kam Lake Road
Box 1978
Yellowknife, NT.,
Canada, X1A 2P5
Tel: +867 920 7999
Fax: +867 920 4999
E-mail: wwfnwt@internorth.com

AMAP

Janine Murray
Northern Science and Contaminants Research
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
10 Wellington Street, Room 659
Hull, Quebec
Canada K1A 0H4
Tel: +819 997 9448
Fax: +81 953 9066
E-mail: murrayj@inac.gc.ca

PAME/ EPPR

Laura Johnston
Environment Canada/
5204 50th Ave., Suite 301
Yellowknife, NT.,

Canada X1A 1E2
Tel: +867 669 4725
Fax: +867 873 8185
E-mail: laura.johnston@ec.gc.ca

EXPERTS
WCMC

Igor Lysenko
World Conservation Monitoring Center
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge, CB3 0DL
UK
Tel: + 44 1223 277314
Fax: + 44 1223 277136

UNEP/GRID-Ottawa

David Henry
c/o Canada Centre for Remote Sensing
588 Booth Street
Ottawa Ontario
Canada, K1A 0Y7
Tel: +613 995 2042
Fax: +613 947 1383
Email: dhenry@nrcan.gc.ca

IUCN

Mac Mercer (Head of Delegation)
IUCN
380, St. Antoine Street West
Suite 3200
Montreal, Quebec
Canada H2Y 3X7
Tel: +514 287 9704
Fax: +514 287 9057
Email: mercer@iucn.ca

Jeanne Pagnan
53 Brouage
Aylmer, Quebec
Canada, J9J 1J5
Tel: +1 819 777 1767
Fax: +1 819 777 1767
E-mail: jpagnan@compuserve.com

Annie Hillary
NOAA
410 Severn Avenue, Suite 107A
Annapolis, MD
USA 21401
Tel: +410 267 5668
Fax: +410 267 5666,
E-mail Annie.Hillary@noaa.gov

CBD

Tony Gross
Secretariat,
Convention on Biological Diversity
UNEP
World Trade Centre

393 St. Jacques Street
Office 300
Montreal, Quebec
Canada H2Y 1N9
Tel: 1 514 287 7025
Fax: 1 514 288 6588
E-mail: tony.gross@biodiv.org
<http://www.biodiv.org>

CAFF SECRETARIAT

Snorri Baldursson
Executive Secretary
CAFF Secretariat, Hafnarstraeti 97
P.O. Box 375
602 Akureyri
Iceland
Tel: +354 462 33 50
Fax: +354 462 33 90
E-mail: CAFF@ni.is

Paula Kankaanpää
CAFF Secretariat, Hafnarstraeti 97
P.O. Box 375
602 Akureyri
Iceland
Tel: +354 462 33 50
Fax: +354 462 33 90
E-mail: paula@ni.is

OTHERS

Nikita Kiriloff
Coordinating Interpreter
Multilingual Interpretation Service
Translation Bureau
Public Works Canada
171 Slater Street, 10th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1A 0S5

Tel: +613 996 3422
Fax: +613 996 4460

Opening Address

Honourable Stephen Kakfwi
Minister of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development
Government of Northwest Territories

Yellowknife, April 28, 1999

Thank you.

On behalf of the Government of Canada and the Government of the Northwest Territories I am pleased to open this meeting of the Working Group on the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna. As members of this working group, you are already aware of how much northern people value their natural environment and how important it is to the social and economic health of northern societies.

I would like to emphasize that the conservation of Arctic flora and fauna is also very important to all Canadians. As Minister of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development I can certainly attest to the thousands of letters I have received over the years from Canadians who want to see the North's wildlife and environment protected and cared for. I must also stress that the residents of the Northwest Territories are very aware of this concern and recognize that they cannot be careless with the stewardship we have been given.

Affirmation of stewardship of the land has been the driving force behind the land claim and treaty entitlement process in northern Canada. Land claims resulted in the development of co-management processes which Canada is known for and are how we decisions on wildlife management. I find it encouraging that this concept has also been recognized in the establishment of the Arctic Council and is reflected in the CAFF Strategic Plan.

Through the co-management process, all interested parties have the opportunity to define a vision for the arctic landscape, and to do so together. This ensures that every perspective and idea is considered, and every issue is broadly addressed.

It recognizes that we need to engage everyone who is affected by northern environmental concerns - residents, industry, communities, and indigenous peoples - everyone. And we need to ensure that each of concern is addressed. It seeks a consensus on the proper course to follow. Without that consensus, no plan, no matter how 'scientifically sound', is likely to succeed.

This is certainly not the "easy" route to take. It involves a lot of dialogue, and can mean a great deal of frustration on the part of the various partners and interests. Nevertheless, we believe it is a process that is absolutely essential to our success. The decisions that we make through this process are ones in which all the various parties can take part.

This is also the process our Government used to establish a Protected Areas Strategy for the Northwest Territories which was approved last month. This strategy is an example of sustainable development in action and sets out a process for how future protected areas will be established.

At the same time, we all understand that the environmental issues we face are not just local or regional - - they are global!

The thinning ozone layer is a global problem, of special concern in polar regions, where the effects of UV rays on sensitive plants, wildlife, and aquatic vegetation may be most pronounced.

The impacts of climate change and the loss of biodiversity are problems global in scale, but they are also problems that are likely to have significant impact on the world's arctic regions.

In northern Canada, significant impacts from global climate change are projected to occur in the Mackenzie Valley region - right where we are today. Who can predict the extent to which the landscape and the lives of the people of this region will be changed?

Recent studies have shown that Arctic peoples suffer some of the most significant exposure to environmental contaminants. Many of these contaminants are carried from elsewhere, transported to the Arctic from around the world by global air currents, and the movement of the world's oceans.

Our government, in partnership with the Government of Canada, is taking positive steps to address the impacts of global environmental concerns on our arctic regions. For example, we have recently embarked on a process involving the public, industry, environmental organizations and the private sector to establish a territorial Greenhouse Gas Strategy. We have also started to work on a discussion paper to look at establishing endangered species legislation to ensure that our children will also have the rich wildlife resources the North is renowned for.

What lies ahead? One of our most important challenges will be to continue to bridge the gap between the concerns of our local and regional communities, and the need for global action.

We must continue to build a sense of responsibility for the global community and reduce the impact of our activities on the ecosystems of our neighbours. Airborne and waterborne pollutants don't stop at the border to have their passports checked.

Migratory species fly across, swim across, and walk across borders every day. We must ensure they can continue to do so, safely, for centuries to come.

One area where we welcome international cooperation relates to the conservation of marine resources. These resources continue to be of vital importance to northern people and indeed to the rest of the world. I understand that the Workshop on Sustainable Development in the Arctic, held in Iceland earlier this month, pointed out that Arctic and sub-Arctic waters supply up to 25% of the world's living marine resources. We have to know more about these species in order to devise long term plans for their survival and growth. And I am pleased to hear that you will be turning your attention to the marine resources of the Arctic. However, I would impress upon you to ensure that traditional knowledge is also part of the knowledge base used to make management decisions.

On behalf of the Minister of the Environment and myself, I would like to thank you for your continuing efforts to find ways to develop better, more sustainable management regimes for Arctic waters and resources. The work you are undertaking, from the monitoring of circumpolar biological diversity to the assessment of the impact of climate change and UV-B radiation on Arctic ecosystems, is vitally important to the interests of northern peoples. A healthy environment is of fundamental importance to all northern residents.

I find it remarkable that representatives of all the governments and peoples of the circumpolar region have come together to help conserve the natural environment we all share.

It was just a few short years ago that a meeting such as this would have not been possible. The international politics of the mid-20th century certainly kept us apart, but our shared concern for the environment is bringing us together. That is something everyone on this planet can applaud!

As I think we all appreciate, the issues you are here to discuss are ones that cannot be solved overnight. They require long-term planning, and a long term commitment on all our parts to address these important concerns. It will take considerable energy and goodwill to achieve the goal of a sustainable Arctic environment.

I wish you well in your deliberations. Mahsi.

Appendix 3

CAFF VII Working Group Meeting Agenda

Date	Time	Activity	Details
Tuesday, April 27			
	0900-1930	Registration	1) provide name tags 2) provide any additional information/documents for the meeting 3) provide information on meeting location, times, facilities 4) confirm attendance with those that preregistered 5) confirm attendance on field trips and evening excursions
	0900-1700	meetings	Delegation meetings
	1330-1700	meeting	National Representatives/PP Meeting - Cornwallis Room
	1900-2100	Reception	Welcoming comments at 2000 hours - Frontier Visitors Centre (across from the hotel)
Wednesday April 28			Plenary - Katimavik Room
	0900-0915	Opening Comments	Chair, Kevin McCormick
	0915-0930	Opening Address	Opening address by the Minister of the Environment
	0930-0945	Adoption of Agenda	Chair and Executive Secretary. Administrative details of meeting and appointment of a Drafting Committee.
	0945-1015	Opening Statements	Opening statements - Permanent Participants, official Observers and invited experts.
	1015-1045	New CAFF Framework	Presentation by Chair
	1045-1100	Coffee Break	
	1100-1145	Ongoing Work	Presentation and discussion of outstanding issues arising from current work plan. Report on National Representatives/Permanent Participants meeting.
	1145-1200	Presentation in Plenary	Overview Report - Status report from Editorial Team
	1200-1330	Lunch	Lunch break for 1.5 hours - at the hotel or otherwise

19 December, 2001

Wednesday, April 28 Cont			
	1330-1445	Break-out Session I	Status and Trends of Arctic Biological Diversity - three Work Groups (WG) - Ellesmere (WG- "A") , Cumberland (WG-"B") and Melville "A"(WG-"C")
	1445-1500	Coffee Break	
	1500-1700	Break-out Session I	Development of conclusions and recommendations
	1700-1930	Dinner - Open	
	1845-1930	NWT Protected Area Strategy	This presentation will take place in the Northern Heritage Centre (ten minute walk from hotel)
	1930-2100		Recorders to prepare summary of Break-out Session I - for distribution on Thursday morning
	1930-2030	Evening Tour	Guided tour of the Northern Heritage Centre (ten minute walk from the hotel)
Thursday, April 29			Plenary - Katimavik Room
	0830-0845	Administrative matters	Instructions to Break-out Sessions. Break-out Sessions 2 and 3 to run concurrently.
	0845-1030	Break-out Session 2	Climate Change and UV-B impacts. Cornwallis (WG-"A") and Ellesmere (WG-"B")
	0845-1030	Break-out Session 3	Monitoring Circumpolar Biodiversity - Cumberland (WG-"A") & Melville "A" (WG-"B")
	1030-1045	Coffee Break	
	1045-1200	Break-out Sessions 2 and 3 continued	Development of conclusions and recommendations
	1200-1330	Lunch	Lunch break for 1.5 hours
	1330-1500	Break-out Session 4	The Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN) - Ellesmere (WG-"A") , Cumberland (WG-"B") and Melville "A" (WG-"C")
	1500-1515	Coffee Break	Coffee, tea, juice, water and muffins
	1515-1700	Break-out Session 4 Cont.	Development of conclusions and recommendations
	1700-1930	Dinner	Open
	1930-2100		Recorders to prepare summary from Break-out Sessions 2, 3 and 4
	1930-2030	Evening Tour	Guided tour of the Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly Building (15 minute walk from hotel)

Friday,			
April 30			
	0830-1030	Break-out Session 5	Implementing other Aspects of the Strategic Plan - Ellesmere (WG-“A”), Cumberland (WG-“B”) and Melville “A” (WG-“C”)
	1030-1045	Coffee Break	
	1045-1200	Break-out Session 5	Development of conclusions and recommendations
	1200-1330	Lunch	Open - Lunch break for 1.5 hours. Record of Decision printed and distributed.
	1330-1515	Recommendations from Break-out Sessions	Plenary - Katimavik Room - Presentation of the conclusions and recommendations from each Break-out Session. Decisions by Working Group on recommendations.
	1515-1530	Coffee Break	
	1530-1600	Work Plan	Adoption of the Work Plan for CAFF VII
	1600-1630	Review of Decisions	Presentation and adoption of Record of Decision for CAFF VII
	1630-1645	Outstanding Issues	Working Group to deal with issues raised during the course of the meeting
	1645-1700	Closing Comments	
	1830-1900	Reception	Cash bar - Katimavik Room
	1900-2200	Banquet	Dinner and entertainment - Katimavik Room
Saturday, May 1			
	0800	Excursion 1 Departs	Excursion 1 (Ekati Mine) departs from hotel at 0800 for airport
	0830	Excursion 2 Departs	Excursion 2 (Ingraham Trail) departs hotel at 0830
	1700-1730	Excursions return	

OPENING STATEMENTS BY PERMANENT PARTICIPANTS, OBSERVERS AND EXPERTS - FULL TEXT

Opening statement by Dr. Gerard C. Boere, observer from the Netherlands, also representing, in his capacity as Vice chair of the Standing Committee, the Bonn Convention.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen,

On behalf of the Netherlands Government and in my capacity as Vice-chair of the Standing Committee of the Bonn Convention, I would like to congratulate Canada in hosting this CAFF meeting and I extend my gratitude to the Arctic countries for their invitation to be present as an observer (for the fourth time).

The Netherlands remains committed to Arctic issues and continues to support concrete activities in this respect. In previous meetings I have explained the background of the interest by the Netherlands in CAFF's activities; thus not repeating myself only a few remarks about some recent developments.

- in March 1998 the "Willem Barents Memorial Arctic Conservation Symposium" was held in Moscow, jointly organised with the Russian State Committee on the Environment and the Russian Academy of Sciences. The symposium was a great success and the results, a book of about 800 pages, will hopefully come out in September/October 1999.
- Recently it was decided to start a long term research programme at the Russian-Dutch "Willem Barents Biological Station" on Taimyr. It will focus on the population dynamics of the long distance migrant, the Curlew Sandpiper (*Calidris ferruginea*) which represents the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) flyway.
- An updated version of the overview of Dutch Arctic research was finalised and is available on the web.
- the waterbird and wetlands conservation programs in West Africa, so important if it comes to the protection of Arctic migratory birds are fully implemented and producing good results on which I will report during future CAFF meetings.
- recently we were able to distribute the final version of the Global overview of the conservation of migratory Arctic breeding birds outside the Arctic. We are pleased to offer to organise a small CAFF workshop in the Netherlands to discuss the recommendations of the report and advise CAFF accordingly.

On a number of smaller issues related to the Arctic I will report to the CAFF Secretariat in writing.

A few comments related to the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement under the Bonn Convention, which I consider as extremely important for the conservation of Arctic biodiversity. The necessary ratifications are almost there with the last African country underway. This means that the AEWA will soon come into force.

In close cooperation with the Government of South Africa and the Bonn Convention Secretariat, the Netherlands Government is preparing the first meeting of the Parties from 7-9 November 1999 in Cape Town; back to back with the CoP of the Bonn Convention.

You all are most welcome to attend both meetings and participate actively in the work of the AEWA and Bonn Convention.

The Netherlands Government will continue to support Arctic conservation issues and welcomes in this respect also the active role taken by WNF/the Netherlands in providing substantial funds to the WWF International Arctic Programme. We also welcome the work undertaken by the small Dutch NGO “ Arctic People Alert” in providing the general public with information on Arctic issues in general.

Mister Chairman,

It is not a secret that the Netherlands Government attaches great importance to the AEWA and other flyway initiatives which may come under the Bonn Convention as formal agreements. It was a pleasure to notice that also the Dutch Postal Service has similar ideas. This was shown with the issue of a special AEWA stamp on 2nd February 1999. It may be a small thing but we should realise that issuing a stamp is a powerful tool to inform the general public and creating awareness for the issues featuring on the stamp.

I am pleased to offer you and the other Head of Delegations of the Arctic Countries a specimen of the stamp and a First Day Cover with the stamp and a picture of an Arctic breeding bird: the Knot.

Thank you for your attention.

WWF-Arctic Programme

WWF Statement for CAFF VII, April 26-30, 1999, Yellowknife, NWT, Canada

WWF - The World Wide Fund for Nature - with its Arctic Program is pleased to participate for the 6th time as an observer in a major CAFF meeting. We, as a nature conservation organization, always felt CAFF to be the nearest partner to WWF of all the working groups and programs of the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS), and now the Arctic Council. And today we appear for the first time as a fully accredited Observer to the Arctic Council and not in the former capacity of a continuous "Ad Hoc Observer". This should help to establish a long-lasting partnership and lead to cooperation on various projects with CAFF.

WWF, Canada is very active in the arctic with offices in all three of Canada's northern territories. Our northern coordinators are:

Juri Peepre (Whitehorse, Yukon Territory) peepre@yknet.yk.ca

John Laird (Iqaluit, Nunavut Territory) jlaird@internorth.com

William Carpenter (Yellowknife, Northwest Territories) wwfnwt@internorth.com

We are all WWF, Canada's front line contacts for our new national Arctic program, "Northern Futures" (see WWF Arctic Bulletin No. 1.99 for details or <http://www.ngo.grida.no/wwfap/resources.html>). We are particular happy to have you here in northern Canada, and we are here to offer connections between our activities and experiences on the ground and your circumpolar approach. Pete Ewins, ewins@wwfcanada.org is WWF Canada's Arctic Program Director working out of our head office in Toronto, Ontario.

When we last time participated in September 1997 in CAFF VI in Nuuk, the results of the WWF/UNEP-sponsored workshop in Karrebæksminde, Denmark, on Arctic Biological Diversity Conservation: Perspectives and Structures were reported to you. One purpose of the Karrebæksminde Workshop was to provide ideas and suggestions for CAFF to use in developing the Long-Term Action Plan. As a major recommendation to CAFF the workshop formulated the new priority objective on communication. To communicate CAFF issues and concerns not only to decision-makers, but also to the general public in order to help achieve other objectives, was seen as a particular important issue.

We therefore are very happy to see that CAFF has included the project of a major report on Arctic Conservation Issues in its work plan, which was endorsed by the Arctic Council Ministers last year in Iqaluit. As we have communicated earlier to the CAFF Secretariat, we will offer to contribute to this book project in various ways. In particular, we will seek additional ways as to communicating the content of the book via other media and channels within as well as outside the Arctic and offer our global communication networks to assist CAFF in reaching more people.

And there are other possibilities where CAFF could make use of WWF activities and projects in the future, for example:

- ✓ Our Climate Change project "Waterbirds on the Edge", contracted with WCMC. You may consider ways in which you would like to integrate this project into your plans to monitor, together with AMAP, climate change impacts in the Arctic.
- ✓ A project proposal, as formulated in a cooperation agreement between RIPON and the WWF Russian Programme, on combining the protection of sacred land for indigenous communities and valuable nature areas within your CPAN.
- ✓ Our project, "Guidelines for the Consumptive Use of Wild Species in the Arctic" by noted wildlife management consultant Curtis Freese. The project has been based in its initial phase on case studies of Aboriginal communities in the Canadian Arctic, and reports on this have been distributed last year. This year we are coming up with a new report on several species groups, such as seals, whales, reindeer and fish in a circumpolar perspective. The findings should have the potential to help also CAFF and the Arctic Council on how to define the sustainable use of species.
- ✓ "Linking Tourism and Conservation in the Arctic". This project has agreed principles for Arctic Tourism, a code of conduct for Tour Operators in the Arctic, and a Code of Conduct for Arctic

Tourists. The project seeks to promote tourism that respects local communities, the environment and provides a quality experience. As decided in the projects recent workshop in Husum/Germany the future development of it will focus on regional concepts to link tourism and conservation. There is e.g. potential that tourism will support new protected areas within the framework of CPAN.

For further information about these projects you may look at our web sites:

<http://www.ngo.grida.no/wwfap/>

<http://www.ngo.grida.no/wwfap/northernfutures/>

<http://www.ngo.grida.no/wwfap/CCU/>

<http://ngo.grida.no/wwfap/tourism/codes.html>

The challenge for CAFF is to maintain the enthusiasm that inspires those who take part in its work. CAFF has attracted the participation of individuals who are committed to conserving Arctic biological diversity, who are willing to work hard, and who enjoy cooperating with like-minded colleagues from around the Arctic and beyond. WWF is prepared to play an active role in CAFF when sharing information, collaborating and exploring new areas of significance. And above all when speaking with one voice to promote the conservation of Arctic flora and fauna, is the issue.

Presented by:

William Carpenter
WWF,Canada

On behalf of:

Peter Prokosch
Director, Arctic Programme
WWF International
Kristian Augusts gate 7 A
Box 6784 St.Olavs Pl
N-0130 Oslo, Norway
E-mail peterp@online.no

Tel: +47 22 03 65 18; Fax: +47 22 20 06 66

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Statement to CAFF VII Yellowknife, 28th April 1999. David Henry

Dear Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Firstly, I would like to thank CAFF for the invitation to this meeting and to thank the organizers who have done an excellent job in organizing this event.

We welcome the fact that CAFF is moving towards a focused work program grounded in its Strategic Plan for the Conservation of Arctic Biological Diversity. There are many important elements in this program, but we feel that the production of an overview report on status and trends of arctic biodiversity is crucial. This product provides an excellent opportunity for CAFF to raise awareness of the Arctic region and the issues of biological conservation. We encourage efforts to ensure that this product is a success and would like to offer our support in its creation and dissemination. UNEP would be happy to be used as a channel for this product to reach a wider international audience.

We would like to thank individual participants of CAFF who have provided expertise and assistance to UNEP in the production of the Arctic sections of the second global environment outlook report (GEO2).

There are many areas that UNEP can contribute to the work of CAFF. Currently the GEF coordination office within UNEP is assisting AMAP, RAIPON, ICC and the government of the Russian Federation in the development of a proposal on contaminant studies in northern Russia. We would also like to explore possibilities to support relevant CAFF related biodiversity conservation issues within the Russian Federation.

Finally, we continue to support the activities of CAFF at a practical level through our GRID office in Arendal, Norway. GRID-Arendal is currently completing the protected area gap analysis together with the World Conservation Monitoring Centre. It has worked with the Icelandic delegation to create the CAFF communications strategy and with the Norwegian delegation to prepare a discussion paper on a CPAN registry. The CAFF homepage remains hosted on the GRID-Arendal web server.

We look forward to a continued fruitful cooperation with CAFF and wish it a successful seventh working group meeting.

Statement to CAFF VII

Presented by Dr. Igor Lysenko

WCMC - the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (Cambridge, UK) is pleased to continue participation as an observer in CAFF process. Since 1994 WCMC has been providing contribution to CAFF process through the information support to the CAFF Reports (N1, N5), CPAN and implementation of concrete projects addressed directly to the evaluation of the characteristic features of the environment and current conservation status of ecosystems and species in the circumpolar Arctic.

Development of the Arctic Biodiversity Map Library electronic tools, implementation of Preliminary Circumpolar Gap Analysis project, arctic birds distribution study and close cooperation with the Russian conservation authorities and institutions has brought the best available information of circumpolar extent on the tables of decision makers in countries participating in CAFF. Ongoing projects on the Gap Analysis for the Russian Federation, Water Birds on the Edge (key component of WCMC Climate Change Program) and Internet Database/Maps Service continue provision of the information in support for the conservation efforts across the Circumpolar Region.

WCMC convinced that the simple arithmetic sum of knowledge related to Arctic and subtracted from many thematic programs and studies are not enough for creation of the reliable basis for the conservation actions in the Arctic. Decisions on the conservation of the arctic Flora and Fauna must be based on the results of analysis which considers the uniqueness, specific and integrity of biological process in the Arctic region as a dominant idea.

Integrative Arctic view should prevail in the cooperative efforts of CAFF participants and the initiative of the CAFF Secretariat on the Overview of Status and Trends in Biodiversity in Arctic appears to be the first but very important step on this way. The specific Arctic Dimension View must be incorporated into public vision of CAFF conservation efforts, into conservation science orientation and into decision making across the countries of the Circumpolar region.

**Statement of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
at the 7th Meeting of the CAFF International Working Group**

Yellowknife, 28 April 1999

Mr. Chairman,

On behalf of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, I would like to say how much we welcome your invitation to be here and to participate in this meeting.

As CAFF will know, the Convention on Biological Diversity provides a framework through which countries take action to fulfil the triple objectives of the Convention:

- the conservation of biological diversity;
- the sustainable use of its components; and
- the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources.

The Convention currently has 175 Parties.

Priorities agreed upon by the Parties for the current work programme of the Convention include:

- conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity;
- conservation and sustainable use of the biodiversity of inland water ecosystems;
- the benefits to and impacts on biodiversity of tourism;
- identification and promotion of the role that traditional knowledge can play;
- the development of a core set of indicators of biodiversity to assist assessment, monitoring and reporting.

Underpinning both analysis of scientific issues and implementation of policies and programmes are the use of an ecosystem approach and a presumption in favour of stakeholder participation and public education and awareness.

As you can see, there is a high degree of correspondence with the guiding principles and the objectives of the CAF Strategic Plan, and the priorities that CAFF will consider at this meeting.

The success of the Convention will hang on the ability of Parties to move through scientific assessment to appropriate policy development to successful implementation. There are good reasons why regional initiatives such as CAFF are fundamental to reinforcing national action to implement the Convention.

In the Secretariat of the CBD, therefore, we are looking towards CAFF with great interest. Your experience in developing assessments of the status and trends of circumpolar biodiversity, in developing a programme of monitoring, in incorporating traditional knowledge, and the very experience of cooperation among countries with different administrative, legal and political traditions will provide important pointers to other Parties to our Convention.

I would urge you to encourage delegations to the CBD from your countries or institutions to bring to the work of the Convention these lessons being learned by CAFF, in order that other countries and regions may benefit.

We were very pleased that your Executive Secretary was able to visit us recently. We discussed ways in which we can cooperate, and we look forward to future collaboration on biodiversity issues. Thank you very much.

Opening Statement to CAFF VII
M.C. Mercer, Director Canada Office
IUCN - The World Conservation Union

April 28, 1999

It is indeed a pleasure for IUCN to participate in this important session of the Arctic Council Programme for the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna

I am joined by two colleagues: Jeanne Pagnan, who, among other roles serves as the Arctic Coordinator of our World Commission on Protected Areas in which role she will oversee the development of a draft programme of work for the Commission's Arctic activities and liase with various Arctic groups, such as CAFF and PAME. Annie Hillary is also with us representing Nancy Foster, WCPA Vice-Chair Marine; among other things she will be working with Jeanne, Nancy and many others here in support of the upcoming Circumpolar Marine Workshop.

All eight members of the Arctic Council are State members of IUCN, as are the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and many of the organizations and agencies from which CAFF representatives are drawn. It is natural then that we seek areas of partnership where we are able to add value in our mutual efforts to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure equity and sustainability in resource use.

In the case of PAME we collaborated on the development of Arctic Offshore Oil and Gas Guidelines for regulators. As a follow-up to this IUCN collaborated with the industry's Exploration and Production Forum to draft a complementary document for operators, ie. "Oil and Gas Exploration in Arctic and Sub-Arctic Offshore Regions - Guidelines for Environmental Protection". PAME was briefed on this at their February 1999 meeting. Both exercises, coordinated through our Canada office, drew broad participation from a range of our members , volunteers and staff.

With CAFF we have a long history and an important current collaboration , namely in the organization by CAFF, PAME and IUCN of the Circumpolar Marine Workshop which is on the CAFF agenda this week. We look forward to hosting this workshop at the IUCN Canada Office in Montreal this September.

Our WCPA is setting up a network and plan of action to integrate with intergovernmental programs in the Arctic. Indeed we are already using our networks to inform the global community on arctic issues (e.g. through a recent publication on Iceland's first marine conservation area).

Other CAFF agenda items this week offer opportunities for us to work together. For example in the area of climate change where both CAFF and IUCN are developing new initiatives, I can confirm that IUCN is prepared to become involved with CAFF. Your Executive Secretary has already been in contact with our climate Program Coordinator in in the IUCN Washington office on this. Our scoping paper on climate change and the boreal forests (see Canada office website, <http://www.iucn.ca>) will be also of interest in this regard.

Our new initiative on Species as Indicators of Biological Diversity, building on our Redlist program, is relevant to this week's agenda and may offer further partnership opportunities. We have already offered to contribute to the CAFF status report on biodiversity.

In closing may I express as a personal remark that it is a pleasure for me to participate in CAFF and especially to renew many old acquaintances from my days in the federal government working on marine and arctic resources and environments. Thank you

COUNTRY REPORTS TO CAFF VII

Ministry of the Environment, Finland

April 26, 1999

CAFF VII, Yellowknife, April 27 - May 1, 1999

**NATIONAL REPORT, FINLAND, FOR CAFF VII
- ACTIVITIES RELATED TO CONSERVATION ISSUES IN FINNISH
LAPLAND**

In order to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity Finland has prepared a National Action Plan for Biodiversity, 1997-2005. The action plan ensures sufficient representation of species and structural diversity of natural habitats and ecosystems in all of biogeographical zones in Finland including Lapland. By introducing "the concept of sectoral responsibility", the national action plan integrates various administrative and economical sectors into the implementing process of the action plan.

A network for monitoring the status of biological diversity in Finland will be established according to the Action Plan, which will be relevant also for CAFF's monitoring tasks. The planning process on the scale and content of the monitoring program, its costs, and national and international reporting is going on.

Related to rare and threatened species in the North, the Red Book of Eastern Fennoscandia was published in cooperation of Finland and Russia in autumn 1998.

Only minor changes has been made to protected areas in northern Finland in recent years, as 33% of Lapland has a protected status. According to the EU Habitats Directive, Finland sent the national proposal on protected areas to the EU Commission to be included into the European wide Natura 2000 network. The Finnish proposal includes all existing protected areas and a few new areas in Finnish Lapland.

The coverage of protected areas in Finnish Lapland is evaluated to be good. However, some conservation issues, which has relevance also for CAFF work, can be highlighted:

- Overgrazing caused by reindeer is well-known problem in Finnish Lapland. This is a complex issue which requires research and can be resolved only by multidisiplinary approach.
- Tourism is an increasing industry in Lapland and, its arrangements with other land use needs is under active discussion.
- Hunting is strictly controlled, but it is allowed and free for local people in all protected areas in Lapland, except in Strict Nature Reserves. Other people can buy hunting licenses, except for National Parks and Strict Nature Reserves. At the moment the hunting pressure is estimated to be low having no significant impacts on the populations of the hunted species. However, more detailed surveys are still needed.
- Natural population structure in freshwater ecosystems has been affected by introduction of fish and fishing in Finnish Lapland and the issue discussed actively.

The landscape planning method has been adopted by Finnish Forest and Park Service which is responsible for the management of the state owned land areas in Finnish Lapland. Local and

Sami people are involved in different levels of planning processes - in ecological forest management, regional land-use plans and management plans of protected areas. The involvement has proved to be important method to strengthen the cooperation between different stakeholders including authorities and local residents.

Finland organized a workshop on Sustainable Development in the Northern Timberline Forests in Whitehorse Canada on May 10-11, 1998. The workshop was held in order to give input by experts to promote international discussion about the development of common criteria for defining sustainable development in northern timberline forests. The proceeding of the workshop is in press and will be distributed at SAO meeting in Anchorage in May 1999.

Since CAFF VI, Finland has provided direct support to CAFF by *inter alia* preparing an internal report to CAFF titled "Arctic Biological Diversity: Concerns and Long-term Threats", arranging an AMAP/CAFF Workshop on Climate Change in Rovaniemi, March 1998 and by allocating a senior expert to CAFF Secretariat for a period of one year 1998/99. After returning to Finland, the expert continues to lead the project on the CAFF Overview, Arctic Conservation Issues - Status and Trends of the Arctic Flora, Fauna and Their Habitats.

Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna An Overview of Activities - Iceland

A short summary is provided of the principal activities since CAFF VI in Nuuk, fall 1997. The Icelandic Institute of Natural History continued to be responsible for the national participation in CAFF and for the national implementation of activities.

Besides the work engaged nationally, Iceland took part in various international meetings associated with CAFF, including National Representatives meetings, Circumpolar Vegetation Mapping (CAVM), Circumpolar Seabird Working Group (CSWG), on climate change and monitoring issues, as well as the communications strategy. Besides given input or comments to work plan items, such as Migratory Birds Outside the Arctic, Report on Threats to Arctic Biodiversity, the Strategic Plan, and Circumpolar Marine Protected Area issue, certain items can be highlighted under different headings as follows:

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

Circumpolar Database on Terrestrial Migratory Species

Work on the distribution of breeding birds of Iceland was continued. Through this contributions to the circumpolar database on migratory species were made possible.

Threatened Species and Species of Common Conservation Concern

A red list for plants was published in 1997. In 1998 work was begun on a red list for birds, and is expected to be published in 1999.

Conservation of Arctic Seabirds

Iceland took an active part in the work of the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group (CSWG), and the last annual meeting of the group was held in Akureyri in fall 1998. The most significant activities relating to the Murre Strategy are breeding-bird atlas work, murre movements and monitoring. The establishment of a computer database on the location and size of seabird colonies was realised for murre, and for several other seabird species, and work is underway for the others. Work on the travels of murre relates both to during and outside the breeding season. The latter project is developed in co-operation with some other countries around the North Atlantic and includes different themes. The preparatory work has been carried out to start full-scale monitoring of murre but as yet it has not been possible to actually start such a program. Iceland is working on a circumpolar banding plan and 5-year implementation plans for murre and eiders. The eider work is based on recent research, which is being published as papers and summarised in a report for future considerations. Contributions were made to the seabird bycatch report, published in 1998, and to the harvest and disturbance to seabird reports being prepared.

Alien Flora species

Preparations have been carried out for compiling information on alien plant species, which have been introduced into Iceland, accidentally or intentionally. A preliminary assessment indicates that there could be as many as 10-12 thousand species, at one time or another. Considerations will be given especially to those, which can survive in the wild and are likely to create environmental problems.

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

Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Mapping Project (CAVM)

Continued emphasis was given to vegetation mapping with inputs into the CAVM work. Mapping was undertaken in various regions, mainly in association with environmental impact assessments. A new vegetation map for Iceland was published in the scale of 1: 500,000, and this won international awards in cartography together with two geological maps produced in same scale. A map (scale 1: 2,5 million) was also produced for the Map of the Natural Vegetation of Europe project.

3. Enhance integration of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives into sectoral and cross-sectoral plans and policies

Communications Strategy

Iceland has lead the development of an outline for a communications strategy for CAFF in co-operation with Grid-Arendal and the CAFF secretariat.

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

Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN)

A general thrust of the implementation of CPAN was slow, while new nature conservation laws were being debated (see below). The overall co-ordination at the circumpolar level was also weak and needs to be re-thought. However, important preparatory work on criteria for habitats was started in 1998. New legislation on the utilisation of natural resources in 1998 will have a strong influence on the direction of research relating to nature conservation and development. An approach has been developed based on habitat types as fundamental units for research to evaluate conservation values. A pilot study is scheduled for 1999, with concurrent programs compiling GIS-based overviews on certain habitat types which may be threatened by their limited size although still ecologically important, such as mud flats, seabird colonies, pingos, and geothermal areas.

Marine Protected Areas

Input has been given to the efforts on the marine protected area issue, while Iceland has been drafting a conservation plan for the Breiðafjörður, Iceland's first marine conservation area. A paper describing conservation efforts in this region was published in the marine protected area issue of PARKS 1998, where this area was the only Arctic marine area featured.

Related to the issue on marine protected area is the work of the Emergency Contamination Committee, formed in fall 1998. This is in the process of compiling information on marine regions of biological importance. The Vestmannaeyjar – Snæfellsnes region (S- to W-Iceland) has been chosen for a pilot study. The aim is to produce detailed maps of important biological entities and their distribution.

5. 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

Monitoring Biological Diversity

Much groundwork has been needed for preparing monitoring of biodiversity, both at the national and international level. Research programs which are underway, such as breeding bird atlas work, stratified terrestrial invertebrate and marine, benthic invertebrate surveys, and a survey of fresh-water lakes, give us the foundation for this. More specifically a Nordic moth-monitoring program is underway.

To further the development of an Arctic Biodiversity Monitoring, Iceland has offered to host a workshop on this issue in 1999. A total revision of monitoring programs is also intended for 1999, scoping the objectives of an overall national monitoring plan and, more specifically, developing the national program thrust along different fronts. In this respect new monitoring sites are being identified, including nature reserves, as part of a more focused approach in the new nature conservation law (see below).

6. Program Management

The CAFF Secretariat

The CAFF Secretariat has been established in Akureyri, North Iceland, since 1996, under the leadership of Snorri Baldursson. Icelandic authorities has given substantial financial support to the secretariat, or USD 105,000 in 1998 and 139,000 in 1999. In 1999 the decision was made to locate the PAME Secretariat on the same premises as that of the CAFF Secretariat, and this is expected to start operating in spring 1999.

7. Some Associated Activities or Issues

Sustainable Development

A meeting was prepared in 1999 at Akureyri, in order to further the efforts of the Arctic Council on this issue. Contribution was also made to the Finland's project dealing with the sustainable use of northern timberline forests, and related to activities of CAFF and that of the Arctic Council on sustainable development. Moreover programs for re-establishing wetlands have been initiated, and are being run in co-operation with local farming or municipality communities.

Nature Conservation legislation

In 1999 a significant progress was achieved for nature conservation, with the revision of the general nature conservation legislation, passed in Parliament. Many aspects of the law were updated in line with the overarching themes of the CAFF co-operation, especially CPAN, and of the Convention of Biological Diversity. Major improvements were made, for instance, relating to habitat protection, which will be valuable in relation to implementing the CPAN strategy. Certain types of habitats, or landscape units, were singled out as needing special care, such as undisturbed wilderness areas and geothermal areas, and re-establishments of wetlands was recognised. Another major positive step was the inclusion of marine regions into the nature conservation legislation, but traditionally these have been out of bounds for nature conservation authorities.

Norway's national status report to CAFF VII

Yellowknife, Canada, April 28-30

INTRODUCTION

Summarized below is the progress made by Norway on the specific work items as described in the 1997-98 CAFF Work Plan and an overview of some selected activities which are relevant to the CAFF Programme and its objectives.

CAFF PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

1.3 Conservation of seabirds (CAFF VI)

Murre and Eider conservation strategies

The Directorate for Nature Management and the Norwegian Polar Institute are currently working on the national implementation plans for the circumpolar Murre and Eider conservation strategies. Due to different reasons the national Murre implementation plan has been delayed. A draft will be ready by July 1999. The Eider implementation plan will be ready late autumn 1999. According to an agreement made at a joint Norwegian-Russian workshop in March 1998, the implementation plans for Northwest Russia and Norway will be coordinated. Norway and Russia share populations of both murre and eiders in this area and during the last 6-7 years important management tools have been developed as a part of the bilateral environmental cooperation - e.g. registry of seabird colonies, marine bird status report (including identification of important threats etc.).

Report on banding recoveries

The Norwegian representative in the CSWG, Vidar Bakken, will be completing a publication on "Patterns of recoveries of banded Brünnich's guillemots, wintering in waters of Greenland and Canada". The paper will be part of Bakken's doctoral dissertation and will be available in June 1999.

1.1.v Pan Arctic Protected Areas Registry (PAPAR)

A discussion paper drafted for CAFF VI (Nuuk) has been revised and will be presented at CAFF VII.

NORWEGIAN HIGHLIGHTS

General

In the period since we last met at CAFF VI in Nuuk, Greenland, there have been several new Norwegian initiatives that can be assigned to respective CAFF objectives. A turning point in Norwegian polar environmental management and research was reached when the Polar Environmental Centre in Tromsø was officially opened December 1, 1998. In addition to the Norwegian Polar Institute, six research and management institutions are situated in this national centre, which is believed to become a force in environmental cooperation in the Barents region and polar areas.

Indigenous peoples

A comprehensive report focusing on the ownership to land and water for the Saami Peoples in Northern Norway is at present on a broad hearing. The Saami claim that they should be recognized as the owners of extensive land areas, which currently are viewed as state property.

Monitoring

A monitoring system for Svalbard and Jan Mayen (MOSJ) has been developed and implementation will start this summer. Several national research and management institutions will submit data sets. One important part of MOSJ is the formation of a group of experts that will interpret and evaluate the processed data and give feedback to the system. In many ways, the system is at present still a framework, and a considerable amount of work remains when it comes to elaborating robust and cost-efficient indicators.

A main effort in *The Working Group for the Marine Environment of the Joint Norwegian-Russian Commission for Environmental Protection* (see below) has been the development of a monitoring program for the Barents Sea and northern marine areas (MONRA). The goal is to start implementation of this program during year 2000.

Environmental cooperation between Norway and Russia

After reorganisation of the structure of the bilateral environmental cooperation between Norway and Russia there has been a significant increase in the level of activity within the different new working groups, especially within the *Working Group for Biological Diversity*. As one of the main intentions within the bilateral cooperation is to support ongoing initiatives, many CAFF-orientated issues has been given priority - e.g. habitat protection, monitoring of biodiversity and seabird management.

The INSROP Project on the Northern Sea Route, which have been conducted in cooperation with Russian experts and authorities was completed this winter. This is a comprehensive EIA which will be of importance as a tool when future use of the NSR is planned.

Biodiversity

At present comprehensive work is being conducted on biological diversity in Norway. An ambitious plan for monitoring of biological diversity has been prepared, involving almost all of the relevant research institutions and management authorities. Implementation of the plan is underway. Several ministries have made or are in the process of making action plans for conservation of biodiversity.

Norway has been the lead of a group under the Nordic Council of Ministers that has worked out an action plan for nature conservation on the arctic islands (Iceland, Greenland, Svalbard). The recommendation and actions to be implemented will include a long range of CAFF-related activities.

Species conservation

A status report for research, management and research needs for polar bears in Norwegian areas will be released during May 1999. The report covers the period 1986-1998. It describes among other things satellite tracking studies which have been conducted in Norwegian and Russian areas in order to delineate the different populations and to help identify other population parameters. Investigations of effects of anthropogenic toxins on polar bears have been intensified.

Revised red lists for Norway (incl. Svalbard and Jan Mayen) has been drafted and will be published early this autumn.

Jan Mayen

An environmental action plan for the period 2000-2005 has been worked out for the isolated, volcanic island of Jan Mayen. The plan adresses priority items to be follow up in a 5-year period, among them the need for nature protection and seabird monitoring. The plan will be

revised according to a hearing this spring and endorsed by the Ministry of Environment this autumn.

Protected areas

In Svalbard, a new plan to supplement the existing protected areas has been launched. Existing protected areas already cover 56% of the archipelago, but a recent comprehensive gap analysis show that some nature types are not or scarcely represented in the existing protected areas, e.g. productive ecotypes in the inner fjord system of Central Spitzbergen. Additional terrestrial protected areas on Svalbard could increase the level of protection in the archipelago up to 65 %.

After long preparations and negotiations with several ministries the isolated and unique Bear Island will probably be designated as a nature reserve within this year. A reserve will include most of the island and surrounding marine areas.

Preparations have started to compile a status report for the marine environment, including an identification of major knowledge gaps, for a larger marine area including the Svalbard archipelago and Bear Island. The report is meant to give a basis for suggesting candidate areas for protection and further developing legislative instruments.

Svalbard - new legislation and White Paper underway

The committee working out a quite new concept for an environmental law for Svalbard will finalize their work this summer.

A new White Paper to the Parliament is underway concerning Svalbard issues. Besides focusing on democracy for the among 1500 local residents and the future for coal mining, the document will focus on the important issues of marine management and the concept of wilderness.

Research

Svalbard Science Forum has been established. The forum's main objective is to coordinate research activities on Svalbard in a way that will optimise the use of Svalbard's research facilities and logistic resources, and to help to coordinate research with the goal to minimise environmental impacts from research activities *per se*.

The Norwegian Polar Institute and Svalbard Science Forum are together keeping a database, resulting in an annual publication called *Research in Svalbard*, where a brief summary of the yearly research activities at Svalbard are given, serving both as general information and as a tool for optimizing the use of Svalbard as a research platform.

April, 1999

STATUS REPORT OF RUSSIA TO CAFF VII

On the realization of the CAFF Work Plan items 1.1.ii, I.2.i, 5.1.ii for 1997/1998:

1.1. ii) **Rare disjunct non-endemic species of the Arctic**

List of rare non-endemic vascular plants of the circumpolar conservational concern: specify the list, annotating.

It was already at the VIth annual meeting in Nuuk that some points of disagreement with US botanists have become evident: they found our established criteria of selection of species to be included into the List insufficient and not quite precise. Thus, we have been discussing the criteria with the US colleagues (D.F. Murray) via e-mail for a year. The consensus was reached at our meeting in Oslo (X 1998) with the participation of the Norwegian botanist Arve Elvebakk. It was decided that the list of rare plants of the circumpolar concern should, in addition to rare arctic endemics (1) also include the following groups:

- (2) rare metaarctic endemics which are in common to both the Arctic and the alpine belt of the same sector of the Subarctic, with the total number of localities not exceeding 20, also with narrow distribution in the Arctic (1-2 neighboring areas);
- (3) rare hypoarctic (low arctic - subarctic) endemics which are in common to 1-2 areas in the Arctic and the neighbouring plain and low mountains in the Subarctic, with the same quantitative limitations.

Species of the latter 2 categories are subendemics in the Arctic and besides, could be the candidates for inclusion into the Global List of imperiled or at least, vulnerable species (especially if the number of subpopulations is less than 10, the latter being widely separated and poor in individuals).

- 4) Plants which are non-endemics but very rare in the Arctic (with less than 10 distant localities in 1-2 areas), whose arctic localities are widely disjunctive from the non-arctic ones in the other zones (the boreal, nemoral, or steppe ones or those located in mountainous areas remote from the Arctic). Such arctic populations of the non-arctic species have adapted to the arctic climate and become the irreplaceable component of the gene pool of the arctic biota, or else they are the components of relic plant communities, persisting on special extrazonal habitats within the Arctic (e.g. steppe relic complexes on south-facing bluffs in the Beringian Arctic).

Unfortunately, we have not received suggestions for supplementing our draft List, distributed at Nuuk meeting, from our colleagues from the USA, Norway, and other CAFF countries. Hence at the present stage we can only specify, shorten and structure our draft List in correspondence with the adjusted criteria mentioned above. Today the additional List numbers 60 species, of which 2 are the metaarctic rare endemics, 14 are the hypoarctic ones, and 43 are non-arctic rare disjuncts.

It is important to complete the work on the List of rare plants of the Arctic of circumpolar concern even though it should become an essential component at planning the further development of the circumpolar network of protected lands (CPAN) as well as at the gap analysis and determining the priorities of CAFF conservation activities on flora.

1.2.i) **Pan-Arctic Flora Initiative**

Critical annotated checklist of the Panarctic Flora: Vascular plants

It was planned to complete the 1st draft version of the checklist: It remained necessary, by September 1998, to complete the texts on ca. 1/5 of the total species set. But in 1998 an important event which changed the plans radically occurred: the Norwegian botanists from the Academy of Sciences and the Oslo University joined the project as they had received a good yearly grant for the works in the Center for Advanced Studies from the Norwegian Academy of Sciences. The works started in Late September by a mini-symposium <<Concept of Species in the High North>> followed by a number of workshops in Oslo and St. Petersburg. The first was devoted to compiling the checklist (which was recognized as a priority task of the project), whereas the others were aimed at discussing the problems of taxonomy of the most difficult, controversial groups of vascular plants (such as *Papaver*, *Draba*, *Potentilla*, *Dryas*, grasses, etc.) on the basis of the checklist and herbarium collections. These thematic working groups included the representatives of the three taxonomic traditions: Russian, West-European and North-American. As a result, an important step has been made towards the elaboration of the unified taxonomy of the arctic flora in the circumpolar perspective; without the latter it seems impossible to assess the real species diversity of the arctic plants, their distribution and the degree of rarity (since it is not seldom that one and the same species figures in different Nordic countries under different names, and vice versa). Thus, the second stage of the project, namely the international critical discussion of and supplementing the Panarctic checklist draft version, prepared by the Russian side, started.

The results of widening the circle of participants were also as follows:

- 1) enlarging the ranges of the region of the Panarctic Flora project: South Greenland, the northernmost Iceland and the northern most Fennoscandia (but not the Commander and the Aleutian Islands!) were included;
- 2) many floristic areas of the Arctic (after Yurtsev, 1994) were split (temporarily, for the convenience of inventorying);
- 3) the set of items at characterizing each species was increased. Owing to this, the participants, instead of completing the checklist, should essentially revise the ready texts. It will prolong the work though make it still more valuable. An international Steering Committee was established, of the representatives of Norway, Russia, the USA, and Canada. The Proceedings of the mini-symposium and the workshops are to be prepared as a computer original model this May.

It should be stressed that the Panarctic Flora project provides the taxonomic ground for all botanical works in the Arctic, including the CAFF activities on the conservation of the arctic flora, creation of the Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map (CAVM project), ITEX, etc. It suggests also the creation of the Computerized Data Base on the taxonomic (first of all, species) diversity of the arctic plants with rough assessments of their occurrence (frequency) in each area of the Arctic. The latter permits assessing and monitoring the diversity of the arctic flora on the regular basis.

5.1.ii) **Biodiversity Monitoring Network**

Creating the network of sites for the long-term monitoring of biodiversity in the Asian Arctic (on the local flora level).

The program and methods of this work were presented at several annual meetings of CAFF experts. In contrast to the more mobile fauna of the Arctic, its flora consists of the organisms attached to substrate with a life-span from a few tens to hundreds of years, and

the species gain benefits to survive in the changing environment due to the diversity of habitats and microniches. However, the expected global changes of climate may be unprecedentedly great and rapid. To monitor the long-term transformation of the whole flora (not only some chosen priority species), one needs a representative network of monitoring sites where within the radius of 6 to 10 km, the set of plant species has been examined in detail, and the assessment of their landscape frequency and habitat preferences has been recorded. One also needs the periodical re-inventorying of a local flora in each 10-50 (100) years, with special attention paid to changes of the set and condition of both the rare and the common indicator species as well as to precise temporal attachment (recording) of the data. We need to bring the available (published or stored as manuscript) materials on the well-studied local floras (LF) in the mobile operation form of computerized data bases (DB) on LF included into the biodiversity monitoring network (additional LF are to be studied mostly for filling the gaps in the network). The monitoring data should determine the trends of flora changes against the background of global or regional changes of the environment and reveal the species under threat of extinctions of their local, regional, or total populations.

In 1996-1998, the research associates of the Far North Vegetation Laboratory of the Komarov Botanical Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences (St.-Petersburg), having received a non-large 3-year grant << Developing the program and the preparation of Biodiversity Monitoring Sites Network in the Asian Arctic on local flora level>> from the Russian Foundation for Fundamental Investigations (RFFI), could perform the following. The program for monitoring has been published in Russian (Yurtsev, 1997a, 1997b, 1998) and its short version distributed among the CAFF countries (1997).

Out of several hundreds of LFs studied by this collective in the Asian Arctic since 1955, the 160 were selected for the inclusion into the monitoring network, 130 basic and 30 supplementary ones (to supplement the set of habitats) among them. Notable gaps in the network were revealed in the Gyda Peninsula, the Polar Urals, the high-arctic islands, as well as in western and eastern Yakutia.

The computerized DB has been created. It includes: the passports of LFs on 45 positions, species lists of LF with assessing their landscape frequencies and abundance (in grades), general information on the geographic distribution and growth-form of a species, as well as the software for various operations with the lists (including calculating the similarity indices and graphical presentation of the results). Quantitative assessments of the differences are suggested for comparisons not only between the various contemporary LFs (to reveal modern gradients of biodiversity), but also between different temporal conditions of each flora.

By the present, the passports of more than 40 LFs and the lists of 110 LFs have been entered into DB. The library of accepted names of species and subspecies numbers 1700 Latin names. A small grant (ca.2400 USD a year) has been received from RFFI for 1999-2001 for the completion of LF passporting, entering the rest of lists, landscape frequency and abundance values of species as well as necessary textual characteristics into DB. A special task is also that of the recognition of the modern gradients of biodiversity in the Asian Arctic along with the analysis of factors which determine them. The network should be coordinated with the AMAP network, weather station network, ITEX sites and other polygons of geobotanical monitoring.

It depends on the CAFF countries whether this monitoring site network will become circumpolar.

The participants of the project are convinced that any other approach to long-term monitoring of the arctic flora as it is (but not of separate representatives of the latter) does not exist.

List of rare species of circumpolar concern (Supplement)

I. Arctic endemics (supplements to Atlas):

1. *Senecio arctisibiricus* Jurtz. et Korobk., Asteraceae
2. *Trisetokoeleria taimyrica* Tzvel., Poaceae

II. Metaarctic endemics:

- 3.(1) *Papaver walpolei* A. Porsild, Papaveraceae
- 4.(2) *Phlox richardsonii* Hook. subsp. *richardsonii* Hook., Polemoniaceae

III. Hypoarctic endemics:

5. (1) *Gagea samojedorum* Grossh., Liliaceae
6. (2) *Polygonum caurianum* B.L. Robins. subsp. *hudsonianum* Wolf & McNeill, Polygonaceae
7. (3) *Chenopodium glaucum* L. var. *pulchrum* Aellen, Chenopodiaceae
8. (4) *Smelowskia calycina* (Steph. ex Willd.) var. *media* Drury & Rollins, Brassicaceae
- 9 (5) *Thlaspi kamtschaticum* Karav., Brassicaceae
10. (6) *Dryas grandiformis* Jurtz., Rosaceae
11. (7) *Oxytropis schmorgunoviae* Jurtz., Fabaceae
12. (8) *Oxytropis sublongipes* Jurtz., Fabaceae
13. (9) *Castilleja yukonis* Pennell, Scrophulariaceae
- 14.(10) *Artemisia lagopus* Fisch. ex Bess. subsp. *abbreviata* Krash. ex Korobk., Asteraceae*
- 15.(11) *Artemisia samojedorum* Pamp., Asteraceae*
- 16.(12) *Erigeron yukonensis* Rydb., Asteraceae
- 17.(13) *Taraxacum anadyricum* Tzvel., Asteraceae
- 18.(14) *Taraxacum stepanovae* Worosh., Asteraceae

IV. Non endemics with disjunct distribution: Va - steppe plants (incl. meadow-steppe)

19. (1) *Festuca kolymensis* Drob., Poaceae
20. (2) *Hierochloë annulata* V. Petrov, Poaceae
21. (3) *Helictotrichon krylovii* (Pavl.) Henrard., Poaceae
22. (4) *Carex duriuscula* C.A.Mey., Cyperaceae
23. (5) *Carex enervis* C.A.Mey., Cyperaceae
24. (6) *Carex sabulosa* Turcz. ex Kunth., Cyperaceae
25. (7) *Anemone sylvestris* L. s.str., Ranunculaceae
26. (8) *Thellungiella salsuginea* (Pall.) O.E.Shultz, Brassicaceae
27. (9) *Phlox sibirica* L., Polemoniaceae
28. (10) *Eritrichium sericeum* (Lehm.) DC. subsp. *sericeum*, Boraginaceae
29. (11) *Taraxacum jacuticum* Tzvel., Asteraceae

IVb - hot springs plants

30. (1) *Ruppia maritima* L., Ruppiales
31. (2) *Juncus ambiguus* Guss. var. *ossoraicus* (V. Novikov) V. Novikov, Juncaceae
32. (4) *Mentha sachalinensis* (Briq.) Kudo, Lamiaceae

* Included in Atlas of Rare Endemic Vascular Plants of the Arctic

IVc - warm sea transgressions plants

- 33. (1) *Puccinellia kurilensis* (Takeda) Honda, Poaceae
- 34. (2) *Bolboschoenus planiculmis* (Fr. Schmidt) Egor., Cyperaceae
- 35. (3) *Atriplex gmelinii* C.A.Mey., Chenopodiaceae
- 36. (4) *Spergularia canadensis* G. Don, Caryophyllaceae

IVd - montane

- 37. (1) *Carex albonigra* Mackenzie, Cyperaceae
- 38. (2) *Salix rotundifolia* Trautv. subsp. *dodgeana* (Rydb.) Argus, Salicaceae
- 39. (3) *Claytoniella bostockii* (A.E. Porsild) Jurtz., Portulacaceae
- 40. (4) *Draba incerta* Payson, Brassicaceae
- 41. (5) *Smelowskia alba* (Pall.) Regel.
- 42. (6) *Douglasia arctica* by *D. alascama*
- 43. (7) *Agoseris glauca* (Pursh) Raf. var. *dasycephala* (Torr. & Gray) Jepson, Asteraceae
- 44. (8) *Arnica angustifolia* Vahl subsp. *tomentosa* G.W. & G.R. Douglas, Asteraceae
- 45. (9) *Aster alpinus* L. subsp. *vierhapperi* (Ohno) Cronq., Asteraceae
- 46. (10) *Leontopodium kurilense* Takeda s.l., Asteraceae
- 47. (11) *Saussurea schanginiana* (Wydł.) Fisch., Asteraceae

IVe - halophytes

- 48. (1) *Suaeda calceoliformis* (Hook.) Moq., Chenopodiaceae
- 49. (2) *Plantago eriopoda* Torr., Plantaginaceae

IVf - others

- 50. (1) *Carex laxa* Wahlenb., Cyperaceae
- 51. (2) *Minuartia yukonensis* Hultén, Caryophyllaceae
- 52. (3) *Aphragmus escholzianus* Andr., Brassicaceae
- 53. (4) *Nesodraba grandis* (Langsd. In DC.) Greene, Brassicaceae
- 54. (5) *Thlaspi arcticum* Porsild, Brassicaceae
- 55. (6) *Tillaea aquatica* L., Crassulaceae
- 56. (7) *Astragalus bodinii* Sheldon, Fabaceae
- 57. (8) *Gentiana raupii* Porsild, Gentianaceae
- 58. (9) *Cryptantha spiculifera* (Piper) Payson s.l., Boraginaceae
- 59. (10) *Crepis elegans* Hook., Asteraceae
- 60. (11) *Erigeron glabellus* Nutt. subsp. *pubescens* (Hook.) Cronq., Asteraceae
- 61. (12) *Erigeron grandiflorus* Hook. subsp. *arcticus* Porsild, Asteraceae

V. Arctic endemics with great disjunction in the Arctic

- 62. (1) *Puccinellia beringensis* Tzvel., Poaceae

United States Summary Report for 1997- 1998

Prepared for the Seventh Annual Meeting of the CAFF International Working Group

CAFF VII
Yellowknife, Canada
April 28-30, 1999

Introduction

All U.S. Federal agencies engaged in the Arctic, along with the State of Alaska have welcomed the Chairmanship of the Arctic Council. It is considered an opportunity to develop systems for linking the various scientific and environmental activities in the Arctic as well as an opportunity to raise the international profile of the Arctic region.

Conservation efforts in the Arctic have been advanced by the formation of two new fora in Alaska that provide a mechanism for addressing International Conservation issues. The Alaska International Affairs Network (AKIAN) is an intergovernmental group formed in early 1998 to facilitate the exchange of information among governments in Alaska who have international programs. A primary area of focus is the relationship between all levels of government in Alaska and the Russian Far East. A second forum new in Alaska is the Alaska Arctic Council Ad Hoc Working Group. Participants include representatives of state and federal governments, NGOs, Alaska Native community, and Universities. The Ad Hoc group provides for coordination of Alaska Arctic issues and provides a linkage with the Senior Arctic Official. Activities of all the Arctic Council working groups are discussed and opportunities for integrating work among the groups are identified.

Emphasis will continue to be placed on protection of the Arctic Environment. The United States will further the development of the AMAP project concerning PCB phase-out in Russia, and hopes for meaningful progress in reducing discharges, emissions and accumulation of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). Additional activities may include expanded efforts to monitor and assess climate change in the Arctic, development of special supporting studies involving contaminants in the Arctic environment and reduction of mercury pollution. Focus will continue on the implementation of the CAFF Strategic Plan and the five objectives identified in it.

High priority is placed on education and public awareness of Arctic-related matters. Support of the University of the Arctic, expansion of the AGlobal Learning and Observation to Benefit the Environment program (GLOBE) to include an Arctic environmental focus, and a public affairs strategy are among some of the activities being considered to encourage education, outreach and coordination.

CAFF U.S. is pleased to welcome a representative of the Aleut International Association (AIA), the newest Permanent Participant to join the Arctic Council.

The U.S. continues to promote coordination and integration of activities of the Arctic Council working groups. One example of cooperation among working groups is the joint effort of CAFF and AMAP working through the Assessment Steering Committee on the impacts of climate change on Arctic ecosystems.

Summary of Accomplishments on the 1997-1998 CAFF Work Plan

Projects with a U.S. lead are reporting good progress and are in various stages of completion. Progress has been made in the areas of identification of rare endemic vascular plants, vegetation mapping, seabird conservation, including the Murre and Eider Strategies, development and implementation of other conservation strategies such as CPAN, and writing of national overviews for technical reports such as *Disturbance at Arctic Seabird Colonies*, *Seabird Subsistence Harvest*, and *Incidental Take of Seabirds in Commercial Fisheries in the Arctic Countries*. Funding continues to be an issue; however, the U.S. remains committed to the goals initiated under the Arctic Council.

Rare Circumpolar Endemic Arctic Vascular Plants

Funding was obtained to publish the *Atlas of Rare Endemic Vascular Plants of the Arctic*. The *AAAtlas* is in press and will be released in June as CAFF Technical Report No. 3. One copy of the pre-publication draft is available from the U.S. delegation for examination.

Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Mapping Project (CAVM)

The 3rd International CAVM meeting was held in Anchorage, Alaska during the period of 1-8 June 1998. Participants from seven countries met to review progress, be trained in integrated vegetation mapping methods, and discuss future plans.

Funding was obtained from the U.S. National Science Foundation for a north-south transect of the Canadian Arctic to better understand the variation in vegetation related to climate and substrate. Participants from five countries will participate over a 24 day period in July 1999. A CAVM meeting is planned for the fall of 1999 in Moscow to (1) present progress on the vegetation mapping in Russia, (2) finalize the procedures for CAVM mapping in Russia, and (3) transfer initial funds to Russian participants.

Conservation of Arctic Seabirds

The five-year *Alaska Murre Conservation Action Plan* was completed in 1998. The seabird community in Alaska began implementing the Action Plan in 1998 by initiating 24 of the 34 action items identified in the Action Plan. The following are worth noting here: 1) the long-established Alaska Migratory Bird Subsistence Harvest Program continues to document the harvest of murre in Alaska; 2) various institutions have monitored about 20 murre colonies in 1998 in a network that extends from the Gulf of Alaska to the Chukchi Sea. Murre monitoring efforts in Alaska use a standard field protocol and all data are archived in a common database; 3) the U.S. continued to improve murre colony information in the Alaska Seabird Colony Catalog Database by recensusing 18 seabird colonies, including those on St. Lawrence Island in the northern Bering Sea; and 4) framework for monitoring murre in the circumpolar region was completed.

Development of an *Alaska Eider Conservation Action Plan* was initiated in 1998 and is nearing completion.

The U.S. took the lead and initiated the CAFF Technical Report on the Harvest of Seabirds in the Arctic which will be completed in mid-1999. In 1998, national overviews were completed for CAFF Technical Reports, *Incidental Take of Seabirds in Commercial Fisheries in the Arctic Countries* and *Human Disturbance Guidelines at Seabird Colonies*. As a follow-up to the overviews, the U.S. participated in developing fisheries regulations to reduce seabird

bycatch in longline fisheries in Alaska, developing a study to evaluate the effectiveness of seabird deterrent devices to reduce bycatch in longline fisheries, and in writing a brochure on disturbance at seabird colonies. In addition to the CAFF work plan items related to seabird conservation, the U.S. also continued to implement the Teach About Seabirds education curriculum in Alaska with a series of ATrain the Trainer[≡] and student workshops.

Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN)

The U.S. already has over 50% of its arctic lands in protected status. Although it is unlikely that the United States will add more protected areas to its current CPAN land base, we are committed to furthering CAFF=s efforts to find a common path which can allow the eight countries to move forward collectively with increased protection of arctic biodiversity within and outside of our respective protected areas. We are also interested in exploring innovative means to conserve marine areas, especially in the Bering Sea.

The early momentum that CAFF showed with respect to its CPAN initiative has waned for a variety of reasons. The U.S. looks forward to the countries making significant progress at this CAFF meeting in identifying which aspects of CPAN we can show progress on together and perhaps which need to be addressed separately in our respective countries.

Participation in Working Groups

The U.S. continued its strong support for CAFF=s seabird initiatives by continuing to provide the leadership for the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group and, along with our Icelandic hosts, assisting in conducting the fifth annual meeting of the Group. A major focus for the U.S. in the coming year will be to continue in a productive role with respect to CPAN. We have been pleased to chair the Ad Hoc task force that prepared the discussion paper for the CAFF VII CPAN session.

CAFF Proposals

The U.S. (Alaska) and Canada collaborated to generate a proposal on assessing impacts of climate change using caribou as an indicator. The proposal is titled *Rangifer as a Circumpolar Indicator of Global Change and Ecosystem Health*. Caribou and reindeer herds in the U.S., Canada, Russia, Norway, Sweden, and Finland have been included in the proposal. In addition, caribou herds in Greenland and the feral reindeer herd of Iceland could be considered for inclusion. We hope to have a productive discussion of the proposal at the CAFF VII meeting.

The U.S. (Alaska) and Canada also collaborated on developing a proposal for an Arctic workshop on Seabird Bycatch in commercial fisheries.

Report on Status and Trends in Arctic Flora, Fauna, and their habitats.

The U.S. has secured funding for our work on the Editorial Team in charge of drafting the report on Status and Trends in Arctic Flora, Fauna, and their Habitats. Henry Huntington will be the North American representative on the Editorial Team, and will have lead responsibility for the text of the report. Most of the effort to date has been helping the CAFF Secretariat to produce the draft outline of the report. We now expect that the work will proceed rapidly, and look forward to working with the other members of the CAFF Working Group to oversee the project and contribute to a strong report. We hope to have a product for the Ministerial meeting in the fall of 2000.

Issues of General Interest to CAFF Members

The U.S. has circulated for CAFF VII an informal discussion paper titled *Incorporating ringed seals into CAFF and AMAP monitoring programs* (Document CAFF VII/10-9). We seek input from other CAFF members concerning their interest in developing specific ideas for cooperative activities in the future. We look forward to discussing the idea at the CAFF VII meeting and to further dialogue and project development as appropriate.

A contribution from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service which may be of interest to CAFF and the Arctic community concerns the plant communities of the Alaska Peninsula. The ecosystems of the Alaska Peninsula are a diverse landscape segment of the circumpolar Arctic. Yet there has been little concerted effort to derive generally applicable principles that relate to the ecology and management of these lands. Through comparative transect studies, we are investigating species and ecosystem diversity of the Alaska Peninsula. In this study, plant communities are being described and classified in relation to environmental factors and caribou utilization. Inquiries should be addressed to Dr. Stephen Talbot, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage.

On October 23, 1997, the United States Senate endorsed new Protocols to the two bilateral migratory bird conventions (U.S. - Great Britain (for Canada) 1916 and U.S. - Mexico 1936) paving the way for a regulatory process to ensure proper implementation of subsistence hunting. The Protocol with Canada mandates that subsistence users will have an effective and meaningful role in the development and implementation of regulations through management bodies. These management bodies will include Native, Federal, and State of Alaska representatives and will develop recommendations to the Service and Flyways Councils. Among other things, recommendations for seasons and bag limits, law enforcement policies, population and harvest monitoring, education programs, research and use of traditional knowledge, and habitat protection will be developed by the management bodies. The management bodies are to be established by the end of 1999 and regulations are to be established by the year 2002.

As a notable contribution to the CAFF Strategic Plan objective to achieve conservation outside of protected areas, especially for migratory birds, the U.S. continued its active participation in the U.S.-Russia Environmental Agreement and Trilateral (U.S.-Canada-Mexico) Agreement processes. We also re-established relationships with Japan in early 1999 for the purpose of cooperating and collaboration on the conservation of arctic migratory species and populations shared between the two countries. Biologists and managers from both countries met in Japan in early February to advance joint strategies for the conservation of seabirds, shorebirds, and waterfowl. The U.S. (Alaska) will now be participating in the East Asian flyway's Anatidae and Shorebird working groups. In this role, we look forward to participating in the proposed workshops concerning protecting migratory birds outside the Arctic.

Finally, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Alaska) has recently completed a white paper on Arctic Studies in Environmental Contaminants. The paper outlines the wide variety of research and management-oriented studies being conducted by the FWS in the Arctic Region. Some of the data collected through these studies are compatible with the AMAP design and will be included in the next AMAP report.

1999-05-06
CAFF Overview
Editorial Team

PURPOSES, THEMES, SCOPE AND AUDIENCE
OF THE CAFF OVERVIEW ON STATUS AND TREND OF ARCTIC FLORA,
FAUNA AND THEIR HABITATS, PRESENTED AT CAFF VII

Purpose of the report:

- Provide an overview on selected ecosystems, habitats and species and discuss their associated conservation issues from a circumpolar perspective;
- Identify the importance of global conservation efforts in addition to national and regional efforts;
- Illustrate the ecological relationships within the circumpolar Arctic;
- Raise the interest and distribute the basic information in order to get political support for further work of CAFF;
- As a process, improve communication and connections between CAFF and Arctic experts, and between CAFF and “the outside world”.

Themes:

- The circumpolar Arctic is subject to influences both from within and external to the region;
- Human welfare is dependent on a health natural environment;
- Many circumpolar environmental stresses can only be resolved through international co-operation;
- The Arctic is ecologically more complex than commonly perceived.

Scope:

- The circumpolar Arctic as defined by CAFF;

Audience:

- The Arctic Council Ministers and other key decision makers;
- General public and northerners (those that influence the politicians).

Product

- Illustrated book of popularised science for wide audience and politicians;
- Maximum 200 pages

1999-05-06
CAFF Overview
Editorial Team

OUTLINE FOR THE TABLE OF CONTENT
OF THE CAFF OVERVIEW ON STATUS AND TREND OF ARCTIC FLORA,
FAUNA AND THEIR HABITATS, PRESENTED AT CAFF VII

Preface

Executive Summary

Table of Contents.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Arctic ecology and ecological relationships

Chapter 3: Humans in the arctic landscape

Chapter 4: Taiga

Chapter 5: Tundra

Chapter 6: Montane

Chapter 7: Freshwater

Chapter 8: Marine

Chapter 9: Status and trends: key elements

Chapter 10: Conservation efforts and priorities

Chapter 11: Conclusions and recommendations

Acknowledgments

Glossary and Acronyms

References.

Index.

Appendices

TIME SCHEDULE

OF THE CAFF OVERVIEW ON STATUS AND TREND OF ARCTIC FLORA, FAUNA AND THEIR HABITATS, PRESENTED AT CAFF VII

April 99	Agreement on scope, purpose, audience and initial recommendations. Identification of contributors	CAFF VII
May 99	Preparation of detailed draft outline and graphics list	Eds.
June 11	II Letter of request and detailed draft outline sent to NRs, PPs and Observers. The letter and the outline to be forwarded to contributors	Eds. NRs
June 21	Initial response by contributors	Contributors
June- Sept. 99	Draft text and graphics prepared by Eds. and contributors. Text and graphics submitted by contributors to Eds by <i>September 15</i>	Eds. & Contributors
Oct. 99	Put the material together as a first rough draft	Eds.
Dec. 99	Eds. meeting in Helsinki (or Eds. meeting back to back with the monitoring workshop in Iceland depending on its timing)	Eds.
Oct 99 – Jan 00	Consolidation of text and graphics into a 2 nd draft. Additional input from contributors	Eds. Contributors
Feb 00	Scientific and country review	NRs, Contrib. Experts
Mar-May 00	Final drafting	Eds.
May 00	Ministerial draft in layout form, send to NRs	Eds.
Summer 00	Final country review	NRs, Contrib. Experts
Aug. 00	Final editing per country reviews	Eds.
Fall 00	Submission to AC Ministerial Meeting for approval	CAFF Chair
Fall 00	Translations	NRs
Late fall 00	Submission to the publisher for layout and printing	Eds.
Winter/ Spring 01	Publication & symposium	

**BREAKOUT SESSION 1: CAFF OVERVIEW REPORT
“ARCTIC CONSERVATION ISSUES: STATUS AND TRENDS
OF ARCTIC FLORA, FAUNA AND HABITATS**

SUMMARY REPORT

Major points:

1. The editorial team has done a wonderful job.
2. This is an overview, not an assessment, and it should be based on existing data.
3. The groups reviewed the purposes, themes, scope and audience. Several new issues were added, and amendments were suggested.
4. Get the attention of decision-makers and provide them with pathways to solutions.
5. Several people questioned whether recommendations should be included in this document.
6. We should be careful that this report is not attempting to be too many things at the same time (too ambitious).
7. Sustaining Arctic biodiversity should consider the role of indigenous people.
8. The report should also consider linkages with areas outside the Arctic.
9. Add international fora to the list of target audiences.
10. Consider other publication media and not just the printed word, e.g. CD-ROM
11. Should we change biodiversity to ecological diversity? Broadening our objectives may serve to advance our goals of better conservation of the Arctic.
12. Include a short history of humans in the Arctic, indigenous and non-indigenous.
13. Should non-renewable resources be included?
14. Avoid use of the term “key elements” and use the term “selected examples” or “illustrative case histories”.
15. Case studies should only be included by consensus. It is very important to use case studies that show the positive side.

Purposes, themes, scope and audience

Purpose

- This is an overview and not an assessment. It should be based on existing data and information. No new data should need to be collected.
- New purpose – provide a bench mark for future changes in biodiversity. How things are changing needs to be documented.
- New purpose – To improve the way biodiversity is conserved.
- New purpose – provide recommendations that governments can implement.
- New purpose – provide material to help Arctic Council convey recommendations to other fora.
- New purpose – help implement provisions of CBD in Arctic.
- Bullet 1 – Whole of Arctic flora and fauna should be included rather than a selection.
- Bullet 2 – ambiguous. Report should focus on why global efforts are needed in addition to national efforts.
- Bullet 2 – reword to “Identify the importance of global conservation efforts in addition to national, regional **and local** efforts.”
- Bullet 2 – “sustainability” should replace the word “conservation”
- Bullet 3 – reword to “Illustrate the ecological relationships within the circumpolar Arctic **and links to global processes.**”
- Bullet 3 – needs to link to other environmental issues, e.g. climate change.
- Bullet 5 – hide this bullet or reword to “Raise the interest and distribute the basic information to forward an understanding of ecological processes in the Arctic.”

- Bullet 5 – reword to “distribute the basic information to raise interest and future support of Arctic biodiversity conservation work”
- Bullet 5 – Add “and visibility” after “interest”.
- Bullet 5 – “to raise the interest” needs to be stronger.

Themes

- Bullet 1 – need more emphasis on change and trends. Are we doing better (mining) or worse (POPs and Climate change). Discuss relative magnitude of stressors.
- Bullet 1 – It’s very important to stress we are influenced by history and should reflect on lessons learned (e.g. over use of species).
- Bullet 2 – Human welfare includes more than economics and human health. It also includes cultural health and long term sustainability.
- Bullet 2 – True, but also needs to be described in a balanced way; health problems are really lifestyle choices (e.g. smoking, drinking).
- Bullet 3 – change “many” to “certain”.
- Bullet 3 – Include how to cooperate to get more information.
- One theme should look at how human activities are stressing the natural system.
- We should address what we do not know about Arctic biodiversity and indicate how much we don’t know.
- Point out to the governments major gaps in knowledge and actions needed.
- The words ‘Arctic’ and ‘biodiversity’ need to be clearly defined.
- We can’t assess biodiversity until we better define species but we could agree on common units of biodiversity (key species?).
- New Theme – Sustaining Arctic biodiversity requires the involvement of local users in an empowered co-operative management process.
- New theme – Biodiversity conservation is influenced by human attitudes and trends towards Arctic resources and their use.
- In North America the population north of the CAFF boundary is predominantly indigenous. In light of this, an additional theme could consider the role of indigenous peoples as major stakeholders (ref. consultation processes, land ownership, participation on national delegations to international fora etc). “Conservation of biodiversity for indigenous people.”
- Need to ensure the report captures traditional knowledge. In addition indigenous perceptions of wildlife could be included (e.g. photo of polar bear with photo of carving of polar bear).

Scope

- Are we using the CAFF definition of the Arctic?
- A pragmatic approach to defining the region of interest would be to cover the major ecosystems (chapters 4 to 8) and take into account national boundary definitions.
- No clear definition of the Arctic exists. One definition provided was “*The Arctic, while definable by various geographical and political criteria, is also an open system, with free and important exchanges involving its atmosphere, ocean, biota and humans with the global system.*”
- The Arctic as a region should be defined in Chapter 2.
- Subarctic areas could be considered.
- The report should extend to areas outside the Arctic, where activities in those areas affect the Arctic or vice versa (imports and exports). We need to know how what we do affects other countries. Other countries beyond the Arctic are involved. We need to demonstrate the linkages more.

Audience

- Add international fora to the list of target audiences.

- Since the Ministers will not read a 200 page report. The audience should be the people who make recommendations to Ministers.
- The book could be laid out to target different levels of user expertise at the same time (with an appropriate use of summaries, boxes, graphics etc.).
- How does this differ from the myriad array of Arctic coffee table books? Emphasise uniqueness of this publication.

Product

- Consider other publication media and not just the printed word, e.g. CD-ROM
- Need to include traditional knowledge as well as science (see “popularised science”).

Miscellaneous

- Funding should be acquired before proceeding.
- Concerning the tone of the report, we need to strike a balance. We don’t want to lose credibility by making a doomsday book.
- Get the attention of decision-makers but don’t give them recommendations that are unsolvable.
- use new indigenous place name were available.

TOPICS

Executive Summary

- Recommendations should be included here, if they are included in the report.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

- Why this book? What is the history of the genesis of this book?
- How indigenous peoples work with governments on co-management and conservation.
 - Lots of indigenous groups have stated that they were the first conservationists, taking and using only what they need to survive.
- This book will be addressed to decision-makers; that’s its value.
- Fundamental theme is the importance of conservation.
- What is the Arctic Council and CAFF.
- Book objectives should be the same as purposes.
- The objectives of the book should mirror the strategic plan of CAFF.

Chapter 2 – Arctic ecology and ecological relationships

- Include definitions of the Arctic
- Include importance of the Arctic in global processes. It’s a contributor to and receiver from other regions (e.g. ocean currents driving the global system, carbon balance, river transport into Arctic from subarctic, etc.)
- Description of Arctic vs. Antarctic
- Change in the environment and how this occurs first in the Arctic.
- Arctic is a habitat of extremes, seasonality, etc. It is also characterised by very significant physical and chemical events. With respect to monitoring, there is difficulty of seeing real change in a system of high variability.
- We need to compare the vulnerability vs. resilience of that environment.
- The Arctic is the edge of the range for many species. It won’t take much to cause changes in the Arctic.
- We have a responsibility to conserve relic species of earlier epochs (pre-glaciation).
- Should we change biodiversity to ecological diversity? Broadening our objectives may serve to advance our goals of better conservation of the Arctic.
- Limited and pulsed productivity affects rates of recovery.

- What's happening now in the Arctic is no different than what happened in the past, but the rate is much faster.
- Important to discuss the geological history.
- Refer to other general material, e.g. AMAP
- Migratory patterns should be included.
- Use this chapter to improve and expand on the perception of the Arctic.
- Include a large (Arctic-centred) projected map showing migratory routes.

Chapter 3 – Human's in the Arctic landscape

- Include a short history of humans in the Arctic, indigenous and non-indigenous.
 - Can't consider humans as separate from Arctic ecology.
 - History of humans in the Arctic is a lead-in to recognition of access rights, need for co-management/partnerships.
 - Include human migration patterns.
 - Include demographic trends.
- Describe the process of the indigenous peoples' use of resources and their traditional knowledge.
 - How to slow the loss of indigenous knowledge base.
 - How many of us consider demographic changes when we discuss managing Arctic species?
 - Need to build in a sense of urgency, more humans and mechanisation. Transitions are likely to be pulsed not smooth, e.g. flipping of ocean currents.
- Impacts of human activities from outside the Arctic on the Arctic itself (e.g. changes in land use).
 - Solutions must come from the areas generating these impacts, e.g. contaminants and climate change.
 - The call to action is what? Broad response from non-Arctic countries is also needed.
 - Even if we start to address the problems now, there will be a long lag time (e.g. demographic changes - birth-rate to zero now won't stop the problem soon).
 - The only thing we can manage is to reduce hunting, fishing, etc. and work on mitigation strategies to address loss of food sources. What problems does this bring us? E.g. transport of food into the Arctic.
- Should improve the misperception of sparsity, that is, it's not an empty landscape, people use the region for hunting, herding, etc.
- Include case studies to show the detailed land-use patterns.
- Case study idea: reindeer herding fences and grazing patterns.
- Land use connects to social and cultural integrity.
- It would be useful to include a box including nutritional information about traditional foods and to show how the whole animal is utilised.
- Include a map of land ownership to compare federal vs. indigenous ownership and to show the connection between land ownership and biological diversity.
- Case study idea: Saami rights to land and water claims.
- Include maps to show traditional land use compared with legal ownership; highlight the disparity with maps.
- How do we value resources? From whose perspective? Need to include the aboriginal perspective.
- Should we include non-renewable resource use?
- Non-renewable resource use has potential environmental impact that could threaten habitats and species. This may then affect the availability of traditional foods. This involves complex cumulative effects. We need to show the implications of non-renewable resource extraction.
- Highlight the difference between monetary and subsistence economies.

- Highlight the difference between legal instruments and traditional law.
- Aim to bring international pressure to companies who are extracting non-renewable resources. Legislation being developed in Russia, but too late and too slow.
- Reorder chapters. Chapter 3 should come after chapter 8.
- Include protection of “cultural landscapes”, ie. protection not of wildlife, but of culture and beliefs

Chapter 4 - Tundra

- Include impact of introduction of alien species.
- Move eco-tourism from chapter 3 to chapter 4? Change eco-tourism to tourism.

Chapter 9 – Status and trends: key elements

- Include habitat fragmentation. Link to endangered spaces. Include idea of habitat restoration.
- This chapter is not a comprehensive list of all key elements. Additionally, it’s not a list of the most important elements. Perhaps avoid use of the term “key elements” and use the term “selected examples” or “illustrative case histories”. Otherwise you will leave the reader with the impression that something that is not included is not important. In the selection, we want: a) geographic representation, b) ecosystem representation, c) examples that reinforce the themes.
- Include species lower on the food chain than those that are harvested.
- Analyse the effects of campaigns, for example anti-seal hunting campaigns destroyed the economic basis in some aboriginal communities.
- Chapter 9 is a pivotal chapter. What’s mentioned here leads to chapter 10. It’s difficult to discuss things in chapter 10 that haven’t been raised earlier.
- Include environmental effects in the Arctic, for example climate change effects of Arctic peoples, animals and landscapes.

Chapter 10 – Conservation efforts and priorities

- Case studies should only be included by consensus.
- It is more important to discuss effects rather than waste time speculating on causes (e.g. climate change disputed still).
- Case study idea - compare and contrast three territorial approaches to protecting areas in the Canadian north.
- Need ownership from local people on the ground. Public participation is key.
- Very important to use case studies that show the positive side.
- Case study idea – Federal US/Russian agreement on polar bears mirrored by counterpart agreement between indigenous peoples.
- Case study idea – Failure to negotiate Federal agreement between US and Canada (on polar bears?) while indigenous peoples have an agreement that works well.
- Lots of national parks, but few international parks. Highlight inter-relationships between international agreements and national implementation of ratification.
- Don’t be shy to use Chapters 10 and 11 to tell what is wrong.
- Case study ideas on bilateral successes:
 - Anilca agreement
 - Kluane/Wrangell-St Elias
 - Porcupine caribou agreement US/Canada
- The issues of remedial action and restoration should be covered.
- Introduction of alien species

Chapter 11 – Conclusions and recommendations

- Recommendations could cover a number of areas including:
 - Direct scientific activity and develop funding for these activities.
 - Management – focusing on co-operative arrangements – bringing people together.
 - Species – are there species that are not protected and should be added to existing legal instruments?
 - Point to the value of the CBD in the Arctic.
 - Communications – improve communications to those outside the Arctic – international fora etc.
- We should be careful in the use of the word “stakeholders”. In some areas this can have the opposite meaning to that desired (i.e. outsiders).
- Recommendations could be linked to objective 5 of the CAFF Strategic Plan.
- Point out that the Arctic is a good place to live.
- If this report is not a comprehensive assessment we should be careful that this chapter is not perceived as a priority list. There are probably many important aspects that are not covered by this publication.
- Is there a difference between the CAFF Strategy Plan and the CBD? The CBD asks for countries to produce a strategy and action plans and that already exists in CAFF.
- Should recommendations be included in this report at all? It might stall the process. They may also date the document. If they are to exist at all they could be included in a separate document. Or list “future directions” in the main document and more detailed recommendations in another report. This report should help to raise awareness of the issues in the Arctic, that will in itself help decision-makers in their decision-making.
- The Arctic has useful lessons to impart to other regions of the world.
- We should avoid the scenario that this report only contains vague, general and not able to be implemented recommendations that the permanent participants can not live with.
- It should not be forgotten that the big issue of Arctic conservation is wider than CAFF’s mandate to look at conservation issues.
- We should be careful that this report is not attempting to be too many things at the same time (too ambitious).
- This report is an opportunity to view the Arctic in a new way. From the perspective of those who live there.
- Maybe the report could cover the issues of incentives to relocation in the north?
- If recommendations are in they could point to other areas of the CAFF program, for example, the biodiversity monitoring program.

Conclusions

- Some conclusions should reflect the themes
- The importance of the Arctic, biologically and strategically (military, resources, transportation)
- Importance of Arctic to people who live there
- Need to keep focus on Arctic biodiversity, not just Arctic in general. What does Arctic biodiversity mean for people?
- What makes the Arctic unique that inspires/requires a need for international cooperation?
- Conservation of Arctic flora and fauna depends on everyone - local (Arctic people) and international. We all share the responsibility for the land and resources of the circumpolar Arctic.
- There is a need for more funding!

Other items to be included in the report:

- aquaculture/mariculture

- heat and cold tolerant bacteria and algae which aid biotechnology
- market demands for Arctic products
- influx and outflux of species in relation to climate (historically and in relation to climate change)
- increased research in the Arctic (guinea pig phenomenon)

BREAKOUT SESSION 2: CLIMATE CHANGE AND UV-B IMPACTS

SUMMARY REPORT

Identifying the main themes/ studies related to climate change and UV-B that should be pursued through/for CAFF in a joint AMAP/CAFF/IASC assessment over the next 4-5 years.

Themes:

- ☐ Climate change and UV-B should continue to be a priority for CAFF.
- ☐ Uncertain as to which country will lead the initiative within CAFF.
- ☐ People of the Arctic have a direct dependence on the land and its resources.
- ☐ Indigenous/local knowledge has much to contribute with respect to climate change, trends and impacts.
- ☐ CAFF approach must be designed to be long-term.
- ☐ An overview of existing research should be identified.
- ☐ Research strategy is needed.
- ☐ Effects: direct effects, indirect effects, cumulative effects.
- ☐ A close link between biological, geophysical and socio-economic impacts: climate change and UV-B affects the physical environment, which affects the foodchain, which has direct and indirect implications for northern human populations.
- ☐ Important to consider various perspectives: local knowledge/experience, biology, physical geography, etc.
- ☐ A need to look at interactions and/or chain effects.
- ☐ Climate change and UV-B research should reflect the inter-connectedness of ecosystems and species.
- ☐ Understanding the causes of climate change will help in the understanding of the effects.
- ☐ Preferred means of tackling climate change and UV-B research: by species
- ☐ Emphasis on the need to set criteria for climate change research - less discussion on recommending specific species studies.
- ☐ Collaboration is required. Biological research is also dependent on its links to physical geography and climate system research.
- ☐ APure science and UV-B/climate change science should be conducted concurrently.
- ☐ Much data are available, but basic data are still lacking. There are a lot of data collected but not yet accessible; therefore there is a need for data rescue.
- ☐ Current data collection sites may not be in the most appropriate locations.

Administrative themes:

- ☐ Joint partnership approach is key to maximize efforts and results and use of available resources (in kind and research - i.e. new funding)
- ☐ CAFF only meets once every two years, which is not sufficient.
- ☐ It was recommended that an ad-hoc working group be established to bring the issue further.
- ☐ CAFF should be strongly involved in ACIA.

Criteria for Selection of Research Focus

- ☐ Research should relate to biodiversity

- ☒ Circumpolar in vision and scope
- ☒ Use existing/available data
- ☒ Pick key species/habitats (flora/fauna) that:
 - Predicts the link between physical processes and the biological processes.
 - Know that what will be measured is measurable
 - Take advantage of common ground between research disciplines - combining knowledge, skills, funds and logistics
 - Examine the implications for conservation management (based on scenario development)

Possible key species/ecology studies:

- ☒ algae, charr, lemmings, lichen, seals, caribou/reindeer (predicated on existing/available data)
- ☒ vegetation communities (ex. tree line forests)
- ☒ Ecosystems: freshwater systems, permafrost, sea-ice extension, snow cover, precipitation
- ☒ TEK: As well as being a component of any of the above suggestions, there is a need to capture local knowledge regarding changes in animal migration, health and behaviour.

What are potential co-operating organizations?

- ☒ Many of the organizations are listed in Document 7.1.
- ☒ Many of the national programs were not listed in Doc. 7.1.
- ☒ Additional information sources:
 - Σ Atmospheric Environment Service (Canada)
 - Σ IUCN Specialists Groups
 - Σ CCAF (Canada)
 - Σ Science Councils (universities)
 - Σ Academies of Sciences
 - Σ NASA
 - Σ U.S. Dept. of Defense (un-classified information)
 - Σ IPCC
 - Σ WMO

BREAKOUT SESSION 3: MONITORING CIRCUMPOLAR BIODIVERSITY

CONSOLIDATED RESULTS □ APRIL 29, 1999

Bill Heal's Scoping Paper was endorsed. It should form the basis of further developing the circumpolar monitoring network.

1.0 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

1.1 Objectives of a circumpolar biodiversity monitoring network:

- # Provide a means to share information, provide advice and co-ordinate national monitoring efforts to be internationally compatible (AMAP model).
- # Develop an ecologically based framework.
- # Link to CAFF strategic plan objectives:
 - i. Detect past and on-going changes in the circumpolar Arctic environment and biodiversity.
 - ii. Distinguish natural and short-term fluctuations from human-induced changes.
 - iii. Use as an early warning system that can trigger more specific and focused research and conservation measures.
 - iv. Provide independent information to test the validity of predictions of changes.
 - v. Implement and help to evaluate the effectiveness of conservation programs.
 - vi. Address the above in a cost effective and efficient manner.
- # Monitoring results could be used to prepare the next circumpolar status report over the next decade.
- # Build on existing national monitoring systems.
- # Community-based approach to monitoring to be effective and efficient, including use of indigenous/traditional knowledge.
- # Identification/use of indicator species should be a function of the monitoring framework.

1.2 Scope of a circumpolar biodiversity monitoring network

- # Use the CAFF definition of circumpolar or broader, if necessary.
- # Scope will be defined as a function of the subject matter.
- # Incorporate an established ecosystem-based approach to allow for comparability between eco-regions, eg: the Tuhkanen system -- use of bio-temperatures and vegetation mapping, eg: what happens in an area during the growing season, useful approach to addressing climate change and also land-water/marine and latitude/altitude factors.
- # The monitoring process should be easily understood, sustainable, cost effective, be relevant to those involved and be paced appropriately.
- # Virtually everything is relevant to biodiversity. CAFF must be specific about what it wants. If the goal of a circumpolar network proves too great, guidance on common features would help:
 - a. Plot-based vs species-based research.
 - b. Protocol for data collection and archiving of raw (not interpreted) data in the public domain.

- c. Involve three or more countries (so phenomenon must be common to three or more).
- d. Arctic floras grow slowly. Long term monitoring at intervals of a decade appropriate. To detect changes, a 10- to 100-year program is necessary.
- e. Think 100 years! Sites that are monitored must be protected.

- # Cumulative impact assessment and an interdisciplinary approach are important components of monitoring.
- # Communications and public information are important features of a monitoring network.
- # Creating a harmonized circumpolar network will be a challenge but necessary (ie: create value added by small adjustments or by larger efforts when necessary).

2.0 LINKAGES

2.1 Links with national and international efforts:

- # Need to be flexible enough so current domestic efforts can be tied in and, at the same time, compatible for comparison purposes.
- # Although inventories of country monitoring activities will probably be needed, doing this in advance of a monitoring framework that would provide the necessary context would be difficult.

2.2 Links with Overview Report:

- # Don't focus solely on charismatic megafauna. Primary decomposers at the lowest trophic level may be more important.
- # Link to AMAP.
- # The overview and monitoring initiatives should continue to be developed in tandem, linking when necessary, e.g., if the overview report detects gaps in reporting on the status of specific flora and fauna, this should then be addressed in the monitoring framework.
- # The results of monitoring may form the baseline for future overview reports.
- # General advice: Species at the limits of their distribution may be more sensitive to change. Relict species may occupy special habitats. Watch impacts of invasive species. From the scoping paper, paragraph 8 subs ii, iv and v are particularly important.

3.0 TOPICS FOR THE MONITORING WORKSHOP

- # In advance of the workshop, through a drafting committee, develop and distribute an ecologically-based framework for biodiversity monitoring.
- # A group should meet to advance Traditional Environmental Knowledge (TEK), including TEK experts and scientists. TEK can provide a retrospective understanding of change that could be made available to Ministers more quickly than such information could be generated by other means (palynology, for example) and may provide otherwise unavailable insights.
- # The key goal of the workshop is to develop and agree to a circumpolar monitoring framework against which future monitoring projects can be assessed and permits countries to assess their existing monitoring networks and, if necessary, make the required changes and additions to be develop a compatible circumpolar network.
- # Countries should provide overviews of their experiences with integrating domestic monitoring systems.

- # General criteria for assessing monitoring proposals should be developed (e.g., must be consistent with the broad framework and generally applicable at a circumpolar level).
- # There were two proposals to test the applicability of the framework.
 - a. A monitoring program on ringed seals could contribute to CAFF and AMAP monitoring goals. The US delegation offered to lead discussions to provide a background paper to the workshop.
 - b. The proposed caribou monitoring project should be further developed in tandem with the development of the framework (the results of this effort should be presented at the workshop).

4.0 ELEMENTS OF A MONITORING WORKPLAN

- # CAFF's strengths are its contacts in all countries and its good links with aboriginal peoples. Take advantage of this.
- # Need for draft framework developed in advance of the biodiversity monitoring workshop.
- # The framework should be based on the discussion/scoping paper and the results of the monitoring workshops held at the CAFF conference

5.0 OTHER OBJECTIVES IDENTIFIED

- # none identified

6.0 KEY POINTS

- # Need to address the available data base on historical trends within TEK.
- # Need clear goals and objectives for a biodiversity monitoring program.
- # Need to develop ecologically-based framework.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Objective and Scope:

- # Form a drafting team to prepare a draft framework for biodiversity monitoring in advance of a monitoring workshop.
 - suggested participants: Kevin McCormick, John Bengston, Aevan Peterson
 - suggested resource people: Bill Heal, Henry Huntington, Natalia Vasilieva

7.2 Linkages:

- # none

7.3 Workshop:

- # Adopt recommended workshop sessions/topics as outlined above.
- # Revisit timing of the workshop as a function of being prepared.
- # Agreement in principle to pursue ringed seal and caribou monitoring proposals in tandem with the development of the broader monitoring framework

7.4 Elements of the Work Plan

- # Promote the workshop, including the TEK component.
- # Establish a working group to develop the agenda, monitoring protocol, initiate the Desk Study.

7.5 Other Objectives
none

BREAKOUT SESSION 4: FURTHERING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CIRCUMPOLAR PROTECTED AREAS NETWORK (CPAN)

SUMMARY REPORT

- 1) **Should one of the tasks at CAFF VII be to initiate a review process of the goals and expectations for CPAN? If so, should there be a task group formed to carry out this work beyond CAFF VII?**

Conclusion:

- (a) Goal/objectives are acceptable and no further review is necessary. But no group is needed to review goal, but maybe to prioritize goals
- (b) Yes, a task group should be formed (it should have appropriate representation, including aboriginal organizations) and this group could review CPAN goals and expectations (rather than trying to achieve it during CAFF VII).
- (c) The session first asked whether there is “problem” with CPAN, does it need fixing? The Observer from the Netherlands noted that as part of Netherlands-Russia bilateral efforts, the two looked at CPAN and concluded that CPAN , as a mapping exercise, seemed to thorough and running smoothly. However, the session did discuss whether CPAN was meeting the objectives set for it (See Principles and Guidelines, Pages 2-3, Objectives on the relationship of PAs). If there is a review of CPAN, it ought to address this question. The Observer from the Netherlands recommended looking at the Council of Europe Pan-European Ecological network which has moved beyond mapping to exploring the cross-boundary physical relationships of national PA designations. The session also felt that national implementation should be explored, concluding that CPAN had stalled. It recommended the possible formation of a Working Group to address and promote CPAN objectives.

- 2) **Should the 12 CPAN Principles be reviewed and updated, where necessary, or set aside?**

Conclusion:

- (a) No need for a full, formal review of principles although some specific (P.1) principles could be revised to more clearly reflect the cultural aspects of new sites.
- (b) Yes the principles should be reviewed to determine if there is a need to update or set aside

- 3) **Should CPAN’s Guidelines for Site Selection and Designation be set aside or reviewed and updated? If the latter, should this review be carried out in cooperation with, for example, regional and global site guideline initiatives (e.g. OSPAR - regional; and IUCN/WCPA - global)?**

Conclusion :

- (a) No

- (b) Yes there should be a review, and in cooperation with global organizations. Consideration should be given to links (i.e. expert knowledge on site selection) to gap analysis workshop.

4) Should CAFF support all or part of the RAIPON project to eventually include Sacred Sites and Sanctuaries of Indigenous Peoples in CPAN? If yes, how should this be accomplished?

Conclusion:

- (a) National Reps. have indicated it will not be in Annual Work Plan but the Secretariat will assist in finding funding. So CAFF is supporting the project.

- (b) CAFF should support the RAIPON proposal. CPAN site selection should give priority to biodiversity criteria, how integration with sacred sites would be achieved needs to be determined. Suggestion was made that nations produce short reports on how the concept of sacred sites is considered and what recognition is given to such sites within a protected areas framework

5) How should CAFF address the issue of the Reporting and Evaluation project?

Conclusion:

- (b) Decision should be deferred until more direction for overall CPAN framework is determined.

6) Should CAFF update its 1994 Habitat Conservation Report No. 1 (State of Protected Areas in the Circumpolar Arctic)?

Conclusion

- (a) There is a big difference between reporting and evaluating process. Reporting can be done routinely in annual country reports. Evaluation should be done on a periodic basis perhaps when the CAFF Strategic Plan is evaluated. CAFF may need to ask Ministers what they want.

- (b) Defer decision to CPAN subgroup

- (c) Not yet.

7) Could information and data obtained in the CPAN Reporting and Evaluation system be useful in producing such a report?

Conclusion:

- a) effort needs to be devoted to updating the CAFF web site and habitat database, and there needs to be a link to country webpages.

- b) Defer decision to CPAN subgroup

8) Should CAFF design a CPAN Implementation Strategy?

Conclusion:

- (a) Redirect CPAN from a "site designation" effort to refocus it into a communication, coordination, and collaboration; ie. Exchange of experience, forum. Should refocus on marine protection areas.

(b) Defer decision to CPAN subgroup.

9) Can the objectives listed on pages 7 and 8 be met within the existing CPAN framework?

Conclusion:

(a) Yes. But need to improve communication, collaboration and coordination aspects and linkages beyond the Arctic.

(b) No, because framework is being reworked.

10) Does the CPAN Strategy and Action Plan need a major overhaul or merely some “fine tuning” to accommodate new information and alleviate concerns?

Conclusion:

(a) No major overhaul, but needs to refocus CPAN into a more implementation mode.

(b) Strategy and Action plan requires fine tuning, should be taken on by CPAN subgroup

11) CAFF V assignment to “Identify partners and resources available . . . to better educate the public on the importance and values of the arctic” What is the status of this work item and should this work be continued?

Conclusion:

(a) No activity has taken place on this work item. It should be rolled into the broader CAFF communication plan and taken out of the CPAN workplan.

12) CAFF V assignment on “how to encourage regional and international public and political support for CPAN” What is the status of this work item and should this work be continued?

Conclusion

(a) No activity has taken place on this work item. It should be discontinued until CPAN program development has advanced further.

13) Should and, if yes, how should CAFF continue with the development of a Pan Arctic Protected Areas Registry and Directory? (See incoming discussion paper from Norway and GRID-Arendal.)

Conclusion:

(a) No decision was made, if a CPAN working group is reinstated then they should examine this issue and determine if they need such a tool. Issues of database/registry maintenance cost and responsibilities, design etc. need to be resolved.

(c) Norway reported that it wanted to continue with this project and indicated that it would use updates to the CPAN database identifying newly protected areas.

14) Should and, if yes, how should CAFF continue with its Gap Analysis work? (See incoming report from Russia/Norway and GRID-Arendal.)

Conclusion:

- (a) Many agencies have been working on gap analysis and therefore there is a great deal of experience with conduct of gap analysis at different scales and with different approaches. Gap analysis needs to continue but priority should be given to regional gap analysis before expansion to circumpolar level and a workshop should be held to determine how circumpolar gap analysis can be approached. The purpose of the workshop would be, among other things, to share examples of successes (where gap analysis lead to protection of an area), technical information, lessons learned at the regional level, examine compatibility of various approaches, to create a common language for managers and specialists....

15) Should the paper on jurisdictional responsibilities and national frameworks for conservation of the Arctic marine environment be published in the CAFF Habitat Conservation Series? Should the views and recommendations of representatives of each country be compiled as a CAFF document, perhaps for internal use?

Conclusion

- (a) Put the document on the CAFF website now and wait until the results of the Marine Conservation Workshop for a publication decision.

Further clarification is needed about intent of this work item before further decisions can be made re. compiling recommendations etc. Some of these issues are larger CAFF issues and not exclusively CPAN issues

- (b) Yes, but only after a thorough review/revision of the existing paper for accuracy. Consideration should be given to whether there is a need for the report to include a 'comparative' or 'analytical' component, as well as to include more illustrative figures or summary tables. Currently it is simply a list and accompanying descriptions of legal instruments.

16) What are CAFF's interests and expectations for the Circumpolar Marine Workshop to be held this fall in Montreal?

Conclusion:

- (a) Conduct the CSWG annual meeting and Gap Analysis Workshop to coincide with the Marine Conservation Workshop.
- (b) CAFF interests and expectations should be defined as per the CAFF Strategic Action Plan. Some decisions need to be deferred until after revised meeting themes have been presented.
- (c) The session endorsed the objectives of the workshop and expected as result:
- an answer to the threshold question of desirability and value-added to expanding CPAN to include MPAs.
 - linkages to PAME
 - a compendium of MPAs
 - a marine focus
 - an exploration of the range of marine conservation, including MPAs

The session recommended that workshop participants bring a list of presently protected marine areas and the degree of protection in the r countries and

recommended that the workshop use the CAFF Legal Instruments paper as background.

17) How can the Circumpolar Marine Workshop best advance CPAN?

Conclusion:

(c) by:

- highlighting the value added ;
- marine protection by establishing linkages to PAM;
- identifying linkages to monitoring in the terrestrial and marine environments and between terrestrial and marine indicator species, e.g. seabirds and seaducks;
- there may be a need in CPAN for an acceptable stratification for sensitive and representative eco-zones which the workshop can identify;
- guidance on the utility of MPAs as a tool for marine conservation;
- guidance on the possible use of transition zones surrounding MPAs.

18) Should CAFF have a special component of CPAN for the marine environment (i.e. A Circumpolar Marine Area Network - CMAN)?

Conclusion:

(a) No. But if CPAN reestablishes itself there should be some marine protection - like people involved in CPAN. Perhaps even a marine protection sub-committee under CPAN.

(b) Should be discussed at Montreal meeting. Suggested that it should be kept together until merit of splitting into a separate marine component can be reviewed.

(c) Premature to say

19) How can CPAN best contribute to a circumpolar biodiversity monitoring program? Species and habitat monitoring?

Conclusion:

(a) The establishment of long term monitoring sites requires a certain level of site protection to maintain and ensure site integrity over time. Protection system staff could also be useful in conducting studies and as a funding mechanism.

(b) Contribution of CPAN to circumpolar biodiversity monitoring is through provision of sites of common conservation concern, sites can help set priorities for monitoring.

(c) The session responded that protected areas (PA) can be the focus for monitoring activities, using indicators, to assess human impact. A PA can act as a controlled site, which can be paired with, and compared to, an uncontrolled site. The session noted the usefulness of focusing on both flora and fauna, in combination, as indicators of change within a PA. The session suggested using the IUCN system to test the effectiveness of the levels of protection accorded by national governments. Existing national evaluations of the efficacy of PAs could be provided to the Editorial Team, e.g. Russia has completed a detailed analysis of its PAs. The session noted that there may be limitations in what one country can learn from another's experience, given the variety of national regulatory schemes.

20) What elements of CPAN could be useful to monitor circumpolar biodiversity (i.e. species, vegetation cover)?

Conclusion:

(c) Species composition; vegetation; and habitat.

21) How can CPAN contribute to assessment of the effects of climate change and UV-B on Arctic ecosystems?

Conclusion:

(c) The session noted that PA could be the focus of the assessment of climate change and UV-B by

1. Monitoring to gather data;
2. Recognizing trends and extrapolating from them. One example was that retreat of the ice-edge could be observed as physical change within a PA and by recording the change in the size of populations of ice-edge dependent seals.

22) How should CPAN fit into the CAFF Status Report?

Conclusion;

(c) The designation and mapping of PAs reported in CPAN documents can be included in the status section of the overview as a measure of protection accorded by national governments in the Arctic. This should specifically address the progress on new site designation by national governments since CAFF began its CPAN efforts.

23) How can CPAN contribute to the sustainable development agenda?

Conclusion:

(b) CPAN can contribute to SD agenda through economic value of protected areas (note IUCN work on this subject).

(c) Most significantly, by mapping PAs, thus identifying a baseline of protected sites and serving as a control area. The session noted:

- that national governments will establish their own sustainable developments agendas;
- the emerging relationship of eco-tourism to PAs., specifically the need to balance long-term ecological integrity with the economic benefits of eco-tourism;
- that sustainable development also includes subsistence use and noted the need to balance the protection of areas with the protection of subsistence ways of life.

24) What unique values does CPAN have that can be linked to economic well-being of the north?

Conclusion:

(c) PAs can be used to define acceptable multiple uses within a PA, including subsistence use. Research conducted within PAs may have “economic spin-off” which, in turn, may require nationally decision-making on what future activities may be appropriate within the PA. Employing local people in the operation and maintenance of PAs is also an economic benefit. PA designation of critical habitats can have the effect of improving resource availability for local peoples.

25) Should CAFF carry out a project/review to demonstrate the values of protected areas and CPAN to the Arctic and its people? If so, how could this relate to similar initiatives underway in the international community?

Conclusion:

- (b) Yes, such a project should be carried out. Note should be made of similar projects already underway. IUCN offer to partner with nations on this initiative as it picks up on work they are already doing.
- (c) Since CAFF has committed to, and invested in, CPAN, CAFF should be willing to review it, or have it reviewed by others. This should include a review of completeness in reporting PA designations and a review of the lessons learned from existing site designations and management. The latter review could be by a literature search or by canvassing members and requesting them to report on their experiences, successes, and/or needs to improve. With respect to international initiatives, there are efforts in process in Africa to designate PAs, where, e.g., subsistence use is being allowed in game reserves. IUCN could also make its experience in, and data base on, international efforts available.

NOTE: although Group B deferred many of the work plan items to the “revived CPAN subgroup”, it noted a number of work plan items (Numbers 4, 6, 13, 14, 23, 25) that could go forward in parallel to the formation of the group, if leads can be identified.

BREAK-OUT SESSION 5: IMPLEMENTING OTHER ASPECTS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

Report to Plenary

Work Group A: Flora Conservation Issues

Key Points and Conclusions

The inclusion of indigenous knowledge is essential to CAFF's work. One project that could be undertaken is to compile a report on indigenous knowledge about and use of plants around the Arctic, to complement work done on rare, endemic vascular plants.

As CAFF determines how it will cooperate with other initiatives in the Arctic, we need to know who those initiatives are and what they are doing. A summary report describing other initiatives active in the Arctic or on Arctic issues and relevant to the work of CAFF should be prepared.

The CAVM proposals in the discussion paper (CAFF VII/10-13) are still relevant.

A Flora Conservation Group is needed to help identify priority areas for conservation and to ensure that CAFF's responsibility regarding flora conservation is adequately addressed. Its first action should be to convene a workshop to address the questions of how it will address its work, how it relates to other CAFF activities, and how it relates to initiatives outside CAFF. The workshop should produce a report to the CAFF Working Group regarding these topics.

CPAN should take account of the atlas of rare endemic vascular plants in its gap analysis, and should also take account of the list of rare non-endemic vascular plants when it is available.

Action on land-use principles and mechanisms for conservation is very important and should be continued.

Ecotourism is an important issue in conservation, especially potential impacts in protected areas from increased numbers of visitors. Since the SD Program is considering a proposal regarding tourism in the Arctic, CAFF should be prepared to offer its assistance on the issue as appropriate at the SD meeting in Anchorage next week.

Recommendations for Action by the Plenary

1. A Flora Conservation Group should be formed, and its first task should be a workshop to design the flora conservation approach within CAFF.
2. A report should be prepared listing other international initiatives relevant to CAFF's work so that CAFF can determine how best to cooperate with those initiatives.

Work Group B: Fauna conservation issues

Scope of session

To forward recommendations to the plenary on how CAFF best can contribute to the implementation of the Strategic Plan relevant to the conservation of arctic fauna (objectives 2 and 5 in the Strategic Plan.)

Objective 2:

- objective 2 seems to be inadequately addressed in projects.
- recurring discussion on why CAFF seems to be substantially involved in seabirds
- some bilateral work is done on marine fauna, but little in a circumpolar context
- marine mammals and salt water fish are felt taken care of by others
- for migratory birds, an assessment should be made towards the workshop in the Netherlands for April 2000
- lack of prioritization process regarding proposed projects within CAFF
- CAFF should develop some criteria for giving to presented proposals/projects

Objective 5:

- need more information from the sustainable development working group on their agenda
- would “harvest as a conservation tool” be a suitable case study to link different work groups?
- need to develop guiding principles on how to work with indigenous peoples and issues
- possible case study: promotion of tools to build links to indigenous peoples

Recommendations:

1. CAFF should produce an assessment with the objectives to produce a list of groups of species in the arctic environment that are relevant to CAFF and/or projects that involve such groups of species, and to prioritize these species and projects according to what is being elsewhere by others. Flora and fauna could initially be dealt with by the same group.
2. CAFF should establish a working group to work with criteria for selecting and giving priority to species/projects, and to address this in a more continuous manner (cf. CSWG).
3. The CAFF secretariat need to develop a communication strategy that involves the other WG's and relevant fora and transfer this information to the CAFF working group.
4. There is a need to establish a working group to elaborate on the guiding principles of working with indigenous peoples.

Working Group C: Communication and integration of conservation objectives into economic sectors

Key Points

Identified three action items to move Biodiversity forward:

- identify opportunities
- develop communications
- conduct case studies

Valuing biological resources

- factoring in the indigenous perspective, intrinsic value, economic value.

Conclusions

- Utilize case study to develop approach and language to advanced biodiversity in the sector areas of non-renewable resources (mineral and hydrocarbon exploration and development) and renewable resources (animal husbandry and boreal forest);

- Identify mechanisms for the further integration of the role of Indigenous people into CAFF program (2nd 1994 Iceland workshop needed)
- Criteria to be factored in to case studies should include the indigenous perspective; sustainable
- resource use, economic and intrinsic value, full cost accounting, cumulative impact, and mitigation measures.
- Case studies should focus in irreversible process (introduction of species); areas of species at risk (habitat fragmentation); and having a broad relevance and application.

Recommendation for Action by the Plenary

To develop an approach and language for presentation of the Biodiversity Case to decision makers (balanced debate) by using selected case studies, in the non-renewable and renewable resource areas, as a tool to advanced Biodiversity forward. The focus for case studies should target at risk, irreversible processes, and have a broad relevance and application. Criteria to develop the case scenarios should include the indigenous perspective; sustainable resource the use, economic and intrinsic vale, full cost accounting, cumulative impact, and mitigation measures.

Appendix 12

Report of the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group Report of the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group (CSWG)

Because there are a numerous species of seabirds that are common to the circumpolar countries, many shared populations, and several common conservation threats and management issues requiring international cooperation to resolve, a significant effort has continued to be directed towards seabird conservation activities under the auspices of the CAFF Circumpolar Seabird Working Group (CSWG). The CSWG conducted its fifth annual meeting in 1998 which was hosted by Iceland. The CSWG selected two groups of seabirds (murre and eiders) to focus CAFF's circumpolar conservation efforts. The International Murre Conservation Strategy and Action Plan and the Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan were endorsed by the AEPS Ministers in 1996 and 1997, respectively. All countries except two have or will soon be completing national murre and eider implementation plans. Most countries are already implementing action items in their national plans. The CSWG is also completing four CAFF approved murre projects in 1999: Circumpolar Murre colony Database; Circumpolar Murre Monitoring Framework; Murre Band Plan-Atlantic Region, and; Murre Banding Recoveries Report-Atlantic Region.

- Seabird Harvest in the Arctic Region. The CSWG will be completing a circumpolar report on the harvest of seabirds in 1999.
- Migratory Bird Linkages Outside the Arctic. CAFF completed a Technical Report *on Global Overview of the Conservation of Migratory Arctic Breeding Birds Outside the Arctic* in 1999. As a follow-up to that report, the Netherlands Directorate for Nature Management, the CAFF Secretariat and the CSWG will be conducting a workshop in 2000 to further the conservation of Arctic migratory birds.
- Seabird Bycatch in Commercial Fisheries. The CSWG of CAFF completed a Technical Report on the *Incidental Take of Seabirds in Commercial Fisheries in the Arctic Countries* in 1998. Among the recommendations in this report were suggestions to improve cooperation with the fishing industry to reduce seabird bycatch. CAFF has endorsed a recommendation for the SAO's approval concerning implementing the FAO's International Plan of Action to Reduce Seabird Bycatch in the Long-line Fisheries, and also renew this issue for gillnet fisheries in the circumpolar region. The CSWG will be conducting a workshop in 1999 on seabird bycatch in Canada and will be sponsored by both Canada and the U.S.
- Human Disturbance at Seabird Colonies. The CSWG completed a report on *Human Disturbance at Arctic Seabird Colonies* in 1998. One of the recommendations in that report was to prepare a public outreach document aimed at reducing disturbance at colonies. The CSWG will be completing a brochure in 1999 and will make it available to all circumpolar countries.
- The CSWG will be conducting its sixth meeting in conjunction with the CAFF Circumpolar Marine Workshop in September 1999¹

Appendix 13

¹ Note: The Circumpolar Marine Workshop is now scheduled for in Montreal, November 28 - December 2 1999.

Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) Work Plan 1999-2000

Final draft, 30.04.99

I. INTRODUCTION

The CAFF Work Plan 1999-2000, specifies actions agreed upon by the eight Arctic countries to be undertaken by CAFF under the auspices of the Arctic Council during the period of April 1999 to October 2000.

The CAFF Work Plan 1999-2000 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.

1. 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. Design a program to monitor circumpolar biodiversity for consideration by the second Arctic Council meeting in year 2000: hold an expert workshop in Iceland in fall 1999 to initiate this process and develop a first draft program for consideration by countries (**Iceland/CAFF Secretariat**).

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

Flora

2.1. Continue efforts to complete the critical annotated checklist of Pan-Arctic Flora and revise the list of rare non-endemic plants of circumpolar conservation concern. Provide a status report to CAFF VII (**Russia**)

2.2. Work towards completion of the Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map in year 2001 as per timeline provided in at CAFF VI in Nuuk 1997. Conduct a field transect in the Canadian Arctic during the summer of 1999 to verify the North-American continental map (**USA**)

2.3. Assess CAFF's role with respect to Arctic flora conservation in light of other circumpolar and international initiatives and provide a discussion paper to CAFF VIII (**USA/Russia**) .

Fauna

2.4. Co-ordinate the national and circumpolar implementation of the International Murre Conservation Strategy and Action Plan and report on progress to CAFF VIII and to the second Arctic Council Meeting (**All/CSWG**)

2.5. Co-ordinate the national and circumpolar implementation of the Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan and report on progress to CAFF VIII and to the second Arctic Council Meeting (**All/CSWG**)

- 2.6. Complete by fall 1999 a CAFF Technical Report on Harvest of Seabirds in the Circumpolar Region (**All/CSWG**)
- 2.7. Prepare recommendations to CAFF and the Arctic Council concerning incidental mortality of seabirds in commercial fisheries in the Arctic region: conduct a workshop on this topic in Halifax, Canada, in spring 2000 (**Canada/USA**)
- 2.8. Evaluate recommendations of the CAFF Technical Report No 4, "Global Overview of Conservation of Arctic Migratory Breeding Birds Outside the Arctic" and address other issues related to protection of Arctic migratory birds for consideration of CAFF and the Arctic Council: conduct a workshop on this topic in Wageningen, The Netherlands, in spring 2000 (**Russia/The Netherlands**)

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

- 3.1 Finalise by fall 1999 a report summarising the jurisdictional responsibilities and national frameworks for conservation of the Arctic marine environment (**Canada**)
- 3.2 Advance circumpolar efforts by CAFF, PAME and IUCN to protect the Arctic marine environment: cosponsor a Circumpolar Marine Workshop in Montreal, Canada, September 1999 (**All/PAME/IUCN**)
- 3.3 Establish by fall 2000 a Pan-Arctic Protected Areas Registry (PAPAR) as specified in the CPAN Strategy and Action Plan (**Norway/UNEP GRID-Arendal**)
- 3.4 Develop ways to enhance support and sustainability of Russia's Arctic protected areas: hold a workshop on this topic in Anchorage, Alaska, October 1999 (**USA/Russia**).
- 3.5 Review and evaluate recommendations made by CAFF VII with respect to CPAN and prepare by CAFF VIII a discussion paper on ways to advance CAFF's CPAN effort (**USA**)

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 Prepare, in collaboration with AMAP and IASC, an assessment on impacts of climate change and UV-B on Arctic ecosystems (**Sweden**)

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 Prepare an authoritative, illustrated report, "Arctic Conservation Issues: Status and Trends of

Arctic Flora, Fauna and Habitats”. Submit an advanced draft to the second meeting of the Arctic Council in year 2000, anticipating publication in year 2001. **(Finland/CAFF Secretariat)**

5.2 Develop by fall 1999 a draft CAFF communications strategy for consideration by the SAOs **(Iceland)**

ADMINISTRATION

- Prepare by fall 1999 draft CAFF Operating Guidelines for consideration by the SAOs **(USA)**