

**CAFF Board Meeting  
April 9-10, 2002, Akureyri, Iceland**

**Summary Report**

**1. Welcome (Chair)**

Sune Sohlberg, CAFF Chair, welcomed participants to the first CAFF Board meeting of 2002 and noted that it is exactly 10 years from the first meeting of CAFF in April 1992. Three National Representatives were regrettably unable to attend: Esko Jaakkola (Finland), Vladimir Pischelev (Russia), and Peter Nielsen (Greenland). Finland was represented by Outi Mahonen, and Russia by Stanislav Belikov the second day. Mr. Sohlberg specifically welcomed the new Executive Secretary of the Indigenous Peoples Secretariat, John Crump. Participants then introduced themselves (Appendix I).

**2. Initial remarks by participants**

No initial remarks were given.

**3. Adoption of Agenda**

*The agenda (Appendix II) was adopted with some re-arranging of Agenda Items and addition of the following:*

- ♦ AC Capacity building strategy and action plan
- ♦ Millennium assessment from UNEP.
- ♦ UNEP WCMC Climate change conference – impacts on biodiversity – April 2003 – request to CAFF to provide a chair for the Arctic session.

**4. Review and adoption of minutes from CAFF Board Meeting – August 2001 (Chair)**

*The report from the CAFF Board meeting in Uppsala, August 29-30, 2001 (BMI-02/4-1) was adopted.*

**5. Update on CAFF activities since last meeting (Chair)**

➤ **Arctic Council Restructuring**

The Chair provided a brief update on the restructuring of the Arctic Council. Current discussion among the SAOs indicates that all the working groups will be maintained for continuing work with only minor changes in mandate. A previous suggestion that all monitoring be handled by AMAP has been dropped, with current wording suggesting that AMAP and CAFF work together on monitoring .

Similarly there is no consensus for the suggestion that all sustainable use be handled by CAFF. The current recommendation is that SDWG works with sustainable use projects where economic aspects are in the forefront, while CAFF continues to work with the biodiversity aspects of sustainable use. However, there is a need for close collaboration between the two groups.

It was noted that the review is now in the hands of SAOs. If anyone wishes to affect the restructuring process, they should contact their own country's SAO.

➤ **Input into the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD),  
Johannesburg, 2002**

The Chair noted that some work has been done on this but that it will be discussed further at next SAO meeting in May.

➤ **Letter of support for the ringed seal monitoring network**

CAFF provided a letter of support to Kit Kovacs, leader of the Ringed Seal Monitoring Network, to help get financing for the network from the EU.

*All agreed that providing such letters of support is an important function of CAFF.*

➤ **Barents Council**

The Chair reported that he took part in Barents Council Environmental Group meeting.

➤ **Timberline workshop**

The Chair reported that he is participating as a Swedish representative in the AC SDWG Timberline workshop project and offered to serve also as a link to CAFF.

➤ **CAFF Website**

CAFF and PAME launched new websites in March. Unfortunately the new sites are set up for Explorer and do not work well with Netscape. It was noted that this creates a problem for some countries that do not use Explorer because it appears to transfer viruses more easily.

***Decision:***

*The Secretariat will contact the web designer to make the web sites compatible with both Netscape and Explorer.*

## **6. CAFF Recommendations**

The Secretariat introduced a revised draft of the recommendations stemming from the CAFF overview report (BMI-02/6-1). The recommendations were tabled at last SAO

meeting; four countries provided written comments to CAFF. The revised draft is based on these comments. The draft now includes 16 recommendations, which are structured around five themes (Conserving Arctic Flora and Fauna; Conserving Arctic Ecosystems and Habitats; Assessing and Monitoring Arctic Living Resources; Global Issues; and Engaging Society).

It was noted that the recommendations are not directed only at CAFF but at any organisation working on conservation in the Arctic (e.g., other AC working groups, WWF, UNEP.) The recommendations will also provide a basis for a new CAFF strategic plan; the existing plan was written for a 5-year period ending in 2003.

Finland noted that for AC level, it is important for them to know what the experts are thinking and recommending. CAFF is the bridge that links science to decision-making. This document is a useful tool for this. WWF noted that the recommendations document would be a very valuable to have, to see where the priorities lie and show where there may be opportunities for co-operation.

It was emphasised by many participants that CAFF must take care to clarify that the recommendations are for the broader Arctic community and not just CAFF. The goal is to influence the activities of others as well as CAFF. All working groups of the Arctic Council should be able to see themselves in this document. Some concern was expressed by the IPS that recommendations about humans are not reflected very well in the current document. This needs to be incorporated to reach a broader audience. Although the draft was sent to all Permanent Participants, no comments were received from any of them.

Since the recommendations must be delivered to the SAOs shortly after the CAFF board meeting, participants reviewed the document as a group to try to get agreement on the wording of the recommendations.

There was some debate on how many recommendations to present. Canada suggested having only 1-2 per theme, that having more might make it difficult to get endorsement from Ministers. It was noted, however, that AMAP had 19 recommendations in their document. The recommendations should not be so general that no one sees what should be achieved. A suggestion came to have a target or goal statement accompanying each theme. Participants supported this approach.

***Decision:***

- *The Secretariat, together with Canada, will prepare a revised set of recommendations based on the discussion and present these to the participants later in the meeting.*
- *Representatives from UNEP and WWF will attempt to draft target statements for each theme area based on the current document.*
- *IPS will provide additional text relating to the role of humans in the Arctic.*

[See further items 11 and 15 of the minutes]

## **7. Arctic Council Capacity Building Strategy and Action Plan (Canada)**

Canada presented this item and noted that the Canadian SAO had requested all AC working groups to discuss item. The mandate for the capacity building strategy and action plan comes from the Barrow Declaration and the Sustainable Development Framework document. A workshop on capacity building was held in November 2001 in Finland. At the last SOA meeting, Canada was asked to prepare a draft strategy and action plan. A draft discussion paper is available and comments are being sought from the other countries. The next draft is due on April 15.

The objective of the strategy and action plan is to incorporate a capacity building focus into all AC activities to increase capacity at all levels of society. The intention is to build on existing capacity and structures. A pilot project is being developed to focus on moving knowledge into action. The pilot project will look at adaptation strategies in relation to climate change and contaminants although the project outline is at a very early stage.

Questions arose as to why both climate change and contaminants were selected for the pilot project. It was felt that this is too broad and the suggestion was made to focus solely on climate change. Climate change would be a better focus for all of the working groups, especially in light of the ACIA project. Concerns were also expressed with the concept of “adaptation” to contamination. It was further noted that capacity building must move both ways, i.e., both into and out of communities.

### ***Decision:***

- *CAFF recommends to focus the pilot study on the ACIA/climate change issue.*
- *CAFF will incorporate capacity building elements into future work plans and projects.*

## **8. CPAN (U.S. / Canada)**

### **➤ CPAN WG minutes**

The U.S. introduces this item. The CPAN Working Group met in Anchorage, Alaska, 11-13 February to evaluate progress on the CPAN Strategy and Action Plan and to reinvigorate the CPAN project through, *inter alia*, preparing a CPAN Implementation Plan. The U.S. also introduced a draft charter for CPAN outlining the structure and operation of the Working Group. Participants provided comments for minor revisions, including renaming the group as the CPAN Expert Group.

### ***Decision:***

- *The U.S. will revise the CPAN Charter based on the comments received.*
- *The CPAN Working Group will be renamed as the CPAN Expert Group.*

### **➤ Marine compendium proposal**

A proposal to complete a compendium of ecologically important marine areas was introduced by one of the CPAN Co-chairs from Canada. The CPAN EG had been asked by last Board at their meeting to scope out this task. Discussions within the CPAN EG determined that a project of this nature must be very clearly defined to keep it manageable. They, therefore, proposed to begin with an inventory exercise to identify what is already out there and based on those findings, develop a more targeted proposal. The scoping exercise will include defining the marine environment for the purpose of this activity, previous work and its application to the Arctic, physical and biological characteristics for identifying ecologically important marine areas, and potential sources of information. They further proposed to hold a small workshop in conjunction with CAFF IX to review the findings of the scoping exercise and develop a targeted proposal and budget. The ultimate goal is to create a series of map overlays, similar to the CAVM.

Norway noted that it will be important to determine the definition of “marine.” In Norway, for example, the coast is not normally considered as marine. There may also be problems with coastal bird areas and wetlands. WWF offered the work they had done related to the Barents and Bering Seas for inclusion in the CAFF marine compendium.

The meeting agreed to have the CPAN EG conduct a further scoping exercise.

***Decision:***

- *CPAN will conduct a scoping exercise to develop a more targeted proposal in conjunction with CAFF IX.*
- *The Canadian CPAN co-chair will investigate whether CAFF IX is the best venue for a workshop on the marine compendium.*

➤ **CPAN values proposal**

The Canadian CPAN Co-chair introduces this item. The original proposal for the Full Value of Protected Areas project was quite ambitious. Both the previous CAFF board meeting and the CPAN EG meeting expressed concern about the scope of this activity. The CPAN EG is now recommending a less ambitious project preparing a public education booklet on other values of protected areas (e.g., cultural, spiritual, economic, environmental). The goal is to have a booklet completed in time for the AC Ministerial. A dummy of the booklet was circulated.

Participants discussed who the audience should be for the booklet as this will determine the approach. All agreed that the brochure should be aimed primarily at circumpolar residents. Participants offered some comments on the content and approach taken in the booklet.

***Decision:***

*CAFF agreed to accept proposal to develop a brochure describing the full values of protected areas, incorporating the comments from the meeting.*

## ➤ Sacred Sites (RAIPON)

Mikhail Todishev of RAIPON introduced the draft report from the Sacred Sites project, which was intended as a pilot project using two Model areas, Koryak and Yamal-Nenets. The objective was to identify the convergence between western notions of biodiversity and the sacred sites of indigenous peoples. The long-term objective was to integrate sacred sites into formal protection regimes of Russia. A full draft report is now available.

The project work included both a literature review and field research. Implementation was conducted by indigenous peoples, which was an important feature of this project. The field research was based on interviews with indigenous elders in several communities in Yamal-Nenets and Koryak. The researchers were well-known among the indigenous population and, therefore, were trusted by the people they were interviewing. The project was managed by a Project Committee consisting of RAIPON, CAFF Secretariat, DEPA, and IPS.

Lack of funds prevented revisiting the model areas, but the project has generated a lot of interest in the regions where it was implemented, as well as in neighbouring regions. The Governor of Koryak has promised to protect all sacred sites identified as a part of this project: the Koryak Duma is developing an Act focusing on protection of sacred sites.

In Yamal-Nenets, legislation for indigenous peoples is already in place but there are plans to pass further legislation for enhancing their legal rights. Yamal-Nenets authorities are very supportive of indigenous people, partly because of Sergei Haruchi who also is a member of the National Duma.

Both Yamal-Nenets and Kamchatka are subject to extensive development and, therefore, the project is very timely. RAIPON considers the inclusion of sacred sites into designated lands-use areas of indigenous peoples as the most effective way to preserve these sites.

In Kamchatka/Koryak, sacred sites are not as well-preserved as in Yamal-Nenets. In the latter area, sacred sites are closely linked to reindeer herding; there is much less active herding in Koryak.

There is still a need to prepare an “international context” section for the report. RAIPON intends to publish this as a fully illustrated report and present to the Third AC Ministerial as well as to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Article 8j. An International Workshop is planned for the next phase of this project.

Following a slide and video presentation, a question-and-answer session was held among the participants.

*CAFF welcomed the presentation and looks forward to receiving the final report.*

➤ **CPAN Country Updates**

The Canadian CPAN Co-chair presented a proposal to complete a report on protected area activities in each of the circumpolar countries over the last 5 years. The intention of the CPAN EG is to have this ready by the October Ministerial meeting.

There was some discussion on the format and time involved in providing the necessary information. It was agreed that CPAN would develop a very “tight” information template to complete so as to make information collection as simple as possible.

***Decision:***

*CAFF agreed that CPAN will complete a country update on protected area activities using the simplest format possible.*

➤ **CPAN Implementation Plan**

The U.S. introduced an outline for the first CPAN four-year implementation plan. An implementation plan is considered an important part of the CPAN revitalization process. Action items under the five theme areas identified in the review of the CPAN Strategy and Action Plan will be divided into short, medium and long-term priorities. The U.S. invited the meeting to discuss and adopt the “approach” at this time.

***Decision:***

*The CPAN EG is asked to continue preparation of this outline and to have a final draft ready by CAFF IX.*

➤ **CPAN Website**

CPAN Co-chair provided an update of the CPAN website. A website had been under development for CPAN in 2001, to be linked with the main CAFF website. Since relatively little work had been done on this site, and since a new website has been launched for CAFF, it was decided to simply put all information regarding CPAN directly on to the CAFF website.

***Decision:***

*CPAN Co-chairs to ensure that all relevant material from the draft CPAN website is moved on to the new CAFF website.*

**Day 2 – April 10, 2002**

The Chair welcomed new participants to the meeting: Stanislav Belikov of Russia, sitting in for Vladimir Pischelev, and Bill Heal sitting in for Vincent Fleming for the U.K.

**9. CSWG (USA)**

The United States provided an update of CSWG activities. The 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of CSWG was held in Anchorage in January 2002. It was considered to be the best meeting of CSWG to date. The CAFF work plan identified 5 items relating to CSWG and at the last

CAFF board meeting, an 3 additional items were given to CSWG (seabird bycatch in gillnets; harvest issue and recommendations; conservation of migratory birds outside of Arctic.) These eight action items have 23 activities associated with them.

➤ **Conservation of migratory birds outside of the Arctic**

A prioritised list of birds nesting in the Arctic and wintering outside of it is being prepared – BACC (Birds of Arctic Conservation Concern). It is proposed to publish this as a CAFF Technical Report. It will include all migratory birds, not just seabirds, and will probably involve approximately 40-50 species.

➤ **Seabird by-catch in commercial fisheries in the Arctic**

CSWG will continue reporting on seabird by-catch. In addition, an assessment is being prepared on the seabird gillnet by-catch issue, to be released as a CAFF Technical Report.

➤ **Seabird Harvest in the Arctic**

The CAFF Technical Report No. 5 (Seabird Harvest Regimes in Circumpolar Nations) is being revised. It was noted that there is a need to improve seabird harvest monitoring in Russia, specifically in Chukotka Region.

➤ **Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy**

This is an on-going activity for CSWG. A new part of the strategy is to create a common eider colony map, to be completed by Canada.

➤ **Circumpolar Murre Conservation Strategy**

There are a number of activities associated with this item. Canada offered to develop a thick-billed murre population model (a similar model has already been completed for eiders). A murre colony poster is ready and has been published in English. CSWG discussed translating the poster into other languages and it was decided that each country should be responsible for its own translation. The base poster will be provided to each country. A murre colony catalogue database has been completed and a clickable map with tables is being prepared for the CAFF website. Additionally, murre posters have been developed for the Atlantic and Pacific regions.

➤ **Circumpolar Seabird Monitoring Network**

The development of a seabird monitoring network will be discussed further under the CBMP. A monitoring plan and terms of reference are currently being prepared.

➤ **Circumpolar Seabird Bulletin**

There has been a delay in publication of the bulletin.

➤ **CSWG Charter**

The CSWG charter will be modified according to comments received on CPAN Charter yesterday, with respect to the chair, membership and meetings. The name of group will change to Circumpolar Seabird Expert Group (CSEG). In addition, it was recommended

that Dr. Dave Irons of the US Fish and Wildlife Service be appointed the new Chair of CSEG. The CAFF Board was asked to approve this appointment.

***Decision:***

- *The CSEG charter will be revised as discussed.*
- *CAFF approved the appointment of Dr. Dave Irons as the new Chair of CSEG.*

There was discussion among the participants about how to disseminate the minutes from the CSWG meeting and the other expert groups. The Flora Group's first meeting is to be published as a CAFF Technical Report since it was not just a working meeting but rather a workshop with prepared papers. It was noted that a technical report implies much more rigour in writing and publication than meeting minutes which tend to have a more limited audience.

***Decision:***

- *The minutes of the last CSWG meeting will be included in the upcoming seabird bulletin*
- *Further discussion and approval of the CSWG activities will be conducted at CAFF IX.*

The next CSWG meeting proposed for Tromsø in October 2002.

## **10. CAFF Flora Group**

The U.S. introduced the proceedings of the first CAFF Flora Group workshop held in fall 2001 in Uppsala. There were several recommendations made, including a charter. The charter will have to be revised to reflect the discussions at this meeting. Since this has not been distributed before and there are several action items in it, it was suggested that this item be tabled at CAFF IX.

***Decision:***

*All agree to defer discussion/approval of action items until CAFF IX.*

## **11. CAFF Overview Recommendations Re-visited**

The CAFF Secretariat introduces the recommendations which were revised according to yesterday's discussion. The number of recommendations was reduced from 16 to 13. After further discussion, the Secretariat agreed to revise the comments and present them to the meeting in the afternoon session.

## **12. Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program – CBMP (Iceland)**

Iceland spoke to the status report tabled (BMI-02/10-1). Two new network coordinators have been identified: Stanislav Belikov of Russia for polar bears and Bart Ebbinge of the Netherlands for geese. Only the "wetlands network" is without a coordinator, however, this last one is a bit different from the species-based networks. Canada noted that they made a presentation on a wetlands monitoring network at a Pan-arctic Remote Sensing

workshop in Whitehorse but that it received only mixed response. This group will meet again in Svalbard this summer providing an opportunity to revisit this issue. A coordination meeting will be held in Akureyri, Iceland, 11-12 April, 2002, sponsored by the Nordic Council of Ministers.

A small group has been developing a funding application to EU to strengthen the infrastructure of the CBMP and to provide financial support for continued work of the monitoring networks. EU funds are also being sought to prepare a scoping paper for the full CBMP, a paper on linkages with other regional and global observation systems, opportunities for community monitoring, and a prototype meta-database for the CBMP.

Canada suggested that it may be in CAFF's interest to table a one-pager with the SAOs, explaining CAFF's thinking on the monitoring issue and to clarify its relationship with monitoring conducted by AMAP. All agree that such a paper should be prepared and it is suggested that this can be initiated at the upcoming coordination meeting.

***Decision:***

*CAFF will prepare a one-pager clarifying its approach to monitoring and its relationship with AMAP.*

➤ **Linking CPAN and CBMP?**

Norway recommended that CAFF only operate one monitoring program, i.e., combining species- and habitat-based monitoring. Bill Heal noted that there is a need for an multi-level integrated approach since migratory species don't necessarily fit in with site-based monitoring.

➤ **AMAP/CAFF cooperation**

It was noted that the SAOs seem to be interested in integrating CAFF and AMAP monitoring activities. The Secretariat highlighted decisions from the Joint AMAP/CAFF meeting where there was no formal agreement on an Integrated Arctic Monitoring Program. There was agreement, however, that the two Secretariats develop a joint discussion paper stating the ins and outs of such a program. There has been no follow-up on this from either Secretariat.

➤ **Need for a formal Biodiversity Monitoring Group**

Iceland raised the question of whether there was a need for a formal biodiversity monitoring experts group within CAFF. The meeting felt that it was premature to have such a group at this time.

### **13. ECORA (Norway)**

Norway spoke to a status report tabled (BMI-02/11-4) and provided a PowerPoint presentation. Preparing the project brief for submission to the GEF Secretariat had proved to be a great deal of hard work. Currently, three Model Areas are being proposed

for the main phase: Kolguev Island (Nenets AO); Kolyma River Basin (Yakutia/Sakha Republic); and Beringovsky (Chukotka AO). Letters of support have been received from two regional governments but they are still awaiting one from Chukotka. The project management has been very encouraged to see large contributions pledged to the project from Russia.

The current level of funding for the main phase, will probably only suffice to support two Model Areas. Further international funding, in addition to internal funding, will be required to include Beringovsky in the main phase. There was a discussion about the status of funding for this Model Area.

There were questions about the role of indigenous people in implementation of ECORA. It was stressed the RAIPON has been involved in project meetings and the project preparation. In addition, the Model Areas are primarily inhabited by indigenous peoples who will be fully involved in the project implementation.

Norway presented a review of the available funding for ECORA. Canada has already sent in a letter of support; Norway expects to have confirmation of their contribution shortly; Finland expressed the potential to make a contribution. Stanilav Belikov stated that the new Russian NR to CAFF, Vladimir Pischelev, has reached an agreement with Russian funders regarding ECORA although he did not have the details available at this meeting. The Russian Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) has been trying to clear obstacles, which have been in the way of this project. There was a meeting recently between Russian President Putin and Russian scientists. President Putin stated that one of eleven priorities for Russia was the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. As such, 4% of the annual budget will be allocated to scientific work (until recently science received approximately 0.4% of budget.) With this clear commitment from government, MNR is giving priority to conservation projects. Also, MNR has finally finished re-structuring. There are now two ministerial boards relating to CAFF work: Valeri Orlov is head of Biological Resources board; Vladimir Pischelev is head of Protected Areas board.

#### **14. ACIA**

Norway noted that Pol Prestrud has new position with CICERO at University of Oslo but wants to continue with ACIA.

The Secretariat presented an update on ACIA (BMI-02/13-4). A meeting of the ASC was held in Ottawa, in December 2001 (BMI-02/13-1). Some of the writing teams have been very active while others are not as advanced, specifically the fishing, hunting and gathering, and forestry chapters. First drafts of all chapters should be ready for this May in time for next ASC in Oslo, June 2-4. The writing process is on-track and no real input required from CAFF at this point.

AMAP and CAFF are responsible for preparing an ACIA policy document which will highlight policy implications of ACIA with recommendations to Arctic governments on

how to mitigate impacts of climate change. A joint strategy for preparing the policy document was submitted to SAOs. Two scenarios were presented: for active involvement of SAOs or passive involvement. SAOs opted for the second option. There is a need to update the strategy document before next SAO meeting. It was recommended that the CAFF Chair discuss this with the AMAP Chair. The Executive Secretaries can then pursue this further among themselves, if needed.

There may be an opportunity to seek GEF funds to support Russian portion of the ACIA process. At the December meeting, a small team drafted PDF-A application to GEF to prepare Medium Sized Project (BMI-02/13-2). The purpose of the application is to ensure that Russian observation systems are able to provide the necessary information for the ACIA, and to ensure that all necessary Russian information can be obtained for the impact section of assessment. An application has been drafted and is with Russian GEF focal point awaiting signature (BMI-02/13-3). AMAP will be implementing agency on the western side.

***Decision:***

- *CAFF must identify representatives for the policy document writing team by CAFF IX.*
- *The current CAFF Executive Secretary may attend the June meeting on behalf of either CAFF or Iceland and the AMAP Chair.*

**15. CAFF Overview Recommendations – Draft 3**

The Secretariat introduced a revised draft of the recommendations from the overview report. He emphasised that the drafting work had only focussed on the wording of the recommendations and goal statements. He asked for agreement-in-principle on the goals and recommendations before the end of this meeting. The meeting provided the Secretariat with some further comments on the recommendations.

***Decision***

*The Secretariat will prepare a fully revised draft of the recommendations. All participants are asked to submit any comments on the supporting text.*

**16. Preparations for Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting**

The Chair introduced the requirements for the SAO meeting, including a tentative work plan. The Secretary introduced a tentative list of deliverables for the October Ministerial which must be given to SAO meeting in May. The meeting reviewed the list and identified those items which should be presented as separate items and those which will just be part of the CAFF report. The overview recommendations, the ECORA project, the CAVM, the Sacred Sites final report, and the CBMP should all be highlighted. The CAFF report will present the biodiversity status reports; biodiversity EU proposal; ACIA policy framework; ACIA GEF application; CAFF website; CSWG harvest report; CAFF communications strategy and operating guidelines; murre banding plan; CSWG bulletin 3; murre monitoring; murre climate change paper; Flora workshop report; and the GLOBE project. It was further agreed that there should be displays of the murre poster; CPAN values brochure; CAVM; and the overview report and recommendations.

**Decision:**

- *The Secretariat will circulate a draft report for a quick review. The report will be forwarded to the SAOs by May 1.*
- *A joint CAFF-AMAP statement will be made available to SAOs in May.*

➤ **Organisation for CAFF IX (Chair)**

The Chair noted that CAFF IX has been moved to the last week of August at the Abisko Research Station in Sweden. In response to a question about a Board Meeting, it was decided to set aside one-half day for this in advance of the main CAFF meeting. It was noted that CAPN was considering holding a subsidiary meeting right before CAFF IX and that other groups may wish to do the same. It was suggested that both ACIA and ECORA could be major themes for the meeting. In addition, all four groups of CAFF (CPAN EG, CSWG, Flora, and CBMP) should have their intended work plans ready for discussion at CAFF IX.

**Decision:**

*CAFF IX will begin on the afternoon of 27 August with a half-day Board Meeting and continue through August 30. An optional excursion is planned for 31 August.*

## **17. Co-operation with Other Bodies**

➤ **AMAP**

The Executive Secretary introduced this item and noted that co-operation with AMAP has already been discussed at this meeting with respect to monitoring and the ACIA policy document.

➤ **PAME**

The Executive Secretary introduced Soffia Gudmundsdottir, Executive Secretary of PAME. There have been discussions with PAME over opportunities for collaboration with CAFF, and particularly with CPAN on the marine compendium.

Soffia Gudmundsdottir informed that PAME will meet next week in Reykjavik to prepare for the October Ministerial and develop a draft work plan. There is a proposal to restructure PAME to work more like CAFF does, i.e., with Expert Groups. It has been suggested that one or two experts from PAME participate on CPAN. The Executive Secretary will meet with the heads of delegation to see whether there is interest in this and which countries might be interested in participating on CPAN.

With respect to ACIA, there is some opportunity for PAME to be involved. PAME was invited to participate in drafting of policy document but this has not taken place yet.

Currently PAME is not working on any projects, but are revising their oil and gas guidelines, and their legal framework document. In addition, they are involved with the

Russian NPA. It is hoped that they will move toward new projects and develop expert groups.

*The Chair thanked the PAME Executive Secretary and noted that she will speak directly with the CPAN Co-Chairs over needs for marine expertise.*

➤ **SDWG**

The CAFF Chair has attended each SDWG meeting and will attend next one in advance of SAO meeting.

➤ **EPPR**

A representative of EPPR attended the August 2001 CAFF board meeting. EPPR has drafted a marine sensitivity map but it is still classified so CAFF does not have access to it.

➤ **IUCN**

IUCN has prepared a book (Nowland, L. 2001. Arctic Legal Regime for Environmental Protection. IUCN Environmental Policy and Law Paper No. 44.) on legislative frameworks which the CAFF Chair contributed to

➤ **GLOBE Program**

GLOBE is an worldwide learning program focussing on monitoring of seasonal markers. The Icelandic co-ordinator of GLOBE sent CAFF letter requesting support and input to the GLOBE Arctic workshop being held in Akureyri this year. They were requesting that CAFF their name and logo for use in its announcements. They noted that there would be no financial implications to this since the workshop is already fully funded.

***Decision:***

*CAFF supports the use of CAFF logo in connection with the GLOBE workshop.*

➤ **WWF Arctic Programme**

The CAFF Chair and CAFF Arctic char network coordinator, Johan Hammar, attended a WWF ecoregions meeting.

➤ **Nordic Council**

The Chair noted that he is now working with the Nordic Council as a secretary for its Nature, Culture and Outdoor Working Group. The message coming from the Nordic Council is that there needs to be more work at the borders. The Nordic Action Plan provides an opportunity to join forces. They make it clear that they do not want to duplicate CAFF work.

Iceland noted that the Nordic Council has already incorporated CAFF seabird actions into their plan. As a result, the Nordic Council is helping to finance some seabird work. Also, the by-catch issue has been highlighted by the Nordic Council and they are trying to find money to fund this project.

➤ **Other**

A letter has been received from Bart Ebbinge, coordinator of goose specialist network seeking funding for the proposal, “Pristine wilderness: Unravelling the riddles of the Siberian High Arctic Tundra Ecosystem with special reference to reserve management, local awareness and ecotourism.” There was a discussion that CAFF is not a funding agency and that if CAFF supports one such proposal there will likely be many other requests. It was strongly felt that any surplus funds should be reserved for CAFF projects.

***Decision:***

*CAFF decided to decline Bart Ebbinge’s request for funding for the proposal “Pristine Wilderness.”*

**17. Secretariat**

The Executive Secretary introduces the Secretariat report (BMI-02/16-1). The Secretariat budget is in good shape this year and it is anticipated that there will be a surplus.

The CAFF Secretariat managed three sub-activities of ECORA: on-going international and national projects in Russian Arctic; overview of best practices for integrated ecosystem management; and draft training program for the main phase. It was suggested that the first two activities might be worth publishing as CAFF Technical Reports. They are currently only available on the ECORA web site and GRID-Arendal does not have plans to publish them.

***Decision:***

*CAFF agreed that the two reports should be refined and tabled at CAFF IX for potential publication.*

The \$24K shortfall on the overview report (due to extra costs in graphics) was subsumed in Secretariat report. 250 copies of overview report have been sold (approx. \$4K). It was proposed that the Secretariat carries cost of overview recommendations (approx. \$6K) and that Edita in Finland be approached to publish the report.

A further proposal was made to give \$5K to the CPAN values brochure to help cover the costs of printing.

***Decision:***

*CAFF approved the Secretariat paying the cost of publishing the recommendations and giving \$5K to the printing of the CPAN values brochure.*

Iceland asked whether there is a need for more technical staff at the Secretariat. The reply is that for the Secretariat to be efficient, it would be good to have one good all-round person to assist Secretary, rather than technical person. This person would function as a deputy secretary.

Iceland asked how much time the ECORA project will take from the Secretariat, if it goes through? The Secretary replied that this must be principled decision by NRs, but if the CAFF Secretariat is to be a CAFF focal point for the ECORA project it will demand significant personal resources.. Norway notes that if it is to be a CAFF project then there is a need for a dedicated person to follow the entire process, i.e., a CAFF focal point. A decision on how to involve CAFF, however, cannot be made in advance of a decision from GEF. This should be known by CAFF IX.

***Decision:***

*CAFF's involvement in the ECORA project will be reviewed at CAFF IX.*

➤ **Change with CAFF Executive Secretary**

The Chair noted that Snorri Baldursson will be leaving Secretariat on May 31. Hiring of a replacement is being co-ordinated between Iceland, the CAFF Chair, and the Vice Chair. Iceland provided an update of the hiring procedure. The Executive Secretary also noted that he may be available for the transition period. The Icelandic Ministry of Environment asked whether Secretariat could be moved to Reykjavik, partly because of the incoming AC to Iceland. For the time being, however, the Secretariat will remain in Akureyri. It was proposed that the job notice be mounted on the CAFF website.

***Decision:***

*The notice for the position of CAFF Executive Secretary will be mounted on the CAFF website.*

➤ **Next Vice-Chair**

Esko Jaakola, Finland has offered to take on the role of next Vice-Chair.

➤ **Millennium Ecosystem Assessment**

WCMC will distribute information on this for CAFF to consider and discuss at CAFF IX.

➤ **Impacts of Climate Change Workshop - Polar Region Session**

The representative for UNEP noted that this workshop will take place in early April 2003 in Norwich, UK and asked whether there is an interest from CAFF to participate. There is a need for a chair for the polar session. Also, ideas are needed for presenters and presentations very soon (end April).

**Close of Meeting**



## Appendix 1: List of Participants

### **Aevar Petersen**

Icelandic Institute of Natural History  
P.O. Box 5320  
125 Reykjavik  
Iceland

Tel: + 354 562 9822  
Fax: + 354 562 0815  
Email: [aevar@ni.is](mailto:aevar@ni.is)

### **Bryndís Kjartnasdóttir**

Ministry for Foreign Affairs  
First Secretary  
Raudararstigur 25  
150 Reykjavik  
Iceland

Tel: +354 560 9900  
Fax: +354 562 2373  
Email: [bryndis.kjartansdottir@utn.stjr.is](mailto:bryndis.kjartansdottir@utn.stjr.is)

### **Christoph Zoeckler**

World Conservation Monitoring Center  
219 Huntington Road  
CB3 0DL Cambridge  
UK

Tel: + 44 1223 277 314  
Fax: + 44 1223 277 136  
Email: [cristoph.zoeckler@wcmc.org.uk](mailto:cristoph.zoeckler@wcmc.org.uk)

### **John Crump**

IPS  
Executive Secretary  
P.O. Box 2151, Pilestræde 52  
DK 1016 Copenhagen  
Denmark

Tel: +45 33 69 34 62  
Fax: + 45 33 69 34 99  
E-mail: [jpc@ghsdk.dk](mailto:jpc@ghsdk.dk)

### **Kevin McCormick**

Environment Canada  
5204 50th Avenue  
Suite 301  
X1A 1E2 Yellowknife, NT  
Canada

Tel: + 1 867 669 4760  
Fax: + 1 867 873 8185  
Email: [kevin.mccormick@ec.gc.ca](mailto:kevin.mccormick@ec.gc.ca)

### **Berit Lein**

Directorate for Nature Management  
Tungasletta 2  
N 7005 Trondheim  
Norway

Tel: + 47 73 58 05 00  
Fax: + 47 73 58 05 01  
Email: [berit.lein@dirnat.no](mailto:berit.lein@dirnat.no)

### **Bill Heal**

University of Edinburgh, School of Agriculture  
West Mains Road  
EH9 3JG Edinburgh  
UK

Tel: + 44 1968 674 927  
Fax: + 44 1968 674 927  
Email: [o.w.heal@ed.ac.uk](mailto:o.w.heal@ed.ac.uk)

### **Gunn-Britt Retter**

Technical Advisor  
P.O. Box 2151, Pilestræde 52  
DK 1016 Copenhagen  
Denmark

Tel: +45 33 69 34 26  
Fax: + 45 33 69 34 99  
E-mail: [gbr@ghsdk.dk](mailto:gbr@ghsdk.dk)

### **Kenton Wohl**

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
1011 East Tudor Road  
99053 Alaska, Anchorage  
USA

Tel: + 1 907 786 3503  
Fax: + 1 907 786 3641  
Email: [Kent\\_Wohl@mail.fws.gov](mailto:Kent_Wohl@mail.fws.gov)

### **Mikhail Todishev**

RAIPON Secretariat  
Office 527, Building 2  
Prospect Vernadskogo 37,  
Moscow, 117415  
Russia

Tel/Fax: + 7 (095) 930-44-68  
Email: [mtodishev@mail.ru](mailto:mtodishev@mail.ru)



**Outi Mahonen**

International Affairs Unit, Ministry of the  
Environment  
C/O Lapland Regional Environment Center, P.O.  
Box 8060  
FIN-96101 Rovaniemi  
Finland

Tel: +358 16 329 4444  
Fax: +358 16 310 340  
Email: [outi.mahonen@ymparisto.fi](mailto:outi.mahonen@ymparisto.fi)

**Soffia Gudmundsdottir**

PAME International Secretariat  
Hafnarstraeti 97  
600 Akureyri  
Iceland

Tel: +354 461 1355  
Fax: +354 462 3390  
Email: [pame@pame.is](mailto:pame@pame.is)

**Stefan Norris**

Head of Conservation  
WWF International Arctic Program  
P.O. Box 6784, St. Olavs Plass,  
0130 Oslo  
Norway

Tel: +47-22 03 65 02  
Fax: +47-22 20 06 66  
Email: [snorris@wwf.no](mailto:snorris@wwf.no)

**Tiina Kurvits**

Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
200 Kent Street  
K1A 0E6, Ottawa, Ontario  
Canada

Tel: +1 613 990 1575  
Fax: +1 613 990 8249  
Email: [KurvitsT@DFO-MPO.GC.CA](mailto:KurvitsT@DFO-MPO.GC.CA)

**Snorri Baldursson**

Executive Secretary CAFF  
Hafnarstraeti 97  
600 Akureyri  
Iceland

Tel: +354 462 3350  
Fax: +354 462 3390  
Email: [snorri@caff.is](mailto:snorri@caff.is)

**Stanislav Belikov**

All Russian Research Institute for Nature  
Protection Ministry of Environment Protection  
and Natural Resources  
Znamenskoe-Sadki  
113628 M 628 Moscow  
Russia

Tel: +7 095 423 84 44  
Fax: +7 095 423 23 22  
Email:

**Sune Sohlberg**

Swedish Environmental Protection Agency  
Natural  
Resources Department  
Blekholsmerrassen 36  
S-106 48 Stockholm  
Sweden

Tel: + 46 8 698 13 36  
Fax: + 46 8 698 10 42  
Email: [sune.sohlberg@environ.se](mailto:sune.sohlberg@environ.se)

