

Arctic Council
Meeting of Senior Arctic Officials
DRAFT MINUTES
12-13 April 2007
Tromsø, Norway

In Attendance:

Senior Arctic Officials

Chair: Karsten Klepsvik

Canada: Adele Dion

Denmark: Mikaela Engell

Finland: Erik Ulfstedt

Iceland: Thorir Ibsen

Norway: Robert Kvile

Russian Federation: Alexander Ignatiev

Sweden: Helena Ödmark

United States: Julia L. Gourley

Permanent Participant HoDs

AAC: Chief Gary Harrison

AIA: Victoria Gofman

GCI: Mary Ann Ross

ICC: Patricia Cochran – IPS Chair

RAIPON: Pavel Sulyandziga

Saami Council: Stefan Mikaelsson

AAC: Arctic Athabaskan Council

AIA: Aleut International Association

GCI: Gwich'in Council International

ICC: Inuit Circumpolar Council

RAIPON: Russian Arctic Indigenous Peoples of the North

SC: Saami Council

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

The Chair of the Senior Arctic Officials, Mr. Karsten Klepsvik gave the welcoming address and opened the meeting.

State Secretary Liv Monica Bargem Stubholt gave opening remarks which focused on the human dimension of Arctic communities, integrated oceans management and climate change.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was approved. Item 9.3 was moved to last point before lunch on 13th. SDWG presentation was moved up to the first day.

Item 3: Approval of Observers

Applications from Italy and the Peoples Republic of China as observers, and the EU Commission as an ad hoc observer to the Tromsø meeting had been received and circulated in advance of the meeting. No objections were received.

Decisions:

1. Italy and the People's Republic of China may participate as ad-hoc observers to the SAO and WG meetings until a formal decision is made at the next Ministerial meeting. The EU Commission was welcomed as an observer to the Tromsø meeting.

Item 4: Arctic Council Secretariat

A Secretariat has been established in Tromsø for the Norwegian, Danish and Swedish chairmanships over the next 6 years. Two of the three new staff of the Secretariat were introduced. Jesper Hansen will be responsible for the website, and IT. A tour of the offices was given during the lunch break.

Item 5: Update on the Arctic Council Working Group Activities

Reports from the Working Groups were distributed before the meeting. These reports and the accompanying Power Point Presentations can be found on the AC website.

5.1 ACAP- Arctic Contaminants Action Programme

Presentation was given by Mr. Bob Dyer, Chair of ACAP (*United States*)

Discussion:

1. The United States expressed concern that AMAP recommended ACAP to do work outside member state countries. Clarification was given by AMAP that trans-boundary transport into the Arctic originates, in some cases, outside the Arctic. One example is China. China is becoming an observer in part to facilitate the work on trans-boundary pollution transport.
2. Regarding NEFCO as a co-chair of the ACAP PCB Project Steering Group (PSG), concern was expressed that all other PSG chairs are country representatives. NEFCO is an observer. ACAP Chair clarified that NEFCO is doing a parallel project on PCBs, and NEFCO is one of 3 co-chairs for this PSG along with Russia and USA.
3. Russia encouraged ACAP to cooperate closely with international financial organizations in order to attract additional funding.
4. Russia discussed the Integrated Hazardous Waste Management Strategy of Rostekhnadzor, encouraging support from other AC member states, as it serves as a basis for application in PCB and obsolete pesticide treatment and destruction.

Decisions:

1. NEFCO remains as a co-chair of ACAP PCB Project Steering Group.

5.2 AMAP – Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme

Presentation was given by John Calder, Chair of the AMAP (*United States*)

Discussion:

1. The United States encouraged cooperation between SDWG and AMAP – requested further clarification on the scope of the health assessment. AMAP will provide more detail in an expanded outline of the health assessment.
2. The United States expressed concern whether the Arctic Council through AMAP/ACAP is the right venue for addressing trans-boundary contaminants in relation to health issues. Or is this more applicable or appropriate to take up in other international organizations? AMAP clarified that as a part of its mandate, AMAP historically has looked at sources that impact the Arctic. It is not possible to ignore developments that impact the Arctic, such as in China.
3. Sweden requested clarification on how the Oil and Gas Assessment will be presented to the Arctic Council SAOs and Ministers. Findings should not bypass the SAOs because the report did not make the original Ministerial deadline. Chair of SAOs stated that perhaps the main launching of the Oil and Gas Assessment is a main role of the Chair. AMAP reinforced that the SAOs will receive the presentation first; and then that the AC should seize opportunities as they come up to showcase the O&G Assessment, for example at international conferences and meetings like the Arctic Frontiers Conference 20-25 January 2008 in Tromsø.
4. Regarding Acidification and Arctic Haze, Sweden asked for an update on how AMAP envisions to pursue further work on Arctic haze and the linkages to climate change. AMAP clarified that the further work on climate change will be the way acidification is incorporated in future research.
5. On CAFF/AMAP cooperation – SAOs expressed the wish to see the difficulties overcome. AMAP stated that AMAP and CAFF are holding a joint meeting of the heads of delegation in September in Copenhagen, to discuss joint monitoring. Cooperation is proceeding.
6. Sweden stated that human health issues should be high on the AC agenda in the coming years. There should be an in-depth discussion within the AC on how to move all the various aspects of health related issues within the AC forward, regardless of which Working Group is organizing the project. Canada is looking forward to co-lead with Denmark on the human health assessment. AMAP is involved in the health coordination.
7. Support was expressed by member states and PPs for AMAP validating the work of ACAP through continued AMAP monitoring.
8. Statement from RAIPON on the interrelationship between the Oil and Gas Assessment and the livelihoods of the indigenous peoples in the North. Concerns expressed over the lack of involvement of RAIPON and Russian experts in some research projects. Chair of SAOs stated that involvement of PPs in AC projects is highly relevant, but with certain domestic issues, these may fall outside the mandate and scope of responsibilities of the AC. AMAP stated that they rely on RAIPON for many experts, but if something is not being done, or needs improvement, RAIPON should notify AMAP. Case studies are often included which address the concerns expressed by RAIPON.

Decisions:

1. Regarding trans-boundary pollution, and sources outside the Arctic, this topic will be put on the agenda for further in-depth discussion at a future meeting.
2. Oil and Gas Assessment launch is in the hands of the SAOs. The tentative plan for public release of the O&G Assessment will be presented at the next SAO meeting, and as much time as needed will be set aside for this discussion. One possible option for public release will be the Arctic Frontiers conference 20-25 January 2008 in Tromsø.

5.3 CAFF - Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna

Presentation was given by Inge Thaulow, Chair of CAFF (*Greenland*)

Discussion:

1. Regarding the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP), Finland stressed that the overview document of the implementation plan is very ambitious and needs support from all countries and PPs. This project needs to be coordinated with the 2010 Arctic Biodiversity Assessment (ABA). Finland also noted that they have offered to be one of the lead countries of the ABA, but urged other countries which have more substantial parts of the Arctic biodiversity to be in the leadership of this Assessment. Strong participation of the PPs should be reflected in the workplan.
2. Arctic Athabaskan Council (AAC) expressed concern and disappointment that the ABA work plan will not be approved at this meeting. AAC and Gwich'in Council International (GCI) encouraged using the intercessional process to approve the work plan.
3. Canada reiterated appeal for other countries to contribute financially to the CBMP. Finland noted that it has reserved some financial support for the CBMP this year.
4. The United States welcomed the CBMP overview document and noted that CAFF has been very productive these past years.
5. Russia noted contributions to CAFF through ECORA, and in-kind contributions.
6. RAIPON noted the successful completion of the Sacred Sites Workshop in Salekhard April 2007 and thanked Canada for co-financing. Looking forward to contributing to the ABA.
7. Saami Council is planning a project for community based monitoring. This project will be carried out in close cooperation with EALAT. Want to see more emphasis on value of traditional livelihoods, and sacred sites.
8. Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC) recommended that the IPY studies be incorporated into the ABA work plan, including sustainable use and socioeconomics, for a balanced approach.
9. Oceana expressed interest in becoming an AC Observer. Expressed interest in Arctic ecosystems, threats to biodiversity and adaptation to climate change. Would like to see development of recommendations on ways to maintain resiliency in the Arctic.
10. Chair urged member states to consider the possibility to become a lead country of Circumpolar Protected Area Network (CPAN).

11. Chair urged member states to consider the possibility to become lead country of the ABA.
12. SAOs are asked to assist with funding the boreal forest mapping project which was supported by AC Ministers in the 2004 Reykjavik Declaration.

Decisions:

No decisions taken.

5.4 EPPR – Emergency Prevention Preparedness and Response

Presentation was given by Mr. Jan Nerland, Executive Secretary of EPPR (*Norway*)

Discussion:

1. Russia noted the project “Development of security systems for implementation of economic and infrastructure projects in the Arctic” presented to PAME in August 2006. It is expected that this project will be introduced to the next EPPR meeting. Russia requests consideration of a project on accident prevention in the context of oil development and transportation from the new Russian terminal “Varandey” in the Barents Sea.

Decisions:

No decisions taken

5.5 PAME – Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment

Presentations were given by Mr. Chris Cuddy, Chair of PAME (*Canada*) and Mr. Lawson Brigham, Vice Chair of PAME and Chair of the Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment

Discussion:

1. The United States emphasized the importance of the shipping assessment and encouraged full participation of all Arctic states in the AMSA and look forward to having it completed under the Norwegian chairmanship.
2. Russia expressed high appreciation for the PAME report and is prepared to participate in chapters 2, 6 and 8 in the shipping assessment. PAME will be informed as to the format of their participation.
3. Norway expressed that they would discuss how they would engage in Chapter 6 of AMSA on environmental impacts.
4. Denmark expressed interest in being a co-lead author for Chapter 7 on social and economic impacts.
5. Canada echoed the intervention by the United States on AMSA and encouraged other countries to follow Canada, Finland, and the United States in contributing both expertise and funding to ensure that AMSA be a truly circumpolar endeavor.
6. Norway stated that they will look into how they will engage in AMSA.
7. The Saami Council expressed appreciation for the PAME report and the efforts of the AMSA team to actively involve the Indigenous Peoples in this assessment through outreach venues such as the convening of Townhall meetings. The Saami Council plans to convene Townhall meetings in northern Norway. These efforts

- are of great importance to the Saami as increased shipping poses threats to their livelihoods as coastal people.
8. ICC stated that AMSA is a very important issue and noted interests in convening Townhall meetings in Greenland.
 9. Iceland noted the growing importance to the work of PAME, and informed the Meeting that Iceland will contribute a co-lead author to Chapter 8 of AMSA. Iceland summarized the highlights of the Breaking the Ice conference in Akureyri, North Iceland.

Decisions:

No decisions taken

5.6 SDWG – Sustainable Development Working Group

Presentation was given by Mr. Stein Rosenberg, Chair of the SDWG (*Norway*)

Chair noted the difficulty in presenting to SAOs when the SDWG meeting is held only the day before.

However noted the advantage to participants in reduced travel costs. Chair noted the broad mandate of SDWG.

Presentation on EALAT was given by Mr. Anders Oskal, Association of World Reindeer Herders, and International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry

Presentation on SLiCA was given by Mr. Birger Poppel, Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic and Ilisimatusarfik, University of Greenland.

Discussion:

1. Russia brought the SDAP (Sustainable Development Action Plan) forward and encouraged participation by all Working Groups to complete this format, with the purpose of identifying key gaps more easily. Reminded that WGs are to submit reports in this required format after each SAO meeting.
2. The United States stated that papers from nearly all of the member states have been received for the Energy Summit.
3. The United States, Denmark, Canada, ICC, Saami Council and RAIPON voiced support for a full briefing on SLiCA, ECONOR and Arctic Social Indicators at a future SAO meeting.
4. Canada will participate in efforts to develop a discussion paper for the way forward with AMAP and SDWG on Arctic human health.
5. ICC and RAIPON raised issue of funding of PP participation in WG projects. This issue needs to be an issue of discussion for the next agenda.

Decisions:

1. SAOs endorse ECONOR II and grant approval to proceed
2. SAOs endorse EALAT and grant approval to proceed
3. The United States and Canada are to be co-leads and consult during the summer on a discussion paper on human health to be presented to the SAOs at the November 2007 meeting.

4. Note SDWG comment on the need to include PPs in projects of special interest to them, and the necessity to provide funding for this. This item will be put on the next agenda.

Item 6: Integrated Oceans Management

Presentation was given by Mr. Alf Håkon, University of Tromsø

Discussion:

1. General discussion on content, outline, scope and implementation of the proposed project. Some member states stated that it was outside the scope of the AC to engage in academic studies of comparisons of domestic programs. Iceland requested additional time to submit comments.
2. ICC recommended better inclusion of indigenous participation as lead authors and co-authors.
3. Sweden stated that it did not consider its marine management activities to be of “oceanic” character.

Decisions:

1. Project proposal was edited during lunch, and re-reviewed in plenary. Member states were given additional time of 3 weeks for in-country review based on the text changes made during the SAO meeting.
2. The title of the project proposal was changed to “Best Practices in Ecosystems Based Ocean Management in the Arctic”.

Item 7: Follow-up on Climate Change

7.1 Climate Change and the Cryosphere

Presentation was given by Mr. Jan-Gunnar Winther, director of the Norwegian Polar Institute

Discussion:

1. Norway proposes a thorough assessment of the research in the science community which will lead to a better understanding of climate change. Norway reiterated this is not a new ACIA, and not duplicative of IPY or IPCC.
2. Member states generally commented there is mandate and obligation to follow up on the findings of the ACIA report.
3. IASC stated it is important to make sure this project is well linked with what is happening now in the scientific community, and IASC offered to help make these linkages. This offer was well received and appreciated by the SAOs.
4. Denmark holds special interest in the Greenland Ice Sheet and offered to lead this subproject.
5. Sweden expressed possibility for leading permafrost and snow cover subproject in cooperation with others, but this requires further clarification.

6. Norway will lead on sea ice subproject.
7. The United States stated that it could not join consensus to allow this project to go forward given that: 1) the proposal was insufficiently clear and appeared to be duplicative of existing and on-going climate change work; 2) the project could not in any way become an “assessment” nor a second ACIA; and 3) the proposal was distributed far too late for SAOs to be able to fully analyze it.
8. The chairman of the SAOs proposed that the proposal be given to AMAP for examination by the Climate Experts Group at its September meeting, and that the AMAP-revised proposal be taken up again at the Fall SAO meeting. The United States agreed to this, but reserved its position stating that it will decide, upon examination of the AMAP-revised proposal, whether it will be able to join consensus in allowing the project to go forward. The United States also urged AMAP and the chairmanship to get the revised proposal out to SAOs in a timely manner to allow for a full vetting in capitals prior to the Fall SAO meeting.

Decisions:

1. AMAP will take the lead on this project. AMAP will revise the Norwegian proposal in consultation with others who are interested to participate and merge it with the AMAP proposal presented under item 7.3. Comments are to be returned to AMAP no later than 1 June.
2. Progress report will be given at the next SAO meeting

7.2 Adaptation

Presentation was given by Stein Rosenberg, Chair of SDWG

Discussion:

1. Discussed in-depth at the SDWG meeting and conclusion was that more time is needed to formalize this Norwegian project proposal.
2. IASC offered to assist in identifying experts.
3. Russia stated that the national policies coordination and measures on adaptation to climate change, the joint research programs and use of modern technologies meet their interests.

Decisions:

1. An intercessional process is approved for the approval of this project.
 - a. Encourage all member states and PPs to send comments by 24 May, and to nominate a contact person for this project.
 - b. An SDWG telephone conference will be scheduled to discuss the comments
 - c. Norway will prepare a re-draft by 7 June.
 - d. A second telephone conference will be scheduled, if needed, to discuss the new proposal.
 - e. Norway will distribute a revised proposal to SAOs by 20 June.
 - f. Final comments by SAOs due 9 July.

7.3 Other WG projects on climate change

Presentation was given by Mr. John Calder, Chair of AMAP on Cryosphere project.

Discussion:

1. CAFF is addressing ACIA follow-up primarily through the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program and community-based monitoring, in cooperation with PPs and indigenous communities.
2. PAME is addressing ACIA follow-up primarily through the Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment and the Regional Programme of Action.

Decisions:

See item 7.1

Item 8: Arctic Council Activities in support for the International Polar Year

- a. Presentation was given by Mr. David Carlson, International Programme Office
- b. Tour de table on IPY Launch Events
- c. Highlights of Arctic Science Summit Week. Presentation given by Volker Rachold, Executive Secretary of IASC
- d. Presentation on a Sustained Arctic Observing Network (SAON) by John Calder, Chair of AMAP. The work on creating a SAON is undertaken in response to the call from Ministers in Salekhard, and is intended to be a major AC contribution to the IPY legacy.

Discussion:

1. IPY proposed formalizing a relationship between IPY and IPS to provide guidance to the researchers, and to assist with education and outreach. Chair of IPS spoke in support of this proposal.
2. IPY made suggestion to attempt the cooperation between CAFF's Arctic Biodiversity Assessment and the project leaders of the biodiversity-related projects within IPY. This may lead to opportunities for funding the ABA from outside sources. Sweden encouraged CAFF to pursue this idea.
3. Several member states reported on the domestic celebrations held for the official opening of IPY.
4. Canada informed on their IPY launch activities. Canada has invested \$150 million in its 6 year (2006-12) National IPY Program which features two components - science and research with a focus on climate change impacts and adaptation, and health and well-being of northern communities. There were broad-based responses to Canada's call for proposals from universities, government departments, northern colleges, other northern institutions, and from Aboriginal organizations - 116 related to climate change impacts and adaptation; and 31 related to health and well-being of northern communities. A total of 44 projects have been approved and were officially announced at Canada's IPY launch held at the National Museum of Civilization on March 1, 2007 where scientists, students,

- First Nation leaders, federal Ministers and representatives from all its territorial governments were in attendance. A Northern Canada delegation also attended the IPY International Launch at the Palais de la Decouverte in Paris, which included a celebration at the Canadian Museum of Civilization, Quebec; and a Yukon celebration in Whitehorse.
5. Iceland informed that the Arctic Portal would be used as a venue for IPY projects and it has been used for webcasting many of the IPY launch celebrations. The Arctic Portal will contribute to the legacy of the IPY. Special attention will be paid to IPY projects in schools and for the general public.
 6. Sweden offered the website www.ipy.se and offered to post IPY links on this site.
 7. Indigenous Peoples IPY launched EALAT in Kautokeino with 600 participants. Launch webcast on Arctic Portal.
 8. Denmark, Greenland, and Faroe Islands and Iceland held a joint launch event with a lecture series. Youngest scientist was a Greenlandic woman, a perfect symbol of the IPY.
 9. Arctic Council is represented by AMAP in SAON and AMAP is speaking on behalf of all Working Groups.

Decisions:

No decisions taken

Item 9: Presentations from Delegations, Observers and Invited Guests***9.1 The Saami People and the Work of the Saami Council***

Presentation was given by Gunn-Britt Retter, Saami Council

9.2 Global Outlook for Ice and Snow

Presentation was given by Katherine Johnson of UNEP

The project will be presented on World Environment Day 2007.

9.3 Northern Dimension and the Arctic Council

Presentation was given by Ambassador Percy Westerlund, EC Delegation, Norway and Iceland

Short presentation on the status of the work of the Northern Dimension and the relevance for the Arctic Council (*text can be found on AC website*)

Discussion:

1. The AC Chair noted that the AC has status of participant in the Northern Dimension
2. Denmark gratified the Northern Dimension is now more formalized which speaks well for future cooperation with Arctic countries.
3. RAIPON expressed gratitude to Ambassador Westerlund, mentioning that one of the first results of the ND is to hold a joint international day of IPs in Russia. RAIPON offers cooperation in this project.

4. Arctic Parliamentarians also expressed thanks and noted the prominent European participation in the 6th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, held in Kiruna in August 2006.

Decisions:

No decisions taken

9.4 Presentation of the University of the Arctic

Presentation was given by Mr. Lars Kullerud, University of the Arctic (*text can be found on AC website*)

9.5 Statement on behalf of the Observer States

Presentation was given by Jakub T. Wolski, Poland (*text can be found on AC website*)

Item 10: Organizational/administrative issues***10.1 Organization of the Arctic Council***

Presentation was given by Chief Gary Harrison, Head of Delegation for the Arctic Athabaskan Council

Discussion:

1. Ideas were presented by AAC for re-organizing the Arctic Council including the formation of a task force to focus on functions and issues rather than Working Groups (*text can be found on AC website*)
2. Russia stated that many new cooperation projects are being established. Iceland, the United States, and Sweden encouraged taking a closer look at functions within each Working Group, to improve efficiencies, e.g. SDWG establishing thematic areas.
3. PPs stated that they will step up and show leadership in this area, and stated they feel a lack of power and authority due to lack of resources. They will review the rules of procedure in this regard and contribute to a draft discussion paper.
4. Possible review of rules of procedure is warranted.

Decisions:

1. Based on Ministerial mandate in the Salekhard Declaration, the SAOs will continue to examine the organization of the AC, with a view to improve its effectiveness and efficiency. Norway will make a draft discussion paper that will be circulated for comments. Possible revisions to the AC Rules of Procedure will be addressed. If this process produces something which needs further discussion, it will be added to the agenda of the subsequent SAO meeting.
2. Effectiveness and efficiency review will be a standing item on the SAO agenda from this point forward.

10.2 Endorsement of non Arctic Council activities

Decisions:

1. Discussion on this item is postponed until the next SAO meeting, pending the synthesis of information from each of the Working Groups and Norway's preparation of a draft discussion paper. A review of the use of WG logos and endorsements, implications to SAOs and the AC as a whole will be addressed.

Item 11: Any other business

Farewell to Finnish SAO, Erik Ulfsted

Brief statement by Erik Ulfsted. SAOs expressed congratulations and good wishes in new appointment.

Dates of next meeting were discussed

Decisions:

1. Date of next meeting: 28-29 November, 2007

-end-