

Report/Minutes of the SDWG Regular Meeting

Copenhagen, Denmark, 03-04 March 2010

1. Opening of Meeting

The Meeting Agenda was approved with the addition of a new item 3. (e), an update on the ongoing ICS project, and the removal of item 4. (c) relating to possible follow-up on energy issues. The Minutes of the last SDWG meeting, held on in Copenhagen on 10-11 November 2009, were agreed to.

2. Nuuk Seminar of Hope and Resilience in Suicide Prevention

This item was introduced by Dr. Kue Young, the Co-chair of the Arctic Human Health Expert Group (AHHEG). He advised that considerable work had been undertaken since the last SDWG meeting to prepare of the Report of the seminar which had involved about 100 people including, youth, researchers and policy makers. This final report is to be circulated to the seminar participants in the very near future and subsequently made available to a wider audience. Cecilia Pedersen and Christina Larsen, two graduate students who had been part of the organizing committee for the seminar, had edited the Report. Christina V.L. Larsen is PhD-student at Greenland Institute of Health Research and at the National Institute of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark. Cecilia P. Pedersen is Research Assistant at the National Institute of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark. Ms. Pedersen and Ms. Larsen presented the report to the SDWG meeting.

Their presentation was organized into 4 parts:

- Developments since the seminar and a short overview of the final report
- General Recommendation in the Report
- Facing the challenges – Background for recommendations; and
- Building solutions – Some good examples presented at the seminar

Developments Since the Seminar:

Participants at the seminar have passed along information by word of mouth and through some written and online materials:

- A youth report and reflections by ICYC can be found at www.inuityouth.org;
- A blog was launched at <http://www.ookpik.org/blogs/> ;
- An article was published in the ICC Magazine Alaska (DRUM);
- Generation "I" - Workshop in Alaska: *"The "Hope and Resilience" seminar attributed the positive shift in large part to three factors: affirming the self-worth of Inuit teenagers, promoting a deeper sense of Inupiat cultural identity, and putting youths in contact with positive role models."*

- A documentary of the youth seminar will be available to view in 2010;
- Reflections from the seminar were published in the Norwegian journal on suicidology by Henning Herrestad;
- There will be future follow up meetings for Greenlandic health practitioners based on the final report.

Overview of Final Report:

The Final Report contains:

- Background to the seminar;
- Proceedings by health practitioners, researchers, policy makers and youth delegates;
- Recommendations from the four workshops; and
- The main points from the panel discussion between politicians, policy makers and youth representatives.

General Recommendations:

The recommendations in the Report fall under 4 general themes:

- Youth empowerment and involvement
- Research and documentation
- Local and professional partnerships
- Comprehensive prevention

Facing the challenges—Background for the Recommendations:

The Report noted that there are similarities and differences among the Arctic regions. The history of trauma, social problems, socioeconomic conditions, remoteness, lack of professionals, and so on, are quite similar across the Arctic but there are local and regional differences that are important. This requires that local problems need local solutions; however, international knowledge and cooperation is relevant. Some key observations include:

- (1) ***The Gender Paradox:*** Young men seem to be especially at risk. As one participant observed, young men are "not allowed to have feelings". Young male lack or have underdeveloped coping skills, whereas women seem to have adjusted to changes in society better than men. Women have more caring functions and domestic functions but men have historically been providers.
- (2) ***Lack of opportunities and self esteem among youth:*** There is a need to strengthen self-awareness and the indigenous identity of the youth. Strengthen the feeling of accomplishment as a child and the feeling of being needed were identified as key factors. Openness about problems and strengthen problem solving has to be encouraged. It is necessary for youth to understand that feeling challenged and depressed is a normal part

of life – so youth need to be given tools to better handle these feelings. Creating opportunities and activities for youth is a positive way forward.

Building Solutions

The seminar provided evidence of many great initiatives and projects throughout the Arctic. These examples can inspire solutions to some of the challenges. However, the seminar also reminded participants that they need to make an effort to document what is going on in order to facilitate the exchange of knowledge and experiences in the future. Among the examples of positive initiatives were the following:

- (1) **Greenland Public Debate about sexual abuse of children:** Greenland's has held a public debate about sexual abuse of children and this was emphasized as a good example at the seminar. During recent years different measures have contributed to a more open debate and increased awareness. These include television advertisements condemning sexual abuse (Paarisa); a chat forum for children and youth who have been victims of abuse (MIPI); and social and health research among youth.
- (2) **Mental health care in Sápmi – Norway:** The Sámi National Center for Mental Health Care (SANKS) is a centre with a particular responsibility to develop a mental health service for the Sámi people in Norway. SANKS has a psychiatric team dedicated to Sami youth – (PUT). PUT works with youth from 15-30 years who struggle with substance abuse, gambling and suicidal behaviour. Young people can contact PUT directly or go through doctor. The PUT team use cell phones to interact with young people to arrange therapy and help them right away if they are thinking about committing suicide.
- (3) **Canada: Inuit Wellness Plan and Embrace Life Council:** Alianait provides goals for an effective mental wellness health system to restore the general well-being of Inuit through coherent integrated programs and services for Inuit Nunaat. Mental wellness is conceptualized as an all-inclusive term encompassing mental health, mental illness, suicide prevention, violence reduction, and reduction of substance abuse and addictions. This program was created in 2004 to meet the need of a coordinated initiative in addressing the high suicide rates in Nunavut. *Embrace Life Council* (IIK) is a partnership between several Nunavut groups - the Government of Nunavut, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and others. These groups work together to find solutions that meet real local needs and circumstances. The *Inuusivut Project* is an example of a life-promoting project by Embrace Life. More information can be found at: www.inuusivut.com
- (4) **Alaska: Data based policy and Community Collaboration:** Alaska shared examples of data-based policy initiatives. A study about nearly-fatal suicide attempts called "Means Matter" found most suicide attempts to be impulsive and carried out at home. Access to guns at home raises the risk. A policy solution was sought: safe gun storage at home and safe storage options outside home. Mental health professionals ask about guns in home. The *People Awakening Project* focused on protective factors developed in collaboration with the communities through local initiatives. The result was a "toolbox" of solutions that can be adapted to the specific community. This was cited as a very good example of how research can give back to communities involved.

Concluding Remarks

The recommendations, challenges and possible solutions point towards the need for a comprehensive approach in suicide prevention. It will be necessary to focus on protective factors, mental wellness and mental health rather than hopelessness and death – in other words, a public health perspective. This approach demands from governments in Arctic regions the development of policies to address not only suicide but all aspects of a healthy life with respect for cultural values and especially for indigenous youth.

Discussions:

Several Heads of Delegation commended AHHEG and the seminar organizers for efforts to recognize this issue and begin to move on it. It was noted that this seminar helped move many participants away from hopelessness and helplessness by engaging youth who made a major contribution. It wasn't just the researchers and health professionals who were involved. The SDWG participants expressed a willingness to try to maintain the momentum and to find ways to move forward from this seminar to take a knowledge-to-action approach. It was noted that greater efforts are required to involve the Russian Federation and RAIPON in this work and make use of the Russian data. In addition, it was noted that all efforts should be taken to continue and expand the network which was developed through the organization of this seminar, with special efforts to involve more young men. Canada offered to work with IPS and RAIPON on ensuring translation into Russian of these reports as part of the Outreach and Communication work of the Arctic Council.

3. Project Progress Reports

a. Arctic Energy Summit

The USA reported on this item and advised that the Institute of the North was the implementing project manager. The Final Report has been posted on the SDWG website <http://portal.sdwg.org>. The report covers the three stages of the project and goes into some detail on the papers presented at the conference. The appendices are actually the key part of this report in that they give excellent summaries and identify experts that gave papers on energy issues. These experts come from all 8 Arctic states.

b. ECONOR II

Norway was the lead country on this project. A detailed presentation of the Final Report was given by the editors of the Report who were also the two coordinators of this work: Ms. Iulia Aslaksen and Ms. Solveig Glomsrod.

The ECONOR II report looks at 27 regions in the Arctic from a statistical point of view. One new area which the project examined was a comparison for some regions of the GRP and house-hold income. This report also includes some new information on subsistence economies (Alaska especially). For example, there are graphs on diversity of wild resource harvests in communities in Alaska.

Another element of ECONOR II was a comprehensive study of oil and gas economies in 5 regions: Russian, Canada, Alaska, Norway and Greenland. No environmental factors have been taken into account in this study. Those are not insignificant but are covered in the AMAP oil and gas assessment. There is much demand for information on this subject but the data at the present is still insufficient.

The final reports for both ECONOR I and ECONOR II can be found on the SDWG website <http://portal.sdwg.org>.

During the discussions it was noted that:

- a follow up to this report is still under discussion in Norway;
- as an ongoing contribution to socio-economic dimensions of major Arctic Council assessments, consideration could be given to developing report cards and fact sheets similar to those prepared by AMAP in relation to contaminants, etc. This could be part of the SOS Arctic approach (State of Societies in the Arctic);
- a more permanent arrangement on Arctic statistics is also required and this is in fact in the ECONOR II report as a recommendation that would involve national statistics bureaus. The requirements for implementing this recommendation should be studied further;
- collaboration between ECONOR and ASI could be pursued. Care must be taken in the Arctic about drawing any conclusions based on single year analysis, especially given the boom and bust economies in the North. A data collection team is needed to collect time series on the northern economy, to the extent these are even available;
- the data from this project could be made more readily available for other researchers, through a website for example.

c. Arctic Social Indicators II

Iceland is the lead country on this project. The project coordinator, Dr. Joan Nyman Larsen, advised that the printed version of the phase 1 final report of the Arctic Social Indicators (ASI) would be available very soon. ASI phase II is now "ground-proofing" the indicators developed in phase I by collection of data in relation to them. Cooperation on data issues is therefore very important during this phase of the project.

Dr. Larsen reminded participants that the overall ASI objective (2006-2011) is to facilitate the long-term monitoring of human development in the Arctic. The ASI Phase I objective was to devise a limited set of indicators, reflecting key aspects of human development, tractable in terms of measurement, and monitoring at reasonable cost. The ASI-II Phase II objective is to implement the identified indicators, through testing, validating and refining the indicators across the Arctic, including measuring and performing analyses of select applications, with ultimate goal of long-term monitoring of human development.

During Phase I (2006-2009):

- a set of Arctic Social Indicators were constructed

- the domains were selected
- criteria for selection of indicators were established
- indicators were selected;
- preliminary testing was begun; and
- some recommendations were formulated.

During Phase II (2009-2011):

- data challenges will be explored and addressed
- a tier system will be developed
- indicator measurement will take place
- testing will be initiated
- applications will be considered
- recommendations will be made; and
- ultimately, a monitoring system will be developed.

The six domains chosen for selection of indicators in Phase I were:

- 1) Fate control and or the ability to guide one's own destiny
- 2) Cultural well-being
- 3) Contact with nature or interacting closely with the natural world
- 4) Health and Population
- 5) Material well-being
- 6) Education

Based on these 6 domains, certain indicators were selected. As data collection and quality are realized, the project team has been are confronted by compromises to find indicators that are available at reasonable cost. For example, some of these are indicated below:

Health and Population

- Infant Mortality; Net-migration

Material Well-being

- Per capita household income; Composite index

Education

- Ratio of students successfully completing post-secondary education

Cultural Well-being

- Language retention; culture index

Closeness to Nature

- Harvest of country foods

Fate Control

- Fate Control Index

Phase II is the implementation stage of the project. Among the tasks is the systematic identification and description of data challenges, including data availability and data quality by region for each of the final set of recommended ASI indicators. In addition, efforts will be made to select other and promising Arctic social indicators considered in ASI and to test and validate ASI indicators by region. Other tasks during Phase II include:

- To refine the ASI indicators where needed based on further research, testing, and feedback from northern communities and other arctic stakeholders;
- To conduct a series of regional comparisons and analyses based on measured ASI indicators to illustrate and further test their strength and applicability;
- To formulate recommendations for a long-term monitoring system;
- To present the final results in a format that targets a broad audience and which at the same time makes the report useful in educational instruction in the University of the Arctic and other northern colleges and universities; and
- To work towards developing an ASI monitoring system.

A workshop was held in November 2009 in Roskilde, Denmark to discuss the structure of ASI Phase II report, the selection of applications, the data challenges and the ASI data team. The workshop identified data challenges and organized these under a tier system. Various case studies have been identified. Recommendations will be formulated with some outline of what a model could look like to implement a monitoring system. The next workshop is also scheduled for Roskilde on 05-07 June 2010. This workshop will continue work on ASI-II, in particular, the discussion of problems/challenges encountered, presentation of introductory chapters, presentation of progress on ASI applications, the review process and discussion of implementation of an ASI monitoring system.

[d. Circumpolar Information Toolkit on Minerals and Oil and Gas](#)

Canada is the lead on this project. The project coordinator, Sarah Kennedy, advised that the idea for the project arose from a mining toolkit developed for aboriginal communities in Canada's North. The original proposal was made in 2007 to the SDWG. A steering group comprised of Arctic states and Permanent Participants has been established. Electronic communications on the content of the toolkit have been undertaken. Case studies are being developed. Final revisions will be done over summer and the final report will be table to SDWG at fall meeting in 2010. Canada has been working to ensure that the project is circumpolar in nature. The project is now focusing on minerals rather than oil and gas. Canada advised that a consultant had been retained to assist with the work. The project is on track to produce a 'deliverable' by the end of Danish Chairmanship so that best practices and capacity building experiences can be shared.

[e. Survey of Infectious Diseases \(ICS\)](#)

The USA is the lead on the ICS project and also provided an update on the Arctic Human Health Initiative (AHHI). The next ICS meeting will take place on 24-26 May 2010 in Khanty Mansysk, Russia to talk about tuberculosis. There will be a follow-up meeting on 20-24 September 2010 in Copenhagen. Matters related to monitoring, including health, will be discussed at the State of the Arctic Conference in Miami on March 16, 2010.

On the matter of AHHI, this initiative has now been integrated into the AHHEG process. At the Oslo IPY science meeting in June 2010 human health issues related to the AHHI work will be covered.

4. New Projects

This portion of the agenda was chaired by Co-Vice Chair Carl Christian Olsen.

a. Arctic Indigenous Languages

Canada provided an interim report on this matter and advised that the hoped-for speedy follow-up to the *Arctic Indigenous Languages Symposium* held in Tromso, Norway in October 2008 had not been as possible. However, there have been efforts not to lose momentum. Canada has been working closely with ICC Canada on possible follow-up activities. The Arctic Indigenous Languages Symposium was circumpolar in nature and was complemented by the good attendance. This was a precedent for a project lead by Permanent Participants. Canada has provided funds for the work on preparing follow-up activities. A scoping exercise is looking at what the next steps should be. This work has only recently begun. There are some ideas but the scoping exercise will seek input from others on how to move the work forward. It is hoped that this will lead to a new project. There is an online survey to be answered (see: <http://www.arcticlanguages.com>). There is also a copy of the Symposium proceedings online.

b. Cultural Heritage

Norway reminded participants that this project was first presented in 2008 and then again in 2009. Some amendments have been made to the proposal recently. The project seeks to identify certain sites that have significance beyond national boundaries. The project proposes to develop some principles to clarify the international significance of cultural sites in the Arctic. National protection might already exist for some of these sites. Relevant guidelines from other fora will be taken into account. Best practices for site protection is sought. There is no preconception of which sites will qualify. An expert group is to be established to undertake this work. If the Arctic Council agrees with the list of cultural sites then a common protection plan could be developed. The project coordinators hope that the core group of experts can be formed immediately to attend a workshop in Norway as soon as possible. A final workshop will then be held by the end of the year. Presentation of this project proposal to SAOs for their approval at their meeting in the spring of 2010 is the objective. In relation to funding, 800,000 NK are available for this project. Funding of other national experts is to be covered nationally.

Decision:

There was consensus within the SDWG to forward this project proposal to SAOs for approval at their meeting in Ilulissat, Greenland in April 2010, subject to appropriate revisions and clarifications

within the written proposal by 24 March 2010. In particular, the proposal was to be clarified in relation to the participation of Permanent Participants within the steering group of experts.

c. Arctic Energy Follow-up

Norway advised that it is looking at the possibility of a comparative study on environmental impact assessments, to be coordinated with PAME. At this stage, it is still be considered whether the scope of the work could be in relation to both the onshore and the offshore, or just offshore. The conception is to extract a list of best practices to improve the impact assessment processes. Also, the possibility of having a roundtable with industry on offshore activities and their promotion is under consideration. Much Working Groups' activities have looked at impacts of energy development but few have considered the positive contributions such activities and developments could have in respect of Arctic income and so on.

d. AHHEG projects

Canada introduced the three new projects recommended by AHHEG based on their work plan which had been approved at the last SDWG meeting and accepted by SAOs at their meeting in November 2010. Canada advised that after consultation with Denmark Greenland it was determined to propose that these three projects be agreed to by the SDWG and moved forward to SAOs for their approval at their meeting in April 2010.

Denmark/Greenland advised that human health is a priority area and these proposed projects fit into this area quite well. They are practical. These are not just research projects but have actual practical benefits for communities in the North with clear policy links to improve the life of people in the region. There are also links to the SAON process. These are well grounded projects within existing networks of experts and can produce clear deliverables for the Ministerial meeting in 2011.

Dr. Kue Young advised that some details relating to implementation of the projects will be worked out at the May 2010 meeting of AHHEG.

The proposed projects are:

- **Proposal for the development of a Circumpolar Health Observatory [CircHOB]:** CircHOB is an international collaborative health information system, involved in systematic, standardized, and consistent data collection and analysis. It is population-based, and covers all northern regions in all circumpolar countries. CircHOB's purpose is to monitor trends and patterns in health status, health determinants, and health care, and provide an on-going and sustainable knowledge base and analytical support for decision-makers, service providers, academic researchers and consumers. CirHOB promotes training and research in population health and health systems and enhances partnerships and collaborations among circumpolar regions and countries.
- **Proposal for a Comparative Review of Circumpolar Health Systems [CircHSR]:** The proposal is to create an international circumpolar partnership in health services and policy research. During the planning phase, the intention is to:

- Assemble and create a team of eminent researchers with diverse expertise from different circumpolar countries;
- Generate a circumpolar database of currently available and comparable indicators of health care resources and utilization;
- Compile a series of analytical (both narrative and statistical) profiles of the national and northern regional health care systems of circumpolar countries;
- Engage northern-based researchers, health care providers, and decision-makers in research planning and enhance research capacity in the North;
- Determine feasibility and viability of new research directions in health systems and policy research and the need for novel tools and techniques appropriate for the North;

At the conclusion of the planning phase, the research team will have acquired the necessary evidence and achieved consensus on research priorities and methods to apply for longer term support from research funding agencies. The longer term impact of the proposed research is not limited only to optimizing the use of limited resources in the North, but also in enabling a pan-Arctic and transnational collaboration. Innovations developed and well tested in one region (such as training), can complement and enhance those in other regions.

- **Proposal for a Comparative Review of Circumpolar Nutritional Guidelines**

[CircNuGuide]: The objectives of this project are to:

- Collect published national and regional nutritional guidelines and collate, organize and tabulate their contents and recommendations for comparison;
- Conduct relevant literature review and consultation with experts to understand the rationale for specific recommendations;
- Disseminate information to health agencies across the circumpolar world.

This review is directed at health care providers such as nutritionists, physicians, nurses, health educators and other professionals, health care planners and policy-makers. It is not intended to produce the “ideal” circumpolar guideline but to assemble currently existing information to assist government health agencies and community organizations to design and implement better nutrition policies and programs by learning from other circumpolar countries and regions.

During discussions clarification was sought as to the process for selecting the team of experts for the CircHSR project. Dr. Young advised that there is no fixed process yet. The AHHEG co-chairs have some idea of who might be experts that could be used. Journals also reference the names of many experts.

[Decision:](#)

It was agreed that the SDWG would forward these 3 projects to SAOs for their approval at their meeting in April 2010; however, some Arctic states reserved the right to do additional internal consultations. In these circumstances, there is a possibility that additional comments might be made through their SAOs in April 2010.

[e. Arctic options within the European Framework \(FP7\) for research](#)

This presentation was made by Lars Wikman, Head of the Grants Office at Umeå University and coordinator of the regional EU Project Office. The objective of the presentation was to bring to the attention of SDWG participants this international program which might help with the funding of Arctic-relevant projects. This is the largest funding program in the world. Canada, USA, Russia Norway are included in this program. The regional EU Project Office (www.euprojectoffice.eu) is located in Umeå in the county of Västerbotten, in Northern Sweden. This can be a “gateway” for cooperation in research and innovation.

The Council of the European Union in their Draft Council Conclusions on Arctic Issues (Brussels, 30 November 2009) called for increased support for research on Arctic related issues and agreed that this should be adequately reflected in the work programmes of the Seventh Community Framework Programme for Scientific Research (FP7) and in other community research and innovation activities.

As the SDWG Status report 2006-2009 (dated 29th of April 2009) states: “Funding of projects is a challenge for all delegations and working groups”. Therefore, the FP7 could be considered as an option for funding.

Mr. Wikman outlined some of the Thematic Priorities of the Programme which have Arctic relevance, including:

- Health
- Food, agriculture and biotechnology
- Information and communication technologies
- Nanosciences, nanotechnologies, materials and new production technologies
- Energy
- Environment (including climate change)
- Transport (including aeronautics)
- Socio-economic sciences and the humanities
- Security
- Space

FP7 funding schemes for cooperation include:

- Large (IP) Collaborative projects
 - 8-20 partners
 - 4-25 million Euros (average 10)
 - Up to 5 years
- Small and medium/(STREP) Collaborative projects
 - 4-8 partners
 - 1-4 million Euros contribution
 - Up to 3 years
- NoE –Network of Excellence
 - 6-20 partners
 - 2-8 million Euros contribution
 - Up to 3 years
- Coordination Actions (CA)
 - 3-20 partners
 - 0.5-2 million contribution (average 1)
 - Up to 3 years
- Support Actions (SA)
 - 1-15 partners
 - 0.5-2 million contribution
 - Up to 3 years

Mr. Wikman provided additional details relating to some specific areas of the programme and concluded with some suggestions as follows:

- What to do?
 - The Arctic Council, SDWG, researchers, industry, society, etc. can promote Arctic calls within FP7 and FP 8

- Set up task forces/partnerships for calls/proposals with universities, industry and society
- Promote the Arctic area – (as does the Arctic Portal) through news, documentaries, drama, education, research, tourism, industry, small and medium sized enterprises, etc.
- When to do it?
 - Now and into the future
- Who will coordinate and participate?
 - The regional EU Project Office in Umea can take a role and assist the SDWG

During the discussions it was pointed out that this fund can be difficult to access. Mr. Wikman advised that through lobbying in Brussels it could be possible to have funds ear-marked for Arctic issues and this allows a better success rate in the applications for money.

The Chair requested that Mr. Wikman's PowerPoint presentation be made available to the SDWG participants.

5. [Update on the Strategic Planning Task Force](#)

a. [Preliminary report on the Roundtable on Cross-Cutting Issues 01-02 March 2010](#)

Canada organized and coordinated the roundtable in cross-cutting issues which took place on 01-02 March 2010 in Copenhagen. The roundtable was divided into three sessions. Rapporteurs have made comprehensive notes and a report will be prepared for the spring of 2010. This will be a data set that can help flesh out the strategic plan. Some aspects of the strategic planning exercise might carry over into the Swedish chairmanship (2011-2013).

During the Roundtable the participants looked at what the SDWG had done and what the SDWG can build on to meet Arctic requirements. It examined the foundation of socio-economic work within the SDWG and looked at how to cooperate with other working groups to undertake work on the human dimensions of major assessments, notwithstanding the structural differences among the Working Groups. It examined questions such as: "How do we draw on resources outside the SDWG such as IASSA, other observers, and stakeholders." Facilitators helped organize and animate the discussions. A framework flowed from the strategic planning discussions and included issues such as "do we have what we need?"; "How do we build on this?"; "How do we engage others?"

The level of engagement in the plenary and the mix of the participants aided the comprehensive discussions on issues and challenges, data requirements, ethics, experts, resourcing and so on, and led to some interesting ideas on the way forward. It was observed that the SDWG has a decision framework and expertise on the human dimension in the Arctic but other Working Groups

are going elsewhere for their help. The SDWG needs to be more involved in the planning of major assessments, by AMAP for example.

The observer question and its impact on the Permanent Participants is an ongoing issue and needs to be taken into account in the SDWG's strategic planning work. The roundtable approach seems to be a good way to scope the major issues. Socio-economic monitoring and measuring seem to be the major preoccupations. Some kind of structure is required to monitor these issues over time. Periodic report cards and fact sheets could address the needs of the other working groups in relation to human data sets. Some of this can be done during the Danish chairmanship; however, there needs to be some consideration of a phased approach, perhaps through roundtables in the interim with some structural mechanism (such as a socio-economic expert group) to be established in the longer term. Key questions need to be identified to guide the work of the SDWG. Such questions can be explored through round tables.

This is the front end of the session on strategic planning. We cannot advance by relying only on our plenaries. SO this was worth doing and will help invigorate our work.

During the discussions on this agenda item it was pointed out that it is expected by other working groups that SDWG can deliver on socio-economic issues, whether in AMSA, SWIPA, Oil and Gas assessments, and so on. However, the SDWG also has its own needs and its own mandate. The SDWG should overlook ideas that might originate from within the SDWG. Many of the options were discussed at the roundtable and it would be helpful to summarize these into guidelines on how to conduct work in the future. The SDWG also need to find ways to engage statistical agencies which played such a big role in the preparation of the two ECONOR reports. Additional ECONOR reports can be considered. One suggestion during the roundtable was the preparation of regular reports on the State of Arctic Societies (SOS). The Chair suggested that it would be important to continue to meet with the Working Group chairs, for example on the margins of the SAO meetings, to attempt to work out integrated strategic plans and good communications on work schedules so that there was timely information about the requirements for SDWG input into major assessments.

ICC expressed disappointment that there was not better engagement during the roundtable on the issue of involvement of northerners in the SDWG and requested that this be considered in the strategic planning process. ICC offered to share a paper it had prepared on the observers issue and expressed concerns that a proliferation of Observers could diminish the voice of the Permanent Participants.

The Saami Council pointed out that success will lie in the follow-up and the discussions which take place in the task force developing a draft strategic plan.

[b. Progress on the Strategic Plan](#)

Canada tabled a document on a Terms of Reference for a strategic plan. There was then discussion on the project template developed by Canada. Some concerns were raised about the principle in the template that reads: "Project lead(s) will ensure there is adequate funding to support the meaningful engagement of Permanent Participant Organization(s) in the realization of this project's objective(s)." Some Arctic states advised that further internal consultations are required before the project template can be approved. Some Permanent Participants pointed to the

possibility of using wording similar to the Reykjavik Declaration which contained some commitments on funding to ensure the Permanent Participants were financed to participate in the activities of the Council. It was pointed out that block funding to Permanent Participants provides a core amount and Permanent Participants have some flexibility in deciding how this is spent; however, new projects require additional funds and this is where the principle in the Canadian draft was favoured by Permanent Participants: growth of work requires growth of funds.

The Chair noted that this is an important issue and requested some consultations during the coffee break and lunch break to determine if a comprise wording could be worked out. Canada agreed to work with the other interest participants over lunch and then to proceed intersessionally as necessary.

6. Cooperation with other Working Groups

a. CAFF text on Indigenous Languages

It was noted that the text of the Arctic Biodiversity Trends documents is available on the website. Any comments on linguistic chapter are to be forwarded directly to the CAFF Executive Secretary, Tom Barry, by 09 March 2010.

b. SAON update

The SDWG representative on the SAON process, Dr. Joan Larsen, provided an update on the SAON discussion since the last SDWG meeting. It was noted that not much has happened since the last meeting of SDWG meeting in November 2009, other than a teleconference. There is a high level meeting in Miami on 18-19 March 2010 to advance the monitoring system discussions. It includes funding agencies and will look at mechanisms for coordinating longer term monitoring systems. AMAP and IASC are taking the lead. There will be 4 breakout groups and Dr. Larsen will co-chair one with ICC on health, social-economic issues and so on, so this all fits in well with the discussions from the SDWG Roundtable on cross-cutting issues. A fuller report will be made to the next SDWG in the fall of 2010.

c. SWIPA

The AMAP representative at the SDWG meeting advised that the scientific “brick” will be sent for peer review in the summer of 2010 and the layman's overview will be done in the fall, but they are having difficulties finding an author at this point. The draft document might be ready for review by the time of the SDWG meeting in October and this would be the better document for the SDWG to comment upon.

d. PAME: Arctic Ocean Review

A PAME representative, Renee Sauvé, provided a status report on PAME's Arctic Ocean Review (AOR) initiative, outlining the objectives and the anticipated process.

Canada is one of 5 co-leads on this activity, along with Iceland, USA, Norway and Russia. The AOR is one of “flagship” projects for PAME. PAME did a 1996 review of sources of marine pollution

from land based sources, with some legal analysis of the relevant instruments. The AOR is the next phase of this review and it was referenced in the 2004 Arctic Marine Strategic Plan which called for Periodic reviews of the status and adequacy of international regional agreements and standards that have applications in the Arctic marine environment.

It was explained by the PAME representative that the AOR is not really a scientific assessment. Rather it is a review that will summarize some of the work that has taken place. The Project manager is Alf Hakon Hoel of Norway. Permanent participants have been asked to name an expert to participate. The AOR will help demonstrate the Arctic states' stewardship efforts in the Arctic, so it has an outreach function. A communication and outreach plan has been accepted at this PAME meeting in Copenhagen (March 2010).

During discussions following the presentation questions arose as to whether:

- there are any early indications of major gaps in rules and regulations, given the broad interests in this issue outside the Arctic;
- there have been pressures from outside the Arctic Council to undertake this work; and
- there is a role that could be played by SDWG in this review process given SDWG interest in promoting activities and sustainable development in the region?

The PAME representative advised that gaps are hard to identify at this point, but there is a possibility that increased activity in the region might demonstrate that there are not yet adequate tools to monitor cumulative impacts. Experts' workshops and forums will be discussing such issues. Significant new attention seems to be directed at marine-based governance and related issues. There has been a lot of pressure already from outside interests and many NGOs and academics are looking at these issues so this argues for a need for Arctic governments to also do work in this area. A role for the SDWG role could be to help develop a comprehensive picture of the Arctic marine area, not just the environmental dimension. More work is needed on the human dimension in the AOR. The AOR covers both conservation and sustainable use. The Project Manager will seek working contacts through the SDWG Secretariat.

7. [Report on SAO Chair/Working Group Chairs Meeting, 01 March 2010](#)

The SDWG Chair advised participants about the arrangements provided by the SAO Chair in relation to the Deputy Ministers Meeting (27 May) and Arctic Council Information Meeting (28 May) scheduled for Copenhagen in May 2010. The agenda for the Deputy Ministers Meeting will not include any items directly pertaining to the SDWG; however, she requested the input of SDWG participants regarding any items to put forward for the Information Day (for example, information on ECONOR, ASI, the strategic planning exercise, etc). SDWG Heads of Delegation will need to communicate electronically or by conference call in advance of the information session in order to confirm any such items.

8. [SDWG Report to SAOs](#)

The SDWG Chair advised that the report to SAOs will be comprised of the detailed report of the last SDWG meeting (November 2010). In addition, the recommendations on new projects emerging from the current SDWG meeting will be put forward to the SAOs for their approval. In this regard, the SDWG will need to make any necessary revisions to the written project proposal relating to cultural heritage by 24 March 2010 so that it can be forwarded to the Arctic Council Secretariat for distribution. The three health project proposals prepared by AHHEG proposals will be forwarded in their current form to Arctic Council Secretariat for distribution to the SAOs. Some Arctic states might conduct additional internal consultations on these projects on the understanding that if there are comments or concerns, these would be raised at the SAO meeting by the relevant SAO.

In response to the Chair's inquiry as to whether the Arctic Energy Summit final report should be sent to SAOs now or left for later, the USA advised that it will consult internally on this question and respond to the Chair prior to the SAO meeting.

9. [Other Business](#)

A number of information items were raised under this agenda item as follows:

- **Norwegian High North Policy:** It was noted that increasingly the High North and the Arctic deal with the same questions. There may be projects from the Norwegian High North program that have potential for cooperation with the SDWG and with the Arctic Council generally. The SDWG Chair recommended that the lines of communication on such cooperation be kept open.

- **UArctic Atlas:** Iceland provided a short presentation on this matter as a notification of the intention to initiate a project that could be brought forward to the next SDWG meeting as a proposal. The UArctic Atlas aims to be a comprehensive resource, presenting all aspects of the Arctic region in visual geographical form online. A first edition was launched by the University of the Arctic in cooperation with GRID-Arendal and StatoilHydro in January 2009. The University of the Arctic and the Arctic Portal are cooperating on the creation of the 2nd edition of the Atlas. The UArctic Atlas is divided in to 5 themes:
 - Defining the Arctic, introducing different definitions of the Arctic region
 - Environment, Climate and Ecosystems
 - Natural Resources
 - Peoples, Cultures and Societies
 - Socio-Economics and Politics

It is hoped that further development of such an atlas would facilitate dialogue, education and information exchange among stakeholders within and outside the Arctic region with emphasis on:

- The Public
- Educators and Students
- Policy-makers
- Indigenous Peoples / Inhabitants of the Arctic
- International Organizations / Scientists

The objective is to make this new edition operational in 2011. Iceland encouraged involvement by all Arctic states. It was noted in the discussions that there other similar projects going. Iceland advised that it is aware of these other projects and emphasized that the idea is to seek very broad cooperation. The importance here is the link to the UArctic which means it is being used immediately in education. Also the other important dimension is the social sciences dimension and the link to Arctic inhabitants. It is not just about physical sciences. Canada noted that this initiative addresses some of the issues raised during the Roundtable on Cross-cutting issues. The idea of better engagement of the UArctic was welcomed. In response to questions about funding for maintenance of such an atlas Iceland advised that it would provide more details about the funding and other elements of the project at the next the meeting of SDWG.

- **Arctic Frontiers:** The Executive Secretary gave a short overview of the Arctic Frontiers Conference held in Tromso, Norway in January 2010. The theme of this year's conference was "Living in the Arctic". He noted that this conference was becoming a recognized annual venue for researchers, policy makers and industry representatives on a wide range of issues that are relevant to the SDWG. It was suggested that it might be possible to explore the possibility of some formal connection between the SDWG and the organizers of this, or other, Arctic conferences as a way of addressing some of the matters discussed during the Roundtable on Cross-cutting Issues. In particular, the SDWG might assist in formulating the agendas for such conferences and this might lead to a better connection between the work of the research community and the SDWG on human dimension issues. The Saami Council advised that it was part of the steering committee for this year's conference. In steering committee the Saami Council managed to highlight the human dimension. The theme next year's conference is "Tipping Points".
- **Model Arctic Council:** A representative from the Government of Yukon, Harley Trudeau, provided an update on preparations for the youth activity involving a Model Arctic Council. Updated information has been posted on the SDWG Website. [The precise date for this event has not been set but the intention is that it take place in Yukon, Canada in October 2010].
- **Arctic Indigenous Leaders Summit, 14-15 April 2010:** RAIPON provided information about a summit of indigenous peoples to be held in Moscow on 14-14 April 2010. This will also be the 20 year anniversary of RAIPON. Representatives of SDWG were invited to attend and to meet with the heads of the indigenous peoples' organizations. Further information is available on the websites of IPS and RAIPON.
- **Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER):** Dr. Heather E. Hudson (hehudson@uaa.alaska.edu), the new Director of Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER) at the University of Alaska in Anchorage, informed the SDWG that this year is the 50th anniversary ISER. ISER will be organizing some research discussions and highlight plans for future. Further information will be provided to the SDWG when it is available.

10. [Date of Next Meeting](#)

The next SDWG regular meeting is scheduled for 02-03 October 2010 in Ilulissat, Greenland. Participants are encouraged to make their hotel and travel arrangements as soon as possible. Information is available on the SDWG website in the password area (There is a link in the left sidebar on the homepage).