

## ARCTIC COUNCIL

### Senior Arctic Officials Meeting Washington, D.C., U.S.A. November 18-19, 1999

Minutes (Draft - 4/12/2000)

#### **Agenda Item 1: Approval of Agenda**

Russia moved that agenda item #7, the address from Mr. Goman on "The Russian Far North" be moved from 3:15 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. The move was seconded, and the schedule was amended as requested.

#### **Agenda Item 2: Approval of May '99 SAO Meeting Summary**

Norway intervened to request that the section in the summary dealing with ACAP be amended. The Secretariat received and made the requested amendment.

#### **Agenda Item 3: Chair summarizes developments since Anchorage**

The Chair gave the following brief overview of Council activities since the last SAO meeting in Anchorage in May 1999:

- EPPR, PAME, and AMAP working groups met during the interim. The Chair indicated that details of those meetings, as well as other working group activities would be provided during the "Reports from Working Group Chairs."
- The Chair reported that the following groups had been accorded ad-hoc observer status for this meeting: the Red Cross, the Nordic Council of Ministers, NAMMCO, the Circumpolar Conservation Union, Bellona, and ACOPS. The Chair reminded delegates that applications for permanent observer status need to be submitted to the Council Secretariat 120 days prior to the next Ministerial Meeting, but asked that delegates have organizations make their intentions known in time for discussion at the next SAO meeting in Fairbanks. To date, the Secretariat has received applications for observer status from IUCN (the World Conservation Union) and IASSA (International Arctic Social Science Association).
- Canada seconded the Chair's suggestion that delegates come prepared to discuss requests for observer status in April 2000 in Fairbanks, well before the next Ministerial.
- Russia remarked that they would like to explore permanent observer status for ACOPS and the Red Cross at the meeting in Fairbanks.

In response to questions about procedural requirements related to becoming a Council observer, the U.S. stated that it would notify organizations that had applied for observer status

in the past of the requirements and timeline so that they will be able to apply if interested.

Norway, on a separate note, intervened to request that working groups attempt to present their reports, in writing, to SAOs, well in advance of the SAO meeting so that delegations will be able to come to the meeting prepared to take action on working group suggestions. Canada voiced agreement with Norway and the Chair suggested that working groups consider planning their meetings further in advance of SAO meetings in the future.

Representatives from AMAP and PAME intervened to state that both working groups had set the dates of their meetings prior to when a date for the SAO meeting had been set. The PAME representative suggested that the scheduling problem, in this case, appeared to lie with the Council Secretariat. The EPPR representative requested guidance from the Chair on how best to circulate documents for the SAO meetings ahead of time. It was suggested that optimal use of the Internet be made.

### **Welcome by U.S. Undersecretary of State for Global Affairs, Frank E. Loy**

Under Secretary Loy welcomed delegates to the State Department and delivered a letter of welcome and support from President Clinton. Mr. Loy shared his beliefs on the growing importance of environmental and natural resource issues to international relations and reported on the U.S. State Department's efforts to strengthen the role of science in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy. Mr. Loy praised the work of the Council and underlined the importance of the Arctic as a bellwether for what is going on in the broader environment. In conclusion, Mr. Loy outlined U.S. hopes for the Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting in Alaska in the fall of 2000. Mr. Loy's remarks may be found on the website at <http://www.arctic-council.org/> and at the State Department website at <http://www.state.gov/>.

### **Agenda Item 4: Working Group Chairs Report to SAOs**

AMAP Report:

Topics discussed included:

- A new Vice Chair for AMAP, Helgi Jensson (Iceland);
- AMAP Monitoring Programs and National Implementation Plans (NIPs) for 1998-2003;
- The Arctic Climate Impact Assessment;
- AMAP deliverables to ministerial meetings in 2000 and 2002
- Operating guidelines for AMAP;
- AMAP Assessment Report on CD-Rom;
- Distribution of the SOAER;
- Thematic Data Centers;
- Workshops arranged;
- Implementation of the Multilateral Cooperative Project on Phase-out of PCB use, and Management of PCB-contaminated Wastes in the Russian Federation;
- Persistent Toxic Substances (PTS), Food Security and Indigenous People of the Russian north (the RAIPON-GEF project);
- The Future of Children and Youth in the Arctic;
- Anderma Station;
- International cooperation (IASC, UNEP, EU, EEA, ARTERI, The Northern

Dimension, WHO, The Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Nordic Council of Ministers, ACOPS, OSPARCOM, QUASIMEME, and the Global International Water Assessment/GIWA)

- Future conferences and workshops under preparation;
- Finances;
- Time schedule for AMAP 2000-2002.

For details of the above, please see [Appendix A](#), "AMAP Report to Senior Arctic Officials."

### **Comments on the AMAP Report:**

RAIPON expressed thanks to AMAP for its help in approaching GEF for funding and thanks to AMAP leadership for fostering stronger ties to RAIPON. RAIPON stressed that the question of health was a very serious problem for indigenous people of the North, especially in Russia. RAIPON reported that there had been several meetings with ICC and Goskomsever to develop this proposal (London, Oslo, and Moscow), that ICC had received an initial grant from GEF to assist with its development. RAIPON expressed hope that they could also count on other Arctic Council members to support the proposal and ultimately, the project.

Norway expressed appreciation and support for AMAP and reported that they would continue to provide financial support for the secretariat. Norway voiced strong support for AMAP's assistance to RAIPON and ICC in their quest for GEF funds. Norway announced that it would contribute 80,000 USD to this project and urged other Council members to do the same. Norway also urged Council members to contact their national GEF contacts to voice support for the RAIPON/ICC project. Norway noted that the project potentially could contribute important information that could inform the LRTAP protocols on POPs and Heavy Metals.

The United States commended AMAP for its work and stated that it would increase its support for AMAP's work in the future, especially in the areas of POPs and the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment.

Russia expressed support for AMAP, especially its work on POPs. Russia suggested that the group's priorities for its second phase should be: filling in information gaps regarding the state of the Arctic environment, climate change, the impacts of pollutants on human beings, establishment of an effective monitoring program, and assisting with the development of mining guidelines.

Sweden commended AMAP and gave thanks to the group for putting the "State of the Arctic Environment Report" on CD-Rom.

Iceland thanked AMAP for its work, voiced support for the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, and questioned whether timing the production of 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase assessment reports to feed into the "Rio + 10" discussions would be the best way to make use of the assessments. Iceland suggested that presenting the reports in other fora could possibly be a better approach.

Canada asked delegates what they wanted to do with regard to the AMAP assessment reports and "Rio + 10." The Chair suggested that if Canada wished to pursue using the assessment reports in Rio + 10, they could approach the Council's secretariat formally or informally. Canada replied that they would put together and circulate a one or two-page rationale for pursuing this. Denmark voiced support for using the assessments at Rio + 10. Finland voiced

support for the same. Iceland stated that they would not be "disinterested" in this and welcomed Canada's initiative. In light of the discussion, the Chair suggested that Canada move forward with developing and circulating its rationale.

### **CAFF Report:**

Topics discussed:

CAFF Overview Report "Arctic Conservation Issues: Status and Trends of Arctic Flora and Fauna;

- Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA);
- Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program:
- Seabirds and Migratory Birds;
- Sacred Sites in Arctic Russia;
- Request to GEF for funding a CAFF/UNEP GRID/Russia project on "Integrated Ecosystem Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimize Habitat Fragmentation in the Russian Arctic;"
- Overview of upcoming CAFF meetings and workshops;
- Planned Deliverables to Ministers.

For details of the above, please see [Appendix B](#), "CAFF Report to Senior Arctic Officials."

### **Comments on the CAFF report:**

The U.S. commended CAFF and expressed hope that they will accomplish all their goals.

Iceland thanked CAFF for its report and clear presentation. Iceland hailed the Arctic Conservation Issues Assessment Report as an important milestone in what the Arctic Council is doing and hoped it would lead to actions to protect ecosystem.

Norway welcomed CAFF's progress report and endorsed its plans for deliverables. Norway stressed that CAFF must complete its report on status and trends of Arctic biodiversity in time for the next Ministerial meeting and expressed a desire to see the first draft at the next SAO meeting in Fairbanks, Alaska in April 2000. Norway stated that it was looking forward to the Marine Protected Area Network in Montreal and hoped it would point toward ways to protect Arctic coastal environment. With regard to CAFF's approaching UNEP/GEF for funds to develop a project on an "Integrated Ecosystem Approach to Preserving Biodiversity in Russia," Norway announced it will contribute USD 45,000 towards the project's first "planning phase." Norway encouraged others to do the same and expressed a desire to see a progress report from CAFF on this project in Fairbanks.

Canada noted with appreciation CAFF's progress on the overview document on biodiversity in the Arctic and asked if a first draft of the report would be available at the SAO meeting in Fairbanks. Canada stated that it would be important to develop a circumpolar biodiversity monitoring program. Canada voiced support in principle for the "Integrated Ecosystem Approach to Preserve Biodiversity in Russia," but noted that the project comes with significant financial implications. As this is one of a number of Arctic Council projects that are competing for support from GEF, Canada suggested that this is a topic the Council needs to address. Canada stated that it could not offer final support for CAFF's "GEF project" at this

time, but would give it serious consideration.

Finland congratulated CAFF on its good work and expressed appreciation for CAFF's having a final agenda.

### **EPPR Report:**

Topics discussed:

- Circumpolar map of resources at risk from oil spills in the Arctic;
- Analysis of agreements and arrangements (Canada's lead);
- Source control management and prevention strategies for high risks in the Arctic;
- The EPPR web site;
- Operating guidelines for EPPR;
- Report on working group meeting in Svalbard;
- SCAT -- Development of a standardized approach to shoreline cleanup assessment technology;
- EPPR's role in ACAP;
- Cooperation with PAME;
- Oil Spills on Ice Workshop;
- Next meeting EPPR Working Group (Iceland in June of 2000).

For details of the above, please see [Appendix C](#), "EPPR Report to Senior Arctic Officials."

### **Comments on the EPPR report:**

Norway stated that they were looking forward to seeing EPPR's map of "Resources at Risk from Oil Spills in the Arctic," and voiced appreciation for EPPR's cooperation with CAFF on this. Norway pointed at this cooperation as a good example of teamwork among Arctic Council working groups and called on other working groups to create opportunities for working together.

Denmark also encouraged other working groups to follow EPPR's initiative at involving CAFF in its work. Denmark voiced support for all of EPPR's initiatives and its interest in "resource issues" regarding ACAP.

### **PAME Report:**

Topics discussed:

- Introduction of Sofia Gudmundsdottir, Executive Director of PAME Secretariat;
- Report on PAME's Nov 1-4 meeting in Iceland;
- Timetable for implementation of Russia's National Plan of Action (NPA Arctic) for Protecting the Arctic Marine Environment from Land-based Sources of Pollution;
- ACOPS document on Russian NPA Arctic;
- Overview of PAME national workplans;
- PAME Priorities;
- Analysis of shipping activities (Norway lead);
- Monitor ACAP program for opportunities to participate;
- Support for Partnership Conference with ACOPS-Russia;

- PAME's pursuit of project funds from UNEP/GEF;
- Funding for PAME Secretariat and program activities;
- AMAP PCB project included as a component of the Russian NPA Arctic;
- "Global Water International Assessment" (GWIA). How should PAME cooperate with AMAP on this;?
- Development of Mining Guidelines. How should PAME proceed (Canada lead, will clarify at next SAO meeting);
- Danish proposal to phase out dangerous chemicals in Arctic;
- ME's "Regional Plan of Action" as a component of ACAP;
- Cooperation between EPPR and PAME in the area of risk analysis;
- Monitoring progress on the development of a Polar Code, now the Polar Guideline;
- PAME/CAFF/IUCN Marine workshop in Montreal;
- Cooperation with EPPR and CAFF;
- Operating guidelines;
- Coordination of Arctic Council working groups' approach to GEF and other funding agencies.

For details of the above, please see [Appendix D](#), "PAME Report to Senior Arctic Officials."

### **Comments on the PAME report:**

The U.S. Vice Chair of PAME thanked the PAME Chair for the report and for his excellent leadership. Laughlin noted that in addition to the GEF funds that have been committed to the ACOPS/RUSSIA NPA --Arctic Partnership Conference, five U.S. agencies are contributing separately to the project. Laughlin suggested that Council working groups should coordinate their approach to donor organizations. With three Council working groups pursuing GEF funds for three separate projects coordination becomes even more important.

Iceland expressed gratification that the PAME secretariat is up and running. Iceland remarked that it was a "critical time in the history of PAME;" a time for action. Iceland expressed hope that the Russian NPA-Arctic partnership conference would up to its promise. Iceland thanked PAME and AMAP for participating in Europe's "Northern Dimension" conference.

Canada expressed support for PAME's work-plan and hoped that it would receive widespread support. Canada reported that it had contributed CD 70K to the Russian NPA-Arctic Partnership conference. Canada supported PAME's development of mining guidelines and stated that they were open to consideration of including Phase I of the AMAP-administered PCB project in Russia as a component of the Russian NPA-Arctic project. Canada welcomed EPPR's potential participation in analysis of shipping activities. Canada expressed gratitude that working group chairs are discussing how cooperate and collaborate on the submission of grant proposals, but expressed concern that the current round of applications to GEF not be jeopardized or slowed up in any way.

Norway welcomed progress of the PAME Working Group and the establishment of its secretariat. Norway characterized PAME's Regional Plan of Action for Protecting the Arctic Marine Environment as "critical" and reported that they had contributed USD 40,000 to the Russian partnership conference. Norway confirmed that it has taken the lead in developing/looking at shipping guidelines. Like Canada, Norway expressed a strong desire that the "Arctic Council's" GEF proposals not be jeopardized in any way.

Russia expressed appreciation for all the support for the Russian NPA -- Arctic and gratitude for the positive assessment of its activities. Russia reported that it had approached the Russian Vice President regarding this project and had established a successful interagency process to facilitate its implementation.

Denmark reported that the Danish delegation to the recent PAME meeting had encountered reservations regarding its proposal for phasing out hazardous chemicals in one generation. Consequently, they announced that they would revise the proposal's language to comport with UNEP language on the subject.

Finland stated that with regard to the Russian NPA-Arctic, the Barents Council had been working on this type of things for years. Finland suggested that planners of the Russian NPA-Arctic partnership conference need to be fully aware of what has already been accomplished if they are to avoid re-inventing the wheel. PAME responded that it had already contacted NEFCO regarding "hot spots" and feasibility studies that have been accomplished within the Barents Council.

UNEP stated that it did not see any problem or conflict of interest with regard to three Council working groups applying for GEF funds for three separate projects.

The Chair reported briefly on discussions during the Sustainable Development Working Group meeting regarding the draft SD framework document. The Chair suggested that perhaps an intersessional group could meet (constituted of countries that had sent comments to U.S.). A small drafting group could see if consensus on the document could be reached.

#### **Agenda Item 5: The Russian Far North -- Mr. Vladimir Goman, GosKomSever, Russia**

Mr. Vladimir Goman, Chairman of Russia's State Committee of the North (GosKomSever), presented his Committee's thoughts on the work of the Council and its priorities. Mr. Goman stressed that Russia would continue working with all of the Council's working groups and would like to see projects expanded to focus on people of the North, including indigenous. This includes PAME's Global Plan of Action for Protecting the Arctic Marine Environment from Land-based Sources of Pollution. Mr. Goman voiced support for PAME, ACOPS, and the role of Sustainable Development within the Council. He reported that the number of agencies in Russia addressing problems of the north have expanded, highlighting that this work was not being solely undertaken by GosKomSever. Mr. Goman expressed Russian support for RAIPON as well as for the RAIPON, ICC, SAAMI project with which AMAP is assisting. To conclude, Mr. Goman highlighted with gratitude the work that the International Red Cross had undertaken in northern Russia and stated the organization should be a permanent observer to the Council. Mr. Goman wished meeting participants continued success with their work in the Council in the future.

The U.S. expressed appreciation for the expanded, vigorous Russian participation in the work of the Council.

Canada thanked Mr. Goman for his remarks and suggested support for the International Red Cross receiving permanent observer status should they apply.

#### **Agenda Item 6: Arctic Council Action Plan (ACAP)**



Norway reported substantial progress towards developing an "Arctic Council Action Plan (ACAP) to Eliminate Pollution in the Arctic." At the time of the report, Norway reported having hosted two workshops with strong participation by all Council members. The most recent meeting was held in September 1999. Participants focused on developing an overall strategy, concrete proposals for projects, and an implementation plan. Norway reported that delegates should be prepared to negotiate final text for the strategy component of the plan at the next meeting.

While great progress has been made in the strategy component, Norway reported that there was still substantial work to accomplish with regard to the "Operative" part of the plan. Countries were requested to come up with specific proposals for project implementation and commit to bring them forward at the next ACAP meeting.

Norway reported the current ACAP Work-plan as follows:

Feb 15-17, next working meeting: strategy, implementation, and actions. Reps need to come to the meeting with a national position regarding each of these components of the plan. Countries should forward new project proposals to other Council members BEFORE the next meeting. Norway will circulate new proposal for implementation too.

April 27-28 SAO meeting (Norway hopes to have final draft of ACAP ready present to SAOs in Fairbanks); Meeting in May (if necessary); Meeting in October preceding Ministerial (if necessary)

Responses to presentation by Norway:

Sweden requested that EPPR activities/potential activities be more fully reflected in ACAP papers. Sweden reported that it would propose two potential projects with regard to POPs in Russia, one on inventory of Dioxins and Furins, and one on environmentally sound management regime of stockpiles of pesticides in Russia.

Finland reported that it was having problems getting proposals for ACAP projects, and suggested it might be necessary for experts to "build Arctic networks" and arrange small meetings to come up with specific proposals under priority areas of ACAP.

Iceland noted that it appeared ACAP was progressing very well. Especially with the "Strategy component" being in its final phase. Iceland remarked that there appears to be some overlap between ACAP and PAME's RPA, and that this was something they wished to avoid. Iceland further stated that if Council members were entering the negotiating phase of ACAP, Iceland needed to re-evaluate its level of participation in the program.

The U.S. thanked Norway for preparing a comprehensive status report on ACAP and suggested that the text could serve as a point of departure for future discussion in February. The U.S. stated that it would welcome new projects, that it had proposed a number of projects and was developing others. With respect to Norway's paper on implementation, the U.S. requested that it receive a copy ASAP in order to be well prepared to discuss the proposal at the next meeting. The U.S. suggested that the same group at the next meeting should address Strategy and Implementation and that delegations should come to the meeting with country positions prepared to negotiate.



Canada congratulated Norway and stated that they viewed the strategy as a "reasonable compromise." Canada stated that it had some language on how to use "traditional knowledge" in the plan and would bring specific projects to the February meeting. Canada remarked that it would not bring "gap analysis" for discussion to the next meeting. Canada reported that it doesn't yet have final thoughts on implementation, but would appreciate Norway's paper on this well before the next meeting. As far as using ACAP as a coordinated approach in international fora, Canada stated that the Council must continue to rely on individual states to take action. Canada could not support an imposition on national sovereignty.

Denmark stated that it was putting together project proposals, and that it supports negotiations at the next ACAP meeting.

Netherlands expressed concern regarding Norway's proposals on nuclear wastes/safety because of the danger of duplication. The Netherlands remarked that there are a number of other fora that are already taking action on items mentioned in this section of the ACAP report.

The U.K. congratulated the Arctic Council and Norway, and applauded ACAP. The U.K. mentioned that, in the future, the Council would most likely desire to work with other countries on ACAP projects. As a case in point, the U.K. mentioned that there was already information on radioactive discharges from the U.K.'s Sellafield. The U.K. representative asked when ACAP would be contacting other agencies outside of AC countries for help and information and whom they would contact.

EPPR cautioned meeting participants not to forget about other pollutants and mentioned acidification as a case in point. EPPR suggested that it could contribute to ACAP via "source control safety/management," and asked why EPPR was not mentioned in the radioactivity section of the ACAP report.

The ICC highlighted a section on page four of the ACAP plan that refers to "Arctic States coordinating efforts whenever possible" because it, in their view, indicates a concerted effort to look after needs of indigenous people in the Arctic.

Norway welcomed the new proposals from Sweden and commended Finland's suggestion to hold "experts workshops" in the future to generate ideas for potential ACAP projects dealing with specific contaminants. Regarding Iceland's desire to avoid overlap with PAME, Norway characterized ACAP as an overall Strategy and PAME's Regional Program of Action as a potential building block of the strategy. Norway expressed its intent to circulate its paper on implementation a month or more before the next ACAP meeting. Norway agreed with the U.S. that ACAP Strategy and Implementation should be discussed together in one group, with a second breakout group discussing projects. Norway responded to the Netherlands that the Norwegian Radiation Protective Agency was the one that outlined the ACAP proposals on radioactivity and were therefore aware of what's being accomplished/addressed in this area by others. Norway suggested to the U.K that it would be helpful to see from them concrete proposals on how to engage other countries in ACAP, but didn't have any suggestions for accomplishing this at present. Norway told EPPR that while they are proposing priorities for the first phase of ACAP, they were not ruling out any projects addressing other contaminants in the future. Norway characterized ACAP as a "living document."

The Chair expressed on behalf of all great appreciation for Norway's efforts to bring ACAP

along.

### **Agenda Item 7: AMEC -- Mr. Dieter Rudolph**

Mr. Dieter Rudolph briefed meeting participants on the "Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation" (AMEC), a military to military program to prevent damage to the Arctic environment. Mr. Rudolph characterized AMEC as a "cooperative program" as opposed to an "assistance program" which was started in 1996 by Norway's concern with "military generated" pollution in the Barents and Kara seas. The program provides a dialogue between Norway, the Russian Federation, and the United States on these issues. The Norwegian and Russian Ministries of Defense and the U.S. Department of Defense (U.S. Navy) have the lead in the program. In the U.S., the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy are also involved. In Russia the Ministry of Atomic Energy is involved. AMEC currently comprises seven projects that are underway. Five projects address military nuclear waste technologies. Two projects are "non-radioactive." Mr. Rudolph gave an overview of how projects are structured and focused on the cask project for transfer and storage.

Denmark asked if it would be possible to include a paragraph in the Arctic Council declaration noting that the military is responsible for what the military is doing in the Arctic.

The Chair explained that the purpose of the AMEC presentation was to let Council members know of efforts to address Arctic pollution that are taking place outside of the Arctic Council. The Chair then asked how AMEC gets the word out on what it is doing.

Mr. Rudolph replied that they write, publish, and disseminate unclassified reports, and that they invite and encourage questions by other countries.

Canada thanked Mr. Rudolph for the interesting presentation, but stated that Council members need to think carefully if this project could/should be included at all in a Council declaration. Canada reminded Council members that the Council doesn't deal with military issues.

Russia remarked that AMEC is a positive tripartite effort and asked what prevents AMEC from carrying out projects in a more dynamic manner. Russia then asked if it would be possible to increase spending on AMEC?

With regard to the U.S, Mr. Rudolph expressed hope that the success of program would induce the U.S. congress to spend more in this area.

Norway remarked that it had, within AMEC, developed a program with Russia based on Russian priorities. Norway characterized AMEC as a "military entity" that addressed problems with military origins.

AMAP commented that it had already been in contact with AMEC regarding sources and river contamination.

### **Agenda Item 8: LRTAP Protocols on POPs and Heavy Metals**

Denmark opened discussion on this agenda item by expressing disappointment that out of the 35 countries and the EU that have signed the LRTAP protocols on POPs and Heavy Metals

Canada was the only signatory to have -- to date -- ratified the protocols. Denmark remarked that the Nordic countries would meet and urge early ratification and implementation of the protocols. Denmark suggested that the Arctic Council has a responsibility to move quickly on this and that the Council should -- through the chair -- ask countries who have signed to pursue an early ratification.

Canada seconded Denmark's remarks and voiced support for the notion that the Arctic Council be more active in getting other countries to ratify the protocols.

Sweden announced that it will ratify the protocols very soon, reporting that they were currently in Sweden's parliament.

Iceland reported that it was in the final stages of ratifying the protocols and that it would do so before the start of next year.

ICC's intervention addressed the global POPs negotiations and urged the Arctic countries to support these negotiations and produce a strong final agreement. ICC voiced strong support for the Council to take collective action to encourage other countries to ratify the protocols, as contamination by POPs and Heavy Metals "hits them where they live."

Norway announced that it would ratify the protocols within a matter of weeks and urged Russia to ratify the protocols as soon as possible. Norway also called upon Arctic countries to cooperate in developing these protocols further, suggesting that they needed to be as strict as the provisions in the ECE.

Finland reported that while they have no hindrances to ratify the protocols, they don't yet have a timetable for ratification.

Canada suggested that the press release for the Arctic Council would be a good vehicle for a strong statement urging early ratification.

The Chair reminded participants that Council members had already urged early ratification of the protocols in the Ministerial Declaration from Iqaluit.

Norway acknowledged the Chair's point, but seconded the proposal by Canada.

Canada agreed that the statement was made at the ministerial, but that there was still only one country that has ratified the protocols.

Denmark remarked that if it could not get the Chair's signature on a letter urging early ratification of the protocols, it would accept an appropriate statement in the press release.

The U.S. stated that it would work with other Council members to produce a statement in the press release to the effect we are all supportive of signing, ratifying and implementing the protocols.

WWF voiced strong support for the views of Canada, Denmark, and ICC, and suggested it might be appropriate to include a strong statement in the next Ministerial Declaration calling for early ratification of the global POPs agreement.

Canada volunteered that if other Council members were in agreement, it would try to come up with some language on ratification for the press release.

The Chair suggested that if Denmark wished to draft a letter urging other countries, on behalf of the Arctic Council, to ratify the LRTAP protocols on POPs and Heavy Metals, they should do so and submit in to the Council's Secretariat for circulation and consideration. The Chair likewise suggested that Canada and Denmark might wish to work together on draft language on ratifying the protocols for the SAO press release.

### **Agenda Item 9: Coordination of Working Group Activities**

The Chair summarized the results of the meeting of the working group chairs on the coordination of working group activities as follows:

- working group chairs should attempt to gather together one half day before Senior Arctic Officials Meetings in the future to further;
- working group chairs will take turns drafting and circulating agendas for those meetings;
- Council Rules of Procedure guide the work of all the working groups. Working groups are permitted to draft and follow operating guidelines, consistent with the ROP, to facilitate group work not specifically covered by the ROP;
- working group chairs will develop a matrix showing areas where there is overlap in the work of the working groups. The vice chair of CAFF will produce the initial matrix;
- working group chairs noted the increase in working group applications to GEF for funding and agreed on the importance of coordinating their approaches to GEF;
- working group chairs voiced concern over how "observers" to individual working groups could continue to be designated as "observers" under the Council's ROP. Chairs agreed that further discussion of this topic was important;
- Chairs agreed that working groups may not enter into binding arrangements with other international organizations. SAOs must be consulted and must approve of any such arrangement;
- chairs discussed confusion surrounding the question of how individual Council working groups will participate in such new Council programs as ACAP and the ACIA. Chairs questioned how these new programs fit under the Council's current structure.

Discussion of summary:

PAME noted that many of the points discussed during the meeting of the chairs had already been discussed at the SAO meeting in Anchorage (ex. It had been decided in Anchorage that working group chairs would take turns producing an agenda for meetings on coordinating working group activities).

Canada and Norway asked if it might be possible in the future for the working group chairs and the Secretariat to draft a 2-3 page paper on "Decisions to be Taken/Issues to be Considered" by the SAOs for presentation to the same at the beginning of SAO meetings. Norway further suggested that it was very clear from the summary that a half-day meeting of working group chairs and the Secretariat chair would be very useful. Norway suggested that this be pursued in the future. Norway also requested that the Arctic Council Chair conduct an

analysis of the structure of the Council in light of its new activities and responsibilities.

Russia stated that the document produced by the working group chairs and secretariat should clearly indicate the goals of the individual working groups so that overlap might be avoided and SAOs would be able to work with the groups more effectively and efficiently

Denmark supported the requests of Canada, Norway and Russia for a document that could be used by the SAO to focus on decisions to be taken and issues to be decided. Denmark also requested that such a document be made available well in advance of the SAO meeting so that SAOs would have enough time to prepare for the meeting.

The Chair agreed that a more precise summary of the results of future meetings of working group chairs would be helpful and useful to the Secretariat, but questioned the utility of an "analysis of better ways for the Council to do its business." The Chair stated that, given that the Council was only recently established, any comprehensive restructuring might be premature. The Chair, however, encouraged any and all suggestions for improving the Council's efficiency and stated that any such suggestions would be circulated among Council members and Permanent Participants discussion at the next SAO meeting.

## **Agenda Item 10: Coordination with other Bodies**

### *The Nordic Council of Ministers*

Norway noted that there appears to be these days a trend towards increased regional cooperation, that this is something positive, but that it can lead to too many meetings, documents and overlap of work. For the purposes of the Council, Norway suggested that future coordination with other bodies focus on the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, the Council of Baltic Sea States, the Nordic Council of Ministers and the Northern Dimension. Organizations in this group each have their areas of expertise and could rely on each other, or possibly represent each other, as appropriate. For example, the Arctic Council would be the lead organization on environmental protection and sustainable development in the region.

Norway suggested that there needed to be an improvement in the internal coordination in the Arctic Council with regard to international bodies and suggested:

- need for a more structured approach:
- focus on mutual challenges;
- support "area specific" cooperation;
- support a division of labor (organizations could act on behalf of each other);
- need a practical approach in the short term:
- exchange of reports, calendars of meetings, lists of contact people;
- cross representation at meetings (chairs of groups should attend other meetings);
- inform other organizations of Arctic Council initiatives;
- support joint activity at the working group level.

Canada voiced support for stronger linkages with other groups and mentioned specifically strengthening the connections with the Barents Euro-Arctic Council and the Nordic Council of Ministers. Canada also remarked that this type of coordination will require supplemental resources. Canada suggested that the Council build on Norway's ideas and pursue

coordination more strenuously.

### *The Northern Dimension of the European Union*

Finland reported on the meeting in Helsinki on the Friday preceding the SAO meeting of the EU and discussions concerning the Northern Dimension that took place during the meeting.

Highlighted topics included:

- critical nature of environmental and nuclear safety;
- investment projects to improve nuclear safety;
- regional programs to address climate change;
- energy issues, nuclear safety, nuclear waste management, rule of law;
- importance of making the Northern Dimension an open and inclusive process;
- increased funding for Northern Dimension programs;
- joint projects (possibly with World Bank financing);
- linking the Northern Dimension to the Arctic Council through the themes of environmental protection and sustainable development;
- working on an action plan for the Northern Dimension;
- Sweden's presidency of the EU in early 2001 will allow for continued northern emphasis.

Denmark equated the Northern Dimension with a "contact between the EU and the Arctic Council" and emphasized the importance of including indigenous participation.

Canada remarked that it had a parallel initiative at home, developing a "northern dimension" for their foreign policy and voiced support for Council cooperation with the EU's Northern Dimension.

Iceland stated that it favored Arctic cooperation and supports links with the Northern Dimension.

Sweden wanted to thank Finland for starting the process of the Northern Dimension of the EU, which had helped the EU to focus its attention on the Northern region, thus contributing to strengthening cooperation, peace and stability. Four areas required immediate attention: the environment, nuclear security, health and the fight against crime. Sweden confirmed that it was prepared to continue the valuable work done by Finland during the Swedish presidency of the EU in 2001.

Russia supported the idea of cooperation with the Northern Dimension and integration of the work among these regional organizations with similar mandates. Russia suggested:

- The interests of all nations should be met by this;
- content should be comprehensive, addressing:
  - economic concerns (investment);
  - environment;
  - social/cultural aspects;
- free movement of people across national boundaries;
- need to find finances for these activities;
- should include nations from other areas as well. The Arctic Council could be the EU's

"window on to the Arctic."

### *Barents Euro-Arctic Council*

Finland reported that the Barents Euro-Arctic Council was established in 1993 and meets once a year. The Barents Council has 9 observers -- including Canada and the U.S. -- and is constituted of the following four sub-groups:

1. Economic Cooperation and Trade
2. Environmental Cooperation
3. Energy Use
4. Development of a Northern Sea Route

Finland reported that Russia will be the next Chair of the Barents Council and highlighted that environmental cooperation has been one of the Council's core actions. Finland hoped that there would be more cooperation between the environmental group and the economic development group in the future and suggested that Russia could be instrumental in removing political and economic obstacles to investment in the region. Finland further noted progress towards protection of biodiversity in the Barents region had occurred and that an MOU signed with Russia in June of 1998 regarding transportation in the region will strengthen economic links and improve trade in northwest Russia. Finland concluded by suggesting that the Barents Council grapple with the need for sustainable forestry management in the region.

### *Northern Europe Initiative (NEI)*

The United States reported on this initiative that it launched in 1997 which is similar to Europe's Northern Dimension. The U.S. characterized the NEI as a "soft security side" designed to promote stability, security, and prosperity. NEI "activity areas" include: environment, law enforcement, civil society, energy, public health, and business and trade promotion. The NEI presenter expressed a desire to coordinate with the Arctic Council in order to avoid duplication of existing activities and expressed an interest in exploring opportunities for cooperation towards meeting common goals. NEI works closely with the Council of Baltic Sea States, the Nordic Council of Ministers, the EU, the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, and has observers in many of these.

The Chair remarked that there was much work going on within numerous regional organizations focused on the Arctic and that there appeared to be a significant amount of overlap. The chair reported that the challenge would appear to be for groups to be productive without being competitive and that it would be to all of our benefit to smooth out coordination between the groups.

The U.S. welcomed the idea of "added value by sharing information," and suggested that a first step might be for the Arctic Council Secretariat to generate a list of all ongoing Council activities with the goal of identifying any overlap. The Secretariat could then call for similar "lists of activities" from other Arctic regional organizations and present the documents at the next SAO meeting in Fairbanks in April of 2000.

Canada expressed gratitude for the U.S. offer and asked if it might be possible for the U.S. to include the mandates of the organizations along with the lists of their activities.



The U.S. clarified that it was not volunteering to do this for all Arctic regional organizations, but only for the Arctic Council, concentrating on highlighting areas of overlap.

Russia stated that it is important that we as a group examine the legislative basis for the various initiatives being undertaken in the Arctic region because there are "legislative gaps and problems" that need to be addressed. Russia stated that the Arctic Parliamentarians are the ones that deal with these issues and that we should encourage them to do so.

The Netherlands stressed the importance of cooperation between Arctic regional organizations. It suggested that since the next chair of the EU will be Portugal (and not a member of the Arctic Council), the Arctic Council might wish to send a representative to EU meetings, and invite the EU to send a representative to its meetings.

IUCN requested that some thought and discussion also be given within the Council with regard to improving the coordination between IUCN and Council activities. The IUCN stated that it was becoming more active within the Arctic and that it wished to contribute to the Council's work as best it could. IUCN mentioned that it was already working with Council working groups and gave as an example the Marine Protection Workshop with CAFF and PAME. The IUCN directed participants' attention to two documents on its activities and strategy that it had made available to meeting participants.

Canada remarked that, regarding links between the Arctic Council and the EU, the "ball was in the EU's court." Canada further suggested that, if we want the EU to participate, we should consider formally inviting them, and that we might wish to mention this in the SAO press release.

The Chair suggested that the topic of coordination among regional groups be discussed further at the Heads of Delegation lunch. The Chair stated that the U.S. would summarize in a document the discussions on this topic and would circulate the document prior to the SAO meeting in Fairbanks.

### **Agenda Item 11: The Northern Forum**

Mr. John Doyle of the Northern Forum opened the Forum's presentation by expressing that they have a great deal in common with the Arctic Council and that they wish to increase their work with the Council in the future. Mr. Doyle stated that the forum comprised 24 northern regions that were dedicated to work together to promote international cooperation on economic, social, and environmental matters through sub-national governments. Mr. Walter Hickel, former Governor of Alaska added that it was logical to include regional governments in the Council's activities, as they had a great deal in common and they could work together with the Council on many fronts.

Mr. Mikhail Nikolaev, current President of the Northern Forum, stated that the Arctic Council was very important and that there were a number of key issues the Forum desired to jointly address with the Council. These included: infrastructure, transportation, east-west air routes, and the Northern Sea Route. Mr. Nikolaev stated that the Northern Forum should be a "full-fledged associate member of the Arctic Council."

Mr. Hannele Pokka, Governor of Lapland and member of the Northern Forum called for greater cooperation between organizations, nations, and sub-regional governments in the

region. He stressed that this was even more important given the fact that the region is so sparsely populated. Mr. Pokka highlighted the importance of increased cooperation in the area of tourism, and reported that he had been working on this with WWF, the University of the Arctic and others.

Mr. Doyle concluded by stressing the great similarities between Arctic Council and Northern Forum projects, mentioned that a list of those projects was available outside the conference room, and stated that accomplishing the goals would require national and sub-national leadership.

The U.S. thanked Northern Forum for compiling the list of projects and remarked that it indicated lots of room for the two organizations to work together.

### **Agenda Item 12: Update on the University of the Arctic**

Mr. Richard Langlais of the University of the Arctic began his presentation by stating the goals of the group that is attempting to establish the university. These included:

- establishing a routine consultative relationship with the Arctic Council;
- achieving depth and solid platform construction;
- simultaneously pursue modest "pilot activities;"
- seek to include interested academic institutions, but accept rejection of the University of the Arctic by uninterested institutions;
- approach the University of the Arctic not as a "gold rush" or "gold mine," but as "joyful work;"
- work diligently towards accomplishing the University's four current priorities:
  1. Inviting the formulation of indigenous studies programs
  2. Achieving meaningful Russian participation
  3. Developing a "Bachelor of Circumpolar Studies" program
  4. Creation of a circumpolar mobility program

Mr. Langlais reported that the Russian academic community had been participating and that they had also had grassroots participation from Greenland students. Langlais reported that the Northern Research Forum had completed its feasibility study, and that the Secretariat for the University of the Arctic was up and running at the University of Akureyri in Iceland. Efforts are currently underway to implement a governance structure for the University, select trustees, and send out a "call for proposals" for institutes to participate in the "Bachelor of Circumpolar Studies" program. Mr. Langlais informed meeting participants that the University of the Arctic would report on its progress at the next SAO meeting in Fairbanks.

### **Agenda Item 13: Discussion of Public Awareness, Education, and Outreach**

Dr. Bruce Molnia of the U.S. Geological Survey gave an update of the state of the Arctic Council web-site, and made an urgent request for the help of Council members in updating their national pages for the web-site. Specifically, Dr. Molnia requested lists of national contacts, national activities, and links to other sites. The Chair requested that delegations please send the requested information to Dr. Molnia.

Sweden complimented the U.S. on the job that it was doing with the site. Norway stated that the site was very useful, but could be even better, and in this line, suggested that the U.S. use

the site to distribute documents for Arctic Council meetings. The U.S. took the suggestion and committed to exploring this possibility.

Mr. Alan Saunders gave a brief presentation on the Arctic Environmental Data Directory (ADD) and the possibility of the ADD taking over management of the Arctic Council Web Site at the conclusion of the U.S. chairmanship of the Council. Such an arrangement would provide continuity over the years throughout rotations of the chairmanship. Mr. Saunders stated that he would prepare a more detailed presentation on ADD, its capabilities, and opportunities for assisting with the work of the Arctic Council, for the SAO meeting in Fairbanks.

Dr. Kathleen Crane of the Office of Naval Research gave a presentation on the "Arctic Environmental Atlas." Expeditions to collect data on transport of contaminants in the Arctic for the Atlas were funded by the United States in 1993-95. The Atlas also provides links to other organizations conducting similar work. Dr. Crane reported that copies of the Atlas were available, free of charge, from the U.S. Office of Naval Research. At the conclusion of Dr. Crane's briefing, the ICC asked if it might be possible to arrange for Dr. Crane to give her briefing to other countries outside of the Arctic.

To conclude the discussion of public awareness, education, and outreach, Norway reported that it was currently putting together a proposal for a GLOBE (Global Learning to Benefit the Environment) program. As it is currently envisaged, the program would train "trainers" to go to schools in the Arctic and enlist students and teachers there to help gather scientific data on the state of the Arctic environment. Norway will keep Council members apprised of its activities in this area in the future.

#### **Agenda Item 14: Update on the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment**

Dr. Robert Corell, representing the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC), briefed meeting participants on the status of the development of an Arctic Climate Impact Assessment to analyze the effects of global warming and increased levels of UV-B radiation on the Arctic. Dr. Corell reported that the work of the Assessment Steering Committee (ASC) in planning the implementation of the assessment had involved members of CAFF, AMAP, IASC, ICES, and indigenous people from the Arctic. Dr. Corell outlined the guiding principles for developing the ACIA included:

- ensure a breadth of participation;
- establish scientific credibility;
- address issues of uncertainty;
- communicate process, results, and products;
- make recommendations;
- communicate in clear, accessible language.

To continue his presentation, Dr. Corell reported results of research scientific research, pointed out the current level of ozone depletion in the Arctic, and discussed the scope, strategy and content of the assessment. With regard to content, Dr. Corell stressed the importance of stating what we know, what the likely changes will be, and what their impacts will be. The assessment will focus on what we know in the atmosphere, on land, in fresh water and in the marine environment and the likely changes and impacts on each of these

environments.

It is planned that the assessment will produce three volumes: a synthesis document, a scientific document, and a policy document. The proposed management structure of the ACIA will include the Assessment Steering Committee (ASC), the committee's chair, and a secretariat for the ASC. The actual drafting of the volumes will operate on the basis of a "Lead-author strategy."

The tentative plan regarding a time-frame for the assessment is to have the document completed by late 2002, in time to be integrated, if possible into the next report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Financial resources to produce the report will be sought through in-kind contributions, joint programs, and assessing costs for shared interests. The ASC will generate status reports, an annual review, and science reports to keep SAO apprised of the group's progress. The U.S. will host a scoping workshop to further work out these issues in February/March of 2000.

Canada characterized the ACIA as a "critically important project," and asked that the Arctic Council Chair consider putting this item near the front of the agenda for the SAO meeting in Fairbanks. Canada committed to supporting the ACIA in a strong way.

Sweden stated that it was concerned about the threat of Climate Change and could agree in principle to the idea of an Arctic Climate Impact Assessment as suggested earlier by CAFF. Sweden thought, however, that it was too early to take a decision and said that it needed more time to study this specific project and also asked AMAP and CAFF to present their views.

Dr. Corell reported that CAFF and AMAP chairs and the executive directors of their secretariats had been involved in the project every step of the way.

The U.S. reported that the U.S. AMAP working group fully accepted the ACIA as it is currently written, but that the scope of the assessment -- which includes socioeconomic considerations -- lay a little outside AMAP's current mandate.

CAFF reported that it was fully behind and supportive of this initiative and would explore ways of being full participants in the assessment itself.

Iceland thanked everyone who had been involved with the ACIA and expressed pleasure at the degree of progress. Iceland supported moving ahead with the ACIA to full implementation and stressed the need for a credible and readable report. Iceland, however, expressed concern with the review and adoption of "policy implications" and "socioeconomic aspects." Iceland stated that it was critical to have a strong report, and that, consequently, these issues should be addressed in the assessment. Iceland suggested that this might necessitate changing some of the working group mandates to allow them to grapple with these topics.

The Chair reminded participants that approval of the ACIA ultimately depended on the Ministers, and that it was important for delegations to send in their comments and concerns regarding the ACIA so that we will be able to have fruitful discussions of this initiative at the Fairbanks SAO meeting.

Iceland stated that it had questions regarding the policy aspects of the report itself.

The U.S. thanked the ASC for all of its hard work on the ACIA to date and agreed that we needed this information to make sound policy decisions. The U.S. offered enthusiastic support for the project and announced that it was prepared to serve as lead country for the project and, in this capacity, be willing to:

- serve as chair of the Assessment Steering Committee;
- fund and staff and ASC secretariat;
- host a scoping workshop for the ACIA early next year (2000);
- support strong participation by U.S. experts;
- publish and distribute the final report.

The U.S. remarked that, while it was interested in making these contributions, it would need the strong support of all Council members if it is to make the ACIA a successful global effort.

The U.K. thanked everyone involved with the ACIA, characterized the initiative as "excellent," and stated that the U.K.'s Arctic research people would be most interested in participating. The U.K. announced that it would be hosting the second Arctic Science Week in Cambridge between April 2<sup>nd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>.

Canada asked if it would be possible to move forward with the ACIA before the ministerial, thanked the U.S. for its offer of leadership, but stated that it would have to give this some consideration.

Norway supported the proposal and thanked the U.S. for its offer of leadership and its willingness to establish a secretariat. Norway also agreed that we should work towards completing the assessment in time for inclusion in the IPCC's next report. Norway stated that it would focus on the synthesis and scientific volumes and wait for further discussions before turning its attention towards the policy volume.

Denmark supported the proposal, expressed gratitude to the U.S. for its offer, and expressed a need for the Council to be careful regarding the socioeconomic aspects of the project.

The U.S. clarified that it was offering to provide a secretariat and infrastructure for the initiative, not change the components of the ASC or how the work of the ASC would be done.

The Chair thanked everyone for their comments, and stated that he would place this on the agenda for Fairbanks. The chair requested comments from others on the socioeconomic aspect of the project and stated that we would want to have further discussions on the policy implications of the ACIA.

### **Statements of Observers**

Representatives of the International Red Cross and the Russian Red Cross reported on their efforts to provide humanitarian assistance to inhabitants of the Russian Arctic during the winter of 1998-1999. The Russian Red Cross reported on assistance from the Red Cross organizations of each of the Arctic Council member countries. The Red Cross expressed an interest in becoming an observer to the Arctic Council.

The ICC reported that Alaska's North Slope Borough had provided hunting and fishing equipment to make the Russian indigenous more self-sufficient, and asked if the Red Cross had intentions of following up in this area in the future (with regard to the type of assistance it provides). The Red Cross reported that it did have a sustainable development/capacity building aid program.

Finland formally offered to chair the Arctic Council at the conclusion of the U.S. chairmanship. Finland's offer was accepted unanimously - with gratitude - by the other Council members.

The Senior Arctic Officials formally adopted the final versions of the minutes from the Sustainable Development Working Group and Senior Arctic Officials Meetings, held in Anchorage Alaska in May of 1999.

### **Agenda Item 15: Work Program and Deliverables for the Ministerial Meeting in Fall 2000**

The U.S. outlined what it anticipated would be the deliverables for the Ministerial Meeting October 12-13, 2000.

Under the Sustainable Development Program, project reports and recommendations for further action will be given for each of the following:

- Telemedicine;
- Future of Children and Youth in the Arctic;
- Fisheries Management;
- Contaminants and Health of Arctic Residents;
- Emerging Infectious Diseases;
- Submission of new projects for ministerial approval;
- Submission for approval of ministers an agreed-upon framework document for sustainable development.

Under the Council's Environmental Program:

- AMAP, CAFF, EPPR, and PAME will complete their workplans as scheduled;
- A final version of ACAP will be presented for approval (with a credible number of projects);
- ACIA hopes to have something ready for ministerial approval;
- Public outreach:
  - virtual secretariat will be completed and ready to be passed on to ADD;
  - web-site will be up and running;
  - Update on educational efforts.

Canada expressed satisfaction with all the suggestions for deliverables and suggested the following additions:

- Canada would present a concrete project on capacity building;
- could the chairs of the four environmental working groups meeting ‡ day ahead of time in Fairbanks to draft a paper for SAOs on "decisions to be made?";
- could delegates put together in time for the SAO meeting in Fairbanks a draft agenda

- for the Ministerial;
- would the Arctic Council chair put the question of "Observers" on the agenda for the SAO meeting in Fairbanks?

The chair presented meeting participants with a draft version of the press release for the SAO meeting, minor changes were made, and participants agreed on a final version of the press release.

The Chair adjourned the meeting.

**APPENDICES:**

[Appendix A](#), "AMAP Report to Senior Arctic Officials"

[Appendix B](#), "CAFF Report to Senior Arctic Officials"

[Appendix C](#), "EPPR Report to Senior Arctic Officials"

[Appendix D](#), "PAME Report to Senior Arctic Officials"