

CAFF Management Board Minutes
Homer, Alaska from November 18 to 20, 2003
(Issued January 16, 2004)

Agenda Item 1: Introduction

Introductory remarks by Kenton Wohl, the CAFF Chair, and round table introduction of all participants to the meeting. A list of the participants to the meeting is contained in an appendix to the minutes. The CAFF Chair then reviewed administrative issues for meeting, including the planned visit to the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge, and the reception and dinner hosted by the US.

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda.

The draft agenda was revised by adding Agenda Item 20: Other Business on Thursday afternoon, immediately following Agenda Item 19: CAFF Collaboration with Other Organizations. There was a question raised about those members of the CAFF Working Group who were not able to attend this meeting. The CAFF Chair agreed to approach the Russian SAO about future participation at the CAFF meetings. The CAFF Chair also commented that an interim Greenlandic representative has now been appointed to CAFF. There was a request that time to be allocated for a general discussion of CPAN issues, and a request for a discussion of AC financing of projects, both of which are now placed under Other Business. With these changes, the revised agenda was adopted.

Agenda Item 3: Overview of CAFF Activities since Girdwood.

Magdalena Muir, Executive Secretary, CAFF Secretariat, briefly reviewed the monthly reports of CAFF Chair and Secretariat which have been filed since May 2003, and the CAFF reports to the meetings of the SAOs for April and October 2003. Detailed discussions were deferred to specific Agenda Items, or under the discussion of the CAFF Secretariat Activities and Budget.

There were some general observations made by the Executive Secretary as to recent changes in the nature of requests to CAFF and the CAFF Secretariat. In the past year, there have been increasing requests for participation in AC wide initiatives or activities of other AC Working Groups (WG). The Executive Secretary also indicated that the Secretariat was not able, given the current staffing, to respond to all these requests for cooperation. Therefore, the Secretariat would not be able to respond to all these requests without further assistance within the Secretariat or contracted help.

There was discussion among attendees as to why these changes are occurring. They appear partly due to initiatives of AC and Icelandic Chair, and partly due to other WG initiatives. The AC Finnish Chair and the emphasis on partnerships within and external to the AC was referenced. The CAFF WG recognized the need to participate in a range of

AC and WG initiatives, but also recognized the difficulty in allocating time and resources when CAFF was approached between Ministerial meetings, and when these matters were not included in the CAFF Work Plan 2002-2004.

The CAFF Chair referred to the need for CAFF to be more adaptive in response to these requests, and that greater assistance will be required by the CAFF Chair and Secretariat from National Representatives, Permanent Participants and other members of the CAFF WG. One suggestion was the establishment of a set of criteria to determine the basis and level of involvement. Another suggestion was that it would be useful for CAFF to focus on core issues, i.e., policy initiatives like the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA). The CAFF Chair suggested this criteria could be included for discussion under Agenda Item 20: Other Business.

The comment was made that there was the need to have advance discussion involving National Representatives and other members of the CAFF WG prior to the CAFF Chair and Secretariat making commitments at SAO meetings. The CAFF Chair and Secretariat pointed out that no commitments were made by CAFF at the October SAO and related meetings. Instead, CAFF had indicated the need to discuss its participation in these initiatives at the CAFF Management Board meeting. However, decisions had been made by the SAOs that resulted in work commitments for CAFF.

One party referred to the fact the CAFF Work Plan 2000-2002 included a work plan item that referred to the role of the CAFF Secretariat in liaising with the AC and AC WGs, and that it might be useful to re-include this item in the new CAFF Work Plan 2004 to 2006, in recognition of the demands being placed on the CAFF Secretariat.

The CAFF Chair summarized that was a need for an overall discussion of these requests for cooperation. One party described this as a process issue, which might be raised during the meeting of the AC Chair and the WG Chairs and Secretariats that occurs in conjunction with every SAO meeting. Another party indicated that CAFF needed to avoid being overwhelmed, so that it was still able to complete the work approved in the CAFF Work Plan. Another party referred to the ongoing need of CAFF to prioritize and determine its level of involvement for each request. There was emphasis by another party for scoping this process of responding to these requests, and making sure that there is an advance determination of need for cooperation, and an understanding of the level of commitment and engagement.

In response to concerns of over commitment raised by the CAFF Chair and Secretariat, there was a discussion of a variety of options, and the possibility of taking on contract people at the Secretariat to work on projects. One party referred to outsourcing and contracting by the CAFF Secretariat, where the CAFF Working Group could provide feedback and supervision of this contract work.

There was also reference to CAFF reporting under its monthly status reports, and a query whether it would be useful for CAFF to summarize once or twice a year in a general way the outcomes and deliverables resulting from its different activities. The CAFF Secretariat referred to the possibility of this report being incorporated under the CAFF report for the SAO meetings, which occur twice a year. There was general support for this proposition. There was overall agreement from the meeting attendees that the monthly reports of CAFF Chair and Secretariat are useful, and should be continued.

Agenda Item 4: Status of ECORA

The discussion of the status of ECORA began with a power point presentation by GRID-Arendal. This presentation concluded with a review of the November report on ECORA, provided by GRID-Arendal. Norway then reported on ECORA. It was noted that ECORA was a very challenging process, where CAFF, as one of the three representatives in the Steering Committee (SC), plays an important role together with UNEP and Russia.

Recapitulating recent events, the first budget for ECORA was acceptable to CAFF and UNEP, but not to Russia. Referring to the ECORA project, the balance between economy and responsibilities is worked out now, and there are hopes that an agreement will be reached on a revised budget and related implementation plan. It was hoped to provide news for this meeting, but this acceptance had not yet been confirmed. An SC meeting will be held once the project document, including the budget, have been approved by all partners, tentatively in early 2004.

With respect to overall timing of this project, Norway wishes to get ECORA up and running, before matters and partners change. An executive meeting will occur in winter 2004 as a means of getting overall agreement on all outstanding matters, with a kickoff meeting for key participants in the spring of 2004.

In response to a question as to what the budget issues were, it was explained that the Russians had raised questions about salaries and responsibilities and the amount of funds used on project administration by Russian and Western partners, as well as other issues related to the use of GEF funds. In response to a question as to whether such budget issues are normal for other GEF projects in Russia, it was explained that there are some similarities particularly with the salaries requested.

The allocation of responsibilities is another key issue, and the SC is still seeking the right balance between UNEP and Russian responsibility. The Russians have requested the Deputy Project Manager's time be reduced. The role of the Deputy Project Manager, however, was designed to be a full time function, involving both project administration and operations, as well as technical expertise. Implementation in Russia is the key issue on other GEF projects, and the fact that ECORA has come this far is a complement to efforts of the CAFF and other parties on the SC.

Reference was made to a recent meeting in Finland on ECORA implementation on Kolguev Island, held in conjunction with the third Barents Region Habitat Conservation Forum. This meeting was very positive, showing the potential for future ECORA work across other model areas. The idea was raised that links between the AC SDAP (led by SDWG and with a Russian lead), the upcoming Russian Chair of the AC, and the ECORA project may facilitate implementation of ECORA. There was a response that relations are already quite good, but that future may indeed hold improvement.

A question was raised as to the role of the CAFF Secretariat in ECORA. It was noted in response that there is increased responsibility of countries in this phase of ECORA, unlike earlier phases (PDF-A and PDF-B). Further discussion was deferred to discussion on overall role of CAFF Secretariat in various projects. There was a question about payments by CAFF member nations for December, given that ECORA status is unclear. The Swedish representative noted that Sweden can earmark the funds, but it was noted that other nations may not be as flexible.

The Executive Secretary noted that the CAFF Secretariat's role in ECORA can be revisited at the time of the next CAFF Work Plan. Immediate deliverables for the CAFF Secretariat that will be completed in this work plan period are two reports from the PDF-B phase. The Secretariat has money budgeted to print those reports, but requires revisions by UNEP representative and by former CAFF Secretariat. There was some discussion as to whether these reports will now proceed.

Assurances were given by Norway that ECORA is going forward. There was confirmation that the planned SC meeting will be limited to the overall governance of the project, with no role for Western Advisors and Regional Teams.

A question was raised as to near-term CAFF involvement, under the assumption that ECORA will go forward. What are most important in-kind contributions that should be made? The UNEP response was that training is a good example and that there is a need to identify existing projects and approaches that could be applicable. Reference also made to CBIRD, CPAN, and CFG work that may be relevant to ECORA. The indication was given that CBIRD is already active at Kolguev Island through the participation of Hallvard Strøm of Norway.

The role of SDWG was raised, with reference to reindeer husbandry as an important and clear example of sustainable development involving the Northern Forum and the World Reindeer Herder Association. A reference was made to the ecosystem-based approach for the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan, with the note that the ECORA project may provide a good example for "ecosystem-based" approach, and may then be used to inform other matters and areas of CAFF involvement.

The Secretariat asked whether ECORA information should be provided on the CAFF website, or whether it is sufficient to have links to GRID-Arendal website. The Board concluded that only links to other websites need to be posted on the CAFF website.

The US Representative noted that US remains very interested in participating in central and eastern Model Areas, and is very interested in learning who the Model Area Coordinator will be. The issue of the Western Adviser role for the Kolyma River Model Area was raised. The US Representative confirmed that the US will be the Western Advisor for the Kolyma River Basin Model Area, though they are also willing to share that role with another CAFF country.

Canada and Finland confirmed that they do not have existing links that encourage direct participation as, for example, Western Advisors. Iceland agreed, noting that bilateral links are insufficient to encourage participation. Iceland does contribute to PAME and POPS projects, due to fisheries and marine links, but it is more difficult for Iceland to link to a Russian-based biodiversity project such as ECORA. Questions were raised as to the exact role of Western Advisors, and as to the existence of a template for an “Integrated Ecosystem Management” (IEM) plan such as ECORA. The UNEP representative volunteered to pull together literature references to serve as a template for development of an IEM plan.

The ECORA status reports put out by GRID-Arendal were noted to be very useful, and it was hoped that they will continue or increase as further news becomes available. Approval for the communications approach outlined by Norway was indicated by the group.

Action Items:

1. The meeting of the Steering Committee which is anticipated in winter 2004.
2. Kick-off meeting for entire ECORA may be in spring 2004, pending release of GEF funds.
3. The UNEP Representative will prepare a package of background information on Integrated Ecosystem Management to aid Western Advisors and CAFF participants.

Agenda Item 5: AC Arctic Marine Strategic Plan

The CAFF Secretariat briefly commented on CAFF and CAFF Secretariat involvement and the involvement of other parties, such as the US and Iceland, in the AMSP. This involvement was writing the discussion paper, and participating in the actual workshop, which incorporated results from the CPAN Workshop on the Marine Compendium. Upcoming dates and required participation by CAFF was also highlighted. There was a brief review of the draft outline for the AC AMSP that was circulated by PAME on November 15.

The CAFF Chair discussed CAFF visibility during the workshop through the presentations of the CAFF Chair and Secretariat, and through participation of members of CPAN and CBIRD, as well as other members of the CAFF Working Group such as WWF and GRID-Arendal. The CAFF Chair summarized the last day of the workshop, which included a meeting in the afternoon by the different AC WGs, and included a discussion of WG participation in the drafting process, the transparency of process, and the inclusion of the goals and criteria of the different WGs in this plan.

The November 15 draft outline was meant to address the concerns raised by the WGs at this meeting. Referring to this outline, the CAFF Chair noted that the success of the AMSP will be based on transparency of the process, and how the comments of the other AC WGs will be included in drafting process, which will be led by a three-person PAME drafting committee. Right now, there is a very strong focus on the plan being a deliverable for the SAO meeting. The next task of CAFF will be to respond to this outline, and to highlight omissions such as the lack of references to marine protected areas and renewable resource uses that occur in a sustainable way.

The discussion on the AMSP was led by the Iceland representative. It was noted that the original context paper of PAME only addressed contaminants, pollution, and shipping issues. There was reference made to past concerns by Board members that the focus was too narrow, with inadequate attention to biota and biodiversity. It was noted that these continue to be concerns. There was general agreement that AMSP should feature an upfront focus on biodiversity, and the conservation of biodiversity.

It was noted that the annotated outline for the AMSP appears to be very skeletal at this point, with inadequate attention to audience, scope and purpose. A suggestion was put forward to redraft the outline, reflecting CAFF perception of what this strategy is about; or to seek direction on this matter. Representatives from Observer groups made reference to certain problems and limitations in the draft outline, which had not been sent to the Observers. Reference was made to the CAFF discussion paper presented at the AMSP workshop, and it was asked whether this could be a good basis for inclusion of biodiversity.

The issue was raised of whether there could be a separation of the strategy and an implementation plan, which could be developed over next Ministerial period. It was noted that there is no point in having a strategy without an implementation plan. The Canada national representative suggested that the Board work on revising the AMSP outline over the next few days, so it can be forwarded out in response to this draft outline. There was general support for this suggestion, and agreement to do so by a group including the Canada and Iceland representatives, the WWF, UNEP, and ICC representatives. It was noted that this approach is a good one, and support was given to the distribution of CAFF comments on the AMSP to WGs, PPs, and Observers, with invitation to PAME and others to respond.

Action Item:

- 1 CAFF will circulate a revised AMSP outline to PAME and the WGs, PPs, and Observers, with special attention to biodiversity conservation.

Agenda Item 6: Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program

There was a report by Iceland on the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP), including a review of the draft document. There was a focus on several key areas including monitoring, overall program, implementation strategy, and challenges and considerations.

The Board was reminded that the CBMP Framework document will be a background discussion paper for endorsement by Ministers. Reference was made to different funding attempts, including most recent approach by the Iceland Representative, the CAFF Secretariat, and Icelandic parties to the EU under 6th Framework Research plan under ERRANET. The response suggested that a larger approach is required, which was perceived as premature at this time. Networks are so far working on a voluntary basis, and can only do so much on a voluntary basis. Reference was made as to next steps, which include February 2004 CBIRD meeting (including a seabird-specific monitoring framework document) and December 2003 shorebird network meeting (which is bringing together experts from all over the world, and not just the arctic). Reference was made to the absence of regular observations for every species, even for higher profile species like polar bears. It was noted that overall funding has not been very successful, and may need to wait until the framework is approved by Ministers.

CAFF Secretariat briefly mentioned the role of CEON, as well as Northern View and Scannet. It was noted that the CBMP is the only initiative so far that is circum-arctic. The Secretariat raised the issue of climate change as the key focus for most recent funding proposals, as well as focus of CEON and the likely outcome from ACIA. Reference was made to ICAR, with indications that GEF had come back and was willing to support future efforts for climate change in relation to biodiversity in Russia.

The IPS representative noted that AAC and RAIPON are very interested in community-based monitoring from different perspectives. It was noted that Iceland and PPs have lead roles in this project, and that there is a need to have some information in the framework about priorities and cost implications, based on existing parties and anticipating a more ambitious approach. Reference was made to Northern View, with funding until October 2004 (first phase), and a bidding process after that time for the second phase (3 of 10 initial parties being funded). It was noted that the framework document is very thorough, but there is a need to consider target audience and perhaps strengthen the “justification” section of the framework document.

Questions were raised about related or potentially linked monitoring efforts of EU. In response, reference was made to Scannet and Envinet, but it was noted that both have limited and restricted funding. Reference was made to links to Russia and North America, which CAFF can provide. Reference was also made to having shared funding between NSF and EU.

The Chair raised the relationship between CBMP and ACIA's monitoring requirements arising from recommendations in ACIA Scientific Report, showcasing some success stories to support CBMP (such as seabirds and shorebirds). It was predicted that CBMP may be most likely to succeed as flowing from ACIA. It was noted that CBMP is unique in circum-arctic, and that there is a need to harmonize national efforts with international commitments. Reference was made to ITEX, caribou and seabirds, and the Canada Representative offered support for ongoing monitoring in these areas, in part led by CAFF. The Board agreed that monitoring data analysis receive priority, versus data collection.

Reference was made to cooperation with AMAP climatic monitoring efforts, in order to have integrated complimentary approach. Reference was also made to gap analysis (raised in framework document) being a very valid output, and the focus on individual subject areas. The link with ACIA is imperative, and should be highlighted further; and the Iceland representative would appreciate suggestions in this regard. Further suggestions were to focus on target areas: protected areas, gap analysis, seabirds, community based monitoring. Questions were raised as to who to work with, perhaps AMAP and ACIA, some external parties etc? Deadline for CAFF comments on CBMP framework draft paper could be December 15, with a March 1 target suggested for a final document to go to SAOs for approval, and then to Ministerial meeting. The discussion wrapped up with a suggestion for a case study approach, showing how monitoring can provide meaningful information on a circumpolar scale, and emphasizing clear relevance to humans.

Action Items:

1. CAFF comments on CBMP framework draft by 15 December.
2. Final draft of CBMP framework by 1 March, to be delivered to SAOs for eventual Ministerial endorsement

Agenda Item 7: CAFF/AMAP Coordinated Monitoring Plan/Meeting:

Discussion was initiated by reviewing the situation of AMAP monitoring (contaminants-based) and CAFF monitoring (biodiversity-based). It was noted that the SAOs have requested that CAFF coordinate monitoring efforts with AMAP, noting that not only will there be direct benefits to each program, but also that successfully coordinated monitoring programs will positively demonstrate the viability of coordination at the circumpolar AC scale-leading to further benefits down the road. It was noted that monitoring is issue-driven and that AMAP and CAFF have different issues, complicating the coordination. It was noted that overlap between AMAP and CAFF monitoring programs (in terms of sampling, counting, site locations, etc.) should be viewed as a bonus, and not as the basis for a coordinated plan.

The Icelandic representative raised the idea of a separate paper on coordination of AMAP and CAFF, and references to the paper in the framework document. The Finland representative indicated that Finland has money (up to \$15,000 US) that can be used in this regard. There was discussion of a joint meeting of CAFF and AMAP for March 30 to April 1 2004. This meeting will deal with ACIA as well as with coordination of monitoring approaches. There was discussion as to the expected breadth of the meeting in reference to both ACIA and coordinated monitoring. There was a suggestion that a team get together to flesh out issues to coordination document, meeting with agreement by the Board.

Action Item:

- 1 A smaller group composed of Iceland, US and Finland will flesh out the coordinated monitoring issues for Board review, working towards a final document for eventual distribution to AMAP and AC.

Second day

On morning of second day, a warm welcome to the CAFF Working Group was provided by Gary Edwards, Region 7, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Edwards also attended this day's meetings. This day began with a summary by the Chair of the prior day's outcomes.

Agenda Item 8: ACIA Scientific Report and Policy Document

A report was provided by the CAFF Secretariat on the status of the ACIA Scientific Report (ACIA SR) and Overview Document (OD), and the recent change in the CAFF role for the ACIA Policy Document. The Secretariat noted the participation of the CAFF Working Group in the review of the Scientific Report, and the future role of the CAFF Working Group in the review of the Overview Document. As of November 2003, the drafting of ACIA Policy Document (PD) is being addressed by the SAOs, and CAFF and AMAP are no longer coordinating this process.

After this report, there was extensive discussion of ACIA SR, proposed changes to Chapter 10 of that document, and a discussion of Overview Document and related review process for that document by CAFF beginning in February 2004. Some concerns were raised as to whether revisions to Chapter 10 are manageable given the time frame, and the review of these revisions. The Secretariat indicated that changes to Chapter 10 would be reviewed by scientists and the ACIA Executive, and that a broader review would not be possible. However, it was noted that the revisions were responding to earlier concerns expressed by CAFF as to the omission of biodiversity and conservation in the overall Scientific Report and in this particular chapter.

There was a discussion of scope of CAFF review and responsibilities for ACIA SR and OD in February, and during the course of the joint AMAP and CAFF March meeting.

There was then a discussion of ACIA Policy Document meeting in relation to that March meeting, and what will be addressed in that March meeting given the absence of CAFF responsibilities for PD.

The CAFF Secretariat raised the possibility of this being a board meeting used for other CAFF purposes and responsibilities, including other shared responsibilities with AMAP. Another party indicated that there may be other responsibilities for CAFF at this meeting, so it was necessary to keep these dates available. There was more general discussion about the nature of the ACIA PD. The Board determined that the action item would be for the CAFF Chair to communicate with the AMAP Chair as to agenda and responsibilities for March meeting, given the removal of these responsibilities for the ACIA PD from CAFF and AMAP.

Action Item:

- 1 The CAFF Chair will communicate with the AMAP Chair as to agenda and responsibilities for the joint March meeting.

Agenda Item 9: Compendium of Ecologically Important Marine Areas Workshop.

Discussion began with a review of the recent workshop (October 15-17 2003, Akureyri, Iceland) together with comments by Iceland and WWF, who both attended the workshop. Iceland gave an overview of the two-page summary of the workshop, and provided indications of the outstanding work still to be done. Reference was made to the fact that the identification of “sensitive” areas (beyond the officially protected areas) is a key challenge. There was a suggestion that CAFF needs to scope out in more detail what CAFF is trying to achieve in the Compendium. There were extensive comments by National Representatives and Observers that the workshop was not efficiently planned and led, and concern was expressed that the workshop had the potential to dissuade further participation. Process issues were raised. The fundamentals (audience, purpose, scope) of the workshop were not adequately addressed or clarified ahead of the workshop. Particular problems noted were the low attendance and the excessive focus on GIS as a tool, with inadequate focus on ecological and marine questions. Stepping back, regrouping, and returning to the topic was suggested. Substantive issues were raised as to how to move forward for next aspects of Compendium implementation (relevant given possible next stage in February 2004 in conjunction with a proposed CPAN meeting).

Reference was made to the potential value of the product, particularly in relation to the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan. It was noted that the Compendium can eventually be a high-tech or low-tech deliverable; and that beginning with the lower-tech option may be a good initial step. It was noted that the WCMC has UN mandate to compile a database of world protected areas. Ecologically “important” areas are a broader and less defined category. There was general agreement that Marine Protected Areas are easy; the difficult area is the identification of ecologically important marine areas. This issue is important in relation to AMSP, EPPR (with ecologically important areas), and PAME.

In response to the need to determine ecologically important marine areas, it was suggested that the CAFF Management Board provide direction to CPAN on ecologically important areas, building on past work by CAFF and CPAN, and other parties (IUCN and WCMC). Comments were given that there are many ways to implement this approach. The point was made that it is first necessary to determine product, and then resolve criteria. Actual creation of the product might be relatively simple.

The Chair summarized by noting that the Compendium represents a potentially good product, but there are some problems with implementation. CAFF will recommend that the CPAN step back and redefine the framework. The Chair is willing to send a letter to the CPAN Co-Chairs requesting clarification and assigning this task. There was some discussion by Norway and Canada about data sets that they can provide in the future. The Chair stated he will work with the Iceland and WWF representatives in providing direction and recommending further tasks. This will include an indication that CAFF not accept the summary and recommendations from workshop.

Action Items:

- 1 The Chair will send a letter to Compendium leads, requesting clarification of the points raised by the CAFF Management Board.
- 2 The Chair will work with the Iceland and WWF representatives to provide direction from CAFF to the Compendium.

Agenda Item 10: Wild Places for Wildlife Workshop

The Canadian representative reported on this CPAN co-sponsored workshop in Yellowknife. The Canada representative raised the possibility of the document from that workshop being a CAFF deliverable for 2002 to 2004. An annotated outline can be provided if there is interest, and the date of deliverable can be for Ministerial 2004.

The proposed document will contain a summary of current literature for protected areas, the state of protected areas, and the development of circumpolar guidelines. The following time frame was proposed for reviewing the summary of the workshop (early December 2003), sending an annotated outline to the CAFF WG (no later than January 2004), Once the summary of the workshop and annotated outline are provided, the Board can decide whether the document can be a CAFF deliverable, with a subsequent final decision and moving forward by CPAN shortly thereafter.

Action Items:

- 1 The Canadian National Representative is to provide a workshop summary and annotated outline by early 2004.
- 2 The Board is to determine whether the document can be a CAFF CPAN deliverable.

Agenda Item 11: Alaska Sacred Sites Project

The AIA Representative gave an introductory presentation. Some concern was expressed about culturally significant sites not being “sacred” sites due to conflict with Russian Orthodox religion. AIA stated they were not interested in doing a pre-proposal for workshop, but will instead use the workshop to develop a proposal. A comment was made that the Russian, AIA and GCI approaches may differ, and it is difficult to have one approach that is totally transferable. It was noted that the Sacred Sites project is an exciting idea overall, but it will need to be respectful of regional differences. Biodiversity and cooperation between indigenous peoples and scientists were highlighted.

The IPS Representative gave an overview of the GCI proposal. The GCI definition of sacred sites includes burial grounds, rearing areas for animals, and areas of spiritual significance. GCI spans three regions and two countries, and it was noted that considerable work is already occurring in Canada. Concerns were raised, focusing on impacts of development and resource activities. It was noted that the goal is to create a database within the Gwich'in Nation, and to develop regulations and international agreements, restore sacred sites, and create educational materials. Methodologies and expected outcomes were suggested.

The AIA Representative requested clarity and direction from the CAFF WG, particularly in regards to the workshop and facilitation of the AIA proposal. The AIA Representative mentioned that they envisioned two separate proposals by AIA and GCI, and see no problem with having different approaches.

The comment was made that the GCI proposal may not be consistent with US objectives and mandates. AAC spoke to and supported the proposal. WWF indicated that they would support the GCI proposal as a very important planning tool that works well with their Conservation First initiative (discussed subsequently under Item 20: Other Business).

It was noted that there is a common overlay between important indigenous sites and sites of biological diversity. In areas where that overlay still exists, there is a clear link to the CAFF mandate. In areas where that overlay has already broken down or never existed, it may be more difficult to link with the CAFF mandate. In contrast, another party noted the links between the Sacred Sites concept and the World Heritage Convention, and the cultural and biological designations within that Convention. It was noted that AC countries in CAFF are also full members of WHC.

There were comments on the breadth of the GCI proposal, and the need to perhaps clarify some aspects. Canada agreed to further discussions with GCI on their proposal, but noted that substantive efforts are required before a sacred sites proposal is ready for endorsement by the CAFF Board. The US indicated that it would have further discussions with AIA on their proposal. There was directional support from the Board for both these proposals being included under CAFF, provided the respective lead countries were satisfied with the proposals. Eventual endorsement of these proposals is subject to there

being a joint leads with a CAFF country and the GCI and the AIA.

Action Item:

1. As potential lead countries, Canada will have further discussions with GCI to clarify their proposal, and the US will have further discussions with AIA.

Agenda Item 12: CAFF Participation in SDWG Action Plan

CAFF Secretariat reviewed the overall request of the SDWG to CAFF for the SDAP, with reference to different directions in concept paper, and ecological block. Discussion ensued as to whether there might be clarification from Russia. Under this review, one can list ongoing projects, as well as completed projects.

There was discussion about the CAFF Strategic Plan, the impact of lack of money, and the extent to which the CAFF agenda will be determined by other parties. There was discussion as to whether CAFF Secretariat should complete this matrix. The Executive Secretary indicated that, given the current resources and staffing of the Secretariat, the Secretariat can only do a very cursory summary based on the CAFF work plan, with no analysis or meeting of the requirements referred to in the SDAP document.

There was a decision that the CAFF Secretariat will contact SDWG Chair and Secretariat to get clarification about the type of reporting required for January 15, 2004. After receiving a response, this will be reported back to the CAFF WG. The CAFF WG will then make a decision how to proceed then. However, no CAFF country assume a lead role at the meeting, and there are no designated CAFF contacts for the SDAP (a lead country is required to coordinate CAFF participation in this project, and no CAFF country is assuming the lead role at this time).

Action Items:

- 1 Decision that the CAFF Secretariat will contact SDWG Chair and Secretariat to get clarification as to type of reporting required for January 15, 2004.
- 2 The response will be reported back to the CAFF Working Group, and the Working Group will then make a decision how to proceed.

Agenda Item 13: Assessment of Petroleum Hydrocarbons in the Arctic, to be delivered to the AC Ministerial 2006

This agenda item began with remarks by the CAFF Secretariat on the assessment of environmental impacts of petroleum hydrocarbons in the Arctic, including the amendment of the proposal to include assessments of socio-impacts by the SDWG. The Executive Secretary reviewed the letter and information provided by AMAP, concluding with a recommendation that CAFF undertake a lead role for chapter 6, and either cooperate with AMAP on Chapter 5 or lead on certain aspects.

Iceland and Norway noted that biological effects have always been within the mandate of CAFF, and supported cooperation with AMAP. The CAFF Chair suggested that CAFF lead for Chapter 6, and that CAFF help or work cooperatively with AMAP for Chapter 5. However, a lead country is required to collate the project, with all the parties involved in this process. Canada mentioned that it was assuming lead country role for the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan, and there was the need for another country to take a lead role in this matter. The CAFF Chair indicated that the US can bring expertise on accidental oil spills arising from Exxon Valdez. There was a discussion as to the cost and scope of the assessment (which could be narrow, or broad, if it is conducted in the manner and scope of an ACIA-style assessment), and the best means for CAFF to approach it.

There was the following agreement on how to proceed. The CAFF Chair is to have discussions with the AMAP Chair, as well as the AMAP representative and US SAO. This item will be included on the agenda for the joint CAFF and AMAP meeting in March 30 to April 2. There was agreement as to the need to have correspondence between AMAP and CAFF, in preparation for the joint March meeting.

There was a discussion of the option of contracting to have this responsibility completed after there was a review of the CAFF Secretariat budget, but no decision was made. No CAFF country is assuming as lead role at this time for this project. This matter will also be placed on the agendas of the CBIRD meeting (including invitations to attend being forwarded to the UK CAFF representative and Martin Huebeck, SOTEAG) and the CPAN meeting.

Discussion as to whether CAFF should raise this issue with the SAOs. If so, it needs to be done for early April when CAFF files its report with the SAOs. The CAFF Chair raised the issue that CAFF still needs to have lead country role (i.e., a lead country is required to coordinate CAFF participation in this project, and no CAFF country is assuming the lead role at this time).

Action Items:

- 1 The CAFF Chair will have discussions with the AMAP Chair, as well as the AMAP national representative for the US and the US SAO. This item will be included on the agenda for the joint CAFF and AMAP meeting (now scheduled for April 19 to 21 in Oslo).
- 2 No decision has been made for CAFF or the CAFF Secretariat to contract or outsource this work.
- 3 This item will be placed on the agendas of the next CBIRD and CPAN meetings.

Agenda Item 14: CAFF Participation in SDWG Capacity Building Review

The CAFF Secretariat discussed the different documents for this capacity building review. For each entry or example of capacity development, it is necessary to include the project title and brief description and various elements:

- 1 A list of the project's capacity-building elements,

- 2 The Arctic Council working group or groups involved, and
- 3 Contact information for readers who want to find out more.

This information can either be included in an annotated version of the draft documents provided for the review, or in a separate document.

One of the circulated documents, "Introduction", provided a description of what is intended by capacity development, which will assist the CAFF Working Group in making its determinations.

Capacity building places a high value on information - gathering it, interpreting it accurately, sharing it with the right users, and turning it into action toward positive change. ...

In short, capacity building is making sure that individuals, communities, businesses, industries, institutions, governments, and other organizations have the information, knowledge, and skills they need to solve today's problems and adapt to change in a way that protects resources for future generations.

The decision on how CAFF will proceed is summarized in the action item below. It was noted that this project requires a lead country to coordinate CAFF's participation, given the ongoing commitments for editing for this report up to the Ministerial meeting in November 2004, and the important role that this document will play in communicating CAFF's efforts for capacity development and other matters within and external to the Arctic Council. At this time, no CAFF countries have assumed a lead role.

Action Items:

- 1 The CAFF Secretariat would circulate a list of possible examples of capacity development to CAFF's National Representatives, Permanent Participants, Observers and the CAFF subgroups (CAFF Members).
- 2 The parties for each suggested matter or project would then determine if these matters or projects are appropriate examples of capacity development, and provide the required information for these matters or projects.
- 3 There would be a January 8, 2004 deadline for the CAFF Members to provide their responses to the CAFF Secretariat.
- 4 The text provided would be in a final form, and not require further editing by the CAFF Secretariat.

Agenda Item 19: CAFF Collaboration with Other Organizations

IPS Collaboration

There was a presentation by the IPS representative that focused on funding for participation of the Permanent Participants in Arctic Council and CAFF projects. There was also a discussion of the overall responsibilities of the IPS.

Agenda Item 15: Status of CAFF Work Plan Issues

CAFF Flora Group

- 1 The CAFF Chair referred to the Arctic Circumpolar Vegetation Map, which is now being printed and distributed. A copy was displayed at the meeting.
- 2 Iceland indicated that Canada may in the future lead on Item 1.2. Discussion among the specialists had led to the suggestion that Canada take the lead in preparing the checklist of Arctic bryophytes. The Canadian National Representative will confirm this role after speaking with Dr. Belland.
- 3 There are some questions both with respect to time frame and assistance with Russian participation in reference to Item 1.6, dealing with scoping traditional knowledge for use and conservation of arctic plants.. The CAFF Chair will work with the Chair of the CFG and AIA in this regard.

CAFF CBIRD Group

The CAFF Chair sought national contacts for the Birds of Arctic Conservation Concern. The following information was provided:

- 1 For Canada, the CAFF national representative will be the contact.
- 2 For Finland, the national representative on the CBIRD group will be the contact.
- 3 Sweden will provide a list of parties.
- 4 For Iceland, the national representative will be the contact.
- 5 For Norway, Hallvard Strøm will be the contact.

Another item raised was a poster, which being completed by a Canadian, and which will be provided at CBIRD meetings in the Faroe Islands in February 2004.

CAFF CPAN

Questions were raised as to why CAFF isn't implementing CPAN strategy and action plan. A representative noted that the last CPAN meeting was February 2002, and that CPAN is an important group, yet doesn't seem to be very active. Reference was made to the lack of an implementation plan for CPAN. Representatives referred to protected areas as an in-country process, so CAFF circumpolar involvement may be limited. An exception may be in marine areas, where collaboration is more useful. The point was made that CPAN might do well to refocus its mandate towards development of comprehensive conservation strategies and plans, and focusing on wilderness values, as opposed to identifying and developing wilderness areas.

It was noted that CPAN was initially very active, but has perhaps had too many changes in leadership lately. There are now two US and one Canadian co-chairs. A national representative noted that Norway originally aimed to lead the development of CPAN strategy, but said that they would then step aside and another country would lead the implementation phase. The problem now is that CAFF has not effectively assigned leadership of the implementation phase.

A representative suggested that CAFF give input and guidance to the next CPAN meeting. A impediment so far may have been making the leap from the CPAN scheme to the national representatives, and to bridge the gap between ideas and action. It was

suggested that national representatives should ask: Is CPAN a useful tool? Will there be policy impacts in each nation? and How do we measure success?

Another representative emphasized CPAN must be regarded in global context, and highlighted that protected areas will be the focus of the ninth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); also reference to the focus on protected areas for the fourth meeting of the CBD's Conference of the Parties (COP). The focus could be not just on the establishment of protected areas, but also on their management and the participation of local communities. There was a suggestion for some linkages to provide the relevance of the arctic approaches and global approaches.

Action Items:

1. The CAFF Chair and Secretariat will discuss these issues with Co-Chairs of CPAN. The CAFF Chair will attend the next CPAN meeting. Issues to be discussed include the status of the CPAN charter and conservation plan, the status of conservation issues, how to measure success and address the five themes, and 26 action items, and the CPAN response to the draft program of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
2. The CAFF Secretariat will work with the UNEP representative to define CAFF/CPAN participation in the protected areas side session of the upcoming Commission on Sustainable Development meeting (CSD-12).

Agenda Item 19: CAFF Collaboration with Other Organizations

Grid Arendal Collaboration

GRID-Arendal raised the proposal for support for a side session presentation on the Arctic at CSD 12. There will be no cost to CAFF in relation to this participation. GRID-Arendal will communicate with the CAFF Secretariat. The participation of Permanent Participants was which also welcomed. Northern View is participating already.

Action Item:

- 1 GRID-Arendal will communicate with the CAFF Secretariat, and provide more information on this participation.

Agenda Item 16: CAFF Secretariat Budget and Activities

The CAFF Secretariat commented on the activities, and the financial and time budget of the Secretariat. Since May, the CAFF Working Group has been receiving monthly reports from the CAFF Chair and Secretariat. There have also been separate emails and information on other projects, and information on past and future meetings of the CAFF Chair and Secretariat. The CAFF Secretariat indicated that it would welcome overall and specific comments on its activities, as this meeting is an opportunity for feedback and discussion on these issues.

The CAFF Secretariat also referred to budgeting issues. A summary of actual financial expenses for January to September 2003 was provided for the meeting, as well as estimated budget expenses for 2003 and 2004. The accrued expenses for January to September 2003 represent actual expenses, and are audited by an Icelandic institution. The impact of the shifting value of the US dollar was noted. The CAFF Secretariat also referred to the budget for time. The Executive Secretary noted that she had severely “overbudgeted” her time over the past year, so that she worked significant amounts of overtime and failed to take holidays etc. She also indicated that she could not continue to “overbudget” time in the future, and that there would be the requirement of paid assistance or the secondment of individuals at the Secretariat.

There was then a general discussion. There was no discussion or comments on the activities of the CAFF Secretariat. Discussion focused on the financial budgets of the CAFF Secretariat for 2003 and 2004. There was a discussion of surpluses from 2003, and of retaining these surpluses for the impending tasks in 2004. There was specific discussion of printing costs, support for the CPAN poster, the participation and financial support for Permanent Participants and projects with their involvement, expenses in relation to domestic and international travel of the CAFF Secretariat, and the financial expenditures of the CAFF Secretariat under different special projects.

The Board decided that any budget surplus from 2003 should be carried into 2004. There was also a request for greater detail for CAFF Secretariat expenditures in 2003, in relation to forecast amounts in the 2003 budget estimate, travel, and special projects.

The Canadian representative discussed and provided an excel spreadsheet which could be used by the CAFF Secretariat to provide monthly updates of budget estimates, monthly and cumulative expenditures in relation to 2004 budget estimates, and the Secretariat’s evaluation of any monies that were uncommitted in any of the budget categories. The Board agreed that this information would be useful, and the CAFF Secretariat will use this or a similar spread sheet to provide these monthly financial reports to the Board, beginning January 2004.

There was a discussion of revenues from the CAFF Secretariat, including revenues for 2004, and future payments by Greenland and the Faroe Islands.

For the 2004 budget, there was a discussion of the need for the attendance of the CAFF Secretariat at future meetings for the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan, the AMAP Assessment of Hydrocarbons, the SDWG Capacity Building Review and the SDWG Sustainable Development Action Plan (see discussion below). To the extent that the CAFF Secretariat would not attend these meetings, the 2004 budget could be amended to reflect these changes.

There was a more general discussion of the role of the CAFF Secretariat under special projects. The CAFF Chair indicated the huge task played by the CAFF Secretariat for the ACIA Scientific Report and Policy Document. Other parties noted that given the CAFF

and AMAP lead, it was important that this role for the CAFF Secretariat continue for ACIA.

There was a discussion as to whether there should similar extensive involvement of the CAFF Secretariat in other or future projects, or whether this work should be accomplished by and under lead countries. One party noted that in past CAFF work plans, the CAFF Secretariat had liaison roles, and could be active in projects under the direction of the CAFF Chair. Another party raised the concern that it was important that the CAFF Secretariat have time to complete administrative duties.

There was then a discussion of whether CAFF should amend its 2002 to 2004 Work Plan to reflect additional requests for participation and involvement. This has never been done in the past, and the decision was made to not amend the Work Plan at this time. The CAFF Chair summarized this overall discussion by noting that there was no question that CAFF will need to be more active in the future for cooperative and larger AC projects, and that this matter would be raised at subsequent meetings of the WG Chairs.

The CAFF Secretariat and the Icelandic representative then discussed draft plans for the CAFF Secretariat's office for October 2004 onwards. There remain some outstanding concerns about the amount and distribution of space for the CAFF Secretariat, given new and proposed projects that may require additional employees or secondment of individuals, at the Secretariat. The CAFF Secretariat and Iceland agreed to continue their efforts to clarify this situation.

Action Items:

1. Decision by the Board that any budget surplus from 2003 will be carried into 2004.
2. CAFF Secretariat to provide more detail for 2003, including comparisons to 2003 budget estimate, and specific expenditures under different special projects.
3. CAFF Secretariat provide greater breakout of salaries and benefits for 2004, as well as for proposed contract expenses for that period.
4. The CAFF Secretariat will provide monthly financial summaries of expenditures and uncommitted monies in relation to the budget categories in the 2004 budget estimate.
5. The CAFF Secretariat and Icelandic representative will work to finalize office arrangements for the CAFF Secretariat for October 2004 onwards.

Upcoming meetings and attendance by CAFF Chair and Secretariat

The CAFF Chair reviewed the upcoming meetings in the October 2003 report of the CAFF Chair and Secretariat. The CAFF Chair then made a series of recommendations for the role and participation of the CAFF Secretariat, as well as confirming the participation of different parties for the AC Arctic Marine Strategic Plan. These recommendations were adopted by the Board, and are reflected below.

Action Items:

- 1 The continuing role and involvement of the CAFF Secretariat for the ACIA Scientific Report and the Overview Document was confirmed.
- 2 The CAFF Secretariat will not attend meetings, allocate substantive time toward, or participate in the ECORA project, the PAME-led Arctic Marine Strategic Plan, and the AMAP-led Assessment of Hydrocarbons in the Arctic.
- 3 No decision was made on the SDWG Sustainable Development Action Plan, as the role of CAFF Secretariat is only to make an inquiry at this point.
- 4 There will be a limited coordination role initially for the CAFF Secretariat for the SDWG Capacity Building Review, until a lead country is assigned.
- 5 Canada agreed to take a lead role for the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan, and the CAFF Chair and Vice-Chair will attend the PAME meeting in February in Helsinki.
- 6 No decision has been made for a lead country of the AMAP Assessment of Hydrocarbons in the Arctic, the SDWG Sustainable Development Action Plan, and the SDWG Capacity Building Review.
- 7 A summary of upcoming meetings, similar to that included in the monthly reports of the CAFF Secretariat, will be posted on the CAFF webpage and routinely updated by the CAFF Secretariat.

Agenda Item 17: CAFF Report to Ministers and Deliverables

The CAFF Chair proposed a range of potential deliverables: ACIA Scientific Report and Overview Report; Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map; Eider Poster, and perhaps Murre Poster; BACC Report; Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Framework (May and fall 2004); Coordinated Monitoring Paper (May and fall 2004); Status report for ECORA; Protected Areas Values brochure/display; Seabird Monitoring Framework; Climate change murre paper (on table as scientific); the Sacred Sites Reports/Proposals; Murre Banding program; Circumpolar Seabird Bulletin; Seabird harvest report; Seabird bycatch report.

There was some discussion as to what defines a “deliverable”. There was a suggestion that the audience must be kept in mind, and that deliverables to Ministers should emphasize visual products. There was general agreement that the best way forward is to highlight three or four key elements of the CAFF program, and expand on those. The remainder can be items within the CAFF display at the meeting. There was discussion about the single item picked for press release-suggestion of the ACIA SR conclusions, tying them into the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Plan (CBMP) and highlighting the need for monitoring to understand and interpret climate change.

The CAFF Chair noted that there were no questions or comments for CAFF at the last SAO meeting; and the concern as to whether CAFF is stimulating enough interest. There was some agreement that the lack of questions from SAOs is worrying. Reference was made to CAFF priorities that are controversial and interesting (climate change, marine protected areas, bycatch, hunting, monitoring).

Strong input was given that CAFF must keep their audience in mind. CAFF issues must therefore be related back to environment, human health and welfare. Clear links must be drawn from CAFF activities to humans. It was also noted that CAFF issues and priorities must be action-oriented, giving tools for Ministers to take home and possibilities for achievements within the Minister's term in office. Much of the challenge for CAFF is of course in production, but it must be kept in mind that packaging can also be important.

Some support was given to the idea of focusing on CBMP, and the ACIA linkage. It was noted that monitoring on its own is not always understood to be dynamic and interesting. One avenue by which to generate enthusiasm for monitoring is to emphasize acquisition of baseline information as a by-product (and starting point) of monitoring, and to emphasize that in many cases we have little or no idea "what's out there" in terms of biodiversity.

Agenda Item 18: CAFF Biennial Meeting 2004

The Chair stated that the Ministerial meeting is likely to be in October 2004. There was discussion about best timing for next CAFF meeting; and agreement that 14-16 September 2004 are the best dates and that the meeting should be held in Anchorage. The agenda is to include reports from subgroups, work plans, Finnish incoming chair, and special reports on big projects. There was the suggestion of a brainstorming session to consider the overall approach of CAFF. There was agreement to invite a keynote speaker, then have board session following to incorporate brainstorming into CAFF mission. There was a suggestion of a provocative conservation speaker (Rasmus Hansson, CEO, WWF Norway), with a possible public relations focus.

Action Items:

- 1 Decision that CAFF X would take place from September 14 to 16, 2004 in Anchorage, with the inclusion of a brainstorming session to consider CAFF's overall approach.
- 2 Decision to hold the next CAFF Management Board meeting in Oslo, in conjunction with the joint AMAP meeting. Parties agreed to set aside March 30 to April 2, 2004 for these two back-to-back meetings.

Agenda Item 19: Collaboration with Other Organizations

WWF Collaboration

WWF presented its Conservation First Principle in the form of a position paper, and presented examples of key areas in the Arctic where this principle is being tried out in various forms in cooperation with local peoples, government, business and NGOs (Mackenzie Valley, Canada; and Barents Sea, Norway). There was general agreement that the key elements of the Principle presented were in line with CAFF priorities and

focus. The Sweden National Representative, and former CAFF Chair, indicated that some of the core elements of the Principle had been incorporated into the CAFF Strategic Plan. There was discussion that it would be useful to review the Strategic Plan to identify whether there were additional elements of the Conservation First Principle could be incorporated.

Action Item:

1. WWF to review CAFF Strategic Plan to identify congruence with Conservation First and to bring these results back to a future CAFF board meeting.

Agenda Item 20: Other Business

Coordination between CAFF and AMAP

Iceland and other parties indicated they would defer a discussion on coordination of monitoring between CAFF and AMAP.

AC Arctic Marine Strategic Plan

There was a brief discussion by Canada of brief summary of annotated outline for the Arctic Marine Strategic Plan. Discussion focussed on change of the suggested PAME format, substitution of “biodiversity” for “resources”, and reference to “sustainable use of renewable resources”. Conservation of marine biodiversity is an issue. Other issues are invasive species, habitat fragmentation, and overexploitation. Phrases suggested: “integrated management”, and “Input of WG needed for implementation”. There was a suggestion that marine protected areas be included, though it was not clear if where should be located. One party indicated that need to clarify to threats, and causes of those threats. Canada would work further on this annotated outline, which will then be sent to the CAFF Chair for editing and distribution.

At the conclusion of Other Business, the Executive Secretary informed the CAFF Management Board that she would be concluding her position with the CAFF Secretariat in May 2004, immediately following the meeting of Senior Arctic Officials (SAO) from May 4 to 5, 2004. The Executive Secretary thanked CAFF for an interesting and challenging position at the Secretariat. The Executive Secretary indicated that she was looking forward to working jointly with the CAFF Working Group and the Subgroups over the coming months to meet CAFF’s commitments and obligations for that SAO meeting. On behalf of CAFF, the CAFF Chair thanked the Executive Secretary for her efforts with the Secretariat.

There were no other matters, and the meeting closed.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Draft Agenda, with List of Documents (CAFF website)

Agenda Item	Name of document
1. Welcome of Chair	
2. Adoption of Agenda	Revised Agenda CAFF Board Meeting, Girdwood, Alaska, March 11-13 2003
3. Overview of CAFF Activities since Girdwood	CAFF Report to SAO Meeting on October 23 to 24
4. Status of ECORA	Draft Terms of Reference for ECORA Project
5. AC Marine Strategic Plan	Discussion Paper: Ecosystem-based Approaches for Conserving Arctic Biodiversity Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna, Kenton Wohl Ecosystem-based Approaches for Conserving Arctic Biodiversity, Magdalena A K Muir November 2003 ECORA Status Report
6. Biodiversity Monitoring Network Program	CBMP, Objectives, Structure, and Principal Components
7. CAFF/AMAP Coordinated Monitoring Plan/Meeting	
8. ACIA Scientific and Policy Documents	ACIA Scientific Report- October 2003 Follow up by ACIA Secretariat
9. Compendium of Ecologically Important Marine Areas Workshop	CPAN Summary of Workshop
10. Wild Places for Wildlife Workshop	Wild Places Workshop Summary
11. Proposed Alaska Sacred Sites Workshop	GCI Sacred Sites Proposal
12. CAFF Participation in SDWG Sustainable Development Action Plan	SDAP Table SDAP Concept Paper October 31 Letter re Initial Steps for the SDAP
13. CAFF Participation in AMAP Hydrocarbon Impact Assessment	AMAP Request to Chairs for Participation
14. CAFF Participation in SDWG Capacity Building Review	Introduction Circumpolar-Regional Cooperation Information for Decision Making Community Partnerships Conclusion 2003-11-4-ACCcapacityBuildingOverview-Timeframe
15. Status of CAFF Work Plan Items	CAFF Report to the SAO meeting in Reykjavik, Iceland from April 9-10,2003 CAFF Report to SAO Meeting on October 23 to 24 Birds of Arctic Conservation Concerns (BACC) - Document 1 BACC - Document 2 CPAN Summary of Work Plan Activities
16. Secretariat Budget and Activities	CAFF Chair and Secretariat Monthly Reports - May 2003 - June 2003 - July to August 2003 - September 2003 - October 2003 Report - Proposed drawings for CAFF Secretariat Office (for October 2004) CAFF Secretariat Work Plan 2003 Draft
17. CAFF Report to Ministers and Deliverables	CAFF IX CBIRD IX Report CAFF Work Plan 2002-2004
18. CAFF Biennial Meeting 2004	
19. Collaboration with other organizations	The Northern View The Northern View letter from Caff Scanned Minutes from Third Annual Meeting, October 16-18,Kevo, Finland Draft Minutes of CEON Meeting, October 3-5, 2003 WWF Arctic Program: Conservation First: Achieving sustainable development in Arctic

**APPENDIX:
CAFF Management Board Meeting List of Participants**

IPS	USA
<p>Crump, John Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat Strandgade 91, 4th Floor PO Box 2151 Copenhagen DK-1016 Copenhagen K Denmark</p> <p>Tel: 45 3283-3790 Fax: 45 3283-3791 Email: jpc@ghsdk.dk</p>	<p>Edwards, Gary Region 7 US Fish and Wildlife Service</p>
AIA	AAC
<p>Gofman, Victoria Executive Director Aleut International Association Anchorage Office</p> <p>Tel: +1-907-222-4283 Fax: +4-907-279-4351 Email: VictoriaG@apiai.com</p>	<p>Harrison, Gary Traditional Chief, Tribal Chairman Athabascan Nation Chickaloon Village Traditional Council PO Box 1105, Chickaloon AK 99674, USA</p> <p>Tel: 1 907 745-0707 Fax: 1 907 746-7154 Email: garyharrison@chickaloon.org</p>
FINLAND	UNEP
<p>Jaakkola, Esko CAFF Vice Chair Ministry of the Environment P.O. Box 380 FIN-00380 Helsinki</p> <p>Tel: +358 9 160 39371 Fax: +358 9 160 39364 Email: esko.jaakkola@ymparisto.fi</p>	<p>Kurvits, Tiina Associate Polar Program UNEP/GRID-Arendal c/o Canadian Polar Commission 350 Albert Street, Suite 1710 Ottawa Ontario K1R 7X7</p> <p>Tel: +1 613 262-3395 Email: tiina.kurvits@grida.no</p>
NORWAY	CANADA
<p>Lein, Berit Directorate for Nature Management Tungasletta 2 N-7485 Trondheim Norway</p> <p>Tel: +47 73 58 08 21 Fax: +47 73 58 05 01 Email: berit.lein@dirnat.no</p>	<p>McCormick, Kevin Environment Canada Northern Conservation Division 5204-50th Ave. Yellowknife, Canada X1A 1E2</p> <p>Tel: +1 867 669 4760 Fax: +1 867 873 8185 Email: kevin.mccormick@ec.gc.ca</p>

WWF	FAROE ISLAND
<p>Norris, Stefan Head of Conservation Oslo, Norway</p> <p>Tel: +47 22 03 65 02 Fax: +47 22 20 06 66 Email: snorris@wwf.no</p>	<p>Olen, Bergur Museum of Natural History FO-100 Tórshavn</p> <p>Tel: +298 31 85 88 Email: bergur@frs.fo</p>
ICELAND	AIA
<p>Petersen, Ævar Icelandic Institute of Natural History Hlemmur 3 P.O Box 5320 125 Reykjavík</p> <p>Tel: +354 590-0500 Fax: +354 590-0595 aevar@ni.is</p>	<p>Pletnikoff, Karen Aleutian/Pribilof Islands Association, Inc. 201 East 3rd Avenue Anchorage AK 99501, USA</p> <p>Tel: +1 907 276-2700 Fax: +1 907 279-4351 Email: karenp@apiai.com</p>
SWEDEN	USA
<p>Sohlberg, Sune The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency S-106 48 Stockholm Sweden</p> <p>Tel: +46 8 698 13 36 Fax: +46 8 698 14 02 Email: Sune.Sohlberg@naturvardsverket.se</p>	<p>Van Pelt, Thomas U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service 1011 E Tudor Rd. Anchorage, Alaska</p> <p>Tel : +1 907 786 3503 Fax : +1 907 786 3641 Email: Thomas_Van_Pelt@fws.gov</p>
USA, CAFF Chair	CAFF Secretariat
<p>Wohl, Kenton CAFF Chair U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service 1011 E Tudor Rd. Anchorage, Alaska</p> <p>Tel : +1 907 786 3503 Fax : +1 907 786 3641 Email : kent_wohl@fws.gov</p>	<p>Muir, Magdalena A K CAFF Executive Secretary Hafnarstræti 97 600 Akureyri Iceland</p> <p>Tel:+354 462 3350 Fax:+354 462 3390 Email: magdalena.muir@caff.is</p>