

**Arctic Council**  
**Senior Arctic Officials Meeting**  
**Fairbanks, Alaska**  
**April 27-28, 2000**

**Minutes (Revised – 10/03/00)**

**Agenda Item 1: Approval of Agenda**

Norway observed that Agenda item 16, approval of press release, was slated as the last item on Friday. Norway requested that delegations assign one point person for consultation on the press release before presentation to the group. The Chair said that he would consult with his staff but it should not be a problem. The Saami Council announced that Halonen was stepping down as the chair of the Indigenous People's Secretariat and requested that SAOs endorse the next chair under Agenda item 15. The Chair stated that he would check the rules of procedure regarding endorsing the new chair, but that the Council would certainly be prepared to listen to the IPC's recommendation. The ICC requested clarification on agenda item number 11 regarding work program and deliverables for the fall ministerial. The United States (US) responded that they put the item on the agenda with the intention of acknowledging that applications for observer and permanent participant status would be considered in Barrow at the fall ministerial. The agenda was approved. The Chair moved to agenda item 3.

**Agenda Item 2: Approval of Ad-Hoc Observers**

This item was addressed at the conclusion of Agenda item 4.

**Agenda Item 3: Approval of November 1999 SAO Meeting Minutes**

Norway noted that they had technical points to address, but that they wouldn't take up the meeting time with details. Norway stated that at the last meeting Canada had suggested making an outline paper of issues and decisions to guide discussion at the SAO meeting; Norway inquired about the progress of this proposal. The Chair responded that the Council had agreed to continue the meetings of working group chairs. If the chairs agree that the outline paper is needed, the Council will do it, but it needs to be a decision of the Council over the role of the working groups' chairs; whether the chairs become a stronger unit or whether they simply look at the interaction between the working groups and talk about coordination. The United States stated that the working groups have prepared reports in time for the SAO meeting. For the first time under the US chairmanship, those reports have been available on the web prior to the SAO meeting.

Canada commented that the Council should ensure that there is a tracked record from meeting to meeting that establishes an understanding of the direction in which the SAO's working group chairs should work so that the Council can determine whether that direction has been implemented. Canada pointed out Norway's suggestion at the last meeting of a follow-up analysis of the Council and its evolving structure in light of changes and new work loads. The Chair stated that the idea of getting some sense of

progress was a good one and that the Secretariat would make note of the actions posed to the working groups as well as the steps they have taken to implement them.

Regarding the analysis of structure, the Chair asked if this should be put on the agenda in order to get feedback. The Chair stated that such a discussion would run the risk of generating old political arguments over structure. The Chair stated that he would be happy to put it on the next agenda and asked whether it should be a limited or broad discussion; the Chair invited comments at that time or further consideration before the next meeting. Canada stated that the matter was not pressing but it struck them as a good thing to do periodically as the Council moves forward. Norway stated that it was a good idea to put a review of structure on the next agenda and suggested that the discussion occur before the ministerial meeting. Canada pointed out that the current agenda allowed for discussion of other fora and reports. Canada suggested that relationships with other groups could be considered at the same time. The Chair noted Canada's comment and stated that the next morning would begin with coordination of other bodies and reports from working group chairs. The Chair welcomed the technical changes from Norway. The Minutes were approved.

**Agenda Item 4: Gwich'in Tribal Council Request for Permanent Participant Status**

The Gwich'in Council (GC) thanked the Chair and the Secretariat for allowing them to make a presentation. They then thanked Ambassador Simon and Canada for their support of the GC and stated that they had been working on the issue of permanent participation for four years, commending Canada's kindness in that process. The GC stated that they had been discussing the idea of being part of the Council for several years and that there may be some issues of concern. The GC stated that they intend to seriously structure themselves in both the US and Canada to address the issue of accountability and to ensure that the GC is recognized as an appropriate international representative. The GC continued that another element of question that is undermining the process is that the composition of the GC is not a collective Athabaskan group. The GC stated that they had outlined in the previous year to other Athabaskan groups, the establishment of a joint protocol among these groups, but acknowledged that there was still some work to be done. The GC stated that they are not trying to undermine the opportunities of other groups. The GC representative described his personal government history to point out that he brings political experience to the GC. The GC stated that the most important thing is that the GC has a community of people who reside north of the Arctic Circle. The GC noted that they were conducting negotiations with the Inuvialuit on self-government; they also had discussions about oil and gas development, tourism, health, social development, and education, which the GC pointed out as appropriate issues to the forum of the Council. The GC stated that the Arctic Council is a vehicle of huge opportunity for everyone to lay out a framework for arctic policy and the future. The GC pointed out that they are not seeking to undermine the jurisdiction of other countries; rather that the Council has taken leadership and raised new issues, particularly the issue of collectiveness. The GC stated that, as a group of indigenous people, they and the Council had a lot to offer each other, pointing out a series of common challenges. The GC restated that they have a lot to offer as they are one of the few groups who work on traditional ecological knowledge and co-management as well as integrated resource

management. The GC stated that they could contribute to the growth of the Council. The GC thanked the Chair and the Council for their consideration.

Canada thanked the GC for its kind words. Canada stated that the presentation provides a framework for aboriginal participation and it is important that the GC wants to work with other groups. Canada pointed out that there is a limited number of Permanent Participant seats and that they have been working for several years to get Canadian groups to come together with a common position, but some are not prepared to be at the same level of applying. Canada stated that developing a working protocol with other groups in the area is an extremely important factor in the application process. Canada noted that they appreciate the GC's intent to not undermine other groups' application as the future should allow for participation of all affected groups. Canada stated that it likes the GC's point of trying to develop stronger communities rather than simply complaining about issues. Canada noted that there was some early resistance from member states to allowing NGOs to be at the table; they went on to comment that if Permanent Participants are at the table, it makes a world of difference, changes the dynamic of the Council, and makes such groups a part of the decision rather than having them on the outside looking in. Canada stated that they welcome increased indigenous voices and strongly support the GC's application.

The Saami Council expressed support for the application from the GC. They inquired as to what the international name of the GC might be, whether they have international bylaws, and whether there are formation documents. The GC responded that they have been working on bylaws and should have them set within a month or so. The GC stated that they were established in 1996, that they had one biennial conference with a second coming up this year. The GC stated that they would proceed along those lines and in that context as this issue is important to them as well.

The ICC thanked the GC and welcomed them to the Council meeting. The ICC stated that they and the Saami Council had worked together to develop a role in the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) and later in the Arctic Council. The ICC continued, stating that they think indigenous groups have much to offer, but the process has been difficult. They pointed out that indigenous peoples around the world have no forum, noting that the UN Human Rights Commission fights against the establishment of a permanent forum within the UN for indigenous groups and there has been no resolution of the issue to date. The ICC stated that indigenous peoples' rights are not recognized in other fora, so the Council is important. The ICC stated that perhaps the Chair was right in that the Council is limited in its capabilities, but they welcome the GC. The ICC noted that they hope things will be in order before the ministerial and that they intend to work closely with the GC as they already do on POPS negotiations.

The Chair read from the rules of procedure in order to clarify the application process. The Chair read that the application for permanent participant status would be circulated by the host 90 days prior to the meeting. If there are no objections within 30 days, the item will appear on the agenda. The Chair stated that the application should therefore be in by July 12<sup>th</sup>.

The US thanked the GC and requested that the GC further describe their contacts on the US side and that they speak to the beginnings of their long history of cross-border cooperation. The GC stated that they have families who cross borders, making it more personal than political. They noted that historically, the Gwich'in used to meet regularly. The GC stated that in 1988, they renewed the tradition and since then, have met biannually to discuss cooperative issues and the Gwich'in nation as a whole. They have discussed such issues as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), education, and language; and have been expanding the issues under discussion over time. The GC pointed out that this weekend they are having a conference in Old Crow on common Gwich'in language. They also had scheduled an economic development conference for Inuvik, but were forced to cancel due to logistics. The GC stated that they need to deal with these issues in order to be a successful collective group, that they had been meeting on a regular basis over the last several months and would work hard over the next ten days.

The Aleut International Association (AIA) stated that they look kindly on the GC application. They stated that they had approached this body in 1994 before it was the Arctic Council, but their application was refused. Later, the requirements were changed in order to allow groups that crossed borders and their application was accepted. The AIA stated that they had found their Russian relatives and persuaded the Russian government to accept their official incorporation, but that the process had not been easy. The Aleuts stated that if they could offer help and experience from their own process, they would do it; they pointed out that this forum allows voices to be heard. The Aleuts welcomed the GC, stating that they realized the decision would be made at the ministerial meeting.

RAIPON stated that they are still "in school" themselves; going on to say that they all welcome the GC and that they should help each other.

The Chair recognized Meredith Sandler from the Governor's office of the State of Alaska. Ms. Sandler asked the GC how they foresaw the concept of a working protocol functioning among groups and secondly, what their vision of protocol might be. The GC stated that it became clear in Whitehorse that they could not exclude the involvement of others in the Arctic Council. It became clear that first they must inform everyone and secondly, that they should use the resources of those organizations to address the Council collectively. The GC pointed out that some of the individual councils have staff whose experience is varied. They pointed out that the Dene nation has a good POPS staff and it is not in their interest to duplicate such efforts; rather, they should utilize existing expertise. The GCC stated that the Tanana Chiefs Council had experts in health and that they should utilize those resources. Following this approach, the GC hoped that they might identify some Gwich'in help as well.

The Chair inquired as to the total population and membership of the GC. The GC stated that they had a population of approximately 10,000, over a wide geographic area. The Chair thanked the GC and stated that its formal application was due 90 days prior to the

ministerial. The GC recognized that chiefs and chiefs' representatives were present and requested that they please stand. The GC representatives stood up and were recognized by the Chair. The Chair reminded delegates that applications for observer status were due 90 days prior to the Ministerial Meeting.

The Chair then noted that one item was missed: approval of ad hoc observer status. The Chair stated that if there were no objections, ad hoc observers would be approved. There were no objections and ad hoc observers were approved. The Chair pointed out that another item, the Sustainable Development framework redraft by the US and the Danes was now in delegations' boxes. The Chair stated that the working group chair reports would begin with AMAP after the break.

### **Agenda Item 5: Working Group Chair Reports to SAOs**

#### *Arctic Monitoring & Assessment Program (AMAP)*

AMAP reported that it had not had a working group meeting since the last SAO meeting, but that it had done some work intersessionally through AMAP national representatives. They stated that they had no organizational changes to report, but noted that they had approved a new observer to the group, the International Union of Radio-oncology. AMAP reported that it had established a strategic plan describing an overview of work to be done through 2003. Within this plan is a new format for registering projects in its project directory, which has been simplified for easier use and is in an electronic format. AMAP thanked the US for helping get the new and improved directory off to a good start by adding 15 projects on climate change to the directory. AMAP reported that it had been working with CAFF on the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA), and that Bob Correll of the US had been elected as chair of the ACIA Steering Committee. AMAP noted that a draft form of the "Terms of Reference" for the steering committee as well as a report on ACIA progress had been circulated for comment. AMAP stated that it would accept full responsibility for its work with ACIA, but noted that part of the assessment, including socio-economic recommendations, lay outside its mandate. AMAP asked SAOs for instructions as to how to proceed regarding this issue. AMAP stated that it would start on the "science aspect" and wait to hear from the SAOs before attempting to deal with the socio-economic aspect.

AMAP reported that it had asked for information from each Council member regarding sources of Arctic pollution in each nation. AMAP remarked that collecting this data was difficult because each of the countries had different reporting systems. AMAP asked all countries for help with this problem and requested that they continue sending pollution data, which AMAP intends to put together in a report in time for presentation at the Barrow Ministerial. AMAP reported that they had prepared a first draft of the pollution report and was circulating it for comments. AMAP asked the SAOs if there was a special question that needed to be included in the report. AMAP pointed out that at the last meeting, they had announced that a CD-ROM was available to all countries in order to make the report more manageable. AMAP stated that the existing data centers have received solid funding for 1999, but that they are still in need of funding for the atmospheric and marine thematic data center in 2000.

AMAP reported that the human health database is fully developed and that AMAP is exploring possible “cooperation partners” to operate a terrestrial TDC base. AMAP stated that a list of international conferences had been included in their written report. AMAP highlighted its Rovaniemi workshop on POPs in the Arctic, which focused on human health and environmental concerns. A published report on the workshop is available from the AMAP Secretariat. An electronic copy is accessible through AMAP’s web site.

AMAP reported that they have been working closely with the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC) on the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA); in addition they have been working closely with the Nordic Council of Ministers who have funded several projects. AMAP mentioned that they had received a letter from the Global International Water Assessment (GIWA) in the last meeting. AMAP met with GIWA in December of 1999 in order to clarify the work GIWA had requested; AMAP expects a revised request this spring. AMAP mentioned that they had also been cooperating with UNEP, which received funding from GEF to do regional based assessments on persistent toxic substances; the work was anticipated to begin in April of 2000 and to be finalized in 2002. AMAP stated that UNEP has 12 regions for reporting, one of which is the Arctic and that UNEP had recruited AMAP to assist in the preparation of a regional report for the Arctic. AMAP noted that Canada has provided funding for this project. AMAP stated that they had plans for future international conferences as well as special projects, but that funding was short. AMAP reminded the Council that they had requested funding at the meeting in Washington DC and that to date, Canada and Finland had allocated support for specific activities while other activities remained unfunded. AMAP repeated its request for funding. AMAP stressed that the assessment work required by ministers to be performed during 2000 and 2002 needed financial support. The AMAP Chair gave the floor to AMAP Executive Director, Mr. Lars Otto Reiersen, to report on specific AMAP projects.

Mr. Reiersen reported that the PCB project in Russia was on the day’s agenda for the afternoon and would be discussed later. Mr. Reiersen gave a progress report on the AMAP/RAIPON project, stating that the project had received \$750,000 US dollars in support from GEF. Mr. Reiersen requested of the Council further financial support for the project. Mr. Reiersen pointed out that they have spent two years on project design and hoped to begin work by July of this year so that data would be available at the ministerial. Mr. Reiersen stated that the funding from GEF is not available until co-financing has been established so they are currently waiting for further funding. Mr. Reiersen requested that the ministers review the project and support it, requesting that letters of support be provided to AMAP soon so that they don’t miss the summer field season.

RAIPON briefly reminded the Council of the history of the project, emphasizing the importance of dealing with environmental threats to health. RAIPON stated that Russia was in a difficult situation and that environmental health threats were literally a matter of life and death, citing statistical examples. RAIPON stated that they had put forward the

idea for the project last May in Anchorage, reiterating that GEF will finance the project in part but that more help is needed. RAIPON requested that nations give their support, noting that they had received some support from the Russian government. RAIPON stated that Arctic Russia is entertaining the idea of expanding to include Sakhalin and the Aleutians, noting that they have been talking with Japan about it and hoped to add the US to the discussions.

Russia confirmed the interest of Russia and the State Committee on Northern Affairs and their support of this project, noting that they will give in kind support as well as political support, including the support of local authorities. Russia stated that they looked forward to implementation. Russia reported that the State Committee for the Environmental Protection of the Russian Federation had received a letter from AMAP regarding their draft report for the ministerial meeting. Russia requested that two sentences be deleted regarding Russian plans to use floating nuclear plants in the Arctic and Russian military plans. Russia stated that they would submit this recommendation to AMAP.

Sweden thanked AMAP for publishing information on the Internet. Sweden noted that they were satisfied with AMAP's activities since the last meeting, indicating that the project with RAIPON was a good one and was needed.

Norway welcomed AMAP's progress, stating that they were pleased that the working group was looking for cooperation, including a sustainable development program. Norway stated that they would continue with a substantial contribution for this year and hope that others could join by adding funds for special activities, particularly the assessment work scheduled for 2000-2002 in accordance with the requests of the ministers. Norway stated that they were prepared to find support for their national experts in this work. Norway expressed support for the RAIPON project, noting that they understood that the GEF funds were secured if there were matching funds. Norway stated that they would consider the request. Norway reminded RAIPON and the working groups that they should carefully consider which proposals and in what form their proposals should be presented at the ministerial.

Denmark noted that the AMAP/UNEP cooperation was good, going on to express support for AMAP as the secretariat for the RAIPON project in Russia. Denmark stated that they supported the RAIPON project in general and would try to find funding for it, but could not yet give a concrete answer.

Finland commended AMAP for its work and cooperation, stating that extended cooperation was important. Finland stated that AMAP should help UNEP with the Arctic component of the persistent toxic substances report. Finland noted that AMAP and the human health subgroup had accepted responsibility for the biophysical health component of the "Future of Children and Youth in the Arctic" project and that such use of existing groups was good. Finland stated that the GEF/RAIPON project was a good one and they would look for funding to support it.

Canada thanked AMAP for its report, stating that they continued to watch and be supportive. Canada congratulated AMAP for receiving funding from GEF and stated that they were glad AMAP had involved indigenous peoples in the persistent toxic substances project. Canada stated that they had received AMAP's letter requesting funding, but had difficulty committing funds at present, indicating that they may have difficult choices to make on what they would be able to fund.

The Chair recognized John Calder of the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Mr. Calder thanked the secretariat for the new database system, stating that it was a good project. Mr. Calder stated that NOAA had been happy to host the recent ACIA planning meeting, which had good support and participation.

The US stated that there were three positive things about the GEF project. First, the US has already applied for substantial support for the project, being particularly interested in the proposed work in the Russian Far East and its implications for the State of Alaska. Secondly, the US welcomed the RAIPON suggestion for a bilateral discussion about extending the work to the Aleutian Islands. Third, the US was prepared to send experts to the proposed workshop in St. Petersburg in order to move the project along.

The ICC stated that they had received a letter from the UNEP director saying that he would help them get funds from the UNEP Foundation for the RAIPON project. The ICC said that they wanted AMAP to work with GRID/Arendal and expressed hope that Mr. Lars Kullerud would be able to help with that. The ICC stated that they heard a message in Russia's stark words on life expectancy in the region, remarked on its incredibility, and stated that the RAIPON project was clearly important. The ICC stated that individual states should help fund the project.

The Aleut Association stated that they were happy to hear that AMAP and RAIPON were interested in working with them on the Commodore Islands. The Aleuts expressed concern about RAIPON's health issues, stating that the proposed project is welcome.

AMAP stated that the comments from Russia would be handled in the working group and assured Sweden that they were eager to ensure quality assurance.

#### *Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF)*

CAFF announced that they had submitted a progress report to all ministers, which could be found in the meeting binders. CAFF reported their intent to have a draft of their overview report available at the fall ministerial with a final printed version ready by fall 2001; they wouldn't be circulating every manuscript, but had an evolving draft on the web site. CAFF reported that the basic text of the overview report had been drafted and was being reviewed by Arctic specialists; CAFF intended to circulate the report in August for country reviews. CAFF reported that they were unable to cover everything under the allotted time frame and resource constraints, but the report would be a good overview of biodiversity in the Arctic when it is finished. CAFF reported that they were also working on a draft of recommendations from the report and aimed to finalize the draft at the CAFF heads of delegation meeting in early May for submission to SAOs later

that month, then on to the CAFF meeting in Trondheim in September and finally, to the ministers for review.

CAFF stated that Mr. Bob Correll would speak about the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) under a later item on the agenda, but that they wanted to make a few points at this time. CAFF stated that the report from the joint CAFF/AMAP workshop in Reykjavik had been prepared and submitted to the ministers. Secondly, CAFF stated that they did not see ACIA has a separate work group, but as a joint project with a wide scope. Third, CAFF stated that socio-economic issues in ACIA were not under its mandate and the Council should consider the matter and address it.

CAFF reported that they had printed a final report for distribution at the next meeting of the circumpolar protective network group, with thanks to the planning team for an excellent job. CAFF said that they had not reviewed the report as a body and would therefore, consider the report later and forward their recommendations to the ministers. In regards to species management, CAFF reported that there were two workshops underway for birds, the first of which was the Bycatch of Seabirds Workshop in Nova Scotia, which had 60 attendees. The second workshop will be held in May in the Netherlands on the conservation of Arctic migratory birds. CAFF stated that in regard to the RAIPON/GEF project on biodiversity in Russia, they were hoping to be able to report on a positive GEF secretariat decision. CAFF reported that there had been two rounds of comments on this project, but no final decision is expected from GEF before May because the project was so large. CAFF stated that support from Arctic countries at this meeting would help move the project forward. CAFF stated that they listed their planned deliverables to the ministerial meeting in their written report, but that there was some confusion regarding the correct format of working group reports to ministers, and further guidance from SAOs was needed. CAFF requested that the floor be given to Mr. Lars Kullerud from UNEP to speak about the RAIPON/GEF project.

Mr. Kullerud stated that the idea behind the proposal was to manage the Arctic wilderness areas in a way that maintains the quality of the wilderness as well as the quality of life for the humans living there. UNEP stated that the key objectives of the project were to enhance biodiversity in the Russian Arctic, to ensure sustainable use of the land, to use an integrated ecosystem approach, and to minimize habitat fragmentation, all of which objectives are in line with CAFF's priorities. UNEP stated that they wanted to develop management strategies and strengthen the capacity of all the stakeholders. UNEP said that in order to establish cooperation of management, they wanted to start with a few selected model areas. There are currently 24 model areas; UNEP anticipated starting the project in 4 to 6 of those areas. UNEP reported that they had been working on the project and that Russia had expressed a documented interest in the work. UNEP stated that they had been consulting with GEF, but required project development funds over the next year and a half to develop the project further, anticipating a start date in 2002 with the project lasting about 6 years. UNEP proceeded to demonstrate the process of fragmentation in Norway over the last century with a visual aid, emphasizing the importance of the project through the example.

Russia thanked the speaker for his presentation and voiced the full support of the Russian Federation for the project. Russia stated that they wanted to minimize habitat degradation and that the project would spark interest in biodiversity concerns all over Russia. Russia commented on the “Circumpolar Protected Areas Network Project,” stating that they felt the project was important and that the network should be as complete as possible. Russia stated that they would be ready to submit progress reports under the 1996 agreement of the ministers. Russia said that they considered the registry of protected Arctic territories to be very important, but they understand that it should also serve as an information management instrument. Russia stated that they were interested in taking an active part in the monitoring of biodiversity in the Arctic, particularly in working out a monitoring strategy with an emphasis on the necessity of unification of methods. With regard to CAFF, Russia proposed that the working group have its sessions in accordance with the schedule of the ministerial meetings, preferably as soon after the meeting as possible in order to react quickly to ministerial decisions. Russia pointed out that they had significantly contributed to the CAFF report on biodiversity in the Arctic and requested that the report be published in Russian when it is finished. Russia expressed their support for the new initiative sites of indigenous peoples and pointed out that RAIPON, in collaboration with others, was ready to finalize a detailed project description and work plan.

Sweden stated that they were impressed by the breadth of CAFF’s activities and were satisfied with their progress. Sweden said that they were in favor of the habitat fragmentation project, and would consider Swedish participation provided that they could obtain funding from the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency.

Canada stated that they were glad to see progress on all the work plan items. Canada noted the progress on the overview document on habitats and species and said they were looking forward to receiving the next draft at the ministerial. Canada acknowledged the value of developing the circumpolar diversity-monitoring program and stated that they were looking forward to future progress reports. Regarding habitat fragmentation, Canada stated that they were intrigued by the scope and range of the project as well. Canada said that they supported the project in principal and that it had substantial capacity building components, but Canada’s role in the financial aspect was yet to be defined. Canada stated that they could not commit additional funding to the project at this time, but they would take a look at the project and their capacity to contribute. Canada noted that there were significant funding pressures for at least some of the working groups and requested that the Chair or the Secretariat identify these potential funding pressures to SAOs so that they could make choices and provide direction. The Chair thanked Canada.

Finland thanked CAFF for its overview report and active participation. With respect to habitat degradation, Finland stated that they found the project very important and would probably be able to co-finance in the near future. Finland noted that there was a new joint project to promote sustainable development in Northwest Russia. Finland stated that they would work on more cooperation and information exchange on forest and biodiversity issues between CAFF and cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region.

The US commended CAFF on its recent publication of its work on protected areas, citing it as an example of excellence in technical expertise and organization.

Norway thanked CAFF for its work and stated that they supported CAFF's reports and their plan for products to be delivered at the ministerial. Norway expressed their pleasure at hosting the eighth meeting of the CAFF program in Trondheim in September. Norway pointed to section 3 in the CAFF report as a very good way for a working group to report to the SAO meeting. With respect to CAFF's overview report, Norway stressed that an advanced draft of the report must be ready by the ministerial meeting and that it should be given high priority in order to further Council work on biodiversity. Norway expressed pleasure in regard to CAFF's active role in the ACIA, stating that it is important for CAFF and AMAP to work closely together on this project. Norway stated that they were pleased with CAFF's new initiatives and were happy to see CAFF's effort to secure GEF funds for the project to conserve biodiversity and lessen fragmentation in the Russian Arctic. Norway expressed hope that GEF would fund the second phase of the program and stated that the Council should demonstrate its joint support from this meeting.

Iceland conveyed their thanks and commendations to CAFF and expressed full support of the GEF project.

RAIPON expressed gratitude to CAFF for their report and the work they are doing, pointing out that RAIPON had developed a good working relationship with CAFF as of late, and had begun discussing a few projects for joint work. With respect to the new initiative, RAIPON said that as they understood it, since there is a lack of legal issues which need to be resolved in order to determine land use by native peoples, the project may become a catalyst for defining legal terms for subsistence land use issues. RAIPON stated that this was a serious problem in areas where native people live in the vicinity of oil companies.

The Aleut International Association (AIA) stated that CAFF was doing a lot of good work for the conservation of flora and fauna in the Arctic, citing the return of migratory birds to their area as an example.

The WWF stated that they were happy to see such strong support of CAFF and its projects. WWF is currently working to put together a workshop with CAFF and UNEP to focus on Russian conservation efforts. WWF stated that the biodiversity project is very important to everyone. WWF pointed out that the Netherlands is investing a lot of money into helping establish protected areas in Russia and that they are working on increased cooperation with RAIPON. WWF stated that they would very much like to see the biodiversity project move forward.

The Northern Forum expressed support for the biodiversity project and congratulated the Council for bringing together the parties involved.

The Chair reminded the Council that there had been a suggestion from Canada and a request that the working group chairs list financial commitments, obligations, and shortfalls. The Chair reminded the Council to turn in registration forms.

*Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response (EPPR)*

EPPR reported that they had a meeting at the beginning of March in London in preparation for their June annual meeting in Keflavik, Iceland. EPPR stated that they were proceeding with projects, but pointed to timing difficulties and noted that they would not be able to be more precise regarding deliberations for the ministerial meeting. EPPR stated that they could supplement the Secretariat with excerpts from papers for the Keflavik meeting once they have them.

EPPR reported that there was a seminar in Anchorage organized by the Alaskan Clean Seas in cooperation with other organizations on oil and ice that included international participation. EPPR stated that they were concerned about the possibility of a demonstration by the North Slope Borough regarding responding to oil spills in cold weather. EPPR stated that questions could be directed to Mr. Walter Parker and that the EPPR would probably have a discussion on the state of oil spill responses in icy conditions.

EPPR reported that Svalbard University, in cooperation with the Norwegian Pollution Control Authority, prepared a draft list of training courses for oil spill response in Arctic environments. EPPR stated that they were interested in having experts from their own oil spill response organization involved in the training courses, pointing out that they had prepared a proposal for the course content and were looking to endorse the project and develop the first training course in the next year.

Norway noted that they are the lead country for the project on a circumpolar map of resources at risk from oil spills in the Arctic, stating that the deadline for countries to contribute information was March 1 and that only Norway had responded to date. Norway asked that countries submit their reports so that they could finalize the project for the fall ministerial. Norway added that they regarded the activities of the working group as a very important part of the overall work of the Council in the environmental field and encouraged the working group to increase its level of activity, suggesting that they direct more attention toward the potential environmental consequences of increased oil and gas production in the far north.

Canada stated that they would like to see the inclusion of a description of the role and responsibilities of all the working groups in the ACAP document in order to encourage inter-working group activities. Canada pointed out that the inclusion of EPPR and PAME's role in risk analysis and pollution prevention could then be seen in light of AMAP's assessment role, for example. With regards to the circumpolar map project, Canada noted that they had organized a small working group to compile information, which they hoped to submit by April 30<sup>th</sup>. Canada stated that they remained committed to participating in the project on source control management and prevention strategies for high-risk activities, noting that they were supportive of using ISO 14001, and that this

proposal followed earlier work undertaken by EPPR. With respect to development of a standardized approach to shore line cleanup and assessment techniques, Canada stated that a step-wise approach is preferable and that they would commit to completing the preliminary analysis of existing material in order to provide an updated proposal in advance of the next EPPR meeting.

The US reported that they would contribute data to the circumpolar map project and had people working on it. With regard to the source control activities of EPPR, the US noted that the United States and Russia would be prepared to report at the June meeting on bilateral cooperation. The US recognized Mr. Walter Parker. Mr. Parker reported that the oil and ice workshop was very successful with about 300 participants, a large international turnout, and strong participation from all Arctic nations. Mr. Parker stated that the findings of the workshop were to be published, and that they come at an opportune time as the world is entering a period of high activity in oil and gas development in the Arctic.

*Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME)*

PAME noted that they had already submitted their report to the SAOs and would proceed through a summary of their activities. PAME pointed out that a work plan as well as a list of completed and ongoing projects could be found in Attachment 1 of the submitted report. PAME apologized to Denmark, noting that there was an omission in the report; Denmark is providing support for the Russian NPA Arctic project and that information will be included in Attachment 4. PAME stated that one of its key priorities was ongoing support for the Russian NPA Arctic, noting that funding is an important consideration. PAME pointed to Attachment 2, which lists the status of financial contributions to the project, noting that funding had been received from a number of institutions and that they were working with the World Bank, NEFCO, and others to receive additional support.

PAME stated that there was a possibility that the PCB project could be included in the partnership conference, an issue they had brought up before at the meeting in Washington. With respect to ACAP, PAME reported that they believed the Regional Program of Action to be a building block for ACAP and is complementary to the strategy outlined in ACAP. PAME reported that they were in the process of updating their legal analysis report originally presented to the ministers in 1996, which they would send to the Secretariat and noted -

that several things had changed since the 1996 ministerial meeting: increased ratification for the United Nations Law of the Sea, a number of ratifications for the 1996 protocol to the London Convention, and progress on the UN EC LRTAP project on long range transportation of airborne pollutants. PAME also noted that they had collaborated with EPPR and CAFF on the legal analysis report. PAME noted as well their collaboration with CAFF and IUCN on the circumpolar marine workshop project. PAME stated that copies of the report on the marine workshop had been distributed, both in English and in Russian. With regard to shipping activities, PAME reported that they were continuing to look at shipping measures that might require action, noting that Norway had taken the lead in this endeavor by establishing a correspondence group. PAME stated that with the

information this group generates, they would be able to develop a snapshot analysis, which they hope to bring to the June PAME meeting in Copenhagen. PAME noted the importance of collaboration particularly on shipping issues, pointing to previous presentations on the circumpolar mapping project and the northern sea route.

PAME reported that they were reviewing the 1997 guidelines on offshore oil and gas by evaluating whether the guidelines have been implemented and if so, to what extent they are followed and working to meet the original objectives set forth. PAME noted that Norway held a workshop on oil and gas and that the Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) also has a project underway in which they will help PAME evaluate guidelines.

PAME noted that the issue of good communication had been raised at the Washington meeting, pointing out that a recent WWF Arctic bulletin made specific reference to PAME's activities. PAME stated that they were also in the process of developing a homepage.

PAME reminded the Council that their next meeting was scheduled for June 5<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> in Copenhagen and thanked Denmark for hosting the meeting. PAME recognized the Russian Federation to speak on implementation of the Russian National Plan of Action (NPA) for the Arctic.

Russia reported that the Russian government pays much attention to the Russia NPA for the Arctic. Russia noted that the government had established a special working group headed by Mr. Vladimir Goman, chairman of the State Committee of the Russian Federation of Northern Affairs, and that the working group's membership included representatives from 17 ministries and agencies. Russia reminded the Council that there is a wide scope of activities under the projects, requiring extensive cooperation, which will culminate in a partnership conference in early or mid 2001. Russia noted that they are working under the PAME working group and appreciate the group's interest, endorsement, and support. Russia stated that cooperation with AMAP and RAIPON was also important and they looked forward to closer cooperation with ACAP and the Sustainable Development Working Group.

Russia called on ACOPS to speak on behalf of the Russia NPA Arctic project and the expectations for the partnership conference and beyond. ACOPS noted that the new system of partnership conferences with financial resources of external partners will only be available if there is a sufficient guarantee from the recipient country or region that they have done their utmost to meet the necessary conditions for a successful partnership conference. ACOPS reported that they anticipated that the new Russian institutional framework will be capable of delivering the necessary projects in a climate of stability, noting that the newly upgraded Russian interagency commission on the Arctic with 17 different ministries was making progress in this direction. Mr. Sebek stated that Ambassador Obukhov has pledged the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in assisting Goskomsever in coordinating the work of different governmental agencies interested in the NPA Arctic. ACOPS stated that the partnership conference is envisaged as a vehicle that will hopefully lead toward large-scale investments in the infrastructure

to assist the improvement of the Arctic environment. ACOPS noted their efforts in involving international financial institutions, especially EBRD and NEFCO, to ensure that the pre-investment studies developed meet the standards of financial institutions. ACOPS noted the challenge ahead with respect to financing, as the purpose of the PDF-B part of the GEF project is to develop a framework of a full scale project that may be valued at 10 to 20 million dollars. ACOPS reported that the GEF secretariat hopes that this project will succeed as it would provide the much needed adrenaline for comparable projects in other areas. ACOPS thanked all the governments and agencies for their support of this project with hope for continuous support and their active involvement leading to and during their partnership Conference.

WWF stated that they had been in dialogue with PAME regarding a study of offshore oil and gas guidelines, noting that they were undertaking an evaluation of guidelines' effectiveness. WWF reported that the goal of the project is to determine both if the guidelines are being followed and how well they are achieving the goals laid out in the original document.

IUCN, as co-sponsor of the circumpolar marine workshop, stated that the main goal of the workshop was to develop practical measures to protect the Arctic marine environment and conserve its biological diversity as well as to facilitate improved collaboration among Arctic countries, indigenous people, and other stakeholders and organizations. IUCN stated that the workshop was structured into three modules and two panels in order to address those goals, noting that the full workshop report is available to the Council. IUCN stated that there was a need for an increased decision-making capacity of locals at the local level, which is why they created two panels: one for indigenous people and one for local authorities. IUCN reported that several issues had come out of those panels: concerns about fishing methods conflicting with traditional lifestyles, a need for increased capacity and training of local residents in marine management, and a need for decision-making to be moved closer to the actual level of impact. IUCN stated that a wide range of recommendations came out of the workshop, which they have consolidated into project proposals that now will be submitted to two working groups of the Arctic Council as well as to the IUCN General Assembly.

Canada thanked John Karau for an organized and succinct report. With respect to the regional program of action, Canada stated that they continued to support development of the project including their current commitment of \$75, 000. Canada confirmed their commitment to clarify between codes of practice and guidelines for mining. With respect to the phasing out of hazardous chemicals, Canada said they supported the initiative in principle, but believed that the proposal required some amendment to make it consistent with other regional and global approaches. Canada stated that they continued to support shipping activities and encouraged EPPR to participate. Canada went on to say that they supported WWF's collaborative evaluation of oil and gas guidelines. Canada asked if Norway wanted to see oil and gas projects managed under the sustainable development working group. With respect to funding, Canada stated that they encouraged a coordinated approach to GEF applications and, suggesting that SAOs should consider developing guidance on funding partnerships with GEF and others as an effort toward

capacity building. Canada stated that they supported the PCB project being part of the Partnership Conference as long as it would not delay holding the partnership conference.

Norway stated that they were pleased with PAME's high level of activities. Norway said that they had established a correspondence group on shipping activities, which had sent out a questionnaire to countries with a response deadline of March 20<sup>th</sup>. Norway noted that only Finland has responded and that a reminder would be sent out at the end of April.

The AIA thanked PAME for its comprehensive report. The Aleuts stated that both their Russian members and American members wanted to support the sustainable use of living marine resources, emphasizing that they would like to have a commercial harvest of fur seals in the North Pacific.

The ICC expressed concern about shipping in the Arctic as it might have a negative impact on the marine mammals in the region and subsequently, the people who subsist on those mammals. The ICC asked the Council how many nation-states are aware of the IUCN "Arctic Plan," also wanting to know who put it together and who will approve the plan in the end.

Sweden asked PAME if they were still working on their oil and gas guidelines response to WWF as they had read in the report that PAME would respond to WWF by January of 2000, which had already passed. With respect to shipping activities, Sweden stated that the issue of hazardous substances was particularly important and should be pursued vigorously. Sweden said that they were also concerned with the issue of ballast water and alien species being introduced into the Arctic marine environment, threatening biodiversity.

Canada reconfirmed its support for voluntary contributions to the PAME Secretariat for 2000-2001. Canada also extended congratulations to the CAFF/PAME/IUCN circumpolar marine workshop.

Denmark reported that the Nordic proposal on phasing out of hazardous chemicals was in the process of being revised to reflect UNEP language; the revision should be sent out at the beginning of May in order to have a discussion at the next PAME meeting in Copenhagen.

EPPR asked if the secretariat could follow the status of international agreements on the Arctic Marine Environment instead of the working groups each doing it, which creates overlap.

Iceland stated that they were satisfied with PAME's work and would continue to support it as they have done in the past.

Norway replied to Canada's question regarding whether oil and gas guidelines should fall under sustainable development, stating that the Council needs to decide where they want this issue to go. Norway said that if it is a "pollution prevention" issue, it should be

managed by PAME; whereas if it is an “energy related” issue, it should fall under the Sustainable Development Working Group.

PAME clarified that they deal with marine pollution. With respect to shipping, PAME said they were looking at information that is readily available. Regarding oil and gas guidelines, PAME stated that WWF requested that organizations try and respond within the given time frame.

The Chair noted that AIA should direct their questions on the safety of marine mammals to CAFF and with respect to shipping and the Northern Sea Route, then ICC should direct their questions to Norway.

Canada asked if the Council would discuss the sustainable development chapeau and if so, when. The Chair responded that he would see if people had comments to discuss by the end of the day, time permitting.

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

Norway reported that much progress had been made toward developing the “Arctic Council Action Plan to Eliminate Pollution in the Arctic” since the last SAO meeting. Norway reported that it had held three “expert level” meetings and expressed hope that the SAOs would be able to reach a decision on the strategy component of ACAP at the Fairbanks SAO meeting. Norway recognized Mr. Gunnar Futsaeter. Mr. Futsaeter reported that there were a few open issues with regard to the ACAP strategy, noting that it was now in its third draft; and that the ACAP group has produced an outline of proposals under review for potential ACAP projects. Mr. Futsaeter identified the “implementation mechanism” as an open issue and suggested that this be handled at the next ACAP meeting after a decision has been reached on the strategy component. Mr. Futsaeter stated that ACAP should consist of representatives from Arctic Council member states and Permanent Participants. Mr. Futsaeter suggested the following options for the “implementation mechanism:” 1) New working group, 2) Steering committee building on the working group chairs (temporary solution), or 3) Broadening the mandate of PAME to allow it to implement ACAP. Mr. Futsaeter said that there was still a great deal of debate regarding who should actually approve ACAP activities, with some countries insisting that ministers approve all ACAP activities while others suggest that the ministers delegate this function to the SAOs. Mr. Futsaeter stated that the Council also needed to decide how to finance ACAP activities.

The Chair stated that the key question in regard to ACAP is how to manage the structure. Norway suggested establishing a steering committee consisting of working group chairs where the Permanent Participants and the Environment Ministry would guide the work of the program and make recommendations to SAOs. Norway stressed that it did not support a new ACAP working group or an expanded mandate for PAME, offering its own proposal as an interim solution. With respect to ACAP projects, Norway stressed the need both to identify projects ready for inclusion in the program and to determine the level of support member states and permanent participants were prepared to offer. Norway noted that they currently had financial commitment to only one ACAP project:

the Multilateral Cooperative Pilot Project for phase out of PCB use and Management of PCB containing wastes in the Russian Federation.

Iceland voiced support for the work of the project to date and stated that it would like to see a minor text amendment citing the Iqaliut declaration in the report instead of a summarization. With respect to implementation, Iceland expressed support for extending the mandate of PAME and renaming the group “Protection of the Arctic Environment” (PAE). Iceland stated that establishing an ACAP steering group would be taking a step backward toward the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy.

Canada congratulated Norway on the progress ACAP has made and expressed hope that the program would be ready for endorsement by the SAOs in October. Canada stressed the importance of including traditional knowledge as one of the basic principles of ACAP, stating that the current wording in the ACAP document does not adequately support respect for the ownership of traditional knowledge. With respect to implementation of ACAP, Canada expressed support for the third option of broadening PAME, but said that they would further discuss Norway’s interim solution. Canada stated that ACAP should promote cooperative action and the pursuit of common action in international fora, but that individual states would have to maintain responsibility for their own actions. Canada stated that they could not commit to individual projects at the present time. With respect to the LRTAP protocols, Canada encouraged all Arctic states to allow their indigenous people access to the global negotiations.

Sweden expressed welcome for the current draft of ACAP and thanked Norway for its work. Sweden stated that they did not support creating a new working group and suggested that the Council base ACAP on the existing ad-hoc structure for coordination of working group activities, emphasizing the need for provision of a clear mandate. Sweden stated that its main concerns were moving forward with concrete projects under ACAP and attaining the cooperation and support of other Council members for the two projects they have proposed.

Russia expressed appreciation for the work of Norway and suggested that national plans of action, such as the Russian plan for 1999-2001 and Russian NPA, be included as ACAP actions. Russia stated that ACAP priorities should be geared toward dealing with large-scale transport of contaminants through the air and marine environments, including transport from non-Arctic states and Southeast Asia. Russia stated that there is a need to perform some monitoring activities that would confirm or amend AMAP reports relating to Russia, and that Council members should think about establishing a circumpolar network of international monitoring stations.

Denmark commended Norway on its good work and stated that ACAP should provide a forum for discussing policy issues. Denmark suggested establishing a special steering committee to discuss environmental issues.

Finland expressed thanks to Norway and offered support for Norway’s suggestion of establishing an interim steering committee to begin implementing ACAP.

The US thanked Norway for all of its hard work. The US stressed that whatever form the ACAP group structure would take, it must follow the Arctic Council Rules of Procedure, pointing out that members and Permanent Participants must have a seat at the table and be able to designate their own representatives with no special conditions. The US stated that it could not support working group chairs heading the committee, but could support an interim ad-hoc group provided that the group comply with the Council's Rules of Procedure.

Canada pointed to the Council's "Global Statement on POPs," stating that the Council needed to support its earlier statement regarding increasing activities by seeking ratification of the protocol on POPs. Canada stated that it expects capacity building, technology transfer, and financial assistance to be offered to developing countries in order to encourage them to sign off on the POPs agreement.

ICC expressed appreciation for Canada's comments and congratulated Norway on its leadership and tenacity with respect to moving the ACAP program forward.

Russia suggested that Council members consider postponing the decision on ACAP structure until the fall ministerial.

EPPR stated that they were interested in some of the issues touched on by ACAP, but might not be able to contribute to all aspects of the discussion.

The Chair stated that working group chairs already have a problem deciding when they can meet, making the idea of the chairs running ACAP a daunting prospect. The Chair noted that there did not appear to be any support for establishing a new working group and that whatever is established, would be on an interim basis. The Chair stated that two camps had arisen: one supporting an expanded mandate for PAME and the other, supporting the establishment of an ad-hoc group. The Chair stated that the success of the new group would depend on solid leadership and that until one country decided to take that lead, the steering group would be unguided. The Chair said that the language of "under the leadership of the working group chairs" meant that the chair of the Arctic Council would have to provide leadership, which meant that Finland would have to support such an arrangement. The Chair asked Norway whom they had in mind to lead the steering group: Norway or the current chair of the Arctic Council? The Chair noted that Sweden and the ICC had raised questions regarding the mandate of the ACAP group and that answering those questions would require leadership. The Chair suggested that it was time for informal consultations among countries and noted that PAME had not yet commented on the discussion.

Norway thanked the Chair for a fair summary of the discussion. Norway stated that the strategy of ACAP existed outside of its proposed structure, going on to describe the roles of the Council's working group in the strategy. Norway suggested that members use their time in Fairbanks for informal consultations on an implementation mechanism. Norway asked about Denmark's proposal for a special steering committee to discuss

environmental questions more broadly and suggested that it might be better not to mix up this activity with ACAP, but rather pursue it as a separate function of the Council. Norway stated that the SAOs should not wait until the ACAP meeting in June to answer the question of an implementation mechanism, but should make a decision now.

The Chair stated that SAOs should consult among themselves, keeping in mind that someone would have to take the lead if the Council decided to establish a steering group or task force. In the absence of such leadership, the Chair stated that expanding the mandate of PAME seemed to be the best option. The Chair observed that projects work under the Council when someone decides to establish a group and then provide the leadership.

Iceland stated that it seemed logical that the Arctic Council should take the lead. Finland replied that it was not yet prepared to serve as the lead for ACAP and agreed with the Chair's assessment of the daunting nature of such an undertaking. Finland stated that they would need to discuss the issue further at home.

#### **Agenda Item 7: Arctic Climate Impact Assessment Update (ACIA)**

Dr. Corell reported on the progress of the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) for the US, beginning with a clarification of the word "climate," stating that in this context it refers to the variability that goes on over a seasonal basis with respect to everything from the green house warming issue to ozone depletion. Dr. Corell reported that they had held a successful scoping workshop, as suggested by the Council in September, with strong participation by experts. Dr. Corell said that the workshop clarified ACIA to the point of being able to identify a key goal of evaluating and synthesizing what is already known in order to anticipate the potential consequences. Dr. Corell said that there were three high level questions that should guide the assessment: 1) What is the state of scientific knowledge?, 2) What are the anticipated effects?, and 3) What are the gaps in knowledge essential to future understanding? Dr. Corell stated that they anticipate three documents to result from answering these questions: 1) a scientific document on the state of knowledge, 2) a synthesis document with a comprehensive survey of the main findings, and 3) a policy document that makes recommendations based on analysis. Dr. Corell went on to identify the possible changes that might occur in the future, both near and long term, identifying these issues as central to the impact assessment: marine, atmospheric, terrestrial, fresh water, social environments, fisheries, and human health. Dr. Corell stated that there were two time scales to be looked at: a generational time scale that accounts for what is likely to happen in the next 25 to 30 years, and a longer term time scale that looks at the next 50 to 100 years. Dr. Corell stated that the assessment is targeted for completion by 2004. With respect to management, Dr. Corell stated that there is a steering committee with two members appointed from AMAP, two from CAFF, and individuals from the International Arctic Science Committee as well as IPCCs and PCCs indigenous people. Dr. Corell said that the steering committee was complete with the exception of the need for one more member from an indigenous people's organization. Dr. Corell reported that they had been working with the US to establish a secretariat, which will likely be located in Fairbanks with the confirmed interim directorship of Dr. Gunter Weller. Dr. Corell reported that the basic strategy would be to

seek nominations from appropriate organizations around the Arctic for lead authors who would then become members of the steering committee with the goal of having each Arctic country represented in the steering committee. With respect to a communication plan, Dr. Corell reported that status reports would be sent to SAO meetings, that annual reviews would be produced, and that there would be a review of science and synthesis. Dr. Corell moved to financial issues, asking that each nation contribute in-kind funds in support of each of their scientists. He went on to note that joint projects would be established that would hopefully be jointly funded. Dr. Corell stated that there were five major categories that require funding: 1) lead authors, contributing authors, and experts; 2) indigenous people along with some experts; 3) workshops and special meetings (voluntarily hosted by countries); 4) modeling and special analyses; and 5) the secretariat. Dr. Corell extended an invitation to the Council to meet with him or ACIA representatives at 5:00 PM that day in order to ensure full participation by indigenous groups as they are an essential aspect of the project.

Friday, April 28, 2000

Denmark stated that it was a great idea to have a comprehensive ACIA, but that the component on socio-economic and cultural effects was creating confusion from an organizational point of view. Denmark questioned who should be responsible, whether it should be AMAP or CAFF, and what the ministers would approve in this area. Dr. Corell responded that there were three documents to prepare on science, synthesis and policy, stating that initially they would focus on the first two. Dr. Corell stated that they were prepared to “think through” the problem with the Council, suggesting that an intergovernmental committee could develop action items and that other issues could be added to deal with the economic, social and cultural aspects.

Norway expressed their pleasure at the US willingness to provide secretariat support. Norway stated that the ACIA was a priority project for them, pointing to several issues requiring special attention: a clear distinction between science assessment and policy recommendations, the need for formal contact with IPCC, and sensitivity to regional priorities and overshadowing. Norway supported the US as the lead country while emphasizing that all of the countries should be represented. Norway expressed support for the proposed reporting model with the three documents. Norway asked how the model ensured the participation of all countries, what CAFF and AMAP think about the socioeconomic question, how the IPCC relationship will be formalized, and whether the head of the ASC would report directly to the SAOs.

Dr. Corell stated that he was working directly with Bob Watson who is the chair of IPCC, and that they were constructing an MOU that will explain how it all fits into the IPCC process. Dr. Corell said that IPCC sees the project as a pilot of a new kind of element in the IPCC process. Dr. Corell stated that climate change would take place in a patchy manner, which increases the importance of regional assessments, noting that this could form the foundation of the IPCC’s future approach to the project. Dr. Corell said that they would circulate a document to the SAOs for review, but would not have the IPCC serve as an “approver” of the project because it could slow things down or complicate

them. Dr. Corell stated that they needed to sharpen the terms of reference to state that all member states would be a part of the process. With respect to socioeconomic aspects, Dr. Corell said that these issues were a fundamental part of understanding the assessment and that the ASC was attempting to figure out how to integrate those issues. AMAP and CAFF stated that they would look over the question of socioeconomic aspects and report back at the next SAO meeting. Dr. Corell said that ASC would meet in June to structure the ACIA process and discuss how the group might better address the socioeconomic aspect.

Sweden expressed concern about climate change and thanked Dr. Corell and his team for their hard work. Sweden said that they were still somewhat doubtful as to whether ACIA should address the political implications, stressing that a clearer division is needed between politics and science. Sweden stated that AMAP and CAFF should not be subordinated to ASC. Sweden said that they would come forward with scientists to participate. Sweden asked how the ministerial decision should be structured, what they were actually going to be asked to decide upon, and what the adoption of the project would look like. Sweden stated that it must be clear that participation is on a voluntary basis.

With respect to research, Dr. Corell stated that Sweden's bottom line was consistent with their own perspective, noting that the modeling study team would look at state of the art predictive models with the aim of finding an analytical model that would help them do their job. Dr. Corell said that the group needed to be thoughtful about gaps in knowledge, discerning what information was required answer to the questions they were posing. Dr. Corell stated that he and Bob Watson and Bert Bolin had talked about having Dr. Bolin serve as an informal liaison with IPCC with respect to contact and research in addition to being a formal contact at the IPCC's secretariat in Geneva.

The US addressed the question of how the presentation should be structured for the Ministers at the Barrow Ministerial, stating that they shouldn't introduce any statement that doesn't clearly state that participation is voluntary as it is with all other Council activities. The US stated that were providing approximately 2 million dollars for the secretariat and its activities and that US agencies would support the participation of US scientists. The US asked if Dr. Corell would say more about how the meeting with the indigenous representatives had gone the day before.

Dr. Corell said that there was a need for a consultative process in the early stages of the project so that communities could participate in the design of the assessment. Dr. Corell stated that they needed to set up a panel of 6-10 representatives in order to decide how an indigenous knowledge base could be incorporated into the assessment. Dr. Corell suggested that this goal could be achieved by setting up regional workshops or by having a separate chapter of the assessment written that deals directly with the indigenous community (and prepared by that community).

Canada stated that the issue of climate change was of critical importance, noting that there was extensive dialogue in Canada on this topic. Canada pointed to the large

amounts of revenue generated by Bristol Myers and Squibb on the sale of sunscreen products in the north, indicating that something was clearly wrong. Canada said that they were coming up with scientists who would participate in the project and would like to further explore the issue of reporting lines for the project.

Russia expressed support for ACIA and its plans for a steering committee. Russia stated that their own program on “prevention of dangers of climate change,” which is run by Hydromet and the US Environmental Protection Agency, is very similar to this project. Russia noted that their scientists who are involved in this project, would also participate in the ACIA.

Finland expressed support for the ACIA project in general, noting that they were building up a network of experts who would be able to contribute. With respect to the list of potential impact topics, Finland said that high priority should be placed on the issues of terrestrial ecosystems, freshwater systems, conservation and wildlife management, and human health. With respect to subregions, Finland noted that the Nordic region could provide expertise for that area, but pointed out that the Council should keep in mind issues relating to the connection of the Arctic region with the global system.

The ICC thanked the US for its leadership on the project, stating that if it is done properly, it could be the most important work of the Council. The ICC expressed full confidence in Jan-Idar Solbakken, the permanent participant representative on the project steering committee. The ICC stated their pleasure at the process being open to traditional knowledge, noting that they don't want to be seen merely as victims, and that they have a lot of knowledge to offer. The ICC stressed that the project must look at the socioeconomic angle, stating that it's not only about science, but people as well. The ICC expressed hope that involvement would encompass more than just travel to rural areas, noting that traditional knowledge can be just as expert as science. Dr. Corell stated that the ICC was correct in correcting him and extended his apologies.

Iceland welcomed the project and its attempts to understand the short-term variations from one region to another in the Arctic. Iceland stressed that science and policy must remain separate.

The Saami Council thanked the US and Dr. Corell for their leadership, expressing their own support for the project. The Saami Council stated that aside from ACAP, they saw this project as the most important project the Council would work on over the next few years. The Saami Council expressed appreciation for the desire to incorporate traditional and indigenous knowledge as well as the desire to have indigenous people on the steering committee.

The United Kingdom (UK) congratulated the US on its progress on the project and thanked Dr. Corell for his work. The UK asked about participation by non-Arctic states, noting that 2 programs in the UK are relevant to the project, one on Arctic ice and one on thermohaline circulation systems.

Dr. Corell stated that they would be contacting the UK and other countries and asking for lead authors, noting that they will be contacting all 17 member countries of IASC and asking them to participate. Dr. Corell introduced Dr. Gunther Weller, interim executive director of the secretariat, to the assembly.

**Agenda Item 8: Multilateral PCB Project Update**

AMAP reported that progress on the project is going well, noting that they received data today on the production of PCBs in the former USSR. AMAP stated that all aspects of the study were being completed satisfactorily, noting that all data should be ready by May with a report ready in June to be presented in Moscow. AMAP said that the report would cover production, sources, and the use of PCBs today. AMAP stated that they were now looking at Phase II, the feasibility study, as requested by the US.

The US recognized Seth Low from the Environmental Protection Agency. Mr. Low cited the Iqaluit Declaration, noting that the ministers had expressed support for a three-part multilateral cooperative PCB project and endorsed Phase I, which AMAP just discussed. Mr. Low pointed out that Phase II was a feasibility study involving the study of alternatives to PCBs and disposal methods aimed at reducing the sources of PCBs in Russia. Phase III, Mr. Low said, would be demonstration projects that test the alternatives generated by Phase II. Mr. Low stated that Phase I of the project had worked well, but noted that Phase II required additional work by experts and a Russian performing entity as well as a secretariat to oversee the work. Mr. Low said that the project steering group would finalize the structure for Phase II by the end of June. Mr. Low noted that the US EPA would continue to provide experts to participate in Phase II and would contribute some funding, but that the US must have Phase II endorsed at the ministerial in order to move forward.

Norway congratulated Russia for their success in Phase I, particularly the mapping of production sites. Norway thanked AMAP for their competent management of the project. Norway stated that they supported Phase II financially and think that it should be handled in the same way as Phase I, noting that they see no problem with a ministerial endorsement.

Finland noted their appreciation of the positive results of Phase I and expressed support for Phase II. Finland stated that the AMAP secretariat had done good work in Phase I and suggested that they hire a technical expert to assist with Phase II.

PAME stated that they needed clarification on Phases II and III of the project, asking if it would be part of ACAP. PAME noted that with the PCB project up and running, the intention should be to have it move forward independently of ACAP.

Canada said that good work had been done on the project and they were grateful for the success of Phase I. Canada said that they wanted to see the project move forward through ministerial approval, but noted that they couldn't commit funds at the present time. Canada stated that they viewed Phase II as one of the candidate proposals for

inclusion under ACAP and would review Annex A of ACAP in order to determine funding priorities.

The Chair noted that it is expected that Phase II would be an item for ministerial approval at the Barrow meeting and requested that the ministers advise if they foresaw any problems with that inclusion.

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

The Chair stated that the group was currently discussing administrative matters and overlap, asking if there is something else the group should be doing. The Chair summarized the discussion as involving questions about how to manage ACAP, how to participate in ACIA, and how working groups would report at the next ministerial meeting. The Chair stated that he would provide guidance on this in the near future.

AMAP stated that they were willing to be flexible and come to meetings whenever necessary. The Chair noted that an extra half-day meeting would be helpful, but would be a strain on participants' schedules. EPPR stated that they couldn't participate because they received late notification after travel arrangements had already been made. EPPR noted that the meeting seemed to be useful, stating that they had been too busy with normal meeting activities to discuss with their colleagues from other working groups the issue of avoiding overlap. PAME noted that there was a challenge posed by the multi-phase nature of a number of the Council's projects, stating that this issue made it important to sit together during the planning stages in order to sort out problems before they arise.

Canada stated that they supported keeping the meetings non-institutionalized. Canada asked if the assembly would revisit the ACAP structure again that day. The Chair stated that it could be discussed under "planning for ministerial."

Sweden thanked the Chair for undertaking these meetings and expressed support for continuing them, but noted that they should not be institutionalized. Sweden stated that the only drawback was that they received the paper too late, which made it difficult to have their experts review it in time to offer comments.

Norway thanked the Chair for organizing the meetings, noting their appreciation for the written minutes from the meetings as a help to the SAOs. Norway stated that with the way the Council was working, it has to be a burden for the Chair to take extra action in order to make these meetings happen. Norway said that they needed to be practical in scheduling the meetings, but that they could be scheduled separately from SAO meetings in the future if necessary.

Denmark asked if they could see a matrix of working group activities in the future, noting that the ACAP discussion called for an analysis of the entire Arctic Council structure. Denmark stated that it would be helpful if the Chair would take responsibility for setting up this structure on paper. The Chair credited the chairman of CAFF for constructing a

matrix of working group activities, and stated that a first draft of a comprehensive matrix was produced and would hopefully be circulated within the next few months.

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

Denmark reported on the activities of the Nordic Council of Ministers, noting that Denmark is the current President and Chair of the Council, which was founded in 1971 to establish official cooperation among Nordics. Denmark stated that the prime ministers from the member countries meet biannually to discuss issues that are decided by consensus. Denmark stressed that the organization is not supranational and is not one Council, but actually several. Denmark noted that individual ministers who are responsible for different areas meet several times over the course of a year. Denmark reported that the annual budget was 714 million Danish kroner, that they have a 75 person staff, and that the Presidency is rotational. Denmark noted that they had provided the secretariat with 28 pages of the Nordic Council's program activities. Denmark stated that the Nordic Council was attempting to deal with: demographic changes, ensure adequate health care, environmental protection, refugees and immigrants, childcare and education. Denmark noted that they would focus their talk on welfare and that Mr. Stuart Pierson would talk about the work of the Nordic Council.

Mr. Pierson noted that cooperation in the Arctic covers an extensive range of issues, stating that the Nordic Council had adopted a special program for cooperation in the Arctic in 1996, which focuses on areas adjacent to the Nordics. Mr. Pierson stated that this program was funded by 2.2 million Danish kroner annually and is aimed primarily at promoting the development of traditional arctic products sustainably as well as studying living conditions in the Arctic, particularly of indigenous people. Mr. Pierson said that this work takes various forms including press trips, exhibitions, and research.

Mr. Pierson reported that the total annual budget of the Arctic Research Program is about 30 million Danish kroner. Mr. Pierson said that the Board had a secretariat at the University of Oulu in Finland. Mr. Pierson reported that environmental problems are given high priority and that 14 concrete projects were developed in an action plan last year. Mr. Pierson noted that the Program also supported external projects in the Arctic, including provision of some funding to AMAP and CAFF. Mr. Pierson said that the funding is linked to the AMAP "State of the Arctic Report" and the "Barents Sea Region Nuclear Contamination Project."

Mr. Pierson reported that a new Nordic working group started to focus on strategies specifically for adjacent areas and that their report should be ready by the end of the year. Mr. Pierson noted that last summer, the ministers appointed an expert panel to discuss and report on the future of cooperation over the next century and that that report was due in September, stating that it may impact future cooperation with other groups such as the Arctic Council.

The Chair asked Finland to report on their work on the Barents Euro-Arctic Council (BEAC) and the EU Northern Dimension. Finland reported that BEAC convened their seventh session in March at which time the chairmanship was handed off from Finland to

Russia and that the US made a presentation on the Arctic Council at that meeting. Finland noted that one of the most successful outcomes of that meeting was a strengthening of the BEAC's role as a forum for nuclear safety in the Arctic. Finland stated that some of the highlights of their chairmanship included investment project work on economic cooperation, the forest sector initiative, and the work carried out in relation to border crossing and trade. Finland noted that the steering committee on Barents Euro-Arctic transport had defined the backbone network for transport in the Barents region, which was approved in November of 1999. Finland pointed to BEAC's youth policy, which was established in June of 1999 with the formation of a working group emphasizing promotion of research and development of a network for provision of information. Finland noted that they were gathering information from young people from surveys dealing with living conditions, and that this would serve as a foundation for the working group's activities. Finland noted that there were five priorities for the program: development of industry and infrastructure, competence building and education, health, environment, and indigenous people. Finland noted their satisfaction over the beginnings of cooperation between BEAC and the Arctic Council, stating that they had come a long way together since 1993.

Mr. Heikkinen was recognized to speak on the Northern Dimension. Mr. Heikkinen mentioned that since the present Portuguese European Union chair was not represented at the Arctic Council, Finland would be happy to discuss this item. Mr. Heikkinen noted that since the last SAO meeting in November, the European Union (EU) held a summit in December at which time, they invited the European Commission to prepare an action plan for the Northern Dimension, to be done in close cooperation with the Russian Federation, Norway, Iceland, the Baltics, and Poland. Mr. Heikkinen reported that the Commission had prepared a draft action plan and presented it to the member EU states, generating discussion and consultation among the Portuguese Presidency and EU partners in their respective capitols. Mr. Heikkinen reported that the action plan was currently evolving, that it would take place over a three year time frame (from 2000-2003), and that the plan focused on three parts: horizontal issues, operational issues, and projects/proposals. Mr. Heikkinen noted that the action plan would not only list projects, but would also point out the proposals that bring out value-added to existing EU reports. Mr. Heikkinen stated that there would be a follow up conference in 2001 in Sweden. With respect to the Northern Dimension Plan and the Arctic Council, Mr. Heikkinen stated that the Arctic Council was not listed as a suitable partner for the Northern Dimension because: 1) the work the Arctic Council is doing is not well known and 2) the EU is not represented on the Arctic Council. Mr. Heikkinen stressed that the Arctic Council doesn't want to make suggestions to the Northern Dimension, but might want to consider presenting a list of Arctic Council activities to the EU. Mr. Heikkinen suggested that the Arctic Council might also want to discuss whether or not they would undertake to carry out part of that plan.

Sweden said that the work of the Northern Dimension was now entering a new phase, and that the Arctic Council should identify existing possibilities for cooperation. Sweden noted that Finland had made the same proposal. Sweden thanked Finland for their work

on the Northern Dimension, noting that Sweden would be the EU Chair in 2001 and that they would do what they could to bring work on the project forward.

Iceland stated that it was important to establish contacts with the EU Northern Dimension because of the clear overlap. Regarding areas of activity and interest, Iceland said that the Arctic Council was not represented probably because of a lack of knowledge of the organizations' mutual interest, and that the Arctic Council should work toward gaining recognition for itself.

Russia noted that the Arctic Council had a healthy tendency to look to other cooperative international groups for activities and opportunities for collaboration. Russia stated that Finland has done a good work as the Chair of BEAC and that Russia hoped to do the same under its own chairmanship, using Finland and the Arctic Council as a model.

Canada commended Finland and said that they were keenly interested in this initiative, noting that they were interested in developing a northern dimension to their own foreign policy. Canada noted that they wanted to coordinate activities in the north and that the issue of coordination and overlap is not a new one, pointing out that there is a clear understanding for the potentiality of overlap. Canada stressed that this issue, though acknowledged, still needed to be effectively addressed by the Council. Canada stated that they were recently in Helsinki where they spoke about the "Children and Youth Initiative," and that they were able to share concrete ways activities were working with Barents members. Canada stressed the need to get away from talk and move toward action, noting that the Council might need to push its own ministers to work on clearing up mandates between forums, noting that they would bring this up under structural review.

Norway stated that it was important to know what is going on in other organizations and that the Council needed to send a clear signal to the EU about wanting close cooperation with them. With respect to overlap, Norway agreed with Canada, noting that the Council couldn't avoid all overlap, but that there was a need for better coordination than exists today. Norway noted that they had asked a Nordic research institute based in Stockholm to look at organizations, structure, overlap and coordination with the purpose of providing suggestions on how they might better work together. Norway said that this paper should be ready for review this summer.

The Northern Forum expressed appreciation for the updates on other organizations and hoped that the Arctic Council obtains a better working relationship with the EU. The Northern Forum extended thanks on behalf of their 23 members who spoke at the previous SAO meeting in DC for allowing them to participate. The Northern Forum noted that the BEAC model for cooperation might be a better way to coordinate with other arctic fora, pointing out that they had a record of success in raising arctic issues to the attention of other Arctic governments. The Northern Forum stated that they were ready to pursue their identified goals and stressed that they wanted to cooperate rather than compete with the Arctic Council and other organizations, pointing out that they all needed to work together in order to improve their collective well-being. The Northern

Forum urged the Arctic Council to consider how it could better work with observers and other organizations.

The US suggested that the Council take a look at the list compiled by the working group chairs on Arctic Council projects, noting that they would like to finalize the list by the middle of May so that the Council would then have a living document to send to BEAC, the Nordic Council, the EU, and others. The US noted that this would provide a practical bit of information and a snapshot of Arctic Council activities.

Sweden thanked the US for undertaking that bit of work and asked if ACAP should be listed as well. The US replied that they would include projects once they had been accepted and approved.

AMAP asked how they should provide their link to the 500 other projects that are somehow connected to AMAP as the current list only shows the bilateral and multilateral projects AMAP is involved in. The US asked that AMAP look at the existing one-page document describing activities fostering cooperation and determine if it is a reasonable description and whether they have any improvements. Norway stated that the document is helpful to the Arctic Council as well as other bodies and that perhaps, the Council should think about how they can have SAOs meet with their counterparts in other fora. Canada said that the one-page draft was helpful but that it could be strengthened, and that some time was necessary to provide substantive commentary. Canada said that they could provide others with a list of their activities, but it was another thing to reach out and coordinate work with them because of delineation of mandates, among other things. Sweden stated that coordination should also be done at home in order to prevent overlap with domestic agencies and organizations. The Chair said that the Council needed to establish its own internal awareness and coordination. The Northern Forum commented that some of this type of work was underway already, noting that they had already met for discussions with Finland, and had found Sweden's comments helpful. The Chair commented that this discussion was helpful, noting that it was also helpful for him to attend the BEAC meeting with Undersecretary Loy in Finland.

#### **Agenda Item 11: Work Program & Deliverables for the Fall Ministerial**

The Chair pointed to two documents for the SAOs to review: the fall agenda and a list of potential accomplishments. The Chair noted that the agenda was theoretical at this time, remained open to change, and had not been vetted with the people of Barrow. The Chair noted that the schedule called for a Thursday arrival with meetings to start in the afternoon with local officials and observers, while the next day would begin with a morning session that would include comments from the working groups, discussion with ministers, approval of an action plan, and a press conference. The Chair said that they were looking for suggestions for improvement.

Canada stated that they wanted a roundtable discussion on capacity building, asking if countries had a view and a format for a ministerial discussion.

Iceland noted that ministerial meetings tended to become ritualistic rather than substantive and suggested that there be a day of “signing the statement” and a day for frank discussions among ministers over “important topics.”

The Chair stated that there were two possibilities for Iceland’s suggestion of a meeting, one on Thursday afternoon when the ministers + 1 would meet with local officials, and the second on the day after where a “ministerial discussion” could be listed on the agenda.

Norway expressed support for Iceland’s suggestion, noting the need to get ministers to Barrow on the appropriate days and that the discussions should be of political interest to the ministers in order to get them to come. Norway said that there must be some structure to the meeting, but not so much structure that they cannot interact. Norway suggested that capacity building and Rio +10 could be discussed, noting that ministers, from a political perspective, would probably like to discuss climate impact assessment and coordination with other regional bodies. Norway said that this could give future guidance to the Council.

The Chair stated that it is difficult to control what the ministers will talk about, noting that the Council’s responsibility is to put together the declaration.

Canada stated that it likes the topics Norway was suggesting for the roundtable, noting that they needed to begin a declaration for the minister as soon as possible so that they don’t have to do the whole thing the day before.

The Chair said that Norway’s list looked pretty good and requested that the SAOs send comments to the Chair during the next month. The Chair noted that they also needed to begin working on the report to the ministers and that a draft should come together this summer for people to begin working on. The Chair said that they should be able to do a general report and that they are looking for suggestions from the delegations for the declaration as soon as possible, with a projected distribution of the draft report by mid-summer.

Norway noted that they did not think any Norwegian journalists would be coming to Barrow, stating that the ministerial meeting by itself would not be enough to bring the journalists. Norway suggested that the ministerial be combined with some other reporting from Alaska that could potentially bring reporters in, asking if a photo opportunity could be put together.

The Chair brought the Council’s attention to the list entitled “Notional Accomplishments,” noting that it was a list of items that are expected to be produced, emphasizing that the list should stick to accomplishments. The Chair listed the following projects for inclusion on the list: ACAP, ACIA, PCB Phase II, Sustainable Development’s new and ongoing projects, Sustainable Development framework, and the virtual secretariat (public relations, information and communication).

Canada asked about the report from the working group chairs on capacity building for the ministers. Canada asked if there could be guidelines on capacity building that the ministers could bless. The Chair replied that it would be helpful if Canada could provide a structure for inclusion, suggesting that PAME could take the lead and then other groups could use it as a guideline. The US suggested that Canada go through the Arctic Council secretariat, as do the working group chairs, so that progress can be tracked. Canada said that they could do this, but were not sure whether the working group chairs would actually do the project. The Chair replied that there appeared to be a general agreement from the chairs and asked for comments from them. PAME said they would do it in combination with their matrix. EPPR stated that they took this directive as an order, not a request. CAFF and AMAP echoed their willingness.

Norway asked that the discussion revert back to ACAP implementation, noting that they agreed with the US and Finland on the need for leadership of the group. Norway stated that they could offer their services as the chair of a steering committee on an interim basis, but that it was important that a permanent solution be established. Norway said that a review should be undertaken in order to determine how best to structure the framework of the Arctic Council, stating that the temporary work of a steering committee should not extend past 2002. Norway stated that the SAOs should answer the question of implementation.

Iceland stated that ACAP was an important deliverable for the ministerial meeting, stressing the need to finalize the issue. Iceland expressed appreciation to Norway for their willingness to lead the committee on an interim basis, but that it appeared to Iceland that the Council was heading toward the establishment of a new working group. Iceland stated that the Council would be adding to the structure it already has and that it would bring implications for all the working groups, questioning what the mandate of the new working group would be in relation to the others. Norway stated that there were broader implications that should be thought through and discussed further before a decision is made, suggesting resolution at the June meeting.

Denmark remarked that ACAP was important for the ministerial and that the Norwegian offer had solved an immediate problem. Denmark commented that Iceland's concerns were important, but that they were covered by Norway's interest in examining the structure of the Arctic Council.

Sweden stated that it was not only the issue of leadership that is important for ACAP, but also the issue of what the Council wants the group to do. Without direction, Sweden said the project would just be a list of tasks on paper. Sweden said that they were open to suggestions about which tasks needed to be undertaken in order to make it the body the Council wants it to be.

Russia expressed support for Iceland's suggestion of taking back the material and suggestions to respective capitols in order to reflect and generate more discussion later.

Canada expressed appreciation for Norway's work to date as well as their offer, noting that ACAP was very important to Canada. Canada stated that they still supported the idea of the PAME working group managing ACAP because it would not require establishing a new body. Canada noted Iceland's comment regarding the necessity of making a decision at this meeting and how this would affect progress toward the ministerial. Canada stated that the Council needs to think through the possible implications and how ACAP will fit in the Arctic Council structure, noting that once something is created, it is difficult to change. Canada said that they would prefer to have a little more time to think about things, but are not rejecting Norway's proposal.

The US commented that they had come to the meeting with two options in mind, noting their concern that whatever form the group takes, it should adhere to the Rules of Procedure of the Arctic Council, and that the working group chairs should play a support role rather than a leadership role. The US stated that the Council should not mix an ambitious review of the Arctic Council organization with the problem of answering the concerns the ministers raised at Iqaluit.

The Chair said that the feedback gave Norway some initial reaction and expressed appreciation for Norway's continued willingness to take the lead. The Chair said that the June meeting of ACAP did allow some time for revisiting this issue, but it did not necessarily allow for SAO participation. The Chair stated that an interim arrangement would be a good one and would provide something under which to operate under for the next 2 years. The Chair suggested that Norway might want to make note of the comments made and elaborate their offer, or that others may want to deal directly or through the Chair with Norway.

Norway expressed appreciation for the reactions given and stated that they understood the need for reflection. Norway stated that it would be helpful if they could receive replies to their proposal, noting that they were very concerned that the discussion of the issue continue at the SAO level.

The Chair stated that it was up to the individual countries regarding whom they wished to send to represent their views, noting that empowered experts should be acceptable. The Chair stated that it did not seem like the issue could be taken much further at this point, noting that the assembly had outlined some broad actions to pursue, suggesting a possible conference call among SAOs for further discussion.

Canada stated that the discussion on implementation should be limited to SAOs because of the level of importance, noting that experts could provide advice.

Norway expressed agreement with Canada, pointing out the need for a little flexibility. Norway stated that at this time, the important thing was to work successfully on the proposed projects and find financing. Norway stressed that work on the PCB project should not be hampered. Norway emphasized the need for flexibility.

The Chair said that, at a minimum, there would be a group that would oversee ACAP, led initially by ACAP, present at the ministerial. The Chair said that there should be at least some agreement among the SAOs on the broad parameters of ACAP, which should allow for a timely presentation at the ministerial. The Chair suggested moving the ministerial meetings back by a week, and asked about October 3-6 as a possibility in order to allow for participation by other Arctic Council ministers. The Chair noted that the vice chair of the SDWG had suggested that there be another meeting of the SDWG before the ministerial, possibly in September; the Chair asked for reactions to this possibility, noting that it could also be a time to discuss the organization of the working group and progress on its new projects.

#### **Agenda Item 12: International Red Cross**

The Red Cross emphasized that there were two major parts of the International Red Cross movement: the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of the Red Cross, noting that it would be the International Federation that would be the primary focus of their presentation. The Red Cross stated that the International Committee deals with conflict situations while the International Federation comprises the rest of the movement. The Red Cross explained that the Federation is a global network composed of a number of bodies including a general assembly with representatives from all 176 national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies around the world. The Red Cross said that the Federation secretariat is the coordinating body for the organization and its role is to provide coordination and operational support to developing situations, which in this case, concerns circumpolar issues. The Red Cross reported that they currently have one delegation serving in the circumpolar region and that delegation was in Russia. The Red Cross explained the mission of the Federation to be the improvement of the situation of the world's most vulnerable, with the field of action being primarily emergency relief. The Red Cross reviewed some of their worldwide programs and their allocation of resources, noting that in 1999, their programs reached 30 million people, with 1.5 million in the Russian Federation.

The Red Cross stated that after 8 years of activity in Russia, they had determined that Central Siberia and the Northern Territories appeared to be most in need of assistance. The Red Cross reported that they have found that most of their beneficiaries are based in isolated communities and consist of pensioners, large families, children and institutions. These findings, the Red Cross stated, had led them to launch a mixed program in the Russian Federation which included food aid, direct intervention, hygiene assistance, TB and HIV/AIDS education, TB treatment, and community development. The Red Cross stated that these projects were funded primarily by the Norwegian Red Cross, the Finnish Red Cross, and the Canadian Red Cross. The Red Cross stated that they were still appealing for approximately 50 million Swiss francs for initial work in Siberia and Northern Russia.

The Red Cross expressed pleasure at a recently established cooperative tripartite between the State Committee on Northern Affairs, the Russian Red Cross and the International Federation. The Red Cross noted that they hoped to achieve a similar agreement with RAIPON and were looking forward to other such collaborative arrangements.

**Agenda Item 13: Update on the Northern Sea Route**

Norway gave a presentation on the Northern Sea Route during the Sustainable Development Working Group Meeting under agenda item 6: National Reports.

**Agenda Item 14: Discussion of Public Awareness, Education and Outreach**

The US recognized Mr. Lars-Otto Reiersen to speak on contaminants and human health. Mr. Reiersen reported on a panel discussion held earlier that focused on the sources of contaminants, the transport of contaminants, and the accumulation of these contaminants in the food chain. Mr. Reiersen stressed that AMAP had produced recommendations that clarify the threat of contaminants, but that there were many positive signs that should be considered as well more negative ones that have not yet been clearly documented. Mr. Reiersen said that such issues were appropriate to the Arctic Council and he hoped that they might be discussed later this year in linkage to the work in UNEP and UNEC.

The Chair stated that this kind of public outreach was very productive and provided good interaction with the community, especially when it could focus on an issue close to the community.

The Chair recognized Dr. Bruce Molnia, as webmaster for the Arctic Council, to speak about electronic outreach. Dr. Molnia stated his intention to address the future data and information needs of the Arctic Council, pointing to a “digital divide” that did not necessarily have to befall the people of the Arctic. Dr. Molnia acknowledged the assistance of Kathy Frazier and Fred Riegle for their behind the scenes work in maintaining the web site. Dr. Molnia said that even though there had been a lot of discussion regarding the next home for the secretariat, the Barrow Ministerial would not mark the end of the US’ operation of the Council’s information and web activities, but that the US could continue to operate the site during the following six months. Dr. Molnia suggested possible improvements to the site including real time updates on Council activities, the development of a data and information management plan for climate action, and for simple information provision by members. Dr. Molnia gave Council delegates a visual tour of the Council web site, pointing out recent additions such as the telemedicine presentation, a live television broadcast of the contaminants panel, and the presentation of digital photographs. Dr. Molnia emphasized the utility of an electronic instrument for delivering data across great distances and maintaining communication and accessibility to information. Dr. Molnia said that the US would be visiting the Barrow site and anticipated posting photographs of the ministerial site on the web site for viewing. Dr. Molnia asked that the Council consider the following questions: whether the site is useful to the members; what its weak points are; what they can do to improve the usefulness of the site; and what else the secretariat web and information staff can do to assist the Council.

The Chair said that the connection to other countries’ Arctic programs web sites could be better, but that help is needed from the member states to identify potential sites. The Chair thanked Dr. Molnia for his work and commented on the excellence of the Council’s web site.

Iceland expressed appreciation for the work on the web site.

Canada said that they wanted to think about the questions Dr. Molnia proposed, but that they would get back to the US on a bilateral basis.

Sweden commented on the utility of the web site in generating knowledge and interest in the Arctic Council. Sweden noted the problem of the “digital divide,” saying that older generations did not use web sites as a primary source of information, meaning that sometimes it is possible to come to a meeting of the Arctic Council without the proper preparation materials because they were posted on the web site. Sweden suggested that when new documents are posted, a fax or email could also be sent out to let people know. Sweden said that they felt there was a burden of distribution for material on the receiving side since they now had to monitor the appearance of new documents and the distribution to the appropriate authorities domestically.

Dr. Molnia said that the home page had a box on the lower left-hand side that identifies new material, including updated revision dates. Dr. Molnia went on to suggest that when new documents must be distributed, one could simply forward the web site address along with the necessary password so that the recipients could review it themselves.

Sweden responded that it just doesn’t work that way, noting that if people don’t receive paper, they do not look at it. Sweden pointed out that the date of documents is not always clear, making it difficult to determine when the last update was.

Dr. Molnia said that he would make sure that in the future, any document posted will have the latest update right on the first line with the title.

The Saami Council said that the web site had been extremely useful to them, noting some small problems with locating necessary documents for upcoming meetings. Dr. Molnia said that perhaps if the ministerial book were completed early enough, the entire document could be posted as one file so it could be scanned in entirety.

The IPS noted that the web site had been particularly useful in answering questions from students and scholars as well as in obtaining necessary documents. The IPS asked if it were possible to begin posting items in Russian. The Chair responded that this would be very possible and welcomed the help of the IPS.

The EPPR asked if the Council could develop a permanent address for the Arctic Council that would not change every time the chairmanship changes. The Chair said that issue would be discussed shortly in the next agenda item.

The ICC pointed out that web site development was very important to the indigenous people groups, noting that there was a great deal of possibility for linkages to indigenous sites, and that they would work with the secretariat to determine some of those links.

The Chair recognized Mr. Alan Saunders to speak on the Arctic Environmental Data Directory. Mr. Saunders identified the basic mandate of the AEDD organization to be making knowledge in the Arctic more accessible for a variety of reasons. Mr. Saunders said that the aim of the project was to establish a kind of dedicated Arctic Gateway, which they are working on. Mr. Saunders described the AEDD as a cooperative network of organizations that produce and utilize Arctic data and information, counting among its members, most Arctic countries and possibly Japan and the Netherlands in the future. Mr. Saunders stated that AEDD develops standards in consultation with national and international organizations so that Arctic data can be more accessible, as well as useful for general outreach purposes. Mr. Saunders demonstrated some of the capabilities of the AEDD. Mr. Saunders emphasized that AEDD did not deal strictly with data, but also on the development of news scans on Arctic issues. Mr. Saunders pointed out that AEDD has proposed hosting the Arctic Council web site in conjunction with GRID-Arendal, recognizing the key benefits of collaboration on web site design, content and data management. Mr. Saunders said they were proposing to the Council that they host the Arctic Council server and provide technical and content support toward the purpose of enhanced dissemination of Arctic data and information. Mr. Saunders noted that it would be helpful if an Arctic Council representative could attend AEDD meetings, the next of which is in Copenhagen in early June. Mr. Saunders said that it would be a good idea to have regular dialogue with the Arctic Council working groups for joint data and information projects. Mr. Saunders suggested preparing a report to the Arctic Council on information management and technology in the Arctic.

Canada stated that they could certainly support the six or seven recommendations Mr. Saunders made in his presentation. Canada asked if it would not make more sense for the AEDD to request observer status to the working group meetings as an appropriate linkage, rather than to the Arctic Council as a whole. Mr. Saunders replied that he thought that might be appropriate.

The Chair asked if AEDD intended to make a formal proposal to the Council based on the recommendations made during the presentation. Mr. Saunders replied that they did indeed want to move the proposal forward. The Chair suggested that AEDD speak both with the US and Finland, in their role as the new chair.

Canada asked if the proposals had costs attached to them. Mr. Saunders said that the costs were fairly minimal given financial support from Grid-Arendal, noting that it would really depend on the level of involvement the secretariat would like to have.

The Chair recognized Russia to speak on the Arctic Council Magazine. Russia stated that the Arctic Council needed to be better known in the world and that the publication of a regular Arctic Council magazine could be the answer. Russia said that such a magazine should be published monthly and be comparable in quality to National Geographic. Russia said they could consider transforming Russia's Northern Spreads magazine into an Arctic Council magazine, and that if the Council were interested, they would submit a paper on anticipated costs.

Norway expressed gratitude to Russia for putting the proposal forward, noting that they agreed with the basic idea about needing better contact with the outside world. Norway said that the Arctic Council needed better contact with the public in general. Norway welcomed the proposal, noting Russia's role as an important member of the Council, and stating that the Council should consider Northern Spreads and hear about the costs involved.

Canada said that it would be helpful to have a rough idea of what the cost parameters would be to take over publication of the journal. Russia replied that it would be about \$20,000 per issue if it were published in several languages.

The Chair noted that there was some interest and said that it would be helpful if Russia could expand some on the idea, letting the Council know how the project would get done and how the financing would work.

**Agenda Item 15: Other Business**

The Chair commented that it appeared the Council was relatively close to the legendary chapeau, requesting that Council members get comments back quickly so a decision could be reached.

The Saami Council announced that they had decided to resign as the chair of the board of the IPS. The Saami Council said that the heads of each of the permanent participants would meet soon to determine the best way for IPS to participate in the future work of the Council.

**Agenda Item 16: Approval of Press Release Summarizing the Proceedings**

Norway commended the Chair on an excellent job of preparing the press release, noting that they had two minor proposals for change: on page 2 in the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, Norway requested that the sentence "Norway gave a presentation of the Northern Sea Route and reported on" include the word international so that it reads "international workshops;" and secondly, that the last word in the same paragraph "manner" be replaced with "perspective." The Chair noted that those changes would be made

The Chair expressed appreciation for the meeting to the Tanana Chiefs Conference, the Executive Secretariat, the Logistics Team, the translators, the State of Alaska, and the University of Alaska.

The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and work. The Chair adjourned the meeting.