



Meeting of Senior Arctic Officials
FINAL Report
28-29 April 2010
Iulissat

In Attendance:

Senior Arctic Officials (SAOs)

Chair: Lars Møller

Canada: Sheila Riordon and Patrick Borbey (Alternate SAO)

Denmark/Greenland/Faroe Islands: Mikaela Engell, Inuuteq Holm Olsen (Greenland), Elin Mortensen (Faroe Islands)

Finland: Hannu Halinen

Iceland: Greta Gunnarsdottir

Norway: Stein Rosenberg (alternate)

Russian Federation: Anton Vasiliev

Sweden: Helena Ödmark

United States: Julia L. Gourley

Permanent Participant (PP) Heads of Delegation (HoD)

Aleut International Association (AIA): unable to attend

Arctic Athabaskan Council (AAC): Michael Stickman

Gwich'in Council International (GCI): Chief Joe Linklater

Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC): Aqqaluk Lyngø

Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON): Rodion Sulyandziga

Saami Council (SC): Geir Tommy Pedersen

1.1. Welcoming Remarks

Inuuteq Holm Olsen, Greenland, welcomed the participants to Greenland. **Lars Møller, SAO Chair**, welcomed delegates and noted the importance of the meeting to ensure that all the necessary processes are on the right track for the 2011 Ministerial.

1.2 Introduction to Iulissat and Social Events

Decision: For information only.

1.3 Introduction of new SAOs, PP HoDs

Greta Gunnarsdottir was welcomed as the newly appointed Icelandic SAO and Aqqaluk Lyngø was introduced as Head of Delegation for the ICC. It was noted that Karsten Klepsvik was unable to take part in the meeting, and that Stein Rosenberg was Head of the Norwegian delegation. The Chair also noted that no AIA delegates were able to attend.

1.4 Approval of the Agenda

Decision: The agenda was approved with no amendments.



1.5 Approval of Ad-hoc Observers

Decision: Four states (the People’s Republic of China, Japan, the Italian Republic and the Republic of Korea) and the EU Commission were approved by SAOs as ad hoc observers to this meeting.

2 Administrative Issues/ Effectiveness and Efficiency of the Arctic Council

2.1 Information about Deputy Minister’s meeting 27 May 2010

Background: The SAO Chair provided information on the status of the planning of the first Arctic Council Deputy Minister’s meeting (mandated by Ministers in the Tromsø declaration) to be held in Copenhagen 27 May 2010. The meeting will take place under the heading “Responding to emerging challenges in the Arctic”, which will also be the topic for the first part of the discussion and provide for an exchange of views on the general role of the Arctic Council and its leadership on Arctic issues. Thereafter, the meeting will discuss the three specific topics of Search and Rescue (SAR), Short Lived Climate Forcers (SLCF) and SAON. An annotated agenda for the meeting will be prepared with a view to focusing the discussion under each item on a limited number of questions that could be useful for the further work in the areas. The Chairman’s conclusions will be general and aimed particularly at helping the two Task Forces in their work. A press event and a reception will be held after the meeting to launch CAFF’s Arctic Biodiversity 2010 Trends report.

Discussion: One Member State reminded that the DM meeting was agreed in the context of a desire for more frequent political engagement in the Arctic Council and that Deputy Ministers can take decisions within the overall framework of the Ministerial mandate for the Arctic Council. One Member State suggested to consider also showcasing to Ministers some key communication/visualization tools that have been produced such as the SWIPA/GRIS film. The broad topic “emerging challenges in the Arctic” is an opportunity for each DM to raise topics they feel most important. Norway informed that under this theme the Norwegian state secretary will raise integrated ocean management. It was suggested that the meeting discuss strengthening the Arctic Council. The Chair confirmed that the press conference will be limited to release of the CAFF report.

Decision: Planning for the meeting will continue as proposed by the Danish Chairmanship, taking due account of the comments. Member States are requested to inform the SAO Chair of topics that Deputy Ministers may raise in the general discussion.

2.2 Arctic Council Information Day 28 May 2010

Background: The SAO Chair provided information on the planning for the first biennial Information Day that will take place on 28 May, the day after the Deputy Ministers’ meeting. As per the SAO Report approved by Ministers in Tromsø, SAOs decided to “institute a biennial “Symposium” for more general information exchange with both Working Groups and Observers”. According to the mandate, the key objective is to invite more detailed communication of WG information to SAOs, as well as to invite observers to highlight their contributions to the work of



the AC and of related activities. In the morning, Working Groups are invited to choose the highlights of their activities to present. In the afternoon Observers will present their activities and interests in relation to the Arctic. There will be time for questions and answers. The chair will not conclude on the deliberations. SAOs, PPs, WG Chairs and observers will be invited to the Information Day, with participation limited to 180 persons. The purpose of this first Information Day is to improve the information exchange within the Arctic Council itself (the press will not be invited).

Discussion: SAOs pointed to IDAC as an interesting new development and an important opportunity for Working Groups and observers to provide information additional to the SAO meeting agenda. Observer engagement with PPs and approaches to communication and outreach were raised as important cross-cutting topics. WGs expressed mixed views regarding their participation in IDAC. SAOs and PPs were asked for input on issues they would like to hear about while other WGs wished to present on areas of work of their own choosing. Observers were encouraged to present on their activities related to the Arctic Council's work, however, the SAO Chair reminded that no discussion on the role of observers was envisaged during the IDAC.

Decision: The SAO Chair underlined that the first IDAC is a trial activity and that planning for any next IDACs will take into account the comments received. The objective for the first IDAC is internal communication of WGs and observer information to SAOs and PPs. PPs are therefore not expected to make presentations. Although WGs are invited to choose which highlights of their activities to present, the SAO Chair will invite SAOs and PPs to indicate any specific issues they would like WGs to include in their presentations.

2.3 Communication and outreach

Background: At the previous SAO meeting in November 2009, it was decided to create a contact group to work interessionally on the issue of communication and outreach. The contact group has a two-part mandate to: 1) “develop guidelines for engagement in outreach activities, and 2) develop an Arctic Council communication and outreach plan based on common priorities.” The overarching objectives are to improve the effectiveness of Arctic Council communications efforts and increase awareness of the Arctic Council amongst target groups. The contact group assessed the current communication and outreach activities of the Arctic Council. The Chair, Mr. Giles Norman, Director of CICAR (Canadian International Centre for the Arctic Region), Oslo, presented an overview of the issues and challenges facing Arctic Council outreach identified in the contact group's preliminary background paper *Analysis of Arctic Council Communications and Outreach*. (This and all other presentations from the meeting are available at the AC website, in the password protected area.)

The contact group had identified three key issues.

- 1) Roles and responsibilities are not defined- the AC “voice” is not heard because different entities in the Arctic Council take different approaches to communication.
- 2) There is inconsistent use of the AC logo and the relationship between large scale assessments and other WG products and the AC is not clearly communicated.
- 3) The communication potential of the AC website is poorly utilized and the relationship between the AC and the WG websites needs to be strengthened.



The contact group underlined the importance of developing a strategic communication plan to strengthen consistency and impact of AC and WG communications.

Following the contact group's presentation, CAFF presented new information on the migration patterns of Arctic Terns and examples of CAFF's success to widely communicate this information.

Discussion: SAOs welcomed the contact group's background paper. Several SAOs noted it would be useful to have a full day discussion on this topic prior to the next SAO meeting. WGs look forward to clear and timely SAO guidance on communication as it relates to their activities.

WG activities represent the cooperative work of the Arctic Council and the need to better communicate the relationship between the AC and its WGs was underlined. In particular, SAOs discussed the potential to use the AC logo (with a disclaimer if necessary and/or appropriate) on all WG products requested via the Arctic Council. It was also suggested that the WG logos be tied more closely to the AC logo (i.e. one AC logo with name of WG beside it) and that access to WG websites could be through the AC website.

The need to strengthen the Arctic Council Secretariat as an important facilitator of AC communication and outreach activities was underlined. A good website is seen as mandatory, but written products such as brochures are also important, especially as a means to publish in multiple languages. Several WGs already make efforts to translate some reports into Russian. The role of the IPS needs to be considered in the AC communication strategy and it was noted that the IPS has Russian language capacity and this is an important resource for the AC.

Careful consideration of target audiences is needed. Some suggested an initial focus on northern/Arctic audiences, while others noted that AC communication also needs to inform non-Arctic players about the results of the AC work, what the Arctic Council is and what it is doing. WGs were reminded that they are requested to include a communication plan in their work programme.

There is a desire for the AC, in particular through the Chairmanship, to be able to respond quickly to communication opportunities. Although lately there has been difficulty to form consensus to communicate with an "AC voice", it was noted that the AC has been able to do this in the past. In this respect planning, for example of pre-screened lines, is important. The way that the AC is structured has an influence on communications and this should also be considered.

Decision: SAOs supported continuing the Contact Group asking that it develops recommendations on guidelines and a communication and outreach plan, taking account of SAOs comments and guidance, and to present a final report with recommendations to SAOs at their next meeting.

Thematic Areas

3 Climate Change

3.1 Short report from the AC activities at COP 15

Background: The "Arctic Venue at COP15" was sponsored by the Nordic Council of Ministers and the Danish Energy Agency at the North Atlantic House in the center of Copenhagen during the second week of COP15. A booth was reserved at the venue for information about the Arctic



Council. Some PPs and WGs were present and used the booth to present relevant material. In addition the GRIS Report was presented and information about the SWIPA was distributed.

The SAO Chair thanked Arctic Council Member states, PPs and Working Groups for their activities to bring Arctic climate change to the attention of the world. A wide range of Arctic related activities, including events prepared by indigenous organizations, press conferences, presentations by Arctic organizations and scientists, films and staffed booths presenting the work of the Arctic Council took place at the well-visited “Arctic Venue”. On the 14 December Denmark/Greenland and Norway/Al Gore hosted a joint side-event at the COP15 venue. At the side-event the preliminary SWIPA report about the “Greenland Ice Sheet in a Changing Climate” was presented by the chair of the Arctic Council – the Danish Foreign Minister and the Premier of Greenland - and the lead scientist, Professor Dorthe Dahl-Jensen. The report “Melting Snow and Ice – A call for Action”, a product of the “Melting Ice Conference” held back to back with the 2009 Arctic Council meeting in Tromsø, was also presented at the event. The event was crowded and the press conference after the event also attracted many journalists.

The SAO Chair invited proposals for an Arctic Council event during COP 16 in Mexico but reminded that in Mexico Denmark will have only one side event and will likely not have the opportunity to use this for outreach efforts on behalf of the Arctic Council.

Discussion: Denmark was thanked for hosting the Arctic Venue at CoP15 and Norway thanked Denmark for its partnership to host the successful joint side event. The US reiterated that the AC must use previously approved material and cannot apply to become an observer at COP 16 because it is not a legal body. CCU was thanked for its standing offer to the Arctic Council for use of CCU’s side event time at CoP16. Norway mentioned that the ATCM may also arrange a side event at CoP16, and that the AC might coordinate with them.

Decision: The SAO Chair is to further explore opportunities for an AC outreach effort in connection to UNFCCC COP16 in Mexico in November 2010.

3.2 Climate Change and the Cryosphere – Snow, Water, Ice and Permafrost in the Arctic – SWIPA

Background: SWIPA is one of the major deliverables for the 2011 Ministerial meeting. The preliminary GRIS report was successfully delivered at the COP 15. The GRIS science report and layman report as well as two films are already produced. There will be two SWIPA films- the first describes why AC is doing SWIPA, and the second film will focus on the results of the project.

AMAP Vice-Chair and Chair of SWIPA project, Morten Skovgård Olsen, reported that the project is on schedule. The project plans to deliver the following products for the Ministerial meeting: A science report of approximately 500 pages, a summary report in layman language based on the science report and containing science-based policy relevant recommendations, a film about the results of the SWIPA project and an update of the film about the Greenland Ice Sheet.

A rigorous peer review of the different modules of the science report is ongoing. In addition, 3 senior scientists will read the full SWIPA report and ensure consistency in the report, scrutinize the scientific key findings of and across modules. This should be completed by mid-June and then technical editing can begin. Based on the peer reviewed science report, a team of science writers will write a summary report. The first draft of the summary report is scheduled ready by August



and will be circulated for comments from WGs and PPs. The peer reviewed (but not finally edited) version of the report will also be available for WGs and PPs at this time. The SWIPA Integration team (IT) and the AMAP WG will draft science-based policy relevant recommendation in the period mid June-mid September based on the science report. (The next IT meeting is to take place on the margins of the Oslo IPY conference). The SWIPA chair stressed the importance that AMAP HoDs cooperate closely with their respective SAOs in this process. Science-based policy relevant recommendation are planned to be signed off by the SWIPA IT and the AMAP WG (including PPs) before the next SAO meeting (19-20 October) and draft films will also be ready in the autumn of 2010. The SWIPA IT and AMAP WG have recommended that the films made for COP15 be updated/revised, and the SWIPA chair and the AMAP secretariat are currently looking into the technical and financial implications. All AC member states are urged to contribute financially to the editing, layout, and production of SWIPA products.

Discussion: AMAP was commended for its excellent work, which included an appropriate peer review process, outreach activities, and translation of the preliminary SWIPA Summary report on the Greenland Ice Sheet into other languages such as Greenlandic. AMAP informed SAOs that the project so far had attracted sufficient direct and in-kind contributions, including contributions from observers. SAOs agreed to the proposed plans and timelines for the finalization of the SWIPA report.

SAOs requested to see the revised SWIPA film at their next meeting (and that it also contains the disclaimer which was agreed for the preliminary SWIPA films produced for COP15. AMAP confirmed that a draft film was expected ready to be shown at the next SAO meeting and noted that the “disclaimer” urging others to use the films for non-commercial purposes would be included in the new films.

AMAP confirmed that AMAP HoDs would develop policy recommendations based on the science report and that these would be included in the summary report (layman’s report). SAOs stressed that, with respect to the policy recommendations, it is the responsibility of AMAP HoDs to interact closely with their SAOs so that they are more comfortable with the report and its recommendations when it is delivered to SAOs. SAOs underlined the importance of SWIPA being seen as an AC report. AMAP noted that it does not normally place an AC logo on science based reports but requested SAO guidance. The SAO Chair noted that use of the AC logo will be discussed separately under agenda item 2.3.

Decision: SAOs approved AMAPs proposed plans and timelines for finalization of SWIPA, including the elaboration of science-based policy relevant recommendations by the AMAP WG. SAOs were urged to cooperate closely with their AMAP HoDs on this matter. Although AMAP HoDs are involved in drafting the science-based policy recommendations in the summary report, the AMAP secretariat was requested to circulate simultaneously the final draft recommendations to AMAP HoDs and SAOs at least 4 weeks prior to sign-off at the WG level in order to allow for national consultations. SAOs will also view the updated SWIPA film (with disclaimer) at their next meeting and be given a SWIPA progress report.

3.3 Short-lived Climate Forcers Task Force

In Tromsø, Ministers decided to establish a Task Force on short-lived climate forcers (SLCFs) reporting directly to the SAOs, to: 1) exchange information on existing national policies, regulations and opportunities for immediate voluntary action in the Arctic States to reduce



emissions of short-lived climate forcers, and 2) identify existing and new measures to reduce emissions of these forcers, recommend further immediate actions that could be taken and to report on progress at the next Ministerial meeting. The terms of reference for the Task Force were approved at the November 2009 SAO meeting. The U.S. and Norway co-chair the Task Force. Participants include national representatives, Arctic Council observers, and invited experts. Although methane and ozone are also important, the Task Force will focus on black carbon, because it is the area in which the Arctic Council can add the most value.

The Task Force Co-Chairs, Benjamin DeAngelo (USA) and Håvard Toresen (Norway), updated the SAOs on the mandate and operating guidelines of the TF, progress to date, remaining work and the process for developing recommendations. The Task Force held its first face to face meeting in San Francisco, 11-12 February 2010. It will develop two key products: an underlying technical report and a summary for policymakers with the specific recommendations of the Task Force.

National representatives are responsible to provide information on national emission inventories, policies and programmes, and will serve as the core TF group to develop recommendations. Experts (on emission inventories, future projections, mitigation cost estimates) have also been invited. The TF is coordinating with the AMAP SLCF Expert Group, tasked with updating its science report on the role of SLCFs in the Arctic. The TF is developing, with the AMAP expert group, a series of climate model runs to analyze climate sensitivity to hypothetical changes in black carbon and organic carbon emissions in and near the Arctic. The analysis will help to inform the TF about the potential for increases in key emission sectors and regions and the potential Arctic climate benefits of emission reductions.

Although most countries do not yet have official black carbon and organic carbon emission inventories, some inventories are available from the research community. It is possible to describe the relative magnitude of sources and directional impact on the Arctic climate. Current data points to on-road and off-road diesel transport as the highest source of BC emissions in the Arctic, followed by wildfires and prescribed burning, as well as agriculture burning (particularly in the USA, Canada and Russia). Residential burning appears to be a more significant source than was thought. There is concern about a future increase in shipping emissions. The extent of data related to emissions from gas flaring is particularly uncertain. The TF co-chairs also presented preliminary BC projection estimates to 2020 for all 8 countries. The TF is examining policy and programme options for emission reductions. To support the TF, mitigation potential estimates are being done by IIASA and the assessment of costs is ongoing.

Other relevant forums outside of the AC are: the IMO (emissions from shipping), the CLRTAP (Convention on Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution) expert group on BC, the UNFCCC (although there is no current action on SLCF), as well as an opportunity to integrate BC during the Gothenburg Protocol review.

AMAP informed the SAOs that the work and report of the AMAP SLCF Expert Group will be integrated with the SLCF report to be provided to SAOs in April 2011.

Discussion: SAOs and PPs welcomed the good work in progress and noted that it was important to have recommendations ready for the Ministerial in 2011. They agreed that although the deadline is ambitious, with full national support from all 8 Member States, the deadline can be reached. SAOs agreed that a signal from DMs to enhance and speed up the cooperation and



contributions would be useful. The item will also be on the agenda of the Arctic Environment Ministers meeting. Russia announced that it has nominated 2 additional experts to the TF and Iceland announced that it will now also contribute to the TF.

SAOs reminded the SLCF TF to focus on its mandate- to identify existing and new measures that could be immediately implemented to reduce emissions of SLCFs. It was noted that if there was additional work beyond the mandate, the TF might be tasked to continue to operate post the 2011 Ministerial. Regarding the US Black Carbon Initiative, the US highlighted that the TF is not involved in project implementation so the US BC initiative is separate but related.

A key concern is ensuring high quality inventories. For some, it is challenging to meet the TF timelines. Due to the preliminary nature of some inventories uncertainties must be made appropriately clear. Each country representative will have an opportunity to review any country data being used. The TF will focus on emissions from the 8 Arctic states now, but transport from other regions is included and leaves open the possibility for engagement with non-Arctic region sources at a later date. Shipping will be included once adequate data is available. The human health co-benefits for BC reductions were noted and there will be a chapter on this in the TF report.

AAC reminded that they want to be involved because action on BC could really make a difference in the Arctic. However AAC could not afford to attend the San Francisco meeting. The importance of PP involvement, especially in the policy recommendation stage was stressed.

Decision: SAOs welcomed the work undertaken by the Task Force and looked forward to the Deputy Ministers' discussion on this topic in May. SAOs approved the TF plans for continuation and finalization of its work by the 2011 Ministerial. The TF was requested to take due account of the comments, including the importance of ensuring high quality of the work, to fully engage national reps and PPs, especially with respect to development of policy recommendations, and the interest in the human health and shipping aspects of the work.

3.4 Black Carbon Initiative launched at COP 15

Background: At COP 15, the United States announced a \$5 million initiative on black carbon mitigation. The Arctic Council received a paper on the initiative from the US and the U.S. is interested in determining whether there is interest by the member states and PPs in bringing this initiative into the Arctic Council.

The US SAO said that the US is taking the effects of BC on the Arctic cryosphere very seriously and is exploring the potential for near term benefits for the Arctic as UNFCCC discussions proceed. She noted that relevant agencies are close to proposing a set of projects that might be implemented and that they are following closely development of the SLCF TF's work. The US noted that this initiative demonstrates early action and that funding needs to be committed by autumn 2011 latest. The projects will, inter alia, aim to fill information gaps, identify approaches to overcome any barriers to implementation, and demonstrate technical and non-technical mitigation options. There are 3 major focus areas: diesel engines, district heating and industrial facilities, and open burning including wildfires and agriculture burning. It is important to keep in mind also the co-benefits of GHG and air pollutant reductions, (health benefits and improved energy efficiency).



The US welcomes project partners and is already building partnerships with the member states. The initiatives could be implemented as bilateral or multilateral partnerships, with or without a formal AC designation. If within the AC, experts in interested Member States can work collaboratively on projects and report to SAOs or through a WG.

Discussion: Several Member States, PPs and NEFCO expressed interest in the initiative and the potential for collaboration within the AC. Some will also look into opportunities to contribute funding. There is potential that the initiative could include ACAP projects funded through the PSI and other associated projects leveraged through NEFCO. The discussion also focused on how to structure this initiative if it is within the AC. It was suggested that existing mechanisms be used and that ACAP have a role as it is the working group most experienced in implementation of demonstration projects. Others noted that experts within the SLCF TF could also be a source of guidance to what kind of projects might be implemented, but it was stressed again that the BC initiative is separate from that of the TF's.

Decision: All welcomed the US initiative. SAOs and PPs will continue their consideration of how to structure this initiative with an initial view that the initiative should be brought into the AC and be anchored in a WG.

4.1 The Arctic Biodiversity Assessment

Background: The key messages of the *Arctic Biodiversity Trends 2010: Selected Indicators of Change* report were approved by SAOs last November. The full report *Arctic Biodiversity Trends 2010: Selected Indicators of Change* Report has now been delivered to SAOs. The report is an important outcome in line with the Chairmanship program, an important contribution to the International Year of Biodiversity and at the same time a contribution to the CBD's 3rd Global Biodiversity Outlook to measure progress towards the 2010 Biodiversity Target.

The CAFF Chair reported that Sweden has now joined several other countries (Finland, Greenland, US) as a co-lead of the ABA. In this report twenty-two indicators were selected to provide a snapshot of the trends being observed in Arctic biodiversity today. The indicators were selected to cover major species groups with wide distributions across Arctic ecosystems. Special consideration was given to indicators closely associated with biodiversity use by indigenous and local communities, as well as those with relevance to decision-makers. Each indicator chapter provides an overview of the status and trends of a given indicator, information on stressors, and concerns for the future.

The report presented 7 key findings which reflect the information in the 22 indicators presented in this report. While a more complete scientific assessment of biodiversity in the Arctic will emerge from the full Arctic Biodiversity Assessment (currently underway) CAFF has already started to follow-up on the key findings and the gaps identified by the Trends report. Issues being addressed include sea ice associated species (led by US), marine protected areas (led by Iceland), and polar bears (coordinated by CAFF/CBMP and IUCN Polar bear specialist group and funded by US Marine Mammal Commission). CAFF has developed a communication plan and press strategy including a web portal www.arcticbiodiversity.is. The report will be officially released (including with the AC logo) at a reception following the DM meeting in May, presented at the Oslo IPY Conference in June and at a CBD COP10 side event. CAFF is seeking funding for a film.



Discussion: CAFF was congratulated on its excellent work and all lead countries and contributors were thanked. SAOs and PPs were pleased at incorporation of TEK in report. SAOs and PPs supported the release of the report after the DM meeting. There was interest that it be on the agenda for the DM meeting and that the AC mark the International Year of Biodiversity in a visible way. The SAOs looked forward to continued work on ABA and recognized the importance of CAFF's work to the international Year of Biodiversity. It was noted that it was important that SAOs consider the key findings from the Trends report and consider how to respond to them. The Saami Council offered to assist CAFF at the side event at CoP10. On request from Norway the CAFF Chair will investigate further available data on Atlantic cod stocks.

Decision: SAOs welcomed the *Arctic Biodiversity Trends 2010: selected indicators of change* report and stressed that follow-up to the report and its key findings is important. SAOs asked CAFF to take due note of the comments made and approved official release of the report at a reception following the DM meeting in May.

5.1 Approval of new SDWG projects

a) Health/ AHHEG

Background: The SDWG Chair requested SAO approval of four new SDWG projects: three projects related to Arctic Human Health developed by the new SDWG Arctic Human Health Expert Group (AHHEG) and one project proposed by Norway relating to an assessment of cultural heritage sites in the circumpolar Arctic. The new projects are:

- a) Proposal for the development of a Circumpolar Health Observatory [CircHOB]
- b) Proposal for a Comparative Review of Circumpolar Health Systems [CircHSR]
This project will develop circumpolar partnerships in health services and policy research, and is funded by the NCM and perhaps Canada.
- c) Proposal for a Comparative Review of Circumpolar Nutritional Guidelines [CircNuGuide].
This project is intended to share information and lessons learned. It has links to the SAON process, existing networks, and will have clear deliverables for the Ministerial meeting.
- d) Proposal for Assessment of Cultural Heritage Monuments and Sites in the Arctic
This project will be implemented by an expert group with MS and PP representatives and will focus on identifying sites with significance beyond national boundaries. A common protection plan can be developed if agreement is reached on common sites. The project has funding of 800,000 NOK.

Discussion: The SAO Chair noted that these projects are very much in line with the priorities of the Danish chairmanship program as they focus on improving the living conditions of Arctic residents. Human health and heritage are particularly important issues for PPs. There was broad support among SAOs for the human health projects. It was noted that the Circumpolar Health Observatory will be located in Yellowknife, Canada. AMAP noted that its AMAP HHEG meets in Tromsø June 4-6 and invited SDWG experts to attend.

Due to the sensitivities around heritage sites and to delays in finalizing the project, it was suggested that due to delays as well as its sensitivity, the cultural heritage project take a longer-term approach so that all stake holders would have a chance to express their ideas. It was also stressed that the project is not a substitute for the UNESCO process. ICC underlined that it is important to consider what the cultural sites and monuments are and for whom they are important,



and also to look at the adequacy of laws concerning who deals with cultural heritage monuments with respect to industrial and other developments. The Saami Council has nominated an expert in archaeology and offered to host the first workshop in northern Norway. Russia noted that the cultural heritage project relates to the Russian-led SDWG project on electronic memory of the Arctic and that a workshop is planned late August.

Decision: SAOs approved the four new SDWG projects, stressed the importance of human health and heritage, and encouraged the SDWG to ensure appropriate links and synergies with associated discussions in other fora.

6.1 The Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment Recommendations

Background: At the November 2009 SAO meeting, SAOs underlined the importance of Arctic Council follow-up to the AMSA recommendations and supported PAME's efforts in this regard. PAME, other WGs, SAOs and national governments were encouraged to follow-up as appropriate on the basis of the discussion at the meeting and in response to the AMSA follow-up matrix as presented by PAME.

Atle Fretheim, PAME Chair, updated the SAOs on mandate/basis for AMSA follow-up and follow-up actions that PAME has already begun to work on. For example, there are 3 actions related to IMO and Arctic Shipping identified under recommendation I(B). Updating of Arctic Guidelines is completed and work to make relevant parts of the Arctic Guidelines mandatory is on-going in IMO (Denmark lead). Norway and USA co-lead follow up actions related to regulating the use and carriage of heavy fuel oil. PAME has also begun discussion on recommendation I(C). In response to recommendation I(D) on strengthening passenger ship safety in the Arctic, efforts are underway related to IMO Guidance for Passenger Ships and on ship operators work to develop, implement and share best practices (Denmark lead). Response to recommendation II (D) to designate sensitive Arctic marine areas is closely related to the outcome of II(C) on areas of heightened ecological and cultural significance. CAFF, AMAP and SDWG will start work to identify potential areas, after which PAME will consider proposals for the AC to go to IMO with proposals for IMO designations. Recommendation IIC requires much work and needs designated experts and funding. Other WGs are also involved in follow up vis-à-vis the SAR and an EPPR correspondence group led by Norway will follow-up on recommendation III(C) and II (F). The EPPR Chair added that the EPPR will meet in June and will discuss 2 project proposals in this area and one SAR-related project proposal.

There will be a full report on AMSA follow-up for Ministers in 2011

Discussion: The SAO Chair noted that the AMSA report has been one of the most central reports of the Arctic Council in the last few years and how important it was to ensure that there is appropriate follow-up to the AMSA recommendations both via cooperation across the working groups and via the Arctic States agreeing to stand united internationally, for example in the IMO.

SAOs commended PAME on its efforts to coordinate the AMSA follow-up and noted that the AMSA follow-up is an excellent example of how AC work can help Member States set priorities within international bodies and also lead to domestic and international legislation. Norway announced that it would look into funding for II(C) activities.



There was broad agreement that more stringent shipping standards should be applied to the Arctic. Indigenous people need to be consulted and accommodated. Some noted that there are regulatory regimes in place in Arctic and the potential to learn from each other regarding how to strengthen them. Canada informed that as of 1 July it will make it mandatory for all ships passing through Canadian waters to be registered and that Canada will expand its Arctic waters pollution prevention act. ICC informed that the Inuit have marine protected areas, and are in negotiation with Canada to set aside even more.

Decision: PAME and other WGs involved were commended for the way they coordinated and implemented follow-up to the AMSA recommendations. SAOs looked forward to a full report on AMSA follow-up for Ministers in 2011.

6.2 The Arctic Ocean Review (AOR) Project

Background: Elizabeth McLanahan, /USA, Vice Chair of PAME reported that the Arctic Ocean Review is proceeding according to the AOR Project Plan revised in accordance with guidance from last SAO meeting. A Project Expert Group (PEG) has been established. The outline of the AOR Phase I Report contains 7 main sections including the status of the Arctic marine environment, global, regional (Arctic and partially Arctic) and bilateral instruments, and an analysis. In development of the Phase I AOR Report, consultations with other Arctic Council working groups are underway to identify possible areas of collaboration, in particular relating to the section on “*The Status of the Arctic Marine Environment and Emerging Trends*”. An AOR expert workshop is planned for the 13 September 2010 in Washington. The phase I Report, including the outcomes of the workshop, is to be ready for the Arctic Council Ministerial meeting in April 2011. The report will be ready for PAME approval in February 2011. PAME has also developed a communication and outreach plan.

Discussion: PAME was asked to ensure SAO review of the documents before they are made public. The review is seen as important to express the AC views on Arctic Ocean governance and what is needed. The purpose of the work is not to recommend any new structure but to look at the breadth of existing instruments, opportunities to make better use of them, and to determine if there are any gaps and steps that the AC could take to fill them, such as it has on SAR. Russia noted that if some countries prefer to address certain issues at the national level this does not necessarily indicate a gap in international cooperation. Russia also asked PAME to avoid the term “strengthening governance of Arctic” as per page 1 of the project plan as it has unintended meaning when translated into Russian. PAME will take account of these Russian concerns during the course of work. EPPR will support the AOR in the emergency response dimension of the review (Canada lead).

Decision: SAOs noted that the AOR is progressing according to plan and welcomed cooperation between the WGs. SAOs requested they be closely consulted during the process including an update in October, with a view to delivering the Phase 1 report to the Ministerial Meeting in 2011.

6.3 SAR Task Force

Background: At their meeting in Tromsø in April 2009, Ministers decided to establish a task force "to develop and complete negotiation by the next Ministerial Meeting in 2011 of an



international instrument on cooperation on search and rescue operations in the Arctic". The US and Russia co-chair the task force.

Ambassador Vasiliev of Russia, TF co-chair reported that all eight Arctic States are actively involved. The task force met in Washington in December and in Moscow in February. The next meeting will take place in June in Oslo. There is agreement to negotiate a legally binding document and this means the TF is in the process of full intergovernmental negotiations. It is therefore premature to disclose details. At least 2 or 3 more plenary sessions in the fall 2010 are needed and practical drafting of the text will begin at the next meeting in Oslo. Although an agreement to be signed by Ministers in 2011 would be a landmark outcome for the AC this should not be seen as ultimate goal. The ultimate goal is to improve SAR ability to respond to increased human activity.

Discussion: The US and Russia were thanked for their leadership of the TF and hosting the first workshops. The work of the SAR TF was commended as an excellent example of the Arctic Council's flexibility and responsiveness to new challenges.

Decision: SAOs concluded that the work is progressing well and is on track to be ready for the 2011 ministerial. The work of the SAR TF will also be discussed at the Deputy Minister Meeting next month in Copenhagen.

7.1 Update on The Project Support Instrument (PSI)

Background: Arctic Council Project Support Instruments (PSI) Guidelines, approved by the SAOs, on 7 April, 2005, requires that the Funds Manager (NEFCO) shall semi-annually present a report to the SAOs about the activities of the PSI. As described in NEFCO's report on the PSI for this meeting, the PSI Trust Fund has received contributions from Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden; interest and bank cost, as of 31 December 2009, stands at a total of EURO 739 800.39. Total pledges are considerably higher. The actual operation of the Fund is contingent upon a contribution from Russia. The Russian Federation contribution has been approved with respect to domestic legislation and has been included in its 2010 Federal Budget. The remaining internal procedures for depositing the RF contribution into the PSI Trust Fund Account are being expedited. Upon signing of the Contributor's Agreement with Russia and receiving the contribution from the RF, NEFCO will proceed with making PSI operational, including its contribution of EURO 450 000, and call for convening the first PSI Committee meeting.

Discussion: Russia reported that the most complicated domestic legislative procedures have been completed and are awaiting the signature of the minister.

Decision: SAOs noted NEFCO's Report on the PSI and status of contributions and pledges. SAOs welcomed the announcement from the Russian Federation that the necessary domestic legislation is now in place and look forward to the completion of the remaining domestic processes for depositing the RF contribution into the PSI Trust Fund Account so that NEFCO can proceed with making the Arctic Council PSI operational.

7.2 Mercury



Background: AMAP Chair Russel Shearer reported how mercury is transported to the Arctic and why that amplification at the top of food chain poses a serious human health issue. He provided SAOs with an update on AMAP's Mercury Assessment (Canada Denmark co-lead), that is now undergoing a scientific review and is expected to be delivered to Ministers in 2011. AMAP has been working closely with UNEP Chemicals since 2007, including production of mercury assessment reports and global emission data, and has decided to enter into a MOU with UNEP Chemicals. AMAP will cooperate closely with UNEP on its process to develop a legally binding instrument on mercury (which used to be voluntary), noting that AMAP assessment information cannot be pre-released before April 2011 but this will be in time to be used in the global negotiations. AMAP will also contribute to effectiveness evaluation of the Global Monitoring Plan for mercury. SAOs were requested to approve an AMAP booth at the UNEP Inter-governmental Negotiating Committee (INC) in Stockholm in June in order to provide relevant information on the relative importance that mercury has as a major pollutant of concern in the Arctic region and the potential impacts it may have on the Arctic environment and its peoples.

Discussion: SAOs and PPs noted the UNEP process on mercury was agreed to by the UNEP Governing Council in February 2009. An Inter-governmental Negotiating Committee (INC) has been established to negotiate a global treaty that is expected to be launched in 2013. Sweden will host the first INC in June. SAOs and PPs supported AMAPs mercury related work and encouraged AMAPs involvement in support of the UNEP negotiating process stressing that mercury pollution is a global issue with important regional consequences. It is a serious issue for Inuit, especially women, who eat more traditional foods. NW Greenland is the area with highest contamination. The Arctic Council needs to strive actively to influence the outcome of international transboundary pollution issues that are of direct concern to the Arctic region. SAOs discussed the role of Arctic States and working together to ensure conclusion of the agreement by 2013 as envisioned. The Stockholm PoPs Convention was pointed to as a model of AMAP and PP cooperation and PPs asked for a similar level of involvement in the work on mercury.

Decision: SAOs encouraged enhanced AMAP cooperation with UNEP. Member States were urged to take a strong position in the UNEP Global Mercury INC negotiation process with a view to concluding a global mercury treaty by 2013. SAOs look forward to receiving AMAPs updated mercury assessment at the 2011 Ministerial.

8.1 SAON – Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks

Background: AMAP Executive Secretary Lars Otto Reiersen presented background information, progress to date and future plans for the SAON, which is now in its second phase. The vision of SAON is that “users should have access to free, open and high quality data that will realize Pan-Arctic and global value-added services and provide societal benefits.” The current priorities for the SAON Steering Group has been to 1) make an inventory of national observing networks. (All 8 Arctic states have contributed, and this work has proven to be very valuable in itself, as many of the countries did not have such inventories in place nationally). 2) facilitate data access, archive and sharing, 3) promote community based monitoring, 4) explore funding and agency cooperation and 5) recommend an institutional framework for the long-term future of SAON.

The meeting of the SAON SG and the workshop of the funding agencies in Miami last March was a success as several new parties had joined the network. The workshop report from Miami is being produced. The outcome of the workshop was underlined, especially concerning the future institutional framework and specific tasks that SAON should undertake.



SAON needs to demonstrate added value and to that end, it will have a report ready for the 2011 Ministerial meeting. At the next SAO meeting in October the Steering Group will present a draft list of tasks and establish initial priorities.

Discussion: There was general support for the AC to continue to take the lead on SAON. Several SAOs expressed satisfaction with the development of SAON, especially with the development into a more tangible product. The US SAO underlined the great importance the US attaches to SAON and that it is willing to commit 0.5 million USD to the SAON process contingent upon pledges from other countries prior to the SAON SG and DM meeting. If so, the Deputy Ministers would be able to declare specific commitments in Copenhagen. To keep SAON coordinated and moving forward, it was important to have at least one person dedicated to the project. The US was looking into possibly providing that person. Some countries noted that it was necessary to move forward carefully, to evaluate the process, and to look more closely into the institutional framework, and consider options to operationalize SAON. Norway wanted to contribute to SAON, and underlined that Norway would continue to fund the SAON /AMAP secretariats and that the new Svalbard Integrated Arctic Earth Observing System (SIOS) would interact actively with SAON in the future. Denmark asked whether Terms of Reference for SAON were still missing. Sweden informed that they were now recruiting a new national focal point for the SAON, and that this was a big step forward in the domestic context. Some SAOs were concerned that the SAON SG meetings 10 and 25-26 May would be too late to provide relevant and up-to-date information to Deputy Ministers before their 27 May meeting. CAFF asked about the relation between CBMP/SAON, and AMAP explained that SAON will facilitate observations but not do the monitoring itself.

Decision: SAOs thanked AMAP and IASC for chairing the SAON Steering Group and took note of progress, including at national level. The SAON SG was requested to take into account the views raised by SAOs. SAOs looked forward to discussions at the DM meeting on questions such as funding, institutional framework and a coordinator/champion. There is a need to evaluate the process and progress to date, and to have clear terms of reference.

8.2 CBMP - Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Programme

Background: The Arctic Species Trend Index (ASTI) is a critical component of the CBMP, and the CBMP is a significant AC contribution to SAON. *The Arctic Species Trends Index* (ASTI) is complete and the first report on the Index has been submitted to the SAOs (www.asti.is). The report was released at the Miami conference. The ASTI collected and integrated biodiversity datasets from each of the Arctic countries so that Arctic wide data and the trends for Arctic species can be seen. Almost 1000 datasets representing 35% of all known Arctic vertebrate species are found in the ASTI – a significant accomplishment. The key message from this first report is that there is a general decline in Arctic biodiversity- highest in the high Arctic but with increases in the low/sub-Arctic. The CAFF Chair noted the importance of going beyond knowing about the physical impacts of climate change and other stressors in the Arctic and to examine the consequences for flora and fauna.

Discussion: SAOs welcomed the report. Norway underlined the importance to Norway of accurate data on Atlantic cod and asked that the figure on page 13 be corrected to read Greenland cod. Iceland seconded Norway's position with regards to the Atlantic cod and noted that this forum would only be able to welcome the release of this report, as it was not suppose to approve or



verify its content. The Saami Council noted that they have a holistic ecosystem management approach. They noted that regarding the information on page 9 further data was available and could be included. All data, including TEK, needs to be incorporated. CAFF acknowledged that the report makes use of the best available data but that there can be more data. The CAFF Chair said that the working group strives to include TEK and pointed to the importance of its community based monitoring strategy as a part of CAFFs CBMP.

Decision: SAOs welcomed the first report on *The Arctic Species Trends Index* (ASTI) as an important achievement of the CBMP and look forward to its continued development. CAFF was encouraged to continue its activities to integrate TEK in its work.

8.3 Arctic Protected Areas Map

Background: CAFF presented the completed updated map (and dataset) of protected areas in the Arctic. The first protected areas dataset for the Arctic was created by CAFF in 1994 and was last updated in 2004. The data here represent the first results of this new update. The CAFF Chair informed that protected areas in the Arctic had increased from 6% to 11% since 1980 but noted that the protected status of these areas varies. CAFF has established an Arctic Protected Areas monitoring expert group and plan and is also working with PAME on AMSA follow-up mapping particularly related to marine sensitive areas. CAFF is discussing cooperation with IUCN on Arctic world heritage sites. This updated dataset will be submitted as an Arctic component to UNEP WCMCs World Protected Areas Database. Iceland is leading a project focusing on those protected areas which have a marine/coastal component. This project will further develop the information on these areas and compile a dataset detailing the nature and extent of the protection afforded. The dataset can be downloaded through the data portal www.arcticdata.is where all published data from CAFF and PAME is being made available to access and use. CAFF through the CBMP has established an Arctic Protected Areas monitoring expert group and plan and is also working with PAME on AMSA follow-up mapping particularly related to marine sensitive areas. CAFF is discussing cooperation with IUCN on Arctic world heritage sites and marine sensitive areas.

Decision: SAOs noted these achievements and welcomed the updated Arctic Protected Areas Map.

9.1 Maximizing the Legacy of IPY

Background: Norway, represented by Kim Holmen, Research Director at the Norwegian Polar Institute, presented the background for the IPY legacy discussion by comparing it to the IGY in 1957. He stressed that while the IGY had been a top-down process, the 2007 IPY was a bottom up process with a huge number of projects and a great variety in both content and financing sources. There will be a workshop in Oslo on June 9th to examine the question of what the real legacy of IPY will be. The aim is to secure how the successful communication & outreach from the IPY could be best continued and also to secure continued and strengthened cooperation. A scoping paper will be provided. The workshop targets scientists and policy makers.

Discussion: SAOs noted the IPY legacy workshop during the Oslo IPY Conference in June is a key event in identifying the IPY legacy. It was noted that the workshop must be referred to as “supported by the AC and ATCM”, not as a joint AC/ATCM workshop. The 2012 IPY Conference in Canada is another opportunity to discuss the IPY legacy. Canada noted it will host



the 2nd IPY Conference in 2012 in Montreal and hopes to make a strong bridge between the two conferences. Russia noted that the upcoming IPY Legacy workshop in June also has the mandate to consider an International Polar Decade (IPD) and that the special WG of the WMO will submit a concrete proposal soon. Russia offered to circulate to the AC the Russian draft concept of IPD that it circulated to WMO.

Decision: SAOs agreed to support the workshop in Oslo and to discuss IPY legacy again at the next meeting. AMAP was asked to report back to SAOs in October on the outcome of the workshop.

10. Working Group Administration

10.1 Working Group Progress Reports

Background: Working Group Progress Reports contain information on project progress and outcomes intended for Ministers, including special issues for SAO consideration.

Decision: SAOs took note of the reports from the Working Groups.

10.2 Approval of the Strategic Plan of EPPR

Background: EPPR circulated the final version of its updated strategic plan on March 5, 2010. SAOS were asked to approve this plan and a small revision of the EPPR Operating Guidelines to reflect the changes of the new Plan, namely that the Strategic Plan of the EPPR is a high level strategic/steering document separate from the work plans which are updated periodically.

Discussion: SAOs noted that the importance of EPPR's work is growing and the importance of EPPR as a venue for experts to exchange information. SAOs noted that other WGs (i.e. AMAP, SDWG) are also developing strategic plans and that for consistency also these should be reviewed by SAOs. It was requested that AMAP circulate the results of the AMAP external review.

Decision: SAOs approved the EPPR Strategic Plan and the revised EPPR Operating Guidelines. SAOs requested WGs to seek SAO approval of their Strategic Plans in the future.

11 Any other business

11.1 The 4 Councils of the North

Background: The Tromsø declaration welcomed the increased cooperation with regional bodies such as the Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM), the Barents Euro-Arctic Council (BEAC), and the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) and acknowledge(d) their contributions to circumpolar cooperation. There are regular meetings between the 4 councils, both at political level and at Senior Arctic Officials level. As decided at the last SAO meeting, discussion on this item will continue. The SAO Chair participated at a meeting with the 4 councils in Kirkenes, Norway 23 March 2010 and gave a brief report. At the meeting of the 4 Councils, the SAO Chair reminded participants of the different mandates and work cycles of the 4 Councils and that cooperation needs to be pragmatic and based on bottom up model through contacts, for example, between working groups and secretariats.



Discussion: SAOs welcomed the SAO Chairs approach to how to proceed in relation to the 4 councils of the North with the view of fulfilling the mandate given in the Tromsø declaration. The Saami Council informed of the first congress for indigenous people of the Barents region in Kirkenes, Norway.

In addition, RAIPON reported on the Arctic Leaders Summit that took place 14-15 April in Moscow. More than 120 participants, including the SAO Chair, took part and the meeting focused on 2 critical issues: intensified industrial development in Arctic region and climate change as it affects Indigenous Peoples and their livelihoods. The SAO Chair was thanked for his participation.

Decision: For information only. The SAO Chair will circulate the final report from the Chair of the meeting when it is available. The Arctic Council will host the next meeting of the 4 Regional Councils in spring 2011.

11.2 The Indigenous Entrepreneurship project

Background: At the last SAO meeting in November 2009, Russia suggested that the Indigenous entrepreneurship project of the Barents Euro-Arctic Council (BEAC) might be a possible and suitable project for exploring any extended cooperation between the councils. The project aims to develop entrepreneurship among indigenous peoples in the Barents region. The participating entrepreneurs should have businesses/ideas closely related to indigenous cultures and traditions. The project is formally a cooperation between the different Indigenous Associations in the Barents region, and in contact with the Canadian Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. The project budget is approximately 1 million euro. Main financiers will be Interreg IVA Nord (EU), Nordic Council of Ministers, Norwegian Barents Secretariat and the International Barents Secretariat. Several regional governments and the Saami parliaments of Norway and Sweden have also granted funding to the project. The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Canadian Department of Indian and Northern Affairs are also contributing to the project.

Russia introduced the goals of the project and underlined that it is an important capacity building and sustainable development initiative for indigenous people. The project is partnering with the Arctic Portal.

Discussion: SAOs and PPS supported the proposal as an excellent way to make use of strengths and cooperation between regional organizations in the north and asked the SDWG to consider making the initiative circumpolar. RAIPON noted that RAIPON, SC and BEAC will meet next week to discuss in more detail. The Saami Council noted that many Saami associations are already partners.

Decision: Cooperation with the project was strongly supported by SAOs and PPs. Russia and others were invited to raise the proposal in the SDWG with the aim to make it a SDWG project. The SDWG was requested to take this up at their next meeting in Ilulissat October 2-3 2010.

11.3 Information about the Nordic Council of Ministers' (NCM) Arctic Conference in Copenhagen 26 May 2010.



Background: The Danish presidency of the NCM informed that it is organizing an Arctic Conference in Copenhagen on 26 May. The current plan for the conference includes a 1 hour opening session on overall Arctic issues followed by 3 panel sessions on: governance in Arctic; resource development in the Arctic (oil and gas); and living in the Arctic.

Decision: For information purposes.

11.4 SCPAR (*Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region*)

Background: Bjørn Willy Robstad, Secretary General of The Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Regions (SCPAR) gave a brief update on the cooperative work of SCPAR. SCPAR met in Washington on 18 March 2010 and discussed energy, offshore oil and gas development and climate change. The US presented its US Arctic policy to the meeting. SCPAR will also meet in Oslo on 7 June 2010 to discuss the Norwegian Arctic policy, education, research and IPY legacy. The 9th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region will be arranged in the European Parliament, Brussels, on 13-15 September 2010. The main topics are sustainable use of resources in the Arctic, IPY, cooperation in research, and consequences of melting ice. SAOs and PPs are invited and the Danish Foreign Minister as Chair of the AC is invited to address the conference

Decision: SAOs noted the importance of SCPAR to facilitate that parliamentarians of the Arctic circumpolar region meet to discuss the Arctic agenda.

11.5 Information about the Arctic Environmental Ministers Meeting in Ilulissat 8-11 June

Background: Denmark informed SAOs that the Danish Ministry of Environment, in cooperation with Greenlandic government has invited Arctic Environment Ministers, PPs and AC permanent state observers to a meeting 8-11 June 2010 in Ilulissat. The meeting will focus on the fragility of the Arctic environment with respect to: the fast growing development in marine shipping, offshore oil and gas activities and the consequences of climate change in this sensitive Arctic environment. The meeting will be an opportunity for the Arctic Environmental Ministers to set the stage for a common understanding of the environmental issues facing the Arctic Marine Environment with focus on IMO, among others including the AMSA recommendations IIC and IID. Relevant Arctic Council Working Group activities (AMAP, CAFF and PAME) will be presented. It was stressed that this is not a formal AC meeting, but an initiative by the Danish Minister of Environment.

Discussion: SAOs thanked Denmark for the initiative. It was noted that as the AC work often has an environmental objective, it is important to engage Environment Ministers. Questions were asked concerning the agenda for the meeting, whether black carbon would be on it, on participation at the meeting, the role and participation of AC PPs and working groups and why SAR was included on agenda. Denmark promised that the agenda will be sent out within the next 2-3 weeks, and would include an item on outcome of the Deputy Ministers' Meeting. Several PPs pointed to the funding difficulties following from this not being an AC meeting. The importance of following the AC protocol was underlined.

Decision: The SAOs thanked Denmark for arranging the meeting, and requested the organizers to take note of the interventions at this meeting.



11.6 Arctic Ocean Foreign Ministers' meeting

Background: Canada provided a debrief of the meeting of the Arctic Ocean coastal states that took place in Chelsea, Canada on 29 March 2010. The Ministers had a dialogue on issues of particular relevance to the roles, responsibilities and jurisdiction of those states. Ministers discussed the extensive work underway on the delineation of the continental shelf and ways to enhance collaboration. Ministers also discussed a number of emerging issues, including those related to public safety that could arise from increased access to the Arctic. The meeting, as noted in the Chair's Summary, also served to compliment the work of the Arctic Council and to highlight its significance as the central forum for international cooperation on Arctic issues. The Chair's summary from the meeting is available on the website of the Canadian MFA.

Discussion: SAOs thanked Canada for the briefing. The SAOs of Iceland, Finland and Sweden, and some PPs pointed to the lack of inclusiveness at this meeting, and noted that after the Ilulissat Declaration they had the understanding that there would be no more Arctic Coastal States meetings. It was underlined that the AC is, and should continue to be, the central body for discussion of Arctic issues, with full participation of all Members. To strengthen the AC one should avoid fragmentation. Russia noted the successful Norwegian-Russian agreement of settlement of overlapping claims and that this is a result of good cooperation between coastal states and demonstrates the need for Ministers to meet in several arenas.

Decision: SAOs thanked Canada for the debriefing, took note of the interventions and welcomed the Norwegian-Russian agreement on the delimitation in the Barents Sea.

11.7 University of the Arctic

Background: Jan Henry Keskikalo, UArctic board member gave an update on recent developments. UArctic is now established as a legal entity as the UArctic Association based on Finnish law. He informed briefly about positive developments with new funding from the Danish government and further expansion of the UArctic.

Discussion: RAIPON welcomed the UArctic initiative to launch a new position as vice president for indigenous issues.

Decision: For information only.

Suggestion to consider new project about Volcanic influences on Arctic climate

Norway informed that a small expert group from the Norwegian Polar Institute in cooperation with Icelandic experts had been in the process of making a short document on the effects outlining how the Icelandic volcano eruption is a new element affecting climate, environment, air transport in the Arctic. Norway suggested asking AMAP to make an outline of a potential study on climate effects, mercury, etc and circulate to SAOs intersessionally for later decision.

Discussion: Consensus was not reached on the idea, since some SAOs required time to consult further on this issue domestically and were not in a position to take a decision at this meeting. AMAP was requested to consider the issue further in accordance with established procedures with a view to developing an outline/proposal for future work to be presented to SAOS at a future meeting as appropriate.



Decision: AMAP will consider the Norwegian proposal, according to established procedures and if appropriate, make a draft outline of a possible project and distribute to SAOs for further consulting/decision.

11.8 Information on next SAO meeting in Tórshavn, Faroe Islands, 19-20 October 2010

Elin Mortensen, The Faroe Islands, informed that the next SAO meeting will take place in the Faroe Islands 19 and 20 October 2010. Invitation and participant information will be distributed before the summer. For information about the Faroe Islands, this link is recommended:

www.visitfaroeislands.com

She also informed about the **Seas the Future Conference**, which is to take place in Tórshavn on 6-7 October 2010. The meeting participants were invited to attend this high level international oceans conference that will promote integrated oceans management, and therefore is of relevance also to the Arctic Council. The conference will be arranged in cooperation with the Nordic Council of Ministers.

11.9 Information about Ministerial Meeting 2011

The Chair informed that the next Ministerial Meeting is to take place, final confirmation pending, in Nuuk, Greenland, on 12 May 2011.

Closing of meeting

The Chair thanked all for a productive meeting, and thanked Greenland for its great hospitality. The beautiful surroundings in Ilulissat had been conducive to the good work. He thanked the Greenland government, the local organizers, his Danish/Greenlandic/Faroe Island colleagues and the Arctic Council Secretariat for support. Special thanks went to Jesper Hansen, who was taking part in his last AC meeting as ACS staff.



LIST OF ACRONYMS

| | |
|---------|---|
| AAC | Arctic Athabaskan Council |
| ABA | Arctic Biodiversity Assessment |
| AC | Arctic Council |
| ACAP | Arctic Contaminants Action Program Working Group |
| AIA | Aleut International Association |
| AMAP | Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program Working Group |
| AON | Arctic Observatories Network |
| BEAC | Barents Euro-Arctic Council |
| BSSN | Bering Sea Sub-network |
| CAFF | Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna Working Group |
| CBMP | Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program |
| EEA | European Environment Agency |
| EC | European Commission |
| EPPR | Emergency Prevention Preparedness and Response Working Group |
| GCI | Gwich'in Council International |
| IASC | International Arctic Science Committee |
| ICC | Inuit Circumpolar Council |
| IPS | Indigenous Peoples Secretariat |
| IP | Indigenous Peoples |
| IHWMS | Integrated Hazardous Waste Management Strategy |
| IMO | International Marine Organization |
| IPY | International Polar Year |
| NCM | Nordic Council of Ministers |
| PAME | Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment Working Group |
| PP | Permanent Participant |
| PSI | Project Support Instrument |
| RAIPON | Russian Arctic Indigenous Peoples of the North |
| RPA | Regional Programme of Action |
| SCAR | Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research |
| SCPAR | Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region |
| SDWG | Sustainable Development Working Group |
| SWIPA | Climate Change and the Cryosphere - Snow, Water, Ice and Permafrost in the Arctic |
| SAO | Senior Arctic Official |
| SAON | Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks |
| SAON IG | Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks Initiating Group |
| SC | Saami Council |
| SDAP | Sustainable Development Action Plan |
| TEK | Traditional Ecological Knowledge |
| UAS | Unmanned Aircraft Systems |
| UNCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |
| WG | Working Group of the Arctic Council |

