



Progress Report to PAME II-2014

Group of Experts on the
Ecosystem Approach to Management

4 September 2014

PAME
Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment

Progress report to PAME II-2014

Group of Experts on the Ecosystem Approach to Management version 4 September 2014

Table of Content

BACKGROUND	1
MEMBERSHIP.....	1
TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	2
4 TH EA WORKSHOP, VANCOUVER, CANADA, 16-18 JUNE 2014.....	2
5 TH EA WORKSHOP IN 2015	2
MAP INFORMATION – AREAS OF HEIGHTENED ECOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE, HABITATS AND HUMAN ACTIVITIES	3
EA ‘ROAD MAP’.....	3
OAK FOUNDATION PROJECT TO ESTABLISH A COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE ON EA IN THE ARCTIC	3
ANNEX 1-EA WORK PLAN 2013-2015 FROM PAME WORK PLAN 2013-2015	4
ANNEX 2-RECORDS OF DECISIONS FROM PAME I-2014 ON ECOSYSTEM APPROACH.....	5
ANNEX 3-NOMINATED EXPERTS BY MEMBER STATES, PPS AND WORKING GROUPS 2013-2015	6
ANNEX 4-SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS FROM THE 4TH EA WORKSHOP, VANCOUVER, 16-18 JUNE 2014	8

Background

PAME established in 2007 an expert group on the Ecosystem Approach to Management (the EA-EG). This was broadened in 2011 to become a PAME-led joint expert group with participation also of other Arctic Council working groups (AMAP, CAFF and SDWG). Norway and USA are co-lead countries for the theme ‘Ecosystem Approach to management’ (EA) under PAME. The work of the EA Expert Group is carried out according to a work plan as part of the agreed PAME Work Plan for 2013-2015 (Annex 1).

The co-leads presented a progress report on the EA work to the PAME I-2014 meeting in Girdwood, Alaska, 11-13 February 2014. The outcome of the discussion at PAME on the EA item as reflected in the RoD is included as Annex 2.

Membership

PAME members and other Arctic Council (AC) working groups were requested to nominate new or renominate members in order to secure active participation of experts including from other AC WGs and their networks of experts.

The new list of members is included as Annex 3. There are now 10 members nominated by the Arctic states, 3 members from two WG secretariats (AMAP and CAFF), and representatives from 5 Permanent Participants (AIA, GCI, ICC, SC, IPS). More people have generally attended the EA workshops (22-28 participants at each of the 4 workshops).

There is a need to make the EA-EG become more effectively a **joint group** with 'ownership' by the other AC WGs such as AMAP, CAFF and SDWG. In doing so, another attempt to strengthen the membership of the group should be made.

Terms of Reference

A Terms of Reference (ToR) for the EA-EG was agreed in 2009 as a basis for the 2009-2011 work plan. The ToR were revised in 2011 and used as basis for the 2011-2013 and 2013-2015 work plans.

We have now prepared a new **draft revised ToR** (included as a separate document) which is presented to PAME for discussion and approval after any amendments. The draft ToR should also be sent to the other WGs which are part of the joint EA-EG for their comments before it is finally agreed.

The new ToR is structured according to the 6 elements in the framework for implementing EA described in the EA concept paper:

http://www.pame.is/images/03_Projects/EA/EA_Docs_and_Workshop_Reports/EA_Concept_Paper/EA_Concept_Paper_Web.pdf.

The ToR will form the basis for the new work plan for the 2015-2017 period. It is suggested that the existing 2013-2015 work plan should remain unchanged for the remaining part of the period (until spring 2015). This allows time for consultations with the other working groups on the ToR and the new work plan 2015-2017 before it is finalized and agreed by PAME I-2015 and the AC later in the spring.

4th EA workshop, Vancouver, Canada, 16-18 June 2014

The 4th EA workshop (WS) was planned and organized by a planning group consisting of the two co-leads and members from Canada, AMAP, CAFF, PAME and WWF. The WS reviewed progress on development of Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (IEA) and related EA aspects with focus on two Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs), the Barents Sea and the Beaufort Sea. It was attended by 22 participants from five countries (Canada, Iceland, Japan, Norway and USA).

A report from the WS has been prepared and is published by PAME:

http://www.pame.is/images/03_Projects/EA/EA_Docs_and_Workshop_Reports/4th_EA_Workshop/EA_Workshop_Report_4th_EA_June_16_18.pdf.

The summary and conclusions from the workshop is included as in Annex 4.

5th EA workshop in 2015

We have tentatively identified the issue of **ecological objectives** as the topic for the next EA workshop. Defining ecological objectives is one of the 6 component elements of the EA and is the step where the dual objectives of sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity are translated into practical management objectives. Setting ecological objectives is one of the items of the current work plan (Annex 1), where the initial steps are to compile information on existing higher level objectives and species management objectives for species and habitats, and to review methodology for setting ecological quality objectives.

We will establish a planning group with representatives from the AC WGs and aim to present a plan for the 5th EA workshop to the next PAME meeting (PAME I-2015) and to the other WGs at the same time. Tentatively we will aim to have the workshop in late spring or early summer 2015, if possible in association with another meeting to facility travel and reduce cost.

Map information – areas of heightened ecological significance, habitats and human activities

Two of the items on the work program (Annex 1) relate to mapping and spatial map information on areas of heightened ecological (and cultural) significance, human uses and habitats. There has been limited work on these items by the EA-EG so far. We had a presentation on the general issue of marine spatial planning in relation to the EA at the Vancouver workshop (by Erik Olsen, IMR, Norway). We also had some discussion on these items but of limited scope since they were peripheral to the main focus areas for the workshop.

At the workshop it was noted that there are at least three different thematic information layers that are relevant and of interest in the context of IEA and EA:

- i) the identified areas of heightened ecological and cultural significance identified in the AMSA II report by AMAP/CAFF/SDWG,
- ii) coastal and marine habitats,
- iii) human activities (infrastructure, usage areas, etc.).

We will continue work on these items, specifically in relation to the broader issue of IEA (how to use spatial information on important areas, habitats and human activities in an assessment context). These spatial items should be considered in the revised EA work plan for 2015-2017.

EA 'Road map'

A short discussion note (2 pages) called **"Road map" for EA work in the Arctic** was included as an annex (annex 6) to the EA Progress Report to PAME I-2014 meeting. The document highlighted two aspects which should be discussed and considered in relation to the EA and IEA work in the Arctic:

- Work carried out inside and outside of the sphere of the Arctic Council
- Work carried out at the scales of LMEs and pan-Arctic

Oak Foundation project to establish a Community of Practice on EA in the Arctic

The Oak Foundation is supporting a project 'Implementing the Ecosystem Approach to Management (EA) in the Arctic: Building the Circumpolar Community of Practice' run in association with the EA-EG and managed by the PAME secretariat. The goal of the project is to support implementation of the ecosystem approach to management (EA) in the Arctic marine environment through development of a functional Community of Practice (CoP) specializing in Arctic EA.

The project aims to consolidate gains in knowledge base relevant to EA by establishing a web-based inventory of relevant information products such as paper and reports on EA and components such as IEA, objectives etc. The project also aims to create a CoP by identifying and establishing communications among specialists from relevant agencies of the Arctic States, the circumpolar indigenous communities, and non-governmental entities.

Annex 1-EA work plan 2013-2015 from PAME Work Plan 2013-2015

Ecosystem Approach to Management

PAME will continue work on integrated assessment and comparing cases and reviewing existing methodologies.

- To resolve data issues, PAME will continue to work from the 3rd EA workshop (June 2013) at two levels: LMEs and pan-Arctic.
- On its ecological objectives, PAME will begin and continue compiling information on higher level objectives and species management objectives for species and habitats; review methodology for setting ecological quality objectives.
- PAME will consider the use of identified areas of heightened ecological significance in relation to EA for the Arctic LMEs.
- Planning tools include mapping of human uses and habitats in LMEs in relation to integrated assessments and other tools for EA.
- Explore the feasibility of developing pilot projects to demonstrate outcomes from the other EA activities.

Annex 2-Records of Decisions from PAME I-2014 on Ecosystem Approach

- ✓ *PAME welcomes the progress report on the work of the Ecosystem Approach expert group (EA-EG) and noted the importance to further advance the coordination effort of a common approach to the work of the Arctic Council on EBM in the marine part of the Arctic.*
- ✓ *EA co-leads to provide the PAME members with a list of skill sets and areas of expertise for new contributing members of the EA-EG. In consideration of the needs PAME members are requested to nominate or re-nominate members for this group to the PAME Secretariat by February 28, 2014.*
- ✓ *PAME Chair to write to the other Arctic Council working groups addressing marine-related issues of relevance to ask them to nominate/re-nominate active members/points of contact from their network of experts for the EA-EG by February 28, 2014.*
- ✓ *PAME Secretariat to circulate to PAME members for their comments on the PAME I-2014 EA-EG Progress Report Annex 5: EBM Recommendations and response on follow-up by PAME and Annex 6: Road map for EA work in the Arctic. Deadline for comments on Annex 5 is March 15 and deadline is May 2, 2014 for Annex 6. EA co-leads and the EA-EG members to provide revised versions of these annexes for the PAME II-2014 meeting.*
- ✓ *PAME Chair to request inclusion of the follow-up on EBM Expert Group Recommendations on the agenda of the next meeting of Arctic Council Working Group chairs and secretaries to ensure coordination of efforts in this regard.*
- ✓ *PAME welcomes the planning and convening of the 4th EA workshop on “Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (IEA) – Understanding national approaches and reviewing progress on IEA in the Arctic LMEs”. Tentative venue and time is Vancouver, Canada 18-20 June.*
- ✓ *PAME urges the EA co-leads and the EA-EG members to ensure an active involvement of the other Arctic Council working groups working on marine-related issues of relevance (AMAP, CAFF and SDWG) in the planning and participation of this workshop.*
- ✓ *The EA co-leads, in cooperation with the EA-EG member, to revise its Terms of Reference, taking into account new and ongoing activities (e.g. the follow-up of the EBM Recommendations) and submit a revised draft to PAME II-2014 meeting for approval.*

Annex 3-Nominated experts by Member States, PPs and working groups 2013-2015

(List to be updated)

PAME-led Ecosystem Approach (EA) Expert Group	
Canada	<p>Martine Giangioppi Martine.Giangioppi@dfo-mpo.gc.ca</p> <p>Cc. Renee Sauve Renee.Sauve@dfo-mpo.gc.ca</p>
Denmark Greenland Faroe Islands	<p>Dite Mandoe Andreassen (DK) diman@nst.dk</p> <p>Tina Mönster (GL) tinm@nanoq.gl</p>
Finland	<p>Hermanni Kaartokallio Finnish Environment Institute hermanni.kaartokallio@ymparisto.fi</p>
Iceland	<p>Cc. Sesselja Bjarnadottir Sesselja.bjarnadottir@umh.stjr.is</p>
Norway	<p>Hein Rune Skjoldal hein.rune.skjoldal@imr.no</p> <p>Cecile von Quillfeldt quillfeldt@npolar.no</p> <p>Cc. Anja Elisenberg Anja.Elisenberg@md.dep.no</p>
Russia	<p>Dr. Aleksander Bagin abagin@hse.ru</p> <p>Professor Gennady G. Matishov Director Murmansk Marine Biological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences (MMBI RAS) icd@mmbi.info</p>
Sweden	<p>Patrik Brodd Ministry of Environment Patrik.brodd@environment.ministry.se</p>
USA	<p>Phil Mundy phil.mundy@noaa.gov</p>
Working Groups	<p>AMAP: Lars Otto Reiersen lars-otto.reiersen@amap.no</p> <p>Jon L Fuglestad jon.fuglestad@amap.no</p> <p>CAFF: Kari Larusson kari@caff.is</p>

Permanent Participants	<p>AIA: Jim Gamble aia@alaska.net</p> <p>GCI: Victoria Lorraine Peter (no email address but Chief Joe Linklater is also a regular participant Email: jlinklater@vgfn.net)</p> <p>ICC: James Stotts, Chair jimmy@iccalaska.org</p> <p>Saami Council (SC): Gunn-Britt Retter gbr@saamicouncil.net</p> <p>IPS: ips@arcticpeoples.org</p> <p><u>Cc for information sharing (AAC)</u></p> <p>Colleen Henry (AAC) Colleen.Henry@cyfn.net</p> <p>Terry Fenge (AAC) Ttfenge7006@rogers.com</p>
-------------------------------	---

Annex 4-Summary and Conclusions from the 4th EA Workshop, Vancouver, 16-18 June 2014

1. The Arctic Council and its working groups have laid an extensive foundation for the understanding and implementing of the EA in the Arctic.
2. Progress on EA/IEA in the Barents Sea has been considerable on national and international levels. The progress within the Beaufort is at an earlier stage of implementation.
3. It has become apparent that AMAP, CAFF, PAME and SDWG, all produce products in support of the implementation of the EA that are complementary and substantial synergy have been identified.
4. It is recognized that a wide range of environmental assessment activities related to IEA are conducted for a wide range of purposes among the members of the Arctic Council. There is a need to better understand how much integration is required for these assessment activities to be considered an IEA. A further issue is how such assessments can collectively contribute to an IEA.
5. The Beaufort Sea LME provides an important and timely opportunity to build international cooperation and understanding on the ecosystem approach to management (EA) and Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (IEA).
6. The Beaufort LME is recommended for development of a transboundary EA/IEA pilot project as suggested by the Kiruna declaration.
7. A pilot project would initiate a dialog and ultimately develop an Ecosystem Status Report for the Beaufort LME, working in concert with the AMAP AACCA-C project.
8. A Barents – Beaufort LME comparative effort should be investigated based on oceanographic and climatic connections between these LMEs.
9. Continued cooperation between the Alaska Ocean Observing System and Canada's Department of Fisheries and Oceans by sharing data and metadata is strongly encouraged.
10. Establishing an online bibliographic resource to hold a prioritized set of key references on the science and policy of the Beaufort and Barents LMEs is recommended.