

Draft Minutes of the 2nd Joint AMAP – CAFF Meeting, Stockholm, Sweden, 31 August 2001

Agenda item 1: Opening of the AMAP-CAFF meeting and adoption of the agenda

The AMAP Chair, Hanne Petersen, opened the meeting, noting her pleasure that the idea for joint meetings between AMAP and CAFF had been continued, and looking forward to open discussions.

A list of Participants is attached as Annex 1.

The draft agenda (Annex 2) was adopted without addition. It was decided that item 3 would be treated as an introduction to the ACIA policy document, and the document would be dealt with in more detail under Item 6.

A list of documents for the meeting is attached as Annex 3.

A list of actions arising from the meeting is attached as Annex 4.

Agenda Item 2: The Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) process

Status of ACIA

Hanne Petersen invited Pål Prestrud, Vice-Chair of ACIA, to provide a status report. Pål Prestrud thanked for the opportunity to address, for the second time, a joint meeting of AMAP and CAFF and invited ACIA people in the audience to add to his report.

Since the last AMAP-CAFF meeting, all drafting groups have been established with lead, contributing- and consultant authors. In total, there are approximately 190 authors, with good representation from all Arctic countries. An outline of the chapters and lead authors was presented (available from ACIA homepage www.acia.uaf.edu). Most drafting teams will have convened their first workshops by December 2001 and should have their first chapter drafts ready in the 3rd quarter off 2002. There are differences in the progress among drafting teams, but as a whole, the ACIA process is on schedule.

ASC meetings were convened in October 2000 in Seattle and in April 2001 in Reykjavik; the next ASC meeting will be convened in Ottawa in early December 2001. An operative outline for ACIA was ready early in 2001. A workshop was held in St. Petersburg in May 2001, aimed at involving more Russian scientists in the ACIA process. Indigenous peoples are already well represented in the ACIA and the relationship with IPCC has been clarified.

A scenario workshop was convened in Stockholm in January 2001. Two types of scenarios exist for assessing climate impacts: scenarios for future emissions of GH gases

and aerosols, and scenarios of the future of the physical environment. Uncertainties for climate change predictions are recognized to be large. An inter-comparison of 19 global climate change models (GCMs) was conducted from an Arctic perspective. It showed significant increases in temperature in the sub-arctic and polar ocean areas. A moderate scenario, B2, was chosen for the assessment. Biologists, however, need more accuracy than the GCM will give; terrestrial biologists need predictions at smaller scales. Statistical downscaling is being used to get a higher resolution, i.e. on a 50 m x 50 m grid-scale. The models assume a steady (linear) increase in temperature, which is easier to adapt to. However, paleological records from Greenlandic ice-core samples show rapid changes, which have not been captured in the scenarios. Therefore, one of ACIA's priorities is to incorporate also paleological scenarios into the process. Models and scenarios for Ozone depletion and UV-B are being prepared.

An overhead of the budget was presented. Funding for ACIA is based on direct funding by some countries, in-kind contributions, and shared costs through potential joint programs. The estimated total cost is 3.6 million USD, and US funding will be 2.4 million. The estimated USD-equivalent value of in-kind and cash contributions by other countries is 1.2 million.

In response to a question regarding whether there are chapters AMAP/CAFF should monitor more closely than others, Pål Prestrud noted that the ACIA Operative Outline is very clear and had been reviewed by the WGs. Therefore, he could not foresee any special issues or chapters that would need special care. He also noted that lead authors are quite satisfied with the contribution of the social scientists in each group. There is a plan to put together a small group of social economists to bring the information all together in terms of impacts on the social economy, particularly for chapter 16 (Synthesis).

A comment was raised about the apparent overlap of chapters (e.g. the Fisheries chapter appears to overlap with the one on Oceanic and Marine Systems). Pål Prestrud explained that chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8 look at impacts on ecosystems and biota while chapter's 9-15 focus on impacts on humans and sectoral activities. Lead authors are requested to coordinate the contents of related chapters.

Yuri Tsaturov commented that Roshydromet provided input to the ACIA Secretariat on possible Russian scientists to participate in the ACIA process. He further noted that hydrology was poorly covered by ACIA and that, perhaps, there should be a separate chapter dealing with this topic in light of its importance for energy transport to the North. Pål Prestrud stated that ACIA would look into this, but that the physical environment including hydrology should be described in chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 before moving on to sectoral activities.

Lars-Otto Reiersen noted that all five Nordic ministers of the environment had expressed strong support for the ACIA process at their Kirkenes meeting (fall 2001).

Application to GEF in support of ACIA

Lars-Otto Reiersen introduced this item. At the ASC meeting in Reykjavik, April 2001, a decision was made to apply for funding to support Russia in order to have Russian data included in the ACIA. The AMAP Secretariat and GRID Arendal were charged with leading this work and as a result, an initial concept proposal was sent for comments to UNEP- and GEF secretariats in Nairobi and Washington D.C. in May.

Vitaly Kimstach described the status of the application and the associated complications. The first discussions with the Russian Federation were held at the end of April, and the initiative received further support from the workshop in St. Petersburg in May. An updated concept paper describing a medium-sized project was then presented.

Stakeholders involved in this project include Russian federal and regional authorities, Roshydromet, MNR (Ministry of Natural Resources), MED (Ministry of Economic Development), RAIPON, ACIA, AMAP, CAFF and IASC. The estimated total budget (US\$) for this project is 1950, with GEF providing 650K and co-financing of 1275K (355K direct; 900K in-kind from Roshydromet).

Lars-Otto Reiersen noted that UNEP/GEF initially gave the impression that this project would be approved in mid-July and funding would be in place by December. A more recent response from UNEP/GEF indicated a longer process as well as a recommendation from GEF to focus the project more on ecosystem management, rather than direct support to ACIA. He noted that it would be important to clarify whether this was a firm requirement or a formality.

Snorri Baldursson noted that CAFF had first heard of this project, at the Reykjavik ASC meeting in April 2001. Then the idea was to assist Russia in providing information to ACIA, particularly for land-locked systems chapters for which it is difficult to obtain data. CAFF had requested that data provisions for biological components, i.e. biodiversity and biological sectors such as wildlife management, forestry and agriculture, be included in the proposal. He expressed his disappointment that CAFF's concerns had not been adequately incorporated into the proposal. Therefore, the current proposal does not seem to be broadly relevant for ACIA and questionable if CAFF should be listed as stakeholder in the project.

Lars-Otto Reiersen clarified that AMAP, based on comments received to the May version, had updated the proposal and sent this to GRID-Arendal as well as all project stakeholders in early July. Unfortunately this version was not sent to UNEP and GEF in Washington D.C. and Nairobi until August, and this has led to some confusion. The process had been quite open and biological aspects were already covered adequately in his opinion.

Yuri Tsaturov noted that the ACIA GEF project had been discussed officially with Amirkhan Amirkhanov, head of departments in the Ministry of Natural Resources and CAFF National Representative, and that he had approved the concept in writing (the July version). Berit Lein confirmed this.

RAIPON tabled written comments on the ACIA process and the ACIA/GEF application (Annex 5). Their priority in ACIA is to involve indigenous peoples of the North in climate change monitoring and assessments, and in the elaboration of adaptation strategies and interactive environmental policies related to climate change. For this they intend to establish an Arctic Indigenous Peoples Climate and ecosystem Change Network.

Decisions:

- *AMAP and CAFF agreed that it is important that they work together on the ACIA-Russia GEF application.*
- *The AMAP Secretariat will work with CAFF to make biodiversity more visible in the ACIA-Russia GEF application and will contact UNEP to get a statement on the current status of the application.*
- *RAIPON's suggestions will be incorporated into the application.*
- *CAFF and RAIPON shall provide exact wording changes.*

Agenda Item 3: Planning of the production of the ACIA policy document

Hanne Petersen drew attention to a draft document (AMAP/CAFF 2/3/1) prepared the AMAP and CAFF Secretariats. Snorri Baldursson presented the document. Two possible scenarios were proposed: 1) a 4-6 person drafting team including all Arctic Council Working Groups right from the start; or 2) a drafting team composed of just AMAP and CAFF that will approach all other Working Groups to inform them and to ask them each to assign a person to be a key contact. The draft timeline was presented. To achieve approval of the Policy Document by Ministers in the fall 2004, drafting teams need to begin work no later than January 2003. Snorri Baldursson further noted that PAME has recently requested to participate in the preparation of the Policy Document and suggested that all other Working Groups be invited to take part in this process.

Participants felt that a drafting team should be put in place soon, i.e. by spring 2002 to start addressing elements of structure and format and to take contacts with lead authors. Miliza Malmelin noted that the SDWG had not been formally invited to participate in this process although so stated in the document. RAIPON requested that Indigenous Peoples Organisations be given equal opportunity to participate in the drafting process. Harald Loeng noted that the document did not say anything about the type of recommendations to be expected. Also, that it was his understanding that lead authors should propose recommendations for each chapter.

The meeting agreed to a proposal from John Calder, suggesting that a small drafting team would scope out the plan for developing the Policy Document and return later with a proposal. John Calder (US/AMAP), Kevin McCormick (Canada/CAFF) and Miliza Malmelin (Finland/SDWG) were assigned as team members.

Decision:

- *AMAP and CAFF agreed to use a handout developed at the meeting as a basis for a proposal to the SAOs for preparing the ACIA Policy Document. The AMAP and CAFF Secretariats were charged with scoping out the proposal for review by the WGs before submission to the AC Secretariat.*

Sune Sohlberg, CAFF Chair, assumed the chairmanship of the meeting.

New agenda item - update from Arctic Council Secretariat

Sannamaaria Vanamo, Arctic Council Secretariat, informed the meeting about relevant developments in the Arctic Council:

- The next SAO meeting will be in Espoo, Finland, October 6-7, 2001
- The minutes from the June SAO meeting are on the AC website, open for comments.
- The AC Chair has initiated bilateral consultations with the member states regarding reorganization of the Arctic Council based on Pekka Haviso's report
- The SAOs have invited the AC working groups to prepare key messages that will be incorporated into the AC message to WSSD in Johannesburg, official deadline for input is October 7.
- The "Arctic window" in WSSD is still not clear. Therefore it is important to follow the ongoing WSSD preparation process.

Agenda item 5. Ongoing Arctic Monitoring Activities

Sune Sohlberg briefed the meeting about CAFF priorities for biodiversity monitoring and introduced a discussion paper from CAFF regarding this issue. Six out of nine CAFF expert monitoring networks are functional. Although CAFF's main focus is to monitor biodiversity and AMAP's focus is on contaminants, there are areas of mutual interest and overlap such as climate change. Therefore CAFF proposes that the two working groups join hands in developing an Integrated Arctic Monitoring Program for presentation to the AC Ministers in 2004.

Hanne Petersen agreed to the general observation made by Sune Sohlberg and noted that AMAP looks forward to programs from the networks so that the integration process can continue.

a. The CAFF Networks

Ævar Petersen introduced this item and handed out a paper (2/5/1). The six already functioning CAFF expert monitoring networks deal with: reindeer/caribou, waders, seabirds, Arctic char, vascular plants through ITEX and ringed seals. Their mandate is to assess interest/need for monitoring activity on circumpolar level and consider practical issues of funding, data gathering, harmonization of methodologies etc. The networks

vary in their progress and how much history is behind them, for example the ITEX program has been ongoing for 10-12 years. Avar Petersen then gave the floor to two network representatives.

Johan Hammar, Inst. of Fresh Water Research, introduced the CAFF Arctic char network, which includes 25 experts from the circumpolar region.

Arctic char is an excellent indicator species for global changes. It is the most northern of all freshwater fish. It is really a complex of sub-species and ecological forms that inhabit a variety of freshwater environments, including marginal ones sensitive to changes. The Arctic char complex is rapidly changing and many southern marginal populations have already extirpated. Monitoring efforts should probably focus on northern marginal populations, as one would expect them to be most responsive to warming trends. There is a wealth of ecological and genetic data including on temperature sensitive genetic marker (esterase), which provides an excellent opportunity for monitoring.

Philip Wookey, chair of the International Tundra Experiment (ITEX) introduced the ITEX network and its plans regarding biodiversity monitoring.

The ITEX network has been operating for over 10 years and has produced a wealth of data on individual plant and plot-based response to climate change. ITEX is still going strong, especially in N-America, although there are gaps in Siberia and some places in northern Europe due to financial difficulties. However, the sites are still there and can be easily resurrected if funds are made available. ITEX is interested in assuming an advisory role for organisations such as CAFF and AMAP. Regarding biodiversity monitoring, ITEX is currently plot-based, but is committed to develop monitoring methodologies on phenology and community changes and will include provisions for that in its next ITEX Manual due in 2002.

b. Other ongoing activities, e.g. NAMMCO and ICES monitoring programs.

Lars-Otto Reiersen introduced a handout (2/5/2) from Grete Hovelsrud-Broda, Secretary of NAMMCO (North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission) who could not attend the meeting. NAMMCO has important data on N-Atlantic marine mammals and has expressed interest in linking with AMAP/CAFF monitoring activities.

Harald Loeng informed about ICES (International Council for the Exploration of the Sea). ICES has observation stations around the North Atlantic. They produce every year an Ocean Climate Status Summary (available on the Web), as well as status reports on zooplankton and commercial fish species. ICES have prepared guidelines for monitoring contaminants. Its sister organisation in the Pacific is PICES (North Pacific Science Organisation).

Simon Wilson informed the meeting about an activity being conducted under the auspices of the OSPAR (Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Northeast Atlantic) Biodiversity Committee to compile information on 'Threatened and

Declining Species and Habitats' in the OSPAR area. This activity also covers the Arctic part of the OSPAR area (OSPAR region 1), and maybe linked to establishment of priorities under OSPAR in relation to biodiversity issues. He therefore suggested that, if they had not already done so, CAFF might find it useful to look into this activity and consider its relevance to their work.

b. The AMAP Effects Monitoring Programme, and the species list for the contaminant and biological effects monitoring under AMAP.

Lars-Otto Reiersen introduced the AMAP Trends and Effects Monitoring Programme, and the relationship between parts dealing with contaminants monitoring and those concerned with monitoring effects. Referring to the programme documentation (available on the AMAP website – <http://www.amap.no> - under online documents, he described the tables that present the various parts of the programmes in terms of marine, freshwater and terrestrial sub-programmes, etc. He also explained the classification of the activities in terms of E (essential), ES (sub-regionally essential) and R (recommended) components. The documentation of the AMAP programmes includes recommendations regarding methodologies, etc. Mention was also made of the 10 key areas in which AMAP have requested countries to concentrate their efforts given the logistical impossibilities of conducting large scale monitoring work throughout the Arctic. A list of species included in the various parts of the AMAP monitoring programmes was presented

Simon Wilson added that the AMAP programme as described by Lars-Otto Reiersen was a blueprint for obtaining the information that scientists had identified as necessary for the conduct of the AMAP assessments. On the basis of this (theoretical monitoring) plan the 8 Arctic countries developed their National Implementation Plans (NIPs) for AMAP – under which ongoing national monitoring and research was tailored or adapted as far as possible to coincide with the AMAP specifications. In some cases new monitoring programmes were established specifically to meet AMAP goals. The extent to which the AMAP NIPs fulfil the blueprint programme differs from country to country and between the different fields of science concerned. The AMAP National Implementation Plans are also available as separate documents from the AMAP website.

c. The AMAP Project Directory

Simon Wilson then proceeded to describe and briefly demonstrate the AMAP Project Directory (PD). This Internet based resource (<http://www.amap.no/amappd>) is used by AMAP to compile information on ongoing monitoring and research projects and programmes in the Arctic. Its main purpose is to provide AMAP assessment experts with information on potential sources of information for use in their assessment work (project details, contact information, media and parameters measured, data collection and accessibility, regional setting, etc.). In addition to information of relevance to AMAP, the AMAP PD also contains a considerable amount of information that is of relevance to CAFF and ACIA. The project directory system has been developed by AMAP and GRID-Arendal. AMAP has on several occasions invited CAFF to make use of the AMAP PD to compile information on biodiversity, etc. related projects. A development of the AMAP PD, by which the underlying database is also used to maintain information for a project directory activity under the ENVINET (European Network for Arctic and Alpine

Research Infrastructures) Programme was demonstrated as a model for how a CAFF version of the PD could easily be implemented. A similar development is planned to incorporate US NSF project information into the database. Simon Wilson also briefly referred to the online database of maps and graphics that AMAP had set up to disseminate products of its first assessment, and suggested that this too could be further developed as a joint AMAP/CAFF resource.

Sune Sohlberg, CAFF Chair, informed the meeting that CAFF had discussed the AMAP PD and agreed to use the system – and were already using it for compiling information on biodiversity related projects in Arctic Russia.

In response to a question on how project information could be registered in the PD, Simon Wilson informed that the system was fully implemented online – scientists need only connect to the PD and click on the link to ‘Register a new project’ (<http://pusnes.grida.no/amap/amappd/edit/AMAP.asp>) to access a form that can be used to add their projects. The registration will then appear immediately in the database and these can be (interactively) updated at any time.

A second question asked whether the PD could provide a solution to online access to long-term weather station records. The answer to this was that, while the PD itself was not a system for access to actual data, it did (in a number of existing registrations) include information on where such data could be found – in some cases these data are already being compiled online (e.g. data for Abisko). A possibility does exist to promote online access to long-term meteorological data through the ENVINET project and Simon Wilson would look into this further.

Decision:

- *AMAP and CAFF agreed that the Secretariats should continue to work together to make the Project Directory a common resource.*

AMAP also noted that it operates a number of thematic data centres (TDC) to compile data to support the AMAP assessment work. The TDC of most relevance to CAFF and ACIA is the AMAP freshwater/terrestrial TDC that is currently located at the University of Alaska-Fairbanks, where the ACIA Secretariat is also located.

Agenda item 6. Next Steps

Sune Sohlberg informed the meeting about the next steps in developing the CAFF expert networks. Funding is a constant problem and the CAFF Secretariat will investigate options for long-term core-funds from international funding agencies. Iceland will continue to lead the CAFF monitoring work and intends to host a meeting in early 2002 among network coordinators and a support group from CAFF. CAFF welcomes involvement from AMAP in this support group and the planned meeting. CAFF will consider sending representatives to the AMAP Tromsø workshop in January 2002. Finally CAFF has agreed to propose to AMAP that the two WGs develop an Integrated

Arctic Monitoring Program, which would seek to harmonise data gathering and management, methodologies and indicator species as appropriate.

Agenda item 7: Future cooperation between AMAP and CAFF

Decisions:

- *AMAP and CAFF agreed that the two WGs should continue mutually beneficial cooperation in monitoring activities, both for ACIA and on a more general level.*
- *AMAP and CAFF agreed that the Secretariats would prepare a discussion paper aimed at identifying mutual interests of the programs and areas where stronger links and cooperation could be developed. This paper will be reviewed by AMAP and CAFF WGs before it is submitted to the SAOs.*

Agenda item 8: Any other business

Sune Sohlberg informed that the next full CAFF WG meeting, CAFF 9 is scheduled for last week in August in Abisko, Sweden.

Agenda item 9: End of the meeting

On behalf of AMAP, Hanne Petersen thanked Sune Sohlberg for hosting the meeting. She thanked all delegates for their participation and wished everyone a safe trip home.

Annex 1 – List of Participants

Name	Institute	Address	Tel/Fax	E-mail
Baldursson, Snorri	CAFF	Hafnarstræti 97 600 Akureyri Iceland	Tel: +354 462 3350 Fax: +354 462 3390	snorri@ni.is
Bryhn-Jacobsen, Linn	Norwegian Pollution Control Authority	P.O.Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	Tel: +47 22 57 36 85 Fax: +47 22 67 67 06	Linn.Bryhn-Jacobsen@sft.no
Calder, John	National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration Arctic Research Office	SSMCI, Mail Code R/ARC 1335 East-West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910	Tel: +1 301 713 2518 ext.288 Fax: +1 301 713 2519	john.calder@noaa.gov
Elling, Henrik	Arctic Environmental Secretariat	Danish Polarcentre Strandgade 100 H DK-1401 Copenhagen	Tel: +45 32 88 01 19 Fax: +45 32 96 07 03	He@dpc.dk
Johan Hammar	Institute of Freshwater Research	SE-178 93 Drottningholm, Sweden	Tel:+46 8 620 04 24 Fax: +46 8 759 03 38	johan.hammar@fiskeriverket.se
Huntington, Henry	Huntington Consulting	23834 The Clearing Dr. Eagle River, AK 99577	Tel: + 1 907 696 3564 Fax: + 1 907 696 3565	Hph@alaska.net
Jaakkola, Esko	Ministry of the Environment	P.O. Box 380 FIN-00131 Helsinki Finland	Tel: +358 9 1991 9371 Fax: +358 9 1991 9364	esko.jaakkola@vyh.fi
Jensson, Helgi	Environmental and Food Agency of Iceland	P.O. Box 8080 IS-128 Reykjavik	Tel: +354 585 10 23 Fax: +354 585 1020	helgij@hollver.is
Kalhok, Sarah	Indian and Northern Affairs Canada	Rm. 656 10 Wellington Street Hull, Quebec, K1A 0H4	Tel: +1 819 997 0663 Fax: +1 819 953 9066	kalhoks@inac.gc.ca
Kimstach, Vitaly	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat	P.O. Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	Tel: +47 23 24 16 34 Fax: +47 22 67 67 06	vitaly.kimstach@amap.no
Lein, Berit	Directorate for Nature Management	Tungasletta 2 N 7485 Trondheim Norway	Tel: + 47 73 58 05 00 Fax: + 47 73 58 05 01	berit.lein@dirnat.no

Loeng, Harald	Institute of Marine Research	P.O.Box 1870 Nordnes N-5817 Bergen	+47 55 23 84 66	harald.loeng@imr.no
Macdonald, Robie	Institute of Ocean Sciences Department of Fisheries and Oceans	P.O.Box 6000 Sidney V8L 4B2 British Columbia	Tel: +1 250 363 6409 Fax: +1250 363 6807	macdonaldrob@pac.dfo- mpo.gc.ca
Mähönen, Outi	Ministry of the Environment	Lapland Regional Environment Centre P.O. Box 8060 FIN-96101 Rovaniemi	Tel: +358 16 329 4444 Fax: +358 16 310 340	outi.mahonen@vyh.fi
Malmelin, Miliza	Ministry of Environment	P.O. Box 380 00131 Helsinki Finland	Tel: +358 9 1991 9740 Fax: +358 9 1991 9716	miliza.malmelin@vyh.fi
McCormick, Kevin	Environment Canada	5204 50th Avenue Suite 301 X1A 1E2 Yellowknife, NT Canada	Tel: + 1 867 669 4760 Fax: + 1 867 873 8185	kevin.mccormick@ec.gc.ca
Nielsen, Peter	Greenland Homerule, Department of Environment and Nature	P.O. Box 1614 DK 3900 Nuuk Greenland	Tel: + 299 34 67 15 Fax: + 299 32 52 86	PEN@gh.gl
Notter, Manuela	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	Blekholmstrassen 36 S-106 48 Stockholm	Tel: +46 8 698 10 61 Fax: +46 8 698 10 85	Manuela.notter@environ.se
Petersen, Aevar	Icelandic Institute of Natural History	P.O. Box 5320 125 Reykjavik Iceland	Tel: + 354 562 9822 Fax: + 354 562 0815	aevar@ni.is
Petersen, Hanne	Department of Arctic Environment National Environmental Research Institute	Frederiksborgvej 399 P.O. Box 358 DK-4000 Roskilde	Tel: +45 46 30 19 40 Fax: +45 46 30 19 14	hkp@dmu.dk

Prestrud, Pål	Norwegian Polar Institute	Polar Environmental Centre, N-9296 Tromsø, Norway	Tel.: + 47 77 75 05 00, Fax. + 47 77 75 05 01	pal.prestrud@npolar.no
Reiersen, Lars-Otto	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat	P.O. Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	Tel: +47 23 24 16 32 Fax: +47 22 67 67 06	lars-otto.reiersen@amap.no
Retter, Gunn-Britt	Indigenous Peoples Secretariat (IPS)	P.O. Box 2151, Pilestræde 52 DK-1016 Copenhagen K Denmark	Tel: +45 33 69 34 98 Fax: +45 33 69 34 99	ghs@ghs.dk
Ridom, Birte	Danish Environmental Protection Agency	Strandgade 29 DK-1401 Copenhagen K	Tel: +45 32 66 01 66 Fax: +45 32 66 04 11	BR@MST.DK
Vanamo, Sannamaaria	Arctic Council Secretariat Ministry for Foreign Affairs	P.O. Box 176, Laivastokatu 22 FIN-00161 Helsinki	Tel: +358 9 1341 5772 Fax: +358 9 1341 6120	Sannamaaria.vanamo@formin.fi
Sohlberg, Sune	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Natural	Resources Department Bleholmserassen 36 S-106 48 Stockholm Sweden	Tel : + 46 8 698 13 36 Fax: + 46 8 698 10 42	sune.sohlberg@environ.se
Solbakken, Jan-Idar	Saami Council	Saami College N-9520 Guovdageaidnu	Tel: +47 78 48 77 29 Fax: +47 78 48 77 02	jan- idar.solbakken@samishks.no
Steenhuisen, Frits	Arctic Centre University of Groningen	P.O.Box 716 NL-9700 AS Groningen	Tel: +31 503 63 60 56 Fax: +31 503 63 49 00	frits@let.rug.nl
Stone, David	Indian and Northern Affairs	Les Terrasses de la Chaudiere North Tower Ottawa KIA 0H4 Ontario	Tel: +1 819 997 0045 Fax: +1 819 953 9066	stoned@inac.gc.ca
Sulyandziga, Pavel	RAIPON	Prospect Vernadskogo 37 Jorpus 2, Kom. 527 117425 Moscow Russia	Tel: +7 095 930 7197 Fax: +7 095 930 4468	udege@glasnet.ru
Tsaturov, Yuri	Russian Federal Service for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Monitoring	Novovagankovsky Street 12 123242 Moscow	Tel: + 7 095 252 2429 Fax: + 7 095 255 24 00	tsaturov@mecom.ru

Utne, Inger	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat	P.O. Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	Tel: + 47 23 24 16 35 Fax: + 47 22 67 06	inger.utne@amap.no
Westerberg, Carina	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	Blekholmsterrassen 36 S-106 48 Stockholm	Tel: +46 8 698 16 13 Fax: +46 8 698 1585	Carina.westerberg@environ.se
Wilson, Simon	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat	P.O. Box 8100 Dep. N-0032 Oslo	Tel: +31 10 466 2989 Fax: +31 10 4662989	s.wilson@inter.nl.net
de Wit, Cynthia	Institute of Applied Environmental Research (ITM) Stockholm University	S-106 91 Stockholm	Tel: +46 8 674 7180 Fax: +46 8 674 76 36	cynthia.de.wit@itm.su.se
Wohl, Kent	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	1011 East Tudor Road 99053 Anchorage, Alaska USA	Tel: + 1 907 786 3503 Fax: + 1 907 786 3641	Kent_Wohl@mail.fws.gov
Åkesson, Christina	Embassy of the United States of America, Stockholm, Sweden	Dag Hammarskjölds Väg 31, SE-115 89 Stockholm Sweden	Tel: +46 8 783 53 00 Fax: +46 8 661 19 64	

Annex 2 – Agenda

AMAP/CAFF 2/1/1

Friday 31: The 2nd joint AMAP – CAFF WG meeting, draft annotated agenda.

0830 – 0930 Preparatory CAFF ACIA meeting on the train from Uppsala.
Preparatory AMAP ACIA meeting in Stockholm.

0940 - 1000

1. Opening of the joint AMAP/CAFF meeting and Adoption of the agenda.

AMAP/CAFF 2/1/1

1000 – 1230

2. The ACIA process.

Status report by the ACIA Chair.

The GEF ACIA application, status report by the Secretariats. AMAP/CAFF 2/2/1

3. Planning of the production of the ACIA-policy document.

Discussion on how AMAP and CAFF will produce the policy document setting out preliminary time frame.

AMAP/CAFF 2/3/1

1230 – 1330 Lunch

1330 – 1615

4. Cooperation in monitoring. Introduction by the Chairs.

Short discussion on the need for the cooperation and the benefit for both WGs and AC in having such cooperation.

5. Ongoing Arctic Monitoring Activities.

- a. The CAFF networks. Short status report from the lead of the network, ringed seal, arctic char, seabirds, reindeer/caribou, ITEX,
Short report from the lead of the network of the status of the programmes, description of the projects use of project directory.
- b. The AMAP contaminant and biological effect programmes, the list of species and the national implementation plans.
- c. The AMAP Project directory, demonstration of usefulness.
- d. Other ongoing activities, e.g. NAMMCO and ICES monitoring programmes.

6. Next steps.

- a. What data - biological and chemical, is available, identification of gaps?

Short analysis of the status

- b. The needs in the near future.

Funding, manpower, priority, etc

- c. Deliverables to the ministerial meeting in 2002 and 2004

Reflection over what this cooperation aims to deliver to the next ministerial meetings of the AC.

7. Future cooperation between AMAP-CAFF

8. Any other business

9. End of the meeting

1615 **Adjourn**

Annex 3 – List of documents

List of Documents Distributed Prior to or at the 2nd joint AMAP – CAFF WG meeting, 301 August, 2001, Stockholm.

Document No.	Document Title:
AMAP/CAFF 2/1/1	Draft Annotated Agenda
AMAP/CAFF 2/1/2	Minutes from the Joint Meeting between AMAP and CAFF regarding ACIA, September 4, 2000, Trondheim, Norway
AMAP/CAFF 2/1/3	Draft List of Documents
AMAP/CAFF 2/1/4	Draft List of Participants
AMAP/CAFF 2/2/1 CAFF BMII-01/11-1	Draft Application and Concept Paper for a Medium Sized GEF Project in Support of the ACIA in Russia
AMAP/CAFF 2/2/2 CAFF BMII-01/11-2	Feedback from GEF Secretariat and UNEP regarding GEF Application in Support of ACIA
AMAP/CAFF 2/2/3 CAFF BMII-01/7-1	ACIA Progress Report, July 2001 (Previous numbered AMAP/CAFF 2/2/1 by mistake)
AMAP/CAFF 2/3/1	AMAP/CAFF Works Plan for Developing the ACIA Policy Document – Draft
AMAP/CAFF 2/3/2	ACIA GEF Concept – Proposal from RAIPON.
AMAP/CAFF 2/5/1	Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Programme (CMBP). A discussion paper prepared by Aevan Petersen and Snorri Baldursson
AMAP/CAFF 2/5/2	North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission – NAMMCO

Annex 4 – List of Decisions and Actions

Regarding the ACIA-Russia GEF application:

- *AMAP and CAFF agreed that it is important that they work together on the ACIA-Russia GEF application.*
- *The AMAP Secretariat will work with CAFF to make biodiversity more visible in the ACIA-Russia GEF application and will contact UNEP to get a statement on the current status of the application.*
- *RAIPON's suggestions will be incorporated into the application.*
- *CAFF and RAIPON shall provide exact wording changes.*

Regarding the process for preparing the ACIA Policy Document:

- *AMAP and CAFF agreed to use a handout developed at the meeting (as a basis for a proposal to the SAOs for preparing the ACIA Policy Document. The AMAP and CAFF Secretariats were charged with scoping out the proposal for review by the WGs before submission to the AC Secretariat*

Regarding the AMAP Project Directory:

- *AMAP and CAFF agreed that the Secretariats should continue to work together to make the Project Directory a common resource.*

Regarding general cooperation in monitoring:

- *AMAP and CAFF agreed that the two WGs should continue mutually beneficial cooperation in monitoring activities, both for ACIA and on a more general level.*

Regarding further integration of AMAP and CAFF monitoring work:

- *AMAP and CAFF agreed that the Secretariats will prepare a discussion paper aimed at identifying mutual interests of the programs and areas where stronger links and cooperation could be developed. This paper will be reviewed by AMAP and CAFF WGs before it is submitted to the SAOs.*

Annex 5 – Proposal from RAIPON regarding ACIA

